



Richard P. Buchner
UC Orchard Crops Farm
Advisor - Tehama County
- Emeritus -

Richard

Luke Milliron
UC Orchard Systems Advisor
Butte County



SACRAMENTO VALLEY REGIONAL PRUNE NEWSLETTER



IN THIS ISSUE:

- Spring & Early Summer Orchard Considerations
- Thinning Prunes
- Update on Rootstocks for Prune Production

ANNOUNCEMENTS

PPE IN SHORT SUPPLY FOR FARM WORK DURING COVID-19

ANR NONDISCRIMINATION AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY STATEMENT: It is the policy of the University of California (UC) and the UC Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources not to engage in discrimination against or harassment of any person in any of its programs or activities (Complete nondiscrimination policy statement can be found at <http://ucanr.edu/sites/anrstaff/files/169224.pdf>). Inquiries regarding ANR's nondiscrimination policies may be directed to John Sims, Affirmative Action Compliance officer, University of California, Agriculture and Natural Resources, 2801 Second Street, Davis, CA 95618, (530) 750-1397.

To simplify information, trade names of products may be used. No endorsement of named products is intended, nor is criticism implied of similar products which are not mentioned.

Cooperative Extension Work in Agriculture and Home Economics, U.S. Department of Agriculture, University of California, and County of Tehama, Cooperating.

Full color articles and photos are available on our Website: cetehama.ucanr.edu





Spring & Early Summer Orchard Considerations

Luke Milliron, UCCE Farm Advisor, Butte, Glenn and Tehama Counties
Franz Niederholzer, UCCE Farm Advisor, Colusa, Sutter and Yuba Counties
Katherine Jarvis-Shean, UCCE Farm Advisor Sacramento, Solano & Yolo Counties

Late April

Got a crop? We had an early bloom and expected we would have an early reference date. However, it has been generally cool for a month after full bloom, and we are seeing and hearing reports of very slow fruit development. Fruit set in many counties is uneven from orchard to orchard. Continue monitoring crop development, and be ready to check cropload and shaker thin where needed. Typically reference date is 7-10 days after pit tip hardening. Thin early for best size results.

The exact definition of reference date is when 8 or 9 out of 10 sampled fruit have a visible endosperm, which you can see a photo of at: sacvalleyorchards.com/prunes/horticulture-prunes/thinning-prunes/.

A prune thinning calculator is available at: sacvalleyorchards.com/prunes/horticulture-prunes/prune-thinning-calculator/

Irrigation: We have had several small storms in late winter/early spring, however have they significantly contributed to your soil moisture? Special attention to orchard water status and irrigation is needed.

Monitor a combination of net ETc (ETc – effective rainfall), soil moisture sensors and pressure chamber readings to track orchard moisture status and time irrigations. The most direct measure of water status is the pressure chamber, read more at: sacvalleyorchards.com/manuals/stem-water-potential. ET reports are also published weekly: sacvalleyorchards.com/et-reports/2020-et-reports

Fertilization program starts: Consider a nitrogen (N) application before the end of April if there is a good crop set. If considering foliar potassium nitrate applications as your potassium (K) program or to supplement soil applied K, begin spraying in late April and make additional applications every 2-3 weeks. More details at: apps1.cdfa.ca.gov/FertilizerResearch/docs/Prune_Plum.html

Aphid: Monitor for leaf curl plum aphid and mealy plum aphid since colonies can grow soon after bloom. Monitoring details at: ipm.ucanr.edu/PMG/r606900211.html. Oil sprays anytime from petal fall to May 15 can reduce mealy plum aphid to acceptable levels with good to excellent coverage. Oil is not effective against leaf curl aphid during this period as the spray can't reach inside the curled leaves where the aphids are feeding. Other pesticides are effective in controlling aphids during the spring, but be careful to avoid flaring mites with pyrethroids (Asana®, Warrior®, etc.) or neonics (Actara®, Provado®, etc.). Movento® and BeLeaf® can provide excellent aphid control when monitoring shows a need.

