# **Surround:** An evaluation of the Effects on Pistachio

Dan Forey, BioResearch, Fresno, CA



2008 -



Study Description:	An Evaluation of the Effects of Surround WP on Pistachio
Reference Number:	forey pistachio 2008.doc
Researcher:	Daniel Forey & Scott Hicks; BioResearch; 1738 N. Fowler Road; Fresno, CA 93727
Location :	Kerman, CA
Year:	2008
Trial Quality (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor):	Fair

Product(s):	Surround WP
Rate(s):	50 lb/A fb 25 lb/A
Adjuvant(s):	
Rate(s):	

Crop(s):	
Variety:	
Pest(s):	OBLR
Quality:	Sunburn
Summary:	Even though measurable OBLR damage did not occur in the test orchard and the direct effects of sunburn were not observed, useful information was obtained on the potential for Surround WP to suppress panicle and shoot blight and possibly Alternaria late blight. Numerically, there were approximately 20% and 30% fewer infected shoots in the Surround WP-treated plots on average at 32 DA-C and 39DA-C, respectively. Surround WP was also shown to be effective at reducing bird feeding damage on the fruit. This preliminary data should be enough to warrant further investigations on these types of uses on pistachios and other susceptible cropping systems. The heat reducing effects of Surround WP did not enhance kernel quality in this trial. Occasional epicarp lesion resembling shrivel was observed related to plant bug feeding damage, but did not occur in measurable numbers. The crop was light due to alternate bearing and this year was an off year within the test orchard, so the trees were not particularly stressed. The result was that there were no statistical differences between treatments concerning kernel length, width and the weight per kernel. Surround WP did present handling problems related to weighing and loading because of the particle size and packaging of the formulated product. Mixing and spraying were not a serious problem using a commercial-type sprayer with mechanical agitation. No phytotoxicity was observed.

## **Processed-Kaolin Particle Film on Pistachio**

Research Director:Daniel Forey, Bio Research – Fresno, CAPrincipal Investigator:Scott HicksResearch Technician:Marc BrantStudy Sponsor:NovaSource/ Tessenderlo Kerley, Inc.<br/>Kurt Volker, Ph.D. – Yakima, WA

### Introduction

This trial was conducted to evaluate the effects of spray applications of Surround WP on pistachios. The trial was designed to test for control of obliquebanded leafroller (OBLR) and to determine if there were beneficial effects on kernel quality from reduced heat stress. The spray applications were initiated based on the presence of OBLR in pheromone traps within the test orchard. No OBLR were observed during field evaluations of leaves and clusters. It appeared that heat stress was not a serious factor that affected the pistachios this year. Tree canopies were more extensive because 2008 was an off-year for alternate bearing based on an equivalent response from untreated trees. However, during the field evaluations, a moderate to severe incidence of panicle and shoot blight disease was observed to have been affected by treatment, particularly on shoot stems and foliage. In addition, bird feeding damage on nuts within clusters was observed to also have been affected by spray applications of Surround WP. The results of this trial are primarily based on the latter two parameters. Kernel quality in terms of size and weight were also determined in the event there was shrivel due to heat stress.

#### **Materials and Methods**

Α.	Site Location:	Plumas and Shie Kerman, CA	lds Roads	3			
B.	Target Species:	Common Name: Scientific Name: Developmental S	tage:	Obliquebanded Leafroller (OBLR) Choristoneura rosaceana All			
		Common Name: Scientific Name:		Panicle and Shoot Blight Botryosphaeria dothidea			
C.	Host Crop: Variety: Age:	Pistachio Kerman Approximately 30	ing				
D.	Plot Description:	Plot Size: Cultural Practices: Soil:		24 x 36 feet (3 trees per plot) Minimal cultivation, flood irrigation Sandy loam			
Ε.	Pest History:	OBLR infestation	s had his	torically been a problem in the test orchard.			
F.	Pesticide History:	No maintenance	pesticide	s were applied at the test site for the duration of the trial			
G.	Experimental Design:	Complete randon	nized blo	ck design			
H.	<b>Replication No. &amp; Units:</b>	4, 3-tree replicat	es per tre	eatment.			
I.	Application Equipment:	Ford <sup>®</sup> 1720 Diese with mechanical	el Tractor agitation	pulling a Rears airblast orchard sprayer,			
		Nozzle: PSI: RPM: Tractor Gear: Speed: Spray Volume:	Six D8-4 150 1500 4L 1.3 mph 200 gpa	15 nozzles			

