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8:02 a.m.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Please take your places, we are about to start. Good morning to all and we're starting with day 2 of our meeting. And I am calling the meeting to order. Thank you, Madam Secretary, make it official. Thank you for that, as well, Julie. I hope you all had a pleasant rest last night. We have a heavy schedule today. We're going to start with a presentation on materials and recommendations on the part of all the committees, and then we'll follow with another session of public comment. In the first place, $I$ would like to ask the Chair of the Policy Committee, Dr. Barry Flann, to give us his presentation on the recommendations on both the changes to the policy and procedure manual and also to the new member guide. Barry.

MEMBER FLANN: I always need lots of help. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Policy Committee, everything we do is a real team
effort and the committee consists of Bea James, Hu Karreman and our Chair Rigo Delgado. And today it will be no different. I'll lead off with the first of our recommendations and then Hu is going to report on our other recommendations and then followed finally with Valerie Francis who always gives us tremendous help on every committee meeting and Valerie will make the final report on -- from the Policy Committee.

Our first recommendation is a change in the Policy Development Manual, on Section 1 page 6 of the NOSB Mission Statement under carrying out the mission, we propose adding the words, "or deletion from". The statement would then read, "Review petition materials for inclusion and/or deletion from the national list of approved and prohibited substances from the national list". This is to conform with the language in the regulations and yesterday there was a number of comments on this very subject.

The second recommendation, Section 1 page 6 of the NOSB Mission Statement under
carrying out the mission, combine Items 4 and 6, also add "timely" in the statement and "make full use of communication channels". The statement would then read, "Communicate with the organic community, including conducting public meetings, soliciting and taking public comments and provide timely information and education on the NOP, making full use of communication channels". That's the recommended changes in the -- the first recommended changes and Hu will carry on from here.

MEMBER KARREMAN: Thank you, Barry. The second change -- let's see, it's number 3, right, Barry?

MEMBER FLANN: Number 3.
MEMBER KARREMAN: On Section 8 of the National Organic Program material review process, we want to add the paragraph describing how we deal with petitions, their handling if they're withdrawn by the petitioner and the proposed paragraph would be placed immediately after Phase 6, page 35 and it would read regarding withdrawal
of petitions, "When a petition involving materials are withdrawn by the petitioner, the Board shall suspend its review and recommendation procedure. In the case of a petition not involving a material, board members have the option of completing its review and providing a recommendation or guidance. In the case of a petition previously withdrawn is then resubmitted, the Board should review it in the order that it is received. That means that a withdrawn petition should be considered a completely new request and then falls to the end of the queue of materials pending review. And of course, the petitioner can withdraw a petition at any moment during the process of review by the Board during public comment or prior to the Board's voting on the petition. So petitioner should have the opportunity to withdraw a petition with the intent of improving it, getting new information, new data, research and only that. It is the hope of the Board that petitioners will not abuse this privilege with the intent of finding agreeable
members in subsequent submissions as our Board changes over." So you can withdraw a petition to add research data, resubmit it, but it will go to the end of the line and you can do that at any time. Okay?

The other update we want to do to the New Member Guide is that we want some of the NOSB members suggested the addition of two sections to the New Member Guide which include adding hyperlinks to past Board recommendations and also a list of common technical sources that we can use as Board members and that should improve the process of conducting our business and training of incoming members to get them up to speed as needed.

So the recommendation would be -recommends two updates to the New Member Guide document, addition to Chapter 5, Section B, suggested best practices, making the most of your conference calls and meetings, of a descriptive paragraph and a link to the final NOSB recommendation table and also addition to Chapter

5 suggested best practices of a new section called F, list of common technical sources used by NOSB members. So that's the two recommendations. I can go in a little more detail for Recommendation 1.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: I think that will be enough.

MEMBER KARREMAN: Is that enough?
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Anything else you want to add, Barry, to that?

MEMBER FLANN: No, not to that.
MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes, as Valerie is scrolling through there, there's a whole long list of hyper-links to various government agencies and NGOs and other professional societies that would be added into the New Member Guide which should be pretty helpful. And we should be open to adding to that kind of as needed. I don't know if that might have to be in the recommendation that it's open for updating.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: It doesn't have to be in the recommendation and I think it is well-
understood that it will be a living document and updated as needed. Are there any questions for the members of the Policy Committee. Yes. MEMBER FLANN: There's still one, we'll let Valerie make her report and -CHAIRMAN DELGADO: I apologize for that.

MEMBER FLANN: -- and then we'll take questions.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Please, Mr.
Chairman, continue. Before that, let me allow Mr. Richards to provide us some comment. I believe this might be relevant. Yes, sir.

MR. MATTHEWS: I just have one question with regard to the timing of the withdrawal.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Mr. Richards, can you hold on, on that, please? Matthews, I'm sorry. It's quite early. I apologize. Let's listen to the last item presented by the Policy Committee and then we'll come back and answer specific questions. Valerie, please.

MS. FRANCIS: One thing that's been
requested a lot is having a list of all historical recommendations by the NOSB and sort of their status. And some go back, way back, 1993, `94, `95. And as people ask questions, too, about recommendations that are sort of lost in the institutional memory, I've been collecting those questions and indicating where they are, in what meeting of what page, of what transcript, little by little and I've amassed quite a document.

They recently -- they've been going through a process of migrating the entire website, so now I'm going to have to go back and update all those links. And so just communicating the status of we're working towards it. It's one of those projects that you tuck in and you do as you go and it's -- I'm hoping it will be a useful thing. I'm not quite sure how it will all fit in on the new website but my webmaster will work with me on that as we get closer to bringing that forward. So, just to let you know, I'm working on it.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, now, we're open to questions. Mr. Matthews.

MR. MATTHEWS: I just need a little clarification on the withdrawal and then resubmission. Clearly a petitioner can withdraw their petition at any time. But is it my understanding or is my understanding correct that once the Department has spent thousands of dollars reviewing the material, and the report comes out, that the person would be allowed to resubmit so the Department would spend thousands of dollars a second time?

MEMBER KARREMAN: I would -- can I try to answer that?

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Please, yes. MEMBER KARREMAN: I would think that with the resubmission process that it's limited to just new data that you would only need to take that into account on top of what was already accomplished. That would be my understanding, but -- or my thinking.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: That seems to be the spirit of the proposal, is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

MEMBER FLANN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Are you satisfied with that response?

MR. MATTHEWS: Yes, I'll want to think about it more, though. I mean, I just have a problem with, you know, spending thousands of taxpayer dollars to rereview something, so we'd have to work with the contractor to make sure that we weren't repaying for everything. It's still going to be expensive to re-analyze the material with the new data. So I mean, I will still cost us a lot of money.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: But just to clarify, you're saying that you will not have to start from zero; is that correct?

MR. MATTHEWS: Oh, I would think we would not have to start from zero but I'm not saying that it wouldn't be of substantial cost to do it a second time.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: We have Jennifer, correct, followed by Dan -- well, Dan, followed by Tina. Dan.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: Mr. Matthews, I believe the -- and maybe it would need some clarification. I believe the intention of the recommendation is regarding the NOSB. It's not a directive to the NOP that if it's a completed petition and it's been fully reviewed, the we're requesting that you re-review it. It's just a matter of us trying to prioritize the materials and the volume of materials that come to us that we try and deal -- get the older materials that have been sitting on our desk for a long period of time, we try and get those taken care of.

The intent, $I$ believe in this, is simply saying that the date that we're going to look at is when we receive this document, when we receive the petition is not three years ago and now that the petitioner has said, "Reactivate that petition", we are faced with looking at something, "Well, that's -- we've had this for three years". It's to say that we've had this as of today and the one we got last month, we received from the program last month, has time-wise a higher
priority than this one which received today even if this one has been in existence for three years.

I think it's an NOSB directive, not an NOP at all.

MR. MATTHEWS: Okay, so then I would understand that what you're saying is that they would withdraw the petition long enough to submit additional information to the Board and the Board would be acting on that without going back to the contractor for additional work.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: That would be your decision but it wouldn't be impacted by this recommendation. That would be just, you know, Bob's normal evaluation of petitions as they come through and new material, new information comes through.

MR. MATTHEWS: Okay.
MEMBER GIACOMINI: But we've had some petitions in the recent past that have been withdrawn and the petitioners just like come back and say, "Okay, we want you to look at it again now". I'm not even aware that they submitted any
new information.
MR. MATTHEWS: Okay.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Tina.
MEMBER ELLOR: Can I ask what happens now to petitions that are withdrawn officially? I guess that would be a question for Richard.

MR. MATTHEWS: That's going to depend on what had already taken place previously. I mean, if the petition came in and it was withdrawn before we did a TAP, well, then obviously, it would go to the Board and then they would create whatever questions they have for the reviewers, and then it would go out for the TAP review. MEMBER ELLOR: If it was reinstated or withdrawn? So, yes, I think the issue is here, petitions that have gone through the process, it looked like it wasn't going to go the way the petitioner wanted, so they were withdrawn. What happens with those now?

MR. MATTHEWS: Bob? Normally, when they're withdrawn there's nothing that happens with them. They're done.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: But I think the concern is, do you destroy those documents or the record has disappeared or what's happened? Is that your question?

MEMBER ELLOR: Right, yes, they're still on the -- you know, the spreadsheet with a -- sort of an open -- go ahead.

MR. POOLER: This is Bob Pooler, NOP. If the petition is withdrawn, then that is the end of that petition. Then a new petition -- if the substance were to be brought up again, a new petition would have to be submitted. If the petition is going to be considered at a later time, then the petition is deferred until such time as the supplemental information is provided and taken up and put back on the work plan of the respective committee.

MEMBER ELLOR: Okay, and deferred is a decision we make and withdrawal is a decision the petitioner makes.

MR. POOLER: Well, yes, essentially, yes.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other questions?
Kevin?
MEMBER ENGELBERT: Did the committee give any thought to -- with your concern that the petitioners will not abuse the privilege of being able to withdraw a petition until more favorable or agreeable members in subsequent meetings?

Did you give any thought to not accepting a resubmission unless there was new material presented with the petition so that it couldn't simply be held?

MEMBER KARREMAN: I think he means, basically that if they resubmit it, there has to be new data. We need to require that instead of pulling it and sending it back in three years later when there's different board members. Is that what you're saying, Kevin, just to make sure there's new data, you know, as we're asking for specify that. Okay?

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, that is a proposal presented by one of the members, good. Well-articulated. Mr. Chairman, would you like to
add something to that?
MEMBER FLANN: Well, I think that was discussed and I believe we felt that we could not limit somebody submitting a petition. I mean, essentially, we're treating it like it's a new petition and they could submit anything they wanted to, so we really couldn't control it. But we did discuss that several times. So maybe that's either a legal point or a procedural point that could be cleared up, whether we could require that. I think I'm right, Rigo, that we thought in final that we could not limit what somebody submitted. It was up to them and not up to us to determine that. Am I correct?

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: That is correct and there is also a good proposal. My recommendation would be for the committee to get together and discuss that specific item and see if you need to make any additions to your current recommendation. Okay?

MEMBER FLANN: And I think we probably would need some guidance on that point.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Will do. So it's up to the committee and we'll be able to discuss that. Any other question for policy? Jennifer, followed by Dan.

MEMBER HALL: My comments have to do with the resource list and I think it will be quite helpful to new members, and I would just like to encourage and solicit the aquaculture working group to compose a list of links that we could add to this, that would be pertinent to those topics.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you. Dan.
MEMBER GIACOMINI: I'm concerned with in recommendation number 2, on the Policy and Procedure Manual, the expectation that you're potentially placing on Board members with the statement "making full use of communication channels". We're all volunteer Board members. We have certain things that we can get to and certain things that we can't. I can kind of see this as becoming an expectation that we're going to be expected to be on all the 0 sites.

If someone calls and says, "I've got a meeting 500 miles away, come and tell us what's going on at the NOSB", it just seems like there's a potential expectation/burden that is -- could be placed on from this wording that I'm a little concerned with. We're volunteers and we're putting in all the time, sometimes more time than we can afford now.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Response.
MEMBER KARREMAN: I think I can answer that, Dan. The intent of that was not that. The intent is that to make full use of the internet, snail mail, all kinds of communication that way such that farmers that are not on the internet will be apprised of information. Wasn't that what we were talking about?

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: I believe that was the intent. Correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Chairman.

MEMBER FLANN: No, that is correct. We wanted to make sure that as we go more and more in the internet communication, that we did not forget
about people that were not so connected, that we provide information to them also and it was felt that we -- I guess we never thought about it the way you're describing as putting a burden on it. We just wanted to make sure we had a policy of getting information out to all the stakeholders and all the publics we deal with and they receive this information in a timely manner, that it's meaningful and what they were doing. And it's -and I think we feel that that is a role, an important role of the Board is the communication with the public. And we just -- we're trying to strengthen that a little bit in the manual.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any clarifications that you would like to submit then? Was that a clear explanation?

MEMBER GIACOMINI: It's a clear
explanation of your intent. I just -- I'm not sure that that's -- you know, a year down the road when someone is reading that, I'm not sure that that's going to be the same as what their expectation is going to be from reading that statement.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, thank you. Jeff.

VICE-CHAIR MOYER: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. Hu, I've got a question for you regarding that same topic because you do tend to work with a lot of non-internet connected folks in your practice. Are they made aware of these meetings? Do they know they exist? Do they know they can make public comment? Do they choose not to? I know we did see one letter that was scanned into the system but is that something that they know they can do currently, since everything is posted on regulations.gov, which is not within their purview?

MEMBER KARREMAN: Since you asked about my farmers, let's say, my clients that I work with, I would say that in my personal communication with them out in the barns, they know a meeting is about to happen or has happened. They want to know what's going on. I would say you know, we had our meeting in State College,
which is about as close to Lancaster County where I'm from, as it will ever be. Well, Baltimore is pretty close, too, and they weren't really there. So I think that's not because there's not communication of meetings coming up. I'm not so sure that they have time to get away or they have the absolute interest that others may. But I think they should not be neglected as far as communication channels. Does that help?

I mean, that was the intent basically. VICE-CHAIR MOYER: Well, just I'm a little concerned, you know, with Dan's comment and thinking about like what Valerie might have to do. You're going to have to put a notice in the mail of all these things? I mean, how are you going to -- we don't have their addresses.

MEMBER KARREMAN: Well, I think what we were -- the discussion, if I remember right, was mainly talking about the internet and the hyperlinks and it was kind of -- and I said, "Whoa, whoa, whoa, hold on, you know, my farmers don't use that", and that's why we came up with a
more inclusive statement rather than just kind of quick internet, you know, expression of the news or hyperlinks.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Is that clear?
Kevin.
MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes, if I understand this recommendation properly, the only changes that are made are the underlying words "timely", and "making full use of communication channels". The italicized that aren't underlined were already part of the recommendation. So there's no real huge change as far as what's required. It's just the emphasis on using all means to communicate.

VICE-CHAIR MOYER: That was the intent.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Good clarification. Any other comments, questions? Very well. Well, thank you very much. That was a clear presentation, lively discussion. Appreciate that and we can move onto the next topic which involved the Materials Committee and I will yield to my colleague, Mr. Dan Giacomini.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. The presentation from the Materials Committee, we do not have a voting action item under discussion today for this meeting but this portion of the meeting will be a tag-team between myself and some members of -- the co-chairs of the Materials Working Group and so within our time frame, we're trying to devote as much time toward the discussion of that document as possible. As a result, I'm going to give a short presentation, hopefully short presentation on the materials, an update on the material status of things, but it's not as complete as I've given in the past and I will -- I could possibly go over some things fairly quickly that are even on the slides purely as an essence of time, not a matter of trying to get around any information.

But we've gotten back in the habit of doing this on a regular basis at meetings and you can go back to prior meetings and look at those presentation documents for a more full explanation of things.

So to move onto that, we'll have a
brief discussion of the National List of Allowed and Proved Substances Petitioned and Sunset Review Items, the material view process, national list criteria, sunset review criteria and some final notes. Next slide.

The National List of Allowed and Proved Substances is broken down into crops, livestock and handling, Section 601, synthetic -- for crops it's synthetic allowed, 602 is non-synthetics prohibited. For livestock, Section 603 is synthetics allowed, 604 non-synthetics prohibited. For handling Section 605 is non-agricultural, nonorganic substances allowed. Section A is nonsynthetics and Section $B$ is synthetic materials. So all non-agricultural, non-organic in processing as opposed to livestock and crops must be on the National List.

606 for handling non-organically
produced agricultural products allowed as ingredients in or on processed products labeled inorganic. The petitioned items and sunset review items for this meeting, status at the time of this
meeting, we have recommendations for 601 with three items as listed. 603 has two items as listed, one of those having two separate recommendations. We have no 605 item recommendations being considered at this meeting. Section 606, we have, I believe it is 20 items being considered at this meeting. Sunset items at this meeting, we have tartaric acid being reviewed for sunset, for its listing both on 605A and 605B and we will be reaffirming -- voting to reaffirm or not the sunset recommendations from the fall 2000 meeting, so that we are following the proper governmental guidelines that we give -in case there was any consideration, reconsideration due to additional public comment that was allowed in the timing from the posting of the Federal Register Notice on sunset.

At the time of this meeting, in the NOSB pipeline, that's our pipeline not the NOP's pipeline, we have the substances listed by the sections shown. And you'll see underneath 606 is asterisk next to yeast, that is a petition to
consider the transferring of yeast from 605 to 606.

And the material review process, it is a minimum time frame for the National Review Materials' review of 145 days being an absolutely minimum. That's not necessarily what happens, but that is the minimum. Under the material review process a minimum of 14 working days for the petition to be received by the NOP and reviewed for completeness and upon determination of completeness by the NOP, the petition is forwarded to the NOSB materials chair. That is the optimal situation if the petition is perfect at its original submission. This could take much longer as communication goes back and forth between the program and the petitioner. Once the material is passed on, the petition is passed onto the NOSB and the materials chair, the materials chair forwards the petition to chairman of the designated NOSB committee, crops, livestock or handling that would be handling and evaluating that petition substance. The petition is re-
evaluated for completeness, determination of requesting a TAP and that information is passed back to the program.

So that is the time frame at the beginning of the process. At the end of the process, 60 days prior to the NOSB meeting, the TAPs have been received by the program and sent back to the -- they're sent onto the NOSB. The TAP is reviewed. It's posted on the NOP website for review and public comment. Committee recommendations are posted and within 45 days prior to the meeting, public comment is accepted by the NOP and posted on the website. So we have a beginning time line and an end time line. Do not assume that those two time lines that we're talking about are necessarily touching. There could be -- there's constant work on the petitions, but it does take time and that's why we're talking a minimum of 145 days.

At the NOSB meeting, the committee recommendations are submitted. Further comments are accepted from the public and all public
comments are taken into consideration, and action is taken by the full Board regarding the committee recommendation. During the entire process, we need to remind everyone that all communication between petitioners and the NOSB should go through the National Organic Program.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, just a reminder, and excuse me. Let's make sure we have our phones off and we do have someone paying for drinks tonight. We'll take care of recording the name later. Please continue.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: National List criteria, and for all general substances, petition -- the potential of such substance for detrimental chemical interactions with other materials using organic farming, the toxicity and mode of action of the substance and of its breakdown products. Number 3, probability of environmental contamination from use or misuse and the effect of the substance on human health, and number 5, the effect of the substance on biological and chemical interactions in the agro-eco system.

Number 6, alternatives used to using the substance and the compatibility with a system of sustainable agriculture. The one section that I did cut severely from previous documents is discussed in the processing age and age events, since we had none of those being discussed on the National List at this meeting, for the matter of time, I deleted that section and please refer to the Fall 2007 Meeting Materials Presentation for reference.

For 606 which is agriculture and potential commercial unavailability or potential fragility of supply, NOSB will consider why the substance should be permitted in the production or handling of organic product. Current industry information regarding availability and history of unavailability of the organic form and the appropriate form quality or quantity of the substance. The industry information includes but is not limited to region of production and the number of suppliers and amount produced.

Current and historical supplies related
to weather is also considered. Trade related issues and any other issues that may be present -that may present a challenge to consistent supply. The sunset review criteria taken from OFPA, no exemption or prohibition contained in the National List shall be valid unless the National Organics Standards Board has reviewed such exemption or prohibition as provided in this section within five years of such exemption or prohibition being adopted or reviewed by the Secretary has renewed -- and the Secretary has renewed each exemption or prohibition. So everything needs to be reviewed by five years, reasserted by the program, by the Board in order for relisting.

The sunset process is not used to petition a new item or substance of the National List and it is not used to change an existing annotation. Now, the sunset review criteria, the NOSB must solicit information and comments to reevaluate substances against the same criteria used for National List posting. New evidence must be presented to overturn a prior Board's decision and
remove an item from the National List. Exemptions were accepted because the evidence allowed showed substances were found to be not harmful to human health or the environment. The substances were necessary because of the unavailability of synthetic alternatives and/or the substances were consistent and compatible with organic practices.

Final note, all public comments are currently handled through regulations.gov website, handled according to the appropriate Federal Register docket and governmental agency. The new process sets deadlines for having public comment posted prior to the meeting and all public comment received by the NOP will be made available and is made available to the NOSB members for review in advance of the respective vote whenever possible.

And finally, a listing of relevant websites for the National Organic Program, National Organic Standards Board and regulations.gov. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: You're welcome. Any questions? Julie?

MEMBER WEISMAN: Hello?
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: It is working. MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay. I just -- I am very reluctant to take any time away from the second part of the materials presentation this morning. However, in terms of 606 and in light of some issues that have been raised during the written public comment period and the spoken public comment period yesterday, I wanted to acknowledge two situations.

One, the slide that was up there had a little note at the bottom that no TAP reviews for 606 items. And while that is the case currently, there was public -- there -- it has come to light through very thoughtful public comment in the last few months that some of the items on -- that notation assumed that single agricultural products, raw or processed, were what were being petitioned and that was a common sense notation, that those should not be TAP reviews. It has been pointed out that a number of the color materials that were petitioned at the last meeting are
formulated products and do need to be looked at further. So I just want to say that I think that, that -- not that there will be whole TAP reviews but it is understood that those materials need to be looked at more carefully, not just assumed that it's all agricultural product in there.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Just as a
clarification, so you'll be treating each case on a case-by-case basis?

MEMBER WEISMAN: Well, $I$ don't even -you know, I think that we haven't even really -we haven't had a full and depth of discussion as a committee even, the Handling Committee or enough discussion with the program yet about how to respond, but I did want to acknowledge these very well thought out comments were made and that was not ignorant of them.

The second thing that has come up during comment is that you read a list of the evaluation criteria for 606 items, and I also wanted to point out that more than one comment has been made in recent weeks about which of -- we put
a lot of work recently into the evaluation criteria that are specific to 606 in terms of evaluating the supply and the fragility of the supply. But there are other criteria, evaluation criteria, that do apply to 606 items just like 605 $A$ and $B$ items not the same ones, and many of them are not applicable and it may -- we will also need to look and make that more consistent and have it be very clear which ones are -- very clear, you know, like question by question by question and that that is also something that we are not -we're not ignoring.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Dan.
MEMBER GIACOMINI: The development of the TAP process has evolved a bit. It's a fairly new development that I don't have a full grasp of but there was discussion at the program level with other branches of the government or other offices, I guess is the more proper term, regarding the TAP status of the 606 items that we did pass.

The absolute -- as I understand -- do you want me to deal with this, Barbara, or do you
want to try and attack this?
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Barbara, can you clarify it, please?

MS. ROBINSON: The Board is the -- you are a technical advisory panel. You can do that TAPs on 606.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Dan, do you have - was that clear enough? Do you want to comment some more?

MEMBER GIACOMINI: No, I mean, that's the status from the program and you know, there -- I think it's going to be an evolving situation. We'll just see how it goes, what does need to be further outside review.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: And why way of clarification, we've discussed this at the Executive Committee level and we are in the process of redefining when to deal with the specific TAP, whether we need to farm it out to third parties or use our own resources within the program, because as pointed out, we have our inhouse expertise and we can always tap into that.

Yes, Julie.
MEMBER WEISMAN: Well, also I wanted to introduce the language that -- of a technical review is a word that we've been using which is a bigger concept than just a TAP which is a very specific thing that we normally and historically have associated with outside contractors. Is that a fair distinction?

MS. ROBINSON: What's your question, Julie?

MEMBER WEISMAN: The technical review, as we have been discussing it lately as distinct from what we have historically farmed out to subcontractors which were always called TAPs.

MS. ROBINSON: Correct.
MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: And also the Policy
Committee has part of their work plan to help out and develop the procedures as to -- to identify when to use those different resources, outside or inside resources. Any other questions? First of all, have you concluded? Okay, do you wish to proceed with some other item?

MEMBER GIACOMINI: Yes. The next item under the material section for this morning is a presentation from the Materials Working Group. I believe Kim and Gwendolyn are going to offer up that presentation, if they would come up, please.

MS. DIETZ: Good morning. We practiced but we didn't figure out who was going to stand or sit. We're going to dance, too. Okay, good morning. My name is Kim Dietz and most of you know me but for the new member, I'm a past NOSB member, five years. I chaired the Materials Handling Group and was a Handler Representative. So at the last meeting, I kindly volunteered to handle something called -- or to form something called the Materials Working Group. And Gwendolyn and I co-chair that group.

I just want to read to you the summary. And you've all received a copy of our paper. On the last page, "The members of the Materials Working Group represent a broad spectrum of backgrounds and segments of the industry. All of
us have strong opinions about the subject with extensive implications for the meaning of an organic label and its potential for application to all aspects of food and agriculture, including a host of other consumer goods that were not considered with OFPA was drafted.

We recognize that it would not be easy to resolve many issues surrounding the definition of non-agricultural substances and its impacts on what products may or may not eventually be able to be organically produced." There's 22 individuals on this working group. Most of us have been in the industry for a very long time and to say the least, our conversations were heated many times, but I think we're working very good and functioning very well together.

> I'd just like to take a moment to tell
you that the group is independent. We're not an affiliation of a task force of the NOSB. We're not an organic trade association working group. We are individuals and the purpose of that was so that everybody could be welcome and we encourage
everybody to participate. So anybody out there who wants to join out group, please come see Gwendolyn and I at some point.

The other thing, I'd like to thank OTA because they did offer us to use their conference line weekly. Twenty-two people on a weekly basis was very expensive, I'm sure. So thank you, OTA. And they also volunteered Grace because she needs time to draft the documents. We couldn't have done it without Grace, so Grace, thank you as well.

With that, I'm going to just turn it over to Gwendolyn. We're going to kind of tagteam this a little bit. We want to get right into the meat of it because there was a lot of questions about the working group and the different alternatives, so Gwendolyn.

MS. WYARD: Okay, quite the topic for this early morning. Valerie, I'll just give you the key there when to turn over. I want to jump right into the definition of non-agricultural. This is the little bugger that's put us into this
fine mess. The definition is ambiguous. The first part of the definition, it has a couple examples. Mineral, minerals have gone largely uncontested. Bacterial cultures, on the other hand, that's really been the stumbling block for three plus years now. We haven't really moved the discussion forward.

The very important discussion that we've been having but it's been whether yeast and other micro-organisms that are cultured on organic substrate can be considered agricultural. That's really where the focus of the discussion has been. The second half of this definition is even more complicated. The idea expressed is that a fraction of an agricultural product can be nonagricultural if the agricultural identity is no longer recognizable. But how do we quantify or qualify words like "identity" or "unrecognizable"? Is it how it looks, how it tastes, how it smells? Is it DNA analysis? Is it memory? How do we recognize something? And if a picture tells 1,000 words, up in the left-hand, top left-hand corner
that's a quar plant and on the top right-hand corner is a pile of white powder. I can't tell what agricultural product that pile of white powder came from but it is in fact, quar gum. And gums are provided as an example as a nonagricultural product. However, quar gum is listed on 606 as an agricultural product.

Xanthan gum, however, is listed as a non-agricultural synthetic in 605. That's an orange down in the left-hand corner and you can't see it, but that's a little bowl of kind of an oily yellow substance. That's essential oil. I can't tell that it came from an orange, but I know that it came from an orange and natural flavors are listed on 605 as a non-agricultural product. Essential oils meet the FDA definition of a natural flavor, readily available in organic form, but certifiers do not require people to use organic essential oil because they're listed on 605 as non-agricultural.

So the current fine mess, as I put it, derives from the presumption that a substance
categorized as a non-agricultural substance product, cannot be organically produced since Section 205-102 requires that only an agricultural product can be labeled as organic. However, substances listed as non-agricultural are available in organic form because they're either derived from an agricultural product which fits the definition of non-agricultural, or and this is very important, they're manufactured using at least 95 percent agricultural material by weight or volume at formulation.

So one or more of their components, 95 percent are agricultural. The whole kit and caboodle is not agricultural but it can be organic as long as the rest of the five percent complies with the composition requirements. So examples that we have are natural flavors, yeast, glycerine, that was the case with colors when they were on 605. So the status of a substance becomes hot to touch, because it determines its placement on the national list, its legibility for certification and whether it's subject to
commercial availability.
Another central and complicating factor
in this discussion is that some of the substances listed on 605 and 606 such as kelp, yeast, bacteria, are permitted as non-synthetic additives and supplements in livestock feed. If they're classified as agricultural, processors can use them when they're commercially available in organic form, while livestock producers must use organic if they're agricultural, regardless of their availability in the right quantity, quality or form. So the composition requirements are different between processed products for humans versus the livestock composition requirement. It creates an inequity if you have processors allowed for commercial availability but livestock producers would have to use the organic form. So that's the problem in a nutshell. This is the problem that this group tried to tackle and Kim's going to provide you with additional background on where we've come from. So next slide, please, thank you. And I forgot to
do that next slide, but $I$ already said all that, so good morning, all right.

MS. DIETZ: Okay, very quickly, the background for this. The Materials Working Group, when we first started this, we took about a month to put together a binder, and Gwendolyn has a copy of that binder right there. It's a huge binder, but we felt was important that we had all the historical background on all of the issues regarding ag and non-ag. So we went back and gathered definitions. We went back and took past recommendations from the Board.

So we really wanted to make sure everybody started with the same foundation. Then we took and became what brought forward to you this paper. So just from a background from an NOSB perspective, in July 2005, there was some guidance on the definition of agricultural based on taxonomy. At that time, yeast was classified as a non-agricultural and not having any fruiting bodies. So this issue even goes back before that because I think Gwendolyn even through organ till
had brought up a discussion paper in 2003 or 2004. So this is an ongoing issue.

In September 2006, public comment demonstrated that yeast fit under livestock and the recommendation at that time recognized yeast to be agricultural. In October 2007, we had the new paradigm, continuum approach and public comment denoted that the past NOSB work was not incorporated, so thus, we have the Materials Working Group to help you so that you can fold in all aspects. We know that we need to have a new paradigm, but we also don't want to lose sight of the past work that the Board has done.

And another one of the issues we have is that this seemed to be focused around yeast, when it's really not -- it is the problem but the bigger problem is just the definition of agricultural and non-agricultural. Next slide, please.

Okay, from -- when we started this project, we actually took that last paradigm recommendation and we wanted to globally look at
synthetic, non-synthetic, ag, non-ag and a lot of the other issues that needed to be resolved. However, in the sake of time and focus, Dan and I and the group said let's just work on ag and nonag right now.

So what we did is we focused the group, we tried to develop a definition of agricultural that would enable everything else to be nonagricultural. So in the book or in the packet that you have, there's a great appendices of the different definitions of agricultural and Rich Stewart did a great job of putting that together for us.

Some of the discussion on if or how to eliminate the need to distinguish between agricultural and non-agricultural, and those are the options that Gwendolyn is going to go through in just a minute with you. We did have a lot of disagreement on whether an agricultural product must be produced on a soil-based farm which is also going on in some other discussions in other areas as well. And we also had ongoing
disagreement about whether all life is agricultural if managed by persons for human or livestock consumptions.

There's also included in our paper a list of questions that need further clarification and a lot of this discussion is -- will be vetted out in those questions and the group is committed to taking this the whole way and any other issues that you want us to help you vet out as well.

So our next slide is options to consider and we've put a chart together to help go through all of these different options. We don't have B plus or triple D or option $F$ or organ tills on there. We stopped at a point which we knew you needed a recommendation or a paper to talk about but we will take everything that's based out of this meeting and take it back to the group and come forward again with probably just a couple options so that we don't have so many to consider. MS. WYARD: Could you go back to A? There we go. Okay, I'm going to run through A, B, $C, D, E$ and $F$, try to give you just the focus on
how it would effect commercial availability, the definition of non-agricultural micro-organisms and then the effect on livestock so that we can kind of compare and contrast and get you comfortable with what these options represent. But first, I really want to drive home that these are ideas that were discussed by the group as possible scenarios. They're avenues to be explored. They're not recommended actions. They're not comprehensive and they're in no order of preference, so there's the disclaimer. And also, you know, additional analysis is needed in a huge way on the potential impact of each of these on the industry.

So this is really just to get everybody's juices flowing, start looking at some different solutions, possible solutions, some working within the box, some outside the box. So A is status quo. This is the current situation that we're in. You know, it's been going on for three plus years now. Most people don't really find the current situation, the current definition
of non-agricultural to be acceptable. As we worked through all the various options and worked through our discussion, I think there were some people that said, "Actually status quo is not so bad, let's figure out a way to work this out through guidance documents, other discussion. Let's just keep it as it is," but, you know, we're in a situation where the materials that are on 605 and 606 don't represent definitions. They don't represent what's available out there in organic form. So I think that most people agree that there is going to need to be some regulation change. We don't want to touch OFPA but we think that there's going to need to be some regulation change.

So with Option B, Option B drops nonagricultural from the regulation all together. Okay, it removes the definition and it also removes the word "non-agricultural" from the heading of 605. Commercial availability would apply to all items listed on 605 and 606. Microorganisms would be retained on 605 unless they're
viewed as clearly agricultural. We still are retaining the word, "agricultural" in 606 but removing non-agricultural from 605. So basically, it leaves everything listed on 605 as ambiguous. We're not identifying it as being either agricultural or non-agricultural.

The -- so it still leaves us needing to determine what is clearly agricultural, which is a potential problem, and it also is a potential problem is if you don't clearly identify something as agricultural, if it was on 605, could it be organic, since 205-102 requires agricultural products to be organic. And then as far as how it affects livestock, it depends on you know, whether the substance in question is listed on 605 or 606, so that one wasn't really clear.

In C , the definition of non-
agricultural is retained, but it's changed to drop bacterial culture. So mineral would be included. The whole second half of the definition, the problematic one that talks about isolated extracted, that whole part is lopped off.

Bacterial culture is dropped, mineral is retained as the only example.

So commercial availability, no change. It applies to 606 listings, and then microorganisms would be petitioned for listing on 606, because bacterial culture, the idea here, bacterial culture would be dropped, so they would be able to be petitioned to 606. And then, in that case, it would require organic yeast to be used in feed, and I put that asterisk there because there's some question as to the interpretation of whether or not supplements need, in livestock, need to be organic.

There's clarification on the NOP Q\&A website that supplements do not need to be organic, but there's also clarification that any agricultural component of the feed needs to be organic. So an example is a lick bucket. The lick bucket, the mineral part of it wouldn't need to be organic, but the molasses in there would need to be organic. So, if you're requiring the agricultural carrier in a supplement or a mineral
to be organic, one would presume that, if you classify the supplement itself as agricultural, that would also need to be organic. But there is some question about that interpretation. So, and if there was a clarification that supplements are just either synthetic or non-synthetic, than this whole question of livestock supplements, agricultural yeast needing to by used, would go away.

Okay, next slide. Option D, Option D changes the definition of non-agricultural. It retains mineral and bacterial cultural. It applies -- commercial availability, then, would apply to 606, but not to 605. And the definition would be a substance that's not a product of agriculture, such as a mineral, or a bacterial culture. Micro-organisms would stay on 605, as per the guidance on the agricultural definition. So this Option D adopts the NOSB guidance on the definition of agricultural. This is guidance only. It's not a change to the OFPA definition on an agricultural product. It's just guidance that
talks about agricultural products being something that are managed by humans, and then it goes on to describe the types of organisms.

It breaks out, it looks at what organisms photosynthesize, which ones have fruiting bodies. So this is the guidance that basically draws a line between fruiting bodies and non-fruiting bodies, and it separates out, it basically draws the line as yeast as being nonagricultural, because they don't have fruiting bodies.

Micro-organisms, and then the effect on livestock; there would be no effect if they're viewed as non-agricultural, and listed on 605. So 605 items, they could be used in products that are going to be organic, but items listed on 605 wouldn't have to be sourced in organic form.

E adds a definition of an agricultural system. It adds a definition of an agricultural system, and it adds a definition for a nonagricultural system. The idea here is that, in considering public policy, and the intention of

Congress, it becomes necessary to further define the systems of agriculture that express the principles of organic farming. So for this reason, a definition of agricultural systems would be added, and this change would effectively remove the issue of what is agricultural, and it would focus on which products could be produced by an organic system.

The definition of an agricultural system would then determine the environments where organic integrity could be established, and further, this definition prevents the unrelenting expansion of organic into systems in which the regulation has not provided standards for. This option that is presented, the definition, in this one, is that it's a land-based system that cultivates soil-producing crops, livestock or poultry. So this option would only remove the issue of what is agricultural if everyone would agree that an agricultural system is a land-based system that cultivates soil producing crops, livestock, or poultry.

Micro-organisms, in this case, would remain on 605 unless they're raised in an agricultural system, and non-organic microorganisms would be allowed in feed, again, unless they're from an agricultural system. In F, we are merging 605 and 606. We're removing commercial availability from the regulation entirely, gone. It's either organic, or it's on the list.

Micro-organisms would be allowed as non-organic. They could be petitioned for removal specific to -- they could be petitioned for removal specific to available -- if they're available as organic, and then micro-organisms would remain on 605, 606, allowed as non-organic, removed, and if they were removed, the impact is not entirely clear.

So the idea here is that we're living in a world where, you know, our economy is based on supply and demand, and commercial availability doesn't work. So if you're using, either an organic ingredient, or something that's on the National List, and if the item on the National

List becomes available, then you petition to remove it, and we improve the system and the process for removing items from the National List once they become available in organic form.

So that's an overview of the options, and I want to -- as far as, at the end, with questions about these options, we want to invite members of our group up to address the various questions, because, you know, we all collectively had a hand in creating these different options, and certain individuals are going to be able to explain them much better than I can. So once we get to that point, all of you Material Working Group people out there, be ready, we might bring you on up here.

MS. DIETZ: Next slide. So in summary,
you can see this is a very confusing issue. Clarification is crucial, and the list needs to be cleaned up accordingly. And that, as you can see by all the different options, and definitions and list requirements should encourage the development of organic food ingredients and feed. Changes to
the regulation should be minimized, and resolution must be consistent with OFPA.

And this is for you folks; the NOSB needs to address the discussion questions, and further explore the impacts of the options presented, and explore additional options, and we certainly are there to help you with that, but our vision, I guess, is that we take the fact, we summarize even more so a couple of options, and work closely with the NOSB to help guide us on what you need from us next. And we're certainly willing to do that.

So with that, the discussion questions, and I know, just based for time, you get Nancy. Dan?

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any questions? Dan?
MEMBER GIACOMINI: Yes. I, fortunately or unfortunately, I'd like you to touch on one of the sections of the document that you didn't discuss that's outside of the options. One of the debates that we had at the last meeting was the concept of agricultural synthetic. I know, as a
member of the committee, and from reading the document, it looks like a product can lose its agricultural nature, and that an agricultural product can become a synthetic, according to this data, where it fits in our definitions.

