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## Goals

- Integrated Pest Management
- Marketing \& Economic IPM
- Ecological Pest Mang. Principles
- Polyculture Experiment


## Integrated Pest Management (IPM)

Science based system (not a romanticized view)
Goal: to reduce the Environmental, Ethical and Economic (E,E,E,) risk of managing pests (weed, disease or insect)

Naturalize pest management systems

- Evaluate new technology


## IPM Methods

- Monitoring - scouting, thresholds
- Forecasting - models
- Cultural Control - resistant varieties.
- Biological Control - predators, antagonist
- Chemical Control - pesticides, pheromone



## Economic IPM and Marketing

## Product $=$ Bundle of Benefits



## Marketing Strategies

## How to differentiate your product?

1) Price - more efficient, less cost
2) Quality - characteristic that customers want

## Selling Strategies

- Not all customers are alike
- The old days of Henry Ford when "You can have any color you want, as long as it's black" are long gone.
- Use different strokes for different folks
- The Law of the Slight Edge Once established, difference between a champion and an also-ran, more often than not, is a very slim margin


## Models for Differentiating Potential Consumers

- Environmental Consumer
- Lifestyle - Health Consumer (LOHAS)
- Mainstream consumer


## Types of Environmental Consumers



Affluent
Mainstream Healers

- Deep Env - Heartbeat of Am: Well Ed. concern - Interested - Upscale
- Will pay in Env. - Personal
- Female - Need a "reason" well being
- Low\& upper- Only when income convenient
- Family \&


Young Overwhelmed Unconcerned Recyclers
-Young - Not - Apathetic

- Never optimistic - Reject that married - Economically chemicals - Reject "just getting harms the paying a by" environment premium goal orient


## Core to Periphery Lifestyle Model Sphere



Core
14\%

Mid Level Periphery (Mainstream) 54\% 30\%

## Lifestyle and Economic Potential

- Cities are where the money is
- City dwellers are clamoring for good food
- To get top dollar target LOHAS

LOHAS- Lifestyles of Health and Sustainability

- 1/3 US pop. - 63 million adults
- Goods \& Services
- Health and Fitness
- Environment
- Social Justice
- Personal development
- Sustainable living


## Mainstream Consumer

- Should we market to green consumer?
- Marketing to green consumer has been difficult
- Most consumers need to satisfy personal needs before planet
- Focus on green behaviors that everyone can aspire to
- Old saying "people that buy drills don't need drills: they need holes."
- Consumers want solutions to their day-to-day problems that also make sense to our environment.
- Create real products that tell an environmental story

Can we design a food production system that is close to consumers and

- Simulates natural systems Ecomimicry
- Uses Ecologically Based Pest Management
- Economically viable $\approx \$ 90,000 / \mathrm{A}$ $=\$ 10$ per ft of row


## Some Principles of Good Farming

- Plan your farm and goals
- Look at the whole picture (water, soil, crops, goals)
- Learn and grow through reading and meetings
- Fertility and slope of land
- A farm must be profitable


## Ecologically Based Agriculture

- General Principles of Ecomimicry
-Select and grow a diversity of crops that have natural defenses against pests
-Choose varieties with resistance or tolerance
-Build the soil with organic matter


## Ecological Based Pest Management

 Builds on strengths of natural systems- Three concepts
- Ecosystem Stability
- Biodiversity
- Biological Control


## Ecological Pest Management Ecosystem Stability

- Ecosystems with more diversity
- Are more stable
-Greater resistance
- Ability to avoid or withstand disturbances
-Greater resilience
- Ability to recover from stress


## Ecological Pest Management Ecosystem Stability

- Reduce tillage/cultivation - fewer weeds
- Reduce mowing - less disruption, increase beneficials
- Maintain "permanent" ground covers
- Add organic matter - substrate for good MO's
- Use cover crops - inc. moisture retention
- Use crop rotation - breaks pest cycle
- Increase crop diversity - more difficult to find
- Create corridors - highways of habitat


## Ecological Pest Management

- Tries to apply stress to the pests -Interrupt their life cycle -Remove alternative food sources
- Enhance beneficial population -Avoid agrochemicals where possible - At least better timing


