



Portland Winemakers Club

November 2022

“Bill’s Meanderings”

Monthly Events

January 19th, 2022

To be determined

VIRTUAL MEETING

February 16th, 2022

To be determined

VIRTUAL MEETING

March 16th, 2022

To be determined

VIRTUAL MEETING

April 20th, 2022

In person at Aloha Grange

May 18th, 2022

Aloha Grange, Tasting & judging, member produced **Bordeaux Reds**

June 15th, 2022

Aloha Grange, speaker speaker Rudy Marchesi of Montinore Estate

July 20th, 2022, no meeting

July 23rd, 2022, Annual

Picnic, \$10 ea. fee, Craig & Mindy Bush

August 17th, 2022

Aloha Grange, Tasting & judging, member produced **All Whites, Rose' & sparkling**

September 21st, 2022

Aloha Grange, Tasting & judging, member produced **Other Reds**

October 19th, 2022

Aloha Grange, Tasting & judging, member produced **Pinot Noir**

November 16th, 2022

Aloha Grange, Crush Talk

December 14th 2022

Aloha Grange, Elections, Planning for Next Year



Oct 30th Cab Franc Harvest

We forgot to take pictures! Believe me, it was a short window and a cold but dry day.

Everything, at least most fruit should be harvested by now and under or just through fermentation. This year should provide a lot of fodder for discussion at our next meeting Nov 16th. It is an extra meeting in our schedule with the move to the Aloha Grange and no conflict with the winery where we had been holding our meetings. We will cover our club business and then discuss harvest and crush.

We had a great turnout for our last tasting of the year, Pinot Noir. As usual there were many entries to get through and I appreciate everyone putting up with me pushing through the comments and voting. I would hope we can have as good turnout for the December meeting as we will discuss the scheduling and events for the following year and of course elections for club officers and chairs. Also, it is coming up on the time of year to renew your membership and also renew your waiver form.

Reminder!

The Gala is coming. It will be back at Parrett Mountain Cellars on January 21st from 5 to 9 PM. Marilyn will bring a sign-up sheet for protein dishes to the next meeting.

Cheers!



Up-coming events / Save the date

The next PWC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 16th in the basement of the Aloha Grange starting at 7:00 pm. This will be a group discussion of the 2022 crush so far.

NOTE: There will be a pot-luck table for those who wish to participate. Bring a dish to share. If you would rather not participate feel free to bring your own snacks.

October Meeting Notes

Members present: 31

- -Bill introduced five visitors to the club; Bob Guptill, Michael & Donna Moore, Jim Molnar & Jan Walters.
- Marilyn Brown reported the Gala will be held at Parrett Mountain Cellars on January 21st, 4 to 7 pm.
- Andy Mocny reported there will be a tour of Resolu Cellars and winemaking facilities (owned by former PWC member Scott Nelson) on the evening of November 31st at his Hillsboro location. The time is yet to be determined. There will be an email requesting your RSVP.
- Al Glasby said grapes ordered from Yakima Valley will need to be picked up soon.



Brian Bowles poured for our annual, member produced "Pinot Noir" tasting. Members critiqued the wines and voted Gold, Silver, Bronze or no medal. See the results in the table below.

2022 PWC - Pinot Noir									
#	Name	Year	Gold	Silver	Bronze	None	Total Score	Medal Score	Medal
1	Hoffard/Hooson/Savage	2018	9	16	6	0	65	2.10	Silver
2	Rob Marr	2019	4	15	10	2	52	1.68	Silver
3	Rob Marr	2020	0	0	24	7	24	0.77	Bronze
4	Rob Marr	2020	1	12	17	1	44	1.42	Bronze
5	Brian & Jolie Bowles	2021	6	10	14	1	52	1.68	Silver
6	Jim Ourada/Paul Rogers	2020	2	11	14	4	42	1.35	Bronze
7	Court Carrier	2019	11	13	7	0	66	2.13	Silver
8	Bill Brown	2019	0	8	19	4	35	1.13	Bronze
9	Brian & Jolie Bowles	2020	14	12	4	1	70	2.26	Silver
10	Bob Hatt	2018	0	0	20	11	20	0.65	Bronze
11	Craig Bush	2016	11	15	5	0	68	2.19	Silver



Three new handbooks are available, free to download, from <http://scottlab.com/>

- Winemaking Handbook
- Cider Making Handbook
- Craft Distilling Handbook



Editor: From the book: Postmodern Winemaking by Clark Smith. Some different opinions about the use of Oak in winemaking.

