

**THE EFFECT OF CROP LOAD AND EXTENDED RIPENING ON WINE QUALITY AND VINE
BALANCE IN VITIS VINIFERA CV. CABERNET SAUVIGNON**

By

Carrie McDonnell Wood

Discipline of Wine and Horticulture

School of Agriculture, Food and Wine

Faculty of Science

University of Adelaide

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at

The University of Adelaide

July 4, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	X
STATEMENT	XII
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	XIII
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	XIV
LIST OF FIGURES	XVII
LIST OF TABLES	XXI
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.1.1 Berry Ripening	2
1.1.2 Ripeness.....	3
1.2 Berry Composition and Accumulation	4
1.2.1 Primary Metabolites	4
1.2.2 Secondary Metabolites	4
1.2.3 Ripening Effects on Flavor Compounds.....	5
1.3 Flavor Compounds: Methoxypyrazines.....	6
1.3.1 IBMP	7
1.3.2 Sensory Evaluation and Methoxypyrazines.....	9
1.4 Transport and Berry Ripening	9
1.5 Extended Berry Ripening	10
1.5.1 Problems with Extended Ripening	11
1.5.2 Weight Loss from Extended Berry Ripening	12
1.5.3 Shortened Post Harvest Period	13
1.5.4 Impact of Extended Ripening on Must and Fruit Nutrition.....	14
1.6 Crop Load.....	15
1.6.1 Measuring Crop Load.....	15

1.6.2	Crop Load and Vine Balance	15
1.6.3	Effects of Crop Load	16
1.6.4	Crop Adjustment	16
1.6.5	Conflicting Responses of Crop Level Adjustment.....	17
1.6.6	Timing of Crop Adjustment	18
1.6.7	Importance of Crop Load Research.....	18
1.7	Sensory Analysis	19
1.7.1	Definition of Sensory Analysis	19
1.7.2	Testing Methods	19
1.7.3	Importance of Sensory Analysis in Viticultural Research.....	20
1.8	Conclusion.....	20
CHAPTER 2: GENERAL MATERIALS AND METHODS		23
2.1	Experimental Site	23
2.1.1	Vineyard Characteristics	23
2.1.2	Standard Management Practices.....	24
2.2	Field Experiments.....	25
2.2.1	Experiment 1: Effects of Crop Load and Extended Ripening	25
2.2.2	Experiment 2: Crop Load and Late Season Irrigation on Extended Ripening	28
2.3	Phenological Growth and Annual Rainfall.....	29
2.4	Statistical Analysis	29
2.5	Hypotheses	31
CHAPTER 3: EFFECTS OF CROP LOAD AND EXTENDED RIPENING ON YIELD COMPONENTS AND VINE GROWTH		33
3.1	Introduction and Experimental Aims	33
3.2	Materials and Methods	36
3.2.1	Berry Components.....	36
3.2.2	Yield Components.....	37

3.2.3	Vine Growth Measurements.....	38
3.2.4	Grapevine Nutrition and Shoot Soluble and Insoluble Carbohydrates.....	39
3.2.5	Statistical Analysis	39
3.3	Results	40
3.3.1	Berry Components.....	40
3.3.2	Yield Components.....	45
3.3.3	Vine Growth Measurements.....	53
3.3.4	Grapevine Nutrition and Soluble and Insoluble Carbohydrates	60
3.4	Discussion.....	62
3.4.1	The Effects of Crop Load and °Brix at Harvest on Berry Components	62
3.4.2	Effect of Crop Load and Extended Ripening on other Yield Components	68
3.4.3	Effect of Crop Load and Extended Ripening on Vine Growth.....	73
3.4.4	Grapevine Nutrition and Soluble and Insoluble Carbohydrates	79
3.5	Conclusions	81
CHAPTER 4: EFFECTS OF CROP LOAD AND EXTENDED RIPENING ON FRUIT AND WINE COMPOSITION ...		85
4.1	Introduction and Experimental Aims	85
4.2	Materials and Methods	87
4.2.1	Berry Development	87
4.2.2	Harvest Juice Chemistry.....	88
4.2.3	Fermentation and Winemaking Details	88
4.2.4	Wine Color and Phenolics	90
4.3	Results	91
4.3.1	Berry Development	91
4.3.2	Harvest Juice Chemistry.....	101
4.3.3	Wine Composition.....	107
4.3.4	Wine Color and Phenolics	111

