Lighting up CEA Crops

Neil Mattson <u>nsm47@cornell.edu</u>



Outline

- When does supplemental lighting make sense?
- When do LED fixtures make sense over HID?
- Costs of lighting / calculator tools
- When do tunable spectra LEDS make sense?





Primary uses for horticultural lighting

- Photosynthetic lighting (light quantity)
 - Supplemental (in greenhouse)
 - Sole source (indoors/vertical farm/warehouse)
- Photoperiodic lighting (light duration)
 - Flowering/Vegetative
- Light quality on plants
 - Height
 - Leaf expansion
 - Red pigmentation (lettuce)
- (Insect and disease control)





Greenhouse lighting deserves a second look

| Lamp type | Photosynthetic Photon Efficacy (μmol/J) |
|--|--|
| HPS magnetic ballast 400 W (1994) | 0.98 |
| HPS magnetic ballast 1,000 W (2014) | 1.16 |
| HPS double ended electronic ballast (2014) | 1.70 |
| LED best in 2014 | 1.70 |
| LED best in 2016 | 2.39 |
| LED best in 2021 (reported via DLC) | 3.69 |



You live in a northern climate



Average outside DLI by month

Faust and Logan (2018) HortScience 53(9):1250-1257



Note: typical greenhouse light transmission is 50-70%











You produce crops during winter months





You notice issues with crop quality or yield from low light





You notice issues with crop quality or yield from low light







Winter lighting strawberry 'Albion'



DLI set point 15 mol/m2/d

■Ambient ■HPS ■LED

Jonathan Allred, Cornell



Winter lighting strawberry 'Albion'



DLI set point 15 mol/m2/d

■Ambient ■HPS ■LED

Jonathan Allred, Cornell

You wish to speed up crop turns Pansy grown for 3 weeks under different lamps

DLI (mol·m⁻²·d⁻¹) 8 10 12.5 16 19.5 23



Increasing light integral decreases time to flower for Pansy 'Crystal Bowl Supreme Yellow' (LD)

You wish to speed up crop turns

College of Agriculture and Life Sciences



12

High density crops (plugs, liners, seedlings)







High density crops (plugs, liners, seedlings) Ex: Argyranthemum at 73/70 Fin a double-poly greenhouse in Grand Rapids, MI

| | Prop. DLI (mol m ⁻² d ⁻¹) | p. DLI m ⁻² d ⁻¹) Heating cost (\$/sf) | | Total heat + light cost (\$/sf) |
|--------------------|---|--|---------------------|---------------------------------------|
| No suppl. Light | 7 | \$1.28 (5 weeks) | \$0 | \$1.28 |
| Suppl. Light | 12 | \$0.75 (3 weeks) | \$0.03 (2 weeks) | \$0.78 |

Heating with natural gas 15 x 400 W HPS lamps (75 μ mol m⁻² s⁻¹) for 18 hr



Source: Roberto Lopez, MSU

Head Lettuce

- 12 to 17 mol·m⁻²·d⁻¹ if vertical airflow fans are installed
- Greater light → increased incidence of tipburn
- Lower light → longer crop turn or lower biomass
- Photoperiod: continuous lighting (24 hr) can be used



'Ostinata' lettuce fresh weight response to DLI Adapted from A.J. Both, 1997



Lettuce







Symptoms of low light

Symptoms of high light



Baby Leaf Greens

- 18 to 30 mol·m⁻²·d⁻¹ (depending on crop)
- Not sensitive to tipburn at young age
- Lower light → longer crop turn or lower biomass
- Photoperiod: depends on species





Baby leaf greens yield increased up to 24-30 mol·m⁻²·d⁻¹

Photos & Figure: Charles Gagne, Cornell University

College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Collards

Lettuce

Herbs

- 12 to 20+ mol·m⁻²·d⁻¹ (depending on species)
- Need for more research
- Photoperiod: depends on species
 - Long day
 - Cilantro, dill, peppermint, spearmint
 - Short day
 - 'Blue Spice' basil, Stevi
 - Day neutral
 - 'Genovese' basil, oregano

Sweet Basil 'Nufar'

3 weeks after transplant

mol·m⁻²·d⁻¹ during seedling stage

| 12 | 23 | 35 |
|----|----|----|
| | | |



CornelicaLS of Agriculture and Life Sciences

Walters and Lopez, Produce Grower Magazine

6

Vine crops

Cucumbers

Minimum: 15 mol·m⁻²·d⁻¹, Optimum: 30+

Tomatoes

Minimum: 20 mol·m⁻²·d⁻¹, Optimum: 30+

Sweet Peppers

Minimum: 15 mol·m⁻²·d⁻¹, Optimum: 20+

Photoperiod: all day-neutral plants for flowering

- Tomatoes and peppers require a 6-hour dark period
 - Continuous light causes physiological disorder (leaf chlorosis, smaller plant size and yield)





What type of light?