Oak Reconsidered: Its Seven Functions

Postmodern Winemaking

April 2010 by Clark Smith

My postmodern definition of winemaking is: “the practical art of touching the human soul with the soul of a place by rendering its grapes into liquid music.” If grape flavors of origin are primary, what is the role of oak?

Even U.S. federal regulations, which are no treasure trove of winemaking wisdom and guidance, distinguish wine from beer and other beverages through the basic principle that wine has no ingredients—yet oak flavors are an exception. Barrels got grandfathered in as a container long before anybody paid attention to their roles as a flavor source, and oak alternatives rode those coattails.

“Oak is like cosmetics for wine,” Terry Lemaire of Oenodev taught me. “In the best case, you can’t tell she’s wearing any.” Jim Concannon likens oak to garlic in cooking: At best, it’s invisible, lifting out flavors.

A purist would say a self-respecting woman should wear no makeup. Yeah, right. In practice, most like to look their best. Winemaking is a commercial enterprise, and few brands willingly sacrifice fiscal viability for philosophical purity—nor is unbalanced wine forgiven for its purity.

Randall Grahm likes to talk about vins d’effort and vins de terroir, essentially wines that show their processing vs. those that highlight natural aspects. There is a place for oak in the latter, but as a supporting actor or even as an extra with no lines. Oak isn’t the enemy of terroir any more than yeast inoculation or any other tool. But inept, clumsy winemaking certainly is. Over-oaked wine is just bad cooking.

Complete wines do not need oak. They often do benefit from time in old barrels, to out-gas off odors and facilitate slow oxidative development. It pays to consider what deficiencies a particular wine may possess in order to choose the right oak to supplement them.

Subliminal intentions

Novice winemakers look at wood first and foremost as a flavoring agent. This is a mistake. Oak has five primary functions that must be addressed before its own aromatics can have any relevance.

1. Co-extraction: Red wine is a lot like chocolate syrup, containing tiny phenolic beads that in turn contain tannin, color and flavor. When we ferment crushed grapes on their skins, it is challenging to extract the anthocyanin pigments as well as flavor components such as the spicy derivatives of cinnamic acid, which are not soluble.

Untoasted oak is a rich source of hydrolysable tannins called ellagitannins, which break down in must to yield prodigious quantities of gallic acid, a powerful cofactor. The toasting process turns these useful small molecules into large polymers that won’t form colloids. Toasted wood doesn’t work to enhance color extraction. Worse, the barbecue aromas of toasted wood are amplified by yeast action to produce a strong Worcestershire aroma.

Green, untoasted wood contains trans-2-nonenol, a nasty, planky sawdust aroma that persists in wine for years. To prevent this, oak needs curing outside, in weather that will leach tannins and

foster subtle microbial transformations. Curing wood is an art, and skill is required to avoid the formation of TCA. Thus, only highly reputable coopers should be entrusted with the production of untoasted chips or barrelheads.

2. Anti-oxidative power: A common deficiency in musts is reductive strength, without which structural integrity, good texture and graceful longevity are not possible. Besides its co-extraction properties, gallic acid is also a wonderful antioxidant. As a vicinyl triphenol it imparts supplemental reductive vigor to weak wines, which are poorly concentrated, or which have lost their energy to field oxidation during excessive hang time.

In oxygen's absence, ellagitannins will lend a harsh crudeness, but proper exposure to oxygen will convert this to a fat, round texture. Oak plays a particularly important supporting role in Pinot Noirs, which often cannot support the extensive aging required to elaborate their flavors without supplemental anti-oxidative power.

3. Sweetness: As a general rule, the desired palate architecture for red wines is a sweet core of fruit contained by an angular frame of tannin. Some wines start off with excellent fruit core but lack definition—typically Barbera, Grenache and some Merlots. Others have the frame but not the fruit, a common problem in Mourvèdre, Carignane and Cabernet Franc.

Oak can be a source of a wide variety of sweet elements. Untoasted wood supplies a coconut element (whisky lactone) that lifts out varietal fruit aromas, rich in forests where sessile oak species predominate, such as Alliers, Vosges and Argonne. Toast can enrich vanilla, toffee and sometimes sweet coffee elements. The flame converts cellulose to cellobiose, an exotic sugar that can feed *Brettanomyces*. It is important to match the wood you are using to the deficiency you are trying to address.

