


2008 PROCESSING TOMATO VARIETY TRIALS



University of California Cooperative Extension
70 Cottonwood Street
Woodland, CA 95695
(530) 666-8143

CONTRIBUTORS

GROWER COOPERATORS:

Special appreciation to our cooperating growers. Their generous donation of resources (management, land, labor and equipment) remains essential.

JOE ROMINGER, D.A. Rominger and Sons, Winters

STEVE MEEK AND JOHN PON, J.H. Meek and Sons, Woodland

FIELD ASSISTANCE:

MARK KOCHI, Field Research Assistant, Yolo County

MARGARET LLOYD, Summer Field Assistant, Student, UC Davis

SARA PEARSON, Summer Field Assistant, Student, Modesto Junior College

PROJECT COORDINATION:

UC ADVISORS SCOTT STODDARD (PROJECT LEADER), BRENN AEGERTER, MICHELLE LE STRANGE, JAN MICKLER, MIKE MURRAY, TOM TURINI AND JOE NUNEZ

DIANE BARRETT & SAM MATOBA, Food Science and Technology Department, UCD

TIM HARTZ, Vegetable Crops Specialist, UCD

FRUIT QUALITY EVALUATIONS:

TOM RAMME, RICHARD MONTGOMERY AND CREW, Processing Tomato Advisory Board

DIANE BARRETT, SAM MATOBA AND CREW, Food Science and Technology Department, UCD

TRANSPLANT SUPPORT:

ANDY PON, WESTSIDE TRANSPLANTS, FIREBAUGH

CHRIS TIMOTHY, WESTSIDE TRANSPLANTS, WINTERS

TIMOTHY, STEWART AND LEKOS SEED COMPANY, WOODLAND.

FUNDING SUPPORT:

CHUCK RIVARA AND THE CALIF. TOMATO RESEARCH INSTITUTE

SEED COMPANIES

CALIFORNIA LEAGUE OF FOOD PROCESSORS (PROCESSING STUDY COMPONENT, #T-4)

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS FOR STATEWIDE REPORT:

GAIL NISHIMOTO, Statistician

SCOTT STODDARD, PROJECT COORDINATOR FOR UC

BOOKLET COMPILATION:

KATIE CHURCHILL, Secretary, Yolo County

Respectfully submitted,

Gene Miyao

Farm Advisor, Yolo/Solano/Sacramento counties

Dec 2008

105 copies

Cooperative Extension in Agriculture and Home Economics. US Department of Agriculture, University of California and Yolo County Cooperating.

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

The University of California prohibits discrimination against or harassment of any person on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, physical condition (cancer-related or genetic characteristics), ancestry, marital status, age, sexual orientation, citizenship, or status as a covered veteran (special disabled veteran, Vietnam-era veteran or any other veteran who served on active duty during a war or in a campaign or expedition for which a campaign badge has been authorized).

University Policy is intended to be consistent with the provisions of applicable State and Federal laws.

Inquiries regarding the University's nondiscrimination policies may be directed to the Affirmative Action/Staff Personnel Services Director, University of California, Agriculture and Natural Resources., 1111 Franklin, 6th Floor, Oakland, CA 94607-5200. (510) 987-0096.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| SUMMARY OF 2008 YOLO/SOLANO/SACRAMENTO COUNTY TRIALS | 1-5 |
| Table 1A. Early Maturity Entries, Winters..... | 6 |
| Table 1B. Mid-Maturity Variety Entries, Dixon | 7 |
| Table 2A. Plot Specifications, Early-Maturity, Winters | 8 |
| Table 2B. Plot Specifications, Mid-Maturity, Dixon | 9 |
| Table 3. Fruit Quality Factor Definitions | 10 |
| <u>WINTERS, REPLICATED, EARLY-MATURITY</u> | |
| Table 4. Yield, °Brix, color & defects at harvest..... | 11 |
| Table 5. Stand, vine size, canopy and maturity | 11 |
| <u>DIXON, REPLICATED, MID-MATURITY</u> | |
| Table 6A. Yields, °Brix, color and defects at harvest | 12 |
| Table 6B. Stand, vine size, canopy and maturity | 13 |
| <u>DIXON, OBSERVATIONAL, MID-MATURITY</u> | |
| Table 7A. Yields, °Brix, color and defects at harvest | 14 |
| Table 7B. Stand, vine size, canopy and maturity | 14 |

Statewide compile variety report is located on the Internet at:

<http://vric.ucdavis.edu/>

Local report is also electronically available at UCCE Yolo web site:

[http://ceyolo.ucdavis.edu/Vegetable Crops/PROCESSING TOMATO VARIETY TRIALS.htm](http://ceyolo.ucdavis.edu/Vegetable_Crops/PROCESSING_TOMATO_VARIETY_TRIALS.htm)

2008 Processing Tomato Variety Evaluation Trials Yolo/Solano/Sacramento Counties

by

Gene Miyao, UC Farm Advisor, and Mark Kochi, Field Assistant, Yolo County

Statewide production of canning tomatoes in 2008 was over 11.8 million tons. While statewide acreage totals are arguable, average yields are likely record highs approaching 43 tons per acre.

Dry soil conditions in the Sacramento Valley may have contributed to reduced compaction and thus helped to achieve high yields. Higher yields were observed even for the late season harvests. Estimates are that 25 to 33% of the northern production area is currently irrigated by drip, a practice further enhancing yields, and gaining in popularity.

Weather conditions were fair. From Woodland weather station records, we had few 100° plus days: 3 in mid May, 2 in June, 5 in July, 7 in August, and 3 in September. Nearly all the high temperatures occurred in continuous streaks for that month. Rainfall was low during the season. No rainfall occurred in March and 0.05" accumulated in April and May combined. The harvest period was favorably dry until a 0.07" rain event on Oct 4th, but remained dry thereafter until the 31st.

We saw the most widespread, severe tomato powdery mildew ever in our area. Leaf desiccation especially in September was alarming. Fungicides commonly failed to achieve a high level of mildew control.

We also saw a substantial increase in the incidence of tomato spotted wilt virus in the area. While losses were generally limited in most fields, some fields had high rates of infection from this thrips-vectored virus.

Variety Evaluation Trials

Evaluation of varieties for local adaptation continued to be a part of the University of California farm advisor program. Our objective was to identify dependable, high yielding and high quality variety releases that can be grown over a wide geographic area under varying environmental conditions. The varieties were compared side-by-side in an experimentally sound designed test within local counties in the Central Valley from Colusa to Kern. Tests were conducted in a similar fashion to compare local results with tests by UC farm advisors in other locations.

Entries:

Varieties were selected in consultation with processors and seed companies.

The early-maturity trial included 9 varieties (table 1A). Variety standards were Heinz 9280 and APT 410. All early varieties were evaluated in a replicated design. All varieties in the early trial had VFFNP resistance, except H 2006 with only VF, Gem 89 with VFF and HED 1058 with only FN resistance. APT 410 was also evaluated as 2 plants per plug compared to the traditional single plant.

In the mid-maturity trial, 13 replicated and 8 observational varieties were included (table 1B). Mid-maturity standards were AB 2, H 9780 and H 2601. All mid entries except AB 2 and NDM 5578 have nematode resistance; and only AB 8058, Nun 672 and UG 4305 were without bacterial speck resistance. AB 8058 and Nun 6385 are listed as resistant to spotted wilt.

Locations:

The local early trial was north of Winters with Don Rominger and Sons. The mid maturity trial was northwest of Dixon with J.H. Meek and Sons.

Other UC tests were conducted by farm advisors representing Colusa, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced, Fresno and Kern counties.

Methods:

Both the early and mid-maturity trials were established from commercially grown greenhouse transplants. Plants were pulled from trays, counted, bundled and bagged ahead of the field planting. The grower's equipment and crew mechanically set the transplants. Skips were filled within a day of the planting. The few transplants that did not survive were replaced over a 2-week period.

Both trials were transplanted on twin lines, a foot apart from each other, centered on a 5' bed. All plots were 100' long. A short alley separated each replicate block.

All cultural practices in these ~1 acre experimental sites were those of the cooperating grower and matched management of the remaining larger area of their commercial tomato field.

Field meetings were held at each site as fruit ripened to provide an opportunity to examine the performance of the varieties in side-by-side comparisons.

To measure yield, fruit from the entire plot were harvested into special weigh trailers using the grower's harvesting equipment and crew. A 5-gallon volumetric sample of unsorted fruit was collected from the mechanical harvester to evaluate fruit defects. Fruit was sampled along the length of the plot. These fruit were graded into categories of marketable red, pink, green, sun-damage, mold and blossom end rot and measured by weight.

From the marketable reds, an ~7 pound sample from each plot was bagged and delivered to a local inspection station of the Processing Tomato Advisory Board. Color, °Brix (soluble solids) and pH were determined by PTAB with a procedure consistent with commercial grading. Additionally, similar samples were hand picked by the Diane Barrett Lab from the UC Davis Food Science and Technology Department to evaluate processing quality.

