


2012 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) is essential.

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

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

SCOTT AND BRIAN PARK, Park Farms, Meridian

FIELD ASSISTANCE:

MARK KOCHI, Field Research Assistant, Yolo County

AUSTIN BRICKEY, Summer Field Assistant, Student, Winters High School

PROJECT COORDINATION:

UC ADVISORS BRENNA AEGERTER (PROJECT LEADER), SCOTT STODDARD, MICHELLE LE STRANGE, TOM TURINI AND JOE NUNEZ

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

DANIEL ACEVEDO, 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)

OLAM FOODS, WILLIAMS

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS FOR STATEWIDE REPORT:

GAIL NISHIMOTO, Statistician

BRENNA AEGERTER, PROJECT COORDINATOR FOR UC

BOOKLET COMPILATION:

KATIE CHURCHILL, Secretary, Yolo County

Respectfully submitted,

Gene Miyao

Farm Advisor, Yolo/Solano/Sacramento counties

January 2013

100 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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| SUMMARY OF 2012 YOLO/SOLANO/SACRAMENTO COUNTY VARIETY TRIALS | 1-6 |
| Table 1A. Early Maturity Entries, Winters..... | 7 |
| Table 1B. Mid-Maturity Variety Entries, Woodland..... | 8 |
| Table 2A. Plot Specifications, Early-Maturity, Winters | 9 |
| Table 2B. Plot Specifications, Mid-Maturity, Woodland | 10 |
| Table 3. Fruit Quality Factor Definitions & Field Sampling Procedure | 11 |
| <u>WINTERS, REPLICATED, EARLY-MATURITY</u> | |
| Table 4. Yield, °Brix, color & defects at harvest | 12 |
| <u>WOODLAND, REPLICATED, MID-MATURITY</u> | |
| Table 5A. Yield, °Brix, color and defects at harvest | 13 |
| Table 5B. Stand, vine size, canopy and maturity..... | 14 |
| <u>WOODLAND, OBSERVATIONAL, MID-MATURITY</u> | |
| Table 5C. Yield, °Brix, color and defects at harvest | 15 |
| Table 5D. Stand, vine size, canopy and maturity..... | 16 |
| Table 6. Organic Entries..... | 17 |
| Table 7A. Plot Specifications, Organics, Winters | 18 |
| Table 7B. Plot Specifications, Organics, Meridian | 18 |
| <u>ORGANICS, WINTERS</u> | |
| Table 8A. Yield, °Brix, color & defects at harvest..... | 19 |
| Table 8B. Stand, vine size, canopy and maturity..... | 20 |
| <u>ORGANICS, MERIDIAN</u> | |
| Table 9A. Yield, °Brix, color & defects at harvest..... | 21 |
| Table 9B. Stand, vine size, canopy and maturity..... | 22 |

Statewide compile variety report is located on the Internet at:

http://ceyolo.ucdavis.edu/Vegetable_Crops/Processing_Tomato_Variety_Trials/

This report, as well as historical reports, is electronically available at the same web site.

2012 Processing Tomato Variety Evaluation Trials Yolo/Solano/Sacramento Counties

by

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

The California processing tomato industry produced 12.6+ million tons in 2012 with an estimated statewide record average of 49 tons per acre.

Locally, we saw limited harvest activity until late July due to rain-delayed planting. While rains were limited in January through early March, storms beginning in mid-March and continuing into mid April created wet soil conditions for many (Fig. 1). Harvest was relatively dry and without major rainfall until mid October.




Figure 1. Daily rainfall in 2012. Source: Davis CIMIS #6 station

Temperatures were moderate in the late spring through the summer (Table A). During the bulk of the fruit setting period, in the spring through August, there were only 20 days with temperatures over 95° F. Only 3 days were above 100° F (June 16, July 11 and August 11 with 103°, 102° and 103° F, respectively). Extreme high temperatures were not prevalent in 2012.

Table A. 2012 temperatures, Davis.

| Month | Number of days | |
|--------------|----------------|----------|
| | > 95° F | >100° F |
| April | 0 | 0 |
| May | 1 | 0 |
| June | 5 | 1 |
| July | 7 | 1 |
| August | 7 | 1 |
| Sept | 2 | 0 |
| Oct | 2 | 0 |
| Total | 24 | 3 |

Tomato powdery mildew activity was again low compared to a run several years ago when mildew appeared to be a major, widespread disease. Bacterial speck incidence was very low, especially compared to last year.

Tomato spotted wilt virus (TSWV) was widespread and common in our area. There were some fields (or portions of fields) where damage was severe. For some growers, the need to reduce losses to TSWV may include use of resistant varieties or early spray programs. For the vast majority, TSWV may well be present, but without the intensity that requires an aggressive treatment program.

Fusarium crown and root rot is spreading with a high level of severity in a number of fields.

Resistance breaking populations to our root knot nematode resistant varieties are continuing to develop in several additional fields. The resistance problem may also be occurring in other fields, but at a level that isn't readily detectable.

The use of drip irrigation systems continues to increase in popularity. Wide beds on 80-inch centers are being used and will likely remain a part of the culture into the near future, as will the traditional 60-inch configurations.

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 Yolo to Kern. Tests were conducted in a similar fashion to combine and 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 15 varieties (table 1A). Variety standards were Heinz 2206 and APT 410. All early varieties were evaluated in a replicated design. UG 15908 and HMX 1893 have spotted wilt resistance.

In the mid-maturity trial, 16 replicated and 15 observational varieties were included (table 1B). Mid-maturity standards were AB 2, H 9780 and Sun 6366. All mid entries except AB 2 were nematode resistant. Several varieties were listed as resistant to spotted wilt virus. Campbell C 316 was the only entry with Fusarium wilt race 3 resistance.

Additionally, in 2012, two local tests were conducted in certified organic production fields with a set of 15 varieties (Table 6). The test was in cooperation with OLAM Foods.

Locations:

The local early trial was northeast of Winters with Don Rominger and Sons. The mid maturity trial was between Davis and Winters with J.H. Meek and Sons.