Would -- could you, like, discuss that, and would you say whether -- is that a -- sort of the mind of the majority of the people, members on the committee, after that document was prepared? MS. DIETZ: Would you just go to the next slide, because that is one of the questions that we do need to clarify. So if you look down on the third one, Can agricultural product also be synthetic, if so, can it also be certified organic? So yes, we did discuss that in length. I don't -- unless there's somebody else here, I don't think we actually came up with a definite answer. This was a question that we do need to answer to move forward, and I can't say whether or not we had a majority that felt that it could or couldn't. By the time we got to these questions, we were on some of the last calls. So I would say
that we'll take that back, and we will answer these questions, as well, and hopefully, that's good enough. Go ahead.

MS. WYARD: I don't have an answer, but I just want to point to a little bit more of our discussion, and also to a committee working draft, an NOSB committee working draft document that you'll receive in your notebook. And it goes back to, it's the processing, handling and labeling committee working draft from 1993 on the organization, the setup of the National List, why things were placed where they were placed, and the thinking behind agricultural, non-agricultural, synthetic, and non-synthetic.

And one of the ideas in that document, which I just misplaced underneath of everything that was clever of me. Here we go. This is verbatim from that document. It says, the term synthetic should not include the effects of normal food processing activities. In other words, the term synthetic should not be applied to an otherwise non-synthetic substance that's
formulated or manufactured by processing, as processing is defined in the Act. In this respect, there's no such thing as a synthetic -wait, that stopped.

Okay, now I go on and say, "in this respect, taking that into consideration, there would be no such thing as a synthetic agricultural product, but a processed agricultural product. So, we have to keep in mind that, you know, that second part of the definition of non-agricultural is very, very important. If you decide to remove that second part, you're basically -- unless you provide guidance elsewhere, you're saying something starts out as agricultural, it's never going to lose its agricultural status. That second part is the part that you would want to point to and, you know, maybe work on further defining words like recognizable and identity. Can the agricultural ever be processed out of the agriculture?

And with the definition of processing that we have, lopping, chopping, mechanical, I
mean, it goes on and on and on, and ends up with saying, and otherwise manufacturing, we don't put any restrictions on processing. Some practices, yes, but generally speaking, you know, you can process the beegeegees out of something, and call it organic. So we have to be really careful if you -- you know, if you say something is synthetic, and it's organic. So, and I've always said, it's a processed agricultural product, versus a synthetic, because you have chemical changes.

If you look at the definition of synthetic, chemical changes occur, whether you're talking about the Maylard reaction, you know, cleaving of your -- if you're taking triglyceride, and, you know, breaking your fatty acids from your glycerine backbone, chemical change happens. It's my new bumper sticker. So I mean, that's just some food for thought in all of that.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: All right, thank
you. Any questions? We have the Secretary, followed by the Vice Chair.

SECRETARY HEINZE: I do not have a question, but I do have a thank you. Having participated on most of your calls, the amount of work contributed by everyone on the Material Working Group is astounding. I mean, you met for months every week. Everyone brought everything to those calls, and you had hefty debate. So it is greatly appreciated, and we're looking forward to partnering with you as we, hopefully, wrap this up sooner rather than later. So thank you.

MS. DIETZ: You're welcome.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Jeff.
VICE-CHAIR MOYER: I do have a question, Kim, but before I give you the question, I'd like to second what Katrina said. Having not been on any of these calls, but knowing the vast amount of work that these calls take, I also appreciate, along with the rest of the board, all the work you've done. But my question is really, I guess, for Gwen. Yesterday, you talked about the Tilth option, which was sort of a D plus, and somebody, I think it was Emily, talked about a B
plus version. How do those things change what you have in this summary chart, or what other things are in there that we might consider looking at?

MS. DIETZ: And we'll actually take those options back, as well, and add them on, and delete some off on these options, so that it's clear as a group recommendation, because we didn't look at the Tilth option, or the D plus, or the B as a group, so just out of process, we'll take that back, as well.

MS. WYARD: Okay, Valerie, can you go to the next slide for Option D? As far as addressing Emily's B plus, I would call Emily up here to cover that one. So Option Tilth is a variation of $D$. And the major changes is that we -- Option D adopts the 2005 clarification on the definition of agricultural, and that it goes on to split hairs, in my opinion, between the -- you know, basically looks at the taxonomy, and says, you know, this one photosynthesizes, and has fruiting bodies, therefore, it's agricultural, and this one does not, therefore, it's non-
agricultural. So we did not accept that entire guidance on the definition of agricultural.

The part that we did adopt, and again, this was guidance, and I think there might have been a misunderstanding yesterday. We're not suggesting a change to the definition of agricultural product at all. We're simply adopting guidance that would further explain that agricultural product, raw or processed, intended for human or livestock consumption, there's the OFPA definition. We're saying, further guidance would say that agricultural products are those that are managed by humans, and managed by humans is the intentional act of gathering, producing, raising, growing domestically in designated wild harvest areas by persons for human or livestock consumption. So that's the first changes that we have lopped off part of that guidance.

We've also changed the definition of non-agricultural in Option Tilth, and that definition was a substance that's not raised in or derived from an agricultural system, such as a
mineral, or an atmospheric gas, and then we've gone on, and we've said, for the purposes of this part, an non-agricultural ingredient is also anything technically impossible to be organically produced. That's the same definition that Emily has in B plus, but in Option D, we're still retaining -- we're removing the word nonagricultural from the 605 heading, so 605 become just non-organic ingredients; 606 are agricultural products.

We have a definition for nonagricultural. 605 is for ingredients, substances that cannot be organic. So in that list, you would have minerals, atmospheric gas, things that would be clearly non-agricultural. You also may have items that are not agricultural, but perhaps they could be organic, so citric acid. Because currently, now in time, it's not technically possible to have organic citric acid. People are working on it, but it requires the use of materials that aren't on the National List. So that would be an example of something that
technically can't be -- you know, be produced in organic form, now in time, but that could change. So then citric acid would go over to 606 once it becomes available in organic form.

Option B plus just applies commercial availability to both 605 and 606. And Emily, did you want to -- Emily?

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Before we --
Katrina, you had a question for Gwen.
SECRETARY HEINZE: I have a question about Option Tilth.

MS. WYARD: Okay.
SECRETARY HEINZE: So, if I understood what you just described correctly, would that mean that some of the items that we've recently put on 606 might better be on the --

MS. WYARD: 605?
SECRETARY HEINZE: -- the reclarified
605, so, for example, like, I'd have to think through some of the materials, but maybe something that couldn't be processed, and I'm going to make this up, so this may be factually incorrect, but

I'm hypothetical here, maybe like the soy protein concentrate, right, that starts as an agricultural, goes through some processing, cannot today be certified organic, but one could imagine in the future that it might be.

MS. WYARD: That's not --
SECRETARY HEINZE: Under Option Tilth, might that better exist under 605?

MS. WYARD: Yes, that's the idea, and it's an interesting discussion, because there are some people that feel that 606 items, they're -they're just agricultural. Whether or not they can, you know, maybe they're not available at all, because they can't be. For example, fish oil. The standards aren't there.

SECRETARY HEINZE: Right.
MS. WYARD: Or they're available, but not in the quantity, quality or form. So there are some people that, it's an agricultural product, it goes on 606, period. But there's another school of thought that you can't put -that anything that's on 606, it should be able to
be available in organic form. It should be able to make or source it in organic form.

If you're requiring operators to source it, well, there are no standards for it. If it's not out there as organic, it shouldn't be on there. So those are some --

SECRETARY HEINZE: But certainly some of the recent comments we've had about, maybe there's some processing aids, for lack of a better word, that are used to make some of those 606 items, those might better belong on 605. It's an interesting option.

MS. WYARD: Yes, that's what we were getting at. So, fish oil, for example, would be on --

SECRETARY HEINZE: That's lots to debate. MS. WYARD: Yes, yes.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: We appear to have two more questions, and I'd just remind you of the time. It's 9:25 at the moment, and please be brief. We'll start with --

MALE PARTICIPANT: I can wait till after.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Very good. Hu? MEMBER KARREMAN: I was just wondering if it's possible to hear from Brian Baker from OMRI, because they review a lot of materials. Do you have any input?

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Can we have a specific question, Hu?

MEMBER KARREMAN: Well, which option would you go for? If you want to hold off on --

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Brian, excuse me. Brian, I think we can skip on that. This is a discussion item, and we would need a precise question to address that. So I apologize for that, and I would like to go for that. I'm sorry, we're moving forward with --

MEMBER KARREMAN: I did ask the question, actually.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Let's go ahead, please.

MR. BAKER: The answer is real short.

OMRI sent it to the Advisory Council; we're discussing it. We're not -- we are open to all the options, and even those that are not put forward today.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Great, appreciate that shortness. Okay, we'll proceed with --

MS. BROWN-ROSEN: So you wanted me to say what was different about B plus compared to the --

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Yes.
MS. BROWN-ROSEN: It's very similar, it's very similar. The only difference really is that commercial availability applies to 605 -- did I lose you? You're scrolling up on the chart, okay -- on B, so basically, it's the same as B, you drop the title non-agricultural. So 605 is non-organic substances. We apply commercial availability to 605 and 606. So to me, what that does, I mean, it does all the benefits of what Gwendolyn was trying to promote there, same definition, but you don't have this crisis of, does it belong in 605 or 606. It's not as hard a
decision for the Board in the sense that, you know, wherever it is, if there's organic sources available, it has to be used.

And the fact that it's not clearly
identified as agricultural, non-agricultural in 605, I don't think that's a big problem. Mr. Siegel thinks it's a problem, because he thinks that use must be identified as agricultural in order for it to be sold as organic, but with the proposed definition, I think it works. I mean, you have -- if it can be made organically, technically possible, then actually we would be considering it agricultural.

So, I mean, you know, not everything in the world is on 606, and yet we certify all these things. So, I think it's got flexibility. We probably need lawyers to look at this, but I just think it makes the decision making easier, and it -- we also did do these decision trees, which we can revise to show these new options. I would encourage you to go back to look at those. I think it will become much easier to work through
those once we've cleaned up this type of definition.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you. Followup question. Yes, Joe?

MEMBER SMILLIE: It's a general question to the group, and I'm sure you guys thought of this, but did anybody consider -because again, organic is like, considered a soil base, but yet, you can do things organically for some of these things that are not considered agriculture.

Did anybody consider going beyond 607, and creating a 608 for non-soil based, possibly organically certified or grown products, such as the infamous yeast, and many others?

MS. GERSHUNY: Well, we didn't discuss that specifically, although Gwendolyn did make it clear, I think in her, you know, not technically possible discussion that some things, we might say, are not technically possible, because we don't know how they make bacteria or, you know, what all the ingredients are. There might need to
be standards developed, you know, we might decide, or you might decide this is, actually, something we want to support or not, so I mean, that's where you could put new standards. You know, you could develop other sections, or in the body of the processing rule, too, if it was felt to be within the scope.

I mean, you know, we have seen a huge expansion of scope in, you know, cosmetics, shampoo, you know, all this stuff. So, I mean, if we had standards, and if there was agreement, that would be technically possible.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, any other questions? I just want to say that also I'm really grateful for your participation to the group, Kim, Gwen, the OTA as well. This is a fantastic example of how the public can come in and provide constructive, synthesized input, and we're looking forward to the summary of the three solutions so we can review those. Thank you. Any other comments on your part, Mr. Chair?

MEMBER GIACOMINI: Materials is
complete at this time.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you very much.
Okay, we move onto the next topic, and that involves the Compliance, Accreditation and Certification Committee, and Mr. Smillie?

MEMBER SMILLIE: Well, in that vein, again, the public input to NOSB is the fuel on which we run. I mean, basically, we can sit as a group, and come up with our discussion papers and recommendations, but it's the input, that's the purpose of this meeting, and in that vein, that's where we are in the Certification, Accreditation and Compliance Committee's discussion paper.

And I just make sure everybody realizes, it's a discussion paper, not a recommendation yet, because we are seeking to build a public record on this very important and complex issue. We want to hear all the voices, and even though we really want to get to a place to make a recommendation, we don't want to rush. We want to make sure that all the voices that are out there are heard, and given time, because it is
a global issue. I think it's one of the things that really affects the global organic agriculture, not just the U.S.

So we want to hear that, and basically, where we are at in the process is we are really getting fabulous input. We believe that the first discussion paper was presented. The overwhelming response that we heard was that we want more detail. We want to hear more -- you know, we don't understand some of the terms used. We don't understand some of the concepts, such as a single OSP, and an internal control system, and we want more detail on that.

So the committee, especially the lead author, Tracy, who will take over this presentation in a second, basically went back and provided our second discussion paper, which is part of -- it's Part 2 of the overall approach, and basically, we had a very robust discussion within our Certification Committee, which consists of six people. I won't go through it all, but it's listed, and we said, you know, there's also
a lot of discussion on a lot of these issues, and what we want to do is go back, and be really specific about which questions we want the community, you know, the global community to answer. So we created a list of questions that's part of this document that we are seeking feedback on.

So we are, once again, looking for the public to give back to us direction, and we want to continue that dialogue. So now I think I'll let Tracy take over. Tracy is the principal author, and has done enormous amounts of work, and looking into globally, again, all of the people who have -- whether it's ISO documents, or, you know, years of work that IFPO has done on this issue, and what she'll do now is present this document once again, and we are seeking input on it.

MEMBER MIEDEMA: Thank you very much, Joe. Mr. Chair, my colleagues on the Board, and members of the audience, I wanted to first start out by thanking the people here who have submitted
comments, both written, and have come up to the podium to present their comments. There was a lot of commentary unrelated to the specific content of the guidance document, and I wanted to address that first. The guidance document itself is quite lengthy. It's highly detailed. We really tried to get into the nuts and bolts of how these internal control systems work.

There's a lot of question marks around whether or not adequate organic certification can be achieved through some sort of sampling protocol. And that's what this document gets into, and I want to take time here, with my colleagues on the Board, to walk you through that, but it's important, first, that I acknowledge some very strong opinions that are coming to us over these couple days, and I expect to continue to flow in.

First of all, I want to thank the OTA task force. I've been participating with that group as a non-voting member for about a year now, and Grace Gershuny, Kim Dietz, and Tom Hutcheson
are really leading up that effort, and I expect they'll be submitting their comments tomorrow, and the work that this task force is doing.

And I'll tell you, you know, I've really been working lock step with them. They've been willing to take our questions from the committee, and draw on the strength of 20 people to flesh out those questions. Something -- you know, for instance, how do we address conflict of interest in an internal control system. And so you'll see some strong similarities between what appears here in the discussion documents, and, for instance, the OTA task force.

Many others, you know, like I said, about 20 people on that group. I wanted to thank Jim Riddle for his comments. You know, there is a characterization that this idea of looking at this issue as a multi-site certification is somehow a justification -- I think you said, a justification for one certifier's insistence on retailer certification. And you know, Jim, it's just -- that's just not the truth. That's just
not where this is coming from. You know, what was put on trial in October, 2006 with the appeal decision, was whether an internal control system, you know, could serve as some sort of proxy for inspection. And it turned out, when that appeal decision came down, that there were stakeholders affected throughout the industry.

And, you know, grower groups, it turns out they were on shaky legal ground. It turned out retailers that were using this construct were on shaky ground, and out of basic fairness, these multiple stakeholder groups need -- you know, need to be looked at. So, you know, there's just no hidden agenda. And I want to dispel that right up front.

I want to thank the work of the National Organic Coalition. Leanne, Joe Mendelson, Lynn Cody, I have felt like your following of this issue has been very thoughtful, very regulatory based, and $I$ just know that we're reading those comments very closely.

Harriet, you continue to stay really
locked into this discussion, and I have followed your comments even before this came up. As a committee, you had given a comment. You were, I think, the very first person to comment, and I did want to respond to one thing you said about the high turnover rate among retailers, and that somehow being a barrier that's unique, and could pose problems for a sampling protocol, or an internal control system. And just, you know, somebody who works at a farm, and sees seasonal labor, and an organic farm, a certified organic farm, I see an awful lot of turnover every year with seasonal employees coming through, so I don't know if there's data to support that, but if you have it, I'd be happy to take a look at it. CCOF, and Peggy Miars, again, a group that's been really engaged in this, and generally speaking, is not amenable to grower groups. I think yesterday, you characterized CCOF's position as wanting to phase out the concept of grower groups. Sam Welch, my takeaway is that you're of a similar mind, that they're just -- it would be
better if there was always direct independent third party inspection of the smallest divisible unit, which -- well, you're shaking your head, so I want to make sure I don't mischaracterize your position there, and I'll let you speak for yourself later.

I found, of course, an extremely
important stakeholder in this discussion. They represent more of these grower groups than any other organization around the world. They have been the leaders, bar none, in the development of internal control systems, and really, you know, people getting together, clustering together under very rigorous criteria, and bringing organic to the marketplace.

Some others that have also weighed in, Pennsylvania Certified Organic, yesterday, I wanted to respond to one comment, which was, you know, the idea of the 36 -month phase-in, and really, that was to allow folks to comply with the clustering of production -- of members, and of production units. The status quo can't go on.

You know, there are some problems out there in the way grower groups are run, and I'm going to get into that in a second.

But, you know, it's also, we don't want to yank the rug out from people. We've seen that. It happened. There was a big uproar. We're not going to take that strategy. So that's simply to allow a smooth assimilation of new standards, or new guidance. Accredited Certifiers Association, I know you're staying really close to this issue, and have very strong opinions about who should have access to an internal control system as a means of organic certification.

Lastly, Marty Mesh, I will be very disappointed if I don't get to hear a comment from you. You and I have had lots of very interesting conversations, so I look forward to continuing that. All right, well, so getting into the document itself, the idea of disadvantaged small holders having -- being the only ones to be able to get together as a group and get certified, flies in the face of rigorous organic standards.

I absolutely believe we should be promoting people around the world who are disadvantaged, and/or small holders being grower groups, but not because they're small or disadvantaged, but because they're organic. And if others can use that same construct, and still be organic, than the construct works. So what we have on the screen up there is a big fat table of contents of what this document goes through, and what have we got here, maybe 10 minutes left?

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: We have five minutes.

MEMBER MIEDEMA: Five minutes, okay. So let me just highlight some areas of the document that, you know, where there was some real depth of thinking. The first is, you know, what conditions have to be in place before you can even consider multi-site operation, you know, to seek USDA certification. So at the beginning there, you know, you must be organized as a person according to 7 CFR 205.2.

So if you have a bunch of disparate
parts, first of all, you've got to legally be one. Second, you need to be seeking certification with a certification body that can actually handle the job. We've kicked around different ideas for how to get there, you know, should it be a separate category of certification. That idea has been tossed out there, and I've heard the program isn't necessarily amenable to that for some sound reasons, but we know it's got to be a certifier that knows how to peer into complex organizations, and they have to be able to demonstrate that to the NOP. The practices of these multi-site operations must be uniform, and reflect a consistent process or methodology using the same inputs and processes.

For growers, participation in the multi-site operation is limited to those growers who sell all of their organic production through the group. Multi-site operations must use centralized processing distribution, marketing facilities and systems, and one last item here that's important; record keeping protocols must be
consistent. You can't have the record-keeping look different from place, to place, to place, because you're going to have one outside inspector. Your internal surveillance and review is going to happen through the internal control system, and consistency is going to be really important.

Okay, the next part of the paper really talks about the organization within the multi-site certification and, you know, I threw in this term clustering, so the clustering of members or subunits in the production unit. And what we did is we came up with quite an exhaustive list of what it takes to get together. You must be bound by a shared training regimen, for instance. You must operate under the single organic system plan, and that particular section that relates to your piece of the puzzle.

Now, that's going to require an adjustment to the status quo where members might be acting as autonomous members under a single OSP. You know, going forward, members are really
going to need to organize into production units to share best practices. And, you know, I know there was a feeling on the part of IFPO that maybe the training regimen we proposed was overly burdensome. I would push back on that, because I think training is really fundamental to this working.

Next, we go into the facility or site, and an area that I heard everyone on this board, in our comments and discussions we've had in the hall, et cetera, and I heard members of the audience say, there's not enough detail around retailer certification. The section that deals specifically with retailers is quite brief in this document. It's found on page 4. Grower groups have had 20 years to flesh this stuff out.

Retailers have had about four years. So yes, there's history that's going to need to be drawn on for grower groups, and there's going to be criteria that are going to continue to need to be fleshed out.

OTA has volunteered to pull together a
task force in that regard. So, you know, we know we've got additional resources. Just moving through quickly a few other highlights; we're proposing that, in year one, this is looking at sampling protocol. I'm jumping ahead to now, year one, 100 percent inspection rate of all production units, sites or facilities. And that's giving credence to the importance of an extremely thorough audit off the bat, and an understanding of how much risk there is, because, you know, later, and I spent a lot of pages talking about -a lot of information here talking about risk factors.

We need to get to those, and the only way to do that is to look at all the parts right off the bat. Segueing in there, moving into risk analysis, $I$ believe it's 19 points we called out that help guide inspection. Inspection cannot just be a random scatter-shot thing. We need to focus our attention on hot spots, but it's not enough to just pinpoint. We do need a random -we need to keep people on their toes. And people
need to know that, at any given year, you might get randomly selected. So, you know, the idea there was that, of the people selected for inspection, 25 percent would be random.

Another area the program asks for more help with, and fleshing out, was the role of conflict of interest, and so we exhaustively went into that. Jim, I know that was something that you said you wanted to see more data on, and I just -- I want to direct you to, you know, pages 8 and 9. There's a lot of information in there. And then lastly, we gave some pending issues that reflect some of our internal discussion that we were having in committee, and some unresolved questions among committee members that we continue to invite the public to respond to.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, any questions from the Board? Yes, Jennifer?

MEMBER HALL: First, I'd like to thank Tracy. She did an exhaustive search, and real outsourcing to get a lot of information and input
to compile this guidance document. But I'd also like to represent a faction of the committee that did have a different voice, and as a result of us not being unified, that is why the pending issues are reflected here instead of kind of more traditional minority opinion.

I would say that all of us -- and I don't want to speak for everybody, but I think that there is a half of the committee that definitely sees the value in grower groups, and sees the strength of a really good internal control system, and Tracy did a great job of really adding merit to that risk assessment, and all the different components of that.

So we decided, instead of doing a minority opinion, to try and get feedback on the components that a variety of us, for different reasons, had different questions about, and to solicit those in a question format to try and get specific feedback. So I just kind of wanted to put that out there that, as a committee, like Joe said, there was a lot of robust discussion, and I
feel good about what's put out here, but I'm also very genuinely thankful for the feedback that we've gotten that will help direct us to our next phase.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other questions from the Board?

MEMBER FLANN: I'd just like to comment.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Barry, please.
MEMBER FLANN: I just want to echo what Jennifer just said, since I'm part of that half that she just described.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Very well. Tracy?
MEMBER MIEDEMA: Just one last note, I forgot to thank Oregon Tilth, and I thought it was noteworthy in yesterday's comments that both Tilth and IFOAM are not uncomfortable with the strength of an internal control system's role in other sectors of the organic world. They believe -seem to believe that it's rigorous enough to stand up in different sectors of the industry, and happen to be the two organizations here who,
correct me if I'm wrong out there, represent the most grower groups. I just wanted to add that. CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, any other questions? Katrina, followed by Dan. SECRETARY HEINZE: I haven't been part of your discussions, but I did want to weigh in as someone who is very familiar with internal control systems. It's obviously something that a large food processor, like the company I work for, uses to manage our food safety programs, which, arguably, are very critical. And I have a great belief in the construct. It allows us to have very firm control over the foods we produce. So, from that perspective, I very much support the effort that the committee has made in support of that type of construct.

I am concerned about how the expansion, outside of grower groups, would be viewed by our organic community. Certainly, that is not a technical, you know, perspective, but I think it is a factor that we need to weigh as we make a recommendation, because ultimately, we are a
marketing program, and we get judged by the comfort our consumers have in what we do.

And I recognize that that's perhaps an unresolvable problem, right? That it's a construct I very much believe in. I think it can work. I think it can work for all the different types of groups that you've talked about, right? Grower groups, retailers. It can absolutely work in all those cases. I'm just not sure our community will accept it in all those cases.

So I just wanted to get that perspective out, because I do think that factor weighs in the recommendation that we make, much as we might get frustrated by that.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Do you have a
response?
MEMBER MIEDEMA: Yes, I do. It's an important question, it's a worthwhile question, and frankly, it can be looked at now. This is not a future thing we're talking about. There are retailers today certified using this construct. So we don't have to wait until the future to find
out, you know, through some sort of survey.
Lots of us have done informal surveys.
Sam, I know you have your own -- you've talked to people, and believe that consumers are not at all friendly to the idea. I have found there -- I have had absolutely different findings at trade shows. I've just used those opportunities interacting with people to pose a question. So, you know, if somebody has formal data, independent third party data, that helps us get to that answer, I think that would be great to bring to bear.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Dan.
MEMBER GIACOMINI: Thank you. And again, thank you, committee, for all the work you've done on this. But I think, and I'll try to be extremely -- extra brief, because I think I'm sort of echoing Katrina's comments. But to say it slightly differently, I think, for me, this comes down to two questions, and it comes down to a question of concept, and it comes down to a question of scope.

I think it's one thing -- the ICS, as you discuss, is sort of the means that you're using to get there, but are we -- do we have agreement within the organic community, consumers, producers, stakeholders, regulations, and everything else, that a -- that a farmer that makes $\$ 5,001$ in the United States has to pay for an annual inspection to get the benefits of being organic, but yet, I don't even know if they exist, Fair Trade Coffee in South America gets a bit of an exemption. And how are we going to handle that structure?

And we've had a lot of debate, and we've had guidance documents and things. I think, then, to take that to the next phase on a scope level, it is the same ICS format, but it's a different question, and different refinement, and really getting into the meat of the issue of how to make sure that it's going to work, and be accepted, just to pick another company, and I know they do exist, that how this thing will allow Whole Foods not to have to have every store
inspected annually.
I think there's a difference between the concept and the scope. We had public comment yesterday asking us to just -- the committee to just go back, finish off the grower groups, and then bring up multi-site, and I'm not so sure that I see a lot of -- that I see a problem in going that route.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Joe, followed by Jennifer.

MEMBER MIEDEMA: I just first wanted to respond to the 5,000 hurdle that you threw out. You know, what we're talking about here is the exemption for a producer that produces less than 5,000, and that gets thrown around a lot as sort of the, let's just limit this to producers that grow less than 5,000. And, you know, let's just return to why that exists here in our program.

That's to promote market entry, and to get people up and running. You could be a bagillionaire, and only sell $\$ 5,000$ worth of organic, and still receive the exemption. It's
not a disadvantaged help out program, per se, and that's how it kind of gets framed as being used, and how it should get used internationally.

It's -- you know, this is agriculture marketing service, and this really promotes the marketing. So I am concerned about that number getting used as sort of the, you're no longer disadvantaged now, and you shouldn't get to be part of a group number.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: I don't see that number as a disadvantaged number; $I$ see it as a number of a level of participation. And if, at that level of participation, which is not even adjusted for inflation, it doesn't matter how much money the guy has anywhere else, but if that's his participation in the organic industry, according to the regulation, if he's in this country, he has to pay for an annual inspection. It doesn't matter if the annual inspection is a burden for him or not, but he has to pay for it. Whereas, a grower group in some other part of the world, each guy doesn't have to pay it, regardless of how big
they might be individually.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Please wait to be recognized. We have Jennifer, followed by Joe. You yielded to -- okay, Joe. MEMBER SMILLIE: Just to follow-up on that, there's two -- the direction that the committee is going is clear. We're very much hoping that OTA and/or others will convene, you know, a working group for retailers to discuss -to flesh out more of the supposed, you know, probable differences between the approaches. And the word retailers has come to the fore because it seems to us, at this point in time, that they're the only other sector group that could fit the rigorous criteria that we've set down. Katrina mentioned, you know, that her system is for their processing facilities, and that's true. Processing facilities, everywhere between the producer and the retailer, have internal control systems quality, but there's also other criteria that I believe would eliminate them from consideration.

You know, the single OSP, that's -- and other factors that, if you go down through the criteria, I think, and I want to be pointed out if I'm incorrect, that everybody in between a retailer and a producer, just, I do not believe, with what we've set out, they could fit at all. The single OSP is a very sharp razor that will slice them out.

It just so happens, through whatever it
is that's in intelligent design, that retailers and producers seem to be the ones that can fit these criteria. Our next task, as a committee, is to continue our work with this document, and to start to explore the retailers section with the help of OTA and/or others, individuals and groups, that will contribute to the discussion, and to see whether, indeed, the community will accept the proposition that - and I'll limit it to retailers in my discussion - will accept the proposition that retailers can function under a multi-site document or not. That will be our next step. That's where we'll go, and hopefully, we'll come
back with more information and erudition in November, not necessarily with a recommendation.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: I like that clarification. Jennifer?

MEMBER HALL: There's been some discussion about scale neutral, and sector neutral, and I look at this a little bit differently. I don't question the merit of an internal control system, one that's good, and has a good background to it, and execution to it. However, I do see the rule, as published, as the bar that we aspire to, and that being independent operations, getting annual inspections, and I see it more analogous to when we allow a material with an annotation.

It's solving a specific problem with a specific solution, and so I see the application of grower groups as doing a similar thing, that, due to real issues with supply of certain products, that this is -- the grower groups is a potential solution to that specific problem. So that's where the scope of applying it -- otherwise, I
have challenges with that.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other comments? Any other comments from the chair, chairman of the -- thank you. We conclude that section. I appreciate that, and I encourage the chairman of the committee, and the members of the committee, to take the public input from the -- input from the Board, and incorporate that into the next step of your process.

Right, we are due for a break, and at the same time, we're running late, so let's break for five minutes. I know that's brief, but I want to get us back on schedule. So we'll see you here in five minutes.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:02 a.m. and resumed at 10:11 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Board members, please take your places. Calling Board members, take your places, please. We will resume our meeting right now and it is the
turn of the Joint Crops and Compliance Committee to come and discuss their document on Commercial Availability of Seeds.

MEMBER KARREMAN: Rigo, I'm going
to cede that to Gerry, that discussion, I mean, but he's not here right now. Okay.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Mr. Davis?
right, we have both committee chairs for the CACC and the Crops Committee. I'm assuming Mr. Davis will start with a presentation on the Commercial Availability Guidance for Seeds. Mr. Smillie.
MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes, I little
history. It's a joint committee recommendation and that's because the Certification, Accreditation and Compliance Committee submitted a recommendation on commercial availability that included both seed and 606 items. The public feedback was clear and precise. They wanted us to bifurcate that recommendation, that's a fancy word. They wanted us to split that
recommendation and have separate recommendations. So listening to the public as we do, we said, yes, that's a reasonable request, so the CAC committee basically put forward and passed their recommendation on commercial availability and then passed the work that we had done up to that point on seeds to Gerry and the Crops Committee. So, in a certain sense, Mr. Chair, we have -- our committee sort of done our work on it and passed it down to the Crops Committee and they were going to take their expertise in the agricultural realm and craft the recommendation for commercial availability on seeds.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Mr. Davis. MEMBER DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is a complicated issue as we all know and I wanted to start the discussion by pointing out one of the -- a part of the discussion that was in the written recommendation. The Crops Committee and I,
myself in particular, don't feel that leaving this situation as it stands right now in status quo in many -- in several sectors of the seed availability issue, leaving it as it is will perpetuate the current situation which is that in certain sectors, like vegetable seed, there is little movement in the direction of increased supply of more organic seed.

And a lot of that in hearing from the organic seed industry at previous meetings, last fall and previous, was that this is because growers aren't telling their seed suppliers that, "I've got to have organic seed". They're just relying on the loophole and shuffling some papers to make it happen.

I acknowledge the many comments from several certifiers that say they see really good movement in increased organic seed availability for their growers that they're certifying. No doubt there probably is a lot of movement in the right direction with
agronomic crops such as soybeans, corn, the larger field crop type things that are more clear-cut and maybe less specialized on the requirements of what seed is required. But being a California grower and working in that realm with vegetables, the farm $I$ work for, we do 30 different vegetables. It's probably up to more by now, and all kinds of different varieties within each individual vegetable. The seed industry has -- I believe, has to have a clear call to want to produce more seed and if the loophole is in place, it's a big obstacle, and that's my opinion. The committee wanted to highlight that the further development of the organic seed industry is the key to increasing the commercial availability. The goal is to promote the continued growth and improvement in organic seed production and subsequent usage by organic growers without hurting or putting undo burdens on those growers. Achieving the
goal of the healthy, viable organic seed industry is important, not just so we can comply with the regulation but it's important when considering that the pathway of the conventional seed industry is more and more geared towards genetically modified biotechnology, you know, developments that will continue to develop and progress and evolve to a much different type of seed program and breeding emphasis than organic growers need or will need for the long term. We would not -- the organically grown movement will not benefit from allowing the organic seed production industry to stagnate in the current situation in some sectors, vegetable seed, for example, to allow them to stagnate while the conventional seed production sector moves on to the likely future situation in which traditionally bred and produced seed is only an after-thought, sort of relic of bygone days, that they don't put much emphasis on and eventually, it could -- unforeseen things
could happen where we really jeopardize the organic movement seed supply.

A vibrant organic seed industry would be expected to be the best guardian of proven traditional seed varieties and methods as well as the likely source of new innovations in organic growing methods that will result in excellent quality seed, in sufficient quantities to supply the market need at reasonable cost. I understand in many ways that's not the case right now but I think as an advisory board, the NOSB should take the pulpit in some ways to nudge, help nudge the situation in a positive direction. And our approach that we took for this further guidance was to heavily suggest that giving the organic seed industry market information that they need to develop and help make it happen is a key step.

Some of the comments that were received that I think are especially relevant to the situation. Another key factor is
making an even playing field for certifiers to be making sure that they review growers' commercial availability searches for seeds the same way, that we don't have a situation where many of you certifier representatives who have stepped up and say, "Well, we see improvement. We're pushing our growers to improve on more and more organic seed", but there may be other agencies, certifying agencies that don't take that tact at all and they're just shuffling a little bit of paper and saying, "Okay, you satisfied the requirement of proving that you couldn't get organic seed".

So but I think we -- how do I say
this -- for the program I don't know if implementing enough ACA training consistently enough would really realistically change that situation where you have some certifiers actively involved in encouraging their growers to use more organic seeds and you have others who see no real enforcement issues, no problem off of their -- you know, coming from the
program as far as accreditation problems for their certifying agency. So they -- the squeaky wheel doesn't get any -- the nonsqueaky wheel doesn't get any grease if they don't think it's a big issue that's being thrown at them from the program, that they need to make sure growers are showing an improvement in how much seed they're accessing if they're not already doing that.

Some of the -- I think this is kind
of a work in progress. Some of the problematic points that I wanted to make sure that I'm hearing correctly from members of the industry who have provided written or oral comments. One was that in the document, we mentioned that there needs to be written responses from seed suppliers to the producers in response to their list that they supplied to them and that more than one said that getting written responses from seed suppliers is not really dependable.

The grower can't count on that
supplier answering. You know, a small grower can use the catalog itself to show the response but there may be growers who don't order from catalogs but also don't get a response from their seed supplier showing that certain varieties weren't available organically.

I take note of the comments also on growers' concern that their confidentially of the varieties that they want to use, if they feel their confidential and they don't want to make that public knowledge, that they have that right to not have it made public knowledge.

Another good point, I thought, was several of the certifiers saying that -asking for all this grower and certifier commitment of effort to gather these lists for the grower to first make the list and put it down in a form that is readable to someone else and the supplying it to the certifier. The certifier passing it onto whoever it's
going to go to, to commit to that effort before a tabulation and publication vehicle even exists is probably asking for too much and I hear that comment.

Another good point was the need for standardized list format, if we're going to go there. We're requiring growers to do a list. The tabulation of the data base of the organic seed need would really be stumbled by not having a standardized list format. And also how do we create a uniform database, harmonized database. I want to turn that back to Joe Smillie to comment on that. MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes, that's one of the things that's come up and our recommendation was criticized for being rather fuzzy, throwing it out there to some organization as unspecified. And I think we need to do some work on that. To me, I would like to see the NOP take some leadership on that one and come up with a solution as how they'd like to see that database created.

That doesn't mean the NOP has to run the database but I think that the NOP in concert with some of the organizations that have already stepped forward, either one or a combination of OMRI, ASA and OSGATA or whatever it is, Woody, OSGATA.

I mean, we've got the expertise in the community to put that together and I think that that's what we want to encourage. And I would just point out not being derogatory of the US's efforts but the Eu has this organized. It's not perfect in the UE and I think we can learn from what they've done and learn some of the mistakes they've made in doing this, because there have been some flaws in the EU regulation, but in the EU each member state has that database and it's a fairly active one and our colleagues, our USDA accredited certification colleagues in Europe, don't have such the problem that we do. So I think that through some combination which the NOSB encourages, but doesn't necessarily want
to format, we would encourage the NOP to take a leadership role in working with some of our organizations to create a harmonized, unified, you know, seed -- organic seed availability and demand database, because what was pointed out yesterday is the information has to flow both ways.

It's not just good enough to say, "That's what's in Johnny's catalog". I mean, Johnny might want to know, you know, what they should be -- where they should be heading also. So I think that that's one of the key factors that we want to promote. I'm not sure what role the NOSB will play in that but that's one of the things that we want to bring to the NOP's attention.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Jeff.
VICE-CHAIR MOYER: Thanks, Gerry
and Joe. I think you did a great job of pulling that together. Having sat on that committee, I know there was a lot of discussion and it was difficult discussion on
how we're going to spread the burden around because I think clearly we all agreed that we wanted to give greater movement and faster movement in the acceptance of using organic seed and as a farmer, you know, the idea of the burden that we were talking about placing on farmers to collect those lists came up and was discussed. But I know from talking to other farmers that clearly they don't believe that they really need to use organic seed and we have to change that perspective. So we needed to come up with some sort of a tool that would allow us to do that. We also, in terms of spreading the burden around, you know, we were trying to put some of the burden on the program both in terms of sort of giving the input to the certifiers that this is an important issue. We heard yesterday that many of the certifiers felt like it's not part of the audit trail. It's not part of what's really discussed at training overly, and so there's not a lot of great importance put on
that and so they don't see it pushing that onto the farmers.

So I think that, you know, we put some of the burden on the program for that and as you heard, Joe suggests, you know, we're asking the program to take up the challenge and figure out some way of directing the management of that list, whether you manage it yourself or have somebody else do that, we try to do that.

We also put some of the burden on the certifiers by saying, "You need to make an impact, an impression on your farmers so that -- on your producers so that they are giving you this seed list", and I think we're forcing farmers to take up some of the burden by creating that list.

I think farmers, the farmers I talked to, are willing to do that if they felt that their confidentiality was protected and that the list actually went somewhere, meant something, and did something. If it's just
another piece of paperwork and that they -and energy that they have to expend to send a list out into the black hole of data that they never get a response from or have access to use for, then I think it becomes a sad point for them.

And by the same token, we're trying to put some of the burden onto the seed suppliers, forcing them to connect with that list and with the farmers so that you know, while I don't agree with everything in this recommendation, it seemed to be the best tool that we could come up with, with spreading the burden uniformly across everybody and getting off the dime and moving forward.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other
questions? Kevin?
MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes, I'd like to second that also and make people aware that we just simply deny that there is still a problem. It's disappointing that the seed growth hasn't increased like it should,
organic seed usage, and it's a tremendous investment for these seed growers to develop and grow this seed and unlike conventional growers that can simply take leftover seed, retreat it, put it up for sale again next year, organic seed can't be treated and a lot of it goes bad.

