U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE TRANSPORTATION AND MARKETING PROGRAMS

+ + + + +

NATIONAL ORGANIC PROGRAM

+ + + + +

NATIONAL ORGANIC STANDARDS BOARD MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

MAY 20, 2008

+ + + + +

The Meeting of the National
Organic Standards Board convened in the
Chesapeake Room, Holiday Inn Inner Harbor,
Baltimore, MD, pursuant to notice, at 11:00
a.m., Rigoberto Delgado, Chairman, presiding.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

RIGOBERTO I. DELGADO, CHAIRMAN
JEFFREY W. MOYER, VICE-CHAIR
KATRINA HEINZE, SECRETARY
HUBERT J. KARREMAN
KEVIN ENGELBERT
JENNIFER M. HALL
JULIE S. WEISMAN
DANIEL G. GIACOMINI
GERALD A. DAVIS
KRISTINE ELLOR
TRACY MIEDEMA
JOSEPH SMILLIE
STEVE DEMURI
BARRY FLAMM

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Call to Order and Opening Remarks Chairman Delgado	8
Approval of Agenda	8
Announcements	10
Introductions	11
NOSB Mission	22
Secretary's Report Katrina Heinze, Secretary	22
November 2007 Meeting Transcripts	23
November 2007 Meeting Minutes	24
National Organic Program Report Barbara Robinson Deputy Administrator Transportation & Marketing and Acting Director National Organic Program	26
Public Comment on NOSB Action and Discussion Items	36
Ed Maltby Executive Director Northeast Organic Dairy Farmers' Alliance	39
Charlotte Vallaeys Farm and Food Policy Analyst Cornucopia Institute (proxy for Mark Castell)	49

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Harold Newcomb Cattle Tech Services Veterinarian for Intervet/Schering-Plough	56
Patty Lovera Assistant Director Food and Water Watch	61
Harriet Behar Certified Organic Grower Organic Inspector and Educator Midwest Organic Sustainable Education Service	73
George Lockwood Aquaculture Working Group	83
George Leonard Ocean Conservancy	98
Becky Goldburg Former NOSB Member	109
Tom Hutcheson Proxy for Neil Sims Kona Blue Water Farms	120
Barbara Blackstone Director of Scientific Affairs National Fisheries Institute	125
Jim Riddle Proxy for Alex Stone Oregon State University	131
Tom Hutcheson Regulatory and Policy Manager Organic Trade Association	151
Jody Biergiel CCOF	155

Emily Brown-Rosen Policy Director	168
Pennsylvania Certified Organic	
Gwendolyn Wyard Oregon Tilth	180
Grace Marroquin President and CEO Marroquin Organic International	188
M.J. Marshall Director of Government Relations Flavor and Extract Manufacturers Association	202
David E. Adams President and Owner Savoury Systems	208
Kelly Shea White Wave Foods	211
Zea Sonnabend California Certified Organic Farmers	221
Charlotte Vallaeys Cornucopia	240
Jim Pierce Global Certification Program Manager Oregon Tilth Certified Organic	248
Liana Hoodes National Organic Coalition	254

	Kristy Korb On behalf of Miles McAvoy President, National Association of State Organic Programs	263
	Mark Cool Seeds of Change	266
	Pat Kane Accredited Certifiers Association	280
	Woody Deryckx Organic Seed Growers and Trade Association	286
	Becky Goldburg Keep Antibiotics Working Coalition	307
	Paul Richardson Agro Source	313
	Brian Baker Research Director Organic Materials Review Institute	324
	Julia Sabin President, Board of Directors Organic Trade Association	332
Proxy	Patrick Arndt Certification Specialist Pennsylvania Certified Organic for Melanie Saffer Certification Director Pennsylvania Certified Organic	336
	Peggy Miars Executive Director California Certified Organic Farmers	338

Sam Welsch One-Cert	343
Katherine DiMatteo Board Member International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements	351
Harriet Behar National Organic Coalition	357
Leslie Zuck Executive Director Pennsylvania Certified Organic	363
David Guggenheim Aquaculture Development	370

2 11:07 a.m. 3 CHAIRMAN DELGADO: So, we do have quorum and I'm calling the -- the meeting will 4 5 come to order. And On behalf of my colleagues, and 6 as Chair of this Board, I want to welcome all 7 of you to this, the 36th meeting of 8 National Organic Standards Board. 9 10 At this moment, Board members, I'm assuming you had time to review the agenda, 11 12 and I want to call for any changes or comments 13 on your part. (No response.) 14 Hearing none, I will call for a 15 16 motion to approve the agenda as is printed. MEMBER HALL: I move to accept the 17 agenda as printed. 18 19 VICE-CHAIR MOYER: I second that 20 motion. CHAIRMAN DELGADO: It is moved and 21 seconded to approve the agenda for today as 22

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

And we will take a vote viva voce. 1 printed. 2 Those in favor say aye. 3 (Chorus of ayes.) Those against? 4 5 (No response.) 6 Okay, we have an agenda. Thank you 7 very much. By way of a welcome, I just want to 8 say how proud I am of all the Board members. 9 10 For the past four months, we have worked 11 extremely hard. We have changes in some 12 deadlines. And I want to appreciate that 13 work. Ι know all extremely 14 we were 15 focused on our work plans. We were able to of 16 resolve our differences views in extremely constructive manner. And I think we 17 were able to work and participate with the 18 19 program and the public in a most productive of 20 In short, I think this Board is a ways. working unit to be proud of. 21

NEAL R. GROSS

might not know

22

this,

members, but we clocked over 100 conference calls in the last four months. Each one of those calls was for sure at least two hours. We had several participants, in some cases up to 10 or more participants in those calls. There were heated debate going on.

And It doesn't take a lot of knowledge to make the math and realize that we accumulated very close to a thousand hours. I know you hate me to say this, and I consider myself the MBA, in-house MBA, but if you put numbers to those hours, pretty soon they add up to several thousands, if not millions, of dollars.

But the important thing is that all this is volunteer work, and that is highly appreciated. I know that's time away from your work, added pressure to your agendas, and most importantly, it is time away from your families. So thank you very much for that.

Right, a quick announcement on my part: our Board member, Mrs. Bea James, won't

NEAL R. GROSS

1 be able to join us for personal reasons, so 2 she sends her apologies. 3 And I would also like to introduce our newest member of the Board, Mr. 4 5 We are very happy to have him. He has Flamm. 6 been with us for several months now, but that hasn't kept him from being an active member. 7 He is actually forms part of the -- he is the 8 Chair of the Policy and Development Committee, 9 10 and I appreciate your effort, courage, and 11 dedication, Barry. Right, on that note, we can proceed 12 on to introductions, unless there are other 13 14 announcements. 15 MEMBER HEINZE: Catherine has asked 16 that we remind the public, if you haven't signed in in the registration book, to please 17 18 do so, so we know who has attended. 19 you. 20 CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other 21 announcements? 22

NEAL R. GROSS

(No response.)

1	Okay, let's proceed with
2	introductions, and we will start on the window
3	side of the aisle with Dr. Hugh Karreman,
4	please.
5	MEMBER KARREMAN: Good morning.
6	Thank you, Rigo.
7	My name is Hubert Karreman. I'm
8	I sit in the Environmentalist/Resource
9	Conservation seat on the Board. In daily
10	life, I am a dairy veterinarian, working with
11	organic dairy farms in Lancaster County,
12	Pennsylvania, and I've been doing that for the
13	last 12 or 13 years and
14	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Thank you, Hugh
15	and Rigo.
16	I'm Kevin Engelbert. I'm a farmer
17	representative on the Board. I operate a 120-
18	count dairy farm in upstate New York. We've
19	been organic for about 30 years.
20	I want to thank my sons, as I
21	always do at these meetings, for carrying the
22	load for me while I am away from the farm,

1	especially during this crucial month of the
2	year for us.
3	I sit on the Livestock Committee,
4	the Crops Committee, and the Materials
5	Committee. I am very, very honored to be in
6	this role. Thank you.
7	MEMBER HALL: Hi, I'm Jennifer Hall.
8	I live in Spokane, Washington, and I sit on
9	the Board as a consumer representative on both
10	the Livestock and the Certification
11	Committees.
12	In my regular life, I direct an
13	effort right now to open a consumer co-op in
14	Spokane, Washington.
15	MEMBER DeMURI: Hi, everybody. My
16	name is Steve DeMuri. I hold one of the
17	handler positions on the Board.
18	For fun, I work for Campbell's Soup
19	Company, and there I direct organic
20	manufacturing for our company.
21	I have been on the Board now for
22	about a year and a half, and it has been an

honor to be on this Board. 1 2 MEMBER WEISMAN: My name is Julie 3 Weisman. I'm the other handler on the Board. I'm currently the Chair of the Handling 4 5 Committee, and this is it's mУ 6 beginning of my fourth year. Time flies when 7 you're having fun. In my regular life, I am an owner 8 of Elan and Flavorganics, which involves me in 9 10 flavor ingredients, both organic conventional. I am also the mother of two 11 12 girls who I would -- I hope to get 13 meeting before the end of my term. GIACOMINI: 14 MEMBER Му name is 15 Daniel Giacomini. I sit in one of the 16 consumer seats. T'm from the 17 Bay Area in California, and my daily -- the rest of my 18 19 daily work is now taken up with issues of the I am also an animal nutritionist and 20

And I sit on the Board -- this is

NEAL R. GROSS

21

22

dairy consultant.

1	my third year on the Board. I'm Chairman of
2	the Materials Committee and on the Livestock
3	Committee.
4	MEMBER HEINZE: Good morning. I'm
5	Katrina Heinze. I am in a scientist slot on
6	the Board with formal training in chemistry.
7	I also have the honor of being the Secretary
8	for the Board.
9	I'm a long-time active organic
10	consumer and mother of two children. So this
11	certainly fits some personal passions.
12	Like everybody else, my day job, I
13	work for General Mills in our Regulatory
14	Affairs Group and have most of my experience
15	in food safety and manufacturing.
16	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Before we
17	continue, I would just ask you, when you
18	finish talking, please turn off your
19	microphones. That will avoid the echo that we
20	are listening to. Okay?
21	VICE-CHAIR MOYER: My name is Jeff
22	Moyer. I hold a farmer position on the Board.

My day job is the Farm Director for 1 2 the Rodeo Institute, a 333-acre research and 3 education facility in Pennsylvania. I am on the Livestock Committee. 4 5 I'm the Vice-Chair of the Crops Committee. 6 I'm on the Materials Committee, and I'm the Vice-Chair of the Board. 7 Thank you. 8 MEMBER DAVIS: I am Gerald Davis. 9 10 I am a producer representative on the Board and the Chair of the Crops Committee, and I'm 11 on the Handling Committee. 12 13 work for Grimmway Farms in California. Long-time, 15-year organic farm 14 15 advisor and agronomist. 16 MEMBER ELLOR: I'm Tina Ellor. I'm filling one of the environmentalist slots on 17 I've had the honor this year of 18 the Board. 19 working with the Crops Committee and 20 Livestock Committee, and I can't tell you how much I've learned and how nice it is to see so 21

many familiar faces out there.

MEMBER MIEDEMA: Good morning. I'm Tracy Miedema. I live in Oregon and work for a sustainable and organic farm there and manage the Consumer Products Division, and I sit in the consumer -- one of the three consumer and public interest seats.

My committee work is Handling Committee and Certification, Accreditation, and Compliance.

MEMBER SMILLIE: My name is Joe Smillie. I hold the certifier seat on the Chair NOSB. I'm of the Certification, Accreditation, and Compliance Committee and a heavily-worked member of the overworked Handling Committee.

(Laughter.)

I have been a certifier officially since about 1998. I'm the Senior Vice President of Quality Assurance International. Before that, I was an organic inspector for a number of organizations. I was a consultant specializing in industrial compositing and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

orchard management. And before that, I was a organic farmer.

I have been on the Board for three years and, you know, like everyone else, the reason -- one of the reasons I took the CACC job was because that was the Committee that didn't have much work, and I thought, well, I've got a pretty heavy work schedule, so I'll try that one. But that was a mistake because all of a sudden we got a load of work.

So I just want to testify what everybody else has said, that serving on the NOSB is a real commitment and it takes a lot of time. A lot of the people on this Board spend a lot of time doing reviews and many of the other tasks we have. It's an amazing Board to work for.

We have definitely differences of opinion all the time, but we work really well together as a group, and I'm especially proud of that fact.

MEMBER FLAMM: As Rigo announced,

NEAL R. GROSS

1	I'm the newcomer on the Board.
2	I live in Polson, Montana on the
3	beautiful Flathead Lake. I always have to do
4	a little advertising for Montana.
5	I have spent my life, vocation and
6	avocation in conservation, particularly in
7	natural resources and environmental work.
8	On the Board, as Rigo mentioned, I
9	am currently Chair of the Policy and
10	Development Committee. I also serve with Joe
11	on the CAC Committee and also the Crops
12	Committee.
13	I, my briefly, my background, as
14	I mentioned, is in conservation and natural
15	resources, environmental work. Currently, I
16	am primarily an international consultant on
17	conservation in different parts of the world.
18	And I just recently sold my organic
19	cherry and apple orchard.
20	And I'm extremely pleased to be
21	part of the NOSB and have worked with a great
22	group of people. I'm real happy to be here

you

6	Board members and members of the public, if
7	we do hear a cell phone go off, we'll take
8	your name down and you will have to buy drinks
9	for all the members of the Board. So please
10	take this time to turn those off.
11	I would like also to continue
12	thank you very much for with members of the
13	program, if you were kind enough to introduce
14	yourselves and tell us something about your
15	background. Then if we can start with Dr.
16	Robinson?
17	MS. ROBINSON: Oh, I'm sorry, what
18	do you want?
19	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Introductions,
20	please.
21	MS. ROBINSON: I'm sorry.
22	Barbara Robinson, Deputy
	NEAL D. ODOGO

comments

and

meet

and

hear

your

1	Administrator for Transportation and Marketing
2	Programs and presently the Acting Director for
3	the National Organic Program.
4	Do you want me to introduce the
5	whole staff, or do you want
6	On my right is Richard Mathews. To
7	his right is Katherine Benham, then Toni
8	Strother. On my left is Mark Bradley. Next
9	to Mark is Bob Pooler, and next to Bob is
10	Shannon Nally at your service.
11	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: And lastly, we
12	have our Executive Director, Ms. Valerie
13	Francis. Could you tell us something about
14	your background and the most funniest thing
15	that has happened in the last three hours?
16	(Laughter.)
17	MS. FRANCIS: Long-time organic
18	person, nutritionist by training, worked on
19	farming, marketing, retail, wholesale,
20	research, a lot of different activities,
21	certification even more recently.

And glad to be here.

22

This will be

my third year in this role, and it has just been a blast. I love working at the Board.

And the funniest thing that has happened in the last three hours is we've had a heck of a time with our projector. And so we are trying to get that worked out, but it has just not wanted to cooperate. So we have a back-up plan for later. I don't know how funny that is.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you, Valerie.

Okay it's part of the tradition here on the Board is for the Chair to read the Board's mission, and that is what I am going to do at this point. It reads as follows, and it is found in the Policy Manual:

The mission is to provide effective and constructive advice, clarification, and guidance to the Secretary of Agriculture concerning the National Organic Program and the consensus of the organic community. All right?

1	And let's move on, then, to the
2	Secretary's report. Dr. Heinze, if you would
3	be so kind?
4	MEMBER HEINZE: Okay. It has been
5	a while since anybody has called me "doctor".
6	It's a little bit shocking.
7	Okay we have two matters to take
8	care of as part of the Secretary's report.
9	One is the meeting transcripts from our
10	November meeting, and the other is our meeting
11	minutes. So we'll take those in order.
12	So I have I believe the
13	transcripts are in order and there's no
14	discussion unless anyone on the Board has
15	discussion on the transcripts.
16	(No response.)
17	Okay, hearing none, I move that we
18	accept the November 2007 meeting transcripts.
19	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any second?
20	MEMBER ELLOR: Second.
21	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: It is moved and
22	seconded to accept the November 2007 meeting

1	transcripts.
2	Discussion?
3	(No response.)
4	All right, ready for the question?
5	The question is on the motion to accept the
6	November 2007 meeting transcripts, and we'll
7	take a viva voce vote.
8	All those in favor please say aye.
9	(Chorus of ayes.)
10	All those against?
11	(No response.)
12	Okay, the motion is approved here.
13	Any abstentions?
14	(No response.)
15	Thank you for the correction.
16	None. So, thank you.
17	We'll continue on.
18	MEMBER HEINZE: Okay, the second
19	matter is the November 2007 meeting minutes.
20	Typically, that is a combination of the
21	Secretary's minutes as well as the vote
22	summary. Due to the transition in Secretary

1	and a technical error, the Executive Committee
2	has not voted on the vote summary. So we'll
3	have to handle those at our next meeting. So
4	this is just the minutes from our November
5	2007 meeting.
6	Any questions or discussion on
7	those?
8	(No response.)
9	Okay. I move that we accept the
10	November 2007 meeting minutes.
11	VICE-CHAIR MOYER: I'll second
12	that.
13	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: It is moved and
14	seconded to accept the November 2007 minute
15	meeting minutes.
16	Any questions? Discussion?
17	(No response.)
18	Hearing none, we are ready for the
19	question. The question is on the motion to
20	accept the November 2007 meeting minutes, and
21	we'll again take a viva voce vote.
22	All those in favor please say aye.

1	(Chorus of ayes.)
2	All those opposed say no.
3	(No response.)
4	Any abstentions?
5	(No response.)
6	Okay, the motion is approved.
7	MEMBER HEINZE: That ends the
8	Secretary's report.
9	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you very
10	much.
11	Well, it is 11:29, and it is now
12	the turn for the National Program to provide
13	us with their report. And I'll ask Dr.
14	Robinson to do so at this point.
15	MS. ROBINSON: Good morning.
16	First of all, I would like to
17	welcome Dr. Flamm to the Board.
18	Barry, we certainly do appreciate
19	you accepting this appointment. And we have
20	for you a plaque and your letter of
21	appointment, signed by Secretary Edward
22	Schafer. So I want to present that to you now

with appreciation for accepting the call to serve the Nation and the United States

Department of Agriculture as a member of the National Organic Standards Board.

(Applause.)

Okay. Well, we've had some good things happen to us this year. One was we got a lot of extra money. And with this program, every little bit helps.

The FY08 budget increase was almost a 100 percent increase in our budget, which for the size of this budget is -- I guess you could say that's not saying much, but for us we jumped up and down for joy. We're up to \$2.6 million in program funding.

And last fall, when I talked with you -- with the Board and with the industry -- I told you that we were going to make some changes if we got some new money, and so we have. At that time I talked with you about trying to increase transparency in this program. So we think that we are on the road

to doing that.

I also told you that we would probably, you know, scrape our knees a little bit when we did it. But we have done some -- made some changes, and I am pretty pleased with those.

Because of the additional funding that we have received, we are now to the point we have been able to actually create some structure in this program. Whereas, before we always had kind of the situation that I like to call, you know, seven or eight people, just, you know, get up there and do some work, now we have been able to create three branches in the program for the first time.

We have a Standards Review and Development Branch. We have a Accreditation, Auditing, and Training Branch, and we have a Compliance and Enforcement Branch.

Rick Matthews heads up the Standards Review and Development Branch. Mark Bradley heads up the Accreditation, Auditing,

and Training Branch, and at the moment we don't have anyone heading up the Compliance and Enforcement Branch.

But for the moment, and until we fully get staffed up, we are trying to staff up to 15 or 16 people this year, and we hope that we will be able to do that. For the moment, if you are in either the Accreditation, Auditing and Training Branch or the Compliance and Enforcement Branch, my expectation is that you wear both hats.

We also have changed our website, which I am sure -- in fact, I know -- that many of you have noticed. We now look like the USDA home page. If you've ever been on that site, we now look like that.

We have been waiting a long time to be able to do that. So we're very happy that we now look like the USDA home page, and we had to come into compliance with that directive.

But when we did that, it enabled us

NEAL R. GROSS

to take advantage of some things and begin to create what I talked to you about last fall, which was to start to build more transparency and create this glass house for the NOP to begin to publish everything that we can publish for this program and put it on the website.

So we are beginning to publish all the information that we can relative to our certifying agents. We started something called NOP Access, where we are trying to put up questions and answers that we receive from outside parties.

We know that you are reading it because you let us know where we don't do it right. I'm not going to apologize for the website or for the fact that you point out our mistakes because that lets me know you are reading. So I'm very happy for that.

Like I said before, Access is new.

The website is new. Like anything new, it's not perfect. We'll get there.

NEAL R. GROSS

We are engaged in equivalence discussions with Canada. We have had two technical meetings with them. We are coming up on a third discussion with them. We are very optimistic and we remain so. It is a priority for us because it is a priority for you. So it is high on our list of things to accomplish.

Yesterday I met with officials from Japan, after they were meeting with from U.S. Trade representatives the Representative's Office. We presented them with a letter of recognition. So they are now step closer to requesting equivalency one discussions with us as well.

We understand that they have removed restrictions on potassium bicarbonate lignin sulfonate. still and They problems with fumic acid. That will be a if problem request equivalency they discussions with us.

We understand that the EU has also

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	backed away from their concerns about
2	potassium bicarbonate as well, which is good.
3	As for regs, the materials dockets
4	are moving through clearance, as they need to
5	be, and we will get them done. The sunset
6	dockets, everything will move through and get
7	there on time.
8	The pasture rule is still working
9	its way through clearance, and we remain
10	optimistic that we will have something for the
11	industry.
12	That's all that we have for the NOP
13	update, unless you have questions.
14	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Are there any
15	questions? Kevin?
16	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Two questions,
17	Barbara: Do you have any idea what the
18	pasture rule is going to look like? Will it
19	resemble the NOSB recommendations at all?
20	Two, where does the origin of
21	livestock stand?
22	MS. ROBINSON: We're writing the

1	origin of livestock rule right now, Kevin. We
2	haven't put it through clearance yet, but we
3	are writing it.
4	Yes, I do know what the pasture
5	rule will look like because we wrote it, not
6	to be flippant or anything, but I do know what
7	it will look like.
8	What was the other part of your
9	question? Will it look anything like the NOSB
10	recommendation? Yes, it will meet everyone's
11	needs. Yes.
12	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
13	questions for Dr. Robinson?
14	Kevin, was that clear? Satisfied?
15	(Laughter.)
16	Never mind. Well, we'll move on.
17	Mr. Smillie?
18	MEMBER SMILLIE: Any timeline on
19	the head of the third branch of the NOP, for
20	hiring that person?
21	MS. ROBINSON: I'm hoping this
22	summer.

1	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
2	questions? This is your chance.
3	MS. ROBINSON: Oh, it's not your
4	only chance. I'm here for the whole meeting.
5	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Absolutely.
6	Yes, I must recognize that, and thank you for
7	participating with us every month on the
8	conference calls. You have been extremely
9	supportive, and I want to recognize that.
10	Very well. Thank you very much for
11	your report.
12	MS. ROBINSON: You're welcome.
13	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: And it is 20
14	before the hour. That concludes our first
15	section of the meeting. The next part is very
16	interesting. It is lunch. So we'll take a
17	recess and come back at quarter to 1:00.
18	We have a total of 47 public
19	commenters. We'll start with Mr. Ed Maltby.
20	We need to be here promptly. So I'll ask you
21	to be here at quarter before the hour.
22	Yes? Is the room going to be

1	locked? Can we leave our valuables here? It
2	will be locked and you can leave your
3	valuables.
4	Yes?
5	MS. FRANCIS: Rigo, I'm not sure we
6	can really start before we say we're going to
7	start when it comes to accepting comment, to
8	be sure that a commenter does not miss their
9	opportunity.
10	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: I stand
11	corrected. You're absolutely right. So we'll
12	start at the listed time, which is one o'clock
13	local time.
14	Any other clarifications?
15	Questions?
16	(No response.)
17	Okay, we are in recess.
18	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter
19	went off the record for lunch at 11:38 a.m.
20	and went back on the record at 1:05 p.m.)

1	A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N
2	1:05 p.m.
3	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, we're
4	ready to start.
5	We are now into the second part of
6	our program for today, which is public
7	comment.
8	Before starting, however, I would
9	like to read the policy for public comment
10	that is stated in our Policy and Procedures
11	Manual. It has seven points and I will read
12	all of them, starting with No. 1.
13	"All persons wishing to comment at
14	NOSB meetings during public comment periods
15	must sign up in advance." And that has
16	happened.
17	"A person will be called upon to
18	speak in the order they sign up. Unless
19	otherwise indicated by the Chair, each person
20	will be given five minutes to speak.
21	"Persons approaching the Board
22	should give their names and affiliations for

the record." And I will be reminding all 1 2 speakers of that. 3 I'll just skip to the next one. "No person will be allowed to speak 4 during the public comment period for more than 5 10 minutes." 6 And the most crucial I think is the 7 following: "Individuals providing public 8 comment will refrain from personal attacks and 9 10 from remarks that otherwise impunge on the character of any individual on the Board or 11 the members, on the program, or the public." 12 13 So I'll be asking that of the public, and I'll be very careful with that. 14 15 All right, on that note, we have 16 some other groundrules on the part of our 17 Secretary. Part of my duties 18 MEMBER HEINZE: 19 as Secretary are to assist those speaking with 20 their time management. So I have my timer. Five minutes. When you have one minute left, 21 a big yellow sign. When you have used up your 22

1	time, stop sign. So, hopefully, everyone will
2	be able to see those.
3	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you very
4	much.
5	There is one clarification there on
6	the part of our Director.
7	MS. FRANCIS: I didn't hear if you
8	actually said this; I was talking to someone
9	up here, but I just need to make sure that, if
10	you have written comments that you want passed
11	out, that when you come up here, check in with
12	me before your comment time, and bring me the
13	comments, I will pass them out.
14	I guess you'll bring the first
15	person up, and then there will be someone on
16	deck each time?
17	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Yes.
18	MS. FRANCIS: And you also need to
19	state your name and your affiliation for the
20	record at the beginning of your talk for
21	purposes of the transcript. That would help
22	us a lot.

1	CHAIDMAN DELCADO: Cood Eboul-
1	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Good. Thank
2	you.
3	All right, any other comments,
4	announcements?
5	(No response.)
6	Let's move on to our first speaker,
7	Ed Maltby, representing NODFA.
8	After will be Charlotte Vallaeys as
9	a proxy for Mark Costell.
10	MR. MALTBY: My name is Ed Maltby.
11	I'm the Executive Director of the Northeast
12	Organic Dairy Farmers' Alliance and
13	Administrator for the Federation of Organic
14	Dairy Farmers, which is a national umbrella
15	organization for dairy farmers across the
16	country.
17	What I am going to, I should say,
18	read but nothing I'm going to say today is
19	in any way new, and that is the problem. We
20	have an access to pasture rule that isn't due
21	to come out for quite some time. We have an

industry that is split. We have an organic

consumer which is questioning the integrity of the organic seal in a very public way, so much so that once the integrity of the seal is diminished, then the consumer, the farmer, the marketer, the industry as a whole will lose the credibility necessary to justify the increased profitability for every sector of the industry.

Now in looking at the access to pasture rules -- and I was on a conference call last week with organic dairy farmers across the country, and they had a few suggestions as to how I might present myself today, 100 percent of which I ignored because your caveat in starting was to be polite and not insulting.

One of the suggestions was I should bring some stale milk and put it around the room, so that you wouldn't forget the crisis that organic dairy farmers are in.

To get back to the necessary regulations, and this is nothing new, 120

NEAL R. GROSS

days, 30 percent dry matter has been out there now for two years, three years, four years. So we're not suggesting anything different from what the NOSB recommended many years ago. We're not looking for anything new. We're looking for something to be published.

To that extent then, we continue our lobbying at the USDA. Last month myself, a representative from the National Organic Coalition, and Horizon Organic met with the Under Secretary for Agriculture and expressed our deep concern with what was happening and the delay. We need something out. We need something that recognizes exactly what the NOSB put out there, not in part, but 100 percent, so that will retain the confidence of farmers who have been struck not just with one but with three or four different crisis, crises.

You all know the price of diesel, \$4.80 or \$4.90 a gallon. You know the price of health insurance. You know that farmers are

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

suffering. You know that farmers are going out of business and going back to conventional, and now is the time to act.

We need to have clear direction to the certifiers: This is how you measure access to pasture. Many certifiers are doing that now, but we don't have a level playing field across the country.

That should be relatively а straightforward thing to do. It is welcomed by both small farmers, not small farmers but Most of farmers who have small herds. farmers with small herds are rather large, but -- one minute left. But it is welcomed by small and large farmers across the country in arid areas where land is irrigated, California, in the Midwest, in the Northeast.

Anytime any of you need any substantiation of that, go to the NODFA website, and it's a bit easier to navigate than the USDA NOP website, which is, of course, coming along very nicely, and thank

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	you very much.
2	But before she shows me the yellow
3	stop sign, which when I'm driving I disobey
4	routinely, origin of livestock, last third of
5	gestation, we need it; we need it now. We
6	have to stop farmers who are going to enter
7	the industry doing so under false pretenses.
8	We have to have enough information
9	so organic dairy farmers can plan for the
10	future, can invest in livestock, can invest in
11	the land base they need to farm sustainably
12	for the future.
13	Thank you very much.
14	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Mr. Maltby,
15	please
16	VICE-CHAIR MOYER: Ed, can you
17	return to the podium? Thank you.
18	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: We have a
19	question here from Dr. Karreman.
20	Go ahead, please.
21	MEMBER KARREMAN: Ed, regarding the
22	farmers in economic crisis, one of the things

that I read about definitely on some of the LISTSERVs, one in particular, is that because of the large certified organic dairy farms, the small certified organic dairy farms are getting -- you know, they don't have the economies of scale and whatnot, and if there weren't that many, it would be a lot better.

So how many, roughly, how many of those large organic dairy farms do you think there are that are actually -- do you have any numbers somewhere that show that the large organic dairy farms are actually, you know, truly affecting directly the small farms?

That is one of the reasons for the pasture rule, of course, is that all the cows will be out, and apparently the larger farms might not be able to make that. Therefore, there will be smaller farms left.

So I guess I'm just asking, do you have any clue about how many of those large farms that you feel or your group feels that might not be in compliance with the current

NEAL R. GROSS

rule that are affecting things right now? 1 2 MR. MALTBY: I think the problem is 3 that they probably are somewhat in compliance with the current rule. 4 The current rule is 5 not specific enough. 6 If you look at the reasons why you 7 need an access to pasture rule that defines quantifiably just how much grass or forage 8 crops that need to be grazed is what consumers 9 10 That is what is on every carton of milk. 11 So you need the cows out there in 12 13 their hobbie-fours. They need to be out there grazing. 14 If you look at the number of large 15 16 dairies coming online, then we are talking perhaps eight to ten 5,000-plus cow dairies 17 which are going to come online unless some 18 19 regulation comes out that clearly defines what

Now if you look at 5,000-cow herds

NEAL R. GROSS

they need to do and what land base they need

to have.

20

21

1	and multiply that by 10, that's 50,000. The
2	most conservative estimates, we've got under
3	200,000 organic dairy cows in the country. So
4	the math is quite simple.
5	When there was a surplus a year
6	ago, people were talking about a wall of milk.
7	Well, unless we get definition on exactly how
8	many acres you need to sustain a large dairy
9	herd, then we will have a wall of milk coming
10	from the West and the Midwest that is going to
11	drive small family farmers out of business.
12	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Mr. Engelbert?
13	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes. Ed, I
14	think I may resemble one of your remarks.
15	(Laughter.)
16	MR. MALTBY: It wasn't directed at
17	you, Kevin.
18	MEMBER ENGELBERT: I have a number
19	that I heard of family farms in the Northeast
20	who have gone out of business. But do food
21	farmers in NODFA have an official number? Do

you know how many farms have gone out of

business in the last year?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. MALTBY: We don't exactly because it is very difficult to calculate. We know that at least 25 organic dairy farmers have stopped shipping organic milk. Some have gone back to conventional. Some have gone out of business.

What do know is that we one supplier of organic feed in the Northeast said his receivables went from 500,000 back September of '07 to 1.5 million. So you are are in debt. seeing farmers who You seeing farmers who have used their savings. You've got farmers whose line of credit has run out, and expect something catastrophic to happen this fall, which is not going to do the integrity of the seal any good.

