Effect of

CANE SEVERANCE

on quality of

MACHINE HARVESTED RAISINS

M ECHANICAL HARVESTING of Thomp-son Seedless raisin grapes by means of vibration has been under study at the University of California since 1968. During this time, machines have been developed for uniformly distributing the fruit onto a continuous paper tray (see photo) and for collecting the raisins from the tray after drying.

The key to the success of the system is cane severance, whereby the fruiting canes (second year wood) are cut with hand shears 4 to 6 days prior to harvest. The cut is made at a point near the juncture of the cane with the vine head. The purpose of cane severance is to induce easy separation of the fruit as single berries from the vine. The vibratory type grape harvester machines normally detach the fruit as single berries but, if the canes are not cut first, the capstems of the berries are usually pulled from the berry leaving an open wound from which juice exudes. On the other hand, when canes are severed, the capstems dry and become brittle. During harvest, they break from the rachis and are generally retained by the berry. Consequently, damage to the harvested fruit is reduced and free juice is minimized.

The effect of cane severance on the quality of the harvested fruit has been studied extensively. The purpose of this article is to present some of these results so that the importance of the operation can be appreciated adequately by growers who may be considering mechanical harvesting of raisin grapes.

| TABLE 1. SU | BJECTIVE EV. | ALUATION C | OF RAISIN | TRAYS FOR |
|-------------|--------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| THE | PRESENCE O | F CLUSTERS | AND LEA | VES |

| | | | Pie | ot 1 | | Plot 2 | | | |
|-------------|---|-----|-------|------|------|--------|-------|-----|------|
| | | Clu | sters | Lec | aves | Clu | sters | Leo | aves |
| Treatment | | C* | NC | с | NC | с | NC | С | NC |
| Replication | 1 | 6† | 10 | 4 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 6 |
| | 2 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 10 |
| | 3 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 8 |
| | 4 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 8 | - 4 | 8 |
| | 5 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 8 | - 4 | 6 |
| | 6 | 5 | 10 | 4 | 10 | 4 | 10 | 4 | 10 |
| | 7 | 4 | 10 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 8 |
| | 8 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 10 | 2 | 8 |
| Means: | | 4.8 | 9.0 | 3.5 | 8.5 | 3.5 | 8.5 | 3.3 | 8. |

| TABLE 2. EFFECT OF CANE SEVERANCE AND |
|---------------------------------------|
| DEFLORATION ON DEGREE OF SPOTTING |
| OF THE RAISIN TRAY PAPER |

| | Ave | erage spot count | (no. spots/ft ³) |
|-------------|-----|------------------|------------------------------|
| Treatment | | C* | NC |
| Replication | 1 | 25.0 | 103.5 |
| | 2 | 27.5 | 69.5 |
| | 3 | 21.5 | 60.5 |
| | 4 | 20.0 | 71.5 |
| | 5 | 19.5 | 80.0 |
| | 6 | 25.0 | 68.0 |
| Means: | | 23.1 | 75.5 |

TABLE 3. EFFECT OF CANE SEVERANCE ON PERCENTAGE OI MECHANICAL DAMAGE IN THE RAISIN SAMPLES

| | | | Per | centage | e of me | chanic | al dama | age | |
|-------------|-----|-------|---------|---------|----------|--------|---------|-----|------|
| | | Pla | ot A | Pla | t B | Pla | ot C | Plo | nt D |
| Treatment | | C* | NC | C | NC | C | NC | С | N |
| Replication | 1 | 2.3 | 9.4 | 0.9 | 7.7 | 2.4 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 7 |
| • | 2 | 1.8 | 5.0 | 2.3 | 3.7 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 1.1 | 4 |
| | 3 | 2.3 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 0.7 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 3 |
| | 4 | 1.6 | 4.8 | 0.8 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 10.3 | 3.1 | 5 |
| | 5 | 3.8 | 12.6 | 1.1 | 2.4 | 4.0 | 2.1 | 2.4 | - 3 |
| | 6 | 2.0 | 4.5 | 1.3 | 3.9 | 1.7 | 3.1 | 1.8 | 6 |
| | 7 | 1.4 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 0.8 | 2.2 | • • | |
| | 8 | 0.5 | 3.6 | 1.4 | 4.5 | 1.9 | 2.0 | • • | |
| Means: | | 2.0 | 5.7 | 1.4 | 3.6 | 1.8 | 3.3 | 2.0 | 5 |
| | | | severed | | | | | | |
| | | | not sev | | ior to h | arvest | | | |
| †Cod | | | | | | | | | |
| | - | ow | = | : 4 | | | | | |
| | n n | nediu | m == | : 6 | | | | | |
| | ŀ | nigh | = | : 8 | | | | | |
| | v | erv 1 | nigh = | 10 | | | | | |