So we just thought, we have to do something to move this industry forward. And like Jeff said, spread the burden around and get this moving. And again, farmers that use organic seed aren't going to be faced with any additional paperwork, any additional problems. It's only those that are trying to get around this regulation or these -- the intent of these rules that will have to really do more work to prove that they actually cannot get certified organic seed.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Jennifer. MEMBER HALL: I kind of want to restate a little bit of what I said yesterday and I would -- my preference would be not to
institute more paperwork to solve the issue, that there were some comments, I think from Pat yesterday saying that certifiers should not be in the position of being a promoter or a marketer of organic seed and I fully agree with that. However, I do think they are there to enforce the regulations, and that as a certifier, they do need to make sure that the grower is following the letter of the law and it's clearly stipulated that every effort needs to be made to find organic seed.

So I do think that the burden of proof is on the grower to do that and that it would only take a couple of times for the certifier to say, "You're not doing this and there is organic seed available and I'm sorry that it's in the ground already," but it's quite readily available and that certain item can't be sold as organic this year, which does not disband your entire production, but that it would just take one or two instances of that to overcome what's concerning to me that
growers don't -- I mean, in your words necessarily, see it as their number one concern, that it's something that they need to be really aware of and making sure they're doing their due diligence about.

And that, for me, it's tied together then with enforcement, that there are certainly a host of other things that this rule stipulates that are never questioned as important and they are very strongly enforced.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Yes, Tina.
MEMBER MIEDEMA: I have to say I
had a lot of reservations about this recommendation but it was the three people on the committee who would actually be effected by this recommendation, that we're very much for it and thought that they could -- that the investment of their time would be worth the result that tipped my hand toward voting for it on the committee.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Julie.
MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes. Not being a
farmer or on the Crops Committee, I am struck by the similarity between the struggles around this issue and some of the questions that we keep wrestling with and hearing about in the handling community on issues around 606. And it sounds to me like -- I guess I'm asking this as a question to the rest of my fellow board member; I hear two separate issues. One is the question of seed that's available and how to require people to use what's available. But the second one is that in many cases there is nothing available and there's this question which is also critical in 606, how does the supplier community become incentivized to supply these items? And I guess one thing that I'm not clear about is like what percentage of crops are currently being grown from organic seed right now, like what is -- what percentage is available is organic? Like, how far -- what additional has to be created that's not there right now? CHAIRMAN DELGADO: That's a fair question. Gerry.

MEMBER DAVIS: I'll respond to it. I would base it on comments received yesterday from the public on the amount that it is, you know, various certifiers said, "We see good progress in corn, soy beans, so on and so forth", whereas there's a fairly high percentage of those growers that grow those crops using organic seed.

A comment from CCUF from California that deals with a lot of vegetable growers that they're thinking it's probably only two or three percent of that market is organic seed, and they see it, it's doubled, I think the comment was over the last couple years, but it's gone from one or two percent to two or three and I know speaking for our farm, we access -- we already do something like this where we submit a list to our seed suppliers, and being a large farm, we get a response and they say what they can find for us organically and many of the varieties we use are organic
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but a lot of the hybrid varieties is a big problem.

There's kind of a bit of a gridlock in vegetable seed hybrids on being organically produced, that of sufficient quality and quantity.

MEMBER DAVIS: Was that clear?
MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes, thank you.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other questions? Okay. Well, thank you very much, both of you. Then we can move onto the next topic which is again, the Crops Committee. Before that, I want to remind the public, if you have signed up for public comment today or tomorrow please go back and make sure that your signature appears on those sign-up sheets. And if your kind enough -- just the registration, I stand corrected.

Go back, make sure that your signature appears in the registration, is that correct? Okay.

SECRETARY HEINZE: For each day
that you're here. We need a count of every day we have to report who is here.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you for that clarification. Okay, back to Mr. Davis to talk about Crops Committee.

MEMBER DAVIS: Okay, for out petition materials for this meeting, we have three, tetracycline, cheesewax and Dextrin and I'd like to start with tetracycline. The petition is for adding tetracycline which is specifically oxytetracycline hydrochloride as plant disease control for all diseases on the crops registered by the US EPA on the National List, adding it to 601, Item I-10 and with a note we put in which would effectively remove the current annotation if we were to do so, I believe, but that is probably up to discussion, but the committee voted six no, zero yes, one absent to reject that petition based on we felt that particularly with reference to adding all crops which effectively would add peaches and nectarines
to the crop list that could use these materials. In reference to that we felt it was not necessary. The reason tetracycline is on the list for apples and pears even though it's very contentious material, many, many people in the industry and consumers probably alike, shutter at the thought of antibiotics being sprayed on organic crops. So there's a lot of problems with -- a lot of resistence to the use of materials like this in organic. So for that reason, we did not feel
that for peaches and nectarines it was so needed that it could overcome the basic incompatibility and consistency with the rule. Apples and pears, the reason they're on there, as I started to say was that the damage from fire blight in pears specifically, is so devastating that entire orchards can be lost and the previous board that looked at this material last in Sunset a couple years ago, had a split decision, it was a very close vote and allowed it to stay on the list mainly
because of the dire need that pear growers particularly have for the material. Otherwise it would not have been relisted in my opinion because I was there.

This material, we rejected it basically because we did not want to add it to more crops. The petitioner is here and made comments yesterday that they would be willing to represent the material for just apples and pears and to change their petition. In trying to analyze this on the fly here at the meeting, I'm not exactly sure of the proper policy and the way it should be, but the best I can tell, probably if that is the petitioner's wish, they should come forward and state that for public record what their intent now is and we can decide what to do with the material.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Would the petitioner of tetracycline come up to the forum and state their intention for the petition, please? And if you can state your
name and your rank and file.
MR. RICHARDSON: Yes, Taw
Richardson, President of AgriSource.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Can you get
closer to the microphone, so our recorder can
-- and if you would, spell your name, please.
MR. RICHARDSON: T-a-w, Taw
Richardson, and yes, as stated, we are willing to withdraw the portion of our petition that deals with peaches and nectarines and limit it to pears and apples to facilitate a decision on the part of the Board related to the component.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you. Any questions for the presenter? Mr. Davis?

MEMBER DAVIS: I have no further questions for Mr. Richardson. CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you very much.

MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you. MEMBER DAVIS: I believe the proper thing to do would for the Crops Committee to
convene at this meeting, perhaps this evening and this afternoon, and discuss this development and decide whether we proceed with a vote on the recommendation as it stands or possibly defer it for the fall meeting.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Very good.
Questions no that specific topic? We have Tina first followed by Jeff.

MEMBER ELLOR: Well, while the whole group is here, our options are probably several. We could send it back for TAP because it is a different chemical, correct, or not a TAP, a Technical Review.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Technical review.

MEMBER ELLOR: Or is it possible to
add it to the current listing rather than make a separate listing, either of those two possibilities.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Gerry, can you clarify that? What is the intent of --

MEMBER DAVIS: You're absolutely
correct. There have been statements made that even though the EPA considers and regulates tetracyclines, you know, the current one that's on the list is Oxytetracycline calcium. This one is Oxytetracycline hydrochloride. The EPA considers them as the same and the petitioner in written public comment went at great length to explain all of that. But there have been several comments saying that this should have a technical review done in it because it is a different material. I don't have a comment on what's the right thing there. It's beyond my expertise to say what is right.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Very good, so again, you will take that back to your committee and make a decision by tomorrow. MEMBER DAVIS: Right.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Jeff?
VICE-CHAIR MOYER: Yes, the other question that the committee had really needs to probably addressed by the program which was
if we do reconsider this material, obviously, we are going to do that, and put it on the list, given the fact that at the last Sunset process tetracycline barely passed by I believe it was a six to five vote if my memory serves me correctly. Would this necessitate or put this on the list for a five-year period at Sunset or would it simply be an addition of the new chemical compound name on this existing list in which case it would Sunset in only two and a half years along with the existing tetracycline?

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: That is a question for --

VICE-CHAIR MOYER: Does that make a difference in how the Board views this material? It would be nice to get a comment on that.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Can we have a comment from members of the program, please?

MR. POOLER: This is Bob Pooler, NOP. This essentially is a new material.

It's different from the calcium complex that's currently on the list, so it would have to be a separate material at this point.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: So it is a separate material and the count will start again, correct, five years? Thank you for that. It does not effect the old one, that's correct. Next is Katrina. She passes and we have Dan.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: Gerry, for those of us that are not crops folks, on the list currently, could you give -- just clarify the way these two annotations are listed. We have streptomycin for fireblight control in apples and pears only and then we have tetracycline Oxy-Tech, calcium for fireblight control only. If we're putting the tetracycline, the new tetracycline in the -- sort of under the category of the existing Tet, what's the difference in those two annotations?

MEMBER DAVIS: They sound different but effectively, they aren't different because
fireblight only exists on apples and pears. CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Right, any other questions?

MEMBER KARREMAN: I would think --
you were talking about the options you can take today, either having a committee meeting at some point, and I'm not on your committee, I realize that, but -- and maybe changing the annotation to what the petitioner wants, or deferring it. I would suggest we vote on it, vote on the material at this meeting and not defer it.

I don't think a TAP needs to be done. If the other Oxytetracycline is already on the list, functionally it's the same. And you know, I'd say we should vote on it, at this meeting.

## CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other

comments? Jeff?
VICE-CHAIR MOYER: Although that being said, Hu, we just heard from the program that it is a different material and is going
to be viewed within the program as a different material and it does have a different CAS number with the EPA.

MEMBER DAVIS: So that's an
interesting quandary we're placed in with exactly what to do.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Again, that's a question for the committee to resolve. Any other questions from the Board? Okay.

MEMBER DAVIS: Moving onto the next material, Cheesewax, in response to some of the public comment received yesterday, specifically referring to some of the -- on the recommendation form, the responses, the documentation responses, the committee acknowledges that some of the comments made perhaps, should have been deleted and we are going to also convene on this and remove some items.

But I jumped ahead a little bit, excuse me. The petition is for inclusion of micro-crystalline Cheesewax and the CAS
numbers mentioned are three CAS numbers because it's three different wax-type materials, paraffin, a couple other things, that account for those CAS numbers. And it's added to the National List as a production aid in log grown mushroom culture and with the stipulation made without either ethylene, propylene, co-polymer or synthetic colors.

We voted as a committee to put this material on the list. It's very small usage but effects dramatically a small segment of the organic producer community. They are asking for help on this because they are stuck because they don't feel they have another option. Some of the comments that we made in the documentation section referring to petroleum or crude oil that the petition itself had some opinions about crude oil and petroleum as semi or natural material and we did not intend to construe that we agree with that petitioner's position on that by our responses in the documentation section.

So we will work on removing some of those specific things that don't change our answers specifically. They're just part of the documentation and the backup. So we will expunge those and show them at the meeting tomorrow before the vote.

The next material is -- oh, discussion, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Yes, are there any questions from the Board? We have Tina followed by Steve, yes.

MEMBER ELLOR: I'd just like to
say, I've looked at this petition exhaustively. I am in the mushroom industry. I work for a mushroom farm. We don't use this material. We don't grow mushrooms this way.

This is used by a very small, very small growers, very small segment of the industry and they did a huge amount of work on this petition, and I have to say there was no obfuscation, however you pronounce that, on this petition. It was very straightforward.

They provided a tremendous amount of information. It just turned out to be a lot more complicated than I ever could have anticipated from such a simple-sounding substance. So I think with going through it thoroughly, looking thoroughly at all the CAS numbers that, you know, I feel pretty good that -- and I went out and talked to some of these small producers and mostly on their own, they don't use colored Cheesewax, but it would be good to eliminate that possibility.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, Steve. MEMBER DeMURI: Tina just answered my question. I was going to ask her specifically as a mushroom producer, for her opinion on this material and she just gave it, so --

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you.
Katrina?
SECRETARY HEINZE: I can't find it exactly right now, but there was one written public comment that gave a lot of detail on
this material and had questions about whether the CAS numbers were accurate. I was wondering, could you speak to the public comment? I'm rifling through my binder. If I find it, I'll be more helpful.

MEMBER ELLOR: Yes, I went through
the petition and there was, I don't know, 180 pages of it or something, and picked out every CAS number I could find and looked it up, so that's how we got the information that we have. If I missed a CAS number, then, you know, certainly I'd like to know that, but we listed specifically only three CAS numbers that we're going to allow on here and as far as I know, I took those out of the petition. I looked them up and if we made a mistake there, then you know, whoever made that comment maybe could come and see us.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other questions? Okay, thank you. We can proceed to the next one. MEMBER DAVIS: Thank you. The next
material is for Dextrin petitioned to be used as a binder in seed coatings with placement on the National List 205601N as seed preparations. One change that I think the committee will agree to, we may have to vote on it, but it's a small one. In Section B there for substance fails criteria category, the sentence, "Non-synthetic starches", I wanted to changed that to "Binders". And there was one other place in the documentation in further pages that says the same sentence essentially. What seed coating companies use for their binders and their materials in their process, I've learned from talking to several of them, are quite secret and they really won't give you specifics of what they are very much. So for us to say they're starches, I can't say I know that for sure. So we'll use a more generic term of binders.

We voted as a committee four no, zero yes to reject this petition in that we
felt that it failed criteria category 2 and 3, that it wasn't essential for producing organically approved seed coatings and that it -- for Category 3, it was not compatible with and consistent with organic regulations in that adding synthetics to the list when there is available options is not compatible with the rule.

And one -- there are currently a couple examples of organically approved seed coatings from two different companies that are on the market and although they were not willing to state what they are using, the -and because of certifier confidentiality, the certifier that certifies that as organic can't tell us that either, but we are sure that they are all using organically approved materials.

So, the committee voted to reject this because there are other seed coatings using organically approved binders, not Dextrin. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Questions from the Board? Dan.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: In your notes on the material, you referred to hydrochloric acid as a source of a ph change or stabilizer. They refer to food acids. I'm not sure that -- or food approved, I forget their exact terminology. Can you address the issue of whether this is going in as a ph stabilizer or is it initiating a chemical change?

MEMBER DAVIS: From reading the petition and which I believe the petition does not say hydrochloric acid, I believe that was from an internet search that I did, but regardless of the acid, the acid itself is not a problem. It's the statement that the petition made that the acid is sprayed on the natural starch and a polymerization process is initiated by that acid treatment. So it's not a ph adjuster. It is actually the material that stimulates a chemical change.

And I guess we could receive comment if that is incorrect but I don't think
that's been put forth.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, any other questions? Very good, thank you and I appreciate the work of all the members of the committee. I know you went out of your way to contact suppliers and talk to producers and did a thorough investigation. Right, moving on and also including Gerry, we have Dr. Karreman with Joint Crops and Livestock Committee.

Sunset material, I'm sorry, I was getting over-excited, thinking that we were ahead of the schedule. So my apologies. Back to you, Gerry.

MEMBER DAVIS: I was wondering what you were doing.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Yes, I tell you I have no excuse this time.

MEMBER DAVIS: For the Sunset material questions, there was additional public comment received after the November meeting vote on these materials, so we needed
as a committee ro reaffirm that we had looked at those public comments and that they did not effect in any way the outcome of our vote. So we -- that's what this item is about.

Just to say that in response to the additional comments received after the November 2007 NOSB meeting and vote, the committee reaffirms its recommendation of November 2007 for the relisting of the following substances in these use categories as published in the final rule; copper sulfate, ozone gas, parasitic acid. EPA lists three inerts for use in passive pheromone dispensers and calcium chloride. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Questions from the Board? Okay. None. Very good. We'll proceed.

MEMBER DAVIS: Onto the next item, we have a discussion document. The hydroponics issue has been on the Crops Committee work plan since I believe 2001 and
probably because of the complexity and -- of the issue and it's not common knowledge with a lot of people. It's kind of sat there with some work being done on it, so we felt that we should begin the discussion again and move towards an eventual recommendation.

We -- the main -- and there were a lot of public comments received regarding this document. And I thought I should address those quickly, first of all. We -- it is not the committee's intent to certify as organic liquid-based hydroponic growth culture of terrestrial plants. So almost all the comments were addressing that topic that no, you can't go there, you can't go there, and we just wanted to say that through out discussion of it, that is not our intent to go to suggesting certifying terrestrial plants grown in truly liquid culture.

So the intent of this discussion item was to reopen the issue and get public comment from the industry on -- so we can
proceed forward with the proper determinations on should liquid-based, you know, terrestrial plant culture be allowed. I've already addressed that. What systems can be allowed, soiless systems, kind of dispensing with the hydroponic term because it's -- I think the committee feels that it's truly specific to liquid culture of terrestrial plants.

So what other soiless growing systems are possible? What can be certified as organic? I wanted to receive comment on that. In the hydroponic issue, there will need to be guidelines around such things as growing spiraling, you know, plants that are normally aquatic plants, other higher plants that are naturally water -- naturally aquatic species, things like that.

So really the whole intent of this
was to stir the pot a little bit and it speaks for itself and just to get the issue opened back up again and start moving in a direction of some guidelines. The Europeans already
have guidelines on this subject. The
Canadians are moving towards -- they already have some greenhouse guidelines that touch upon these topics and I'm told that they are moving towards adoption of standards in the not too distant future, so we felt it was timely for the US system to address the topic and move towards recommendations also. Any questions? Steve.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Steve.
MEMBER DeMURI: Do you know what they're doing in Europe? Can you briefly describe what the standards are there?

MEMBER DAVIS: I'm not sure. It
would take a little time to really spell it out. There are some differences between what the Canadians currently allow and what the Europeans, and there's differences within what the EU system overall says versus what individual member states allow. It's a pretty confusing situation. There was one public comment, written comment submitted from
someone in the Netherlands that pointed out that currently in the EU overall system that it has -- the terrestrial plants have to be grown in soil but I'm told from investigating it, that that's not necessarily true in all member states. So I don't know where you go with that.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Joe?
MEMBER SMILLIE: I just wanted to be sure. You didn't touch on sprouts at all. This was not part of your consideration.

MEMBER DAVIS: No.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other questions? Okay, well, thank you very much. This time we can move onto to the Joint Crops and Livestock Committee report on the aquatic plants recommendations and Jeff, you'll be participating in that.

VICE-CHAIR MOYER: I will, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The reason that this particular item was handled by a Joint Committee of Crops and Livestock is that often
aquatic plants are grown strictly for the use in -- to sell directly for human consumption. The other use, of course, is for a feed source for fish or fish-type creatures, so that's why it was in a Joint Committee.
If you -- I'll direct your
attention to either the board, the visual
board, or your notebook item number 8.
Basically what we did was we treated aquatic plants just as if they were any other crop, so they fall specifically under Section 205.258(c) in that they have to follow all the rules and regulations that any other crop would have to follow with the exceptions, and that's why I direct your attention to Section A and eventually Section B.

Under Section A you'll see that we are directing aquatic plants to be treated a little bit different. In Section A we're talking about a closed containment system. This would be a pond, a pond-type system that has, for the most part, a soil base. So if
you look at A1, you'll see that any pond with soil from which aquatic plants are intended to be represented as organic, must have no prohibitive substances as listed in 205.201 for at least 36 months, again, treating it just like we would a field crop because it is a soil-based pond.

However, if the container or the containment system is more like a greenhouse in that it is a pool or a channel or some sort of raceway, we are growing these plants, we have indicated that you can have an approved clean-out procedure to prevent contact or contamination with prohibited materials, just like you would in a greenhouse.

You don't have the three-year
transition period there because you're not against the soil. Section A2 aquatic plants may be provided dissolved macro nutrients and micro nutrients including trace minerals and vitamins listed in 205.601, just like any other crop would. However, the dissolved
amounts shall not exceed those necessary for the healthy growth of the plants and such a culture medium shall be disposed of in any manner that does not adversely impact the environment.

And in Section 3, a pond or a
containment vessel must have a berm elevation to protect any -- basically, it's a buffer zone, just like you would in a field to protect any run-off from the surrounding area to come into the pond, and then item 4, and this is an important one. We felt that often times there's a pond or the pond might be drained to collect the fish out of the pond. You could not use that time of harvest as a mechanism to dump the water into a receiving waterway as a mechanism of purging the pond of any collected environmental hazardous material or dissolved fertilizers.

So if you are going to dump the pond, you must -- the pond must -- the water coming out of the pond must meet the standards
based on the total maximum daily load requirement of the receiving waterway as provided by the current state code. That deals mainly with US based operations where you would have TMDL.

In cases where there is no TMDL metrics, if you look at Item 4(ii) you'll see that we have listed there based on EPA guidelines, a secondary treatment that's listed as 30 milligrams per liter BOD, total suspended solids where 85 percent removal of the BOT is attained. Again, giving some guidance to anybody who wants to grow aquatic plants under this system, some idea of what they can discharge into a waterway.

And my understanding from the EPA
folks is that this is sort of the lowest common denominator that they accept anywhere and again, we would want foreign certifiers to adhere to that as well.

Section A5, talking about manure, we're saying that in this recommendation that
manure from terrestrial animals may be used to fertilize aquatic plants intended to feed organic fish in aquaculture ponds for organic production systems provided the manure is composted in compliance with 205.203, which we had approved at an earlier date.

Aquatic plants may be grown in open water systems. This would be different from what we had just previously talked about with containment systems, in that they can be grown in open water but here you would not be able to use manure-based fertilizers because we don't want people just randomly going out there and dumping manure into open waterways that would have access to non-contained systems.

That, Mr. Chairman, is our recommendation.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, questions? Joe?

MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes, I'm thinking about the B part. Was consideration of other
examples, like in open water, like nori culture for example. In 606 we're working with a lot of wild harvested aquatic plants but I'm presuming in the very near future we're going to be looking at you know, farmed aquatic plants, and I can think of nori for one, perhaps clorella, you know, I think is on our work plan also.

How does this recommendation -does that interface with that type of open water organic farmed aquaculture, aquatic plants?

VICE-CHAIR MOYER: Well, I think it does. I mean, our main stipulation was when you are in open water system, you have very little control of the movement of the water and we wanted to make sure that people weren't somehow dumping manure-based fertilizers into this open water, because that just -- I don't even think even if we approved it, it would not be approved by any other agency. You just cannot do that.

I mean, Dan brought that up in your conversations during the meeting that putting manure in water to begin with is a touchy subject, and that's why we said it has to be composted but --

MEMBER SMILLIE: I don't mean that there's anything wrong with what you've said, it's just that we're going to need a bigger framework with a lot more points of, you know, open water contamination, all sorts of other things if we start to look at, I'll just use nori as an example, nori culture which has been practiced in Maine as well as Japan. Those are open water -- those are farm systems.

They hang out nets, they've got specifications on the culture and how they collect and harvest it. So it is farmed. It's not wild harvested and there will be, I think, other considerations.

> VICE-CHAIR MOYER: Are they
fertilizing those systems?

MEMBER SMILLIE: No, as far as I know, not.

VICE-CHAIR MOYER: We have not come across any point where they were but I don't know everything, obviously, on the subject.

MEMBER SMILLIE: But like the whole background contamination issues and that sort of thing. I just -- it's a big topic, farmed aquatic plants and there's a number of cultures that don't seem to fit into this recommendation.

VICE-CHAIR MOYER: Well, obviously, like with all of our documents, you know, this guidance document is a living document.

MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
VICE-CHAIR MOYER: And as issues come up, we would certainly be prepared as a Joint Committee to introduce those items for further discussion and recommendation.

MEMBER SMILLIE: Well, in our work plan, clorella is there and that is -- that's wild harvest, though, I guess. We don't know.

We'll find out.
MEMBER WEISMAN: There's two
algaes, one is --
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Wait to be recognized.

MEMBER WEISMAN: There are two
algaes on our work plan. One is wild harvested and one is close containment and I forget which is which but there is definitely one that is wild harvested, so it will become an issue.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Again, I will ask you to be recognized first before you address the Board. No problem. We'll go with Dan and followed by Gerry.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. In A5, you're talking about manure and then qualifying it as composted. In B all you're talking about is manure. I would be comfortable and would it not be appropriate to include both manure and composted manure in B? VICE-CHAIR MOYER: It would be and
we have no problem adding that. We thought we covered that by saying "in any form." So we were saying manure, whether it's composted, raw. Any way you look at it, it could not be applied, but if the Board felt more comfortable adding the word "compost" there, I don't think the Joint Committee would have problems with that, but I put that to the Board.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, Gerry?

Okay, any other questions? All right, well, thank you very much, both of you. And we move on to -- we're on schedule, fantastic, ahead of schedule in fact. We move onto the Livestock Committee with Dr. Karreman.

MEMBER KARREMAN: All right, thank
you, Rigo. Our first material for discussion is one that -- well, it's Fenbendazole and that we -- let's see the Board had looked at Fenbendazole as a wormer for ruminants back in the late ` 90 s in kind of a little trio of compounds, Ivermectin, Levamisole and

Fenbendazole and I don't know the whole history of it except that Ivermectin passed at that point and Fenbendazole didn't. But regardless, a TAP review was done back then and we relied on that TAP review because at least nothing has changed to Fenbendazole that I know of just as a clinician but -- and I think that is accurate in general. The formulation hasn't changed.

So what we recommended after going through the checklist and everything, we did recommend to allow it in a vote of five in favor and zero opposed, two were absent, but also to maintain the annotation which is a paragraph long, I heard some resistance to those long annotations yesterday, but to keep the annotation as Ivermectin has it right now. Should I read that because -- okay, there is a slight addition to it, okay, right in the beginning.

And the beginning part that I added just from my experience being a farm vet, the
annotation would be for "Fenbendazole only to be used upon a written diagnosis of clinical infestation by a veterinarian," that's the new part. And then it goes on to say, "Prohibited in slaughter stock, allowed in emergency treatment for dairy and breeder stock when organic system plan approved preventive management does not prevent infestation. Milk or milk products from a treated animal cannot be labeled as provided in Subpart D of this part for 90 days following treatment and breeder stock treatment cannot occur during the last third of gestation of the progeny will be sold as organic and must not be used during the lactation period for breeding stock."
This -- we didn't -- we had discussion on this and it seemed to be pretty straight up. I guess the Committee was somewhat relying on my input being that I'm in contact with that realm quite a bit and I can say that it's -- one, it's better than

Ivermectin in the sense that I like that it's a more narrow spectrum. It's got a different mechanism of action. It doesn't affect the dung beetles in the manure. It only --

Fenbendazole only works during the grazing season and that's kind of good. You can't just use it on and on throughout the year but even so, you wouldn't be doing that in organics, but it's just a more limited type use of this compound for specifically gastrointestinal worms, whereas like Ivermectin you can use it for skin-type mange and lice and whatnot.

It's given orally. It's not given
by injection or pour-on. There's no longacting formulation. There's been no resistence to it even in regular conventional agriculture that's been noted. Very low toxicity due to the mechanism of action so it's a pretty safe compound. So anyway, that's the way we discussed it and there were no negative public comments. If anything, I
don't know how many, but they were all in favor of us recommending it. CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, any questions? Dan? MEMBER GIACOMINI: As a member of the Committee, it's not a question, but just to make the statement that I don't think anyone on the Committee would want this to have the appearance that we're trying to continually add more parasiticides on the National List for dairy and breeder stock. I think the goal of the Committee is to get the best one. I think it's pretty universal within the industry that we're not -- the organic community and the livestock group Committee or part of that is not happy with Ivermectin.

The Board has passed Moxidectrin in past. It originally met resistence with the program as a macrolite antibiotic which is more a structural definition than an activity definition, and there seems to be some
movement there but how that will proceed is out of our hands.

So the Committee in looking at this wanted to -- decided to proceed with it and sort of when all the dust settles, will look and see what's on the list and hopefully then the community will come back and will look at taking off all but the best one, the best option we would have.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Comments to add? MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, Gerry.
MEMBER DAVIS: My question for Hu , commonly what is the circumstance when a material like this would be used? I hear all the restrictions of when it can't be used. What's the reality of how it is used?

MEMBER KARREMAN: Generally, I find the weakest link in livestock husbandry and organics and I do work with conventional herds still but not too many, is the young stock
that are weaned that are about one to two months away from weaning or that have been weaned and they're one or two months beyond that up to about 10 to 12 months old. Their natural immune competency is not up to snuff yet, their IGE to live in balance with worm challenge like adult cows can, and so as well, many times, I mean, a lot of farms, you know, the young stock, different batches of young stock go in the same area and parasites love that when animals are in the same area all the time.

And so that's the group that really
needs it, really truly, and you know, I take manure samples, look under the microscope for the eggs, see how many eggs there are and if there's only very few and the animals look good, I say, "Don't even worm right now with Ivermectin," but if they look bad and they're heavily infested, I say, "Let's use the Ivermectin," and then start correcting things again in an organic manner. So it's for the young stock.

MEMBER DAVIS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Jeff?
VICE-CHAIR MOYER: Yes, just one last comment, $I$ wanted to second what Dan said in that we would hope that the community after this, assuming it does get approved, would petition the Board to either remove other substances or through the Sunset process get those other materials off so the goal is not to add more materials to the list, but to find the best product out there that fits with the organic production systems.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Good comment. Dan.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: Yes, it's just that that can't happen until it's on the list. It's not -- it can't happen just based on our recommendation. It has to be based on postfinal rule.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Good comment. Steve.

MEMBER DeMURI: This is for Hu. Not having a livestock background, this seems to be a fairly complicated annotation to me. Do you anticipate that any producers would have trouble maintaining documentation to prove these conditions were met?

MEMBER KARREMAN: The annotation, the bulk of the annotation there has been in place for the last -- well, since Ivermectin got on, whenever that was, and the program got started. So producers know that. They truly know that they can't give it to beef stock, beef animals that are going to be slaughtered as beef and they can't give it within 90 days of lactation. Okay.

The only thing that's added on here
is that it's got -- the use has to be predicated on a written diagnosis by the veterinarian. You can say, "Well, it's given me work," but you know, honestly, it is an over-the-counter type product, as is Ivermectin, but I really think it's needed
only sometimes and I really think that the healthcare provider really should write down what they found, that they are infested and they need it.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: All right, Barbara, I believe you had a comment. MR. MATTHEWS: I have one concern. I recognize that we already say this in Ivermectin about when organic system plan improved preventive management does not prevent infestation. Now we're talking of putting that into a second annotation. That part of the annotation is totally unnecessary. And the reason why I say that is that we already have a regulation at 205.238(b) that says when preventive practices and veterinary biologics are inadequate to prevent sickness, a producer may administer synthetic medications provided that they're on 603. And if anything, what the Board might want to consider doing is what we've already done to 601, which was at the lead-in
paragraph to 601, we reminded everyone, "You have an obligation for fulfilling the practice standards first and when all else fails, you can use these materials. So rather than adding it into every single material or just some materials, you may want to consider putting it into the lead-in paragraph because this provision that you're talking about putting in and which we've already got in Ivermectin, is required of everything in 603. MEMBER KARREMAN: I don't think it's everything because they can -MR. MATTHEWS: Okay, you're right. It's not everything. It's for the medications, yes, all medications are already required that way. And so the paragraph at the beginning would talk about which lettered sections or lettered paragraphs within the section would be applicable to following the practice standards first.

And it's really important that certifying agents be requiring that their
clients delineate in their organic systems plan how they're going to exercise their obligations for preventing sickness in advance. And if it's not in the organic systems plan and they're just allowing the use of the materials, then they're violating the regulations.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Hu?
MEMBER KARREMAN: That's fine.
We'll try to go that route. I would just say that perhaps then on any medicine that's listed on 603 but still just staying within Fenbendazole, I would say at least for Fenbendazole, only to be used upon written diagnosis of clinical infestation by a veterinarian. Is that an okay annotation, short and sweet like that?

MR. MATTHEWS: Sure.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: But that would also imply that you need a second motion to put that clarification at the top of the section, if I interpret correctly. Are you
following that?
MEMBER KARREMAN: Well, I think we'll have to have a Livestock Committee meeting to reduce this bulky annotation here and then in the next few months, probably not in this meeting time, but well, okay, maybe at this meeting time by those faces, we can get that preamble onto 603.

MR. MATTHEWS: Don't get me wrong,
I'm not criticizing the bulkiness of the annotation. What I'm clearly or trying to say is that there's a redundancy here because it's already required and if we feel that there needs to be a reminder, the best place to put it is at the beginning of the section so that everybody knows in advance where it's supposed to be.

I have no problem with saying you can't use it in slaughter stock. That needs to be clear. I have no problem with saying that it has to have a withdrawal period for dairy animals. That needs to be stated. So
it's not so much that I have a problem with the length of the annotation. It's the redundancy.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Very good. So that will be an action item for your Committee and you'll decide and tell us tomorrow. I believe there's another question, participant, Dan. Hu, do you want to add another comment to that?

MEMBER KARREMAN: No.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: All right. If that's the case, we can proceed onto the next material.

MEMBER KARREMAN: All right, the next material, let me get that up here for a second, is Methionine. Methionine has an interesting history with the Board. I think it's the only livestock material that's been added since 2002, except for this last batch in December. It was renewed -- let's see the first time it came on and perhaps there's institutional history here but the first time
it came on, it had a three-year time limit put on it, from 2002 to 2005 in the hopes that there would be research to show that there could be non-synthetic Methionine available. When that time was coming around there was a petition to extend it and right now, we've living under that time line and it would expire October of this year, 2008. So the petitioners requested that the time limit or -- it's not a Sunset but I don't know what you'd call it, just a removal date would just be --

> CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Expiration, expiration date.

MEMBER KARREMAN: Expiration date, yes, would be deleted, that's it, so there's no expiration date on synthetic Methionine for use in poultry and I want to specify that it is only allowed in poultry and organic livestock, no other species.

The Committee voted five opposed to that and zero in favor of that action to
remove the deadline date. And we immediately, however, and believe me, we had a lot of discussion on this material, and we can get into that more, but we immediately came up with a new proposal or proposed removal date, expiration date of October 2010 to allow two more years of synthetic Methionine to be used in rations for certified organic poultry.

The reason we went for two years and not just taking the expiration date off totally is because of some work that has been happening and I went to the Upper Midwest Organic Framing Conference this past February and I sat in at Dr. Walter Goldstein's really informative talk on the agronomy of Methionine and high Methionine corn and from what I could glean from that talk, there's high Methionine corn, if everything is ideal commercially available in quantity hopefully within about three year's time. And so I took that into account and I shared that with our Livestock Committee.

And then also during the Aquaculture Symposium, there was a fellow from South Carolina, I forget the company, I apologize, but he talked about insect meal and that kind of thing and showed the analyses and there was Methionine in there and then I think there's some work having been done on fermentation to derive Methionine that way but there's not any hard data from what I understand but there's work on that.

Then, of course, the other way to
look at Methionine is that the birds, you know, traditionally, I guess you could say, you know, get their Methionine from pecking at the ground for grubs and insects and whatnot.

So taking in those four factors, I think is why we decided not to allow the extent or the expiration date to just vanish, but to give two more years to hope that the industry, you know, can get over that hump that I think we're kind of almost at the top at from what I'm understanding and so that's
our reasoning on that.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any questions? Gerry?

MEMBER DAVIS: Hu, the talk that you listened to on the high Methionine corn, I remember getting some information off the internet two years ago on the high Methionine corn and it was probably from the supplier or the breeder of that particular variety or varieties. And they were asking for people to grow this corn so it would be more universally available for organic growers to use for poultry.

Did that talk address what's taking them -- you know, two years down the road, you would think there would be good development so far on that.

MEMBER KARREMAN: Dr. Goldstein is
in the room. We can ask him to come up and address that briefly in a moment. I guess, you know, I'm just -- that question, you know, regarding, okay, if you're allowed to use
synthetic Methionine or if there is a loophole to get non-organic seed or other kind of little loopholes that kind of don't, you know, give the full stimulation of organic, you know, progress, I think we as a Board, like you're saying, somewhat are incumbent to maybe move the industry forward and so I think there may not be that many growers but I want to hear that from Dr. Goldstein first, or there may be, but if we don't have them at -- yes, that we have Methionine public comment. Yes, I know, there's a lot of folks here. So we'll hear from them, but to answer his question, perhaps Dr. Goldstein should --

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Absolutely, I would like to call Dr. Goldstein to the podium if he is present.

DR. GOLDSTEIN: I'm Dr. Goldstein.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you for responding. We have specific questions for you and as I recall correctly, the question is, do we have enough sources of Methionine
coming up in the near future?
MEMBER DAVIS: Yes, two years ago there was a call from this developer of the high Methionine corn to you know, we need to get this out here and grow the supply of this corn, so it can be available. What's happened in the last few years that makes it still in the status of not fully developed, I guess, as far as supply?

DR. GOLDSTEIN: Well, we have been moving forward in terms of trying to get seed for growers and we have produced seed, for example in Chile, with help from the Methionine task force this last winter. It's just arrived and we're about to get it out to farmers and to different people who will test it.

We are on a learning curve and a developmental curve with high Methionine corn and the learning not only is agronomic, it's also developmental in terms of getting farmers interested in it, getting seed growers
interested in it, getting the Methionine end user, the poultry producer, to invest in it.

So it's bringing along the whole gamut of players that is, perhaps, the most difficult part of the whole thing.

MEMBER DAVIS: And your affiliation
is?
DR. GOLDSTEIN: I work for Michael
Fields Agricultural Institute. We're a nongovernmental organization in Southeastern Wisconsin for sustainable and organic farming, and we've been breeding corn. Our project is a team project together with the USDA and --

MEMBER DAVIS: So your organization is the holder or the breeder of this type of corn.

DR. GOLDSTEIN: Right, we breed corn and we also use corn from our cooperators.

MEMBER DAVIS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN DELGADO: All right, we have a question for the doctor from Katrina
followed by -- Katrina.
SECRETARY HEINZE: Could you just repeat your affiliation so $I$ can get it down? DR. GOLDSTEIN: Michael Fields Agricultural Institute.

SECRETARY HEINZE: Thank you. CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Any other questions? MEMBER KARREMAN: I have one question.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Hu.
MEMBER KARREMAN: I think, you know, with the expiration date, if we give two years now, we're recommending that, will that stimulate these growers that might be growing it or you know, is it just going to kind of keep kind of -- I don't know -- spinning wheels in a sense? I hate to put it that way but we want the high Methionine corn to come in as well as other methods of feeding the birds hopefully, in an organic way, so what's your feeling on, you know, the stimulus for
those corn growers to do that?
DR. GOLDSTEIN: I think the two years is certainly a stimulus. It's also a time in which we could, with the full backing of the industry, the poultry industry, we would be able to get quite a bit of seed produced, perhaps not sufficient for everyone but getting closer. And I have some figures that I'll present later at my presentation on that.

I think the whole thing has to be industry driven. There has to be buy-in from the poultry companies and I'm seeing that happening with the activity of the Methionine task force. I'm very excited about their inputs at this point.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Joe, followed by Tracy.

MEMBER SMILLIE: It's both for Walter and Hu. When I heard two years, I thought, you know, that's a short period of time. That's two growing seasons and I'm just
wondering why you picked two years, Hu , and Dr. Goldstein, whether you think that that's an adequate amount of time.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Hu?
MEMBER KARREMAN: I think the
reason we picked two years partially was based on hearing your talk out in Wisconsin that in three years' time if there's ideal conditions, you have in Hawaii there's corn coming on and there would be commercially available in sufficient amounts. That was part of it, if I remember that right. And that would be in three years.