Statistical analysis of variance methods were used to help interpret the data. Conclusions derived from non-replicated data should be viewed with much less confidence.

EARLY-MATURITY EVALUATION: WINTERS (TRANSPLANTED)

Early-maturity varieties were evaluated with Joe Rominger in a Don Rominger and Sons field north of Winters. We transplanted on March 18 into twin seed lines per bed in a class 1, Yolo silt loam soil with good soil conditions (Table 2A). Vines grew well during the season. Irrigation was frequent in alternating, every-other furrow sequence and maintained close to harvest. Fruit set was fair. Harvest was timely on July 18.

Table 4 early replicated—yield, fruit quality and culls: The highest yielding group was led by BOS 66509 with 50.3 tons per acre, although statistically grouped with 3 other varieties including Sun 6366, APT 410 and AB 4606. H 9280 was one of the lowest yielding with 34.7 tons. These same varieties also ranked highest and lowest in the 2007 test.

H 2206 had the highest Brix level with 5.5, but included AB 4606, Sun 6366 and CXD 274 in the high solids group. Gem 89 had the best color at 24, but included 3 others as well. Fruit pH was lowest with AB 4606 with 4.41, but included 2 others in the same statistical grouping.

The level of below-colored fruit was highest for AB 4606 at 13% combined green and pink fruit. Sunburn damage was variable and without statistical significance. Mold was highest with HED 1058 and H 9280, both at 4%. H 2206 had the smallest fruit while AB 4606 had large fruit (as measured by weight of a 50-count batch of fruit).

Double plants per plug of APT 410 had similar yield to the single plant configuration (45.3 vs 47.0 tons, respectively).

Table 5 early replicated— stand, vine size, canopy cover and estimated maturity: Plant population on the double row planting was about 9,600 plugs per acre. Transplant stands were comparable to each other amongst the varieties.

Vine size was difficult to judge with the twin row planting. Overall vine size was moderate. The smaller-vined varieties in this test were H 9280, H 2206 and Gem 89 at or below 78% of the row width.

Canopy cover for fruit protection from sun damage ranged from 55 to 88%. Fruit canopy cover was fair overall, but weak with H 2006, HED 1058 and H 9280.

Visual rating of 'days-to-estimated-harvest' date was made relative to APT 410. The differences appeared to range from -9 to 5 days later on average. The earliest variety in the test was H 2206, estimated to be 9 days earlier than APT 410. The latest maturing variety was CXD 274, almost 5 days behind APT 410.

MID-MATURITY EVALUATION: DIXON (TRANSPLANTED)

Our local mid-maturity variety trial evaluation was transplanted with J.H. Meek and Sons northwest of Dixon on a class 1, Yolo silty clay loam soil. Seedling plugs were mechanically transplanted on April 7th in double lines per bed (Table 2B). Seedbed condition was very good. The field was only furrow irrigated. Vine growth was robust and required vine training. Verticillium wilt was prevalent

while powdery mildew incidence was moderately low. Ripening was slower than calendar-days projection schedule. Harvest on August 20 was optimal for fruit conditions.

REPLICATED ENTRIES (DIXON)

Table 6A mid replicated— yield, fruit quality and culls: Five of the varieties were in the top yield category led by AB 8058 with 65.5 tons per acre. The lowest yielding varieties were H 2601, NDM 5578 and PX 1723, all with at least 52 tons per acre. Overall yields were high.

Brix level was moderate. The high Brix group was led by AB 2 with 5.5, but included 5 other varieties.

NDM 5578 had the best color with 23.3, but included 6 others.

Fruit pH was lowest with HM 6898 at 4.44, but included 5 others in the statistically similar group. Fruit pH tended to be elevated with several varieties above 4.50.

Culls levels were low to moderate. Differences were statistically significant for all categories from pink, green, sunburn and mold, but not blossom end rot (of which there were few). PX 1723 tended to be one of the largest fruited varieties, although many other varieties were within a similar size category.

As double plants per plug, none of the individual varieties tested were statistically significantly different when compared to their single plant counterpart. When compared as a group, doubles were significantly superior to singles with an average yield gain of almost 3 tons per acre, even though fruit size was smaller.

