Evaluation of Herbicides for Controlling Alligator Weed (*Alternanthera philoxeroides*) and Restoring Native Plants at Eufaula National Wildlife Refuge



Shannon L. Allen School of Forestry and Wildlife Sciences Auburn University





- Reduces gaseous
   exchange
- Reduces waterway
   drainage
- Displaces native plants



### EUFAULA NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

- Northern portion of Walter F. George impoundment of the Chattahoochee River
- 2,300 hectares of open water and managed wetlands



 Refuge objectives include providing food and habitat for waterfowl and other birds, including endangered species such as wood storks (*Mycteria americana*) and threatened species such as bald eagles (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*)

# MOIST-SOIL MANAGEMENT

- Maintenance of moistsoil conditions during growing season to:
  - Promote growth of desirable vegetation
  - Control undesirable vegetation
  - Provide food and habitat



CALCOLOGICAL STREET

# MOIST-SOIL MANAGEMENT

- Gradual removal of water from wetland in spring to moist soil conditions
- Flooding of wetland in fall to a depth less than 6 inches



# NATIVE WETLAND PLANTS



# EUFAULA NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

- ENWR has attempted control strategies such as burning, discing, water-level
- management mowing, biological control and numerous herbicides
- ALLIGATOR WEED the managed wetlands



#### CHEMICAL CONTROL

- Renovate<sup>®</sup>
  - Triclopyr amine
  - SePro Corporation
  - Approved November 2002
  - Selective for
  - Little
  - bioaccumulation in environment
- Habitat<sup>®</sup>
  - Imazapyr
  - ♦ BASF Approved
  - December 2003
  - Broad spectrum (favors legumes)
  - Leaks from roots/ persistent in soil

# **OBJECTIVES**

- Objective 1
  - Determine the rate and timing of RENOVATE and HABITAT application that is most effective at controlling alligator weed
- Objective 2
  - Determine the rate and timing of RENOVATE and HABITAT application that is most effective at restoring native wetland plants

### PREDICTIONS

- Best control of alligator weed will occur at the highest application rates and at the latest application dates.
- Best restoration of native plants will occur at the lowest application rates and the earliest application dates.

# **METHODS**

Randomized block design

- Kennedy Unit (n = 2)
  Bradley Unit (n = 2)
  18 plots/block
- $(5m \times 5m)$

### Treatments

- 3 application rates/ herbicide
- 2 application dates
- April and July 2004



# HERBICIDE RATES

- Renovate (935L<sup>-ha</sup> or 2.4L<sup>-plot</sup> of water)

  - Medium =  $9.6L^{-h\alpha}$  or  $24ml^{-plot}$  High =  $14.4L^{-h\alpha}$  or  $36ml^{-plot}$
- Habitat (467L<sup>-ha</sup> or 1.2L<sup>-plot</sup> of water)

  - Medium = 2.4L<sup>-ha</sup> or 6ml<sup>-plot</sup>
    High = 3.5L<sup>-ha</sup> or 9ml<sup>-plot</sup>

Rates within range recommended by manufacturer.

## TREATMENT APPLICATION

- Herbicides applied with a 2L,  $CO_2$ pressurized backpack sprayer
- 5-nozzle boom



## PLANT SAMPLING

- Quadrat sampling  $(0.5m^2)(n=2)$
- Pretreatment (before each application date)
- Post treatment: 7, 14, 21 days, and 1, 2, 3 months



# PLANT SAMPLING

#### Parameters measured:

- Alligator weed density (#stems/quadrat)
- Alligator weed height (cm)
- Percent cover of all species
- Soil moisture/water depth (tensiometer/cm)



# PLANT SAMPLING

### October 2004

- Alligator weed and native plant biomass collected in subplots  $(0.25m^2)$  (n = 2) and sorted by species
- Plants dried to constant mass and weighed

# STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

- Differences in plant biomass between herbicides, rates, and application dates were tested using PROC GLM in SAS
- cover was not correlated with biomass







Variable	F Value	DF	P Value
Herbicide	8.61	1,33	<0.05
Rate	0.27	2,33	N.S.
Application Date	34.90	1,33	<0.001
-lerbicide x Rate	0,24	2,33	N.5.
Herbicide x Application Date	0.14	1,33	N.S.
Rate × Application Date	1.23	2,33	N.S.
lerbicide x Rate x Application Date	0,88	2,33	N.S.





ALLIGATOR WEED BIOMASS					
Variable	F Value	DF	P Value		
Herbicide	4.02	1,33	0.05		
Rate	4.29	2,33	<0,05		
Application Date	26,45	1,33	<0,001		
Herbicide x Rate	0.03	2,33	N.5.		
Herbicide x Application Date	4,07	1,33	×0,05		
Rate x Application Date	2.37	2,33	N.5.		
Herbicide x Rate x Application Date	0.46	2,33	N.5.		





NATIVE PLANT BIOMASS					
Variable	F Value	DF	P Value		
Herbicide	2,83	1,33	0, <u>1</u>		
Rate	1.28	2,33	N.5.		
Application Date	7.70	1,33	<0.05		
Herbicide x Rate	0.16	2,33	N.5.		
Herbicide x Application Date	0.57	1,33	N.5.		
Rate × Application Date	3,64	2,33	∢0,05		
Herbicide x Rate x Application Date	0,31	2,33	N.5.		







# SUMMARY OF RESULTS

- Control of alligator weed:
  - High rate results in better control than medium or low rate
  - July results in better control than April

#### Native plant restoration:

- Renovate results in greater restoration than Habitat
- April results in greater restoration than July

### CONCLUSIONS

- Objectives of wetland managers will influence application of specific herbicide, rate, and timing
  - Seasonal alligator weed control
  - Seasonal native plant restoration



# FUTURE WORK ....

 Long-term monitoring of treatment plots will enable us to determine appropriate use of herbicides to control alligator weed and restore native wetland plants to managed wetlands at ENWR



OD DUCK (Aix sponsa)

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

Committee members: Dr. Gary R. Hepp, Dr. Bob S. Boyd, Dr. James H. Miller, and Dr. Ralph E. Mirarchi

Field Technicians: Erwin Chambliss and Betty Tee Smith

Refuge Staff (especially Frank Dukes and Milton Hubbard)

Funding: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, BASF, and SePro



