UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

IN RE:

NATIONAL ORGANIC STANDARDS

BOARD MEETING

X HELD APRIL 29, 2004
X 8:00 A.M.
X BEST WESTERN INN OF
X BUCKINGHAM ROOM
X 162 E. OHIO STREET
X CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611

VOLUME II OF III

APPEARANCES:

COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN: MR. MARK KING

MS. REBECCA J. GOLDBURG BOARD MEMBERS:

> MR. MICHAEL P. LACY MS. GOLDIE CAUGHLAN MR. KEVIN O'RELL

MS. NANCY M. OSTIGUY

MS. KIM M. DIETZ MR. JAMES RIDDLE

MR. DAVID CARTER MR. GEORGE SIEMON MS. ANDREA CAROE

MS. ROSALIE KOENIG MS. ANN L. COOPER

ALSO PRESENT: MR. RICHARD MATTHEWS

MS. KATHERINE BENHAM

MS. BARBARA ROBINSON

MR. ARTHUR NEAL MS. ZEA SONNABEND MS. LESLIE ZUCK MS. MERRILL CLARK MR. MARTY MESH

MR. DAVE ENGEL MS. KELLI SHEA

REPORTER: MS. LEAH JOHNSON

CONTRACTOR (NOT PRESENT): R & S TYPING SERVICE

(903) 663-9567

PROCEEDINGS

8:05 a.m.

J

CHAIRMAN KING: I'd like to call to order the Meeting of the National Organic Standards Board.

First off I'd like to thank everyone for their patience and persistence in your input yesterday; I think it was really valuable.

This morning the first thing we're going to start with is the .606 Task Force report, or the Jim & Kim Show, if you will.

A quick reminder for everyone: please put your cell phones to vibrate; if you have a comment, conversation, so on and so forth, take it out in the hallway, please; and then also, there's a sign-up sheet for Friday public input. I would remind everyone that we have two hours allotted for public input, so please sign up early, if you have comments, because we certainly want you to be a part of that.

So without further ado, I'll turn it over to Mr. Jim Riddle.

MR. RIDDLE: Okay. Good morning, and we're still getting the technology set up, but --

Yesterday afternoon I passed out the current draft from the task force, and this task force is for commercial availability, recommended rule changes, and just

a little background, while you're digging out that report:

It came to the Executive Committee attention early this year, I guess in January, that, you know, there remain issues on commercial availability and the need for consistency and how it's being interpreted in the field, and this was actually -- when the Final Rule was published in 2000, there was a request for comments at that time and recognition of the need for further rulemaking on commercial availability, and so it's -- it's remained an open issue.

There were comments originally submitted, including comments from the Board, and then further recommendations on the -- from the Board as it relates to the agricultural ingredients on the list, 205.606.

And so that was really the basis of the work, the starting point, of this task force, and the objective was: to establish acceptable practices to be followed by certification applicants, certified operators, and certifiers, for consistent, transparent, and predictable determinations of commercial availability that provide regulatory certainty, and commercial availability, really, applies to two different sections of the Rule, the one being seeds, where a producer can use non-organic seeds if it's documented that organic seeds are not commercially available in the equivalent variety and form, quality, and

quantity needed by the operation; and then it also applies to minor agricultural ingredients used in processed products, where a handler must attempt to source organic ingredients if the product is to be labeled as organic, they must attempt to source organic ingredients for everything agricultural in that product, and if it's documented that an ingredient is not available in an organic form, is not commercially available, then the certifier can allow a non-organic form of the ingredient, but there's been no further guidance to provide consistency in how those determinations are being made or to spell out the requirements for the operators to meet in order to state their case.

So that was the background for our discussion, and in the recommendation from the task force, you see a fairly length introduction section, and then background section, which has the definition of "commercial availability," some citations from the regulation and from the preamble, and I'm not going to read through that at all, that's all been posted on the web, and -- yes, George.

MR. SIEMON: Jim, is there an extra one of the handouts? I can't seem to find mine from yesterday.

(Document handed Mr. Siemon.)

MR. SIEMON: Thank you.

MR. RIDDLE: In case it's not commercially R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

available, we will get you another one. (Laughter.)

MR. RIDDLE: Okay. So skipping down now to Recommendation 1a, which is found on Page 3. So, Ann, if you can scroll down a ways. All the Board members have this in front of you; I wanted to put it up on the screen so that members of the public could follow along.

I'm not seeing how that -- okay, so the first part of our recommendation was simply reaffirmation of a recommendation the Board made in May 2002 concerning the -- really the title and heading, the paragraph, in 205.606, and part of that is to remove the words "as ingredients," which don't appear in this recommendation, they do appear in the Rule currently, as written, and it's redundant, because when it says "allowed in or on agricultural processed products," "in or on" includes ingredients. So it's not to remove ingredients from consideration.

And then also this section only applies to organic products. "Made with organic" products can include conventional ingredients.

MS. DIETZ: And the other reason that we had originally recommended that we take "as ingredients" off is that materials on 205.606, in processing and ingredients, is defined as something that's put on the label, and processing aids are not ingredients, so there was some

confusion on whether or not people needed to have processing aids, and it's our everything that everything needs to be on the list, so we wanted to take away that confusion and basically state processing aids or anything

used in or on must appear on the National List.

MR. RIDDLE: Right. So that really, 1a, was an affirmation of the prior standing recommendation of the Board, and then there's some new rationale which has been added to this version, and all of the new language is underlined in the Board's text and the language to be deleted has strikethrough.

Okay, moving to Recommendation 1b, and this is where this new draft is recommending some changes to the previous draft from the task force, and this is in response to comments submitted to the web posting, and here we are — would be — you know, if the Board supports this recommendation, we would be calling for replacement of the current Section 205.606 with a new Section 205.606, which would be entitled:

Non-organically-produced agricultural substances prohibited or restricted for use in or on processed products labeled as "organic" or "made with organic."

And, I'm not sure, maybe that "made with" should be deleted. Yeah. That's an oversight there. So --

MS. CAROE: Well, wait a second, do you want to R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

delete it, because you're talking about processing aids as well, and you would want it -- processing aids --

MR. RIDDLE: Okay, no -- yeah. I'm sorry. Yeah, that's -- Andrea. We would leave this in this section.

I'm confused. I was -- because the intent --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: (Inaudible.)

MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. Just to explain first, the intent of this new section would be similar to crop inputs and livestock inputs, where there's a category for prohibited naturals.

There may be certain agricultural ingredients which, after a petition, rulemaking, recommendation, that the Board may recommend are inappropriate for use in organic or should have some restrictions. There's no place on the current 205.605 List for such substances to be addressed. This -- especially the prohibition of agricultural materials.

So this would create a placeholder -- we don't have any specific substances in mind right now, but it would create a placeholder in order to address either prohibited naturals or agricultural substances that need very specific restrictions on their use, and that would apply to a product that's labeled "organic" or "made with."

Okay. And then, you know, it just follows with the language of the text for that section, which basically

repeats the title. 1 2 Any other questions or comments on that? MS. DIETZ: Just a comment. The further 3 4 rationale for doing this is that the current materials 5 listed under 205.606 were confusing the industry there. 6 There were materials on there that people were considering 7 okay to use even though organic substances were out there 8 in the area, so they were using them as a commercial 9 availability list, and that was not the intent of 205.606. Again, the intent was to put materials on there that the 10 11 Board wanted to restrict in some way. 12 MR. SIEMON: Jim? MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. 13 MR. SIEMON: I'm sorry, I'm confused. 1a and --14 15 1b is building on 1a? These aren't alternatives, are they? 16 MR. RIDDLE: Well, yeah --17 MR. SIEMON: Because you're talking about the 18 same .606 in both of them. 19 MR. RIDDLE: Right. 20 MR. SIEMON: I'm confused, as usual, so --MR. RIDDLE: Good (chuckles), and I was reading 21 22 back through it this morning, and I felt the same way: 23 they are contradictory to one another.

existing recommendation, but now that we have altered 1b -
R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

In the first instance we were reaffirming an

24

25

originally 1b, as you can see, was written to call for a 1 2 new Subsection .607, but that's really unnecessary. It really should just replace .606 and --3 4 MR. SIEMON: So if we've got 1b, we don't do 1a? 5 MR. RIDDLE: Right. MR. SIEMON: I wasn't clear. 6 7 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. And I think the task force 8 should meet briefly during the break outside session to 9 address that, and maybe we'll just scrap the whole discussion of 1a and focus on 1b, so --10 11 MR. SIEMON: Well, and we get to 1c, I'll ask 12 about that one too. MR. RIDDLE: Well, yeah, I'm ready to go there, 13 if you are. But yeah, thanks for -- thanks for pointing 14 15 that out, George. I did want to mention that. MS. DIETZ: Yeah. It could just be wordsmithing, 16 17 where we say "prior recommendation NOSB May 2002" and just take away that Recommendation 1a. 18 19 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, just as part of the 20 background. MR. SIEMON: Yeah. 21 22 MS. DIETZ: Because it's not really a 23 recommendation. 24 MR. RIDDLE: Okay. 1c. Now, this one is an 25 attempt to deal with the substances that are currently on R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

.606 and two substances that the Board has reviewed and recommended be added to .606, gelatin and shellac, and our recommendation is that the Board look at those substances again, we use the words "review," but we're not talking about another TAP review or anything to that extent, we're talking about -- the Board has already completed the work on these substances, but now to run them through the choices of A, B, C, or D to determine where they should fall on the National List.

Since there will no longer be that list of commercially-unavailable agricultural ingredients under our recommendation, something needs to be done with each of those substances, they either need to be removed totally from the National List and just fall under the ACA authority of determining commercial availability for that material; or we might choose to recommend some kind of restriction or prohibition on any one of those substances, I'm not prejudging where they should go. Kim, then Rose.

MS. DIETZ: Yeah. I mean, an example is, you know, on the gums, there's an annotation: using water extraction only, and that might -- that would certainly be one that would -- could stay under .606, because it has a restricted annotation.

MR. RIDDLE: Okay. Rose --

MR. SIEMON: But you're recommending --

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

MR. RIDDLE: Rose. 1 2 MR. SIEMON: Sorry. MS. KOENIG: So the handling committee would then 3 4 -- I'm just looking at the process. So the handling 5 committee would then make that recommendation based on, you 6 know, some just small process, or -- I mean, how would we 7 get that form of recommendation? MS. DIETZ: Well, we know that -- I mean, this 8 9 board, this existing board, has reviewed gelatin and shellac, so those -- I think those are ones that we could 10 11 easily say, "This is how we recommended originally, this is 12 where they should go," and then bring the others back 13 forward and give some type of background and review as to why we feel that they should be moved, in what place, bring 14 15 it back to the Board as a formal recommendation and have 16 the Board vote on it. 17 MR. RIDDLE: But, yeah, it would be the handling 18 committee --19 MS. DIETZ: Yes. 20 MR. RIDDLE: This is kind of a work order for the handling committee. 21 22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: (Inaudible.) 23 (Laughter.) 24 MR. RIDDLE: George, did you have --25 MR. SIEMON: So the basis of this one is to have R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

```
three sections under .606 and divide it up into three
 1
 2
    different categories of what the real recommendation is
 3
    here?
 4
              MR. RIDDLE:
                            I'm sorry --
 5
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Just one --
 6
              MR. SIEMON: You have 3a, b, c, and d --
 7
              MS. DIETZ: You'll have 205.605(a), .605(b), and
     .606.
 8
 9
              MR. SIEMON: All right, I'm looking (inaudible).
              MR. RIDDLE: Well, yeah, if you're just looking
10
11
    at a through d in this document, that's not where we're
12
    recommending changing to the Rule, that's just the way that
    the task force divided this up as the choices.
13
14
              MR. SIEMON: Okay. I --
15
              MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. You see a is actually
    205.605(a), and then b is to place it on .605(b), c would
16
17
    be the new .606, and d would be removal from the list.
18
              MR. SIEMON: I didn't catch the five [phonetic].
19
     I see.
20
              MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. Okay. Any other questions or
21
    comments on that part?
22
     (No audible response.)
23
              MR. RIDDLE: Okay, so that's really the substance
24
    of the recommendation from the Board on how to address some
25
    changes to the National List.
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
```

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

The next, Recommendation Number 2, is how to bring consistency and predictability to the commercial availability process, procedures to be followed by producers, handlers, and certifiers, so we just repeat the definition of "commercial availability" from the Rule and then go through determination procedures, and a change in this draft is that those procedures would fall under Subpart (e), Certification section of the Rule. We're not saying what number or creating a new number; we're just saying that it belongs in Certification Subpart (e). So that's a change here based on comments received.

Okay, at the top of the next page: A) "The applicant or certified operator must submit a written report to the certifying agent as part of the Organic System Plan or Organic System Plan Update that provides," and I am going to read through these:

Number 1) "A description of the ingredient and the required technical specifications of the ingredient, including form and quality";

"Estimate of the quantity of the ingredient needed within the specified time period if this is a factor in the requested allowance of a non-organic ingredient," and then in parens: "Quantity, quality, form, and function may be considered for individual product requirements and not for total business requirements for all potential

product lines."

And, Number 3) "Explanation of how the ingredient is used to fulfill an essential function."

So that's the information that the operator must include in the Organic System Plan.

And then, 4) "During the inspection, the application or certified operator must provide information concerning known sources of the ingredient and organic status thereof and provide written evidence of efforts to locate sources of organic ingredients, including the dates when potential supplies of applicable organic ingredient suppliers were contacted."

"Written evidence may include letters, faxes, e-mail correspondence, or phone logs of discussions with potential suppliers. A minimum of three potential suppliers shall have been contacted during the previous 12 months."

Rose.

MS. KOENIG: My question is in terms of kind of the way the Rule is presented, I mean --

MR. RIDDLE: If you can speak up, please, or closer.

MS. KOENIG: I'm sorry. I just don't see any section of the Rule that has this kind of descriptive requirements, so --

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MS}}$. CAUGHLAN: Proscriptive is really -- quite proscriptive.

MS. KOENIG: -- so I don't know if this is really -- you want them in the Rule or do you want a directive or -- I mean, this seems more like -- I mean, I appreciate the spirit of what you're trying to achieve, I have no qualms with, kind of, what's written; it's just placement in the Rule just seems a little inconsistent, I guess, to me, that there --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Well, I don't --

MS. KOENIG: It seems like there should be a format where you explain those things, whether it's a definition or a directive or --

MR. SIEMON: Should be a guidance (inaudible) -MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, and I -- I didn't read through
all of the background and citations from the Rule, to save
some time, but some of that's explained there, and the
language at the top, "Applicant must submit a written
report to the certifying agent as part of the Organic
System Plan on commercial availability," that fits with the
Rule.

And we aren't saying what specific number or how it would fit, we leave that to the NOP, but we just recognize or acknowledge that it is the certification section, it's not the materials list section that needs

changed here, and maybe it can be addressed with a directive or policy guidance, but it's a certification issue and not a materials list issue.

Andrea, then Kim.

MS. CAROE: Well, I have somewhat the similar concern as Rose on this, is that the Rule doesn't state that you have to call three suppliers, and I think once you say three suppliers, that's all you'll ever get, and a lot of folks out there are doing a lot more to find those organic ingredients, and I think it might be counterproductive.

And also, telling the certifiers that the inspector has to look at this, instead of them looking at it through the application process, I think is getting into their business; I think it should be broader and say that "this should be evaluated by the certifier during their certification process," but telling them to do it at the inspection with the inspector I think is -- is: getting into their business.

So some of this, I -- I agree that this is founded in the Rule and that the Rule specifically states that you have to -- as a user of a non-organic ingredient, you have to justify the use of that ingredient with a search for the organic ingredient, but this has gone a little bit past that, and although it's great -- guidance

are a great -- a set expectation, perhaps, but I don't think that we can say three suppliers and evaluate at inspection and -- some of that is -- the detail may be too much.

MR. RIDDLE: Kim.

MS. DIETZ: Just a bit of background on this.

These recommendations, really, have been in the industry for probably the last three or four years and -- as a kind of -- not written that you have follow this, but people somewhat have been following it.

So the -- let me try to -- there were so many things that you said, that I wanted to comment on.

So that I don't necessarily agree that this isn't going to work, because as -- first of all, as a handler, you're required to have in your handling plan a commercial availability process, okay, so right now, if people don't have what they do, they could, really, be in violation of the Act. So that's the first thing. So this, I think, is very fair for the handling/ processing groups out there to follow, and we have been following it, in some sense.

The other thing is that you have to understand that when you're out there sourcing ingredients, you don't know you're going to be doing that when you submit your application, this is something that's going to happen in the field, so to speak, so you have to document what you've

got, you've got to have a system, and then you've got to follow the system. And so to me, having the inspector actually validate that you've done it is the right place to do that.

So those are my comments.

MR. RIDDLE: Mark, then Rose, then Andrea.

MR. KING: Yeah, I've been somewhat a part of this task force, and first of all, thanks for all the work, because I know a lot of time has gone into this, but one of the things you mentioned, Jim, that sort of caught my attention is Subpart (e), "We're not sure where this should go but we know it should go in the Certification section," and it seems to me that what we're attempting to do, in small part at least, is verify information through the inspection process.

So I don't know if at some point in the future we would want to consider that section verification of information, integrate commercial availability into that, I don't think that section totally does this document justice, but perhaps, as we talk about the inspection process, it could be inserted in there.

MR. RIDDLE: And the inspection process is part of Subpart (e) as --

MR. KING: Yes, in Section 403.

MR. RIDDLE: Right. So we're -- yeah.

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

```
Basically, we're wanting to hand something to the NOP
 1
 2
    and --
 3
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Let them determine
 4
    where it fits.
 5
              MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, from the Board. Let's see,
 6
    Rose.
 7
              MS. KOENIG: So I guess just clarify on this
 8
    Section (a), so is this for all ingredients, would a
 9
    potential person have to --
10
              MR. RIDDLE: All agricultural ingredients.
11
              MS. KOENIG: All agricultural -- whether they're
12
    using organic or non-organic ingredients or all
13
    ingredients?
14
              MR. RIDDLE: All ingredients used in a product
15
    labeled "organic."
16
              MS. CAROE:
                          The non-organic, this is for the non-
    organic, this is supporting the non-organic --
17
              MR. RIDDLE: It's all agricultural ingredients
18
19
    used in a product labeled "organic."
20
              MS. KOENIG: So even if it's -- even if you're
21
    finding organic sources, you would have to document --
22
              MS. CAROE: No. No, not for the organic
23
    ingredients, not for ingredients that you find organic --
24
              MR. RIDDLE: Oh. Well, no, you've got a
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
```

certificate, you've got organic, you've bypassed this, it's not applicable then, because you've already exceeded it.

It's only -- yeah, it kicks in when you want to use a non-organic, but applies to all agricultural ingredients used in a product labeled "organic," not in a product labeled "made with," and of course not in one "100%" either, it's irrelevant there, so --

Andrea, did you have something else?

MS. CAROE: Yes, I do. I just want to point out that ingredients are -- can be very specific. Say you were making a product that included spirolina as an ingredient, right now there's two manufacturers that I know of that do organic spirolina, just two. If you called both those manufacturers and they didn't have it available, would you not be in compliance because you didn't call three?

I mean, I think by setting a number, you're not understanding the scope of searching for ingredients.

Sometimes the ingredients are quite available, other times they're very narrow, you know, you may be looking for a chocolate that freezes, for an ice cream bar, that's very specific, you know, I mean it's -- it's not necessarily -- I just -- I think the three -- I think once you use that on a certification level, that's -- it's just -- it's not always applicable.

And the other thing I want to say is that the R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

Rule specifically states that a certifier must have enough evidence, before they send an inspector in, that says this operation can possibly be certified, and the certification agency has the right to say, "We want to see that document for the sourcing of that ingredient" before they go in.

Now, if you -- you know, yes, it is the obligation of the on-site inspection to verify the information that was received in the claims that that operation is making, but you're specifically stating here that this is how the certification operation -- certification agent is going to operate, and I -- I just don't believe that we have the right to tell them how they're going to operate. You can tell them what needs to be done and what -- through the process, what you need to get out of it, but where it needs to be done, I think it's inappropriate.

MR. RIDDLE: Well, yeah, and I'd like to respond to that. The first point, on the minimum of three potential suppliers being contacted: that's not being changed in this draft; that was already something that the task force had agreed to in the prior draft. So we're not looking to change that, you know, right now.

And the intent is to bring predictability, so that you know if you have contacted at least three, it doesn't limit it to three, but at least three, then you

have fulfilled a standard, that the certifier can't, you know, change the rules on you at that point. It's to provide consistency and predictability.

And yeah, maybe it's not appropriate/adequate in all instances, but as a rule of thumb, that's what we're trying to establish.

And on the -- yeah, on the other one, which is a change being proposed in this draft, Number 4 there, that was in response to comments, that the -- that this really happens during the inspection, and I hear what you're saying, that the applicant should submit the information on the known sources of the ingredient and organic status thereof in their organic system plan, and that should be reviewed in advance of the inspection.