But then we also want to see -- I guess, you know, representing the organic community, I guess you know, we want to hopefully see a diversity in diet and not just -- you know, I mean poultry are omnivorous animals. They're not herbivores and a lot of the -- I think the organic birds are perhaps being fed a fairly herbivorous diet with the synthetic Methionine. And I think we need to
let the animals express their natural behavior more and perhaps have a more diversified diet and therefore, we put two years instead of three so that some of these other factors that I mentioned of those four would play in.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Do you want to complement that answer, Kevin? MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes. CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Please go ahead. MEMBER ENGELBERT: Also, Joe, as simple as it seems, the last time it was put on was just for three years and we decided that two would make it a full five for the normal Sunset process and let that be the -MEMBER SMILLIE: But this isn't a Sunset process.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: No, no, it's not.

MEMBER SMILLIE: And I am a little confused. Maybe I'll wait until tomorrow but I'm not quite sure what we're going to be voting on tomorrow but you'll fill us in on
that because this document simply is rejecting the removal of the time limit.

MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes, but then we
-- there's a second document we voted on
immediately afterwards, and I'm -- literally immediately for a two-year extension after all our discussions.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, so there's two motions, just to clarify. One is to reject the petition and the other one is to extend it two more years.

MEMBER SMILLIE: And I still would like to get Dr. Goldstein's opinion on the two years for seed development.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: That's right, that's pending. Please, can you answer that question?

DR. GOLDSTEIN: Well, we're doing
somewhat of a rush job. We're taking the best corn that we have, we're making trials on it in different states. We're analyzing it. We're doing the best we can to get the seed
out within the two years. Three years would be more comfortable. The problem is that we need to make some fundamental changes and fundamental things have to come into place. We have a new product. We have a price issue, what's it going to cost? There has to be relationships established between seed companies and the poultry companies that aren't there in place right now. There has to be incentives for farmers to grow it, so the farmers are the other link that has to be worked out. Two years, we certainly could have quite a bit of seed there, particularly if industry was willing to invest in growing seed in Chile for a winter period, we probably would have sufficient seed.

So there's all these different factors that are in play here.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay. Tracy, followed by Jennifer.

MEMBER MIEDEMA: If we get it wrong in our prediction that there will be non-
synthetic alternatives available by October 2010, what will start happening and how soon to the chickens, the eggs, the organic egg industry?

MEMBER KARREMAN: Well, that's definitely why we didn't take the -- that's why we didn't allow the expiration date to actually take effect this October, okay, because we don't want to see just a disruption in the industry.

But we certainly want to have the stimulus to look for alternatives and this has been discussed twice before by two Boards and here we're discussing it again and Dr.

Goldstein and others are trying to do as good a research as they can. But I'd like to -Dan, do you mind if I -- you know, Tracy's question was regarding the health of the birds and whatnot and the nutrition. Do you have some thoughts on that?

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Before we continue, do we have any more questions for

Dr. Goldstein. I want to make sure that's the case. Jennifer.

MEMBER HALL: Thank you. Dr. Goldstein, mine is similar and I'm curious in your trials, if it's strictly the growing of the corn or if it is -- if it does include trials on the impact of what I see as the end user which is the bird?

DR. GOLDSTEIN: Both. Agronomic
trials to find out what the yield penalty might be for growing these corns relative to growing normal hybrids, but also feeding trials together with our colleagues from University of Minnesota, Organic Valley, we've done both broiler and layer trials with our corn, with quite favorable results.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, any other questions for Dr. Goldstein? Tracy, are you satisfied with the answer so far?

MEMBER MIEDEMA: I don't know that
I got an answer to, you know, how soon would we start seeing effects and what are the
effects, I mean, just in lay terms of someone not very familiar with what the benefits are of Methionine to eggs and to the birds? What would start happening, you know, say, two months in?

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: I believe, Dr. Goldstein, could you answer that and then -DR. GOLDSTEIN: I believe my colleagues, who are going to give testimony a little bit later on will answer that. I think they're quite prepared in that direction. MEMBER MIEDEMA: Okay, that's fine, thanks.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, in that case, thank you very much for addressing our group. You have a comment, please proceed. MEMBER GIACOMINI: Okay, the evolution of this petition was ongoing and rigorous, I think, and there was a minority opinion that's expressed and in the recommendation and I would just like to make a few points that led to that point as the one
no vote on the Livestock Committee and the writer of that document, that part of the document.

It was very disturbing to me, number one, for the petition to be saying that we're very close to an alternative but the solution that we want you to deal with right now is to take off the incentive and the push to -- of any expiration date at all. That didn't seem to make a lot of sense to me. One person I was talking to yesterday said that that was based on the advice of an attorney and I guess all I'll say for that is maybe sometimes you should talk to another attorney because that does not go -did not go over well with the Committee.

The second part of that, as we looked at the data that was presented with the document, and the possibility of looking at a two-year expiration date, three year, whatever we were going to look at, I'll repeat what I said at the last meeting, that I would be --

I would never want to see a loss of the poultry industry or any part of it because of such a restriction and a loss of such a small amount of the diet as what we're doing with Methionine.

But that being said, we have to
really need it, and the data that was presented with the petition was essentially -it did discuss the theoretical pure diet type effects of having no Methionine; health, immunity, feathers, cannibalism, all sorts of things. But when the data was presented that looked at specific trials with additional -the additional Methionine removed from the treatment, the only data that was presented was less growth. There was no immunity, there was no health issues presented.

And being someone who works in the industry and the livestock sector of this, the ability to match conventional performance rates is not a justification to add synthetic substances to the National List in my mind and

I don't think we do that in other sectors. So I'm more than welcome and I hope we have some presentation of some real health issues, not just theoretical of pure diets where no Methionine was present, but based on current diets with current feeds, modern feedstuffs, where we're looking at what that difference would be and I'm not even saying that it would take a lot.

There was one public testimony that was handwritten and scanned in where it was simply a gentleman saying, you know, "I raise birds, and birds will die." That's almost enough because it's a real testimony and it's not just theoretical. But if we are going to give a performance exemption on this product and we are going to go put it on in two years, simply for consistency and there's parts of the industry that will want to tear me apart on this, but simply for consistency I don't see limiting it to poultry. If we're going to -- if all the presentation that they can make
is performance, we've got aquaculture coming up, we've got pet food issues, we've got other things that will probably be coming up before this two-year expiration date is done and giving this exemption only for one small sector of the industry when the only data presented is performance, I don't think is consistent. But I would more than welcome and hope that we see some real health data presented.

CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Thank you for that comment. Any other questions related to the proposal? Okay, should we --

MEMBER KARREMAN: That's it for the livestock presentation right now. CHAIRMAN DELGADO: Okay, thank you
very much. It is now 10 before 12:00 o'clock which is very good. I appreciate the fact that we are ahead of schedule. The next item on the agenda is the welcome lunch period. So we'll recess for lunch and come back here exactly at 1:00 o'clock if you will, 1:10, so
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A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N
(1:05 p.m.)
we can continue with the scheduled agenda.
(Whereupon, a luncheon recess was

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. We have a quorum and we're back in session. We'll continue with the second part of our agenda for today, and that includes Livestock

Committee with Dr. Karreman talking about aquaculture.

DR. KARREMAN: All right. Thank you, Rigo. So we're going to talk about our recommendation, proposed recommendation for the use of fish meal and fish oil in the proposed aquaculture standards. It's posted up there on the screen.

So, basically, we needed to clarify the fish meal/fish oil issue since we put that on hold since last spring as a contentious issue that has to be kind of balanced within the organic community. And we had our symposium last November, which I think we all still feel was a very good educational day, and we learned a lot from that. And so then we, as Livestock Committee, re-huddled over many phone calls, definitely the vast majority of all our phone calls since December until early April about fish meal and fish oil, and taking into account what the Aquaculture Working Group had proposed, and came up with,
based on very sound science from their producers and Ph.D. nutritionists, as well as the symposium panelists, as well as, for sure, public comment, the following points kind of helped come up with this recommendation that we posted, which has been posted already on the site.

So while respecting current knowledge of the nutritional needs of aquatic animals for fish and fish oil, there are potentially certifiable organic alternatives becoming available, but to what extent is an open question. Certified organic fish meal and fish oil would be expected to become increasingly available as the aquaculture industry would grow. To insure that the diets are nutritionally complete at the beginning of any aquaculture program that might start, we propose that the aquatic products of other certification systems be allowed via 7 USC 6505, Section 2106(b).

By doing this, we would reduce the
depletion of existing wild caught fisheries as a direct feed to any industry that would start here, as well as promote aquatic products from organically managed and, hence, sustainable systems that are already elsewhere established, like with the Soil Association and Tourland, and that's what we're kind of -that was our thinking there. This will allow the nascent USDA certified aquaculture industry the needed time to establish enough basic feed for itself.

And since aquatic species are considered livestock under OFPA, we should also promote their natural behaviors. And since many species of fish - and, honestly, the Livestock Committee certainly was looking at the whole spectrum of fish. I mean, not that we talked about every fish species, or family, or genus out there, but not one specific kind of fish that guided any of our thinking, it's to incorporate them all. But a lot of species are piscivorus, or eating
other fish in the ocean, and that should be a goal of nutrition in organically managed animals, so that they're eating a natural diet.

And then we talked a little bit about the fish oils that the organic consumers that consume fish also don't want to probably have any terrestrial type of animal parts being fed to organic fish. We took that into account. And, also, the need for the -- if we only feed plant-based feeds to the marine fish, their Omega-3 content, which is something that the consumers look for, might not be there, or in a different kind of fatty acid profile.

An earlier version of what the
Livestock Committee was talking about would have included that fish meal and fish oil from wild caught fish, and other wild aquatic animals produced from sustainable food grade fisheries, or sustainably managed foraged fisheries could be allowed in the following
step-wise levels. No more than 12 percent during year one through five, and then no more than six percent during year six through eight, and no more than three percent during year nine through ten, with the percentages being on average over the production cycle of the aquatic animal life. That is still retained in the Minority Report that is attached to the back of this proposal.

We also had talked about in our conference calls discussions between December and April about creating a provisional-type label until there would be enough fish oil/fish meal harvestable from certified organic fish. And that would have had a 10year life span, as well. But that did not make it into our recommendation, so with all that background, we would like to insert - I'm going to do the aquaculture feed first, but we also have . 251 we'd like to insert, the Origin of Aquaculture Animals, but I'm going to do the Aquaculture Feed first, and that's
205.252. Let's see. I don't need to read through all of them. Which one was that? Sorry, just trying to find where -- I don't have to go through all of them, do I? (Off the record comments.) DR. KARREMAN: Okay. Sorry. So we're recommending to insert . 252 A-M as posted, and we voted yes, in favor, one opposed, and one absent, as far as aquatic feed. There was a minority opinion from the one no vote, and perhaps that dissenting opinion, you might want to talk about the minority opinion, so if I may give it to Dan. CHAIR DELGADO: Dan. MEMBER GIACOMINI: Thank you, Rigo, and Hugh. In reviewing this topic, and I apologize to everyone, appearing as Mr. Minority Opinion today, but I started looking at this, trying to consider all the stakeholders, and all the options, and from my own background, and education, and experience. And it seems to me that with the growing world
population, a diet of high Omega-3 fatty acids is going to continue to be a positive health aspect for the human population. And if we're going to meet that, we want to try and do that without devastating our ocean fisheries. And in order -- and if there are problems in conventional aquaculture, can we work with the fundamental basics of the organic principles? Granted, we're not dealing with soil, but can we use those principles to improve on the problems that we're seeing in the conventional aquaculture to help us achieve these goals. And so that was my framework, and where I'm coming from in trying to work through this information to come up with a workable solution.

My opposition in the wording of the existing report has a couple of points. Number one is that I question our ability to essentially tell the secretary what to do, to we currently do not have any full equivalency agreements on organic regulations with any
countries, as I understand it. Telling the secretary to make it okay, and just call organic, all the foreign organic fish meal and fish oil seems very presumptuous to me.

I, also, am very uncomfortable with the inequity that that puts on -- would put on the U.S. Organic Aquaculture farmers part of the industry; whereas, I could see fish meal and fish oil being traded between the salmon and the sea bass people in Chile, and the U.S. farmers wouldn't have any access to it, but Chile would be shipping in organic sea bass, and organic salmon to our regulations.

When I further look at the regulatory issues involved, and I look to OFPA, Section -- we have the issue that we keep coming back to of, if it's organic, it has to have an organic diet. And the -- but when I look to OFPA, it not only says that, and even though in my reading it may say it a little bit differently in OFPA than it says it in the regulation, it also has Section 2107
that says that with certain consultations, the Secretary shall allow wild caught to be certified or labeled as organic. And with those two sections in there, I guess I'm going to give credit to Congress that maybe some other people wouldn't necessarily want to get. I think they were aware that both parts were in the Bill, and that the fact that that is there, maybe there is some intention of - I don't know what it is - but maybe there is a way through the regulatory process that this can be found, a working solution to this can be found. And I would like to give the industry and the regulators the opportunity to try and discover that, rather than just presenting them with a document that does not have those points.

Finally, $I$ have a fundamental -- a final point that makes me extremely uncomfortable, on the one hand, but I think it's something we need to recognize on the other. We keep hearing that wild caught
cannot be organic because of a number of reasons. Some of that is contamination, but the essence of it is that they are not managed, and that they are not "agricultured." If wild caught fish, in my mind, are not agricultured, then they should not be considered livestock. And if they're not considered livestock, then the fish meal and fish oil from those would be viewed entirely differently as being sourced from livestock, and being sourced from an agricultural source. So, I think that's an aspect that hasn't been looked at at all. And I realize that may not be a very popular idea, but I think when I really sit down and look at what OFPA says, the law says, that's kind of the conclusion I come to. That then brings us to the question of what is the definition of livestock, which just lists aquatic species, which seems to be a little contradictory in that sense also. But I -- to come around, I have a number of problems with the report, with the recommendation.

I recommend that we go back and institute the step-down, insert the step-down language into the recommendation to give the rule making process and the stakeholders a chance to see if there's a workable solution that does fit in with the way we are currently looking at regulations and laws.

CHAIR DELGADO: Back to you, Hugh.
DR. KARREMAN: Thanks, Dan.
Certainly, those discussion items are very clear in my mind still from all our calls.

Under OFPA, livestock definition does include fish used for food, it's not just aquatics, so it's difficult with OFPA. But since it does say wild caught can basically be considered, that's why I think we came up with that foreign certified that may use live caught, or wild caught, just their carcasses, trimmings and whatnot could be used for fish feed, but never to be sold here in the U.S. as final human product, those fish, just the
trimmings. Because if the industry is going to start, it's got to have something to start with. You've got to feed the animals, and after a lot of deliberations, and you were part of it, we all were in Livestock, I think we feel that we came up with the best possible way to start the aquaculture industry, and honestly not just tilapia and catfish, because that could take a very, very long time. And if they're farmed, they might not have the right profile of essential fatty acids and whatnot, that other fish that might have been fed wild caught would have, that are certified organic under sustainable conditions and whatnot. And so that's how we came up with the foreign inclusion.

And, also, from public comment, actually, from George Lockwood and their public comment, is to go back to what they proposed last year, essentially. However, in a way, if we would consider foreign certified allowable, but also include our prohibitions
on the fish feed coming in as foreign certified, but that that fish, carcasses, viscera, and whatnot trimmings have to be from animals that were not give parasiticides, and not given any antibiotics. And, Joe, you mentioned that yesterday, how that's very limited, it sounds like. And perhaps they could do that in those areas, and then we would be relieved of that major hurdle with the antibiotics and parasiticide use.

We feel that this is our best try, after a lot of talking. And the minority report also reflects our thoughts and discussions, and we just -- I guess we need to know a little bit perhaps how the Program feels about looking at foreign sourced certified feed for fish. We haven't really gotten any feedback from the Program at all on that, but the provisional label, I think we got some feedback where that just probably won't fly.

CHAIR DELGADO: Would members of
the Program like to comment? The answer appears to be yes, but they need time to find the answer. Are you ready?

PARTICIPANT: Not yet.
CHAIR DELGADO: Let's continue with other questions, and then we can come back to pose that. Jeff?

VICE CHAIR MOYER: Hugh, the other point that I think was brought up, I brought it up yesterday, but it was brought up a lot during our discussion, was that in light of the fact that we don't have a certification program for aquaculture currently, foreign certified fish products are being sold in the supermarket today in the United States as human food. And what we're talking about is taking a byproduct from them, and using them to feed fish that would now be certified under our standards, so I think the standard that we're proposing is quite a bit higher in terms of the proportion of the foreign certified material that would be consumed by humans in
this country from what it is, down to the current lack of any standard.

CHAIR DELGADO: Good point. Okay. Dan, you had a comment.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: I just would like to clarify something that you just said a second ago there, Hugh. As I remember, the Aquatic Working Group said that they preferred their 12 and 12, but they would accept the step-down as a reasonable -

DR. KARREMAN: Yes. That's
correct. Sorry. I retract that, what I said.
CHAIR DELGADO: Thank you. Any other comments? Joe.

MEMBER SMILLIE: I'd be pleased to provide a gap analysis of a limited number of foreign certification programs; namely, two, that shows where and when they could be out of compliance with our interpretation of the U.S. regulations, so there's two caveats there. It's just, it's an interpretation of where they could be out of compliance. But we could
-- I could come up with that document, if that -- if the path that you're headed down proves fruitful, and there is some consideration of allowing it, we could come up with a gap analysis that showed the difference between current foreign and national aquaculture programs that are -- where they could possibly be out of compliance with the interpretation of the current regulations; namely, the parasiticides and antibiotics, if that channel proves fruitful.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any comments on your part? I believe Barbara is ready to give a response. Please go ahead.

MS. ROBINSON: Let me understand this. You want the Program, or you want to say that the feed which is made from the fish, which is not organic, you want to accept that.
All right? But the fish itself, the filet, you're not going to allow as food for humans. DR. KARREMAN: If this proposal is accepted, yes. Once that would happen, if
this were to take place, that foreign certified organic fish can be used as chum, or feed.

MS. ROBINSON: Correct.
DR. KARREMAN: Then the Program here would be rolling, and there would be no more foreign certified filets on the market anymore, because then the -- isn't that what we're talking about? They'd have to meet our standards. Sorry. Once the standards here would be in place, the only foreign stuff coming in would be to feed USDA certifiable organic fish. There would be no not tour land or whatever filets on the market in Florida or whatever.

MS. ROBINSON: This is illogical. You're not being logical about this, I don't think. You know, it's not good enough for us to eat, but it's okay to feed to fish.

DR. KARREMAN: Just for regulatory purposes, yes.

MS. ROBINSON: All right. (Laughter.)

CHAIR DELGADO: Let's have MS. ROBINSON: And, moreover, we have -- as I recall, excuse me. As I recall, we lost a lawsuit over this issue.

VICE CHAIR MOYER: If I could
attempt to clarify the comment, Barbara, that Hugh is making, and that this proposal is making. What we are stating in this recommendation is not that we take uncertified product. We're taking product that is currently not certified by U.S. standards, because we have no U.S. standard.

MS. ROBINSON: Understood.
VICE CHAIR MOYER: And right now, there's currently fish on the market today that is being sold as certified organic, under private label in this country.

MS. ROBINSON: Right.
VICE CHAIR MOYER: What we're suggesting, the recommendation suggests is that we use the trimmings from that fish, not
the fish itself, but the trimmings from that fish to supplement, to be the portion of the feed that represents the fish oil and fish meal portion of the feed for fish that would then be certified under U.S. standards. All other portions of the feed would have to fit under the U.S. standard until the point where there is enough U.S. market to supply the oil and meal content portion. Does that help? It's very confusing, I understand.

DR. KARREMAN: Would it also perhaps help to maybe call that, going back to the term "supplement", we have like a foreign certified organic fish meal and fish oil supplement.

VICE CHAIR MOYER: Well, it is, but

DR. KARREMAN: Instead of like a feed.

VICE CHAIR MOYER: It is, but at 24 percent of the -

DR. KARREMAN: I realize that.

VICE CHAIR MOYER: -- food, that's a heck of a supplement.

MS. ROBINSON: Well, we need to -
CHAIR DELGADO: Let's make sure. Barbara, are you going to answer that?

MS. ROBINSON: We need to think about this, but it's -- because -- let us think about this. You know, I'm loathe to give you answers just off the top of our head. We usually get into trouble here, but it's just -- because I really do want to make sure that there's a logic and consistency here. Jeff, you raise a good point. I mean, I do need to know, first of all; we need to know are we just talking about the supplement part of this?

VICE CHAIR MOYER: Yes, we are talking about the 12 -- currently, what we're talking about is the 12 percent fish meal, 12 percent fish oil, which is -- if you add that up it's 24 percent, if my math is correct, so it is a fair chunk of the diet. Too much to
actually be called a supplement, but it is that portion of the feed that is unavailable currently from any organic source, because we have no organic standard in this country. And so, taking the fish that is currently being accepted by consumers as organic under private label, and taking just the portion of that that's not being sold here for human consumption that's currently the viscera and the trimmings, using that to create the oil and meal portion, because it is coming from a certified organic - it's not our standards, we understand that - but it is currently accepted by the public as certified organic, or as organic. Using that portion to fill that niche of that -

DR. KARREMAN: And we could have a phase-out, as well.

VICE CHAIR MOYER: Right. But once they want to sell fish in the U.S. to our standards, all of that material would have to meet our standards, so it's a very -- I mean,
it's hard to tell at this point what that window would be until even those trimmings would meet our standards. But if they intend to market any of their fish product here in the future, they would have to adhere to our label, thereby, those trimmings would have to adhere by our label, too. Gets us out of the wild caught version, and it also gets us away from the idea of a step-down version, which, in my mind, has tremendous potential for failure in the marketplace with consumers. If you have a step-down process, and the industry fails to meet that, by the rule, what would happen is one day it would be organic, and the next day it wouldn't. And consumers have a hard time understanding how the product they bought yesterday was certified, and the product they buy today doesn't have certification, because we didn't make the alternate sources of fish meal and fish oil available through research over the next seven to ten years, whatever it works out to be.

That's very confusing to people in the marketplace, I think. It would be to me.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay.
MR. MATTHEWS: I would say that it's probably no more confusing than when we went from accepted standards worldwide to the NOP. And under the NOP and the Organic Foods Product Action of 1990, if you want to sell label or represent in the United States as organic, it has to be produced to our standards. So I really am having problems with producing to a different organic standard, and then representing it, selling it in the United States as an organic feed for fish.

I would, if I were on the outside, I would be arguing well, why can't I use Germany's feed for my dairy cows? Why can't I use Chile's feed for my hogs? Why can't I use New Zealand's feed for my lambs? But even if it is at a supplement level, $I$ mean, it's still being represented as an agricultural
product, so why can't I use some other country's agricultural product in the production of any other livestock, other than an aquatic species?

I don't -- I'm not sure that the attorneys would tell us that that is legal. And I'm also suspicious that Mr. Harvey would file a second lawsuit on the feeding of nonorganic feed to U.S. organic animals.

CHAIR DELGADO: Very good. Thank you. The Program will respond later, it's my understanding, so we'll move on to the next question. We have Kevin, followed by Katrina.

MEMBER ENGELBERT: I'd like to try to address a few of the points that are made. The first is, with the feed from a foreign source, this is simply trying to bring in an oil that's not available in the current system. We were told that a step-down system would not stand up to lawyer scrutiny, that wild caught would also not stand up to -- wild caught fish oil and fish meal would not stand
up to the scrutiny of all the regulatory bodies that the measure would have to be approved by. So this is what we've come up with.

And as far as the feeding for dairy, cattle, or any other product, this market is already established in the United States, and those feeds would have to meet USDA NOP program requirements. If it did, and somebody thought it was cost-effective to import it from a foreign country, they could. But right now, we don't have those standards, and this was the only thing that we could come up with that would allow that to take place.

CHAIR DELGADO: Right. Katrina.
SECRETARY HEINZE: This is a
complicated issue, so I'm trying to understand it in my simple mind. This really is for fish who are piscivorus. Is that right? And as I understand it, what you're trying to do is find a way to kick-start that industry. And so you've looked at a couple of different
options, wild caught was one, this foreign is another, the step-down is another. And what you're struggling with is, which one will pass regulatory scrutiny. Am I getting it right? CHAIR DELGADO: Kevin, you want to respond?

MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes. We've been told that the foreign certified organic, they don't know. Everything else we've been told won't pass the scrutiny. And the one mistake we've made with our recommendation we need to add to, and Hugh will read it off, is under (A), we assumed that everything else would have to meet our standards. And we need to be specific about that, and add in this one section to (A) to make it perfectly clear that everything else about this foreign certified has to meet our standards as far as substances or prohibited materials, or anything like that.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Katrina, you had a question?

SECRETARY HEINZE: Well, I was just going to follow-up with, it does seem then that an NOP response would be helpful to get you to how do we do that kick-start in the way that's right.

CHAIR DELGADO: I believe that Barbara wants to comment, please, and we'll follow with Julie.

MS. ROBINSON: I just would like to
say, the Program has never said that - at least I hope we have never conveyed to you that there can be no wild caught standards. We have a law that says that there can be wild caught standards, and the Program has certainly never issued any kind of statement that said there can be no wild caught standards. And if you somehow have gotten that impression, that's a mistake.

DR. KARREMAN: Well, I apologize, but we have been under the impression, maybe from various other stakeholders or whatever, that that just won't fly.

MS. ROBINSON: Well, you know -
DR. KARREMAN: And I've always
wondered about it.
MS. ROBINSON: We've heard that some consumers may not want wild caught standards, but USDA has never made that statement.

DR. KARREMAN: Yes. You know, and some of us have wondered about it, because it is sitting there in OFPA that it can be considered. But then, apparently, to make it into regulation, we've been under the impression that that just won't fly.

MR. MATTHEWS: Well, it's allowed by -

CHAIR DELGADO: Please wait to be recognized, please. Mr. Matthews. MR. MATTHEWS: It's allowed by statute, and we've had a work plan on the book for years. In fact, it was just republished for wild caught, and that stimulated a lot of phone calls to me as to what's happening on
it. Well, the bottom line is nothing is happening on it. It's just that we renewed the work plan, and so basically a previous board said no. There's a work plan that's out there because after the board said no, the statute was amended. So if this board wanted to move forward with a different decision from what the previous board did, well, then that's perfectly within their right.

Right now, there's no wild caught because there's been no recommendation by the board to develop standards for it. But that doesn't mean there couldn't be, so we've never said you cannot do it. Only the board has said you cannot do it.

CHAIR DELGADO: All right. Julie. MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes. This may be opening up a different can of worms, but what is the downside of setting the standard that for the moment, only herbivorous fish will meet? And then those fish are being produced as certified organic at some later date, there
will be a certified feed source available that will then allow piscivorus species to then be certified organic.

CHAIR DELGADO: Dan, do you want to address that point?

MEMBER GIACOMINI: I believe there's already enough of a recommend passed that would accomplish that, once it makes it through rule making, in the practical rule making side. The second part of what you asked there is the fact that you are what you eat, to a certain extent. And those fish do not eat the diet that raises their oil levels high enough to achieve the kind of numbers that they're going to need, that they're looking at to be needing to feed the piscivorus.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any other comments? Yes, Tracy.

MEMBER MIEDEMA: This is just a
little bitty one, but we refer to these trimmings as imported certified organic, and

I think that's a point of confusion, because that makes it sounds like it's USDA certified organic, and happens to be imported, and so just as a clarification for language, if we said organic non-USDA certified.

DR. KARREMAN: Sure. We can figure that in.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Joe, followed by Jennifer.

MEMBER SMILLIE: Well, this is itty bitty to the itty bitty. It shouldn't even be foreign, it should be private standards.

That's the word you want to use.
DR. KARREMAN: Okay.
MEMBER SMILLIE: Private standards.
DR. KARREMAN: Very good.
CHAIR DELGADO: Jennifer. Any
other comments, questions?
DR. KARREMAN: I think, George, did you have -- George Lockwood, did you want to say something?

CHAIR DELGADO: Mr. Lockwood, can
you -- Dr. Lockwood, please approach the podium and address your -- do you have a specific question, Hugh, or do you want to allow -

DR. KARREMAN: I just thought I'd let Mr. Lockwood have some input here, since they put so much time into this, and he's head of the Aquaculture Working Group.

CHAIR DELGADO: Please do, sir.
MR. LOCKWOOD: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. I'm George Lockwood, Chair of the Aquaculture Working Group, your Technical Advisory Panel.

We have a number of concerns about the proposal, and hopefully, maybe some comments I can make will help clarify some of your thinking. We are concerned about implementation under 2105(b), it's never been done. When you determine an equivalent standard, are you going to have to go and determine that all of Natureland's standards are equivalent, or just that having to do with fish meal?

We also have concerns about whether the fish that will be grown for fish meal and oil will be grown to equivalent U.S. standards. We have proposed to the Chair of the Livestock Committee to insert that actually you would grow to two standards, the U.S. standard, and to the foreign certified that you're going to import.

If, in fact, we're able to get through the implementation and equivalency issues, we see that there probably will be a source of meal coming from very large sloppier production around the world. There's already one grower that is seriously considering this. Sourcing oil is a major concern, because the only oil, the only source of oil is the ocean, practically speaking. There are no land crops that produce DHA and EPA which are the Omega-3 fatty acids that are so important.

I would like to give you an example here of salmon, for instance, how this would
apply to salmon aquaculture. Salmon is the third or fourth most consumed fish species in the American diet. The average American eats two to two and a half pounds per capita. It's a very high oil fish in nature and in culture. It requires somewhere between 10 and 20 percent oil for a healthy diet.

In the regulations that you've already adopted in your March 2007 meeting, you adopted under 205.252(j) the prescription of feeding fish the same, from the same genus. In other words, salmon can't be used to feed salmon. That means we would have to turn to some other species for oil. The only other species that will undoubtedly be grown, at least initially, in any quantities are shrimp, tilapia, and catfish. They are very low oil producing fish. We're talking about one, two, or three percent. So if we take the viscera from catfish, for instance, that only has one percent oil in it, we're not going to have much oil in order to develop a salmon
industry. It just won't work.
Another way of doing this would be to grow anchovies, for instance, for example, for the sole purpose of feeding to U.S. aquaculture, salmon, for instance. In other words, what we would do is take wild oil in Europe, grow anchovies, extract the oil and send it to the United States to be used as is proposed. We are, in essence, laundering the oil. That's all that we would be doing. And that just doesn't make sense to me.

As I said yesterday, upon our very careful review, and from a practical point, we just simply don't see how this is going to work. We have made recommendations, and we strongly urge that you seriously consider restoring to what we had proposed, and you acted on on March 27th of last year, our Paragraphs B, C, D, and I. And we suggest that you add Paragraph Q, which is from the Livestock Committee report, that would read something like the following. And I've made
an amendment, and I'll tell you when I get to it.
"Fish meal and oil from carcasses, viscera, and trimmings from the processing of foreign certified organic aquatic animals" and I would add - "as provided under 2107(b), and otherwise produced in compliance with this section, will be considered organic for use in fish feed only."

So that, basically, is what we
would recommend, that you support our recommendations that we labored over very hard, just as you have been doing. We think the Act fully supports this.

For instance, in 2103.11, the Act
clearly intends for fish to qualify as
organic. In Section 2114(f), provides for the harvesting of wild crops. Section 2107(c)
allows wild fish to be organic. 2103.21 provides for products from naturally occurring biological processes. 2110(f) allows the use of supplements, or at least acknowledges the
use of supplements.
In conclusion, the Act states the intent for organic seafood, and provides the legal structure. To effectively eliminate fish oil, there will be no organic seafood. In the absence of a firm standard, foreign grown, foreign certified, foreign labeled salmon will continue to enjoy their harvest in the U.S. market for organic salmon.

Again, we urge the restoring of the paragraphs in our original proposal, which, incidentally, are in our public comment as Appendix $A$, and the ones that were withheld, they weren't deleted, they were withheld for further consideration, are italicized. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any questions for George? Hugh? Any questions from the Board for George? Thank you very much.

MR. LOCKWOOD: Thank you.
CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Any questions for the members of the Livestock

Committee on the part of the Board? Very good. Well, it seems to me that Chairman of the Livestock Committee, you probably need to do some reword, some rethinking.

DR. KARREMAN: Major, big time, probably.

CHAIR DELGADO: Very good. And that concludes your presentation. Do we have anything else?

DR. KARREMAN: That does. The only
other thing was that discussion item on net pens, and we're working still with the Aquaculture Working Group on the main -- well, two of the issues are siting the pens, potentially. And, also, the manure nutrient effluent from those pens, and so we've asked the AWJ to be available to answer questions regarding that from the Livestock Committee in the coming months, and hopefully come up with a few alternatives to each of those questions that we can choose from in the public sphere.

CHAIR DELGADO: Very good. All
right. Thank you, again, and I look forward to having those changes or modification suggestions from the group.

We move on next to the Handling
Committee, with Mrs. Weisman.
MEMBER WEISMAN: Good afternoon. Wow! Congratulations, Rigo, we're still on schedule.

CHAIR DELGADO: We're on schedule, yes.

MEMBER WEISMAN: I hope I'm not going to mess it up, but there's a good chance that I will.
(Laughter.)
MEMBER WEISMAN: We have on our agenda two classes of things. We have petition materials, and we have some sunset items. I think the first thing that we have on our agenda are the petition materials.

There were originally posted on the agenda two items for 605, which have both been deferred, one because we felt we did not have
sufficient time to -- in the case of calcium derived with seaweed, we did not feel we had enough time to adequately tease-out the issues. There was also sodium chloride acidified, and that was a late petition that did not really have adequate time for the TAP review that we felt was required, and for that reason it was deferred.

For 606, out of the 20 materials that are listed on the -- that are indicated on the agenda, 16 -- four were deferred, and actually one also was withdrawn in the weeks prior to this meeting, so I think that means that we have 15 petitions to present today.

Now, before we actually present the petitions, I did want to make a couple $p$ some comments, some sort of opening comments about 606, in general, to attempt to address some of the comments that we have received, both written ahead of the meeting, and so far during our public meeting.

The first thing that I wanted to
clarify, from our point of view - no, not just from our point of view - I want to clarify, the Handling Committee and the NOSB in considering 606 petitions, is not deciding commercial availability. That is the job of the certifier. That's number one.

The second thing I wanted to clarify is that when materials are deemed appropriate for 606 by the Handling Committee, they will be listed based on the Board's finding, if either of two situations are found to exist; that it is not available as organic, period. Now that doesn't mean, necessarily, that the raw agricultural product may not be grown, but it's not available in the form that's needed for a processed product. The second is fragility of supply, so either it's not available, or the supply is fragile. One of those two situations has been found to exist.

The second issue that has been coming up very consistently is the question
about whether listing on 606 is an incentive or a barrier to the stimulation of the development of new organic materials to replace the ones that are being listed on 606. And the organic community, I think we have seen, is sharply, and I think pretty evenly divided on this issue.

I would like to offer a couple of thoughts on this. As with many things in life, the answer likely is not one or the other. Both may be true, and the answer may differ either case-by-case. I do appreciate the comments that express concern over the growth of -- the increase in items on the National List, and the despair that it's only going to get bigger, and it's never going to get smaller. And I guess I want to remind everyone that even though it feels like we've been at this forever, because I think for many people in the room, it's been most of your adult lives, that the industry and the regulation in the world of federal regulations
is very young. It's only been in effect for five years. And I believe that the -- first of all, as new products begin to understand the regulation and want to participate, it is natural that there are going to be materials that are seen as needed, and petitioned on to the list.

But I also think that we are going to see very soon -- I think there are already -- we are already hearing about petitions that are being written and formed for specific items. I'm not talking theoretically here. I mean, there are specific items that we are going to see petitioned off the list. And I know that it seems like it's taking a long time, but that doesn't mean that that is not going to start happening with more frequency, I believe.

The other -- there have been calls in different ways for a moratorium for listing any new items for a couple of reasons. One that was mentioned was a concern about --
well, one was a suggestion that only raw agricultural products should be petitioned on to 606. We can certainly fully discuss all of these. I don't think that that's really a practical approach.

The other is that we refrain from listing items until we have clarification on what, besides the agricultural ingredient, is also included in a formulated product, in a multi-ingredient product. And I have two thoughts about that. One is that, I was very, very interested in the suggestion that Richard Matthews made earlier today, when we were discussing annotations on livestock. And I believe that something like that in the heading of 606 might help clarify what can and cannot be included in a multi-ingredient product on 606.

The second note I wanted to make is that of the 16 petition, of the live petitions as of today for 606, only six are going to be put forward as recommendations for listing by
the Handling Committee, and none of them are multi-ingredient products. So I believe that -- I want to allay people's concerns about the actual petitions that we may be considering for listing at this meeting.

I think that's probably enough opening comment. And I can move into actually looking at petitions, unless there are questions.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any questions for Julie? None. Please proceed.

MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay. I think the -- we have a list in our meeting books. It's in Alphabetical order. We are -- the first two items on that list are the alcohols, the fortified cooking wines. And I'm actually asking different members of the Handling Committee to present different of these petitions because there's so many of them, and you'll get really tired of hearing my voice.

The other note I wanted to say is
that there was a whole group of petitions that
were submitted by one petitioner. They were somewhat boilerplate in their presentation, and they were so similar, and we pretty much, I think, are treating every single -- I mean, we had similar findings on all of them, without exception, pretty much, so the bulk of those are going to be presented by Katrina and Steve, with a few stragglers. So I think we'll proceed with Tracy on the cooking wines.

CHAIR DELGADO: Tracy.
MEMBER MIEDEMA: Thank you, Mr.
Chair. Thank you, Julie.
I'd like to actually start with the second one. The first two petitions were submitted by the same petitioner, and they included a bunch of their evidence, lack of supply in the fortified cooking wine sherry that supports their petition for Marsala, so I thought it made sense to start with that one.

So we recommended unanimously for the inclusion of fortified cooking wine sherry
to 205.606 to the National List. We felt that it did satisfy in our evaluation criteria, one, two, and four, and number three was N/A, not applicable. Our Committee vote was six yes, zero no. And just a little bit about the petition.

This substance does have unique flavor and fragrance characteristics that are necessary for the prepared dishes that the petitioner makes in their prepared foods. And they were able to demonstrate that it had these unique properties. They also did an excellent job of thoroughly listing fortified wine producers that didn't have any organic available, and organic wine producers that didn't have any fortified wine available. So it was quite an exhaustive list of both of these types of producers. And just sort of as a check, we triangulate, use various means to check availability. Just doing Google searches, it was interesting. The only organic sherry I could find when I put quotes
around those two words, you'd think you've get 15,000 hits or something, just because it's a pretty typical phrase, the only hits I could find was the petitioner begging the industry to please produce some, so they seem to really be out there doing their due diligence, looking for someone to produce these two types of fortified wines, so opportunity out there. Hopefully, this would be one of those situations that we hope happens, where 606 is seen as an opportunity, and spurs an organic version to be made.

The petition for Marsala is almost identical, if I can move on to that one. The only difference is just the unique flavor, profile, and characteristics, some very slight differences in the way the wine is produced. And they use their, like I said, their evidence of going to wine producers and not being able to find any organic versions, going to organic wine producers and not being able to find those two varietals, as evidence. But
they only put that evidence in one petition, sherry. In their Marsala petition, they referred to their sherry petition, which was -- procedurally, it would have been cleaner for the petitioner to have went ahead and just repeated that research, so it wasn't siloed off. One petition referring to another just isn't procedurally accurate. But we, as a Committee, agreed that it was sound. And on Marsala, we voted unanimously 6-0 to include fortified cooking wine Marsala on 205.606. Any questions?

CHAIR DELGADO: Any questions for these two products? Jeff.