| ñ | fornia Division of Agricultural Sciences. Villiam W. Paul |
|---|--|
| 1 | Agricultural Publications |
| J | erry LesterEditor |
| | Eleanore Browning Assistant Editor California Agriculture |
| | Articles published herein may be republished or reprinted provided no advertisement for a |
| | commercial product is implied or imprinted |
| | Please credit: University of California |
| , | Division of Agricultural Sciences. |
| | Jalifornia Agriculture will be sent free upon request addressed to: Editor, California |
| | Igriculture, Agricultural Publications, Uni |
| ۲ | ersity of California, Berkeley, California |
| | To simplify the information in California |
| ż | foriculture it is sometimes necessary to use |
| t | rade names of products or equipment. No |
| ŝ | ndorsement of named products is intended |
| 1 | nor is criticism implied of similar products which are not mentioned. |

en 👘 🖓 🖓 🖓

New **Publications**

GUIDE TO TURFGRASS PEST CONTROL. Leaflet 209, revised. This leaflet is designed to be used in conjunction with Manual 41, TURFGRASS PESTS, and to supply information about chemicals that can be recommended for use in controlling such pests. Because of frequent changes in regulations as well as new discoveries, information regarding chemicals often has an extremely short life. As a result, this leaflet will be revised and reissued

Single copies of these publications—except Manuals single copies of these publications—except Manuals and books—or a catalog of Agricultural Publications may be obtained without charge from the local office of the Farm Advisor or by addressing a request to: Agricultural Publications, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720. When ordering sale items, please archae normat the charts as a series of the please enclose payment. Make checks or money orders payable to The Regents of the University of California.

as often as necessary to keep it current. This edition is dated March 1973.

COMMERCIAL CROPS IN CALIFORNIA. Leaflet 198, revised. A listing of California's commercial crops (forest products not included). Acreages are shown for 34 fruit and nut crops, 36 vegetable crops, and 39 field crops. This listing is mainly from the 1969 U.S. Census and the California Crop and Livestock Reporting Service.

| TABLE 4. EFFECT | OF CANE SEVERANCE ON | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|--|
| PERCENTAGE OF | LEAF FRAGMENTS IN THE | |
| | RAISINS | |

| | | ins with embedded |
|-----------|----------|-------------------|
| | leaf fro | agments |
| Treatment | C* | NC |
| Sample 1 | 5.7 | 27.3 |
| Sample 2 | 4.0 | 13.6 |
| Sample 3 | 2.2 | 17.2 |
| Sample 4 | 0.2 | 2.6 |
| Sample 5 | 4.1 | 5.1 |
| Sample 6 | 2.8 | 51.4 |
| Mean: | 3.2 | 19.5 |

TABLE 5. EFFECT OF CANE SEVERANCE ON MOLD PERCENTAGE IN RAISINS PRODUCED UNDER FAVORABLE DRYING CONDITIONS

| | | | | | Aold pe | rcentag | | | |
|-------------|-----|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|--------|------|
| | | Plo | ot A | Plo | ot B | Pic | t C | Pic | t D |
| Treatment | | C* | NC | c | NC | c | NC | с | NC |
| Replication | 1 | 0.9 | 1,3 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 2. |
| | 2 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 2.1 | 3.3 |
| | 3 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 1.4 |
| | 4 | 4.1 | 2.0 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 2.3 |
| | 5 | 1.6 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 3.0 |
| | 6 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 4. |
| | 7 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 2.6 | | |
| | 8 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 1.5 | | |
| Means: | | 2.0 | 1.2 | .4 | .8 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 2.8 |
| | | | PERCEN | . EFFE | WHEN | RAIN | OCCL | | |
| | | | | | | Mo | ld perc | entage | |
| | Sai | nple r | 10. | | N | o rain | | | Rain |
| | | 1 | | | | 1.5 | | | 3.6 |
| | | 2 | | | | 1.6 | | | 1.5 |
| | | 3 | | | | 1.8 | | | 8.5 |
| | | 4 | | | | 1.5 | | | 2.1 |
| | | 5 | | | | 20 | | | 21 |

| 4 | 1.5 | 2.1 |
|-------|-----|-----|
| 5 | 2.0 | 2.1 |
| 6 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| 7 | 1.5 | 1.9 |
| 8 | 1.1 | 2.3 |
| 9 | 2.6 | 2.8 |
| 10 | 0.8 | 3.3 |
| 11 | 2.0 | |
| 12 | 1.6 | |
| 13 | 1.3 | |
| 14 | 0.6 | |
| | | |
| Mean: | 1.5 | 2.9 |