## Ecological Pest Management

- Is a preventative approach
- Uses little "hammers"
- Instead of one big "hammer"
- Relies on Biological Control (as much as possible)
- Beneficial predators and parasites
- Disease-causing organisms
- Beneficial fungi and bacteria that inhabit roots


## Ecological Pest Management Enhancing Beneficials/Biocontrol

- Characteristics typical of fields with plenty of beneficials
- Fields are small - a lot of edges, natural vegetation
- Cropping systems are diverse
- Include perennials and flowering plants
- Crops are managed with minimal agrichemical inputs
- Soils high in organic matter, biological activity during off season
- Covered with mulch or vegetation


## Ecological Pest Management Biodiversity

- Spatial diversity - across a landscape, within fields
- Genetic diversity - different varieties, different crops
- Temporal diversity - different crops at different stages of growth


## Ecological Pest Management Fertility

- Slow release of nutrients the best,
- any compost is good compost (yard waste, dairy barn, vermicompost)
- Pests seem to follow the Nitrogen (plant suckers i.e. mites \& aphids)
- Too much synthetic fertilizer cause nutritional imbalances

Goal - to determine optimal layout of an intensive fruit \& vegetable polyculture system that mimics natural systems \& can be used by the small periurban or urban farmer.
Economics
Pest density

Efficiency


Modular Ecological Design
-scale up for needs $(1,3,8)$

## Commodities and Treatments



Early, Mid, Late cultivars

## Layout of plots

| RB | SR | MR | CB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MR | RB | CB | SR |
| SR | CB | RB | MR |
| CB | MR | SR | RB |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{RB}=\text { Raised Bed } \\
& \mathrm{SR}=\text { Solid Row } \\
& \mathrm{MR}=\text { Mixed Row } \\
& \mathrm{CB}=\text { Checker Board }
\end{aligned}
$$

Each plot - 44' x 60'
Total Acres - 1.4 A

## $2006$



## April 2005 Land Preparation



April 2005

## Raised Beds <br> April 2005 <br> (\$1.20/ft)



April 2005
maynarymivali x Mrat


## Yard Waste Compost May 2005



May 2005


May 2005

## Tree and Bush Planting



## Groundhog, Rabbit, Deer Fence



June 2005


## Raised Bed Mixed Row



## $2006$



## June 2006 - Weeding Cost



2005 Weeding Costs - \$1.35/ft
Labor hrs $(760 \mathrm{hr})=\$ 6,080$
2006 Cost - \$0.37/ft
Landscape Cloth $=\$ 1,250$
Labor $(214 \mathrm{hr})=\$ 1,612$
Total $=\$ 2,862$

## $2007$



## $2007$



## High Tunnel Growth Differences (cm)

| Trt | All | Ap | Blue | Rasp | Peach | Soy | Stra | Apples <br> Aph/M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| No <br> HT | 172 a | 232 a | 118 a | 142 a | 271 a | 74 a | 41 a | $19 \% \mathrm{a}$ |
| HT | 196 b | 243 a | 123 a | 185 b | 333 b | 86 b | 44 b | $38 \% \mathrm{~b}$ |
| Inc. | $14 \%$ |  |  | $30 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $7 \%$ |  |

## High Tunnel Yield Differences (g/m)

| Trt | Straw | S Rasp | F Rasp | Tom | Soy | Blue | SnP |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| No <br> HT | 4673 a | 2276 a | 2086a | 6806a | 1147 a | 706a | 269a |
| HT | 3779 b | 1162 b | 3736 b | 8764 b | 1348 b | 951a | 387 a |
| $\%$ | $-19 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $16 \%$ | - | - |

Tunnels have a shading impact and reduce wind Strawberries are primarily wind and gravity pollinated

## Problems - 2006, 2007

- Straw. - Voles, Botrytis
- Tomato - Septoria
- Apples - Potato leafhopper
- Peaches - Japanese beetles, OFM
- Raspberries- Japanese beetles
- High Tunnels - mites, aphids on apples, powdery mildew on strawberries, raspberry sawfly on raspberry


## Japanese Beetle

(July-Aug)

Year
2005
2006
No. JB
15,000 60,000
2007
283,000
Trt
High Tunnel 11,300 (4\%)
No HT 271,700 (96\%)

