

The History and Future of Methyl Bromide Alternatives Used in the Production of Forest Seedlings in the Southern United States

Scott A Enebak

Scott A Enebak is Professor of Forest Pathology and Director of the Southern Forest Nursery Management Cooperative, School of Forestry and Wildlife Sciences, Auburn University, AL 36849; email: enebasa@auburn.edu

Enebak SA. 2013. The history and future of Methyl Bromide alternatives used in the production of forest seedlings in the southern United States. In: Haase DL, Pinto JR, Wilkinson KM, technical coordinators. National Proceedings: Forest and Conservation Nursery Associations—2012. Fort Collins (CO): USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. Proceedings RMRS-P-69. 20-25. Available at: http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs/rmrs_p069.html

Abstract: This paper gives a brief history of the Southern Forest Nursery Management Cooperative's (SFNMC) efforts in testing methyl bromide (MBr) alternatives for soil fumigation. In the southeastern United States, fumigation with MBr has been the most commonly used method for producing high quality, pest-free forest-tree seedlings in an environment that is conducive for soil-borne pathogens, nematodes, and weeds. As a result of the Montreal Protocol, the production and use of MBr was to be incrementally phased out beginning in 2005. Included in this process are exemptions allowing for continued use and testing of fumigants with the goal of finding an alternative that is economically feasible and efficacious. Testing by the SFNMC has shown that, although there are alternatives to MBr, they are not as efficacious. Any choice of currently available alternatives will most likely require an increase in pesticide use to compensate for alternative short-falls. The effects of all alternatives following 4-5 crop rotations without methyl bromide are unknown. Currently, recommended alternatives vary in their effectiveness from one nursery to another. The most significant development in soil fumigant research in the last 5 years has been the availability of high barrier plastics that will allow lower fumigant rates to be used. The most efficacious alternative for forest seedling nurseries in the southern United States is one that contains a significant percentage of chloropicrin as its active ingredient.

Keywords: soil fumigation, chloropicrin, loblolly pine, high barrier plastics, broadcast fumigation

Introduction

Soil fumigation with methyl bromide (MBr) has been the standard method for producing high quality, pest-free forest-tree seedlings in the southeastern United States (Jang and others 1993, South and Enebak 2005). Methyl bromide has shown broad efficacy in the control of soil insects, nematodes, soil-borne pathogenic fungi, and problematic weeds such as nutsedge (*Cyperus* spp.) In the southern United States, *Fusarium*, *Pythium* and *Rhizoctonia* are three fungal genera that are of primary concern in the production of pine seedlings as they are associated with seedling root and foliage diseases. Over the years, methyl bromide has been effective in controlling all three of these soil-borne pathogens in a wide variety of soil types (South and others 1997).

Since soil fumigant alternatives vary in efficacy between nurseries, a description of forest seedling bareroot culture in the South may be beneficial. Loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda* L.) is the primary tree species produced in southern forest-tree nurseries. Seeds are sown in mid-April and lifting begins in December of that same year. The range of soil pH is from 5.0 to 6.0 and soil organic matter from 0.8% to 1.9%. Most nursery soils are in the sandy-loam or loamy-sand classification. Generally, forest-tree nurseries operate on a 3-yr cropping system with 2 seedling production years per soil fumigation. Fumigation can occur in either October or March. October fumigation provides a greater biological and operational window to obtain proper soil moisture and temperatures. The average nursery fumigates about 20 acres (8 ha) per year using a certified fumigation contractor. All fumigations are broadcast/flat fume using 13ft (4 m) rolls of plastic glued together (Gao and others 2011; Carey 1995).

Due to the concern over ozone depletion in the stratosphere, the Montreal Protocol under the Clean Air Act began a phase-out program for MBr use in 1991. The Southern Forest Nursery Management Cooperative (SFNMC) actually began looking for an alternative to MBr

before the official phase-out program began and this paper will outline the sequence of products tested and their results. While finding an alternative for MBr has been a priority within the forest nursery industry, it has been difficult to find a soil fumigant that is as broad-spectrum as MBr.

