



# Southeastern Regional Peach Newsletter

Volume 6, No. 1

February 2006

In this issue...

## Editor's Note

**Focal Points – Copper Review by EPA**

**Weed Science Update – Karmex,  
Gramoxone and Glyphosate**

**Regulatory and Pesticide Application  
Issues – AZM and Phosmet  
Update**

**Section 18 Rules Change**

**Horticulture Update – White Fleshed  
Peaches for the Southeast**

## Editor's Note

As I write this, we are finishing up February, and to date, we have had an exceptionally warm winter once again. January has been particularly warm, and we have had a goodly amount of moisture to date. How this will impact the coming year is somewhat difficult to predict at this early stage. I suspect that pest management, both disease and insect, may be more problematic as a result, but that remains to be seen. Nonetheless, the best we can do is to be diligent in application of the materials which are critical for control.

With that in mind, we are also going through a time of EPA scrutiny of many of the materials we utilize in peach production. It is not by intent, but a large portion of this newsletter is dedicated to issues with reregistration of numerous compounds that are important to peach production in the Southeast. **In this issue, I am encouraging all who work with peaches to take an active interest in the copper reregistration process (see information below).** Please forward the information contained

in this newsletter, as well as pertinent attachments, to as many folks as you can. We need every Tom, Dick and Harriett to support the use of coppers on peach. **The deadline for sending information to EPA is 27 March, so please keep this in mind**

Also, Bob Bellinger has submitted information for the newsletter on two insecticides, phosmet and AZM, which are also under scrutiny. Thankfully, the whole newsletter is not dedicated to regulatory issues. Wayne Mitchem has an article on herbicides, and Desmond Layne and Dick Okie have an update on white fleshed peaches and nectarines.

As always, we hope the year will be an excellent one for peach production in the Southeast!

*Phillip M. Brannen*  
Editor

## **Focal Points – New Information for the Peach Industry**

**Coppers under scrutiny by EPA.** In the last newsletter, we discussed the fact that EPA is reviewing copper uses. **Comments on the use of and importance of coppers must be received by 27 March, 2006. In discussions with EPA, they have indicated that the best way to submit a comment would be through the docket system (see below and attached for information on how to do this), which can be accessed via the web at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov).**

Comments from producers and researchers are very important to this process, since the EPA will use these comments to help them determine effective levels of copper for control of diseases of interest in a specific commodity. In our case, the major concern would be the use of copper for control of bacterial spot; we are a heavy user of copper, so we have to defend this position as to the timing, amounts, etc. if we are to maintain our needed applications. Though you can find a good template for a letter to EPA (see below), let me suggest that letters should be individualized as to our impression of the value of copper. In other words, if you are a producer, describe what the loss or reduction of copper would mean to your operation. For research and extension personnel, your letters may be more detailed from the standpoint of rates, etc., but individual letters and opinions will be important

to this process. Numbers do matter in this process, so please take time to do this.

The major concern from the perspective of EPA seems to be water quality impacts, and we will likely have to address these during the risk mitigation process. The summary document (click below for PDF) is the shortest of the documents associated with this reregistration process (one is over 500 pages in length), and it really does give a pretty good overview of the concerns with copper application. Fruits are generally listed as a major user, and though that does not necessarily mean that fruits will be targeted for reduction, it likely does mean that we will have to defend these higher uses.

While this is not a “panic” situation at this point, I do once again encourage all to respond to EPA in this process. IT IS IMPORTANT!

**(click here for a copy of the summary document which explains the perceived environmental risks from copper compounds)**

**(click here for a copy of a template letter from the Copper Sulfate Task Force)**

**(click here for additional information on how/where to submit your comments)**

### **TO SEND YOUR COMMENTS ELECTRONICALLY:**

TO THE DOCKET:

- 1) Go to [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov)
- 2) On the top line, select "Advanced Search", then "Docket Search"
- 3) Enter at the Docket ID: **EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0558**. Scroll down and press "Submit". It may take a few minutes while it searches for that Docket.
- 4) Once record is up, go the right hand side of the screen to "Actions". Please note that you may have to hold your CTRL button if you have a pop-up blocker on.

