http://ipm.osu.edu/fruit/index.html



Newsletter Extension

Fruit ICM News

Volume 5, No. 23 June 28, 2001

In This Issue:

Calendar Charitable Gifts - Too Good to be True? Leafhopper and Aphid Control with Provado Green Aphids and Wooly Apple Aphid Apples Added to Russian Food Aid Renovating Strawberries Fruit Observations & Trap Reports Phenology Northern Ohio Scab & Fire Blight Activity Ohio Degree-Days

Calendar

June 30: Ohio Fruit Growers Society Summer Tour and Meeting: The Ohio Fruit Growers Society (OFGS) and Patterson Family of Chesterland, Ohio invite fruit growers and direct agricultural marketers to the 2001 Ohio Fruit Growers Society Summer Tour on Saturday, June 30. Refer to last week's newsletter for more information.

Charitable Gifts - Too Good to be True?

Source: Jim Polson, Northeast District Farm Management Specialist (A recent article in the American Fruit Grower created interest in this topic).

Sometimes charitable giving is sold like the snake oil of the past. We may be told it will "solve" all our income tax and estate tax problems. The claims are not all "snake oil." The truth is, the Federal government encourages gifts to schools, churches, hospitals, and other publicly supported charities by allowing charitable deductions for a variety of gifts. Gifts can solve a variety of tax and income problems, including some that are not so obvious.

Recently I was asked if it is possible to give a farm to a charity, avoid income tax on the transfer, lower

or eliminate estate taxes, and get a guaranteed income for life? The answer is yes, plus the persons making the gift may deduct part of the gift on their income tax return. The tool that will do this is the "Charitable Remainder Unitrust." Here we will discuss some of its advantages and disadvantages. Other charitable tools may help you accomplish different objectives. One of the easiest and least expensive ways to learn what tools might work for you is to contact a charitable organization and ask to meet with someone knowledgeable about charitable gifts. We say more about how to get started below.

Are there disadvantages to charitable giving? Of course! There are potential additional advantages as well. The potential advantages and disadvantages in each case will depend on the type of property transferred to the charity and each individual's particular circumstances.

Charitable gifts certainly deserve a careful look by persons who have accumulated substantial assets, some of which are not needed by the next generation. Many families in NE Ohio own a farm or other rural property that has appreciated substantially. Some of these same families have little cash and low annual incomes. At least some of these families could give all or part of their property to charity, increase their income, and have fewer worries.

Here is a simple example. Let's assume a married couple gives a farm worth \$500,000 to charity in order to fund a charitable remainder trust which will pay them income for life.

Here Are Some Advantages:

- Unlike a sale, there are no capital gains taxes on the transfer to the charity. The property transfers tax free.
- Assume the husband is age 65 and the wife age 60; the charitable remainder trust will pay them a predetermined percentage, but not less than 5% of the fair market value of the trust's assets, as revalued annually. In our example, if the predetermined payout rate is 6%, the husband and wife may receive \$30,000 (6% x \$500,000) in the first year of the trust. The net proceeds are invested, so the actual amount received will fluctuate, depending on how the investments do.
- The husband and wife have reduced their estate by \$500,000, plus any costs they incurred to make the transfer.
- They are entitled to an itemized income tax deduction of over \$125,000 which may be used in the year of the gift and five additional years, if necessary.
- The proceeds will be managed by professionals who work for the organization and have every incentive to invest well because the charity ultimately gets the proceeds.
- They can help one or more worthy causes of their choice.

Here are Some Disadvantages:

- In order to generate an income for the donor family, the charity will immediately try to sell the property for the best price possible; if the property is not sold immediately, the donor family may receive little or no income from the trust until the property is sold.
- Generally, the property gifted to the charity must be free of debt.
- The property owner's heirs normally receive nothing from the property given to the charity. However, the annual income payments can be paid to persons other than the ones who made the charitable gift.
- The annual income payment is a fixed percentage of the investments in the individual's account. The percentage is guaranteed, but the value of the underlying investments will fluctuate.
- The costs of making the gift (such as title work, the appraisal and legal work prior to the charity accepting the gift) are usually paid by the person(s) making the gift; other costs associated with

acquiring and holding gifts of real estate will be charged against the sale proceeds.

Getting Started

One of the most important steps for most people is to seek professional advice about your charitable gift plan. Persons who may provide wise counsel include your accountant, attorney, and your financial advisor.