More information on leaf curl plum aphid at: ipm.ucanr.edu/PMG/r611301811.html

More information on mealy plum aphid at: ipm.ucanr.edu/PMG/r611301711.html

May

Rust: Monitoring commences with the start of the month, surveying 40 trees every 1-2 weeks. Pay close attention to non-bearing replants, exceptionally vigorous trees, and previous hot spots. Consider treating when the first leaf with rust is found. For more on rust see: ipm.ucanr.edu/PMG/r606100611.html

Peach twig borer (PTB) and Oblique-banded leaf roller (OBLR): These worms feed on the fruit surface later in the season, “opening the door” for fruit brown rot infection as sugar increases in the fruit. Don’t assume earlier sprays worked to control these pests. Inspect fruit at 400 degree days after the first PTB biofix. In the orchard, look for larval entry points on the fruit (ideally 15 fruit from 80 trees), especially where fruits contact each other or touch leaves. Treat if 2% or more (24+ of 1,200) of the fruit have damage. For OBLR, begin fruit inspections at 930 degree days after biofix for that pest, following the same sampling protocol and treatment threshold. More on PTB at: ipm.ucanr.edu/PMG/r606300211.html and on OBLR at: ipm.ucanr.edu/PMG/r611300511.html

Aphids: While monitoring for leaf curl plum aphid comes to an end in mid-May, continue monitoring for mealy plum aphid until mid-July.

Irrigation: Continue monitoring pressure chamber, soil moisture and/or tracking ETc to manage irrigation. May and June are the most critical months for end-cracking, which occurs when dry orchards are irrigated. Stay on top of orchard water status since irrigation is critical during the spring.

Fertility: Continue with nitrogen and potassium fertilization program if a good crop is set. More than 50% of annual N budget should be applied before June 1st.

June

Continue monitoring for **aphids** and **rust**.

Spider mites: Begin scouting by checking two different sections of the orchard each week. Spend about five minutes in each section checking 2-3 leaves (some inside and outside of the canopy) on 10 trees. Look for spider mites and predators (predaceous mites and sixspotted thrips). Treatment decisions should be based on population levels of both mites and predators. If more than 20% of leaves have mites, but less than 50% of the leaves have predators, treat for mites. If more than 60% of leaves have mites, treat even if most leaves have predators. For more on mites, see ipm.ucanr.edu/PMG/r606400411.html

July

Aphids, rust, and spider mites: Continue monitoring for late summer (preharvest) outbreaks of rust and/or spider mites. Infestations of these pests can cause leaf drop at harvest, slowing conveyor and elevator belts at harvest in order to better blow out the leaves and keep the bins clean.

Brown rot: Consider preharvest treatments for brown rot according to UC IPM guidelines: ipm.ucanr.edu/PMG/r606100911.html. See timings and material efficacy at: ipm.ucanr.edu/PDF/PMG/fungicideefficacytiming.pdf

Monitoring Fruit Maturity: When color just begins to show along the suture, fruit should be mature in roughly 30 days. Begin measuring fruit internal pressure once fruit shows color. Warmer weather slows fruit maturity; cooler weather = faster fruit maturity. Fruit lose 1 to 2 lbs fruit pressure per week and are mature at 3 - 4 lbs internal pressure.

Timing Irrigation Cut off: Track fruit pressure to plan harvest timing and irrigation cut off. For example, if shake target is 3 lb fruit pressure and you want 2 weeks between last irrigation and harvest, then water shut off should be getting close when fruit hits 6 lbs pressure – assuming pressure drops 1.5 lb/week.

July leaf samples: To help evaluate your nutrient program this year, collect leaves from non-fruiting spurs from representative trees and submit to a lab for analysis. Leaf sampling details at: sacvalleyorchards.com/prunes/horticulture-prunes/july-leaf-sampling-a-critical-task-in-prune-production/

PTB, OBLR, San Jose Scale, and brown rot: Sampling for damaged fruit just ahead of harvest will give you an indication of the efficacy of your IPM program. Randomly examine 1000 fruit (40 from 25 trees) looking for larvae, worm damage, and halo spots caused by San Jose scale. More information is available at: ipm.ucanr.edu/PMG/r606900711.html

Clean up orchard ahead of harvest: Cut out broken limbs and dead branches and remove them from the orchard ahead of harvest. This will reduce the risk to the harvest crew from flying dead wood during shaking and chances of canvas tears and other glitches that can slow harvest.

