

# **NGWB GRANT FINAL REPORT**

## **Contract Number**

18-13-147

## **Contact Information**

Group: Nebraska Winery and Grape Growers Association  
Contact: Jason Hayes and Seth McFarland  
Phone: (402) 304-9414 and (308) 325-9534  
Address: P.O. Box 82081  
Lincoln, NE 68501-2081  
Email: [jason@hayes.org](mailto:jason@hayes.org) and [seth@macscreekvineyards.com](mailto:seth@macscreekvineyards.com)

## **Issue of Interest**

Wine Quality Assurance Program Grant – Year 2

## **Approach to Problem**

The Colorado Wine Industry Development Board and Nebraska Winery and Grape Growers Association participated in a wine quality assurance research study, titled “Comparison of Scoring for Two Types of Wine Quality Assurance Panels with a Derived Composite Score of Both Panels”. The study served as a commercial wine sensory evaluation session for both the Colorado Wine Quality Initiative and the Nebraska Wine Quality Assurance Program.

The study’s Co-Principal Investigators were Dr. Stephen Menke from Colorado State University (CSU) and Dr. Susan Cuppett from University of Nebraska at Lincoln (UN-L). The study was carried out in the Sensory Laboratory, at the UN-L Food Science Processing Facility, on UNL’s East Campus on August 1-2, 2011, in Lincoln, NE

The study investigated a unique methodology for wine sensory quality assurance evaluation, developed and first implemented by Dr. Menke in 2007 under the Pennsylvania Quality Wine Initiative, funded by the Pennsylvania Wine Marketing and Research Board, and still in use there.

## **Goals/Achievement of Goals**

The evaluation protocol consisted of two panels, who evaluated wines from both states, as well as some wine samples from outside the states which are accepted as consumer market standards for their niches and price points. Both panels were composed of individuals in isolated sensory booths, doing blind tasting of submitted commercial wines. All samples were tagged blindly with a randomized code.

## **Results, Conclusions, Lessons Learned**

The first panel was trained to detect specific ranges of concentrations in wine of nine aroma chemicals involved in common wine faults. This panel sniffed the wine samples in the study, and did not taste them. These panelists deducted points from a possible total for each category of fault aromas, which can reduce the possible score. Then they made written comments on each sample.

The second panel did a sniff and taste of the same samples, immediately after the first panel tested them, and then the second evaluated the wines on a modified Davis 20 point scale.

The panelist made written comments on each sample wine. For each sample, the scores from the two panels were tabulated together to form a composite score. This composite score was evaluated against a pass/fail score, meant to be comparable to a level of consumer acceptability.

All individually identifiable scores and comments are only available confidentially to each submitter for those wines submitted by them, for their own quality assurance purposes. All scores were analyzed by randomized codes and grouped scores were statistically evaluated to assess the consistency of the scoring among judges and between panels and with the consumer market standard wines.

## **Progress Achieved According to Outcome Measures**

An analysis was provided to each participating winery. The results were confidential, but will be helpful in providing the necessary feedback for quality assurance to each of the participating entities. They will be able to use this data to make adjustments to future production cycles.

## **Financial Report**

\$6,000 was paid to Stephen Menke for his services in conducting the analysis.