Portland Winemakers Club

September 2023

"Bob's Blurb"

Our leaders' leader

Sorry, I missed the August meeting. Thanks to Rob Marr for taking the reins and I heard that the speaker was excellent.
Harvest is here, get your fermenters and carboys cleaned, buy your yeast and nutrients, and clean those crushers and presses.
Winemaking seems to be a lot of cleaning! But in the end, it is all worth it for what comes out of that bottle at the end of the process. That often strange and effusive flavors that tantalize the palate. See you at the September meeting and the "Other Reds" member wine tasting.

Portland Winemakers Club
Since 1969

Monthly Events

January 18th, 2023
Discuss plans and ideas for 2023

January 21st, 2023
Gala at Parrott Mountain Cellars

February 15th, 2023
Barrel sample tasting
Wine trading pool

March 15th, 2023
Tasting & judging, member produced Italian varietals

April 19th, 2023
speaker Sarah Linnemeyer

May 17th, 2023
Tasting & judging, member produced Bordeaux Reds

June 21st, 2023
Tasting & judging, member produced all Whites, Rose' & sparkling

July no meeting

July 22nd, 2023
Annual Picnic, $10 ea. fee, Craig & Mindy Bush

August 16th, 2023
Speaker: Marco Prete with "Wines of Kings"

September 20th, 2023
Tasting & judging, member produced other Reds & fruit wines

October 18th, 2023
Tasting & judging, member produced Pinot Noir

November 15th, 2023
Crush Talk

December 13th, 2023
Elections, Planning for Next Year

Wine related tours may be scheduled on non-meeting days.

Drink Responsibly
Drive Responsibly

Upcoming events / Save the date

The next PWC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 20th in the basement of the Aloha Grange starting at 7:00 pm. After our business meeting, We will have a Tasting & judging, member produced other Reds & fruit wines. **Other reds are varietals such as Tempranillo, Syrah, Petite Sirah, Zinfandel, Sangiovese, Nebbiolo, Barbera, Grenache, etc.. Do not include Bordeaux varietals or Pinot Noir (e.g. Bordeaux varietals are Cabernet Sauvignon, Merlot, Malbec, Petit Verdot, Cabernet Franc, Carmenere & Touriga Nacional.)**

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.

NOTE: ***Bring a bottle of wine to put into a trading pool. Everyone who brings a bottle draws a number to pick from the wine trading pool. Numbers get picked until the pool is empty.***

- Please visit the PWC website: portlandwinemakersclub.com where there are Newsletters archived back to 2007.
- Also, visit our public group Facebook page: "Portland Winemakers Club" facebook.com Give it a look, join the discussions and enter some posts of your own. There are 33 members in the group so far.

August Meeting Notes

Members present: 18

• A report report from Al Glasby on the grape purchase plan.
- August 2023 - Added on 100 lbs Viognier from Two Palms confirmed.
- Jamison update as of Tuesday 8/15/23-
106F outside my house and 109F at the Richland airport.
Everything looks on track to start harvest in about two weeks.
chardonnay and viognier will probably come in together about Labor Day weekend.
Merlot, syrah and tempranillo will be close behind.
I'm still planning for Fred Meyer on Cornelius Pass Road.
I will need help with every delivery. Tore a tendon in right shoulder & scheduled for surgery in November.
Need at least one person who isn't too aged, infirm or otherwise damaged and is willing to get a bit dirty.
- Chandler Reach update as of 8/16/23
Chandler Reach vineyard just finished up veraison. Will start sampling on Monday.
• Andy Mocny is putting together a possible vineyard tour at Stag Hollow.

PWC group tours Benza winery and vineyards on August 9th.

Our speaker for the evening was Marco Prete along with co-founder Cristina Fragni from “Wines of Kings” a US-registered wine importer and online wine store, offering a curated selection of high-end European wines. Marco has decided that, from all standpoints, Oregon is the best state in the USA to establish a winery. In 2022, the co-founders expanded their ambitions with the purchase of 81 Acres in the McMinnville appellation in the Willamette Valley where they presently have established their vineyard. They also plan to open a world-class wine-tasting room, set to debut in Portland in 2023.