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

The evaluation in organic fields was conducted with Joe Rominger of D.A. Rominger and Sons near

Winters and also with Scott and Brian Park of Park Farming south of Meridian.

Methods:

Both the early and mid-maturity trials were established from commercially grown greenhouse transplants. All plants in the replicated portion of the trial were directly planted from trays. Non-replicated entries were pulled from trays, counted, bundled and bagged ahead of the field planting to conserve space on the transplant sled storage racks. 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 our trials were transplanted on twin lines, with each line 12" apart from each other, on a bed centered on 5'. All plots were 100' long with the exception of the non-replicated mid-maturity lines that were 60 feet 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 non-sorted 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.

Organic evaluations: Fields were mechanically transplanted from plants grown in trays but pulled and transported in cardboard boxes. The Meridian trial was planted on single lines per 5' centered beds with plots 100' long. The Winters trial was planted on double lines per 5' centered beds with plots 75' long.

EARLY-MATURITY EVALUATION: WINTERS

Early-maturity varieties were evaluated with Joe Rominger in a D.A. Rominger and Sons field north of Winters. We transplanted on April 6 into twin lines per bed into a combination of Brentwood and Rincon silty clay loam soils (Table 2A). Seedlings established well

although soils were wet at planting from untimely rainfall. Water supply was limited during fruit sizing; and as a result, yield suffered. Harvest was on 2 August, 122 days after transplanting.

Table 4 early replicated—yield, fruit quality and culls: The trial averaged 20.6 tons per acre, while our standard APT 410 was one of the lowest yielding. The highest yielding group was led by SVR 0599 with 24.8 tons per acre, although statistically grouped with 8 other varieties.

Brix levels were very high with a trial average of 6.8. SVR 0541 had the highest Brix level with 7.6, but included HMX 1893 and UG 15308 in the high solids group.

Rots were high, predominately composed of blossom end rot.

Vine size was difficult to judge with the twin row planting. Overall vine size was moderate. The smaller-vined varieties in this test were BQ 204, H 2206, K 2769 and H 3044 at 73% or less of the row width. The larger vined varieties were N 6397 and SVR 0541 with 95% cover of the row width.

Canopy cover for fruit protection from sun damage ranged from 43 to 80%. Fruit canopy cover was moderate overall, but especially weak with K 2770, H 3044, H 2206 and BQ 204, all 50% or less at harvest. Levels above 80% are good targets.

Visual rating of 'days-to-estimated-harvest' date was made relative to APT 410. The differences ranged from -6 to 5 days later on average. The earliest variety in the test was H 2206, which was 6 days earlier than APT 410. The latest maturing varieties, 5 days behind APT 410,

were BOS 602, HMX 1893, N 6397, SVR 0541 and UG 15308.

MID-MATURITY EVALUATION: WOODLAND

Our local mid-maturity variety trial evaluation was transplanted with Steve and Sam Meek and Jon Pon of J.H. Meek and Sons in a field between Davis and Winters on a class 2, Rincon silty clay loam soil. Seedling plugs were mechanically transplanted on May 9th in double lines per bed (Table 2B). Seedbed condition was very good. The field was irrigated with a buried drip system. Plants established quickly and vines grew well. Verticillium wilt was prevalent, while spotted wilt and Fusarium crown rot were present, but minor. Harvest was timely on 12 September (126 days after transplanting).

REPLICATED ENTRIES (WOODLAND)

Table 5A mid replicated— yield, fruit quality and culls: Overall the yield average for the trial was 63.4 tons per acre. Seven of the varieties were in the top yield category led by UG 19406 with 69.6 tons per acre and included N 6402, N 6404, AB 2, UG 19306, HM 9905 and BQ 205. The lowest yielding group included H 9780, PX 1245 and BQ 163, all with less than 60 tons per acre. *Note: last year with high levels of bacterial speck, UG 19406 was in the lowest yielding group.*

°Brix level was moderate with an average of 4.9. The high Brix group included DRI 0319 and AB 0311 with 5.58 and 5.35 °Brix, respectively.

Fruit pH levels were overall good with an average of 4.33. Interestingly, the high fruit pH levels (above 4.40) were measured from N 6402, N 6404, Sun 6366 and included H 5608 and HM 9905.

Overall, cull levels were low. Spotted wilt virus levels measured on fruit were below 1%.

Table 5B mid replicated— vine size, canopy cover and estimated maturity: All of the varieties covered the width of the beds completely or nearly so, with an average of 97%. The smaller vined varieties were H 5508, H 9780 and PX 1245 with a row cover of 93% or less.

Fruit protection from canopy cover was evaluated shortly before harvest. A 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 PX 1245 at 39% resulting from a high level of leaf necrosis. H 5608 was measured at 55%. Cover was best with UG 19306, DRI 0319, BQ 205, AB 2 and AB 311, all with a cover of 81% or higher.

A visual estimate of days to harvest was assessed and compared to the standard AB 2. The earliest variety was Sun 6366 at 4 days early than AB 2. The latest maturity varieties were H 9780 and UG 19306 at 5 days later than AB 2.

NON-REPLICATED ENTRIES (WOODLAND)

Table 5C: mid observational— yield, fruit quality and culls: The highest yielding non-replicated variety was HMX 1892 with 81.9 tons per acre.

The high Brix varieties were BQ 268 and Campbell C 316, both at 5.5.

HMX 1885 had the lowest sun damaged fruit at 1% while BQ 270 and BQ 273 had the highest with 10% each.

Fruit with spotted wilt symptoms were at a low level.

Table 5D mid observational— vine size, canopy, and estimated maturity: Vines were overall large and covered from 90 to 100% of the row width, except for C 316 at 85%.

Canopy cover was highly variable amongst the varieties. H 1175 and BQ 270 were poorest with 40%. H 1170 and SVR 0686 had the best with 90% (but were also in the later maturing group).

Maturities ranged from -5 days to +7 days to estimated harvest compared to AB 2. BQ 272, BQ 270 and BQ 273 appeared to be the earliest.