Thinning Prunes

Dani Lightle, former UCCE Orchards Advisor, Glenn, Butte & Tehama Counties
Franz Niederholzer, UCCE Farm Advisor, Colusa and Sutter/Yuba Counties

In the 2020 season, large prunes (A and B screen) have value, medium to small fruit has much less, if any value. To avoid growing medium to small fruit, even if you pruned, it is critical that growers 1) check cropload from 2-3 trees per orchard to decide if thinning is needed and 2) THIN if needed. Thinning should occur roughly around the time of ‘reference date’, when 80 to 90% of the fruit have a visible endosperm. The endosperm, a clear gel-like glob, the beginning of the developing seed, will be found in the seed cavity on the blossom end of the prune (Figure 1) and is solid enough to be removed with a knife point. Typically, the reference date occurs in late April or early May, approximately one week after the pit tip begins to harden. This year, with an early bloom and cool weather after bloom, check frequently to make sure you don’t miss pit hardening. The earlier thinning is done, the better the fruit size boost. However, if you thin too early and shake trees too hard , you may damage the trees without removing the desired number of fruit.

To decide whether to thin, **estimate** the number of fruit per tree needed to produce your desired crop, **determine** the number of fruit on 3 representative trees, at or just before reference date, and, using those numbers, **decide** if you need to thin. **Calculate** how much fruit needs to come off if thinning is needed. Finally, **shake** if thinning is needed. Below we walk through the math, step by step. Alternatively, skip doing the calculations by hand and use the prune thinning calculator, available at: sacvalleyorchards.com/prunes/horticulture-prunes/prune-thinning-calculator



Figure 1. Extraction of the endosperm on a developing prune.

1. **Estimate** the targeted tonnage from a given block by considering orchard history, age, etc. Let’s assume a target of 3 tons/ac, and shoot for 55 dry count/lb in an orchard spaced 16’ x 18’ (151 trees/acre) .

From there, calculate a targeted number of fruit per tree:

$$(Dry\ pounds\ per\ ac \times Dry\ count\ per\ lb) \div Trees\ per\ ac = Target\ number\ fruit\ per\ tree$$

$$6,000 \frac{lbs}{ac} \times 55 \frac{count}{lb} \div 151 \frac{trees}{ac} = 2,185 \text{ fruit/tree (target)}$$

2. Determine the actual number of fruit in a sample tree and compare that number to the target of 2,185 fruit (from step 1). Ideally, repeat this procedure on 3 representative trees to ensure accuracy. Place a tarp under the tree and mechanically shake off as much fruit as possible, then hand strip any remaining fruit. Collect all the sound fruit and weigh them (for easy math, let's assume it weighs 100 lbs). Take a 1-lb subsample of the fruit and count how many sound fruit are in a pound (assume 90 fruit/lb). Don't count fruit that looks like it wouldn't have stayed on the tree until harvest - these fruit are light green or otherwise look slightly "off" compared to the strong fruit. Then use those numbers to determine the total number of fruit per tree:

$$\text{Total tree fruit weight} \times \text{Number of prunes per lb} = \text{Total number of fruit per tree}$$

$$100\text{ lbs} \times 90 \frac{\text{fruit}}{\text{lb}} = 9,000 \text{ fruit/tree (actual)}$$

3. Decide if you need to thin. Subtract the number of fruit needed at harvest from the number of fruit on the tree now (reference date). In this example, there is roughly 4 times the number of fruit on the tree than desired to hit the target of 55 dry count/lb. You don't want to simply remove all those extra fruit, because you need to account for natural fruit drop and variability in fruit per tree across the orchard. Estimates of natural fruit drop range from 10% to 40%. Selecting the appropriate drop percentage should account for orchard history, as well as your own risk threshold. Many growers prefer to leave approximately 50% more fruit on the tree after mechanical thinning than we want remaining on the tree at harvest:

$$\text{Target number prunes per tree} \times 1.5 (= 50\% \text{ fruit drop buffer}) = \text{Adjusted number fruit per tree}$$

$$2,185 \times 1.5 = 3,278 \text{ fruit/tree (adjusted target)}$$

4. Calculate how many fruit to remove by subtracting the adjusted target number from the actual number of prunes on the tree:

$$\text{Actual fruit per tree} - \text{Adjusted target fruit per tree} = \text{Number fruit to remove}$$

$$9,000 \frac{\text{fruit}}{\text{tree}} - 3,278 \frac{\text{fruit}}{\text{tree}} = 5,722 \text{ fruit/tree to remove}$$