MEMBER KARREMAN: I guess I have one follow-up question, if I may. My question, more specifically, is perhaps, do you have any numbers about the amount of consumers that have backed off buying organic

NEAL R. GROSS

1	dairy products because of this perception out
2	there with the large farms skirting the rules,
3	or whatever, you know, like you all say?
4	MR. MALTBY: Right, and we don't
5	have those figures yet, but if you look at
6	anecdotal accounts in newspapers, you see that
7	people are backing off from apparently paying
8	extra for organic milk.
9	Our study shows that the retail
10	price of organic milk in the marketplace is,
11	in fact, slightly less than it was two years
12	ago. So it is not price.
13	So if you take that information,
14	then it is questioning the integrity of the
15	seal, and whether they should pay extra for
16	that, and what does it do to benefit their
17	environment, their children's environment, and
18	in my case my grandchildren. I don't look
19	that old, but I had kids when I was young.
20	(Laughter.)
21	MEMBER KARREMAN: Thanks.
22	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other

1	questions?
2	(No response.)
3	Thank you very much.
4	MR. MALTBY: Thank you.
5	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Up next is
6	Charlotte Vallaeys. After her is Mitch
7	Johnson.
8	MS. VALLAEYS: Hi. My name is
9	Charlotte Vallaeys. I'm a Farm and Food
10	Policy Analyst at the Cornucopia Institute,
11	and I have a proxy statement for Mark Castell,
12	who is the Co-Director of the Institute.
13	Mark would like me to share with
14	the Board our concern for the lack of
15	enforcement of the organic regulations for
16	these large dairy farms and the apparent
17	favoritism toward certain corporations at the
18	compliance level.
19	He has asked me to read the
20	following sections from a press release issued
21	by the Cornucopia Institute earlier this

month:

"The Cornucopia Institute has filed a formal legal complaint with the USDA claiming that one of Dean's Horizon suppliers, a dairy in Snelling, California, was skirting the law by confining the majority of their cows to a filthy feedlot rather than allowing them fresh grass and access to pasture, as the federal organic regulations require.

"Cornucopia has also asked the Inspector General at the USDA to investigate appearances of favoritism at the agency that has benefitted Dean Foods.

"Cornucopia charges that past enforcement of the Organic Foods Production Act, the law governing organic food labeling and production, has been unequally applied toward major corporate agribusiness by the USDA.

"We are asking the USDA, once again, to investigate serious alleged improprieties at dairies that produce Horizon organic milk.

NEAL R. GROSS

"Besides the legal issues that Cornucopia raised, they suggest Dean Foods has seriously injured the value of its Horizon label and the reputation of organic milk. In the eyes of consumers, factory farms with questions about humane animal husbandry and records of endemic pollution do not meet the ethical litmus test.

"Cornucopia's most recent complaint is the third filed with the USDA alleging Dean Foods has broken the federal law that governs organic production. Prior complaints also charged Dean with confining cattle on their two corporate-owned dairies, managing as many as 8,000 head of cattle each.

"Although the USDA, based on Cornucopia research, sanctioned or decertified two independent factory farms supplying Horizon, the federal agency dismissed both legal complaints against Dean Foods itself.

"According to documents obtained under the Freedom of Information Act by

NEAL R. GROSS

Cornucopia, the USDA never investigated or even visited Dean's largest corporate-owned industrial dairy in the desert-like conditions of central Idaho.

"It appears that Dean Foods has more political clout in Washington than the two independent factory farm operators that were found to have been abusing the trust of organic consumers.

"According to FOIA documents, Dean Foods hired lawyers at Covington and Burling, one of the Capital's most powerful and influential legal and lobbying groups, to plead their case.

"The USDA closed complaints we filed in 2005 and 2006 without ever having visited the Horizon dairy in Idaho and warned Dean Foods in advance before inspecting their Maryland farm.

"In a letter to USDA Inspector General Phyllis K. Fong, Cornucopia asked her to investigate why the agency arbitrarily

NEAL R. GROSS

chose to adjudicate some of the formal legal complaints filed by Cornucopia, but looked the other way when it came to the largest corporate dairy processor and marketer in the country for almost identical alleged offenses.

"Cornucopia's letter stated conditions on the 8,000-head factory farm operated by Dean in Idaho were very similar to the factory farms that the USDA has already sanctioned. The only discernible difference appears to be how much money Dean Foods has spent on lobbyists and campaign contributions in Washington."

We would like to stress that the current rules are enforceable, as evidenced by the enforcement actions against Aurora and VanDrake. So we ask the Board to be on record to support strong and even-handed enforcement against all marketplace players no matter how large and powerful.

Furthermore, we urge the enactment of the new regulatory language controlling

NEAL R. GROSS

pasture and the origin of livestock. 1 2 must be no less strict than the standards are 3 today, only easier to understand and enforce. Thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN DELGADO: All right, thank 5 6 you. Any questions from the Board? 7 Dr. Karreman? 8 Just a simple --MEMBER KARREMAN: 9 10 not a simple point, but it's conventional and organic. Regarding animal welfare and how 11 12 animals are kept, I've got to say that on some of the larger farms, animal welfare is better 13 than on some of the small farms I see. I'm 14 just saying that. You can't just take a broad 15 16 brush and say large farms, 1,000-2,000 head, conventional or organic, have bad 17 animal welfare. 18 19 I'm in the industry. I just want 20 to correct you on that. 21 CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay. Ms. 22 Miedema?

MEMBER MIEDEMA: I just wanted to
add to my colleagues on the Board and to our
Chair, I do take exception to this pulpit
being used as a forum for unfounded
allegations, and we're going to have a really
long three days if this is the type of
information that flows to us.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay. Well, I
do have to remind the member of the Board that
this is public comment, and we are obligated
to listen to those comments. Whether we agree
with those or not, or whether we think those
comments are appropriate for our mandate, it's
another story.
MEMBER MIEDEMA: I question whether
enforcement is under the purview of this
Board.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Absolutely.
Okay, any other comments?
(No response.)
Thank you very much.
Up next we have Mitch Johnson,

1	please, and after Mr. Johnson is Patty Lovera.
2	MR. NEWCOMB: Actually, I'm Harold
3	Newcomb, and I'm a cattle tech services
4	veterinarian for Intervet/Schering-Plough, the
5	petitioner to add Fenbenzadole to the National
6	Organic Standards as a parasiticide
7	MEMBER HEINZE: Could you spell
8	your name, please?
9	MR. NEWCOMB: Ma'am?
10	MEMBER HEINZE: Could you spell
11	your name, please?
12	MR. NEWCOMB: N-E-W-C-O-M-B.
13	MEMBER HEINZE: Thank you.
14	MR. NEWCOMB: Anyway, we wish to
15	add Fenbenzadole to the National Organic
16	Standards as a parasiticide to be used as an
17	emergency treatment in dairy and breeder
18	stock.
19	We appreciate by unanimous vote the
20	NOSB Livestock Committee recommended
21	Fenbenzadole to the National List in
22	accordance with Section 205.238 of the

National Organic Standards.

We also want to acknowledge the National Organic Program's decision to allow the petition to be advanced under the 1999 TAP review of Fenbenzadole, Ivermectin, and Albendazole.

Parasite control today stands as perhaps the major factor limiting development of certified organic livestock production. Fenbenzadole addresses this need in a manner much more compatible with the principles of organic agriculture than can be offered by Ivermectin or Moxidectin.

Certainly management practices are the foundation for parasite control in organic livestock production, but the same section that requires organic producers to maintain preventative livestock health practices also requires producers to use appropriate medication to restore an animal to health when methods acceptable to organic production fail.

In addition, animals on pasture

NEAL R. GROSS

naturally have more exposure to parasites than those in confined situations. Current biological and natural parasite controls are not always effective to control emergency outbreaks of internal parasites.

While Diatomaceous Earth is

While Diatomaceous Earth is effective in controlling external parasites, there is no scientific evidence regarding the efficacy of this product on internal parasites.

Controlling internal parasites should never be the main motivation for adding Diatomaceous Earth to the feed.

Organic livestock producers approached Intervet a couple of years ago to request that petition Fenbenzadole we marketed under the commercial name of Safequard for approval allowed as an parasiticide under Section 205.603 because Fenbenzadole offers three major advantages.

No. 1, Fenbenzadole is not a macrolide antibiotic. Fenbenzadole is part of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

a class of compounds called Fenbenzadoles. contrast, Ivermectin and Moxidectin are both macrolide antibiotics. such, As they are inherently inconsistent with organic management practices. In fact, the Secretary of Agriculture in 2006 initially refused to accept the NOSB's recommendation Moxidectin to the National List for reason.

Secondly, Fenbenzadole is benign to dung beetles, earthworms, and other beneficial microorganisms. Dung beetles recycle nutrients in pastures and control horn flies and face flies. single manure pat Α 60 to 80 adult horn flies if generate protected from insect predators such as dung beetles. Fly populations have been shown to decrease significantly in areas with dung beetle activity.

Ivermectins have a broad range of activity in nematodes and arthropods as well.

By contrast, Fenbenzadole only targets

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

nematodes. Studies cited in our petition document the benign impact of Fenbenzadole on the dung beetle, earthworms, and other beneficial microorganisms.

Third, parasite resistencies into the Avermectins or Ivermectin. The repeated use of the same drug class contributes to the development of resistence parasites. Parasite resistance by to Ivermectin compounds is well-documented. contrast, little resistance to Fenbenzadole has been shown during the past 20 years.

In summary, Fenbenzadole represents a viable resource that will allow organic producers to have access to an appropriate medication that will not violate the principles of organic production. We strongly urge that NOSB adopt the recommendation of the Livestock Committee and recommend the addition of Fenbenzadole to 205.603 of the National Organic Standards.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any questions

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

from the Board? 1 2 (No response.) 3 Okay, I hear none. Thank you very much. 4 5 So Ms. Lovera, and after that is 6 Harriet Behar. My name is Patty 7 MS. LOVERA: Hi. Lovera, and I'm the Assistant Director of Food 8 which and Water Watch, is 9 а consumer 10 organization based in Washington, D.C. here today to speak about the aquaculture 11 12 recommendation. 13 I just want to start off by saying that we represent consumers, and our members 14 15 especially communicate with us that they have 16 very high expectations of the organic standard general, and the credibility of 17 standard is what I am here to talk about, and 18 19 aquaculture is no exception. 20 Food and Water Watch So 21 longstanding concerns about aquaculture

general, especially done in the open oceans.

So the issue of open net pens and wild fish used in meal or oil are two practices we are very concerned about. We think they have such high environmental impacts that it makes them incompatible with the principles of organic production.

So, therefore, with the recommendation you all are considering at this meeting, we were pleased to see Section 252(b) that says there will be no use of wild fish meal or oil in feed, but we have concerns about a couple of the other sections in the recommendation.

The first concern we have is with Section 252(a), which allows the use of fish meal and oil from carcasses, viscera, trimmings from processing of foreign certified organic farmed aquatic animals to be used in fish feed for domestic organic production.

We have concerns about this on a couple of levels. One is as a process question, whether it is really good precedent

NEAL R. GROSS

just to declare a foreign process basically equivalent to a U.S. process that doesn't yet have a standard. So we are very concerned about the order of events there if we don't have a U.S. standard yet, but we're allowing foreign organic products to come in and be used in organic production here.

Then we have very specific concerns about some foreign standards for organic that allow things like antibiotics and parasiticides to be used that we feel don't match up with the livestock standards we have here.

The other section we are concerned 252(1), and we're a about is little bit confused about this one because it specifies where you can't get fish meal and oil from. fisheries You can't come from that overfished or at risk, which doesn't compatible with Section (b) that says can't use it. So we are a little bit confused about why that is in there. We think that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that is unnecessary if Section (b) says you're not to use wild fish meal or oil.

The final point on aquaculture I need to make is we are very concerned about any proposal to allow a transitional or a made-with-organic ingredients label for aquacultured fish. We don't feel like that is an acceptable interim solution while we are still having this debate. We need to figure out what the standards are going to be, come up with a good standard, and we don't think that an alternative label or an interim label is an adequate solution to the current debate that we are having.

So I think, rather than repeat the comment I made six months ago, I will just say that we are very concerned about kind of the sense we get from this recommendation and from some previous debates, that there is this pressure to have a standard for carnivorous fish. We don't think that that is the way it is supposed to work with organic if organic is

NEAL R. GROSS

going to remain credible with consumers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

We don't want to see the standard stretched to meet practice. current The industry practice has to come meet the standard, and the standard has to remain very high for organic to be credible with consumers.

Finally, I will just say, to save some time, we are a member of the National Organic Coalition, and you are going to hear comments from them later that we fully support about grower groups and the need to maintain that issue for growers, and also for the issue of materials and the national lists. We think that this is a huge issue of credibility for organic consumers to trust the standard, and we think there's a lot of process issues that have to be cleared up with the way materials are being added to that list before we add a lot more.

Finally, I just have to also point out that the issue of pasture and figuring out

NEAL R. GROSS

that pasture rule is another huge credibility issue with consumers.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, thank you.

Questions? Yes, Ms. Hall?

MEMBER HALL: On the fish meal and oil, in the interest of trying to reduce the burden on wild stocks, and also try to preserve a natural diet for pisciverous species, where would you suggest they get their diet?

MS. LOVERA: We think that it isn't going to be an automatic that carnivorous fish immediately can be organic. So I know there's some companies exploring raising fish organically, herbivorous fish organically, to then turn them into feed for carnivorous fish. If that takes longer, that is the sequence of events. We just don't see wild fish being an acceptable bridge to that because of the environmental impact that it has.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Yes?

NEAL R. GROSS

MEMBER SMILLIE: Patty, since you're the first aquaculture person, I thought I would take the opportunity to forget about the details for a second and try to figure out where your group, what you want out of this. Because I had participated in the beginning on the aquaculture debate, and to recommendations that the Livestock Committee has come up with have really gone through a lot of the details and they've gotten down to like what they consider the barest minimum, future organic aquaculture a possible industry may or may not even be able to grow or survive or even start with what currently is being recommended.

The end game for your group, surely you want to support an organic aquaculture industry because most of your complaints, which are valid and legitimate, are against conventional aquaculture. Don't you feel that we have to find a middle ground, a compromise position, so that we can start an organic

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

aquaculture industry that can be replaced, hopefully, bу consumers voting at the marketplace with organic aquaculture an industry?

But if we kill, if we don't allow this organic aquaculture industry to start, then there won't be really a real competitor to the conventional aquaculture industry that seems to be at the core of most of your issues.

So Ι just wanted to ask you philosophically, has your group thought about the strategic end game in this? Do they want to support an organic aquaculture industry to in the marketplace with compete conventional industry that causes all of these problems that you have noted?

MS. LOVERA: I think that the definition of organic is what we are talking about, and if it is only able to be done for certain fish, then it is only able to be done for certain fish. I don't think we want to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

sacrifice the credibility of the organic standard for all foods to deal with the issue of aquaculture, and that is a concern that we have.

So we don't think that this is the only way to deal with the negative impacts of conventional aquaculture. We're doing plenty of other stuff to try to deal with that as well. There are fixes that need to be made there, and it is not only going to be duked out in the market with organic versus conventional.

Т have the mean we to stop environmental impacts conventional of production and we have to have organic production when it is appropriate and when it meets the criteria of what people expect of organic.

MEMBER SMILLIE: Right.

MS. LOVERA: I mean I don't think we have any reason to bend that in some kind of short-term battle.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MEMBER SMILLIE: One of the problems face is that it is such different thing to deal with. the In conversations with the Aquaculture Working Group and many, many others, we have realized that some of our organic rules, which we hold steadfastly to, don't seem to fit, and we need to spend more time in trying to figure out what organic and aquaculture mean. Because if you just take livestock rules or the current feed rules we have, sometimes they just don't fit with the aquaculture realities. working off a terrestrial basis.

I mean you will hear more at this meeting about hydroponics, how it can't possibly be organic, and aquaculture is a very hydroponic operation in many ways.

So what we are looking at in aquaculture is trying to figure out how organic integrity fits with aquaculture. If we hold a strict terrestrial definition, it will be problematic, but I understand your

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	point. It was a good answer. You answered my
2	question.
3	MS. LOVERA: Yes, but we just have
4	the concern that in the short term I
5	sympathize; I don't envy you guys the job you
6	have to do, but there are bigger credibility
7	issues at risk to solve this one problem of
8	aquaculture. I don't think that that is worth
9	it for organic as a whole. I mean we have to
10	put that integrity first.
11	MEMBER SMILLIE: Like the foreign
12	fish example?
13	MS. LOVERA: It makes us very
14	nervous, yes.
15	MEMBER SMILLIE: Okay.
16	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Jennifer?
17	MEMBER HALL: I would share that I
18	have equal concern about the integrity of the
19	label and aquaculture as a whole. However, I
20	do think, like Joe suggested, that there does
21	need to be some point at which we can start,
22	and that if it is all noes, then the

legitimate concerns you bring up about conventional aquaculture, consumers do respond to that. I do worry that then that just hyperinflates the demand on wild stocks which are already in great jeopardy.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Hugh?

MEMBER KARREMAN: If the Livestock Committee were to amend its position on the foreign organic fish such that they cannot have had parasiticides or antibiotics, would that be helpful?

Compared MS. LOVERA: to people in this room, I'm а newcomer to organic, but my understanding is that to declare a foreign standard equivalent, you have to have a U.S. standard. So I'm a little bit confused about the order of events of allowing that in.

MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes, I'm not trying to get to that point right now. I'm just saying that if there were foreign fish coming in, let's just say, and they were

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	certified not to have had antibiotics or
2	parasiticides, would that allay some of your
3	there's one point that you mentioned on
4	that?
5	MS. LOVERA: Yes, I mean that would
6	be a start, and we would have to then go look
7	at, are they using that and some of the other
8	concerns that we have that just aren't on the
9	table for this agenda.
10	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
11	questions?
12	(No response.)
13	Thank you very much.
14	MS. LOVERA: Thanks.
15	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Ms. Harriet
16	Behar, and on deck we have George Lockwood.
17	MS. BEHAR: Hello, everyone. I'm
18	Harriet Behar, a certified organic grower, an
19	organic inspector, and an educator with the
20	Midwest Organic Sustainable Education Service.
21	I have a few comments on a few different
22	things.

Commercial availability of seed recommendation, the proposal as written puts a tremendous burden on producers, seed suppliers, and certifiers. For agronomic crops, the vast majority of the organic corn, beans, small grains, and legume seeds are now certified organic. However, the availability of organic vegetable seeds is limited.

The marketplace would be better served by having the seed breeders survey the needs of organic farmers and produce seeds to meet those needs. This would get more to the heart of the issue than producing voluminous lists from each certifier.

aquaculture, the On proposal allowing foreign-certified wild-caught fish meal to be used as feed for NOP organic fish puts our domestic producers at a disadvantage, stating that a lower standard certification foreign entity is allowed а requiring a higher standard from any domestic producers.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The proposal to test the wild-caught fish for contaminants also takes us down the slippery slope of having the organic label be based in a testing regime and not in a production system.

The NOSB and the NOP should not be pushed by the marketplace to come up with something to meet the marketplace demand for a cleaner fish. The final standard should be consistent with all other NOP standards; otherwise, we risk the lowering of consumer of perception categories for all labeling.

groups: Calling this a Grower multi-site certification process goes beyond the original issue brought before the NOP and does take into account fundamental not differences between farmers and retailers/handlers. Farmers are part community where there is peer pressure remain true to production standards set by that community. Farmers manage their

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

from year to year, and it remains within the family as well as for generations.

Handlers are hourly or salaried employees who may lose their jobs if they do not perform their work satisfactorily, but would not lose their homes and livelihoods if they do not follow their organic protocols.

The retail environment is notorious for employee turnover, losing the consistency needed from year to year to continuously improve the organic management system.

This proposal to improve internal control systems should be returned to only include farmer producers with any discussion of multi-site certification for retailers or handlers to be part of a completely different document which would address the significant differences between the two types of operations.

TAP reviews: At this time, TAPs are not needed for items on 205.606. It appears that the decisions on these 606 items

NEAL R. GROSS

are being made solely on the petitioner's statements without any further impartial analysis done in the marketplace. There is no review of the environmental or health effects of the conventional farming or processing practices to produce these items on 606, which is clearly required by OFPA.

After Harvey, there was a tight deadline to have items 606, on and expediency TAP reviews were not done. However, this should not become the status With the increased funding of the NOP, these TAPs should be instituted.

The presence of okra on 606 and petitioner's justification is one example. I also noted that there was no TAP done on the cheese wax to be reviewed during this session.

Again, the NOSB is relying only on those who support the petition to support them with their information, which inherently will be one-sided and not impartial.

Q&As on the NOP website: It is

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

impossible for the NOP staff to have deep knowledge on every subject, resulting in errors on the website.

One example is whether honeybees can be certified organic. Comparing honeybees to poultry shows a great lack of knowledge in the biology of honeybees.

There is a good NOSB recommendation on apiculture which addresses not only the origin of honeybees, but also the will within the hive which need to be transitioned. Many entomologists suspect the high concentration of toxic substances used in beehives is of colony collapse а cause disorder, and ignoring the honeycomb issue as well as lack of understanding of bee biology makes this an unworkable answer.

Q&As should be verified as correct by running them by a knowledgeable person, such as Nancy Ostiguy or a member of the NOSB Apiculture Task Force for this specific question.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Methionine, I would hope that some 1 dollars could be found to fund the research on 2 3 a methionine replacement. Relying only on the marketplace to do this is resulting 4 5 continual extension of the sunset of this 6 clearly prohibited substance. All synthetic amino acids are prohibited in the OFPA. 7 Lastly, I ask the NOSB to request 8 from the NOP to hire employees with strong 9 10 technical backgrounds, especially materials area, from the increased funding 11 which all of us worked very hard to get in the 12 2008 farm bill. 13 Thank you. 14 It is a big handful. You have a 15 16 lot of things on your docket that we have to 17 comment on. Thank you. 18 CHAIRMAN DELGADO: 19 Questions from the Board? We'll start with the Vice-Chair. 20 MS. BEHAR: Hi, Jeff. 21 Hi, Harriet. 22 VICE-CHAIR MOYER:

1 You did a good job reading very 2 fast. 3 (Laughter.) 4 MS. BEHAR: And you have it in 5 front of you. 6 VICE-CHAIR MOYER: We do. Thank 7 you. On your comments on commercial seed 8 availability, you said the proposal as written 9 10 would be a tremendous burden. Can you explain more about that, how tremendous that burden 11 is? 12 Well, you are asking 13 MS. BEHAR: certifiers to keep lists of all the items that 14 15 they approving as commerciallyare not 16 available. At this point, that's done at the inspection level. It's not always present in 17 a database of the certifiers. 18 19 I personally am a certified organic 20 I probably have purchased 30 percent organic vegetables or seeds 21 mУ organic for my vegetable operation, but 22 70

percent not organic because I couldn't find it. That is probably about 250 kinds of seeds.

So imagine if a certifier has a hundred vegetable growers. Do the math. They are going to have to maintain these lists. We are asking the seed suppliers to respond back to every vegetable grower that they don't have these 300 vegetable seeds. It is just a tremendous paperwork burden.

VICE-CHAIR MOYER: But as a grower, do you not already make a list of the seeds that you have or that you purchase?

Yes, but I don't have MS. BEHAR: it electronic. They would have to enter it in some kind of database. There would be these voluminous lists done the certifiers, by basically, to service a marketplace demand, where I think the seed people, they should be marketplace their surveying to see producers It may not only be by want. variety.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The vegetable producers may certain characteristics; there isn't even a variety available right So the now. marketplace would actually get more information that they need from а survey rather than just finding out that they can't get tyee spinach organic, because they are not finding out from the producer why do they want tyee.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Mr. Davis?

MEMBER DAVIS: Harriet, I just wanted to point out that your assertion that certifiers would have to collect and make a list and compile all this, that is not correct. That is not what the recommendation suggests.

So the recommendation purely is that certifiers act as the channel for the growers' list just to collect them, not compile them into a further list. So I just need to point that out.

MS. BEHAR: But the inspector is

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	usually seeing that on site. It is not always
2	going back to the certifier because, again, of
3	the large amounts. You know, there is a kind
4	of long list there.
5	And in the areas where we haven't
6	had a problem, I know in the Midwest I am
7	not sure about the East Coast, but I would say
8	65 to 70 percent of all the corn, soybeans,
9	small grains are organic seeds at this point.
10	Really our lack is in the vegetable area.
11	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
12	questions?
13	(No response.)
14	Okay, thank you very much.
15	Mr. Lockwood, and after that is
16	George Leonard.
17	MR. LOCKWOOD: Thank you, Mr.
18	Chairman. It is, indeed, a great pleasure to
19	be here today. I'm appreciative of this
20	opportunity.
21	I would also like to say that,
22	since we began this journey with the National

Organic Standards Board in 2005, we greatly appreciate the attention, the interest, the patience, and the diligence that you have provided, and particularly your Livestock Committee. It has been a pleasure working with them over the last several years and a multitude of a conference calls.

You mentioned the number of calls that you have had. I think the Livestock Committee must have the record of the majority of them.

We have carefully considered the proposal after working with the Livestock Committee, what they have proposed, and we are very concerned that perhaps it is not the most workable solution.

I would point out that, since 2006, the Board has been involved in many different meetings and discussions, including a symposium. Our 12-member professional group has participated in all of these. We have carefully considered what the proposal is, and

NEAL R. GROSS

we, frankly, believe that it is just too risky at this time to place all of aquaculture in what is being proposed.

In what we had proposed back in our interim final report in the year 2007, which was basically adopted with some exceptions, we were of one mind. There was no minority report, and we still are of one mind, that we are unanimous in what we are recommending.

To make our recommendations short, sir, what we simply would like to suggest is originally suggested, what what originally proposed to be adopted. We think that there is merit to what the Livestock Committee is proposing here, and perhaps it could be included as Item Q that fish meal and oil from carcasses, viscera, and trimmings foreign from the processing of certified organic farmed aquatic animals will considered organic for the use in fish feed only.

And the risks are simply this has

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

never been done before. The equivalency part of the law gives us great concern that the Secretary is going to have to determine a foreign certifier to be equivalent to what we have in the United States. The only way we can possibly see this working is if a grower is to grow to, say, a Natureland standard and to your standards simultaneously, so that that fish could possibly be used as a source of feed.

A second big concern we have is in oil. Right now there are no ways of producing the equivalent of fish oil. That may come, but it is far from certain at this particular stage.

So that is our recommendations, sir. We are just concerned whether or not the equivalency requirement really can be met in an expedient way.

I would also say that at one time the Livestock Committee was considering a phaseout of fish meal and oil. We support

NEAL R. GROSS

If that is what the Board wants to do, 1 that. 2 we think that is a workable condition. 3 But when it comes back to what we recommend, all feel 4 really we what we 5 originally proposed was, indeed, the best way to make a viable aquaculture industry organic 6 or to make organic aquaculture viable. 7 Thank you, sir. 8 CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you. 9 10 Any questions? Yes? 11 VICE-CHAIR MOYER: Thank you for 12 your comments, George. 13 A question: If I go down to the supermarket today and buy organic fish, where 14 and how is that produced? 15 16 MR. LOCKWOOD: Well, Natureland and the Soil Association are certifying fish that 17 18 come into the United States under 19 different standards. As one of the previous 20 speakers pointed out, they allow antibiotics and other prohibited things that we 21

22

allow here.

VICE-CHAIR MOYER: I understand that. So what our position was is that we're trying in some way to accommodate your needs and also the needs of the previous speaker. So when we have an aquaculture working group, an industry, that's not 100 percent happy, and we have an environmental group that's not 100 percent happy, I think we are working on the right track here as a Board, because it is a fine line for us to try to walk.

What we are also trying to do is make it possible to remove that organic fish from the marketplace and substitute it with a U.S. standard that I think is going to be quite a bit higher than what you are seeing there. They would not be able to sell that fish today in the marketplace if this standard that we have proposed would be in place. In fact, they would only be able to use the trimmings of that fish to feed these fish at a very low percentage, 12 percent fish meal and 12 percent fish oil. So that is our goal.

NEAL R. GROSS

1 MR. LOCKWOOD: Well, first of all, 2 Jeff, we're not unhappy. We are very, very 3 pleased with the progress that has been made. VICE-CHAIR MOYER: 4 Good. MR. LOCKWOOD: We just want to make 5 6 sure that what is finally adopted here 7 workable, and we have serious questions, as the 12 of us who are professionals in this 8 field, seven PhDs, we are just very concerned 9 10 that it may be very difficult to implement. 11 VICE-CHAIR MOYER: Okay. MR. LOCKWOOD: That is our concern. 12 13 CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Yes, Dan? GIACOMINI: 14 MEMBER George, 15 regarding the foreign fish meal and fish oil, 16 if that were to go through, meet muster, meet legal challenges, whatever else, would that 17 18 create a disadvantage to the U.S. aquaculture, 19 fish farmers, as far as getting access to that 20 or do you think that would all just be staying

NEAL R. GROSS

in country and shipping out the fish at the

end?

21

MR. LOCKWOOD: Dan, I have heard a number of people, U.S. growers, who are very concerned about what you just mentioned, that this is discriminatory against the U.S. farmer.

My feeling is that if a U.S. grower wants to get Natureland to certify their crops, that they could probably grow to these standards. I think that is unprecedented. I have never heard of it being done. Maybe you all who are in the business know how that is being done. But, yes, it is a concern.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Yes, Kevin?

MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes, George, briefly, I just want for the record to know that we have done the best we could with what our parameters were. We were told that wild-caught fish oil and fish meal simply will not be allowed when the OPIA writes the rule. When it says organic, it's got to be organic.

Hugh brought up the suggestion, well, there are foreign-certified operators

NEAL R. GROSS

selling fish in the United States. If we added onto that recommendation that no prohibited substances be allowed, would that be something that you think would be workable?

As Jeff said, we've got to have some way to get these -- and that you have

some way to get these -- and that you have said, too -- we have got to have some way to get these oils into the system to start the process. Maybe it won't start all at once, but we've got to do something. If we are going to have an organic aquaculture, we've got to bring them in some way.

MR. LOCKWOOD: Kevin, let me say I know how frustrating it has been for all of you, and we share the frustrations and we, again, have great appreciation for all that you have done in that area.

Our biggest concern, again, is workability and equivalency. This has never been done.

What you are saying is, if you were to proscribe antibiotics, and so forth, would

NEAL R. GROSS

this be equivalent? I don't know. It really boils down to the equivalency concern.

MEMBER ENGELBERT: Equivalency wasn't our main objective. We were simply looking for a source of these fish meals and fish oils that would still qualify as at least some type of organic. Because there are fish processors, from what we understand, being certified by foreign entities. That would provide a source for these oils.

We are not saying that their standards are equivalent, but we are looking for something that would qualify as organic, even though it is not USDA. But once our standards are in place, then everyone would have to meet those.

MR. LOCKWOOD: Well, again, the law foreign standards requires that the equivalent, whatever that means. It is my understanding that has never been tested in of putting it into rules terms and implementing it. That is one of our major

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

concerns.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, we have Dan, followed by Jennifer.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: I just feel I want to respond to what Kevin just said. We did receive in our discussions, we felt we were receiving pushback from the program when we were discussing the step-down possibilities.

But I think we need to recognize that the discussions that go into rulemaking, for instance, using pasture as an example, the discussions that went into the original rulemaking of pasture is far different than what has gone into the discussions of the pasture document that they are working on right now.

I think whatever we send to the program will be reviewed within the entire scope of the law and the regulation. If Congress felt that it was okay to put into the law, into OFPA, that the Secretary would be

NEAL R. GROSS

able to consider wild-caught fish to be certified or labeled as organic, knowing that they also had in there the restriction on the feed side of the issue, I think it is prudent of us to put forth the best document we can. If we want to try to see this industry go, we put forth the document that we think might do it and let those kinds of issues be resolved by the NOP. I think we are putting the cart before the horse.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Jennifer?

MEMBER HALL: I just want to respond to your comment that, in relation to equivalency, that this has never been done before. I would suggest that this whole recommendation as it relates to aquaculture has never been done before.

So I think we really took the time to sit with that and give ourselves the opportunity to think creatively, given it is a whole new realm. In so doing, the suggestion of using foreign-certified seemed like a good

NEAL R. GROSS

certain step-up, knowing that those suppliers, once we have a rule in place for aquaculture, they will be stepping up their own production to meet that regulation, that they can have access to not the fish feed market, but the human feed market. So it would be a pretty short-lived window that perhaps a lower margin might be the source of feed for the bulk of the species, that over a pretty short window it would be not out of the realm to think that most of the supply would meet our standard anyway.