That's what we originally had recommended. And then the commenter was saying no, that that really should occur during the inspection, and on further thought, you know, I'm thinking that maybe -- that during -- the inspection, you know, part, should only apply to Number 5, that that's when the inspector reviews the written evidence, that -- that's something that happens on a daily basis and can't be submitted as part of the organic system plan, that's, you know, an ongoing process, the attempts to source. It's not something that you do one day out of the year, send in your plan, and you're done.

So I think that is appropriate that that be 1 2 directed to the inspection process, but Number 4, submitting information on the known sources of the 3 ingredient and organic status, I think is appropriate to 4 5 keep in the organic system plan. So when the task force meets, I think we can talk 6 7 about a change there. Mark, then --8 CHAIRMAN KING: I was just going to say, I think 9 this is really good dialogue and this is a good piece in front of us. It sounds like what we're really talking 10 11 about here, if I may, is the difference between review of application and verification of information throughout the 12 13 inspection process, and there are -- there are some ways to 14 accomplish the same end through that. So I appreciate the comments, and in about five 15 16 minutes I'd like to wrap this up to stay on schedule, so --Okay. Okay, so I think we'll 17 MR. RIDDLE: 18 continue that discussion in the breakout session. 19 B, which is really the steps that the certifier would need to follow in making these determinations, and, 20 21 once again, to bring predictability and consistency to the 22 process, so: 23 24 claim that no organic substitutes are commercially

25

Evaluate the applicant or certified operator's claim that no organic substitutes are commercially available in form/quality/quantity needed by the operation R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

to fill the required function;

- 2) Verify that the applicant or certified operator has made a good-faith effort to source organic ingredients;
- 3) Verify that the ingredient is not commercially available in organic form by reviewing the best-available information, listing known sources of organic ingredients;
- 4) Notify the certification applicant or certified operator of sources information which lists available organic ingredients if the certifying agent finds that such ingredients exist;

And then we're recommending in this draft to delete Number 5;

And then, moving on: Maintain and annually submit to the NOP an up-to-date list of ingredients that have been granted allowances in non-organic form, and then in parentheses: The list shall maintain the confidentiality of ingredients, suppliers, and parties granted allowances.

"The reporting requirement shall be implemented through the accreditation process by providing ACAs ample notification and time to adopt data-management systems," and that's a recognition that not all certifiers have the data-management systems currently in place. This is -- would be a new reporting requirement that will take some

time to implement.

And then the rest of this remains as it came out of the task force: Require certified operators to update commercial availability information in each organic system plan update;

Acknowledge all complaints concerning allowances granted and provide rationale for determinations. If the investigation of a complaint provides significant new information, then the certifying agent must revisit the allowance; and

Require that products without sufficient documentation not be labeled "organic." Such products may be labeled "made with organic ingredients" if they meet all applicable labeling and product-content requirements for that category.

Any comments, questions on that part? -- and this is the last part. Andrea.

MS. CAROE: I -- as I voiced previously with this task force, I think Number 3 changes the intent of what the certification agent's role is. The certification agent isn't to take on the liability of the product. They are to verify that the justification provided by the applicant is appropriate. I don't feel that the certification agent's job is to verify that that ingredient is not available. They're verifying that the effort was due diligent but not

```
1
    that it's not available.
 2
              So -- I mean, I've said that before, and I really
 3
    can't see that certification agents should take on that
    role.
 4
 5
              MS. DIETZ: I think the same intent, she -- well,
 6
    I think you're --
 7
              MR. RIDDLE: Kim?
 8
              MS. DIETZ: I think you're meaning the same
 9
    intent that we are. We're not --
              CHAIRMAN KING: Yeah.
10
11
              MS. DIETZ: We're not saying you need to go out
12
    and verify that those are commercially available, saying
    verify the documentation --
13
14
              MS. CAROE: But that's not --
15
              MS. DIETZ: -- that's provided to you.
16
              MS. CAROE: I mean, that's -- the one before
    that, Number 2, says "verify the good-faith effort."
17
    I believe that is accurate.
18
19
              MS. DIETZ: Right.
20
              MS. CAROE:
                          The next one says "verify that it's
21
    not commercially available." I don't agree with that.
22
    I would suggest, once again, to strike Number 3.
23
              MR. RIDDLE: Well -- yeah, and you're on the task
24
    force, and --
25
              MS. CAROE:
                           I know.
                                    I've said it before, though.
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

MR. RIDDLE: -- we have considered striking that, 1 2 and it's in the draft now, and in -- my sense is that in 3 order to determine if an operation is in compliance, the certifier needs to assess not only the effort but also the 4 facts of whether those substances are at all available in 5 6 an organic form. 7 MS. CAROE: I disagree. I don't think that's 8 (inaudible). 9 MR. RIDDLE: This is an attempt to bring 10 consistency, and yes, there is a need for more information 11 on commercially-available organic minor ingredients to give certifiers better tools to make those assessments, but they 12 need to actually perform some due diligence to determine if 13 14 the operation complies or not, besides just: whether they 15 made a good effort. Rose. 16 MS. KOENIG: Yeah, I hear Andrea's point. You know, I look at this -- you know, there -- I guess it's 17 18 sort of like -- you know, not to go back to the List 3 19 inerts, but I will go back to them. There's probably some ways in the future -- some 20 21 ways that the industry can develop these databases for 22 either -- you know, in this case it's manufacturers, 23 another case might be pesticides. 24 So I don't know if you want to -- you know, I 25 think maybe our efforts might be better placed:

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

than requiring this, is: working on and trying to establish those kinds of lists and sources for certifiers and acknowledge that people who are accredited certifiers should be doing those kinds of things.

You know, I -- I think what Andrea's saying is not that she opposes necessarily that -- you know, the intent, I guess; it's just she thinks -- and I guess I tend to agree -- that the format that it's in -- I think 3 probably does cover it.

MS. DIETZ: And we acknowledge that there is really no place out there right now that has commercial availability lists, so --

MS. KOENIG: Yeah. So, I don't know, I'm just putting forth that it seems like in many cases that we're showing that there has to be some kind of databases, I mean similar to like what OMRI does in brand names, I mean there should be databases used for reference. It's not a requirement, again, but references so that people can get those sources of information via -- I don't know -- NOP website or what have you, so that there is tracking, and I think that the USDA -- I mean, it's not their mandate to do this kind of stuff, but they do have data-collection kinds of things all the time, that maybe there could be some kind of tracking --

MR. RIDDLE: Right.

MS. KOENIG: -- of the marketplace and what's available.

MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. And I think --

MS. KOENIG: Not only, you know -- as a source not only to help, you know, conventional, but also, if there is organic, that really would be a great service.

MR. RIDDLE: I'd like to wrap this up, and the task force will be meeting during breakout for just fine-tuning this recommendation.

I did just want to point out that the rest of the document explains -- summarizes some of the comments that were submitted and how they have been addressed in this draft.

And I also want to just point out: one of the commenters said something in quite detail, that I encourage you to read, and essentially advocating the removal of commercial availability considerations altogether from the Rule for minor ingredients, and if someone cannot find organic ingredients in significant quantity and they can't meet that 95-percent threshold, then the products be labeled "made with organic," but just to take it totally out, but that was contrary to the recommendation of the task force, but I did feel obligated to mention that that is another option and something which should be considered and is addressed in these comments.

MS. DIETZ: And in closing, remember that we -
we have to have truth in labeling, so most of this is going

to happen in those minor ingredients, where if you have

something that's under 5 percent that you just can't source

-- take organic vanilla, for example, that's just right now

not available, or something like that, you're not -- and

you're going to label properly, whether it's a "made with"

MS. COOPER: It's not like we're trying to cheat the system, but --

MR. RIDDLE: Thanks, Ann.

label or an "organic" label (inaudible).

CHAIRMAN KING: We thank all of you for helping us stay on schedule, I appreciate that.

The next item on the agenda is new for this Board in that it's a breakout session. The intent for the first hour is to have three committees in a breakout, which would be crops, livestock, and handling, those committees dealing with materials.

It is at the chairs' -- the committee chairs' discretion in terms of how they want to involve the public. The ongoing goal here is to increase the level of transparency and when we're reviewing it also confirm for you that we do consider public input and that we do take your comments when we deliberate and make decisions on materials.

1 So I think at this point --MS. DIETZ: I --2 CHAIRMAN KING: Let me finish, one second. 3 it's at the chairs' discretion. In other words, the public 4 5 perhaps may just simply observe and then at the end we 6 could have a quick question-and-answer. We'll do this for 7 one hour, then -- if the chair so desires, and then we'll 8 do a quick break. Kim? 9 MS. DIETZ: A point of clarification with NOP. 10 number of the committees have to go back and actually make 11 recommendations on materials. Is that something that we 12 can have the public involved in, in deliberating and making recommendations --13 14 CHAIRMAN KING: Observing. 15 MS. DIETZ: -- and observing? I mean, you know, 16 we've got some materials that we have to take back, soy 17 protein isolates and TSPP. 18 MR. MATTHEWS: Richard Matthews, National 19 Organics Program. That's really up to the committee. 20 MS. DIETZ: Okay. MR. MATTHEWS: The idea is that the committee 21 22 would get together, go over the written public comment that 23 was submitted prior to this meeting, plus what you heard 24 yesterday during the public session, and that you would 25 then rework your current position if you believe that there R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

is a need for reworking, or you may come back and say, 1 2 "We're not making any changes." 3 Whether or not you take additional feedback from the public is really up to you. 4 MS. DIETZ: I just wanted to make sure we weren't 5 6 violating anything. 7 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. No, that's an important 8 thing. 9 MS. KOENIG: I would suggest, though, in terms of 10 process, that -- that the committee would formally 11 recognize or ask somebody if that information is needed, 12 that it's not the arena -- because it's really not fair, this is not -- this is not a section for public comment. 13 14 If there's clarification, I think that, you know, it has to 15 be a real specific issue, but certainly people can observe 16 and listen. 17 CHAIRMAN KING: No, I think that's a really good 18 point, and actually, I think primarily it is for you to 19 observe. Occasionally if the chair wants to recognize someone or you have a pertinent point that deals 20 21 specifically with that topic, you can make that point 22 specifically, then that's fine, and it's at the chair's 23 discretion. 24 MS. KOENIG: And then the only thing -- also, if 25 the public is involved and the actual petitioner is there,

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

I think that it -- well --1 CHAIRMAN KING: This is at the chair's 2 3 discretion, Rose, we'll let them decide that. MS. KOENIG: Yeah, but I think there needs to be 4 5 disclosure of anyone who is presenting -- who is -- if they 6 are called upon, who they represent, because I think it's 7 really important that we have some kind of process so that 8 the committee understands who those individuals are. 9 CHAIRMAN KING: Okay, duly noted. Well, I want 10 to see what Katherine -- then we'll go to Jim. Katherine, 11 is that the sign-up sheet or the --12 MS. BENHAM: The sign-in book -- that's for public comment, this is the sign-up book, so everybody 13 14 needs to make sure that they sign in. 15 CHAIRMAN KING: This is sign in for today, as --UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Attendance. 16 CHAIRMAN KING: -- as in "I've attended." 17 18 MS. BENHAM: Yes. 19 CHAIRMAN KING: Yeah. And you don't want to be on her bad list, so sign in now. 20 (Laughter.) 21 22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Is the sign-up sheet 23 for public comments --24 MS. BENHAM: Public comments out there too. 25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Out there too, okay, R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

for tomorrow morning.

CHAIRMAN KING: Okay, and Jim, you had a comment.

MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. As I understand it, we're going to -- the crops, livestock, and handling committees are going to break out now, during this first session, before the break, and then after the break I'd like to meet with the 606 Task Force --

MR. CARTER: I'd like to meet with the policy development committee.

MS. COOPER: And I would like to meet with materials.

CHAIRMAN KING: Okay. So essentially -- it's almost 9 o'clock. This first session will go approximately 60 minutes, and then we'll take a break and come back and do the other stuff.

MR. MATTHEWS: For the record, Richard Matthews.

I just want to clarify one thing. What I meant by: it was up to the committee chair is not that -- this is not a new opportunity for public comment; it would be strictly for maybe a clarification, somebody who had made a public comment, if you're wanting clarification you could ask for clarification, if the petitioner's there you could ask for clarification on something. This is not an opportunity for more public input.

MR. CARTER: So when Marty hands a yellow sheet

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

```
of paper, is that public comment or clarification?
 1
 2
     (Laughter.)
 3
               MR. MATTHEWS: That's probably public comment.
    (Laughter.)
 4
 5
               CHAIRMAN KING: Yeah, and I think Rick brings up
    a really good point. There is work to do during this
 6
 7
    session, so please keep that in mind and respect the
 8
    interests of the committee.
 9
               So at this time let's go ahead and break out.
10
    (Off the record and reconvened.)
11
               CHAIRMAN KING: Welcome, hope you had a nice
12
    break, and thanks for your help during the breakout
    session.
13
14
               We're going to start this off with Keith Jones,
15
    who's going to do a presentation, or an update, if you
16
    will, on the ECERT Program. ECERT, not Easter, Katherine.
17
    (Laughter.)
18
               CHAIRMAN KING: So if you could take your seats
19
    and get prepared, we'll get started here.
     (Long pause.)
20
21
               CHAIRMAN KING: Keith, it's all yours.
22
               MR. JONES:
                           Imagine, if you will --
23
               UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: You need to get near
24
    a microphone.
25
    (Pause.)
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

1 MR. JONES: Folks, I apologize that our system's 2 not going to let me be on the record. There's nothing that 3 I'm going to say that's going to be of any sort of regulatory consequence, it's totally educational, you can take 4 5 good notes, you can talk to me afterwards, you know, we'll 6 make sure that you have the information you need, so --7 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Can you please get 8 near a microphone? It's pretty hard to hear. 9 CHAIRMAN KING: Yeah, we couldn't --I can talk louder, how about that? 10 MR. JONES: 11 CHAIRMAN KING: Thank you, yes. 12 MR. JONES: All right. From the diaphragm, okay. Okay, let's start over. 13 14 Imagine, if you will, a product supplier in 15 Belgium wanting to source NOP product, an accredited 16 certifying agent in California entering data real-time on 17 producers and processors, and Item-S compliance, tracking 18 also in real-time, compliance data related to non-compli-19 ances and trim lines in those non-compliances that are going on around the world. That's the vision of what I'm 20 21 about to share with you this morning. 22 Multiple users entering data into a common 23 database that would capture both regulatory information and

That is the NOP ECERT project, and I'm hoping R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

compliance information for use on a real-time basis. Okay.

24

25

that I can run this thing. Katherine? Okay, tell you what, let me go back to the tried and true.

Our vision is simply this: to supplement a secure, integrated web-based system for electronic collection, use, and dissemination of information that is required to be submitted under the National Organic Program regulations. Okay.

Real-time submission, access worldwide through a web-based interface, and utilizing data that we're required to collect anyway. Okay.

Now, we have designed this system with our firstline interface in mind, and our first-line interface, folks, is the accredited certifying agents, so we've designed this system with their needs in mind, and also AMS compliance. So that is the two primary user interfaces that the system's designed for.

Now, flowing out of that, because we're capturing this data, will be trade uses as well, which means that that purchaser in Belgium can eventually go online, source through our web-based source, and have access to every NOP product that is certified around the world. No other system will be able to combine both trade, product, and regulatory information.

Now, part of this will be proprietary, only USDA and accredited certifying agents will, obviously, have

access to certain information related in the primary interface. Okay.

The public side will be the trade side, where you, as an individual, can go in, type in a keyword, "potatoes," "corn," "soybeans," whatever, and outflow from that database will be a list of products that are certified with the NOP standards around the world.

One of the features that we are considering building into the system will be a distance measurer, because we know that people are very concerned about sourcing product as close as the location of their processing facilities, so one of the things that we're considering is doing, at least on the US side, a ZIP code search, where I, as a processor, could put in a ZIP code that says -- and my ZIP code in Virginia is 20121, I type that in, I click on "give me 150-mile radius," and then it spits out, based on ZIP code searches, products within 150-mile radius of my personal ZIP code. Okay.

Now, what I'm about to show you today represents the first build of this system, and let me tell you how we're putting this together. This system is designed to be modular in approach, we have contracted with a software developer, and what we are building is functionality over time. So what I'm about to show you today will not have all the features in it that I have just described, but I

can walk you through what we can do today once we have the system fully operational and then what our future builds will be.

Now, one of the things that you need to understand too is that one of the things that's going on in the federal government right now is a complete integration in US Customs departments' international trade data systems, and for some of you I had talked to about this project before, we actually expected to have it fully up and running this summer. That's probably not going to happen, because what has happened at AMS is that we have been tasked with ensuring that everything we do relating to software, data collection, and things like that, can integrate and interface with Customs ITDS project, okay.

ITDS, International Trade Data Systems, was kicked off back in 1995. It's designed to integrate all of the trade flow data and make more efficient clearing products through Customs. It has taken on an enormous urgency for Homeland Security, and so I, along with other AMS staff, are involved in looking at our systems to make sure that they integrate with ITDS, and that perhaps will slow down the full implementation of the project, so you just need to be aware of that. But regardless, what I'm about to demonstrate and show to you will be where we will be going, okay.

Now, as I said, the primary user -- the primary interface that we've designed is for ACA. ACAs are our eyes and ears on the ground. And I know you guys don't like to hear this, you are our agents on the ground, okay. You're the first line of defense.

So what we've done is designed this system for you, we've designed it to help you submit your data to us in an electronic common format, where you're not going to have to send paper to us anymore. We've also designed it and will design it to assist you in reporting non-compliances to us on a real-time basis so that we can begin to track trim lines related to various sectors of the Rule. Okay. So for the ACAs in the audience: this is really designed for you in mind. Okay.

Now, you will come to a site entry screen like this, and unfortunately, as I copied it off the website, we've got a number of marvelously gorgeous graphics that just didn't show up, okay, so there's some graphics up there, it's got AMS's logo, a little bar that says "National Organic Program Online Services," which is kind of what we're calling this.

So you're going to have a username and password. Marty, what do you want your username to be?

MR. MESH: I forgot my password. (Laughter.)

(Cross-talk.)

MR. JONES: I'll tell you what I'm going to do, we're going to use Marty as a guinea pig and I'm going to -- for his username consider this: "I Cause Trouble Every Day," okay? That's his username, all right? (Laughter.)

MR. JONES: And Marty, you'll have to pick out your own password.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: (Inaudible.)

MR. JONES: Backing away from the facetiousness:

An ACA will have a unique username that they'll set up,
they actually go into the system and set that up. They
also set the password up, and then that password can be
shared by any person on staff that they feel like needs to
have access to the system. We're not going to be dogmatic
about security at that level, we feel like you need to make
decisions on your staff as to who needs access to the
system, okay? But you'll come to the system, you'll
identify a username, and you'll be into the system. Okay.

You'll come -- as you come into the system, then, you will enter your data, okay? Now, we're going to have much of this data, address and phone numbers, so you will be able to say if it's a corrected address, a corrected phone number, in other words you'll be able to enter to us the latest information, because one of the things that

we're noticing is that addresses and phone numbers obviously change over time, the address and phone number that you gave us at the time of your accreditation may not be necessarily the address and phone numbers that you're using today. In most cases -- in fact, I can't think of a case where you didn't update it, but you'll be able to provide the latest information to us.

Now, I don't know how many of you can see the bottom of the screen, but down in this area, this will be information for USDA, so once -- and this actually, unfortunately, says "certified" instead of "accredited," so instead of "accredited," that's actually an error that the contractor is going to have to go back and correct.

But we will verify this data, make sure it is accurate, and then we will go into the system and make sure that -- and in this case, this hypothetical case, this individual's authorized for TM11 issuance [phonetic], shipping to Japan [phonetic], they've been accredited for crops, livestock, wild crops, and processed products.

Okay. So that sets the database parameters. Okay.

And then also it's got the creation of the file date, any modifications in the date of accreditation.

Okay. That way we can keep track and determine (inaudible).

Okay, now let's go to the certifying [phonetic]

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

client screen, and this is probably the most -- I think the most interesting screen, and also it's going to be long-term the most useful. This will be the screen that the ACAs will use to update -- and I say update -- their client list.

Marty, let's assume you certified Tom, you signed off yesterday, you come to this system and you enter in X-Y-Z Organic, Tom Hutchison, address, information, and then one of the things too that the system will do is assign a unique identifier number to this client, okay? That way we'll be able to track the client throughout the system.

Now, I can't tell you what that unique identifier number is going to be yet, we're still going back and forth the contractor as to what makes sense in terms of using the identifier screen, whether it needs to be an alphanumeric screen, whether it needs to be something related to the certifier's name so that we can immediately identify it, we're still going back and forth as to what it's going to look like, but it will assign a unique identifier number.

