

NORTHEAST OHIO AGRICULTURE NEWSLETTER

Your Weekly Agriculture Update for
Ashtabula, Portage and Trumbull Counties

September 8, 2021



Mexican Bean Beetle Damage in Geauga County

In This Issue:

- ODA Confirms Spotted Lanternfly in Cuyahoga County
- Managing Forage Stands Damaged By Fall Armyworm
- Are Fall Armyworm Infesting Corn, Too?
- Sunshine On My Pumpkins Makes Me Unhappy
- When is it Appropriate to Appropriate?
- Lee's Monthly News Column

Hello Northeast Ohio Counties!

Welcome to September! I wish we had had better news as we come into the fall months, but fall armyworm, spotted lanternfly, and Mexican bean beetles have all been found in our area in the past couple of weeks. Scouting your fields is the best way to find these infestations early.

Don't forget that Farm Science Review is coming up on September 21-23! You can purchase tickets through our offices in advance to skip the lines and save some money.

Have a great week!

Lee Beers
Trumbull County
Extension
Educator

Andrew Holden
Ashtabula County
Extension
Educator

Angie Arnold
Portage County
Extension
Educator

ODA Confirms Spotted Lanternfly in Cuyahoga County

By: Amy Stone

Source: <https://bygl.osu.edu/index.php/node/1861>



Earlier today, September 2, 2021, the Ohio Department of Agriculture announced a population of the invasive Spotted Lanternfly (SLF) has been found on the east side of Cleveland. The information in this alert is from the announcement that ODA distributed today.

The Ohio Department of Agriculture (ODA) was notified of the initial discovery by a tree care professional on August 26, 2021.

ODA Plant Pest inspectors confirmed living, adult SLF are in the area. An inspector with the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), an agency of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), also confirmed a population of the SLF has been found at a secondary location, near the initial report.

A railroad line connects both locations.

ODA has been working with the United States Department of Agriculture, Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Ohio State University Extension, and the Ohio Grape Industries Committee to do visual surveys, insect trapping, and outreach in the region.

SLF is a great concern to the grape and wine industry. The insect is fond of grapevines, fruit trees, hops, blueberry, oak, pine, poplar, and walnut. Adult SLF are attracted to the invasive *Ailanthus* tree, also known as tree-of-heaven, while nymphs feed on a wide

range of hosts. Both adults and nymphs feed on stems and leaves, causing sap bleeding and reduced photosynthesis, which can eventually kill the plant.

Now through November is the best time to spot the SLF because it is in its most recognizable stages as a colorful winged adult plant hopper. After hatching in the late spring, the SLF goes through four nymph stages. By midsummer, the nymph SLF can be identified by its red body, roughly a half-inch in size, with black stripes and white dots. During the late summer until roughly November, the SLF is in the adult stage. These adults are larger, roughly one inch in size, with black bodies and brightly colored wings.

The public is the first line of defense against the SLF. If you believe you have seen an SLF in your area, you can easily report a suspected infestation by going to [ODA's Spotted Lanternfly Information Page](#) and filling out a suspected infestation report. You may also call the Plant Pest Control Division at 614-728-6400.

For more information about the spotted lanternfly and what you can do to help, please [visit our website](#).

Additionally, any suspect reports can be made using the Great Lakes Early Detection Network App. If you have any questions about the App, contact Amy Stone at OSU Extension at stone.91@osu.edu

Managing Forage Stands Damaged by Fall Armyworm

By Mark Sulc

Source: <https://agcrops.osu.edu/newsletter/corn-newsletter/2021-30/managing-forage-stands-damaged-fall-armyworm>

A severe and fall armyworm outbreak developed across Ohio and neighboring states. It has caused serious destruction in many forage fields. For more complete details on this pest, including how to scout for this pest and options for control, see the articles posted at <https://forages.osu.edu/forage-management/pests-diseases>.

This article addresses how to manage forage stands damaged by the fall armyworm. Fields with minor to no damage seen.

