

Yield Quality and Bruise Susceptibility for Selected Russet Varieties

Rob Wilson, Center Director/Farm Advisor; Darrin Culp, Superintendent of Agriculture; Kevin Nicholson and Skyler Peterson, Staff Research Associates; University of California Intermountain Research & Extension Center, 2816 Havlina Rd., Tulelake, CA. 96134 Phone: (530) 667-5117 Fax: (530) 667-5265 Email: <u>rqwilson@ucdavis.edu</u>

Introduction:

Several Russet varieties were recently released for fresh market with higher yield potential, improved disease resistance, and lower input requirements compared to Russet Norkotah. However, many of these new varieties are more susceptible to shatter bruise, white-knot bruise, or blackspot bruise. Grower experience with these new varieties has been mixed. Some growers experienced excellent results and few problems, while others experienced significant crop loss due to bruising and storage rot. This study compared several Russet varieties yield and bruise susceptibility.

Trial Information

Location:	Intermountain Research and Extension Center, Tulelake, CA				
Soil Type:	Tulebasin mucky silty clay loam				
Planting Date:	May 14 th , 2015				
Harvest Date:	September 23, 2015				
Harvest Pulp Temperature:	56				
Irrigation:	Solid-set sprinklers				
Plot Size:	2 rows (6 ft) wide by 20 ft long				
Vine Kill Date:	September 2 nd and 9 th , 2015				
In-Row Seed Spacing:	10 inches				
Number of Replications:	4				
Fertilizer per Acre:	204 N-40 P205-110 K20-34 S				
Seed Treatment:	Fir Bark Dust, Maxim 4FS				
Weed Control:	Prowl H ₂ 0 & Roundup (pre-emergence), Outlook, Matrix				
Insecticides:	Admire Pro (in-furrow), Vydate				

Fungicides:

Vine Kill Method:

Quadris, Endura, Omega, Bravo Weatherstick, Tanos, Tattoo, Curzate Rolling vines followed by two applications of Reglone

Methods

Tuber yield and defects were evaluated on 11/5, 12/22, 2/5/2016 and 3/31. Tubers were stored in controlled storage at 46°F. Blackspot and white-knot bruise were evaluated during each session from. Ten tubers were evaluated at both evaluation times. Blackspot bruise was evaluated using an abrasive peel method. Samples were peeled in a Hobart peeler for 30 seconds, then incubated for 24 hours at 60-70°F. Potatoes were then separated into 5 categories based on enzymatic discoloration.

Results

Vine kill date did not have a significant influence on yield or tuber bruising, so data from all vine kill dates for each variety were combined for analysis. Varieties differed in their yield and bruise susceptibility at harvest (Tables 1 and 2). TX296 Norkotah, ATTX91137-1RU had the highest total yield and US# 1 yield of the trial (Table 1). GemStar Russet, Teton Russet, and Russet Norkotah also produced high yields. Varieties with the largest tuber size included ATX91137-1RU and TX296 Norkotah. Classic Russet has historically produced similar or higher yields than GemStar Russet and Russet Norkotah in IREC trials, but Classic Russet yields were low this year for an unknown reason.

GemStar Russet and AC00395-1RU had the most severe lenticel scarring, while Russet Norkotah and Canela Russet had the least (Tables 2). COTX09052-2RU, TX296 Norkotah, and Ruset Norkotah had the most severe black spot bruising at harvest (Figure 1). Interestingly, black spot bruise appeared to increase for several varieties including Classic Russet, Canela Russet, GemStar Russet, and Teton Russet after being stored for 60 days, while Russet Norkotah black spot bruising appeared unchanged (Figure 1). White Knot was evaluated 60 days after harvest with no significant incidence for all varieties and therefore was not reported. See Figure 2 for entry pictures and comments.

	Table 1. Russe	t Tuber	Yield ar	nd Size	Characteristics
--	----------------	---------	----------	---------	------------------------

	Total Yield	US #1's	2's	< 4 oz	Culls	Stand	Average Tuber Size	Tubers Per Plant
Variety		CWT/A				%	ounces	#
ATTX91137-1RU	514	329	140	34	12	98	8.1	6.0
AO3158-2TE	515	443	33	35	4	96	8.1	6.1
AO1010-1	467	389	20	55	4	99	6.3	7.0
Canela Russet	293	210	30	46	8	49 ¹	6.1	9.4
Teton Russet	454	309	82	50	13	89	7.0	6.8
Russet Norkotah	472	396	32	31	12	97	7.9	5.7
Classic Russet	428	311	73	34	10	94	7.6	5.6
GemStar Russet	447	332	59	49	8	91	6.8	6.6
Mercury Russet	401	310	46	32	13	90	7.6	5.4
AC00395-2RU	466	381	30	52	3	96	6.6	6.8
CO03276-5RU	506	397	10	92	7	97	5.4	8.9
Average	451	346	50	46	8	90	7.0	6.7
95% Conf. Interval	32	29	19	9	4	6	0.4	0.9

¹Canela Russet had an unknown problem with the stand.

Table 2. Russet Internal & External Defects at Harvest

	% Breakdown of Culls of Total Tuber Count			External Skin Evaluations				
Variety	Knob %	Growth Crack %	Green %	Irregular Shape %	Skinning ¹ 1-5	Lenticel Scarring ¹ 1-5	Shatter Bruise ¹ 1-5	Specific Gravity
ATTX91137-1RU	0.8	14.1	0.6	4.8	3.4	3.5	3.8	1.074
A03158-2TE	0.9	3.0	0.1	2.7	3.4	3.0	3.8	1.085
AO1010-1	0.6	0.8	0.2	2.7	3.4	2.1	3.8	1.086
Canela Russet	1.6	1.0	1.7	4.8	3.3	4.3	3.9	1.081
Teton Russet	2.5	8.5	0.5	4.2	3.4	2.1	3.8	1.075
Russet Norkotah	3.5	0.7	0.6	3.6	3.9	4.1	4.0	1.067
Classic Russet	3.3	1.3	1.3	3.0	3.8	3.4	3.6	1.084
GemStar Russet	4.4	0.5	2.0	4.6	3.8	4.0	3.8	1.082
Mercury Russet	1.7	8.2	0.7	2.9	3.9	3.8	3.8	1.073
AC00395-2RU	0.0	2.3	0.8	1.9	2.9	2.6	4.1	1.099
CO03276-5RU	1.3	0.4	0.7	0.6	4.0	2.8	4.0	1.079
Average	1.9	4.2	0.8	3.2	3.5	3.2	3.8	1.080
95% Conf. Interval	1.1	2.2	0.7	1.7	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.004

¹10 tuber sampled at harvest. Based on a 1-5 scale, 1 = most severe, 5 = no incident

Figure 1.



Error indicate a 95% confidence interval

Black Spot Bruise Evaluation Test Rating Scale After Abrasive Peeling



Figure 2. Russet Entry Pictures

	Ent	try	
ATTX91137-1RU	AO3158-2TE	AO1010-1	Canela Russet
Teton Russet	Russet Norkotah	Classic Russet	GemStar Russet
Mercury Russet	AC00395-2RU	CO03276-5RU	