VICE CHAIR MOYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question isn't, necessarily, just for you, Tracy, but for the Handling Committee, in general. And not only specific for the cooking wines, because my question pertains to all of the products that I see listed in front of me. When you look at the list of criteria for every one of them, we
have that it meets the criteria for impact on humans and environment; yet, this is conventionally produced agricultural products, and so it leads me to wonder if there's no human or environmental impact from conventionally farmed products, why are we here? It would seem like just by definition, the fact that they're conventionally produced in the minds of an organic person, it doesn't meet those standards.

Whether we vote it on to the list or not, in my opinion, it fails that criteria. I'm not saying that's grounds to list or unlist it, I'm just saying I have a problem with that.

CHAIR DELGADO: Response from Julie Weisman.

MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes. Well, I think the -- for instance, some of the questions -- I do think that there is some cleaning up that has to be done, that some of these have been -- I mean, I do agree that has
to be looked at, but I also would like to point out that some of the questions, there are certain questions on these Category 1, 2, and 3 of the evaluation criteria checklists where the notation refers to 205.600(b) and various numbers under (b). And those are questions that are really meant only for synthetic substances. Okay? Some of these questions are meant for synthetic and non-synthetic substances, and I think that where something that would be an agricultural product that's not organic needs a little clarification where that fits in. And I think that they've not been considered exactly the same on each petition, and that may, in fact, be something that does have to be cleaned up.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Tracy. MEMBER MIEDEMA: I would agree with Julie, and also add that when you look through that list of questions, things like is there a toxic or adverse action of the material or
its breakdown products? We're talking about what happens when that wine is in the environment, not what happens during its whole life span of the grapes being grown. And since 606 is non-organic, it is a given that we're potentially talking about conventional agricultural practices, so I think it's embedded in that we're talking about conventional.

CHAIR DELGADO: That is a key. I just want to clarify 606 is the allowance of non-organic products, agricultural products if there are no organic available, and that's sufficient for now. Jennifer.

MEMBER HALL: In the evaluation, do
we consider the percentage of the composition
of the product that the material we're allowing is? Is the Marsala or sherry 60 percent of -

MEMBER WEISMAN: This is only for the -

CHAIR DELGADO: Julie.

MEMBER WEISMAN: I didn't wait. Sorry for jumping the gun, Rigo. It's only 5 percent of a finished product, so the Marsala wine at most can be 4.9 percent or something like that.

CHAIR DELGADO: Tracy.
MEMBER MIEDEMA: And the last thing
I'll throw in here is that the petitioner stated very clearly this was for a Chicken Marsala product, and it really made me bristle that this is non-organic Marsala in a product calling itself Chicken Marsala. And my colleagues on the Committee reminded me that that's an enforcement issue, not within the purview of this Board or our Committee. However, I was really impressed by the way the petitioner handles this, and they on their own website say we're looking for organic Marsala wine. We want everybody to know we're not trying to get away with something, and so it was very -- it was handled really well.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any other questions
on those two products? Thank you. Back to you, Mrs. Weisman.

MEMBER WEISMAN: On our list, which is alphabetical, the next four items that I'm just going to mention briefly are deferred. They are the two algaes that I mentioned earlier today, also black pepper extract and bucholt powder, those four items have been deferred.

I'm going to ask my colleague, Dr. Heinze, I like saying doctor, to present a group of petitions that were submitted by one petitioner.

CHAIR DELGADO: Madam Secretary.
SECRETARY HEINZE: Okay. Thank you for the Madam.

Okay. As Julie said, a number of materials petitioned for listing on 205.606 were submitted by the same petitioner, so I will be presenting five of them, then the rest will come. So the five materials that I am presenting are Chinese thistle daisy extract,
peony root extract, polygala root extract, polygonum root extract, and tangerine peel extract. On a personal note, $I$ do thank the petitioner for the education $I$ got reviewing these.

None of these - so kind of the top
line, first - none of these materials are being recommended by the Handling Committee for listing because of not meeting the criteria for Category 4, so that's the commercial supply is fragile or potentially unavailable. We did not feel that the petitioner made that case.

So a little bit of background.
Yes, Kevin?
CHAIR DELGADO: Kevin.
MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes. Katrina, could you please repeat what the five were that you were going -

SECRETARY HEINZE: I'd be happy to.
MEMBER ENGELBERT: Thank you. I
was trying to find that page.

SECRETARY HEINZE: Okay. Chinese thistle daisy extract, peony root extract, polygala root extract, polygonum root extract, and tangerine peel extract. See, I even made Hugh chuckle. All my co-workers chuckled, too, while I was working on this.

Okay. Are we ready?
CHAIR DELGADO: Please continue.
SECRETARY HEINZE: So a little bit
of background on these materials. In all
cases, these ingredients are intended by the petitioner to be used as nutraceutical ingredients in dietary supplements and foods. And then, again, in all cases, a little background on how they're produced. The raw agricultural material, so for example the Chinese thistle daisy root, is harvested, dried, shipped to a processor. It's milled, then extracted with water and ethanol. The extracted liquid is concentrated into essential oils. That will be important in a minute, so it becomes an essential oil. And
then it's standardized, mixed with organic I can't say this word again - astragalus root carrier, spray dried and ground into a powder. So they're all processed the same way.

Okay. So now we get to the heart of the matter. In all cases, the justification by the petitioner for the organic not being available was the same. What they said, and this is a paraphrase, was that the sourcing department was continuously searching for the organic forms, but had been unable to find them. No information was provided to explain why the organic ingredient could not be available, so they just said we're looking for them, we can't find them, we're still looking. They didn't really address this fragility, like what were the underlying factors that could have made the organic not available, which the Handling Committee felt very strongly was necessary information.

So, as an example, I, and probably
many of you can buy organic tangerines at my local co-op, so what are the technical hurdles that would prevent that peel from the tangerine being used to produce organic tangerine peel extract? And the petition didn't address that at all, which we felt was a problem.

Finally, in three cases, the Chinese thistle daisy, the peony root, and the polygala root, fairly simple internet search found organic forms of these materials. Now, not in this exact form, but either as an essential oil, or as the raw agricultural material. So, again, just because you can find it doesn't mean that it's in the right form, quality, or quantity, but certainly, we would have liked the petitioner to address that, and help us understand, again, what the technical hurdles were. So to wrap that up, in each case, these materials were recommended for listing on 205.606 consistent with our past practice.

So, remember, motion to list, and then in each case, the Handling Committee vote result was in the negative resulting that we're not recommending them for listing. Did you follow that? Okay. So I am supposed to give you the vote results, so by material, Chinese thistle daisy extract, zero yeses, six nos; peony root, zero yeses, five nos, one absent; polygala root extract, zero yes, five no, one absent; polygonum root extract, one yes, four nos, one absent; tangerine peel extract, zero yes, six no.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any questions on these materials? Hugh.

DR. KARREMAN: Just a general question. Did I understand you right, in that they told you the process where they make the extract, so that they're buying the raw material and making the extract, or what?

SECRETARY HEINZE: I don't believe
that's true. They just explained how it's made. I believe they're looking for the -

DR. KARREMAN: The final product. SECRETARY HEINZE: The final product. From the petition, that would be how I read the petition.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any other questions? Okay. Thank you. Back to you. MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay. Now I'm going to turn the mic over to Steve DeMuri, who has a group of similar petitions.

MEMBER DeMURI: Thank you, Julie. These were all petitioned by the same petitioner that Katrina just had for her five, and these five are as follows; Codonopsis root extract, Jujube fruit extract, ligusticum root extract, Poria fungus extract, and Rehmannia root extract.

MEMBER WEISMAN: Can you do that again, slower? Thanks.

MEMBER DeMURI: Codonopsis root extract, Jujube fruit extract, ligusticum root extract, Poria fungus extract, and Rehmannia root extract. Everybody got those?

Just like the items that Katrina had, these ingredients were also intended to be used as nutraceutical ingredients in dietary supplements and foods. So this petitioner petitioned numerous items all to be used for the same end-use. And like Katrina's five, and these as well, the raw agricultural materials harvested, dried, shipped to a processor where it is milled, and then extracted with water and ethanol. The extracted liquid is concentrated into essential oils standardized to desired concentration, mixed with organic astragalus root carrier, spray dried, and then ground into a powder, so that's the process they supplied to us.

And, again, in all cases, the statements concerning organic non-availability was the same, that the sourcing department was looking for the items, but just could not find them. But, again, like the previous five, there is no information provided as to explain
why the organic ingredient cannot be available in organic form. In all five of these cases that I had, internet search, and also some follow-up phone calls revealed that there were organic forms of the raw agricultural materials available in all cases, but the petitions did not address the reasons or conditions that made their specific process forms unavailable. So for those reasons, all five of these materials failed Category 4 of the criteria.

In each case, the Handling
Committee vote resulted in a negative for listing. And the vote results were as follows: for Codonoposis root extract, zero yes, six no, no absent, no abstentions; for Jujube fruit, zero yes, five nos, one absent, zero abstentions; for ligusticum root extract, zero yes, five no, one absent, zero abstentions; for Poria fungus, zero yes, four no, one absent, one abstention; and for Rehmannia root extract, zero yes, five no, one
absent. So that finishes up those five petitions.

There's one other one that Julie mentioned that I had on my list. That was oat bran concentrate that does show up in your list. That's the one that was withdrawn just a few weeks ago, so we do not plan to take any action on that. And that's it. I'll turn it back over to Julie, unless there's any questions.

CHAIR DELGADO: Are there any questions on these materials? Okay. Thank you. Back to you, Julie.

MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay. There's about two more materials that were part of this group from this petitioner, and Gerry is going to present one of them.

CHAIR DELGADO: Gerry.
MEMBER DAVIS: Thank you. The material petition that I went over was Camucamu powdered extract, and it is from a berry produced in the Amazon, generally, South

America. And it's an extract slightly
different than the ones mentioned. It's produced just from juicing and straining the berries, which is then concentrated and spray dried along with organic cassava starch.

The petitioner states that the extract is produced from juicing and straining these berries, and that it has -- the Camu berry has never been available as organic. The berry is harvested in remote wilderness areas of the Amazon flood plain over vast areas which have not been practical to manage under an organic system plan. Being that none of us were familiar with this type of wild harvest situation in South America, one of our members suggested I contact the Instituto Biodinfmico, IBD, in Brazil. And in contacting them, they do certify wild harvested Camu-camu as organic, but when asked to check on it further, what they certify is organic Camu-camu as an ingredient of a liquid juice product, not as powdered extract form.

And they report that there is no domestic U.S. organically certified product available at this time. But since the petitioner did not really address why it's not -- that this organically produced Camu-camu from Brazil, why it can't be used, they didn't even talk about at all, they said it was not available. It never has been grown, which didn't seem to be accurate, versus what we found from IBD, so the Committee voted that Category 4 criteria was not met because the petition did not address why organic Camu-camu produced in Brazil cannot be used. So the vote was zero yes, five no, one abstention to not include it on the National List. Any questions?

CHAIR DELGADO: Questions on this material? None. Thank you. Back to you, Julie.

MEMBER WEISMAN: I would like to ask Joe Smillie to present three materials. MEMBER SMILLIE: Val, we're going to do caramel first, then Kombu, then the poster child okra.

When we were dividing up these, just a little aside on this group. When we were dividing up these materials, those all had big names and looked hard, and so I thought I took the easy ones. Boy, was I wrong. But I'd also like to thank our Chair, who hearing the squeals of pain from the Handling Committee jumped in and brought in the calvary, and Gerry kindly, and Tracy joined the Handling Committee to help out with the materials. So once again, the group work and our wonderful Chair, we got through these materials.

So starting off with caramel color, it was a really interesting petition because the petition for the conventional caramel colors was actually petitioned by one of the manufacturers of organic caramel color. And that, right away, you don't usually see that, but when we got into the petition, and, again, going through Category 1 and 2, basically, in

Category 2 is the substance essential for organic production?

Well, people in the U.S., at least, want their colas dark colored, so whether that's essential or not, I guess the marketplace says it is. I don't particularly feel it to be essential, but not being a cola drinker, I don't have that problem. But, nonetheless, we quickly got into the fact that various different manufacturing -- it's Category 2, number 5, is there an organic substitute? And I thought yes, there's organic caramel color available. There's at least two companies producing it. But when we got into it deeper, and the petitioner did an excellent job explaining it all, every different manufacturing process, and every different manufacturer has various different constraints, mostly to do with pH , and viscosity, and oh, boy. It's food science world out there on what can be used, and what can't be used. And the petitioner had nothing
to hide. I mean, they produce organic caramel color, and they're saying we can't produce this color for all the needs of the organic manufacturing sector.

So, basically, the petitioner claimed that these forms were needed. We checked into the other major manufacturer that we knew, just to see, check the voracity of the petitioner's comments. And sure enough, they backed it up. They said yes, that's the case. And there's a lot of manufacturers in this room that know more about this than I do, but all caramel colors are not created equal.

So we looked at it, and we were open to the idea. But when it got right down to it, the main barrier to the production of caramel color for different uses was it was cost-prohibitive. That ended up, it wasn't constrained by supply, because caramel color is nothing but burnt sugar, basically, more or less in layman's terms, so it wasn't constricted by supply or civil unrest in the
sugar world, or any of the usual things. It was cost-prohibitive. And on that basis, we voted. Again, a motion was made to list it. The vote was zero yes, six no, no absent, and no abstentions.

We felt that cost of production was not a significant reason to add it to 606. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any questions for this material? None. Continue with the next one, please.

MEMBER SMILLIE: The second one. Simply enough, Kombu seaweed. Well, on the surface it's simple, but technically, it would Lamanaria Japonica, Lamanaria Japonica variety ochotensis, Lamanaria Angustate, Lamanaria Angustata variety longissima. We also had a very good public comment that said you can group these varieties into what's commonly called Pacific Kombu, as different from Atlantic so-called Kombu, which the Japanese afficionados would not call Kombu, but which
is called Kombu in the trade, being a type of Lamanaria, but not having those unique qualities of Kombu that are essential for the organic production of certain products.

So, again, is there organic substitute? The answer is there are organic certified seaweeds on the market, and some of them even are similar to Kombu, but they don't create the Kombu-like effect, which is essential for certain foods.

The petitioner did an excellent job, once again, in describing why these characteristics are needed, and why the current production of Kombu at this point in time cannot be certified. And, again, there exists for possibilities for the certification of Kombu under the wild harvest regulation, but for a variety of reasons, these have not been attempted as yet. And that was documented very well on the reasons why, and I haven't got the time to go into them all.

It's possible in the future, but it
doesn't look probable, and we shall see. Because, once again, as Julie said, once a supply of organic Kombu is available, that supplier can petition the Board to remove Kombu from the list. And that is, I believe, a very effective action, and I also believe, and I don't think it's been mentioned yet, but that action, that petition to remove takes precedence in the petition queue.

We followed up, and talked to five or six distributors of Kombu, and kelp, and seaweeds, and that thing. They all verified that they could not find, even though they've searched themselves, for organic Kombu. There was only petitioner, but many people, including some who have been certifying product for many, many years using Kombu in the process, even they, who are well-known for their diligence in finding organic ingredients, simply locate organic Kombu.

So the case seemed clear to us that it certainly met the criteria, and the vote
was for five yes, zero no, and one abstention.
CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Any
questions? Can you repeat the vote, please.
MEMBER SMILLIE: Oh, five yes, zero no, one absent, and zero abstentions.

CHAIR DELGADO: Very good. Any questions on this material? Okay. Can you please proceed with the next one.

MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes. I would be happy to. If you believe that, I've got shares to sell you and a bridge.

The next petition substance is okra, specifically IQF frozen okra. The petition was very long, and thoroughly documented petition. And it basically said that it's not available. There's certainly a fragility of supply, but it also wasn't available at this time. So the two criteria for the actual consideration were both in place.

It's an agricultural product, and Jeff raised that argument that it's
conventionally raised, so, hence, we look at Category 1, Adverse Impacts in the Humans or Environment. We all agree that we're going to move along on that.

Was it essential for organic production? And the answer is yes. The word "gumbo" comes from the African root, which was the description of the vegetable okra. It's not simply a vegetable used for its taste, it's used for other properties, mucilaginous properties, which is why some people love gumbo, and other people can't stand it. And, also, if you will humor me for a while, is what's called in New Orleans, filet gumbo. Well, in the winter when any okra was not available to the gumbo makers, they had to keep delivering gumbo, so instead of okra mucilaginous agent, they used sassafras leaf, and sassafras was called filet. And that's where the word "filet gumbo" comes from. It doesn't have okra, so perhaps the organic substitute could be
sassafras leaf, which is probably not available organically either, but real gumbo lovers are not going to go for it.

So we're on to Category 3, is it compatible with organic production? One of the questions we look at, and I know all the NOSB followers love this one, is the primary use to recreate, improve flavors, colors, textures, and things of nutra values lost in processing? And the answer, no. The value of this product doesn't replace something lost in processing. It brings something very unique to the product.

So then we get to Category 4. Is the commercial supply of an agricultural substance as organic fragile or potentially unavailable? And the answer, according to the petitioner, was yes, and they documented that. The petition actually contained long lists of the different producers and IQF facilities that they had contacted in the search for this product.

We double-checked that, and talked to a lot of people. Now, we did not talk to the Southeast African American Farmers Organic Network, but we did talk to a lot of the certification agents, especially those that do a lot of work in areas that have 120 growing days. Marty, don't run out of the room. And they did not have qualified commercial supplies of organic okra available. There seemed to be a paucity of growers that were growing okra commercially. It's a difficult crop. It does not transport well. And matching up a very scarce supply with an even scarcer IQF capability was documented in the petition. That's about all I can say about that.

Quality is not particularly an issue. Quality of okra, doesn't transport well, and it isn't an issue in a fresh market, but in the IQF market, it wasn't such an issue. Quantity just did not seem to be there. And, again, back to the form argument,
what was asked for, and I'm not sure if the petition reflects this correctly, was frozen IQF okra. That was what the petition was for, not fresh okra. I'm not sure if we need to amend that or not.

We talked about it, and we said --
I said, you know, I'm telling you guys, when this goes on the list, there's going to be a human cry because you can grow okra organically. It's not -- it should be that difficult, but the petitioner was exhaustive. Our search of available IQF facilities and growers, and, again, our search was not globally worldwide. We did -- the petitioner did list foreign sources, as well, and we did our best to try and find it. And a couple of members of the Handling Committee, being growers also, worked through their networks, so I wouldn't say it was an exhaustive search, but it was a pretty good search. And based on what -- the document that we received, we voted five yes, zero no, zero abstentions,
zero abstain, and one recusal.
CHAIR DELGADO: Any questions on
okra? Yes, Julie.
MEMBER WEISMAN: I just want to double-check. Let's see. Under Category 4, Question 3, the comment. I'm wondering if that was what you meant to write, or if there's a word that was omitted by error. Did you mean to say that fresh okra does keep well, or that it does not keep well.

MEMBER SMILLIE: Oh, does not. I'm sorry. That's an error. Does not.

MEMBER WEISMAN: Thank you.
CHAIR DELGADO: For the record, that correction is being made. And, Dan.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: As it is in a lot of cases, the issue comes down to the words used in the question. It seems -- the question is, is there any okra grown near the freezing facility? I mean, do you have the okra, do you have a freezing facility, or if you have a freezing facility, could you grow
the okra? Do you know how sort of -- I mean, do you think the right questions were asked?

MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes. Again, those
-- if you have the okra in commercial supply, and there's not an IQF facility nearby, I still think you could get it done. It would be hard, but it could be done, so it wasn't that we had a lot of okra available, but no IQF facilities. That wasn't the case in this case.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: But what about the other way around?

MEMBER SMILLIE: A lot of IQF capacity, ready to go, and no suppliers? That wasn't the case either, at least not with all the IQF facilities that we contacted. And the list was exhaustive. I mean, I won't say we did the entire list, but we certainly did a big chunk, and none of them said that they never processed nor had abilities to process organic okra.

CHAIR DELGADO: Tracy.

MEMBER MIEDEMA: I just wanted to add. In trying to piece together a crop with a frozen facility is a real trick, and my -the firm I work at is a large IQF processing facility, and we plan our crops very carefully for their distance from the facility based on the time of year. In the warmer months, our spinach can't travel further than 45 minutes from the field to the IQF facility, or its pretty slimy by the time it gets there. And okra was described to us as one of those crops that grows in a warm climate, and really gets slimy fast, and so I don't know exactly what the radius is. At our farm with about 30 crops, we have it all mapped out exactly how far they can travel, what the radius is. And I don't recall whether that was noted in the petition, but it's a very real issue.

CHAIR DELGADO: Yes, Steve. MEMBER DeMURI: Just a comment. I can tell you, Dan, that I was involved in a project to try to source some IQF okra for my
company, and we couldn't find it either.
CHAIR DELGADO: Gerry.
MEMBER DAVIS: One other thing to add to the difficulty of putting an IQF facility together with a crop. I believe the farm that I work for was contacted, because we have IQF freezing, we have capacity, we have a very long growing season. We could grow okra if we chose, but one difficulty was that okra is only harvested a little bit each day. It's not grow a crop like peas, and you come through there, harvest it all and freeze it, or you can schedule freezing time. You'd have to be set up to pick a little bit this day, make a little run for an hour or two a day, and keep doing that on and on to make the crop economically feasible. And that might be another complicating factor in why they don't seem to fit together too well.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any other questions, comments? Joe.

MEMBER SMILLIE: I'm also hoping,
and we certainly heard some comments yesterday, and I would ask everyone to take the information you've heard from this Committee, and from the public, and also, hopefully, we'll get some more comments, and to sleep on it.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Thank you.
Back to you, Julie.
MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay. It's my turn. I have one last material that's part of that group of petitions that were all submitted by one petitioner, that's the ginger root powdered extract. And as you have already heard, ginger root powdered extract is manufactured the same way as all of those other harder to pronounce root extracts that you heard about, in that it's extracted. The ginger rhizomes actually are dried and milled, and then they're placed into an extraction kettle with water and ethanol. The liquid is concentrated into essential oils, and standardized. And then those essential oils
are mixed with organic astragalus root, and then spray dried, and ground into a powder. And, again, this is a situation where the petitioner had the exact same comment, that their procurement department is always looking for organic forms unspecified, not mentioning any particular material. And an internet search found, of course, that much organic ginger root is being grown, extracted, and even dried, and none of this is -- not necessarily spray dried onto organic astragalus root, but because no acknowledgment is made by the petitioner that these forms are available, and they do not address why they're -- that they're available, but they're not in the form we need them. Because that simple comment isn't even made, we found this petition not to meet evaluation criteria number four. And the vote on that was zero yes, six no, there were no absent, no abstentions.

And this being the last of that
group of petitions, I did want to make the comment that we had hoped that when these recommendations were posted ahead of the meeting for public comment, that the petitioner might have come to us with some acknowledgment or some additional information. That did not happen. We view this -- again, I have said it before, that this whole 606 process is fairly new to us, and there's been a learning curve on our part on how to deal with it. And we believe that there's also a learning curve out there in the organic community about the way to petition for these, so we somewhat view the petition process a little bit as a conversation between the Board and petitioners, as we come to a process that we think meets regulatory requirements, and the needs of the community.

So if there are no more questions about that, I'm going to move on to the petition for -

CHAIR DELGADO: Are there any
questions on ginger root? And we have a question from the Executive Director.

MS. FRANCIS: Actually, more of a comment, just to affirm also that the Program sends out letters informing petitioners that a recommendation has been made, inviting them to make comment.

CHAIR DELGADO: And that information includes the actual determination from the Committee. Correct?

MR. POOLER: This is Bob Pooler, NOP. The meeting notices went to all petitioners notifying them that their petition was going to be considered at this meeting, and not the actual recommendation was included, but I would just say information as to where the recommendation was located on the website was included within the letter. So they were notified, and invited to provide response.

CHAIR DELGADO: Thank you for that. All right. Any questions on this material?

Okay. Thank you. Back to you.
MEMBER WEISMAN: All right. We're moving on to Pectin, low-methoxy, nonamidated. And I think that that requires a little bit of explanation and background.

Pectin, everyone should be aware, is listed in two places. It is listed in 605(b), where it's currently notated lowmethoxy Pectin. And on 606, it's high-methoxy Pectin. And I think at the time that those listings were made, the reason why low-methoxy Pectin was found to be synthetic was because it was what is called "amidated". In other words, it is exposed to ammonia, and a chemical change takes place.

Pectin is a material that is used for texture to gel certain products. They could be dairy products. I know you can't make jam without Pectin. And, in fact, the petitioner is -- for this material is a jam manufacturer.

Now, what they are petitioning is
not a new material. They are actually petitioning for a certain form of low-methoxy Pectin to be reclassified as an agricultural product, so it may be that this did not exist at the time that low-methoxy Pectin was put on the list, or it may have been not adequately understood at the time, but this petitioner is describing the manufacture of a product that is available, that is low-methoxy Pectin, that is not amidated, that is, in fact, manufactured from apple pumice, which is a byproduct of the juice, the apple juice pressing industry.

So in terms of the evaluation criteria, we found that it met the applicable criteria. And, in fact, in terms of the environmental effect, I think that it seemed to us that the use of this material actually had a good effect on the environment, and that it provided a useful outlet for what would otherwise have been a waste stream that would have had to be disposed of.

And we also believe that in terms of the -- actually, subsequent to the -- yes, there has been no organic form of this Pectin available, because up until now, it has been included on -- low-methoxy Pectin is included on 605(b) as a synthetic. It was not reflected in the petition at the time the recommendation was made, but further discussion with the petitioner indicates that this petition is actually a preparation to the introduction and marketing of organic lowmethoxy non-amidated Pectin. So they're actually preparing the ground for an organic form of this material to become available. And I apologize that this information was not available to include in the recommendation. It was not -- it took place at a conversation that happened at a trade show after the close of the publication deadline, but I thought it was important to note. So the recommendation was made for this material to be listed, and the vote at the
time were five yes, zero no, and one absent.
CHAIR DELGADO: Any questions on this material? Steve.

MEMBER DeMURI: In your discussion with the petitioner, is their intention to petition to have it removed as soon as they have an organic form available?

MEMBER WEISMAN: That's an
excellent question. I did not ask it. I was
-- I guess I was so impressed that they were being proactive to prepare the ground for an organic material to be introduced, that I just did not have my wits about me. But we can find that out.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any other questions on this material? All right. Julie, does that conclude your section on 606?

MEMBER WEISMAN: If everyone is satisfied. Oh, no, no, it doesn't. No, we have one more material. I'm sorry.

CHAIR DELGADO: That's all right. Lost track there.

MEMBER WEISMAN: I thought you meant on the material. Okay. Yes, we do. We have one more material that's being petitioned, which is Tragacanth Gum, which is what is called an exudite gum. This is being petitioned for inclusion on 606. It is actually -- at one point, the Program asked us to consider whether this was already included in gums that are already listed on the National List, because they had been included in discussions at the time that gums were originally listed. And it was thought that it might have been an error that Tragacanth was left off the list. But we felt, especially after looking at the quality of the petition, that for good order sake, it made sense to treat it as a new material being petitioned.

And we found that it did meet all the evaluation criteria. In fact, it is -the production process is identical to other gums that are already listed. What happens is
a cut is made in the bark of the tree, and the secretion hardens, and the chunk is harvested from the trees, and they are dried and ground into a powder. In fact, I think there was a picture up on the screen earlier during the materials presentation of guar gum, which is a relative, or produced in a very similar manner.

In terms of commercial supply being
fragile of organic, there was a lot of
information given in the petition about the fact that non-organic Tragacanth gum is even difficult to acquire. All the Tragacanth gum produced in the world comes from Iran right now, and neighboring countries. So, first of all, there are trade issues. No one is
allowed to import it into the United States at the moment. However, non-organic Tragacanth
gum that they currently use is coming from Turkey, and they are working closely with Turkish growers and processors to increase that supply. And they note that organic
agriculture in Turkey is increasing, and that they feel that they can foresee in the not distant future that there can be -- they will be able to secure supply of organic Tragacanth gum, but it's not currently available.

And in terms of why this would be -

- if there are organic substitutes, there are other gums available, but Tragacanth has some unique qualities that other gums do not exhibit, and that's why there is a call for it.

So we made a motion that Tragacanth gum is appropriate for listing -- we made a motion to list Tragacanth gum on 606, and the vote on that was six yes, zero no, that was a unanimous vote.

Oh, yes. There is one annotation, water-extracted only. Gums do get produced in other ways. This one being petitioned is water-extracted.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any questions on this material? Okay. Thank you. Back to

MEMBER WEISMAN: That concludes the presentation of materials for 606.

CHAIR DELGADO: Good. Can we proceed with the next section then, sunset materials.

MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes. I think on the -- we had a similar situation with some Handling Committee sunset materials that were voted on at the full meeting. You heard the situation described by the Crops Committee this morning, and the same situation existed for a number of materials that were recommended at the full meeting for re-listing on 605(a), which are Agar-Agar, animal enzymes, Calcium Sulfate, Carrageenan and Glucono Delta Lactone. And then also -- well, I'll do A and B separately.

What happened was because there was an additional ANPR for materials that were due to sunset, and the comment -- it was published in December after our meeting, and the comment
period closed in January, so we just need to acknowledge that comments that came in, in that period did not in any way call into question the recommendation that had already been made. So ahead of this meeting, the Handling Committee voted, five yes, one absent, to reaffirm those 605(a) sunset decisions from the full meeting. And the same is true for the material, Cellulose, to be reaffirmed for 605(b). That was also a five yes, and one absent.

CHAIR DELGADO: All right. Any questions on those documents? All right. Let's proceed to the next item.

MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay. Another
situation we've been needing to clean up.
When the -- in the multi-phase notice for sunset materials, Tartaric Acid should have been included on $A$ and $B$ with the materials that I just mentioned. And, in error, was not included in those ANPRs, and so, therefore, could not be considered at the full meeting.

And so this, I believe, may be our last opportunity to consider them now for sunset. We have two different forms of Tartaric Acid, one is one 605(a), made from grape wine, and one on 605(b) from Malic Acid.

I did want to mention one thing regarding sunset, and acknowledge a comment that was made yesterday about the availability of organic -- we heard that there's organic Tartaric Acid available. And what I wanted to say is that this -- the recommendations were made and posted six weeks before this meeting, I believe. And the discussion about Tartaric Acid has been happening for at least two meetings before that, and so what I would like to say is that the petition for the removal of a newly available organic form of a listed material can be made at any time.

I think that there was a lot of time when this information came forward, and getting it for the first time yesterday does not really help our process. So I want to
acknowledge that we did -- we appreciate being informed that Tartaric Acid organic may be available now. We have absolutely no opportunity at this meeting to qualify that statement. Well, I shouldn't say that we have no opportunity. I suppose -- I think we certainly have an opportunity to question the person who made the comment, but I don't -- it would still require time for us to verify, and discuss, and talk about, so I would encourage that if someone has organic Tartaric Acid available, that it would have been helpful to know about it at least in the last six weeks, not just yesterday.

CHAIR DELGADO: Julie, do you plan to change your recommendation?

MEMBER WEISMAN: I do not, no.
CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Any questions?

MEMBER WEISMAN: But I also didn't finish saying what the recommendation was.

CHAIR DELGADO: Please.

MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay. I'm sorry. The recommendation was to list, to re-list both on $A$ and $B$. We did not receive any comments opposing this. And the vote was five yes, and one absent. There was no dissension on the Committee.

CHAIR DELGADO: Go ahead. Madam Secretary, please.

SECRETARY HEINZE: I wanted to add that our review was complicated by the fact that the current listings on the National List do not include the annotations made from grape wine, and made from Tartaric Acid, so we ended up doing quite a bit of research into past actions of Boards. In fact, went back to the 1995 transcripts, where these were originally voted on. And so one thing that we would ask is perhaps the Program could help with a technical correction to add those annotations, to clean it up for future boards.

We have tried to, in our recommendation, include all that history, so
that five years from now when some of us are not here, and they have to be reviewed, we've provided some guidance. But I think a technical correction might be helpful.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Any comments? Dan.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On this technical correction issue, Tartaric Acid is not just sort of a two-way street, it's a three-way street. We have the Tartaric Acid on 605(a) from grapes, where we are modifying a natural product. Then there's also the Tartaric Acid that we have on B, which is coming from Malic Acid. Malic Acid, L-malate is on 605(a) coming from a natural source. Not on the National List is DL-malate from a synthetic source being butane. We've done the best we can going directly to -- the Committee has done the best they can going directly back to the transcripts, but anyone here with any historical memory of whether that was actually
generic malate with no designation that was reviewed and voted on for $B$, or whether the intent was L-malate being the natural source, and not allowing the petroleum source, any historical memory of that would -- in public comment, or some other form, would be appreciated.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any other comments? Julie.

MEMBER WEISMAN: I just wanted to make one correction on the recommendation for this. At the very, very bottom, I think it just needs to be corrected that where it -okay. She fixed it already. Never mind.

CHAIR DELGADO: What was the correction?

MEMBER WEISMAN: Well, the correct
was the last three words were made from Tartaric Acid. That's what's in our books, and that was not -- it should have said made from Malic Acid.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Any
questions? Jeff.
VICE CHAIR MOYER: Just a question for you, Julie, and I don't know if you can answer it. Is the reason that there's two listings there, because they're two totally different materials that are used two totally different ways, or was it a convenience for end-user?

CHAIR DELGADO: Do you intend to address that question?

MEMBER WEISMAN: Katrina is going to address that.

CHAIR DELGADO: Katrina.
SECRETARY HEINZE: This gets a little bit to the heart of the definition of materials. It is the same material, but its source is different. So something the Material Working Group discussed in quite a bit of detail, is that a material is not just what you have in the glass, but it is what its original source is, and how it was processed to get to that final result.

Tartaric Acid is the poster child for that. Same material, same thing in the glass, two very different sources, one that the original board felt was a non-synthetic source, grape wine, and one that they felt was a synthetic source. Getting to Dan's comment that historical reasons why they felt it was a synthetic source are a little bit lost in history for us. Does that help?

VICE CHAIR MOYER: Well, it does help, but my question was, do we continue to need both materials, given the fact that one is synthetic, or at least listed as synthetic, and the other is a non-synthetic, if they're both -- and the indication of the report was that the majority of what's used out in the world is from the grape juice. Do we, indeed, continue to need the synthetic on the list?

CHAIR DELGADO: Dan.
MEMBER GIACOMINI: I have the same concerns that you do, Jeff. It's my understanding that there's a slightly
different way, and its characteristics and processing, and maybe we'll hear some comment on that later in the day.

VICE CHAIR MOYER: Thank you.
CHAIR DELGADO: Any other questions? Okay. Back to you, Julie.

MEMBER WEISMAN: That now does conclude my presentation. CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Well, thank you very much to you and the rest of the Committee members. Well done. And now we have concluded the review of recommendations and materials, and we're due for a break. It is quarter after the hour. We have a comment from Mr. Smillie.

MEMBER SMILLIE: Before you make a ruling, Mr. Chair, I would humbly submit that we don't lose that time. Would it be possible, unlike yesterday, to see who the first commentors are, and see if they would be ready to go.

CHAIR DELGADO: They are ready,
they say. Let me check with our Executive Director, and this is a proposal about it. I propose that we start calling people. If they're here, fine. And if they're not, we'll keep their name on the list in the order that they had appeared, and we'll continue calling them until we reach the agreed time of initiation of the comment. Will that satisfy our legal -

MS. FRANCIS: I have a feeling they're all here.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. So we can proceed.

MS. FRANCIS: It's the poultry
folks.
CHAIR DELGADO: And we have a
comment from the Secretary. Yes, ma'am.
SECRETARY HEINZE: A break before public comment would be helpful, at least for me.

CHAIR DELGADO: And well deserved, absolutely. So it's quarter after the hour.

We'll see you here at $3: 30$ to start with public comment. Thank you.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 3:14 p.m. and resumed at 3:37 p.m.)

CHAIR DELGADO: We have quorum, and we will continue with our next item on the agenda, and that is public comment. We'll
start. Do we have Valerie, have we heard from Marty? They have agreed, so the first one up is Marty Mesh, if you'll please proceed to the podium. We're making some updates here. I will remind the presenters to give your full name and affiliation for the record.

MR. MESH: Are you guys ready?
CHAIR DELGADO: We are ready.
Please proceed.
MR. MESH: Marty Mesh, and I have a proxy for Rom, who was supposed to speak yesterday on aquaculture. If you can tell me five minutes into one, then I'll know.

SECRETARY HEINZE: Okay. So you
have two separate five minutes.
MR. MESH: Correct. And three, if
you want to be really nice.
(Laughter.)
MR. MESH: So for the new person, Dr. Flann, I'm Marty Mesh. I started farming organically in 1972, on the larger scale in
76. Incidentally, Belleview Gardens Organic Farm has produced a small amount of quality organic okra ever since 1976. I have approximately 160 acres, and my partner has several hundred additional acres, but I can circle back to okra in just a minute.

I helped form Florida Organic Growers, and currently serve as Executive Director of FOG, which operates quality certification services at NACA. Additionally, I serve on the boards of the OTA, which none of my comments serve as official position of, the boards of the National Campaign for Sustainable Agriculture, the ACA, and as President of the board of the Southern

Sustainable Ag Working Group, which again may be relevant to your discussion about organic okra.

I want to welcome you to the board, as well as thank all of you for your tremendous time commitments on behalf of the whole organic community for all the NOSB members. I also want to thank the Department for its positive work on a very small budget, and hope with additional resources, which are long overdue and will increase with time, that the issue of funding is no longer the reason for inaction or delayed action by the Department.

While I'm sure I could focus on the positive work done by both the Department and the Board, let me at least touch on a few other concerns. First, to recap the lack of a simple pasture rule seems to be undermining faith in the U.S. National Organic program, and organic products in the marketplace. The community and industry have been in sync for
years, and the continued delay is negatively affecting the growth of organic agriculture, and the health of the industry.

QCS was the first certifier to certify organic shrimp after the USDA Program Director stated in a public workshop for the organic farmers that if one can produce shrimp organically using the rule, then by all means, put a USDA seal on it, and put it out in the market.

People have been producing organic mushrooms without specific standards, organic honey, and so we thought the statement by the Program Manager enabled a new sector of producers to differentiate product in the marketplace.

Producers invested hundreds of thousands of dollars. We, the certifier, made them source organic feed at considerable cost, and then shortly thereafter, because of the controversy surrounding salmon, USDA reversed its opinion, and said to the get seal off all
the seafood, including shrimp, tilapia. And that has caused considerable market disruption, confusion, and organic shrimp producers to go bankrupt, while foreignproduced shrimp and salmon, in some cases far from compliant with the U.S. regulation, but without the U.S. seal, has taken the place on the marketplace shelf.

And now the recommendation is to reward the producers and the certifiers with more market opportunities; this all in the name of refusing our many years ago suggestion to start with the basics, start with the lowhanging fruit, start with shrimp, tilapia, catfish, and build upwards, but to get started. Those several years to build an industry would have, by my calculations, been completed, if we had ever gotten started to begin with.

Shrimp continue to be held hostage to the more controversial complicated, and not easily solved salmon battles, which,
incidentally, once, if and when the feed issues are wrestled down, net pens can continue to hold up the simple peaceful organic shrimp from gaining its rightful place on a marketplace shelf. And now, adding insult to injury, it seems that we need to move QCS off-shore under the current recommendation.

Now, the critical feedback from the technical staff, who have much less baggage than me, and are joyful at the progress being made from the recommendations, and I can go into the specifics on wording that they've said, but you'll have to ask me later on, because I'm going to run out of time. So let me skip right to okra. And I'm happy to come back and answer any questions on specific wording suggestions on the aquaculture recommendations. Or, as Tracy asked, on group certification issues.