5. Shake (if needed). Use harvest machinery (shaker) to remove the approximately 5,700 excess fruit. Shake a tree for one second, and following the steps above, calculate how many fruit were removed. If needed, increase the shaking time until the desired numbers are removed. Typical shaking time is 2 to 4 seconds; avoid shaking for longer than 6 to 7 seconds to prevent unnecessary damage. Once you've calibrated your shaking time, go through and thin the block. If you are thinning for more than a week, check fruit per tree and green fruit per pound every few days to make sure that your shake time doesn't need to be adjusted down as fruit grow.



Update on Rootstocks for Prune Production

Luke Milliron, UCCE Farm Advisor, Butte, Tehama and Glenn Counties
Franz Niederholzer, UCCE Farm Advisor, Colusa, Sutter and Yuba Counties

Two rootstock experiments in grower orchards were planted in Northern California in 2011. One site in Butte County and a second in Yuba County. The two sites are evaluating the performance of Improved French on 14 rootstocks planted in replicated randomized trials. The sites share five standard rootstocks that already had widespread adoption in the industry, namely Myroblan 29C, Myroblan Seedling, Marianna 2624, Marianna 40, and Lovell. The sites also share eight test rootstocks, Krysmek 86, Krysmek 1, Viking, Atlas, Citation, HBOK 50, Marianna 30, and Marianna 58. Rootpac-R is only at the Yuba location, and Empyrean 2 is only at the Butte location.

The Butte site was previously planted to almonds on Lovell rootstock, while the Yuba site is prune following prune. The Butte site is a Farwell clay adobe alternating with a lighter textured Nord loam, while the Yuba site is Kilga clay loam. The Butte site received no pre-plant fumigation, while the Yuba site had Telone fumigation. Following late planting during a wet spring, there were extensive replants in 2012 at both sites. At the Butte site, replants benefited from spot fumigation with 0.5 pounds of chloropicrin. The Butte and Yuba sites are irrigated with drip and micro-sprinkler, respectively. Finally, the Butte site is 12.5 feet in-row and 17 feet between rows (205 trees/acre), and Yuba is 16 feet in-row and 18 feet between rows (151 trees/acre). We previously reported in this newsletter on the results from this trial in 2016 and 2018 issues.

Rootstock survival:

Although the vigor imparted by the rootstock is an important consideration, survival in adverse conditions is the most valuable benefit a rootstock can impart (Table 1). Percent tree survival was assessed at both sites in 2019 and survival ranged from 10% (Empyrean 2) to 97% (Atlas) at the Butte site, and 37% (HBOK 50) to 100% (Viking and Lovell) at the Yuba site (table 2). There are notable differences and similarities in survival between the two sites.

% Tree Survival, 2019			
Rootstock	Butte	Rootstock	Yuba
Atlas	97% a	Viking	100% a
Viking	93% a	Lovell	100% a
Myro.	93% a	Atlas	97% a
M29C	90% ab	K86	97% a
M40	86% ab	Root.-R	93% a
M2624	80% ab	M40	87% a
K86	77% ab	M2624	83% a
HBOK50	77% ab	Citation	80% a
M58	73% ab	K1	80% a
Lovell	70% ab	M58	77% a b
Citation	53% abc	Myro.	73% a b
M30	43% bc	M29C	63% a b
K1	43% bc	M30	37% b
Emp. 2	10% c	HBOK50	37% b
Average	70%	Average	79%

Table 1. Percent tree survival at the Butte (7 September) and Yuba (12 June) sites in 2019. Values followed by the same letters are not significantly different at 95% using Tukey's HSD.