You may wish to discuss your gift plan with several charities, although talking to more than one at one time may get confusing. You may know you want to give all or at least most of your property to your college alma mater or church, but if you are considering a substantial charitable gift, you also would be well advised to visit representatives from at least one other charity.

Some factors which are somewhat negotiable and vary between charities include: the annual payout percentage, who pays the legal and other transfer costs, their ability and willingness to work with a potential donor, and their investment ability. It is important to compare different charities' historical investment records, particularly if a substantial portion of your future income is dependent on the investment ability of the charity. If you don't know how to compare their investment history, ask your accountant to help. If future income is not an issue, but selling the property is, some charities may be much more willing and able to guarantee the future use of the property in ways you wish.

A charitable gift of real estate may help you solve some of your income tax problems. It may also provide you with the satisfaction of knowing your contribution will provide a substantial benefit to the charity of your choice. Funding a charitable remainder trust with real estate requires thorough analysis and consideration. Hopefully, you will find substantial benefits to you and your family. The choice is ultimately yours.

Leafhopper and Aphid Control with Reduced Rates of Provado

Source: Dick Straub & Peter Jentsch, Entomology, Highland, NY, Scaffolds Vol. 10, #15

All (New York) growers remember last year's severe infestations of potato leafhopper (PLH). Damage by this migratory pest is usually worse when it shows up early -- they arrived early again this season. PLH can cause significant damage to newly planted trees that are not yet established. In general, though, we feel that PLH infestations are not harmful to established, bearing trees. When PLH, white apple leafhopper (WALH), rose leafhopper (RLH) and aphids are present, however, control measures are often warranted. That scenario is now, or will soon be present in most Hudson Valley orchards.

Knowing from earlier lab studies that Provado is very effective against leafhoppers, we performed field trials last season to evaluate reduced rates of this insecticide against all three species of leafhoppers. This research was prompted because PLH are terminal feeders (on new growth only) and constant reinfestation of new foliage is the norm; therefore, when trees are vigorous, untreated foliage is often available within hours after application of an insecticide. This obviously computes into wasted dollars. The same rationale can be applied to aphids, which are also terminal feeders.

We applied Provado in combinations at a full rate (2 oz/100 gal) and a quarter rate (0.5 oz/100 gal) at varying intervals (3rd-5th cover). We monitored nymphs of PLH/WALH/RLH and leaf damage by PLH. Because of Provado's translaminar activity, all rates and schedules produced excellent control of

WALH/RLH nymphs (however, reduced rates will not control leafminer). Against PLH nymphs, the number of applications was shown to be more important than rate; i.e., better protection of new foliage. Considering the percentage of leaves with PLH damage, the number of applications again appeared to be more important than application rate.

Although data on aphids were not taken, we know that Provado is an excellent aphicide, and the same principle would hold as for PLH -- maintaining coverage of new growth is more important than rate. Moreover, reduced rates are likely to increase the survival of cecidomyiid and syrphid predators that are common and effective biological control agents. In the table below, we estimated the relative costs per acre that would be attributed to each schedule. Reduced rates of Provado will provide comparable control of the foliar-feeding pests described, and could result in a significantly lower spray bill.

Rate/100 gal	# applications,	Number of ny	mphs/5 leaves	% leaves damaged by	Estimated cost	
	(interval)*	WALH/RLH	PLH	PLH	\$/acre	
2 oz	1 (3 rd C	0.1	13.0	66.0	24	
2 oz	2 (3 rd C, 4 th C)	0.0	1.6	19.0	48	
2 oz +	1 (3 rd C)	0.0	0.2	56.0	36	
0.5 oz	$2 (4^{th} C, 5^{th} C)$					
0.5 oz	3 (3 rd C - 5 th C)	0.0	0.7	37.0	18	
Untreated	0	5.1	11.0	97.0	0	

Performance of Reduced Rates of Provado, HVL - 2000

*3rd cover - 6/13; 4th cover - 6/23; 5th cover - 7/4

Bug In Your Ear

Source: Art Agnello & Harvey Reissig, Entomology, Geneva, NY, Scaffolds, Vol.10, #15

Green Aphids (Apple aphid, *Aphis pomi* De Geer, Spirea aphid, *Aphis spiraecola* Patch): Although small numbers of these aphids may be present on trees early in the season, populations generally start to increase in mid- to late June. This trend has been evident once again this year, as the plentiful rains and recurring heat have resulted in a profusion of succulent terminal growth much favored by these insects. Large numbers of both species may build up on growing terminals on apple trees during summer. Both species are apparently common during the summer in most N.Y. orchards, although no extensive surveys have been done to compare their relative abundance in different production areas throughout the season.