Table 6B mid replicated— vine size, canopy cover and estimated maturity: The larger-vine varieties which spanned the full row width were AB 2, AB 8058 and UG 4305. H 2005 and Nun 672 were also in the large vine group. The moderate sized vine types included H 4007 and NDM 5578 were among the smallest-vine varieties at 84% row-width. Overall vine size was large in the trial. Vines were larger when planted as double plants per plug (as a general group).

Canopy cover was evaluated shortly before harvest. Canopy cover at time of harvest of 80% or more is desirable, while levels below 50% are usually problematic for fruit protection from sun damage. Canopy was poorest with H 4007 at 64% and included in this group, H 8004, HM 6898, H 2601 and NDM 5578. Canopy cover was 85% or better with PX 1723, Nun 672 and AB 2.

A visual estimate of days to harvest was assessed and compared to the standard AB 2. H 4007, NDM 5578 and UG 4305 appeared to be the earlier maturing varieties, respectively 7, 6 and 4 days earlier than AB 2. The latest varieties in our test appeared to be H 9780 and H 2005, 4 days later maturing than AB 2. HM 6898 was also in the later statistical grouping, at 2 days later.

NON-REPLICATED ENTRIES (DIXON)

Table 7A: mid observational—Dixon: The highest yielding non-replicated variety was CXD 255 with 67.5 tons per acre with large fruit. DRI 0303 (AB 3) had the highest Brix at 5.3° and amongst the best color at 24. Acid levels as measured by pH was generally high, but lowest with H 8504 at 4.37.

Culls were generally low except mold level was high with CXD 269 at 11%. BOS 1411 had very large fruit.

Table 7B mid observational— vine size, canopy, and estimated maturity: All vines covered 90% or more of the row width, except for HMX 7885 at 80%. Canopy cover was good overall except for Nun 6390 and HMX 7885 with 60 and 65%, respectively. Maturities ranged from within -4 days to +4 days of AB 2.

UC STATEWIDE VARIETY REPORT: Statewide compiled variety report with other UC advisor tests is posted at UC Vegetable Research and Information Center at:

<http://vric.ucdavis.edu/>

Table 1A. Early Maturity Entries, 2008 Statewide UC Processing Tomato Variety Trial, D.A. Rominger and Sons, Winters.

| | Company | Replicated (9) | |
|---|---------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 1 | Campbell | CXD 274 | \$VFFNP |
| 2 | DeRuiter | AB 4606 | \$VFFNP |
| 3 | HED Seeds | HED 1058 | \$FN |
| 4 | Heinz | H 2206 H 9280 | \$VF \$VFFNP |
| 5 | Nunhems | SUN 6366 | \$VFFNP |
| 6 | Ochoa Seed | Gem 89 | \$VFF |
| 7 | Orsetti Seeds | BOS 66509 | \$VFFNP |
| 8 | Seminis | APT 410 | \$VFFNP |

BOLD LETTERS = trial standards

Code: Disease Resistance and Hybrid Status*

| | | |
|------------------|---|---|
| ¢ | = | OPEN POLLINATED |
| \$ | = | HYBRID |
| V | = | VERTICILLIUM WILT RESISTANT |
| F | = | RACE 1 FUSARIUM WILT RESISTANT |
| FF | = | RACE 1 AND 2 FUSARIUM WILT RESISTANT |
| FFF ₃ | = | RACE 1, 2 AND 3 FUSARIUM WILT RESISTANT |
| N | = | ROOT KNOT NEMATODE RESISTANT (SOME SPECIES) |
| P | = | BACTERIAL SPECK RESISTANT (RACE 0) |
| D | = | DODDER TOLERANCE |
| TMV | = | TOBACCO MOSAIC VIRUS |
| Lv | = | POWDERY MILDEW |
| SW | = | SPOTTED WILT VIRUS |

* Check with seed company to confirm disease resistance.

Table 1B. Mid-Maturity Varieties, 2008 UC Processing Tomato Variety Trial, JH Meek and Sons.

| Company | 13 replicated | | 8 observational | |
|--------------------|------------------|-----------|--------------------|------------|
| 1 Campbell Soup | | | CXD 255 | \$VFFNP |
| | | | CXD 269 | \$VFFNP |
| 2 DeRuiter | AB 2 | \$VFFP | AB 3 (DRI 0303) | \$VFFNP |
| | AB 8058 | \$VFFN SW | | |
| 3 Harris Moran | HMX 6898 | \$VFFNP | HMX 7885 | \$VFFNP |
| 4 Heinz | H 4007 | \$VFFNP | H 8504 | \$VFFNP |
| | H 2005 | \$VFFNP | | |
| | H 2601 | \$VFFNP | | |
| | H 8004 | \$VFFNP | | |
| | H 9780 | \$VFFNP | | |
| 5 Nippon Del Monte | NDM 5578 | \$VFFP | | |
| 6 Nunhems | Nun 672 | \$VFFN | Nun 6385 | \$VFFNP SW |
| | Sun 6368 | \$VFFNP | Nun 6390 | \$VFFNP |
| 7 Orsetti | | | BOS 1411 | \$VFFNP |
| 8 Seminis | PX 1723 | \$VFFNP | | |
| 9 United Genetics | UG 4305 | \$VFFN | | |