Myrobalan 29C, Myrobalan seedling and HBOK 50 have all had higher numerical survival rates at the Butte site than at the Yuba location where bacterial canker created significant tree losses, potentially due to bacterial canker susceptibility at the Yuba location (Photo 1). It is unclear why Lovell, Krymsk 86, Citation, and Krymsk 1 have had numerically higher survival at the Yuba location. At both sites Atlas and Viking, which were planted a year later and in the case of the Butte site received spot fumigation before planting have had excellent survival (97-100%). Marianna 40 and Marianna 2624 have also had good survival (80-87%). Marianna 58 has had intermediate survival performance at both sites (73% and 77%). Finally, Marianna 30 has had very low survival at both sites (43% and 37%)



Photo 1. Satellite image of the UCCE prune rootstock plot (inside the blue line) in Yuba County showing differences in tree size and survival between different rootstocks. Although tree loss was likely from multiple causes, bacterial canker was a significant player. Each rootstock is planted in six tree groups down the rows running E-W. Note gaps of six trees show where a particular rootstock failed, adjacent to large, healthy canopies where a different rootstock is thriving. The grower's trees, outside the blue line are all on M40. (Google©, Imagery Maxar Technologies ©2019, and U.S. Geological Survey map data ©2019).

Rootstock vigor:

The 2018 article includes discussion of relative vigor, potential nematode and crown/root rot susceptibility, as well as early assessments of rootstock bloom timing at Butte, canker and tree loss at Yuba, and the 2017 trunk size and yield results. You can find the full discussion of these preliminary findings at: sacvalleyorchards.com/blog/prunes-blog/preliminary-observations-for-new-prune-rootstocks.

Generally, larger trunks = larger, more vigorous trees with greater yield. Trunk diameter (in) for 2019 is shown for 2019 in Table 2. Myrobalan 29C and HBOK 50 had the largest diameter at the Butte and Yuba sites, respectively. The rootstocks imparting among the greatest vigor according to diameter at both locations were Myrobalan 29C, Viking, Atlas, Krymsk 86, and Lovell. Krymsk 1 had the smallest diameter at both sites. In addition to Krymsk 1; Marianna 58, Empyrean 2, Citation, and Marianna 2624 imparted the least vigor according to diameter. In general, trees were larger at the Butte site than in Yuba.

Trunk diameter (in), 2019					
Rootstock	Butte		Rootstock	Yuba	
M29C	7.1	a	HBOK50	5.5	a
Atlas	6.5	ab	Viking	5.3	ab
Viking	6.3	ab	Atlas	5.3	ab
M30	6.1	ab	K86	5.0	abc
Lovell	5.9	abc	M29C	4.7	abc d
M40	5.4	abc d	Lovell	4.6	abc de
K86	5.3	abc d	M30	4.5	bcd e
Myro.	5.2	bcd	M40	4.3	cde
M2624	5.0	bcd e	Root.-R	4.0	def
Citation	4.9	bcd e	M2624	3.8	ef
HBOK50	4.0	cde	Myro.	3.8	efg
Emp. 2	3.9	cde	Citation	3.4	fg
M58	3.8	de	M58	3.0	gh
K1	2.9	e	K1	2.3	h
Average	5.2		Average	4.3	

Table 2. Trunk diameter (in) at the Butte and Yuba sites in 2019. Values followed by the same letters are not significantly different at 95% using Tukey's HSD, with letter order denoting highest to lowest.

Yield has been much more variable at the two sites. Together with trunk diameter, yields have been numerically higher at the Butte site. The exception of this was 2018, following potential over cropping in 2017 at the Butte site and poor return bloom density in 2018. Unlike trunk diameter, yield differences by rootstock have not been consistent at each site, year-to-year. However, Krymsk 1 has been amongst the lowest yielding rootstocks at both sites for every harvest. More harvests are needed to more clearly define yield differences between the rootstocks. Despite this variability, it has been true that generally yield increases with increasing trunk diameter (Table 1).

When interpreting yield results, it's important to consider that all rootstock trials that impose the same spacing across the plot disadvantage lower vigor rootstocks that could have been placed at a higher density. Although yield generally increases with increasing tree size, there are some rootstocks that yield particularly well or poorly for their size. In 2019 at the Butte site, for example, Marianna 2624 and Marianna 30 had the highest yield efficiency, Empyrean 2 had the lowest and all other rootstocks fell in-between. Again, more harvest data is needed to enumerate which rootstocks are over- and under-yielding for their vigor. Some growers with an interest in lower vigor inducing rootstocks are beginning to trial high density plantings.