Nymphs and adults of both species suck sap from growing terminals and water sprouts. High populations cause leaves to curl and may stunt shoot growth on young trees. Aphids excrete large amounts of honeydew, which collects on fruit and foliage. Sooty mold fungi that develop on honeydew cause the fruit to turn black, reducing its quality.

Aphids should be sampled several times throughout the season starting in June. Inspect 10 rapidly growing terminals from each of 5 trees throughout the orchard. Record the percentage of infested terminals. No formal studies have been done to develop an economic threshold for aphids in N.Y. orchards. Currently, treatment is recommended if 30% of the terminals are infested with either species of aphid, or at 50% terminal infestation and less than 20% of the terminals with predators. An alternative threshold is given as 10% of the fruits exhibiting either aphids or honeydew.

The larvae of syrphid (hoverflies) and cecidomyiid flies (midges) prey on aphids throughout the summer. These predators complete about three generations during the summer. Most insecticides are somewhat toxic to these two predators, and they usually cannot build up sufficient numbers to control aphids adequately in regularly sprayed orchards. Both aphids are resistant to most organophosphates, but materials in other chemical classes control these pests effectively, including Asana, Danitol, Dimethoate, Lannate, Provado, Thiodan, and Vydate.

Woolly apple aphid (WAA), *Eriosoma lanigerum* (Hausmann): WAA colonizes both aboveground parts of the apple tree and the roots and commonly overwinters on the roots. In the spring, nymphs crawl up on apple trees from the roots to initiate aerial colonies. Most nymphs are born alive to unmated females on apple trees during the summer. Colonies initially build up on the inside of the canopy on sites such as wounds or pruning scars and later become numerous in the outer portion of the tree canopy, usually during late July to early August.

Aerial colonies occur most frequently on succulent tissue such as the current season's growth, water sprouts, unhealed pruning wounds, or cankers. Heavy infestations cause honeydew and sooty mold on the fruit and galls on the plant parts. Severe root infestations can stunt or kill young trees, but usually do not damage mature trees. Large numbers of colonies on trees may leave sooty mold on the fruit, which annoys pickers because red sticky residues from crushed WAA colonies may accumulate on their hands and clothing.

During late May and June, water sprouts, pruning wounds, and scars on the inside of the tree canopy should be examined for WAA nymphs. During mid-July, new growth around the outside of the canopy should be examined for WAA colonies. No economic threshold has been determined for treatment of WAA. *Aphelinus mali*, a tiny wasp, frequently parasitizes WAA but is very susceptible to insecticides and thus does not provide adequate control in regularly sprayed commercial orchards. Different rootstocks vary in their susceptibility to WAA. The following resistant rootstocks are the only means of controlling underground infestations of WAA on apple roots: MM.106, MM.111, and Robusta. WAA is difficult to control with insecticides because of its waxy outer covering and tendency to form dense colonies that are impenetrable to sprays. WAA is resistant to the commonly used organophosphates, but other insecticides are effective against WAA, including Thiodan and Diazinon.

Apples Added to Russian Food Aid

Source: http://www.fruitgrowersnews.com

The USDA announced June 22 its intent to purchase over 100,000 bushels of apples as part of the Food for Progress agreement with the Global Jewish Assistance and Relief Network (GJARN). Apples will be purchased for inclusion with other agricultural commodities for distribution in the Russian food aid package.

According to the U.S. Apple Association (USApple), this is the first time apples will be included in such an effort. Other commodities in the agreement are wheat flour, rice, peas, lentils, nonfat dry milk, and vegetable oil. Underprivileged Russians will receive approximately 12,000 metric tons of food aid, 2,000 of which will be apples.

GJARN plans to distribute the food to approximately one million people in Russia over a 12-month period, reaching individuals in orphanages, hospitals, and schools, as well as veterans, disabled persons, pensioners, and children in the Russian Far East, Volga, Urals, Northern Russia, Southern Russian, and Central Russia.

Renovating Strawberries

Source: Eric Hanson, MSUE Horticulture, Fruit CAT, Volume 16, No. 13, June 26, 2001

Strawberry beds that are to be carried over for another harvest season need to be renovated. Renovate beds as soon as harvest is over to narrows rows and reduce plant crowding. Deciding whether to renovate or remove a bed differs with each grower's circumstances, such as market demand, land availability, and production costs. As strawberry fields age, yields and berry size tend to decline, while weeds and some diseases increase in severity. Growers with high market demand but limited available acreage may need to retain beds longer. In the end, an educated decision requires knowledge of your production costs and net returns over the preceding seasons.