- 5) The Docket Details screen will come up. Go the right hand side of the screen to "Add Comments". Please note that you may have to hold your CTRL button if you have a pop-up blocker on.
- 6) The Comment Form will come up.
- 7) In the 3rd section, enter your "Submitter Information"
- 8) The 4th section is the "General Comments" section. Here you can copy and paste your letter in the box or enter your comments in directly.
- 9) After entering your comments, select "Next Step" at the bottom to complete the action.

#### TO YOUR SENATORS:

- 1) Go to [www.senate.gov](http://www.senate.gov)
- 2) On the top right hand corner, select your state with the drop down arrow. Select "Go".
- 3) Your senators will come up.
- 4) Select email or internet address listed under your senator. There should be a place to insert your comments. Please note that some fields are required before your comments are accepted.

#### TO YOUR REPRESENTATIVES:

- 1) Go to [www.house.gov](http://www.house.gov)
- 2) On the top left hand side of the screen, enter your 5-digit zip code PLUS your 4-digit code. If you do not know your 4-digit code, just enter your zip code, select "GO" and the website will route you to an area where you can locate your 4-digit code. You may also go to <http://zip4.usps.com/zip4/welcome.jsp> to find your 4-digit code.
- 3) Once you have your entire zip code, enter it, select "GO".
- 4) Your representative(s) will come up.
- 5) Click on your representative. Each site will be different, but there should be an option to "contact" your representative online. Again, some fields will be required before your comments are accepted.

TO THE OFFICE OF PESTICIDE PROGRAMS AND SPECIAL REVIEW AND REGISTRATION DIVISION AT THE ENVIROMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY: **NOTE: Please remember to include the DOCKET ID # EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0558 in your subject line.**

If you would like to email your comments rather than use the docket system, the Office of Pesticide Programs has also provided an email address to send your comments:  
[opp\\_docket@epa.gov](mailto:opp_docket@epa.gov)

Jim Jones, US EPA, Director of Office of Pesticide Programs  
[jim.jones@epa.gov](mailto:jim.jones@epa.gov)

Debra Edwards, US EPA, Director of Special Review and Registration Division  
[edwards.debbie@epa.gov](mailto:edwards.debbie@epa.gov)

# Weed Science Updates

## Herbicide formulation updates for Karmex, Gramoxone, and Glyphosate

*Wayne Mitchem  
North Carolina State University*

### **Karmex XP**

Karmex and other generic diuron products are very familiar to peach growers. However, there is a new Karmex formulation that you may encounter in the market place. The new formulation is Karmex XP. It is an 80% diuron product just like the Karmex DF formulation, but there has been a rate change pertaining to peach orchards. The maximum use rate for Karmex XP in peach orchards is 2.75 lbs per acre, which is considerably less than the maximum use rate on the Karmex DF formulation which was 5 lbs per acre. The rate when tank mixed with Sinbar is not affected by this label change. The reduction in use rate occurred during the reregistration process. As of now, the only label indicating a reduction in rate is for the Karmex XP formulation. Karmex DF and generic diuron labels have not been changed at this point.

### **Gramoxone Inteon**

A new formulation of Gramoxone is now on the market too. It is called Gramoxone Inteon, and it is a less concentrated formulation than the Gramoxone Max formulation. Therefore, the amount of Gramoxone Inteon used per acre is greater than the equivalent rate for Gramoxone Max (see Table 1). The new formulation contains additives to reduce absorption in the event the product is ingested. Additionally, the odor of Gramoxone Inteon is less offensive, having the aroma of “freshly cut grass”. The effectiveness of the product has not changed. The rate and reduced toxicity are the only differences between the new formulation and the previous one.

**Table 1. Rate Comparison for Gramoxone Formulations**

Herbicide	Standard Burndown Rate (pts/acre)		
Gramoxone Inteon	2.5	3.0	4.0
Gramoxone Max	1.7	2.0	2.7

## Glyphosate Formulations

There are numerous glyphosate products being marketed to growers. In addition to the numerous brands, there are 5 different formulations containing different concentrations of the active ingredient. The table below is a listing of various brands (although there are more) and equivalent rates for the various formulations.

