


Training Walnuts During Canopy Development Phase and Irrigation Management- Benefits in a Low Crop Price Year

Bruce Lampinen
UC Davis Plant Sciences

Presented at Quad County Walnut Day, March 5, 2019

UC DAVIS

DEPARTMENT OF PLANT SCIENCES



Walnut training trials

Nickels Howard training trial 2004-2010 (Lampinen and Edstrom)

Nickels Chandler training trial 2009-2016 (DeBuse, Lampinen and Hasey)

Chandler training trial Merced County 2012-2016 (Doll and Lampinen)

Forde training trial Yolo County 2012-2015 (DeBuse and Lampinen)

Howard training trial Butte County 2012-2014 (Hasey and Lampinen)

Tulare training trial Tulare County 2012-2013 (Fichtner and Lampinen)

Forde training trial CSU Chico Butte County 2012-2016 (Hasey and Lampinen)

Chandler training trial on Paradox and own-rooted 2012-ongoing (Caprile and Lampinen)

Howard training trial on own-rooted trees 2012-ongoing (Caprile and Lampinen)

Chandler training trial Lake County 2012-2014 (Elkins and Lampinen)

Solano training trial CSU Chico Butte County 2016-ongoing (Lightle and Lampinen)

Chandler training trial CSU Chico Butte County 2016-ongoing (Lightle and Lampinen)

Livermore training trial Kings County 2017-ongoing (Culumber and Lampinen)

Solano training trial Butte County 2017-ongoing (Lightle and Lampinen)

Total of 14 trials have included Chandler (5), Howard (3), Forde (2), Solano (2), Tulare (1) and Livermore (1)

Walnut height of heading at planting trials

Chandler Howard and Tulare height of heading at planting trial UC Davis Yolo County
2012-2017 (Lampinen)

Chandler height of heading at planting trial Yuba County 2014-15 (Hasey and Lampinen)

Chandler height of heading at planting trial Lake County 2014-16 (Elkins and Lampinen)

Howard Pruning treatments imposed in March 2004- after scaffold selection following second growing season

12' x 25' spacing (145 trees/acre)


Unpruned after scaffold selection

Pruned (1/3 of previous year growth each year until tree fills allotted space)



Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

Jan. 2010



Unpruned



Pruned

Unpruned Howard tree growth over study period



4/16/04

1/9/06

3/15/07

2/9/09

1/12/10

2nd

4th

5th

7th

8th

Howard pruned versus unpruned trial


After 7 years of treatment imposition, no benefits to pruning

Howard walnut trees can be brought into bearing without annual pruning

by Bruce D. Lampinen, John P. Edstrom, Samuel G. Metcalf, William L. Stewart, Claudia M. Negron and M. Loreto Contador

CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURE • VOLUME 69, NUMBER 2

APRIL–JUNE 2015



Canopy growth in young walnut trees is bimodal: Preformed growth forms in the bud during the previous season, and neoformed growth forms during the current season.

Chandler pruned versus unpruned trial

Chandler orchard planted at 15 x 22 ft.

Planted 2008 at Nickels Soil Lab

Nursery budded on Paradox rootstock

March 2009 pruning treatments imposed

Treatments

- Heavily pruned**
- Minimally pruned**
- No heading/no pruning**

Chandler pruned versus unpruned trial

Chandler orchard planted at 15 x 22 ft.

Planted 2008 at Nickels Soil Lab

Nursery budded on Paradox rootstock

March 2009 pruning treatments imposed

Treatments

- Heavily pruned
- Minimally pruned
- No heading/no pruning

Chandler pruned versus unpruned trial

Chandler orchard planted at 15 x 22 ft.

Planted 2008 at Nickels Soil Lab

Nursery budded on Paradox rootstock

March 2009 pruning treatments imposed

Treatments

- Heavily pruned
- Minimally pruned
- No heading/no pruning

Chandler pruned versus unpruned trial

Chandler orchard planted at 15 x 22 ft.