Lighting for several hundred hours per year

Examples

- year-round vegetable production in northern climates
- sole source lighting





Katherine Rogers and Kale Harbick DLI target: 17 mol·m⁻²·d⁻¹ Fixtures p

²·d⁻¹ Fixtures provide 200 μmol·m⁻²·s⁻² PPFD

Electricity costs are expensive

Costs per kWh vary from 8.8¢ (OK) to 22.7¢ (RI) Residential prices U.S. average is 13.2¢



| State | Cost (¢/kWh) | | | |
|---------------|-----------------|--|--|--|
| Hawaii | 32.1 | | | |
| Rhode Island | 22.7 | | | |
| Massachusetts | 22.5 | | | |
| Alaska | 21.8 | | | |
| Connecticut | 21.5 | | | |
| New Hampshire | 20.0 | | | |
| California | 18.3 | | | |
| New York | 17.3 | | | |
| Maine | 17.3 | | | |
| Vermont | 16.7 | | | |

Need to add light during warm cloudy days (and don't want to add additional heat to canopy)



Thermal images of strawberry plants under supplemental HPS lighting (Left) and ambient solar irradiance (right)



24

Not relying on HIDs to fulfill greenhouse heating requirements

- Some greenhouses account for waste heat from HID and reduce boiler size accordingly
- LEDs still provide some waste heat





Limitations to electrical grid – adopting LEDs may help you expand without adding electrical capacity





https://www.thisiscolossal.com/ Photo by Tom Hegen

Selecting a lighting fixture

- Photosynthetic photon efficacy
 - Typical units µmol/j
 - Note: $umol/j \times 3.6 = mol/kWh$
- Initial cost (\$/fixture x # of fixtures)
- Lifespan (often reported to 70 or 90% output)
- Bulb replacement cost
- Installation cost
- Shading of fixture
- Uniformity of light plan
- Wavelength/light quality?





Which LEDs meet energy efficiency and reliability criteria?

DLC Horticultural Lighting Qualified Products List (QPL)

- Fixtures registered with DLC meet several minimum requirements
- Fixtures design for North American AC line voltage
- Many utility companies use this list to decide if a fixture qualifies for energy efficiency incentives
- Specification revised every 2 years to become more rigorous



Which LEDs meet energy efficiency and reliability criteria?

DLC Horticultural Lighting (version 2.1), minimum requirements:

- Photosynthetic Photon Efficacy (PPE) \geq 1.9 μ mol/j
- Photon Flux Maintenance $(Q_{90}) \ge 36,000$ hours
 - i.e. # of hours until light output is degraded to 90% of original output
- Driver lifetime \geq 50,000 hours
- Fan lifetime \geq 50,000 hours
- Warranty: fixtures \geq 5 years; lamps \geq 3 years



Design Lights Consortium



| TESTED PHOTOMETRIC PERFORMANCE | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Tested Photosynthetic Photon Efficacy (400-700nm) 🕕 | 3.46 µmol/J | | | | | | | |
| Tested Photosynthetic Photon Flux (400-700nm) 🕕 | 1821 μmol/s | | | | | | | |
| Tested Photon Flux Blue (400- 500nm) 🕕 | 196 µmol/s | | | | | | | |
| Tested Photon Flux Green (500- 600nm) 🕕 | 103 µmol/s | | | | | | | |
| Tested Photon Flux Red (600- 700nm) 🕕 | 1522 μmol/s | | | | | | | |
| Tested Photon Flux Far Red (700- 800nm) 🕕 | 9 µmol/s | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