**Table 2. Glyphosate Formulation**

Brand Name	Formulation	Active Ingredient (lb formulated salt/gal)	Acid Equivalent	Equivalent Rates	
				lb ae/gal	fl. oz. product/acre
Buccaneer Buccneer Plus Clearout Plus Credit Credit Extra Gly-Flo Gly-4 Gly-4 Plus Glyphos Glyphos X-TRA Glyphomax Glyphomax Plus Glyphosate 4 Gly Star Original Gly Star Plus Honcho Honcho Plus Roundup Original	Isopropylamine salt	4	3	0.375 0.56 0.75	16 24 32
Gly Star 5	Isopropylamine salt	5.4	4	0.375 0.56 0.75	12 18 24
Touchdown	Diammonium salt	3.57	3	0.375 0.56 0.75	16 24 32
Roundup OriginalMax Roundup WeatherMax	Potassium salt	5.5	4.5	0.375 0.56 0.75	10.7 15.9 21.3
Touchdown HITech	Postassium salt	6	5	0.375 0.56 0.75	9.6 14.3 19.2

Source: A.C. York. 2006 NC Ag. Chem. Manual. p. 399.

# Regulatory Update

**EPA's Settlement Agreement on Phosmet and Azinphos-methyl (AZM) - UFW vs. Johnson, Case No. 04-0099 (W.D. Wa.)**

*Bob Bellinger  
Clemson University*

**In January, the EPA** reached a settlement agreement with the United Farm Workers and the other public interest plaintiffs who brought a lawsuit against the Agency in January 2004 regarding the pesticides phosmet and azinphos methyl (AZM).

*The suit alleged* that the phosmet and AZM Interim Reregistration Eligibility Decisions (IREDs) were inconsistent with the requirements of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), because EPA did not appropriately consider the risks and benefits of these pesticides.

*The settlement agreement stays* the legal challenge pending EPA's reconsideration of the "time limited" uses of these pesticides, scheduled for reevaluation later in 2006. It establishes a time frame in which EPA will propose decisions on the re-evaluation of the nine phosmet time-limited uses and the 10 azinphos-methyl time-limited uses. Prior to finalizing the agreement, EPA took public comment; the only comment submitted was in support of the agreement.

**Phosmet:** In the phosmet IRED (October 2001) EPA determined that three (3) uses should be canceled and that 33 uses were eligible for reregistration, pending development and review of additional data related to worker exposure and the completion of the OP cumulative assessment. EPA made a time-limited determination for nine (9) uses: apples, crabapples, **peaches**, pears, **nectarines**, apricots, **plums/prunes**, grapes, and highbush blueberries. EPA was to complete reconsideration of those uses in 2006. The IRED stated that this reconsideration would involve a determination whether the restricted-entry intervals (REIs) for workers that were imposed as a result of the IRED should be maintained indefinitely or whether longer "default" REIs, or other appropriate REIs, should be adopted. EPA is still in the process of conducting its reevaluation of these nine uses.

## **Deadlines:**

**April 3, 2006:** EPA will propose a decision on the restricted-entry intervals (REIs) for the nine (9) phosmet time-limited uses which include: apples; apricots; highbush blueberries; crabapples; grapes; **nectarines**; **peaches**; pears; and **plums/prunes**.

**August 3, 2006:** EPA will determine whether the existing REIs for the nine (9) time-limited phosmet uses should continue on phosmet products produced after October 30, 2006.

**Azinphos-methyl:** In the azinphos-methyl IRED (October 2001) EPA concluded, based on evaluation of the risks and benefits of the use of AZM, that 35 uses should either be immediately canceled or phased out over a four-year period. The remaining 10 time-limited AZM registrations - almonds, apples/crabapples, highbush and lowbush blueberries, Brussels sprouts, cherries, nursery stock, parsley, pears, pistachios, and walnuts - were eligible for reregistration, pending completion of the cumulative assessment, for a period of four years. After this period EPA would accept and evaluate applications for renewal of the registrations, taking into consideration, among other things, the additional data EPA required the registrants to submit. The IRED stated that if the AZM registrants wished to extend the life of the registrations beyond the original four years, they could apply for amendments to their registrations to do so. In July 2004, the AZM registrants submitted applications to extend the AZM registrations for the 10 uses. EPA is currently considering those applications.