Marco’s winemaking philosophy for winemaking is to make grape-picking decisions based on taste rather than numbers, allowing fermentation to finish on the natural yeasts and 3 to 5 years of barrel aging. Examples would be Borolo produced in the Piedmont region of northern Italy and Tokaj Essencia from Hungary.

Winesofkings.com

Does potassium metabisulfite powder lose its strength over time?

I have a question about sanitizing. I just mixed a fresh batch of potassium metabisulfite (1.5 oz. powder to 1 gallon water) to sanitize my equipment, and this latest batch has very little smell. Until now, every batch I’ve made has smelled quite powerful. I know that you’re supposed to replace the liquid when it loses its smell and that the solution will lose its strength over time. Will the dry powder also lose its strength over time? I purchased this sulfite powder six months ago, and I used this new solution to start a new kit, but now I’m wondering if it’s okay to use.

You’re right to suspect that both the potassium metabisulfite powder and solution can lose their power over time. The solution, which you make by mixing the powder with water, is particularly unstable. All that antioxidant power we love means that when it comes in contact with air, which it usually does in a storage container (despite our efforts to prevent this), it’s getting oxidized. This means that it is losing some of its power. As sulfur dioxide is soluble only at relatively low temperatures, the liquid solution is also particularly sensitive to high storage temperatures. Store it for a week at 65 ºF (18 ºC) or above and it’s guaranteed that you will lose a significant amount of microbe-killing and antioxidant power. How strong your solution smells can be an indicator of strength, but it is an inconsistent one as we all have different tolerances to the odor. I suggest trying to get a handle on the strength of your solution by measuring the free sulfur dioxide.

Most winemaking books suggest using a sanitizing solution made out of water, citric acid and potassium metabisulfite, where the free SO_2 is around 75-100 mg/L and the pH of your solution is under 2.9. The dry potassium metabisulfite powder itself can also lose its strength over time with exposure to air, and hence, its ability to retard microbial growth and oxidation. Because of this, it’s wise to buy the powder in small pouches or bags that make sense for your scale of winery and then to only make up as much liquid solution as you will need for any given job. This way you have a good feel for the amount of sulfur dioxide you really have in that solution. An aqueous solution of potassium metabisulfite powder can lose as much as half of its strength in two weeks when stored at 65–70 ºF (18–21 ºC).

For your current dilemma, I suggest getting a new batch of powder if it can’t be used

to make a solution that is strong enough for your winemaking needs. Small pouches and cool, if not cold, storage conditions for liquid and powdered potassium metabisulfite can make a big difference in the life of your sulfur dioxide.

Call of the Wild

Written by Phil Plummer

Every Spring, as buds begin to swell and break in vineyards of the Northern Hemisphere, a different but no less exciting ritual occurs in their associated cellars: The arrival of fermentation supply catalogs. Bright and inviting, they're filled with a dizzying array of the latest and greatest yeasts, nutrients, fining agents, etc.; everything a winemaker might want to ensure the coming vintage lives up to its full potential. But if you've been leafing through them over the last 10–15 years, you may have noticed a new trend taking root in their pages: An emphasis on harnessing or mimicking wild fermentation. If that seems counterintuitive to you, you're not wrong. Why would yeast manufacturers with millions of dollars tied up in producing and promoting highly selected strains be throwing attention on anything as freely available as wild yeast and bacteria? The answer is simple: Complexity.

It's no secret that the yeast and fermentation technologies that we all take for granted are new . . . like, really new. We've known the role of microflora in fermentation since the mid-1800s, so it's easy to lose sight of the fact that there were literally *thousands* of vintages on the books before the first-ever yeast pitch. But the ubiquity of wild microbes certainly didn't make things easy on pre-modern winemakers. Think of every problematic fermentation you've encountered in your own cellar, and then remind yourself that all of that happened while our understanding of fermentation has been at its peak. With that in mind, it's easy to understand why the precision of our modern winemaking tools was so desired. Clean, predictable fermentations have allowed the wine industry to, for lack of a better term, industrialize. This consistency has made winemaking easier and more profitable while also greatly increasing the accessibility of the finished products. So why look backward? Again: Complexity.

