

**OREGON WINE BOARD -  
MEETING MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 16, 2011  
CONFERENCE CALL**

**Attendees:** Sam Tannahill (Chair), Michael Donovan (Vice Chair), David Adelsheim (Chair Emeritus), Leigh Bartholomew (Treasurer), Kara Olmo, Tim Kennedy, David Beck, Terry Brandborg, Bill Sweat  
**Staff:** Jeanette Morgan (Executive Director), Annie Cocchia  
**Guests:** Chad Vargas, Adelsheim Vineyard; Tony Soter, Soter Vineyards; Pat Dudley, Bethel Heights Vineyards; Jaques Tardy, Torii Mor; Chris Serra, LIVE

---

**Call to Order**

Tannahill called the OWB meeting to order at 2:40pm.

Tannahill and Donovan discussed the reason for the call; the Executive Committee of the OWB met via conference call on February 10<sup>th</sup> following the Board discussion and motion on the OCSW Steering Committee's recommendation regarding use of Dimethyldicarbonate (DMDC) in OCSW wines. The Executive Committee agreed there needed to be more clarity regarding the duties of the OCSW Steering Committee and the powers of the OWB in case there was ever a dispute. The conversation related back to the genesis of OCSW, and what it was originally intended for and there was concern about falling into a precedence of being in a position of making more technical decision regarding certifying standards. The Executive Committee convened this call with the Board to discuss the mandate to the OCSW Steering Committee, charter, and in that discussion debate the motion that passed 2/2/11 regarding the OCSW Steering Committee recommendations.

Tannahill pointed to two decisions in front of the Board today, accept/not accept the change of wording for the Certification Manual sent out to the Board via email and to talk about the issue with DMDC.

Adelsheim provided historical context to the start of OCSW; it was set up as a mechanism in which the OWB would not have to create yet another certifying agency, but instead use the ones already in place. Referred back to the proposal he brought to the Board at the 2/2/11 meeting, that in an instance where an agency has a standard that the OWB/OCSW does not agree with, let the agency know the issue, give them a set time, and if they don't have a satisfactory response in that time, then they would be removed from the program. It has to be a real threat. Hopefully the research will be in done in time (Neil Shay has read the proposal and has accepted the challenge to work on it), and we wouldn't get to that point.

Dudley mentioned we would need to look at where this chemical issue stands with all of the programs, not just LIVE. A winery under NOP guidelines, could have the winery facility certified with the wines applying for Demeter/Organic, and still have a non-allowed chemical in the winery and use it on non-Demeter/Organic wines. Those wines can apply for OCSW, because OCSW looks at the processing facility for certification, which is based on the organic wines. There is a need for an OCSW scoresheet which would apply to anyone under NOP and LIVE.

Sweat responded there is going to be gaps among all of the agencies, and the job of the OWB is to define which gaps are acceptable and which are not. The intention of OCSW was to clarify in the minds of the consumer what those certification agencies meant. To the extent to which we are finding which standard is okay with one agency and which is not with another just adds the confusion we were trying to avoid.

Dudley noted two choices. OCSW goes away as an umbrella, and the certification agencies are left to market themselves with their own logos (which is what we were trying to avoid when creating this platform). Or we do the research, have the dialogue and do what we need to do in the meantime to maintain the integrity. If not, it's going to blow the integrity of OCSW and that will be the end of it.

Donovan responded that committee does not have the pedigree or technical knowledge to make that call. Instead could the OWB say, you (agency) have one/two years to come up with a definitive reason for including this, so when the member of the media calls, we can turn it back to the certifying organizations. If the agency hasn't done anything – we would drop them from the OCSW program. It wouldn't set a precedent or put anyone in the lurch.

Tannahill pointed to the need to discuss the process of - if we see a gap, how do we solve the gap? DMDC is the immediate issue but what do we do when our technical committee comes to us and says this organization is not doing the right thing. What does the OWB do? Do we say please stop using X or its okay to use until we have the research?

Sweat responded, with regard to the role of the OWB/OCSW – the most defensible position is to make sure we are ratifying the scientific standards – and how they make their determination on their own. Then we look at the robustness that we feel most comfortable about. That way we aren't surprised. What happens if LIVE goes through this – and they come back and say we will still certify this product. We've been hanging our hat on scientific study, but we say we would go over that?

Dudley agreed, we have to be comfortable with process they are going to use to research – then we are going to have to say OK. If the press says why? we can say go talk to LIVE they have science about it. The problem is right now there isn't any.

Donovan asked why are we not relying on them (agencies)? We trust their ethical standard but when they don't have the science, why do we assume technical expertise? He then pointed out the two paragraphs in the manual (1.2) about the marketing arm of OCSW and defining the nuances of the certification agencies. The OWB set about to say we knew there were going to be these gaps and nuances. Our goal is to help consumers to identify and buy these wines. When the member of the media calls about these gaps we could say we recognize there are gaps, but they all have a set of shared principles.

In review of the motion on 2/2, Beck corrected the note, he did not mention any chemical, but focused on the charge we placed on the Steering Committee. The OWB is not supposed to become a review committee. We are not a certified technical committee. Beck will send corrections of the draft minutes to OWB staff.

Tannahill brought forth the proposed changes to the charter per the Executive Committee and asked the Board if they approve? Or not?

Adelsheim adjourned the meeting at 3:37pm

Donovan responded if we adopt 1.4 as proposed, it would be incumbent on us to overturn the previous motion, because we are talking about adhering to the standards of the qualifying programs. If we leave the motion in place – you can't be OCSW if you use DMDC, which means we wouldn't consider someone coming out of LIVE, and it puts us in awkward position

Dudley answered, it's not a certification agency question, it's a bottling lot question. Does not mean you can't have it in the facility. It's just the bottling lot. And you can solve the problem in the interim with the check box. It covers for all.

Donovan commented with unease going down this direction; it opens a gigantic precedence and this discussion will come up in the future.

Due to time, Tannahill queried the board to move this discussion to the Symposium. If there is no decision, by then, the Board will have to move forward with the motion. Tannahill asked Cocchia to schedule a meeting for sometime during the Symposium.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30pm