To see the complete yield, fruit size, bloom timing and density, leaf mineral nutrition, and tree water status results for this trial you can find the 2019 report at: ucanr.edu/sites/driedplum/files/318583.docx

Rootstock suckers and anchorage:

In the 2016 article on early observation from the two rootstock sites we focused on rootstock suckers and anchorage. Rootstock suckering was evaluated on a rating of 0-4, where trees with a “0” had no suckers at all, “1” had at most only a couple of very small suckers, to “4” where suckers were both numerous and large. At both sites Myroblan seedling had the highest sucker rating. Conversely, Atlas, HBOK50, Viking, Citation, Marianna 58, Krysmk 86, Lovell, and Marianna 40 all were rated below a 0.5 at both sites. Anchorage was evaluated by measuring the degrees of lean from vertical when each tree was pushed with an equal force. There was much more lean at the Yuba site, which is on a Kilga clay loam, over hard pan where soils were wet at the time of evaluation. However, at both sites Krymsk 1, Marianna 58, HBOK 50, and Citation average above 4% lean. At both sites, Krymsk 86 and Viking averaged the least lean. In these evaluations of suckering and anchorage, Krymsk 86 and Viking had among the best performance at both sites. You can see the suckering and anchorage results at: sacvalleyorchards.com/blog/prunes-blog/prune-rootstock-trial-performance

ANR NEWS RELEASES

Published on: April 20, 2020

PRACTICAL • CONNECTED • TRUSTED

PPE in short supply for farm work during the COVID-19 crisis

- Author: Katrina Hunter, UC Integrated Pest Management Program pesticide safety writer



Coveralls should be worn for applications where contact with spray residue is likely. Photo by Katrina Hunter



If the pesticide label requires an N95, you can use a half-mask with N95 particulate filters.

People who work on farms wear personal protective equipment to protect themselves from COVID-19, pesticides, dust and other health hazards.

While most Californians are staying home to slow the spread of the novel coronavirus, California farmers, farmworkers and other agricultural professionals are out in the fields and packing houses working to produce food. With increased demand for personal protective equipment, or PPE, to protect against COVID-19, these essential workers are facing shortages. Agricultural commissioners in 28 counties are hearing from farmers who are having trouble getting PPE for their employees and farmers in another 11 counties who are worried about running out of PPE in the next month or two, according to a California Department of Pesticide Regulation survey.

Gloves, N95 respirators, coveralls and other gear that workers wear to protect themselves from COVID-19, pesticides, dust and other health hazards are in short supply as priority is given to health care workers during the pandemic.

To reduce the spread of COVID-19, workers may wear homemade face coverings, but for applying pesticides, they must wear respirators specified on the pesticide product label, said Whitney Brim-DeForest, UC Cooperative Extension rice advisor.

Pesticide applicators may use gear that is more protective than required by the product label and regulations.

"Although this could change in the days ahead, half-mask and full-mask respirators are more available than disposable N95 respirators for now," said Lisa Blecker, coordinator for the UC Pesticide Safety Education Program.

Before the pandemic, 10% of N95 respirators from 3M went to health care, but that number is now 90%, the company said in a letter to distributors. This has led to significant backorders of PPE supplies for distributors.

Atwell suggests looking for lesser known brands of PPE as opposed to the first tier of choice: "It's sort of like searching for Purell hand sanitizer. Purell brand might be out of stock, but can you find a different disinfectant?"

On Gempler's website, the more recognizable Tyvek coverall from Dupont is sold out, however disposable protective clothing is available from other brands. Reusable chemical-resistant clothing is also available as opposed to their disposable counterparts. Supplies in high demand are reusable and disposable nitrile gloves, protective clothing, disposable respirators and certain protective eyewear, such as goggles and face shields.



Protective eyewear should always be worn in California when handling pesticides. Photo by Katrina Hunter

Some common chemical resistant materials for gloves are barrier laminate, butyl rubber, nitrile rubber, neoprene rubber, natural rubber, polyethylene, polyvinylchloride (PVC) and viton rubber.



For workers who will be applying pesticides, Blecker and Brim-DeForest offered some guidelines on how to meet PPE requirements as the shortage continues.