The Good, The Bad, and The Ugly: Complexity Can Be Complicated

The vast majority of *Saccharomyces* strains on the market have been isolated and purified from spontaneous fermentations — often from classic, Old World wine regions. Why, then, have winemakers in these regions opted to continue their tradition of spontaneous fermentation while safer, more predictable versions of their native yeast strains are so widely available? As it turns out, *Saccharomyces* is just one player in the biological drama of indigenous fermentation.

Honed by natural selection, *Saccharomyces* is perfectly optimized for winemaking. Its ability to withstand the unique chemistry of must and wine allows it to develop strong populations that dominate the microbiome of a fermentation. As the population grows, consumes resources, and generates alcohol, it quickly outcompetes and silences its non-*Saccharomyces* rivals.

However, in the time it takes *Saccharomyces* to build dominant populations, there's room for other yeasts and bacteria to thrive and impact flavor and aroma. That lag phase window is where our problem lies.

Fresh must is teeming with microbes. Some of them, like *Saccharomyces* and *Oenococcus*, are prized for their positive effects on fermentation and wine quality, while others, like *Brettanomyces* and *Acetobacter*, send chills up the spine of most winemakers at their mere mention. Absent intervention, these microbes are allowed to compete against each other until one (generally *Saccharomyces*) gains a competitive advantage. Unfortunately, it can sometimes take several days for *Saccharomyces* to dominate, which leaves an awful lot of time for their less desirable counterparts to do damage. The result can often be disastrous: Wines that are marred by flaws before they're even finished fermenting.

The early interventions that many of us employ in our cellars are aimed at averting catastrophe. Techniques like must-stage SO_2 additions have the effect of killing or suppressing a wild, unpredictable microbiome until *Saccharomyces* can take over. However, this can still take quite some time if not aided by the winemaker's hand — that's why inoculation is such a valuable tactic. By adding a large population of highly specialized, competitively advantaged yeast to a must, the winemaker is able to limit the amount of time it takes for that yeast to establish dominance. This quickly limits the opportunities for spoilage microbes to take root and makes the overall fermentation management far more predictable — a welcome shift at an already chaotic time in the winemaking process.

But what if not all the non-*Saccharomyces* microbes in a must are negative? As it turns out, there are a host of species that fit this description, capable of contributing positive qualities to wine if allowed an opportunity to do their work. Aggressive and early interventions like heavy-handed SO_2 additions and inoculation with *Saccharomyces,* while increasing the predictability and ease of fermentation, deny these other microbes an opportunity to leave their mark and may in fact put a cap on the flavor and aromatic potential of these wines at an early stage. Therein lies the conundrum of spontaneous fermentation: By leaving room for non-*Saccharomyces* microbes to work, the potential for greatness and/or disaster is increased.

With this in mind, yeast manufacturers set out to harness the magic of wild fermentation, separating its best elements from its worst and aiming to develop a toolkit for winemakers who desire more complexity with fewer complications. The first step in this process was to characterize the species and strains most commonly found in spontaneous fermentations, then determine the strengths, weaknesses, and metabolic attributes of each. From there, a wide variety of products have come to light, including commercially available non-*Saccharomyces* strains and SO_2-free bioprotectants. Implementing some or all of these in a strategic manner allows a winemaker to make unique, complex wines without the associated spoilage risks of truly wild fermentation.

Wild Pitch: Inoculating with Commercial Non-Saccharomyces

Of all the tools aimed at capturing the best of wild fermentation, none are easier to apply or manage than commercially available non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts (though it

should be noted that most of these are only packaged in sizes intended for commercial winemakers, for now). Developed to be used in conjunction with *Saccharomyces,* these yeasts impart aromatic and textural precursors to the wine that may then be revealed via alcoholic fermentation. The theory behind these products is the same as their *Saccharomyces* counterparts: By inoculating must with a sizable population, you give them a chance to outcompete the indigenous microflora, leading to cleaner, more manageable fermentations. So, what do these yeasts bring to the table that *Saccharomyces* doesn't? That depends on which one you use.