ORGANIC EVALUATION: WINTERS

An evaluation of organic varieties was conducted with Joe Rominger in a D.A. Rominger and Sons field north of Winters. We transplanted on May 1 into twin lines per bed into a Brentwood silty clay loam soil (Table 7A). Irrigation was by furrow. Plants grew especially well after early bloom and were very healthy. Harvest was on 4 September, 126 days after transplanting.

Table 8A Organics, Winters— yield, fruit quality and culls: At Winters, fruit yields were high with an average yield of 50.9 tons per acre. Plants grew vigorously, especially after early bloom. The highest yielding variety in the Winters test was clearly H 5608 with 60.7 tons per acre. Nine of the 15 varieties exceeded 50 tons per acre. Brix levels were modest with an average of 4.9. The highest Brix varieties were AB 319 with 5.63 and included AB 311, BQ 163 and BQ 206. Harvest was relatively clean. While spotted wilt virus was relatively light at the Winters site, PS 650 appeared to be more prone to damage.

Table 8B Organics, Winters— vine size, canopy cover and estimated maturity: Varieties covered the width of the beds within a range of 78 to 100%. The smaller vined varieties were H 3402, H 5508 and Sun 6366 all at 83% or less. AB 319 was the largest at 100% row width.

Fruit protection as canopy cover was evaluated shortly before harvest. Canopy cover was poorest with H 3402 at 53%, H 5508 at 63% and PS 650 at 66%. Cover was best with several including AB 311, AB 319 and PS 002, all with a cover of 85%.

A visual estimate of days to harvest was assessed and compared to the standard AB 2. Maturities were similar to each other with a relatively narrow range of 6 days separating the extreme differences with most centered around the AB 2 maturity in this trial. The earliest variety was Sun 6366, which was 3 days early than AB 2. The later maturity varieties were PS 650 and H 3402, which were 2 to 3 days later than AB 2.

ORGANIC EVALUATION: MERIDIAN

The same 15 varieties were evaluated in an organic field of Scott and Brian Park south of Meridian. We transplanted on April 30 in a single line per bed into a Shanghai silty clay loam soil (Table 7B). Plants grew well and were healthy. Irrigation was by furrow. Harvest was on 31 August, 123 days after transplanting.

Table 9A Organics, Meridian— yield, fruit quality and culls: At Meridian,

the highest yielding varieties were H 5608 and H 5508 with 51.2 and 47.3 tons/a, respectively, and both with few culls. Overall, Brix was modest with an average of 4.6. The high Brix performer was AB 311 with 5.0, and also included BQ 163, N 6397, AB 2, BQ 206 and H 3402. Blackmold fruit rot levels were a concern. An earlier harvest would have lessened the damage. Sun 6366, PS 002 and AB 2 had levels at or exceeding 13%. Fruit rot levels were lowest with H 5508, H 3042 and H 5608, with 1, 3 and 4%, respectively. Fruit size was large.

Table 9B Organics, Meridian— vine size, canopy cover and estimated maturity: Vine size was moderate with an average spread of 80% of the row width. The largest vines were H 5608 with 91%, AB 319 with 90%, HM 9905 with 89%, AB 311 with 88%, N 6404 with 85% and N 6397 with 83%.

Fruit protection from canopy cover was good overall. Canopy was weakest with H 3402 with 65% and Sun 6366 with 70%. Best cover was with AB 319 with 86%, N 6404 with 85%, H 5608 and HM 9905, both with 83%.

Maturity differences compared to AB 2 were not large, ranging from 2 day earlier with Sun 6366 to 3 to 4 days later with AB 319, N 6404 and PS 650.

Spotted wilt incidence was moderately low. The highest levels were from BQ 163, AB 2 and PS 650 at 1.8, 2 and 2.5 plants per 100' plot, respectively.

Table 1A. Early Maturity Entries, 2012 Statewide UC Processing Tomato Variety Trial, D.A. Rominger and Sons, Winters.

| | Company | Replicated (15) | |
|---|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 1 | Harris Moran | HMX 1893 | VFFN SW |
| 2 | Heinz | H 1015 | VFFNP |
| | | H 2206 | VF |
| | | H 3044 | VFFN |
| 3 | Keithly Williams | K 2769 | VFFNP A |
| | | K 2770 | VFFN, A, TYLCV |
| 4 | Orsetti | BOS 602 | VFFN |
| 5 | Nunhems | N 6397 | VFFN |
| 6 | Seminis | APT 410 | VFFNP |
| | | SVR 0541 | VFFP |
| | | SVR 0599 | VFF |
| 7 | United Genetics | UG 15308 | VFFNP |
| | | UG 15908 | VFFN SW |
| 8 | WoodBridge | BQ 204 | VFFNP |
| | | BQ 287 | VFFNP |

BOLD LETTERS = trial standards

Check with seed company to confirm disease resistance

Code: Disease Resistance

| | | |
|------------------|---|---|
| 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 |
| TYLCV | = | TOMATO YELLOW LEAF CURL VIRUS |
| A | = | ALTERNARIA STEM CANKER |
| SW | = | TOMATO SPOTTED WILT VIRUS |

Bacterial speck resistance to race 0 appears to have little value with our current pathogen population.

Table 1B. Mid-Maturity Varieties, 2012 Statewide, UC Processing Tomato Variety Trial, JH Meek and Sons, Woodland.

| Company | 16 replicated | | 15 observational | |
|-------------------|------------------|----------|---------------------|----------------------|
| 1 Campbell Soup | | | C 316 | VFFF ₃ NP |
| 2 Monsanto | AB 2 | VFFP | SVR 0686 | VFFNP |
| | AB 0311 | VFFNP SW | | |
| | DRI 0319 | VFFNP SW | | |
| | PX 1245 | VFFNP | | |
| 3 Harris Moran | HM 9905 | VFFN | HMX 1885 | VFFNP SW |
| | | | HMX 1892 | VFFNP |
| | | | HMX 1894 | VFFNP SW |
| 4 Heinz | H 5508 | VFFN SW | H 1161 | VFFNP |
| | H 5608 | VFFNP SW | H 1170 | VFFN |
| | H 9780 | VFFNP | H 1175 | VFFN |
| 5 Nunhems | SUN 6366 | VFFNP | N 6405 | VFFN |
| | N 6402 | VFFN SW | N 6407 | VFFN SW |
| | N 6404 | VFFN SW | | |
| 6 United Genetics | UG 19006 | VFFNP | UG 18806 | VFFNP |
| | UG 19306 | VFFNP | | |
| | UG 19406 | VFFNP | | |
| 7 WoodBridge | BQ 163 | VFFNP | BQ 268 | VFFNP |
| | BQ 205 | VFFNP | BQ 270 | VFFNP |
| | | | BQ 272 | VFFNP SW |
| | | | BQ 273 | VFFNP SW |

BOLD = Standards

Check with seed company to confirm disease resistance.