## Japanese Beetle (July-Aug) 2006, 2007

2006 2007
Crop No. JB
Rasp 30,146
\% 52
Peach 22,789 38
Soy 1,851 3
Straw 1,652 3
Blue 1,486 3
Apple 488
1

Tomato 0

0
JB \%
109,292 39
11,047 4
108,239 38

20,232 7
32,115 11
2,801 1
$110 \quad 0$


## Japanese Beetle Raspberry (JB//ft/date)

| Trt | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MR | 10.4 a | 35.0 b |
| CB | 11.7 ab | 29.8 c |
| RB | 13.3 bc | 43.6 a |
| SR | 15.3 c | 37.8 b |


| Cultivar | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Royalty | 3.1 a | 15.5 a |
| Carol | 12.0 b | 36.4 b |
| Prelude | 22.9 c | 57.7 c |

Royalty


Prelude

## Japanese Beetle

## Peaches (JB/5ft/date)

| Trt | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MR | 13.8 a | 4.3 ab |
| CB | 10.1 bc | 3.6 b |
| RB | 11.5 ab | 2.5 c |
| SR | 7.7 c | 4.9 a |


| Cultivar | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Flam. Fury | 16.8 a | 5.6 a |
| Bounty | 8.1 b | 3.0 b |
| Glow. Star | 7.3 c | 2.8 b |



## Japanese Beetle <br> Blueberry (JB/5ftdate)

| Trt | 2007 |
| :--- | ---: |
| MR | 10.0 a |
| CB | 9.9 a |
| RB | 11.1 a |
| SR | 13.6 a |



| Cultivar | 2007 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Duke | 14.7 a |
| Bluecrop | 13.9 b |
| Elliot | 4.9 b |



## Arthropod Collections 2005-06

 Sweep net samples Jun, Jul, Aug, Sep$\frac{\text { Total }}{96} \quad \frac{\text { Beneficial }}{28} \quad \frac{\text { Pest }}{16} \frac{\text { Incidentals }}{52}$
Families
Indiv '05 $25,256 \quad 16 \% \quad 53 \% \quad 31 \%$
'06 16,202 $21 \% \quad 50 \% \quad 26 \%$
Mean individuals
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Trt } & 2005 \\ \underline{S R} & 2006\end{array}$
SR - 57.8 a 25.1 a
MR - 55.0 a 21.3 a
CB - 50.0 a 24.7 a
RB - 34.4 b 19.9 a

## Shannon's Diversity Index

| Treatment | \# Ind 05 | H' 05 | \# Ind <br> 06 | H' $^{\prime} 06$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Checkerboard | 50.0 a | 1.88 ab | 24.7 a | 1.51 a |
| Mixed Row | 55.0 a | 1.86 ab | 21.3 a | 1.48 a |
| Raised Bed | 34.4 b | 1.96 a | 19.9 a | 1.44 a |
| Solid Row | 57.8 a | 1.80 b | 25.1 a | 1.44 a |
| (Mono) Check | - | - | 10.3 b | 1.20 b |

## Shannon's Diversity Index

| Crop | Biodiv 05 | Biodiv 06 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Strawberry | 1.69 d | 2.22 a |
| Peach | 2.24 a | 1.91 b |
| Raspberry | 1.829 c | 1.59 c |
| Blueberry | 1.64 d | 1.46 c |
| Apple | - | 1.17 d |
| Soybean | 2.07 b | 1.01 de |
| Potato | - | 1.08 d |
| Tomato | 1.61 d | 0.84 e |
| Corn | 2.18 ab | - |
| Green bean | 1.89 c | - |

## Insect Individuals (2006)

| Crop | \% Pest | \%Nat. E. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Strawberry | 50.3 | 15.6 |
| Peach | 35.7 | 24.7 |
| Raspberry | 51.2 | 12.5 |
| Blueberry | 44.6 | 23.2 |
| Apple | 61.4 | 17.4 |
| Soybean | 48.3 | 10.5 |
| Potato | 73.8 | 13.6 |
| Tomato | 49.5 | 11.1 |

