

David S. Wall
P.O. Box 756 Newberg, Oregon 97132

February 14, 2019

To: Members: Senate Committee on Environment and Natural Resources

Re: SB 287 I vigorously OPPOSE SB 287, the farm brewery bill (as written).

Whereas some Breweries farm operations are substantial, growing and using products allegedly used in their beers on many acres deserves consideration, sadly, others do not. SB287 would equate All farm breweries as the same without setting defined "standards" and auditing mechanisms to ensure the percentage of "farm products grown" are actually used in the farm breweries products.

The Brewery /Bar [DeBenedetti-Wolves & People] asserts their 21.5 acre farm products are material to the making of their beers. Only ten (10) acres of this "farm" of aged-dilapidated Hazel nut trees are farmed and their EFU status is under review. Approximately ten (10) acres comprise of buildings, parking lot for [125 vehicles], Barn and et cetera are on the National Registry. The assertions and innuendos this farm is equitable to other farm breweries testimonies documented for this hearing is not "accurate" and or "truthful."

Currently, there is NO criteria and or methodology to quantify the amount of farm products allegedly contained in farm brewery products. And there is absolutely "No intention" whatsoever in Yamhill County to audit and or confirm the information given by any and all Yamhill County farm breweries, cider houses and wineries as "truthful." *In Yamhill County, a farm brewery owner can grow a couple of "hop-plants" in a one(1) gallon container and then advertise to the world "hops are grown on our farm."* Or, better yet "wild-yeast" harvested from a rotting plum on the ground next to an aged plum tree is another "farm product" heralded by the farm brewery owner is yet another "farm product" to substantiate qualifications for an Agritourism permit. Additional claims of "farm products" in beers are limitless. The claims of assisting OSU research in any measurable way is laughable.

The issue this committee should consider incorporating into SB 287-1; "Are the farm products grown on the farm to support the commercial enterprise or is the commercial enterprise supports the farm?" In the case of [Wolves & People] testimony of the owner of the property stated, "the commercial enterprise supports the farm."

The concept of "limited Agritourism" is problematic on many levels. It varies from one jurisdiction to another. In Yamhill County the Agritourism "permit conditions" are expressly "Not enforced." The farm breweries, cider houses and wineries are all capitalizing on the concept of Agritourism but in doing so, priceless, irreplaceable farm lands are being consumed by; "B&Bs", cafés, restaurants, commercial tents, parking lots, camp grounds and in the case of "Wolves & People," many of the aforementioned projects and proposed "hiking trails and pavilion." *These "commercial" projects associated with farm breweries, cider houses and wineries can easily evolve into "hotel complexes" using up viable farm in perpetuity.*

Currently, [Wolves & People's] Agritourism permit is under review by the Land Use Board of Appeals [LUBA (Case# 2018-144)]. Many issues mentioned, *supra*, will be adjudicated by this LUBA case.

This committee should consider; re-writing SB 287-1 to define standards and compliance methodologies and or deferring this matter until the Land Use Board of Appeals rules in this matter. Allowing SB 287-1 to move forward is problematic and is therefore unacceptable.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ David S. Wall