Likely the most commonly used non-*Saccharomyces* yeast, *Torulaspora delbrueckii,*has a wide range of positive attributes that lend themselves to versatile winemaking applications. From an aromatic standpoint, *Torulaspora* is a fantastic ester producer, increasing the potential for fresh fruit and floral aromatics. On the palate, it's an excellent driver of weight, producing acid-balancing glycerol and influencing overall roundness. In addition to its applications in traditional ferments, , *Torulaspora's* tolerance of high-sugar musts can be leveraged to limit volatile acidity (VA) production in late harvest and ice wines. With an alcohol tolerance of 7–10%, this yeast may be used on its own; however, using it in conjunction with a compatible *Saccharomyces* strain (inoculated after 1–5 ºBrix depletion) is suggested if fermentation to dryness is desired.

In addition to *Torulaspora, Metschnikowia* yeasts have also been found to have desirable effects on fermentation. Though largely non-fermentative themselves, commercial strains of *Metschnikowia pulcherrima* may be used to shape aroma and mouthfeel. These preparations are perfectly suited for aromatic whites like Riesling, Gewürztraminer, or Traminette because of their ability to generate large amounts of terpene and thiol precursors that may then be released by compatible *Saccharomyces* yeasts during alcoholic fermentation.

From a textural standpoint, *Metschnikowia* rapidly contributes mannoproteins, the polysaccharides often associated with lees aging, contributing a rounded quality to the overall mouthfeel of a wine. *Metschnikowia* also does a great job of making life difficult for other wild microbes, gaining population quickly and scavenging valuable resources like the dissolved oxygen and minerals required by most spoilage microbes; this has led to its application as a bioprotectant (more on that in the next section). *Metschnikowia* is only alcohol-tolerant to around 3% ABV, so it's imperative that it be followed by inoculation with a *Saccharomyces* strain to complete the fermentation. This inoculation should be performed 24–48 hours following the *Metschnikowia* pitch.

Though the mechanics of their use are largely the same as familiar *Saccharomyces* rehydration and inoculation, these yeasts are a bit less resilient and require specific must parameters to survive and thrive. First, winemakers should be aware that the SO_2 tolerance of these yeasts is extraordinarily low; it's important that the free SO_2 of the must be no higher than 20 ppm prior to pitching. Another chemistry consideration that winemakers ought to think about when using these yeasts is yeast assimilable nitrogen (YAN). The manufacturer's YAN guidelines for the *Torulaspora* and *Metschnikowia* strains I use most often (Lallemand's Biodiva™ and Flavia™, respectively) call for YAN greater than 150 ppm; this may be adjusted using complex yeast nutrients or diammonium phosphate

(DAP). A final parameter that may affect the health of non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts is must temperature. Though their ideal fermentation temperatures are right in line with most *Saccharomyces* strains, using these yeasts in the two-step inoculation process we've been discussing doesn't give them a whole lot of time to work — getting your must temperature in line with their optimal range prior to pitching helps to maximize their effect.

Going Native: Tools for Improving the Quality of Indigenous Fermentations

If inoculating with commercial non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts still isn't adventurous enough for you, you'll be glad to know that there are also tools available to improve the efficacy of truly native ferments. Designed with an eye toward inhibiting the sorts of microbes that make wild fermentation scary, these tools provide winemakers with an effective mechanism for shaping must microbiomes. When paired with the right fermentation management strategy, they can have a profound effect on the quality of the resulting wines.

If you've been following along so far, you'll recognize the first of these tools: *Metschnikowia* yeasts. Slightly different strains than those used for amplifying aromatic precursors, these yeasts may be deployed for biocontrol — rapidly scavenging dissolved oxygen while also producing metabolites that have a suppressant effect on wild microbes. By inhibiting organisms that produce VA and other off-aromas, these yeasts keep a must safe until native*Saccharomyces* can establish dominant populations. The *Metschnikowia* strains selected for this purpose are also a bit more cold-tolerant, making them extremely well-suited to cold soaks. They're most often inoculated in juice or must, but can be added at the crusher or even sprayed on fruit pre-harvest to limit microbial pressure during processing. As with the other non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts discussed, a restrained approach to SO_2use pre-fermentation is critical for ensuring successful implementation.

