

# SUMMARY/COMMENTS

## Standardized Turfgrass Evaluation Protocols discussion

Tuesday, October 7, 2008

4:45 - 5:45 PM

Room 382C, George R. Brown Convention Center  
Houston, TX

Approximately 75 people attended this session to discuss the Visual Field Assessment (VFA) document that NTEP has developed. VFA is an effort to further standardize NTEP evaluations, protocols and standards.

The VFA document is arranged in sections, therefore, each section was addressed individually and comments from the attendees were recorded (see accompanying VFA draft document). Following is a summary of those comments arranged by section.

### 1. Components of Turfgrass Quality (pages 4-6)

- a. Are the necessary components included?  
*An attendee suggested that the density section is confusing and should be reworded (pages 4-5)*
- b. Are the components included adequately described? **No comments**
- c. Suggestions for refinements/enhancements **No comments**

### 2. Rating Protocol (pages 6-8)

- a. Are the necessary components included?  
*A question arose over whether overcast skies should be required for evaluations, since in some regions, overcast days are rare or evaluators may have limited time available to rate. Therefore, it was suggested that *Sky Condition* required protocol (page 6) be changed from overcast skies to ideal conditions or suggested protocol.*
- b. Are the components included adequately described? **No comments**
- c. Suggestions for refinements/enhancements **No comments**

### 3. Turfgrass Quality Reference Standard (pages 8-10)

- a. OEM vs. CEM reference standard  
*The Turfgrass Breeders Association (TBA) passed a motion that states they favor the Current Environment and Management (CEM) standard over the Optimal*

Environment and Management (OEM) standard when evaluating turfgrass quality (pages 8-9). Some breeders feel that the Trait Specific Trials that NTEP is establishing in 2009 may only have a spread of 1-3 numbers on the scale with OEM, therefore spread the data using CEM.

Which variety is the best under those specific traits; a 3 goes nowhere, a 7 means something because of a minimum score.

Some of the extension/management people felt that they would need to be taught how to rate using CEM as most extension folks use a OEM scale.

There was concern that CEM takes out the best source of variation from a statistical sense (environment). Need to keep environment variation.

There was some discussion about the goals of NTEP, is it location differences or cultivar differences?

Lack of training by evaluators...need to get breeders and others on same page as to how to get the best data for cultivar differences.

b. Minimum acceptable score (pages 9-10)

TBA approved 5 as minimum, the standards use 6 as a minimum.

Tend to have a specie specific minimum, 7 for bent and 5 for kbg or PR.

c. Use of 1 and 9 score (page 10)

Some commented that there is a need to spread the data and TBA thinks use of CEM provides a better spread of the data.

d. Suggestions for refinements/enhancements

A question arose : are we to a point that we need two raters at each location because one is not enough?

4. Applications (pages 10-17)

a. Comments/concerns with specific applications **No comments**

b. Weight transfer among quality components **No comments**

c. Suggestions for refinements/enhancements **No comments**