MR. LOCKWOOD: Our biggest concern, Jennifer, as I said, has more to do with oil than with meal. Farmed tilapia may well be the first source of fish meal. Unfortunately, farmed tilapia is not a high oil fish, and salmon and shrimp require larger, substantial amounts of oil in order to be healthy.

Let me also comment, Kevin. I appreciate that perhaps you have been told that wild marine resources are not going to be

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

allowed. We've considered that, and simply, as your professional group has sat back and said what we proposed originally is workable and it's still, we think, the only way we can see a viable organic aquaculture industry develop.

We have tried, you all have tried a number of different approaches, and we have, too. We are most appreciative of that.

When we sat back, all of us said what we originally proposed we thought was pretty good and that we have seen nothing that would be workable that is better at this time.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any questions?
Kevin?

MEMBER ENGELBERT: Just one real quick. To Dan's point, we have to make sure we make the distinction between feed that's being produced for human consumption and feed that's being produced for livestock. It all comes back to, well, if you can feed it to humans, why can't you feed it to livestock?

NEAL R. GROSS

1	And you can. As authors of OFPA, we are still
2	concerned about human consumption in that
3	respect, just like we are right now with this
4	fish oil and fish meal.
5	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
6	comments? Questions? Joe?
7	MEMBER SMILLIE: I would just like
8	to thank George and his working group for
9	spending the time with us. I know it was very
10	frustrating for you at many times. Our group
11	certainly appreciated working with you. It
12	was a very valuable collaboration, and
13	hopefully, we will get somewhere with it.
14	MR. LOCKWOOD: Well, as Jennifer
15	just said, we're all plowing new ground here
16	or charting uncharted waters.
17	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, Kevin,
18	please.
19	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Thanks for that.
20	I meant to do that with my comments. I
21	forgot. But right, we thank you a great deal,
22	George, in all your patience with us and

1	working with us and explaining things, the
2	whole nine yards. You've been great.
3	MR. LOCKWOOD: Well, you're
4	welcome, and it has been our privilege, too.
5	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, any other
6	questions?
7	MR. LOCKWOOD: We'll also be here
8	tomorrow.
9	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Great. Thank
10	you, George.
11	Next is George Leonard, followed by
12	Becky Goldburg.
13	MR. LEONARD: Good afternoon.
14	My name is George Leonard. I'm with the Ocean
15	Conservancy.
16	First, I want to thank the NOSB,
17	the Livestock Committee, and George Lockwood
18	and the Aquaculture Working Group for these
19	challenging issues on aquaculture. As you all
20	know, this is hard stuff. This is the
21	intersection of sustainability and organic
22	principles. If it was easy, I think we would

have been done long ago. But I think we are making good progress.

We have submitted some comments to you in writing, myself and Cory Pete from the Monterey Bay Aquarium in California.

We were also participants in the Symposium you put on in the fall, where we tried to present some performance metrics on the issue of fish meal or fish feed and this issue of net pen aquaculture and the intersection of organic principles.

preparing some comments afternoon, I took a look at the comments that had been submitted. of In many those comments, particularly on the industry side, there's a lot of discussion of this issue of practicality; that is, can we do this? are the implications in terms of industry development?

I think what this really boils down to is two issues that are at play. One is the practicality aspect, but the other is this

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

fundamental principle of organic and what organic means and being true to the label. These are sort of in some cases fundamentally at conflict.

I guess I would suggest that our comments kind of come at this from, if you need to make a decision going forward about which of those is going to persevere, I think we ought to probably start with principle and then bring practicality in secondarily.

I think the reason for that is the potential long-term damage to the brand itself if we focus too much on practicality, maybe something that it is difficult to recover from.

So given that, with the concept of starting first with principles, I would suggest that the work that the Livestock Committee has done is good progress. The exclusion of wild-caught fish meal and fish oil we think is a good thing. It is a very strong stance against this concept that wild-

NEAL R. GROSS

1	caught fish can be declared organic. It is a
2	strong stance for conservation. It is a
3	strong stance that 100 percent of the
4	ingredients in organic farm fish themselves
5	have to be organic.
6	So all of that I think is good
7	progress. It is a strong stance. We are in
8	support of that.
9	The flip side, of course, is this
10	issue of the use of foreign-certified
11	products. That, obviously, causes some
12	trouble. I think it causes trouble on a
13	couple of fronts.
14	One is there's a real potential to
15	confuse consumers if the standards on the feed
16	inputs are different than the standards on the
17	product coming out of that system.
18	In addition, I think there are some
19	concerns about the standards of foreign
20	certification, including the use of
21	antibiotics, parasiticides, and those are the

primary drivers. There are some other issues

as well.

So we remain concerned about that, and that is the reason we have been generally supportive of trying to come up with a U.S. standard that sets the bar for the rest of the world.

So, in a sense, I think that the desire on the practicality side to get a source of meal and oil for the industry to start off perhaps puts too much emphasis on the practicality issue and too far sacrifices the principal concept.

Now perhaps a way to move forward on this would be to focus more on sources, domestic sources of U.S.-certified oil and meal from byproducts of farm fish. I realize this potentially gets us into a bit of a circular argument, but that gets us away from the foreign certification issue.

I suppose secondarily you could work to a situation in which you allow the foreign-certified products with a phaseout

NEAL R. GROSS

much as the Aquaculture Working Group was suggesting for wild-caught feed, as a potential to move away from that in the long run.

Either way, I think we recognize the fact that many producers are concerned that there simply won't be sources for certified meal and oil to get the industry up and running. I think that is a legitimate issue, but is one in which we need to stick by standards first.

I think, finally, we would just take exception in the minority opinion on this issue of farm fish generally eat wild fish, and as a consequence, we ought to use that as sort of a reason to continue to use wild fish meal and farmed fish -- I'm sorry -- wild meal and oil in organic fish.

We have put together a table for you from some basic literature on the wild diets of many of the common farmed fish. You will see that there's a whole diversity of

NEAL R. GROSS

1	food products in the wild, including things
2	like zoplank and phytoplank and algae,
3	microinvertebrates, macroinvertebrates, and of
4	course a number of small fish as well.
5	So I don't think we should use the
6	idea that wild fish eat regular old wild fish
7	as an excuse to continue the use of wild-
8	caught fish meal and fish oil.
9	So thank you for your time. I
10	appreciate it today.
11	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you.
12	Any questions? Joe?
13	MEMBER SMILLIE: I hear all of your
14	comments and I tend to agree with a lot of it.
15	I just wanted to do the equivalency thing
16	is problematic.
17	MR. LEONARD: Yes.
18	MEMBER SMILLIE: We recognize that.
19	I'm not sure how it is going to work.
20	But, again, equivalency doesn't
21	mean identical. There's certain rules about
22	judging equivalency that may be useful if the

National Organic Program wishes to follow them.

The second thing is just grouping all foreign certification standards together.

They're not all the same. There's some that are much better than others.

Having reviewed, for example, soil associations, and Naturelands in particular, there's not indiscriminate use of parasiticides. Yes, they are allowed under certain conditions which we wouldn't allow, agreed, but those -- I didn't want to paint them as free use of that.

If you look carefully at those standards, they are very limited, limited use once in a while in certain stages of early growth and all that.

So it is absolutely correct there are prohibited substances under our rule and couldn't be allowed, agreed, but they are extremely limited. Those organizations have in the past said that, if there are additional

NEAL R. GROSS

1	requirements needed to meet the U.S. market, a
2	gap study can be done, and every prohibited
3	substance can be pointed out in those
4	standards. They would sign onto an additional
5	requirements declaration that in this case for
6	this load none of these prohibited substances
7	were used, because they aren't used
8	indiscriminately even on those standards.
9	It's a minor point, but it is
10	something that we could possibly work through
11	with additional requirements on prohibited
12	substances.
13	MR. LEONARD: Well, I think that's
14	right. Can I just respond to that?
15	I didn't mean to imply that it is
16	indiscriminate use of parasiticides and
17	antibiotics. I certainly didn't mean to imply
18	that.
19	The other thing I think it is
20	important to recognize in the context of this
21	issue with aquaculture is aquaculture is not
22	just one species. There's a broad diversity

1	of things that might be farmed organically,
2	including seaweeds, obviously the bivalve
3	issue, and then a range of fish.
4	So in many cases this issue itself
5	is boiling down to a couple of species. Most
6	dominantly, farmed salmon is the one that
7	would be most likely influenced. So although
8	there may be some restrictions in terms of the
9	ability of farmed salmon to be declared
10	organic under U.S. regulations, certainly a
11	broad diversity of other species would be just
12	fine.
13	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
14	questions? Hugh?
15	MEMBER KARREMAN: Where do you
16	think the marine fish oil should come from to
17	start the industry?
18	MR. LEONARD: I know that's the
19	hard nut to crack here.
20	I appreciate the issue that
21	certainly species like tilapia may not be not
22	be able to provide all the oils we need. I'm

1	intrigued by the concept, and I don't know how
2	this would fit under the rubric, but a series
3	of many marine algae are producing oils that
4	apparently are quite good in terms of
5	nutritional qualifications. Whether those
6	could be produced or farmed in a way that
7	would be declared organic, I haven't looked
8	into that enough, but I think there's some
9	opportunities there that probably haven't been
10	explored in detail yet.
11	MEMBER KARREMAN: You know, when we
12	were thinking about this at the Symposium in
13	November, there was a fellow from South
14	Carolina who was talking about some kind of
15	insect production. Maybe you remember that
16	MR. LEONARD: Yes, right.
17	MEMBER KARREMAN: and how that
18	could work.
19	We're just trying to look at
20	various inputs, not to lay it all in one
21	basket, so to speak, to get the marine fish

from various inputs.

oil, but

22

So maybe

1	algae do you have information on that you
2	could send?
3	MR. LEONARD: Yes. I mean I can
4	get you some of that. I think certainly the
5	insect idea is a good one. Annelid worms is
6	apparently a good source and is becoming
7	commercially available.
8	I like the idea of a diversity of
9	diet, feed ingredients. Certainly that is
10	consistent with wild diets for sure.
11	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
12	questions?
13	(No response.)
14	Okay, thank you very much.
15	MR. LEONARD: Thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Next is Becky
17	Goldburg, followed by Sebastian Belle.
18	MS. GOLDBURG: Thank you very much.
19	I am Becky Goldburg. I am a former
20	member of the NOSB and also a member of the
21	Aquaculture Working Group. I would like to
22	talk about two related issues today with

aquaculture. One is feed and the other is use of composite in aquaculture ponds.

First of all, let's start out with is the issue that receiving the most attention, fish meal and oil and feed. Lockwood presented comments from the Aquaculture Working Group just now, that the NOSB go back to the AWG's earlier recommendation concerning fish meal and oil.

I want to make clear that at issue is not the major goal that we all share, and that is going to organic sources only of meal and oil, which means byproducts from farm fish and potentially other sources of protein and lipids for fish diets, looking to alternatives like George Leonard just talked about with marine algae, worms, insects, and so on. We're all there.

What is at issue is how we get to having a viable industry. There's no perfect solution here. People put forward in good faith a lot of alternatives. We happen to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

feel that a transition is probably more workable than going to a system that depends heavily on foreign-certified byproducts from organic aquaculture, which is problematic, for reasons others have described today.

I also want to comment briefly on a couple of Livestock Committee's other feed recommendations. One is an issue that Patty Lovera pointed out. The way the current recommendation from the Livestock Committee is written, there is a Section (1) concerning fish meal and fish oil from wild fish in a recommendation that is otherwise about not using wild fish and feed, and it is just really confusing. That section doesn't belong there. It's about the status of fisheries. think it was just a mistake it was included, and I urge you to eliminate it.

My other comment, a little bit more substantive, concerns Section (m), which talks about contaminants in fish meal and fish oil.

This is not a section that we in the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Aquaculture Working Group got to in our discussions of the Livestock Committee recommendations. So I am offering my own perspective here.

One is that this section requires monitoring of contaminants in fish meal and oil, and says essentially that all pollutants must be removed if there are above regulatory levels in commercially-available meal and oil.

Well, it is really unclear to me what this recommendation means because there in general, no regulatory levels these contaminants in feeds. FDA doesn't have set tolerances or action levels for these contaminants in feed, and even ACCO lacks standards for many of them, especially Lipophilic compounds, which are the ones we worry about most in meal and oil, things like dioxins.

So I am quite concerned that this recommendation, while really well-intentioned, is not particularly workable. I think that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

using the original language recommended by the essentially which says that AWG, the contaminant levels in meal and oil have to be comparable to the lowest in the marketplace, probably makes the most sense at this point. Ιt is not а totally satisfactory recommendation either, but it reflects the reality of current U.S. regulations.

Finally, on the feed topic, I would like to note that while we on the AWG favor a foreign-certified transition using over element of the Livestock materials, one Committee recommendation that I personally the like is step-down for process transition, where you set some intermediate levels of meal and oil that are allowed in feed, because that ensures that people are on the road to getting where we want them to go.

With that said, I would like to turn to the topic of compost and say how strongly I support the Crops Committee recommendation. It is essential to my mind

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

for truly organic systems for producing shrimp and some finfish species like tilapia and carp, which are naturally scavengers and grazers in nature.

Basically, what the Crops Committee recommendation says is that manure from terrestrial animals may be used to fertilize aquatic plants intended to feed organic fish in aquaculture ponds, provided that the manure is composted in compliance with 205.203, the standard composting recommendations.

Conventional aquaculture producers often fertilize their ponds now to produce blooms of algae and other microbes and the zoplank that feed on them all, and these organisms provide a significant part of the feed for the shrimp or other fish being raised in the pond, essentially building a pasture, if you will, in your pond.

Without a provision allowing the use of compost in aquaculture ponds, organic aquaculture producers, who cannot, of course,

NEAL R. GROSS

use synthetic fertilizer, will not be readily
able to create such, quote/unquote
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Becky?
MS. GOLDBURG: Yes?
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: I'm afraid your
time is up. Can you just sum up?
MS. GOLDBURG: okay, I'll
complete in two seconds on "pasture-based
pond systems". Rather, their systems will be
more like feedlots. I think that is really
undesirable and it would be great if you
supported the Crops Committee recommendation.
Thanks.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you.
Any questions for Becky? Hugh?
MEMBER KARREMAN: Just as far as I
think you mentioned the residues, or whatever,
in the fish meal/fish oil possibly, in OFPA
2107(a)(6), that is where we based that on. I
am sure you are aware of that section there.
MS. GOLDBURG: Yes, I'm well aware
of that section, but then you have to go and

1	see what the underlying EPA or FDA structures
2	are. In this case, they are not there.
3	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Gerry?
4	MEMBER DAVIS: Becky, on the
5	compost as the guidelines that are in the rule
6	now with the CN ratios and stuff that are
7	there, would a compost like that be adequate
8	for aquaculture pasture, as you call it?
9	MS. GOLDBURG: You know, I think
10	that's an open question. I have discussed it
11	with a couple of people, and the answer is not
12	entirely clear, but my sense is we've got to
13	start somewhere. By at least allowing the use
14	of compost in ponds, I think
15	MEMBER DAVIS: And there's not a
16	lot of nitrogen there.
17	MS. GOLDBURG: Yes.
18	MEMBER DAVIS: But I don't know
19	anything about aquaculture to speak of,
20	either.
21	MS. GOLDBURG: Yes, it is a really
22	good question and one I've thought about and

1	asked questions about. The literature is very
2	scarce. There's a small amount of literature,
3	but not a whole lot.
4	MEMBER DAVIS: If you ever hear
5	anything, if you come across any information
6	that would be helpful to the Committee.
7	MS. GOLDBURG: Yes.
8	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Right, the Vice-
9	Chair, followed by Jennifer.
10	VICE-CHAIR MOYER: Becky, I would
11	value your opinion on this question: If fish
12	are declared livestock, and livestock need a
13	100 percent organic feed, how can you justify
14	your step-down version over seven years, where
15	they would for seven years not be fed 100
16	percent organic feed? How do you do that?
17	MS. GOLDBURG: That's a really good
18	question. I think it probably is confusing
19	for consumers, and it is one of those things
20	where you justify it, that it is for purely
21	practical purposes, to initiate an industry.
	1

We are making real progress toward where we

1 want to go, and this is the way forward. 2 VICE-CHAIR MOYER: But it is 3 clearly against the rule, and the rule says, once something is declared livestock, it must 4 5 be fed -- it doesn't say it should be or could 6 be -- it says it must be fed 100 percent 7 certified organic feed. Well, what had MS. GOLDBURG: 8 Yes. been discussed with Valorie and among 9 10 Committee was potentially creating transitional label for the farmed product, so 11 that it was clear that products weren't fully 12 13 meeting the rule. I realize that is not a perfect 14 15 solution, either; none of these are. 16 really open to other ideas. No one has come up with quite the right answer, but at least 17 18 from the perspective of creating an industry, 19 the transition seems to offer the most promise. 20

Jennifer?

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRMAN DELGADO:

21

22

Thank you.

1	MEMBER HALL: On the contaminant
2	levels, where do you access the information
3	about the lowest level in the current
4	marketplace?
5	MS. GOLDBURG: There is actually a
6	lot of testing right now of feed going on
7	because Europe, the EU actually does have
8	regulatory levels. So you would have to ask
9	feed suppliers about the levels, which are
10	almost certainly being looked at in order to
11	sell feed in Europe.
12	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
13	questions? No?
14	(No response.)
15	Okay, thank you, Becky.
16	MS. GOLDBURG: Thanks.
17	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Next is
18	Sebastian Belle. No Sebastian?
19	Well, after that is Tom Hutcheson,
20	proxy for Neil Sims from Kona Blue.
21	We have some changes. We've got
22	the monopoly here, so trust us.

(Laughter.)

That clarified, Tom, please.

MR. HUTCHESON: Thank you, yes, proxy for Neil Sims of Kona Blue.

Dear Board members:

I would like to offer the following comments on behalf of Kona Blue Water Farms, LLC.:

Kona Blue is the first integrated open ocean fish farm and marine fish hatchery in the U.S. We're growing sashimi-grade Kona Kampachi in waters over 200-feet deep using innovative hatchery techniques and advanced ocean engineering. We are committed to environmentally-sound aquaculture, and we believe that open ocean fish farming can and should be organic.

Monterey Bay Aquarium's Seafood Watch Program recently ranked U.S. yellowtail as a good alternative. This demonstrates that open ocean aquaculture of marine fish can be undertaken in a sustainable manner. We simply

NEAL R. GROSS

have to ensure that it is done right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The development of an achievable organic label for marine finfish will provide such assurances and will, thereby, provide real benefits to marine ecosystems and real benefits to consumer health.

The organic label will also provide a widely-recognized imprimatur of quality that encourage will more conscientious farming techniques to be adopted as the industry grows, but we need to create a regulatory climate that will allow an organic offshore industry to grow.

The nutritional needs of marine fish and the low levels of critical fish oil in most other aquacultured species decree that an alternative source of organic fish meal and fish oil needs to be identified to allow development of an organic marine fish culture industry.

We have reviewed the Livestock Committee's recommendation for allowing fish

NEAL R. GROSS

meal and fish oil from processing byproducts of foreign-certified organic aquaculture and the Aquaculture Working Group's recommendation allowable stepwise decrease in the fish meal fish oil levels of and from processing byproducts from sustainable edible seafood processing.

Both hold merit, yet each of these alternative sources present may yet challenges. Therefore, in the interest of providing the best chances for growth of an organic marine fish culture industry, we would recommend that both the Livestock Committee's the Aquaculture Working and Group's recommendations be accepted together.

We see the best benefits to be gained for consumers and for the ocean by accepting both recommendations; i.e, both the Aquaculture Working Group's recommendation for a limited introductory and diminishing period of using edible wild seafood trimmings at about 12 percent and concurrently the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Livestock Committee's recommendation for allowing fish meal and fish oil from processing byproducts of foreign-certified organic aquaculture.

We recognize that the proposals before us may not be perfect, but we place our faith in the guiding principle of continuous improvement, the same principle that is a foundation of the terrestrial organic industry.

Please remember NIH studies, Mozaferian and Rem, 2006, have shown that modest increases in seafood consumption could result in a 17 percent reduction in overall mortality and a 35 percent reduction in mortality from heart disease. These are lives that could -- that must -- be saved.

for Organic standards marine finfish can encourage better marine fish farming practices and improve national health and the health of our oceans. To do this, however, the organic standards must be

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	achievable and the products must be available.
2	We commend the NOSB, the Livestock
3	Committee, and the Aquaculture Working Group
4	for their continuing hard work toward
5	establishing regulations for organic
6	aquaculture, and thank you for your
7	consideration.
8	Sincerely, with aloha, Neil Sims.
9	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Well, thank you.
10	Any questions for Mr. Hutcheson?
11	Yes, Dan?
12	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Just for
13	clarification there, I think in the step-down
14	that he is talking about, and I understand
15	you're reading his statement, but he talking
16	about the Livestock Committee's step-dowr
17	rather than the Aquaculture Working Group 12
18	percent set amount.
19	MR. HUTCHESON: I take your
20	comment. Thank you.
21	(Laughter.)
22	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other

1	questions?
2	(No response.)
3	Thank you, sir.
4	Next is Barbara Blackstone from
5	National Fisheries Institute, followed by Mr.
6	Jim Riddle, Organic Outreach Coordinator for
7	the State of Minnesota.
8	MS. BLACKSTONE: Good afternoon.
9	I'm Dr. Barbara Blackstone, Director of
LO	Scientific Affairs for the National Fisheries
L1	Institute in McLean, Virginia.
L2	NFI is the Nation's leading
L3	advocacy organization for the seafood
L4	industry. Its member companies represent
L5	every element of the industry, from fishing
L6	vessels at sea to the national seafood
L7	restaurant chains. NFI and its members
L8	support and promote public policy based or
L9	scientific research.
20	NFI greatly appreciates the
21	opportunity to speak to the NOSB on behalf of

22

the seafood industry.

1	As we all know, aquatic foods are
2	the final major category of food not yet
3	approved for U.S. organic certification.
4	Though only 1 to 2 percent of food produced in
5	the U.S. is produced by organic methods, 20
6	percent of the consumers queried in focus
7	group research sponsored by the New Jersey
8	Department of Agriculture said they were
9	committed to purchasing organic seafood while
10	52 percent said they would buy it
11	occasionally, and 72 percent, significantly,
12	said they would buy organic seafood if
13	available.

Mark then that the industry must have an organic seafood rule to serve consumers who are asking for it, and many of them are asking for it.

Salmon is No. 3 of the top 10 seafoods enjoyed by American consumers, and therefore, should be available for organic labeling.

Supplements of fish meal and fish

NEAL R. GROSS

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

oil to feed pisciverous finfish such as salmon is a good agricultural practice that will expand the availability of organic salmon at a reasonable price.

NFI is very concerned because the feed industry has no alternative to fish meal and fish oil for finfish, though it seeks such.

Results in alternative feed research to date are not encouraging, and nothing is on the distant horizon. Sunset clauses will not make feed alternatives happen and will in time prohibit use of fish meal and fish oil to feed salmon and other pisciverous finfish, thus eliminating organically-labeled salmon from the consumer's menu.

USDA will most likely have to extend the sunset clause and provide immediate research dollars for alternative feeds to be a reality within seven years. In the meantime, NFI supports the recommendation of the Aquaculture Working Group that fish meal from

NEAL R. GROSS

wild fish as a feed additive or supplement may not exceed 12 percent by weight of feed, and fish oil from wild fish used as a feed ingredient may not exceed 12 percent by weight of feed as averages over the production cycle of the fish.

Two notes of concern in the Aquaculture Working Group's recommendation found in appendix A:

One, as just stated, the Aquaculture Working Group's prediction of seven years of research may not be sufficient to find fish meal and oil alternatives.

And, two, exclusion of the use of genetically-modified organisms, GMOs, as a feed ingredient or as an aquatic livestock enhancer represents today's Pollyanna myopic view of aquaculture.

Without the assistance provided by GMOs directly to aquatic animals and to the feeds they consume, seafood may not be a sustaining industry tomorrow.

NEAL R. GROSS

Our opinion is one shared by the Biotechnology Industry Organization, a worldwide association of over 1100 biotechnology companies, academic institutions, and state technology centers.

In conclusion, NFI urges completion of the current work on organic standards for farm-raised seafood, so that work can begin on standards for those seafoods currently excluded, wild-caught and mollusk.

Further, with our concerns about appendix just stated, NFIΑ is generally pleased with the recommendation of the Aquaculture Working Group. The organic label for seafood happen can when remind we ourselves that the label is venue for а steward practices that use and natural resources, not rigid conservation practices.

Organic labeling is not about addressing activist issues, but is about defining USDA best practices in production of safe, healthy seafood for the consumer.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 Thank you for the opportunity to 2 speak to the Board. 3 CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you. Ouestions? Joe? 4 5 MEMBER SMILLIE: Well, it is not 6 really а question. The U.S. organic 7 regulation which you're supporting excludes GMO methods from organics. 8 MS. BLACKSTONE: Yes. 9 10 MEMBER SMILLIE: And speaking as Pollyanna, as I recall the movie, she had the 11 12 rest of the village smiling pretty well by the 13 end of that movie. Now it may be Disney World, but we oftentimes want to remake the 14 15 world in our image, which excludes GMOs. 16 Therefore, Ι think that any proposal or thing that we hear that talks 17 about confirming the regulations has to take 18 19 that into account. 20 I think you can MS. BLACKSTONE: smile for a few years and then we are going to 21 get to a point where there just isn't anything 22

1	available that doesn't have a GMO in it.
2	MEMBER SMILLIE: Well, we are going
3	to do our very best.
4	MS. BLACKSTONE: Okay.
5	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
6	questions?
7	(No response.)
8	Thank you very much.
9	MS. BLACKSTONE: Okay.
10	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Next is Mr.
11	Riddle, and I take this opportunity to explain
12	that Mr. Ram Balasubramanian has rescheduled
13	his presentation for another day. So we will
14	take care of him.
15	Mr. Riddle, followed by Tom
16	Hutcheson again.
17	And you, I understand, are doing a
18	proxy?
19	MR. RIDDLE: Right, from Alex
20	Stone, Oregon State University. Ten minutes,
21	please.
22	Thank you.

Well, thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Jim Riddle, Organic Outreach Coordinator with the University of Minnesota, former NOSB member. It is good to see all of you once again.

I am also on the leadership team for eOrganic, which is a multi-state project funded by USDA, CSREES, that is bringing the best scientific information on organic agriculture to the internet through land grant universities and cooperative extension.

I have handed out a brochure about eOrganic, just in summary, a web community where farmers, researchers, and educators can exchange objective research and experience-based information about organic agriculture.

We have a lunch planned for this fall. This is part of a larger e-extension initiative where universities across the country are working together to consolidate information. It is not limited to people working in land grant universities. It is

NEAL R. GROSS

open for anyone with organic agriculture experience to contribute and become a part of the community of practice.

So I encourage you to check it out.

We are working in cooperation with the Sustainable Ag Research and Education, or SARE, ATRA, the National Ag Library, New Farm, OFRF, and other organic information providers. So we are trying not to duplicate, but to rather maximize the use of resources and make the best information especially available to farmers and extension agents that is research-based information.

having We will be our own frequently asked questions that will be rulecompliant and searchable and follow а the chronological order of organic regulations. It will be built in as part of this website.

I would like to thank you all for the hard work you do in preparing for this meeting. I see some of you still are

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	suffering from conference call ear and elbow.
2	I know the feeling well. It is certainly a
3	challenge, the work you do.
4	We've got a lot to celebrate right
5	now with all of the very strong organic
6	language that is in the recently-passed farm
7	bill. I want to celebrate that and
8	acknowledge the efforts of so many people in
9	this room to make that a reality.
10	But we also have some cause for
11	concern with these recent polls showing for
12	the first time ever an erosion in consumer
13	confidence in the integrity of organic.
14	There's various reasons for that, but I think
15	it is something that we need to take seriously
16	and do what we can to address that.
17	In addition to promoting the
18	eOrganic project, I am here today speaking on
19	my own behalf. Even though I live in
20	Minnesota, I am here to defend organic okra.
21	I strongly disagree with the
	1

Handling Committee's recommendation that okra

be added to 205.606. When I look through the decision sheets, Ι find the strongest justification being the petitioner presented voluminous information and references organic okra in commercial quantities was not available, especially near or transportable to an IOF facility. Maybe the petitioner should move the IQF facility nearer to organic okra fields or possibly transition land near an IQF facility to grow organic okra, or label the products that contain non-organic okra as made with other organic ingredients.

There's a lot of options here, but there's no entitlement to the use of non-organic ingredients.

The recommendation appears to rely solely on the information provided by the petitioner, and I am concerned that that petitioner is a client of the person who made the motion to add okra to the list.

The petition and the recommendation contain no market analysis and no information

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

from organic okra growers, and it exemplifies some of the things that have gone wrong with this rush to add materials to the list and the review process, and this particular recommendation should be rejected.

The items that go on 606 need to be rare exceptions. They must be well justified with neutral objective analysis and TAP reviews, not just relying on information from the petitioner.

On a positive note, I support the Livestock Committee's recommendation to add Fenbendazole to the National List. However, it is time to remove Ivermectin, which is not compatible with organic principles and organic production.

I support the allowance of DL-Methionine for two more years only. I think the research can be concluded and alternatives commercialized in that time.

I support the Crop Committee's recommendation to add cheese wax with the

NEAL R. GROSS

annotations and to reject Dextrin and Tetracycline.

Ι the NOSB to table the urge Livestock Committee's draft on aquatic plants. I think it is a good starting point, but it doesn't have any background information. Ιt has not been subject to discussion shouldn't be brought forward to a vote until there's been more thorough discussion of this draft recommendation.

There's a discussion document on hydroponics. Really, the two are so similar that they should be considered together, not separately. It all needs to be done in the context of what the law allows. So looking back at OFPA and requirements for the use of soil and land-based production.

I support the Crops Committee's additions to the existing recommendation on organic seeds. I think there are some problems with that language, but as any guidance gets implemented on this, the NOP

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

needs to work very closely with accredited certifiers to make sure that standardized protocols are implemented that really work without being an unfunded mandate or overly burdensome.

I do urge that the existing organic seed requirements be better addressed during accreditation audits. There already are requirements.

One thing I like about the Committee's draft on organic seeds is that it followed a good model by building on an existing Board recommendation and amended that recommendation. Well, that is not the case with the discussion document posted by the CACC on multi-site certification.

Instead of building on the existing 202 NOSB Grower Group recommendation, which was recognized by the NOP for guidance, which is a highly unusual thing, and that should have been the starting point -- instead, the CAC chose to expand a previous discussion

NEAL R. GROSS

document which was never adopted by the Board.

So you are building on a discussion on a discussion of something that has never been adopted instead of resolving the issue of grower group certification when you've got a solid recommendation to be amending and working from.

This draft on multi-site certification, it appears to justify one agency's sample inspection program for retail chains by extending grower group protocols to cover retailers and other types of handling operations.

The draft from the Committee, the discussion document makes no mention of OFPA 2107(a), which states, "A program established under this title shall provide for annual onsite inspection by a certifying agent of each farm and handling operation that is certified under this title."

And OFPA defines handling operation to mean any operation or portion of an

NEAL R. GROSS

operation that receives or otherwise acquires agricultural products and processes packages or stores such products.

Farm is not defined in the OFPA or the rule. This gives USDA more flexibility in how that term "farm" is applied to a grower group operation.

direct The Board should the Committee, CACC, to discontinue work on the discussion draft, take some of the advice that will be offered here by the National Organic Coalition, the Organic Trade Association that is focused on grower groups, respond to the concerns that were identified by the NOP in the appeals decision and revise the 2002 Board recommendation to strengthen language on conflict qualifications, inspector of interest, and risk assessment protocols.

In addition, the NOP should consider establishing a separate accreditation category for certifiers who conduct grower group certification.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	I would just like to let you know
2	that the University of Minnesota will be
3	converting our 70-cow dairy herd to organic,
4	have committed to that.
5	Also, next week there will be a
6	signing ceremony for a new MOU on organic
7	agriculture with three state, four federal,
8	and three universities in Minnesota, all to
9	service the organic sector.
10	Thank you. Viva la okra.
11	(Laughter.)
12	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any questions
13	for Jim? Kevin, please.
14	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Jim, I know you
15	have your hand on the pulse of everything
16	organic.
17	MR. RIDDLE: I wouldn't say that.
18	(Laughter.)
19	MEMBER ENGELBERT: In your opinion,
20	what's the best way to introduce fish oil and
21	fish meal into the
22	(Laughter.)