BOLD LETTERS = trial standards

*** Check with seed company to confirm disease resistance.**

Table 2A. Plot Specifications, Early-Maturity, Winters, 2008

Cooperator: Joe Rominger,
D.A. Rominger and Sons, Winters

Location: NW of Winters. ~ ½ mile west of CR 89 & ½ mile north of CR 31.
NW 1/4 of SE 1/4, Section 4, T8N, R1W, MDM. SCS sheet #66.

Field Variety: APT 410, double lines on 5'-centered beds.

Plot Design: Randomized complete block, 4 reps. Individual plots were 500 square feet, 100' x 5'.

Greenhouse: Westside Transplants, Firebaugh with #338 trays

Planting Date: 18 March as transplants, #338 tray from Westside Transplants

Population: ~9400 plugs per acre

Fertilizers: 100 lbs. 11-52-0 sidedressed in fall
10 gallons 8-24-5 plus zinc chelate pre-plant
50 gallons 28-0-0 (5% S) sidedress at layby
10 gallons UN 32 & 10 gallons CAN 17 as water run

Field Meeting: 14 July

Fruit Quality Sample: 15 July, UCD Food Science Project
18 July, PTAB

1st Ripe Fruit ~15 June (early fruit ripening stage)

Harvest: 18 July (122 days after planting)

Soil type: Yolo silt loam, Class 1, Storie Index 100.
32% sand, 37% silt, 31% clay in top foot

Soil Sample 18 March

O-1 foot depth

| | |
|-----------------------------|------|
| pH | 6.4 |
| EC (dS/m) | 0.6 |
| P (ppm) | 20 |
| K exchangeable (ppm) | 208 |
| Na exchangeable (meq/100 g) | 0.14 |
| Ca exchangeable (meq/100 g) | 12 |
| Mg exchangeable (meq/100 g) | 8 |

Previous Crop: 2006 & 2007 tomatoes

Irrigation method: furrow

General: Good planting conditions. Slow vine growth from the early to mid growth stages. Frequent, every-other-row irrigation. High tonnage, especially for slow early growth with early maturity varieties.

Table 2B. Plot Specifications, Transplant, Mid-Maturity, Dixon, 2008

Cooperator: Steve Meek and John Pon, J.H. Meek and Sons, Woodland

Location: ~5 miles northwest of Dixon, ~2 mile west of Stevenson Bridge Road, ~1.25 mile south of Putah Creek Road near Campbell Road at northern connection to Putah Creek Road. MDM SCS map #2.

Field Variety: AB 2, double lines on 5'-centered beds.

Plot Design: Randomized complete block with 4 reps. Non-replicated plots adjacent to 1st rep. All individual plots 500 square feet (100' x 5')

Greenhouse: Westside Transplants, Firebaugh/Winters in #338 trays for replicated and #392 trays for observational entries

Planting Date: 7 April as transplants

Population: ~8700 plugs per acre.

Fertilizers: 100 lbs. 8-25-26 sidedress in fall
140 lbs N as 28-0-0 (5 Sulfur) as sidedress
10 lbs. N as CAN 17 mid season

Field Meeting: 14 August

Fruit Quality Sample: 11 August, Food Science; 20 August, PTAB

First Ripe Fruit: ~13 August (early ripening fruit stage)

Harvest: 20 August (135 days after transplanting)

Soil type: Yolo silty clay loam, class 1, Storie Index 90
16% sand, 52% silt, 32% clay in top foot.

Soil Sample: 7 April

O-1 foot depth

| | |
|-----------------------------|------|
| pH | 7.3 |
| EC (dS/m) | 0.9 |
| C (%) | 1.3 |
| P (ppm) | 30 |
| K exchangeable (ppm) | 308 |
| Na exchangeable (meq/100 g) | 0.20 |
| Ca exchangeable (meq/100 g) | 12 |
| Mg exchangeable (meq/100 g) | 12 |

Previous Crop: 2007 wheat

Irrigation method: furrow

General: Transplants established and grew well. Verticillium wilt prevalent with scattered low level of spotted wilt and moderately low level of powdery mildew. Very high tonnage. Harvest was well timed for the trial.

