
INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMITTING ALL ABSTRACTS WHERE REQUIRED

I. Abstract Format

1. The text should be roughly 150-250 words, in font size of 12. **For those entries not submitted on-line**, an original copy of the abstract must be submitted as well as an electronic copy on a labeled CD. Abstracts included on the CD should be in Wordperfect or Microsoft Word.
2. **TITLES SHOULD BE COMPLETELY CAPITALIZED**, and typed from the left margin on the first line. It should not be underlined. The body of the abstract should be fully justified (both margins even).
3. Name(s) of author(s), institutional affiliation(s), and address(es) should be entered two lines below the title line. Name(s) of author(s) should be underlined and written in the order of family name and the initials of the given and middle name. The last name of the presenter should be marked with an asterisk (*) at right.
4. Insert an empty line before beginning to type text. Text should be preceded with a space of three letters.
5. Scientific names (i.e., botanical names) should be written in italic type or underline.

II. General Instructions for Applications that require an abstract.

1. **Electronic copies** of the abstract are to be submitted with the application by following the on-line submission process.
2. Abstracts will not be accepted if they do not conform to the instructions contained herein, both in content and/or format.
3. The following is an example of the abstract format that must be followed for all abstracts. The abstract selected is the 2006 National Winner of the Poster Session Applied Research category.

Sample FORMAT FOR ALL NACAA ABSTRACTS

When published, the entire abstract (including the title and by-line), will be printed by phototype process exactly as you submit it. Author(s) underlined and written in order of family name, given and middle initials, with an asterisk (*) to the right of the presenting author; followed by the address; and that the text starts on the next two lines, indented three spaces.)

The Committee responsible for the award category **may choose not to publish an abstract if it does not meet the required rules and format layout.**

Submission of abstracts must be completed online no later than March 15, 2010. Additional information (the schedule of presentation, details on presentation methods, and so on) will be provided after the abstract has been approved.

EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF BIO-FUNGICIDES IN THE PRODUCTION OF FRESH MARKET ORGANIC TOMATOES

Blevins, * P.K.¹, Straw, R.A.²

¹. Extension Agent, Virginia Cooperative Extension, Washington County, Abingdon, Virginia 24210

². Extension Specialist, Virginia Cooperative Extension-Southwest Virginia AREC, Glade Spring, Virginia 24340

Disease control in fresh market tomatoes is a major factor limiting the adoption of organic production methods by growers in Southwest, Virginia. Six bio-fungicides were compared to a conventional standard [Bravo (3 pts/acre) alternated with Manzate (2 lbs/acre) plus Tanos (8 oz/acre) plus BCS Copper (64 oz/acre) for the first four weekly sprays, and Bravo alone thereafter] and an untreated check (UTC) for relative effectiveness in controlling diseases such as early blight. The biological materials and rates applied were, Storox (1% solution), Biophos (2% solution), Prophyte (4 pts/acre), Serenade Max (3 lbs/acre), BCS Copper (2qts/acre), and Serenade Max (3lbs/acre) plus BCS Copper (2qts/acre). All treatments were made on a weekly basis. The tomato variety 'Mountain Fresh Plus' was used in a drip irrigated, trellised, plasti-culture system. Fruit was harvested and graded and placed into one of the following grades: Jumbo, Extra Large, Large, Medium, Small, No. 2, or Cull. Yield data and disease ratings were analyzed using ANOVA techniques and means were separated using Duncan's Multiple Range Test. There were no statistical differences in yield of total marketable fruit. The UTC plot produced the greatest number of Jumbo fruit, while the Serenade/BCS Copper produced the lowest. Storox has been a material that local organic growers have relied on for disease control. In terms of disease control, all treatments including the UTC were better statistically than Storox, which had leaf area damage ratings in excess of 40%. This study suggests that there are differences in the relative effectiveness of these bio-fungicides for disease control. However, in this case it did not significantly impact total marketable yield. If harvest had continued, yield differences would have been expected due to defoliation by early blight.