



Olive News



March 26, 2008
 Vol. X, No. 1

IN THIS ISSUE

2008 Olive Day

Olive Fly Update

Nickels Hedgerow
 Planting

Bill Krueger
 Farm Advisor

In accordance with applicable State and Federal laws and University policy, the University of California does not discriminate in any of its policies, procedures, or practices on the basis of race, religion, color, national origin, sex, marital status, sexual orientation, veteran status, age, medical condition, or handicap. Inquiries regarding this policy may be addressed to the Affirmative Action Director, University of California, Agriculture and Natural Resources, 300 Lakeside Drive, 6th Floor, Oakland, CA 94612-3560. (510) 987-0097.



To simplify information, trade names of products have been used. No endorsement of named products is intended, nor is criticism implied of similar products which are not mentioned.

UCCE Sacramento Valley Olive Day

April 16, 2008

Veterans Memorial Hall - 1620 Solano Street – Corning

Co-Sponsored by

Bell-Carter Olives, Musco Family Olives and the Tehama County
 Agricultural Commissioner

- 8:00 a.m. **Registration**
- 8:30 **Introductions** - *Bill Krueger UCCE Glenn County*
- 8:35 **Ag. Commissioner Update Including New Olive Pests**
Doug Compton Tehama County Ag. Commissioner's Office
- 8:55 **Olive Fly Research Update**
Marshall Johnson, UC Entomologist, Kearney Ag. Center
- 9:35 **Local Olive Fly Trapping Results and Plans for 2008**
Bill Krueger, UCCE Glenn County
- 9:45 **Pest Control District Updates**
Tehama County - To Be Determined
Glenn County - To Be Determined
- 10:00 **Break**
- 10:20 **UC Davis Olive Center** - *Dan Flynn, Executive Director*
- 10:50 **Mechanical Harvest Update** - *Louise Ferguson, UC Olive Specialist*
- 11:20 **Pruning and Training Trial for Mechanical Harvest of Table Olives**
Bill Krueger, UCCE Glenn County
- 11:40 **California Olive Committee Activities Update**
Christi Darling, COC Manager
- 12:00 **Lunch**
Sponsored by Bell-Carter Olives and Musco Family Olives

Olive Fly Update

Starting in early April we will be monitoring olive fly populations in orchards in Glenn and Tehama Counties and posting the information weekly on our website, <http://ceglenn.ucdavis.edu/> . We plan to monitor the same sites as last year (three in Glenn County and three in Tehama County) and add 4 unsprayed locations, two in each county. We will be using plastic McPhail traps again this year because they have been shown to catch more flies in this area than the yellow sticky traps.

There has been some concern that our trap catches last year did not reflect the higher infestation levels that were seen at the canners during harvest. The higher levels of infestation are most likely related to the cooler summer that we experienced in 2007, compared to 2005 and 2006. In 2007 our trap activity peaked in April and May and then declined with the onset of heat in July, and then resumed as temperatures cooled in the fall, very similar to what was observed in 2006. My observations at harvest were that most of the higher levels of infestation were coming from unsprayed or minimally sprayed orchards or trees that were next to unsprayed orchards. Four of our trapping sites ended up being sprayed, so the relatively low levels of trap catches may reflect the fact that most of the sites were sprayed.

These results serve to emphasize the importance of having traps in your own orchards. You cannot rely on our trapping data to make your treatment decisions. Even traps in your own orchard will not give complete confidence when making treatment decisions. All of the information together with what we are learning about the effect of environment (temperature and the availability of food and water) on the survival of the flies will lead to better treatment decisions.

Information on tolerance and the survival of olive flies under hot summer conditions is being developed by Marshall Johnson, UC Entomologist at the Kearny Agricultural Center in Parlier. He will be talking about this research at our upcoming Olive Day in Corning on April 16th. He will also be hosting a website this summer which will provide updates on what effect current weather conditions could be expected to have on olive fly populations. This information can be found at <http://arcims.gis.uckac.edu/cimis/> .

Establishing and Training Manzanillo Table Olives For Mechanical Harvest

William H. Krueger, Louise Ferguson, Stan Cutter and Antonio Isern

From 1997 to 2000, the California Olive Committee (COC), the table olive marketing order, sponsored the development of a mechanical harvester for table olives. Prototype machines were developed which had vibrating rods which engaged the tree canopy, resulting in a canopy shake. Although these machines looked promising, they had two major drawbacks: 1.) Efficiency of harvest - when the picking head came into close proximity of the fruit, it was removed. However, leading and trailing canopy edges and inside fruit proved to be problematic because it was difficult to get the head close to fruit located in these positions. Fruit removal was often disappointing. 2.) Fruit damage - The fruit can be damaged in the removal process. While this damage may appear similar to what may occur with hand harvest, the bruises are generally deeper and more severe. One of the major table olive processors quit accepting mechanically harvested fruit due to concerns related to fruit damage. This temporarily stopped progress toward mechanical harvest with this machinery. A continued and increasing need for mechanical harvest has rekindled interest. The COC resumed funding for mechanical harvest research in 2006 and expanded that support in 2007. The focus of the research has been on improvement of the previously developed machinery to increase removal and reduce damage and the development of loosening agents to facilitate mechanical harvest.