Okra. As I've said, our farm is certified, has certified organic okra. Okra grows well in the south. On the petition it
says CCOF was checked with, and on behalf of agriculture outside of California, and yes, it does exist. And certifiers should maybe more on the ground in areas where okra grows well. You know, I have to raise concerns. I didn't see any list of who was called, and I don't believe I'm convinced that the petitioner has tried to find organic okra, where okra likes to grow. I think this petition may need to be voted down at this point.

At Southern SOG we have not
received any communication or outreach looking for suppliers of organic okra. And if a fair and equitable contract was offered from companies like General Mills and Campbells, I believe there may be growers interested.

There is certainly production, harvesting, and post-harvest challenges with okra. You have to pick it every other day by-hand, make it worth our while -

CHAIR DELGADO: Marty, your time is up. Can you wrap up, please.

MR. MESH: That's the first guy's wrapped up. Man, I'm ahead of schedule. I could have gone back and done the aquaculture one, but all right.

CHAIR DELGADO: Please continue.
MR. MESH: So make it worth our while as growers, and I'm sure there'll be some folks interested.

Let's see. You have to at least have the courtesy to talk to us in the south before putting conventional okra on the list. Liana mentioned Alrussio, a former member of this board, who now heads an effort to get more African American farmers in the South involved growing organically who had the email. Where is this kind of stuff heading? What would be next? Organic frozen okra ready for frying that doesn't contain organic okra? Call it gumbo made with something, call it whatever you want, but don't call it organic okra.

I believe the petitioner has the
corporate resources to find, or to get a facility located where you need to have it located, down south where we love okra, know how to grow it, know all the wonderful ways to prepare it, and where the differences between organic and non-organic production can be clear, so that organic okra that comes from there will not be confused.

Going back to the aquaculture stuff. Let me at least touch on organic seed. We had concerns on the recommendation, but hearing CCRF say that 2 percent of vegetable seeds are organic, and likely other west coast certifiers, if those numbers are consistent or similar for other organizations, we actually support ramping up the -- something needs to be done to make people use organic seed.

The CACC recommendation for Tracy, you'll have to ask me about. Tetracycline I think is off the list now. Methionine, I think I'm supportive of a three-year, not a two-year -- it didn't always -- things don't
always go perfect. In fact, most things don't, and I would be pleasantly surprised if a new variety can be grown and an infrastructure and relationship solidified within the two-year framework. I would think that highly unlikely given reality. So let's go back to fish.

Okay. On 205.208(b) aquatic plants may be grown in open water systems. You know, our comment was, it's not clear what open water system means. Are we talking about growing in public ponds, lakes, oceans? If that's the case, then this may better fall under the wild harvest area, and not farmed aquatic plants. And if wild harvested, then the staff thought that wild fish can't be part of it, but yet you're allowing wild aquatic plants. They thought there was a bit of a disparity among the two. They also were concerned about how one would manage the possible aggregate, cumulative effect of wild harvesting.

Going to the aquaculture one itself, 205.2, organic certification for foreign certifiers shouldn't be allowed for several reasons. They identified the minority opinion as being one that they support, that you can't base it on foreign certifiers. As of today, all the standards are currently private standards, as Joe mentioned, and some standards allow terrestrial animal byproducts to be certified organic, and you're using it for aquaculture feed.

I think our solution would be to allow fish meal and fish oil from rendered fish facilities to be used as a supplement. Maybe that's a capital S, Supplement, and a stair-step reduction method has been proposed by the AWG, or utilize the statutory authority to make wild caught fish renderings in organic livestock feed product.

Live foods on D, clarification must be provided what exactly constitutes live foods, insects, worms, and are you saying that
they need to be certified organic, too, was the question from our staff.

Lipids, they had a couple of technical corrections on your wording on the lipids one. And that is, feed for aquaculture products for human consumption may, and they thought it should say "must", or "shall not" contain lipids from sources. That may doesn't give the regulatory assurance of your desire. Second line, line two, "except that other lipids from organic sources", and it wasn't clear whether or not those other lipids could or couldn't be from terrestrial animals.

All right. So let's just go on. If you want to know, you'll just have to ask me. On the whole, they thought the livestock recommendations had merits, and we're pretty happy with them. On J -- well, if you want to know the technical correction, you'll have to ask.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any questions for the presenter? Yes, Tina.
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MEMBER ELLOR: Marty.
MR. MESH: Yes, Tina.
MEMBER ELLOR: You wouldn't have any specific recommendations for wording on aquaculture, would you?

MR. MESH: Funny you should ask, Tina. On L, where you have fish meal or fish oil may not be sourced, their wording suggestion was must not be sourced, as opposed to may.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any other questions for the presenter?

MR. MESH: Like on grower groups, maybe.
(Laughter.)
CHAIR DELGADO: Tracy, do you have a question?

MEMBER MIEDEMA: Marty, do you have any specific feedback on the document, the guidance document that was posted; for instance, in the area of conflict of interest, or internal control systems?

MR. MESH: Yes. Kudos goes to
Tracy for her work, patience and willingness to listen to very divergent opinions on behalf of all this. We do have a paragraph typed out in red, but I think I have to say that our sense is that the grower group dilemma has evolved to group certification, and we really support it being focused to grower groups for now, and getting this one off the table. For those growers that outnumber all the other growers combined in the world, the most disadvantaged, the most at risk growers in the world for being left out of the organic marketplace, and that we really urge you to focus on what the original issue was, which was grower group certification, for now, and leave the other for another day to have a discussion about. And I'll try to -- we're concerned about throwing the baby out with the bath water.

CHAIR DELGADO: Tracy.
MEMBER MIEDEMA: May I ask a
follow-up question?
MR. MESH: Sure. You can ask all you want, until he cuts you off.

CHAIR DELGADO: Tracy, please. MEMBER MIEDEMA: Would you or FOG be able to articulate what the benefits are to grower groups of not allowing other groups that meet the rigorous criteria? MR. MESH: You know, Tracy, I think sometimes it's the confidence of a label is in the marketplace, and the confidence of those people supporting a label is in their hearts, or in their minds. And that we've all, in the organic industry, heard well, show me the science, or where's the science behind it? You go, we know it's better. Okay? It's in our heart, that sometimes some of these things may be passion, and that I'm concerned about the baby being thrown out with the bath water, that grower group certification may be lost if this board continues down the road of trying to essentially, for lack of a better word,
shove group certification down the consuming public's mind.

I saw how the pasture issues were framed in the press, or on the internet, and you could debate pasture all you want. But what $I$ know is, it hurt the industry.

MEMBER MIEDEMA: Okay.
CHAIR DELGADO: Tracy, comments? No. Any other comments from the board, questions? Okay. Well, thank you very much, Marty.

MR. MESH: Thank you all.
CHAIR DELGADO: Up next is Chris Pierce, and after Chris we have Dave Martinelli.

MR. MESH: And I wanted to thank Chris for allowing me to go before Methionine.

MR. MARTINELLI: We're actually just going to do this as a group Methionine presentation.

CHAIR DELGADO: Please.
SECRETARY HEINZE: And you are
which folks?
MR. MARTINELLI: I'm Dave
Martinelli.
SECRETARY HEINZE: Okay.
MR. MARTINELLI: Coleman Natural, but I'm actually Chair of the Methionine Task Force.

SECRETARY HEINZE: So we have
Chris, Dave, David, and David?
MR. PIERCE: That's correct. I am
Chris Pierce.
SECRETARY HEINZE: Okay.
CHAIR DELGADO: You're Chris
Pierce.
SECRETARY HEINZE: So you're combining your time.

MR. MARTINELLI: We're all members of the Task Force.

SECRETARY HEINZE: Okay.
MR. MARTINELLI: So what I'm going
to do -
SECRETARY HEINZE: So you want 20
minutes.
MR. MARTINELLI: Correct.
SECRETARY HEINZE: This is just purely administrative questions on my part.

MR. MARTINELLI: Okay.
MS. FRANCIS: And could you please each walk up to the microphone and introduce yourself and your affiliation.

CHAIR DELGADO: At this point, yes, please.

MR. MARTINELLI: Okay. Dave Martinelli, Coleman Natural.

MR. PIERCE: I'm Chris Pierce with Heritage Poultry Management Services.

MR. WILL: David Will, Chino Valley Ranchers.

MR. BRUCE: David Bruce, Organic Valley.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Thank you. So who will start?

MR. MARTINELLI: So I will start. I'm going to go through this PowerPoint, and
then I'm going to turn it over to these three to give kind of their background and perspective, and their experience with trials. So what we'll do, there's maybe a 10 or 15minute PowerPoint, they'll do their thing, and then we can open it up to Q\&A.

CHAIR DELGADO: Very good.
MR. MARTINELLI: So just to kind of get everybody up to speed, I think everybody is familiar with the issue. Obviously, Methionine is a necessary nutrient for poultry production. There's some history with the board, twice you've approved a three-year annotation to allow Methionine in organic poultry production. The Task Force, of which I am Chair, has been working on this issue for the last six years, and I want to say thank you for the opportunity to update you. I had a chance to talk to you in November, kind of what the Task Force was all about. And you urged us to submit a petition at that time, so we've gone ahead and submitted the petition
that's before you. And we're active on a number of fronts developing alternatives, and that's what I really kind of want to talk about today.

To give you a little sense of who the Task Force is, these gentlemen will speak with respect to their personal experience, but it's really a volunteer group of organic poultry producers. We've aligned ourselves with partners through a variety of universities. You're going to get a presentation later today from Dr. Walter Goldstein, who is not officially a member of the Task Force, but we've obviously worked very closely with him. And I'll hit on some of the projects that we're currently under development with him. But all these institutions have helped us in some capacity, either with literature review, research, trials, what have you.

I also wanted to kind of frame it up for everybody in terms of the scope of the

1 industry that we're talking about. This is kind of an interesting chart that was pulled together from some USDA data over the last 15 years, just kind of showing the growth of the organic ling and industry, and I've got -- the next slide shows a similar trend for the organic broilers, so I don't want to belabor these, but in both cases you see a significant growth in the last five years in this industry.

And the final point that I want to make around the organic poultry industry is that it touches a lot of other producers in this room. It's not strictly eggs and meat, but it's a variety of products that are, in turn, made from eggs and meat. So when we're talking about Methionine, the impact we're talking about is very significant and wideranging.

I think the question of the day is
really why do organic poultry producers need Methionine, and is it purely a production
crutch, or are there legitimate bird health and environmental concerns that appropriate levels of Methionine in the diet ameliorate, so we've got a number of studies here that I'm just going to kind of run through them.

I've actually pulled together for the board's benefit a listing of all the reports that were cited in this slide show, and I'll leave it with Valerie. There's a variety of papers and presentations that came out of the literature review which we had conducted about a year ago by some folks at Cal Poly Pomona.

This was a study from 1997,
Ambrosen and Petersen, indicating that inadequate protein decreased feather plumage and cannibalism in laying hens, so actually that's decreased feather plumage, not decreased cannibalism. It's actually cannibalism laying hens, and actually they kind of go through two scenarios, that if you've got inadequate protein in the diet, at
a minimum, you're going to get poor feather condition and feather pecking, in a most highly evolved state you would have cannibalism. Next slide, please.

The other big issue, in addition to bird health, are environmental impacts. One of the strategies to overcome low Methionine diets would be to feed an excessive amount of other proteins in the diet. And this, in turn, is excreted by the hen typically as nitrogen, and also creates ammonia emissions, so there's been studies conducted at Iowa State that indicate that for the amount of protein increase that would be needed in the diet to provide a higher level of Methionine to the birds, you would have 150 percent increase in the ammonia generation and emission.

> If you go to the next slide, there's a series of reports out of Europe that I'm going to touch on, because they've been grappling with this issue, as well. This was
from a 2001 workshop that an inadequate supply of amino acids is not simply a production problem. There was a report from Owen in 2000 that feather pecking on each other feathers in search of amino acid is found when Methionine is deficient in the diet, and that obviously creates a bird welfare problem. Next slide, please.

There was an extensive study that I've got a copy of in this document that was done around organic poultry production in Ireland, where they concluded that obviously the prohibition in the EU on adding Methionine was a serious health concern. Again, around the same issues we're talking about, animal health and environmental welfare. And the fact that you've got to then formulate the diets to have excessive levels of protein.

This, again, is from the report out of Ireland, and I think the take-away here is that Dr. Owen Keene from Heritage Poultry Management Services recommends that Methionine
is needed in organic poultry production in order to maintain the best nutrition and the health of all the avian species.

This is a report out of Germany in 2004 on the impacts of raising organic poultry without Methionine. And, again, copy of the report in here, but their concluding remarks are that the -- from the animal welfare and environmental pollution perspective, synthetic Methionine should be a legal feed component in organic broiler production.

And then this is our last European reference. There was a report done by DEFRA in the UK, and they talk about without additional organic Methionine rich protein sources, Methionine deficiencies will become more pronounced, and more widespread in organic poultry production, as the level of permitted non-organic proteinaceous ingredients in the diet fall. This will impact on bird health and welfare.

Also, one of the issues that was
pointed out in the Livestock Committee's review of our petition, and it's a great point, is have we looked Heritage breeds? Do Heritage breeds because they're slowing growing genotypes, do they offer an opportunity to avoid supplementing the diet with synthetic Methionine? And there's actually been some work done by Ann Fanatico out of the University of Arkansas. This is pulled from her latest body of work. There was an abstract done in 2006, where she indicates that the slower growing genotypes do not appear to have substantially lower Methionine requirements, which agrees with previous research, and it's consistent with the conversations our Task Forces had with her, as well.

One of the other points raised in the Livestock Committee's recommendation was about a pasture-based system; to the extent that would be able to provide supplemental Methionine to the birds. It's really -- we
kind of grouped it into two categories.
There's insects and earth worms, and there's grass. And this slide specifically speaks to the insects and earth worms.

And if you recall from our November presentation, both insects and earth worms carry an elevated level of Methionine, but in and of themselves, especially in the quantities found in nature, they don't typically close the gap between what the Methionine in the diet is, and what the bird's actual nutritional requirement is.

Dr. Joe Moritz from the University
of West Virginia has also presented to the Task Force about a year ago, his findings on pastured poultry, and this is a take-away from one of his reports, that Methionine requirements -- he ran a no-Methionine group of birds as part of his trial. And, again, it's in the book here. Methionine requirements of pastured no-Methionine birds were not completely met by the forage.

And then this is a report out of Canada from the Manitoba Department of Agriculture, specifically talking about grass. And their point is that grass is not easily digestible by poultry, and so it's not as digestible as the typical poultry diet. And there are tremendous environmental benefits to having the birds outside and foraging, but from a nutritional standpoint, from the standpoint of closing the gap on Methionine, grass itself is not the answer either.

So I'm going to switch gears a little bit. We've talked about some of the problems with Methionine deficiencies, but I really also want to talk to you about the work that the Task Force is currently engaged in. And there's three specific alternatives that we're really focused on and getting funding for, and making some progress with. I don't want to steal Walter's thunder. He's got a great presentation on high Methionine corn. And obviously you
engaged him a little bit earlier in some questions. I do want to point out that the Task Force has funded two projects this winter with the Michael Fields Agricultural Institute, the project in Chile and the project in Hawaii, and that seed is coming back to the U.S. and being used not only for feedstock development, but also for further hybrid development. And the Task Force has also signed up for this year to fund those, the planting of those seeds and the collection of seeds both for the hybrids and for the feedstock development.

And with the feedstock, what the Committee has agreed to do is we have agreed to buy that grain back and run trials with that, so we will get the benefit of his agronomic expertise. Can this corn be grown? And then we, in turn, will buy that feed, and feed it to birds to see what does it do in the diet, or what is the performance of the birds with that in the diet.

We also are very interested in the alternative of naturally produced or naturally fomented Methionine, and we currently have a proposal that's been put in front of us from the University of Arkansas to do a -- it's a study to do some research, a three-phase project around developing a natural source of Methionine. We've also been in contact with a private party who has -- supposedly is further along on this process, that we've asked to submit a proposal for additional research funding, put their project to us. And what we really want to do is get side-byside proposals, see which group is further along, and then provide some funding to whichever group can get us to go quicker in terms of bringing this to fruition. We're really hopeful, this is a lot of theory in this concept, but I think from an overall efficacy standpoint, this one has a lot of merit. So this is one we're very keen on supporting and funding.

The third area that we're working in, and Dr. Karreman had brought this up in the November NOSB meeting, you all had a presentation from Neptune Industries, specifically around aquaculture at that point, but this is a company that's engaged in a pilot project to do insect meal. And I've had conversations with them. They are very interested in working with us, and we're very interested in working with them. Their time line is a little bit elongated. Originally, I think, at the NOSB meeting, they were talking about being in production in 2008. Now they're talking about maybe a pilot in 2008, but actually not in full-scale production until 2009. I have yet to see actual specs on what the product looks like, so we can get a nutritionist to look at it, see how it would work in the diet, so that's kind of the next step in this process. And then we can start talking about availabilities and pricings. And, obviously, the big thing
for us is to get it on the farm, do some farm trials, and see how the birds perform with it.

So what we've tried to do here is kind of indicate to you what -- address the concerns that were raised by the Livestock Committee, particularly, the minority opinion. There is a full body of research that's been done on this topic. We are going to continue to do trials. We actually have a number of trials in the pipeline on a sufficient scale to be a viable trial, that we can hopefully get some real meaningful data back on. We can talk about that when these folks present behind me.

## Clearly, we've cited improved

 performance in the petition. It's our perspective that improved performance is just the consequence of healthier birds. You're not going to get better performance if the birds aren't healthy, and our objective is around the health and welfare of the birds. And, lastly, the point Iillustrated earlier about the size of the industry and the impacts. This is just too important an issue to let go. There's a great concern out there by producers that they simply won't be able to raise organic poultry come the fall if we don't have an additional extension. And the ramifications and repercussions of that go well beyond just the poultry industry, it's really the entire industry that will be impacted. One of the things that I don't think the Task Force has done a very good job with is communicating back with you folks. You've had a commitment to us to give us additional periods of time to get some work done, and we've kind of dropped the ball in terms of communicating back to you what we are doing. So I think the November meeting was kind of the first step in that. Hey, here's letting you know how your commitment of time is playing out, and our commitment of research and development. So one of the things we
wanted to leave you with is a time line that we've developed around actionable goals, specific trials that we're looking at running, when we're going to get those trials started. We still need to get turkey trials going. We need to get the turkey community kind of involved in this, as well. We've got specific due dates and actionable items for high Methionine corn, for the natural Methionine and for the insect meal. Next slide, Valerie.

I think the most important thing is at the bottom here, that it's our goal to provide regular updates to you all over the next 24 months at your meeting, if we can get a 5 -minute slot, or 10 -minute slot to say here's where we are, here's the projects we're working on, here's what we're finding out good or bad, here's the progress we're making on research and development. And we'll get Dr. Goldstein to present, as well. But I do want to keep that dialogue open and keep it going during an extension period so you're not left
in the dark wondering what the heck the Committee is up to, and what we're doing. So we'll pledge that to you, that we will keep that line of communication open.

I do want to give these folks a chance to introduce themselves and talk a little bit about their backgrounds, specifically around Methionine. We also have -- I do want to acknowledge, we have a number of producers in the room, as well, folks that we deal with on the East Coast. They're a little bit reluctant to come up here and actually do a full-blown presentation, but I do want to acknowledge the fact that they're here, and they're, again, very interested in this issue.

SECRETARY HEINZE: I'm just telling you, you've got five minutes.

MR. WILL: My name is David Will. I'm with Chino Valley Ranchers, and we're organic egg producers in California. We have actually been working with the Methionine Task

Force for about the last two years, and one of the things we've noticed is that the trial data on layers is very small to lacking, so our company has committed with help of the Task Force. We actually on May 14th set 22,000 layers of which 11,000 will be grown under our normal management program, and 11,000 will be grown with no added Methionine to their diet for the next 100 weeks, or as long as we can without seriously impacting the bird health. We will be providing regular updates, both visual performance and health updates through the Methionine Task Force. And we'd like to invite any of you, if you're in southern California, we'd be more than happy to bring you out. You can take a look at the birds side-by-side. They will be in sister houses. We anticipate that they will be moved to lay sometime in early October, and have some sort of significant egg production numbers or comparisons some time in midDecember. So we hope to alleviate the
concerns that there hasn't been a full-scale trial with this program.

MR. BRUCE: My name is David Bruce, and contrary to popular opinion, you don't have to be named David to be part of the Task Force. The last time I testified to the NOSB was about outdoor access, 15 years ago when we were just starting the egg program in Organic Valley. Today, the co-op is now over 1,400 members strong. The egg program itself is 87 members in four states, primarily Midwest and here on the East Coast.

And I'm also representing the
Poultry and Turkey Production for Organic Valley. So, obviously, our producers have a very strong interest in continuing the allowed use for at least another two, hopefully another three years.

We've been active for the last five to six years pursuing the whole list of alternatives, working closely with universities. We've done three different sets
of fairly small-scale trials, but one with a rice brand derivative, one with a potato protein, and then working very closely with Dr. Walter Goldstein on his high Methionine corn ones. And we're going to be continuing to do that this coming summer. Those have been fairly small-scale trials because of the amount of seed that's available, but we've been working with Dr. Goldstein and the University of Minnesota on that. We actually talked to them about doing a small-scale trial with no Methionine in the ration whatsoever, and they were concerned about being able to get that through the administration because of the welfare issues, and the wellness of the birds involved in that study.

We are -- also, I'm the primary
contact in contact with the private party who I don't think would mind being mentioned, is Dr. Joe Ward. He's on the Iowa State Organic Board and he works for a private feed company.

He's developed a bacterial method to do alternatives in Methionine. He's now entered commercial-scale production trials of that, and that will be the next stage, to see whether he can really bring that to market. He's very confident that at some point he'll be able to, so we're each keeping it brief so that we have time for a strong dialogue, so thank you.

CHAIR DELGADO: Thanks. MR. PIERCE: Good afternoon. My name is Chris Pierce. I'm with Heritage Poultry Management Services. We're East Coast, we're in Pennsylvania. We are a management consulting company that we have a full-time poultry nutritionist on staff. That's Dr. Owen Keene. He finished graduate school at the University of Maryland in nutrition in 1955, and Dr. Keene's is around 72 years old, and he's still going strong. And he's made comment to you as board two times during the last seven years as this
issue has come up.
And from our standpoint, as we work with poultry, our first organic flock was in 1997. So as you remember that chart, as we look at where we were in `97 and move to 2007, we see a dramatic increase in the demand. But we are committed to be part of the Methionine Task Force, as we are only a small representation of many producers around the country that are trying to put the funds, the resources together from our own companies towards providing you the research. And from my behalf, we do not take this issue very lightly. We are committed, I think as you've seen in David's presentation, that we are very committed to serving and providing the answers to the questions you may have.

MR. MARTINELLI: So we'll stop there. And, obviously, if there's Q\&A, I'd like these folks maybe to come up, and to the extent there's questions, engage -

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Questions?

Gerry.
MEMBER DAVIS: One slide you put up
on insects and earth worms mentioned Methionine content was not exactly what you need from them, but then you went to mention the Neptune Industries. Are they selecting certain insects that are different than that?

MR. MARTINELLI: I don't know the exact answer. I suspect it's one of concentration, that in a natural environment the concentration of insects is not going to be anything like the concentration in a meal product, where it's going to be a higher percentage of their diet.

MEMBER DAVIS: So that slide didn't necessarily say the insect by weight is the wrong component of Methionine. It's just the ability to get enough insects, is the problem.

MR. MARTINELLI: Yes. I don't have it with me. There's a chart -- I mean, insects are probably three times the level of the more typical ingredients you'd find in
feed from a Methionine standpoint. But they're a fraction of what the benefit you get from a full Methionine supplementation is. So the idea is, in a normal diet, as a small percentage of the diet in a free ranging environment, you're not going to pick up enough earth worms or insects to make a difference. But if it's feed additive, you probably could make -- it, in theory, could make a difference. We really need to see the nutritional profile to know. MR. BRUCE: I would just add that that's just one element that shows promise. Again, there's going to be issues like feeding fish meal at a certain level, you're going to have offsets in flavor and that kind of thing, so it's about a diversified source.

CHAIR DELGADO: Katrina, followed by Kevin.

SECRETARY HEINZE: We're back to Katrina's simple questions, don't know a lot about chickens. But I want to ask a question
about the insects and earth worms, as well. Again, this is a consumer perspective. I'm a city girl, but my parents retired on a farm, and my mom has ten, so again, it's not the same amount, hens. And they go out in the grass, they go out in the snow in the winter. She gives them corn, eggs are fine, chickens are fine. So what are the hurdles to be able to do that on a production scale?

MR. MARTINELLI: I guess I'm not really familiar with what -- how many she's raising, or what she's trying to do. I'm not familiar enough with that operation to really tell you.

SECRETARY HEINZE: Okay. Well, don't worry about my mom's.

MR. MARTINELLI: Okay.
SECRETARY HEINZE: For a long time, people raised chickens, and they raised them without Methionine.

MR. MARTINELLI: Right.
SECRETARY HEINZE: And people had
eggs.
MR. MARTINELLI: Sure.
SECRETARY HEINZE: And it worked, so why doesn't it work now?

MR. MARTINELLI: We went back -- as part of our petition, actually, there's -- we pulled feed rations from the 1940s and 50s. And, I mean, the typical additive in feed rations were either table scraps, or some sort of meat meal or bone meal. I mean, in virtually all the diets you look at, that's what you'll find. So there's some way of getting that protein to the birds in the form of a meat byproduct, which is relatively rich in Methionine, and that's the compensating difference.

MR. PIERCE: Can I just add to that? Dr. Keene, who I mentioned earlier, talks about the good old days, the 50s, and 40s when he grew up, and he talked about how the mortality was significantly higher. The life standard and the quality of the bird's
life was much more difficult because of those elements with feathering and with mortality. So as we see mortality -- maybe that's not an answer. The consumer wants to know the chickens are going to kill each other, so that's something that's important to the chicken, so the quality of life is much different in the 50s than it is today in regard to the chickens that are surviving. CHAIR DELGADO: Follow-up question. SECRETARY HEINZE: And, again, I'm sure I'm seeing this from a very simplified version. The only thing killing my mom's chickens is the fox. They're not killing each other. I don't think she's feeding them meat. So it is -- I think from a consumer perspective, there's an optics thing. Right? That I can go -- big thing in Minneapolis is the neighborhood chicken. Everyone is getting chickens now that they can put in their backyards, and let them run around in the grass, so I think it's an optics thing. But
it's hard for consumers to understand, and it gets complicated by pasture for cows. So maybe some help understanding that. MR. MARTINELLI: Yes. I don't know that we can answer a consumer perception question. I mean, that's not really -- I mean, we're more from a nutritional standpoint looking at NRC values, looking at our history in poultry production, and we've actually got speakers following us that actually can speak very specifically to the science behind it. I cannot. So, I mean, we can address those issues, but consumer perception and optics is kind of out of my league.

MR. BRUCE: Can I just add one brief amendment to that, and that is that -to reiterate that Heritage breeds don't have different Methionine needs. But one of the ways that that's been approached in Europe is to have -- it's a density issue, and it's to have much smaller flocks, and be able to move the flocks around so they have a much greater
outdoor area. But what they found even in those flocks is without supplementation there's feathering problems, and picking, and the feathering scores of those birds are fairly poor.

CHAIR DELGADO: All right. Kevin, followed by Tracy.

MEMBER ENGELBERT: You've touched on one of the questions that I had for you, but I'd like you to elaborate farther. Before the advent of synthetic Methionine, how were the needs of these birds met? And my second question is, any of these trials that you reference where the grass and these other materials or substances weren't meeting the Methionine needs of the birds, were they ever fed synthetic Methionine as chicks, and then taken off it and put into these trials? Do you know that, because they could develop a dependency on the synthetic, and then when you put them out on a trial and say well, this doesn't work, that could be the reason.

MR. PIERCE: I was going to say I now it was, you could share part of it, but from a diet standpoint, I know fish oil, fish meal, crab meal was an important part of the diet pre-synthetic Methionine to try to elevate those levels. And I know some of those products, of course, are not available at this point to us, so maybe you want to add to that.

MR. MARTINELLI: Again, that's covered in the petition about the diets from 40, 50 years ago. I don't know the answer to your question about whether the chicks were fed synthetic Methionine. We've got the report here. We can flip through it at the break or something and look. I mean, it's a great question. I just don't know.

CHAIR DELGADO: Tracy.
MEMBER MIEDEMA: Valerie, can you pull up the slide that shows the quarter-byquarter projects. My question is for our Livestock Chair, and maybe for you all to
chime in on.
I heard earlier that the reason we put the, or were suggesting the two-year expiration is to try to light a fire under the development of non-synthetic Methionine. And the indications I'm getting is that there's a lot of irons in the fire out there, and so I'm wondering, at the two-year point, where we're going to be, and whether that's adequate.

CHAIR DELGADO: Hugh, would you
like to respond?
DR. KARREMAN: I don't know where we're going to be, but they have a good time line up there for doing a lot of trials, and poultry trials don't take as long, usually, as some of the other large livestock, so that's helpful. The original petition is to take the expiration date off indefinitely. Right? If we did that, would you be doing this?

MR. MARTINELLI: It would still be subject to the five-year sunset.

DR. KARREMAN: No. There's
something weird about that, I think, isn't there?

MR. MARTINELLI: That wasn't our intent, so if it's weird, we didn't mean to be weird.

CHAIR DELGADO: He has a clarification. Dan.

DR. KARREMAN: I do have some questions about that whole thing, but is this two-year time line kind of because of our secondary recommendation here?

MR. MARTINELLI: In part. I mean, I am sincere. I mean, I think part of the problem is we haven't had a strong time line, and we certainly haven't communicated it to you guys. And, I mean, if you're going to give us any time, we need to tell you what we're going to do in that time, not just hey, we're going to work really hard.

DR. KARREMAN: Right.
MR. MARTINELLI: So I echo what Dr.
Goldstein said earlier, that two years is a
bit of a rush. I mean, frankly, it's a bit of a rush. We will do the things we're committed to do up there, but I can't look you in the eye and say yes, and we will have an answer. DR. KARREMAN: Right. Right. No, I understand that part. I just -- this is the second extension on Methionine. Y'all know that, or third, whatever it is. But we just want to -- I guess, we just don't want to keep having this discussion every two to three years. I remember in 2001 when the meeting was at the USDA building there was someone really needing Methionine, and now it's 2008. So, I guess, we just -- we want to make sure that this isn't just an ongoing thing, and that's why we're asking about alternatives and all that.

And, actually, my question, if I may is, what's the typical ration of layers, typical ration that you're feeding with each new batch of layers you get in?

MR. WILL: Depending on the age of
the bird, but our typical ration is the majority of it is an organic corn, limestone, alfalfa, natural salt, and soy. And then on a per ton basis, it's around 4 pounds per ton of Methionine.

DR. KARREMAN: That's pretty
standard around?
MR. BRUCE: It's fairly standard, although I would just add to that by saying that our producers are really experimenting with a wide variety of things, field peas, wheat, barley, everything that they could think of because of the current livestock feed situation.

> MEMBER HALL: Just wondering,
though. I mean, if organics is to promote the natural behavior of the livestock species, I mean, poultry are not herbivores. I mentioned that earlier this morning, I think, and I think we'd like to get to that point. It's like the whole pasture discussion is because ruminants are herbivores, and they need to be
out there and whatnot. Well, poultry, it's a little bit the other way, so we want to see that -- I guess the Livestock Committee wants to see that come in. I'm glad to hear there's variety, but it's still all plant-based, and I guess we want to start seeing some more access to the outdoors, and perhaps some of what Katrina was getting at, incorporated. Not maybe basing all the Methionine on that, but not denying them that particular input as a Livestock Committee, and as a Board, perhaps.

MR. MARTINELLI: Am I hearing you right that it's -- so like the insect meal, earth worm meal, that kind of stuff is the direction you're going?

DR. KARREMAN: Well, I always like to call things when I give talks to farmers or vets, a multi-prong approach, not just reliance on the same inputs, like the ration that I just asked you about. So yes, you know, have a variety.

MR. BRUCE: I couldn't agree with you more, but we, nonetheless, have to address the issue right now. I'd encourage the NOSB to take up the issue of further defining outdoor access for poultry, but, nonetheless, we're on a long time line I'm sure with that, too.

CHAIR DELGADO: Our Director has a point to make. Please.

MS. FRANCIS: I just wanted to remind the Board why they were concerned about moving this material to a traditional sunset rule versus keeping the expiration date, and that the sunset rule puts more of the burden on you to be soliciting whether or not this is still needed. And keeping it on the list, rather than putting the burden on the industry to prove that they still need it.

CHAIR DELGADO: Thank you for that. Dan, you had another similar comment? No. Okay. Jeff. Hugh, are you done?

DR. KARREMAN: Yes.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Do you have a similar comment on that, or question? I have Jeff here.

SECRETARY HEINZE: Jeff can go first.

CHAIR DELGADO: Jeff, proceed, please.

VICE CHAIR MOYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You mentioned in the beginning of your conversation that, and your points that you had some growers in the room. And I appreciate their reluctance maybe to come to the podium, but I would like to invite them to come up and give their name, something about their farm, briefly where they're from, just so we have some indication of who is here representing the poultry industry.

SECRETARY HEINZE: As you do this, please go very slowly. I'm going to have to write you all down.

MS. MITCHELL: Susan Mitchell. I'm from Lancaster County, and we have been
growing organic chickens broilers for three years.

VICE CHAIR MOYER: Are we allowed
to ask questions or not?
CHAIR DELGADO: Yes, we are. Why don't we allow them to present themselves, and then we'll have questions for them.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Earl Ray Zimmerman.
I live in Lancaster County, I'm growing
organic broilers for four years. I'd like to comment a little on grandma's backyard chickens. Big issue is phosphorous for the Chesapeake Bay.

CHAIR DELGADO: Excuse me.
Katrina, you had a question.
SECRETARY HEINZE: Before you do that, can you spell your last name.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Z-I-M-M-E-R-M-A-N.
If we'd all have 50 chickens in our backyard, think how your backyard would look eventually.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Thank you
for that. Comment, next?

MR. MARTIN: Dennis Martin from Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. I've been growing organic broilers for just about two years now.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay.
MR. STUMP: Lavere Stump from Adams County. I've been raising, I put up poultry barns a year and a half ago.

CHAIR DELGADO: Can you come back?
SECRETARY HEINZE: Spelling, again.
CHAIR DELGADO: Spell your name, please.

MR. STUMP: My first or last?
SECRETARY HEINZE: Both.
MR. STUMP: Lavere, L-A-V-E-R-E.
Stump, S-T-U-M-P.
SECRETARY HEINZE: Thank you.
MR. KING: Matthew King, farm is in
Chester County. And we actually have our first organic flock in the houses currently. We've been raising chickens, I'd be the second generation, broiler operation at this time, 13
or 15 years.
MR. RANK: My name is Ryan Rank.
I'm the Grow-Out Manager with BC Natural Chicken. I'm not an actual farmer, but I'm here with the farmers today. We have many family farms represented with our operation where we grow organic birds. So I just wanted to give a general outlook on who we brought with us here today.

CHAIR DELGADO: All right. Thank you.

MR. FRAN: My name is Tom Fran.
I'm from the southern California, work for MCM
Poultry, and I have a Bachelor of Science in
Poultry from Cal Poly St. Luis, and 34 consecutive years in the layer industry.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Thank you.
Any questions, follow-up questions -- one more? Several more. Please.

MS. MILLER: Hi. I'm Denise Miller
with Dennis L. Miller farm. We've been growing organic chickens for almost a year.

We're from Hamburg, Pennsylvania, Berks County.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay.
MR. SMELTER: My name is Steve
Smelter, and I work for Kramer Feed, Incorporated in Kramer, Pennsylvania. We are a certified organic feed mill, and we make feeds for organic layers, organic broilers, organic turkeys. And we sell feed both to ourselves for our integrated growing program, and we sell to independent growers for the most part up and down the east coast from Maine to Florida. I work in the retail division, and have the experience, sometimes quite strange experience of dealing with the backyard grower like your mother. I'll come off the phone with a grower who has five chickens, and then I'll talk to some of our large independent retail customers who have 30 or 60,000 layers, so kind of gives us a unique perspective. But we've been doing this for 15 years now, so thank you.

SECRETARY HEINZE: Can you spell your last name?

MR. SMELTER: Smelter, S-M-E-L-T-E-
R.

SECRETARY HEINZE: Thank you.
CHAIR DELGADO: Anyone else? Okay.
VICE CHAIR MOYER: I want to say
thank you. I appreciate you coming up and giving us that information. It really does put a face on the industry for us. And now, I guess, it's up to you, whether the Board can ask questions.

CHAIR DELGADO: Absolutely. Are there any questions for our group of producers, and also members of the Methionine board?

DR. KARREMAN: I'm glad Lancaster County and Chester County is well represented here. Glad it wasn't a far drive.

I'm just wondering what -- I was hoping to hear what kind of size bird houses you have, and how much of your land is
certified organic with the farm that you have. MR. STUMP: I've got, what is it, 88,000 - no, I started 96,000 birds. I have four houses, and they do have access area on organic rye grass. They can go out and they have windows for natural light. And so yes, we're trying to raise the most healthy bird that we can.

SECRETARY HEINZE: Did you say your name?

MR. STUMP: Lavere Stump.
DR. KARREMAN: You don't have to all go through that, unless you want to. MR. RANK: I can kind of speak for the group a little bit. We have various farms.

SECRETARY HEINZE: And your name? MR. RANK: I'm Ryan Rank with PC Natural Chicken, Coleman Natural Foods. We have a variety of farm sizes, anywhere from small houses to a few thousands birds, up to large farms, which Mr. Stump just shared here.

Just give you kind of an overview of what we do.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Any other questions from the Board? Dan, then Hugh. MEMBER GIACOMINI: I'd like to go back to the Task Force on a couple of issues. I have a couple of different questions, if I can. You indicated that in your typical diet, you have about . 2 percent Methionine inclusion rate. What percent of the Methionine that you're feeding is coming from synthetic Methionine?

MR. WILL: That is our added rate. There's a little bit in the feed that is on top of that. But we add about four pounds of synthetic Methionine to our ration.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: So then almost all of -- are you saying then -- I mean, you're not saying all the Methionine. I mean, there's Methionine coming from other feeds.

MR. WILL: Correct.
MEMBER GIACOMINI: What percentage
of the Methionine in the diet is synthetic? MR. WILL: About two-thirds. MEMBER GIACOMINI: Okay. Valerie, could you go to the, I believe it was a pasture slide on the Mortiz study. I guess I partly take exception to a statement you made, that just in a general sense, faster growing birds are healthier birds. That's kind of like saying the fastest growing birds, or anything that's not growing the fastest is not as healthy as something growing faster. We know in a general sense that slightly underfeeding is the healthiest animal in a species, so I take exception to that.

> And in this study, it's looking what a -- stating a deficiency in Methionine. Is this based on the production level of the birds in the study, or based on a preferred growth level that they wanted to achieve? Were the birds out-performing their Methionine intake, or was it just less than what they would have liked to see the birds perform?

Because Methionine requirement is directly tied to the production level that you're trying to assume, and the production level comes down when the production level comes down, and I'm going to come back, again, as I started this question, disagree with your statement that the healthiest birds in the house are necessarily the fastest growing ones.