1 MR. RIDDLE: Oh, thank you. 2 right, I love to fish. You're dangling that 3 hook in front of me. Well. I think starting with the 4 5 herbivorous fish that can be fed an organic 6 diet, you know, let's start there. That can 7 be done. Everyone agrees that can be done. Let's have standards for that and 8 let's build from there. That's what I would 9 10 say. It may take going to Congress. 11 otherwise, this predicament 12 of 100 13 percent organic feed is always going to be a problem. 14 15 I mean the other is -- and there 16 has been some consideration about this phasing -out allowance, temporary with a built-in 17 phaseout for the non-organic fish meal and 18 19 fish oil as feed supplements, which non-20 synthetic supplements are allowed under the rule, but that it still is a phaseout to allow 21

the industry to adapt.

1	But I think focus on the low-
2	hanging fruit, which are the herbivorous fish,
3	is really the place to start. Let's have some
4	standards, but don't jump into this, the Board
5	equivalent with some provisions that go beyond
6	a foreign certifier's norm I just think
7	that's really problematic.
8	I don't know if you've gotten
9	feedback from the NOP on that proposal. I
10	think it is a good idea just to talk about,
11	but I don't know that it would fly.
12	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Kevin, if we can
13	stick to the comments by the speaker, and
14	before you proceed, let me give the
15	opportunity to Joe. You wanted to talk? Or
16	Dan? And then if you need to expand further,
17	you will have the opportunity.
18	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Thanks, Jim.
19	You recommended relisting of
20	Methionine, and let's remember this is not
21	for poultry.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. RIDDLE: Yes.

1 MEMBER GIACOMINI: And let's 2 remember this is not continuation as in 3 This is considered a new petition. sunset. But you would have probably been 4 here three years ago when it came up 5 6 second time --7 MR. RIDDLE: Right. MEMBER GIACOMINI: -- this being 8 now the third time. 9 10 Are you aware, either then or now, significant 11 of real data, any not hypothetical, not what happens if there's no 12 Methionine in the diet, but real data showing 13 in practical diets impact on health, immunity, 14 15 feathers, cannibalization, whatever, in real 16 data, with a practical diet of no Methionine, with no added Methionine in it, that we can 17 really hang our hat on? 18 19 Because what they gave us in the 20 petition is performance data. I'm not aware of anywhere else where it would just throw 21

bones to an industry like we have done with

Methionine for the ability to maintain more 1 conventional growth. 2 3 Can you give us -- do you know where that data is? Are you aware of it? 4 you remember it? Or is somebody going to come 5 6 up with it to help us out on that? Yes, well, I could 7 MR. RIDDLE: come up with data showing that Methionine is 8 an essential nutrient for poultry. I would 9 10 have to do a lot of research to try to come up with the rest of the answer, and I'm not aware 11 of that either. 12 13 But I am aware of very promising research on high Methionine corn varieties, 14 15 for instance, or other feed ingredients that I 16 think are very promising, but we need a lot flocks, feeding 17 more research that, establish some of that data of how well they 18 19 perform. 20 But they do need to have outdoor

access. It needs to be real, and they are going to gain Methionine if they do have

NEAL R. GROSS

21

1	access to earthworms, insects, and fresh green
2	grass and seeds in their diet. A diversified
3	diet provides a lot of different sources of
4	Methionine.
5	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
6	questions? Joe?
7	MEMBER SMILLIE: Well, I'll jump
8	into the gumbo with you, Jim.
9	MR. RIDDLE: Hey!
10	(Laughter.)
11	MEMBER SMILLIE: 606 is a whole new
12	process caused by the Harvey lawsuit. It
13	wasn't anticipated when we were setting up TAP
14	reviews and for quite a while.
15	The NOSB was forced to get into the
16	606 listing, and I just want to point out that
17	the procedures that we're following for 606
18	are different than the other procedures. I
19	don't know if it is significantly different or
20	not, and I don't want to steal Julie's thunder
21	because I know tomorrow she is going to talk

in general about 606 quite a bit. It is

problematic. It is a little complicated.

But one of the things the NOSB is charged with is examining the fragility of supply and doing sort of a risk analysis, to jump over to a different topic, of the situation. Our job is not to determine commercial availability. That is the certification agent's job, because, again, it is a two-step process.

You can't use an agricultural ingredient unless it is on 606, and even if it is on, that doesn't mean you have license to use it. You must prove it is not available.

So it is a two-step process, not that that limits your argument. I mean your argument still stands. Once it gets on 606, then there is more of a chance.

But our job on the NOSB is to look at the risk of the supply side and the fragility, and that is what we did in that case.

The other thing is that when you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 say it needs no market analysis and no information from organic growers, in filling out those documents we have been talking among ourselves that we are going to give more information to the public at large about what went into that decisionmaking. I agree with that, and we are just going to have to do that.

The volume of materials we had to deal with really limits your ability to go into extremely great depth, but that research was done, market analysis and information from organic growers, freezing facilities, and certification organizations. They were polled, and we can go into the details perhaps later or off-session, if you want to.

That having been said, I think tomorrow and during the thing when that comes up, we can get into great detail on the gumbo controversy. Because as soon as that passed, I said, "We are going to catch it on this one, guys, guaranteed," because it doesn't look

NEAL R. GROSS

1	good.
2	MR. RIDDLE: Yes.
3	MEMBER SMILLIE: And I understand
4	that. I mean I grew okra. Heck, I grew okra
5	in northern climates.
6	But when you look at it really
7	carefully and you look at the petition and
8	what we went through, you will see why our
9	Committee justified it and we will see what
10	the Board thinks of that down the road.
11	MR. RIDDLE: Okay, but the larger
12	process issue, the things that go on 606 still
13	have to meet all criteria, and you need to be
14	addressing there's not a pass given to 606
15	that it only has to address market
16	fragility
17	MEMBER SMILLIE: Right.
18	MR. RIDDLE: but it has to be
19	reviewed for the environmental, human health
20	impacts, and all of that. I don't see that

NEAL R. GROSS

happening for 606 items because there aren't

There's not objective neutral research

TAPs.

21

1	being conducted for the Board.
2	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes. Will you
3	handle that tomorrow?
4	MR. RIDDLE: Yes.
5	MEMBER SMILLIE: That's a very good
6	question, and we've spent a chunk of time this
7	morning actually going through that, and I
8	will let Julie handle that tomorrow in her
9	response.
10	MR. RIDDLE: Okay.
11	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Very well, we
12	will make that clarification tomorrow.
13	Do we have any more questions?
14	Dan?
15	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Going back into
16	that vast mind of yours, we have tartaric acid
17	on both (a) and (b) 605 up for sunset. Any
18	remembrance of how that exactly came to play
19	and any comment or any knowledge of usage or
20	anything?
21	MR. RIDDLE: I'm sorry, I would
22	have to do some review to refresh my mind.

1	Sorry.
2	And I understand my comments about
3	Ivermectin coming off, that that may take a
4	petition to trigger that, but I do think it is
5	time, and anything we can do to get it off
6	when the other goes on would be a very good
7	step forward.
8	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Jim, before you
9	leave, I believe Barbara has a comment,
10	question. No? Okay.
11	Kevin, you wanted to conclude with
12	your statement.
13	MEMBER ENGELBERT: No, that's all
14	right. I'll pick Jim's brain privately.
15	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Fantastic.
16	Thank you very much.
17	MR. RIDDLE: All right, thanks.
18	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you, Jim.
19	Next is Tom Hutcheson, followed by
20	Jody Biergiel.
21	MR. HUTCHESON: Good afternoon. My
22	name is Tom Hutcheson, and I am the Regulatory

and Policy Manager of the Organic Trade Association.

Thank you very much for all your work, and thank you for the opportunity to present these comments.

First, I would like to commend to you the work of the Materials Working Group, with which I served and which is posted as a discussion document regarding the definition of the term "agricultural" and related issues.

This group dove deep into the issues and has developed a document that can serve well as a foundation for discussing the myriad of issues involved.

I believe you received OTA's comments on the certification of multi-site operations, and they should be in your meeting book. These and some replies to the questions that you asked at the end of the current document, discussion document, will be discussed at length by Grace Gershuny and Kim Dietz, Co-Chairs of OTA's Task Force, in a

NEAL R. GROSS

later comment.

In addition to these issues, I would like to offer some other comments. Regarding the proposed aquaculture standard, NOSB has taken the first step toward a useful standard by recommending that new sections of the rule be created for aquaculture in the so far reserved 205.250 series.

However, thinking from terrestrial ecological management systems still infuses NOSB thought, and I urge you to acknowledge and celebrate the differences in aquatic ecological management that can make the upcoming recommendation both more useful in growing the organic system and more practical for those wishing to participate.

The terrestrial provision should not necessarily apply to aquaculture unless they make sense specifically for aquaculture.

Therefore, NOSB should recommend, and NOP should implement, renaming the current rules sections referring to livestock, 205.236 to

NEAL R. GROSS

239, to refer to terrestrial livestock, to help clarify the situation, with the 250 series referring to aquatic livestock.

On farmed aquatic plans, some OTA members have indicated support for the NOSB recommendation, and we applaud NOSB for their substantial attention to this field.

On seed commercial availability guidance, the Joint Committee has made its desires clear and has laid out a number of practices that could help stimulate the growth of the organic seed trade.

The major obstacle for farmers to growth in the organic seed trade cited in the paper, though, was the quality of organic seed, which seems to be left unaddressed. Joint Committee seems to be proposing substantial increase in the requirements for certifiers and buyers without necessarily getting at the main cause of the problem.

These steps might be helpful to some degree, but the recommendation does not

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	give much hope that the problem will be much
2	closer to being solved, even with the
3	substantially increased reporting requirements
4	proposed.
5	OTA generally supports the
6	direction of the carefully-crafted and well-
7	thought-out recommendations of the Organic
8	Seed Growers and Trade Association, OSGATA.
9	Thank you.
10	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you.
11	Any questions for Tom?
12	(No response.)
13	All right, thank you very much.
14	On with Jody Biergiel.
15	MS. BIERGIEL: Hello. Thank you
16	for the opportunity to address you today.
17	This is my first time addressing you. Thank
18	you very much.
19	My name is Jody Biergiel, and I am
20	representing CCOF, Organic Certification.
21	Regarding the materials up for
22	sunset review, generally, CCOF has a diverse

membership, producing many kinds of products, the handlers. We support the relisting of all materials, as we have historically.

Regarding the two forms of tartaric acid, we also support the relisting of both of those, understanding that it was some sort of historical typo.

(Laughter.)

Regarding the 606 additions, we have one client who will be able to upgrade their product from "made with organic" to "organic" based on one of these additions. So they will be happy to hear that.

CCOF would However, not be surprised if both of the marsala line and sherry, for example, become available organically in the near future. We would continue to require that thorough commercial availability searches are conducted annually, if not more frequently.

Now I would like to comment on the use of materials listed on 605 in or on

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

products labeled as 100 percent organic.

Certifiers are interpreting the 100 percent organic labeling category a little bit differently. The regulation states that products sold as 100 percent organic must be processed using organic processing aids. This does not seem to be clear enough direction to certifiers, as in the case of chlorine used as a sanitizer for fresh products.

Some certifiers are not allowing chlorine to be used on products labeled as 100 percent organic and some are allowing that use, chlorine, over the Safe Drinking Water Act standard.

Just last week we informed a client that their product would not be considered 100 percent organic by CCOF due to the use of chlorine at levels above four parts per million in water that contacted the product, and the client solicited comments from other certifiers about his product. He provided an email from another certifier demonstrating

NEAL R. GROSS

that he would be able to call his product 100 percent organic if he went to that certifier. On the phone with me, he said he felt he was at a market disadvantage because of CCOF's take on this issue.

Certifiers also vary in their allowance in the use of sanitizers on the of meat labeled 100 surface as percent This issue extends beyond sanitizers to many items on 605, including the use of nitrogen gas in bagged salad, Diatomaceous Earth, and juice processing or rice treated with CO2.

These examples illustrate a larger issue. Where there is room for interpretation of the rule and certifier interpretations differ, certified operations are figuring out that they can shop around for a desirable answer.

In short, CCOF is requesting clarification as to whether items on 605 that directly contact food, not all of which are

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

necessarily processing aids, are or are not allowed for use on a product destined to be labeled 100 percent organic. Is the intent of the 100 percent organic labeling category to apply to a very limited scope of products or all organic product that may also be using allowed materials? It appears to CCOF that complicated this has become а issue semantics about what is is and not а processing aid.

More generally, CCOF would like to make the NOSB formally aware of the impacts of differing certifier interpretation and encourage the NOSB and NOP to provide rule clarifications in order to prevent this certifier shopping in the marketplace.

Lastly, CCOF is requesting clarification as to whether DHA and other omega-3 fatty acids are allowed under the nutrient, vitamin, or mineral listing on 605.

CCOF does certify a company using this material as a supplement in baby food. But

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

recent complaints have surfaced against the use of this material. CCOF would like to know either way if this material is allowed for use in organic production.

This question extends to a general discussion of accessory nutrients, like other fatty acids and other health-promoting compounds and their allowance in organic products.

Another client has requested the use of DMAE and choline in a product labeled "made with organic". Although we have not allowed the use of these substances, there is increasing market pressure to accept a very wide interpretation of the vitamin and mineral allowance.

Please clarify whether nutrients, vitamins, and minerals should be interpreted to include only actual vitamins or whether it can be extended to other substances that could be considered essential for growth and development.

NEAL R. GROSS

1 Thank you. 2 CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any questions? 3 Joe? MEMBER SMILLIE: Right. 4 MS. BIERGIEL: Hello. 5 6 MEMBER SMILLIE: This 100 percent thing, I'm not sure that all the NOSB members 7 are up-to-speed on this, but as the certifier 8 rep, I have to tell you there has been a great 9 10 deal of disturbance in the forest on this one. Again, it is an NOP issue, and it 11 hasn't been on our work plan. But the NOP, 12 13 the current thinking of the NOP seems to be -and please correct me if I am wrong -- seems 14 15 to be that almost anything is considered a 16 processing aid when it comes to the 100 percent claim. 17 That means if you take grain and 18 19 put it in a silo and add Diatomaceous Earth, 20 totally allowed, then filter and Diatomaceous and send that grain out, 21

grain loses its 100 percent status.

If you take CO2 and -- what's the word? -- I hate to use the word "fumigate" -- you know, put strawberries through it, those strawberries are not 100 percent organic anymore because the CO2 isn't organic.

If you take nitrogen and 100 percent olive oil and put that nitrogen as a packaging aid, was our previous interpretation, then that olive oil cannot be 100 percent, even though it fulfills every other requirement.

This is kind of a bit of a shock to the certification community. It has caused a lot of consternation in the industry, to the point that the 100 percent label has been problematic from the very beginning of this regulation.

I can't tell you how many hours I have spent explaining to clients and prospective clients, "No, you can't say it's 100 percent, even though everything is organic in it, because the processing aids weren't

NEAL R. GROSS

organic."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

It was hard enough; now it has become almost impossible. Basically, I think all of us in the certification world are saying, please, don't make 100 percent claims.

It has created this kind of real problem in the industry, and I am not sure everybody is aware of it. It is not on our work plan. I'm not sure what we can do about it, other than conference with the NOP to at least come to a decision of how we're all going to move forward, because everything like this does create this certification shopping. eliminated certification We just about shopping to some extent, based on money and service, and with these different now interpretations coming back in as people explore the regulation, it is coming back.

So we need to act quickly to clarify and create that common ground. I am not sure that all of you were aware of this 100 percent issue, but we have had to deal

NEAL R. GROSS

1	with it. The ACA LISTSERV has had a number of
2	options, and perhaps Pat will speak to that
3	tomorrow or the next day, but it has become a
4	serious issue, but I don't see it on any of
5	our work plans.
6	As far as the second issue of the
7	vitamins, minerals, and other nutrients, as
8	allowed in 104.20, that is, if I am not
9	incorrect, that is going to be on our work
10	plan, Julie.
11	MS. BIERGIEL: Thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: That was yes
13	from Julie.
14	MEMBER SMILLIE: That was a very
15	reluctant yes though.
16	(Laughter.)
17	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
18	questions? Steve?
19	MEMBER DeMURI: This is in response
20	to you, Joe. No, I was not aware of the
21	issues with 100 percent, but I am glad I am
22	now.

now.

1	MS. BIERGIEL: Thank you.
2	MEMBER DeMURI: I do think it is
3	something we need to work on pretty quickly.
4	MS. BIERGIEL: Yes, thank you.
5	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: So there we have
6	the action item. Very good. I like to hear
7	that.
8	Any other questions, participating
9	from the program, clarifications? Barbara?
LO	MS. ROBINSON: What did you want,
L1	Joe?
L2	MEMBER SMILLIE: Did I present
L3	it
L4	MS. ROBINSON: Yes, you did, and
L5	the program will take a look at it.
L6	MS. BIERGIEL: Thank you.
L7	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Kevin?
L8	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Joe, what about
L9	the instances where there are requirements
20	above and beyond organic standards for
21	sanitation, things like that? How does that
22	play into your decisionmaking with 100

1	percent?
2	MEMBER SMILLIE: Well, to go back
3	to a previous decision, we do not regard a
4	sanitizer as a processing aid, as long as it
5	is rinsed off and does not come into contact
6	with the final product.
7	So, in other words, if you clear
8	your line with a sanitizer, it's a clean
9	rinse, a sanitized rinse, as a manufacturing
10	facility, you have to prove to us that there's
11	no residual left. So we don't think it is an
12	issue. That is our current stance.
13	MS. BIERGIEL: If it doesn't
14	contact the product and there's no residual
15	MEMBER SMILLIE: Right.
16	MS. BIERGIEL: it is not an
17	issue.
18	MEMBER SMILLIE: Right, but the
19	Diatomaceous serves the carbon dioxide. We
20	are talking about nitrogen, carbon dioxide.
21	You know this is like what we breathe every

minute, this stuff, you know.

22

You can't see

1	it.
2	MS. BIERGIEL: Right.
3	MS. ROBINSON: Rigo? Wait a
4	minute, Rigo.
5	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Barbara, please.
6	MS. ROBINSON: There is a
7	definition of a processing aid in the
8	regulations, and the sanitizer is not a
9	processing aid. It doesn't say nowhere in
10	the definition of a processing aid is the word
11	"sanitizer". Okay?
12	MEMBER SMILLIE: But Diatomaceous
13	Earth, carbon dioxide, nitrogen are processing
14	aids under your definition.
15	MS. ROBINSON: Yes, but they are
16	not added to food.
17	We'll look into this further.
18	Okay?
19	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: All right. Any
20	other questions for the presenter?
21	(No response.)
22	Thank you very much.

1	MS. BIERGIEL: Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: At this point
3	we're going to take a well-deserved break. We
4	will come back at 3:15, and the next speaker
5	will be Emily Brown-Rosen.
6	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter
7	went off the record at 3:09 p.m. and went back
8	on the record at 3:24 p.m.) CHAIRMAN
9	DELGADO: We are ready to resume our public
10	comment.
11	At this point, Emily Brown-Rosen
12	from the PCO we are ready to start our
13	public comment.
14	Emily, thank you for being with us.
15	Please start.
16	MS. BROWN-ROSEN: Okay, thank you.
17	My name is Emily Brown-Rosen,
18	B-R-O-W-N R-O-S-E-N. I work for Pennsylvania
19	Certified Organic as the Policy Director.
20	Thank you very much for the chance to speak to
21	you here again today.

Pennsylvania Certified Organic is

an accredited certifier. We have about 500 clients. We have filed a number of comments that should be in your book on various different topics, materials, grower groups, seed. But today I am going to focus my little five minutes here on the materials definition I don't think anyone has talked about should something this yet. When agricultural and when something is agricultural? So I will be the first.

If you have questions about any of our other comments, feel free to ask me later.

Also, we have two other people that will address some of those issues coming along.

Previously, I posted a comment in support of option D. I should say, starting out, that I was a member of this Materials Working Group, this collection of different individuals who worked quite a bit on that lengthy proposal that we gave you. I think it was a really good discussion. We came up with lots of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

different ideas. It was a hard one because there was a lot of difference of opinion, but we gave it a shot, and I came out in support of option D.

But having thought about it further and having read other people's comments, which is all part of the process, I have now revised my opinion. So I am handing out another one. I have a new option I am supporting, and I am calling it option B-plus. I will explain this. It is not A. It is not perfect. Nothing will ever be perfect, but I think this is good enough. So I will explain where I got this from.

This option B is based on the proposal that commercial availability is required for everything on the list that's 205.605 and everything on 205.606. I think this really makes it simple. Initially, we had rejected doing this because it seems like it is too much work to prove availability of this other section of the list, but we are

NEAL R. GROSS

doing this already with 606 as far as certification goes. I think we know how to do that. A lot of the things on 605 will be fairly obvious that they are not possible ever to be organic. So it won't be that much of a stretch to add this to that.

From reading CCOF's comments, which I support on this issue, they pointed out this does provide more incentive to develop organic forms of all the substances on the National List. Ιt gives back that order of us organic preference; want whenever we available.

And as Oregon Tilth has pointed out, we need to get back to the old, original thinking that there is sort of this order. You know, organic is best; then if you can't find something organic, something natural is best, and then something synthetic on the list. That really fell out when the final rule got published, but it is something worthy of trying to bring back.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So I think this proposal does that.

It will keep the section (a) and (b), synthetic, non-synthetic, so that's there for identification purposes, and then people will have to justify that they are not using organic if it is available.

Now this also requires that we drop the term "non-agricultural" from the title of 205.605. So everything listed on 605 will just be non-organic substances allowed in food processing. So it won't be one way or the other, it's agricultural or non-agricultural. It is just a substance that has been reviewed that is allowed. If you can possibly find a way to make that organically, that is the form of it you should be using.

barrier. So there's no Tt.'s classified because it's not. as nonagricultural, like right now the NOP's says that yeast is non-agricultural you organically. cannot make it So that nomenclature problem will just disappear

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

because we won't identify it one way or the other.

this is my change here. Ι Now addition to suggest that, in this major the definition $\circ f$ change, nonwe use agricultural substance that Oregon Tilth has proposed. I will repeat. Gwendolyn nicely wrote up, "A substance that is not raised in or derived from an agricultural system, such as a mineral or atmospheric gas. purposes of this part, a non-agricultural ingredient is anything technically also impossible to be organically produced." So Gwendolyn went on to explain that "technically impossible" refers to either а lack standards or the current production methods available for the substance in question are limited to materials and practices that are not consistent with the standards for an organic product.

So this is something that is doable. This is something that I think will

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	be a very bright, clear dividing line for NOP
2	to say, "We don't have standards for
3	microorganisms. We can keep microorganisms on
4	the list."
5	I'll finish my sentence and then
6	you can ask me questions.
7	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Yes, if you can
8	wrap up.
9	MS. BROWN-ROSEN: Okay.
10	Keep microorganisms on the list,
11	but you could also put baker's yeast or the
12	types of brewer's yeast that are available
13	organically on 606.
14	I want to point out that attached
15	to my comments I have printed out a page from
16	the AFGO manual listing the 45 different kinds
17	of bacterial and fungal microorganisms that
18	are used in livestock feed. I can't even
19	pronounce these names, but at this point in
20	time I don't see them being available for
21	organic livestock, and therefore, let's just

keep microorganisms on the list at 605, and

1	you could do that with this proposal.
2	All right, any questions?
3	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay. I just
4	want to make sure, did you get a copy of
5	Emily's proposal?
6	MEMBER HEINZE: I was going to
7	point out we had a little miscommunication
8	gap. So this side of the table has the
9	written comments; this side of the table
10	doesn't. So we'll get them to you.
11	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you for
12	that.
13	Okay, now any questions?
14	We'll start with Dan followed by
15	Gerry.
16	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Just so I
17	understand your B-plus, the clarification on
18	the definition of non-ag, which is a fairly
19	significant change, is coupled with the fact
20	that you're dropping the term non-ag out of
21	the title of 605, correct?
22	MS. BROWN-ROSEN: Correct.

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Gerry?

MEMBER DAVIS: You mentioned that list of all those microorganisms. Do you have any comment on the importance of -- I know you say they are being used, but is there any centering at all on certain ones that are vitally important and others are just occasionally used?

MS. BROWN-ROSEN: Well, I will say, from the standpoint of someone who reviews livestock feed additives all the time, that you see all of these in multiple combinations all the time. It is considered a very important part of a healthy diet for ruminants to prevent other medical problems that would require medications or treatment.

So I can't judge whether one is better than another one. I know the formulators all have their reasons why they think certain combinations are better for certain purposes. So I would say they're in everything.

We will commonly see a livestock feed additive that has 30 or 40 ingredients, including maybe five or ten microbials and then all the vitamins and the different things for different purposes. So there is a lot of

6 work reviewing those products to begin with.

So if we had to get organic certificates for all of them, we could do it, but I don't think it is going to happen any time soon.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Dan?

MEMBER GIACOMINI: Just a comment on that, Gerald, as an animal nutritionist working a lot with dairy cattle ruminants and these types of products, a large part of what these products are trying to do is a balance of enzymes in the rumen. It is very likely that the optimal enzyme supply balance is not even -- it may be three of these bacteria species that are used very minorly now, but they just haven't put them together yet.

So you have the regulars now, and

NEAL R. GROSS

the favorite, the A list. It may be that two or three or four or five from the B list may end up being the best thing in two to three years. So it would be very hard to just try and start splitting hairs on where on this list the best is going to come from.

MEMBER DAVIS: So you would concur that there is a vast amount of differing concoctions being marketed in feed? I mean that list is reflective of what's actually being used, just like she said?

MEMBER GIACOMINI: Well, the technology of bringing these to the animal, to a great extent, is a technology in being able to get the billions of different species that are in the rumen already fed back to the animal in a product where you are still getting to them in a live state. There may be changes in technology and maybe modifications down the road where this list may be obsolete in five years.

MEMBER DAVIS: So it may be a bit

NEAL R. GROSS

1	of a shotgun approach that they are using
2	because they don't know precisely which one
3	are the key ones? Am I gathering what you're
4	saying?
5	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Well, the answer
6	is always going to be a shotgun rather than a
7	rifle because it is going to be the balance of
8	amino acids, but what BBs go into that shotgun
9	is going to be changing constantly also.
10	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Was that clear
11	enough, Gerry?
12	MEMBER DAVIS: Yes.
13	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay. Any other
14	questions?
15	(No response.)
16	Very good. Thank you, Emily.
17	Up next is Gwen Wyard, followed by
18	M. J. Marshall.
19	MS. WYARD: Good afternoon, members
20	of the Board, NOP staff, and ladies and
21	gentlemen of the gallery. My name is
22	Gwendolyn Wyard. I am presenting today on

behalf of Oregon Tilth.

We are a membership-based nonprofit organization. Our mission statement is to support biologically-sound and socially-equitable agriculture through research, education, advocacy, and product certification.

The topic for this afternoon is the definition of materials, namely, agricultural versus non-agricultural. The comments in their entirety were submitted to regulations.gov, so you should have them and all their gripping details in your book.

We also submitted comments in conjunction with PCO on the 606 review process, and I believe those are going to be addressed in later comments, but if you have any questions for me, at the end of my five minutes I will be happy to answer them.

I also was on the Materials Working Group, and I have some comments with respect to the options that were offered up in that

NEAL R. GROSS

document.

We start off our comments by laying down five key concepts that should remain central to this discussion. While all are equally important, in the interest of time I will highlight only two.

No. 1, the NOP definition of organic production, and No. 2, 205.605 should be reserved for substances that technically cannot be organic.

Working Group discussion document, we are tossing another option in for discussion. It is referred to as option Tilth. It could have been option DD, it was suggested, because it is largely based off of option D, but we're sticking with option Tilth.

There are some significant differences that I would like to point out. Option D adopts a 2005 clarification on the definition of agricultural product. We would like to see only part of that guidance

NEAL R. GROSS

adopted, namely, the following: Agricultural products are those that are managed by humans, humans refers to the and managed by intentional act of gathering, producing, domestically raising, growing oror designated wild harvest areas by persons for human or livestock consumption.

Oregon Tilth does not agree that lines agricultural between and nonagricultural should be drawn based an The focus organism's taxonomy. should be whether they are a living organism managed by humans and intended for human or livestock The focus from there on out consumption. should be whether they can or are produced and handled in accordance with the act and the regulations.

The definition of non-agricultural should either be revised or removed completely. We feel a revision, rather than complete deletion, is more appropriate because the general concept is very ingrained into our

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

regulation and is extremely useful when explaining why certain substances such as water and salt are allowed in or excluded from certified products.

Therefore, we recommend the following definition: Non-agricultural, a substance that is not raised in or derived from an agricultural system such as a mineral or atmospheric gas.

For the purposes of this part, a non-agricultural ingredient is also anything that technically cannot be organic. It is the same definition as B-plus.

We support the change in the title of 605 as presented in option D. Drop the word "non-agricultural" and refer to nonsubstances only. This organic approach provides a place for non-organic inputs that either non-agricultural substances are substances that do not belong on 606 because they cannot be certified to the production or handling standards.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

We support retention of agricultural, non-organic non-synthetic, and non-organic synthetic as categories because they cater to the organic preference stepwise approach of using materials which, I might add, has been lost in time.

Yeast -- hang onto your knickers. While Oregon Tilth cannot positively point to yeast as being agricultural in a traditional sense, we can say that yeast are living organisms and their production relies primarily on agricultural material that is available in organic form.

We recognize that yeast production has definite agricultural and environmental implications, and we feel these should and can be addressed by applying organic principles to yeast used in organic food.

Option Tilth offers the following fodder for thought: Retain microorganisms on 605 as non-agricultural substances and clarify that yeast products can be produced

NEAL R. GROSS

organically using non-organic yeast seed covered under the listing of microorganisms on 605.

While Oregon Tilth strongly believes the handling requirements of 205.270 provide adequate standards for certifying organic yeast, we accept that the larger community may feel more comfortable if organic yeast guidelines are further defined. The appropriate place to do this is in a guidance document that would ultimately need to be circulated by the NOP for public comment via The Federal Register, adopted if favorable, and posted to the NOP website.

Once processing guidelines for organic yeast products become available via the NOP website, specific products such as baker's yeast and nutritional yeast could be petitioned to 606 as agricultural products subject to commercial availability.

Under this working theory, a distinction can be made between a

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	microorganism classified as non-agricultural
2	substance and the organic processed product
3	that can be produced when the microorganism
4	and substrate are formulated in accordance
5	with requirements of processed organic
6	product.
7	One last sentence?
8	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: One last one.
9	MS. WYARD: This approach would
10	continue to allow direct-fed microorganisms to
11	be allowed as non-synthetic, non-agricultural
12	livestock feed supplements while continuing to
13	support the organic production of yeast
14	products listed on 606.
15	Thank you very much.
16	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you, Gwen.
17	Any questions? Steve?
18	MEMBER DeMURI: Without having both
19	yours and Emily's proposal side by side, can
20	you explain the difference between yours and
21	her B-plus?

WYARD: B-plus

MS.

22

applies

1	commercial availability to both lists. So it
2	merges the list. It doesn't actually merge
3	them, but commercial availability is applied
4	to 605 and 606.
5	I have made a distinction between
6	605, which contains products that cannot be
7	certified organic, and 606, which are products
8	that can be certified organic. I have
9	included these categories, like I said, along
10	with synthetic and non-synthetic. So there is
11	this progression of organic preference.
12	Otherwise, they are very similar.
13	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
14	questions?
15	(No response.)
16	Thank you very much.
17	MS. WYARD: Okay. Thank you.
18	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Up next is M.J.
19	Marshall.
20	Julie, you had a comment?
21	MEMBER WEISMAN: Well, no, it was
22	with regard to a different person on the list.

1	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Yes.
2	MEMBER WEISMAN: I don't believe
3	she is in the room, and I do believe that they
4	are signed up tomorrow.
5	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Tomorrow.
6	MEMBER WEISMAN: As of yesterday,
7	that was my impression.
8	MEMBER HEINZE: Julie, she asked
9	and I told her that that wasn't possible.
10	MEMBER WEISMAN: When was this?
11	MEMBER HEINZE: It was an email
12	late yesterday, and I said that it was too
13	booked, and I'm sorry.
14	MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay.
15	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: So we are
16	skipping M.J. then, and next up is Grace
17	Marroquin, followed by David E. Adams.
18	MS. MARROQUIN: I'm back.
19	(Laughter.)
20	Good afternoon. My name is Grace
21	Marroquin. I'm President and CEO of Marroquin
22	Organic International, based in Santa Cruz,

California.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I founded my company in 1991, and we are importers and suppliers of organic ingredients.