| Tested Photosynthetic Photon Flux (µmol/s) 1480 - 5000 | |
|---|--|
| 1480 - 5000 | |
| | |
| | |
| Fested Photon Flux Blue (μmol/s) | |
| 1460 - 5000 | |
| | |
| Fested Photon Flux Green (μmol/s) | |
| 380 - 5000 | |
| | |
| fested Photon Flux Red (umol/s) | |
| | |
| 1940 - 5000 | |
| | |
| fested Input Wattage | |
| 0 - 2000 | |
| | |
| | |
| fested Photosynthetic Photon Efficacy (μmol/J) | |
| 3.1 - 5 | |
| | |
| Tested Power Factor | |
| 0.00 1 | |
| 0.00 - 1 | |
| | |
| Fested Total Harmonic Distortion | |
| 0 - 0.24 | |
| | |
| Tested DC Photon Efficacy (280-800nm) | |
| A D S | |
| 1.8 - 5 | |
| | |
| | |

Approaches to Maximize

Profits



https://www.designlights.org/horticultural-lighting/

| | Solid | State Lighting | Horticultural Lighting | Lighting Contro | ols Current Eff | orts News and Ev |
|--|-------|----------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| Clear All Filters | | H-PLS0JDZ | VR-2X-I-x-xx-xxx-xx-x | Fluence Bioengineering Inc. | Fluence Bioengineering | VYPR 2x PhysioSpec Indoor |
| Manufacturer 🚽 | • | H-0WNDYAR | HT-02 Uniformity Pro 320W | FGI | Forever Green Indoors Inc | FGI Uniformity Pro 320 |
| Listing Status + | | H-ZI8J8X3 | HT-02 Uniformity Pro 640W | FGI | Forever Green Indoors Inc | FGI Uniformity Pro LED |
| Technical Requirements Version 4 Number | | H-AMU5JMO | ZK2-ML600- [SP01,SP02]/D | SANANBIO | Fujian Sanan Sino-Science Photobiotech Co., Ltd | 625W LED grow light |
| Product Function + Product Categories + | | H-S0O25G3 | ZK2-TL300- [SP01,SP02]/D | SANANBIO | Fujian Sanan Sino-Science Photobiotech Co., Ltd | 300W LED grow light |
| State Compliance | | H-CNRSSYT | ZK2-TL600- [SP01,SP02]/D | SANANBIO | Fujian Sanan Sino-Science Photobiotech Co., Ltd | 600W LED grow light |
| | | H-R0A9JR4 | GEHTL-HPPB4- (2,3)NX1 | GE Current a Daintree company | GE Current, a Daintree company | ARIZE ELEMENT L1000 |

www.glase.org

ABOUT ~

MEMBERSHIP ~

GLASE Webinar Series

AI Technology at the

September 23, 2023

Controlled Environment

Agriculture Innovation Center

AI Technology at the Controlled

Environment Agriculture Innovation Center

Response of cannabinoid hemp to light

quantity

- Lighting research
- **Webinars**
- Newsletter

Cornell**CALS**

College of Agriculture and Life Sciences

Annual shortcourse



GLASE

Design considerations for large scale CEA projects

October 19, 2023





Response of cannabinoid hemp to light quantity and quality

GLASE Webinar Series Towards a Sustainable Lifecycle in Controlled Environment Agriculture (CEA) Mava Ezzeddine Schneider Electric

EVENTS ~

MY ACCOUNT ~

Towards a Sustainable Lifecycle in Controlled **Environment Agriculture**

August 17, 2023

CALENDAR



Panel: Small-Scale CEA Growers

hortlamp.uga.edu



Lighting Approaches to Maximize Profits



United States National Institute Department of of Food Agriculture and Agriculture

This work is funded by USDA-NIFA-SCRI Award Number # 2018-51181-28365 Project 'Lighting Approaches to Maximize Profits'





| $\leftarrow \ \ \rightarrow \ \ G$ | | https://uga-lighting-calc.shinyapps.io/supplementalcalc/ | | | | | |
|--|------|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----|------|--|
| SupplementalCalc | Home | Add Location | Add Greenhouse Design | Required Supplemental Lighting | FAQ | Quit | |



Lighting Approaches to Maximize Profits Welcome to our 'How large should my lighting system be' calculator!

With this calculator, users specify on how many days of year they want to be able to reach the target DLI (expressed as a percentage of 365 days). After entering what percentage of days you want to reach the target DLI, the calculator will determine the required lighting capacity, and provide a graphical summary of the lighting conditions you can expect in your greenhouse. This lighting system also estimates the demand charge, associated with the use of the lighting system. This calculator is particularly useful for the design of new lighting installations.