4. Framing: The oak selections to supply framing are entirely opposite those that provide sweetness. Certain forests, particularly those of Eastern Europe and Limousin, which favor the pedunculated species, supply the most tannin. Moderate toast can bring out spice elements, which accent mouthfeel. Very heavy toast can produce deep espresso notes that frame fruit well and enrich flavor persistence in the finish.

5. Structure for Aromatic Integration: Wines containing vegetal or microbial notes often can benefit from enhanced structure, which can serve to integrate these aromas into the background and allow them to merge with and support fruit character. Oak can be used to assist this process in several ways already discussed, such as anthocyanin extraction and structural supplementation. Oak introduced during primary fermentation can also provide sacrificial tannins that remove protein and deactivate yeast enzymes destructive to color. Structural enhancements call for extra wood, usually in the form of high-quality, untoasted oak chips.

6. Curing Aromatics and 7. Toasting Aromatics: Oak aromatics receive so much emphasis that little needs to be rehashed here. A year of air curing is essential for degrading plankiness (trans-2-nonenol) and to enhance whisky lactone. The longer curing occurs, the more ellagitannins are leached. High temperature is necessary to create clove spice, vanilla, caramelization and espresso aromas. These functions are listed last because, all too often, the first five functions are ignored when choosing oak. Decisions are based solely on aromatic embellishment, resulting in unbalanced wines—cloyingly sweet or overly framed, with poor structure and problematic integration of aromas, tiring easily in the cellar

Ships into chips

The magical changes that occur during the maturation process in barrel are not easily replaced. Barrels breathe. They inhale a small, steady dose of oxygen. More uniquely, they exhale, cleaning the wine of

funky off odors. They facilitate settling, good lees contact and interaction between reductive and oxidative zones within a small space, with intriguing flavor benefits.

Old barrels do all these things as well. New barrels as a source of barrel extractives are fiscally foolish and environmentally reprehensible. High-quality chips, when prepared with skill and care, provide these extractives much more reliably, responsibly and economically.

A French oak barrel is made from a 200-year-old tree planted by Napoleon to build future navies. When bark is stripped away and heartwood removed, the premium wood remaining yields about 25% staves for barrels. The rest is perfectly good wood, and it is discarded. Why? Because winemakers want to look cool.

Scoring the sublime

To paraphrase Forrest Gump, a barrel is like a box of chocolates: You never know what you're gonna get. The innate variability in oak forests, even within a single tree (south vs. north side, high vs. low), is absolutely staggering. An exhaustive French government-funded study by INRA in the mid 1990s documented vast inconsistency in wood composition everywhere that was examined.

The point was hammered home at a 2001 California State University, Fresno, seminar about oak. First, we were generously treated to a book of splendid prose from the hand of Jeff Cohn, then at Rosenblum Cellars, with one-page sensory descriptions of 27 cooperage house styles: an extremely well articulated and perceptive guide.

The next talk featured Steve Pessagno, who stated disarmingly that he would be more comfortable with barrel alternatives if he only knew what he was doing. Meanwhile, he could get all the complexity he desired from the variability in Seguin Moreau's medium toast. If he filled 50 barrels with Cabernet, he could expect after a year to select 10 for reserve, 10 to dump on the bulk market, and the rest would become his regular bottling, imbued with far more nuance and complexity than he could ever intentionally bring about.

This is not very good news for the guy who only has six barrels. And for the vast barrel warehouses at Mondavi Woodbridge, Bronco and any number of other behemoths, averaging has taken the place of the human attention that might be given a tank.

Glorious stave, humble chip

Full disclosure: I used to sell Oenodev's chips, and I still love them. But I cannot tell you how I longed to sell staves. So sexy, the oak alternatives' halfway house. I begged my French colleagues to make them. They would love to, they said, if not for the unfortunate fact that (as they explained in that patient, kind, diplomatic way all Frenchmen have) staves are very stupid.

The biggest challenge confronting winemakers and oak vendors is the problem of reliable consistency. You can't just try one sample, because products vary from lot to lot. Cohn's treatise is precious because it reflects decades of experience from which he extracted an average profile for each cooper, an ideal to which no single barrel actually conforms.