Then you will click on -- and unfortunately, folks, we don't have web access today, so I can't show you a lot of the functionality, but you'll click on the status of Tom's operations, which at this point will be certified, you'll click on the operation type -- crops, livestock,

whatever, there's a drop-down box there, that you can click 1 on what is being certified for, any -- or, I'm sorry, this 2 is processor and handler here, so this would be certified 3 producer and processor here, and then what the operation is 4 5 certified for, we just click boxes down in here. 6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: I have a question. 7 MR. JONES: I'd like to hold -- the way I talk is 8 I'd like to hold questions till the end. I can go back 9 and --10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: I retract that last 11 question. 12 MR. JONES: I understand. (Laughter.) 13 14 MR. JONES: I can go back and run through any of 15 these slides, and, you know, I'm here as long as I need to 16 be, I know you guys are on a schedule you need to stay to, 17 I've got this loaded on my system, if we want to gather up 18 afterwards and walk through it in more detail, I'm happy to 19 do that. So I'm here at your disposal, within reason. (Laughter.) 20 MR. JONES: And then there's, of course, a date 21 22 creation, a modified date, and certification date, and 23 status change date. This status drop-down box here is 24 where you will go in and identify -- let's say you've 25 identified a non-compliance. There will be a drop-down

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

box, and this will be in the next build, it'll probably be over here somewhere, there'll be a drop-down box that says "non-compliance," and then there'll be a drop-down box on every section of the Rule, 205.404 (inaudible), whatever, okay, and you can click on that, as the non-compliance, and that will, when you click on that, autopopulate a common non-compliance letter, that you will have the choice -- and one of the things I do want some feedback on is whether or not you would like to have this e-mailed automatically to your client, if your client has e-mail access.

So essentially what you would do is you would go to this screen, populate this on a real-time basis with whatever data needs to be populated in the case that we're just talking about, it's a non-compliance 205, let's say .406, for whatever reason we want to use that. That will autopopulate and bring you to another screen that will be a common non-compliance letter, it'll have boilerplate language in it that we have passed muster at OGC, and then you will insert any applicable information that you feel necessary, and then that letter can be sent either through e-mail or you can print off and send it through regular mail.

But we are considering the e-mail option. We're trying to make this as electronic-focused as possible, as paperless as possible, okay. Now, that doesn't mean you

couldn't get into the system and print off the letter for a hard copy or something like that, but you would have the ability to send a non-compliance letter by e-mail.

Another thing that the second build will do is that once this screen is finished and completed, it will autopopulate a common format certificate with standardized language on it, okay. You can print that off at your desk. So you fill this out, it will collect the information out of the various fields, autopopulate into the common certificate format, and you can print that out right at your desk. Okay.

And really, as I summarize, what we're trying to do, folks, is develop, as I said, an electronic system that is the window to the NOP world, for regulators, for traders, for ACAs. Okay. And we believe that within relatively a short period of time, with -- hopefully within the next six or eight months, we will have this system live and operational, with the functionality that I just described. Okay.

Now, software development within the federal government is always a long and kind of laborious process and it has taken on -- I want to share with you that it's taken on a different kind of flavor now that we have an emphasis on Homeland Security, because we have to integrate with so many systems now, so you just need to be aware of

that.

But I hope what you can do, in walking away from this presentation today, is really two things: one, recognizing that we are -- and I know you guys don't believe this -- we are trying to make your life easier, okay, and we're trying to make it more efficient, the process more succinct, and the results more consistent.

And think, if you would, what this means for us in terms of enforcement, where we can look in a database that has non-compliances that's being inputted on a realtime basis, think what that does to us for our enforcement capabilities. We can begin to identify trim lines -- I go back to the 205.406 example. Let's say that over time we're seeing an enormous amount of non-compliances on this section. Well, that gives us some tips, either, one, nobody understands the section; two, it's poorly written, I mean there's reasons that nobody understands it; three, we haven't done an effective enough job in training on that particular section; or, four, maybe it's just not working on the ground, I mean maybe it's just -- there's just a disconnect with what's going on on the ground and the regulation, okay.

But can you see how having that data will help us make better management decisions and better enforcement compliances, and that's really where we want to be, is that

we want to operate, folks, not on supposition, we want to 1 operate on data. 2 3 And with that, I conclude my presentation. Katherine, I don't know if I've got another slide in there 4 5 or not. Yeah, just my contact information. 6 I'm happy to take questions, walk you through 7 anything you don't understand. Thank you very much. 8 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: A question. 9 MR. JONES: Yeah. 10 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Okay. Before that 11 one where the non-compliance letter goes out --? MR. JONES: Uh-huh. 12 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: -- directly, if it's 13 14 a non-compliance letter that somebody's supposed to get 15 information in within 30 days, if somebody in real-time, 16 you know, sees this person is noncompliant but the real --17 or certification process really isn't completed, it kind of 18 almost puts like a black mark on this person. I'm not sure 19 exactly what non-compliances you're talking about, minor ones as well as major --20 21 MR. JONES: Well, you have to report non-22 compliances, okay --23 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: And this is only 24 major ones that --25 MR. JONES: Yeah. R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: -- (inaudible)
suspension or (inaudible)?

MR. JONES: Yeah, ones that haven't been resolved, ones that you've tried resolving, hasn't been resolved. Now, keep in mind, folks, this is ACA data only. The world's not going to see this. That particular -- that particular screen -- that's why I said it's password-protected.

Now, what I didn't show you is that -- if we go back to -- if we go back to the trade side, what you will do on the trade side -- and this is not at all what it's going to look like, but you will just go in and say, "I'm looking for corn," and that would be a publicly-accessible data site [phonetic], okay (inaudible).

The ACA information that I've just described to you in the other screen, the only way that you get to that is through a password, which you will have, so the public's not going to see that. That's going to be ACA data, that's going to be USDA data.

I've got a lots of questions (inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: I've got a question.

How would someone know if the client is currently

certified, would it be that it creates a modified date? I

mean, this is a continuation, they're certified in October

2003, then they get recertified again in November 2004. As

an inspector, I have seen numerous times where someone has been waiting six, eight months past when their annual inspection date is supposed to be, and still selling current product, switching certifiers. This also doesn't, you know, have anything to do with that either. There's -- the problem now with certificates is not really what's currently certified.

MR. JONES: Okay. Folks, certificates are good until suspended or revoked, okay? That's the way the regulation reads. They are good until suspended or revoked.

Now, the way you're going to keep track will be with the certification date, okay? This will change over time. The screen will also have a modification date, and every time you go and make a change to this screen, the database records the date that it is modified, okay? So we'll know, we'll know, we'll know every time an ACA makes a change (inaudible).

MS. SONNABEND: Is that modified date on the certificate that's automatically printing out?

MR. JONES: No. It'd be the certificate date.

MS. SONNABEND: Only that. So we wouldn't know if it's current, if they had had their annual inspection --

MR. JONES: A certificate is good until suspended or revoked, okay?

1 MS. SONNABEND: Are you going to be able to 2 accept imported data from (inaudible)?

MR. JONES: Yes. Great question, I'm glad somebody asked me. I'm ready for it. Okay.

The question is: are we going to be able to accept imported data? -- and the answer is yes. That was one of the first questions I asked the contractor, is: are we going to make certifying agents go back and recreate their lists? No. Okay.

And let me tell you what we're doing on that.

You submitted to us 2003 data. You were required to do so.

We have that. We've got it in lots of different formats.

Okay, so what we're doing is we're going back and we are
the program is taking that information that you sent to

us and putting it into a Microsoft Access database.

In the not-too-distant future, probably sometime this summer, you will be receiving a letter from the program, that says: you will submit all data to us related to 205.400, .404, in this format, which will be a Microsoft Access database format, it will have the fields laid out, how we want the fields, because what we're going to do then is just take and capture that data when you send it to us and import it into the system.

So what you're going to be doing, Zea, is essentially you're going to be using this screen to update

at the margins, okay?

MS. SONNABEND: If you're going to already take our list and give us our list back --

MR. JONES: Yeah. We're going to take the 2003 data that you've sent us, okay, and, like I said, this summer we're going to send you -- it'll be an Access file, we'll actually send you the file, and say -- and say to you: we want the data imported into this system, okay, so you will -- if everything works the way I hope it does, we will already have 2003 data in place, you will then send us the difference at the margins between the 2003 data and the 2004 data. Everybody understand what I'm saying? The marginal difference between the baseline database and then the database that exists at the end of calendar year 2004.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: I see a field up here that says "Notes," but I don't see a field that's specifically designated for the crops or the products that are being certified.

MR. JONES: Excellent question. Excellent question. The next build that we will do is these will have drop-down boxes, okay? The reason that build number one didn't have drop-down boxes is that we -- I confess to you, folks on the crops and livestock side, it's pretty easy to come up with the nomenclature for certain products, okay, you can use census data nomenclature and things like

that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The difficulty, and the reason -- (inaudible), that's an excellent question. The reason we -- at the time that we made build one, it just didn't have any drop-down boxes, is that that actually forms the basis of the searchable database. So whatever you use as a search screen -- or a word here, okay, impacts how you'll be able to search, and it's particularly -- one of the things that we're still wrestling with, and I will tell you that both our software developers and myself don't have good answers for, is what we do on processed products [phonetic], because we've got accredited certifying agents that are certifying clients that have got 3,000 SKUs for processed products, 3,000 SKUs for processed product, okay, and I don't -- neither the software developer nor I have been able to come up with what would be the appropriate dropdown box there for somebody that might have 3,000 (inaudible), okay.

So there's a data question there that we're still wrestling with. I think we've got -- we've got the crops, livestock, and wild crops nailed, because I think we (inaudible), okay, but the process -- nobody's -- nobody's ever really tried to track products at this kind of level [phonetic], so (inaudible). (Inaudible)?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: You said that the USDA

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

and the federal certifiers [phonetic] will be the only people that have access (inaudible) because of your relationship (inaudible), if the National Security Agency or IRS comes to you and says, "I'm investigating Marty Mesh" (inaudible), you'll have to make that data available?

MR. JONES: Sure. I mean, this data -- when I say this is between the USDA and the ACAs, obviously any other federal agency would have access to it too, so that if there was a criminal investigation or something like that, we would share that. My point, then, is that this screen, these screens, are not available to the general public.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: How much did you pay for the software?

MR. JONES: Well, the first bill was 25,000.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: (Inaudible)?

MR. JONES: I actually don't know. Folks, now -I mean, keep in mind, folks, software is a (inaudible),
it's based on functionality, okay, and -- and one of the
things too is that we were able to build it as cheap as we
were, as they were, build it, is because we took a lot of
the source code -- (inaudible) you can understand this -we took a lot of the source code that existed for a program
that AMS Fruit & Vegetable had and modified the existing
source codes. So the fact that we only spent 25,000 on

this first bill is solely related to the fact that we're using multiple -- or we're using a common source code for multiple functionality, and so we're trying to build it as cheap as possible.

But when you look at software, each additional function has a cost, and some (inaudible) as you go up in functionality, you know, and of course I'd love to have all the bells and whistles you can possibly put on it, with software development, the marginal cost actually increases with functionality. In other words, I can build the first module for 25,000; the next module, because I want to add additional functionality, it may take me \$45,000 to build the next module -- and that's just hypothetical, I mean that's not -- I don't know what we're going to spend, but what I want you to understand is that as you build functionality, costs increase.

So we're still figuring out what's the best bang for the buck so that we don't go overboard in functionality but that we deliver the kind of services that you -- that you expect and need.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: (Inaudible) things we've discussed in other contexts, been discussed here at the Board, is that when a certifier -- when a certifier permits a client to use a non-organic ingredient because an organic ingredient is apparently not commercially

available, or if a certifier lets a grower use a nonorganic seed because that equivalent variety is apparently
not commercially available, we've been talking about the
benefit of having this data come in, and a certifier
records this, "on such and such a day I allowed a grower to
use X-Y-Z seed because organic was not commercially
available," same thing with an ingredient. Is this the
kind of thing that you envision coming into this system?
It seems to me this would be an excellent conduit to
(inaudible).

MR. JONES: It actually is, Dick, and I'm glad you brought that point up, because we actually think that over time, if the ACAs are doing their job and are updating this on a real-time basis, then you can go onto the public side, and let's say you want to see if, I don't know, a spice is available, or an ingredient, or something like that; if the ACAs are doing their job on a real-time basis, you ought to be able to find whether or not that particular ingredient is indeed available, you know, NOP (inaudible), okay.

So the seed side, Dick, is a little bit more difficult, because I think when we have -- and I'm not saying we wouldn't do this, but I think we might have to build another screen in for commercial availability issue related to seed, but on the ingredient side, maybe not,

because the ACAs would actually -- if it's a seed producer,
they could put that information in, and so if I was looking
for a variety of a seed -- I'm thinking off the top of my
head here -- I'll think about it, but it's a good point.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: And what you said was
that if the ACAs are keeping track of all the things
they've certified --

MR. JONES: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: -- then there would be a list of what's available --

MR. JONES: That's my bottom-line point, is that if the ACAs are doing their part and updating this on a timely basis, then this database that outflows from this data collection should be the most accurate information available about the universe of NOP-certified products anytime, in the world.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: What about if a supplier thinks that people are using a non-organic version — an inorganic ingredient, then what's to know who is allowing the non-organic version to be used, or is it being allowed (inaudible)?

MR. JONES: That's a level of complexity -- I'd have to think about that. I mean, that gets in -- as you can see, you can sit for the next 20 minutes and think out all kinds of functionality you'd like to see in this thing,

and, okay, I can, you know, do this and I can make this 1 2 data go this way and things like that, because functionality and -- sometimes the cost of functionality 3 increases, we're going to have to decide how best to handle 4 some of those issues, but your point's well-taken. We've 5 6 identified the system as a way to get to some of those 7 issues. 8 Let me get to Leslie, she's had her hand up for 9 hours [phonetic]. 10 MS. ZUCK: Thank you. You (inaudible) 11 categories, and a lot of us have our (inaudible) PRS [phonetic] categories, is that what you were talking about, 12 PRS, is that organic (inaudible)? 13 14 MR. JONES: Yeah, Kathy and I have actually --15 Kathy and I talked about this. To put everybody's mind at 16 rest: I actually do talk to a lot of people within the 17 government. 18 (Laughter.) 19 MR. JONES: And Kathy and I have consulted closely on this --20 21 MS. ZUCK: (Inaudible.) 22 MR. JONES: Yeah. And one of the things that --23 in fact, Kathy and I had a meeting just the other day, and 24 let me tell you what the problem is, Leslie, in terms --25 MS. ZUCK: Because you're dropping a drop-down R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

box. A drop-down box, you can only (inaudible) --1 2 MR. JONES: That's right. And if those categories are too broad -- I mean, Kathy and I have talked 3 about this: if the categories are too broad, then Kathy 4 doesn't get the stratification that she needs to sort 5 6 out --7 MS. ZUCK: (Inaudible.) 8 MR. JONES: -- and I don't think a trader would 9 either. 10 MS. ZUCK: (Inaudible.) 11 MR. JONES: Okay. I mean, a trader needs very precise stratification, okay, and that's -- that's the big 12 dilemma with process side, is: what is this -- what is 13 14 this dividing line between the right amount of 15 stratification -- you know, giving enough data to traders 16 where they can make a trade decision based on a product (inaudible) see if it's really available -- as opposed to 17 18 just having, you know, a list of products a mile long and 19 somebody's got to scroll through (inaudible). 20 MS. ZUCK: Well, my most important question is --21 (Laughter.) 22 MS. ZUCK: Has it come up at all that -- where --23 I -- the Rule doesn't require us to report individual 24 process (inaudible), it requires us to report whether we 25 certify (inaudible), products, but I guess handling, I'd R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

like (inaudible) --1 2 MR. JONES: Here's what we think's going to happen on that. I mean, if we --3 4 MS. ZUCK: I mean, I'll do it, I just --MR. JONES: Well, and here's what we -- here's 5 6 what we think's going to happen. I personally believe: 7 why (inaudible). 8 MS. ZUCK: Well, some people might not, and 9 that's what I'm saying. 10 MR. JONES: Okay. 11 MS. ZUCK: And you're saying it's a required field, we have to fill it out, but it's an ACA -- and some 12 13 ACAs are saying, "I don't want to fill this out." 14 MR. JONES: But here's what we're going to do, 15 We want this system to work, and if we need to make 16 a reg -- we don't want to have a heavy-handed approach to 17 this, but if we need to make a reg change to get the 18 quality of data that we believe is needed, we would look at 19 that, okay. 20 MS. ZUCK: (Inaudible) not required. 21 MR. JONES: No, it's a fair -- it's a fair 22 (inaudible). 23 UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: This is less of a 24 question, more of a request or a comment, from a certifying 25 agent's perspective, where I think we can -- as certifying R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

agents, we all have our own current data systems, and what you're trying to do is standardize the way we, as certifying agents, track document data (inaudible) certify, which I think is a great role [phonetic], but (inaudible) common nomenclature and what fields are being defined.

That's really important for us in terms of being able to easily import our data from our existing systems into yours. So I request that as you guys, working with your software developer, pin down, "these are the fields we know we are going to request of you guys, and this is the nomenclature we are going to want you to use," let us know so we can kind of develop our system to --

MR. JONES: I have got -- if it would be useful, I have actually got -- it would have to go out as draft, because it's still a discussion document between myself and the software developer, but I could give you a draft of what we believe the database fields will look like at the current time, and that would be useful. If I could get that to you -- it'll be the middle of May by the time I get back to the office, but I can get that to you, if that'd be (inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: What would be most useful is once you've made a decision: this is what it's going to be, so that then we've (inaudible).

MR. JONES: Well, I can tell -- I mean, when I
R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

send that draft out, I can tell you that that is the result of the best professional judgment of both myself and the software developer on (inaudible). Now, we have not gone back to the software developer and said, "Okay, build this into the system," we haven't made that decision yet.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: You're selling this program very much to us as a service-oriented approach for traders and not only to identify certified products but also availability, which is another feature in the program, and what I not hear about [phonetic]: will that be mandatory, for ACAs to use that program? -- because what you said, this is a service offered for you to work with and lend the service of (inaudible), but on the other hand, I understand that the Custom authorities will have the possibility to check, you want to get the data out of it, you want to check. So will it be mandatory, then, at the end?

MR. JONES: Well, this system is what we will be requiring ACAs to use. This will be (inaudible) --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: (Inaudible.)

MR. JONES: Yeah. I mean, if you're a USDA -- if you're a USDA-accredited certifier -- and the reason for that is exactly the issue that was brought up, okay. We are required -- I mean -- and let me -- let me tell you what we went through -- I know you guys have got your hand

up, and I'll get to you in just a second.

We went through a very sophisticated process, kind of wrestling with the service side of what we were going to do, and as I sat down with the -- with the software developer, it became very apparent that we could never write software programs to input un-data [phonetic] for uncommon systems [phonetic], that what we had to do is to build a system, essentially build it around a Microsoft Access database -- and assuming everybody's used Microsoft Access -- build it around a Microsoft Access database and then say: this is indeed the system, okay, this is what we're [phonetic] going to have to use.

Now, we believe that there's so many benefits around it, in terms of real-time data submission, trade availability, not only for that but also just for our ability to track -- track compliance issues related to it, that at the end of the day, everybody is going to be using the system without a lot of grumbling and complaining and that kind of thing.