Table 2A. Plot Specifications, Early-Maturity, Winters, 2012

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Cooperator: | Joe Rominger, D.A. Rominger and Sons, Winters |
| Location: | NE of Winters. 1.5 miles south of CR 31 and 0.5 east of CR 89 SW ¼ of NE ¼, Section 15, T8N, R1W, MDM. SCS sheet #66. |
| Field Variety: | BOS 66509, 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, all in #338 trays |
| Planting Date: | 6 April as transplants |
| Fertilizers: | 100 lbs. 11-52-0 sidedressed in fall 10 gallons 8-24-5 plus zinc chelate pre-plant 55 gallons 28-0-0 (5% S) sidedress at layby 30 lbs N/acre as UN 32 as water run |
| Field Meeting: | 26 July |
| Fruit Quality Sample: | 30 July for Food Science, UCD 2 August for PTAB |
| Harvest: | 2 August (122 days after planting) |
| Soil type: | Brentwood silty clay loam, Class 1, Storie Index 81 Rincon silty clay loam, Class 2, Storie Index 73 |
| Irrigation method: | furrow |
| General: | Established well, but grew slowly. Limited water supply during fruit sizing impacted vine growth and fruit yield. |

Table 2B. Plot Specifications, Transplant, Mid-Maturity, Woodland, 2012

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Cooperator: | Steve and Sam Meek and John Pon, J.H. Meek and Sons, Woodland |
| Location: | west of Davis- 1/4 mile south of CR 31 & 1/2 mile west of CR 95. SE 1/4 of NW 1/4, section 9, T 8N, R 1E, MDM. SCS map #67. |
| Field Variety: | N 6404, double lines on 5'-centered beds. |
| Plot Design: | Randomized complete block with 4 reps. Non-replicated plots adjacent to 1st rep. Replicated plots 500 square feet (100' x 5') Non-replicated plots 300 square feet (60' x 5'). |
| Greenhouse: | Westside Transplants in #338 trays for replicated and #392 trays for observational entries |
| Planting Date: | 9 May as transplants |
| Population: | ~8700 plugs per acre. |
| Field Meeting: | 6 September |
| Fruit Quality Sample: | 11 Sept for Food Science, UCD 12 Sept for PTAB |
| Harvest | 12 September (126 days after transplanting) |
| Soil type: | Brentwood silty clay loam, Class 1, Storie Index 81 |
| Irrigation method: | buried, drip irrigation |
| General Notes: | Transplants established and grew well. Some spotted wilt infections were noted. Verticillium wilt incidence was moderate. Some Fusarium crown rot was also detected. |

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.

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.

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 (T-4). 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.

Table 4. Winters, Replicated, Early-Maturity: Yield, quality and cull-out from tomato variety evaluation, D.A. Rominger & Sons, 2012.

| | Variety | Yield tons/A | | °Brix | PTAB color | pH | % green | % sun burn | % rots | lbs./ 50 fruit | % bed cover | % fruit canopy cover | estimated maturity relative to APT 410 (days) |
|----|--------------------------|-----------------|------|-------|---------------|------|------------|---------------|-----------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| 1 | SVR 0599 | 24.8 | A | 7.1 | 21.8 | 4.48 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4.44 | 83 | 66 | 1 |
| 2 | BOS 602 | 24.4 | A | 6.6 | 20.5 | 4.50 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 5.18 | 90 | 71 | 5 |
| 3 | HMX 1893 | 22.1 | AB | 7.3 | 21.3 | 4.40 | 3 | 8 | 14 | 4.82 | 81 | 64 | 5 |
| 4 | K 2769 | 22.0 | ABC | 6.6 | 21.5 | 4.53 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 3.52 | 71 | 60 | -3 |
| 5 | N 6397 | 21.9 | ABC | 7.0 | 20.3 | 4.55 | 5 | 2 | 16 | 4.21 | 95 | 80 | 5 |
| 6 | H 2206 | 21.3 | ABCD | 6.9 | 21.8 | 4.53 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3.90 | 69 | 50 | -6 |
| 7 | BQ 287 | 20.6 | ABCD | 6.5 | 20.5 | 4.54 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 4.02 | 78 | 56 | 1 |
| 8 | H 1015 | 20.4 | ABCD | 6.8 | 20.3 | 4.54 | 3 | 5 | 17 | 4.35 | 83 | 58 | 1 |
| 9 | SVR 0541 | 20.4 | ABCD | 7.6 | 20.0 | 4.52 | 7 | 4 | 12 | 4.31 | 95 | 74 | 5 |
| 10 | K 2770 | 19.7 | BCD | 6.2 | 21.5 | 4.49 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 3.54 | 78 | 43 | 0 |
| 11 | BQ 204 | 19.4 | BCD | 6.5 | 22.0 | 4.56 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4.24 | 68 | 50 | -3 |
| 12 | H 3044 | 19.4 | BCD | 6.0 | 20.0 | 4.51 | 2 | 9 | 11 | 5.38 | 73 | 48 | -2 |
| 13 | UG 15908 | 18.4 | BCD | 6.8 | 20.3 | 4.49 | 3 | 4 | 19 | 4.42 | 85 | 70 | 4 |
| 14 | APT 410 | 17.6 | CD | 6.7 | 20.5 | 4.52 | 3 | 8 | 13 | 4.74 | 76 | 59 | 0 |
| 15 | UG 15308 | 17.1 | D | 7.2 | 19.8 | 4.55 | 3 | 8 | 20 | 3.79 | 90 | 68 | 5 |
| | LSD 0.05 | 4.4 | | 0.46 | 1.05 | NS | 1.3 | NS | 5.6 | 0.77 | 8 | 10 | 2.4 |
| | CV | 15 | | 5 | 4 | 2 | 31 | 87 | 34 | 13 | 7 | 11 | 7 |
| | Average | 20.6 | | 6.8 | 20.8 | 4.51 | 3.0 | 5.5 | 12.4 | 4.3 | 72.2 | 55.1 | 1.2 |
| | ^ non-additivity problem | | | | | | | | | ^ | | | |