A piece of wood as big as a stave, my French colleagues instructed me, can never be produced consistently. Sure enough, I remember unloading a truckload of staves, stacking them into two identical tanks, and filling each with the same Merlot for micro-oxygenation. One tank took 35 ml/liter/mo. for three weeks; the other took 75 for six weeks. Subtracting for the oxygen uptake from the Merlot's native tannin, that's a LOT of difference. I saw their point. Not a good business to be in.

Why do we use staves? Americans cling to several myths.

Myth No. 1: Staves are split along the grain and have no exposed end grain, causing chips to impart a planky harshness. But if you look at oak under a microscope, you can see that it has lots of rays (tubes that run perpendicular to the grain). That planky dryness arises from poor wood selection, inadequate air drying or inconsistent toasting—not exposed end grain.

Myth No. 2: Staves, like barrels, have a toast gradient that imparts complexity. The reality is that the untoasted interior imparts a green pithiness at just the wrong moment, just as it does in barrels. It would be so much better if the toast were on the inside and the green wood exposed to the young wine, which can better handle it.

Myth No. 3: Toast fixes color during fermentation. Ain't so. Anthocyanins are not fixed by aldehydes unless oxygen is present. If they were, the high concentration of aldehyde in fermentation would fix everything. Doesn't happen. What fermentation does do is to amplify the barbeque furfurals to the level of Worcestershire sauce. Ugh. Toasted staves provide no co-pigmentation or antioxidative ellagitannins to fermentations.

Myth No. 4: Staves replicate the complexity of cooperage at lower cost. In reality, barrel complexity arises from varying distance from the fire, and also from the traditional use of untoasted heads, which add sweetness and tannin. Stave manufacture in no way resembles coopering.

Three cheers for the chip

The lowly chip is the perfect format for blending to achieve consistency. It allows rotary toasting (similar to coffee beans), which produces even, predictable results. Unlike dust, chips retain aromatics and do not surface-adsorb wine flavors. Any degree of complexity can be achieved by blending different chip products, preceded by single-bottle trials. Staves share the inconsistency and inconvenience of barrels and offer no technical advantage over chips.

To be sure, there are plenty of crappy chips on the market. My advice for starting out down this path: Buy only the most expensive chips on the market and get your flavor from them instead of new barrels.

There will always be enough lunkheads around who will sell you used barrels at a small fraction of the cost of new. Barrel sterilization with ultrasound or microwave can alleviate the most fastidious winemaker's microbial fears. Once they no longer leach out pithy green tannins, you will come to regard your oldest barrels as your greatest asset.



How do you sterile filter your wine?

Q

I have a Chardonnay aging in my garage. I have about 65 gallons, which I initially fermented at about 40 degrees F for four months and then moved to oak. The wine fermented slowly and is now at 1% residual sugar and has completed malolactic fermentation. It is a very fruity, semi-sweet wine that is no longer fermenting. Rather than attempting to restart fermentation, I am inclined to bottle it as is. I don't want to mess it up trying to get rid of the residual sugar. I have just purchased a filter system. The finest filter pads that it has are 0.5 micron nominal. I understand this to mean that it will stop half of the 0.5micron particles. Is this fine enough for sterile filtration so that I can bottle this wine without worry of fermentation starting in the bottle? And do you think I should even put my wine through a sterile filtration?

A

The short answer to your question is: 0.45 micron nominal filter pads are the industry standard for "sterile" filtration. These pads prevent all yeast and bacteria from getting through. So, if you want to be as certain as possible, it's best to filter with a 0.45 micron nominal pad. This will ensure that you take out the maximum amount of unwanted material. The 0.5 micron filter sheet is a little bit "looser" than the 0.45 micron sheet and would most likely allow some microbes to pass through. If I was a winery with 50,000 gallons of 1% RS (residual sugar) Chardonnay that I wanted to bottle and put into the market, I would certainly make sure to final-filter with the tightest pads possible. Ruining thousands of customers' opinions about your products due to one little yeast cell is a scary prospect.