ជ

Enter Greenhouse Location

Location Name

(Enter a unique identifier for your Location)

| Grand Rapids, MI |
|-------------------------------|
| Zip Code (5 digits) |
| 49501 |
| Electricity Rate (\$/kWh) ? |
| \$0.105 |

Save



Step 1

Enter:

- Location name
- Zip code
- Electricity rate





College

Enter Greenhouse Design

Step 2A

Enter:

- Length
- Width
- Transmission % (typically) 45-70%





Step 2B

Enter:

- Target DLI
- Lighting efficacy (typically 1.2 3.0+ μmol/J)
- Percentage of day where you reach target DLI
 - Is 100% necessary? Requires greater installation
- Hours on, ex:
 - Lettuce can be lit continuously
 - Fruiting crops require 4-6 hr dark period
- Demand charge for electricity (\$/kW)
 - Based on highest usage in a single 15-minute period during the month



Required Supplemental Lighting

| Location |
|------------------|
| Grand Rapids, MI |
| Design |

| Update | Adjust | Reset |
|----------|--------|-------|
| 🕹 Downlo | ; | |

gutter connect

Lownload Adjusted Results

Press the Update Button to view results

WARNING: Press the Adjust Button to adjust the supplemental DLI capacity AFTER clicking on the chart

Press the Reset Button to revert changes

Results

| Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Grower Input

Monthly Area Lighting %

| Greenhouse Transmission (%) | Target DLI (mol/m2/day) | Lighting Efficacy (umol/J) | Electricity Cost (\$/kWh) | Hours On | Demand Charge (\$/kW/month) | Percentile (%) | Area (ft2) |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| 60.00 | 17.00 | 3.00 | 0.10 | 20.00 | 6.00 | 90.00 | 21600.00 |

Sunlight (accounting for transmission)





Red line indicates the target DLI of 17(mol/m2/d)

Weekly Lighting Cost

| Week | \$ Per ft2 | \$ Per acre | \$ Total Design |
|------|---------------|----------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 0.079 | 3,448 | 1,710 |
| 2 | 0.065 | 2,837 | 1,407 |
| 3 | 0.056 | 2,422 | 1,201 |
| 4 | 0.048 | 2,110 | 1,046 |

Annual Lighting Cost

| \$ Per ft2 | \$ Per acre | \$ Total Design |
|------------|-------------|-----------------|
| 1.435 | 62,519 | 31,001 |

Annual Demand Cost

| \$ Per ft2 | \$ Per acre | \$ Total Design |
|------------|-------------|-----------------|
| 0.393 | 17,135 | 8,496 |

Supplemental Light



Required Lighting System Capacity

176 umol/m2/s

Max Supplemental DLI Capacity





College

Comparing 100% vs. 90% of days with target met

Annual Lighting Cost

| \$ Per ft2 | \$ Per acre | \$ Total Design |
|------------|-------------|-----------------|
| 1.435 | 62,519 | 31,001 |

Annual Demand Cost

Annual Lighting Cost

| \$ Per ft2 \$ Per acre | | \$ Total Design | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1.481 64,492 31,979 | | | | | | | |
| Annual Demand Cost | | | | | | | |
| \$ Per ft2 | \$ Per acre | \$ Total Design | | | | | |
| 0.497 | 21,637 | 10,729 | | | | | |

| \$ Per ft2 | \$ Per acre | \$ Total Design | | \$ Per ft2 | \$ Per acre | \$ Total Design |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------|------------|-------------|-----------------|
| 0.393 | 17,135 | 8,496 | | 0.497 | 21,637 | 10,729 |
| 90% of days | | vs tar | get me | et | 100% of d | ays |







ted line indicates the maximum supplemental DLI needed, which is 12.7(mol/m2/d)

```
Required Lighting System Capacity
```

176 umol/m2/s

Max Supplemental DLI Capacity

12.7 mol/m2/d



Red line indicates the maximum supplemental DLI needed, which is 16.04(mol/m2/d)