General PPE requirements: "Remember, the label is the law," said Brim-DeForest. "PPE requirements for agriculture are not being loosened." The UCCE advisor recommends purchasing only what you need for the season and choosing reusable PPE whenever possible. Growers who have excess supplies of PPE can coordinate with their county agricultural commissioner or UCCE advisor to help other producers in their area.

Respirators: If you can't find the respirator required on the label, Blecker said, "Use an alternative, more-protective respirator. For example, if an N95 is required, you can use a half-mask with N95 particulate filters; these can be stand-alone filters or ones that attach to an organic vapor cartridge. You could also use a different pesticide that doesn't require a respirator. Consult with your PCA (pest control adviser) for options."

Gloves: Chemical-resistant gloves, usually 14 mil or more in thickness are required for most California pesticide applications and should be worn by mixers, handlers and applicators. If nitrile gloves are not available, viton and laminate gloves are universal chemical-resistant materials for most pesticide labels. If the glove material is specified on the label, that instruction must be followed.

"Disposable gloves less than 14 mil can be worn, but not for more than 15 minutes at a time," Blecker said. "Farmers should also note that thinner gloves cannot be layered on top of one another."

Coveralls: Coveralls should be worn when required by the pesticide label or when the signal word is "WARNING" or "DANGER," or when applying by backpack or airblast. "Coveralls can be made out of high-density polyethylene fibers (Tyvek and other brands), which are disposable, or cotton, which are reusable," Brim-DeForest said. "If reusable coveralls are worn, the employer must ensure employees are provided clean coveralls."

Goggles/face shields: Face shields are required for mixing and loading pesticides only if it's stated on the label. "If a face shield is unavailable, a full-face respirator can be used," Blecker said. "Goggles or protective eyewear should always be worn in California when handling pesticides, regardless of what the label says. The face shield, goggles or safety glasses must provide front, side and brow protection and meet the American National Standards Institute Z87.1 standard for impact resistance."



The UC Integrated Pest Management Program also covers these topics in their pesticide safety webinar series at <http://ipm.ucanr.edu/IPMPROJECT/workshops.html>.

For more information about PPE, contact your county agricultural commissioner or see the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's posters at https://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/whs/pdf/gloves_for_pesticide_handling.pdf and https://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/whs/pdf/n95_alternatives_for_pesticide_handling.pdf.



SACRAMENTO VALLEY REGIONAL PRUNE NEWSLETTER



The University of California, Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (UC ANR) prohibits discrimination against or harassment of any person in any of its programs or activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender, gender expression, gender identity, pregnancy (which includes pregnancy, childbirth, and medical conditions related to pregnancy or childbirth), physical or mental disability, medical condition (cancer-related or genetic characteristics), genetic information (including family medical history), ancestry, marital status, age, sexual orientation, citizenship, status as a U.S. veteran.

UC ANR policy prohibits retaliation against any employee or person in any of its programs or activities for bringing a complaint of discrimination or harassment. UC ANR policy also prohibits retaliation against a person who assists someone with a complaint of discrimination or harassment, or participates in any manner in an investigation or resolution of a complaint of discrimination or harassment. Retaliation includes threats, intimidation, reprisals, and/or adverse actions related to any of its programs or activities.

UC ANR is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. All qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment and/or participation in any of its programs or activities without regard to race, color, religion, sex, national origin, disability, age or protected veteran status.

University policy is intended to be consistent with the provisions of applicable State and Federal laws.

Inquiries regarding the University's equal employment opportunity policies may be directed to: John I. Sims, Affirmative Action Compliance Officer and Title IX Officer, University of California, Agriculture and Natural Resources, 2801 Second Street, Davis, CA 95618, (530) 750-1397. Email: jsims@ucanr.edu. Website: http://ucanr.edu/sites/anrstaff/Diversity/Affirmative_Action/.

This policy statement supersedes the UC ANR Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Policy Statement for University of California Publications Regarding Program Practices dated July 2013.

To simplify information, trade names of products may have been used but no endorsement of named product is intended, nor is criticism implied of similar products, which are not mentioned.

Cooperative Extension Work in Agriculture and Home Economics, U.S. Department of Agriculture, University of California, and County of Tehama, Cooperating.



NON PROFIT
US POSTAGE
Paid
Red Bluff
Permit No. 112

“52”
Red Bluff, CA 96080
1754 Walmut Street
University of California
Cooperative Extension