However, as you might imagine, I've got a longer answer for you and you can choose what option best suits you. You're a home winemaker with only 65 gallons of the 1% RS Chardonnay, not 50,000 gallons. I should explain a little bit about filter and filtration jargon for

those of us that might not be familiar with words like “0.45 micron nominal filter.” Pad filters are stacks of cellulose sheets that get mounted in a stainless steel or metal frame. Wine or juice is forced by a pump or by air pressure through the cellulose pads and depending upon the “tightness” of the cellulose matrix and the back pressure on the system, a varying degree of particles will pass through. When we say “nominal” and list a measurement like “0.45 micron” we are talking about the size of a filter pad. This pad is designed to prevent particles larger than the specified size (e.g. 0.45 micron) to pass through. Not all filters available to home winemakers offer a true 0.45 micron nominal filter pad. Many only go as small as 0.5 micron nominal which is not truly a “sterile” filter. It is very close, but no cigar (as the saying goes). Bacteria, especially, because they are so much smaller than yeast cells, could get through filters with this porosity. Once they’re in, they can start munching on the sugar left in your wine and cause re-fermentation in the bottle. This is exactly what you’re trying to avoid. However – you might be willing to take the risk because in your case I actually think that the 0.5 micron filter would cut out enough microbial life to render you a relatively stable product. If you are very careful in your sanitation, filtering and bottling processes, I’d say it’s an acceptable risk. Your wine fermented slowly, went through malolactic fermentation and is not fermenting now – so it’s pretty stable (microbially speaking). It’s also a white wine, which means that you probably would be consuming it within a year or two. Most importantly – you love the wine the way it is and don’t want to conduct a re-fermentation to decrease the residual sugar to a more stable level.



Rosé

In the summertime, many of us gather with family and friends around the barbeque. The chefs boast their talent amid the billowing smoke and the guests quaff a few glasses of wine to quench their thirsts, all the while wondering if the meat will come off recognizable and what wine pairs well with the blackened quarry. While not all barbeques go this way, I’ve seen a few in my family which resulted in years of ribbing, if you’ll pardon the pun, about the time the Weber grill served as a crematorium.

That time of year, I am often asked which wines would pair well with the grilled meats and vegetables, burned or not, and I almost always offer the same suggestion — rosé.

I like the rosé style. In the heat of summer, red wines, while complementing most grilled foods, are too heavy and not refreshing as a thirst quencher. White wine can quench your thirst, but different white wines pair best with different specific foods, and thus there is no single white that will work reliably in most situations.

The rosé is a simple, light-colored and light-bodied “red” wine, that’s dressed up to make it a white wine. The style is produced from a plethora of red grapes and most of the varieties pair well with beef, lamb, chicken, pork, fish or vegetables. These “pink” wines, when served slightly chilled are refreshing to the palate, as well as complementing the food with its refreshing acidity and bright red fruit characters.

The Styles of Rosé

Rosé is a wine style that has experienced increased popularity in recent years. While this style has been made by winemakers in the Rhône and Champagne regions of France for a long time, it has only been in the last thirty years or so that the style has been commercially produced in the United States, and other wine-producing countries, in any appreciable quantity. The style most familiar to us is that of white Zinfandel, made popular by Sutter Home Winery in the 1980s. Other varieties were tried in the style such as Cabernet Sauvignon and Merlot, which were marketed as either blush or White Merlot. However, it was white Zinfandel that went

on to typify, for many, the rosé wine world. This sweet wine was identifiable by name, and easy to pronounce as well. “Blush” meant a lot of things and “White Merlot” just didn’t have a good ring to it.

In the late 1990s, there were rosé wines produced from Sangiovese, Pinot Noir and Syrah. These new rosés were not made in the white Zinfandel style (which was typified by early harvest, residual sugar at 1–2% with perhaps some Muscat blended back). What made these new rosé style wines stand out, was that the fruit was mature at harvest, and the wines were mature, dry or slightly off dry, and fruit forward, much like the original rosés of France and California. The wineries producing the new styles had one heck of a marketing image to overcome due to the immense popularity of the sweet version of white Zin. Enough to impose almost a stereotype on anything pink. In essence, rosé was the subject of enological profiling. The challenges facing the producers of the new rosé wines was to get white Zin detractors to even get it in a glass at the tasting bar. The true wine lovers, once convinced it was indeed not white Zin, focused on the exceptional quality and refreshing change it offered and the style took off, albeit mostly in the form of limited production wines in order to sell out of the current vintage, so that the market was prepared to receive the new vintage the following spring. I like to think of it as the equivalent to the Beaujolais nouveaux release in November, only with this release happening in the spring (although the American wine marketers don’t generally follow this trend). The producers focus on limited production levels to keep the wine fresh, producing only enough to make it to the next vintage in most cases.

Making Rosé

There are three main methods of making rosé. The principle behind rosé is developing some color in the juice. All red grapes of *Vitis vinifera*, except for those teinturier varieties, have white juice. Through some form of skin contact, the anthocyanins — which compose the red or purple color in the skins, — are extracted into the juice.