Planted 2008 at Nickels Soil Lab

Nursery budded on Paradox rootstock

March 2009 pruning treatments imposed

Treatments

- Heavily pruned
- Minimally pruned
- No heading/no pruning



After first growing season

Before pruning- after 2nd leaf




After pruning



After second growing season

Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

Before pruning- after 2nd leaf



After second growing season

Before pruning- end of 3rd leaf

Heavy pruning

Minimal pruning

Unheaded/unpruned

1/24/11

1/24/11

1/24/11

After pruning

Heavy pruning

Minimal pruning

Unheaded/unpruned

4/5/11

4/5/11

4/5/11

After third growing season

Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

Before pruning- end of 3rd leaf

Heavy pruning

Minimal pruning

Unheaded/unpruned

1/24/11

1/24/11


1/24/11

Heavy pruning

Unheaded/unpruned

4/5/11

4/5/11



After third growing season

Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

Before pruning- end of 4th leaf

Heavy pruning

Minimal pruning

Unheaded/unpruned

1/15/12

1/15/12

1/15/12

Before pruning

Heavy pruning

Minimal pruning

Unheaded/unpruned

12/30/12

12/30/12

12/30/12

After fourth growing season

Bruce Lampinen

UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

Before pruning- end of 4th leaf

Heavy pruning

Minimal pruning

Unheaded/unpruned

1/15/12

1/15/12

1/15/12


Heavy pruning

Unheaded/unpruned

12/30/12

12/30/12

12/30/12



After fourth growing season

Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

Heavy pruning

Minimal pruning

Unheaded/unpruned



1/30/14




1/30/14


1/30/14

2013

2014

2015






- Light interception significantly lower
- Yield significantly higher




Only broken scaffolds occurred in 2013 in minimum pruned treatments- no broken scaffolds in 2014 or 2015

Tree age 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Cumulative yield to 2015 (8th leaf)




Water needed to support canopy based on proportion of 42 inches needed at 60% canopy cover





A tree that looks like this has stalled out from overwatering, not from lack of pruning

Based on canopy size, 10 inches more water needed for minimally pruned in 3rd leaf




Water use efficiency for pruned versus unpruned treatments Years 2-6 summary

Treatment	Total water needed based on canopy size (years 2-6)	Cumulative yield (tons/acre)	Water use efficiency expressed as pounds of walnuts produced per inch of water applied	Water use efficiency (% of unpruned)
Unpruned	134	10.01	149	100
Minimally pruned	156	9.42	121	81
Heavily pruned	142	8.42	118	79

Chandler pruned versus unpruned trial

**After 8 years of treatment imposition, no benefits
to pruning**

Chandler training trial Merced County (Doll and Lampinen) Plot Layout



Block 1 Block 2 Block 3 Block 4

5th Leaf Chandler in Merced County



Headed



Unheaded, unpruned

Cumulative yield 1500 lbs/acre greater on unheaded compared to headed

Janet Caprile headed and unheaded trials- Contra Costa County

Chandler- own rooted and Paradox rooted

Rootstock Pruning Treatment	After 5 th leaf (2015)		
	Trunk Diameter (cm)	Light Intercept (% PAR)	Yield (lb/acre)
Paradox			
Headed	17.2 a	71.2 a	
Unheaded	15.6 b	51.7 b	
	*	*	
Own Rooted			
Headed	16.1	60.7 a	
Unheaded	16.0	55.7 b	
	NS	*	
Combined			
Headed		66.1 a	978.5
Unheaded		53.8 b	1624.0



2017 Cumulative

Yield
(lb/acre)
Headed 3530
Unheaded 4090

As of 7th leaf (2017), the unheaded have out-yielded headed by 560 lbs/acre

Janet Caprile headed and unheaded trials- Contra Costa County

Howard- own rooted

Pruning Treatment	After 4 th leaf (2014)			After 5 th leaf (2015)		
	Trunk Diameter (cm)	Light Intercept (% PAR)	Yield (lb/acre)	Trunk Diameter (cm)	Light Intercept (% PAR)	Yield (lb/acre)
Headed	13.1 b	48.8 b	133 b	15.5 b	44.1	744 b
Unheaded	13.9 a	55.8 a	620 a	16.7 a	48.3	1954 a
	*	*	*	*	NS	*

2017 Cumulative
Yield (lb/acre)
Headed 3220
Unheaded 4699



As of 7th leaf (2017), the unheaded have out-yielded headed by 1479 lbs/acre

Walnut training trials

Nickels Howard training trial 2004-2010 (Lampinen and Edstrom)

Nickels Chandler training trial 2009-2016 (DeBuse, Lampinen and Hasey)

Chandler training trial Merced County 2012-2016 (Doll and Lampinen)

Forde training trial Yolo County 2012-2015 (DeBuse and Lampinen)

Howard training trial Butte County 2012-2014 (Hasey and Lampinen)

Tulare training trial Tulare County 2012-2013 (Fichtner and Lampinen)

Forde training trial CSU Chico Butte County 2012-2016 (Hasey and Lampinen)

Chandler training trial on Paradox and own-rooted 2012-ongoing (Caprile and Lampinen)

Howard training trial on own-rooted trees 2012-ongoing (Caprile and Lampinen)

Chandler training trial Lake County 2012-2014 (Elkins and Lampinen)

Solano training trial CSU Chico Butte County 2016-ongoing (Lightle and Lampinen)

Chandler training trial CSU Chico Butte County 2016-ongoing (Lightle and Lampinen)

Livermore training trial Kings County 2017-ongoing (Culumber and Lampinen)

Solano training trial Butte County 2017-ongoing (Lightle and Lampinen)