Table 3. Fruit Quality Factor Definitions

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| SOLUBLE SOLIDS OR °BRIX | A measure of mostly fruit sugars. Soluble solids are directly related to finished processed product yield of pastes and sauces. Soluble solids are estimated with a refractometer, and measured as °Brix. |
| PH | A measure of acidity. A level below 4.35 is desirable to prevent bacterial spoilage of finished product. pH rises as fruit matures. |
| COLOR | Measured with a Processing Tomato Advisory Board LED instrument simulating Agtron. Lower numbers correspond to better red fruit color. |

FIELD SAMPLING PROCEDURE

Fruit quality determinations were obtained by collecting ~7 pound sample of ripe, non-defect fruit from each plot. A local grade station of the Processing Tomato Advisory Board evaluated our fruit samples for soluble solids (Brix), color and pH.

To determine finished product thickness, additional samples were collected by Sam Matoba and crew and evaluated in the Diane Barrett lab at the UC Davis Food Science and Technology Department as part of a California League of Food Processors-funded project. Two blocks of replicated varieties and all non-replicated plots were evaluated. °Brix, pH, titratable acidity (reported as percent citric acid), and juice Bostwick were the factors measured. The results of the Food Science project are in a separate report.

Fruit defects in the field were estimated by collecting ~5 gallons of unsorted fruit from the mechanical harvester. Fruit were separated into marketable red, pink, green, sun-damaged, mold and blossom end rot categories. Measurements were on a weight basis and reported as percent.

Table 4. Winters, Replicated, Early-Maturity: Yield, quality and cull-out from

| Variety | Yield tons/A | | Brix | PTAB color | pH | % pink | % green | % sun burn | % mold | % BER | lbs./ 50 fruit |
|----------------|-----------------|------|------|---------------|------|-----------|------------|---------------|-----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 BOS 66509 | 50.3 | a | 4.9 | 26 | 4.49 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 7.0 |
| 2 SUN 6366 | 47.1 | ab | 5.2 | 27 | 4.46 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 7.1 |
| 3 APT 410 | 47.0 | abc | 4.8 | 26 | 4.49 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 6.8 |
| 4 APT 410=Dbls | 45.3 | abcd | 5.0 | 24 | 4.45 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 6.4 |
| 5 AB 4606 | 43.8 | abcd | 5.4 | 27 | 4.41 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8.1 |
| 6 Gem 89 | 43.0 | bcd | 5.0 | 24 | 4.51 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6.8 |
| 7 CXD 274 | 40.5 | cde | 5.2 | 25 | 4.49 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 6.3 |
| 8 HED 1058 | 40.0 | de | 4.4 | 26 | 4.45 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4 | 1 | 6.2 |
| 9 H 2206 | 35.5 | e | 5.5 | 25 | 4.51 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4.5 |
| 10 H 9280 | 34.7 | e | 4.5 | 25 | 4.50 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 7.0 |
| LSD 0.05 | 6.5 | | 0.32 | 1.5 | 0.05 | 3.0 | 1.3 | NS | 1.1 | NS | 0.7 |
| CV | 11 | | 4 | 4 | 1 | 89 | 53 | 83 | 54 | 139 | 7 |
| Average | 42.7 | | 5.0 | 25.2 | 4.48 | 2.5 | 1.7 | 5.3 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 6.6 |

Major Points:

- | 4 varieties in the top yielding group led by BOS 66509 (Bos 66509 top yielding in 2007 test)
 - | H 2206 in the top Brix group along with AB 4066, Sun 6366 and CXD 274
 - | Double plants per plug no yield advantage over singles with APT 410 in this test
- tomato variety evaluation, D.A. Rominger & Sons, 2008.