TABLE 7. EFFECT OF TRAY ELEVATION AND CANE SEVERANCE ON MOLD PERCENTAGE IN RAISINS RAIN OCCURS EARLY IN DRYING PERIOD HEN

| | | | | M | old per | centag | e | | |
|-------------|-------|------|------|------|---------|--------|------|------|------|
| | | | Plo | ot I | | | Plo | + 11 | |
| Sample loca | ation | LC | w | н | GH | LC | W | H | GH |
| Treatment | | C* | NC | c | NC | с | NC | c | NC |
| Replication | 1 | 72.9 | 49.3 | 3.3 | 10.4 | 21.4 | 18.3 | 3.1 | 21.4 |
| | 2 | 49.5 | 46.3 | 4.1 | 7.8 | 15.6 | 41.4 | 7.7 | 12.2 |
| | 3 | 55.6 | 27.2 | 12.3 | 11.8 | 13.2 | 31.8 | 9.0 | 7.6 |
| | 4 | 56.7 | 62.7 | 11.2 | 26.1 | 9.2 | 59.8 | 7.3 | 10.2 |
| | 5 | 50.7 | 43.8 | 8.1 | 36.7 | 41.4 | 42.1 | 5.9 | 20.6 |
| | 6 | 51.5 | 34.1 | 7.8 | 16.1 | 11.6 | 22.9 | 9.8 | 8.3 |
| | 7 | 35.7 | 63.3 | 17.8 | 16.5 | 8.9 | 14.2 | 7.7 | 8.2 |
| | 8 | 51.0 | 62.9 | 12.1 | 11.5 | 11.4 | 31.6 | 6.0 | 15.1 |
| Mean: | | 53.0 | 49.0 | 9.6 | 17.0 | 16.6 | 327 | 71 | 13.0 |

TABLE 8. EFFECT OF CANE SEVERANCE ON FLAVOR OF MACHINE HARVESTED SUNDRIED RAISINS

| | Number of samples judged by USDA having a non-typical sundried flavo | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|-----------|----|--|--|--|--|
| | | Treatment | | | | | |
| Plot A | Replication | C* | NC | | | | |
| | · 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| | 2 | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| | 3 | 0 | 2 | | | | |
| | 4 | 0 | 2 | | | | |
| Plot B | 1 | 0 | 2 | | | | |
| | 2 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| | 3 | 0 | 1 | | | | |
| | 4 | 0 | 1 | | | | |
| Total with r | on-typical flavor: | 2 | 12 | | | | |
| | samples judged | 16 | 16 | | | | |

Clusters and leaves

Two vineyard plots in the Biola district were evaluated for the presence of clusters and leaves on the tray after machine harvest. The canes were severed on a portion of each plot, the remainder was untreated. The results are shown in table 1. Significantly more leaves and clusters were found on the trays after harvest in the untreated controls. Clusters or cluster parts dry more slowly and more unevenly than single berries. Leaves deposited on the tray can create some shading problems. Fruit from the cane-severed plots dried more uniformly (less variation in final moisture content) and overall drying time was reduced. Generally the drying time required for cane-severed fruit varies from 11 to 14 days, depending on the depth of fruit spread on the tray and on weather conditions.

Mechanical damage

Some juice from berries which are damaged during harvest is absorbed by the tray paper. Samples of tray paper were collected after raisin pickup and spots or discolorations of the paper were counted. These spot counts (per square foot of tray paper) are tabulated in table 2. These data imply that much more free juice is present when canes are not cut.

Raisin samples were collected from four plots and evaluated by USDA for mechanical damage. The results are shown in table 3. In each case, the fruit from severed canes exhibited less mechanical damage than fruit from untreated vines. Moreover, all of the samples from severed canes were well below the maximum allowable value of 5% mechanical damage, while nearly 25% of the samples from untreated vines exceeded this 5% maximum value.