4.4	Discussion	122
4.4.1	Treatment Effects on Berry Development.....	122
4.4.2	Treatment Effects on Harvest Juice Chemistry	130
4.4.3	Treatment Effects on Wine Composition	137
4.4.2	Treatment Effects on Wine Color and Phenolics	143
4.5	Conclusions	152
CHAPTER 5: EFFECTS OF CROP LOAD AND EXTENDED RIPENING ON WINE SENSORY ANALYSIS.....		155
5.1	Introduction and Experimental Aims	155
5.2	Materials and Methods	156
5.2.1	Difference Testing.....	156
5.3	Expert Panel	157
5.3.1	Descriptive Analysis.....	159
5.3.2	Scaled Attribute Rating	163
5.3.3	Consumer Preference	163
5.3.4	Statistical Analysis	164
5.4	Results	164
5.4.1	Difference Testing.....	164
5.4.2	Expert Panel	165
5.4.3	Descriptive Analysis.....	170
5.4.4	Scaled Attribute Ratings (Australian Panel).....	186
5.4.5	Consumer Testing.....	187
5.5	Discussion	189
5.5.1	Difference Testing.....	189
5.5.2	Expert Panel	190
5.5.3	Descriptive Analysis.....	199
5.5.4	Scaled Attribute Ratings (Australian panel).....	202

5.5.5	Consumer Testing.....	207
5.6	Conclusions	208
CHAPTER 6: EFFECTS OF CROP LOAD AND LATE SEASON IRRIGATION ON EXTENDED RIPENING.....		213
6.1	Introduction and Experimental Aims	213
6.2	Materials and Methods	215
6.2.1	Experimental Design	215
6.2.2	Leaf Water Potential.....	216
6.2.3	Yield Components	217
6.2.4	Vine Growth and Canopy Density.....	218
6.2.5	Fruit and Wine Composition	218
6.2.6	Wine Color and Phenolics	219
6.2.7	Wine Sensory.....	219
6.2.8	Statistical Analysis	222
6.3	Results	222
6.3.1	Leaf Water Potential.....	222
6.3.2	Yield Components	224
6.3.3	Vine Growth.....	231
6.3.4	Berry Development	235
6.3.5	Fruit and Wine Composition	242
6.3.6	Wine Color and Phenolics	246
6.3.7	Wine Sensory.....	249
6.4	Discussion.....	251
6.4.1	Treatment Effects on Leaf Water Potential	251
6.4.2	Treatment Effects on Yield Components	252
6.4.3	Treatment Effects on Vine Growth	258
6.4.4	Crop Load and Irrigation Effects on Berry Development	262

6.4.5	Fruit and Wine Composition	264
6.4.6	Effects of Crop Load and Irrigation on Wine Color and Phenolics	268
6.4.7	Effects of Crop Load and Irrigation on Wine Sensory	272
6.5	Conclusions	274
CHAPTER 7: INTEGRATIVE DISCUSSION		279
7.1	Introduction to the Experiment.....	279
7.2	Effects of Crop Load	280
7.3	Effects of Extended Ripening.....	285
7.4	The Interaction of Crop Load and Extended Ripening.....	287
7.5	Economic Evaluation	288
7.5.1	Grower Perspective Model	289
7.5.2	Winery Perspective Model	289
7.5.3	Economic Analysis: Experiment 2	291
7.6	Recommendations to the Industry and Further Research.....	293
APPENDIX 1: BERRY COLLECTION PROTOCOL USED FOR ALL BERRY SAMPLES WITHIN BOTH THE CROP LOAD X EXTENDED RIPENING AND CROP LOAD X IRRIGATION EXPERIMENTS.		299
APPENDIX 2: CEPTOMETER PROTOCOL FOR LAI AND PAR MEASUREMENTS		300
APPENDIX 3: GRAPEVINE PETIOLE AND BLADE NUTRITION COLLECTED AT BLOOM 2008.....		301
APPENDIX 4: NUTRIENT ADDITION SCHEDULE USED FOR ALL EXPERIMENT FERMENTATIONS		302
APPENDIX 5: PROCEDURE FOR TITRATABLE ACIDITY OF MUST		303
APPENDIX 6: WINEMAKING PROTOCOL		304
APPENDIX 7: SPECTROPHOTOMETER SAMPLE PREPARATION AND PROCEDURE FOR TOTAL PHENOLS AND COLOR DENSITY		307
APPENDIX 8: NOPA AND AMMONIUM PROCEDURE TO ACQUIRE YAN.....		308
APPENDIX 9: PREPARATION OF SAMPLES FOR FOSS WINE SCAN™ MODE		309
APPENDIX 10: SCHEMATIC MAP OF THE RESEARCH SITE FOR THE CROP LOAD AND LATE SEASON IRRIGATION EXPERIMENT (EXPERIMENT 2).....		310