***Deadlines:***

**April 3, 2006:** EPA will propose a decision on the remaining ten azinphos-methyl uses, which include almonds; apples/crabapples; lowbush and highbush blueberries; Brussels sprouts; cherries, sweet and tart; nursery stock; parsley; pears; pistachios; and walnuts.

**August 3, 2006:** EPA will determine whether to approve or deny the AZM registrants' July 2004 applications to retain the remaining ten AZM uses.

14Feb06; EPA sources

**EPA Revises Its Pesticide Emergency Exemption (Section 18) Process**

*After March 28, 2006, applicants for emergency exemptions must use the new methods and approach described in the final rule.*

***Bob Bellinger***  
***Clemson University***

**At the end** of January 2006 the EPA published a [final rule](#) that revises the regulations governing emergency exemptions – known as Section 18's - that allow unregistered uses of pesticides to address emergency pest conditions for a limited time. These emergency exemptions are called Section 18's because they are authorized by Section 18 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). In the petition to the EPA, the emergencies are officially declared, usually by the pesticide regulatory agency in a given state. *After March 28, 2006, applicants for emergency exemptions must use the new methods and approach described in the final rule.* State and federal agencies involved in regulating pesticides and pest management are directly affected by these regulatory changes - growers, commodity groups, and extension agents should be interested in the changes.

The intent of these revisions is to reduce the burden to both applicants and EPA, allow for potentially quicker emergency responses by EPA, provide consistent determinations of "significant economic loss" as the basis for an emergency, and to make the regulations consistent with the requirements of FQPA and incorporate minor administrative improvements identified since the rule was last modified.

**The changes to emergency exemption process** - The rule makes two primary revisions to the application, review and approval process for specific exemptions:

**(1) Streamlined recertification application.** For eligible repeat emergency exemption requests, the revised regulations allow states to submit an abbreviated "re-certification" request. This "re-certification" request cites previously submitted and reviewed data to support their response to an on-going emergency pest problem. These streamlined requests should reduce the burden on states and facilitate efficient processing of emergency requests by EPA for eligible uses.

**(2) Redefinition of significant economic loss and revision of data requirements for documenting loss.** A new, tiered approach allows an applicant to demonstrate the obvious emergencies more easily, while minimizing data requirements. The thresholds in the tiered approach are intended to provide clear, uniform standards to determine the significance of anticipated economic losses - the previous approach compared revenues under the emergency to historical variations in revenues for the particular crop and region. Applicants may be able to submit less economic information to document a significant economic loss under the new approach. EPA's analysis of previous applications using the new economic approach showed that approximately the same number of requests would qualify for a significant economic loss.

EPA believes this final rule will not compromise or alter current protections for human health and the environment, because the risk evaluation process and requirements in this regard remain unchanged.

Again, the final rule is effective on **March 28, 2006**, which is 60 days after publication in the Federal Register. *After March 28, 2006, all applicants must use the new methods and approach.* Applicants submitting exemption requests that are received by the EPA after publication of the final rule, but before the effective date, will have the option of using the revised approaches for re-certification or documenting a significant economic loss, or using the previous application method and approach.

15Feb06 EPA sources

## Horticulture Update

### **White Fleshed Peaches and Nectarines for the Southeastern USA**

*Desmond R. Layne (Clemson University) and W.R. Okie (USDA-ARS, Byron, GA)*

White fleshed peaches and nectarines are a delicacy that has been enjoyed for centuries around the world. They are native to China and were introduced to the United States in the 1800's. Many cultivars from government (public) and private breeding programs have been introduced in the United States in the last two decades. Patented cultivars (note number in Table 3) are more expensive because a royalty (up to \$2.25/tree) is paid to the patent owner.