Another indispensable tool for improving the quality of native ferments should be old hat for many home winemakers: Chitosan. While traditionally used for clarification, fungal chitosan has the ability to bind and/or destroy the cell walls of spoilage microbes like *Acetobacter,* lactic acid bacteria, and *Brettanomyces,* all while allowing favorable yeasts like *Torulaspora, Metschnikowia,* and *Saccharomyces* to proliferate. Additionally, its chelating abilities allow it to remove heavy metals from juice and must, greatly decreasing the potential for downstream oxidative defects, and, as with *Metschnikowia,* allowing the winemaker to use less SO_2. Chitosan may be deployed in the same manner as a fining agent, though care must be taken to select an appropriate preparation; most are well-suited to juice applications, while other, more specialized preparations are designed for use in whole-fruit fermentations.

While these biocontrol products are excellent additions to the wild fermentation toolkit, they're even more powerful when paired with a timeless, Old World culturing technique called "Pied de Cuve." French for "foot of tank," Pied de Cuve is effectively the wine world's answer to a sourdough starter. Ahead of harvest, a small number of grapes are picked and crushed, the native yeasts are allowed to start fermentation, and the fermentation is regularly fed with fresh grapes or juice. This helps to build a large and healthy yeast population that may then be added to must as an inoculum. Some extra complexity may even be gained by including items from the vineyard and surrounding area that may be sources of wild yeast

cells: Wildflowers, fruit, stones, and tree bark among them. Pied de Cuve also allows winemakers to evaluate their wild microbes before adding them to more consequential volumes of must; if evidence of spoilage microbes is present, there is an opportunity to shut them down early. Chitosan and *Metschnikowia* may be used to great effect here: Either can be added to the must upon crush as a prophylactic; chitosan may be added to refine the microbiome if undesired species announce their presence. This combination of culturing techniques and biocontrol products puts clean, complex wild fermentations within reach for winemakers of any experience level.

Wild Thing, You Make My Heart Sing: Conclusions

Commercial *Saccharomyces* yeasts may be prized for their predictability and ease of use, but the complexity gained from wild and non-*Saccharomyces*fermentation is undeniable. With unique and compelling contributions to aroma, flavor, and texture, it's not hard to see why winemakers and yeast manufacturers alike have set out to harness this potential. New products like non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts allow even the most cautious winemakers an opportunity to flirt with this wilder style. For more adventurous vinification, combining biocontrol products like chitosan with the time-tested
Pied de Cuve technique allows for wild fermentations without many of the rough edges we've come to expect of them. It's a brave new world with Old World sensibilities. So if you're looking for new ways to bring out the most in your wines, try taking a walk on the wild side — it's never been easier.

Lees, Sur Lie Aging, and Bâttonage

Written by Dave Green

While this issue's topic is really more of an intermediate to advanced concept and technique in winemaking, there is no reason beginning winemakers should not be thinking about these techniques as they advance. Let's start with the basic idea of what lees are, the process of sur lie aging, and how bâttonage fits into the picture.
Understanding Lees

In the broadest sense of the term, lees are what falls to the bottom of a fermenting or aging vat of wine. Winemakers generally will split lees into two classes, each with their own set of characteristics. Gross lees are generally the first to precipitate to the bottom of your fermenter, usually within the first 24 hours after the grapes are pressed. These include grape skins, MOG (material other than grapes), seeds, stems, dead yeast, and tartrates, among other things. It is preferred that gross lees are removed after they have settled since they can contribute off-flavors.

Fine lees take longer to settle and they mainly consist of dead yeast cells. These take days to settle, even weeks, and unlike gross lees, can greatly enhance the body of a wine. This is why some of the great wines of the world, e.g., Champagne, are aged on fine lees. While it is traditional to age some wine on the lees, not all wine is meant to be aged on them. So let's take a spin on why you may want to use them.