APPENDIX 11: IRRIGATION SCHEDULE FOR THE CROP LOAD AND INCREASED IRRIGATION DURING LATE STAGES OF RIPENING EXPERIMENT.....	311
APPENDIX 12: SAMPLE TASTING SHEET FOR DIFFERENCE TESTING (TRIANGLE TEST)	312
APPENDIX 13: SCORING SHEET FOR DIFFERENCE SCREENING DONE PRIOR TO BLENDING IN 2007.....	313
APPENDIX 14: ASSAY FOR STARCH AND TOTAL SOLUBLE SOLIDS USED BY THE GU LAB.....	314
APPENDIX 15: SENSORY SCORE SHEET FOR DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS AROMAS.....	315
APPENDIX 16: SENSORY SCORE SHEET FOR DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS FLAVOR BY MOUTH.....	316
APPENDIX 17: SENSORY AROMA DESCRIPTORS AND REFERENCE MATERIALS	317
APPENDIX 18: HARVEST DATES FOR EACH TREATMENT 2005-2007.....	318
REFERENCES	319

ABSTRACT

Crop load reduction and extended ripening are two practices commonly required for wine grape growers with intention to improve wine quality; however, both cause significant yield loss. Studies on crop load have been conflicting and limited studies exist on extended ripening—warranting further research. The aim of this study was to investigate the interaction of crop load and extended ripening on yield components, wine and fruit composition and to increase understanding of the synchronization of flavor ripeness with sugar ripeness through optimal vine balance. In 2005, 2006 and 2007 a commercial vineyard of clone 8 Cabernet Sauvignon located in Paso Robles, CA was adjusted to four crop levels post fruit set. Each crop level was harvested at five target °Brix levels from 22.5-28.5 °Brix and fermented into wine. Yield components, growth, wine and fruit composition, and wine sensory were measured and assessed on all replicated treatments. A second experiment was conducted in 2006-2007 to investigate the effects of crop load and late season irrigation on extended ripening.

Grapevines exhibited self regulation in growth and yield component compensation. Yield components were reduced from both crop thinning and extended ripening. Pruning weight per vine increased in treatments thinned to lower crop loads in all three seasons, indicating changes in vegetative growth from the crop thinning. Consequently, the light environment within the fruiting zone was effected. Average berry weight, cluster weight and berries per cluster were inversely related to crop load. Extended ripening increased wine color density and anthocyanins each year. Additionally, the lowest crop loads consistently had the lowest color density.

Results from the descriptive analysis characterized the wines, and showed opposing differences between treatments harvested early (22.5-24.0 °Brix) versus those which underwent extended ripening and were harvested at the 27.0-28.5 °Brix target. Consumer acceptability ratings and

expert grading demonstrated that in general, wines from higher °Brix levels in all crop load treatments were preferred. However, the best wines were from treatments with the combination of higher crop load and higher target °Brix at harvest. These results suggest that wine quality can be improved with extended ripening, although significant yield is lost. Additionally, lowest crop load does not always produce highest wine quality. Crop thinning had a detrimental effect on wine quality by disturbing the natural balance of the vine, increasing vegetative growth and negatively affecting the light environment within the fruiting zone. Furthermore, crop thinning did not improve wine quality enough to justify the associated economic losses. Extended ripening proved to be an effective remediation tool for increasing wine quality; however, extended ripening to a target °Brix of 28.5 is not always necessary for well balanced vines. Increased irrigation late in ripening maintained significantly more berry weight and yield relative to the control, and had limited effects on wine quality—although careful monitoring is suggested to avoid wine quality reduction.

STATEMENT

This thesis contains no material which has been previously accepted for an award of any degree or diploma in any University and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the text.

I give my consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University of Adelaide Library, being available for loan or photocopying.

Carrie McDonnell Wood

July 4, 2011

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work would not have been possible without the support of Jerry Lohr of J. Lohr Vineyards and Wines. His immeasurable contribution to this research aided in both the success and completion of the project—thank you Jerry, for taking a chance and believing in me. In addition, I would like to thank everyone at J. Lohr Vineyards and Wines who assisted at any level on this research, and specifically to: Kim Adams, Steve Carter, Ricardo Garcia, Steve Lohr, Kim Lutz, Jeff Meier, Alex Morfin, Genevieve Sharma, Brian Thompson, John Walter and Brenden Wood.

I greatly acknowledge Dr Peter Dry, whom I was honored and privileged to work with as my principal supervisor. Dr Dry is not only a remarkable supervisor and mentor, but a person of utmost integrity. I will be forever thankful for his guidance and friendship.

Additionally, I would like to thank Dr Robert Wample for his valuable contribution as my external supervisor, Dr Susan Bastian for her guidance on wine sensory, and Dr Chris Ford for his efforts as graduate coordinator. As a remote candidature student, I compliment the University of Adelaide and associated staff in facilitating my research program on a truly international level.

Thanks to Martin Mendez and Dr Nick Dokoozlian of E. & J. Gallo, for conducting the IBMP analysis. Additionally to Dr Sanliang Gu at CSU Fresno for his assistance on carbohydrate testing.