Some white fleshed peaches and nectarines are highly perishable and bruise easily but are of very high eating quality. These are perhaps best suited for the local roadside market where they can be sold and consumed more quickly. Others, are much firmer at harvest, have a longer shelf-life and are suitable for long-distance transport to wholesale markets. White fleshed peaches and nectarines may have some acidity or they may be very low acid with high sugar content (brix). Some novel flat (peento or donut) types also exist. Proximity to an urban market with a substantial Asian population is advantageous because Asians, in particular, often prefer the low-acid flavor and are willing to pay premium prices for high quality fruits.

In our peach and nectarine cultivar evaluation program at Clemson, we are currently evaluating seventy cultivars and advanced selections at four different locations in South Carolina (Table 3). Several of these noted in Table 3 have been evaluated since 2000 and the "top performers" over the last six seasons are noted in Table 4. Color photos of each of these "top performers" from the 2005 season are noted herein. Many cultivars and advanced selections noted in Table 3 do not appear in Table 4 because they were introduced to the program recently and have only been evaluated for 1-2 years or because the young trees have not fruited yet. Many, however, that have been evaluated since 2000 performed poorly and these have limited or no utility for the southeastern United States.

Patented cultivars from the California breeding programs may have increased susceptibility to bacterial spot in years/locations with high bacterial spot pressure. However, we have not observed significant bacterial spot problems in the "top performers" noted in Table 4 during the years/locations of our study to date. In general, most of the white nectarines and the flat/donut peaches and nectarines have serious problems with insect damage and brown rot. For complete details on all of our peach and nectarine evaluation work in SC since 2000, please see my Peach Web Site at <http://www.clemson.edu/hort/Peach/index.php>

The authors acknowledge Adams County Nursery and Dr. Denny Werner (NC State Univ.) for the donation of trees. Technical support of W.C. Newall, D. Cox, E. Hitzler, C. McClive, R. Curry, and S. Layne was gratefully provided. Grant support was also generously provided by the SC Peach Council.