If the hayfield or pasture shows any feeding damage at all and is reasonably close to having enough growth for harvest, cut or graze it as soon as possible. This is perfect timing to take the last cutting of the season (see article on that topic at <https://agcrops.osu.edu/newsletter/corn-newsletter/2021-29/autumn-forage-harvest-management>). If there are large numbers of fall armyworms present (more than 2 to 3 per square foot) and they are $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch or larger, they will “harvest” the entire field for you while you sleep another night or two. So be aware of what is in your hayfield!



Alfalfa Damaged Field, Photo Courtesy of Mark Badertscher

If your hayfield is not quite ready for harvest or is regrowing from a recent harvest, scout it now and continue to scout for fall armyworm every few days until you do harvest it. Be prepared to make a rescue treatment if fall armyworm numbers reach the threshold of 2-3 per square foot.

Fields with severe fall armyworm damage.

If an established hayfield or pasture has already been severely damaged by fall armyworm, cut it down and salvage what you can or mow off and remove the stems or graze it to prevent any windrows from smothering of the regrowth. This mowing will stimulate the plants to regrow.

But be aware that fall armyworms have been seen to survive a cutting, so they could continue to devour the crown buds and any regrowth. Those surviving fall armyworms could also move to adjacent fields including soybean and corn (especially non-Bt corn hybrids).

Established alfalfa should recover from having the leaves being stripped off. Essentially, the fall armyworm took the best half of your last harvest. Cutting of the remaining stems will stimulate the fall regrowth process.

The speed of recovery will depend on how many crown buds in alfalfa were devoured by the insect. Regrowth will be slower if crown buds were fed on and new crown buds need to be initiated. Be patient, but it is also very important to stop the feeding from continuing.

Be on the alert for any second infestation from another generation that might occur yet this fall. The Ohio State University Extension entomologists and extension educators across the state are monitoring for further fall armyworm moth flights and which could potentially lead to another generation.

Established grass hayfields and pastures will likely show variable recovery depending on the extent of fall armyworm feeding on new tillers and the soil moisture situation. With severe feeding and dry soil conditions, permanent damage and loss of stand could occur. With more limited feeding and good moisture conditions, recovery should occur this fall.

New seedings made late summer with severe feeding by fall armyworm in the early seedling stages are likely to be completely lost. Going forward, if your new seeding has no signs of fall armyworm, be monitoring every few days for fall armyworm until frost.

Summary of steps to help your forages recover:

- Stop the feeding of fall armyworm and continue scouting every few days to prevent re-infestation. This is critical in new seedings made late summer.
- Harvest or graze off the alfalfa and red clover stems and mow or graze grass stubble as soon as possible to stimulate regrowth
- Check soil fertility and make corrective applications of P and K if needed
- On grass stands, apply 50 to 75 lbs of nitrogen per acre as soon as possible, right ahead of a rain forecast (to wash the N into the soil).

Our turf specialists recommend N application in September to help lawn grasses tiller through the fall and in early November to increase root growth (<https://turfdisease.osu.edu/news/benefits-late-fall-fertilization-0>). So a shot of nitrogen is probably a good practice this year in damaged grass hayfields and pastures. Recent preliminary work Chris Teutsch at University of Kentucky (personal communication) showed a positive response in grass pasture growth the next spring after a late fall N application (20 lbs of additional forage per 10 lbs of actual N applied). While this idea needs further testing, the evidence from University of Kentucky and a great deal of



Alfalfa Field Partially Mowed after Fall Army Worm Damage. Photo Courtesy of Mark Badertscher

work in turfgrasses suggest nitrogen application in the fall will be beneficial to grass hayfields and pastures recovering from fall armyworm damage. Make sure there are green tillers present in the grass crowns before investing in the nitrogen.

- Do not harvest fields later this fall. Give them a rest and allow leaf area to capture sunlight so energy and protein reserves in the plant are replenished before winter.

It is essential to continue monitoring the forage stand and apply timely control of fall armyworm if 2 per square foot are present to prevent additional feeding. We have time for recovery this fall, assuming additional feeding does not occur and the damage already done is not so severe as to have killed the stand.

The fall armyworm egg laying could have been somewhat asynchronous over time, so eggs could have been recently hatched or are still hatching in and around your forage fields. Fall armyworm population numbers can grow exponentially with each advancing generation. So, we aren't out of the woods even after cutting or after an insecticide treatment applied now. Continued monitoring this fall is very important.