Table 5. Winters, Replicated, Early-Maturity: Stand, vine size, canopy and maturity (twin-row per bed), D.A. Rominger and Sons, 2008.

| Replicated Variety | plants per 100 feet | % bed cover | % fruit canopy cover | estimated harvest days (to APT 410) |
|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|--|
| 1 AB 4606 | 109 | 85 | 83 | 2.5 |
| 2 APT 410 | 110 | 90 | 83 | 0.0 |
| 3 BOS 66509 | 109 | 90 | 88 | 2.0 |
| 4 CXD 274 | 110 | 83 | 73 | 4.8 |
| 5 Gem 89 | 108 | 78 | 85 | 2.5 |
| 6 H 2206 | 108 | 73 | 55 | -9.0 |
| 7 H 9280 | 109 | 70 | 63 | -1.5 |
| 8 HED 1058 | 109 | 88 | 55 | -3.8 |
| 9 SUN 6366 | 110 | 90 | 78 | 1.8 |
| 11 APT 410=Dbls | 110 | 90 | 85 | 0.8 |
| LSD .05 | NS | 7 | 9 | 2.1 |
| % CV | 1 | 6 | 9 | 6 |

Major Points:

- | Vine size least with H 9280 and H 2206 at about 70%
- | Fruit canopy cover sparse with HED 158, H 2206 and H 9280
- | Maturity was clearly the earliest with H 2206, 9 days earlier than APT 410 in this test.

Table 6A. Dixon, Replicated, Mid-Maturity: Yield, fruit quality and defects from processing tomato variety trial (transplant), JH Meek and Sons, 2008

| Replicated Variety | Yield tons/A | | Brix | PTAB color | pH | % pink | % green | % sun burn | % mold | % BER | lbs per 50 fruit |
|--------------------|--------------|-----|------|------------|------|--------|---------|------------|--------|-------|------------------|
| 1 H 9780 double | 67.0 | a | 5.00 | 25.5 | 4.45 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 7.08 |
| 2 AB 8058 | 65.5 | ab | 4.73 | 24.5 | 4.51 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 7.55 |
| 3 AB 2 double | 65.5 | ab | 5.53 | 27.0 | 4.44 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 5.19 |
| 4 SUN 6368 | 64.6 | ab | 4.95 | 25.8 | 4.45 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6.35 |
| 5 H 9780 | 64.2 | ab | 4.95 | 26.5 | 4.45 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 7.53 |
| 6 UG 4305 | 64.0 | ab | 5.03 | 24.8 | 4.52 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 6.45 |
| 7 AB 2 | 63.6 | abc | 5.50 | 26.8 | 4.46 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 7.56 |
| 8 H 2005 | 61.8 | bcd | 5.23 | 25.5 | 4.51 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6.20 |
| 9 NUN 672 | 59.7 | cde | 4.78 | 23.8 | 4.56 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 6.09 |
| 10 H 8004 | 58.7 | de | 5.20 | 26.0 | 4.55 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 7.43 |
| 11 H 4007 | 58.5 | de | 4.75 | 23.8 | 4.64 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 5.96 |
| 12 HM 6898 | 57.4 | ef | 5.30 | 26.3 | 4.44 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 7.53 |
| 13 H 2601 double | 56.2 | efg | 5.13 | 25.3 | 4.57 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 6.75 |
| 14 PX 1723 | 55.5 | efg | 5.30 | 24.8 | 4.53 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 8.53 |
| 15 NDM 5578 | 53.4 | fg | 5.05 | 23.3 | 4.53 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 7.94 |
| 16 H 2601 | 52.2 | g | 5.23 | 24.8 | 4.59 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 6.76 |
| LSD 5% | 4.3 | | 0.28 | 1.6 | 0.07 | 1.62 | 1.6 | 3.5 | 2.1 | NS | 1.4 |
| % CV | 5 | | 4 | 5 | 1 | 92.3 | 70 | 58 | 66 | 245 | 14 |

Group comparisons:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|------|--|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|------|
| singles vs. | 60.0 | | 5.23 | 26.0 | 4.50 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 4.3 | 1.9 | 0.1 | 7.28 |
| dbl plants/plug | 62.9 | | 5.22 | 25.9 | 4.48 | 1.7 | 2.5 | 4.5 | 1.8 | 0.1 | 6.34 |
| F value | 5.7 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.4 |
| Probability | 0.02 | | NS | NS | NS | NS | 0.11 | NS | NS | NS | 0.02 |

Main Points

- | AB 8058 in the top yielding group along with Sun 6368, H 9780, UG 4305 and AB 2.
- | AB 2 in the top Brix level along with PX 1723, HM 6898, H 2601 and H 2005
- | Double plants per plug, as a group, outyielded singles by almost 3 tons per acre and had smaller fruit.