Blanc de Noir

Color extraction is achieved through one of two methods of winemaking. The first, Blanc de noir, refers to the making of a white wine from black grapes. We see this term commonly on the labels of sparkling wine bottles. What it’s telling us is that the grapes that went into the making of the sparkling wine were probably Pinot Noir or Pinot Meunier. Essentially red grapes that were made into a white sparkling. Some color may be evident, but that is not the goal in the style.

The process of Blanc de noir, involves crushing and pressing the grapes after little skin contact. Essentially, the must is added to the press and the press cycle is started. The juice is collected and fermented chilled, just as you would with a white wine. There is some color extraction depending on the variety used. For example, Pinot Noir or Sangiovese yielding lighter color juices than those of Syrah or Tempranillo. Vineyard or grape variety and maturity goes hand in hand with good color development of the wine.

Saignée

For a rosé style in which more color development is desired, the winemaking technique of saignée is employed. Historically the process is part of a red winemaking style to improve the juice to skin ratio, thus resulting in better color in the red wine. Saignée is the French term for “to bleed.” In this case, you crush the fruit and the juice is allowed to stay in contact with the skins and seeds for some period of time. The saignée is then moved to a cool tank for fermentation and is treated as a white wine. The time left on skins is very dependent on the rate of color extraction, temperature and desire for color in the final product, but generally this period is no more than 24 hours. The longer the contact with the seeds, the more seed tannin that can be extracted leading to increased bitterness and astringency, although this is not usually a problem

given the short maceration time. If there is a determined desire to make rosé from a variety that is not yielding its color, enzymes can be employed to assist in dissolving the skin of the grape and releasing its contingent of anthocyanin molecules to the juice.

The winemaking process after the juice is produced should mimic that of a white wine. Your goal is a clean, fruit forward wine with crisp acidity. Although prevention of the malolactic fermentation (MLF) is the rule with my white wines, some would prefer to induce a partial or full MLF, but that is the preference of the winemaker. Cold settling the juice off the gross solids, racking the juice and fermenting at a temperature around 60 °F (16 °C) are critical to developing those fruity esters that make a rosé. The term “fermentation bouquet” is another term for esters. Esters are the result of wine acids reacting with alcohols (mainly ethanol) during the fermentation.

Fermenting at cooler temperatures increases ester retention and keeping the wine cool — up to and post bottling — will help maintain the esters. Yeast choices play a significant role as well. Choose a yeast strain that is described as having the effect of enhancing esters.

Blending

Another technique is the blending of white and red grapes, which was a practice in the Champagne region of France — and much to my chagrin, my father-in-law’s kitchen. In modern times, blending is generally not used now, except to improve color qualities of the wines made through the extraction process. However, this is no reason that it could not be tried at home. Likewise, you can blend a finished red wine into a finished white and produce a rosé in that manner. When doing this, you can even taste test various blending proportions before blending the wines in bulk — something you can’t do when you blend grapes.

There is also the unusual position of having produced a red wine that just did not cut it with respect to color. In reviewing this year’s vintage with my colleagues, one of them referred to a particular red Zinfandel that could pass for a rosé if need be. This would be the one technique I would not advise you to try at home.

Varieties

Rosé can be made with any red variety, although some grape varieties are better suited than others. A quick glance at the shelf in the wine section of your local bottle shop or supermarket yields rosés of Pinot Noir, Cabernet Sauvignon, Merlot, Syrah, Sangiovese and Tempranillo. As I always caution, one must use clean, mature fruit regardless of the variety. My first experiences with rosé were with Sangiovese and Syrah. What a way to start learning with two distinctly different grapes. Sangiovese is a color struggle while Syrah generally does not have a problem with color. With the latter, careful monitoring of the extraction process must be maintained to keep from too much color extracted. With the former, the production of the rosé is often done to improve the color for the red wine version, thus color development is secondary and adjusted perhaps later in the process with the small contribution from some neutral red wine. I found that the Sangiovese wines were better behaved during fermentation. The yeast were generally happy and there was good development of color and subsequent color stability, though some enhancement was necessary in some vintages. With every Syrah rosé I have made; I experienced the same problem of sulfide development during the fermentation, despite the use of the same cooler temperature yeasts, nitrogen supplements and aeration during fermentation. The wines cleaned up well post fermentation and were very enjoyable, but this experience was like Jekyll and Hyde.