Total of 14 trials have included Chandler (5), Howard (3), Forde (2), Solano (2), Tulare (1) and Livermore (1)

Walnut height of heading at planting trials

Chandler Howard and Tulare height of heading at planting trial UC Davis Yolo County
2012-2017 (Lampinen)

Chandler height of heading at planting trial Yuba County 2014-15 (Hasey and Lampinen)

Chandler height of heading at planting trial Lake County 2014-16 (Elkins and Lampinen)



Grower unpruned trial-
4th leaf Tulare on Paradox
Fresno County

Jan. 2018



4th leaf guard tree between plots (Chandler on Vlach) that was re-grafted in 2014 and not painted the following winter (Yolo County)

Jan. 2018



Grower unpruned trial-
5th leaf Chandler on VX211
San Joaquin County

Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

2nd leaf Solano pruning trial
Glenn County



Headed



Unheaded

Jan. 2018



Chuck's do nothing

Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist



3rd leaf Chandler clonal
rootstock trial at Sierra Gold
Nursery, Yuba County- yield
for Chandler on RX1 was 1.5
tons/acre in 3rd leaf

Jan. 2018

After 14 years of replicated unpruned trials plus 12 grower trials we have found no benefits to pruning during the orchard development phase except removing branches in the way of traffic

Advantages to no prune training

- Early increased yield

- Nice tree structure

- Less limb breakage in year 5-7

- Trend towards better quality with no prune

Disadvantages to pruning


- Expensive to prune and dispose of prunings

- Slightly lower quality/size for nuts on pruned

- More scaffold breakage in years after pruning stops

- More rapid shading of lower canopy- this is related to quality problems

3rd leaf yield for unpruned treatment in different trials




Pruning stopped after 2nd leaf

1st leaf

unheaded at planting

3rd leaf yield for unpruned treatment in different trials



Pruning stopped after

2nd leaf

1st leaf

unheaded at planting



Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

Unheaded June budded Chandler on RX1 planted spring of 2015

1.5 tons/acre



June 2015



After first leaf

January 2016



After third leaf

January 2018

Early season water management and physiological indicators for irrigation management in walnut

PIs: Ken Shackel, Allan Fulton, Bruce Lampinen, Kari Arnold (Hal Crain, Jeff Phillips, cooperators)
Graduate student: Nick Matsumoto

Objective #1: Field test four levels of SWP for the start of irrigation in the spring.

In the spring, use a pressure chamber, measure SWP



- 1) Let the grower do what he wants.
- 2) For us, wait to start irrigating, until the trees hit:
1, 2, 3, or 4 bars below (more stressed than) the 'baseline' (fully irrigated) SWP value.


Started 2014

Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

Treatment average yields, 2014-2018

Only 2015 showed a statistical separation between the highest (Grower) and the lowest (4 bar) treatment.

No apparent trend of an increasing yield gap as a result of delaying irrigation.




2018 Yields, nut weight, and PAR

As in previous years, the only statistical separation between treatments was in nut weight.

Treatment	Plot yield (tons/ac)		Tree sample nut weight (g)		Plot PAR		Plot yield/PAR	
	(% G)		(% G)		(% G)		(% G)	
Grower	2.38	(100)	10.70 ab	(100)	83.8	(100)	0.028	(100)
1 bar below	2.43	(103)	10.80 a	(101)	79.7	(95)	0.030	(109)
2 bars below	2.34	(99)	9.89 ab	(92)	82.4	(98)	0.028	(101)
3 bars below	2.33	(99)	9.69 ab	(91)	81.3	(97)	0.029	(102)
4 bars below	2.25	(95)	9.59 b	(90)	81.9	(98)	0.027	(97)

Results: Seasonal (MSWP and baseline)





Summary:


- 1) This experiment was designed to test whether delaying irrigation in the spring was a good idea that would avoid over-irrigation problems or a bad idea that would cause water stress problems around harvest.
- 2) It is definitely not a bad idea on this soil in this location, in fact, trees in all delay treatments were less stressed around harvest than the control.
- 3) Based on grower acceptance it appears to be a good idea, but we have not observed any specific over-irrigation problems that were solved by delaying irrigation.
- 4) Visually, the grower reports that the delay trees look healthier, so a longer term trial may be needed, although maintaining a “control” treatment in a commercial orchard for this test may be difficult.
- 5) There is evidence that mild/moderate stress is associated with higher nut load and % edible yield, both of which appear to be key positive factors in orchard economic productivity.

A new trial was initiated on a heavier soil in a commercial walnut orchard in Stanislaus Co. (Patterson, CA).

Quality impacts



Condition	Peak
Thin shell	June
Severe shrivel	early July
Slight shrivel	early Aug
Yellow pellicle	early Aug
Black pellicle	mid- Aug
Bronze pellicle	late Aug/early Sept.