If a tree canopy could be developed in which all of the fruit was accessible to the picking head, a much improved harvest efficiency with reduced force and, therefore, reduced fruit damage should be attainable. The ideal tree and orchard configuration would appear to be a close spaced hedgerow system which would present a flat fruiting wall to the harvester with no leading or trailing edge and no inside fruit. A thin fruiting canopy approximately 6 feet in width and approximately 12 to 15 feet high would be appear to be ideal for maximum machine efficiency. With a narrow tree canopy and tree height such as this, narrower row spacing will be necessary to achieve maximum yields. This type of tree architecture should also be more adaptable to other types of mechanical harvesters including existing trunk type shakers and other types of machinery which could be developed.

Objectives:

The objectives of this work are to: 1.) Develop a narrow canopy hedgerow to facilitate mechanical harvest. 2.) Evaluate and demonstrate the feasibility of a high density hedgerow developed specifically for mechanical harvest. 3.) Compare different training methods for developing a narrow canopy hedgerow.

Methods:

In the spring of 2000, Manzanillo variety table olives were planted on 2 acres at the Nickel's Estate in Arbuckle with a north-south row orientation and a tree spacing of 12 feet in the row and 18 feet between rows (202 trees per acre). The selected training treatments included "conventional" and three Espalier treatments. The conventional training consists of thinning out fruit wood and opening up the center of the tree. The trees will eventually have 3 to 5 primary scaffolds. With the Espalier treatments, permanent limbs are being trained parallel to the row in a narrow plane with flexible temporary fruiting wood extending approximately three feet out into the row middle on either side. Large stiff limbs extending into the tree row middle are positioned into the permanent limb plane or are removed. The Espalier treatments are: Free Standing - where pruning alone is used to conform the trees to the system, trellised woven - where potentially permanent limbs are woven between three wires spaced at 4, 7 and 10 feet and trellised tied - where potentially permanent limbs are tied to the wires.

Originally 6 trees of the Sevillano variety were strategically placed in the planting to provide for cross pollination for the partially self incompatible Manzanillo. Due to disappointing growth of these trees, cross pollination was inadequate. Even though there was a good bloom, the fruit set for 2003 was disappointing and did not warrant harvest. During the summer of 2003, the center row of the planting was top worked to Sevillano to provide for adequate cross pollination. During bloom in the spring of 2004 and 2005, the block was artificially cross-pollinated using Sevillano pollen. The grafted pollinators developed well and artificial pollinization was discontinued in 2006. In the spring of 2007, about two weeks after full bloom, all of the plots were chemically thinned with Naphthalene Acetic Acid (NAA). Because the crop appeared light at pruning time in May, the tied Espalier treatment was not pruned.

Results:

Yields for 2007 were very good and ranged from 6.07 tons per acre for the woven Espalier to 7.51 for the tied Espalier with no statistically significant differences between treatments. Value per ton for the tied Espalier was significantly less than the other two treatments (Table1). There were no significant differences in value per acre. Through the seventh year, the cumulative yields are very similar for all of the treatments.

Table 1. Nickel's Hedgerow Olive Harvest, 2004-07

<u>Treatment</u>	2004	2005	2006	2007			Cum. Yield Tons/A
	Tons/A	Tons/A	Tons/A	Tons/A	\$/Ton	\$/Acre	
Conventional	4.09	1.75	2.81	6.39	\$1,037 A	\$6,600	15.04
Free Standing Espalier	3.66	1.51	2.26	6.40	\$1,037 A	\$6,636	13.81
Espalier, Trellised, Woven	4.21	1.68	2.28	6.07	\$1,011 A	\$6,153	14.24
Espalier, Trellised, Tied	3.58	3.45	1.76	7.51	\$868 B	\$6,438	16.30
	NS	NS	NS	NS		NS	

Numbers followed by different letters are significantly different at the 5% level using Fischer's test.

Discussion:

Fruit values were not different for any of the treatments which were pruned in 2007. The higher yield and smaller value per ton (fruit size) for the tied Espalier was, almost certainly, due to this treatment not being pruned in 2007. Cumulative yields for all treatments are very similar through the first seven years and would be considered good for this area. To date the results indicate that olives trees can be grown and maintained in a narrow canopy hedgerow configuration with no reduction in yield or fruit value.

As the effort to develop mechanical harvest for table olives continues, the planting at the Nickels Estate is positioned to play a critical role. A field meeting was held in October at the end of the table olive harvest season to show the planting and to demonstrate 3 different types of trunk shake harvesters. The meeting was attended by about 40 interested growers and industry personnel. Because it is an established planting it will continue to offer opportunities for research in support of the mechanical harvest project. We will be able to test new developments in machinery as it becomes available. We will continue to follow the development and production of the established treatments.

Nonprofit Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Orland, CA
Permit No. 63

University of California
Cooperative Extension
Glenn County
P. O. Box 697
Orland, CA 95963