MR. MARTINELLI: Well, I would disagree with my own statement. If that's what I said, it's not what I meant. The point is that the slow growing genotypes don't necessarily have any different Methionine demand than the faster growing birds. And what I meant to say was that the birds, healthy birds are typically higher performing birds. So yes, you will see an incidence of higher performance out of birds that are given supplemental Methionine, but it's our belief that it's because the birds are healthier.

CHAIR DELGADO: Hugh, followed by

Kevin.
DR. KARREMAN: Last autumn, was it last autumn, Tina? Tina and $I$ were shown a couple of poultry houses in our area, and I was glad to get those tours, and learn a lot from that. One thing I was a little worried about, when one of the owners was there, I just said well, how big is your farm? And he said, 88 acres or whatever it is. I said, certified. Right? No. It wasn't, and it really was kind of shocking that these two poultry houses were on not certified land. So that would -- I think in agriculture, and especially organic agriculture, you've got to have a tie between the animals and the land. That's the way it's always been, and that's what we try to do in organics, I believe. I'm not saying all the time out there or anything, but I was like well, how are those poultry birds going to be getting their outdoor access as it is in 239(a), I think? It's a little bit -- it was
troublesome. Do most of -- I'll just leave it at that. Just wanted to make a statement.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Kevin. MEMBER ENGELBERT: I'd like to get back to the point of healthy birds and their productivity, and how you measure that. I mean, are you looking at mortality rates, or what do you use to judge -- what criteria are you using to make that statement?

MR. MARTINELLI: Well, the criteria
we looked at, the measurable things we could observe were mortalities, egg size, rate of lay, bird weight, feed conversion, all those sort of things, a variety of metrics depending upon the bird. Obviously, there's also observation that goes into it, too. And our field people could tell if we have birds that we either withheld methionine or gave them less than the targeted amount of methionine, they will tell you they can just look at the birds and tell which group was the lowmethionine and no-methionine group.

MR. WILL: I just want to add to this. We actually had an opportunity to walk into poultry houses in first-time producers about a month and a half ago, right after the OTA, and these birds were about 40 weeks old, and when we walked in, they were completely featherless from the backs of their necks to the vents. There were no feathers on the ground. They had been picked clean, because when we looked at the ration, these birds were low in methionine. It was about 15 percent low in the ration of methionine consisting based in their ration. Their production was excellent, but their health and general wellbeing, the mortality was just starting to shoot through the roof. They picked all the feathers off. And we actually just in that house for a short amount of time, actually saw cannibalism happening because those birds were having nutritional challenges.

CHAIR DELGADO: Kevin.
MEMBER ENGELBERT: Would the
concentration of birds in that house have any impact on that? And did they have any access to the outdoors?

MR. WILL: They had -- they were a cage-free flock, so they did not have access to the outdoors. However, they were not solid walls, so they did have the environment interacting with them. And their density was at or above industry-accepted standard.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any other questions? Dan.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: When we're looking at a compound that's supplying twothirds of your requirement needs, I don't have a chance to go through an exhaustive search, but I just have -- as a nutritionist, I have a database for amino acids on my laptop here, and over the last couple of days, I've run a number of feeds.

Even if we look at one of the more enhanced versions of corn for Methionine being a corn gluten meal, you'd have to look at like

1
a 200 time increase over conventional to get anywhere close to the amount of Methionine that you'd be supplying. I'm trying to understand how -that doesn't seem like it's going to be -- I mean, it's going to help, but are you really sincerely coming to us and telling us that you think that in three to five years, between corn -- I mean, you're going to have to have exclusive processing centers, you're going to have to have supply chains that will just be incredible to manage, insects, a little bit of fish meal, worms, or are just going -- or are you going to come back, and are we going to need Methionine forever to meet the production levels that you really want with the health that you're claiming that you need. MR. MARTINELLI: That's an
extremely fair and legitimate question. For boilers, when we looked at the diets, you get really close with corn gluten meal, which is not approved for organic production, but which
you cited, and high-methionine corn. I mean, you get really close. And I guess my perspective would be, I'd like to try that diet and see what sort of -- see how the birds look, see what sort of results we get. But I think your question is great, because it really illustrates -- I know there's a lot of frustration around gosh, you've had three years, you had another three years, you guys aren't doing anything. And I don't -- it's not that we're not doing anything, it's we've got a tall order. I mean, what you're describing is the crux of the problem. This ain't easy, and it's -- we will do everything we possibly can, but I can't deliver you a two-years from now, 36 months from now we'll have the solution.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: Well, I think the crux of that problem is, on our side, at least on my side, is very close to an absolute commitment seeming to be on your part of wanting to maintain conventional growth rates.

And there doesn't -- I'm not hearing a great acceptance to well, we can come back 10 percent and we'll be able to do there, we'll be able to do this, we'll be able to go so many days longer, and this will make it work. I'm just hearing chickens are going to be killing each other if we don't keep our Methionine.

I don't -- as a nutritionist, I
hope you keep trying, but I'm not really
optimistic on any of these for you. So, granted I'm a ruminant nutritionist, not a poultry, but I still know nutrition.

Are you going to reach the point where if it -- I mean, we're just going to have to live with a lower performance level, production level?

MR. MARTINELLI: Yes. And I guess
I want to go back. I mean, you're completely right. I mean, this is much more your realm than mine. Closing the gap. So, I mean, if we can get these alternatives in the system,
and we can close the gap, then if we get results that are close, yes, we can live with that. But right now you're talking about a wide gap that creates bird health issues, creates environmental issues.

The thinking would be if we could get some of these alternatives in place and get the gap to where at least we're not dealing with bird health issues, we're not dealing with environmental issues. You're maybe dealing with a loss of production, but you have to just manage your way through that. CHAIR DELGADO: Hugh, followed by Tracy.

DR. KARREMAN: Just taking that into account, let's say in a few years you're using the alternatives, and gee whiz, you still need a little bit of methionine even for a reduced level of production, which is our problem right now, is just trying to keep production. I'd like to ask the Program, is it ever possible to say okay, synthetic
methionine, which is only for poultry, we're not allowing it for pet food, or fish, or nothing else. It's just poultry. If that can be at a smidge, a fraction of what you're doing now, if that would be allowable. Can we say that, because it is a vitamin or essential nutrient, but it's only for poultry. I was wondering, could we have an annotation on that? Let's say come up in three years or two years, whatever, if this happens again, or maybe work on that now. Just say you can have it at whatever, like 15 percent of the level you have it now, so that you are forced to use some other inputs and have a diverse diet. CHAIR DELGADO: So you're proposing a scaled down -

DR. KARREMAN: Not a total phaseout, necessarily. I'm just saying is that an option of bringing it down, stepping it down so then the alternatives have an incentive to step up. That's what we're dealing with, fish oil, fish meal from the symposium. We were
talking about a phase-out, so then the people with the new products for fish oil, fish meal will have stimulus to go up, because they know you're coming down. Is that legal, being an essential nutrient, well, because you're supposed to balance the rations, vitamins, minerals, and all that.

CHAIR DELGADO: Can a member of the Program address that point?

DR. KARREMAN: An annotation to have a certain amount, no more.

MR. POOLER: This is Bob Pooler, NOP. We're going to have to take a look at that and get back to you on it.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Thank you. But that's an option that probably the Committee should consider. Kevin.

MEMBER ENGELBERT: There's a nutritional supplement company in Pennsylvania that I'm sure you're familiar with that offers a poultry nutri-balance or supplement without methionine. Can you give any opinion on that?

MR. PIERCE: Yes. Kevin, I'm not familiar with -- I'm familiar with the company I think you're talking about, but I'm not familiar with that product, but we can include that in the Methionine Task Force information.

MR. SMELTER: That product was developed by Dr. Jack Robinette to -- was a colleague of mine going back to 1980 when I started in the feed industry. Jack had a great understanding of all species, one of the few nutritionists, I think, who could excel in all those fields, and he's up there in his elder age right now, but he's still providing information to specific companies.

The nutri-balancer comes two ways. It comes with Methionine, and without methionine. And Jeff is not here from that company to speak for it, but originally his company, Fortrell, provided feed supplements to the "natural grower" before the organic program existed. When organics came, they modified some of their pre-mixes.

The pre-mix with methionine is chosen by people who wish to use it in their birds, some of them wish to use the one without methionine. Some of those are natural growers who will use some other ingredients that the organic program is not allowed to use, so Fortrell has always had the natural people, many of whom use fish, some might even use meat and bone. Meat and bone hasn't been mentioned, but historically in the 40 s and 50 s that was the main carrier of methionine into these poultry rations, was tankage, whey, things that we call slaughter byproducts, which are not allowed in organic production today. So they do have both, and their premix without methionine would just be the necessary vitamins and trace minerals, macro and micro minerals that the bird would need. So there would be a difference in how the birds would be able to survive and perform. MEMBER ENGELBERT: They make the claim that they have replaced the methionine
with acceptable ingredients, one of which is kelp meal. Do you know what the methionine levels of that ration might be? And have you, or any of your growers used this product to compare the results?

MR. SMELTER: Well, as one of their
chief competitors, I've looked at it very closely, and they would use that product to grow all types of poultry, with some minor modifications. For instance, for layers, they would bring in some added calcium from limestone or oyster shell to supplement that out. I'm sorry. Oh, the kelp meal.

I know that Jeff has experimented with recommending his organic growers to use fish meal and crab meal, which is allowed under organic rules, as long as the preservative is okay. And he gets good results, and he has -- in those recommendations with no methionine, he'll use have a fish and a crab recommendation. Kelp is a great natural vitamin and trace mineral
source, but not a source of methionine, of any significance, other than the tiny amount of sea life, animal life that might be in it, which is very negligible, and not really claimed.

CHAIR DELGADO: I understand that
Richard Matthews has a statement that might add to the previous question that you had.

MR. SMELTER: My name is Steven
Smelter.
MR. MATTHEWS: Richard Matthews.
Hugh, I'm going to go out on a limb, and remind the board that in Section 205.602 for sodium nitrate, that there already is a cap on the amount of sodium nitrate that can be used to meet the nitrogen needs, so why not in livestock production, as well? So if you wanted to say that synthetic methionine is capped at a certain level, you can surely propose that.

CHAIR DELGADO: Thank you.
MR. MATTHEWS: Granted, I'm talking
-- you know, it's already been done for a natural which is restricted, but there's no reason why you can't also restrict the synthetic that you allow.

CHAIR DELGADO: Thank you for that comment. Gerry, you wanted to comment on that.

MEMBER DAVIS: That's a major difference. That's a prohibited natural that's restricted to that amount. It's not synthetic.

CHAIR DELGADO: Hugh.
DR. KARREMAN: It's still on the list.

MEMBER DAVIS: It's a similar precedent, but it's synthetic versus natural. DR. KARREMAN: Yes, but we're also talking living creatures.

CHAIR DELGADO: Very well. So, again, this is an option that the Committee might consider, and explore that further. Yes, Dan. You can a comment.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: Kind of another question. Well, first of all, let me say as far as the things -- I think the biggest help that I would see is in the fermentation products, because that's where you're going to have the best chance of concentrating your methionine. But has there been any work done on finding an economical organically approvable hydrolysis procedure and isolation technique to isolate some of the methionine out of some existing protein sources?

MR. MARTINELLI: No. I don't know of any, let's put it that way.

CHAIR DELGADO: Follow-up question?
MEMBER GIACOMINI: No. I
understand it might be an idea.
CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Thank you. Tracy.

MEMBER MIEDEMA: I just wanted to switch gears a little bit and go back to the petitions that we have before us, which deal specifically with the changing of this
expiration date, which the Livestock Committee seemed to have made pretty strong
recommendation on. And a lot of what we were dealing with was the date, and that we were looking at two-year extension.

One of the things that you
mentioned earlier today was that two years was arrived at sort of loosely based on it was three, plus two, it's loosely tied to a sunset-type period, and I'm just wondering, since this is our only time to discuss this and tomorrow we just vote. Right? We're trying to confine our discussion to today.

CHAIR DELGADO: Right.
MEMBER MIEDEMA: If two years seems
like enough, given the amount of work that's in the hopper right now, and where we're going to be at in two years. And whether we're going to go through this whole exercise just to say add one more year, when we could potentially just make it three.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Hugh, if you
can answer that question, I really would like to wrap this up and move on to the next topic. So we'll have Hugh, followed by Joe.

DR. KARREMAN: Certainly, that's possible. You've got to remember that the Livestock Committee unanimously voted to not take the petitioners recommendation or their petition at all, meaning methionine would be out this October.

MEMBER MIEDEMA: Okay.
DR. KARREMAN: We certainly do not want to kill an industry, so we came up with the two years, kind of like what you said with these alternatives, and what's in the hopper and all that. We could make it three years, possibly, but $I$ want to make sure that -- I won't be on the board next time when this happens, but that it won't happen again, that another three years is needed. And, so, maybe we can do something with a restricted amount, a small amount of synthetic methionine, possibly, to stimulate the growth of some of
these other alternatives into the diet, to get some variety in the diet, as well, from the natural sources of proteins and whatnot. Anyway, it's possible for three years.

By the way, quick thing, Livestock Committee meeting tonight at some point.

CHAIR DELGADO: We'll make that announcement. And just as a reminder, there's always -- prior to voting, there's a period of comment on that specific item. And you'll have more opportunities to comment on that.

MEMBER SMILLIE: I was simply going to say the same thing. It seems two won't do, meth free in three.

CHAIR DELGADO: That's it? Well, any more questions? Thank you very much to the group, and we'll continue on to the next speaker.

MS. FRANCIS: The next speaker had to leave to catch a flight, unfortunately, and he has handouts, which I will pass around, which are collated and everything. So I'm
assuming the next speaker is still here.
CHAIR DELGADO: And that will be Greg Herbruck. Is that correct?

MS. FRANCIS: Eric Gingerich is after -

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. So we are moving on. Greg is gone. Right, Valerie? Greg is the one who left. Next up -

MS. FRANCIS: Greg left.
CHAIR DELGADO: Next up will be Eric Gingerich.

MR. GINGERICH: That's right. Eric Gingerich from the University of Pennsylvania. I'm a veterinarian, and I have a handout that you will all get eventually.

I've been in the industry about 30
years as a poultry veterinarian. I work in the diagnostic lab portion at New Bolton

Center. We work with a lot of the Lancaster County and surrounding area poultry producers, organic, conventional, everything. So I'm looking at these chickens, I do field
investigations, trying to figure out what's going on with some of these flocks. And I've seen some problems in the -- even present problems with organic flocks.

I have about a list of nine different things that I think could impact poultry health, assuming that we have no good alternative to synthetic methionine to add to these rations. The first one is poor feathering in egg layers. This is definitely a big problem, even with conventional cagefree birds, that once they lose their feathers they lose a protective cover to protect them from scratches, and things like that. These wounds allow bacteria into the system. We get E. coli infections quite often.

> Also, once they lose their
feathers, they become very nervous and more cannibalistic, and we get a lot of peck out mortality. Even with present day organic flocks, we've had some pretty high mortality rates, especially in open-type housing from
peck outs, even with synthetic methionine in the rations.

Another thing, poor feathering in broilers is another thing that without the synthetic methionine, we anticipate that we'd have poor feathering problems there, also. Broilers also need those feathers for prevention of skin scratches, to prevent gangrenous dermatitis, and E. coli infections, as well.

Without synthetic methionine, the rations are going to have a lot of excess protein due to added soybean meal to raise the methionine level trying to get near the requirements, and this extra nitrogen is going to go into the feces. And this extra nitrogen is going to increase our ammonia levels in the houses, and this will impact the respiratory tract negatively. It reduces the ability of the respiratory tract to rid itself of bacteria. We're going to see more bacterial infections.

Also, birds are very sensitive, especially brown egg layers are very sensitive to ammonia. They get corneal ulcers. We've even had some -- this winter we had some pretty significant losses of birds due to corneal ulcers from high ammonia in brown egg pullets.

Talk about decreased growth rate with lower methionine rations. This, in a veterinarian's eyes, you're going to have these birds out in the field longer, broilers and turkeys, by the way, going to have them out in the field longer so that exposes them to more disease risk. The longer they're out in the field, the more risk they have.

Kidney problems could be an issue
also with the excess nitrogen that birds have to excrete. This puts a big stress on the kidneys, and we anticipate possibly more visceral gout problems, urolythiasis problems in poultry, especially layers due to the increased amount of soybean meal that's going
to be used. This increases the potassium level of the diet, and this potassium is very prone to cause wet droppings. And these wet droppings, wet litter in chickens is a very bad thing. It increased pathogen load, it increases the bacterial level of the litter, it increases the ammonia release from the litter, so it's got a lot of negatives to it. Also, increased heat stress is a possibility with increased nitrogen crude protein in these rations, because of the heat, the metabolism is going to be increased. During real hot weather, we're going to have some probably more heat stress, and mortality due to heat-related problems.

Pododermatitis, which is ulcers on the bottom of the feet of birds, this is -some research has been done that shows a significant increase in turkeys, where you use higher levels of soybean meal, higher crude protein levels. They didn't really say exactly what it was due to, if it was the wet litter
issue with potassium or what, but there was a big increase in foot problems.

Lastly, cocciciosis may be increased. The severity of cocciciosis, some research has been done that equated inadequate methionine to increased severity of cocciciosis.

So, in summary, I think without a good alternative to synthetic methionine, I think we're going to have some -- see more birds in the lab due to some of these health issues. Any questions?

CHAIR DELGADO: Questions for our speaker? Okay. Thank you very much. Moving on to Walter Goldstein, followed by Brian Baker.

DR. GOLDSTEIN: Right. There's a handout. I don't know if you've received it yet. If not, it will be coming around. And it will go more in depth into what I wanted to say. If I only have five minutes, there's only certain things I can deal with.

CHAIR DELGADO: Dr. Goldstein, can you just state your name, and your affiliation, please.

DR. GOLDSTEIN: Right. Walter
Goldstein, Research Director, Michael Fields Agricultural Institute, East Troy, Wisconsin. CHAIR DELGADO: Thank you.

DR. GOLDSTEIN: Okay. If we can look at the screen over there, I have a few slides for you. First off, I want to point out that the work that we're doing is actually a team effort that involves our institute, Iowa State University Serial Testing Lab, USDA ARS, especially the Corn Breeding Group at Ames, Iowa, Practical Farmers of Iowa, University of Minnesota, Lamberton, we're all doing research. We're doing it also together with Organic Valley and Methionine Task Force, so it's a nice team effort.

Looking at the actual methionine content, we've heard some discussion about what needs to be in a ration. What I'd like
to point out here is that we have three different types of corn here. This data is on the basis of total dry matter, and you can see normal corn, this is average of 1,903 samples from the Iowa State Grain Testing Lab. And we have 28 samples of our hard kernel methionine corn, and 16 samples of our soft kernel methionine corn. And you can see that there are some profound differences. We have a higher protein content. The methionine content is about half again more. Also, the total sulfur amino acid content, which counts for chickens, is higher. And the lysine content is higher. In fact, it's almost twice as high for our soft kernel corn as it is for normal corn. Lysine is also very important amino acid for balancing the ration for chickens.

And you can see that's an average of 28 samples, and 16 samples. These samples are expensive. For a company to do these analyses, it costs them $\$ 150$ a sample. We
feel very excited that we've made a new breakthrough in testing of methionine and lysine with a near infrared spectroscopy. We've developed a new calibration that's broken the inherent correlation between protein and methionine and between protein and lysine. We've made a big breakthrough. And with this technology, it's going to be possible to measure methionine very cheaply, and quickly. And that's going to be an important ingredient in terms of bringing the high methionine corn forward as an alternative for organic producers. The grain handlers are going to be able to need to test the corn, and to see whether it's going to be meeting their specifications in terms of methionine. The next slide, please.

Okay. Here shows some yields.
These are yields from last year, from Wisconsin, from Iowa, and from Minnesota with the Lamberton Station. And you can see that what we're looking at is three different
groups, and we're looking at the yields of commercial hybrid checks, mostly three checks, and our best three high methionine hybrids. And if you look at that, you'll see that with the hard kernel late group that we're producing yields that are 90 percent of that of the commercial hybrids. These are Blue River hybrids. With our hard kernel early, it's 80 percent of the same yield as the commercial hybrids, for the soft kernel it's 70 percent. Soft kernel has the best nutritional value, probably because of its high lysine content, but we're sitting here with our best hybrids, we're somewhere between 70 and 90 percent of the yields, depending on the hybrid. So what we're doing is mostly going forward in terms of seed production with the hard kernel late time. Next slide, please.

> We've done feeding trials with
broilers. I should say that Organic Valley has done, Nick Levendoski and his group of
farmers, a broiler feeding trial with Cornish cross cockerels, small experiment. Birds fed out from when they were chicks. This experiment was simply to replace normal corn plus synthetic methionine in a normal diet with our corn, with our high methionine corn. The gain was essentially the same. We also had a third treatment, which was potato extract, high methionine potato extract. It did not perform. We had higher mortality, and the birds did not grow as well.

The birds that received the high methionine corn, and the birds that received the normal corn plus synthetic methionine had essentially the same rate of gain. Feed to gain ratio was the same, but for the potato extract it was higher. It wasn't as efficient forage.

Do you want me to continue with this? I can wrap it up in say three more minutes? There's a layer trial.

CHAIR DELGADO: Just provide a
quick wrap-up sentence, please. And then we'll open up for questions. Can you wrap-up your comments, Doctor?

DR. GOLDSTEIN: I wanted to show you a layer trial, which I think is very pertinent to -- a 44-week layer trial. It would take me about another minute on that. And then I wanted to say where we are at in terms of our seed production.

CHAIR DELGADO: Let's go on to questions. Joe.

MEMBER SMILLIE: Dr. Goldstein, could you tell us about a layer trial, and where you're at with your seed projections?

DR. GOLDSTEIN: Okay. Next slide, please.

CHAIR DELGADO: Thank you, Joe.
DR. GOLDSTEIN: Feeding trial was a trial carried out by the University of Minnesota together with Organic Valley and ourselves. It took place with Bovan Brown pullets, six replicated pens per treatment.

We had the same setup with normal corn, plus synthetic methionine, versus our corn in the context of a normal diet. The birds were fed out from when they were chicks, and the gain feed consumption was essentially the same. Egg production was 2 to 5 percent less per pen for the high methionine corn. However, there were some other differences.

The birds that received the high methionine corn were more enthusiastic about their feed. They loved it. It had to be controlled, because the birds liked it so much that they would go into frenzies about it. By the end of the trial, half of the pens with the controlled feed had been progressively disqualified because the hens were eating their own eggs. This is for the controlled diet, not for the high methionine corn, where there was no problem on that. This is a switch on the cannibalism issue.

Anyway, this interest in the high methionine corn was also seen in the broiler
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trial, and so that's what I have to report at this point. Forty-four weeks, small flock, essentially no differences in performance.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay.
DR. GOLDSTEIN: Or feathering, for that matter.

CHAIR DELGADO: Very good. Any other questions? Gerry.

MEMBER DAVIS: Can you spell out the progress of your seed increase program, and particularly, I wanted to know, looking at the chart from the Task Force that they put up earlier on your plans, they had it laid out quarterly. By the fourth quarter of `09, I'm kind of curious to see what kind of volume that represents, versus the percent in the organic feed marketplace for the need that is, what would be needed?

DR. GOLDSTEIN: Well, I think the point is, is that we can make projections, and it's important also to realize that real life doesn't always follow through on them. But in
projections, and this handout, when you have a chance to look at it, on page 6, we've given projections of production for the two top varieties that we're bringing back from Hawaii this year, and which we're multiplying with the help of the Methionine Task Force. They paid for the seed, everything is going forward.

And on that, you'll see that on page 6 under 2010, we project that 3.1 million bushels of corn could be produced at rather conservative production assumptions for the organic poultry industry by the end of 2010. That is if everything goes right. And it has been estimated that there is a total demand of 8 million bushels per acre.

MEMBER DAVIS: For organic.
DR. GOLDSTEIN: Organic poultry
over the whole nation. So that could be accelerated by producing seed during the winter in Chile in order to give a leg-up, or the three-year -- the idea of extending the
two years to a three-year would give us a little bit more leeway in case things just don't go as well as we want.

There's a number of things that we haven't resolved fully. As I explained earlier, we're going as fast forward as we can, and everything is looking positive, so far. But there are -- some time will help us. MEMBER DAVIS: So does the chart, the information contained in this explain that these numbers are based on winter time production in Chile and things like that? DR. GOLDSTEIN: No. These are without wintertime production in Chile. MEMBER DAVIS: These are without. DR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes, that's -- the last wintertime production would have been this last winter. And now we're going forward from now.

MEMBER DAVIS: So these numbers are, if you did not do that, take those DR. GOLDSTEIN: That's right.

MEMBER DAVIS: -- extraordinary measures of getting essentially two seed crops a year.

DR. GOLDSTEIN: That's correct. That's correct.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any other
questions? Steve.
MEMBER DeMURI: With the current pressure on with corn production right now, do you anticipate you'll have any problems getting growers to grow this lower yielding corn for the organic poultry industry?

DR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes, that's a very good question. I do anticipate we will have problems. I do anticipate, because farmers are going to be trying something new, and because what's not in place now is a price incentive system which is clear. We need to have outreach, we need to have a clear set of contracts, and that all needs to be developed.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any other questions? Dan, followed by Jennifer.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: When we're looking at something like corn, and we're trying to deal with something like methionine, where we're talking about something basically plus or minus, a 10 percent protein level, we can improve methionine, but we're still talking about small amounts, unless we do something to that corn to process it to concentrate the methionine and the protein. Is your company looking at any processing possibilities to make this a little more utilizable, and work into the ration?

DR. GOLDSTEIN: Could you go to the next slide, please. Sorry. The next one after that. I'd like to emphasize that actually $I$ don't think that's necessary, not for broilers and layers, at least that's not what our results are showing, that it's necessary to concentrate the feed.

Cromwell in `68 and Chee in `73 did trials with the same floury to corn that we have with layers and broilers. They had the
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same results. It's possible, I believe, to feed corn with organic, not necessarily natural, organic corn, and to be able to get adequate production levels. I think that's what the life has been showing us, so I'm not sure that that assumption is actually true in reality.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: Okay.
CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Jennifer is not asking a question. Anybody else? Okay. Well, thank you very much. DR. GOLDSTEIN: Sure. CHAIR DELGADO: Appreciate your comments. DR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes. CHAIR DELGADO: Next up is Brian Baker as proxy for Dave DeCou, and after that is Katherine DiMatteo.

MR. BAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the NOSB, members of the NOP. I appreciate this second opportunity to comment, and I will try to get straight to the point.

OMRI appreciates the recognition of our work on the database, if you could back up to that slide.

We conducted a survey of accredited certifiers to find out how they were verifying commercial availability, and we found, as many of you are aware, that none of them are following the NOSB's recommendations. They're using supplier letter seed catalogues as their main references.

OMRI comes in behind producer logs, around half of the certifiers are using it. We wanted to know how to improve that, and we also asked what's out there. Anyone want to guess what the number one crop that certifiers said that they were saying their producers had a hard time finding organic seed?

PARTICIPANT: Corn.
PARTICIPANT: Okra.
MR. BAKER: You got it, yes. And there's a reason alfalfa -- alfalfa is the answer. You want to go to the next slide,
please. Alfalfa, a lot of people don't realize that alfalfa is really sold into two markets, and we think of hay, and the run up in demand for hay because of the increased dairy production, but there's also a vegetable market. And seed for sprouting is not allowed to be exempt, so alfalfa spout producers have still be able to find organic seed, but they've had to pay quite a bit of money to keep that going. And we found out this past spring, we've been very pleased to say, and surprised, actually, that we're getting as many hits on our seed database as we were getting on our products list. And the thing that -- we've also noticed that we're getting a lot of hits on corn, and a lot of concern over the ability to get uncontaminated -- get corn seed that's not GMO contaminated.

> Briefly, we've talked to
individuals at FIBL, Soil Association, the Danish Ministry of Agriculture in the
development of our database and there are limitations to adopting the European model that would require changes in the way seeds are regulated in the United States. And, so, yes, the European Registry has certain advantages, but that's a very different mind set that they have, and how seed is regulated, and what varieties are out there for farmers to grow, so I caution against mandating a European-style approach, without an understanding of how that's connected to how seeds are regulated in Europe. Switching over to the other commercial availability issue, the allowance of agricultural ingredients in organic processing and handling creates some interesting challenges in inspection and labeling. Under OFPA, items that contain less than 70 percent organic ingredients are exempt from certification. And under 7 CFR 205.101(c)(3), that exemption is carried forward in the regulation. Now guess whose door people knock
on when they want to get their non-organic agricultural ingredients certified for use in organic production? Okay. So the ACAs don't want them. We're aware that not only colors, but also anti-foaming agents, flavors, fruit coatings, these things are coming to us, and they're formulated with items on 605A and B, items on 606, and organic agricultural ingredients, less than 70 percent organic agricultural ingredients.

We're getting mixed messages from subscribing certifiers in the industry about what we're supposed to do to gather, verify, and communicate information on these products that are clearly ineligible for organic certification. Specifically, how are people supposed to know the organic content of these non-organic ingredients, or should they just assume none of it's organic?

We also have to deal with the fact that organic claims and the labeling of such intermediate BtoB products are covered under

305 and 310. And the vendors want to keep this specific information proprietary. They don't want their customers to know it. They don't want certifiers to know it. They don't even want us to know it, but we'll get it. And then we don't know what to do with it, so we need guidance. We need help.

That's something where we're asking
for your assistance, and we're also asking that the information -- that the increased funding for data collection be used to estimate the market for organic seed and nonorganic agricultural ingredients, and I'd be willing to answer questions on tartaric acid and methionine.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Any
questions? Katrina.
SECRETARY HEINZE: I want to make sure I understood that list bit right.

MR. BAKER: I was trying to get it out in less than five minutes.

SECRETARY HEINZE: I know. You're
getting questions about the non-organic materials being used in products labeled as made with, so ones that are below 95 percent and above 70?

MR. BAKER: No. We're getting formulated products that are combinations of non-organic agricultural ingredients on 606, non-organic non-synthetic ingredients on 605A, non-organic synthetic ingredients on 605B, and organic agricultural ingredients that are combined in formulations that are, in turn, used in organic products that have over 95 percent organic content, and they want to sell these formulated packages to organic processors or packers. I mean, fruit coatings, what do you do with fruit coatings? You've got five ingredients in a fruit coating, and it's a black box. The company that formulates it doesn't want the packing house to know the specific ingredients or the percentages. And the fruit packer wants to sell their fruit as organic. Heck, they'd
like to sell it as 100 percent organic, but it's not 100 percent organic if it has a nonorganic coating that includes shellac and an organic vegetable oil. And I don't want to give the whole formulation away.

SECRETARY HEINZE: Thank you for clarifying.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Joe.
MEMBER SMILLIE: Has OMRI been working with the other seed databases that we've heard about?

MR. BAKER: Yes, we have. We've worked with the Organic Seed Alliance, and are very complementary to their's. We've talked extensively with Cricket Rakita, and Save our Seeds at the Organic Seed Conference. We were on a panel together. We think that there need to be multiple portals, and we don't want to see a single database. We want to see a diversity out there. I mean, our community thrives on diversity.

CHAIR DELGADO: Dan.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: Can you add anything of historical memory to the Tartaric Acid, A-B. If we're looking to make a technical correction, and we're going to make a request, I want to make sure that -- I want to increase the chance that we're getting it right. And, also, then knowing what we're voting. MR. BAKER: Yes. Thank you for asking. I was one of the advisors to the National Organic Standards Board at the November 1995 meeting in Austin, Texas, where that was discussed. I pulled up the Minutes and what notes I could find, and the -- my recollection, having been there, was that the industry felt strongly that they needed to have all available sources of Tartaric Acid, all sources of Tartaric Acid available to them, including those made from synthetic sources. There was no distinction between the L and other isomers of Malic Acid as being the source.

That was a split vote to allow the synthetic from all sources, but you have to remember two things. One is that at that time, the NOSB was operating under the assumption of organic preference. If organic was available, you had to use it. If it wasn't available, you had to use the natural. If the natural wasn't available, only then could you use the synthetic, and so you had this assumption that orders of preference would be in the rule, and it would enforceable.

That fell out in 2000, five years after that recommendation was made. The second thing was that there was an assumption that the sunset process would take care of a lot of these substances that were controversial, and where there were split decisions. And that as the organic industry grew, these sources would become available, and the sunset process would take them off.

CHAIR DELGADO: Kevin.

MEMBER ENGELBERT: Hi, Brian.
Would you repeat again what your objective is with this, for example, the coating you gave and trying to call a product that's been used, have these 605s, 606s all put together. What exactly, again, do you want from the Board in that regard?

MR. BAKER: I think the most important thing is making sure that people have the information that they need in order to make decisions as to whether a given ingredient will meet the organic standards. So if it has a 606 item, it is very difficult for us to understand how the user of that ingredient will be able to assess commercial availability if that item is not conveyed to the processor, or the certifier. And that we think that 305 and 310 need to recognize that items that are agricultural and non-organic, and on 606, need to appear on the label. And I don't know if we can go so far as to say that the percentages of organic and non-
organic ingredients need to be declared. But, obviously, if you assume that the organic agricultural ingredients in this formulated product don't count as organic, then that's a conservative approach that insures compliance. Does that make sense, or is it -- yes. People need to know what they're getting.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any other questions? Julie. MEMBER WEISMAN: I just want to go through this one more time to make sure. I want to phrase it a different way. So what you're saying is that there -- certain 606 items are making their way to processors, but their presence in the formulations that the processors are buying is currently hidden by the manufacturers.

MR. BAKER: Right. It's considered proprietary by the manufacturer, and they want -- and the ability of OMRI to require them to disclose that information to the processor and to the certifier of that processor is being
challenged.
MEMBER WEISMAN: Can I continue?
CHAIR DELGADO: Follow-up, yes.
MEMBER WEISMAN: So that because the product that's being sold to the processor is not being sold as organic, it is not being subjected to any scrutiny.

MR. BAKER: Plant is not inspected.
MEMBER WEISMAN: And the person who holds the certificate for the organic product that it's going into, has no idea that there's an ingredient in there where there's a burden to source it organically.

MR. BAKER: That's correct.
MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay. I got it now.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Dan, then Gerry.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: I'm going to jump around, I guess, a little. We'll jump around a little bit, I guess, here. I want to go back on Tartaric Acid. In your review of
products, can you give us any insight into what you see as A form, B form, or anything along those lines?

MR. BAKER: Well, yes. I was a big fan of order of preference. I mean, if it's available organic, then it should be used from organic sources. The annotation that was proposed in `95 required that it come from grapes, the 605A version come from grapes. Now, I've been in plenty of organic vineyards, and I know a little bit about how Tartaric Acid is made, so I'm told there's organic Tartaric Acid on the market. But, again, we're put in a position where there's
something that's on 605A as being nonagricultural when it comes from grapes.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: But of the A versus $B$ form that we do have in the rule now, what are you seeing in products that you're reviewing?

MR. BAKER: We're seeing both. And it's not just cost-driven, it's quality-
driven, and there are certain technical and functional requirements, but it's more often the non-synthetic form that is the higher quality, what we've been seeing. And, again, I have to defer, in part, to our Advisory Council Members. They've done more of that work than I have.

CHAIR DELGADO: Gerry. Any other questions? All right. Thank you very much, Brian.

MR. BAKER: Thank you.
CHAIR DELGADO: Next is Katherine DiMatteo, and then after her we'll have David Bailey.

MS. DiMATTEO: Hello. Katherine DiMatteo, Senior Associate, Wolf, DiMatteo \& Associates. And I'm giving up my Wolf, DiMatteo \& Associates time to read a letter from one of our clients, Blue River Hybrids.
"Dear NOSB Members: Thank you for the opportunity comment today. In addition to the comments that Blue River submitted through
regulations.gov, on the recommendation on commercial availability of organic seed, I would like to add a personal experience to demonstrate how the current lack of enforcement of the NOP requirement to use organic seed impacts an organic business. Within the past month, Blue River Hybrids has had 481 bags of organic corn seed returned from our dealer in the upper Midwest. The value of this returned seed is $\$ 62,193$. The seed was from three hybrids, all of which were capable of good performance in the area, and the seed was shipped in a timely way, ready for delivery to organic farmers to plant this season.

Why was the seed returned? Because the organic farmers in the area told our organic dealer, who is also an organic farmer, that they would be allowed by their certifiers to plant conventional seed. This seed was being reserved for use by these customers, and because of the lateness of this decision, Blue

River lost the opportunity to sell this seed to other farmers. Had this decision been made in February, we would have sold the seed to other organic farmers wanting seed for these hybrids.

I understand that accredited certifiers, the NOSB, and perhaps even the NOP, do not want to impose undue burden on organic farmers who may already struggle to make a living farming, as well as complying with the NOP rules, and the paperwork requirements of certification. But organic seed is grown by organic farmers, and their livelihood and mine are just as precarious, and the requirements of NOP just as burdensome.

The NOSB recommendation that you are amending has been in place since 2005. In that time, the organic seed industry has grown, and the availability and the use of organic seed has increased, but the prevalent attitude among farmers and certifiers
continues to be that using organic seed is the exception, rather than the rule.

I believe there is more that can be done to verify that farmers seek available sources and use organic seed, and that certifiers enforce the use of organic seed as required by the NOP rule.

Better guidance about how to determine commercial availability and equivalent varieties is needed in your recommendation. Clear and coherent explanations of why an organic variety is not sufficient, must be provided by the farmer, and kept on record by the certifier.

The accredited certifiers should be held accountable for their decisions on the availability and use of organic seed during the audit by the National Organic Program. And, as a resource, a National List of available seed must be developed under the supervision of the USDA, National Organic Program, similar to the organic feed grain
producers and handlers list which is currently available on the NOP website.

As the largest certified organic field corn seed supplier in the United States, the implementation of effective protocols is of vital importance to our company, and to the integrity and growth of the organic industry. Thank you very much. Maury Johnson, Director of Production and Sales."

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Thank you. Any questions? Joe.

MEMBER SMILLIE: Do you have personally any comments to make on the recommendation on seed availability, commercial availability?

MS. DiMATTEO: I think that there's a number of things about the recommendation -the amendment doesn't go far enough to really make -- produce any incentives, or to really create any more information that's already been around since 2005. Like Maury said in his letter, the current recommendation has
been around, and we're amending it -- and you're amending it in ways -- you're making progress. I think that there's just more to be done. And I don't like the idea of in a recommendation mandating a non-governmental organization as the source of where information is going to be provided. And I think that that can cause a lot of problems, both for the people providing the information, and for people accessing the information. And I most definitely think for the certifiers, and for the National Organic Program to do that kind of thing.

I would hope that with the additional money that NOP has, that maybe some of this information can be available. And they've done it once, as Maury has pointed out in his letter, by having the feed grain producers and handlers database on their site. So perhaps that can be another way to at least provide a resource for people looking for seed.

And we've discussed it both as Wolf, DiMatteo \& Associates, and with our client, Blue River Hybrids, about whether to ask you if you could have different protocols, or more emphasis on commodity seeds, like corn and soybeans, which are readily available in different forms and varieties that can be used in organic farms, versus the problem with the vegetable seeds.

I realize there's different levels of ability to be able to comply with this organic seed requirement, but we never could come up with an idea of what to suggest, so we haven't posed that. That just would add one more kind of imbalance to the whole system. So, basically, I haven't looked at what's being done in the EU. I know that there's some problems with their database system, but I also think that it has provided some incentive to use more organic seed, and for seed suppliers to go ahead and develop new varieties so that they can get posted on those
databases, and show that they're available.
CHAIR DELGADO: Thank you. Any other questions? Well, thank you very much.