## Harvest Evaluations 2006

| Trt | Soy | S.Rasp | Straw | Tom | Pot |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SR | 32 a | 381 a | 1407 a | 2338 a | 486 b |
| CB | 59 b | 279 a | 1310 a | 2083 a | 300 a |
| MR | 47 b | 289 a | 1314 a | 2420 a | 275 a |
| RB | 56 b | 505 a | 1619 a | 3086 b | 475 b |
| $\%$ <br> inc | 67 | 81 | 24 | 48 | 73 |

## Harvest Evaluations 2007

| Trt | Straw | S.Rasp | F.Ras | Tom | SnP | Soy | Blue |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SR | 2984 | 903 | 1512 | 3685 | 170 | 1021 | 882 |
| CB | 2707 | 1034 | 1429 | 5429 | 250 | 694 | 551 |
| MR | 2542 | 797 | 1685 | 4193 | 260 | 880 | 661 |
| RB | 3287 | 1403 | 1424 | 6965 | 512 | 1064 | 662 |
| \% <br> inc | 20 | 54 | - | 57 | 125 | - | - |

## Total Hours to Harvest all Crops 2005

 (green beans, tomatoes, sweet corn \& soybeans)| Treatment | Hours/Meter/Person |
| :--- | :---: |
| CB | 7.31 a |
| MR | 6.82 a |
| RB | 6.44 a |
| SR | 5.78 a |

Means followed by the same letter are not significantly different (LSD, P>0.05)

Labor Cost $=\$ 1.00 /$ ft for $\$ 8 / \mathrm{hr}$ for 6 months

## Economics (\$10/ft goal) Best plots

| Crop | Price/ft |
| :--- | :---: |
| Gr. Bean'05 | 1.99 |
| Sw. Corn'05 | 2.25 |
| Ed. Soy'05'06'07 | $3.35,3.65$ |
| Tomato'05 | 11.83 |
| Tomato'06 (cupid)'07 | $26.67,25.52$ |
| Straw'06 '07 | $9.21,12.65$ |
| Sum. Rasp'06 '07 | $8.80,13.27$ |
| Fall. Rasp'06'07 | $7.46,15.36$ |
| Blueberry '07 | 5.67 |
| Snap Peas '07 | 0.85 |
| Peaches'06, '07 | 0.00 |
| Apples'06,'07 | 0.00 |

Retail Price Used = current price crop being sold at local supermarket

## Establishment Costs

| 2005 |  | 2006 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Establishment |  | Seeds | \$ 484 |
| Soil prep | \$ 176 | Harvest material |  |
| Plants | 5,015 | (qts, pts, container) | 292 |
| Fencing/lrrigation | 1,956 | Weed Control |  |
| Sub total | 7,147 | Landscape cloth | 1,033 |
| Weed Control |  | Staples | 216 |
| Labor - 760h (weed, mulch) | 6,080 | Labor -182h | 1,456 |
| Mulch (17 truck loads) | 4,250 | Sub total | 2,705 |
| Sub total | 10,330 | Trellis |  |
| Raised Beds |  | T-post | 290 |
| Materials | $\underline{2,280}$ | Lumber | 310 |
| Total | \$19,757 | Screws, wire | 49 |
|  |  | Sub total | 649 |
|  |  | Misc. | 590 |
|  |  | Total | \$4,720 |
| Total investment |  | 4,477 |  |
| per plot |  | $1,530(+\mathrm{RB} \$ 1.20)$ |  |
| $\$ / f t$ |  | $\$ 3.20(+\mathrm{HT}=\$ 9.50 / \mathrm{ft})$ |  |

## Conclusions to Date

- Jap. Beetles were a big problem in '07 especially on rasp and soybeans
- High Tunnels Crops - had the fewest JBs, best growth, nicest fruit (\$ 9/ft)
- Strawberry \& Peaches had the most biodiversity
- Peaches had the lowest \% pests \& highest \% natural enemies
- Potatoes had the highest \% pests


## Conclusions to Date

- Raised beds (\$1.2/ft) - seems to have fewer arthro. easy to harvest and the best yield on some crops
- Staff wanted solid rows on raised beds
- Paid for capital improvements (plants, fence, irrigation, etc. ) after year 2
- \$ 10/ft may be obtainable when under full production, with the correct market \& certainly would be easier with a higher price than in grocery stores