Before turning to discuss yeast as agricultural product, I have а brief an comment on tartaric acid. Organic tartaric acid is available. At this meeting, the will Handling Committee make а recommendation that tartaric acid remain on the National List both as non-synthetic on 605(a) with an annotation "made from grape wine", and as synthetic in 205.605(b) with an annotation "made from malic acid".

My company can supply organic tartaric acid made from grape juice extract. Since this organic version of organic tartaric acid is now available from at least one source, and grape juice is an agricultural product, it is my opinion that non-synthetic tartaric acid made with grape juice or grape wine should be listed in 606.

NEAL R. GROSS

Turning now to the Materials Working Group report, since July 30th, 2004, I have been asking this Board simply to recognize yeast as an agricultural product. I appreciate the work that the Materials Working Group has done. I also served on this group.

I am grateful today that Kevin Orell, a former Chair of the NOSB, Goldie Caughlin, former member and officer of the NOSB, Lynn Clarkson, a leader in the organic community, have all submitted comments in support of our request. I am pleased that Dave Adams of Savoury Systems International is joining us today to voice his support.

Before organic yeast became available on the market, yeast was classified on the National List as a non-agricultural under 605(a). This means organic yeast cannot be a required organic ingredient.

Organic food processors do not have to use it at all. They are free to use conventional yeast and do not have to search

NEAL R. GROSS

for an organic alternative.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Organic yeast uses an organic grain substrate and absolutely synthetic no chemicals in its production process. Conventional yeast, on the other hand, is made using synthetic chemicals. I have to remind you about this every time, but Ι Ammonia is the nitrogen source. Sulfuric acid and caustic soda lyes are used to regulate pH. Synthetic vitamins and synthetic anti-foaming agents are used, and the waste water is a major problem.

In the organic yeast production, further make the waste water is used to organic products. Nearly two years ago we thought this matter was on its way to being resolved in September 2006, when of the Handling and Materials Committee voted unanimously, eight to zero, to recommend to the Board that yeast and dairy cultures be listed on 606 as agricultural products. Αt 2006, the Board meeting in October of

NEAL R. GROSS

Board discussed this but deferred action.

We all understand the OFPA does include fungi, including yeast and other microorganisms, in its definition of agricultural product. No one on the Board or from the NOP had challenged this.

At this meeting, the Board will be reviewing poria fungus extract for listing as an agricultural product on 606. The NOP and the Handling Committee have simply accepted this petition for a fungus as an agricultural product. No one has questioned the status of fungus as an agricultural product.

While the Committee voted not to approve this petition, it did so on other grounds. Yet, the Board has still not acted on a unanimous recommendation from the Handling and Materials Committee of 2006. We see it as the principal reason for the impact it will have on livestock feed, which is understandable. Livestock feed is the reason we have a stalemate on recognizing yeast and

NEAL R. GROSS

1	other microorganisms as agricultural products.
2	The Materials Working Group report is a
۷	
3	reflection of this stalemate.
4	Okay, here we go, option G. Option
5	G is working within the framework of what we
6	have right now, which is OFPA.
7	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: You have one
8	minute.
9	MS. MARROQUIN: All right. Okay.
10	Option G, keeping the existing
11	definition of non-agricultural substances in
12	the NOP regulation, it identifies a bacteria
13	culture as not a product of agriculture. This
14	would mean livestock operators could continue
15	to use non-organic bacterial cultures in their
16	feed as a supplement allowed under 205.237(a).
17	Processors using bacteria dairy cultures
18	could continue to use them without the need to
19	search for an organic alternative.
20	Two, since organic yeast can be
21	available for food and feed, recognize yeast
22	as an agricultural product and transfer yeast

1	alone to 605(a) from 605(a) to 606. A
2	definition of non-agricultural substance, the
3	NOP regulation identifies bacteria cultures as
4	not a product of agriculture. This does not
5	apply to yeast. Yeasts are fungi, not
6	bacteria. This is a well-known scientific
7	distinction.
8	Three, keep the existing listing of
9	microorganisms as non-agricultural in 605(a).
10	This is the same approach the EU has recently
11	taken toward yeast in its regulation of
12	834/2007, blah, blah.
13	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay.
14	MS. MARROQUIN: Yes.
15	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you,
16	Grace.
17	Any questions? Joe?
18	MEMBER SMILLIE: Grace, we've got
19	to get into the details. So I would like to
20	ask you why, to the two options that we just
21	heard, wouldn't your problem be solved by
22	those options?

MS. MARROQUIN: Yes. I like those
options, too, but that is an act of Congress.
I might be dead by the time anything happens
on that because it has taken four years
already. I hate to say that.
There's also yeast and other items,
ingredients like this, could be certified as
processing standards. I think there have been
clarifications that said, if 95 percent of the
ingredients on substrates are used, they are
considered an organic product. So that would
be one avenue we could take.
I like B-plus. I like the various
options. But, again, we are working within
the framework of OFPA, and I thought that's
what NOSB is to do, is to make and serve and
clarify the regulations within OFPA.
MEMBER SMILLIE: Well, you join the
Pollyanna crew?
MS. MARROQUIN: Yes, right, but I
do think, you know, these other options that

are being presented are good options.

MEMBER SMILLIE: The criticism of
them is they take regulatory change.
MS. MARROQUIN: They take an act of
Congress, which is like an act of God.
No, I mean, aren't you talking
about changing OFPA in some of those cases?
MEMBER DAVIS: Didn't I hear
Gwen
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Hang on a
minute, Gerry.
Are you done with her?
MEMBER SMILLIE: For now.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: For now, okay.
MEMBER DAVIS: I'm sorry. I'm
trying to sort this out in my own mind,
listening to Gwen and Emily. I thought I was
hearing them saying they have to redefine the
word "agricultural". I heard them dropping
non-agricultural out, but I thought I guess
I am wrong, but I thought I heard them mention
that agricultural should mean this. Well,
OFPA already says what agricultural is.

1 MS. MARROQUIN: Is there a lawyer 2 in the room? 3 (Laughter.) 4 CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Can you state 5 your name, please? SIEGEL: 6 MR. Richard Siegel, Washington, D.C., attorney and counsel to 7 Marroquin Organic International. 8 OFPA is a statute -- this Board is 9 10 assigned in OFPA to advise the Department on how OFPA should be implemented. So this Board 11 this Board and 12 has operate 13 Department of Agriculture have to within the four corners OFPA. 14 15 Now OFPA says that in order to have 16 an organic product, it must first be agricultural product. Ιf blur 17 you the distinction between agricultural 18 and 19 agricultural, and you make a nice, big, happy 20 list, and you say, "Now here's this nice, big, happy list," and if someone can come up with 21

an organic version of something on this list,

fine, it will be an organic version, but that organic version has to be an agricultural product. So you can't get around the fact that anything that is going to eventually be organic has to pass muster as an agricultural product.

That is why we are suggesting in this latest option that we have, option G, consider that yeast is an agricultural product and leave bacteria and the other microorganisms as non-agricultural.

MS. MARROQUIN: And again, this was all framed within moving forward from the idea that we have to work within this framework of OFPA. If it was possible that we don't, then all these other options are all very good options. I mean not all of them. I like B-plus. I like Tilth. But again, we're bound by the law.

One last thing: Organic preference has been mentioned here, but it is the reason my company is here. Because it was a great,

NEAL R. GROSS

1	fun challenge to look at those lists and see
2	what on that list can we make organic, and
3	there are plenty of things. Lecithin can be,
4	glycerin, but why aren't people petitioning
5	these? There must be reasons. It takes away
6	the challenge of producing organic
7	ingredients.
8	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Very good. All
9	right, the Secretary, please.
10	MEMBER HEINZE: You'll be relieved
11	to know I don't have a yeast question. Now I
12	have a tartaric acid question.
13	So you have that available? Is
14	that what I am hearing you say?
15	MS. MARROQUIN: Yes. We haven't
16	brought it in. It was three years in the
17	making because they were trying to make baking
18	powder, and we have it made with organic
19	baking powder, which no one has to use, of
20	course.
21	But because of that, they had to
22	produce a tartar, and they were trying to get

2	develop this. But again, the issue came up
3	and it was like, oh, dear, do I really want to
4	do this?
5	MEMBER HEINZE: I will admit, as a
6	member of the Handling Committee, sometimes I
7	feel like I'm stuck in a chicken-and-an-egg
8	thing on the sunset. We saw this with
9	lecithin a couple of years ago, that someone
10	did say it was available, but yet it wasn't in
11	a form that industry could use. Yet, what you
12	say is, until it is off the list, industry
13	won't be incented to use it.
14	I do feel a bit stuck sometimes.
15	MS. MARROQUIN: Yes.
16	MEMBER HEINZE: We all have the
17	same goal.
18	MS. MARROQUIN: Right.
19	MEMBER HEINZE: Get things off the
20	list, but it does seem
21	MS. MARROQUIN: Organic is about
22	chicken and eggs.

rid of the phosphates. So they were able to

1	MEMBER HEINZE: Okay.
2	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Dan?
3	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Thank you, Rigo.
4	Not a question, but just a reminder
5	to everybody: We will have a presentation
6	tomorrow by the Materials Working Group.
7	Depending on how long all the presentations
8	fall within our time limit, there will be
9	discussion.
10	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Very good.
11	Thank you.
12	MS. MARROQUIN: I want to thank you
13	all again for all your patience and
14	understanding and attention to the matter.
15	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Before you
16	leave, are there any other questions for
17	Grace?
18	(No response.)
19	Okay, thank you.
20	Okay, I understand that M.J. is
21	present at this moment, M.J. Marshall. Is
22	that the case?

1	MS. MARSHALL: That's it.
2	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, you're up.
3	After M.J., we'll have David Adams.
4	MS. MARSHALL: Sorry I was late.
5	The train was a little late, believe it or
6	not.
7	I'm M.J. Marshall. I'm the
8	Director of Government Relations for the
9	Flavor and Extract Manufacturers Association.
10	Along the lines of the discussion
11	that you were just having with respect to ag
12	versus non-ag, I just wanted to give you an
13	update as to where the flavor industry is with
14	respect to those discussions.
15	Certainly, FEMA shares the concerns
16	for the integrity of the program and the
17	tremendous efforts that have gone into all of
18	these discussions of late. We have made
19	enormous progress, I think.
20	We have had our own internal FEMA
21	Task Force looking at this issue. We have had
22	twice monthly meetings with more than 20

company participants. Then at our recent annual meeting, which was just a couple of weeks ago, we had some presentations on the organics issue, and we have been giving these to a wider audience within our organization to try to educate the members as to the concerns that we have about the definitional issues.

Certainly FEMA wants to help reach a solution to ensure business continuity in a way that will satisfy the producers of organic products, the certifiers, and the regulators.

I would also stress that we have also been working with the certifiers very closely on this issue as well. I think that is an important point.

We will also continue to work closely with the Materials Working Group and, as I said, the certifiers. We want to help try to resolve any outstanding concerns with the definitional issues by achieving a solution that we believe will provide a consistent approach to the challenges that we

NEAL R. GROSS

1	face.
2	On a final point, we believe that
3	the solutions must support the program and
4	ensure the integrity of organic products.
5	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Well, thank you.
6	Any questions? Barbara?
7	MS. ROBINSON: M.J., I'm glad you
8	came. I just would like to say that, as a
9	matter of fact, I got an email the other day
10	and it was not from FEMA, but it was from
11	someone I can't remember his name now.
12	MS. MARSHALL: A member of FEMA?
13	MS. ROBINSON: I'm not sure. It is
14	a gentleman out in California who has been
15	working with flavors for quite some time.
16	It was an extremely educational
17	communication about natural flavors, the way
18	actually that they are annotated on the
19	National List and kind of problems with the
20	original annotation, linking it back to FDA's
21	definition of a natural flavor.

So, unfortunately, I was on my way

1	here, and I didn't really have time to it
2	was like a three-page email when I printed it
3	out. So I want to go back and look at that
4	and then go back and look at the regulatory
5	citation at FDA, and then we probably do need
6	to talk. Because like I said, it was really
7	educational about the FDA regulations
8	governing natural flavors.
9	MS. MARSHALL: Which FDA has said
10	that they are not going to define, "natural"
11	that is.
12	MS. ROBINSON: Actually, there is
13	some regulatory history there.
14	MS. MARSHALL: Well, there's
15	definitely history
16	MS. ROBINSON: Yes, right.
17	MS. MARSHALL: but what I'm
18	saying is that they've come out recently and
19	said they weren't going to try to define
20	natural
21	MS. ROBINSON: Right.
22	MS. MARSHALL: any further than

1	they already have.
2	MS. ROBINSON: But I guess what I
3	am saying is that we still have more work to
4	do delving into this.
5	MS. MARSHALL: I agree. So that is
6	why I wanted to come and participate today
7	MS. ROBINSON: Right.
8	MS. MARSHALL: just to give the
9	Board a status report on where we are
10	MS. ROBINSON: Right.
11	MS. MARSHALL: and to reiterate
12	our concerns and our goal of trying to find a
13	workable solution.
14	MS. ROBINSON: And so is ours. So
15	is ours. I just wanted to reaffirm that with
16	you.
17	MS. MARSHALL: Yes. Well, if
18	that's an email you would feel comfortable
19	sharing with me
20	MS. ROBINSON: Oh, I would,
21	absolutely.
22	MS. MARSHALL: Yes, that would be

1	great.
2	MS. ROBINSON: Because I would like
3	your feedback on it.
4	MS. MARSHALL: Yes, okay, and we
5	can have some followup after that.
6	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, thank you.
7	Joe, you had a question?
8	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes. A member of
9	FEMA participated in the Working Group.
10	MS. MARSHALL: Okay.
11	MEMBER SMILLIE: Has FEMA looked at
12	that document, and do you have any comments to
13	make on that document about which option you
14	may be leaning toward at this point?
15	MS. MARSHALL: I am really, Joe,
16	not comfortable commenting on that. I would
17	say that, yes, we have looked at the document,
18	but we are still having some internal
19	discussions about it.
20	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
21	questions?
22	(No response.)

1 Good. Thank you very much. 2 MS. MARSHALL: Thank you. 3 CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Up next is David Adams, followed by Kelly Shea. 4 Good afternoon. MR. ADAMS: 5 Thank 6 you for the hearing. I'm Dave Adams from 7 Savoury Systems, President and owner. a natural ingredient company working with 8 products for the food industry. 9 10 We are making organic baker's yeast This 11 extract. is natural flavoring It is a very stable product. 12 material. 13 has been around for centuries really, baking yeast and reliable low allergen. 14 15 We have been making this for about 16 three in the U.S. Ιt is years now sustainable, as you grow it on a carbohydrate 17 18 source, molasses and sugar, which yields a 19 nutritious, protein broth for flavor 20 nutrition, kind of like chicken broth, if you will, but it is vegetarian. So it has a big 21

benefit and it is a sustainable product.

We respect the efforts of the members of the Materials Working Group and look forward to a decision on the issue here.

We have looked at options also. We wrote a letter about (c), but really it doesn't resolve the issues with all the dairy cultures and the microorganisms and everything else that are a bit complicated.

Yeast is a little simpler product and reliable. So what we have come up with also is the option G. Tilth also suffices for the same program to sort it out, but I think that would work well.

Comparing it to EU, there is a similarity if we used the other issue, the production standards for organic yeast. The EU recognized yeast as eligible for organic certification in food and feed and had issued production standards.

So if we need standards, the EU are pretty standard; we could use those as a model. Here again, standards should not be an

NEAL R. GROSS

obstacle.

Also, if the NOP continues to keep yeast as a non-agricultural substance, NOP-certified manufacturers will continue to rely on conventional instead of organic yeast, while the EU could soon start blocking organic imports from the United States unless they contain organic yeast.

Again, I think you've got a fast program from Grace Marroquin on the option G and its similarities. So I won't belabor that issue.

But the purpose of NOP regulation is that new organic ingredients are developed for processed products. There is an organic preference that should favor the use of these ingredients, and we see option G as the best one now that would be in perfect interest of strengthening the organic integrity of processed food products by finally requiring the use of yeast in organic form if it is commercially available.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you.
3	Any questions?
4	(No response.)
5	All right, thank you very much.
6	MR. ADAMS: Good.
7	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Next up is Kelly
8	Shea, followed by Zea Sonnabend.
9	MS. SHEA: Hi, Everybody. I'm
10	Kelly Shea with WhiteWave Foods, better known
11	to most of you as Horizon Organic Dairy and
12	Silk Soymilk.
13	I want to thank the people at
14	USDA's Egg Marketing Service, NOP, and members
15	of the NOSB for all the effort you put into
16	preparing for this meeting. For a lot of us,
17	we travel here for the meeting, but we know
18	how many hours and days have gone into
19	preparing for the meeting.
20	As well, a welcome to Mr. Flamm to
21	the Board.

So I am here today to offer public

comment on a number of issues of importance to 1 2 the organic community. 3 1, No. want to show we our 4 continued support for the renewal and 5 reaffirmation of the following materials to 6 the National List: Karaginan, Agar Agar, and cellulose. 7 in Handling 8 noted the Committee's reaffirmation of the above 9 10 materials, numerous comments in favor 11 relisting, with opposed, no comments received in the months following the November 12 2007 meeting. 13 Secondly, we thank the Board and 14 the public for the discussions around 15 16 definitions of ag, non-ag, non-synthetic, synthetic. Proper definitions will allow for 17 consistent interpretation of 18 the rule and 19 transparent decisionmaking. As well, it will 20 encourage further production and availability of organic inputs. 21

So I would ask the Board that you

request the Materials Working Group continue the efforts begun and that our next report would be delivered at the autumn NOSB meeting.

As you can see, even since the last time the Materials Working Group stopped working, we have had a number of new options. So I think it would be great if we had an opportunity to go back and come forward at the autumn meeting with another document for you that would be more advanced.

I want to talk a little bit about organic seed. So in organic dairying, it is as much about raising grass as raising cows, face difficulty locating good and farmers quality organic seed with a high germ rate that is suited to organic farming practices, when it. located all, can be at and specifically grass seed.

So I want to really thank the NOSB for the document you put together. I think it is the best work to date.

I also want to thank Mark Cool at

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Seeds of Change for the great service he has done to the organic community with his public comments on this important issue over the last few NOSB meetings.

So some of the seeds that farmers struggle to find in their areas as organic are yellow sweet clover seed, red clover, crimson clover, a good two-row barley that is going to produce good straw, stands well, and doesn't lodge, sudex, triticali, which is a lot better for grazing.

So we are going to be compiling further information on this. Ed Maltby, the Executive Director of NODPA, has offered to join us in putting a call out to organic dairy farmers in order to ascertain what other seed varieties they cannot find as organic.

I think there has been a lot of focus on the vegetable seeds, as we have heard, but less on cool season and warm season grasses, and some of the annual forages.

But here's a question: So if I

NEAL R. GROSS

have compiled this list of seeds that are hard to find as organic, then what do we do with that? I mean it is a little odd to think I am going to send that list to every seed supplier here in the U.S. There is not sort of a seeds wanted database. There's databases of existing seeds. So just a little something to take away as you go back to look at reworking your document.

So organic, as you know, is under attack from many levels today. We've got price issues, supply issues. We've got a lot of imitators coming onboard.

I really thank the NOSB for the work that they have done to promote organic as the only third-party certified products produced under protocols that benefit the environment and provide food and fiber that can be traced back to the farm. Organic has been called the poster child for biosecurity and country-of-origin labeling.

The USDA organic seal must meet the

NEAL R. GROSS

expectation of the organic consumer. So we thank you for the work that you are doing.

Last, but not least, something we have talked about before -- I will be done in less time than that, Katrina (responding to time limitation on speakers) -- we urge USDA to act quickly on the two critical priorities for the organic dairy community today, the immediate publication of the pasture rule with very clear metrics for compliance, at least 30 percent dry matter intake from active grazing, and not less than 120 days of the year. We all know most dairy farms can graze many, many more days of the year than 120 days.

Lastly, as opposed to an advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on origin of livestock, we really need to go right to a proposed rule. We did an ANPR on pasture. It came out in April of 2006. So it is just a long road coming.

I think the whole community is aligned on what we want out of origin of

NEAL R. GROSS

Τ	livestock. So we could probably dispense with
2	an ANPR.
3	Thank you.
4	That was really more for them and
5	less for you.
6	Thanks.
7	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you,
8	Kelly.
9	Any questions? Joe?
10	MEMBER SMILLIE: Kelly, I
11	appreciate your comments that the Materials
12	Working Group should go back and further
13	refine the great work that you have already
14	done. You have obviously chosen that route
15	rather than seeking a recommendation for the
16	November meeting.
17	I just wonder, do we need to take
18	that time? Do you think that we should take a
19	little more time rather than try to come out
20	with a recommendation?
21	MS. SHEA: Yes. Well, we might be
22	able to have one by then, but let me tell you,

the calls were some of the most amazing calls

I have been on in a long time. You had a lot

of members of the community on these phone

calls.

I've got to tell you, the first "how long" was just resurrecting history, right? So Brian and Grace and everyone that was on the phone call going, "Oh, member in '95," and "member in '92," and a lot of you that sit on the Board have a hard time finding all this history. So it was just rich mining to pull all this together.

Then, once we got it all together and made sure nothing was left out, the time was already half gone, and then it was time to start really eating that and digesting it and deciding where to go from there.

So it is not finished. Could it be November? I think -- ask the team -- yes, probably, but I would rather underpromise and overdeliver.

MEMBER SMILLIE: I would be remiss

NEAL R. GROSS

1	which option are you leaning toward? I am
2	doing a survey of everybody who speaks to it?
3	(Laughter.)
4	MS. SHEA: I'm not saying yet.
5	(Laughter.)
6	MEMBER SMILLIE: You're not saying?
7	MS. SHEA: No. I don't have a
8	position on it yet for public consumption.
9	(Laughter.)
10	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Barbara, you had
11	a comment, following by Jennifer.
12	MS. ROBINSON: Yes. I should have
13	mentioned this this morning when I was doing
14	the NOP update, and I apologize for forgetting
15	to do this, but we have decided, Kelly, to
16	omit the ANPR on the origin of livestock and
17	go straight to a proposed rulemaking.
18	MS. SHEA: Praise the Lord. Thank
19	you very, very much.
20	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Jennifer?
21	MEMBER HALL: Whichever direction
22	that the Materials Working Group does go, if

it goes back to that group, I do want to really applaud that group's work. I really appreciate how collective it was and how the results of it, at least to date, were really exploratory about the different options and kind of bringing the Board good information to digest and think about what the impacts of those are and kind of not a dictum about which direction to go and kind of "my way or the high way" sort of a thing.

So if it does go back to that group, I would really appreciate a similar sort of a presentation, maybe fewer, that go through that sort of option and implications, but it was quite helpful for me.

MS. SHEA: Thanks for saying that, Jennifer. It was painful, but what we kind of want to be able to do is preserve this sort of history for the future because I'm almost getting 50, a lot of us are getting older; we are going to want to leave this information so people will know why the decisions were made

NEAL R. GROSS

1	that were made, right? So thanks, you guys.
2	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any more
3	questions for Kelly?
4	(No response.)
5	Thank you very much.
6	Next is Zea Sonnabend, followed by
7	Claudia Reid.
8	MS. SONNABEND: Well, Kelly's
9	comment about mining history is a perfect
10	segue to what I have to say.
11	Zea Sonnabend, California Certified
12	Organic Farmers.
13	CCOF recently passed the half a
14	million acres mark in certified organic
15	acreage with over 1800 clients.
16	The decisions that you make affect
17	great numbers of us out in California. We
18	hope sometime we will get you to come out to
19	California and have a meeting, or at least to
20	the West Coast, so more of our people can give
21	some input to your process.

Thank you for the opportunity to

address the NOP and NOSB. I want to talk about materials and a little bit about seed.

First of all, I came to my first NOSB meeting in 1993. We were brought in, a few of in the industry, to give us introductory reference to the first NOSB members, at which time I said there's a nice definition in the OFPA about synthetic, and it it needs a little bit good, but of is clarification and elaboration, particularly as things it applies like extraction, to agricultural, formulation, and agricultural, and other definitions like that. Combustion was one of them.

number Over the years, а of attempts have been made by NOSB to work on the synthetic definition and elaborate on it. Since 1995 maybe, when Richard Steward did some work on synthetic, there's not been any finished pieces that have proceeded to clarify what extraction means and what types extractants are necessary, formulation issues,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and then of course the agricultural issues that you are dealing with now.

So some of us in the industry that review materials and work with them are stuck on a number of things, and you, in fact, since you may not know it because many of the petitions were deferred before your time, but there are deferred petitioners sitting there waiting for you to come up with clarifications on synthetic and non-synthetic to make a decision.

Therefore, Ι urge you, in conjunction with this materials discussion document on agricultural, to pick up the last piece done by Rose Koenig and fellow NOSB members that has really good information on extraction things and other issues. It may not be quite done, but it is really time to make a decision on this and to move forward on this issue, because once you get synthetic, then you can proceed to agricultural and some things can fall into place.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Part of that is to acknowledge that synthetic distinctions are not necessarily the same for handling as they are for crops. Much of the recent work done was done only from the handler point of view and neglected some of the crops realities.

So, for instance, one of the deferred petitions is soy protein isolate. Soy protein isolate as a food ingredient would be able to be acceptable in organic products because potassium hydroxide is on the handling list, which is used as the extract for the soy protein isolate. But its petition for use as a fertilizer in crops is not considered to be acceptable extract something to potassium hydroxide and use it on crops. So the Committee at the time got bogged down in deciding whether it was synthetic or natural and has tabled that discussion for several So I do urge you to pick that up. years now.

For the agricultural and the discussion paper, I have submitted some

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

written comments. We support option B in CCOF. We can go with the B-plus thing, but we like option B because it is the simplest, and simple is what you need. Your life is already really complicated, and so if you just drop the non-agricultural issue, subject everything on the list to commercial availability, which we actually do for the most part, that would enable yeast to be on the National List, and if it is commercially available organically, it would be okay, and if it wasn't, then the "non" would be okay.

So we think that B is the simplest choice. We would like you to make a decision on this as soon as possible also.

Now regarding the petitions -- and this sort of leads into the new website -- we appreciate your effort to make the website uniform with the USDA. The petitions portion of website the turned into really an incredible dinosaur. Ι having real was trouble, trying to get ready for this meeting,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

figuring out the status of where petitions were because you have to go to each letter and look at each one individually, instead of being able to see a chart that has them all there, and you can sort the chart in different categories.

So I really hope you will try to work on that, so it is more functional for us and yourselves. Along those lines, there was terminology that was unclear about where a petition actually stood, like in some cases — and there's some actual wrong information on some of the petitions. I know this because I was the TAP contractor to the NOSB from 1994 through 1996. So the older petitioners, I'm largely responsible for making sure they moved through onto the National List.

I don't have time to go over every single entry in the petitions database to clean up all the mistakes, but I will do what I can when I find them.

So, anyway, there are several

NEAL R. GROSS

petitions that we really would like you to see addressed that have fallen by the wayside.

One of them is the soy protein isolates.

Another one is the terpines petition, which at the time got turned away because the EPA ruled that the terpines could be added to List IV. However, then when you made a declaration about the new inerts policy, it ruled out the terpines which were decided after 2004.

So the terpines are still in a gray area, and the cleanest way to solve it would be to take up the petition, send it to TAP review, and either put it on the National List or not, so that we can know the answer to terpines.

Another example of a petition wrong on the database, which I feel still needs work, was the one on phosphoric acid as a crop production aid. When you go to the website, it gives a TAP review for phosphoric acid for handling and says nothing about it for crops.

NEAL R. GROSS

It was petitioned as a stabilizer for fish, and the Department was giving some strange rulings at the time about non-synthetic and synthetic. Therefore, they just wrote a letter to the company saying they could use the product, and this is not really adequate. This needs to be addressed by a TAP review. So really I hope you send this on for a TAP review.

Then I do echo what some of the people have said about other TAP reviews should be done for everything put on the list. If you have a streamlined TAP process for 606, I can understand that, but you still need objective information. Ιt needs to transparent, so that people can see it and that if a person was comment, so growing organic okra, they could step forward at this meeting and say, "I'll grow it all, all that you want," or whatever, like we saw some of at the meeting last spring when some of the other things were reviewed for 606. But we would

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

like to see transparency and objectivity.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

to the commercial Okay, on so availability of seed. do applaud your We efforts to keep working on this very complicated and hard-to-grapple issue. We were one of the main people complaining about the previous recommendation which put too much burden upon certifiers to have to put information that is normally now kept on farms that we inspect, and it was asking us compile it and send it in.

So we appreciate that you have thought a lot about it and you have put out a good, thoughtful piece in the introduction.

We also support the growth of the fledgling organic seed industry. You will hear later from the Organic Seed Growers Association, which is a newly-formed organization that we would like to support.

However, we still feel that some of the details in your seed availability proposal are fairly cumbersome, and now the onus has

NEAL R. GROSS

shifted a little bit away from the certifiers and onto the growers. It is still asking for collection of information that normally we only review on the farm. So we would like you to keep working on it, but I don't think our growers are going to be happy with the way it is.

Lastly, I was the person who mainly pushed for the petitions for tetracycline and streptomyocin to get onto the National List in the first place when they were added. I understand that you have a new recommendation for an additional tetracycline product. I understand that you came to the Committee recommendation without doing an additional TAP review on that new product.

Even if it is essentially the same, as they claim, to the existing material on the list, they are petitioning a new use for it for use on peaches for bacterial spot, and that has not been TAP reviewed. No peach growers have asked -- I'm on the last sentence

NEAL R. GROSS

1	no peach growers have asked for this that I
2	know; maybe some will go forward today. No
3	study of the alternatives for uses on peaches
4	has been conducted.
5	So I think you are correct in
6	either turning down the recommendation or
7	deferring it until you do a proper TAP review
8	on the subject because you really need to do a
9	TAP review for each use that is on the
10	National List.
11	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you, Zea.
12	MS. SONNABEND: Thank you.
13	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any questions?
14	Yes, Tracy.
15	MEMBER MIEDEMA: Thank you, Zea.
16	I want to make sure I understand
17	what the burden is on farmers or certifiers in
18	feeding back that information on organic feed.
19	MS. SONNABEND: The proposal, as I
20	understand it, says that a grower has to make
21	a master list of every seed they use and then
22	send it around to all the seed companies that

they buy from and ask if they have any of those varieties organically.

Now we allow the grower to show us the seed catalog from Johnny's, and we know that if Johnny's doesn't have it in their catalog, that sending them a list is not going to make them have it if they don't have it already. So we accept the Johnny's catalog as evidence of here's what organic varieties are available or not.

We don't make the grower write it all down onto one master list. We question the grower about each variety that they are using non-organically and say, "Why are you using this?" Then we write much of it in our report.

But if they are growing three hundred varieties, as Harriet is, we don't ask every single variety every year. We look at what they get every year. We ask them about the ones that we feel are key. We don't make them turn in the completely master list. They

NEAL R. GROSS

1	keep it with their own OSP on their farm, the
2	lists of what they use.
3	Most growers, many growers are very
4	protective of what varieties they are growing
5	and they don't want them turned in, even to
6	file reviewers to see, much less to some third
7	party to see, if it might disclose their
8	identity in relationship to that variety.
9	MEMBER MIEDEMA: Okay. A follow-up
10	question then: If the end game is to get more
11	organic seed available, do you have any
12	alternative suggestions to making that demand
13	transparent to the marketplace?
14	MS. SONNABEND: Yes. We look at it
15	as a continuous improvement in a situation.
16	So we don't look for an absolute you contacted
17	three people or you used "X" percent. What we
18	look for, continuing effort and improvement
19	each year in what they are doing.
20	I think that at this point the best
21	solution on the whole is for maybe like the

or

one

Research Service

Economic

22

of

the

granting agencies for data collection in the USDA to do the market research about what varieties those are or give a grant to one of these groups who are interested in organic seed to do the market research to see which varieties are most widely grown that are not being grown organically, and also to ask processors, because a big area of this gap is in seeds for processing which processors are requiring certain agronomic traits.

So you shouldn't force the growers to have to supply the seed companies with data that they really need to collect themselves as market research, and you should do what you can to get certifiers to keep -- you know, you have to have a recommendation like you have, but it has is like keep to be one that tightening the screws, that all so certifiers keep tightening the screws to some extent.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Katrina, followed by Gerry.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MEMBER HEINZE: You talked about continuous improvement. Do you see that with the growers that you certify, that they are

5 using every year?