Finally, I am truly thankful to my dear friends and family who were supportive every step of the way. And specifically to: my mother Jeanne, father Barry, grandmother Rosemary, stepfather Martin and my husband Brenden, for their enduring encouragement, love and support throughout the entirety of this endeavor.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>Abbreviation</i>	<i>Explanation and Units</i>
°	degrees
A	Absorbance
AOV	analysis of variance
BB	bud break
CD	color density—Absorbance (420nm) + Absorbance (520nm)
cl	crop load (clusters/vine)
CuSO ₄	Copper sulfate
DAA	days after anthesis
DAV	days after veraison
DI	double the standard irrigation
EMS	error mean squares
ETc	evapotranspiration rate of the crop—grapes
ETOH	ethyl alcohol
g	grams
g/L	grams per liter
ha	hectare
HCL	Hydrochloric acid
IBMP	3-isobutyl 2-methoxy pyrazine
Kc	crop coefficient
kg	kilogram
L	liter
LAI	leaf area index
LSD	least significant difference

LWP	leaf water potential (MPa or negative bars)
μL	microliter
mg	milligram
mL	milliliter
mm	millimeter
MPa	megapascal
MOG	material other than grapes
nm	nanometer
N	normality
NaOH	Sodium hydroxide
ng	nanogram
ng/L	nanograms per liter
NH_4^+	Ammonium
NOPA	alpha amino nitrogen (ppm)
PAR	photosynthetically active radiation ($\mu\text{mol photons (400-700 nm) m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$)
PCA	principle component analysis
pH	measurement of acidity
pml	post malolactic fermentation
ppb	parts per billion
ppm	parts per million
ppt	parts per trillion
P value	statistical significance
QDA	quantitative descriptive analysis
r	correlation coefficient
R^2	coefficient of determination

rpm	revolutions per minute
SD	standard irrigation
SO ₂	Sulfur dioxide
t	tonne(s)
t/ha	tonnes per hectare
TA	titratable acidity (g/L)
TSS	total soluble solids
TH	thinned
UN	unthinned
VA	volatile acidity
VSP	vertical shoot position
wt	weight
YAN	yeast assimilable nitrogen (ppm)
Y/P	yield to pruning ratio

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: Schematic representation of the crop load and extended ripening treatments across the research vineyard.....	27
Figure 3.1: Crop load effects on berry weight development during the ripening period in 2005, 2006, and 2007. a, b, c, respectively.	41
Figure 3.2: Treatment effects on weekly shoot growth in spring 2007 after two years of crop load and extended ripening treatments. * indicates that data was significantly different at $p < 0.05$ or otherwise not significant.	59
Figure 3.3: Treatment effects on weekly shoot growth in spring 2008 after three years of crop load and extended ripening treatments.....	59
Figure 3.4: The effect of crop load on berries per cluster across three years and calculated from peak mean cluster weight and berry weight.....	70
Figure 3.5: The effect of crop load and extended ripening on yield in tonnes per hectare (t/ha). The highest and lowest yield (t/ha) within each crop load are presented as an average of the three years 2005-2007. The lowest yields were always at the 28.5 °Brix target, regardless of crop load.	72
Figure 3.6: The effect of crop load on the percent (%) difference in pruning weight/vine (kg) relative to the unthinned (UN) for three vintage years.	74
Figure 3.7: Regression analysis of leaf area index at harvest LAI (harvest) and days after veraison (DAV) required to reach target °Brix for all treatments in 2007.....	76
Figure 3.8: The effect of crop load on leaf area index at harvest LAI (harvest) in 2007. Each column represents the average LAI (harvest) within each crop load. Columns with different letters differ significantly at $p < 0.001$	77
Figure 3.9: The interaction of crop load and °Brix at harvest on leaf area index LAI (harvest) measured at harvest in 2007.....	78
Figure 4.1: Crop load effects on °Brix development during the ripening period in 2005 (a), 2006 (b), and 2007 (c).....	92
Figure 4.2: Crop load effects on sugar (g) per berry during the ripening period in 2005 (a), 2006 (b), and 2007 (c).....	94
Figure 4.3: Seasonal affects on sugar accumulation in the 20 cl for sugar (g)/berry (Figure 4.3 a) and °Brix accumulation (Figure 4.3 b) in 2005, 2006 and 2007.	95
Figure 4.4: Seasonal affects on sugar accumulation in the UN for sugar (g)/berry (Figure 4.4 a) and °Brix accumulation (Figure 4.4 b) in 2005, 2006 and 2007.	96
Figure 4.5: Crop load effects on pH development during the ripening period in 2005 (a), 2006 (b), and 2007 (c).....	98
Figure 4.6: Crop load effects on titratable acidity (TA) development during ripening in 2005 (a), 2006 (b), and 2007 (c).	100

