Table 8. When did you experience failure of fungicides to control CLS?

Location	Respondents	No failure	July 31	August 15	August 31	September 15	September 30	After September 30
					-% of respondents-			
Fargo	32	25	9	13	31	9	9	3
Grafton	49	55	-	12	8	14	6	4
Wahpeton	44	2	18	55	18	5	2	-
Willmar	15	7	20	27	13	20	-	13
Total	140	26	10	27	17	11	5	4

Table 9. If you had failure with fungicides for CLS control, which fungicide did you apply prior to observing field failure?

Location	Respondents	Minerva, Eminent	Inspire XT	Proline	Headline	Priaxor	Gem	Tin	Topsin	EBDC	Mixtures
					-% of respondents-						
Fargo	21	-	10	10	38	10	-	19	-	-	14
Grafton	34	-	3	3	6	26	-	26	12	-	24
Wahpeton	40	8	-	3	78	8	-	-	3	-	3
Willmar	88	6	2	7	22	16	10	27	6	-	5
Total	183	4	3	5	33	15	5	20	5	-	9

Table 10. What soil-borne diseases affected your sugarbeet production in 2016?

Location	Respondents	Rhizoctonia	Aphanomyces	Both	Neither
			-% of respondents-		
Fargo	34	35	15	35	15
Grafton	49	27	14	57	2
Wahpeton	43	47	2	21	30
Total	126	36	10	40	15

Table 11. Did you use a *Rhizoctonia solani* resistant variety in 2016?

Location	Respondents	Yes	No
		-% respondents-	
Fargo	35	97	3
Grafton	47	94	6
Wahpeton	40	90	10
Willmar	98	80	20
Total	220	87	13

Table 12. What methods were used to control *Rhizoctonia solani* in 2016?

Location	Respondents	Seed treatment only	In-Furrow only	Postemergence only	Seed treatment + In-Furrow	Seed treatment + Postemergence	All three treatments used
				-% of respondents-			
Fargo	34	47	-	-	-	53	-
Grafton	48	42	-	-	4	54	-
Wahpeton	42	86	-	-	2	10	2
Willmar	99	52	-	4	6	30	8
Total	223	55	-	2	4	35	4

Table 13. Which seed treatment did you use to control *Rhizoctonia solani* in 2016?

Location	Respondents	Kabina	Rizolex + Metlock + Kabina	Other	None
			Seed treatment		
		---------------------------% of respondents---------------------------			
Fargo	35	86	14	-	-
Grafton	49	82	10	4	4
Wahpeton	39	87	10	3	-
Willmar	101	85	10	4	1
Total	224	85	11	3	1

Table 14. Which fungicide did you apply in-furrow to control *R. solani* in 2016?

Location	Respondents	Headline	Quadris	Other	None
			In-furrow fungicide use		
		---------------------------% of respondents---------------------------			
Fargo	32	6	9	-	84
Grafton	49	2	8	-	90
Wahpeton	41	-	10	-	90
Willmar	104	6	7	3	85
Total	226	4	8	1	87

Table 15. Which POST fungicide did you use to control *R. solani* in 2016?

Location	Respondents	Headline	Quadris	Proline	Priaxor	Other	None
				POST fungicide			
		---------------------------% of respondents---------------------------					
Fargo	34	-	59	-	3	-	38
Grafton	51	4	63	2	14	-	18
Wahpeton	40	-	10	-	-	5	85
Willmar	102	1	44	5	3	2	45
Total	227	1	44	3	5	2	45

Table 16. How effective were your POST fungicides at controlling *Rhizoctonia solani* in 2016?

Location	Respondents	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Unsure
			Effectiveness of fungicides			
		---------------------------% of respondents---------------------------				
Fargo	30	3	47	13	-	37
Grafton	46	2	41	35	7	15
Wahpeton	33	-	9	3	3	85
Willmar	89	6	30	16	8	40
Total	198	4	32	17	6	41

Table 17. Did you use an Aphanomyces resistant variety in 2016?

Location	Respondents	Yes	No
		Variety type	
		--------------------% respondents--------------------	
Fargo	25	96	4
Grafton	47	87	13
Wahpeton	38	84	16
Total	110	88	12

Table 18. What rate of precipitated calcium carbonate (waste lime) did you use?

Location	Respondents	Lime use rate			
		None	>5 T/A	6-10 T/A	10+ T/A
		------------------------------% of respondents--------------------------			
Fargo	33	61	3	27	9
Grafton	52	77	-	21	2
Wahpeton	41	39	15	44	2
Willmar	101	51	46	4	-
Total	227	56	23	19	2

Table 19. What is your soil pH?

Location	Respondents	Soil pH					
		6.0-6.5	6.5-7.0	7.0-7.5	7.5-8.0	8.0-8.5	8.5-9.0
		------------------------------% of respondents--------------------------					
Fargo	32	-	6	13	31	50	-
Grafton	45	9	7	29	27	27	2
Total	77	5	6	22	29	36	1

Table 20. Are you concerned about using waste lime on pH soils above 8.0?

Location	Respondents	Safety concerns	
		Yes	No
		--------------------% respondents---------------------	
Fargo	32	28	72
Grafton	48	25	75
Total	80	26	74

Table 21. How effective was waste lime at controlling Aphanomyces?

Location	Respondents	Waste lime effectiveness					
		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Unsure	No Lime
		------------------------------% of respondents--------------------------					
Fargo	36	8	19	-	-	22	50
Grafton	49	6	10	8	-	6	69
Wahpeton	42	26	19	5	-	17	33
Willmar	100	3	24	5	3	16	49
Total	227	9	19	5	1	15	50