MS. DiMATTEO: Thank you.
CHAIR DELGADO: At this point, we're going to take a quick 5 -minute break. We have nine more speakers, and I know several of the Committees have to do some work and homework, so I'll ask the Board Members to stay close, and we'll start in five minutes. Next up after our break will be David Bailey.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 5:37 p.m. and resumed at 5:46 p.m.)

CHAIR DELGADO: And I'm glad to hear that someone recognizes what we're talking about. Thank you so much, Mr. David Bailey.

MR. BAILEY: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, and fellow members of the Board, and members of the NOP, at least those are still here. My name is David

Bailey. I am here representing Small Planet Foods, which is the organic division of General Mills. And I'm here to speak about the okra petition, which has my name on it.

We did submit that to add it to Section 205.606 of the National List. Most of my points that I'm going to hit right now were mentioned earlier in previous discussions, so bear with me as I just kind of hit them again.

First, critical. I want to repeat that our petition is not for okra in a blanket sense. Somehow, and I don't know how, the IQF, the Individually Quick Frozen annotation or whatever you want to call it was dropped, and I think that's caused a lot of the uproar and whispering I'm hearing. So I don't know what you need to do to make sure that that gets on before you bullet, but I just wanted to point that out, and why? Because that distinction between the fresh and frozen is critical for a petition.

We have never denied the existence
that there's organic fresh okra out there. The basis for our petition is that for over a year now we've been looking for it. We've been looking for frozen okra. We have an application which we want to use it. The frustration is not shared -- I mean, it's shared by us. We've been looking quite hard for it, too. And we would have found it, obviously, we would not have filed the petition. We haven't been able to find it at a reliable processor. And one of the big issues, obviously, again, hit on earlier is perish-ability. The application which we want to use it makes it impossible for us to harvest fresh okra, transport it to our plant, because it doesn't travel well, as was, again, said earlier. And the window of production that we would have to make the product would be so small, if it would even exist at all, very difficult to do.

I also want to stress that we want
to make sure a source is obviously steady and reliable. And we are committed, again, we're committed to buying an Instant Quick Frozen okra as soon as one is available.

We have a sourcing group that's been working on this, like I said, for over a year. Their efforts are continuous. At the time we submitted the petition, none of the processors we contacted had seen nor heard of organic frozen okra. Since that time, I can contribute that we have seen some leads emerge, and I call them leads only because upon further digging, none of those have panned out, unfortunately, so we press on with this petition.

Often what we're getting back from processors regarding their -- either their reluctance or their inability to meet a request to freeze their organic okra, is a combination of a few factors. And, again, most of these have been brought up a short time ago in discussion.

Okra fields are not harvested in one clean shot. The pods have to be picked over a series of days as they ripen, so in that case, the volume that you need has to be amassed over a period of time. Again, the fresh okra is highly perishable. So point three is that freezers need a significant volume of products in order to make a minimum run happen. And to do that, just to get that minimum amount they're going to need a fairly large amount of acreage of organic okra to amass that volume quickly enough to avoid spoilage of the okra. Consequently, right now our volume needs do not justify what they would need to make a minimum run. That's what they're telling us. So, again, I want to reiterate that we are committed to buying it as soon as it's available. Again, as soon as a reliable source is available. And I just want to thank you for the opportunity to address this with you.

CHAIR DELGADO: Before we move on, so we do have to make that clarification on the petition, as the petitioner has clarified to -- requested to add IQF into that petition. Is that correct?

MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes. It is my intent. That was an oversight. It is my intention when the motion is made tomorrow to include that. Is there anything procedurally that I would need to do before that?

CHAIR DELGADO: No. When you make the motion, as you stated, you will clarify that.

MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay.
CHAIR DELGADO: And it's on the record that the petitioner requested that.

Okay. On that note, let's proceed with questions. Jeff. Program, yes.

MS. FRANCIS: You just said that you don't need to modify it, but actually in your Committee, you need to have a -- are you just looking at it as a typo, or is this --
are you going to motioning on the Committee level before the Board vote? If it's going to come to you -

CHAIR DELGADO: It will come to the Board with IQF added to it, and you are absolutely right. It will have to be handled at the Committee level to make that change.

MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay. Well, HC wants to get into the queue for a Committee meeting tonight.

CHAIR DELGADO: Very good. Okay. And we'll start with -- we'll continue. Thank you for that, and we'll continue with Joe. Jeff.

VICE CHAIR MOYER: I don't know much about what you're going to be using the okra for, or how that all works out, but we've heard several people talking from southern locations that say they have the okra, or certainly could step up and produce okra. And they do have access to freezer plants. Have you checked in those regions, or what is -

MR. BAILEY: Personally, I haven't. If they have access to a freezer, we're all ears. I'd love for them to step up and give me a card.

VICE CHAIR MOYER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any other questions? Joe.

MEMBER SMILLIE: Could you walk us through how -- you're saying that you are in the market to buy frozen IQF okra. But you're also -- your infrastructure and your capabilities is, you would be able to contract growers to grow that for -- are you asking the IQF processor to not only freeze the okra, but also find it, locate it, and manage it, or are you more involved than that in the process?

MR. BAILEY: We can be more involved in the process. The potential is there.

MEMBER SMILLIE: So if a group came to you and said this IQF freezer guy will do
this job for us. You would contract with the growers, or would you say hey, we'll buy the frozen, but you've got to do all the contracting and the ag work?

MR. BAILEY: I should clarify. We probably could help him. Okra is not one of our ag department specialties that's in our division. I'm sorry. I'm going to ask you to repeat the second part of your question.

MEMBER SMILLIE: Well, the fact of another HC meeting today has actively floored me, but I'm going out to eat first. But I guess the question was how involved will you be in the process? Are you just saying we want to buy frozen IQF okra, or are you saying that if there's a freezer in a group, you're willing to step in and contract that acreage, or do you demand that the IQF facility do that?

MR. BAILEY: At this point, we are demanding the IQF facility do that.

MEMBER SMILLIE: I've got another
question. We're only talking about 5 percent, so your product is going to have 5 percent or less, probably less, because there may be citric acid or something else in the product that needs that 5 percent, too. So the product you're making, is 5 percent enough to utilize the wonderful talents of this wonderful vegetable?

MR. BAILEY: The mucilaginous properties?

MEMBER SMILLIE: There you go.
MR. BAILEY: Yes, it is.
MEMBER SMILLIE: Okay.
CHAIR DELGADO: Jeff. Any other questions? I lost track. Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. BAILEY: Thank you.
CHAIR DELGADO: We move on to Kim Deitz, and followed by Grace Gershuny.

MS. DEITZ: Start you day with me, and end with it. How's that? If you could put 10 minutes on, I'm going to real quickly
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do a Marty and change hats in the middle of my presentation.

CHAIR DELGADO: Kim, do you have a -

MS. DEITZ: I'm up, and Grace is right behind me, so we're going to actually -

CHAIR DELGADO: You're going to team up?

MS. DEITZ: We're Co-Chairs for the Multi Site, so I'm going to roll right into that.

CHAIR DELGADO: Excellent. Okay.
MS. DEITZ: Okay. Ready?
SECRETARY HEINZE: I'll try to do a better job than I did with Marty. Do you want to know when you have one minute left out of the ten?

MS. DEITZ: No. I'll just roll right through.

SECRETARY HEINZE: Okay.
CHAIR DELGADO: Great.
MS. DEITZ: Okay. I always like to
give personal comment from Kim Deitz, not on behalf of Smuckers, or OTA, or anybody else towards the end of a meeting on what I see from a historical perspective with regards to materials, so $I$ hope this helps you.

There was some discussion earlier about deferred materials, withdrawn petitions, petitions, in general, so a deferred material, either the NOSB or petitioner can request the material be deferred for gathering more information. Once the information is brought back to the Board, then you review the material and vote on it.

A withdrawn petition is most likely
a petitioner requesting the withdrawal. For example, when we had Harvey, we got inundated with petitions in light of Harvey not going the way that it did. Those petitions should be archived so that if we ever need them again, we should never shred any documents. That came up, what do we do with withdrawn petitions? Should we shred them? I think
those just need to be archived, because some of them actually have TAP reports with them, as well.

And then, as usual, I get up here and I sit in the audience, and I get all agitated about the petition process. And I just want you to remember to follow the process, and I say that every meeting. It's in all of my Minute notes. Follow the process, especially for removing a material from the National List, or changing an annotation. You have it written down. There's Federal Register documents that tell you what to do, and what you need, and what the public needs, so please follow those processes.

While I appreciate and support organic alternatives out there, they need to demonstrate that they are in the form, quality, and quantity that the industry needs before they're just taken off the list, because it could be a business hardship.

606 materials, do you need a TAP review? That should be a case-by-case basis, and you are going to have to determine whether nor not you have enough information for that, whether you need it, or whether you don't. That's just my personal opinion, and we can talk later on that, if you want.

Tartaric Acid. Tartaric Acid, folks, is a sunset material. If you really don't have any way to change the annotation right now, to change it from the National List, to delete it from 605A or B, or anything, so if somebody wanted to change the Tartaric Acid right now, it would have to be a petition to remove it, a petition to move it, or petition to change the annotation. You're reviewing it under sunset, so unless you had somebody come forward and give you a reason why Tartaric Acid should be taken off the National List, you have to vote on what you've got, and that's public comment. So, again, there's specific reasons, and specific
things that are needed to remove a petition, or to remove a material during sunset.

Methionine, I was on the Board when we reviewed Methionine the first time. And I encourage you, we, at that time, gave them that window of opportunity to come forward as a Task Force, and to bring us data. I think they're doing a great job. I think they're almost there, they're just not quite there. So take that into consideration. If it's two years, or three years, give them what they need so that we finally have the answer to that, and don't hurt the industry in the meantime.

Okay. Other hat. Rolling into
Multi-site Certification or Group
Certification. Grace Gershuny and I CoChaired that group, another wild group, 29 people on this Committee, and all very, very opinionated and very strong voiced in their ideals, so we're going to split up the thing. Grace is going to go first and talk to you
about the OTA recommendation, and then I will follow it up on the questions.

MS. GERSHUNY: Okay. We have a summary overview. You should all have received both the recommendations from the OTA Group Certification Task Force, and much more recently we submitted some responses to the questions, the additional questions posed by the CAC Committee. So I will just start out by acknowledging the fact that Tracy was, indeed, on just about all, if not all of the calls that we had, and we had many. And that the document that you folks have created does, indeed, have a great deal of commonality with our recommendations by some strange coincidence. But there are a couple of things that are different, and I just wanted to mention the fact that our recommendations did not call for a rule change, and did not call for any distinction between initial and subsequent inspections of multi-site operations.

We did not in any case call for any reduction of 100 percent annual inspections of all production units. And we went to great lengths to identify ways in which a production unit made up of a whole bunch of sub-units would be inspected by sampling of the subunits, so that not every sub-unit would be inspected every year.

So first requirement for a group would be that it's organized as a single legal entity. The certification is for the group, not for individual members. This is, therefore, not anything like a pass for any of those members who would otherwise become independently certified. In most cases, they would not be independently certified. They would not be in the organic market at all. The only way they're in the organic market is as segments or portions of this group entity.

All sites facilities and production units as called for in the current rule would be inspected annually. All production units
operate under a single organic system plan, not just all the sub-units in a given production unit, but all production units in the group operate under a single organic system plan.

Criteria for production unit that we identified so that how you would identify how many -- whether a given set of sub-units really can qualify as one production unit, is that there would be a maximum number, we suggest 200, but that could be adjusted depending on the type of operations, similar geography, and access by the certifying agent, similar type of crop and harvest season, common harvest collection point marketing, common internal control staff and office oversight. And the handling facility part is very important.

Our recommendation says that any site that includes a handling facility, and particularly if that handling facility processes product from more than one producer,
that handling facility must be inspected annually, and must be considered a single production unit. And this is really with reference to things like the washing, packing, drying, coffee, berry processing, and so forth.

We did a great deal of work on internal control system requirements. We identified need for personnel training and qualifications, items that minimize conflict of interest. And I wanted to also mention that the Committee's recommendation had some good provisions for that, including protection for whistle blowers to not be penalized.

Okay. The five minutes.
CHAIR DELGADO: You have one minute
left.
MS. GERSHUNY: Okay. We had some other requirements, including what the annual inspection should look like. And, in particular, the two-step process for sampling of sub-units based on risk analysis first, and
in higher risk units always inspected. And then a random sample of the lower risk units. And I'm going to let -- hopefully another minute.

MS. DEITZ: Okay. In summary with the questions, we did give you a paper on the pending question issues. We really didn't have a lot of time to go into that, but we did our best based on the paper and the group. We had one call. We tried to address some of those, and I'll run through those real quick.

Our recommendations are based only on producer groups, additional sectors should be considered separately. And you can read those, or ask me to read them, or ask me anything else.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any questions from the Board?

MEMBER SMILLIE: Can you please just finish that.

MS. DEITZ: Okay.
MEMBER SMILLIE: I'm tired of
playing games. Just finish the -
MS. DEITZ: Okay. Additional sectors should be considered separately, including criteria for inclusion and inspection protocols. So, in other words, retailers and handlers. Any site that includes a handling facility must be inspected annually. Samples for external inspection selection through two-step process of risk analysis and combined with random sample of low risk sub-units, as Grace just said. Ability to detect non-compliances not effected, assuming adequate oversight of certifying agencies by NOP.

With the consumers, consumers will accept group certification if integrity of the process is assured. International issues should be factored into the risk analysis, but not be discriminatory toward domestic or foreign operations. And internal control system staff does not function as a proxy for third-party inspectors provided in our
recommendation.
CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Any other questions from the Board? Dan, followed by Katrina.

## MEMBER GIACOMINI: On your

 statements regarding Tartaric Acid, we realize that it's sunset, and that it's dealing with them as they are listed.MS. DEITZ: Right.
MEMBER GIACOMINI: But in the process of evaluating it, the Committee came up, found that there was a difference in the recommendation to the way it's listed. The discussion that we're having on what that annotation is, and the Program looking at that to evaluate what the technical correction would be is, in a way, what we're looking at for the next five years, because that would be done without an NOP review. Number one.

Number two is that it seems to me a potentially valid consideration. I'm not sure that I totally agree with it, but I can
see the point, is that if, as Brian stated, that this was put on the list during a time where the assumption was made of preference, and preference no longer exists, that one of the requirements that the substance were necessary because of the unavailability of wholly non-synthetic alternatives, has changed slightly.

MS. DEITZ: Okay. We are during sunset, though. And with regards to Tartaric Acid, I wrote an original technical correction to this when the proposed rule came out, so I have it in my archives at my desk, so I will definitely forward that to you. It got left off the National List, and then I recommended that it get put back on. And I'm not sure whether it was on $A$ or $B$, but I'll send that to you, Dan. And I do have some other information, so I'll dig that up for you. But that's not going to happen at this meeting, because I wasn't aware that you needed that. Order of preference is nowhere in
the rule, and order of preference is for everything, so Tartaric Acid shouldn't be singled out just because it's an order of preference in 1995. And we all, hopefully, run our businesses in order of preference. I know that we do, so that's my comment with that. And I also know that there's different functionalities for synthetic Tartaric Acid, and non-synthetic forms in the processing plants, in the formulation. So they are needed from both, and as well with this -- I guess there's a new petition out there for the 606.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Katrina.
Sorry. Excuse me. Is that related to the response? Okay. Bob, please.

MR. POOLER: This is Bob Pooler, NOP. Tartaric Acid was added to the National List along with Agar-agar and Carrageenan in 2003 as a technical correction, because it was left off the list.

CHAIR DELGADO: Thank you.

Katrina.
SECRETARY HEINZE: Yes, that's correct. And that's reflected in our current recommendation, so you don't have to go find your records.

MS. DEITZ: Okay.
SECRETARY HEINZE: Because you did a great job, and I found them.

MS. DEITZ: Okay.
SECRETARY HEINZE: And they are in the recommendation.

MS. DEITZ: All right. Okay.
SECRETARY HEINZE: The reason we've asked for the technical correction is in the 1995 transcripts, when the original Board voted on these items, they had the annotations. But in the Federal Register notices that went with the addition in 2003, those annotations were not included.

MS. DEITZ: I guess I'm just confused if we're adding annotations and changing them during sunset, and that's
typically not what we've done.
SECRETARY HEINZE: Right.
MS. DEITZ: But now they're at the petition process, so -

SECRETARY HEINZE: And so our recommendation does not include them.

MS. DEITZ: Yes.
SECRETARY HEINZE: We're just asking the Program to look at that, and go through that history.

MS. DEITZ: Yes.
SECRETARY HEINZE: Yes. Our recommendation is without them, because we know we can't do that.

MS. DEITZ: Okay.
CHAIR DELGADO: Any other
questions? Well, thank you both, and congratulations for being able to manage 29 members of your group. That is quite a challenge.

```
MS. DEITZ: It's very interesting.
```

I thought the NOSB work was hard. Well,
believe me -- thanks.
CHAIR DELGADO: Up next is Nicole Dehne from Vermont Organic.

MS. DEHNE: So hello, members of the Board, and NOP staff. Thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. I know it's kind of late, and I apologize if my stomach growls into the mic, and I mean no threat by that. My name is Nicole Dehne, and I coordinate the certification program for Vermont Organic Farmers, which is part of the NOF of Vermont.

I'm speaking on behalf of over 500 certified producers, and there are several points that I wanted to make this evening. But first I wanted to start out by thanking the Board for all the hard work in creating all these recommendations and guidance documents for this meeting, and to tell you that it's much appreciated.

So I thought I would start with adding new materials. In general, VOF agrees
with NOSB and the Materials Working Group, which also deserves thanks for their hard work, but there's definitely ambiguity in regards to the finding ag, non-ag, synthetic, and non-synthetic. And we appreciate that the NOSB is working on providing clarity for these issues, as it's clearly needed, as we saw in the presentation today how convoluted they can get. But it seems that everybody wants a simple option, and since we're all saying what our favorite options are, I believe that the simplest option is Option E, which hasn't really been discussed much, which is adding a definition of agricultural system as a landbased system that cultivates soil, producing crops, livestock, or poultry.

So this option doesn't stretch the meaning of agricultural, and I think it's what consumers expect of an organic product. And then yeast and other micro organisms can then stay in 205.605, but can be added with an annotation that requires the use of an organic
substrate, much like how yeast exists right now in the National List with prohibition of petrochemical substrate and the sulfite waste liquor.

However, what's most essential, especially with all of these ambiguities, is to insure that all materials added to the National List receive a TAP review, as is required by OFPA. Just so you all know what exactly you're dealing with. And no matter what option is chosen, it seems to me that items without standards or NOSB recommendations on standards shouldn't be considered organic, because there hasn't been adequate discussion about what the details of what goes into making them organic are.

I also wanted to touch on animal welfare standards. With the public interest in animal welfare and treatment, as this continues to grow, and as new labels in this area are being developed, $I$ feel like it's time for the organic industry to strengthen
our commitment to humane animal husbandry. And the organic label should really represent humane animal treatment for the consumer. And it's VOF's belief that the organic standards current address animal welfare issues, and have laid the background for humane practices in animal care. So it's our recommendation that a task force be developed to create additional guidances, for example, veterinary procedures, production systems and facilities, and wide range of other livestock-related welfare concerns.

As far as multi-site operations, despite the VOF not certifying multi-site operations, that's my disclaimer, VOF feels that there should be limitations on who is eligible for multi-site status. So grower group certification has been historically used for farmers in developing countries who have limited financial resources, and who are working together as a cooperative or group. As the CACC Board pointed out in
their guidance report, a limiting factor to the growth of the organic industry is the supply of raw materials, but not necessarily the processing of those raw materials. Thus, it was because of the limited resources and needed raw materials that this exemption, of sorts, was granted to grower groups. And, in contrast, retailers are not required to be certified under the rule. If a retailer chooses to get certified, it's an entirely voluntary practice. So our thought is why grant retailers this exemption when it's not coming from a place of need.

Retailers are choosing to get
certified to assure their consumers that they have implemented best management practices, to insure the organic integrity of the organic products they carry. And if they want to assure their customers of their practices, why not adopt the higher standard of having each individual store go through the certification process? And if this process seems too
rigorous, then the retailer can always choose not to get certified, as it's not required under the rule.

So, for commercial availability, I also wanted to comment on the NOSB's guidance document on the commercial availability of organic seed. And as we've talked about, there's definitely a delicate balance between supporting the organic seed industry, and supporting growers, without over-burdening them. And I know everyone is sensitive to that. And our growers believe that the organic seed industry is still in the growth and development phase, and that the supply and demand will push the organic seed companies to develop seeds on their own.

While a national database of organic seed could be useful for growers as an educational resource, it's not necessarily going to be useful for enforcement.

CHAIR DELGADO: All right. Questions? Hugh.

DR. KARREMAN: Thank you, Nicole. I'm glad you brought up the animal husbandry issue. That is on our work plan, and I was just wondering what you would think of - not to get into real specifics, we can work on that later - but veterinarians sometimes have to dispense not fully approved by FDA type medicines, in other words, alternative medicines, and they need to have a valid client/patient relationship to do that. And I've been wondering, and I wonder what your thought would be on this, about perhaps having some kind of requirement in order to maintain that valid client/patient relationship with organic farmers to perhaps have the vet on the farm at least twice a year, even if the farmer doesn't need the vet for a sick cow, but to make sure everything is going well for the welfare of the animals, records check, all that kind of stuff. Would that be within what you're thinking?

MS. DEHNE: Yes. I do think that
that would give the consumers a certain -- it would assure consumers that somebody is kind of looking out as far as animal husbandry. But we also have the inspection process that happens on an annual basis. And our inspectors are also looking for animal health, and welfare issues, so I don't know if we necessarily need that extra -- I feel like it would sound like another type of inspection. Or maybe a recommendation, instead of a requirement.

DR. KARREMAN: Well, but truly to maintain a legal relationship with that farm, there has to be -- I mean, that's under FDA Center for Veterinary Medicine rules and everything. And I think that could use some bolstering. I've got to admit, self-centered veterinarian here, but this is across the U.S. I mean, I know how to deal with organic farmers, but a lot of the other vets don't, and it would be good if they were staying in contact with the farmers.

CHAIR DELGADO: Any other questions? Okay. Thank you very much MEMBER ENGELBERT: One quick question.

CHAIR DELGADO: I'm sorry. Kevin. MEMBER ENGELBERT: What's the status in Vermont with your dairy farms, have you seen a loss of farms, or farms going back to conventional production because of this pasture situation? Just where is Vermont at, basically?

MS. DEHNE: We have a lot of
farmers who are seriously concerned about their future because they don't know what is going to happen with the pasture issue. As far as -- we hadn't until this year had any farms that had dropped out of the organic program and gone back to conventional. And I can't say that's necessarily all the pasture issue, there's definitely some loss of hope in the organic regs, $I$ think is one level, but a huge part of it is financial. So we've had a
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few farms that have gone back to conventional, and some that have just gone out of business.

CHAIR DELGADO: Question. Dan?
MEMBER GIACOMINI: I've got to follow-up on that. Is that as much feed cost, or is -

MS. DEHNE: Oh, yes.
MEMBER GIACOMINI: Okay. So it's not just the pasture issue.

MS. DEHNE: No.
MEMBER GIACOMINI: Feed cost.
MS. DEHNE: And I hope I just said that. Yes.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: Okay.
CHAIR DELGADO: Any other
questions. Okay. Thank you, Nicole.
MS. DEHNE: Sure.
CHAIR DELGADO: Coming up is Sam Welsch, followed by Sue Baird. Sam is not here? Let's move on then to Sue Baird, and she will be followed by Miles Macavoy.

MS. BAIRD: Hi, I'm Sue Baird. I'm
with QAI, and I want to address several issues today. But my first issue I wanted to address, multi-site organic certification. We served on the OTA Grower Group Task Force, although I admit the last few times I've been out and traveling, didn't do as well. But we agree with the recommendation for implementing the Grower Group certification. We strongly agree that Group Certification should be made available for small growers who otherwise may not be able to afford organic certification on the individual basis.

Additionally, U.S. desires their products and many times we can't produce them here within our borders, and they would not be available for us to use without this method of organic certification.

Try to address some of the
questions you asked, who are small farmers? And that's a tough one, I've heard that discussed back and forth both on the OTA and on the ACA. USDA NOP defines small farmers,
or they did define small farmers in the NOP preamble, and they said it was one with 25 acres and a gross income of $\$ 30,000$. Since that's already been defined in the preamble, perhaps that's one that we all could live with.

I don't think it's practical to
limit a small farmer to one that has less than $\$ 5,000$ gross income as some have suggested.

Those farmers are exempted from certification, and our goal is not to exempt more, but to bring a lot more farmers into organic certification.

Does Grower Group internal control systems improve organic oversight? Yes. Just as HACCP improves food safety, so does having persons that are familiar with local customs and operations improve the organic certification process. Someone who's familiar with the operation, and with those customs knows where to look for flaws and weaknesses. Do those internal control officers replace
third-party certification agent inspectors? No. No. Just as a QA Department does not take the place of FSIS or FDA, but serves as an extension to assist those government auditors to enforce food safety audits, so does an internal control system serve as an extra set of eyes to protect organic integrity.

Are some mistakes made with
internal control multi-site organic operations? Yes. Just as there are mistakes made on individual farms by individual farmers, but we all strive, and they make continuous improvements in their organic system plans to become more effective, just as I've seen many individual farmers make great improvements over time in their own individual inspections, and their own individual operations.

Even though some mistakes have been made, QAI urges NOP to not throw out the baby with the basket. Marty stole my words, I
already had that down. That's here. Let's just better develop stronger criteria for certifying this important constituent of the organic certification.

QAI acknowledges the reasoning of the organic task force, when it stated, let's just work on grower groups cooperatives for the present. We will address the need for further discussion of other multi-site groups at a later date. We understand that logic. We don't want to see and lose our small grower group cooperatives that have been formed all over the world. And NOP did threaten to totally eliminate grower certification. Everyone reacted with fear, but QAI urges NOSB and NOP to not forget that many retail store chains have been certified from the beginning, the last five years, six years under this system with accredited certifying agents. These retail store corporations have spent thousands of dollars to develop comprehensive internal control systems under
which they implement their organic
certificates. They have spent years developing their corporate images and their reputations around being certified organic. They are proud of their organic certification, and they take it very seriously. Consumers will be the losers if these retail stores surrender their exhibited certificates. Please continue to address multi-site certification to allow these businesses to operate as certified entities under their organic system plans.

Commercial availability, we support
this recommendation, except please, please think about 5B and D. We think that's too labor-intensive for certifying agents and producers. I think that you'll see -- I started looking at that requirement. It may be another full-time employee at my office. DL-Methionine, we support you to the Livestock Commission's second proposal to extend the use of DL-Methionine until October
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1, 2010, or maybe even better if that's what you all think. Please allow us time. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR DELGADO: Questions from the Board? Okay. Thank you very much.

MS. BAIRD: Thank you.
CHAIR DELGADO: Next up is Miles
Macavoy, followed by Katherine DiMatteo. I think she already went. Do we have Miles? No Miles. Alexis Bandenmeyer. I think we'll be able to finish sooner than we thought, folks. (Off the record comments.)

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. So Sebastian Belle. Sebastian has agreed to talk to the Committee only.

SECRETARY HEINZE: Give us a sec.
CHAIR DELGADO: Yes.
(Off the record comments.)
CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. So let's call Sebastian Belle, and that will be it for today. So no pressure, Sebastian.

MR. BELLE: Thank you very much.

Batting clean-up, that seems to be my role in life. My name is Sebastian Belle. I represent the Maine Aquaculture Association. We are the oldest state aquaculture association in the country. We represent both fin fish and shellfish growers, and yes, I plead guilty. One of my members is a father and two brothers who own a salmon farm, so I'm the Evil Empire Incarnate here.

I've been in this business for about 30 years, and I want to start by just saying that I have a tremendous amount of respect and thanks for the work that you folks do, and also recognize the hard work that the Livestock Committee under Dr. Karreman's leadership is doing. I realize it's often hard to wade through these issues, and particularly for new issues that we bring to the table, it's probably even more complicated, and at times more controversial than some of the other stuff.

I am a member of the Aquaculture

Working Group or Task Force under George Lockwood's leadership, and I also want to commend him for his leadership, and just strongly support the comments that he made earlier today, as well as the written comments that were submitted. And just indicate that we on the Working Group are really ready and willing to help the Livestock Committee in any way we can as you begin to go back and grapple with a number of the issues that you clearly have got to go back and rework on. And we're willing to do that in a constructive and noninvasive fashion, I think is the politically appropriate way to put that.

I also want to thank the NOP
Program folks for their clarification earlier
today on the use of fish meal and fish oil
from wild sources. I think that was very
helpful, and really helps, I think, some of the proposals that have been made by the Working Group, perhaps see the light of day. It's not, I think, a coincidence that the
minority report on the Livestock Committee was written by a nutritionist, and the point I want to leave you with today is that fish meal and fish oil, and particularly fish oil, is really problematic from a -- particularly a marine fin fish point of view. Animals that are being grown in marine environments. The tilapia and catfish, which are the species that will probably make it through here under the current proposals, if you take byproducts from those organic fish and use them to generate fish meal or fish oil, they are not going to satisfy some of the basic amino acid profiles and lipid requirements for marine fin fish, and that's the conundrum we have. And, so, I respect that we're trying to increase organic production, and use those as feed ingredients, some of the byproducts from those fish. I think that's a great idea. We support that. But physiologically, we've got a problem. You're talking about going from a fresh water eco system and the species there
to a salt water eco system and species, and there are some fundamental differences, particularly during the start feeding phase for marine fin fish.

And what that means is, when a marine fin fish hatches from the egg, it has some internal source of nutrition, and it lives on that for some period of time. And then it has to begin to feed on exogenous sources of food. That is the highest mortality phase in marine fin fish, and we are very early on in the development of feeds for marine fin fish, because we don't know a lot of the nutritional requirements for those species. And, so, fish meal and fish oil are used in those species as kind of a safety factor in the diets, so they're put in there because that's what those animals begin to feed on in the wild. And they kind of are a fudge factor, if you will, and I use that with some trepidation because I'm not a nutritionist, but they're kind of a fudge
factor in the formulated feeds to insure that you're not getting nutritional pathologies at the very early start feeding phase of those species.

I also want to make a point that the allowing of private certified label products and their use as ingredients in fish feeds I think is very problematic. It sounds like that may have been resolved, but the point is, I have members that grow fish that have never used antibiotics on their sites, ever, in the entire history of that farm. And they would be prohibited from reaching organic certifications; and yet, people who were feeding feeds with feed ingredients from Europe in which they're allowed to use two, and sometimes three times prior to harvest antibiotics, those would be allowed, so that's problematic, I think, from our point of view. Thank you. Long day.

CHAIR DELGADO: Questions? Hugh, followed by Dan.

DR. KARREMAN: Two questions, I guess. What kind of fish are those folks growing up in Maine that aren't using the antibiotics?

MR. BELLE: Salmon.
DR. KARREMAN: Okay. And as far as the fish oil being very, very important in the early growth on the exogenous feeding, when they just start out, we've heard that tilapia and catfish and shrimp don't have quite the right essential oil, or fish oils that are needed. When the fish are becoming more adult-like, would the tilapia-derived fish oil be okay for them, versus let's say the little guys that really need the strong stuff?

MR. BELLE: Honest answer, we don't really know.

DR. KARREMAN: What's your best educated guess?

MR. BELLE: I just -- I don't feel
like I'm in a position to really answer that, Hugh. I think that -- we just don't know, honestly.

DR. KARREMAN: Okay.
CHAIR DELGADO: Dan. And before we do that, I just want to announce that we have one more speaker after Sebastian, so please continue. What is your question?

MEMBER GIACOMINI: To Hugh's point, I believe the recommendation from the Aquaculture Working Group is the 12 and 12 on average over the production cycle, so that would be compensated and adjusted through that time frame.

One of the numbers that I'm having a hard time getting a hold of, Sebastian, and maybe you can help me, is - and partly, it's because of the nature, or the difference in the nature of our beast that we're familiar with. There are certainly standards, typical book values for fish meal, all that. But the fish meal that you would be looking to be utilizing, granted you can't feed salmon to salmon, but the fish meal that you would be
looking to utilize in your salmon farms, the number that I'm interested in finding out, and I've asked a couple of people and they don't know, or they're having too hard a time finding it, what is the lipid level on that? So not on book value fish meal, but on the fish meal that you're going to be feeding, what's the residual lipid level in that fish meal? Because one of the reasons I'm asking that is because we're starting to hear comments, we had one of the commenters in our packet address this total lipid content in the diet. I'd like to have a little better idea of where we stand on that when we are looking to combine the two.

MR. BELLE: I don't know the answer
to that off the top of my head, but I'd be glad to go back to some of our nutritionists in the work group and get that number for you. I think that's a very fair questions.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: Thank you.
MR. BELLE: Okay.

## CHAIR DELGADO: Jennifer.

MEMBER HALL: Thank you, Sebastian, for being here. Kind of given some of the new information that we got earlier today, I have a question for the Program. We've been operating lately under a couple of assumptions, one being that wild source for meal and oil was not something that we could consider. And, so, I've also, at least I have, and we've discussed it in Committee, that we've been operating under the assumption that -- we have been told that all of the aquaculture recommendation needs to be submitted at once versus a piecemeal approach, that a piecemeal approach is not something that would be considered. And I guess I want to verify that assumption, because I continue to hear more and more that in the piscivorus requirements, that the nutrition values are not well known at this time. And, so, in the interest of wanting to move some elements forward where there is a greater knowledge and
security about what's happening there, could the whole basket versus none be reconsidered?

CHAIR DELGADO: Can someone from the Program comment on that?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes. Barbara will have to comment on that from the Program standpoint, because that would be a long-term work plan management issue with the Board.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. We'll leave that question open. Yes, you want to followup?

MEMBER GIACOMINI: Just a little clarifying, so we make sure that the answer comes back to the right question. I believe at the last meeting Barbara said that because of fiscal issues, that the Program was essentially sitting on the document that we had already made a recommendation on, and passed on to you, and was going to wait on rule making until all of the aquaculture issues had been passed to you. And so what we're looking at now is whether, with the
additional funding, and the additional manpower resources, will that move up in the agenda, and could we possibly be seeing aquaculture regulations for what we've already passed without fish meal, fish oil, net pens, by valves, and those things being fully resolved?

MR. BRADLEY: As I recall, what Barbara said was that there's a lot of regulatory work ahead of aquaculture in the mill right now, and that we would get to it as soon as we can. If we can acquire additional resources, that will certainly help, but it wasn't a matter of we're going to wait on this until you get the whole thing done. Continue with your work, we'll continue with our's, and we'll begin working on that as soon as we can. CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Any followup questions? Hugh.

DR. KARREMAN: Well, I guess that means that shrimp, and tilapia, and catfish are in the mill. Yes, that's what we passed
last spring. Right. But you guys, we can hope, are going to be working on that before we might get the other parts in. That's what you're saying right now.

MR. BRADLEY: What we're saying right now is that we have pasture in front of us, and we have origin of livestock, and I'm sure aquaculture will be the next thing coming in. We also have sunset items that have to be done, so it's a workload thing, and we don't have resources added to the staff yet that can really take that burden off. We're not in a position to say that yet. It takes a bit of time to get people hired and then trained in a reg writing mode.

CHAIR DELGADO: Just to follow-up, as far as we're concerned, the Program has received all the materials, recommendations that have been approved. Correct? Related to aquaculture. Is that correct?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes.
CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Thank you.

Any other questions? Thank you very much.
Now at this time, our very last speaker will be Dave Carter. And after that, we'll be done.

MR. CARTER: All right. I'm Dave Carter. It's late, you're tired, I'll be quick. I was asked to come up and just give a comment on the record. Grace Marroquin wanted me to come up and just address one of the issues that was identified by the Materials Working Group, and that was if you made the change on agricultural products and had designation of organic yeast, what would be the impact in some of the livestock feed, issues with the yeast, and then other microbial ingredients.

So in visiting with some of the folks who use livestock feed regimens, yeast is really what you would call an alternative ingredient. It's not really a mandatory ingredient. It's not like Methionine. Most of the feeders and the folks that $I$ talk with
don't even use yeast at this point, so it's an alternative ingredient. If you were to have it designated as organic and put it into feed rations at the level that it's put in there, it would be about 9 cents a day per animal on beef, and so it just becomes a simple equation of over a 90-day feeding period does the animal put on X number of pounds to pay for that ingredient?

So in terms of some of the other microbial ingredients that are going in there that would then come under this definition, some of the things like the probiotics that are not now currently considered organic. They're not because they're growing them on yeast substrate, and it's not organic, and so I talked to probiotic producers, said yes, if we got this done, we would definitely move forward with that. So I just want to kind of lay that out there in terms of that.

Now, while I'm here, there's two other things, and I have to say number one is,

I've been working with folks on the Fenbendizole petition. I appreciate the work that was done on that, agree with what Rick Matthews said, just remember I think as one ingredient comes on there, $I$ think it's time to get the other one off of there. I think that will be good.

And then, finally, the Pet Food Task Force gave you a very, very good report a while back, and before it gathers too much dust, it would be very good to see that move forward, because as I walked around Expo West, there are more organic seals popping up on pet food every single day, and it's really time to get the fence around that, and get that under control. So thank you.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Thank you. Questions? Dan.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: I completely agree with you that the yeast issue is in very small amounts, and it's not nutritional. That is the very reason why it makes a difference
in livestock. It is in as a digestive aid, not all yeast is yeast when it comes to the value as a digestive aid. Regarding species of acton in the ruminant regarding the livability of getting it to the animal and through the feed system. That is part of the reason.

The second thing is, if your people are paying 9 cents, they ought to look around. The typical price on yeast is about 5-1/2 on most Tim Graham products.

MR. CARTER: Yes. No, I'm thinking organic. I'm going up the scale in terms of that, so if they can save some money. Actually, the best solution to everything is buy some buffalo, put them out on grass and forget about it.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Katrina.
SECRETARY HEINZE: I just want your affiliation for the notes.

MR. CARTER: What's that?
SECRETARY HEINZE: Your
affiliation.
MR. CARTER: Oh, my affiliation. Actually, I'm representing myself. I'm with the National Bison Association, Crystal Springs Consulting, and Pet Promise.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Any other questions? Julie.

MEMBER WEISMAN: I just wanted to address Dave on the issue of the pet food recommendation, and make sure that it known that we've already had two Handling Committee calls since the publication deadline for this meeting closed, including one that Emily Brown Rosen and the Chair of the Task Force, Nancy Cook, had been on. We have more in the pipeline as soon as this meeting ends, so that's -- it's definitely in gear now.

MR. CARTER: Thank you.
CHAIR DELGADO: Any other comments? Questions? Julie, thank you very much. That was very timely, and I'm really happy to hear that you're working so well with that. This
concludes --
MEMBER: I was going to make a motion for adjournment.

CHAIR DELGADO: No need for that.
MEMBER: Can't adjourn the whole meeting.

CHAIR DELGADO: This concludes Day Two of our meeting. Yes?

MEMBER: Just so not everyone scatters, Livestock Committee does have to have a meeting tonight. How about dinner in the restaurant here, or later at 8:00. Let's just talk afterwards.

CHAIR DELGADO: Okay. Yes, please.
We have--I think the crowds will also have those-- so we are officially -- yes?
(Off mic comment.)
CHAIR DELGADO: No Handling
meeting. Okay. We're in recess until tomorrow at 8:00.
(Whereupon, the proceedings went off the record at 6:45 p.m.)
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