J.	Treatments:	Rate:	Appl. Code 1. Untreated 2. Intrepid 3. Surround V	NP	2F 100WP	12 fl oz/A 50 lb/A	AB ABC
			Break Thru	100L	3 oz/100 gal.		
К.	Application:	Application A Date: Time: Temperature: Relative Humidity: Wind Speed: Wind Direction: Cloud Cover: Plant Growth Stage: Plant Vigor: Foliar Moisture: Water pH:	June 16, 2003 10:00 – 11:30 87° F 28% 0-3 mph NW Clear Shell hardene Good Dry 6.5	8 0 a.m. ed, early	nut fill		
		Application B Date: Time: Temperature: Relative Humidity: Wind Speed: Wind Direction: Cloud Cover: Plant Growth Stage: Plant Vigor: Foliar Moisture: Water pH:	July 1, 2008 2:00 – 3:00 p 90° F 33% 0-2 mph NW Clear Nut fill Good Dry 6.5	.m.			
		Application C Date: Time: Temperature: Relative Humidity: Wind Speed: Wind Direction: Cloud Cover: Plant Growth Stage: Plant Vigor: Foliar Moisture: Water pH:	July 25, 2008 9:00 – 10:15 81° F 40% 0-2 mph N Clear Nut fill Good Dry 6.5	a.m.			

Environmental conditions at the time spray applications were made were taken with a Kestrel® 3000 Pocket Weather Station.

L.	Weather	<b>Conditions:</b>
----	---------	--------------------

The following weather data were recorded at Firebaugh, CA, located approximately 10 miles northwest of the test site (Statewide Weather Service – CIMIS Station 7) from June 12, 2008, to September 8, 2008:

Total Rainfall:	0.00 inches
High Temperature:	105.4°F (July 10)
Low Temperature:	52.9°F (September 2)

See Appendix 1 for complete environmental data.

М.	Test Procedures:	A commercial pista selected as the test of trees using a ran with colored flaggir materials was mad moths entering the 25, 2008, at approx	chio orchard with a reported history of OBLR infestation was t site. Three-tree test plots were arranged down a single row adomized complete block design. The trees were marked ng tape to identify the treatments. The first application of the test e on June 16, 2008, after pheromone trap verification of the first orchard. Subsequent applications were made on July 1 and July kimately 2-week or 3-week intervals after the first sprays.
		Cumulative trap co	unts of OBLR in the test orchard by date:
		4 Ju 11 Ju 24 Ju 0 Ju 12 Ju	une 12 une 16 une 20 une 30 uly 25
		Evaluation of OBLR August 26, 2008 (c and nut clusters (ra was bird feeding da completed on Septe	larval infestations were made on June 20, July 7 (foliage), and luster feeding). Panicle and shoot blight evaluations on shoots uchis) were evaluated on August 26 and September 2, 2008, as amage on the clusters. A harvest evaluation of kernel quality was ember 8, 2008.
N.	Sampling Procedures:	The OBLR evaluation together and afterwite to disturb larvae can threads. In addition feeding damage du activity were observi- shoot blight was evi- tips (3-5 leaves each leaflets, entire leave Botryosphaeria infel lesions in streaks, p areas in the center blight which causes fungus in the center surface. Twenty-five stems examined for the presence or abs severity of infection 0 to 10 where: 0 = damage were deter counting those with or entirely consume field indicated no si systematically sele effects of heat stread (nuts) were separat The kernels were s inch ruler to determ in the trough and m samples were weig weight per kernel.	on consisted of inspecting the foliage for leaves webbed vards by beating branches of foliage at various canopy heights using them to respond by hanging from the leaves on silken , clusters were inspected for wilting on the tree from rachis stem le to larval activity. No live larvae and/or evidence of larval ved in untreated plots to warrant further evaluation. Panicle and valuated by examining 25 non-systematically selected shoot ch) per plot for evidence of infection such as when blighted es or entire shoots dried and turned brown. In addition ection was confirmed by inspecting petioles for elongated black olus blighted leaves having large necrotic lesions with blackened of fungus that would not rub off, as opposed to Alternaria leaf s lesions delineated with reddish margins and sporulating er of necrotic lesions that are blackened and rub off the leaf e clusters were also non-systematically selected and the rachis r evidence of infection. Incidence was then determined based on sence of symptoms on either shoots or clusters. In addition, n on the leaves of infected shoots was ranked on a scale of no infection and $10 = 100\%$ blighted. Effects on bird feeding rmined by inspecting the clusters visible from ground level and n nuts that had been broken open and the kernels either partially ed. Just prior to commercial harvest, clusters inspected in the ymptoms of direct sunburn, so 10 clusters per plot were non- cted and brought back to the field test facility to determine ss based on kernel quality (shrivel). Sub samples of 25 fruit ted non-systematically from the field samples, hulled and shelled. et end to end in a trough and the total length measured with an nine average length. The same kernels were then set side to side neasured to determine average width. Afterwards, the kernel sub yhed on a Sartorius GE1302 electronic balance to determine the

