

**OREGON WINE BOARD  
COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2011  
LOCATION: HILTON EUGENE OREGON  
PORTLAND, OR**

**Attendees:** David Adelsheim (Chairman Emeritus), Sam Tannahill (Chairman), Michael Donovan (Vice Vice Chairman) and Leigh Bartholomew (Treasurer), Terry Brandborg, Kara Olmo, Bill Sweat, David Beck. Absent Tim Kennedy.

**Staff:** Jeanette Morgan (Executive Director)

**Guests:** LIVE Board Members: Stirling Fox, Bill Hanson, Al MacDonald, Chad Vargas, Pat Dudley and Ed Fus.

---

**Call to Order**

Tannahill called the OWB meeting to order at 5:30pm.

Tannahill stated the OWB Board had met twice before to discuss OCSW and DMDC in particular. The first meeting was an in-person meeting and was held on February 2, 2011. During that meeting, a motion was passed in which Beck moved, "that the OWB accept the OCSW's Steering Committee recommendation and modify its Standards Manual to prohibit the aforementioned chemical." Voting in favor of the motion were Beck, Sweat, Tannahill and Kennedy and those voting against the motion were Olmo, Adelsheim, Brandborg, Donovan and Bartholomew. The second meeting occurred via conference call on February 16<sup>th</sup>. Two issues were raised on the February 16<sup>th</sup> conference call, the first was to accept/not accept the change of wording for the Certification Manual sent out to the Board via email and to talk about the issue regarding DMDC. Tannahill mentioned the February 16<sup>th</sup> Oregon Wine Board meeting did not resolve either of the two issues.

Olmo mentioned she was confused on what OCSW's role was intended to be. She believes the role is that of marketing but also remembers the OCSW needs to set standards to ensure Oregon is on the forefront of sustainable wine. Kara mentioned she believes the issue is not chemical based but really what is OCSW supposed to be doing.

Dudley confirmed the confusion to do the speed in which the OCSW program was established. Dudley stated that when the OCSW established the Board new there were inherent contradictions that would need to be addressed. The OCSW was focused primarily on marketing due to grant dollars received. She recognized there is overlap between OCSW and the other technical committees. Dudley and Olmo agreed the charter of the OCSW needed to be worked out.

Sweat asked if the OCSW was achieving the goal it was intended to achieve.

Fus stated that he was the LIVE Technical Committee Chair and that there is no data to prove chemical x is any more sustainable than chemical y...the topic is due to emotions and not technical aspects.

Donovan stated the history of the OCSW is marketing thus it is beyond marketing to ensure compliance for bottling. Donovan is concerned as two different technical committees are saying two different things and we are a public entity and need the facts. Donovan stated he was equally uncomfortable with the OCSW recommendation as he believes the purpose of the OCSW is marketing only.

Dudley stated the request to ban the chemical was just for one year while researchers researched the particular chemical. Bill Hanson stated there was a lack of scientific information to make a decision.

Adelsheim stated that the OWB did not have to approve any report. The charter of the OCSW Steering Committee is to set policy and the policy must be rational and based on science and any reports going to the OWB need to be based on science.

Olmo stated the real issue is that OCSW does not like a particular chemical, LIVE allows it because there is no scientific reason not to use and OCSW would not allow until the technical information is available.

Donovan suggested instead of banning to have LIVE resolve technical aspects within the next year.

Adelsheim agreed with Donovan. Both agreed this was not an emergency issue and that more time needs to be taken to understand what the role of the OCSW Steering Committee is and whether the OCSW should have separate standards or not and it should be thoughtfully put together. He stated it was silly to try and arrive at something when not much information was available. We've done what we have done with the motion. It was approved. He further requested an official cooling off period for review.

Fox stated it was not fair to ban a chemical and this could possibly start a bad precedent with future chemicals. He suggested that the OCSW didn't need a technical committee but could utilize LIVES' technical committee. We pay dues to OCSW to market while LIVE provides technical standards.

Beck stated that OCSW must be based on defensible science. He continued stating the Board could accept recommendations of steering committees and make recommendations based on whatever it believed but it must be based on science.

Tannahill recommended a possible change in the charter to include more science. Bartholomew acknowledged OCSW is well known according to Full Glass Research.

Adelsheim the OCSW charter is unclear and needs to be clarified.

Tannahill asked the discussion be closed due to the Symposium reception that had started over an hour ago and due to the lack of consensus.

Tannahill adjourned the meeting at 7:10pm