Table 5A. Woodland, Replicated, Mid-Maturity: Yield, fruit quality and defects from processing tomato variety trial, JH Meek and Sons, 2012.

| Replicated | | Yield | LSD 5% | PTAB | | | % | % | % sun | % | % | lbs. | fruit w/ | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|----------|--------|-------|-------|------|------|-------|-------|------|-----|--------|----------|-----|
| Variety | | tons/A | yield | °Brix | color | pH | pink | green | burn | mold | BER | per 50 | spotted | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | fruit | wilt | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | (%) | |
| 1 | UG 19406 | VFFNP | 69.6 | a | 4.93 | 23.3 | 4.21 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 7.60 | 0.1 |
| 2 | N 6402 | VFFN SW | 67.9 | ab | 4.80 | 22.5 | 4.47 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 7.50 | 0.1 |
| 3 | N 6404 | VFFN SW | 67.7 | ab | 5.00 | 23.0 | 4.42 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 7.95 | 0.2 |
| 4 | AB 2 | VFFP | 67.2 | ab | 5.23 | 23.8 | 4.29 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 9.03 | 0.3 |
| 5 | UG 19306 | VFFNP | 66.9 | ab | 5.00 | 23.0 | 4.29 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 7.87 | 0.2 |
| 6 | HM 9905 | VFFN | 66.6 | abc | 4.60 | 24.3 | 4.42 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 7.45 | 0.7 |
| 7 | BQ 205 | VFFNP | 65.5 | abcd | 5.05 | 24.5 | 4.28 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 8.22 | 0.0 |
| 8 | H 5508 | VFFN SW | 64.1 | bcde | 4.30 | 23.3 | 4.27 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 6.91 | 0.0 |
| 9 | DRI 0319 | VFFNP SW | 63.8 | bcde | 5.58 | 23.3 | 4.34 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 7.75 | 0.1 |
| 10 | SUN 6366 | VFFNP | 63.2 | bcde | 4.63 | 23.3 | 4.44 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 7.31 | 0.2 |
| 11 | AB 0311 | VFFNP SW | 62.6 | bcde | 5.35 | 22.0 | 4.33 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 8.21 | 0.0 |
| 12 | UG 19006 | VFFNP | 61.5 | cde | 5.03 | 23.5 | 4.25 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 7.44 | 0.0 |
| 13 | H 5608 | VFFNP SW | 60.9 | de | 4.35 | 21.5 | 4.43 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 7.25 | 0.2 |
| 14 | BQ 163 | VFFNP | 59.1 | ef | 5.03 | 23.5 | 4.33 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 8.74 | 0.0 |
| 15 | PX 1245 | VFFNP | 54.0 | f | 4.65 | 24.3 | 4.26 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 7.63 | 0.8 |
| 16 | H 9780 | VFFNP | 53.7 | f | 5.08 | 22.8 | 4.34 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 7.92 | 0.2 |
| LSD 5% | | | 5.3 | | 0.3 | 1.3 | 0.09 | 1.4 | NS | NS | 2.3 | 0.6 | 0.62 | 0.5 |
| % CV | | | 6 | | 5 | 4 | 1 | 113 | 125 | 47 | 65 | 106 | 6 | 188 |
| average | | | 63.4 | | 4.9 | 23.2 | 4.33 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 4.7 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 7.8 | 0.2 |
| ^ statistical non-additivity | | | | | | | | ^ | | | | ^ | | |

Table 5B. Woodland, Replicated, Mid-Maturity: stand, vine size, canopy cover and fruit maturity notes (transplant), JH Meek and Sons, 2012.

| | Replicated Variety | stand count (100') | vine size (% row width) | fruit canopy cover (%) | estimated maturity (days to AB 2) |
|----|------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| 1 | AB 0311 | 101 | 100 | 81 | -1 |
| 2 | AB 2 | 101 | 100 | 81 | 0 |
| 3 | BQ 163 | 101 | 95 | 70 | 1 |
| 4 | BQ 205 | 101 | 98 | 84 | 2 |
| 5 | DRI 0319 | 101 | 100 | 84 | -1 |
| 6 | H 5508 | 100 | 89 | 68 | 3 |
| 7 | H 5608 | 101 | 100 | 55 | -1 |
| 8 | H 9780 | 100 | 93 | 60 | 5 |
| 9 | HM 9905 | 100 | 98 | 75 | 3 |
| 10 | N 6402 | 101 | 100 | 78 | 0 |
| 11 | N 6404 | 100 | 95 | 78 | 2 |
| 12 | PX 1245 | 101 | 93 | 39 | 0 |
| 13 | SUN 6366 | 100 | 100 | 68 | -4 |
| 14 | UG 19006 | 100 | 100 | 66 | 2 |
| 15 | UG 19306 | 100 | 95 | 88 | 5 |
| 16 | UG 19406 | 100 | 100 | 75 | 1 |
| | LSD 5% | NS | 5.2 | 8.2 | 2.2 |
| | % CV | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4 |
| | average | 100 | 97 | 72 | 1 |

Table 5C. Woodland, Non-Replicated, Mid-Maturity: Yield, fruit quality and defects, JH Meek and Sons, 2012.