Alternatives for MBr can be classified into two groups: non-conventional and conventional/chemical. Non-conventional alternatives include: 1) solarization, which is the use of solar energy to control soil pathogens; 2) biofumigation which uses gases from the biodegradation of organic matter; 3) hot water to heat up the soil to temperatures that kill weeds, nematodes, and other organisms; and 4) other miscellaneous alternatives such as chicken litter, yard waste, crab processing residues, and cricket litter and management of soil microorganisms (Enebak and others 1998; Vonderwell and Enebak 2000). These non-conventional alternatives can be effective under limited conditions such as small plots, row crops and container systems. However, they do not have consistent efficacy in large acreages such as bare-root production nurseries where soil types can change across a nursery section (Carey 1998).

The second group would be considered conventional alternatives which include chemicals, both individual compounds and combinations. This later group of alternatives has been the focus of the SFNMC research program since they are more easily adapted to large acreages (Carey 1994). The nursery industry realizes the importance of testing new fumigants, rates and application techniques and consequently, since 1972, the SFNMC and its cooperators have invested over \$2.8 million in alternative research in 57 research studies in cooperation with many member nurseries (Enebak and others 2011a, 2011b). The largest number of studies has been undertaken in Georgia forest-tree nurseries. The following discussion of alternative research has been organized by decades beginning with the 1970's.

1970 – 1979: Decade of Methyl Bromide Acceptance

In 1975, a survey of 55 southern nurseries determined that 39 nurseries were using methyl bromide, and 28 of those nurseries were fumigating on a yearly basis. During this decade, ten studies were conducted in cooperation with the Weed Control Cooperative at Auburn University comparing herbicides with methyl bromide (South 1976; South and Gjerstad 1980).

Methyl bromide (98:2) (98% methyl bromide plus 2% chloropicrin) was being used up to 450 lbs/a (504 kg/ha) by most nurseries. At one nursery in Georgia, 1,3-dichloropropene (1,3 D) was tested. During this decade, research studies compared the economics of fumigation versus hand-weeding or herbicides for controlling weeds (South and Carey 2000). Several interesting conclusions came from these studies (South 1975).

1. Due to the low hourly labor cost, fumigation was not justified for weed control, unless nutsedge was a problem.
2. Control of nutsedge with MBr 98:2 at 444 lbs/a (497 kg/ha) in the fall was recommended.
3. Supplementing soils with endomycorrhizal fungi was justified if using MBr.
4. Alternatives to MBr were needed that would not reduce endomycorrhizae levels.
5. 1,3-D did not significantly reduce endomycorrhize levels.

1980 – 1989: Decade of Herbicides

During the 1970's the use of MBr became widespread and its broad efficacy was recognized and accepted in the production of forest-tree seedlings. In fact, during the decade following 1980, the SFNMC did not conduct a single soil fumigation study. Instead, research efforts focused on obtaining new herbicide registrations for use in nurseries over conifer seedlings. These herbicides included, Goal® (July 1979), Modown®, Poast®, Fusilade®, Roundup®, and Cobra®, most of which are still being used in 2011 (Carey and South 1998). Nursery research also focused on increasing seed efficiency and seedling quality (South 1980).

1990 – 1999: Decade of Losers & Winners

In the Spring 1992 issue of the SFNMC's Newsletter, nurseries were notified for the first time that there was a chance of losing MBr due to Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations mandating a MBr phase-out under the Clean Air Act. At that time it was estimated that MBr would be phased out by the year 2000. Early on, chloropicrin was recognized as a possible MBr alternative but required additional research. While the compound had been shown to be efficacious on soil-borne fungi, insects and nematodes, the compound was not as effective on weeds, especially nutsedge.