0. Statistical Analysis: Raw data were analyzed using 1-Way ANOVA, LSD, CV, Friedman's Test and Duncan's New Multiple Range Test (p = 0.05) using Gylling's Agriculture Research Manager Program (Version 7.5.0). Percentage data were not transformed. In cases when the assumption of variance homogeneity was not met, potentially invalid Analysis of Variance test results were allowed for viewing trends in the data. The percent control was calculated using Abbott's Formula (1925):

Percent control = 
$$\frac{(X - Y)}{X} \times 100$$

X = disease incidence in the untreated plots Y = disease incidence in the treated plots

The replicate raw data are located in Appendices 2-5.

#### **Results and Discussion**

Table 1 presents a summary of the results showing the effects of Surround WP on panicle and shoot blight of the shoots. There were no statistical differences between treatments and the data variation was low to moderate. Numerically, there were approximately 20% and 30% fewer infected shoots in the Surround WP-treated plots on average at 32 DA-C and 39DA-C, respectively. Transforming the data to percent control showed trends towards suppression at both evaluation intervals. Figure 1 illustrates the effects based on percent incidence and shows a consistent reduction in shoot disease incidence. The effects on disease severity shown in Table 1 showed little variation and the statistical separation was highly significant, which was also corroborated by the Friedman's Test results which indicated that a real treatment difference was likely.

**Table 1:** Summary of disease data showing the effects of Surround WP for preventing panicle and shoot blight (*Botryosphaeria dothidea*) on the shoots of pistachios (var. Kerman) grown near Kerman, CA. Spray applications were made on 6/16, 7/1, and 7/25/08, using a commercial-type airblast sprayer to apply 200 gpa. Evaluations were made on the indicated treatment evaluation intervals.

Insect	Code:								Boytros P			
Crop (	Code:								Pistachio			
Part R	ated:								Shoots			
Rating	Data Type:					Counts	Percent	Control	Counts	Percent	Control	Rating
Rating	Unit:					Incid	ence	%Unck	Incid	ence	% Unck	Severity
Rating	Date:						8/26/08			9/2	/08	
Crop S	Stage:						Incidence			Incidence		Rating
Crop S	Stage Scale:											Scale
Insect	Stage:											0-10
Trt-Eva	al Interval						32 DA-C			39 E	DA-C	
Trt. No.	Treatment Name	Form Conc.	Form Type	Rate	Rate Unit							
1	Untreated					13.88a	55.50a	0.0a	18.8a	75.0a	0.0a	2.9a
2	NA											
3	Surround Breakthrough	100 100	WP L	50 3	lb/a oz/100 gal.	10.75a	43.00a	24.7a	13.0a	52.0a	30.5a	2.2b
LSD (F	P=.05)					11.087	44.349	42.43	11.43	45.71	39.86	0.40
Standa	ard Deviation					4.928	19.710	18.86	5.08	20.31	17.72	0.18
CV						40.02	40.02	152.95	31.99	31.99	116.17	6.94
Bartlet	tťs X2					3.214	3.214	0.0	0.292	0.292	0.0	0.021
P (Bar	tlett's X2)					0.073	0.073		0.589	0.589		0.884
Friedm	nan's X2					1.0	1.0	2.25	1.0	1.0	2.25	4.0
P (Frie	dman's X2)					0.317	0.317	0.314	0.317	0.317	0.314	0.046
Replic	ate F					0.667	0.667	1.000	0.354	0.354	1.000	14.644
Replic	ate Prob(F)					0.6263	0.6263	0.2000	0.7919	0.7919	0.5000	0.0269
Treatm	nent F					0.804	0.804	3.420	2.564	2.564	5.928	33.592
Treatm	nent Prob(F)					0.4359	0.4359	0.1615	0.2077	0.2077	0.0929	0.0102

Means followed by same letter do not significantly differ (P=.05, Duncan's New MRT).