Are Fall Armyworm Infesting Corn, too?

By Andy Michel

Source: <https://agcrops.osu.edu/newsletter/corn-newsletter/2021-30/are-fall-armyworm-infesting-corn-too>

We have all experienced the massive damage that fall armyworms did on our forage crops and turf. Keep in mind that fall armyworm can also damage corn. We have found late-stage caterpillars feeding on corn that was planted on May 25 and on June 23rd. The good news is that corn with above-ground Bt offers protection against fall armyworm. The bad news is that Bt resistance has occurred in other states to our south (which is where our fall armyworms likely came from). In some of these areas, fall armyworm has shown evidence of resistance to corn with the Bt proteins Cry1Ab and Cry1F. Corn with the traits Cry1A.105/Cry1Ab2 and Vip3A remain effective against fall armyworm (see the Bt trait table: https://agrillife.org/lubbock/files/2021/02/BtTraitTable_Feb_2021B.pdf). Although we have not seen any Bt resistance with fall armyworm in Ohio, we also don't



Northeast Ohio Agriculture

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION
Ashtabula, Portage and Trumbull Counties

often see fall armyworm at all. Now is the time to check corn ears for feeding damage. At this point, control would be difficult since the caterpillars are protected in the ears. So why is checking Bt corn important? If and when, we have a fall armyworm invasion again, we need to make sure that these traits are holding up as we expect. We have had a large enough issue with forage and turf—we don't need another issue in corn.

Finally, keep in mind that most fall armyworm are pupating now which means adults will be flying soon. In fact, we have already seen some moths in traps already. We are expanding our trap network to help us predict the likelihood of another generation that may impact forage regrowth and potentially any winter wheat or cover crops that begin to emerge.

Sunshine on my pumpkins makes me unhappy

By Jim Jasinski

Source: <https://u.osu.edu/vegnetnews/2021/09/03/sunshine-on-my-pumpkins-makes-me-unhappy/>

This title should seem familiar as a slight twist on the famous John Denver tune from 1971. With temperatures in the low to mid 90's for at least three days last week across most of the state, fruit that were not properly



Sunburned pumpkins by handle. Note even handle is burned on one side.

covered in the canopy were placed at a higher risk for getting sunburned.

Based on observations over several years, fruit that are cut off the vine tend to burn more readily than those that remain on the vine, likely a function of being able to evapotranspire enough moisture to stave off burning. As clade 2 downy mildew was reported on August 13 (active on pumpkin/squash), fields that were not protected suffered almost 100% defoliation with 10-14 days. Amazingly this photo with near total canopy loss had nearly no detectable sun burned fruit despite several fruit actually being desiccated to the point where they were shriveling in the sun! If these fruit were cut off the vine, I would have expected significant rind burning to occur.



Downy mildew infested field with no leaf canopy.

While there are a few “white washing” products on the market to spray on fruit in the field to prevent burning, they have not been investigated at OSU. The best prevention is a good canopy through harvest. The next best strategies though more labor intensive would be to cut and move fruit to a shaded location to cure naturally. If fruit are in a u-pick patch, moving them to distinct piles and covering with shade cloth may also be a possible solution.

When is it Appropriate to Appropriate?

By: By: Jeffrey K. Lewis, Attorney and Research Specialist, Agricultural & Resource
Source: <https://farmoffice.osu.edu/blog/tue-08312021-1145pm/when-it-appropriate-appropriate>

You may have been involved in or known someone that was involved in an eminent domain dispute with a utility company or other state agency. When the government tries to take an individual’s property, emotions are understandably heightened. In Ohio, state agencies and other specific entities – like a public utility company – can appropriate or “take” a person’s property, but only if the taking is necessary and for a public use. If the government or governmental agency does appropriate a

landowner's property, then the landowner is entitled to compensation for the taking.

In the case below, a group of landowners disputed a power company's ability to appropriate their property and the ability of the power company to assume it is entitled to an appropriation simply because a project for public use was approved by state authorities. The landowners also sought to clarify when a landowner is entitled to recover the costs associated with defending their property interests against an attempted appropriation by the state or state agency.