In 1993 and 1994, small plot alternative research trials were established to compare dazomet, chloropicrin, metham sodium with and without chloropicrin, and 1,3-D in addition to soil bio-amendments. In some studies, high density plastic tarps (HDPE) were used and in other cases no tarp was used. As a result of these studies, applications of less than 250 lbs/a (280 kg/ha) chloropicrin or less than 280 lbs/a (314 kg/ha) dazomet were not recommended. Metham sodium produced seedlings similar in quality to those grown in MBr treated soil. There was no significant difference in the results whether HDPE tarps were used or not. Dazomet reduced the beneficial soil fungus, *Trichoderma*, in one trial by 91% whereas, chloropicrin more than doubled *Trichoderma* in other trials. These studies were the first to indicate that dazomet resulted in variable seedling quality and fungal control and was therefore not a strong alternative (Carey 1996). Nurseries were strongly encouraged to plan alternative soil fumigant trials and evaluations in their own nurseries before the final phase-out of MBr.

Also in 1994, a fumigation trial using hot water was established in Camden, AL. Hot water at 110°F (43°C) was shank-injected and mechanically mixed in the soil up to 6 in (15 cm) (Figure 1). This process used the equivalent of 37,000 gal (140,060 l) of water per



Figure 1. Hot water treatment of soil showing water tank and boiler system transferring hot water via hose to tractor / rotavator alongside.

acre traveling at 0.5 mph (0.8 km/hr) and produced inconsistent soil temperatures. The amount of diesel fuel required to heat this water was not reported. Because of the inconsistent results and unknown costs associated with this system, the SFNMC concluded that this was not a viable alternative for large scale alternative to MBr.

By spring 1996, only 30% of nurseries in the South fumigated their soils following every crop and 66% fumigated every two or more seedling crops (South and Enebak 2005). Alternatives that appeared to be effective were: chloropicrin, chloropicrin plus 1,3-D, and metham sodium plus chloropicrin both tarped and untarped. There was still concern about weed control using these alternatives. Therefore, the SFNMC began evaluating EPTC (Eptam®) for nutsedge control at 6 lbs ai/a (6.72 kg ai/ha) rotovated through 6 in (15 cm) of soil (Carey 1996, 1998). Initial results showed good weed activity, however, by the end of the decade the use of EPTC diminished due to the stunting of seedlings (carry over) and the necessity to rotovate this product into the soil (Cram and others 2007). Soil fumigation applicators did not have the equipment to both rotovate EPTC and simultaneously inject soil fumigants using 13 ft (4 m) broadcast tarp applications.

Between 1997 and 1999, the SFNMC was optimistic with research using chloropicrin in combination with metham sodium and believed that this combination could be used without a tarp. By not using a plastic tarp, the additional problem of disposing of the tarp following fumigation was avoided. However, the optimism was short-lived. In the fall of 1999, a nursery in Texas fumigated more than 10 acres (4 ha) with metham sodium plus chloropicrin without a tarp. Following a temperature inversion that night, the fumigant did not dissipate in the atmosphere but rather settled onto areas of adjacent seedlings ready to be lifted. More than 20,000,000 seedlings were killed that evening. As a result, all non-tarped soil fumigation applications in forest-tree nurseries (experimental and operational) were halted.

2000 – 2010: The Decade of Chloropicrin

During the early years of this decade, the dazomet manufacturers changed their protocol in an attempt to identify a treatment that would provide consistent results in southern US nurseries. Further tests continued with metham sodium plus chloropicrin and metham potassium plus chloropicrin (Carey 2000a, b). Studies also examined shank injected and tarped applications of: methyl iodide plus chloropicrin, methyl iodide and Telone C-35® (65% 1,3-D plus 35% chloropicrin).

The results of these studies showed metham sodium, 1,3-D and dazomet were marginally better than methyl iodide and metham potassium. The high cost of methyl iodide (nearly 5 times that of MBr and chloropicrin mixtures) was a concern to nursery managers. Telone C-35® provided good nematode control and enhanced weed control. Although metham sodium plus chloropicrin showed promising results, both metham sodium and metham potassium was dropped from further testing due to application difficulties. Broadcast/flat tarp fumigation equipment technology would not allow a 1-pass rotovation plus shank injected fumigant followed by the standard 13 ft (4 m) tarp application. Thus, until market forces bring about new application technologies, all broadcast alternatives that require some sort of rotovation will not be part of the MBr alternatives used in southern forest nurseries.