Required Lighting System Capacity 223 umol/m2/s

Max Supplemental DLI Capacity

16.04 mol/m2/d

90% of days

target met

100% of days



Target DLI Reached

TRUE





Fixtures needed and electricity cost - Inputs

| | Α | В | С | D | E | | | | |
|----|--|-------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | LAMPS NEEDED CALCULATOR | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | estimating lamp needs for greenhouse space | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | © Neil Matts | on, Cornel | l University | y 4/23/15 | | | | | |
| 4 | Updated Ma | y 2021, no | te that PPE | in µmol/J | is now used | | | | |
| 5 | Use the tabs | Lamp 1 an | d Lamp 2 t | o input the | e data for tv | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Fill in yellow | highlighted | d boxes | | | | | | |
| 8 | 200 | Target inst | tantaneous | s light inter | nsity (µmol/ | | | | |
| 9 | 1090 | Lamp pow | e <mark>r con</mark> sum | ption (W) | | | | | |
| 10 | 43560 | Area to lig | ht (square | feet), note | that there | | | | |
| 11 | 1.80 | Photosynt | hetic photo | on efficacy | (PPE, µmol/ | | | | |
| 12 | 10% | percent lig | ht lost fror | m edge eff | ects | | | | |
| 13 | 2000 | total hour | s lights are | on per yea | ar | | | | |
| 14 | \$0.160 | cost of ele | ctricity (\$/I | kWh) | | | | | |
| 15 | \$350 | cost of ind | lividual ligh | nt fixture (\$ | /fixture) | | | | |



Hypothetical Fixture 1

HPS DE

- 200 $\mu mol\ m^{-2}\ s^{-1}$
- 2,000 hours annually

44

Fixtures needed and electricity cost - Results

| | А | В | С | D | Е | F | G | H | | |
|----|--------------|--------------|---|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|--|--|
| 17 | Calculations | (don't mo | dify these l | ooxes) | | | | | | |
| 18 | 4,047 | Square me | quare meters to light (note 1 square meter = 10.7639 square feet) | | | | | | | |
| 19 | 1,962 | Lamp outp | amp output μmol/s | | | | | | | |
| 20 | 413 | Light fixtu | res needed | l without e | dge effects | 5 | | | | |
| 21 | 459 | Light fixtu | res needed | l with edge | effects | | | | | |
| 22 | \$160,650 | Total cost | of light fixt | ures (assu | ming edge | effects) | | | | |
| 23 | 1,000,620 | kWh of ele | ectricity to | light this m | any lamps | for the giv | en numbe | r of hours | | |
| 24 | \$160,099 | electricty o | cost (\$/are | a in cell A8 | /yr) | | | | | |
| 25 | \$3.68 | electricity | cost (\$/sqı | uare foot/y | r) | | | | | |
| 26 | \$39.56 | electricity | cost (\$/m² | /yr) | | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | *Note* place | ement of la | mps shoul | d be deter | mined by a | a lighting p | rofessional | to optimize | | |
| 29 | | Lamps nee | eded may b | be somewh | at more if | want unifo | orm lighting | g at the edges | | |



https://www.hortlamp.org/outreach.html

Comparing 2 Fixtures

| | Α | В | С | D | E | | | | |
|----|----------------|-------------------|--|---------------|--------------|--|--|--|--|
| 7 | Fill in yellov | v highlight | ed boxes | | | | | | |
| 8 | 200 | Target inst | Γarget instantaneous light intensity (μmol/r | | | | | | |
| 9 | 1090 | Lamp pow | er consum | ption (W) | | | | | |
| 10 | 43560 | Area to lig | ht (square | feet), note | that there a | | | | |
| 11 | 1.80 | Photosynt | hetic photo | on efficacy | (PPE, µmol/ | | | | |
| 12 | 10% | percent lig | ght lost from | n edge eff | ects | | | | |
| 13 | 2000 | total hour | s lights are | on per yea | ar | | | | |
| 14 | \$0.160 | cost of ele | ctricity (\$/I | ‹Wh) | | | | | |
| 15 | \$350 | cost of ind | lividual ligh | t fixture (\$ | /fixture) | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Calculation | s (don't m | odify these | boxes) | | | | | |
| 18 | 4,047 | Square me | eters to ligh | nt (note 1 s | quare meter | | | | |
| 19 | 1,962 | Lamp outp | out µmol/s | | | | | | |
| 20 | 413 | Light fixtu | res needed | without e | dge effects | | | | |
| 21 | 459 | Light fixtu | res needed | with edge | effects | | | | |
| 22 | \$160,650 | Total cost | of light fixt | ures (assu | ming edge e | | | | |
| 23 | 1,000,620 | kWh of ele | ectricity to | light this m | any lamps f | | | | |
| 24 | \$160,099 | electricty of | cost (\$/area | a in cell A8 | /yr) | | | | |
| 25 | \$3.68 | electricity | cost (\$/squ | iare foot/y | vr) | | | | |
| 26 | \$39.56 | electricity | cost (\$/m², | /yr) | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | alculations | Lamp 1 | Lamp 2 | + | | | | |