**Table 3: White Peaches Being Evaluated in South Carolina**

Number	Name	Chill hours	Musser		Attributes	Origin	Patent #	Plant	Location for Testing	Year of First Evaluation
			Ripe Date							
1	Primerose			23-May	peach, clingstone	Italy		NA	Musser	2000
2	Spring Snow				peach, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	9883		Musser, Cooley	2006,2007
3	BY94P5297			11-Jun	peach, clingstone	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser	2004
4	Arctic Star			13-Jun	nectarine, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	9332		Musser	2005
5	BY00P5737			13-Jun	peach, freestone	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser, Cooley	2005, 2007
6	BY95P4340			15-Jun	peach, subacid, flat/donut	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser	2001
7	SC84164-13-6			15-Jun	peach, clingstone	Clemson Univ., SC		NA	Musser, Cooley	2000, 2007
8	Grezzano			17-Jun	peach, clingstone	Italy		NA	Musser	2000
9	Sugar May			17-Jun	peach, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	8034		Musser, Cooley	2000, 2007
10	Snow Queen	750		17-Jun	nectarine, clingstone	Armstrong Nurs., Ontario, CA	3733		Cash, Cooley	2003,2007
11	BY94P5262			22-Jun	peach, freestone	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Cash	2004
12	BY00P4357			20-Jun	peach, subacid	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser	2005
13	Arctic Glo			22-Jun	nectarine, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	7884		Musser	2000
14	Snow Prince				peach, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	9873		Musser, Cooley	2006, 2007
15	Scarletpearl	750		22-Jun	peach, clingstone	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser, Cooley	2000, 2007
16	BY96P3606			24-Jun	peach, clingstone	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser	2005
17	Snowbrite			24-Jun	peach, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	8195		Musser, Cooley	2000, 2007
18	Jade				nectarine	Star Fruits, France	PPAF		Cooley	2007
19	Arctic Sweet				nectarine, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	9542		Musser, Cooley	2006, 2007
20	BY88N2475			24-Jun	nectarine, semifreestone	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser	2000
21	Southern Pearl	650		24-Jun	peach, semifreestone	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser, Cooley	2000, 2007
22	Stark Crimson Snow	800		27-Jun	nectarine, subacid	L.G. Bradford, CA	8461		Musser	2000
23	Stark Saturn	700		28-Jun	peach, subacid, flat/donut	Rutgers, NJ	5123		Musser	2000
24	Roseprincess	850		28-Jun	nectarine, semifreestone	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser	2001
25	Karla Rose	700			nectarine, semifreestone	Armstrong Nurs., Ontario, CA	3733		Cooley	2007
26	BY99P2810			30-Jun	peach, semifreestone	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser	2005
27	BY96P3606			27-Jun	peach, subacid	USDA-Byron, GA			Musser, Cooley	2005, 2007
28	White Lady			28-Jun	peach, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	5821		Musser, Cooley	2000, 2007
29	Carolina Belle	750			peach, freestone	NCARS, Raleigh			Musser, Cooley	2007, 2007
30	Arctic Rose			4-Jul	nectarine, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	7889		Musser	2000
31	Galaxy				peach, subacid, flat/donut	USDA-Fresno, CA			Cooley	2007
32	Galactica	800			peach, subacid, flat/donut	NC State Univ., Jackson Springs			Musser, Cooley	2007, 2007
33	BY93P4055			4-Jul	peach, subacid, flat/donut	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser	2000
34	BY98P4983			5-Jul	peach, freestone	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser	2004
35	BY99P3345			5-Jul	peach, freestone	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser	2005
36	Nectar	1050		7-Jul	peach, freestone	Bakersfield, CA	86		Musser, Cooley	2000, 2007
37	Klondike White				peach, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	10872		Musser, Cooley	2006, 2007
38	BY98P5546			8-Jul	nectarine, subacid	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser	2005
39	Raritan Rose	1050		8-Jul	peach, freestone	New Brunswick, NJ		NA	Musser	2000
40	Sugar Lady			8-Jul	peach, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	7532		Musser	2000
41	L85-2-1			12-Jul	peach, subacid	Calhoun, LA		NA	Musser	2001
42	Arctic Jay				nectarine, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	9908		Musser	2006
43	Peen-to	450		12-Jul	peach, subacid, flat/donut	China		NA	Musser	2000
44	Redrose	850		12-Jul	peach, freestone	New Brunswick, NJ		NA	Musser	2000
45	Wildrose	750		12-Jul	peach, freestone	New Brunswick, NJ		NA	Musser	2000
46	BY93P4130			14-Jul	peach, freestone	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Watsonia	2002
47	Arctic Queen			16-Jul	nectarine, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	8094		Musser	2000
48	BY94P3944			15-Jul	peach, freestone	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser	2004
49	Summer Sweet			15-Jul	peach, freestone	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	8070		Musser	2000
50	Arctic Belle				nectarine, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	10479		Musser	2006
51	BY00P5724			19-Jul	peach, subacid	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser	2005
52	BY95P5584			19-Jul	peach, subacid	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser	2004
53	Arctic Gold				nectarine, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	9406		Musser	2006
54	Sugar Giant			19-Jul	peach, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	8442		Musser, Cooley	2000, 2007
55	Glacier White			22-Jul	peach, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	11868		Musser, Cooley	2006, 2007
56	Belle of Georgia	850		24-Jul	peach, freestone	Marshallville, GA			Musser, Cooley	2005, 2007
57	China Pearl	1100		24-Jul	peach, subacid	NC State Univ., Jackson Springs			Musser, Cooley	2005, 2007
58	Stark's Summer Pearl	850		23-Jul	peach, freestone	NJAES, New Brunswick, NJ			Musser, Cooley	2000, 2007
59	Zephr				nectarine	Star Fruits, France	PPAF		Musser, Cooley	2006, 2007
60	BY98P4980			27-Jul	peach, freestone	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser	2005
61	Arctic Blaze				nectarine, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	10174		Musser	2006
62	Lady Nancy			1-Aug	peach, freestone	Hammonton, NJ	7069		Musser	2000
63	White Rose	850			peach, freestone	Cutler, CA	1831		Musser, Cooley	2007, 2007
64	Snow King			4-Aug	peach, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	8415		Musser, Cooley	2000, 2007
65	Arctic Pride				nectarine, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	8450		Musser	2006
66	BY97P2463			14-Aug	peach, freestone	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser	2004
67	Snow Giant			15-Aug	peach, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	8085		Musser	2000
68	BY82P4971			21-Aug	peach, freestone	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser	2000
69	September Snow				peach, subacid	Zaiger, Modesto, CA	8003		Musser, Cooley	2006, 2007
70	BY85P510			5-Sep	peach, freestone	USDA-Byron, GA		NA	Musser	2001