Figure 4.7: The relationship between tannins (mg/L) and clusters per vine (cl/vine) in three seasons...	119
Figure 4.8: The comparison of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on isobutyl methoxypyrazines (IBMP) in wine for the 2006 season. The grey dotted line implies an optimal threshold for IBMP.	121
Figure 4.9: The comparison of isobutyl methoxypyrazine concentrations (IBMP) ppt in each treatment relative to days after veraison to reach the target °Brix at harvest for the 2006 season.	122
Figure 4.10: The comparison of °Brix accumulation and sugar (g)/berry in the 20 cl and UN in 2007.	124
Figure 4.11: The seasonal comparison of °Brix accumulation relative to days after veraison for 2005 and 2007, in the 20 cl (Figure 4.11 a) and UN (Figure 4.11 b).....	126
Figure 4.12: Regression analysis of pH and °Brix, and TA and °Brix for 2005-07.....	129
Figure 4.13: The relationship between yeast assimilable nitrogen (YAN) ppm and pH in juice (pH juice) in 2007. Data for all crop load and target °Brix treatments.....	137
Figure 4.14: The interaction of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on ethanol (ETOH) in treatment wines for three seasons.....	141
Figure 4.15: The relationship between leaf area index at harvest LAI (harvest) and color density at press (CD press) in 2007.	146
Figure 4.16: Parallel linear regression model of color density at press (CD press) in wine made from crop load and extended ripening treatments in each year.....	148
Figure 4.17: Seasonal affects on color density (CD) post malolactic fermentation (pml) for 2005, 2006, and 2007 relative to target °Brix at harvest.....	149
Figure 5.1: Linear regression of attributes and wine scores from the expert panel in 2006 and 2007 treatment wines.....	169
Figure 5.2: Principal component diagram (PCA) of wines from the 20 crop load and °Brix at harvest treatments in 2005. Attributes and their associated axis are in black: lower case lettering represents aroma attributes and uppercase represents flavor attributes. Axis 1: 50.8 % Axis 2: 23.7 %	184
Figure 5.3: Principal component diagram of wines from the 20 crop load and °Brix at harvest treatments in 2006. Attributes and their associated axis are in black: lower case lettering represents aroma attributes and uppercase represents flavor attributes.....	185
Figure 5.4: Principal component diagram of wines from the 20 crop load and °Brix at harvest treatments in 2007. Attributes and their associated axis are in black: lower case lettering represents aroma attributes and uppercase represents flavor attributes.....	186
Figure 5.5: The effects of crop load and °Brix at harvest on consumer likability rating in 2006 treatment wines.....	189
Figure 5.6: Parallel linear regression of the interaction between crop load and °Brix at harvest on the expert panel wine score in three years.....	193
Figure 5.7: The interaction between crop load and °Brix at harvest on the vegetative rating of treatment wines by the expert panel in 2006.....	195

Figure 5.8: The interaction of crop load and °Brix at harvest on the attribute body rated by the expert panel.	196
Figure 5.9: The interaction of crop load and °Brix at harvest on the attribute flavor intensity rated by an expert panel.	198
Figure 5.10: The interaction of crop load and °Brix at harvest on ratings for the attribute quality in 2006 treatment wines.....	199
Figure 5.11: Parallel linear regression of the interaction of crop load and °Brix at harvest on three attributes in 2005 treatment wines rated by an Australian panel.....	206
Figure 6.1: The effects of increased irrigation late season on leaf water potential (LWP) for two crop loads in 2006. Figure 6.1(a) represents the thinned crop load (TH); Figure 6.1(b) represents the unthinned (UN) crop load.....	223
Figure 6.2: The effects of increased irrigation late season on leaf water potential (LWP) for two crop loads in 2007.....	224
Figure 6.3: The effects of crop load and increased irrigation late season on berry weight development during ripening in 2006. Figure 6.3 (a) represents the thinned (TH) crop load and Figure 6.3 (b) represents the unthinned (UN). The bold line represents the DI.	225
Figure 6.4: The effects of crop load and increased irrigation late season on berry weight development during ripening in 2007. Figure 6.4 (a) represents the thinned crop load and Figure 6.4 (b) represents the unthinned. The bold line represents the DI.....	226
Figure 6.5: Crop load and irrigation effects on °Brix development during the later stages of ripening in 2006. Figure 6.5 (a) is the thinned (TH) crop load and Figure 6.5 (b) is the unthinned (UN). The DI was initiated on 6-Sep-2006.	235
Figure 6.6: Crop load and irrigation effects on °Brix development during the later stages of ripening in 2007. Figure 6.6 (a) is the thinned (TH) crop load and Figure 6.6 (b) is the unthinned (UN). The DI was initiated on 30-Aug-2007.	236
Figure 6.7: Crop load and irrigation effects on sugar (g)/berry during the later stages of ripening in 2006. Figure 6.7 (a) is the thinned (TH) crop load and Figure 6.7 (b) is the unthinned (UN). The bold line represents the DI.....	237
Figure 6.8: Crop load and irrigation effects on sugar (g)/berry during the later stages of ripening in 2007. Figure 6.8 (a) is the thinned (TH) crop load and Figure 6.8 (b) is the unthinned (UN). The bold line represents the DI.....	238
Figure 6.9: Crop load and irrigation effects on pH development during the later stages of ripening in 2006. Figure 6.9 (a) is the thinned (TH) crop load and Figure 6.9 (b) is the unthinned (UN). The bold line represents the DI.....	239
Figure 6.10: Crop load and irrigation effects on pH development during the later stages of ripening in 2007. Figure 6.10 (a) is the thinned (TH) crop load and Figure 6.10 (b) is the unthinned (UN). The bold line represents the DI.....	240