46



Comparing 2 Fixtures





Lamp 1

- DE HPS
- PPE: 1.8 μmol/J
- Cost: \$350



Lamp 2

- LED
- PPE: 3.1 μmol/J
- Cost: \$950

200 μmol m⁻² s⁻¹ target, 2,000 hours annually Lighting 1 acre, 10% light loss to edges Electricity at **\$0.08 vs. \$0.16** / kWh



Comparing 2 Fixtures

| | А | В | С | D | E | F | G | | |
|----|---|--------------|-------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|-------------|----------------|--|--|
| 28 | Summary s | tatistics co | mparing L | amp 1 vs. L | .amp 2 (do | n't modify | these boxes | | |
| 29 | \$3.69 | Cost to pu | rchase Lan | np 1 (\$/sf) | | | | | |
| 30 | \$10.90 | Cost to pu | rchase Lan | np 2 (\$/sf) | | | | | |
| 31 | \$1.84 | Electricity | cost Lamp | 1 (\$/sf/yr) | | | | | |
| 32 | \$1.07 | Electricity | cost Lamp | 2 (\$/sf/yr) | | | | | |
| 33 | 9.36 | Simple pay | yback in ye | ars for Lan | np <mark>2 v</mark> s. Lar | mp 1 (diffe | rence in upfı | | |
| 34 | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | *Note* placement of lamps should be determined by a lighting professional | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | | Lamps nee | eded may <mark>k</mark> | be somewh | nat more if | want unifo | orm lighting a | | |



Simple payback =

upfront price difference annual electricity price difference



Comparing 2 Fixtures

| | А | В | С | D | E | F | G | |
|----|------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 28 | Summary s | tatistics co | mparing L | amp 1 vs. L | .amp 2 (do | n't modify | these boxe | es) |
| 29 | \$3.69 | Cost to pu | rchase Lan | np 1 (\$/sf) | | | | |
| 30 | \$10.90 | Cost to pu | rchase Lan | np 2 (\$/sf) | | | | |
| 31 | \$3.68 | Electricity | cost Lamp | 1 (\$/sf/yr) | | | | |
| 32 | \$2.13 | Electricity | cost Lamp | 2 (\$/sf/yr) | | | | |
| 33 | 4.68 | Simple pay | yback in ye | ars for Lan | np 2 vs. Lar | np 1 (diffe | rence in up | ofre |
| 34 | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | *Note* pla | cement of | lamps sho | uld be dete | ermined by | a lighting | profession | al t |
| 36 | | Lamps nee | eded may b | be somewh | at more if | want unifo | orm lighting | g a' |
| | | | | | | | | |



Simple payback =

upfront price difference annual electricity price difference



Importance of light spectrum Greenhouse Supplemental Lighting

- Sunlight provides full spectrum
- Most spectral studies don't see significant differences in the greenhouse environment
- Favor high efficacy fixtures unless known crop responses to spectrum





Response of baby leaf greens to greenhouse lighting from LED or HPS





Lettuce results across 12-months

- DLI 17 mol·m⁻²·d⁻¹
- HPS: Gavita Pro 6/750e Flex US DE
- LED: Philips GreenPower toplighting DR/B -Low Blue
- HPS yield favored in Nov. to Feb., plus June
- LED yield favored in Aug. and Sept.
- Averaged across year, yield not impacted by fixture

Lettuce relative fresh yield HPS vs. LED





T-Test comparing HPS to LED light for a given month, NS, *, **, *** are non-significant or significant at $P \le 0.05$, 0.01, or 0.001, respectively

Importance of light spectrum Sole-Source Lighting

Vertical Farm with leafy greens
 Spectral distribution broad spectrum including far-red





Photo: Plenty









www.glase.org

Neil Mattson

nsm47@cornell.edu



hortlamp.uga.edu



This work is funded by USDA-NIFA-SCRI Award Number # 2018-51181-28365 Project 'Lighting Approaches to Maximize Profits'