Making the Most of Lees

So what makes fine lees so special to winemakers? Well we can't talk about them without understanding autolysis and mannoproteins. The term autolysis refers to the breakdown of the dead yeast cells that have precipitated out of the wine. While this decomposition may seem like something winemakers would like to avoid, the dead yeast release a class of compounds from the cell wall known as mannoproteins. These compounds are a natural enhancer to the mouthfeel and body of a wine.

It can be fairly easy to distinguish between the gross and fine lees in white wine. The gross lees are darker shade.

Mannoproteins will also interact with tannins, reducing the astringency and harshness that can be associated with excess tannins. The benefits of mannoproteins doesn't stop there . . . they also can stabilize a red wine's color, inhibit tartrate crystallization, and reduce both oxidation and protein haze. Winemakers can find products that will provide them via inactivated yeast like Enartis Pro Uno.
So while winemakers often want to remove the gross lees, as we just found out, aging wine on the fine lees can have many benefits. The only downside with aging on fine lees can be in the extreme example that they completely run out of oxygen in solution and start to produce hydrogen sulfide. This can easily be taken care of by racking wine, which will both remove the wine from the lees and reintroduce a little oxygen to solution.

How To Age on Fine Lees

First off, winemakers using kits or juices are at an advantage here since most will contain very limited amounts of gross lees. The fine lees will be the vast majority of the lees that settle to the bottom of their fermenters. Fresh grapes on the other hand will need an extra step to separate the two forms of lees. Since gross lees will settle within roughly 24 hours and fine lees take longer, we can use the physical discrepancy to our advantage. After pressing the grapes, winemakers can allow the gross lees to settle for 24 hours, then rack the wine off the gross lees. Then most of the fine lees will slowly settle to the bottom over the course of the next several days.

Sur Lie Aging and Bâttonage

Sur lie aging simply means that the winemaker has aged their wine on the lees. An important element to sur lie aging is the bâttonage process. This is simply a French term for stirring the wine and in doing so, mixing the lees back into solution. Why would winemakers want to do this? There are several reasons. First is that it can speed up the autolysis process and the release of the mannoproteins into your wine. Second, if your wine is going through the malolactic fermentation process, the stirred lees can better provide nutrients to the bacteria as well as scavenge oxygen from solution, which the bacteria likes. Finally, the bâttonage process prevents the yeast from compacting on the floor of your fermenter, which can cause problems such as creating hydrogen sulfide gas.

Just be sure to be very gentle while stirring since you want to minimize the introduction of oxygen. Carboys and demijohns can simply be rolled around on their

rim so you don't actually need to even open the fermenter. For larger tanks or when aging in barrels, there are special tools winemakers can utilize for the stirring process. So how often do you want to perform the bâttonage process on your wine when aging on the lees? While there is no hard and fast rule, the general answer from professional winemakers is every 2–4 weeks. If all you're doing is rolling the carboy around, then every two weeks seems reasonable. If you have to open your fermenter and stir, you may want to do it every four weeks to minimize oxidation issues.

For a deeper dive into the science and different stylistic approaches to lees and sur lie aging, I recommend: https://winemakermag.com/technique/lees-and-you-dead-yeast-can-be-your-friend

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 in PDF format, e-mail Ken Stinger at kbstinger@frontier.com

Scott Lab 2023 Winemaking Handbook –18.4MB – 140 pages
Scott Lab 2022 - 2023 Cider Handbook – 2.1 MB – 73 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

(updated 6-28-2023)

Portland Winemakers Club
Leadership Team – 2023

President: **Bob Hatt** bobhatt2000@yahoo.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, and update the membership list with the secretary.
- Pay bills

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

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

Chair of Education / Speakers: **Rob Marr** mdbmarr@live.com

- Arrange for speakers & educational content for our meetings

Chair for Tastings: **Brian Bowles / Jolie Bowles** bowles97229@gmail.com
jolie97229@yahoo.com

- Conduct club tastings
- 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: **Al Glasby / Bob Thoenen** alglasby@gmail.com
bobthoenen@yahoo.com

- Grape purchases and makes the arrangements to purchase, collect, and distribute

- Supplies – These should be passed to the President or Secretary for distribution.

Chair of Competitions: **Rob Marr** mdbmarr@live.com

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

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

- Gala /Picnic/parties

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