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Primary Objective: To develop near-term strategies for improving stem-on retention on mechanically harvested fruit for the brine market.

- Hypotheses (based on grower observations):

  1) Can the optimal window for mechanically harvesting stem-on fruit can be predicted? By GDH; Fruit size, FRF, Soluble solids?

  2) Are single fruits easier to harvest than spurs with multiple fruits?

  3) Can pre-harvest application of plant growth regulators preferentially promote fruit separation at the branch-stem abscission zone?

  4) Does ethylene or pectinase activity continue to work at the stem-fruit abscission zone in brine solution, causing increased stem loss in the brine pits?
How is the fruit removed?
Stem Abscission Zones

• Upper Zone

• Lower Zone

(‘Andersen’ stem separation was unusual)
Experiment 1: Optimal Harvest Window Prediction Factors

- Orchards at 3 climatically different locations (Clarksville, Suttons Bay, Northport)

- Measured Growing Degree Hours, fruit size, weight, soluble solids, and FRF (fruit-stem zone) of Emperor Francis, Gold, and Ulster

- Trees were harvested mechanically from end of Stage II through Stage III (<50% stem-on)
  - Determined % stem retention of harvested fruit
  - Did not determine % fruit removal from tree
% Stem Retention vs. GDH for ‘Emperor Francis’

Too early to determine if we can predict by GDH, need to define a specific biofix point, and have several data sets. Does not seem promising at this point.
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% Fruit Removed From the tree and amount of foliage!
Trash!!

- Trash and % left on the tree are inversely related
% Stem Retention vs. GDH for ‘Gold’
Flore Hypothesis for Stem-on Removal

\[ \text{Force} = \text{mass} \times \text{velocity}^2 / \text{radius} \]

Requirements for stem-on abscission:

Fruit Mass \times \text{Shaker Velocity squared} must be large enough to tear the pedicel from the shoot. The lower abscission zone FRF must be high enough that the fruit does not abscise from the pedicel.
Experiment 1: Conclusions

• Generally, the fruit is torn from the spur, not at any true abscission zone.
• Therefore, the force applied must be at an angle from the branch, not perpendicular.
• The mass of the fruit and the length of the stem must be sufficient to rip the stem from the spur in response to the applied force.
• The FRF at the stem-fruit abscission zone must be high enough to prevent fruit separation.
Experiment 2: Lower Crop Loads(singles) Have Higher Stem Retention (than clusters)

- Six trees were hand-thinned on 3 June to one fruit/spur
- Six trees were untreated
- Stem retention was measured following mechanical harvest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Stem Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>90.8 ± 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinned</td>
<td>94 ± 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Singles vrs clusters!
Experiment 3: PreHarvest PGRs Can Preferentially Promote Abscission Site

- Treated 3 trees with standard rate of ethephon on 3 July
- Trees were harvested mechanically on 10, 11, and 12 July
- Measured stem retention, FRF, brix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Stem Retention</th>
<th>FRF</th>
<th>Brix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethephon-treated</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don’t use ethephon if you want to harvest stem-on!
Experiment 4: Does Abscission Activity Continue During Brining?

- 150 Gold and Emperor Francis (+/- ethephon) cherries were placed into brine.
  - After 101 days, 99% of all cherries retained stems.

- Hand-harvested stem-on cherries were treated with ethephon and with MCP after harvest, then brined.
  - After 100 days, stem loss only occurred with the ethephon-treated fruit and even more from the MC-treated fruit.
Observation: Tree structure
Pruning is important.

- The shake must be transferred to the fruit.
- No hangers.
- Stiffen up the tree.
Conclusions

• In 2009, brine cherries were mechanically harvested with stems on over a significant period during early Stage III fruit enlargement.

• The only parameters associated with the optimum time for successful harvest were FRF of the lower zone and fruit size.

• Varieties differed in response to mechanical harvest - ‘Gold’ was unsuitable for stem-on harvest in 2009.

• Shaker velocity/oscillations, fruit mass, stem length, and tree canopy “stiffness” were key to effective force transmission.
Future Directions

• Crop load thinning strategies may be pursued *if* fruit clusters remain an industry issue.

• Industry practices should focus on fruit size, tree pruning, and shaker operation, with *no use of ethephon* (which preferentially promotes *stem-fruit* separation more than *stem-spur* separation).

• *Stem loss during brining* appears primarily to be a result of the use of *ethephon*, which likely is exacerbated by pumping of brined fruit.
Early Recommendations

1. Be sure you have a home for the stem on fruit.
2. Choose the variety: Emperor Francis and Ulster were acceptable. Gold was not.
3. Prune the trees to stiffen them up.
4. Don’t use ethephon
5. Watch for a break in color of the fruit.
6. Begin harvest when fruit are 5-5.5 grams in weight.
7. Cool season is better than hot.