| Observational variety | Yield tons/A | °Brix | PTAB | | % pink | % green | % sun burn | % mold | % BER | fruit w/ lbs./ spotted wilt (%) | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-------|-------|------|-----------|------------|---------------|-----------|----------|--|-----|
| | | | color | pH | | | | | | 50 fruit | (%) |
| 1 HMX 1892 VFFNP | 81.9 | 4.8 | 23 | 4.35 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 7.7 | 1.6 |
| 2 N 6407 VFFN SW | 71.5 | 5.1 | 23 | 4.24 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 7.7 | 0.4 |
| 3 H 1161 VFFNP | 70.1 | 5.1 | 23 | 4.30 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 8.4 | 0.0 |
| 4 N 6404 VFFN SW | 68.6 | 5.0 | 23 | 4.39 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 7.4 | 0.0 |
| 5 N 6405 VFFN | 66.7 | 4.7 | 24 | 4.42 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8.5 | 0.2 |
| 6 BQ 272 VFFNP SW | 66.5 | 4.2 | 22 | 4.53 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 7.8 | 0.0 |
| 7 H 1175 VFFN | 66.4 | 4.2 | 22 | 4.47 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 7.1 | 0.0 |
| 8 UG 18806 VFFNP | 66.3 | 4.9 | 26 | 4.28 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7.3 | 1.3 |
| 9 BQ 268 VFFNP | 64.9 | 5.5 | 26 | 4.29 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 7.5 | 1.1 |
| 10 HMX 1885 VFFNP TSW | 64.5 | 4.8 | 22 | 4.40 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 7.3 | 0.0 |
| 11 H 1170 VFFN | 61.4 | 4.6 | 23 | 4.25 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 7.5 | 0.0 |
| 12 HMX 1894 VFFNP TSW | 59.0 | 4.4 | 25 | 4.39 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 8.3 | 0.0 |
| 13 BQ 270 VFFNP | 58.9 | 4.9 | 23 | 4.44 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 7.2 | 0.0 |
| 14 BQ 273 VFFNP SW | 57.0 | 4.6 | 24 | 4.48 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 7.6 | 0.0 |
| 15 C 316 VFFFNP | 50.8 | 5.5 | 21 | 4.40 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 6.3 | 0.4 |
| 16 SVR 0686 VFFNP | 47.6 | 4.9 | 25 | 4.36 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 8.8 | 0.5 |
| average | 63.9 | 4.8 | 23.4 | 4.4 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 4.4 | 2.2 | 0.3 | 7.7 | 0.3 |

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

Table 5D Woodland, Non-Replicated, Mid-Maturity: Stand, vine size, canopy cover, and fruit maturity notes, transplants, JH Meek and Sons, 2012.

| Observational Variety | stand count (60') | vine size (% row width) | fruit canopy cover (%) | estimated maturity (days to AB 2) |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| 1 C 316 | 62 | 85 | 80 | -2 |
| 2 N 6405 | 63 | 100 | 75 | 2 |
| 3 H 1175 | 60 | 100 | 40 | 3 |
| 4 HMX 1894 | 62 | 90 | 80 | 7 |
| 5 HMX 1892 | 62 | 100 | 65 | 3 |
| 6 SVR 0686 | 61 | 100 | 90 | 6 |
| 7 HMX 1885 | 61 | 90 | 85 | 4 |
| 8 BQ 272 | 61 | 90 | 50 | -5 |
| 9 BQ 273 | 60 | 90 | 55 | -3 |
| 10 H 1161 | 62 | 90 | 85 | 1 |
| 11 BQ 270 | 62 | 100 | 40 | -4 |
| 12 N 6407 | 62 | 100 | 85 | 1 |
| 13 H 1170 | 61 | 100 | 90 | 4 |
| 14 UG 18806 | 63 | 90 | 80 | 5 |
| 15 BQ 268 | 62 | 100 | 80 | 6 |
| 16 N 6404 | 61 | 100 | 80 | 3 |
| average | 62 | 95 | 73 | 2 |

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

Table 6. Variety Entries, 2012 UC Processing Tomato Variety Trials, **ORGANIC**,
D.A. Rominger and Sons, Winters and Park Farming, Meridian

| | Company | Replicated (15) | |
|---|------------------|-----------------|----------|
| 1 | Harris Moran | HM 9905 | VFFN |
| 2 | Heinz | H 3402 | VFFNP |
| | | H 5508 | VFFN SW |
| | | H 5608 | VFFNP SW |
| 3 | Nunhems | N 6397 | VFFN |
| | | N 6402 | VFFN SW |
| | | N 6404 | VFFN SW |
| | | Sun 6366 | VFFN |
| 4 | Seminis-Monsanto | AB 2 | VFFP |
| | | AB 311 | VFFNP SW |
| | | AB 319 | VFFNP SW |
| | | PS 002 | VFFN SW |
| | | PS 650 | VFFNP |
| 5 | WoodBridge | BQ 163 | VFFNP |
| | | BQ 206 | VFFNP |

Check with seed company to confirm disease resistance

Code: Disease Resistance

| | | |
|------------------|---|---|
| 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 |
| TYLCV | = | TOMATO YELLOW LEAF CURL VIRUS |
| A | = | ALTERNARIA STEM CANKER |
| SW | = | TOMATO SPOTTED WILT VIRUS |

Bacterial speck resistance to race 0 appears to have little value with our current pathogen population.

Table 7A. Plot Specifications, Organics, Winters, 2012

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Cooperator: | Joe Rominger, D.A. Rominger and Sons, Winters |
| Location: | North of Winters. 1.5 miles west of CR 89 and 1/8 mile north of CR 29A adjacent to eastern bank of Chickahominy Slough SW 1/4 of NE 1/4, Section 32, T 9N, R 1W, MDM. SCS sheet #58. |
| Field Variety: | AB 2, double lines on 5'-centered beds. |
| Plot Design: | Randomized complete block, 4 reps. Individual plots were 375 square feet (75' x 5'). |
| Greenhouse: | Westside Transplants, all in boxes pulled from #338 trays |
| Planting Date: | 1 May as transplants |
| Fruit Quality Sample: | 4 September for PTAB |
| Harvest: | 4 September (126 days after planting) |
| Soil type: | Brentwood silty clay loam, Class 1, Storie Index 81 |
| Previous Crop: | 2012 tomato |
| Irrigation method: | furrow |
| General: | Grew vigorously especially after early bloom stage |