Embedded leaf fragments

Normally, the amount of leaf material on the tray during the drying period is quite small. In some instances, a severe leaf fall from the vines may occur because of vine management problems, but these leaves can be easily removed from the raisins at pickup time by pneumatic machinery. Nevertheless, adherence of leaf fragments to the raisins is an indication of damage done to the fruit during harvest since the raisins produced from damaged fruit are sticky (see table 4). As shown in table 4, raisin samples from severed canes contained considerably less fruit with embedded leaves than those samples from untreated vines.



Part of raisin mechanization includes development of machines for uniformly distributing fruit on continuous paper trays and for collecting the raisins from the trays after drying (photo above and cover).

Mold

Mold on raisins is related to the weather conditions during the drying period. The maximum allowable mold content is 5% by USDA standards. The data in table 5 was collected during 1970 and 1971, when drying conditions were quite favorable. In general, the data suggest that cane severance may have some beneficial effect on reducing mold under favorable drying conditions, but none of the samples exceeded the maximum allowable value, and the average mold levels in the fruit were quite low.

The data in table 6 was collected in 1971 and shows comparative mold levels in raisins exposed to rain toward the end of the drying period as opposed to other raisins which received no rain. Cane severance was employed in both cases. The data indicates that a rain late in the drying period may increase the mold percentage in the fruit but in only one sample was the maximum allowable mold content exceeded. The average mold percentage for all samples was well within the tolerance limit.

The data in table 7 was collected in 1972. In this case, very poor drying conditions existed due to a heavy rainfall two days after the fruit was laid on the tray. Raisin samples were collected from well drained areas of the tray (labelled HIGH) and from poorly drained areas of the tray (labelled LOW).

Several conclusions can be drawn from the data in table 7. First, adverse weather conditions early in the drying period can result in considerable mold growth. However, the mold percentage in those samples which were harvested from severed canes was generally significantly lower than in the fruit from untreated vines, irrespective of whether the samples were drawn from well-drained or poorlydrained areas of the tray. Secondly, the mold percentage in those samples drawn from well drained areas of the tray was significantly less than for samples from poorly drained areas. Thirdly, the mold percentage in samples drawn from well drained areas of the tray and also from cane-severed fruit was comparable with that found in hand harvested samples collected from the same vineyard. Consequently, the data suggest that use of a sloped tray is highly desirable to minimize mold development and that cane severing is definitely advantageous in limiting mold development under adverse drying conditions.

Flavor

Raisin samples from cane-severed plots and check plots were evaluated for flavor by USDA during normal incoming inspection. The samples were judged as exhibiting either a typical, or a non-typical, sun-dried flavor. The results of these judgments are shown in table 8. Considering those samples from the check vines, 75% were judged to have a non-typical flavor whereas only 12% of the samples from cane severed vines were so judged. Consequently, it appears that cane severing does promote the development of the characteristic flavor of California sundried raisins.

The data collected from machine-harvested plots indicate that cane severance is a desirable operation, and can result in a, reduction of mechanical damage, mold infection, embedded leaf fragments and stickiness of machine-harvested raisins.

Henry E. Studer is Assistant Agricultural Engineer, Department of Agricultural Engineering; and H. P. Olmo is Professor of Viticulture, Department of Viticulture and Enology, University of California, Davis.

SYSTEMIC INSECTICIDES

for control of

CITRUS MEALYBUG

in

GARDENIAS

J. L. BIVINS · A. S. DEAL

C ITRUS MEALYBUG *Planococcus citri* (Risso) is a serious pest attacking many greenhouse grown crops. Cottony masses of the insect occur in great numbers on the growing tips of the branches of plants (see photo). The greatest numbers occur in the summer, fall, and early winter months, causing the most serious damage to plants. The mealybug is a gregarious feeder ultimately killing the tender shoots.

A number of natural enemies have been successfully introduced that are important in keeping the citrus mealybug in check. Among these, the two species most frequently used are Leptomastidea abnormis (Girault) and the beetle Cryptolaemus montrouzieri Muls. However, the parasites and predators are not always available. Occasionally, it is impossible to colonize them in sufficient numbers to contain the infestation of citrus mealybugs. Where biological control fails, the only suitable alternative has been chemical control.

In the past, sulfotepp was widely recommended and used for citrus mealybug control in greenhouses. Recently, other organophosphate materials—malathion and diazinon—have been used to control citrus mealybug. Interest has also been stimulated in the new systemics, utilizing more effective, highly-specialized

Citrus mealybug on a leaf of Mystery gardenia.