Figure 6.11: Crop load and irrigation effects on TA development during the later stages of ripening in 2006. Figure 6.11 (a) is the thinned (TH) crop load and Figure 6.11 (b) is the unthinned (UN). The bold line represents the DI.....	241
Figure 6.12: Crop load and irrigation effects on TA development during the later stages of ripening in 2007. Figure 6.12 (a) is the thinned (TH) crop load and Figure 6.12 (b) is the unthinned (UN). The bold line represents the DI.....	242
Figure 6.13: The interaction of crop load and irrigation on tonnes per ha in 2007. Columns with different letters differ significantly by LSD.	258
Figure 6.14: The interaction of crop load and irrigation on juice pH in 2006. Columns with different letters differ significantly at $p < 0.01$	266
Figure 6.15: The interaction of crop load and irrigation on juice TA in 2006. Columns with different letters differ significantly at $p < 0.05$	267
Figure 6.16: The interaction of crop load and irrigation on total phenols in 2007, Columns with different letters differ significantly at $p < 0.05$	270
Figure 6.17: The interaction of crop load and irrigation on expert score for two years. Note: grey line represents the minimum score to meet quality expectation for dedicated wine brand. Note: wine quality increases or is more optimal as score decreases.	273
Figure 7.1: Common regression model for the negative linear relationship between clusters/vine and pruning weight/vine in 2007.....	281
Figure 7.2: Common regression model for the negative linear relationship between clusters/vine and mean cluster weight in 2007.....	281

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Key weather measurements and phenological dates within the 2005, 2006, and 2007 seasons	29
Table 3.1: Days after anthesis (DAA) and veraison (DAV) to reach peak berry weight for the three growing seasons.....	42
Table 3.2: The interaction of crop load and extended ripening on berry weight loss from peak berry weight to final berry weight in each crop load and over three seasons, <i>based on the berry development curves</i>	42
Table 3.3: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on berry components for three growing seasons.....	43
Table 3.4: Coefficient of determination and statistical significance level (p value) of the negative linear relationship between berry weight and DAV in three seasons. Significance level is denoted by ***p<0.001	43
Table 3.5: Interaction of crop load and extended ripening on berry weight loss from peak berry weight harvest to the lowest berry weight at harvest i.e. the 28.5 °Brix target in each crop load and over three seasons. Loss is expressed as percent (%) and relative to days after veraison required to reach the 28.5 °Brix target	44
Table 3.6: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on berries/cluster for three growing seasons ..	45
Table 3.7: Effect of crop load on berries/clusters for three growing seasons. Berries/clusters are a calculation of peak mean cluster wt (g)/peak berry weight (g)	45
Table 3.8: Average clusters/vine on crop load and °Brix at harvest treatments for three growing seasons.....	46
Table 3.9: Coefficient of determination (R^2) and statistical significance level (p value) of the positive linear relationship between clusters/vine and days after veraison to reach target °Brix in each season. Significance level is denoted by **p<0.01, *p<0.05	46
Table 3.10: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on mean cluster weight for three growing seasons.....	47
Table 3.11: Coefficient of determination (R^2) and statistical significance level (p value) of the negative linear relationship between mean cluster weight and clusters/vine for three seasons. Significance level is denoted by ***p<0.001	487
Table 3.12: Days after anthesis (DAA) and veraison (DAV) to reach peak mean cluster weight for each crop load for three years	48
Table 3.13: The interaction of crop load and extended ripening on mean cluster weight loss expressed as % loss within each crop load in three seasons. The percent loss is calculated from peak cluster weight (24.0 or 25.5 °Brix target) to lowest cluster weight at 28.5 °Brix in each crop load and relative to the number of DAV to reach the 28.5 °Brix target.....	48