Ohio Power Company v. Burns, et al.

In 2017, the Ohio Power Board of Directors ("Ohio Power Board") gave initial approval for a project located in Marietta, Ohio to enhance the electric transmission network (the "Project"). The Project included miles of new transmission lines and required siting, rights of ways, and some property purchases. In 2018 the Ohio Siting Board ("Siting Board") issued a certificate of environmental compatibility and public need for the Project. In 2019, the Project was given final approval by the Ohio Power Board.



After failed easement negotiations, the Ohio Power Company (Plaintiff) filed petitions for appropriation against several landowners ("Defendants") to take easements on the Defendants' property. As required by Ohio law, the trial court held a hearing on the appropriation petitions (the "Appropriation Proceedings"). Plaintiff argued that it currently possesses an easement across the property of each Defendant, but it was seeking to replace the existing easement with a new, wider easement for the Project. Plaintiff claimed that the new easements were necessary for a public good and that the Siting Board recognized the necessity of the Project and of acquiring easements, rights of way, and other interests in property along the new power line.

Defendants, however, responded by saying that the Siting Board declared the *Project* a necessity, not the *appropriations*. Further, Defendants argued that the easements sought by Plaintiff were overly broad and that the terms of the proposed easements went beyond the necessity to promote the public use. Lastly, Defendants claimed that when Plaintiff was ordered to remove distribution line rights from its appropriation petition, Plaintiff voluntarily abandoned its appropriation which required the trial court to enter a judgement against Plaintiff for

the costs associated with defending against the distribution line rights contained within the proposed easements.

The trial court determined that the Siting Board's certification of the Project and the testimony presented at the hearing established that the appropriations were necessary under Ohio law. Additionally, the trial court found that even if the Siting Board's certificate did not create an irrebuttable presumption, the appropriations were still necessary because Plaintiff, as a public utility company, is in the best position to determine what is necessary and what is not. The trial court also held that Plaintiff did not abandon the appropriations simply by removing certain provisions from the petitions. Defendants then appealed to the 4th District Court of Appeals.

The following is brief explanation of the 4th District's opinion that both agreed and disagreed with the trial court.

Rebuttable and irrebuttable presumption

Normally under Ohio law, a public utility company, like the Plaintiff, has to prove that it has the right to make an appropriation and/or that the appropriation is necessary. Plaintiff can do this by presenting evidence at an appropriation hearing and if the judge is persuaded, then Plaintiff will be allowed to take the property. The important part is that the burden of proof is on the public utility company.

However, there are a few situations where the law assumes that a public utility company or other state agency has the right to make an appropriation. Further, those presumptions are either rebuttable or irrebuttable. If the state agency has a rebuttable presumption, then the law will assume that agency has the right to make the appropriation or that the appropriation is necessary unless another party, like a landowner, can prove otherwise. In these situations, the burden of proof switches from the state agency to the landowner to prove that the state agency does not have the right to an appropriation or that the appropriation is not necessary. A state agency gets a rebuttable presumption when:

1. A resolution or ordinance of the governing or controlling body, council, or board of the agency declares the necessity for the appropriation; or
2. The public utility company presents evidence of the necessity for the appropriation.

A public utility company can also get an irrebuttable presumption about its right to an appropriation or the necessity of an appropriation. This means that no evidence can be presented to prove that the state agency does not have the right to an appropriation or that the appropriation is not necessary. A state agency receives

an irrebuttable presumption when it receives approval by a state or federal regulatory authority of an appropriation.

In this case, the Defendants claimed that the Siting Board, which is a state regulatory authority, and the Ohio Power Board, the board of the agency, approved the *project*, not the *appropriation*. Therefore, Defendants argued that the rebuttable or irrebuttable presumptions did not apply to Plaintiff. Plaintiff on the other hand thought that both the rebuttable presumption and the irrebuttable presumption applied, and because the irrebuttable presumption applied, Plaintiff argued that the trial court did not need to review the easements. Plaintiff maintained judicial review of the easements was not necessary because a jury would decide the scope of the easement at a compensation hearing for the taking.

