Zinfandel Heritage Vineyard

Jim Wolpert and Mike Anderson

Department of Viticulture and Enology, UC Davis



Clonal Variation

- Amount of clonal variation is dependent on:
 Rate of favorable mutations
 - Length of time a cultivar has been cultivated
 - How much effort you spend looking for variability

FPMS Zinfandel Selections Tested

<u>FPMS #</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Heat</u>	
01A	Handel 1V4	None	
02	Handel 1V6	None	
03	Ruetz #1	None	
06	Zin 01A	117 day	

Winemakers' Complaints About Certified Zinfandel Clones

Clusters are large, tight and rot-prone

Berries are large

Wines tend to have poor color and varietal character

Conclusion: Good for "white" but not for "red"

How to improve Zinfandel

- Return to the place of origin for diversity

 Burgundy, Bordeaux, Chianti
- Other countries where history is significant
 Argentina, Chile, Australia
- Old plantings locally

Zinfandel Safari Scouts and Trailblazers Amand Kasimatis **Rhonda Smith** Ed Weber Janet Caprile Paul Verdegaal Jack Foott Donna Hirschfelt **Glenn** McGourty

Criteria for Inclusion in Heritage Vineyard

Vineyard age of more than 60 years

Loose clusters and small berries

No "red leaf" in the fall

Often more than one selection was made from the same vineyard

Additional Criteria

• Geographic diversity

• The "story"

Zinfandel Heritage Vineyard





Oakville Experimental Vineyard Zinfandel Heritage Vineyard

90 Selections
 Phase I – 63 selections budded 1995-96
 Phase II – 27 selections budded 1999

9' x 8' spacing

Saint George Rootstock

Head-Trained – Spur Pruned

Gravelly Bale Loam



Additional Protocol

- Numbers only no identity
 - Donor vineyards requested anonymity
 - Location bias
 - Oakville is Oakville

Oakville Experimental Vineyard Heritage Zinfandel - 1999 - 01



Oakville Experimental Vineyard Heritage Zinfandel - 1998 - 01



Zinfandel Selection

Oakville Experimental Vineyard Heritage Zinfandel - 1998 - 01



Zinfandel Heritage Vineyard (Phase I) 1998 - 2003 harvest data (except as noted)

	99-03	99-03			
		Cluster	Cluster	Berry	Berry
	Yield	Per	Weight	per	Weight
	(kg vine ⁻¹)	Vine	(g)	Cluster	(g berry ⁻¹)
ALL mean	4.8	21	244	136	1.8
ALL std	0.9	2	34	15	0.2
ALL high	7.5	25	331	176	2.4
ALL low	3.3	18	157	98	1.4
Primitivo					
FPMS 03	4.2	24	185	107	1.8
FPMS 05	3.5	23	157	112	1.4
FPMS 06	3.8	24	170	98	1.7
FPMS1a	4.7	19	257	141	1.9
FPMS2	3.9	20	208	118	1.8
FPMS3	3.9	19	219	122	1.8

Conclusions – Phase 1

- Zinfandel selections show variability in yield components (cluster wt and berry wt)
- FPS selections do not appear to be distinctly different from field selections
- The greatest differences are between Zinfandel selections and Primitivo clones

New Phase 2 Vineyard

- 22 Selections, 4 FPS and 18 Heritage
- Rootstock: St. George
- Spacing: 1.8 m x 2.4 m (6 x 8 ft, v x r)
- Head-trained, spur-pruned
- 5 replicates, 18 vines/rep

Analyses and Calculations

- Growth components: pruning wt, shoot number (shoot wt)
- Yield components: fruit wt, cluster number, berry wt (cluster wt, berries per cluster)
- Juice composition: Brix, TA and pH
- Wine lots: unreplicated, half-ton bin lots

Conclusions – Phase 2

- Zinfandel selections show less variability in the yield component of berry wt
- FPS selections do not appear to be distinctly different from field selections
- The greatest differences are between the Zinfandel selections and the Primitivo clones

Phase 3

- 3 sites
 - Sonoma Valley full trial, data + wine
 - Sonoma Dry Creek full trial, data + wine
 - Paso Robles abbreviated trial, data

Support for this Project by:

ZAP Zinfandel Advocates and Producers

AVF American Vineyard Foundation

IAB

Fruit Tree, Nut Tree, Grapevine Improvement Advisory Board

Additional Acknowledgements

- Deborah A. Golino, Adib Rowhani, Susan T. Sim
 - Foundation Plant Services, UC Davis