Table 6B. Dixon, Replicated, Mid-Maturity: stand, vine size, canopy cover and fruit maturity notes (transplant), JH Meek and Sons, 2008.

| Replicated Variety | Stand (plugs per 100') | vine size (% cover) | % fruit canopy cover | estimated harvest days (to AB 2) |
|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 AB 2 | 100 | 100 | 85 | 0 |
| 2 AB 8058 | 100 | 100 | 79 | -2 |
| 3 H 2005 | 99 | 95 | 76 | 4 |
| 4 H 2601 | 100 | 89 | 70 | -1 |
| 5 H 4007 | 100 | 84 | 64 | -7 |
| 6 H 8004 | 101 | 89 | 66 | 1 |
| 7 H 9780 | 100 | 94 | 79 | 4 |
| 8 HM 6898 | 100 | 89 | 66 | 2 |
| 9 NDM 5578 | 100 | 84 | 74 | -6 |
| 10 NUN 672 | 99 | 95 | 93 | 0 |
| 11 PX 1723 | 101 | 86 | 94 | 1 |
| 12 SUN 6368 | 100 | 94 | 81 | -2 |
| 13 UG 4305 | 100 | 100 | 78 | -4 |
| 14 AB 2 double | 100 | 100 | 90 | 3 |
| 15 H 2601 double | 99 | 96 | 74 | -1 |
| 16 H 9780 double | 100 | 100 | 80 | 5 |
| LSD 5% | NS | 5.0 | 10.1 | 2.9 |
| % CV | 1 | 4 | 9 | 10 |
| average | 100 | 93 | 78 | 0 |

Group comparisons:

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----|------|------|------|
| singles vs. dbl plants/plug | 100 | 94 | 78 | 1 |
| F value | 0.3 | 10.4 | 1.3 | 2.0 |
| significance | NS | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.17 |

Percent of off-target plants from singles and doubles per plug

| variety | % singles | % doubles |
|---------|-----------|-----------|
| AB 2 | 3 | 1 |
| H 2601 | 6 | 1 |
| H 9780 | 6 | 3 |
| average | 5 | 2 |

Example: AB 2 as singles had 3% doubles and AB 2 as doubles had 1% singles

Table 7A. Dixon, Non-Replicated, Mid-Maturity: Yield, fruit quality and defects, JH Meek and Sons, 2008.

| Non-Replicated variety | Yield tons/A | °Brix | PTAB color | pH | % pink | % green | % sun burn | % mold | % BER | lbs per 50 fruit |
|------------------------|--------------|-------|------------|------|--------|---------|------------|--------|-------|------------------|
| 1 CXD 255 | 67.5 | 4.8 | 24 | 4.44 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0.0 | 8.20 |
| 2 NUN 6385 | 64.4 | 4.5 | 29 | 4.60 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0.0 | 7.55 |
| 3 BOS 1411 | 63.3 | 5.1 | 29 | 4.52 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0.0 | 9.05 |
| 4 NUN 6390 | 62.7 | 5.2 | 28 | 4.58 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0.0 | 6.65 |
| 5 H 8504 | 62.2 | 4.7 | 26 | 4.37 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0.0 | 6.45 |
| 6 DRI 0303 | 60.9 | 5.3 | 24 | 4.42 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0.0 | 8.65 |
| 7 HMX 7885 | 52.6 | 4.8 | 24 | 4.66 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0.0 | 7.95 |
| 8 CXD 269 | 46.1 | 4.9 | 25 | 4.62 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 0.0 | 7.30 |
| average | 60.0 | 4.9 | 26.1 | 4.53 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 4.12 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 7.73 |

Data is **non-replicated** and should be viewed with much less confidence than replicated tests.

Table 7B Dixon, Non-Replicated, Mid-Maturity: Stand, vine size, canopy cover, and fruit maturity notes, transplants, JH Meek and Sons, 2008.

| variety | Stand (plugs per 100') | vine size (% cover) | % fruit canopy cover | estimated harvest days (to AB 2) |
|------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 DRI 0303 | 103 | 100 | 85 | 1 |
| 2 HMX 7885 | 99 | 80 | 65 | -4 |
| 3 BOS 1411 | 99 | 100 | 90 | 2 |
| 4 H 8504 | 100 | 100 | 70 | 4 |
| 5 CXD 255 | 98 | 100 | 90 | 4 |
| 6 NUN 6385 | 100 | 90 | 85 | -3 |
| 7 NUN 6390 | 100 | 100 | 60 | 4 |
| 8 CXD 269 | 101 | 95 | 90 | -2 |
| average | 100 | 96 | 79 | 1 |

Data is **non-replicated** and should be viewed with much less confidence than replicated tests.