The trial court agreed with the Plaintiff and found that Plaintiff was entitled to an irrebuttable presumption of the necessity for the appropriation because of the Siting Board certification. Additionally, the trial court also found that Plaintiff was entitled to a rebuttable presumption because the Ohio Power Board declared the necessity for the appropriation of property interests for the Project.

However, the appeals court disagreed. The 4th District noted that the Plaintiff's argument ultimately allows it to "take whatever property rights it wants. . ." and the only constraint on Plaintiff's power to take would be how much a jury determines Plaintiff must pay for the taking. The appellate court found Defendants' argument to be persuasive. The appellate court held that because the Siting Board and the Ohio Power Board only approved the project and not the specific appropriations at issue in this case, Plaintiff was not entitled to either a rebuttable or irrebuttable presumption. Although the Ohio Power Board recognized "the necessity of acquiring easements or rights of way in connection with" the project, the board only recognized such a necessity in a broad sense. The appellate court held that specific appropriations must be reviewed and approved before a state agency is entitled to the rebuttable or irrebuttable presumption under Ohio law.

Deference

The Defendants also argued that the trial court erred when it did not review the proposed easements. The trial court found that the Plaintiff is in the best position to determine the necessity of the easements. The trial court, therefore, did not review the proposed easements and deferred to the expertise of the Plaintiff to determine the legality of the easements. Additionally, the court deferred any issues regarding the scope of the easements to a jury at the future compensation hearing.

The court of appeals disagreed with the trial court and held that the trial court should have reviewed the easements and should have made a separate necessity

finding as to each one. The 4th District determined that courts are required to engage in the review of easements under Ohio law to make sure that (1) the state is not taking more property than necessary; and that the state is acting (2) fairly; (3) without bad faith; (4) without pretext; (5) without discrimination; and (6) without improper purpose. The appeals court reasoned that a trial court's role is a critical constitutional check on the state's power. The appellate court noted that it is a trial court's duty to determine the extent of the taking and a jury's duty to determine the amount of damages owed to a landowner as a result of the taking.

Abandonment

Another issue in this case was whether Plaintiff "abandoned" its appropriation for distribution lines. If Plaintiff was found to have abandoned its appropriation, then Defendants would be entitled to fees and other costs associated with defending their property interest.

In its initial appropriation petition, Plaintiff included an appropriation for distribution lines across the Defendants' properties. However, during the appropriation hearing, Plaintiff conceded that it did not need an appropriation for distribution lines and only included the distribution line rights in its appropriation petition just in case it was needed. Plaintiffs admitted that their proposed easement was broader in scope than necessary, and the trial court ordered that Plaintiff remove the distribution line rights from its petitions. However, the trial court did not find that Plaintiff abandoned its appropriation for distribution lines and did not award Defendants any fees and costs for the alleged abandonment.

On appeal, Defendants argued that the trial court was wrong for not entering a judgment against the Plaintiff for fees and costs associated with defending against the appropriation for distribution lines. Plaintiff claimed that it did not abandon its petition because it essentially amended its petition, it didn't drop its petition entirely. The trial court agreed with Plaintiff, reasoning that removing the word "distribution" from Plaintiff's petition did not amount to an abandonment.

The court of appeals agreed with the trial court that Plaintiff did not abandon its appropriation petition but still found that Defendants were entitled to recover costs associated with defending their property interests. The 4th district found three scenarios when a landowner would be entitled to the costs associated with defending its property interest against a taking. Those three scenarios are:

1. When an agency, like a public utilities company, voluntarily abandons the appropriation proceedings;
2. When a trial court determines that the appropriation is not necessary or not for public use; and

3. When a trial court determines, at any time during the appropriation proceedings, that the agency is not entitled to appropriate “particular property.”

Defendants argued that the court ordering Plaintiff to remove the distribution line rights from its petition constituted a voluntary abandonment under scenario 1. However, the 4th District found that Plaintiff could have only voluntarily abandoned the appropriation proceedings before the trial court’s order. The appellate court reasoned that the voluntary part of scenario 1 is absent once a court orders a party to remove an appropriation from its petition. The 4th District also found that scenario 2 did not apply to this case either. According to the appellate court, the trial court must dismiss the entire matter because the appropriations are not necessary or not for public use. Because that did not happen in this case, the 4th District determined that Defendants cannot recover costs under scenario 2.