MS. SONNABEND: Yes, and I also see concurrently to that more organic seed is becoming available, including some organic hybrid seed, which a lot of our growers need for their market characteristics.

increasing the amount of organic seed they are

It is slower than maybe some of us would like. It is certainly slower than the seed companies would like. But I think this really comes into partly an enforcement issue also because a few of our certifiers who were meeting yesterday said, well, the USDA auditors, they never check to see that we are enforcing the seed rules; it might not be on their auditing checklist. So, therefore, if they are not even looking at the very minimal amount of things we are doing now, how are they going to put more things in place?

NEAL R. GROSS

So just starting to write up the certifiers who aren't doing anything about it would be a step to helping there be more organic seed.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Gerry?

MEMBER DAVIS: You partially answered my question in what you just said What suggestions would you have about NOP. for the NOP then on things that they could do, should do, to get all the certifiers to be as is proactive perhaps CCOF seeing as on improvement in the growers?

MS. SONNABEND: Yes, a couple of things. One is make sure that the auditors, the accreditors, do look at the organic seed rule and how it is being applied on an even basis, so that the certifiers all know that the USDA is looking at them. Once they don't look at them a few times, then they think, oh, we can get away with it.

The second thing is that the big problem for certifiers in actually enforcing

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the rule is that it says you have to use organic seed if an equivalent variety is not available. Well, equivalent in your recommendation has a very broad definition. It has no teeth in it that we can say to anyone, okay, this is not equivalent to that, as a certifier, because we just say, "Well, what characteristics are necessary?", and the grower will say, "Well, I have to have early blight resistance in tomatoes."

We'll say, "Okay, well, you know, here's these varieties that are early blight resistant." But they will say, "Oh, well, this one doesn't work because of this; that one doesn't work because of this." We can't say, "You're wrong; this doesn't work."

So we would encourage you, in keeping to work on this issue, to perhaps appoint a task force, which I believe that there will be plenty of seed people willing to serve on, that could help get at this equivalent issue, what's an equivalent

NEAL R. GROSS

variety, to give certifiers guidance on how we could say more to people: This is the equivalent or this isn't equivalent. I think a task force made up of certifiers, seed company people, and growers would be potentially a direction to go in.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Are you done?

MEMBER DAVIS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Kevin?

MEMBER ENGELBERT: Zea, could you give just some rough numbers on what you think the increase in organic seed use is each year with your huge number of acreage?

MS. SONNABEND: Yes. Okay, and it varies a great deal in crops, as other people have mentioned. The increase has been much greater and faster in rice, which is a big crop for us, or grain crops. In fact, in cover crop seed, that is one of the biggest uses of organic seed because that is easiest to get organic source. But the vegetable crops, some of them, it is still quite small.

NEAL R. GROSS

So I would say in vegetables, since the last maybe three years, I have seen it double, but it has doubled from less than 1 percent to 2 or 3 percent.

though, also have seen, companies -and this is а skill issue, unfortunately. If you are the smallest grower and you grow 100 varieties on a quarter acre, you don't have much clout with the company when you say, "I want organic seed." If you have 20,000 acres, and you go and you say, "I need these agronomic characteristics. I'm looking for something," you've got a lot more clout.

So from that point of view, we might lean on the big companies equally as hard or even harder, knowing they have more ability to influence it. We are seeing the most improvement among the bigger companies who have the most power to do something about it, including that they can contract for whole seed crops, for instance; they can transition

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	their own land, if they want to produce their
2	own seed, and they can do other measures that
3	the smaller growers can't do.
4	So we definitely are seeing
5	improvement, but there's still a good ways to
6	go.
7	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
8	questions for Zea?
9	(No response.)
10	Okay, thank you very much.
11	MS. SONNABEND: Thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Next is
13	Charlotte Vallaeys, followed by Jim Pierce.
14	MS. VALLAEYS: Hi. My name is
15	Charlotte Vallaeys with Cornucopia. Thank you
16	for the opportunity to make public comment.
17	We really do appreciate it.
18	My comments will be on hexane
19	extracted oils containing DHA and ARA. I know
20	that a lot of certifiers would like
21	clarification on this, and I hear it is on the
22	work plan.

Currently, these oils have not been reviewed by the Board. They do not appear on the National List as approved substances, nor do accessory nutrients appear on the list. But, nonetheless, these DHA and ARA oils are currently added to all organic infant formula on the market and some organic milk as well.

I would like to stress to the Board issue. why this important Ιt is is an important not just because these are added to infant formula without having been approved, but because some infants are getting sick from these additives. So, actually, I make these just Cornucopia staff comments not as а member, but as an expectant mother and really on behalf of many mothers who have contacted me.

When they do, when they email or call me, they ask, what type of formula can I give to my baby that doesn't contain these oils? And I have to tell them, "I'm sorry, but there is no organic infant formula that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

would be a safe alternative for your baby."

There is no organic formula that doesn't contain these hexane extracted algael and fungal oils.

Clearly, this hurts the infants whose parents cannot turn to organics as safe alternative, but I would also like to stress that it hurts the organic industry as a whole when consumers can't turn to an organic formula as a healthier, more highly-regulated, and safer product, which, frankly, organic consumers expect that, and deserve that, and lose confidence in organics when these decisions are made, not to benefit babies, but to benefit a handful of companies.

So I'd like to share some of the findings which are in our report, which I will submit, so it will be available for you to look at.

We filed a Freedom of Information

Act request with the FDA, and this came out of

conversations with healthcare professionals

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and mothers. And we found that, indeed, many mothers have submitted adverse reaction reports to the FDA.

And I'd like to stress that this is not just, okay, my baby was given, say, a dairy formula, had diarrhea and vomiting, and I switched to a soy formula without DHA. This is really when they switched to an equivalent formula, the only difference being that it didn't have DHA and ARA.

And often -- well, actually, in all of these cases that we documented, symptoms disappeared, usually within 24 hours. And the most common symptoms in newborns and babies are diarrhea and vomiting.

I'd also like to note something which is covered in the report, which is that these oils -- well, that the vast majority of peer-reviewed scientific studies show no benefits to cognitive development of term infants from these DHA-fortified formulas. So there really, at this point -- there is no

NEAL R. GROSS

scientific evidence that would support adding these oils to formula to benefit the infant.

And there is nothing in the organic standards that would indicate that these oils can be added legally to organic foods. Yet, as I mentioned earlier today, if a mother is searching for a DHA-free formula for her baby, she will not find one. These algael DHA and fungal ARA oils are not on the National List as approved substances, nor are byproducts of microorganisms.

An initial legal complaint about these additives was filed in 2006, and was dismissed. The compliance officer noted that, quote, vitamins, minerals, and accessory nutrients, unquote, are allowed when the actual regulations state -- and here I quote from 605 -- nutrient vitamins and minerals in accordance with 21 CFR 10420 are allowed.

Now, DHA and ARA are fatty acids.

This is basic nutritional knowledge. Fatty acids are not vitamins; they are not minerals.

NEAL R. GROSS

That's the first point.

Then - since I am running out of time, I will make this quick - 10420 is an FDA regulation which states that the FDA does not encourage the indiscriminate addition of nutrients to foods. So this is really -- it's a fortification regulation, and the FDA has not required DHA and ARA to be added to infant formula. For example, the American Academy of Pediatrics has not recommended it, either.

Cornucopia filed a second legal complaint, and -- well, we'd like to point out that the NOSB is charged with the task of reviewing materials -- okay, I'll end it here.

Just one last line: I think it's important to note that babies are getting sick from these, and I'd just ask you to at least keep baby formula, if we could at least keep that safe from these indiscriminate additions, that would be good.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Any questions? Yes, Hugh?
2	MEMBER KARREMAN: It sounds like we
3	need to review DHA and - what's the other one?
4	- ARA
5	MS. VALLAEYS: Yes.
6	MEMBER KARREMAN: with TAP
7	reviews if they are not vitamins or minerals,
8	and they're - you cited - didn't you cite CFR
9	whatever it is saying
LO	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Remember, we can
L1	only review materials if they are petitioned.
L2	MEMBER KARREMAN: If they are
L3	petitioned, right.
L4	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: So that would be
L5	the normal process to follow, and we can leave
L6	it at that, unless there's any other
L7	clarifications, questions.
L8	MEMBER DAVIS: Can there be a
L9	negative petition brought to say, these
20	materials should not be in organic products?
21	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Absolutely, yes.
22	So any other questions, comments?

1	(No response.)
2	Does that clarify your question,
3	Hugh?
4	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay.
6	Well, thank you very much.
7	MS. VALLAEYS: Well, we have
8	submitted a legal complaint, so it's really at
9	the compliance level, I think.
LO	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: That's part of
L1	the program. Our main function is to review
L2	materials and recommend those.
L3	MS. VALLAEYS: Okay. Thank you.
L4	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: So thank you
L5	very much.
L6	Okay, next is Jim Pierce, and I
L7	also want to give you an update while Jim
L8	walks up to the podium. We are halfway there
L9	in terms of public speakers, and we have about
20	20 minutes before we finish, according to our
21	agenda. So I will request the Board and the

speakers to summarize their recommendations,

observations, or comments. If they so can, it will be greatly appreciated. However, I want to make sure that we are not sacrificing quality of comments for the sake of time.

Jim?

MR. PIERCE: Okay. For the record, I'm Jim Pierce, former certification czar at Organic Valley, now the Global Certification Program Manager for Oregon Tilth Certified Organic.

I'm still having trouble saying that since the all one word "Organic Valley" has become part of my vernacular, like nuclear.

The most exciting thing about the offer to work for Oregon Tilth is that I honestly believe that the pragmatic solutions to the nascent quandaries of this relatively young national organic program require an open, honest synergy between NOSB, the NOP, and the accredited certifiers, and I want to be part of that solution.

NEAL R. GROSS

1 Also for the record, you may have 2 heard rumors that Ι jumped ship from 3 manufacturing to certification solely for the gaining access 4 privilege of to the **ACA** 5 LISTSERV. Not true. 6 (Laughter.) Others claim it's because I would 7 do anything to attend Mark Bradley's NOP 8 certifier training. Also not true. 9 (Laughter.) 10 maybe, just maybe, 11 Or am positioning myself ever so strategically for 12 the certifier seat that comes available on 13 January 24th, 2011, Joe. 14 15 (Laughter.) 16 I'm thinking, however, we will need decidedly more democratic administration 17 before that particular snowball makes 18 19 through Hades. 20 Hopefully, in the intervening three years, you can put a lid on commercial 21 availability, ag/non-ag, hydroponics, private 22

label, hopefully.

I am no longer certification czar, but I remain in a position where I can address you, the fine folks of the National Organic Standards Board. So, on behalf of Oregon Tilth, here are our comments on multi-site certification and seeds:

Regarding multi-site certification, as was made clear by our comments last November, Oregon Tilth is breaking ranks with most of the other certifiers. Our position remains that, with solid, auditable internal control systems, the model currently being applied to small holder producers could be applied more broadly.

But - and this important - but, in the interest of fairness and integrity, certification of multi-site operations must remain limited to producers only until guidance is final.

Although certification of retailers is optional, it's a good thing, and should be

NEAL R. GROSS

1	encouraged, since it gives consumers an added
2	degree of assurance, and lends further
3	credibility to organic claims.
4	The appendix developed by the CACC
5	and the OTA Task Force is also a good thing,
6	which will help you write the final
7	recommendation. Write rules not for cheaters,
8	but for compliance. Fraud is fraud, at a
9	single site, or a multi-site.
10	605.400(f)(1) and (2) are sharp
11	enough teeth to bite the butts of cheaters.
12	Initial review of each and every site the
13	first year is critical, as is inspection of
14	every new site, every previous non-compliance,
15	and every complaint in subsequent years.
16	The Accredited Certifiers
17	Association can assist you in developing a
18	weighted matrix for reinspection based on the
19	appendix criteria outlined in order to achieve
	consistency among themselves.

successful multi-site certification plan are:

important

Two

21

22

of

а

elements

one, the audit by an organic inspector of the documentation from the internal auditors' inspection of 100 percent of the sites and, two, that the plan for certifying multi-site operations will be written, submitted, and approved for credibility by the NOP.

In the next two days, you will be dealing with two pieces of business regarding seeds: commercial availability, and Dextron used for seed coating. As you biodiversity in agriculture is seriously especially developing threatened, in countries. The Crop Committee's recommendation to tighten accountability while still allowing deregations where legitimate need can be proven is strict, yet fair, and will model for foreign serve а good as agencies.

Several of the specific requirements in the recommendation are overly prescriptive, however, and I would refer you to the Accredited Certifiers Association

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

comments for cut-and-paste solutions.

The recommendation to reject Dextron as non-essential is troubling, since Dextron is commonly used as a binder in seed coatings by suppliers that do not necessarily cater to organic farmers, but who do provide unique or heritage breeds with obvious potential in a system of organic production.

If the synthetic substance, Dextron, in this case, is not compatible with organic principles, then certainly, it should remain prohibited. But if it's used to bathe a baby, then perhaps it shouldn't be thrown out.

As I commonly do from this podium,
I ask you to challenge the good work of the
Crop Committee, and then decide for yourself
if Dextron should be approved or rejected.

So we all look forward to the next three days of deliberation. Thank you for the opportunity to address you, for your tireless dedication to your work, and good luck with

1	the ag/non-ag thing.
2	And, yes, Virginia, hydroponics can
3	be organic.
4	(Laughter.)
5	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you, Jim.
6	Any questions for Jim?
7	(No response.)
8	All right, thank you so much.
9	MR. PIERCE: Thank you.
10	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Next is Liana
11	Hoodes. On deck is Kristy Korb.
12	MS. HOODES: Good afternoon, all.
13	My name is Liana Hoodes. I'm with the
14	National Organic Coalition.
15	We want to thank you for the
16	opportunity to speak in front of you, and also
17	for the hard work and long hours that you all
18	continue to put in. It's just incredible,
19	excellent work.
20	The National Organic Coalition is a
21	national alliance of organizations
22	representing farmers, environmentalists,

consumers, industry members, and others concerned about the integrity of the national organic standards.

The NOSB has an important mandate:

to consider petitions for materials, and make
recommendations regarding changes to the
National List.

In 2007, we saw a record amount of new substances added to the list. Forty-eight new substances have been added in one year. Of these, 38 are non-organic ag substances allowed in organic food that are considered to be currently unavailable, or of fragile supply in organic form.

However, some fundamental policy questions regarding interpretation and classification of the National List remain unanswered. Despite the fact that 38 substances were added as agricultural, as you know, there is still no clarification of the distinction of the definition of agricultural and non-agricultural.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	In addition, the distinction
2	between synthetic and non-synthetic is not
3	clear yet, either, and this is fundamental
4	criterion for consideration of materials on
5	the National List.
6	It's time to put the horse before
7	the cart, and make some fundamental policy
8	decisions before any more materials are added
9	to the list.
10	The National Organic Coalition
11	respectfully requests a moratorium on the
12	recommendations to add any substances to the
13	National List until the following actions are
14	taken:
15	A final recommendation on
16	synthetic/non-synthetic and agricultural/non-
17	agricultural determinations get adopted.
18	Publication of the final rule for
19	the 38 substances added to the 205.606 as
20	interim final rule that addresses the public
21	comments and questions about those substances.

TAP reviews must be conducted for

any substance recommended for the National List. And until the money is available, we consider that materials should not be reviewed.

We respect and admire the efforts carried out by the NOSB to prevent the disruption of the organic industry. However, without independent, objective TAP reviews, the make informed NOSB cannot an recommendation on materials petitioned inclusion on the National List.

The NOSB needs scientific, technical advice, and better access to historical decisions in order to prevent mistakes, and that's a lot of information for you all have to compile on to your own, reviews helping add without the TAP that information.

More comprehensive reviews are needed for substances proposed for 205.606. The environmental and human health impacts of agricultural practices used to produce non-

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

organic agricultural ingredients petitioned for addition to 205.606 need to be evaluated using the criteria in OFPA.

Questions regarding substances on 205.606 need to be answered for the regulation to be uniformly implemented. These include: How is a permitted substance identified? Specifically, are certifiers and their clients to use the chemical abstract services number, or some other standard of identity? formulants may be used with the items on the National List? Are items that appear on 606 subject to restrictions or annotations limiting source, processing aids, or type?

The NOP should develop a policy that permits the NOSB or the TAP contractor to review and summarize confidential business information.

When a material is approved, and there is no TAP, and the petition redacts all the manufacturing information, it is impossible for anyone trying to implement the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

regulations to determine if a substance in question conforms with the substance approved by the NOSB.

Given that it's been very rare that substances are removed from the National List by petition or by sunset, we think it's prudent that the NOSB take the necessary time to resolve these questions before more materials are added. The establishment of a strong policy framework will make NOSB future decisions more credible and consistent.

And we also request that a streamline process be developed to petition for removal of substances on 606, since they may become available in organic form much more quickly than the five-year sunset.

And I'll also say, with regards to okra, I just received an email from the Southeast African-American Organic Farming Network, a new group of the entire Southeast of African-American organic farmers, that said: you wouldn't believe how much okra is

NEAL R. GROSS

1 grown down here. And they said to really 2 consider, ask the farmers how much okra there 3 already is before you allow the discussion on commercial availability. 4 CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, thank you. 5 6 Steve? 7 MEMBER DeMURI: From the 8 Coalition's perspective, can you tell me why you think it is petitioned 9 that we get 10 constantly for things to be added to the list, but we very seldom, if ever, get petitions to 11 have things removed? 12 13 MS. HOODES: I know, from our perspective, it was always a goal of ours to 14 15 begin -- because it's hard enough work for you 16 -- first, let me say that I believe that the NOSB itself could petition them to come off, 17 but that -- with the amount of work you 18 19 have, that isn't going to happen. 20 And so it was always one of our goals to consider trying to do that. And as a 21

coalition of non-governmental organizations,

we -- given the amount of work that goes on to try to advocate for organic, it falls way to the bottom of our list because of the amount of expertise needed to understand the materials enough to petition them off. But it is, for instance, something that we thought would be possible to do when this program began. We thought, well, that would be a great role for us, and it's just not possible. We're unable, in our many groups of coalition, to perform that task.

There is, obviously, commercial advantage to wanting a material on, and very little to getting one off, is basically what - and we don't have the resources, for instance. That's one reason, but not the only.

MEMBER DeMURI: I appreciate your explanation. I still do not quite understand the dynamics there. I would think that we could get more petitions to take things off.

MS. HOODES: Yes, and it would be

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	great to be able to do it. It takes a huge
2	amount of effort and expertise, and it's hard
3	to garner that, for instance, in the non-
4	governmental organizations, and I don't know
5	where else that happens, what the impetus is
6	to get that done. It really should.
7	In addition, and I believe we'd
8	like to look into the idea of how you petition
9	annotations to be added, or brought back on
10	after the sunset. I mean, there's lots of
11	places where we need to be able to do
12	petitioning in places other than where the
13	petitioner has a commercial advantage to do
14	it, and I don't know how that happens.
15	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay. Any other
16	questions?
17	(No response.)
18	Thank you again.
19	MS. HOODES: Thank you.
20	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Next is Kristy
21	Korb, followed by Mark Cool.
22	MS. KORB: Hello. I am going to be

reading a letter on behalf of Miles McAvoy, the President of the National Association of State Organic Programs, and it's a very short letter. I'll be very brief, because it is 10 til 5:00, and unlike you all, I can leave and go to the bar at 5:00. So I will be very quick.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you.

MS. KORB: In a vote taken at a regular business meeting on May 13th, 2008, the National Association of State Organic Programs Board of Directors voted unanimously to oppose the April 3rd, 2008 NOSB CCAC recommendation entitled, `Further Guidance on the Establishment of Commercial Availability of Organic Seed.'

I'd also like to clarify, Oregon
Tilth agrees with this position of NASOP.

In the Board's view, the requirements proposed would be extremely burdensome to diversified organic row crop,

NEAL R. GROSS

and vegetable productions, and organic certifying agents. Of special concern are vegetable farms, many of which produce tens or hundreds of vegetable varieties in a season. The additional recordkeeping burden contained in the CCA recommendation could force many of these farmers to abandon organic certification.

In our collective experience, organic growers understand the good faith and documented effort to source and use organic seed are required, and the costs cannot be used as a factor to determine commercial availability.

They have good systems in place to evaluate organic seed availability, and use information networks that include seed companies, farm input supply companies, and organic farmer peers.

They maintain reasonable documentation of whether the seed they use is organic or not, and there are efforts to

NEAL R. GROSS

source organic.

It's a flexible system that is adapted to the needs of the individual organic operations, and it is working.

The CCAC recommendation would impose additional requirements that will cost organic growers time and money. The additional recordkeeping will not increase the availability of organic seeds.

The requirement that this information be submitted to the certifier, tabulated, and forwarded to a recognized organic seed trade association would be time-consuming and expensive to both the grower and the certifier. The NASOP Board does not support this recommendation.

Additionally - and this is Oregon Tilth speaking - our understanding is this issue is largely complaint-driven by the seed industry, and we encourage the program to address these issues where we believe this problem lies. In other words, if growers are

1	not required to use organic seeds, and have
2	not sufficiently demonstrated that the
3	specific seed is not commercially available,
4	than the issue is with the certifier. It
5	doesn't take this kind of prescriptive
6	requirement. The program needs to address it
7	on the certifier level.
8	Thank you.
9	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you.
10	Any questions?
11	(No response.)
12	Okay, thank you very much.
13	Next up is Mark Cool, followed by
14	Pat Kane.
15	MR. COOL: Hi there. My name is
16	Mark Cool with Seeds of Change. We are a 100
17	percent certified organic seed company.
18	Before I start, maybe a historical
19	perspective: you all may not be aware that
20	Baltimore actually is the home of America's
21	first seed company. In the ESPN Zone building
22	on the Inner Harbor, there is a building right

next to the ESPN Zone, which is the home of the Clark Seed Company, which was founded in 1831, and that's where the first European ships came into America, offloaded their seeds for distribution to the American Northeast. So we are at a very historical place, just so you guys know. Of course, since then, we have developed a very well-run American seed business.

My comments today are going to be on the commercial availability of seed , 205.204.

We are very thankful to the Crops and CAC Joint Committee for their recommendations, which I very strongly support.

A comment was made a couple of times today about the commercial availability and use of organic seed and organic farming systems. In vegetables, so in direct food crops, there is still a very, very, very small amount of the organic farms that are using

NEAL R. GROSS

organic seed. So we've had an NOP program in place now for six years. So in the words of Dr. Phil, "How's it working for you?"

We're not really doing a very good job getting organic seed as a beginning of the chain into the conscience of America. And I believe that the current recommendation goes a long way to provide support for that.

I would ask that the NOSB vote in favor of this recommendation from the Joint CAC/Crops Committee, pass that to NOP. one thing I will offer to NOP is, both from an organizational and association perspective, as well as from a private company perspective, we will offer all of our support in getting into the details of actually making some of these recommendations fruition. come t.o Implementation of this, of course, important part, and there's lot of discussions about that.

What I want to do here briefly is step back a second, and maybe explain for the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Board's benefit some of the reasons why, as a seedsman, I believe that there should be more organic seed available.

Currently, all, literally all, in vegetables, of food crops, all of the seed that is used, all of the organic varieties that are being sold, are actually mimics of the conventional varieties. Someone takes either an heirloom, or a traditional or rare variety, which is available in conventional form, produces it organically, or nowadays, more and more people like ourselves are taking conventional hybrid varieties, which needed by the growers, have uniformity, vigor, other characteristics, we're producing those one generation under NOP rules, and calling it organic seed, and selling that. Ιt is perfectly legit.

That isn't the end goal of this industry. What we are doing is adding no real value. This is the first step in trying to develop what I call organic-specific

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

varieties.

It's ultra-important, in my mind, that we, as an organic industry, which is just fledgling and just beginning, that we actually try to, if we can, go back 50 years and, just like the conventional industry, start developing varieties which the farmers need.

So the goal that we have as an organic industry, and what you can do to support that, is we actually want to find out from the farmers what the traits are that they need. You can think of a whole number of characteristics and traits that organic varieties should have, very different than conventional varieties.

So the end goal, in my mind, and the vision I have for my company, is that we will develop what I call organic-specific, or low-inputs ag-specific varieties, products that do well, they are completely separate products that do well under an organic farming system. Then you're adding true value to the

organic farming community.

And by the way, those products also can be used by conventional farmers because they require less inputs, have higher quality traits, et cetera. And in my mind, that is going to form a basis for kind of a whole revolution in the way that we look at food production, food distribution, and food use in the USA.

So those are my comments on that point. I, again, would like to offer support to NOP for making this happen.

A couple of comments have been made about a couple of the concerns, or questions, or issues that people have about organic seed.

No. 1 is there's a concern, there was a concern raised earlier about seed quality. Seed quality is very, very important for a farmer, obviously. A farmer has to have very high quality seed.

Seed quality isn't under the purview of NOSB. Seed quality is governed by

the Federal Seed Act, which has very specific regulations in place, and also has a recourse system in place if a farmer does not have high-quality seed. Organic seed, any other seed, has to meet Federal Seed Act requirements, period. That's not your job; that's someone else's job, but I just wanted to make that comment here.

Two other concerns that have been raised are the potential certifier liability, and I guess the confidentiality issues with growers. I believe those are important issues to think about and discuss. I don't believe those are things that are hurdles in our way towards the use of more organic seed.

A couple other comments that have been made are equivalency, and the burden of documentation. Briefly, equivalency, in my mind, is actually kind of, frankly, a moot point right now. Equivalency is something that seed companies and farmers talk about every single day.

NEAL R. GROSS

When we go to a farmer to sell that
person seed, we talk about equivalency. We
don't call it that, but we talk about, how
does this product do on the farm. It's very,
very important for a seed company and a farmer
to have an understanding of the requirements,
both from a production, agronomic, and
marketing perspective of how that variety
does. So these are things that we well
understand, we deal with every day.
A comment was made before to form a
task force to actually look at these things,
and I think it's a very good idea. The
stakeholders, seed growers, seed companies,
and farmers can sit down, in my opinion, very
easily, and figure out a way to define
equivalency.
With that, thank you. If there`s
any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, questions?
2.55.27, 1.65.25.55

MEMBER DAVIS: Mark, what do you

think of the comment that was made just a few minutes ago about, really, if the NOP would just enforce the rule through their accreditation, and ask the certifier more persistently, what are you doing to prompt your growers to keep making improvement in using more organic seed, what do you think of that concept as the way to solve the impasse in vegetable seeds, for example?

MR. COOL: Yes, you raise a very good question, and I think it's a very valid point. I think the NOP has a very strong role to play in that regard.

I believe that, you know, I'm very much in favor of the idea of deregations, like everyone else is, and I believe that the discussion should simply be a farmer sitting down with a certifier, and providing a list of the products that farmer wants to use, telling certifier which find the ones he can't organically and why not, NOP overseeing that process fair, to make sure it's and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	transparent, and reasonable, and working that
2	system from that perspective.
3	I think that the documentation
4	requirement of then sending that list to
5	someone, and we can discuss who someone is, in
6	my opinion, really isn't a huge deal. Farmers
7	write everything down they do anyway.
8	I believe in confidentiality. So
9	we have to find a way to give that list to
10	someone without disclosing private
11	information. But I think NOP can have a
12	strong role to play in actually kind of
13	overseeing that to make sure that, indeed,
14	those seed varieties are not available, and
15	their training and their push to the
16	certifiers should be to enforce the current
17	legislation, frankly, as much as they can.
18	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
19	questions? Joe?
20	MEMBER SMILLIE: Just following up
21	what Gerry said, in our document, which we are

hoping to tweak and get it right, do you think

that it's the seed company's responsibility to gather that data? We're hearing pushback from certification agents, and possibly from farmers that they represent, or that speak for in some cases - we haven't heard from farmers directly as yet - that that's burdensome. It's burdensome, and not necessary.

Do you feel -- you know, where is the onus? Is it up to your trade associations and your members to go out and get that information, and not have the certification agents and growers provide that, or is that going to be essential for you to, for your industry to move forward?

MR. COOL: Well again, the comment is made that very little of the food production in America is produced using organic seed. So something is wrong.

I believe there's probably two answers to your question, Joe. One is, as a seedsman, my job is, indeed, to go to the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

market and find out what farmers want. So we do surveys all the time. We talk to farmers all the time. We try to figure out what varieties, what traits, what characteristics, what's lost, et cetera. That's a very important part of our job, and we make those available.

The second thing is, there has to be some kind of a transparent, open, public system that gives lists of -- and we've called this before, opportunity list, so it gives an overview of what types of products are being searched for by farmers. And that is something I think that would benefit the industry, because the reality is very people have stepped up and formed an organic seed company, and the reason is because we don't see what the demand is, and what the opportunity is. So we have to have some kind of a way of, I guess, promoting the idea that people do organic seed, want and specifically what traits, and then we

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

provide that for them.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So it's kind of a dual responsibility, in my belief.

MEMBER SMILLIE: Ι share your I mean, we always hear the comment, concerns. don't dilute the organic standards. And sometimes the suspected dilution is pretty, pretty small and narrow, but here we have something that is in the regulation: Thou shalt use organic seed. And yet, compliance levels are the lowest compliance levels in the entire industry. For anything that we look at, the compliance level to that regulation is incredibly low.

MR. COOL: Yes.

MEMBER SMILLIE: So I think Mark's right, something's wrong, and this is our first attempt to add something to a regulation that is already in place, and to try and figure out without burdening farmers; that is the last thing we want to do. But we've got to get better compliance levels on the

regulation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. COOL: I believe, Joe, that you and Gerry's proposal, your recommendation, which hopefully you all vote on in favor, goes a long way towards doing that in following the intent of the NOP rule from '02.

example would be the inputs An industry, where fertilizers and pest control methods are currently certified organic, and there's full compliance and full availability of a lot of innovative new products that have been developed in the last six years because there's the requirements to actually those. And because there's been the requirement, and the enforcement, and the compliance, this industry has grown to benefit of the farmers. Farmers have access to a lot of new products.

That same thing doesn't yet exist in seed. And again, our vision is to eventually do that, within a couple of years, develop organic specific varieties which add

1	value to the farming and organic community.
2	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
3	questions?
4	(No response.)
5	Okay, thank you very much.
6	MR. COOL: Thank you kindly.
7	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: At this point, I
8	have been requested to take a break. I think
9	our Board members need it. And we'll be back
10	here in 10 minutes. That's 15 minutes after
11	the hour.
12	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter
13	went off the record at 5:05 p.m. and went back
14	on the record at 5:16 p.m.)
15	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: We have a
16	quorum.
17	Pat, please proceed.
18	MS. KANE: Thank you for providing
19	the opportunity to comment today. I'm going
20	to talk briefly about two issues from the
21	Accredited Certifiers Association, for which I
22	am the coordinator. We represent 40

certification agencies.

First, I'd like to thank the NOP for the trainings they provided earlier this year for us, and for addressing the materials review issue, and proceeding very swiftly to resolve that, and permit certifiers to contract for materials review. It will greatly help.

Thank you for the website, and we will continue to provide input on the website.

I am here to comment today on the commercial availability of organic seed recommendation. I did hand out our written comments.

We would like to stress that ACA members currently require that organic producers justify the use of non-organic seeds and monitor the recordkeeping of this effort maintained by the farmers. In our experience, the use of organic seed is growing steadily. Rather than expanding the requirements for all producers and certifiers, complaints regarding

a lack of enforcement of the organic seed requirement could be handled through the NOP accreditation process.

We feel that this document contains useful suggestions for monitoring the use of organic seeds, and we feel that accredited certifying agents, to request them to collect seed lists and forward this information to an organization, not knowing if the information will ever be utilized, is a requirement that does not have a regulatory basis either in the Organic Foods Production Act or the National Organic Program regulations.

In addition, requiring farmers to submit lists of their seeds to companies for verification of the lack of organic seed is burdensome and unnecessary, as the majority of seed companies produce catalogs which identify the organic seeds.

Currently, ACAs do monitor the use of organic seeds through the Organic System Plan. The OSP is then verified by the

NEAL R. GROSS

inspector, and producer documentation is reviewed.

Producers must supply information on the seeds used on an annual basis. Many ACAs provide seed resource lists to producers.

The NOP regulations contain definition of commercial availability. is an increasing number of seed companies offering organic seeds. is There general agreement among ACAs that the use of organic seeds is increasing annually. Promoting and marketing of organic seed is the not responsibility of the ACA.