Understanding the role of orchard factors on Amber kernel color and rancidity development (Objective 2)




Pomology headquarter

H1-9/23/16
H2-10/03/16



Ch1-10/03/16
Ch2-10/10/16

Maturity impact on 'Howard' walnut kernel bronzing measured during storage for 12 months (2016)


'Howard' Percent E&L by Maturity during storage at 32°F (2016)



Maturity and irrigation impacts on 'Howard' and 'Chandler' walnut kernel bronzing over 12 months storage (2016)



↑
Darker pellicle



Effects of preharvest factors on 'Chandler' walnut kernel bronzing measured at 2017 harvest

		DFA	Light
Treatment		(1-4)	(%)
Maturity	2	1.8	96.5
	3	2.0	90.6
	<i>P-value</i>	<i>0.0001</i>	<i>0.0129</i>
Irrigation	Control	1.9	95.4
	Excess	1.9	91.7
	<i>P-value</i>	<i>0.6699</i>	<i>0.1023</i>
Mat*Irrig	2*Control	1.8	96.7
	2*Excess	1.8	96.3
	3*Control	2.0	94.2
	3*Excess	2.1	87.05
	<i>P-value</i>	<i>0.4542</i>	<i>0.1449</i>

For Chandler, date of harvest had a significant impact on color in 2017

Effects of preharvest factors on 'Howard' walnut kernel bronzing measured at 2017 harvest

Treatment		DFA (1-4)	Light (%)
Maturity	2=Hull Split	2.1	87.0
	3=HS +Later	2.2	60.4
	<i>P-value</i>	<0.0001	<0.0001
Irrigation	Control	2.1	81.4
	Excess	2.3	66.0
	<i>P-value</i>	0.0025	0.0011
Mat*Irrig	2 Control	2.0	90.7
	2 Excess	2.1	83.3
	3 Control	2.2228	72.2
	3 Excess	2.4885	48.7
	<i>P-value</i>	0.1249	0.0734

For Howard, both date of harvest and irrigation treatment had a significant impact on color (more water and later harvest both mean darker pellicles)

We also did a study looking at variability in quality within trees for the most and least stressed trees





Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

Howard



Chandler



We are assessing color with 4 methods




CDFA color charts

Minolta colorimeter

New image analysis system in the Crisosto Lab

Photoshop image analysis with Lampinen Lab

image setup (images shown above)





Darker pellicle

wetter



Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist



Darker pellicle ↓

wetter




Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist




Nickels Soil Lab Howards 9/30/08

**Wet conditions in interior
of nut when hull does not
split normally create
problems**




Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

wetter



- Walnut quality Chandler 2007
- ▲ Nickels Howard 2007
- Nickels Howard 2008

Seasonal average midday stem water potential (bars)




Seasonal average midday stem water potential (bars)


Benefits of improved pruning and water management in a low crop price year

Less pruning- increased water use efficiency in years 1-6

- More crop with less water
- Less costs to dispose of prunings
- Fewer pruning cuts- less disease potential



3rd leaf yield for unpruned treatment in different trials



Pruning stopped after 2nd leaf

1st leaf




unheaded at planting

Benefits of improved pruning and water management in a low crop price year

Proper water management during the growing season is beneficial for tree health and monetary returns

- Less stress if trees were irrigated properly early in the season
- Better tree health
- Better kernel fill
- Improved color
- Increased returns

Results: Seasonal (MSWP and baseline)



Darker pellicle
 ↓
 wetter → drier

Unheaded Tulare on Vlach



04/10/13

06/10/13



07/10/13



08/10/13



09/11/13




10/1/13



Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

04/21/14



Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

05/1/14



06/1/14



07/1/14



Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist



Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

09/1/14



Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

10/1/14



Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

1/3/15



Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

7/25/15



Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

12/15/15



Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

1/15/17



Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

1/22/18



Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist



1st

2nd

3rd

5th

April 2013

Jan 2014

Jan 2015

Jan 2016

Jan 2017

Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist



Tip burn



Leathery leaves




Distorted leaf margins



Distorted leaves



Yellowing leaves



Bronzing



Yellowing etc.



Yellowing leaves



Various



Healthy leaf

Leaf damage symptoms observed only on excessively wet trees

Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

Damage symptoms from excessively wet conditions



Damage symptoms from excessively wet conditions



Damage symptoms from excessively wet conditions



Damage symptoms from excessively wet conditions



Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

Damage symptoms from excessively wet conditions



Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

Damage symptoms from excessively wet conditions



Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

Damage symptoms from excessively wet conditions



Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

Damage symptoms from excessively wet conditions



Damage symptoms from excessively wet conditions



Bruce Lampinen
UCCE Orchard Management Specialist

Damage symptoms from excessively wet conditions





Thanks to the California Walnut Board for funding this work

Questions?