Under scenario 3, however, the 4th District did find that Defendants were entitled to costs for defending against the distribution line rights in Plaintiff’s petition. In this scenario, an agency can bring appropriation proceedings for various parcels, property rights, or other property interests. Understanding that different rights can be disputed, the appellate court found that if a court determines an agency is not entitled to appropriate “particular property”, or in other words take a particular property interest, then the agency must reimburse the landowner for its costs and fees associated with defending that property interest. The 4th District determined that because the trial court ordered the Plaintiff to remove the distribution line rights from its petition, the trial court determined that the Plaintiff is not entitled to appropriate the “particular property” – or in this case, the distribution line rights. Therefore, the 4th District determined that Plaintiff must be ordered to pay Defendants for the costs associated with defending against the distribution line rights.

Conclusion

Although this ruling doesn’t dramatically change Ohio law, it helps clarify the requirements and procedures that must be followed when a state agency petitions for an appropriation. This ruling will be closely reviewed by public utility companies and other state agencies to ensure that they have all the required approvals before filing any petition for future appropriations. [View the 4th District’s opinion for more details.](#)

Lee's Monthly News Column

Hello Trumbull County, and welcome to September! I don't know a better way to bring in the fall months than with a fall armyworm invasion. That's sarcasm. The spread of the armyworm this year has been sudden, fast, and very damaging. Fall armyworms are small caterpillars that are usually a minor pest in Northeast Ohio, but they have made their presence known this year by destroying hay fields and turf (lawns). Typically found in the southern part of the country where they are a perennial pest known for eating turf and agronomic crops in a short period of time. We are not entirely sure why they have made their presence known in Ohio this year, but the moths may have been blown up with some storms, laid their eggs, and the caterpillars found a new food source here.

If you do a quick Google search, you will find alfalfa fields and lawns that have been completely destroyed in a matter of hours. We have had reports of the armyworm in Ashtabula, Portage, and Columbiana counties, but just last night I saw one on my back porch in Champion. While you are mowing your lawn or hayfield, watch for small brown dead patches. This is typically the first sign of an armyworm invasion. Look at the soil surface and on the grass for worms. They may be small (1/2" or less), or large (over 1"). They generally have a dark appearance, but may be light green or gray, with an upside down "Y" on their head. A few of the infestations I have seen this week have been present for at least 3-4 days.

Consider yourself lucky if you find only one or two patches of armyworm, as they can explode over night. It's not uncommon this time of year to have a brown spot or two in your yard or hay field due to drought, stress, or some other environmental condition. Take the time to scout those brown spots. Those small spots can quickly turn into multiple acres in a matter of 24-36 hours.

There are several control options out there depending on the severity of the damage. Before you use any chemicals, it is best to determine that you actually have armyworms. You can send pictures to beers.66@osu.edu for identification, or visit <https://bygl.osu.edu/node/1859> for more information. The first control option is to do nothing. I know this can be a hard option, but if you have a small area that is infested, and the armyworms are over 1" in length there is not much you can do as they are hard to kill once they get that size. If you find the infestation early when most of the armyworms are 3/4" or less and the damage is severe, there are several chemical options you can use. The chemicals used will depend on your situation (turf, hay, pasture, etc.) and it will be best for you to call our office at 330-638-6783 to discuss the options. Be aware of any restricted entry, grazing, or harvest intervals. We have reports that many of the pyrethroid based insecticides (Warrior, etc.) are not effective on caterpillars over 3/4" unless mixed with another mode of action. Growth regulators (Dimilin, etc.) are another good option and should be considered when choosing chemical options.

Northeast Ohio Agriculture

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION
Ashtabula, Portage and Trumbull Counties

Cultural control is going to be a good option in hay fields that are infested. Mowing and harvesting hay fields with infestations will kill most of the armyworms, but be aware that forage quality will be lower and you may want to feed armyworm infested forage first.