Table 7B. Plot Specifications, Organics, Meridian, 2012

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Cooperator: | Scott and Brian Park, Park Farming, Meridian |
| Location: | south of Meridian adjacent to eastern bank of Sacramento River North of Tisdale Weir west of intersection of Garmire x Acme Roads, Meridian |
| Field Variety: | BQ 206, single line on 5'-centered beds. |
| Plot Design: | Randomized complete block with 4 reps with 500 square feet plots (100' x 5') |
| Greenhouse: | Westside Transplants, all in boxes pulled from #338 trays |
| Planting Date: | 30 April as transplants |
| Population: | ~8700 plugs per acre. |
| Fruit Quality Sample: | 11 Sept for Food Science, UCD 12 Sept for PTAB |
| Harvest | 31 August (123 days after transplanting) |
| Soil type: | Shanghai silty clay loam |
| Previous Crop: | wheat |
| Irrigation method: | furrow, initially as split beds |
| General Notes: | Transplants established and grew well. Healthy growth. Some spotted wilt. Some Fusarium wilt. Very good soil tilth. Harvest delayed beyond optimal with blackmold fruit rots a concern. |

Table 8A. Organics, Winters, Replicated: Yield, quality and cull-out from tomato variety evaluation, D.A. Rominger & Sons, 2012.

| | variety | disease resistance | Yield tons/A | color | Brix | pH | % pink | % green | % sun burn | % mold | % BER | % SW | lbs 50 fruit | |
|----|--|--------------------|--------------|-------|------|------|--------|---------|------------|--------|-------|------|--------------|------|
| 1 | H 5608 | VFFNP SW | 60.7 | a | 21.8 | 4.63 | 4.37 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7.27 |
| 2 | HM 9905 | VFFN | 55.6 | b | 24.3 | 4.85 | 4.41 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7.04 |
| 3 | AB 311 | VFFNP SW | 54.6 | b | 22.8 | 5.50 | 4.23 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7.54 |
| 4 | N 6397 | VFFN | 52.8 | bc | 23.0 | 5.03 | 4.31 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6.37 |
| 5 | N 6404 | VFFN SW | 52.8 | bc | 23.5 | 4.48 | 4.35 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8.04 |
| 6 | AB 2 | VFFP | 51.9 | bcd | 25.5 | 4.75 | 4.28 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 8.32 |
| 7 | PS 002 | VFFN SW | 51.2 | bcde | 23.0 | 4.73 | 4.34 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 8.60 |
| 8 | H 3402 | VFFNP | 50.9 | bcde | 23.3 | 4.60 | 4.34 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6.44 |
| 9 | PS 650 | VFFNP | 50.8 | bcde | 26.3 | 4.58 | 4.35 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 8.72 |
| 10 | H 5508 | VFFN SW | 49.6 | cdef | 23.8 | 4.28 | 4.24 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6.65 |
| 11 | AB 319 | VFFNP SW | 48.8 | cdef | 25.3 | 5.63 | 4.23 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7.90 |
| 12 | BQ 206 | VFFNP | 47.7 | defg | 24.0 | 5.25 | 4.27 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8.45 |
| 13 | N 6402 | VFFN SW | 46.9 | efg | 23.5 | 4.90 | 4.34 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6.62 |
| 14 | SUN 6366 | VFFN | 45.6 | fg | 24.3 | 4.78 | 4.38 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 7.35 |
| 15 | BQ 163 | VFFNP | 44.0 | g | 22.8 | 5.33 | 4.28 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7.86 |
| | LSD 5% | | 4.8 | | 1.6 | 0.50 | 0.09 | NS | 2 | NS | 2 | NS | NS | 0.76 |
| | % CV | | 7 | | 5 | 7 | 1 | 99 | 83 | 53 | 63 | 440 | 333 | 7 |
| | Average | | 50.9 | | 23.8 | 4.89 | 4.31 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 5.7 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 7.5 |
| | ^ significant non-additivity issue | | | | | | | | ^ | | ^ | ^ | ^ | |
| | * spotted wilt - Not all plots and varieties were measured | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | BER= blossom end rot defect | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Comments:

Highest yielding variety was H 5608 with 60+ tons per acre.

High Brix varieties were AB 319 and AB 311; and included BQ 163 and BQ 206.

Table 8B. Organics, Winters, Replicated: Stand, vine size, canopy and maturity, D.A. Rominger and Sons, 2012.

| | Variety | disease resistance | vine size (% of bed) | canopy cover % | maturity (days relative to AB 2) | stand #plants (75') | *spotted wilt infected (plants per 75') |
|----|----------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|---|
| 1 | AB 2 | VFFP | 93 | 83 | 0 | 81 | 0.3 |
| 2 | AB 311 | VFFNP SW | 95 | 85 | 0 | 79 | 0.0 |
| 3 | AB 319 | VFFNP SW | 100 | 85 | 1 | 80 | 0.0 |
| 4 | BQ 163 | VFFNP | 88 | 79 | -1 | 79 | 0.3 |
| 5 | BQ 206 | VFFNP | 90 | 80 | 1 | 80 | 0.3 |
| 6 | H 3402 | VFFNP | 78 | 53 | 2 | 81 | 0.0 |
| 7 | H 5608 | VFFNP SW | 90 | 73 | 0 | 79 | 0.0 |
| 8 | H 5508 | VFFN SW | 83 | 63 | 0 | 82 | 0.0 |
| 9 | HM 9905 | VFFN | 88 | 75 | -1 | 80 | 0.0 |
| 10 | N 6397 | VFFN | 93 | 79 | -1 | 79 | 0.0 |
| 11 | N 6402 | VFFN SW | 90 | 80 | 1 | 79 | 0.3 |
| 12 | N 6404 | VFFN SW | 95 | 83 | 1 | 81 | 0.0 |
| 13 | PS 002 | VFFN SW | 98 | 85 | 1 | 80 | 0.3 |
| 14 | PS 650 | VFFNP | 93 | 66 | 3 | 81 | 0.5 |
| 15 | SUN 6366 | VFFN | 83 | 73 | -3 | 80 | 0.0 |
| | LSD 5% | | 7.7 | 9.4 | 2.2 | NS | NS |
| | % CV | | 6 | 9 | 5 | 2 | 342 |
| | Average | | 90 | 68 | 0.2 | 80 | 0.1 |

* spotted wilt - Not all plots and varieties were measured

Comments:

Large plants in general

Canopy cover weaker with H 3402, H 5508 and PS 650

Earliest maturing was Sun 6366. Later varieties were PS 650 and H 3402.

