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Introduction
For the past 4 years, the University of Nebraska strawberry team has worked to develop low cost, sustainable methods for farmers and growers to produce strawberries in a double polyethylene greenhouse during the winter. This past year, this growing system was adapted to become a commercial grower’s heated high tunnel for the winter/spring of 2013-14. The idea was to scale up to a farm-size demonstration and compare it to the university greenhouse production system with a goal to expand marketing opportunities for strawberries into the winter season.

Materials and Methods

A heated high tunnel 25’ by 75’ was constructed and equipped with an overhead furnace, three low cost benches and a sustainable capillary mat system (Figure 1). Holes were cut in the plastic to allow the pots to sit directly on the mat while minimizing algae growth (Figure 2). The double polyethylene greenhouse at UNL was about the same size with similar features except the heat was funneled through poly tubes underneath the benches and only 1/3 of the two benches were used. The experimental design for the university study was a RCBD with 5 cultivars (Seascape, Seascape+, Evie-2, Evie-2+, and San Andreas) and twelve replications across two benches. Data included number and pounds of berries per cultivar per week, total water and natural gas usage, monitoring and recording of growing conditions to include incident light level, soil moisture capacity, light reflectance from leaves and relative humidity of the greenhouse. The experimental design for the grower production experiment was also a RCBD with 3 benches (replications) and the same 5 cultivars (treatments). Data included all of the above as well as associated building, growing and marketing costs including sale price.

Results

Water and Gas Usage
Water usage was 7,808 gallons at the heated high tunnel and 3,800 gallons at the greenhouse. This translates to approximately 15.6 gallons per plant over the entire growing season (in the greenhouse) and 7.26 gallons per plant total for the plants in the heated high tunnel. The water usage by the plants in the heated high tunnel was at least 45% less than projected.

The natural gas usage for the growing season at the greenhouse with under bench heating was $2,038.85. The propane usage with the overhead furnace was 4,385 gallons ($7,487.55). Both costs were substantially higher than projected from previous research.

Light, Soil Moisture, and Temperature
The heated high tunnel had increased light transmittance due to the new special double poly cover. This higher transmittance did translate to similar or higher berry production for the Fall/Winter when the plants were small. However once the plants grew larger, the greenhouse plants out produced the cooperator house plants.

The mix temperature of all the pots at the university greenhouse was consistently at 20 °C. For pots in the heated high tunnel, mix temperatures varied from 13-20 °C depending on location in the house.

Fluctuations in the water/fertilizer levels (as measured by the volumetric water content and EC) as well as the air temperature followed a similar pattern probably due to the different heating system in the commercial house. For more details see: Meyer, G.E. et al., 2014. Evaluation of soilless media sensors for managing winter-time greenhouse strawberry production using a CapMat system. Proceedings ASABE-CSBE/SCGAB Annual International Meeting.

Table 1. Mass of berries (pounds) produced by plants in the heated high tunnel. Evie-2 and Evie-2+ produced at least 1 pound of berries per plant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pounds per plant per cultivar</th>
<th>Harvest Period</th>
<th>Evie-2</th>
<th>Evie-2+</th>
<th>San Andreas</th>
<th>Seascape</th>
<th>Seascape+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October - December 31</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January - April 12</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of live plants</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,096 plants of 1,054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As expected, total berry mass peaked during March and both sites showed the same general pattern. In the Fall/Winter, plants grown in the heated high tunnel showed two production peaks in November. Plants grown in the double poly greenhouse showed two production peaks also but around Thanksgiving and Christmas. We thought that the closer we came to holiday production the higher the price and thus, the push towards more berry production in December. This did not turn out to be true as our commercial partner got the same price for the whole growing period (somewhere between $2.50 - $2.75 per pint).

Figure 1. Double polyethylene heated high tunnel with acrylic end walls.

Figure 2. Capillary mat system with white/black polyethylene cover.

Figure 3. CapMat II with reflective mulch and buried sensors at the heated high tunnel location.

Figure 4. Total mass of berries (pounds) produced at the heated high tunnel during January through April 12.