In 2003, the first small test-plots using high barrier plastic tarp (VIF – virtually impermeable film) were established. Due to the inability to glue consecutive strips of VIF using conventional HDPE plastic glue, both ends of the tarp were buried in the ground. A new chloropicrin formulation was also evaluated, PIC+®, which was 85% chloropicrin plus 15% solvent. This formulation of chloropicrin with a solvent

performed akin to a slow release fertilizer, keeping the chloropicrin in the soil for a longer period of time. The presence of a tarp improved the efficacy of nutsedge control using PIC+®. There was no difference in weed control between PIC+® and chloropicrin. Also, chloropicrin and PIC+® enhanced *Trichoderma* in the soil. These studies suggested that application rates of MBr and chloropicrin could be reduced by as much 50% when using high barrier plastics (Carey and others 2005).

In 2004, dimethyl disulfide (DMDS) was first tested in small plots. Seedling quality and the amount of *Trichoderma* in soils treated with this new compound were equal to MBr. However, DMDS had an unpleasant smell, described as similar to propane, which remained in the soil for most of the growing season (Carey and Godbehere 2004).

In 2005, two fumigation studies were established that would evaluate fumigant efficacy over two growing seasons. The first trial in Georgia compared both methyl iodide and MBr under both VIF and HDPE plastic with dazomet using another new protocol and a water seal (Carey and others 2005). The results of the two year study showed methyl iodide had more weeds than other fumigants tested. The seedling quality with methyl iodide was similar to MBr. Seedling quality using VIF were similar to those using HDPE at twice the fumigant rate. However, seedling quality and growth were compromised using dazomet. At the end of the first growing season, seedlings that received dazomet never grew tall enough to be top clipped. At the end of the second growing season, only seedlings in the edge drills of the beds were top clipped. In addition, *Trichoderma*



Figure 2. Nursery section showing stunted corn three growing seasons after being treated with dazomet in the foreground. Methyl bromide treated soil is in the background.

counts for the dazomet plots were the lowest compared to other treatments (Carey and others 2005). During the third year, a cover crop of corn was sown in the test area, and corn sown in the dazomet plots had poor germination (Figure 2).

A second 2-year fumigation study was established in Texas testing Chlor 60® (60% chloropicrin plus 40% 1,3-D), PIC+®, 100% chloropicrin, and dazomet. At the end of both the first and second growing seasons, the PIC+® plots were visibly taller than any other soil fumigation treatment (Starkey and Enebak 2008). Other seedling quality data confirmed that PIC+® was the best alternative in this study. Dazomet again produced the lowest quality seedlings in both growing seasons. Following the results of these 2 studies, the decision was made to stop further testing of dazomet as an alternative to MBr.

Beginning in 2007, the MBr alternative research program of the SFNMC began focusing on replicated large plot studies (greater




Figure 3. Summary of MBr alternative research conducted by the SFNMC; over 57 studies and \$2,800,000 dollars since 1972.

than 4 acres [1.6 ha]), testing of similar alternatives (when possible), in different nurseries (Table 1) and the collecting of similar data (Table 2) over 2-3 year growing cycles (Figure 3).

This new research approach was taken with the assistance of a 5-year grant from a USDA-ARS - South Atlantic Area-wide Pest Management Program for Methyl Bromide Alternatives (Anonymous 2011). This grant allowed the SFNMC Nursery Cooperative to have large-scale studies (10 acre [4 ha]) replicated studies across nurseries in the South. The data collected through this project has been used by EPA in their evaluation of the criteria needed for the soil fumigant Re-registration Eligibility Decisions (REDs) (EPA 2012).