Table 9A. Organics, Meridian, Replicated: Yield, quality and cull-out from tomato variety evaluation, Park Farming, 2012.

| Variety | resistance | Yield tons/A | | °Brix | color | pH | % pink | % green | % burn | % mold | % BER | lbs. per 50 fruit |
|--------------|------------|-----------------|-----|-------|-------|------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------------------|
| 1 H 5608* | VFFNP SW | 51.2 | a | 4.60 | 22.7 | 4.40 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 9.5 |
| 2 H 5508 | VFFN SW | 47.3 | ab | 4.25 | 23.0 | 4.26 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 9.6 |
| 3 AB 319 | VFFNP SW | 44.9 | bc | 4.65 | 24.3 | 4.34 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 9.1 |
| 4 N 6404 | VFFN SW | 44.0 | bcd | 4.25 | 24.0 | 4.43 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 9.1 |
| 5 N 6397 | VFFN | 42.2 | cd | 4.80 | 23.0 | 4.51 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 9.6 |
| 6 N 6402 | VFFN SW | 41.8 | cd | 4.58 | 24.5 | 4.41 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 7.0 |
| 7 AB 311 | VFFNP SW | 41.2 | cd | 5.00 | 23.8 | 4.30 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 8.3 |
| 8 HM 9905* | VFFN | 40.7 | cd | 4.63 | 25.0 | 4.50 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 7.8 |
| 9 BQ 163 | VFFNP | 39.9 | de | 4.93 | 24.5 | 4.35 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 9.6 |
| 10 AB 2 | VFFP | 35.8 | ef | 4.78 | 27.0 | 4.37 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 7.4 |
| 11 PS 650 | VFFNP | 35.6 | ef | 4.53 | 28.0 | 4.44 | 14 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 8.3 |
| 12 BQ 206 | VFFNP | 34.9 | f | 4.78 | 26.0 | 4.36 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 9.7 |
| 13 PS 002* | VFFN SW | 34.3 | f | 4.43 | 23.2 | 4.39 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 13 | 0 | 10.0 |
| 14 H 3402 | VFFNP | 33.9 | f | 4.70 | 23.8 | 4.40 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 9.6 |
| 15 SUN 6366* | VFFN | 32.5 | f | 4.53 | 24.6 | 4.40 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 15 | 0 | 9.1 |
| LSD 5% | | 4.3 | | 0.32 | 1.2 | 0.61 | 3.0 | 2.4 | NS | 4.1 | NS | 1.27 |
| % CV | | 8 | | 5 | 3 | 1 | 49 | 46 | 72 | 33 | 238 | 10 |
| Average | | 40.0 | | 4.6 | 24.5 | 4.39 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 8.9 |

* average of 3 reps
all others average of 4 reps

Comments:

H 5608 and H 5508 were the top yielding varieties with 51.2 and 47.3 tons/acre and relatively clean fruit.

AB 319, BQ 163, BQ 206 and AB 2 were among the high Brix varieties approaching 4.8 °Brix or above.

Mold levels primarily from blackmold were a concern with many varieties at or above 10% levels including Sun 6366 with 15%.

Table 9B. Organics, Meridian, Replicated: Stand, vine size, canopy and maturity, Park Farming, 2012.

| Variety | disease resistance | vine size (% of bed) | canopy cover % | maturity (days relative to AB 2) | stand #plants (100') | spotted wilt infection (plants per 100') |
|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 1 AB 2 | VFFP | 78 | 78 | 0 | 76 | 2.0 |
| 2 AB 311 | VFFNP SW | 88 | 80 | 2 | 75 | 0.0 |
| 3 AB 319 | VFFNP SW | 90 | 86 | 3 | 77 | 0.0 |
| 4 BQ 163 | VFFNP | 80 | 80 | 2 | 79 | 1.8 |
| 5 BQ 206 | VFFNP | 74 | 78 | 1 | 76 | 0.8 |
| 6 H 3402 | VFFNP | 73 | 65 | 2 | 72 | 1.3 |
| 7 H 5608* | VFFNP SW | 91 | 83 | 2 | 78 | 0.0 |
| 8 H 5508 | VFFN SW | 73 | 74 | 1 | 81 | 0.0 |
| 9 HM 9905* | VFFN | 89 | 83 | 2 | 80 | 1.3 |
| 10 N 6397 | VFFN | 83 | 81 | -1 | 78 | 0.3 |
| 11 N 6402 | VFFN SW | 80 | 75 | -1 | 78 | 0.0 |
| 12 N 6404 | VFFN SW | 85 | 85 | 3 | 81 | 0.0 |
| 13 PS 002* | VFFN SW | 76 | 77 | 1 | 76 | 0.1 |
| 14 PS 650 | VFFNP | 78 | 78 | 4 | 75 | 2.5 |
| 15 SUN 6366* | VFFN | 70 | 70 | -2 | 80 | 1.3 |
| LSD 5% | | 8 | 8 | 1.8 | NS | 1.2 |
| % CV | | 7 | 7 | 3.8 | 6 | 113 |
| Average | | 80 | 78 | 1.2 | 77 | 0.7 |

* average of 3 reps

Comments:

Vine size was modest, averaging 80% bed cover.

Vine canopy cover was good, with the exception of H 3402 with a low of 65%, although sun damage was only 3%.

Earliness maturing was Sun 6366 and later varieties were

PS 650 and AB 319 (about 5 to 6 days later than Sun 6366).

Spotted wilt incidence was highest with PS 650 and AB 2, while

the varieties with resistance appeared to hold well to the virus.