Mowing off the leaves just above crown height is the first step in renovation. Do this if the plants are healthy. If the plants are stressed by lack of moisture or root diseases, do not mow the leaves, as the plants will have difficulty developing new ones. Also, do not mow the leaves if renovation is delayed for more than a few weeks after the end of harvest. Removing the leaves is particularly important where plants are infested with mites, since sprays need to uniformly cover the crowns of the plants to control these pests.

The second step is to narrow the rows by cultivating to a width of eight to ten inches with a rototiller or disk. Rototillers with tines removed above the row work very well because they also toss some soil on top of remaining plants, which encourages additional rooting. More than an inch may smother the plants.

Some growers have had success narrowing rows by treating the row middles with directed or shielded sprays of the herbicide Gramoxone (paraquat). Gramoxone is a contact weed killer that is not mobile in plants so it only affects tissues directly treated. This method effectively narrows the plant row and does not expose new weed seeds by disturbing the soil. One potential problem with this approach is that it does not provide a loosely tilled soil, which is best for rooting of runner plants. It also does not throw soil back over crowns. Another approach currently being studied in Minnesota is the potential for narrowing rows by using flaming equipment. This appears to have some potential for the future.

Renovation is also a useful time to treat beds with amine forms of 2,4-D for broadleaf weed control. (Formula 40 is the only 2,4-D product labeled for use on strawberries.) Strawberry plants tolerate 2,4-D after harvest because they are not actively growing. If broadleaf weeds are a problem, apply 2,4-D, and then wait a few days before mowing. This herbicide must be absorbed by the weed leaves to be effective, so don't mow off the weed leaves before applying 2,4-D. Sinbar can also be applied at renovation for preemergent weed control. Apply 2-6 oz of Sinbar 80W per acre after mowing using the

lowest rates on sandy ground or weaker plant stands.

The last step in renovation is to fertilize and irrigate. Apply enough fertilizer to supply 50 lb N per acre. On sandy soils, try applying 30-40 lb N at renovation and again in early August. Do not neglect irrigation on renovated beds. The earlier runner plants develop, the higher they will yield the following year.

Fruit Observations & Trap Reports

Insect Key						
AM:	apple maggot					
CM:	codling moth					
ESBM:	eye-spotted budmoth					
LAW:	lesser apple worm					
LPTB:	lesser peachtree borer					
OBLR:	obliquebanded leafroller					
OFM:	oriental fruit moth					
PTB:	peachtree borer					
RBLR:	redbanded leafroller					
SJS:	San Jose scale					
STLM:	spotted tentiform leafminer					
TABM	tufted apple budmoth					
VLR:	variegated leafroller					

Waterman Lab, Columbus, Dr. Celeste Welty, OSU Extension Entomologist

Traps used: STLM = *Wing trap, SJS* = *Pherocon V, Codling Moth* = *mean of 3 MultiPher*® *traps, Others* = *MultiPher*

Apple:6/20 to 6/27 STLM: 41 (down from 66) RBLR: 20 (down from 62) CM: 1.3 (down from 5.3) SJS: 0 (unchanged) OFM: 2 (down from 10) DWB: 1 (up from 0) TABM: 0 (unchanged) VLR: 0 (down from 2) OBLR: 0 (down from 1)

Peach: 6/20 to 6/27 OFM: 4 (down from 17) LPTB: 6 (down from 7) PTB: 4 (up from 0)

Site: East District; Erie & Lorain Counties Source: Jim Mutchler, IPM Scout Traps Used: STLM=wing traps, SJS=Pherocon-V, Others=MultiPher®

Apple: 6/20 to 6/26 CM: 2.6 (down from 3.7) SJS: 0 (unchanged) OBLR: 7.8 (up from 1.2) RBLR: 35.5 (up from 8.0)

Peach: 6/20 to 6/26 OFM: 2.0 (down from 7.7) LPTB: 18.7 (down from 42.0) PTB: 5.3 (up from 1.0) RBLR: 71.7 (up from 8.7)

Other pests include white apple leafhopper, potato leafhopper, green apple aphid, rosy apple aphid

Beneficials include: lacewings everywhere, orange maggots, white maggots, lady beetles

Site: West District; Huron, Ottawa, & Sandusky

Source: Gene Horner, IPM Scout Traps Used: STLM=wing traps, SJS=Pherocon-V, PC = circle traps, Others=MultiPher® traps