During the first year of this project a new soil fumigant was tested. New PIC+ was a re-formulation of Pic +[®] but containing a different solvent. This fumigant produced similar seedling characteristics, control of nematodes and soil-borne pathogens, and *Trichoderma* to that of Pic+[®] but resulted in a significant annual sedge (*Cyperus compressus*) problem. Because of the weed pressure when this compound was used, it was subsequently dropped from the program after one year.

Latest Findings on Methyl Bromide Alternatives

One of the limiting factors in broadcast soil fumigations has been the inability to glue two pieces of impermeable film together along

Table 2. Seedling quality parameters measured and frequency.

Seedling Parameter	Frequency
RCD	at lifting
Height	at lifting
Seedling density	2 times/season
Soil assay for Nematodes	2 times/season
Soil assay for Trichoderma	2 times/season
Seedling biomass	at lifting
Root architecture: Root length Root diameter Root volume Root tips	at lifting

the seams to form an air-tight barrier. Since the start of the USDA Area-wide project in 2007, the largest private fumigation contractor in the southern United States developed new technologies for gluing the high barrier plastic films used in broadcast fumigation. This glue technology will allow forest nurseries to use high barrier plastics and thus significantly reduce the amount of soil fumigants used. The use of the high barrier plastics will also increase soil fumigation efficacy by allowing the soil fumigant to remain in the soil at a higher concentration and possibly over a longer period of time. By reducing application rates, the buffer zones associated with the new EPA soil fumigant labels will also be reduced, allowing greater access to nursery operations.

Research by the SFNMC to date has shown that there are 3 competitive alternatives available for nursery use. These are: Pic+[®], 100% chloropicrin, and DMDS plus chloropicrin (Enebak and others 2011a, b). These choices were made based upon overall seed efficiency, seedling quality at the end of the growing season, root biomass and morphology, *Trichoderma* levels after fumigation, with no excessive nematode or weed problems. There are several other points to consider when using these MBr alternatives. They all need to be used with high barrier plastics, either TIF or VIF. Chloropicrin needs to be applied at minimum rate of 250 lbs/a (280 kg/ha). While a decent alternative, the strong, lingering odor of DMDS may limit its use and acceptance by nursery managers. Chlor 60[®] was an effective alternative in most nurseries with respect to seedling quality and would be recommended

Table 1. Fumigant tested, rates, plastic tarps and number of research studies conducted since 2005 by the SFNMC.

Fumigant	Rate	Components	Plastic1	# of studies
Chloropicrin	300, 250, 200, 150, 100 lbs/a (336, 280, 168, 112 kg/ha)	100% chloropicrin	HDPE, LDPE, VIF, TIF	7
Pic+ [®]	300 lbs/a (336 kg/ha)	85% chloropicrin plus 15% Solvent A	HDPE, LDPE, VIF, TIF	7
New Pic+	300 lbs/a (336 kg/ha)	85% chloropicrin plus 15% Solvent B	HDPE	2
DMDS + Chlor	74, 70 gal/a (690, 653 l/ha)	79% DMDS plus 21% chloropicrin	HDPE	5
Chlor 60 [®]	300, 250, 200, 150, 100 lbs/a (336, 280, 168, 112 kg/ha)	60% chloropicrin plus 40% 1,3-D	HDPE, LDPE, VIF, TIF	7
Midas [®] 50/50	160 lbs/acre (179 kg/ha)	50% methyl iodide plus 50% chloropicrin	VIF	1
Midas [®] 98/2	100 lbs/acre (112 kg/ha)	98% methyl iodide plus 2% chloropicrin	VIF	1

¹LDPE – low density polyethylene; HDPE – high density polyethylene; VIF – virtually impermeable; TIF – totally impermeable.

to nurseries with a nematode problem. Weeds may become an issue with Chlor 60® if managers do not aggressively control them.