The requirement for producers to send their list of seeds to multiple companies for verification of lack of organic seed is burdensome. We do not have regulatory authority over seed company vendors and cannot monitor their activities. Since this will be done during a peak of seed ordering, it is likely that no response will be received from the companies.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

We would like to suggest a more proactive approach by seed manufacturers and also the use of various seed database programs and opportunities such as through OMRI.

Increased participation by seed marketers in the OMRI seed listing website would provide more exposure for organic seeds.

All marketers of organic seeds should be encouraged to participate in the website.

Additionally, one of our members based in Europe pointed out the European Union countries utilize seed databases that are easily searchable to determine if organic seed is available. Seed producers and traders introduce their available varieties; producers log in and search the varieties they need. They also can go to the website and fill out a form of why the variety they are desiring is not available, and they can send this to their certifier.

I would also like to comment briefly on multi-sites production. The

NEAL R. GROSS

1	majority of ACA members feel that group
2	certification should apply to only grower
3	groups and should not be extended to
4	retailers, handlers, processors, or
5	restaurants.
6	We tried to answer the 13 questions
7	and we didn't get to all of them. We needed
8	more time. But I did supply the answers in my
9	comments to you.
10	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, thank you.
11	Any questions? Joe?
12	MEMBER SMILLIE: Would it be
13	possible in the near future that you could get
14	us information from your European members who
15	may be also NOP-accredited on exactly how it
16	works in Europe? Because I have heard this,
17	too, but, unfortunately, I don't have any
18	real-life experience with it. It shouldn't be
19	too hard to get, the EU database, the way it
20	works in the EU.
21	MS. KANE: Right. Right. Well,

it's in the individual countries.

1	MEMBER SMILLIE: The member states,
2	yes.
3	MS. KANE: So I did go on the
4	United Kingdom one, and it was really easy to
5	use. I did provide the link in my comments.
6	But I can do that.
7	MEMBER SMILLIE: Is this maintained
8	by the member state regulatory authority?
9	MS. KANE: I believe it is, yes.
LO	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
L1	questions?
L2	(No response.)
L3	Okay, well, thank you very much.
L3 L4	Okay, well, thank you very much. Next is Woody Deryckx, followed by
L4	Next is Woody Deryckx, followed by
L4 L5	Next is Woody Deryckx, followed by Brian Kozisek.
L4 L5 L6	Next is Woody Deryckx, followed by Brian Kozisek. MR. DERYCKX: Hello, and thanks for
L4 L5 L6 L7	Next is Woody Deryckx, followed by Brian Kozisek. MR. DERYCKX: Hello, and thanks for pronouncing my name correctly. That's
L4 L5 L6 L7	Next is Woody Deryckx, followed by Brian Kozisek. MR. DERYCKX: Hello, and thanks for pronouncing my name correctly. That's awesome. It's a rare treat.
L4 L5 L6 L7 L8 L9	Next is Woody Deryckx, followed by Brian Kozisek. MR. DERYCKX: Hello, and thanks for pronouncing my name correctly. That's awesome. It's a rare treat. CHAIRMAN DELGADO: I did? Well,

2	for the good work you are doing. I am really
3	grateful to be able to represent the
4	membership of the Organic Seed Growers and
5	Trade Association, also known affectionately
6	as OSGATA. We might have been running short
7	on acronyms featuring the letter "O", so we
8	decided we would make another one.
9	We submitted our written comments
10	on the seed availability issue. They're all
11	available to everybody, is that right?
12	MS. FRANCIS: That was the
13	Regulations Stockup.
14	MR. DERYCKX: The written comments
15	we submitted? I'm sorry.
16	MS. FRANCIS: They were submitted
17	to Regulations Stockup, correct?
18	MR. DERYCKX: Oh, okay.
19	MS. FRANCIS: Right? I think so.
20	So they're in your books, yes.
21	MR. DERYCKX: I won't read them. I
22	don't have time to read them. So I would like
	NEAL R. GROSS

talk to you wonderful people, and thank you

to hit some of the high spots and just speak directly then. You have those.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Yes.

MR. DERYCKX: Great. I ask if you would attend to this. That's great. We carefully chose our wording on those.

I'm an organic farmer in the beautiful Skagit Valley of northwestern Washington State, and I'm an organic seed grower. In fact, since I heard the words, "Thou shalt plant organic seeds," I decided that was going to be my next chapter in life, to grow seeds for organic farmers, to provide my organic farming friends with good seeds.

OSGATA is our new trade association. Our aim is to be nationwide in scope and to promote the evolution of a vibrant and diverse, high-quality organic seed industry, so that all organic farmers can have a wonderful selection of excellent seed to grow.

Our membership on our board is

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

dominated by organic producers, farmers, by our bylaws, but we also have seed companies and affiliates, organizations and regular farmers and consumers on our membership. So we are a membership organization.

We want to support your Joint Committee recommendations, both the original 2005 version and the one that is currently before you. We think it is a very good start. It takes our movement in the right direction.

concerned that However, we are challenges there lot οf in the are а implementation. That is why our main point, I think, in our comments on this issue is that we call for formation of a dynamic task force with representation from the stakeholders in this issue to help NOP and NOSB work through the issues of implementation of this as things go along, as things change.

Overall, we support all five of your recommendations. I won't be able to go through them in detail here, but they are in

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the written comments.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

In the first place, recommendation one, the database, we have a few beginning databases, as you know, and they are really a refreshing addition to the system. People are using them, but they have a long way to go before they are really effective.

Most of it is just getting them used, getting people to come and use them, put their products on there, go to them to look for their seed needs. As Kelly Shea mentioned a little while ago, it would be really nice to have a counterflow where seed needs are posted as well. The OMRI list we feel is probably the best one right now. OSA, which is our sister organization, Organic Seed Alliance, we have one that works pretty well, and AFTA has one, and there's a few others. They are all really good and real helpful, and I think that is a really good start.

So your recommendation one is spot on. There may need to be issues about funding

NEAL R. GROSS

1	and supporting that, but it is certainly in
2	the right direction.
3	Your second recommendation about
4	equivalency, I want to break that into two
5	parts here. The first part is seed quality,
6	which has brought up by other people giving
7	their testimony today.
8	Seed quality for us is absolutely a
9	rock solid requirement that we are providing
10	the very best quality seed that anybody could
11	ever ask for, equivalent or superior to
12	conventional in terms of all the parameters
13	that are measurable.
14	You're kidding. I'm just getting
15	started (in response to time signal).
16	(Laughter.)
17	All the parameters that are
18	measured, in terms of purity and viability,
19	germination and vigor.
20	But the other part of that issue,
21	though, is suitability for agronomic and
22	marketing considerations. That is where we

say we need this task force to help work this out over time, and so forth.

second third Your your or recommendation, I would like to say reporting things back, as a grower, I can tell you that I am asked for an awful lot of information from my certifiers. I am pleased to provide it, but it would really be nice if simplified, standardized there was а instrument of reporting this vital information, and that everybody had the same thing and had it in advance, and they just had to check boxes and fill in blanks.

Most certification applications that I have dealt with are basically like this. So it is kind of a real convenient way to add this on, if the certifying community feels like they can do it. As a grower, gee, I feel like I'm already providing all this information. Let's use it. Let's have it usable in a way so that it passes on to a database that other people can use.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	As a seed grower, I am really
2	interested in what people need. I am really
3	interested. We are actually developing new
4	varieties and cleaning up the old heirlooms.
5	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Woody, your time
6	is up. Can you just wrap it up, please?
7	MR. DERYCKX: And we are doing this
8	for the organic farmers.
9	I sure welcome any questions you
10	might have.
11	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you.
12	We have Joe, followed by Jeff and
13	Gerry.
14	MEMBER SMILLIE: Woody, what do you
15	think of our recommendations four and five?
16	MR. DERYCKX: Thanks, Joe.
17	(Laughter.)
18	I think processor delineation on
19	that is really right on. I spent 15 years in
20	the organic vegetable and fruit processing
21	industry, and I handled an awful lot of seed.
22	If you had told me that I needed to go out and

get organic seed, I would have gone out and gotten organic seed, just as when my boss asked me to go out and get millions of pounds of organic frozen IQF peas and okra, I did it. You know, we went out and found the growers. Yes, okra's not exempt. But, anyway, I like that and we like that.

As for five, there again, we are really excited about this reverse flow of data back. We are concerned about growers' proprietary needs for privacy, and so forth, as has been pointed out. But if we can just get a database bringing us information of what is needed out there, we are going to develop the new varieties. We are breeding. We are going to produce this stuff.

I am always asking my customers -my customers are catalog seed houses mostly -what are your customers looking for; what are
the traits you are looking for? I am going
out and I am looking for genetic material,
selecting out the most vigorous lines and

NEAL R. GROSS

1	working on getting horizontal resistance to
2	the diseases that we face, and so forth, and
3	putting these out there as organic seeds.
4	MEMBER SMILLIE: Thank you.
5	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Jeff?
6	VICE-CHAIR MOYER: Yes, Woody, as
7	sort of a quick survey of your association
8	members, how much organic seed currently goes
9	unsold?
10	MR. DERYCKX: Oh, very little, I'm
11	happy to say.
12	VICE-CHAIR MOYER: So you're
13	selling all you're producing?
14	MR. DERYCKX: Anything that doesn't
15	germ well goes unsold, anything that is not of
16	quality. But I am happy to say that I have a
17	few hundred pounds right now I would be happy
18	to sell you of some real high-quality spinach
19	seed, and it grieves me to know that organic
20	farmers are planting conventionally-grown
21	spinach out there while I've got sacks of it.

VICE-CHAIR MOYER:

22

Well, that was

1	the reason I asked the question. Is there
2	seed that is going unsold that should be sold
3	to organic growers or are they buying
4	everything and there's really not that much
5	left?
6	MR. DERYCKX: I'm not an authority
7	on this, but my impression, Jeff, is that we
8	are trying to keep up with demand, to be
9	honest with you.
10	VICE-CHAIR MOYER: Thank you.
11	Okay.
12	MR. DERYCKX: But as a caveat to
13	that, let me say that I am not making a living
14	at this yet after working on it for four years
15	because my business is all real small seed
16	lots. You know, 200 pounds is about as big as
17	it is really a lot of detail work.
18	I think that we need to have a
19	little bit more encouragement on this in the
20	program and a little bit more broad-scale
21	adaption and uniformity across, so that it is

fairly applied, so some growers are not just

1	ignoring it and others are going out and
2	really making an effort and paying more for
3	seed and everything, so that we can move to
4	the next step. There's a lot more potential
5	there.
6	There's an awful lot of carrot
7	seed, organically-grown carrot seed, produced
8	in Washington State that goes all to Europe,
9	and very little of it ever stays here and gets
10	planted in the United States.
11	VICE-CHAIR MOYER: Okay.
12	MR. DERYCKX: They're real happy
13	with that seed when it gets to Europe.
14	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Gerry, followed
15	by Kevin.
16	MEMBER DAVIS: Woody, your new seed
17	organization OSGATA?
18	MR. DERYCKX: OSGATA.
19	MEMBER DAVIS: We contacted OMRI to
20	ask them, since they have a lot of experience
21	with their database so far, with the mirror
22	image, the needs database, not what's

available now, but what is needed. The talked mentioned that, in gentleman I to okay with participating concept, they were with that, as the one who maintains database, but they estimated that it would \$50,000take one full-time position, say \$60,000 a year, for one person to maintain that database and keep up with it.

What would your organization say about funding that? I mean, is that a reality with the size and scope of your association so far?

MR. DERYCKX: Well, my organization is having a hard time finding two nickels to rub together right now. We are just starting up, and actually we are kind of mooching off of the Organic Seed Alliance, which is our sister organization that kind of spawns.

We would go look for funding. We would want to put together a broad-based consortium of interested parties to go out and try to find some support.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

But, saying that, I really can't 1 2 speak to that directly because Brian Baker is 3 here from OMRI, and he knows all that and I really don't. 4 5 MEMBER DAVIS: Well, I just meant 6 funding. Has your association talked about that like, well, what if they ask us to fund 7 Does it seem doable or does it seem this? 8 like way out of reach for a fledgling --9 MR. DERYCKX: It costs money to run 10 these databases. Again, I don't know how much 11 12 because I'm not doing it. I wish that, in your wisdom, when 13 you suggest that we do things, great things 14 15 like that, that you send a big check to cover 16 the cost as well. (Laughter.) 17 But we are really excited about 18 19 trying to find resources in what comes out of the new farm bill, knock on wood, and other 20 sources, private foundations, and so forth, 21

and growers' fees, and so forth.

22

You know,

1	the industry is going to grow; we are going to
2	be making some money. We are going to be
3	putting it back into infrastructure, but right
4	now it is in the developmental stage.
5	So funding is a limiting factor on
6	this kind of stuff. It costs money to do
7	these databases, as I am sure it costs money
8	to put the information in them.
9	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: All right,
10	Kevin?
11	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes, briefly,
12	Woody, when the organic industry got off the
13	ground, there were no organic seeds. I used
14	to buy conventional because it was all that
15	was available, and I bought them a year ahead
16	of time to let all the treatments supposedly
17	lose their effectiveness. So that is where we
18	started from with this rule, basically a
19	loophole, if you will, of why you don't have
20	to have organic seed.
21	Eventually, we would obviously hope
I	

you will have to have organic seed. How long

do you think that that may take the industry to be able to get to the point where, if the rule was changed to say organic growers must have organic seed, period, could the demand be met? How long would that take?

MR. DERYCKX: I think it would be amazingly head-spinning fast, if everybody wanted it to happen, if everybody really wanted it to happen.

As I look back over the last 30 years and have seen the growth in all the other aspects of this movement, it has been astonishing. I think in five to eight years we would have 90 percent, and we would not only have that, but we would have the beginnings of all new, wonderful kinds of varieties coming in and heirlooms restored and cleaned up, you know. It is a really exciting day.

This is why, after all the other things I have done in organic farming for 30 years, it is why I dropped everything and went

NEAL R. GROSS

into growing organic seed, because it is the most wonderful, exciting thing to come along, and we are going to have a great time with it.

But we just need to keep it moving.

You are doing good things, and I really recommend adopting the recommendations that you have there and forming the task force and letting us help.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Jennifer?

MEMBER HALL: So I find myself in a really difficult spot because if I follow your earlier logic about, if somebody tells me to go find organic, I went and I found it -- and I can't find it stipulated any clearer than it already is in the rule that the mandate is organic for seed and planting stock.

So I'm kind of caught because I am quite reticent to saying something louder, making it more expensive and more burdensome, that I feel is already stipulated. So I am trying to find, where is it really broken?

Because I don't think that this recommendation

NEAL R. GROSS

1 necessarily resolves where we are right now in 2 a productive way. 3 This is going to cost considerable amounts of money, just like a databank would. 4 5 That seems more valuable to me than sending 6 paper all around. So I feel really stuck because I 7 feel like the very origination of organic 8 integrity is to start with the seed. That is 9 10 what we are then protecting along the chain of command or chain of custody. 11 But I don't know. I mean I don't 12 13 want to vote no certainly on something that I think is such an important thing, but I don't 14 15 feel like it is the right solution 16 necessarily. Can you comment on that? 17 We have told people to go find organic. Based on what 18 19 you said before, like you, I believe that 20 demand should solve the problem. So where is that demand breakdown? And is telling someone 21

to do it by filling out forms going to resolve

it?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. DERYCKX: I don't know. It is a big world out there. That is an interesting question.

If I may indulge your patience with an anecdote, I get out in the field quite a bit. One of the things I do is drive all the way across the State of Washington to the dryer parts to grow onions in a certified organic field on a mixed farm, a very large farm.

The field is all certified organic onions, and all that, except for a few hundred square feet out in the middle where I do my trials and grow my propagating bulbs, collaboration with the farm owner, the is all planted hybrid manager, to conventionally-grown onion seed.

Considering that, you look out over this 100-acre field of onions and you realize that the seed came from a farm somewhere else where pesticides that are nowhere near safe on

NEAL R. GROSS

food crops are sprayed and soluble fertilizers used in great amounts, and so forth and so on, it is all behind this; it is the footprint of that seed that went into that field. It could be, and should be in a few years, I think, all organic. Don't you agree? It might as well be. It ought to be.

field gets inspected That I guess I am thinking certified every year. that, if they are showing progress in looking seed, if for organic they trialing are varieties, and they do it by my going out and doing variety trials on their place for them, but if they are trialing varieties, if they are following the guidelines of your current recommendation, they are going to be moving in that direction. It won't be too long before we will be supplying the seed for that farm as organically-grown seed, and that would be a good thing.

MEMBER HALL: Thanks.

MR. DERYCKX: Does that help at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	all?
2	(Laughter.)
3	MEMBER HALL: Thanks.
4	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Dan?
5	MEMBER GIACOMINI: On another issue
6	related to the Board, and I wish I had
7	remembered to ask Mark this, do you
8	individually, or your group, have a comment on
9	Dextron?
10	MR. DERYCKX: I don't.
11	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, any other
12	questions for Woody?
13	(No response.)
14	Okay, thank you very much.
15	MR. DERYCKX: Thank you. Thank you
16	all.
17	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: And we are
18	moving on to the proxy for Brian Kozisek. We
19	don't know who that person is. No one
20	present?
21	MEMBER HEINZE: They didn't get
22	back to me about who that would be.

1	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay.
2	MEMBER HEINZE: So he was going to
3	be here, then he said he couldn't; he would
4	send a proxy. They never let me know.
5	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: We will move on
6	then.
7	The next one is Becky Goldburg,
8	followed by Tom I can't read my own
9	writing Richardson. Is it Tom?
10	MS. GOLDBURG: Thank you. I am
11	Becky Goldburg, and I am going to speak on
12	behalf of the Keep Antibiotics Working
13	Coalition. I will distribute our comments.
14	I also have some aquaculture
15	comments I didn't distribute earlier that are
16	from Steve Craig, who is with Virginia Cobia
17	Farms, and he asked me to pass them out,
18	although they will not be presented orally.
19	Thank you.
20	Well, as I said, I'm Becky
21	Goldburg. I spoke earlier. I am a biologist
22	with the Environmental Defense Fund, a

national nonprofit organization. My comments now are made on behalf of something called the Keep Antibiotics Working Coalition, which is a coalition of health, consumer, agricultural, environmental, humane, and other the Environmental organizations, including Defense Fund, which has over 9 million members.

We at KAW are dedicated to eliminating antibiotic resistance due to agricultural uses of antibiotics, especially the inappropriate use of medically-important antibiotics in farm animals.

I am going to comment today in support of the Crops Committee's recommendation to deny the petition to include on the National List tetracycline for control of all diseases on crops as registered by the EPA.

I want to remind you that at the April 2006 NOSB meeting KAW commented in favor of sunseting the antibiotic streptomyacin and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

tetracycline to control fire blight on fruit trees. Unfortunately, on a split vote, the NOSB chose not to sunset these antibiotics because of their usefulness for fire blight control.

However, KAW's concerns about use of medically-important antibiotics for fruit production continue. We have two types of concerns.

Our first concern is that the use of antibiotics on fruit trees will likely make at least a small contribution to the growing crisis of antibiotic resistance in human Modern molecular tools for tracking medicine. movement of genes make clear the that antibiotic resistance is an ecological and not just a medical problem.

The use of antibiotics selects resistant bacteria, whether in orchards or hospitals. Even if these resistant bacteria are not human pathogens, gene transfer mechanisms special to bacteria allow these

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

microbes to spread their resistance genes from any particular orchard bacteria to other unrelated bacteria, including pathogens.

Although the odds are low that resistance genes from any particular orchard bacterium will end up in bacteria harmful to humans, such highly unlikely individual events become probable, given the vast numbers of bacteria present in soil, water, and living organisms.

In short, the antibiotics in orchards increases the load of antibiotic resistance genes in the environment, and thus, likely contributes, at least modestly, to medical problems with resistant bacteria.

Health agencies and experts have expressed strong concerns about the potential for pesticidal uses of antibiotics on fruit trees to contribute to resistance to medically-useful antibiotics.

In 1994, a company applied to EPA to register another antibiotic, Gentomyacin,

NEAL R. GROSS

pesticide to control fire blight The Centers for Disease apples and pears. Control and Prevention, Food and Drug Administration, and the American Society for Microbiology all expressed their disapproval of the proposed registration because Gentomyacin is an important human drug. The result was that the company withdrew application in 1999.

Particularly relevant in one of its EPA, the Centers for Disease comments to Control and Prevention argued that, quote, "consideration should also be given to the reduction and eventual elimination of the environmental" in other words, pesticidal -- "use of streptomyacin and tetracycline."

A second concern is that antibiotic in organic fruit production is use inconsistent with consumer expectations. antibiotic about in animal Concerns use agriculture led to the current prohibition of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

antibiotic use in animals used to produce organic foods, a standard that the Keep Antibiotics Working Coalition strongly supports.

We expect that organic consumers no more want apples, pears, or peaches from antibiotic-treated trees than they want milk or hamburgers from antibiotic-treated cows. If there were to be broad publicity about antibiotic use in organic fruit production, the result might well be reduced sales of organic fruit.

The upshot is that expanding the use of tetracycline in organic fruit production would be wholly incompatible with both the principles of organic production and consumer expectations.

We urge the NOSB to support the Crops Committee's recommendation and not to allow on the National List a broadened use of tetracycline in organic fruit production.

Thanks.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Questions for
2	Becky?
3	(No response.)
4	Well, thank you very much, Becky.
5	MS. GOLDBURG: Okay, thanks.
6	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: We move on to
7	Tom Richardson, followed by Brian Baker.
8	MR. RICHARDSON: Good afternoon.
9	I'm Paul Richardson with Agro Source. I
10	appreciate the opportunity to speak with you
11	this afternoon.
12	We are here to discuss the petition
13	that we made for oxytetracycline use under the
14	organic rules and the listing by NOP. I
15	wanted to step through that with you, but in
16	order to sort of frame the argument and frame
17	the case, I do want to be clear that what we
18	want to do is really separate two issues.
19	One is the petition that we made
20	for our oxytetracycline hydrochloride under
21	the current listing that exists and being
22	consistent with that versus the broader issue

of whether oxytetracycline should be used generally for organic purposes. We think those are two different issues.

So, with the rebuttal we provided, the main things that I would like to discuss are the interchangeability of oxytetracycline, the petition that we provided, the sunset review that you conducted not too long ago, and then, finally, our request for approval of the petition.

When it to the comes interchangeability, first and foremost, both oxytetracycline hydrochloride and calcium are both oxytetracycline. From а regulatory perspective, when you look at the statements that EPA has made over many, many years, real consistencies that there's some show there.

In 1993, under the re-registration eligibility document, the READ on both molecules, which included both molecules, the EPA stated, and I quote, "There are no

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

differences for regulatory evaluation purposes between oxytetracycline hydrochloride and oxytetracycline calcium."

From a regulatory perspective, therefore, EPA recognizes oxytetracycline hydrochloride to be equivalent to oxytetracycline calcium.

Then, further, in 2006, under the that tolerance reassessment was done, TREAD, EPA reviewed oxytetracycline and calcium within the hydrochloride document and together and, again, made regulatory distinction between the two. Thev used one interchangeably with the other, data for one to make decisions about the other in all cases.

Then, additionally, and even more importantly from the standpoint of the Board and the NOP, the oxytetracycline hydrochloride petition that we provided within the technical evaluation report cited oxytetracycline calcium and recognizes the two molecules as

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

equivalent.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The test states, and I quote here again, "In cases where no information is specifically available for calcium oxytetracycline, related relevant and information for the parent compounds, oxytetracycline and/or oxytetracycline hydrochloride, a closely-related compound, is provided and cited accordingly." Thus, the TP recognizes the interchangeability of the two molecules as well.

Then, finally, within the market itself commercially, both our product, Fireline 17, and the competitive product, Microshield 17, are both recognized as interchangeable for purposes of use.

That is also important from a couple of perspectives. Probably from your perspective, most importantly, is that we are not talking about changing the amount of oxytetracycline used. This is really more, from our perspective, it is just simply a

NEAL R. GROSS

commercial competitive issue. They are either going to use our product or they are going to use the competitor's product because they view them as interchangeable.

As far as our petition is concerned, a denial of our petition for the hydrochloride ignores the questions already answered through relisting of oxytetracycline through the Board's sunset review.

What we are trying to understand is, if this denial occurs, it really constitutes a favoring of one compound over the other.

with the sunset review, I think you know the things that occurred between 2006 and 2007, the approval of oxytetracycline calcium, there are also things that have been approved that don't even cite the salt, hydrochloride versus calcium, or anything else. So it just happens to be in this case that they have listed specifically calcium, but, again, when you look at the evidence, it is clear that

NEAL R. GROSS

1	they are looked at equivalently.
2	Just to summarize, with the EPA
3	READ, the TREAD, the NOP's decisions, and the
4	TP commercial equivalency, we believe there is
5	equivalency there. The relisting that has
6	been done, we would ask that you give us,
7	please give us consideration in this from this
8	perspective. That is all we ask.
9	Thank you very much.
10	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you.
11	MR. RICHARDSON: We will be around.
12	If there are further questions, we will be
13	happy to answer those.
14	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you for
15	that.
16	Any questions from the Board?
17	Hugh?
18	MEMBER KARREMAN: In the letter you
19	sent out that we got, you mentioned that
20	oxytetracycline, something about the essential
21	need for it in organic agriculture. Truly
22	essential?

MR. RICHARDSON: Fire blight is a devastating disease. It occurs under very specific circumstances of moisture and temperature and inoculant. When those things occur and fire blight takes off, it will kill trees; it will not only start destroying branches, leaves and branches and fruits, it will kill a tree, and it will kill whole blocks of trees. If you are next door with a farm to someone that has а fire outbreak, it can be devastating to you as well.

So it is a very serious problem. There are years where it really isn't a bad blight year and you might get by with very little treatment, very nominal treatments, without any use of oxytetracycline or streptomyacin or anything else like that. You might use things that are considered more benign.

But there are circumstances and there will always be times, and we have seen

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

this in other parts of the world where basically there is not a positive view of antibiotic use, but they will go a few years and then they will have a bad year, and the authorities will start to allow it again because it is so devastating.

MEMBER KARREMAN: So what do we say to veterinarians and farmers that are denied that use when you can use it on fruit trees?

MR. RICHARDSON: And again, we are not arguing whether it should or shouldn't be allowed by you. We are saying that you have allowed it in the sunset review. You relisted oxytetracycline in its calcium form. All we are saying is we should also be listed. If you decided on some other perspective on this, we are not trying to argue that it should be listed, that it should on crops and not in animals. We are just saying that, because it is listed, we should be listed. That is the only argument we are making.

We do not feel we will contribute

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

	anything to the road that arready exists of
2	oxytetracycline that is used.
3	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Gerry?
4	MEMBER DAVIS: I don't have a
5	question, but I do have a clarification for
6	the benefit of your company. I see in the
7	comments that you put before us in writing, as
8	well as what you talked about here, your
9	emphasis on the oxytetracycline molecule being
10	close enough to the same, handled the same,
11	and the need for it in apples and pears.
12	I don't dispute what you are
13	saying. The biggest issue we had with this
14	material in the petition was that you asked
15	for all EPA-registered uses to be allowed,
16	which in your case, so far at least, only
17	includes peaches and nectarines or other stone
18	fruit?
19	MR. RICHARDSON: Ours included
20	apples, pears, peaches, and nectarines.
21	MEMBER DAVIS: Peaches and
22	nectarines?

1 MR. RICHARDSON: In the proposal, 2 yes. 3 MEMBER DAVIS: Peaches and nectarines? 4 5 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes. 6 MEMBER DAVIS: So it was the 7 expanded usage to peaches and nectarines which we deemed as not absolutely critical in peach 8 and nectarine production. We checked with 9 10 people and asked them that question: really needed like it is in apples and pears? 11 And there is no consensus in industry, in the 12 13 organic industry, that it is needed for peaches and nectarines. We didn't take so 14 15 much issue with your claim about some of the 16 other stuff. I also wanted to point out that, 17 for the vote that was taken the last time for 18 19 the sunset renewal at College Park, it was a 20 split decision, and one vote less for the material, it would not have been relisted. 21

there was a considerable dispute over whether

1	it even should stay on the list, even for
2	apples and pears. But, in my opinion, the
3	only reason it passed was because it was so
4	devastating, particularly on pears, that fire
5	blight is so devastating that we didn't want
6	to injure organic growers that truly didn't
7	have another option.
8	MR. RICHARDSON: The peach and
9	nectarine use is a new use, and I think it is
10	perfectly appropriate for this Board to make
11	that decision as to whether they believe it
12	should or should not be
13	MEMBER DAVIS: But, anyway, I
14	didn't want your company to go away with not
15	being informed of really what was the driving
16	force behind our vote.
17	MR. RICHARDSON: Well, I appreciate
18	that.
19	MEMBER DAVIS: Okay.
20	MR. RICHARDSON: I appreciate
21	knowing it. Again, that follows with the
22	logic of the argument that we have made. We

1	included that as part of our petition, but you
2	may want to segregate that out and say we have
3	a decision on peaches and pears; we have a
4	decision on apples and or peaches and
5	nectarines and a decision on apples and pears.
6	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: And tomorrow,
7	Gerry, you will have more time to expand on
8	that explanation and justification.
9	Any other questions?
10	(No response.)
11	Thank you very much.
12	MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you very
13	much.
14	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Next is Brian
15	Baker, followed by Julia Sabin.
16	MR. BAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair,
17	members of the NOSB, members of the NOP.
18	Brian Baker, Research Director, Organic
19	Materials Review Institute.
20	OMRI appreciates the NOP's
21	clarification on materials review and explicit
22	public acknowledgment of our work issued

earlier this year. That acknowledgment circulated to NOP-accredited certifiers has helped answer many longstanding questions and enables us to better serve the NOP's accredited certifying agents, the organic industry, and the public.

OMRI offers itself as a technical resource, institutional memory, and vehicle for information collection and dissemination on materials decisions made in organic production and handling. People need consistent and timely answers in a way that is readily understood, clearly explained, and broadly supported by all stakeholders.

OMRI an information serves as resource to the public, and we ask that the that NOSB make decisions clear are and consistent with precedent. We understand that there are many unresolved issues that need to be addressed, but it should be done in a way that does not create more confusion by being inconsistent with precedent and a widely-held

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

consensus of what is permitted and what is prohibited on organic production and handling.

Recommendations, decisions, and guidances that abruptly change the status of materials without opportunity for public comment can result in confusion, conflicting interpretation, and endless debates. citric acid, cheese wax, glycerin, and soy protein isolates as examples in our written comments submitted to you prior meeting. Classifying use as agricultural will have implications for the black mold used to make citric acid as well as for the yeast fed to livestock. If the NOSB decides that cheese wax is natural, then all kinds of petric chemical from benzene to xylene could considered allowed in organic production.

Being animal drug formulators, they are always asking us what kind of glycerin they can use for formulations other than teat dips. The soy protein isolate petition has been before you for a number of years. Many

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of you have been appointed since that petition was received, and it is awaiting clarification on what is synthetic and what is not synthetic.

OMRI urges the NOSB to conduct an independent TAP review on every petition received and make those findings open to the public prior to any making of recommendations to the NOP.

In our experience, petitions can have inaccuracies. They can omit relevant information. They don't always include the information needed to evaluate against the criteria. Like the petitions, the technical reviews themselves need to be subject to public review and comment.

The NOP and NOSB are urged to draw upon the scientific and technical resources that are in the organic community, not just OMRI, but look to the many fine researchers in the Agricultural Research Service who are doing work on organic systems, in the land

NEAL R. GROSS

grant institutions, and public institutions,
Organic Farming Research Foundation. There
are a number of technical resources out there
to draw upon, and we feel that resource needs
to be better used.

Some petitions are technical.

Reviews don't address the OFPA criteria at all, and we have found that most of the petitions for agricultural products do not contain the information on the pesticides and other farm chemicals that have an impact on the environment and human health.

These can't be casually dismissed as insignificant. Organic food cannot be presented as an alternative to conventional farming practices when practices used to produce ingredients used in organic products and carry the USDA label have been grown with conventional practices.

So OMRI asks the NOSB to hold up making recommendations on 606 items until the questions raised by public comments on the

NEAL R. GROSS

1	June 27th, 2006 Federal Register notice are
2	addressed. As OMRI begins to review items
3	that are on 606, not organic agricultural
4	ingredients on 606, for their compatibility
5	with organic production, we need answers. I
6	plan to comment more tomorrow.
7	Thank you.
8	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you,
9	Brian.
10	Any questions from the Board?
11	Okay. You have one?
12	MEMBER HEINZE: Do you think
13	consumers don't understand that the items on
14	606, when they are used in a finished product,
15	are conventional when they are labeled as
16	conventional on the ingredient listing? They
17	are not labeled as organic. I guess it seems
18	that consumers would understand the
19	implications of that.
20	MR. BAKER: Do consumers know the
21	pesticides that are used to grow those
22	products? Do they know the pesticide residues

contained on those products? Do they that, example, non-organic understand for high rate of nonpeppers have very а compliance with the FDA's tolerances for illegal residues? I think not, and I don't see that information being reviewed by the I don't think that information is being conveyed to the public.

