ADDITIONS FOR 1933

A.L. #662
County 20

I. NAME OF PROJECT: Vine Pruning

II. STATUS OF PROJECT: The demonstration plots in the vineyards where frosted vines were treated in 1932 will be observed during the 1933 period to note the affect on the production of fruit this year. It is believed that the time involved in removing the frosted shoots is more than justified in the saving at pruning time. Also, it puts the vine in a more vigorous condition for the coming year.

III. GOALS FOR 1933: 1. Continue series of plots in each of 5 vineyards on treatment of frosted vines.

IV. CALENDAR:

When	What	Who
Dec.	Prune frosted vine test plots	A.E.S.
April	Observe new growth	"
May, June	Check Crop prospects	"
Bal. Year	Check Results	"

Date 2/24/33

R. V. Wright
Agricultural Extension Service-Merced

Date 2/27/33

B. H. Crocheron
Director of Agricultural Extension

Progfess Report No. 9 S.L. No. 662
County No.

VINE PRUNING

Unfortunately the grape growers of Merced county were hit with another frost in the spring of 1933. In the spring of 1932, following a frost on April 20, Professor A. J. Winkler and I laid out some demonstration plots on the following ranches giving several treatments to frosted vines.

C. L. Stringer, Livingston
A. H. Stockman, Livingston
A. J. Andrews, Delhi
Francis Fiorini, Delhi
L. F. Arnold, Fruitland

We had anticipated following through these plots in 1933 to check the wood and fruit development as a result of the different treatments given in 1932, but since the Stringer, Arnold and Stockman vineyards were again frosted in 1933, we gave the same vines the same treatment in April, 1933 that we gave them in April, 1932 and it will be a good plan to check the results on these three vineyards at harvest time in a similar manner to the way we checked them in the fall of 1932. Undoubtedly Professor Winkler will be glad to come down and assist in this project. Also, an observation should be made in the Andrews and Fiorini vineyards to see if the 1932 freeze accompanied with the various treatments given the vines had any different effect upon this year's development of wood and fruit.

Judging by the observations made during last year and at time of pruning in the winter, there was some indications of certain methods of treating frosted vines to be an improvement over other methods.

However, further checking of the various treatments of frosted vines will be necessary before any definite conclusions may be drawn. In general it may be said that in case the frosted shoots are not killed clear back to the cane, that it is advisable to remove such shoots. Failure to do this results in a very brushy growth which is difficult to prune in the fall and winter, and which may be devitalating to the crop. The cost of removing the frosted shoots is more than offset in the reduced cost of pruning. In the case of the Thompson variety, it is practically impossible to get enough fruit from any system of treating frosted vines to justify the procedure. Consequently, the growers should adopt a practice which takesthe least amount of effort and forget about the possibility of getting any crop in that year. The treatment recommended for Thompsons which have been frosted is to cut back the cane leaving four or five dormant buds near the trunk of the vine. As a result of this, a few strong canes are developed for use the following year and the pruning task the following winter is greatly reduced.

In general, the grape growers have had a tendency to prune their vines a little earlier from year to year. From a frost standpoint, there is a decided advantage in delaying the pruning as late in the spring as possible, in fact, I think that too early pruning of vines accompanied by winter cultivation has contributed to a reduction in the production of the vines.

Date June 15, 1933

R. V. Wright

Agricultural Extension Service - Merced