We have not had sufficient experience to adequately evaluate Midas® (methyl iodide). Arista Life Science, the manufacturer of Midas®, has not fully cooperated with our efforts to further evaluate methyl iodide in southern forest-tree nurseries (Enebak and others 2013). The manufacturer has not been willing to extend research studies much beyond Florida. The cost for a nursery to put in a study with methyl iodide is \$5,000/a (\$12,350/ha), a minimum of 20 acres (8 ha), and the nursery is responsible to remove all tarps. In June 2011, EPA opened up a new comment period to examine some concerns of methyl iodide and its US label. Less than a year later, in May 2012, Arista LifeSciences pulled the label on Midas® in the US. The decision came down to whether Arista could afford to keep financially supporting the registration. It typically costs \$50 million to register a new active ingredient and Midas® was well north of that. Not only were there very few applications of the product, as growers were waiting to see how the situation shook out, but there the pressure from environmental groups to re-evaluate the safety of the compound. Thus, the “drop-in” replacement for MBr touted by EPA, USDA and APHIS was now gone from the US market and growers we are back to square one.

Summary

After more than 35 years of MBr alternative research, we have reached the following conclusions.

1. There are soil fumigant alternatives to methyl bromide.
2. We have yet to find an alternative as efficacious as methyl bromide.
3. Any choice of current alternatives will most likely require an increased use of pesticides (especially herbicides) to compensate for alternative short falls.
4. We do not know the long-term benefits of the alternatives. That is, what will happen in 4 or 5 fumigation cycles without methyl bromide? In row-crops there is evidence of soil-borne pathogens such as charcoal root rot appearing.
5. Methyl bromide is highly efficacious under many soil types and environmental conditions; however, alternatives do not have the same physical and chemical properties as MBr. Nurseries must pay close attention to factors such as soil moisture and temperature when using alternatives.
6. An effective alternative in one nursery may not be as effective in another nursery. All nurseries should be testing alternatives at varying rates whenever possible.
7. The most significant development in alternative research in the last 5 years has been the availability of high barrier plastics (TIF and VIF) and the technology to glue this plastic for broadcast fumigation applications.
8. When transitioning from low barrier plastic such as HDPE to high barrier plastics such as TIF and VIF, fumigation rates can be reduced by half. This recommendation should be used with caution since fumigant efficacy varies between nurseries.
9. In our studies, a soil fumigant becomes more efficacious when chloropicrin is part of the formulation at rates above 20%. Three examples are below, however, methyl iodide (Midas®) is no longer available in US markets.
 - a. DMDS versus DMDS plus chloropicrin (Paladin®)
 - b. Methyl iodide versus Methyl iodide plus chloropicrin (Midas®)
 - c. Telone® versus Telone® plus chloropicrin (Chlor 60®)

Future Research with MBr Alternatives

With EPA buffer zone restrictions coming in place in the spring of 2013, low barrier plastics (HDPE and LDPE) will become used less frequently. Since high barrier plastics (VIF and TIF) cost significantly more than low barrier plastics, fumigation costs can be reduced by decreasing the amount of soil fumigant used. In the future, we can expect new plastic technology for controlling emission rates. Although effective, high barrier plastics like TIF have been criticized for not allowing any gas to permeate through the barrier thus potentially creating a problem with outgassing and bystander exposure when the tarps are cut for removal after 10-14 days. New, untested soil fumigants will be harder to register in the future than compounds already labeled and in the market. For example, the SFNMC was evaluating sulfuryl fluoride as a soil fumigant until EPA expressed concern over the release of fluoride into the environment. Opportunities exist for new application technologies to be developed in broadcast fumigation that would allow a combination rotovator/injector/flat tarp applicator or a combination potassium thiosulfate applicator/injector/flat tarp applicator. There is also a need to explore changes in fumigant chemistry that will allow injections of several fumigants in single pass using existing application techniques similar to what nurseries now do by tank mixing pesticides to make them more efficacious. Nurseries also need to look at current management practices that can be altered to reduce the impact of buffer zones (reduce emissions). For example, increasing soil organic matter will make seedling management easier, and will also provide additional buffer zone credits for fumigation (EPA 2012).