I mean, I have -- I have not demonstrated -those of you who might have been in the (inaudible) in
February, I actually demonstrated the program to folks
there. I haven't been in a setting where people didn't
walk away saying, you know, "this thing's really slick,"
"this is really going to make our life easier," okay, "you

guys are doing good work, " you know. 1 So I hope that that's the sentiment that we 2 continue to find, because, like I said, the presentation 3 that I made before, that was (inaudible). Merrill? 4 MS. CLARK: (Inaudible) and certifiers 5 6 (inaudible). Are producers going to be (inaudible)? 7 MR. JONES: Producers won't even need to get into 8 this system. 9 MS. CLARK: They don't need to get in. 10 MR. JONES: They don't even need to get in it. 11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: I don't know why they 12 would even want to get in it. MS. CLARK: (Inaudible) for certifiers' 13 14 information (inaudible) --15 MR. JONES: Well, but keep in mind, Merrill, this 16 is going to -- this is going to be used -- this is going to be used for enforcement functions, okay? In other words, 17 18 we couldn't let certifiers have access to the system 19 because they could go in and click and -- you know, a certifier could write up a non-compliance, a producer could 20 21 go in and click and say: no, non-compliance doesn't exist, 22 you know. 23 (Laughter.) 24 MR. JONES: Okay? I mean, that's not going to 25 work. Okay. So I cannot envision any scenario where you R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

would want a producer in the system. 1 2 UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: (Inaudible.) 3 MR. JONES: Maybe. CHAIRMAN KING: Well, Keith, and what about if a 4 5 producer is trying to select a certifier? 6 MR. JONES: Can I --7 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Keith, I -- and maybe 8 you haven't thought about this, but we have a number of 9 producers who would not want their -- they wouldn't mind 10 their name and address being listed in the (inaudible), but 11 they're growing crops under contract, they're doing all 12 direct marketing, they don't want to have their crop mix and stuff like that go into a trade source --13 MR. JONES: Public release of that information 14 15 will be optional. As an ACA, you will need to require, 16 okay, or you will need to ascertain from your clients: do they want their name, address, and phone number showing up 17 18 (inaudible). If they don't, that's their choice, okay, 19 because they've made it. They may say, "My trade" (inaudible) "are just fine, I'm happy" (inaudible), and so 20 21 (inaudible). So that would be your interface with the ACA. 22 Marty. 23 MR. MESH: The -- multiple users can log on. 24 Will there be a record -- (inaudible) logged on (inaudible) 25 the data on our system, who that was? I'm concerned R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

```
1
    that --
 2
              MR. JONES: So you would want to track it at the
    staff level?
 3
              MR. MESH: Well, I'm asking if that's an option
 4
 5
    (inaudible) --
 6
              MR. JONES: Yeah, we can --
 7
              MR. MESH: (Inaudible) our staff entered in --
 8
              MR. JONES: Yeah, we could build -- we could
    build a build -- I mean, if that -- if you thought that was
 9
10
    useful, that wouldn't [phonetic] be hard to do, is to build
11
    a field for staffing issues as we modify the data set
12
    [phonetic], okay, and that might be useful -- I don't know
13
    that that's useful for us, because the only thing that we
14
    want to know is: you came into the system on April 29th,
15
    2004, and you modified it. Okay. Now, at your management
16
    level --
17
              MR. MESH: We want to know who wrote that
18
    (inaudible).
19
              MR. JONES: -- you might want to know who
    (inaudible).
20
21
              MR. MESH: And then my other follow-up question
22
    -- boy, is this slick.
23
    (Laughter.)
24
              MR. MESH: -- is: on the drop-down field for
25
    certification, you said you can choose one, but many times
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

```
(inaudible) crops, livestock (inaudible), handling all on
 1
 2
    the same operation?
 3
              MR. JONES: You can choose multiple [phonetic],
    the way that's going to work. In other words, if they're
 4
 5
    both producers and processors, yeah (inaudible). We've
    actually thought about some of this stuff.
 6
 7
              MR. MESH: Boy, are you good in making our life
 8
    easy.
 9
    (Laughter.)
10
              MR. MESH: If we could only [phonetic] read this
11
    and some of your directives (inaudible).
12
    (Laughter.)
13
              MR. MESH: We could even keep it organic.
14
    (Laughter.)
15
              MR. JONES: Okay, I know we probably need to wrap
16
    up, so --
17
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Thanks, Marty.
18
              MR. JONES: -- Mark, you had a question?
19
              CHAIRMAN KING: No, I was just going to follow
20
    up, I was saying if a producer was going to actually choose
21
    a certifier -- I understand why they wouldn't have total
22
    access to the system, but could they go in and find out:
23
    oh, by the way, there are now 72 accredited certifiers in
24
    North America -- I'm just using an arbitrary number -- and
25
    then, you know, similar to what you were talking about in
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

terms of close proximity geographically in terms of
sourcing something, could they look at that? I mean --

MR. JONES: Yeah, I suppose. I mean, once we -it's a database question, Mark, but we could create a list
of accredited certifying agents and do a ZIP code distance
comparison, at least with domestic producers. So I could
put in my ZIP code, 20121, and come up with a list of
certifying agents 150 miles from my location, okay. We -that's doable, you know, and I -- if people have got ideas,
I'm -- I want to hear ideas, if you've got ideas that.

Again, I also want to make sure people understand that, you know, software development is not inexpensive, we did this very cheaply, very cost-effective, but the reason we did it is because we're sharing source code. When you have to go out and write new source code, it becomes fairly expensive, okay?

But I don't want to lose good ideas, that's why
I'm making this presentation this morning, is that if you
guys have got ideas, I want to be able to record those and
then kind of sift through those, as to what might make
sense in terms of the next build.

Okay, folks, I appreciate it. I'll be around later on, if you've got other questions, I'm happy to sit down and talk to you. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KING: Thank you, Keith. Thank you very
R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

much. In light of the fact we're a little bit behind 1 schedule, I think what we'll do in order to give sufficient 2 time for the compost tea task force report, we'll move that 3 till after lunch, we'll go ahead and recess for lunch, 4 5 starting promptly at 1:30, so please be back here 6 accordingly. 7 (Off the record at 11:45 a.m. and reconvened at 1:11 p.m.) 8 CHAIRMAN KING: I'd like to officially reconvene 9 the meeting of the National Organic Standards Board. 10 We'll deal with the morning agenda item of 11 presentation of the compost tea task force. Rose Koenig 12 will have it up on the screen, and we'll discuss that. 13 And if you'll note in your agenda, there is not a 14 specific order in terms of the committee recommendations 15 noted, so I'd just like to read into the record: 16 We'll be taking the following committee order this afternoon, for those of you who are interested: 17 18 We'll begin with the materials committee, which 19 will just include discussions of the reports there. 20 Then Andrea's committee, accreditation and 21 compliance will follow. 22 Then we'll go into crops committee, handling 23 committee, followed by the livestock committee, and then 24 we'll finish up with the policy development committee. 25 that's sort of --

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: 606 Task Force, where 2 would that fit? (Inaudible)?

CHAIRMAN KING: Yeah. It was policy, handling, compost. So the 606 Task Force report will be presented under the policy development committee.

Rose, it's your baby.

MS. KOENIG: Okay. This time I don't have to do 40 slides in five minutes, so I get to shine. Actually, I'm going to -- why I'm standing up here --

The task force went through many changes of authority over time. Eric Sideman, who was a past NOSB member, co-chaired the committee with Dennis Holbrook, and myself and Owusu were the individuals that -- from the Board that were actually on the committee, Owusu taking -- Dennis Holbrook being the other co-chair, and then Owusu being the crops chair, both kind of played major roles; and then Dennis resigned from the Board, so I became, at the last moment, able to get some credit, becoming new chair. I guess that's the best chair you want to be, is at the last moment, after all the work is done, you get to gain a new title (chuckles). So now I'm co-chair.

And then Owusu was supposed to do this first half of the presentation today, and he could not make the meeting, so I've asked Zea to kind of be my sidekick, because she was a member of the compost tea task force, and

I've indicated to her that, you know, if there -- comes to a point, especially in the sections that Owusu was going to cover, if she can help me, if there's any questions or things that I'm missing, she may come up to the podium and kind of add some additional information, so just to get you understanding kind of the process and why we're doing it in that order.

So, Ann, the -- it's actually tea 2, t-e-a 2. I can kind of go into the general information too, as we're getting started. You can go to the next slide. Okay.

Now, the Board all has a copy of the documentation, and I'm going to summarize kind of that documentation, but I do encourage everyone to actually go through and read the finer details, because a lot of the literature that's cited -- I mean, I'm going to talk about some of the implications of the literature, but I'm not going to go into them, but the citations are there.

And then for those who are even extremely more interested in the subject, you could actually -- there's a bibliography and you could actually get some of the publications.

And additionally, to those in the audience: the complete copy of the report came onto the website a little bit late, but it is there, so you can access that.

So one of the first questions: why did -- you R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

know, why do we have a compost tea task force? Well, one of the things that was recognized, that there was -there's a wide usage of compost tea by organic growers but there is a lack of uniformity in the regulation of compost tea by certifying agents and the Board felt there was a need to clarify regulations regarding the use of compost tea, and if we all remember -- next slide, sorry, Ann -when the original compost tea task force looked at a number of issues involved around compost, including making recommendations of alternative methodologies for making compost, almost vermicomposting, and there was a section on compost tea that could not really be resolved, so the compost tea task force was initiated to really do further investigation of compost tea, and that's why the task force was -- was extended: to really look more specifically at the implications of compost tea.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So there was a need to investigate scientific data regarding human pathogen issues, and many certifiers and organic farmers expressed concern about the restrictive natures of the NOP's ruling of treating compost tea as a raw manure.

So in other words, you know, practitioners out there utilize compost tea for a multiple of uses, including nutrients, plant pathological properties, pest control, and they felt that following the 90-120-day restriction on raw

manure would really not produce -- you know, not enable them to use compost tea for the properties that they're using it for. So next slide.

Some of the compost tea task force members -well, Eric Sideman, again, was the chair. He was the next
NOSB member. Dennis Holbrook was the co-chair, but he has
resigned. Owusu Bandele is an NOSB member. Will Brinton
from the Woodin [phonetic] Research Lab; Esper Chandler,
Texas Plant & Soil Lab; Steve Diver was a representative at
ATRA and he has expertise in compost tea; Clive Edwards was
from the Ohio State University. Next slide.

Elaine Ingham, Soft Food Web [phonetic],
Incorporated. Myself, member of the National Organic
Standards Board. Fred Magdoff, University of Vermont. Pat
Milner, USDA, the ARS division. Steve Scheuerell is from
Oregon State University. Zea Sonnabend represents CCOF,
California Certified Organic Farmers. And Larry Zibilisk,
I don't know -- I'm not sure what his -- USDA, ARS. Next.

And we just want to have special recognition to Eric for chairing, and also Dennis, the compost tea task force, in keeping the committee on target, Eric really did a great job; and Steve Scheuerell for the massive amount of work, he really took the lion's share of work to prepare the document and do all the editings of the drafts and completing the final document. Next.

So the areas of expertise that the task force covered was organic farming practices and certification, some of the members had expertise in compost, some had expertise in compost tea production and analysis, some had plant pathology backgrounds, horticultural and soil science, some of our members had EPA pathogen regulation expertise, food safety, and environmental microbiology.

So basically we felt that, you know, one of the great things about the task force was the diversity and the -- really, the high levels of expertise that the task force members had, and one of the challenges, I think, was the fact that we had people with such, you know, expertise and really were committed, because there definitely were different viewpoints, especially when it came to the human pathogen aspects of the studies, and some of our recommendations you'll see at the end reflected kind of a -- I think -- a learning process and a collaborative effort to try to take diverse views and really fuse them into a regulation that we all could agree with.

And I think it's noted on a further slide that

Owusu (inaudible) but I can let you know that 11 of the 12

members supported the compost tea task force report as you

see it. There was one member who did not vote in favor of

the task force report. That member agreed with the

recommendations but did not agree with some of the

scientific data and scientific analysis that was expressed in the report, and that individual has been encouraged to do public comment to the Board on that minority opinion, so you will be likely seeing that.

The member requested that I kind of forward that information to the NOP prior to the meeting, but I just did not feel it was my role to do that. So because we're not voting on this report at this meeting, I will encourage that member to put it in a format that they're comfortable with and take more time to kind of detail that information, but we look forward to seeing that minority opinion.

MR. RIDDLE: Did that person vote against or abstain or do you have --

MS. KOENIG: It was against --

MR. RIDDLE: Against, okay.

MS. KOENIG: -- the report as it stood.

MR. RIDDLE: Okay. Thanks.

MS. KOENIG: Okay. So if you go through the report, there are some definitions, to give you a frame of reference in terms of the information that's in the report, and I'm just going to highlight some of those definitions today. Well, actually, Owusu was going to highlight those. These are the ones he picked out, that he thought was important for you to develop a framework for this presentation.

The reason why I included that definition was

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

So "composing" is: A managed process in which organic materials, including animal manure and other residues -- I guess -- are decomposed aerobically by microbial action.

"Thermophyllic composting" refers to: A timelimited self-heating process in which heat generated by microbial respiration is retained in the mass of a pile or (inaudible) such that vulnerable pathogenic microorganisms are destroyed. Next.

And we just wanted to acknowledge that "compost" is defined by the NOSB task force, and this was presented in the 2002 Task Force Report that was submitted to the NOSB from the original compost task force, of which some of the members overlapped to this compost tea task force.

They define "compost" -- in addition to that described in Section 205.203(c), so we're not saying it replaced it, but it was a broadening recommendation of the definition of "compost" -- as "Acceptable if it's made only from allowed feedstock materials, except for incidental residues that will not lead to contamination; 2) the compost undergoes an increase in temperature, to at least 131 degrees Fahrenheit, and remains there for a minimum of three days; and 3) the compost pile is managed to ensure that all feedstocks heats to the minimum temperature."

that the report -- in other words, when it speaks of compost, it -- the recommendations are not only based on the "compost" definition that's in the Rule but also on the compost task force recommendation for the broadened definition of "compost."

So here in the report, and as I'm doing the presentation, again, we're considering a broad definition of "compost."

Okay. "Compost extract" is: Any mixture of compost and water, additives, and adjuvants that is not held for more than one hour before use. Compost extracts lack sufficient holding time for microorganisms to multiply and grow significantly."

So in other words, if you, you know, take a handful of compost, throw it in a bucket of water, mix it up, and spray it before -- in that holding time period, less than an hour -- no more than one hour before use, it's defined as "compost extract."

"Compost leachate" is: Liquid that has leached through a compost pile and collects on the ground, compost pad, or collective" [phonetic] "dishes, puddles, and ponds." It doesn't sound like a very good thing. Okay, next.

"Composting additives" are: "Materials separate from compost and water, that are added in the process of

making compost tea, that are presumed to sustain and enrich microbial growth. These are distinct from spray adjuvants, that are tank-mixed immediately prior to application of compost tea.

Examples include, but are not limited to, the following: molasses (inaudible) extract, fish-based products, kelp, and green plant tissue. Next.

And then a "manure extract" is: Water suspension containing raw, non-disinfected manure when the suspension is maintained for several hours or more, is sometimes referred to as "manure tea."

So in other words, when we talked about the compost extract: the manure is grabbed, thrown in a jug of water, and basically made into a soluble form. Next.

A "pathogen" is: A microorganism capable of causing disease or injury, used to refer to plant or human pathogens. Next.

And then "spray adjuvants" are: Any material added to compost tea immediately prior to application of compost tea. These may include materials that are designed for wetting and sticking agents, plant nutrients, and those materials that sustain and enrich microbial growth but, because of short time frame between addition and application, there is a very low probability of multiplying undesirable microorganisms in the spray tank. Next.

б

And then "vermicomposting," as it's defined and used in the document, is: A process of worms digesting organic matter to transform the material into a beneficial soil amendment. And basically, if you look in the compost task force report, again, there are different time intervals, which I'm not going to read off the slide, and temperature and methodologies that must be met to meet the vermicomposting standard. Next.

So, you know, the environment that we were working in, in terms of the task force, was that compost tea practitioners have developed a wide array of compost tea production practices for both -- the majority for plant disease and/or fertility management.

However, there are relatively few peer-reviewed studies that exist for compost tea production and use, and this is where the compost tea task force had to, you know, deal with looking at what literature there was available and also what experiments that had been conducted but hadn't yet been written up in peer-reviewed publications, to again come together with that information, to present a recommendation that would satisfy the requirements of our task. Next.

The original, again, compost tea task force recommended that compost tea be allowed but no sweeteners, which means molasses, and those other additives, were to be

added.

The National Organic Program ruled that compost tea should be treated as raw manure regarding the 90- to 120-day waiting period, and I explained that earlier.

And then a number of organic farmers and certifiers believe that this interpretation was too restrictive in terms of how practitioners were using it and their real reliance and perceived need of this material in their organic farming system. Next.

So we approved the establishment of this task force at the November 2002 meeting. Our -- the membership of that task force was determined by the original -- you know, Eric and the chairs at that time and was set on May 1st, 2003. The initial conference call was held on May 9th of 2003, and -- actually, Owusu made a mistake in this -- the final draft was approved on April 6, 2004, with 11 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 unavailable, and I explained that issue just prior. Next.

In our report, the compost tea task force attempted to distinguish between the practitioner-based knowledge -- in other words the practice and what farmers are seeing, usually anecdotal information -- versus scientific knowledges, that is supported by controlled replicated experiments.

And, again, because like many, I guess, inputs
R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

and aspects of organic farming systems, a lot -- there hasn't been a whole lot of funding given to land grant institutions to this type of research, so we want as a group to acknowledge kind of the practitioners, the observations and, you know, kind of hands-on science that farmers are doing, but also we needed to balance that with whatever scientific data that we could obtain.

A major concern of the compost tea task force -and if you look at the -- you know, read the whole document
-- was the potential for human pathogen contamination of
edible plants, as regulated by the Final Rule, Section
205.203, and this really was the impetus and the reasoning
of why there had to be, you know, concern about this
product. You know, if there wasn't a human pathogen issue,
I wouldn't be standing here doing this presentation today,
it would have been something that the Board could have
probably wrestled with more -- a year ago.

So, basically, a lot of the discussion and the presentation of the research focused on the human pathogen component or issue involved in compost and compost teas.

Next.

So I want to go a little bit through the methods of production, just in case people are not familiar with it, but basically, methods do vary, because there's farmers who are making their own setups on their farm, and -- and

then there's -- companies are actually selling units [phonetic], so the technology is very diverse.

But water is the primary component, and the compost that's used is the next largest component. Compost tea can differ regarding that water/compost ratio. It also can differ based on whether somebody's putting in supplemental nutrients, or, like I said, molasses or those — those additives, and also the level of dissolved oxygen, whether — to what degree it's aerated, if it's aerated at all, those types of issues.

And there are -- again, commercial and homemade brewers are used, so, again, there's a great variability of the methodologies, the inputs that are used into the tea, and the recommendation needs to kind of encompass all that variability. Next.

Typically the ratio is 1 part compost to 10 to 50 parts water. A porous container is used, aeration is achieved via a direct air injection or recirculation of water for 2 to -- 12 to 24 hours, and often compost tea additives are used to enhance the microbial proliferation, and typical additives include molasses, yeast extract, and algael powders. Next.

There are also passive aerated systems, which usually are 1 part compost/3 to 10 parts of water, they're done in open containers, from 1 to 3 weeks, and they can be

done with or without stirring, and compost additives are used infrequently in these types of systems. Next.

Again, the purpose of these compost tea additives is they encourage microbial growth, which means -- you know, most -- especially if you're using it for pest management or fungal control or microbial control on a plant, you're trying to encourage the beneficials, but it also -- it's non-selective, that kind of growth, so if you do have any kind of human pathogen contamination in your tea, they can also grow, because you have now these compost tea additives.

So basically -- there has, however -- and that was an important point that some of the members wanted to bring out: that although, theoretically, you could possibly support human pathogens if present in small numbers -- because these -- again, the additives increase that growth -- we know of no documented cases of foodborne illnesses from the use of compost tea.

However, the studies -- you know, theoretical studies done in the laboratory, you can -- we saw mixed results, some of them which did not necessarily show microbial growth, but there were studies that did show microbial growth.

So the data -- the data showed -- you know, different researchers, depending on different

methodologies, showed different results, but, again, some members felt that it was really important to bring out that no documented causes [sic.] of foodborne illnesses have been recorded, to our knowledge, from compost tea use.

Next.

How is it, basically, used on the farm. Well, it can be foliar-sprayed or applied through an irrigation system, you know, it would be an overhead irrigation system, or a sprayer. You can have -- it's used sometime as a stubble digester or a green manure inoculant. In other words, it's applied to crop residue or cover crops, usually after mowing and before incorporation into the soil. Next.

It can also be applied through irrigation systems or sprayers on -- directly to the soil. It can be applied through a drip-irrigation system, you know, because it's water -- you know, basically it's a water-soluble product.

And you can use it with a soil-less media, it's used to moisten media before planting or as a post-plant drench. Next.

You can -- some growers use it to pre-soak seed or vegetative planting material before planting. And then some people apply it to suppress -- manure collection points -- to suppress the odor of compost piles,

additionally. Next.

Again, the plant growth responses to compost tea is largely anecdotal; in other words, it's: growers have been using it and they've reported yield increases by their sight, but there's been no replicated -- or few replicated studies to prove that it does in fact show plant growth.

But the postulated mechanisms is that you're providing nutrients and/or the microbes may be producing phytohormones, to help increase plant growth.

There's also postulated indirect mechanisms, including, you know: affecting the soil structure; or creating, you know, a microbial-beneficial population around the rise of sphere -- around that root, that can increase or, you know, provide more nutrients; and in terms of plant pathogens, they may be -- those same micro-organisms may be producing compounds that are deleterious to other microbes in the soil. Next.

And basically -- and, again, that's where the disease management reports come in, again, a lot of anecdotal reports citing less severe foliar diseases and root diseases using the products.

There have been some scientific studies showing both, again, significant and non-significant results regarding disease suppression, and the variability in compost tea composition has been cited, basically, for

these inconsistencies.

In other words, because you have so many different systems operating, you have different quality composts, you have different methodologies and additives going in, it's really hard to produce -- unless you're doing a lot of, lot of, studies -- replicated experiments that are going to give you consistent results. So next.

Again, there were microbial hazards that were considered by the task force, primarily centered around human pathogens. The compost tea task force recognized that this was an area where there was significant data gaps. But basically the task force considered the types of variables potentially associated with the deleterious microbial contamination from a human perspective.