Apple: 6/20 to 6/26 CM: 3.3 (up from 2.6) RBLR: 40.8 (up from 7.0) SJS: 0 (unchanged) STLM: 350 (up from 110) PC: 0 (unchanged)

Peach: 6/20 to 6/26 OFM: 4.8 (down from 7.5) LPTB: 20.8 (up from 18.0) PTB: 2.4 (up from 1.0) RBLR: 51.0 (up from 29.4) TPB: 0 (unchanged)

Other pests include green apple aphid, white apple leafhopper, potato leafhopper, rosy apple aphid, lilac borer, apple rust mite

Beneficials include lacewings everywhere, lady beetles, orange maggots, banded thrips

Phenology

Coming Events Range of Degree Day Accumulations Base 43° F Base 50° F Lesser peachtree borer flight peak 733-2330 392-1526 Oriental fruit moth 2nd flight peak 1000-2908 577-2066 Apple maggot 1st catch 1045-1671 629-1078 Redbanded leafroller 2nd flight begins 1096-2029 656-1381 Codling

moth 1st flight subsides 1112-2118 673-1395 Spotted tentiform leafminer 2nd flight peak 1295-2005 824-1355 Codling moth 2nd flight begins 1355-2302 864-1549 Obliquebanded leafroller 1st flight subsides 1420-2452 899-1790 San Jose scale 2nd flight begins 1449-1995 893-1407

Thanks to Scaffolds Fruit Journal (Art Agnello)

Northern Ohio Apple Scab, Fire Blight, & Sooty Blotch Activity from SkyBit®

	Dates	Level of Disease Activity
Observed	June 1-7, 16, 20-25	Possible scab infection & damage
	June 8-15, 17-19, 26, 27	Scab active, but no infection expected
	June 1-7, June 23-25	Fire blight active, but no infection
	June 8-10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 27	No fire blight activity
	June 11, 13, 15, 16, 19-22, 26	Possible fire blight infection and damage
	June 1-20	Sooty blotch active, but no infection
	June 21-27	Possible sooty blotch infection & damage
Forecast	June 28, 29, July 3-7	Scab active, but no infection expected
	June 30, July 1, 2	Possible scab infection & damage
	June 28, 29	No fire blight activity
	June 30; July 1-4	Possible fire blight infection and damage
	July 5-7	Fire blight active, but no infection
	June 28-30, July 1-7	Possible sooty blotch infection & damage

Degree Day Accumulations for Selected Ohio Sites January 1, 2001 to Date Indicated

Location	Reported Degree Day Accumulations						Forecasted Degree Day	
	June 13		June 20		June 27		Accumulations July 4	
	Base 45° F	Base 50° F	Base 45° F	Base 50° F	Base 45° F	Base 50° F	Base 45° F	Base 50° F
Akron - Canton	932	614	1133	779	1298	909	1499	1076
Cincinnati	1336	953	1538	1121	1705	1252	1922	1434

Cleveland	945	636	1148	805	1311	933	1513	1099
Columbus	1258	894	1478	1079	1661	1227	1881	1411
Dayton	1213	865	1422	1039	1587	1169	1806	1353
Mansfield	953	638	1153	804	1311	926	1498	1078
Norwalk	960	651	1171	826	1334	954	1535	1121
Piketon	1312	923	1515	1091	1695	1236	1898	1404
Toledo	983	670	1191	843	1354	971	1554	1135
Wooster	989	670	1187	833	1355	966	1543	1118
Youngstown	900	587	1085	737	1239	856	1445	1027

The Ohio Fruit ICM News is edited by:

Ted W. Gastier Extension Agent, Agriculture Tree Fruit Team Coordinator Ohio State University Extension Huron County 180 Milan Avenue Norwalk, OH 44857 Phone: (419)668-8210 FAX: (419)663-4233 E-mail: gastier.1@osu.edu

Information presented above and where trade names are used, they are supplied with the understanding that no discrimination is intended and no endorsement by Ohio State University Extension is implied. Although every attempt is made to produce information that is complete, timely, and accurate, the pesticide user bears responsibility of consulting the pesticide label and adhering to those directions.

Copyright © The Ohio State University 2001

All educational programs conducted by Ohio State University Extension are available to clientele on a nondiscriminatory basis without regard to race, color, creed, religion, sexual orientation, national origin, gender, age, disability or Vietnam-era veteran status.

Keith L. Smith, Associate Vice President for Ag. Adm. and Director, OSU Extension.

TDD No. 800-589-8292 (Ohio only) or 614-292-1868

Back