Table 3.14: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on yield per vine for three growing seasons. Designated panel vines.....	49
Table 3.15: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on yield per vine for three growing seasons. Treatment plot	50
Table 3.16: Coefficient of determination (R^2) and statistical significance level (p value) of the positive linear relationship between yield/vine panel and yield/vine plot in three seasons. Significance level is denoted by *** $p < 0.001$	51
Table 3.17: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on tonnes per hectare (t/ha) for three growing seasons. Designated panel vines.....	52
Table 3.18: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on second crop incidence and kg/vine for two growing seasons.	53
Table 3.19: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on the number of shoots/vine for three growing seasons.	54
Table 3.20: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on canopy growth for three growing seasons	55
Table 3.21: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on leaf area index (LAI) and canopy light environment (PAR) in the fruiting zone at veraison and harvest in the 2007 season. PAR is the amount of photosynthetically active radiation on the fruiting zone.	57
Table 3.22: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on percent budbreak (% BB) in 2008, after three seasons of treatment, calculated from the number of shoots per vine greater than five nodes and total buds per vine	58
Table 3.23: The effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on vine petiole and blade tissue nutrition in spring 2008, following three years of treatments.	61
Table 3.24: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on vine carbohydrates after three seasons of field treatments.	62
Table 3.25: The number of days after veraison (DAV) required to reach target °Brix at harvest in each crop load for three seasons.	71
Table 4.1: The effect of crop load and extended ripening on days after veraison (DAV) required to reach peak sugar (g)/ berry in three seasons	96
Table 4.2: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on juice soluble solids (°Brix) for three growing seasons.	102
Table 4.3: Days after veraison (DAV) required to reach target °Brix at harvest for each crop load during three seasons.....	102
Table 4.4: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on harvest juice pH for three growing seasons.	103
Table 4.5: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on juice titratable acidity for three growing seasons.....	105

Table 4.6: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on alpha amino acids and ammonium for three growing seasons.....	106
Table 4.7: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on yeast assimilable nitrogen (YAN) for three growing seasons.....	107
Table 4.8: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on wine pH (pH wine) measured at press for three growing seasons.....	108
Table 4.9: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on wine titratable acidity (TA) at press for three growing seasons.....	109
Table 4.10: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on wine ethanol (ETOH) at press for three growing seasons.....	110
Table 4.11: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on total phenols A (280 nm) at pressing for three growing seasons.....	111
Table 4.12: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on total phenols A (280 nm) post-malolactic fermentation (pml) for three growing seasons.....	113
Table 4.13: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on A(420 nm), A(520 nm), and color density (CD press) at press for three growing seasons.....	114
Table 4.14: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on A(420 nm), A(520 nm), and color density (CD pml) post-malolactic fermentation for three growing seasons.....	114
Table 4.15: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on wine hue at press (Hue press) for three growing seasons.....	115
Table 4.16: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on wine hue at post malolactic fermentation (Hue pml) for three growing seasons.	116
Table 4.17: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on total anthocyanins (mg/L) for three growing seasons.....	117
Table 4.18: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on tannins (mg/L) for three growing seasons.	118
Table 4.19: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on isobutylmethoxypyrazine (IBMP) (ppt) concentrations in wine for growing season 2006.	121
Table 4.20: Correlation coefficient (r) and statistical significance level (p value) of the negative linear relationship between YAN and days after veraison. Significance level is denoted by *** and * for significance at $p < 0.001$ and $p < 0.05$, respectively.	136
Table 4.21: Equations and coefficient of determination for parallel regression model of color density accumulation in 2005, 2006, and 2007.....	149
Table 5.1: Commercial wine scoring system used for expert panel to grade treatment wines into market value price point. Note: Wine quality and price point increase as score decreases.....	159

Table 5.2: Triangle test results of crop load and °Brix at harvest vineyard treatments and subsequent wine replications for two years. Data presented is the number of correct judgements out of a possible 24. Trials which have 15 or more correct judgements are significant at $p < 0.001$ (***) and indicate that a significant difference was detected.	165
Table 5.3: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on wine score by an expert panel for three growing seasons. Wine score is based on a 1-15 scale with 1 being of highest quality and 15 of lowest quality.....	166
Table 5.4: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on the wine attributes vegetative, body, flavor intensity and quality, rated by an expert panel using the 1-9 category scale for two growing seasons. A rating of 1 reflects that the presence of the attribute was extremely low and a rating of 9 reflects that the attribute presence was extremely high.	168
Table 5.5: Analysis of variance of descriptive analysis attribute ratings on wines made from crop load and extended ripening treatments for three seasons. F ratios are for wines, judges, session replications (reps), and their interactions.....	172
Table 5.6: Analysis of variance of descriptive analysis attribute ratings on wines made from crop load and extended ripening treatments for 2006. F ratios are for wines, judges, session replications (reps), and their interactions.....	173
Table 5.7: Analysis of variance of descriptive analysis attribute ratings on wines made from crop load and extended ripening treatments for 2007. F ratios are for wines, judges, session replications (reps), and their interactions.....	174
Table 5.8: The effect of crop load and °Brix at harvest on mean intensity values for wine attributes from descriptive analysis on 2005 treatment wines.	176
Table 5.9: The effect of crop load and °Brix at harvest on aroma attributes from descriptive analysis on treatment wines in three years. Means with different letters differ significantly by $p < 0.05$ by LSD.	177
Table 5.10: The effect of crop load and °Brix at harvest on wine attributes from descriptive analysis on 2007 treatment wines.....	178
Table 5.11: The correlation matrix of 2005 treatment wines from the descriptive analysis testing. The correlation coefficients highlighted indicate a significance at $p < 0.05$	179
Table 5.12: The correlation matrix of 2006 treatment wines from the descriptive analysis testing. The correlation coefficients highlighted in green are significant at $p < 0.05$	179
Table 5.13: The correlation matrix for 2007 treatment wines from the descriptive analysis testing. The correlation coefficients highlighted indicate significance at $p < 0.05$	180
Table 5.14: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on four attributes rated on 2005 treatment wines by an Australian panel.....	187
Table 5.15: Effect of crop load and target °Brix at harvest on the likability rating of 2006 treatment wines. Ratings are based on the 1-9 hedonic scale.....	188
Table 6.1: Commercial wine scoring system used for expert panel to grade treatment wines into market value price point. Note: Wine quality and price point increase as score decreases.....	221