In other words, we looked at kind of the whole environment of a cropping system and we tried to pinpoint areas of risk, and then we tried to gather data to suggest whether these in fact were -- were true. Next.

So the reasoning -- there's things about compost tea production that should be considered if you're considering human pathogen populations or you have concerns about human pathogens.

One of them is that in some of the compost teas, you may be using manure, and manure has a high potential of contamination.

So, again, if you're composting it according to the Rule, this should reduce it, but there still is an associated risk.

Another aspect, where there's not much data available, is compost stability, but the relationship between compost stability and human pathogen levels is really -- has not been determined, but the task force did want to acknowledge that the area of compost stability was a potential area of research. Next.

Other areas of concern was -- was water quality, and basically the task force acknowledged that you want to have clean water to start with.

Sanitation, you want to make sure you're clean, your machines, effectively, to reduce pathogen populations, but, you know, the machines and how you handle those in an operation are an avenue where you could have multiplications of microorganisms.

Vector access, you know, if these machines are set up on farms or areas where you have any kind of rodents, they could potentially contamination a batch of compost.

Brew time and temperature, depending on how long it's being brewed and the temperature levels that is reached could have effects on microbial populations. We acknowledge that compost tea additives -- and within the

report there are a lot of literature citings that I would want to call to your attention.

The only peer-reviewed article that the committee could find was that of Duffy, that was just recently published, and in that there were -- again, you know, I'm kind of doing this from the top of my head, but he looked at, I think, salmonella and different levels of molasses, and it indicated that at lower levels of molasses, there were no multiplications of salmonella, but as you increase the concentration of molasses you could get an increased concentration of salmonella.

A lot of the researchers, however, had opinions on this type of research, and I think they are -- some of the criticisms are valid, because this type of research is done under a laboratory setting, where you're putting a known amount of inoculant in an environment that is usually conducive to pathogen growth, and their argument was that these -- this may not be analogous to what happens in the field.

So just a caution that much of the experimentation that has been done thus far, that is either done, the one study, in a peer-reviewed journal is a laboratory-based analysis.

And then some of the research that was presented by, actually, members of the compost tea task force, where

they did similar studies with e-coli and replicated it in two different labs, it was the same phenomenon, where they incorporated a certain amount of pathogens to start with, added a molasses kind of solution, and then quantitatively looked at the growth of microbial populations.

The compost tea task force acknowledged that there are crop and environmental factors that could affect microorganisms, and some of that includes plant architecture, things like lettuce and apples, there's some evidence to suggest that those types of crops, because of their architecture and the shapes of leaves and the gaps that exist there, that those plants create an environment that may be conducive to the growth of these pathogens.

So we just want to acknowledge that there's certain crops that may have, you know, higher risk factors.

Additionally, there was some -- some thought about, you know, distinguishing between crops that are typically edible, or typically cooked, or typically eaten raw, as maybe ways that a regulation could be written, but there really was no consensus on how that could be formulated into a recommendation.

And, additionally, environmental factors, because we're -- we're trying to create recommendations that can be used throughout the -- you know, the country, you know, UV radiation from the sun, temperature factors, they can all

affect microbial growth, so there was just an acknowledgment that this is an area of -- of interest and where research needs to be done. Next.

Another factor: if there are actual pathogens present, the contaminant levels of compost teas, you know, if there already are some, they can certainly be a problem with human pathogen associations.

And I'm not sure, Zea, if you have anything else to -- to say about those areas, because as I'm standing here, I'm not necessarily recalling those subcategories, so if you have anything to --

MS. SONNABEND: No (inaudible).

MS. KOENIG: Okay. And then pathogen, again, pathogen survival, a lot has to do with, again, crop architecture, environment, and post-harvest intervals, and that was something that -- actually, pre-harvest interval, and what they were -- what we acknowledged in the report, that there -- perhaps as research was developed, there may be regulations that could be developed based on time from application to the time you harvest.

And then, additionally, there may be post-harvest treatments, such as disinfectants, that could be used to reduce microbial populations. Next.

The data gaps that the committee wanted to acknowledge, and there are lots of them, there really was

no information in the literature on cost benefit analysis, very little literature -- informational literature on the ecology of human pathogens, again, pre-harvest application intervals, compost stability, different feedstocks, phytotoxic reaction to compost teas, and dissolved oxygen content. So these were areas that the compost tea task force felt like they had to acknowledge that they felt that data really was needed in these areas, to develop a good recommendation. Next.

Okay, so now what we've all been waiting for, da-da-da, "the recommendations."

So the recommendations from the task force is that:

Potable water must be used to make compost tea and for any dilution before application. So in other words, a clean source of water to start with.

Equipment used to prepare compost teas must be sanitized before use with a sanitizing agent as defined by CFR 178.1010. Next.

Compost tea should be made with compliant compost or vermicompost, using the NOSB Compost Task Force Guidelines set forth on April 18th, 2002, for thermal compost and vermicompost or compost as defined in Section 205.203(c)(2).

For compost tea, this applies to -- even -- and R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

this is the distinction and the important point, I guess on this recommendation: for compost tea, this applies to 100-percent plant feedstock materials in addition to manure feedstock, which may harbor high levels of fecal bacteria because of non-manure compost.

In other words, if you remember the compost reg, the 90-120 days exists for compost that has manure incorporated into it, whereas plant-based compost, there's no waiting period.

But in our recommendation, there is evidence that even plant-based materials, starting materials, can harbor human pathogens. So it's a more restrictive, I guess, guideline for compost tea, compared to compost. Next.

Compost tea made without compost tea additives, so compliant, in other words compost tea can be applied without restrictions. Next.

Okay, this one's a little mouthful, and I think it's a little tricky, but: compost tea that's made with compost tea additives can be applied without restriction if the compost tea production system -- in other words, the same compost batch, the additives, and the equipment -- has been pre-tested to produce compost tea that meets the EPA-recommended recreational water quality guidelines for a bacterial indicator of fecal contamination, and this is based on the US EPA recommendations of 2000, and these

indicators and the passing criteria are --, and it gives you the two numbers for e-coli and enterococci. Next.

And then -- now, after you've done that pre-test, at least two compost tea batches must be tested, using the accepted methodology, with the average population of indicator bacteria, cross-compost tea batch is used as the measure of passing, and then each new batch of compost -- that means any -- so you test your compost twice, and you can use that compost in that aerator continually, but if you go to another compost pile, that would require that the system quality-assurance pre-test be conducted again, as indicated, and after it passes again, compost tea from the system can be used, with that restriction.

This, again, is a recommendation I think that was a compromise and eventually accepted, 11 of the 12 members of the task force, and the -- I guess the victory here is that there was -- you know, a compromise reached by all parties, saying that -- you know, that we recognize the additives -- the issues with additives but we feel that there can be testing protocols developed and there are standards out there that the group -- you know, the compost task force recommends, that the teas then therefore can be regulated with -- with a reduced, you know, risk factor in terms of human populations. Next.

If a compost tea made with compost tea additives

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

has not pre-tested for indicator bacteria, its use on food crops is restricted to the 90- to 120-day pre-harvest interval restrictions, and that's similar to what, you know, compost -- raw manure is in the Rule.

In the view of the task force, educating producers about the potential for contamination and its impact on public health and marketing, as well as how this recommended quality-assurance testing system would avoid potential contamination, will provide compelling incentives for producers to follow the rules. Next.

"Compost extracts," oh, "any mixture of compost, water, additives, and adjuvants that is not held for more than one hour before use, may be applied without restriction." So if a grower just makes a compost extract, it's used before one hour, it could be used with that restriction, and this is based on the feeling from the task force that you would not have a proliferation of growth in that -- in that time period, that would be of any concern.

And then raw manure extracts or teas may be applied to the soil with a 90- to 120-day pre-harvest restriction, but foliar applications are prohibited. Next.

Compost leachate may be applied to the soil with a 90- to 120-day pre-harvest restriction, foliar applications are prohibited, and compost tea is not allowed for the production of edible sprouts. Next.

And then, finally, and I think a very important 1 recommendation follows: 2 3 "The emerging acceptance of compost teas as a biologically-based crop-production tool by organic as well 4 5 as conventional growers clearly indicates the need for further scientific investigation to validate the benefits 6 7 and concerns of compost tea. 8 "The Task Force unanimously urges USDA and its 9 agencies to strongly support additional research on the 10 potential for crop contamination and plant disease, pest 11 control by compost tea. "There is an urgent national need to address 12 critical data gaps, uncertainties, and variability in 13 14 existing data that limited the evaluation of potential crop 15 contamination by the current Task Force." Next. Next. 16 And then, Zea, I'm just going to let you -- I don't know if there were some --17 18 MS. SONNABEND: Yeah. 19 MS. KOENIG: -- just points that you wanted to 20 state. 21 MS. SONNABEND: Yes. I just really have two 22 points to make, in addition to what Rose has said. 23 I think that this task force was very well-24 appointed on your part, the Department and the NOSB, in 25 that it did start out with people with widely-divergent

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

opinions as well as expertise, and, like any group of scientists getting together, there is quite a bit of scientific bickering over every single fine point in this recommendation, and so it really is much more of a victory than it looks, for us to have achieved a recommendation and a report with this degree of information in it and this degree of concrete recommendations.

And then the other point, in relation to that, is: You know, from the practical certifier/inspector side, is this a recommendation that is really enforceable for organics? -- and I think it is, which is why I supported the recommendation.

Although it sounds like a big mouthful, with the testing protocol for pre-testing and batches and all that, that we've explained, the benefits of being able to use the compost tea so far outweigh the relatively small cost of the testing and the relatively small additional burden that it puts on growers, that I think it will be welcomed as a procedure, as opposed to not having the compost tea at all.

So I do think that it is verifiable, that certifiers, you know, are able to work with this, that inspectors can see it in the field, and that growers can achieve this, for the most part. You know, having to do pre-testing will be -- would be burdensome on really small growers who stir their compost tea in a bucket, but those

are really the people who need the pre-testing the most 1 2 (chuckles), because they're not using very sophisticated 3 equipment. So that's all I wanted to say about that. 4 MS. KOENIG: And then if you guys had any 5 6 questions, I mean, we can answer them, I guess. Becky. 7 MS. GOLDBURG: I was curious about the 8 feasibility of doing the testing for indicator bacteria. 9 Are there some quick tests, Scrip [phonetic] tests or whatever, that -- something farmers can use, or do you have 10 11 to have a microbiology lab to test? MS. KOENIG: I mean, I gather that it would 12 actually require a laboratory. 13 14 MS. SONNABEND: You do have to take it to a lab, 15 but it's probably a 24-hour, you know, result, and not 16 really very expensive. 17 MS. KOENIG: And, you know, again, the -- one of 18 the scientists at the USDA, the -- really the food-safety 19 individual who signed off on the report, I think the fact that this testing protocol was there really enabled that 20 individual to have a comfort level with the recommendation. 21 22 So although it is cumbersome and there would be a 23 cost associated with it, it does allow at least businesses 24 that are involved in compost tea to continue to market to 25 organic producers, and I think what Zea says is true, I

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

mean the technology is there for rapid testing and other 1 2 areas, it's just a function of, you know, how much demand 3 there is. So I -- you know, in the future, if compost tea 4 is the next best thing (chuckles), compared to other 5 6 inputs, then, you know, perhaps that'll occur. Jim. 7 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. I'm really impressed with 8 this report, I think the Task Force has done excellent 9 work. I had a couple specific questions on the 10 recommendations. 11 On Number 5, the second paragraph, the compost 12 tea, with compost tea additives that's not been pre-tested, and you're recommending that that would be allowed for 13 14 grain crops intended for human consumption, with no 15 restrictions. Correct? MS. SONNABEND: 90-to 120-day --16 MR. RIDDLE: Oh, it still would be? 17 18 MS. SONNABEND: Yeah. 19 MR. RIDDLE: I'm reading it wrong, then. MS. SONNABEND: Right. The second line --20 It's "not intended." 21 CHAIRMAN KING: 22 MR. RIDDLE: "Crops not intended for human 23 consumption, ornamental plants, and grain crops are exempt 24 from the bacterial testing and 90-/120-day" (inaudible) --25 MS. KOENIG: Yeah, but the concept on that --R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

and, again, remember how I had said that there was a lot -considerable discussion on plant, plant species, literature
that indicated that there could be certain plant types that
harbored bacteria because of their architecture, or the
fact that they're eaten raw, you know, such as lettuce and
apples.

MR. RIDDLE: Yeah.

MS. KOENIG: The general consensus of the group was that grain crops are mostly -- you know, are processed and that they felt assured that they would be cooked, you know, in terms of human consumption.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Right.

MS. KOENIG: And ornamentals are not consumed by humans, but there are -- there is an industry out there that, you know, may -- or, in fact, is producing ornamental crops. So it just allowed for the use of two kind of specific plants that we all could agree upon.

MR. RIDDLE: Uh-huh. Okay.

MS. KOENIG: I mean, there was -- again, there was a proposal during the process of many different reviews that there was a USDA list of most-edible crops that are cooked versus ones that are eaten raw, but we kind of acknowledged as a committee that -- that, you know, we have a natural -- you know, a lot of people are natural food eaters, in the organic community, so what the average

American eats cooked (chuckles), a lot of our consumers eat 1 2 raw --3 MR. RIDDLE: Uh-huh. MS. KOENIG: -- and a lot of us didn't feel 4 comfortable about using that list as a guidance. So this, 5 6 again, was the agreement --7 MS. SONNABEND: It's prohibited for sprouted 8 grains, below. 9 MR. RIDDLE: Okay, right. And then I also had a 10 question on 7 and 8, on the raw manure extracts. There 90-11 or 120-day would apply, but it says "foliar applications 12 are prohibited." That's a strong word, "prohibited." So even if there's more than 120 days, foliar application -- I 13 14 don't -- what's the basis for that? 15 MS. KOENIG: You know, again, a lot of the -- you 16 know, the basis of all the restriction -- the (inaudible) 17 of the task force was human pathogens, and again, because 18 of the composition of that task force, there were 19 individuals on -- you know, you had individuals that had a great comfort level with compost teas, and then there were 20 individuals that had no comfort level --21 22 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. 23 MS. KOENIG: -- and this basically was -- you 24 know, that -- coming together of those two groups. 25 people -- you know, it's similar to the 90/120 day, why is R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

```
there 120 and why is there 90?
 1
 2
              MR. RIDDLE: Right.
              MS. KOENIG: Well, it's an extension of that,
 3
 4
    they just felt that foliar application -- to be safe, at
 5
    this point in time, again --
 6
              MR. RIDDLE: So it's really: an abundance of
 7
    caution.
 8
              MS. KOENIG: It's abundance again.
 9
              MR. RIDDLE: Yeah.
              MS. KOENIG: And again, it's based on the data
10
11
    available today -- well, actually, April 6th, 2004 --
12
              MS. SONNABEND: Or lack of data available to --
              MR. RIDDLE: And lack of data, okay. I just
13
14
    wondered --
15
              MS. KOENIG: So lack of data available.
              MR. RIDDLE: -- if there was something I was
16
17
    missing on that --
18
              MS. SONNABEND: Right. No.
19
              MS. KOENIG: It's the precautionary principle
     (inaudible) --
20
              MR. RIDDLE: No, it's "prohibited," "foliar
21
22
    application of manure tea prohibited, " period.
23
              MS. KOENIG: Goldie.
24
    (No audible response.)
25
              MS. KOENIG: Goldie. I'm sorry, Mark, do you
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

1 want to call on her? MS. CAUGHLAN: No, that's fine, I forgot --2 CHAIRMAN KING: Well, it's --3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Goldie's (inaudible). 4 MS. CAUGHLAN: Well, I was just going to point 5 6 out that wheat and barley are both used for juicing, sprout 7 and then juice. 8 MS. SONNABEND: Prohibited for sprouting. 9 MS. CAUGHLAN: However, it is isn't -- but I 10 think that's another step. In other words, I take that 11 indicator to mean you couldn't use -- the way that read, to 12 me, was: meaning you don't do alfalfa sprouts in a liquid tea, soak, or something like that, I mean -- before they 13 14 sprout, but where you're taking a mature grain crop and 15 then you're making a wheat sprout and then you're juicing it, that's a direct --16 17 MS. KOENIG: I think that that is a good point --18 MS. SONNABEND: Well --19 MS. KOENIG: -- and what we can do is -- you 20 know, we're not voting on this during this meeting, we're 21 just presenting. 22 MS. SONNABEND: I also think that, you know, 23 while it might be a concern, the chance of anyone using 24 compost tea on a grain crop, economically, is like -- so 25 minimal that I don't think it realistically is going to R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

(inaudible). 1 MS. GOLDBURG: Sure, but if you're writing a 2 3 standard, you don't write it to that. 4 MS. KOENIG: Right. MS. SONNABEND: Right. 5 MS. KOENIG: And I think that that's a valid 6 7 point, Goldie, so what we can do is, you know, make note of 8 that and then just kind of look over the recommendation and 9 see where -- see --10 MS. GOLDBURG: I mean, it's also true that 11 commercial --12 MS. KOENIG: I think --MS. GOLDBURG: -- commercial growers can use --13 14 MS. KOENIG: Right. 15 MS. GOLDBURG: -- compost tea to their heart's 16 delight. MS. KOENIG: And I think that the intent of the--17 18 MS. GOLDBURG: With no safety standards, so --19 MS. KOENIG: -- the intent of kind of that sprout, we probably thought that we were covering it 20 underneath that, but it's really not defined, so it's a 21 22 pretty -- I think it's a valid -- a valid point. 23 MS. GOLDBURG: Conventionally [phonetic]. 24 MS. KOENIG: Thank you. Anything else? 25 (No audible response.) R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

MS. KOENIG: Thanks. 1 2 CHAIRMAN KING: Thank you very much for all your hard work. That was fantastic. I know it took a lot of 3 4 time and there were some challenges, so --5 MR. SIEMON: I'd like to make a motion of no task 6 forces over five people. 7 (Laughter.) 8 CHAIRMAN KING: Rose may accept that. 9 (Laughter.) 10 MR. RIDDLE: I have a question about the process. 11 CHAIRMAN KING: Quick comment. 12 MR. RIDDLE: I know we're not voting on this as a 13 recommendation, but should the Board go on record as 14 accepting this report? I mean --15 UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Yes. 16 MR. RIDDLE: Well, I'd move that we accept the 17 Compost Tea Task Force report. 18 CHAIRMAN KING: Is there a second? 19 MS. COOPER: Second. 20 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Second it. CHAIRMAN KING: I'll take Ann, I saw her first. 21 22 It's been moved and seconded, moved by Jim Riddle, seconded 23 by Ann Cooper, that we accept the Compost Tea Task Force 24 report. 25 All those in favor say aye. R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

1 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye. 2 CHAIRMAN KING: Opposed, same sign. 3 (No audible response.) 4 CHAIRMAN KING: Motion carries. MS. KOENIG: Mark, just --5 6 CHAIRMAN KING: Yes. 7 MS. KOENIG: So a point of process too, is that 8 -- so this'll -- it's on the web, we'll accept public 9 comment, it'll be posted, we'll be taking public comment on the recommendations, and then --10 11 CHAIRMAN KING: Is that your desire? 12 MS. KOENIG: Yeah. 13 CHAIRMAN KING: Okay. 14 MS. KOENIG: Because we need to vote on it in the 15 next -- at the next meeting. 16 CHAIRMAN KING: Okay. MS. KOENIG: So we will officially be -- so it'll 17 18 be posted for the public to comment on, and then we'll be 19 voting next meeting on it. 20 CHAIRMAN KING: Okay. Now we're to the point in 21 the agenda where we'll actually be voting on committee 22 recommendations, and we're going to start with materials 23 committee, that of course doesn't have any materials but 24 has a couple recommendations. 25 MS. KOENIG: Okay, the Sunset Proposal, R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

Provision, that was posted on the web, and that we discussed earlier, again, it wasn't up and submitted in time to make a formal vote, so we're not asking for a formal note.

Additionally, the National Organic Program sent us some documentation last week, with what they believe is a better version of our -- you know, they've taken our Sunset Provision, they've reviewed it, they've considered things such as the whole federal rulemaking process, that I think that we considered but, in our naivete of the process, I don't think we really understood the full implications of a 5-year sunset and what that meant in terms of the time frame of how we have to proceed in this process to get it all done by 2007.

I've thought long and hard, and, you know, I've been -- people say, "Oh, you look horrible" (chuckles) at the end of the day, there's many reasons why you do, but, you know, I take this -- you know, this role very seriously, and I take the Sunset Provision and materials quite seriously, and I certainly want to do -- you know, represent the growers that I represent and what's in the best interests of the industry.

Having said that, and thinking about the process, I've asked Arthur Neal to come and give him an opportunity to really fully explain the proposal that they've worked

with, the modifications that they have made, and we've met as a committee and talked about a few areas that we suggested needed a little more thought, and -- so, you know, I don't know if he had time to digest that information.

But the one thing that I think I always come back to, and I think we all have to come back to, in this process -- well, there's two things: one is what our concept of Sunset Provision is, and partly I think it's kind of in a misinterpretation of what a sunset provision is, by the Board. Many times, as we're doing our work, we've always thought about the sunset, you know, and I've heard it many times, "Well, we don't have" -- you know, "we'll put it on, and in 5 years we're going to be reviewing everything anyway."

So we've looked at it, and we've kind of -- at least myself personally -- have kind of, you know, identified it as a time for full review. However, you know, again, because I'm naive to what a sunset is in a regulatory sense, I think we need to listen and understand what sunset means, you know, as -- as far as regulatory aspects, and that was explained in the letter that -- and the documents that we received prior to the meeting and hopefully the NOP is going to share with us.

So I think we need to be open-minded with the R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

1 concept of what sunset means in a regulatory perspective, 2 and then, more importantly, the one thing I always have to 3 remind myself is that the sunset is just mechanism, you know, one kind of safeguard in the system, to review. 4 There always is the opportunity to question things that are 5 6 on the list, okay, and that -- you know, we always have to 7 go back to that point, that at any time anyone has the 8 opportunity to put in a petition to remove something from 9 that list -- and really, that's for the community to 10 understand. 11 So the sunset we thought was -- you know, again, some of us thought as "the mechanism," but I think we need 12 to really rethink what the sunset mechanism is and, again, 13 14 just acknowledge that there are -- there is a second 15 mechanism for the public to address materials that -- that 16 may need to be considered to either be -- you know, be considered on the list. 17 18 So, with that introduction, Arthur -- or I'm not 19 sure who in the NOP was going to --20 MS. ROBINSON: Mind if I be Arthur [phonetic]? 21 CHAIRMAN KING: You can be whoever you want, 22 Barbara. 23 (Laughter.) 24 MS. ROBINSON: Do I have to identify myself

> R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

again? Barbara Robinson, Deputy Administrator,

25

Transportation & Marketing Programs.

Thanks for all your remarks, Rose, that you just made, because a lot of those we are certainly in agreement with, and hopefully then it'll just make our presentation a little bit briefer.

MS. KOENIG: No, don't make it briefer. (Laughter.)

MS. ROBINSON: We do thank the Board for the recommendation on sunset, we appreciate it very much, and we understood the amount of time and thought that went into it. While you were at work on your recommendation, we also were doing research on our end, about what is a sunset, because we had many of the same questions that you had, and so we did that kind of research, we looked at legislation.

Sunset is not unique to this program, it does happen with many laws or many regulations, and what we found was the following, and I believe most of this we explained to you, but the public probably doesn't know this.

Sunset is not -- is typically an expiration that would occur -- it's a call for a review of the conditions that warranted the law or the regulation in the first place.

In the case of this program, sunset is: a call to review the conditions that warranted putting a material

on the National List in the first place.

So try and think about this -- and Rose brought up a very good point. If you have trouble getting your arms around that, that we're asking the public and the Board to review the conditions, not the material, if you have trouble getting your arms around that, remember: since this program has been implemented, only two petitions have been submitted to the Department to remove a material from the National List. One was for cornstarch, on the basis that there was apparently an organic supply of cornstarch available, the Board considered that and rejected that and left cornstarch on the list; the second was sodium nitrate, and the Board again took public comments on that and the Board decided to leave sodium nitrate on the list.

But that provision is available to any person at any time, so that -- if you want to think of that as the trap door, another mechanism, a failsafe provision, however you want to think of that: that is always there.

Now, from our perspective, sunset is a public process. It's facilitated by rulemaking through the National Organic Standards Board's mechanisms. You are the integral part of this process. The reason that we believe that this must be done with rulemaking, aside from the fact that our lawyers will stand there and tell us "that's the

only way you're going to do it," but there's a good reason for that, and I'm going to use these words that you've heard us use, and then I'm going to say something about them:

The reason we do this through rulemaking, with the public fully engaged, is that in that way we pretty much ensure -- not altogether, but pretty much -- we ensure that neither the Department -- and it's important that you understand this, neither we nor you would appear to be arbitrary, or capricious.

Now, we use the words all the time, and, you know, it strikes me that they have a very negative connotation, it makes it sound like you willy-nilly pick things out of the air and decide what to do and, you know, reward your friends and punish your enemies, and that's not what those words mean.

It just means: unintentionally or not, because we all come to the table with biases, doing it in an open rulemaking process is a way to minimize that from occurring.

So the important thing to remember about this, and this is important for the people who are sitting in this room today, two points: if the public does not weigh in -- explicitly, everybody, you can't just think it, you must communicate, in writing, however that is -- to the

1 Board through the Department -- whether you believe there is still a continued need for these materials on the 2 National List, if you do not do that, if we receive no 3 comment on material X, on October 21, 2007, regardless of 4 what the Board thinks, the material goes away. It will not 5 6 be available for use. If it is a prohibited material, it 7 will be available for use. Okay? 8 So the public must get engaged in this. 9 MR. RIDDLE: I missed that last part. 10 MS. ROBINSON: If there is no public comment, if 11 the public is silent -- let's just pick a material. Sodium 12 nitrate. I don't care. Pick anything. UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: No, that's not a good 13 14 one. 15 No, I just meant --MR. RIDDLE: 16 MS. ROBINSON: Whatever. Material X. 17 MR. RIDDLE: The part about if it's prohibited --18 MS. ROBINSON: If it is -- if it's a material for 19 which there is an exemption, it's an allowed synthetic, and there is nothing from the world at large that yes, this 20 need -- a need continues to exist for this material, then 21 22 we can only conclude the need no longer exists; therefore, 23 it will no longer be allowed. 24 If it is a prohibited material and we hear 25 nothing, then we will conclude that it must be okay, and it

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