Long term damage to hay and turf will depend on the severity of the infestation, but most species will recover on their own. Alfalfa may see a decline compared to some grass species. If you have severe damage it may be too late to consider reseeding, but take note of the area and visit later this fall and early spring to determine if reseeding is necessary in 2022.

If you have any questions about fall armyworm or any other gardening/farming topics give me a call at 330-638-6783 or email me at beers.66@osu.edu.

Take care, and stay healthy!



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF FOOD, AGRICULTURAL,
AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Lee Beers

Trumbull County Extension

520 West Main Street

Cortland, OH 44410

330-638-6783

beers.66@osu.edu

trumbull.osu.edu

Andrew Holden

Ashtabula County Extension

39 Wall Street

Jefferson, OH 44047

440-576-9008

holden.155@osu.edu

ashtabula.osu.edu

Angie Arnold

Portage County Extension

705 Oakwood St., Suite 103

Ravenna, OH 44266

330-296-6432

arnold.1143@osu.edu

portage.osu.edu

CFAES provides research and related educational programs to clientele on a nondiscriminatory basis. For more information: <http://go.osu.edu/cfaesdiversity>.

Northeast Ohio Agriculture

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION
Ashtabula, Portage and Trumbull Counties

FARM SCIENCE REVIEW ROAD TRIP



In an effort to serve our members and ag community, Farm Bureau is partnering with the Mark Bruns Agency and Erie County (PA) Farm Bureau to provide bus transportation to the 2021 Farm Science Review. Featured at Farm Science Review will be more than 100 educational sessions, including “Ask the Expert” talks; 600 exhibits; the most comprehensive field crop demonstrations in the United States; a career exploration fair; and immersive virtual reality videos of agricultural activities.

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2021

**Flying J- Austinburg
2349 Center Road, Austinburg, OH 44010**

Bus departs Flying J at 7 AM

A limited number of seats may be available on Tuesday, September 21 with the PV FFA. Please call our director Mandy at 440.812.6709 for details.

WHAT'S INCLUDED?

- Farm Science Review ticket (\$7 value)
- Commercial bus ticket to and from the event
- Morning refreshments

DETAILS

- 7 AM: Bus departs Flying J- Austinburg, OH
- Please arrive at Flying J BEFORE 7 AM
- 5 PM: Bus departs Farm Science Review

COST

- Farm Bureau Members: \$10
- Non-members: \$20
- Does not include meals

RESERVATIONS & PAYMENT REQUIRED- SPACE IS LIMITED

Payment can be made with credit card or by sending a check or cash to 8460 Ridge Rd, North Royalton, OH 44133

**There are only 26 seats available!
Reserve your seat today by calling 440.426.2195**

CFAES

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION



Ashtabula County Master Gardener Volunteer Training

Do you love to garden? Would you like to learn more about gardening? Do you enjoy helping others in your community?

Become an Ashtabula County Master Gardener Volunteer!

You get 50 hours of training in vegetables, flowers, trees, shrubs, soil, insects, diseases, and more. In turn you share your knowledge with others by answering questions, collaborating on service projects, presenting programs for both adults and children, etc.

Join other gardeners **now** by registering to become an Ashtabula County Master Gardener Volunteer

www.go.osu.edu/acmgvapp



Application Deadline is September 30th, 2021



Learn about Chestnut Production in NE Ohio

Are you interested in starting or diversifying a farm and looking for a niche crop market? Join us on September 11th to learn how Wintergreen Tree Farm has become one of the largest chestnut producers in the US.

DATES: Saturday, September 11th

TIME: 9:30 AM

LOCATION: Wintergreen Tree Farm
3898 Winchell Rd Mantua, OH 44255

For more information and to RSVP: Scan the QR code, go to <https://go.osu.edu/portagechestnut>

or call the Portage County Extension Office at 330-296-6432



[Portage.osu.edu](https://portage.osu.edu)



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF FOOD, AGRICULTURAL,
AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

— *We Sustain Life* —

CFAES provides research and related educational programs to clientele on a nondiscriminatory basis. For more information, visit cfaesdiversity.osu.edu. For an accessible format of this publication, visit cfaes.osu.edu/accessibility.