In the last few years, the ability to use soil fumigation in forest-tree nurseries has dramatically changed. With respect to fumigant options, the future does not look optimistic for increasing the use of soil fumigants. The choices for viable alternatives will most likely be limited and decrease as each soil fumigant is reexamined again for registration that is scheduled to begin after 2013 (EPA 2012). The forest nursery community must keep aware of regulatory changes that may impact future soil fumigation, for example, there was discussion concerning the possible elimination of chloropicrin as a soil fumigant. This idea was dropped for now. If it ever becomes an issue, a unified response from the nursery community to advocate for the continued use of this fumigant may be warranted, since chloropicrin is part of every efficacious alternative the forest nursery industry currently has available today.

Acknowledgements

The author and staff of the SFNMC would like to acknowledge the support of TriEst Ag Group (formerly Hendrix & Dail), Tifton, Georgia, the USDA – ARS for a 5 year grant “Area-wide Pest Management Project for Methyl Bromide Alternatives – South Atlantic Region” and the pioneering MBr research efforts of Dr. Bill Carey (deceased) who was killed by a drunk driver on his way back to Auburn from a MBr Alternatives Meeting in Georgia.

References

- Anonymous. 2011. Methyl Bromide Alternative Outreach Conference. 1994 – 2010. Site for all alternative MBr research in agriculture. <http://mbao.org/> (accessed 12 Sept 2011).
- EPA 2012. Implementation of Risk Mitigation Measures for Soil Fumigant Pesticides. http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/reregistration/soil_fumigants/
- Carey WA. 1994. Chemical alternatives to methyl bromide. In: Landis TD, Dumroese RK, technical coordinators. National proceedings,