```
will then become allowed to be used.
 1
 2
              MR. RIDDLE: You mean a prohibited natural.
 3
              MS. ROBINSON: Yes.
              MR. RIDDLE: Okay.
 4
 5
              MS. ROBINSON: Yes.
 6
              MR. RIDDLE: Okay, good.
 7
              MS. ROBINSON: What did I say?
 8
              MR. RIDDLE: That's what threw me.
 9
              MS. ROBINSON: Did I say prohibited synthetic?
              CHAIRMAN KING: No, you just said prohibited.
10
11
              MS. ROBINSON: Oh, okay.
12
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: You can imagine
    (inaudible).
13
14
              MS. KOENIG: Barbara, I just wanted -- because I
15
    see alarmed faces and I just wanted to -- because I also
16
    was -- the state of shock. The -- what Keith had explained
17
    to me, you don't -- in the sense of something that's on the
18
    list in either category, you don't have to provide
19
    additional information, it's simply a letter stating that
    -- you know --
20
21
              MS. ROBINSON: It can be as simple as --
              MS. KOENIG: -- Farmer A, "I use" --
22
23
              MS. ROBINSON: Yes.
24
              MS. KOENIG: -- "X-Y-Z" --
25
              MS. ROBINSON: Yes.
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

```
MS. KOENIG: -- "A-B-C-D, E-F-G," I could list
 1
 2
    156 --
 3
              MS. ROBINSON: Yeah.
 4
              MS. KOENIG: -- and say "I need all of these."
 5
              MS. ROBINSON: That's --
 6
              MS. KOENIG: That's public comment, it stays on.
 7
              MS. ROBINSON: All you need to do is put a
 8
    placemarker down, okay?
 9
              MS. KOENIG: Okay.
              MS. ROBINSON: Write us a letter: you need this
10
11
    material, the need still exists for this material --
12
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: So it's not a
    petition.
13
14
              MS. ROBINSON: No. In fact, that's one thing the
15
    sunset review is not: it is not a petition process.
16
              MS. KOENIG: Okay. So trade organizations --
              MS. ROBINSON: Like I said at the beginning --
17
18
    yeah. Anybody --
19
              MS. KOENIG: -- organizations, individuals --
20
              MS. ROBINSON: Yeah.
21
              MS. KOENIG: -- as long as it's submitted --
22
              MS. ROBINSON: Yeah.
23
              MS. KOENIG: -- then it stays --
24
              MS. ROBINSON: Anybody.
25
              MS. KOENIG: -- everything is status quo.
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

1 MR. RIDDLE: And there doesn't have to be any 2 evidence, just a statement. 3 MS. KOENIG: No. MS. ROBINSON: No, not -- not --4 5 MS. KOENIG: Status quo. 6 MS. ROBINSON: No, you're just going to tell us 7 -- all we want to know is: do you believe that there is a 8 continued need for the material? Just write us a letter 9 and say, "We need it." That's good enough, to keep this 10 process going. 11 MR. ARTHUR NEAL: Arthur Neal, National Organic 12 Program. And what Barbara's talking about is at -- the advance notice of public rulemaking level, because there 13 14 are three -- and she hasn't gotten there yet, but there are 15 three different levels: advance notice of public rulemaking; proposed rule; and final rule. 16 17 MS. ROBINSON: Right. So we will publish an 18 advance notice of proposed rulemaking, and the guts of that 19 will be the document that you already have, the sunset review process, because we tried to develop -- think of it 20 21 almost like a preamble, okay, what is this process about; 22 for everyone else, this is -- is this on our website yet? 23 (No audible response.) 24 MS. ROBINSON: It will be? So that everyone else 25 can read what the Board has been sent.

1 2

3

4

5 6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

reason, why the process that we laid out for you through

rulemaking, it must withstand this annual action by the

And that's one reason, that's a very important

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

Now, another point I want to make, before we get to the process a little bit, I want everyone to understand: there's sort of a feeling and people sense: okay, sunset, it's an event. Sunset is not an event. From now on, sunset is an annual activity that will take place. You understand that.

Every year that you add materials, 5 years later someone is reviewing the need for those materials to continue. This is the first board that will initiate a sunset process, but some of you won't even be on the board by the time sunset -- this sunset occurs. But understand that in 2012 -- if we all are still here --(Laughter.)

MS. ROBINSON: -- in 2012, this big clump, okay, the one that became active October 21, '02, this whole big clump of materials has to go through it again, plus any materials added by the Board through rulemaking in 2007.

Therefore, what you want to realize is that sunset is a growing activity, it will become a bigger and bigger job every year, assuming boards continue to add materials to the list. Because it never is just a one-time review to see if it's okay; it goes on in perpetuity.

Board and participation by the public.

So we could not write procedures for a sunset as if it was a one-time event, we have to put something in place, because what -- again, what you're doing is -- like we've talked about before, here we go creating the process again, for future boards.

So, as Arthur started to say -- do you want me to go through these three stages real quick?

MS. KOENIG: I -- one -- because -- I think it's important, and one of the questions that I had, in terms of the advance rulemaking:

When it goes to public comment, even on the process -- because what I'm assuming is that we also -- there's going to be public comment on this process? You said it would be on the NOP website, but the first rulemaking is rulemaking of the process; correct?

MS. ROBINSON: No. No. An advance notice of proposed rulemaking is the Department's way of saying to the public at large: we are about to engage in rulemaking, heads up. Now, the public is certainly -- the public is always free to comment to us, Rose, the public can write to us and, you know, windows don't close, we don't say, "We don't care, we don't want to hear from you," we never say that. Sometimes we take what you give us and we think about it, but, you know, we don't take it, but we will

1 always take input. 2 So the ANPR -- what? 3 MR. RIDDLE: George had a question. MS. ROBINSON: Oh, I'm sorry, George. 4 MR. SIEMON: I had several questions here. So if 5 those conditions are established, question one is: who 6 7 establishes that condition, one letter is enough, or is it 8 -- somebody makes a judgment that the condition still is 9 needed? MS. ROBINSON: Well, let me walk through that. 10 11 MR. SIEMON: All right. 12 MS. ROBINSON: Okay? We put out the ANPR and we tell the public -- and we do, in the ANPR --13 14 MS. KOENIG: No acronyms. 15 MS. ROBINSON: Huh? 16 MS. KOENIG: No acronyms. MR. RIDDLE: Advance notice of public rulemaking. 17 18 MS. ROBINSON: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. ANPR 19 means advance notice of proposed rulemaking. Forgive me, I shouldn't do that. That's the heads-up I was just talking 20 21 about. 22 Now, remember back to when this rule itself was 23 being created, there was a Proposed Rule, and then there 24 was a Re-Proposed Rule, but there's -- normally there's a 25 proposed rule, everyone is free to comment, the Department R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

takes the comments, Department digests the comments, the Department is obliged to answer the comments through rulemaking, it does so when it publishes the final rule, and then there's even usually some -- well, very often there's still a comment period that's allowed after the final rule.

But what we will do is we'll publish the advance notice of proposed rulemaking and we will tell the public: here's what you need to do, and all that you need to do is communicate to us in writing, and we'll probably allow electronic, but let us know whether or not you believe a continued need exists for any or all of these materials, and that's all they have to do, at first.

That then triggers sort of the universe of materials that the Board is going to look at, and it will also trigger -- hopefully not, but it will trigger a subset, which we haven't heard anything, from anybody about.

Now, before -- I don't want to -- Arthur's much better at going through all the particular details of what's going to be involved in the proposed rule, so I'm going to let him walk you through that process, but then we'll take any questions that you have.

MR. NEAL: In the proposed rule, what happens is that the Board has now formulated their recommendation in

terms of -- they've assessed all of the public comments 1 2 generated through the advance notice of proposed rulemaking 3 -- yes, ma'am. MS. KOENIG: Okay, I think there was a step left 4 5 out. 6 MR. NEAL: Uh-huh. 7 MS. KOENIG: According to your documentation. So 8 Barbara made it sound like it was simply a little letter, 9 that said yea or nay, and what in fact your policy says is that if something affirms something on the list, then you, 10 11 as an individual, can say: yes, we need this, that's all 12 the documentation that's necessary. Or -- step one. 13 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: An ANPR step 14 (phonetic). 15 MS. KOENIG: Okay. But the other -- isn't this 16 step one at ANPR stage if you say -- you say: hey, there's something on there I don't want --17 18 MR. NEAL: Right. 19 MS. KOENIG: -- and you said -- sorry, I don't want to say "you," because I'm assuming --20 21 MR. NEAL: Right. 22 MS. KOENIG: Isn't -- based on your document, a 23 set of information and data that you must then provide, 24 that requires more than just a letter at that stage --25 MR. NEAL: Let me explain --R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

1 MS. KOENIG: -- and that's an important point, 2 that I think needs to be explained.

the National List.

MR. NEAL: -- a little more to you. You've got to take into consideration this big picture. There have been years of activity taking place to put materials onto

When you take into consideration how materials have made it onto the List, they've gone through scientific research, they've gone through public comment, and final rulemaking, so the data that supports materials that are currently listed on the list already have a foundation established.

Now, through the ANPR, you can't tell a commenter what they cannot say. They can say, "We want the material," they can say, "We don't want the material."

However, there is a reverse consequence for saying, "We don't want the material," because the same way that a material was recommended for inclusion onto the National List is the exact same way a material has to be pulled off of the National List, which means that if the recommendation is made that "We do not want the material any longer, there's no longer a need," that has to be justified. That need no longer has to be justified -- I mean that need has to be justified.

MR. RIDDLE: I'm confused, then, because I
R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

thought things automatically expire unless someone says 1 2 they're needed --MR. NEAL: I'm not finished. 3 MR. RIDDLE: Okay. 4 MR. NEAL: Now, the Board has the opportunity, 5 because the Board assesses the comments -- because you're 6 7 going to get comments that say, "We want it," you're going 8 to get some comments that say, "We don't want it." The 9 Board can either attempt to justify the fact that there's 10 no longer a need for the material or just rest in the fact 11 that this material has already been vetted by prior 12 boards --13 MS. CAUGHLAN: Has what? 14 MR. NEAL: -- already been vetted by prior boards and recommended for inclusion onto the National List and 15 16 there is a need that has been established, in formulating 17 their recommendation. 18 Do we understand? 19 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, so far. 20 CHAIRMAN KING: We're hoping there's more. 21 MR. NEAL: Okay. 22 CHAIRMAN KING: Okay. MR. RIDDLE: -- to follow [phonetic]. 23 MR. NEAL: If the Board decides that there is no 24 25 longer a need for the continued use of a substance, then R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

that need -- the need has to be justified to no longer 1 2 exist, and what Rose is talking about is how you document the non-existent need for the use of a material, and that 3 -- that entails that the material has a negative -- what is 4 5 it --6 MS. KOENIG: It's the three points in OFPA that 7 we used for -- during the petition process and evaluation. 8 It's the environmental -- there's a -- you know, 9 detrimental environmental impacts, a wholly natural substance is available, and -- give me the third one. 10 11 MR. NEAL: And that it's not consistent with 12 organic farming and handling. 13 MS. KOENIG: That's not -- okay. 14 MR. NEAL: So the needs to this [phonetic] --15 you'd have to document the substance is harmful to human 16 health or the environment, the substance is not necessary 17

to the production of agricultural products because there is an available wholly-non-synthetic substitute product, and the substance is not consistent with organic farming and handling. Kim.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

When we had talked earlier from the MS. DIETZ: materials committee, is it the public that's providing us with this information or is the Board who's having to provide this information?

> MR. NEAL: Both. It all depends on who's trying R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

to justify that the need no longer exists. So if the public makes that statement, that the need no longer exists, and you've got competing interests, you've got people out there saying, "There is a need for it" and you've got somebody saying, "There is no need for it," somebody's got to justify the position. And the position has already been laid for it to be on the list. The position that has not been lain is the one to take it off. That's why there is a process by which we say -- a petition process to remove a substance from the National List.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: (Inaudible.)

MR. NEAL: Well, I know, that's why -- that's why we do not invite that type of activity.

MS. DIETZ: So this board may receive positive letters and negative letters and then it's the due diligence of the Board to say: okay, if there is not a need, then we need to document it with these factors that you're providing.

MR. NEAL: If there is not a need for it, right, correct. Yes, Rose.

MS. KOENIG: So -- and again, I had the privilege of looking at it, so I kind of processed it a little bit more, and what our -- again, you know, the points are again: the letter, keeping things on as a simple letter,

again, making a change is the one where the burden -- I don't want to say the burden -- it's really the burden of proof, because that's the only way I can think of it in my feeble mind, is: the burden of proof is on the person who wants to remove something from the List, that exists, and this burden of proof that the NOP has suggested and has offered in their final Sunset Provision is acceptable to me because it's based on the OFPA criteria.

We're not pulling things out of the hat, we're not asking people to jump through new hoops, they're basically taking those three OFPA criteria, and additionally, there -- but there is two differences that I could pick out, and I just wanted to pinpoint -- you know, point those out.

One is, there is a greater emphasis on the -because you're asking -- there's a request to really prove
that there are alternatives, with data more than just what
we're getting in some of these TAPs, like -- you know, I'll
give an example of hydrochloric acid, that lactic acid and
acetic acid is available.

The data would have to be provided that the form, the function -- there's a supply of those things, that there's readily-available alternatives and they work. And then -- so that's one difference.

And then the second difference is that there is R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

an econom- --

MR. NEAL: An industry impact.

MS. KOENIG: -- an industry impact statement, in addition to the OFPA criteria, that is written into the language of this final Sunset Provision, and that is the other, second point that I picked out that is distinct and different from what you're seeing in a regular petition process, and I think it would make sense to justify -- Keith did a great job -- understanding why the Office of Management & Budget requires that. So if you can --

MS. ROBINSON: Two points I just want to keep making here, for the folks in the audience. You understand now what we're asking, that when we public the advance notice of proposed rulemaking, a simple one-line, two-line communication to the Department is sufficient for, you know, putting your placeholder down. That is all that's required.

When we get to the proposed rulemaking stage and someone wants to argue to allow the use of a material to expire, we are asking -- as you just heard Rose: that burden of evidence is on the commenter and it will not be sufficient to simply go back and find whatever the Board did, you know, 5 years earlier, or whatever their debates were, and go get out that argument and restate it, because the Board, in its deliberations in previous years, had

already determined, regardless -- you know, taking the totality of evidence it had at the time, it determined that that material met the criteria of OFPA.

So you must be able to show that the material no longer meets the criteria, and the only way to do that, that I can figure in my little brain, is: you must have some new evidence that we don't know about, and that's what the Board will then have to weigh.

MS. DIETZ: And you said this was during the proposed rulemaking?

MS. ROBINSON: Yes.

MS. DIETZ: Okay.

MS. ROBINSON: I mean, you're free to submit -UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Right.

MS. ROBINSON: -- all of that to us during the advance notice of proposed rulemaking; we're just not requiring that.

MS. KOENIG: And that is the note -- you know, and after thinking about the process, something -- this is to the Board and to the public: if there are materials that you -- you know, you now know are going through sunset, this is the time to start gathering data and getting that information in as soon as possible, because there's going to be a very short window of opportunity, unfortunately, unless we can figure out a way to extend it,

1 that we, as a board, are going to be able to handle 2 anything that would contradict -- and I'm saying what 3 exists, you know, any of those second line --MS. ROBINSON: Right. That's -- yeah. 4 MS. KOENIG: -- of products, things where we're 5 6 going to have to really evaluate, and it appears to me --7 you know, and that -- that's the question I have for you. 8 There was this assumption that there could be 9 additional -- you know, there is -- and in your provision, they allow for additional technical information to be 10 11 obtained, but in reality, the way things are going in terms 12 of our petition process, it's not a speedy, immediate 13 response. 14 MS. ROBINSON: That's one --15 MS. KOENIG: So one of the challenges --16 MS. ROBINSON: Right. 17 MS. KOENIG: -- and I'm asking you, I mean, because I see this as kind of the area where we could get 18 19 caught up, is: how -- and I don't know if you've thought 20 about it: how can we get access to information quickly, 21 technical information, if we need it? Because we have, 22 based on what we were talking about, 90 days --23 MS. ROBINSON: That's right. 24 MS. KOENIG: -- to come up with --25 MS. ROBINSON: That's the other thing, is we --R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

included in the document that we have given to the Board is a very detailed timetable that lays out this whole process from start to finish, and if you go through -- I think if you actually add up all the time in there, I think it actually adds to 41 months. That's why we're starting now.

The clock has already begun to tick, from our perspective in the Department. We know what we're up against in terms of OMB, we consider -- we are assuming the Office of Management & Budget will designate this to be a major rule. That has certain significance in the government. Once -- once it is determined that you are engaged in major rulemaking, which means you have a significant economic impact on businesses, of X number of dollars, and once you trip that switch, you trip multiple clearance and review levels throughout government, and you top it all off with Congress getting 60 days to review it themselves.

But it is such a laborious process to get through, that we -- we believe that it must be started immediately.

MR. RIDDLE: I've got two questions. It sounds like if somebody wants something to expire, or be removed, it's very similar to submitting a petition to remove, they've got to -- the burden of proof, the evidence, with new information, you know, is on that petitioner.

