

Charles Sturt University

Gulbali Institute Agriculture Water Environment

Assessment of 'grey zone' smoke exposure on grapes and potential wine production approaches to mitigate impact

Dr Sijing Li, Dr John Blackman & Professor Leigh Schmidtke



NSW Bushfires 2020







Wagga Wagga 5th January 2020 ~40 km from Dunns Road





Smoke compounds in grapes and wine





Grape and Wine Biomarkers

Glycoside biomarker

- Syringol gentiobioside
- 4-Methylsyringol gentiobioside
- Phenol rutinoside
- *p*-Cresol rutinoside
- 4-Methylguaiacol rutinoside

Volatile phenol

- Syringol
- 4-Methylsyringol
- Phenol
- *p*-Cresol
- *m*-Cresol
- O-Cresol
- 4-Methylguaiacol

Sum total glycosides

Sum total volatile phenols



Project Aims



- Examine sensory properties of wines made from 'grey zone' grapes.
 - \circ Can these grapes produce acceptable wines for commercial styles?
- Examine the effects of limiting skin extraction on wine sensory and chemical profiles
 - \odot Making Rosé wine out of red varieties
 - Reducing pressing yields in white varieties



Grape Glycoside Biomarker Concentrations (post event)





Low-Moderate

What is the Grey Zone?





Low-Moderate

Shades of Grey





Low-Moderate

Targeted Grape Harvests from the Grey Zone





Winemaking Parameters





Pinot Noir & Shiraz

- Rosé ~4 hours skin contact
- Dry table wine 4-5 days on skins



Chardonnay

400L/tonne and 500L/tonne extraction



Taste Wine 1 & 2

Total VP concentration in finished wines





*** p< 0.001





Sensory Comparison – Press Yield Differences

Smoke aroma/flavour panel ratings





Descriptive Sensory Analysis - Chardonnay





Taste Wines 3 & 6

• Pinot Noir Rose

• Pinot Noir Dry Red Wine



Pinot Noir Total Volatile Phenols Rosé vs Red

Limiting skin contact decreases VP in wines



* p< 0.05 ** p< 0.01 *** p< 0.001



Rosé and Dry Wines – Pinot Noir





Pinot Noir Descriptive Sensory Analysis





Taste Wines 4, 5 & 7, 8

Shiraz Rose

Shiraz Dry Red Wine

Shiraz Total Volatile Phenols - Rosé vs Red



Limiting skin contact decreases VP in wines



* p< 0.05 ** p< 0.01 *** p< 0.001



Rosé and Dry Wines – Shiraz



Consistent reduction Fruit aroma in Rose

1.5

0.5

-0.5

Smoke A



🗖 Control 🛛 Rose 🗖 Dry Wine

Overall Fruit A

Overall Fruit F

Smoke F



Shiraz



Fruitfulness discrimination by panel for dry wine Masking effect of smoke



How well do grape and wine markers correlate to smoke aroma and flavour?



Perfect Correlation

Good Correlation



Targeted Grape Harvests from the Grey Zone





Wine Chemistry

	400 L/T			-	500 L/T		
	рН	TA (g/L)	Alcohol (%v/v)		рН	TA (g/L)	Alcohol (%v/v)
Chardonnay	P			-	P		
СН.1	3.31	6.9	13.4		3.27	6.9	12.8
CH.2	3.48	6.1	13.2		3.41	5.7	11.3
CH.3	3.35	5.1	13.0		3.27	6.8	12.8
CH.4	3.53	5.3	11.3	_	3.53	4.9	11.3
	ROSE				RED		
	рН	TA (g/L)	Alcohol (%v/v)	_	рН	TA (g/L)	Alcohol (%v/v)
Pinot Noir							
PN.1	3.5	5.9	12.0		3.47	6.1	12.3
PN.2	3.4	6.3	12.7		3.47	5.4	13.8
PN.3	3.5	5.2	12.1		3.49	5.3	12.9
PN.4	3.4	4.8	11.6	_	3.42	5.7	12.0
	ROSE				RED		
	рН	TA (g/L)	Alcohol (%v/v)	_	рН	TA (g/L)	Alcohol (%v/v)
Shiraz							
SH.1	3.3	5.9	14.3		3.62	6.2	12.5
SH.2	3.3	6.3	13.8		3.27	7.6	15.4
SH.3	3.6	5.9	13.3		3.47	5.0	13.8
SH.4	3.6	5.0	12.0	_	3.21	7.4	12.5



Take home messages

Chardonnay

- Lower extraction rates = lower volatiles in wine
- Acceptable wines made noting fruitfulness is key driver

Pinot Noir

• Lacked fruit quality & smoke dominant regardless of style

Shiraz

- Rosé production resulted in a higher perception of smoke taint.
- Corresponding red wines were not perceived to be overtly smoky.
- Fruitfulness key driver of outcome behind glycosidic markers of smoke exposure



Thank you

Wine Australia