Table 6.2: Effect of late season irrigation and crop load on berry weight at harvest.	227
Table 6.3: Effect of increased irrigation late season on berries per cluster in two crop loads.....	227
Table 6.4: Effect of increased irrigation late season on clusters per vine in two crop loads.....	228
Table 6.5: Effect of increased irrigation late season on mean cluster weight in two crop loads.....	229
Table 6.6: Effect of increased irrigation late season on fruit per vine (kg) in two crop loads.....	230
Table 6.7: Effect of increased irrigation late season on tonnes per hectare (ha) in two crop loads.....	230
Table 6.8: Effect of crop load and increased irrigation late season on photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) and leaf area index (LAI) on the canopy light environment measured using the ceptometer at veraison and harvest in 2007. PAR is expressed as the percent (%) of above canopy PAR within the fruiting zone.....	231
Table 6.9: Effect of increased irrigation late season on shoots per vine in two crop loads.....	232
Table 6.10: Effect of increased irrigation late season on mean cane weight (g) in two crop loads.....	233
Table 6.11: Effect of increased irrigation late season on pruning weights (kg/vine) of two crop loads.	234
Table 6.12: Effect of increased irrigation late season on the Y/P ratio in two crop loads,.....	234
Table 6.13: Effect of crop load and increased irrigation during the later stages of ripening on juice soluble solids (°Brix) at harvest.	243
Table 6.14: Effect of crop load and increased irrigation during the later stages of ripening on juice pH at harvest.	244
Table 6.15: Effect of crop load and increased irrigation during the later stages of ripening on titratable acidity (TA) in juice at harvest.....	245
Table 6.16: Effect of crop load and increased irrigation during the late stages of ripening on YAN in juice at harvest.....	245
Table 6.17: Effect of crop load and increased irrigation during the late stages of ripening on Ethanol (ETOH) in juice at harvest.....	246
Table 6.18: Effect of crop load and increased irrigation during the late stages of ripening on total phenols in wine post malolactic fermentation (pml).....	247
Table 6.19: Effect of crop load and increased irrigation during the later stages of ripening on color density A(420 nm + 520 nm) in wine post malolactic fermentation (pml).	248
Table 6.20: Effect of crop load and increased irrigation during the late stages of ripening on hue in wine post malolactic fermentation (pml).....	248
Table 6.21: Effect of crop load and increased irrigation during the late stages of ripening on expert wine score.....	249

Table 6.22: Effect of crop load and increased irrigation during the late stages of ripening on the sensory score for the attribute flavor intensity.	250
Table 6.23: Results of difference testing on wines made from crop load and irrigation treatments in 2007.	251
Table 6.24: The interaction of crop load and irrigation during the later stages of ripening on the percent (%) change in berry weight from peak berry weight to final berry weight.	254
Table 6.25: The interaction of crop load and irrigation during the later stages of ripening on Y/P ratio in two seasons.	262
Table 7.1: Economic analysis of crop load if grower harvested at peak berry weight (between 24.0-25.5 °Brix targets).	289
Table 7.2: Economic analysis of crop load with extended ripening to 28.5 °Brix target.	289
Table 7.3: Economic analysis of crop load and extended ripening treatments from a winery perspective.	290
Table 7.4: Economic analysis of crop load and extended ripening treatments from a winery perspective if grapes were harvested at peak berry weight.	290
Table 7.5: Experiment 2 pumping costs for two different irrigation treatments in 2006 and 2007.	292
Table 7.6: Gross margin of the unthinned crop load at two different irrigation treatments.	292