Mean comparisons performed only when AOV Treatment P(F) is significant at mean comparison OSL.

The effects on the incidence of blighted clusters (rachis) are summarized in Table 2. The response on the clusters was not as apparent as with the shoots and there were still no statistical differences between treatments. However, similar trends were indicated. There were approximately 12% fewer infected clusters in the Surround WP-treated plots than were counted in untreated plots. Percent control indicated possible suppression of the disease. This was most likely a result of chance because there was only a single evaluation of clusters, with low variation in the data, and the Friedman's Test results very strongly indicated that treatment differences were highly unlikely. These results are reasonable considering the difficulty of getting coverage with sufficient spray material on the clusters.

**Table 2:** Summary of disease data showing the effects of Surround WP for preventing panicle and shoot blight (*Botryosphaeria dothidea*) on the clusters of pistachios (var. Kerman) grown near Kerman, CA. Spray applications were made on 6/16, 7/1, and 7/25/08, using a commercial-type airblast sprayer to apply 200 gpa. Evaluations were made on the indicated treatment evaluation intervals.

Insect	Code:						Boytros P	
Crop (	Code: Pistachio							
Part R	Part Rated: Rachis						Rachis	
Rating	) Data Type:					Counts	Percent	Control
Rating	y Unit:					Incid	lence	%Unck
Rating	Date:						9/2/08	
Crop S	Stage:						Incidence	
Crop S	Stage Scale:							
Insect	Stage:							
Trt-Eva	al Interval						32 DA-C	
Trt. No.	Treatment Name	Form Conc.	Form Type	Rate	Rate Unit			
1	Untreated					4.0a	16.0a	0.0a
2	NA							
3	Surround Break Thru	100 100	WP L	50 3	lb/a oz/100 gal.	3.5a	14.0a	20.0a
LSD (F	P=.05)	<u>^</u>			•	2.76	11.02	36.74
Standa	ard Deviation					1.22	4.9	16.33
CV						32.66	32.66	163.3
Bartlet	tt's X2					1.268	1.268	0.0
P (Bar	tlett's X2)					0.26	0.26	
Friedn	nan's X2					0.0	0.0	1.0
P (Frie	dman's X2)					1.00	1.00	0.317
Replic	ate F					0.111	0.111	1.000
Replic	ate Prob(F)					0.9480	0.9480	0.5000
Treatm	nent F					0.333	0.333	3.000
Treatm	nent Prob(F)					0.6042	0.6042	0.1817

Means followed by same letter do not significantly differ (P=.05, Duncan's New MRT). Mean comparisons performed only when AOV Treatment P(F) is significant at mean comparison OSL.

Statistical analysis of the bird feeding damage showed significant differences between Surround WP and the untreated check (Table 3). There were approximately 70% fewer clusters with damaged nuts in the Surround WP-treated plots than were found in the untreated check. These results showed that the test material approached being commercially effective at control, rather than suppressive. Figure 2 is a graphic representation of the response to Surround WP and the relative control compared to the untreated check.

**Table 3:** Summary of single nut data showing the effects of Surround WP for preventing bird feeding damage on pistachios (var. Kerman) grown near Kerman, CA. Spray applications were made on 6/16, 7/1, and 7/25/08, using a commercial-type airblast sprayer to apply 200 gpa. Evaluations were made on the indicated treatment evaluation intervals.