- Forest and Conservation Nursery Associations. Fort Collins, (CO): USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station General Technical Report RM-GTR-257. p 4-11.
- Carey WA. 1995. Benefits of fumigation in southern forest nurseries. In: Proceedings Annual International Research Conference on Methyl Bromide Alternatives and Emission Reductions. San Diego, (CA). November 6- 9, 1995. p 74-1 – 74-3.
- Carey WA. 1996. Testing alternatives to methyl bromide fumigation in southern forest tree nurseries. In: Landis TD, South DB, technical coordinators. National proceedings, Forest and Conservation Nursery Association. Portland (OR): USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station General Technical Report PNW-GTR-389. p 28.
- Carey WA. 1998. Alternatives to methyl bromide in forest tree nurseries. In: Landis TD, Barnett JP, technical coordinators. National proceedings, Forest and Conservation Nursery Association. Asheville (NC) USDA Forest Service, Southern Research Station General Technical Report SRS-25. p 69-71.
- Carey WA, South DB. 1998. Effect of chloropicrin, vapam, and herbicides for the control of purple nutsedge in southern pine seedbeds. In: Landis TD, Barnett JP, technical coordinators. National proceedings, Forest and Conservation Nursery Association. Asheville (NC) USDA Forest Service, Southern Research Station General Technical Report SRS-25. p 39-40.
- Carey WA. 1998. Chloropicrin with metham-sodium and eptam for nutsedge control and the production of southern pine seedlings. In: Proceedings. Annual International Research Conference on Methyl Bromide Alternatives and Emission Reductions. Orlando, (FL). December 7-9, 1998. p. 32-1 to 32-2.
- Carey WA. 2000a. Fumigation with chloropicrin, metham sodium and EPTC as replacements for methyl bromide in southern pine nurseries. Southern Journal of Applied Forestry. 24:135-139.
- Carey WA. 2000b. Producing southern pine seedlings with methyl bromide alternatives. In: Proceedings Annual International Research Conference on Methyl Bromide Alternatives and Emission Reductions. Orlando, (FL). November 6-9, 2000. p. 51-1 - 51-3.
- Carey WA, Godbehere S. 2004. Effects of VIF and solvent carrier on control of nutsedge on and on populations of *Trichoderma* at two nurseries in 2003. In: Proceedings Annual International Research Conference on Methyl Bromide Alternatives and Emission Reductions. Orlando, (FL). October 31 - November 3, 2004. p 31-1 – 31-3.
- Carey WA, McCraw D, Enebak SA. 2005. Seedling production by seed treatment and fumigation treatment at the Glennville regeneration center in 2004. Research Report 05-04. Auburn University Southern Forest Nursery Management Cooperative, School of Forestry, Auburn University. 14 pp.
- Cram MM, Enebak SA, Fraedrich SW, Dwinell LD, Zarnoch SJ. 2007. Evaluation of fumigants, EPTC herbicide and *Paenibacillus macerans* in the production of loblolly pine seedlings. For. Sci. 53:73-83.
- Enebak SA, Wie G, Kloepper JW. 1998. Effects of plant-growth-promoting rhizobacteria on loblolly and slash pine seedlings. Forest Science 44:139-144.
- Enebak SA, Starkey TE, Quicke M. 2011a. Effect of methyl bromide alternatives on seedling quality, nematodes and pathogenic soil fungi at the Jesup and Glennville Nurseries in Georgia: 2007 to 2008. Journal of Horticulture and Forestry 3:150-158.
- Enebak SA, Starkey TE, Quicke M. 2011b. Effect of methyl bromide alternatives on seedling quality, nematodes and pathogenic soil fungi at the Blenheim and Trenton Nurseries in South Carolina: 2008-2009. Journal of Horticulture and Forestry. 3:379-387.
- Enebak SA, Jackson DP, Starkey TE, Quicke M. 2013. Evaluation of methyl bromide alternatives on loblolly pine production and seedling quality over three growing seasons at the Pine Hill Nursery in Camden Alabama. Journal of Horticulture and Forestry (*accepted – in press*).
- Gao S, Hanson BD, Wang D, Browne GT, Qin R, Ajwa HA, Yates SR. 2011. Methods evaluated to minimize emissions from pre-plant soil fumigation. Calif. Agric. 65:41-46.
- Jang E, Wood WS, Dorschner K, Schaub J, Smith D, Fraedrich S, Hsu H. 1993. Methyl bromide phase out in the US: Impact and alternatives, In: USDA workshop on alternatives for methyl bromide. Crystal City, VA.
- South DB. 1975. Artificial inoculation of fumigated nursery beds with endomycorrhizae. Tree Planters' Notes. 28:3-5.
- South DB. 1976. Weed Prevention in forest nurseries. In: Lantz CW editor. Proceedings Southeastern Area Nurserymen's Conferences. USDA Forest Service. Atlanta, (GA) Southeastern Area State and Private Forestry, Charleston (SC) August 3-5, 1976. pp 88-94.
- South DB, Gjerstad DH. 1980. Nursery weed control with herbicides or fumigation-an economic evaluation. Southern Journal of Applied Forestry 4:40-45.
- South DB. 1980. Weed control with herbicides or fumigation at a forest tree nursery. Highlights of Agricultural Research. 27:1.
- South DB, Carey WA, Enebak SA. 1997. Chloropicrin as a soil fumigant in forest nurseries. The Forestry Chronicle. 73:489-494.
- South, DB, Carey WA. 2000. Economics of soil fumigation. Journal of Forestry 98:4-5.
- South DB, Enebak SA. 2005. Integrated pest management practices in southern pine nurseries. New Forests. 31:1-19.
- Starkey TE, Enebak SA. 2008. Indian Mound Nursery, Texas: methyl bromide alternative study 2005-2007. Auburn University Southern Forest Nursery Management Cooperative Research Report 08-07. Auburn, AL. 11 pp.
- Vonderwell JD, Enebak SA. 2000. Differential effects of rhizobacterial strain and dose on the ectomycorrhizal colonization of loblolly pine seedlings. Forest Science. 46:437-441.