MEMBER HEINZE: They clearly don't understand the specifics, but I think they do understand that those ingredients different than the other conventional. it is a conventional pepper used in an organic product, that is the same as going to the buying conventional grocery store and а So I think, from a risk, they might pepper. understand that.

MR. BAKER: Perhaps, but they see the USDA organic logo on the packaging. They think that the National Organic Standards Board is reviewing these things that are not organic for their implications on human health

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	and the environment. They trust the system.
2	MEMBER HEINZE: Okay, thanks.
3	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
4	questions? Yes, Julie?
5	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes, I wanted to
6	also address Brian's issue. Well, let me ask
7	you a question. I think the issue that you
8	are having is that, when things are approved
9	for 606, you don't see where the issues of
10	persistence of things in the environment are
11	being addressed in the evaluations. That was
12	the point that Jim Riddle made earlier.
13	I think that we do need to look at
14	the petition. I think that there is some work
15	that the Board has to do to look at the
16	petition criteria evaluation checklist and be
17	clear for ourselves, since 606 is a new
18	process, it's not applicable to certain things
19	and certain things it is. There may be some
20	confusion that does have to be addressed. I
21	think that there is a point there.

NEAL R. GROSS

I think, also -- I'll leave it at

that. That is the end of mine.
MR. BAKER: Okay. Is there a
question that I can answer there?
MEMBER WEISMAN: Well, okay. Not
anything that is different than what Katrina
asked you.
MR. BAKER: Okay. I think the
message was heard.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, any other
questions?
(No response.)
Okay, thank you, Brian.
MR. BAKER: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Up next is Julia
Sabin, followed by Patrick Arndt.
MS. SABIN: Good afternoon or maybe
MS. SABIN: Good afternoon or maybe
MS. SABIN: Good afternoon or maybe good evening. (Laughter.)
MS. SABIN: Good afternoon or maybe good evening.
MS. SABIN: Good afternoon or maybe good evening. (Laughter.) This will be very, very short and

1	and mainly I wanted to introduce myself to you
2	as the new President for the Organic Trade
3	Association's Board of Directors, and also to
4	thank you, the National Organic Standards
5	Board, for all the significant personal
6	sacrifice and dedication that you give to this
7	industry. It is very much appreciated.
8	Volunteer boards require an immense amount of
9	work, and I thank you.
10	Also, I wanted to thank the NOP,
11	and specifically Barbara Robinson. She is not
12	here, but please thank her for me, and her
13	team for all the hard work and amazing
14	commitment to the organic community as well.
15	Then, finally, the OTA staff
16	remains very excited to continue to support
17	and work hard for the organic community as we
18	move forward together.
19	And that's it. So I get the award
20	for the shortest statement today.
21	(Laughter.)

NEAL R. GROSS

Thank you.

1	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you,
2	Julia. Congratulations on your appointment.
3	Any questions for Julia before she
4	leaves us?
5	(No response.)
6	No?
7	Thanks again.
8	Who's next? Patrick Arndt,
9	followed by Peggy Miars.
10	MR. ARNDT: Hello, everyone. My
11	name is Patrick Arndt. I am a Certification
12	Specialist with Pennsylvania Certified
13	Organic. As you can see, I am speaking as
14	proxy today for Melanie Saffer. She is our
15	Certification Director.
16	I would like to focus my comments
17	on various materials issues before the Board.
18	We filed more detailed comments previously
19	that should be in your meeting book. Here are
20	the key points:
21	No. 1, TAP reviews are needed for
22	almost all materials, including any material

petition for 205.606 that is not a single ingredient raw agricultural commodity. We understand there have been budget issues, but now that more funding is available, we expect that these will resume.

It is not acceptable or adequate to rely on a petitioner's information, which quite naturally can be biased in favor of the petition's substance. This can lead to incorrect decisions and set precedents that cause more problems later. We have noted some specific errors in our submitted written comments.

No. 2, as a certification agency, we are required to have documented policies for decisionmaking and treat all clients equally. We make decisions daily regarding determination of compliance for inputs and ingredients for organic producers and handlers, and these decisions need to be consistent.

We feel that the NOSB should be

NEAL R. GROSS

following similar standardized procedures when reviewing materials. Specifically, we request you complete your deliberations on agricultural versus non-agricultural definitions before any more materials are added to 205.606.

We also need clarification of the definitions of synthetic and non-synthetic substances.

No. 3, we have filed a joint comment with Oregon Tilth regarding the status of the 45 materials now listed on 205.606. When we review our clients' ingredients used in organic products, we need to understand better what the restrictions are for these substances.

These questions were asked last year, and now that we have been reviewing colors in detail, we are asking again. Can they be produced using synthetic solvent extraction? Can they be formulated with other non-list carriers and additives?

NEAL R. GROSS

	Colors can include other additives
2	like maltodextrin or starch. Do these have to
3	be organic?
4	Either NOSB should be reviewing the
5	manufacturing process and additives used in
6	more detail and considering these issues or it
7	should be clear that certifiers need to review
8	these substances and limit approval to
9	products formulated only with substances on
10	the National List. Certifiers are not all
11	reviewing these substances the same way as is.
12	No. 4, specific crop and livestock
13	materials. Cheese wax should be deferred for
14	proper identification of the substances
15	involved and correction of the evaluation form
16	to indicate that petroleum products are, in
17	fact, synthetic.
18	Dextrin for seed coating needs a
19	TAP review before the decision is final.
20	Detracycline, we agree the
21	annotation should not be changed.
l	

Fenbendazol, we support addition as

1	a parasiticide.
2	Thank you.
3	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any questions?
4	(No response.)
5	Okay, thank you.
6	MR. ARNDT: Thank you.
7	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Moving on with
8	Peggy Miars, followed by Sam Welsch.
9	MS. MIARS: Good evening. Thank
10	you for pronouncing my name correctly. I
11	appreciate that.
12	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Wonderful.
13	MS. MIARS: My name is Peggy Miars,
14	and I'm Executive Director of California
15	Certified Organic Farmers. CCOF is a
16	nonprofit organization, and as you heard
17	earlier, we represent more than 1800 certified
18	operations and half a million acres in organic
19	production. We certify nearly 80 percent of
20	the organic farmland in the State of
21	California.

NEAL R. GROSS

Today I am briefly addressing three

topics. First is grower groups.

I would like to thank the Certification, Accreditation, and Compliance Committee for their work on the issue of grower groups. CCOF's position remains unchanged from the last NOSB meeting.

CCOF has not and does not certify grower groups. We believe that, in order to uphold the integrity of organic and provide the oversight that consumers demand, that each grower should complete the full certification process, including an annual onsite inspection by an accredited certifier.

We believe that handlers, processors, retailers, and restaurants should not be allowed under group certification.

We do acknowledge that grower groups have been allowed, in order to enable small growers to achieve certification, which increases the amount of farmland under organic production. However, we believe that grower groups should be phased out of the NOP. As

NEAL R. GROSS

long as they are allowed, participation should only be available to growers producing less than \$5,000 in U.S. organic sales.

We do not believe that the proposed grower group model increases the ability to detect non-compliance. In fact, it might be easier to hide non-compliance issues if the operator wants to.

We have spent more than five years educating consumers about what organic means under the NOP and what organic certification means. Some consumers are already questioning the integrity of organic and the organic seal. We believe that the issue of grower groups will continue to confuse or add to the confusion of consumers and will add to the loss of confidence and trust in the organic seal, which would impact the entire organic marketplace.

Unfortunately, we have not been able to participate as part of a committee or a discussion group on this issue, but now that

NEAL R. GROSS

we do have a full-time Policy Director, we are prepared to participate in continued discussion on this issue.

The second item is regarding the Methionine petition. We support the Livestock Committee's recommendation to add an annotation with the expiration of October 1, enable time for 2010, to commercial development of non-synthetic alternatives to Methionine. I understand a task force is currently working on researching alternatives, and we support those efforts.

And the third area is some miscellaneous items, primarily for the NOP staff. We do ask that the NOSB and NOP please remember that certified operations require proper notification and due process when rule This includes clarity and changes are made. interpretation and а clear timeline for communicating and implementing the changes. Making verbal comments in certifier trainings is not sufficient. Each certifier must be

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

notified in writing, so that all certifiers receive the same information at the same time.

We are still waiting for a pasture recommendation and a rule on origin of livestock. The lack of clarity is detrimental to livestock operations and the entire organic community.

We want to thank you for allowing certifiers to contract with OMRI and WSDA for materials review. We appreciate that very much.

We want to thank the NOP staff for their efforts to update the NOP website, as people said today. While many have improvements have been made, I know you realize that more improvements are needed. I won't go into detail here, but we probably will be submitting comments directly to the staff.

We congratulate you on the increase in the NOP budget, and we ask that you share with us how that money is going to be put to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	good use to benefit the organic marketplace.
2	We appreciate the work of the NOSB
3	and the NOP, and we thank you very much for
4	your time and consideration.
5	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, thank you.
6	Any questions from the Board?
7	(No response.)
8	Okay, thank you.
9	MS. MIARS: Thank you.
10	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Next is Sam
11	Welsch, followed by Katherine DiMatteo.
12	MR. WELSCH: Hi. I'm Sam Welsch
13	with One-Cert, one of the accredited organic
14	certifiers.
15	I have already submitted written
16	comments on hydroponics. They are not
17	organic. Organic comes from the soil.
18	Hydroponics has no soil. I think that message
19	we have tried to make pretty clear.
20	Group certification we have
21	supported for small holders, preferably those
22	who are producing less than 5,000. Again, I

made more comments in writing. I won't read those to you. I would be happy to answer any questions you have about those issues, but today I want to spend a few minutes talking about some other topics.

Regarding materials, I hope we definition don't mess with the $\circ f$ It may be difficult for some to agricultural. deal with the way it is, but we have enough problems with confidence in the organic seal. When we start messing with definitions like agricultural that make sense to most consumers, it is something that comes from the When we start to include microorganisms farm. and other things in the definition agricultural, I see that as doing nothing but harming the overall advantage or overall image of organics.

We already have a definition in livestock that includes other non-plant life. So if we need to have a way of certifying yeast, it is already in the rule. It is other

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

non-plant life.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

It is certainly possible to have a separate section for the certification of yeast or other microorganisms that may need to be certified. So, very clearly, we have a continuum, agricultural on one end, agricultural on the other. It is not discrete There's a lot of things in between baskets. that may be somewhat less well-defined, but if we are looking at what can be certified, there may be another segment of the rule that we need to have that includes those things under the non-plant life that can be certified in definitions on what requirements go into that.

We have heard that yeast is being certified because it is made with organic substrates, but yet, at the same time, other fungi are being certified with using conventional, even GMO, substrates to be grown on. That is what is currently allowed by the NOP, because there are no rules that have been developed for mushrooms, just like there's

NEAL R. GROSS

been nothing for greenhouses, apiaries, beekeeping. Those are things that we were promised before the rule was fully implemented back in 2002, but are rules that have not yet been promulgated.

I just wanted to mention a separate issue. Somebody mentioned there was formula manufacturers. We do certify a formula manufacturer that does not use hexane fatty acids in their products. So it is possible. There is an organic product on the market for that.

Regarding group certification, we lot about how an internal control hear а system improves functioning or the oversight for retailers and other multi-site operations. Τ point just want to out that in 205.201(a)(3), it requires a description of monitoring practices and procedures to performed and maintained. This is something that is required in an organic system plan of all operations. The fact that they do that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	with an internal control system, with multiple
2	sites, is very good, but nothing in that
3	application or that type of monitoring says
4	that those sites don't all need to have an
5	annual inspection.
6	So it is good to have the internal
7	control systems in place regardless of the
8	type of multi-site operation it is, but it
9	doesn't eliminate the requirement that an
10	annual inspection take place in each of those.
11	I also wanted to endorse the
12	comments of others who made statements today,
13	such as Gwendolyn Wyard and Emily Brown-Rosen,
14	about the clarification of ingredients on 606.
15	I also agree with the comments
16	about the so-called cheese wax. I think we
17	should actually call it synthetic hydrocarbon,
18	which is its proper name. It is not made from
19	cheese, just to be clear.
20	(Laughter.)
21	So if it is going to be listed, it
22	should be listed properly. I think it was

1	misidentified in the recommendation from the
2	Committee, and I think it needs to go back to
3	Committee for a correction before it should be
4	approved, if it is justified to be approved at
5	all.
6	I also agree with the OMRI
7	statements that additional rulemaking should
8	be required before we add additional items to
9	the list.
10	And I will add my voice to others
11	who support the requirement that TAP reviews
12	be conducted before many of these items be
13	added.
14	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: All right, thank
15	you.
16	Any questions? Joe?
17	MEMBER SMILLIE: Which option do
18	you currently favor from the Materials Working
19	Group, if any?
20	MR. WELSCH: None of the above.
21	MEMBER SMILLIE: Option A was
22	status quo, wasn't it?

1	MR. WELSCH: Yes.
2	MEMBER SMILLIE: Is that what you
3	are supporting?
4	MR. WELSCH: I am supporting that
5	we actually need some rules for certification
6	of some of these products that are not clearly
7	crops or livestock
8	MEMBER SMILLIE: Right.
9	MR. WELSCH: things like
10	mushrooms, even greenhouses. You know, these
11	have been on the table since before the rule
12	was implemented and they are still not
13	complete.
14	MEMBER SMILLIE: Right.
15	MR. WELSCH: It is just one of many
16	things on the list that are creating problems
17	today because they were not completed within
18	that time limit.
19	MEMBER SMILLIE: Okay.
20	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Dan, followed by
21	Kevin.
22	MEMBER GIACOMINI: You mentioned

1	that we shouldn't mess with the definition of
2	agriculture. One of the things in the process
3	of what we are trying to do, and what the
4	Working Group is trying to do, is find what we
5	do need to do to move forward on this.
6	We actually don't have a definition
7	for agriculture. Are you proposing that that
8	is something we should do?
9	MR. WELSCH: I probably misspoke.
10	I mean agricultural product. There is a
11	definition in the law for that.
12	MEMBER GIACOMINI: But it doesn't
13	mention anything about a farm.
14	MR. WELSCH: Well, I think if you
15	look up the commonly-understood if you look
16	up agricultural in any dictionary, you are
17	going to have what is the commonly-understood
18	meaning, which will include farm. We don't
19	have to create meaning where it is commonly
20	understood.
21	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Kevin?
22	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes. Could you

1	give an example of fungi that is being grown
2	on a GMO substrate, Sam, that you mentioned?
3	MR. WELSCH: Most mushrooms. It
4	was a question that was asked or presented in
5	training, "Can you use GMO substrate like
6	corncobs for raising mushrooms?" And we were
7	told yes.
8	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
9	questions?
10	(No response.)
11	Thank you very much.
12	Moving on to Katherine DiMatteo,
13	followed by Harriet Behar.
14	MS. DiMATTEO: Okay, thank you very
15	much. My name is Katherine DiMatteo. I'm on
16	the Board of the International Federation of
17	Organic Agriculture Movements, which is,
18	obviously, a global, democratic, membership-
19	based organization that has been in existence
20	since 1972 and has contributed to the
21	worldwide discussion of organic standards and

agricultural principles for organic.

I'm going to read this because it 1 2 is long. So I apologize -- no eye contact. 3 IFOAM thanks the Certification, Accreditation, and Compliance Committee for 4 5 the appendix to the discussion document on 6 certifying operations with multiple production units, sites, and facilities, and for inviting 7 discussion and comments from the organic 8 community. 9 10 IFOAM appreciates the careful and thoughtful consideration that the CACC and the 11 National Organic Standards Board are giving to 12 13 this important recommendation. also thanks IFOAM the National 14 15 Organic Program for allowing the use of the 16 2002 NOSB recommendation on grower group certification quidance for 17 as the certification of 18 grower groups under the 19 National Organic Program. 20 These comments address both the appendix and some of the questions posed by 21

the Committee.

1	The guidance provided in the
2	appendix greatly improves the understanding of
3	how to implement appropriate and rigorous
4	controls within operations with multiple
5	production units, sites, and facilities.
6	There is much in the appendix that IFOAM
7	supports: Section 2, Section 3, especially
8	the criteria for clustering of members or
9	subunits into a production unit, including the
10	guidance that an upper limit on the number of
11	subunits included in a given production unit
12	should be based on the feasibility of
13	effective oversight by management personnel
14	and factors such as size and accessibility of
15	the subunits. We also support Section 4, No.
16	(d), the role of the internal control system.
17	IFOAM does not agree with the key
18	premise that there is a distinction between

premise that there is a distinction between initial and renewal inspections of production units, sites, and facilities, presented in Section 4.

Although the language in Section

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

19

20

21

205.403 of the NOP rule appears to distinguish between initial and subsequent onsite inspections, IFOAM does not believe that it was the intent of this provision to suggest that subsequent onsite inspections might be To make less complete than the initial one. this distinction between initial and renewal inspections would diminish the rigor of the certification multi-site for system operations.

IFOAM recommends the NOP accredited certifying agents perform annual audits of the internal control system of the group, annual inspections of each production unit of the group that includes a sampling of members or subunits based on both risk assessment and random selection, and annual inspections of handling facilities and sites of the group and production units.

The internal control system personnel must directly observe and check all subunits at least annually to ensure that the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

organic system plan is implemented.

The criteria written in Section (c) under "Inspection" should be written to reflect factors appropriate to members or subunits rather than production units.

IFOAM does support the recommendation and reasoning for random sampling, but would apply this to members and subunits rather than the production units.

We applaud the Committee for their excellent work on the role of the internal control system, in particular, the statement for the person seeking organic certification to be in compliance with the NOP, all non-compliances detected at the production unit site and facility or at the subunit or member level are required to be reported to the certifying, not just to the internal control system.

You have the rest of this in front of you, but I just want to read my last paragraph.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	IFOAM urges you to recognize that
2	multi-site operations are not simply a
3	collection of individual farms that are
4	collaborating to market crops or are organized
5	to avoid rigorous certification oversight and
6	verification. This system for certification
7	of multi-site operations that includes having
8	a functional internal quality assurance system
9	together with an annual inspection and
10	evaluation by an accredited certifying agent
11	offers a sound and robust organic guarantee
12	system that protects organic integrity. This
13	system offers two levels of control as opposed
14	to one. It also encourages group
15	organization, which enhances the overall
16	capacity of individual members within the
17	group to institute and further develop good
18	organic management practices.

The continuation of multi-site operations is critical to the organic community worldwide.

Thank you for the opportunity to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

19

20

21

1	comment.
2	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Oh, you are very
3	welcome. Thank you.
4	Any questions?
5	(No response.)
6	All right. Okay, thanks again.
7	MS. DiMATTEO: Thank you.
8	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Next up is
9	Harriet Behar.
10	MS. BEHAR: Is everybody still
11	awake?
12	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: We're still
13	awake.
14	MS. BEHAR: Okay, I am going to
15	give comments for the National Organic
16	Coalition, of which MOSES is a member. It is
17	on grower groups. There is only one copy of
18	my comments, but I believe Liana is bringing
19	you some more.
20	I would like to thank the NOSB
21	Certification, Accreditation, and Compliance
22	Committee for the further consideration of

these grower group certifications. However, we are very disappointed that the previous document presented in November has not been withdrawn or reworked to reflect the many public comments, including our own, that objected to this approach.

Instead, the Committee has presented a new appendix outlining guidance for certification of multi-site operations. The unnecessary inclusion of handlers, including retailers, into this proposal remains a great weakness that jeopardizes the protections needed for small farmers in the developing world who have successfully used the grower group model in order to have access to certification and the organic marketplace.

Handlers that operate multiple sites, locations, and facilities are currently certified as single operations under the existing regulations. There is no need for any guidance designed to weaken the inspection protocol for these entities.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

There may be need for specific quidelines regulations retail for orcertification, as this is voluntary, but this separate issue that should not conflated with the problem at hand, which is a producer/grower group certification.

We are in general support of the OTA Group Certification Task Force comment on guidance for producer group certification. believe this document provides the depth of consideration of important relative to certification of producer groups, including guidance on the preferred management structure of internal control an system, conflict of interest, and training, criteria for inclusion in a production unit, and the including inspection protocol, risk assessment.

We particularly support the OTA position that all production units are inspected annually, and discussion of what is a production unit, that definition, and how to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

decide that is part of the larger document which you will get in due course, I hope.

I also want to answer some of the questions that you put out there, such as: Does a process of random external inspection levels based on risk criteria provide enough oversight of individual locations or is there all locations need to quarantee externally inspected minimum at some frequency?

Under that, we support the One-Cert discussion, and we feel that random selection is not sufficient. Selection must be first based on risk criteria with any farm in the group that is high-risk being inspected annually, with the remaining low-risk farms may be randomly selected using a method that guarantees no more than five years between external inspections on any farm.

Then I guess the other one here that I am going to answer is: How will the multi-site model improve the National Organic

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Program? We feel that the multi-site model will not improve the National Organic Program.

Retailers added to the existing structure will only improve the bottom line of retailers.

The grower group model with needed clarifications will continue to provide organic certification in an alternative model for small holders around the world who would otherwise not be able to certify with no loss integrity of USDA standards. The the marketplace will assured of continued be availability of such important commodities as coffee, chocolate, bananas, et cetera.

In conclusion, the NOSB should work to adopt a consensus document that establishes quidelines for small holder group certification and limit this guidance to this arena only. There is no demonstrated need or convincing reason that handlers should afforded eligibility under this proposal to their weaken protocol for the necessary

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

	Individual site inspections.
2	We hope that the organic retail
3	community will take the necessary leadership
4	in this discussion and insist on dropping this
5	idea in order to protect consumer confidence
6	in the organic certification of all items.
7	Growing groups represent some of
8	the world's most vulnerable farmers.
9	Therefore, it will be vital to exercise
10	extreme caution, adequate implementation
11	timelines, and full transparency, including
12	adequate opportunities for public comment,
13	when applying changes to the current model in
14	place.
15	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: All right, very
16	timely. Thank you.
17	Questions for Harriet?
18	MS. BEHAR: Again, that is from the
19	National Organic Coalition.
20	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Great. Thank
21	you.
22	Next is Leslie Zuck, followed by

David Guggenheim.

MS. ZUCK: Hello. I thought would be last. I'm kind of used to being last with a name that starts with Z-U, you know, almost last anyway.

(Laughter.)

Hi. I'm Leslie Zuck, Executive Director of Pennsylvania Certified Organic. I have been sitting here all day just trying to think what I ought to comment on. So many issues, so little time.

(Laughter.)

But I decided that the best use of my time and yours would be to try to address some of the questions I have been hearing from the Board throughout the day. So I will do that.

I heard Joe say -- well, it wasn't really a question, but he is concerned that we need to get better compliance levels on the use of organic seed. I continue to be sort of confused about why it is perceived that this

is such a big problem warranting quite a lot of effort on the part of your Committee and Board.

I mean, are we seeing documented complaints? Is it mostly anecdotal information from seed companies that would really like us to help them meet the needs of growers and find the organic seeds that they really need?

Frankly, we have not really seen a problem, and the organic seed this as availability is stagnating. not is certainly not slowing. At least what we are seeing is that it really does increase every I mean it started out -- and that is like since 2002. I mean it was non-existent before 2002. The first couple of years were pretty slow. I mean there really wasn't anything.

So we have been seeing it increasing every year really in the last three to four years. I am pretty amazed, actually,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that there is as much available that there is, knowing what it takes to develop seed.

There were several questions about the burden that your recommendation would place on the certifiers and producers. I think Zea and Harriet really responded to those questions well.

On my farm, I am certified by a very reputable ACA in Florida, and every December I sit down with my stack of seed catalogs and I start with the Johnny's and the Fedco and the Seedway catalogs. Johnny's and Fedco are in Maine. They are the major East Coast providers of organic seed. Seedway is in Pennsylvania. We certify them, and I know for a fact they work very hard to add organic seed to their line.

So I go through and I flip through the catalog, and if I see something that is what I want and the organic variety is available, I order it. So I will have the order form; I have the invoice, and

NEAL R. GROSS

essentially that is my documentation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Then well-qualified the very inspector from the reputable ACA arrives at my I will show her -- she farm in the summer. will look all of that stack of at catalogs. She will look at my invoice. She will look at my order form, and she will see that I have been using a significant or at least a reasonable amount of organic seed on my operation, and she will check a few things. She knows Brandywine tomatoes are available organically and Detroit dark beets, and she will just make sure that I am using those, and I am.

All the information to assess compliance is there. It is looked at, and a determination of good faith effort is placed in my inspection report that goes back to my certification agent. But if I am going to spend additional time to write all that down and make my list up, it is going to take several more hours on my part, and it may not

seem like a lot, but I am going to be asking why. As a certifier, I am going to be getting asked why by my several hundred clients who are going to want to know how I think that is a reasonable use of their time.

Because, so far, up until now, we have been managing fine without having them to send list of seeds that they want to the seed If I write out my list and send it company. to Johnny's and Fedco and Seedway, and say, in all these "I'm interested 80 90 varieties. they available?", they Are going to think I'm daft. They are going to say, well, check our website, check our seed catalog; that's what they are there for. that is kind of going to be a hard sell, at least to my clients, I think.

At the certifier level, there isn't anybody that really has a nanosecond to spare, much less a staff member to devote the time needed to collect and enter into a database seed lists containing hundreds of varieties

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

from hundreds of farmers.

each, that is over 100 staff hours, and these guys will tell you we're not afraid of work, but I do have a hard time convincing staff of the necessity of such a huge task to fix a problem that we really don't seem to see as being a big problem.

Okay, I feel as a certifier I really can't legally require a client to submit confidential business information to me that would be ultimately used for another purpose. I would have a problem with that. I could get sued. I don't want to get sued. So I would rather not have to do that.

Contract growers was asked -- I think it is already covered in the rule. Efforts to find organic seed have to be in their OSP, just as well as it has to be in any grower's OSP. So I think it is there. That was your No. 4.

If you have any questions about

1	multi-site I have one question and one
2	comment that is one-sentence long, which I
3	would be happy to answer.
4	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, any
5	questions for Leslie?
6	MS. FRANCIS: Do you have any other
7	comments?
8	(Laughter.)
9	MS. ZUCK: Just one really; it is
10	very short. I am wondering why the 36-month
11	phase-in period is there for the 100 percent
12	inspection every year. I mean 100 percent for
13	the initial year.
14	At least the rule I have back in my
15	file clearly requires that now. I think any
16	ACA that is not inspecting every production
17	unit prior to initial certification should be
18	politely questioned by NOP about why they are
19	not doing that now, because I can't read the
20	rule any other way.
21	So my question or my comment, that
22	was it.

1	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay. Any other
2	comments, questions?
3	(No response.)
4	Okay, thank you very much, Leslie.
5	MS. ZUCK: That's a first.
6	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Next up is David
7	Guggenheim. No pressure; you are the last one
8	on the list.
9	MR. GUGGENHEIM: Can you hear me
10	okay?
11	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Yes.
12	MR. GUGGENHEIM: Okay, and I want
13	to thank the Board for their flexibility in
14	getting me in. I suppose I should thank the
15	U.S. District Court for not calling me in for
16	jury duty today. There was some uncertainty
17	about that.
18	Good afternoon. Good evening.
19	I am Dr. David Guggenheim. I'm a
20	principal in Aquaculture Development. It is
21	based in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
22	I think it is also relevant to

mention that I am President of One Planet One Ocean in Washington, D.C., a conservation organization.

Three and a half years ago, I left my post at the Ocean Conservancy as Vice President because I got very excited about the fact that I had a glimpse of the future: closed-containment, land-based aquaculture. These are systems, next-generation systems, that recirculate 99 percent of their effluent, have no discharge, use no chemicals and no antibiotics, can be located close to where their products are consumed. I saw this as the future of putting fish on the table. You may recall I made a presentation on this technology at the Aquaculture Workshop.

Today I want to talk about one point, and that is really focused on a request that the Board reconsider the inclusion of the sunset provision for the use of fish meal and fish oil in aquaculture.

The organic certification addresses

NEAL R. GROSS

both concerns for human health as well concerns for the health of the environment. long term, it is belief that In the mу providing this flexibility will be net benefit and significant benefit for the environment, and here's why:

Without question, from mу experience and that of my colleagues, nextclosed-containment generation, systems represent a quantum leap in the sustainability of aquaculture, both in terms of the attributes of aquaculture itself, but also in terms of, when scaled up, their capacity to actually reduce wild fish pressure on populations and ocean ecosystems.

The U.S. is far behind Europe and Asia in adopting this technology, and now we can add South America to the list. Our primary technology partner, UniAqua, based in Denmark, has just begun construction on two facilities in Chile, each 1,000 tons for salmon. These are facilities that will

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

support the complete rollout of salmon, completely contained land-based systems.

Over the past three and a half years, I have been on the front lines working with industry executives and potential investors who, despite a 15-year track record overseas, haven't really heard much about this technology, view it as something new and scarey, and therefore, a high risk.

But the possibility of an organic certification for their product has been a major factor in bringing these potential investors closer. The challenge is that most of the commercially-viable species in this country are omnivores. Salmon represents about 60 percent of the fish that we eat, obviously, an omnivorous fish.

We at Aquaculture Developments are committed to eliminating completely the wild-caught feed component to the fish that we are growing. At the workshop, we committed to a five-year phaseout period, which I think was

NEAL R. GROSS

faster than just about anybody else.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

That is for two reasons: the time needed for research as well as time needed for economies of scale to kick in. Ιt is technically possible for us to grow organic feed, essentially the prey species for these fish, but the economics don't work yet. economics will work when there is enough of these facilities there. Therefore, it is a chicken-and-egg problem.

The sunset provision will have the effect of stimulating the right kind of industry for aquaculture and take a major step forward toward again protecting and restoring ocean ecosystems.

This is not about weakening the National Organic Program. Taking a larger and longer-term perspective, this is demonstrating leadership and profoundly transforming the way this country puts fish on the table.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you.

Thank you.

Any questions? Yes, Hugh?

MEMBER KARREMAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So even though when we are coming we are trying to come up with standards aquaculture species and for all not salmon -- I've tried to kind of stay clear of just saying salmon because it is not about salmon. But how would you answer some of the groups that would say, well, salmon have to have their natural runs to be in the organic, you know, to demonstrate their natural behavior, and whatnot? I mean, would you answer that with the setup, know, the system that you are proposing?

MR. GUGGENHEIM: I suppose there's two paths you can take in responding to that question. One is a biological and technical path, and the answer is that the technology now exists to grow these fish and grow them out to a commercially-viable size, and to do that completely in indoor contained systems.

So it is doable. These fish are

healthy from a physiological perspective, and they are commercially viable.

I think there is another path, and that may be an ethical path. That is more of a gray area, something I don't think I can respond to because I would be giving you my own personal feelings about that. But I think all of us would have different perspectives on that.

I think it really comes down to the individual species and what their needs are. I think, from my perspective, I have seen eels, I have seen baramundi, the Asian sea bass. I think personally it comes down to the physiological health of these animals. If you look at them and they look healthy, and they don't appear to be adversely impacted at a physiological level, I think that is a good indication -- again, this is my personal belief -- that they are doing well, even if some of their behaviors have been affected.

I think there are others who might

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	suggest that it is just wrong to do that, but
2	I think that is more of a personal choice.
3	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
4	comments, questions?
5	(No response.)
6	Well, thank you very much.
7	MR. GUGGENHEIM: Thank you again.
8	CHAIRMAN DELGADO: On that note,
9	ladies and gentlemen, members of the Board, we
10	are finished with the public comment section
11	for day one of our meeting.
12	We will recess until tomorrow
13	morning at eight o'clock a.m. I will ask the
14	Board members to be here 10 minutes before the
15	hour.
16	I also would like to ask the Board
17	members to gather here to discuss logistics
18	about dinner.
19	Thank you very much for all of you
20	who stayed behind to listen to our meeting.
21	Until tomorrow.
22	(Whereupon, at 6:47 p.m., the

1	proceedings in the above-entitled matter were
2	recessed for the day, to reconvene the
3	following day, Wednesday, May 21, 2008, at
4	8:00 a.m.)
5	
6	