```
But you mentioned that you received two petitions
 1
 2
    to remove and cornstarch was one of them, and do you know
    from the records when that happened? -- because I can't
 3
    find when the Board voted on that.
 4
 5
              MS. ROBINSON: I honestly don't know, Jim.
 6
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: That's inside
 7
    (inaudible).
 8
              MR. RIDDLE: It hasn't been since I have, and I
 9
    can't find it in the records. I just wondered -- since you
10
    said it, I figured you knew when that happened.
11
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: We're in our fourth
12
    year, so --
              MS. ROBINSON: I just made it up.
13
14
    (Laughter.)
15
              MR. RIDDLE: Well, I didn't know.
16
              MS. ROBINSON: No, I'm just kidding.
17
              MR. RIDDLE: I mean, if you could say what year,
18
    I could look back at the minutes --
19
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: (Inaudible.)
              MR. NEAL: I can't recall.
20
21
              MS. ROBINSON: The other --
22
              MR. RIDDLE: But the other -- the question is
23
    about the 90 days for the Board to review.
24
              MS. ROBINSON: Right. And before you get to your
25
    question, let me just address the last part -- something
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

that Rose asked, and that is: whether or not there could be some sort of extension here. I know that we -- you know, that's been talked about, "Well, if the Board is working on it, if the Board is recommending it," you know, "isn't that good enough, can't this keep" -- "go on?" The answer is, unfortunately, no, and it's not because you're in a regulation, it's because you are bound by your law. The law is what will cause the lights to go out here. If it was a matter of just, you know, adjusting the regulation, we probably could figure out a way to do it, but since it's a law, you know, that's the brick wall. So we can't do that.

MS. KOENIG: Right. But worst-case scenario, okay, let's just play hypothetical, because I think -- this is just an issue for me. Worst-case scenario, say product A, there's no -- there is a letter of support for it, and then there's another letter, against it, with evidence, okay, and we get this, and the points are really valid, we find that there's enough OFPA criteria, but it was one of those early-on petitions that did not have an adequate TAP, in our opinion, we need to seek additional technical information. That -- and I know you like to have a really big docket, but hypothetically (chuckles) --

MS. ROBINSON: That's not our preference.

MS. KOENIG: Well, but -- I mean, hypothetically,
R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

that product could be held back. I mean, the worst-case 1 2 scenario is: by doing that, you would trigger it off the list. Correct? 3 MS. ROBINSON: Yes. Are you asking if the rest 4 5 of the list could move forward without --6 MS. KOENIG: Yeah. The rest of the list could. 7 MS. ROBINSON: Yes. Yes. 8 MS. KOENIG: Okay. 9 MS. ROBINSON: Of course. 10 MS. KOENIG: So we are -- we're tied -- so there 11 are ways, it's just --12 MS. ROBINSON: Whoever is affected by that one material --13 14 MS. KOENIG: -- will be mad [phonetic], right. 15 MS. ROBINSON: -- are the affected parties, yeah, 16 and you might be hearing from them. 17 MS. KOENIG: Right. 18 MS. ROBINSON: But -- yes, but -- now -- and we 19 will do our best to work with the scientific experts, you know -- we do have in AMS a scientific program area, food 20 scientists, microbiological folks. We can consult with 21 They have contacts in EPA and FDA. We will do our 22 best to work to make sure that as much technical 23 24 information as is necessary for the Board -- that we can 25 make it available. R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

But remember what you're -- you will have to 1 2 weigh the evidence that is given to you, and there will 3 have to be a -- I don't really want to stand here and say "compelling," but I would assume, if I was in your shoes, 4 it should be pretty compelling evidence why it no longer 5 meets the criteria that you determined it already met. 6 7 MR. NEAL: Well, it's really the need. 8 MS. ROBINSON: Yeah. 9 MR. NEAL: (Inaudible) there's no need. 10 MS. ROBINSON: Right. So -- okay. 11 CHAIRMAN KING: I have a quick question. 12 we're talking about the process and procedures which we'll go through here, and I wanted to know the timeline that's 13 14 listed, as --15 MS. ROBINSON: Yes (inaudible). 16 CHAIRMAN KING: -- I'm guessing, sort of a -somewhat of a draft, if you will, in this document, and I 17 18 have been numerically challenged in the past, so correct me 19 if I'm wrong, but it appears we have 41 months until the deadline --20 21 MS. ROBINSON: That's right. 22 CHAIRMAN KING: -- from -- give or take a few 23 days from today. As I add this up, there are a minimum of 24 32 months in the process. 25 MS. ROBINSON: Right.

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

CHAIRMAN KING: Now, that's not a big window. 1 2 MS. ROBINSON: No, it's not. 3 CHAIRMAN KING: But as we look at this as a board, 90 days clearly --4 5 MS. ROBINSON: Yeah. CHAIRMAN KING: -- is kind of "a train wreck 6 7 waiting to happen" --8 MS. ROBINSON: And that -- that's right. 9 CHAIRMAN KING: -- and so recognizing this 10 difference between 41 and 32, perhaps that's an area we 11 could --MS. ROBINSON: Well, let's -- you know, I mean, 12 we put down what we conservatively estimate --13 14 CHAIRMAN KING: I understand. 15 MS. ROBINSON: -- everybody will want to have 16 their hands on this thing and take a look at it. CHAIRMAN KING: I understand. 17 18 MS. ROBINSON: And yes, one of the reasons we did 19 it like this -- and it does look like it's cutting it close, that there's a little bit of a window. 20 21 A couple of things you want to keep in mind: 22 This year is an election year. You know, I'm sorry to 23 bring up politics, but it's a fact of life where we live, 24 and when there is going to be a congressional election or a 25 presidential election, people get a little bit more R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

reticent, they get much more cautious about regulations that any agency -- not just us, but any agency -- is working on, and so there's -- you know, that just tends to slow the process down a little bit more.

To the extent that we can, if there are places we can save time, give the Board an extra 30 days, take 30 from us, something like that, we'll do it. We're not going to let this train wreck, Mark.

CHAIRMAN KING: I understand.

MS. ROBINSON: That's what the Board and importantly that's what this industry needs to understand: the Department takes it very seriously that this -- you didn't start this industry just to grind it to a halt 5 years later. That's not going to happen. So we'll get there. Andrea.

MS. CAROE: I actually have two questions. My first one is kind of basic and remedial, but tell me: when this -- when we go through the sunset, we do this procedure, are we putting something back on the list for 5 years or are we keeping it on the list for another 5 years?

MS. ROBINSON: You are renewing its exemption.

If it's an allowed synthetic, you're saying: we've looked at it, we've considered all the evidence, we are renewing the exemption for this allowed synthetic for an additional

5 years, and that 5-year date will be the effective date of 1 2 publication of the Final Rule, and that will start the 3 clock over again, and it should be October 21, 2012, or earlier, if a miracle occurred and we actually got this 4 5 done, you know, in the summer of 2007. 6 MS. CAROE: Okay. My next question, and this is 7 -- not to be the big black cloud over this, but: what 8 happens if, somewhere along this process, while somebody's 9 reviewing this, including, and not limited to, Congress, somebody says "No" or "We don't like this" or "We want more 10 11 information" or "We want you to do something different," 12 what happens to the --13 MS. ROBINSON: Somebody -- who, like someone in 14 Congress says they want you to look at more? 15 MS. CAROE: You know, any -- OMB, OGC, anybody 16 along this path kicks [phonetic] this. MS. ROBINSON: Well, the Department has to work 17 18 with its federal partners. Now, as far as telling you that 19 you need -- no one from Congress is going to come and tell you, "Well, I want that material and you need to rethink 20 this." That is the Board's authority: to weigh the 21 22 evidence before it and make that determination. 23 your statutory authority: to renew this exemption. 24 I don't think anybody -- I'm not MS. CAROE: 25 talking about a technical issue as far as whether the

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

material's fit for organic or not, but I'm talking more of a procedural issue or if they wanted something else done.

MR. NEAL: One of the things -- we've taken that into consideration, but that's captured in the timeline, because something could happen where they say, "No, this won't cut it," because it happened to us when we -- when we were developing the proposal, re-proposal, and final, they send it back, and they can take as much time as they need.

So that's why the timeline is such, because those things happen, and if we cut into the timeline, we cut into the opportunity to meet the deadline.

MS. CAROE: And then what happens?

MR. NEAL: We'll have to find out.

MS. CAROE: Okay. I just -- you know, I don't -- I don't know how these things work, and I know you guys go through this stuff all the time, but, you know, obviously business doesn't come to a screeching halt, there's got to be something -- you know.

MS. KOENIG: I had a question, maybe -- you know, and I think it's a good question to ask at this point.

There's a number of annotations, okay, so on the proposal that you showed us, there was just two choices, it either stays on or it comes off. There may be cases where somebody wants it to stay on but they want the annotation removed, maybe they want an annotation that's not there.

Is this the point where those changes can be made in the 1 2 process, Keith, do you know that? 3 MR. NEAL: It really gets you into --MS. KOENIG: Because there may be cases where 4 5 people, you know, write a comment, not necessarily that any 6 of the economics have changed but no -- you know, "this 7 annotation is too small," and they can provide data, but is 8 this the point where they would do that, where there could 9 be made to changes --10 MR. NEAL: I will not say straight up no, 11 somebody cannot do that. However, I will say this. 12 gets you into a petition-type deal and not the continued need for the substance, because after the review process is 13 14 over, they still can petition to modify an annotation. 15 See, what happens is that your workload -- you 16 start to conflict your work, you start to conflict sunset 17 review with petition process --18 MS. KOENIG: So -- but that's the question. So 19 it's not the forum for doing that, or --MR. NEAL: No. 20 21 MS. KOENIG: Well, that's -- I think it's a valid 22 question, because we need to know, and the public needs to 23 know. 24 CHAIRMAN KING: Let's just -- there's a lot to 25 discuss here, clearly, and Keith, you've got a comment, but R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

I want to make one point first, and that is that we need to wrap this up, literally, in the next minute. We've got petitioners here, materials to vote on. So if we could just wrap this up. And one more point before, Keith, you make your comment, is that this will be ongoing dialogue, so you need to understand this isn't the end here, it's just sort of opening it up and asking questions. So Keith. Thank you.

MR. JONES: Okay, I'll take a minute.

Rosie, I think you have to understand, is that once we get into rulemaking -- Arthur made a very good point -- we can't constrain the public to comment, okay, and the public may comment and say, "We want annotation X taken off," "we want Y annotation added." They're free to comment. That's what public comment is about, it's what notice and comment rulemaking is about.

I think as we analyze that set of comments, we're going to be reluctant, though, to accept those comments because we believe that that really is outside of the scope of the sunset process, and let me tell you why we believe that.

We can conclude sunset and then the Board has in its possession public comments, on a range of issues, that it can then take and look at and say, "You know, this is a pretty compelling comment for the removal of this

1	annotation on X material," or Y or whatever, you know,
2	whatever the comment is, and then take an appropriate
3	action straight up on that issue, and I think because of
4	the workload you're going to be facing, it would be more
5	prudent on your part to stay as narrowly focused as you
6	possibly could in the material review process.
7	CHAIRMAN KING: Okay, I just want to make a quick
8	thank you, Rose, for your questions and thought process on
9	this and thank the Department for your comments.
10	A quick agenda adjustment, I'm going to move the
11	handling committee up and we'll discuss those materials
12	now, and then we'll come back with crops after the break,
13	then livestock following that.
14	MR. O'RELL: So, Mark, are you ready to
15	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Same order?
16	MR. O'RELL: Tetra sodium pyrophosphate?
17	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Well, nitrous oxide
18	was first.
19	MR. O'RELL: Well, we were asked to make an
20	adjustment in the order.
21	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: That's fine.
22	MR. RIDDLE: What's going on?
23	MR. SIEMON: We're trying to get (inaudible)
24	before our break.
25	CHAIRMAN KING: And there's some people who need
	R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

to catch flights, and clearly we're a little bit behind, so 1 2 I want to get to materials, just so you understand. 3 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, I appreciate it. CHAIRMAN KING: It's not a coup, Jim, we're --4 MR. RIDDLE: No, I just like to know (inaudible), 5 6 because I thought we had a process. 7 MR. O'RELL: If everybody's comfortable with the 8 change in the agenda now: tetra sodium pyrophosphate, as 9 we discussed yesterday, was petitioned for the use as a 10 pH adjuster and dough conditioner. 11 Following our report yesterday on tetra sodium 12 pyrophosphate with our handling committee recommendation, 13 we had discussion on the Board. We've incorporated -- when 14 we had our breakout session we incorporated some of the 15 comments from the Board, we also considered public comment 16 that was made yesterday, and let me just go -- because we 17 did this and we don't have copies for everybody --18 CHAIRMAN KING: Arthur's going to try to pull it up for --19 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Just the voting form. 20 21 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, that's just a blank. 22 MR. O'RELL: Just the voting form. But let's 23 just go through and note the changes we did make, starting 24 with Category 3. 25 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Category 2. R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

MR. O'RELL: Okay, Category 2, yes. We did make 1 2 an addition on Category 2, Question Number 2, "Is there an organic substitute?", we had marked "Yes," but in our 3 documentation and comments we also noted that this -- that 4 5 what the petition stated with organic lecithin as an 6 emulsifier was not applicable in this situation, it was 7 confirmed by public comment and some other information that 8 we had received prior to the meeting. 9 So we've marked "yes/no." Okay, Jim. 10 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, I'm sorry, but I don't see 11 anything to follow, but I'm trying --12 MR. O'RELL: You don't have the sheet? 13 MR. RIDDLE: No. 14 MR. SIEMON: (Inaudible) your regular sheet. 15 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, I thought they'd be in the 16 meeting book. 17 MR. O'RELL: Okay, moving on now to Category 3, 18 and when the committee met in its breakout session, we 19 considered the comments that were made regarding the public 20 testimony that we had put in the documentation column, which we agree we do not want as a board or a committee to 21 22 endorse a product that may be on the marketplace or 23 recognize products on the marketplace that shouldn't be. 24 So we are striking, in Question Number 1, under 25 "Documentation," the -- starting with Public Testimony R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

91902, Dr. Bossy, "There are products currently labeled 1 2 'Certified Organic' in the marketplace." We are leaving in Public Testimony 91902, Page 3 84, Tom Harding, "All these organic products have high 4 consumer acceptance, period. 5 We are striking "and are certified by responsible 6 7 accredited certifiers." 8 Any questions on --9 (No audible response.) MR. O'RELL: Number 2, "Is the substance 10 11 consistent with organic farming and handling?" We had 12 marked originally, as a committee, "Not applicable." We are changing that --13 14 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: It was an error. 15 MR. O'RELL: It was an error, typo. -- to "Yes." 16 MR. SIEMON: Was it supposed to be "Yes" all 17 along? 18 MR. O'RELL: It was supposed to be "Yes." It was 19 a typo. And then we are striking again the same verbiage, Public Testimony 91902, Dr. Bossy, "There are no" -- "There 20 21 are products currently labeled 'Certified Organic' in the marketplace." 22 23 And then the final comment on the Public 24 Testimony by Tom Harding, "and are certified by responsible 25 accredited certifiers," striking that sentence, that half R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

of the sentence, leaving in "All these organic products have high consumer acceptance."

Number 3, "Is the substance compatible with a system of sustainable agriculture?" We had marked "N/A," so we're striking all documentation in that column.

Now, Number 6, "Is the primary use to recreate or improve flavors, colors, or nutritive values lost in processing?" We have added three sections. The first one is a note from the TAP, tetra sodium pyrophosphate, TSPP, on Page 2, "The specific use petitioned is as a pH buffer and dough conditioner for use in organic meat-alternative products."

We are also including, from public comments made yesterday, testimony from Dr. Garish Ganjyal and Steve Ham, MGP Ingredients, quote: "Currently no alternatives exist for the functional properties displayed by TSPP when used in small amounts in this proprietary process. Extrusion processing is used in this proprietary process, which involves high-temperature and high-pressure cooking for a short duration. TSPP is unique because it has a high melting temperature and thus withstands the extrusion-processing conditions while maintaining its functionality."

We are also adding a quote from an e-mail that was sent on behalf of the petitioner to the handling committee, stating: "Texturization in the finished

ingredient is the primary result of the thermomechanical 1 2 process during the actual extrusion process; i.e., pressure heat shear at the die plate, forming heads, et cetera." 3 Now we go to the handling committee 4 recommendation to the full board. We had discussion based 5 6 on new information -- or public comment and information 7 from the Board, and we have -- we took a second vote, there 8 was a motion by Kim, seconded by Andrea, and let me just 9 pull this up and read this from the computer. 10 (Pause.) 11 MR. O'RELL: The motion was to allow TSPP under 205.605(b), with annotation, in quotes, "for use in meat-12 analog products." 13 14 This is going back to the original annotation 15 that was voted on on the last Board meeting and striking 16 the word "texture." That vote was 6 yes, zero no, zero 17 abstentions, zero absent. 18 CHAIRMAN KING: Discussion? 19 MR. SIEMON: I guess I'd just like to know if that annotation causes any trouble whatsoever for the use 20 21 of the product, I wouldn't think it would, so --22 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: We -- no. 23 MR. SIEMON: Okay. Great. 24 CHAIRMAN KING: Andrea. 25 MS. CAROE: I just wanted to comment on that.

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

1 had relooked at the not using an annotation and the concern that this would be used --2 3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Andrea? I'm sorry. MS. CAROE: The concern was that if there was no 4 annotation, that it could open it up, actually, to improved 5 6 texture in other products, specifically meat. So that's 7 the reason we came up with an annotation that broadly 8 covered the petitioned request but didn't expand it to where it would not meet criterias -- the criteria for 9 inclusion on the list. 10 11 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, I just want to express 12 appreciation for the work of the committee. 13 MR. SIEMON: You going to do that with a motion? 14 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, I --MR. O'RELL: Should do that with a motion? 15 16 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, sure, I'd move approval -- no, 17 I'm not, I am not going to move the approval. 18 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: It dies because of 19 lack of second. MR. RIDDLE: You guys almost tricked me. 20 21 (Laughter.) 22 MS. DIETZ: I'll make the same motion: 23 tetra sodium pyrophosphate on 205.605(b) as a synthetic, 24 with the annotation as a meat-analog --25 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: For use in. R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

1	MR. O'RELL: For use in meat-analog products.
2	MS. DIETZ: for use in meat-analog products.
3	MS. CAROE: I'll second.
4	UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Jim, you could second
5	it.
6	MR. RIDDLE: It already was.
7	CHAIRMAN KING: It has been? Who seconded?
8	MR. RIDDLE: Andrea.
9	CHAIRMAN KING: Andrea seconded. All right, so
10	it's been moved and seconded that we consider the addition
11	of TSPP to .605(a). Correct?
12	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: .605(b).
13	CHAIRMAN KING: .605(b), sorry, with the
14	following annotation: "for use in meat-analog products."
15	Is there any discussion?
16	MS. GOLDBURG: I'm going to raise one point,
17	because I think I'm going to vote against this material,
18	and that is, I think that when we do vote, we ought to
19	consider whether we need organic meat-analog products.
20	MR. CARTER: Yeah, I have the same concern.
21	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: (Inaudible)
22	discussions (inaudible)?
23	CHAIRMAN KING: Okay. Further discussion?
24	MR. SIEMON: Well, if we're going to go that far,
25	my concern always is, if you do that, then you have a "made
	R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
	5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

with "product and you'll still have it out there -- instead 1 2 of being 95-percent organic, you're going to have it 70-3 percent organic, and we've actually done a disservice, because the market will always go to that lower one if they 4 -- if that's what you're enforcing [phonetic], so to me, 5 6 that's really important. 7 MS. CAUGHLAN: I think that's a very valid --8 CHAIRMAN KING: Goldie, go ahead. 9 MS. CAUGHLAN: No, I said I think that's a very valid rationale. 10 11 MS. KOENIG: Can you elaborate on it a little 12 bit, what you're --MR. SIEMON: Well, if we prohibit this material, 13 14 then they'll just put a "made with organic" claim and it'll 15 be 70-percent organic, if we allow it, then people are able 16 to make a meat analog, whether we need it or not, at 95. You're not going to stop the product from being on the 17 18 marketplace and trying to go out to the organic consumer. 19 Now it's a choice of enabling that to be 95 or we limit it to the 70. 20 21 CHAIRMAN KING: Kim. 22 MS. DIETZ: This same discussion we went into 23 detail about 20 pages of the original time we voted on this 24 material, and remember, if this material is also considered

> R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

a processing aid, it does not need to be on the label.