NOTE: there are reports that Karla Rose and Snow Queen are identical

Locations include: Musser Farm (Seneca, SC), Cooley Farm (Chesnee, SC), Cash Farm (Cowpens, SC), and Watsonia Farm (Monetta, SC)

**Table 4: Current Top Performing White Peaches Being Evaluated in South Carolina**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Ripe Date</b>	<b>Size (inch)</b>	<b>Set</b>	<b>Shape</b>	<b>Red Color</b>	<b>Firm (psi)</b>	<b>Free (brix)</b>	<b>Sweet (brix)</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>Sugar May</b>	9-Jun	2.4	7.2	6.7	7	10.1	4	9.8	sweet and firm
<b>Scarletpearl</b>	12-Jun	2.6	7.4	7.1	6.8	7.8	4	10.4	sweet
<b>Snowbrite</b>	14-Jun	2.4	7.3	7.2	7.4	10.9	4	9.5	sweet and firm
<b>Southern Pearl</b>	24-Jun	2.8	7	6.9	6	10.4	4	9.6	sweet with acid
<b>White Lady</b>	27-Jun	2.6	7.5	7	7	11.6	7	9.8	sweet and firm
<b>Sugar Lady</b>	6-Jul	2.6	7.2	7.2	7.3	9.5	8	10.7	sweet and firm
<b>Summer Sweet</b>	9-Jul	2.6	6.6	7.1	7.2	11.7	8	12.7	sweet and firm
<b>Sugar Giant</b>	14-Jul	2.9	6.5	6.7	7.3	10.7	8	11.6	sweet and firm
<b>Stark Summer Pearl</b>	24-Jul	2.9	7	7.1	6.6	10.3	8	13.2	sweet and firm
<b>Snow King</b>	28-Jul	2.7	7.2	6.8	6.9	11.4	8	12.5	sweet and firm
<b>Snow Giant</b>	7-Aug	3.0	7.6	6.6	6.8	10.4	8	12.9	sweet and firm

Notes: Data are means of six growing seasons (2000-2005) at the Musser Fruit Research Farm, Seneca, SC. Firmness is measured as puncture pressure in pounds per square inch. Soluble solids concentration (brix) data was collected beginning in 2004 only. Set, shape, red color, and attributes are rated on a 1-8 scale with 8 being best. Stone freeness from 4 to 8 corresponds to clingstone (4) and freestone (8).







**White Lady**

8 July 2005

1-inch grid

**Sugar Lady**

15 July 2005

1-inch grid







## Southeastern Regional Peach Newsletter

Volume 6, No. 1      February 2006

---

Editor, Phillip M. Brannen  
Horticulture Assistant Editor, Kathy Taylor  
Entomology Assistant Editor, Dan Horton  
Weed Science Assistant Editor, Wayne Mitchem

Published quarterly. The Southeastern Regional Peach Newsletter is available through the following website <http://resources.caes.uga.edu/publications/newsletters/SRPN/>. If a hardcopy is desired, please contact your local county agent. Your local County Extension Agent is a source of additional information on these and other subjects.

**Learning** *for* **Life**

The University of Georgia and Ft. Valley State University, the U.S. Department of Agriculture and counties of the state cooperating. The Cooperative Extension Service offers educational programs, assistance and materials to all people without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex or disability. An equal opportunity/affirmative action organization committed to a diverse work force.