Final Perspective

From a home winemaking standpoint, how do we put all this into perspective? When bringing in the fruit, make sure you are in a time frame that you can spend time monitoring the extraction period. You need adequate refrigeration capacity to ferment at low temperatures. You must

maintain sanitary cellar practices, and bottle within 4–8 months of the wines inception with the goal of consuming all prior to the next vintage. No saving a bottle here and there. Rosé almost always should have the mystique of the nouveau wines. They have a very short duration here on earth and then it's on to the next vintage.



Reference Library

Here is a list of hobby winemaking manuals and other materials in the Secretary's file. They are available for downloading by e-mail or via an internet transfer service. Some are downloadable from the source such as Scott Lab. All are PDF format, e-mail Ken Stinger at

kbstinger@frontier.com

- Scott Lab 2022 Winemaking Handbook – 6 mb - 135 pages
- Scott Lab 2022 Cider Handbook – 2.1 mb - 75 pages
- Scott Lab 2018-2019 Sparkling Handbook - 8 mb - 58 pages
- Scott Lab 2022 Craft Distilling Handbook – 5.2 mb - 26 pages
- Anchor 2021 – 2022 Enology Harvest Guide 15.7 mb - 16 pages
- A guide to Fining Wine, WA State University - 314 kb - 10 pages
- Barrel Care Procedures - 100 kb - 2 pages
- Enartis Handbook - 4.8 mb - 108 pages
- A Review Of Méthode Champenoise Production - 570 kb – 69 pages
- Sacramento Winemakers Winemaking Manual - 300 kb - 34 pages
- Sparkling Wine brief instructions - 20 kb - 3 pages
- The Home Winemakers Manual - Lum Eisenman - 14 mb - 178 pages
- MoreWine Guide to red winemaking - 1 mb - 74 pages
- MoreWine Guide to white Winemaking - 985 kb - 92 pages
- MoreWine Yeast and grape pairing - 258 kb - 9 pages
- Wine Flavors, Faults & Taints – 600 kb, 11 pages
- Daniel Pambianchi wine calculator set – 13.5 mb, 10 calculators
- Wine flavors, faults and taints - 88 kb, 11 pages



Electricity Bills Be Like:

- usage: \$40.21
- distribution fee: \$152.30
- processing fee: \$75.92
- accessing fee: \$45.21
- transmission fee: \$34.50
- fee fee: \$15.80
- fee fi fo fum fee: \$17.75
- might as well fee: \$5.00
- WTF you gonna do fee: \$3.00
- Another dollar won't hurt fee: \$1.00

Portland Winemakers Club Leadership Team – 2022

President: **Bill Brown** bbgoldieguy@gmail.com

- Establish the leadership team
 - Assure that objectives for the year are met
 - Set up agenda and run the meetings

Treasurer: **Barb Thomson / Jim Ourada** bt.grapevine@frontier.com
jmourada57@gmail.com

- Collect dues and fees, update membership list with secretary.
- Pay bills

Secretary: **Ken Stinger** kbstinger@frontier.com

- Communicate regularly about club activities and issues
- Monthly newsletter
- Keep updated list of members, name tags and other data

Chair of Education / Speakers: (need a volunteer)

- Arrange for speakers & educational content for our meetings

Chair for Tastings: **Brian Bowles / Barb Stinger** bowles97229@gmail.com

- Conduct club tastings kbstinger@frontier.com
- Review and improve club tasting procedures

Chair of Winery / Vineyard Tours: **Andy Mocny.** acmocny@gmail.com

- Select wineries, vineyards etc. to visit
- Arrange tours
- Cover logistics (food and money)

Chair of Group Purchases: **Bob Hatt / Al Glasby.** bobhatt2000@yahoo.com
alglasby@gmail.com

- Grape purchases, Makes the arrangements to purchase, collect, and distribute
- Supplies – These should be passed to the President or Secretary for distribution.

Chair of Competitions: **Michael Harvey** mharvey767@gmail.com

- Encourage club participation in all amateur competitions available. Make information known through Newsletter, e-mail and Facebook.

Chairs for Social Events : **Marilyn Brown & Mindy Bush** brown.marilynjean@gmail.com
mindybush@hotmail.com

* Gala / Picnic / parties

Web Design Editor: **Barb Thomson** bt.grapevine@frontier.com

Virtual Meeting Moderator: Rob Marr mdbmarr@live.com