Insect	Code:								
Crop (	Code:								
Part R	ated:						N	uts	
Rating	Data Type:					Counts	Control	Counts	Control
Rating	Unit:					Feed Dam	% Unck	Feed Dam	% Unck
Rating	Date:					8/26/08	8/26/08	9/2/08	9/2/08
Crop S	Stage:					Clusters		Clusters	
Crop S	Stage Scale:								
Insect	Stage:								
Trt-Eva	al Interval						32 DA-C		
Trt. No.	Treatment Name	Form Conc.	Form Type	Rate	Rate Unit				
1	Untreated					3.0a	0.0b	6.0a	0.0b
2	NA								
3	Surround Break Thru	100 100	WP L	50 3	lb/a oz/100 gal.	1.1b	59.5a	1.8b	73.3a
LSD (F	P=.05)	^				1.64	38.02006529	2.0	28.72299482
Standa	ard Deviation					0.73	16.89770486	0.89	12.765669780
CV						35.34	56.72	22.96	34.82
Bartlet	t's X2					1.705	0.0	0.793	0.0
P (Bar	tlett's X2)					0.192		0.373	
Friedm	nan's X2					4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
P (Frie	dman's X2)					0.046	0.046	0.046	0.046
Danlia	ata L					1 607	1 000	6 905	1 000
Replic						1.627	1.000	6.895	1.000
Replic	ate Prob(F)					0.3494	0.5000	0.0736	0.5000
Ireatm						13.235	24.867	45.632	66.000
Treatm	ent Prob(F)					3.0358	0.0155	0.0066	0.0039

Means followed by same letter do not significantly differ (P=.05, Duncan's New MRT).

Mean comparisons performed only when AOV Treatment P(F) is significant at mean comparison OSL.

A summary of the kernel quality data results are presented in Table 4. The heat-reducing effects of Surround WP did not enhance kernel quality in this trial. Occasional epicarp lesion resembling shrivel was observed related to plant bug feeding damage, but did not occur in measurable numbers. The crop was light due to alternate bearing and this year was an off year within the test orchard, so the trees were not particularly stressed. The result was that there were no statistical differences between treatments concerning kernel length, width and the weight per kernel.

In conclusion, even though measurable OBLR damage did not occur in the test orchard and the direct effects of sunburn were not observed, useful information was obtained on the potential for Surround WP to suppress panicle and shoot blight and possibly Alternaria late blight. Surround WP was also shown to be effective at reducing bird feeding damage on the fruit. This preliminary data should be enough to warrant further investigations on these types of uses on pistachios and other susceptible cropping systems.

**Table 4:** Summary of kernel data showing the effects of Surround WP on quality parameters at maturity of pistachios (var. Kerman) grown near Kerman, CA. Spray applications were made on 6/16, 7/1, and 7/25/08, using a commercial-type airblast sprayer to apply 200 gpa. Evaluations were made on the indicated treatment evaluation interval.

Insect	Code:						Boytros P		
Crop (	Code:					Pistachio			
Part R	ated:						Rachis		
Rating	) Data Type:						Kernel		
Rating	J Unit:					Length	Width	Weight	
Rating	Date:						9/8/08		
Crop S	Stage:					MM	MM	Gram	
Crop S	Stage Scale:					Per Kern	25 Nuts	Per Kern	
Trt-Ev	al Interval						45 DA-C		
Trt. No.	Treatment Name	Form Conc.	Form Type	Rate	Rate Unit				
1	Untreated					17.0a	251.8a	0.79a	
2	Intrepid	2	F	12	fl oz/a	17.4a	256.3a	0.90a	
3	Surround Break Thru	100 100	WP L	50 3	lb/a oz/100 gal.	16.8a	258.8a	0.85a	
LSD (F	P=.05)	<u></u>			•	1.32	20.20	0.245	
Stand	ard Deviation					0.77	11.67	0.142	
CV						4.5	4.57	16.72	
Bartle	tt's X2					2.532	2.359	2.565	
P (Bar	tlett's X2)					0.282	0.307	0.277	
Friedn	nan's X2					0.5	0.125	1.5	
P (Frie	dman's X2)					0.779	0.939	0.472	
Denlie	oto L				0	0.626	0.500	0.140	
						0.030	0.590	0.142	
Replic	ate Prob(F)					0.6188	0.6436	0.9310	
Ireatn						0.686	0.369	0.552	
Ireatn	nent Prob(F)					0.5391	0.7259	0.6027	

Means followed by same letter do not significantly differ (P=.05, Duncan's New MRT). Mean comparisons performed only when AOV Treatment P(F) is significant at mean comparison OSL.

Surround WP did present handling problems related to weighing and loading because of the particle size and packaging of the formulated product. Mixing and spraying were not a serious problem using a commercial-type sprayer with mechanical agitation. No phytotoxicity was observed.





#### References

Abbott, W.S. 1925. A method of computing the effectiveness of an insecticide. J. Econ. Entomol. 18 (2): 265-267.