25

on a "made with" product, you may have one ingredient and it'll be a hundred-percent grain and on a "made with" label. So there is confusion out there to the consumer, and that's why we did not originally recommend a "made with" label.

CHAIRMAN KING: And I just -- I actually voted for this recommendation, I had a similar concern with George and I made the point of the "made with" category, and I guess one of the things that helped me to support it is: understanding, as I walk into a grocery store, that there are lots of consumers who -- vegetarians, primarily -- who do consume this product and who are supporting it.

And the second was that -- and I could be wrong on the math here, but it was .5 percent of TSPP in the actual ingredient that then goes into the final product, so I think we're --

MR. O'RELL: 10 percent in the final product.

CHAIRMAN KING: So we're talking about a pretty small percent. Dave.

MR. CARTER: Well, I just -- one of the things I'd like to ask too is just -- on the Category 1, down there under Number 10, the documentation says "as noted, tetra sodium pyrophosphate has been linked to kidney damage; however, all reviewers shared the consensus that the levels used in food manufacture should not pose a

serious risk for most consumers," that's --1 2 (Laughter.) MR. CARTER: That doesn't give me a lot of 3 4 confidence, that it "should not for most consumers." That --5 6 MS. DIETZ: That's what is written in the TAP, 7 that's verbatim. 8 MR. CARTER: Okay. 9 MR. O'RELL: Yeah. I mean, the problem with that, that is exactly -- it's verbatim language from the 10 11 TAP, but the fact is that if you look at the GRAS standing 12 [phonetic] and everything else associated with the safety, 13 it's not considered at these levels for a food additive, 14 it's really not a concern. 15 CHAIRMAN KING: So if I'm hearing you correctly, 16 Kevin, that science was based on much higher usage. There was another reference in the 17 MS. DIETZ: TAP where it said that most of the health risks were 18 19 related to the medical industry, not food. MR. SIEMON: Should we add that? 20 MS. DIETZ: It's in there, it's on our notes. 21 22 MS. CAUGHLAN: I'm just realizing that in our 23 annotation we say "for use in meat-analog products," but 24 this is really for use in meat-analog processing aid or 25 ingredient that goes into the final -- you understand what R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

1 I'm saying? There's a step there. 2 MS. DIETZ: (Inaudible) as a processing aid in 3 meat analog --4 MS. CAUGHLAN: Right. It's actually --MS. DIETZ: (Inaudible.) 5 6 MS. CAUGHLAN: Pardon? 7 MS. DIETZ: That was the original annotation, and 8 so we just felt that was the best one, but whether it's a 9 process or a product, it ultimately is the final product. MS. CAUGHLAN: And it's in there. 10 11 MS. DIETZ: And it's in there. MR. O'RELL: Mark. 12 CHAIRMAN KING: Yeah. 13 14 MR. O'RELL: Can I address the kidney damage? 15 we're reading from the TAP, "extrapolation from rat models 16 may overestimate kidney damage from sodium pyrophosphate as a food additive," and then it says, "but, overall, 17 18 phosphate consumption may be more relevant because sodium 19 pyrophosphate readily converts to orthophosphates, " and orthophosphates we do have on the National List for 20 21 approval --22 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: For use in dairy. 23 MR. O'RELL: -- in dairy foods. 24 MS. KOENIG: And this wasn't -- it's not a 25 comment to this product, it's just a general comment, R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

because -- I mean, we heard it yesterday, and I guess I -- after thinking about it, I was a little uncomfortable with this notion that because something is GRAS or the idea of Good Manufacturing Practices makes something okay, because if that was the -- you know, that is the assumption, I mean that's why you have GRAS, that's why you have FDA, that's why you have testing, but in the -- in the OFPA sense, I mean, if that was the case, then there would never have been a criteria to ask the question.

You know, so the question -- somebody begged the question, because even though in that world, you know, there is that assumption, I don't think that we're supposed to put that in every category, that with Good Manufacturing Practices things should be okay.

I think that category acknowledges -- should acknowledge the data that is out there, and it can say with -- you know, "with GRAS it is" thing, but I don't think that we should just always just go over that and say, "Oh, of course," because we could answer that for everything, you know, pesticide use is fine as long as you're wearing applicators, but -- but we know in reality, as practitioners, that that's not always the case, and to me, that's why the criteria was -- is there, so that's all I wanted to say.

MR. O'RELL: Right. But I think that's only one R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

factor that we're considering; we're not basing the whole 1 2 thing on the fact it's GRAS. In addition, the substance, 3 in terms of anything linked in damage to human health, is very sketchy in the TAP. 4 MS. KOENIG: No, (inaudible), I'm not talking 5 about this product, I'm just saying as we go through these 6 7 forms, there's a reason why those questions are there, and 8 the answer to everything is not "because it's GRAS," you 9 know, you're supposed to think more about it, in terms of a 10 more holistic concept. MR. O'RELL: I agree. I think we did for this 11 12 review. 13 MS. KOENIG: Okay. 14 MR. SIEMON: Call the question [phonetic]. 15 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Call the question. 16 CHAIRMAN KING: The question's been called. 17 MR. SIEMON: Twice. 18 CHAIRMAN KING: "Twice, " George says. Okay, so, 19 again, we're voting on tetra sodium pyrophosphate to be added to 205.605(a), with the following annotation: "for 20 21 use in meat-analog products." All those in favor say aye. 22 MR. O'RELL: Wait, we've got to take a motion. 23 CHAIRMAN KING: We do, sorry. All right. 24 MR. SIEMON: It seemed so easy. 25 (Laughter.) R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

1	CHAIRMAN KING: I know. So we'll start
2	UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Rookie mistake.
3	CHAIRMAN KING: It is a rookie mistake.
4	(Laughter.)
5	MR. SIEMON: Dave always did it in a different
6	order each time, so
7	CHAIRMAN KING: Yeah.
8	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Katherine, are you
9	going to be calling the vote, were you wanting to record?
10	CHAIRMAN KING: Are you recording the vote?
11	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Just total.
12	CHAIRMAN KING: Huh?
13	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Just total.
14	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Do you want me to
15	record the vote?
16	CHAIRMAN KING: Please.
17	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: (Inaudible) the yeas
18	and nays and abstain
19	CHAIRMAN KING: Hold on.
20	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Give me a minute to
21	put everyone's name down.
22	CHAIRMAN KING: All right. All right, we'll
23	start over here, and we won't go the same way every time,
24	okay, but we are going to start with Ann this time.
25	MS. COOPER: Yes.
	R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
	5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

```
1
              CHAIRMAN KING: Ann says "Yes." Rose?
 2
              MS. DIETZ: Yes.
 3
              MS. COOPER: Yes.
 4
              MS. KOENIG: Yes.
 5
              MS. CAROE: Yes.
 6
              MR. SIEMON: Yes.
 7
              MR. CARTER:
                          No.
 8
              CHAIRMAN KING: Andrea's "Yes," George is "Yes,"
 9
    Dave is "No."
10
              MR. RIDDLE: A reluctant yes, hesitant, a slow
11
    yes.
12
    (Laughter.)
13
              CHAIRMAN KING: Mark, yes.
14
              MS. DIETZ: Kim, yes.
15
              MS. OSTIGUY: No.
16
              MR. O'RELL: Yes.
17
              MS. CAUGHLAN: Yes.
18
              MR. LACY: Mike, yes.
19
              MS. GOLDBERG: Becky, no.
20
              CHAIRMAN KING: Okay, so we have 3 no's out of
21
    13, so we have -- we have 10 yes votes, 10 yes, 3 no's.
22
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: 10 yes, 3 no's.
23
              CHAIRMAN KING: 1 absent. Okay.
24
              MR. CARTER: You forgot to ask if anybody has a
25
    conflict.
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
```

CHAIRMAN KING: Oh, yeah. Dave just noted I 1 2 forgot to ask: Does anyone have a conflict they'd like to disclose? Sorry. That's my second rookie mistake. 3 MR. SIEMON: I'm in the meat business. 4 5 (Laughter.) 6 CHAIRMAN KING: Just for the record: George is 7 in the meat business. 8 (Laughter.) 9 MR. SIEMON: That's why. I have five heifers 10 (laughs). 11 CHAIRMAN KING: All right, motion carries. Okay, 12 Kevin, it's yours once again. 13 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Is the next one 14 nitrous oxide? 15 MR. O'RELL: It is, if I can find it. 16 (Pause.) 17 MR. O'RELL: Okay. Second material from the 18 handling committee is nitrous oxide. We presented that 19 yesterday, indicated that it is petitioned for use as a propellant, talked about some of the environmental concerns 20 and the greenhouse effect. I know -- in the interest of 21 22 time, I'm not going to go through all of that. 23 The committee recommendation: there was no 24 change, there was no public comment given, and there was no 25 discussion from the Board. So the committee, on the vote R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

```
to allow nitrous oxide for addition to 205.6 failed, in a
 1
    vote: yes, zero; no, 5; no abstentions; and 1 absent.
 2
 3
    That was as synthetic non-agricultural.
 4
              That was rejected, and that is still the handling
 5
    committee recommendation to the Board.
 6
              CHAIRMAN KING: Discussion?
 7
    (No audible response.)
 8
              CHAIRMAN KING: Is there a motion to consider the
 9
    recommendation?
10
              MS. CAUGHLAN: I move.
11
              CHAIRMAN KING: Goldie moves we consider the
12
    recommendation. Second?
13
              MS. OSTIGUY: Second.
14
              CHAIRMAN KING: Nancy.
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Who did the motion?
15
16
              MR. O'RELL: Goldie did a motion.
17
              MR. RIDDLE: What's the exact wording, what's the
18
    wording of the motion?
19
              MR. O'RELL: It's: to allow nitrous oxide for
    addition to 205.6, synthetic non-agricultural product.
20
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: To allow?
21
22
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: You have to vote to
23
    allow.
24
              MR. O'RELL: The motion is to allow.
25
    (Pause.)
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

```
CHAIRMAN KING: Okay, does everyone understand
 1
 2
    the motion?
 3
    (No audible response.)
 4
              CHAIRMAN KING: All right. Here we go.
    refusals, any conflicts?
 5
 6
              MR. SIEMON: Oh, yeah, I want to start thinking
 7
    about whip cream.
 8
    (Laughter.)
 9
              CHAIRMAN KING: Yeah. You're not in the whip
10
    cream business, okay.
11
    (Laughter.)
12
              CHAIRMAN KING: Okay. We'll start with Becky.
13
              MS. GOLDBURG: No.
14
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: The motion is --
15
              CHAIRMAN KING: The motion is to allow, so a "No"
16
    vote means you will not allow it, we understand.
17
              VOICES: Right.
18
              CHAIRMAN KING: Okay. Mike.
19
              MR. LACY: No.
20
              CHAIRMAN KING: No.
21
              MS. CAUGHLAN: Goldie, no.
22
              MR. O'RELL: No.
23
              MS. OSTIGUY: No.
24
              MS. DIETZ: No.
25
              CHAIRMAN KING: No.
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

```
1
               MR. RIDDLE:
                            No.
 2
               MR. CARTER:
                            No.
 3
               MR. SIEMON:
                            No.
              MS. CAROE:
 4
                           No.
 5
               MS. KOENIG:
 6
               MS. COOPER:
                            No.
 7
                               That's 13 no's, zero yeses, 1
               CHAIRMAN KING:
 8
    absent.
 9
               Do you have anything else?
10
     (No audible response.)
11
               CHAIRMAN KING: Okay, I think we'll take a quick
12
    break, 15-minute break. My watch shows about 3:15, we come
13
    back at 3:30, and we will start with crops.
14
     (Off the record at 3:15 p.m. and reconvened at 3:30 p.m.)
15
               CHAIRMAN KING: Just real quick, as a board,
16
    finish up one quick order of business with the processing
    committee and then we'll move on.
17
18
               MR. O'RELL: Yesterday we -- the handling
19
    committee submitted a written report, which was an update
20
    on materials used as food contact substances.
21
    Unfortunately, this report did not get the 30-day
22
    published, so we can't vote officially on the
23
    recommendation, but what we'd like to do is to propose that
24
    we have a Board vote to accept this document, and then at
25
    least it will be posted again on the website and we can
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
```

take future action. 1 From the handling committee, we are going to be 2 3 working more on food contact substances and we'd like to 4 recognize these six ingredients -- or six materials that we 5 have formally approved for addition to the National List. 6 CHAIRMAN KING: Is there a motion to accept the 7 report? 8 MS. DIETZ: I'll make the motion. 9 MS. CAUGHLAN: I'll second. 10 CHAIRMAN KING: Kim Burton moved that we accept 11 the food contact substance report, and Goldie Caughlan 12 seconded. Discussion? 13 14 (No audible response.) 15 I don't think we need an CHAIRMAN KING: 16 individual vote on this. All those in favor say aye. 17 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye. 18 CHAIRMAN KING: Opposed, same sign. 19 (No audible response.) 20 CHAIRMAN KING: Motion carries. Anything else? MR. O'RELL: That's it from the handling 21 22 committee. 23 Thank you, Kevin. We'll move on CHAIRMAN KING: 24 to the crops committee now. 25 MS. OSTIGUY: Starting with soy protein isolate, R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

the committee met this morning and discussed the comments 1 2 that we received and the public testimony yesterday, and the motion was to reject the TAP and request information 3 that does address the material used as a soil amendment. 4 The vote for rejecting the TAP was 4 yes, zero 5 6 no, and zero abstentions. 7 CHAIRMAN KING: Discussion? Andrea? 8 MS. CAROE: In the TAP, on the first page, in the 9 first paragraph, the last sentence, it says, "No information concerning its use in either conventional non-organic 10 11 or organic plant fertilizer was found, " so they looked for 12 it and they didn't find it. I guess I'm asking: if you're sending it back, 13 14 what are you expecting them to find in the second look that 15 -- because clearly they looked for it, they just -- there's 16 no information there. We're sending it back for more 17 information, but they have acknowledged that there is none. (Pause.) 18 19 MS. OSTIGUY: I'm not quite sure how to put this 20 nicely. I'm not sure how -- and this is nothing about you, this has to do with the reviewer. 21 22 (Laughter.) 23 I'm sorry. MS. OSTIGUY: I saw the --24 MS. CAROE: (Inaudible.) 25 MS. OSTIGUY: I saw the look on your face and was R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

like "Oh my God." No.

MS. CAROE: "Did I ask the wrong thing?"

MS. OSTIGUY: No, no, no. This is the -- the TAP contractor again.

This particular TAP reminded me of the original ones before they started doing some decent ones. I believe, based upon notes that I've taken and such, that there are some questions that they didn't attempt to answer. One does not need specific details about soy protein isolate specifically to be able to answer the concepts of what happens when you use these kinds of materials, which are some of what we want to know about, use in soil, it's not -- you know, you don't have to know -- the studies don't have to have been done specifically on soy protein isolate only, but anything that is similar to it, and I do not have the impression, based upon this TAP or our prior experience with this TAP contractor, that they would have asked questions in that context. I would at the very least like to know that. But --

MS. CAROE: Okay. Well, as I understand soy protein isolates, they are an extracted piece of a plant, not changed or synthesized in any way but just a sophisticated pull-out of that one piece, and I'm pretty familiar with the process from my lab background. That material is already in a plant. How different is using

this material as using a green manure of soybeans? As far as -- as far as the interaction in the soil --

MS. OSTIGUY: There can be tremendous differences with the bacterial interactions when you have extracted all the other parts of a green manure from it.

MS. KOENIG: It's the C-to-N ratio.

MS. OSTIGUY: Excuse me?

MS. KOENIG: It's the C-to-N ratio. In a green manure --

MS. OSTIGUY: I can't hear you.

MS. KOENIG: In a green manure you have carbon in association with nitrogen, and part of that nitrogen is -part of the carbon is broken down by some of that nitrogen.

In a product where you just have solely nitrogen, it's a more quick release. And we're not saying that, you know, that's either good or bad, but we're just saying that there's implications in terms of that use of nitrogen versus of other types of nitrogen in the system and we want that to be -- to be comprehensively covered.

And additionally -- and I'm sorry, Nancy, I don't want to pull -- the discussion that we had after we relooked over the definition of "synthetic" and -- there was some discussion, you know, whether this in fact was a natural, which was different than what the commenters said, so there was kind of a change in position among the members

in our committee as far as the way we were looking at that.

But that said the processing, the hexane extraction process, was not covered in the TAP, and because manufacturing of the soy protein isolate is one of the OFPA criteria, we felt that we needed additional information about the manufacturing process in the sense of using hexane as an extraction material. We wanted to specifically know the environmental consequences and properties of that hexane and, really, whether there are alternatives to that in -- in just the criteria of manufacturing.

MS. OSTIGUY: Kim.

MS. DIETZ: So my question is, because we have deferred materials in the past and not given really good guidance on -- well, that's not true. We've not got back what we asked for.

So when we revised these forms, I was the one that recommended that if we defer, that we be specific in what we believe.

So all I ask this committee is to make sure that you are specific, if we're going to defer this material, so that we get what we need, so that this gentleman does not go on six years [phonetic] without voting on this material.

So I can support that, because I want this to have a very thorough review with this material and make

sure we're doing the right decision, so that's just what I 1 2 would request and that -- you know, that we give a detailed guideline to the TAP contractors. 3 MS. OSTIGUY: Jim. 4 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. Yeah, I think there are a lot 5 6 of detailed questions here, and I would like to add to it. 7 Rose just mentioned about the environmental effects of 8 hexane, and I don't see that in the list yet, because we 9 didn't know --10 MS. OSTIGUY: It's in my notes. 11 MR. RIDDLE: Okay. -- because we didn't know 12 that was part of the manufacturing process for sure. 13 That's not true. It was in the MS. DIETZ: 14 original petition, and it was in the flowchart supplied to 15 the contractors, so I don't know what --16 MR. RIDDLE: Okay. Well, the TAP acted like they 17 didn't know. 18 MS. OSTIGUY: We didn't look at the material. 19 MR. RIDDLE: So I guess I was misled by reading the TAP. 20 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes. 21 22 MR. RIDDLE: And then also the role of legumes in 23 the crop rotation, the whole systems-type questions. And 24 then I just have a question about what you mean, what the 25 committee means, the -- in your questions there, the fourth R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

```
line from the bottom, it starts: Answer, Category 1,
 1
 2
    Question A, "Is soy protein isolate persistence?", I
    imagine "persistent," but then, "can in concentrate"?
 3
 4
              MS. OSTIGUY: Yeah.
              MR. RIDDLE: What does that -- do you know what
 5
 6
    that --
 7
              MS. OSTIGUY: It -- in --
 8
              MR. RIDDLE: Oh, "can 'it' concentrate," okay.
 9
    Okay.
10
              MS. OSTIGUY: Some of these, I know the answer.
11
    They didn't answer the question.
12
              MR. RIDDLE: Uh-huh.
              MS. OSTIGUY: I can provide information.
13
14
              MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. Well, you're not being paid
15
    $4,000.
16
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: We're board members.
17
    (Laughter.)
18
              MS. OSTIGUY: But I also want to make it clear
19
    that we aren't clueless about what the answers are.
20
              MR. RIDDLE: Uh-huh.
              MS. OSTIGUY: I --
21
              MR. RIDDLE: Yeah.
22
23
              MS. OSTIGUY: You know, I can do some of this off
24
    the top of my head without a problem.
25
              MR. RIDDLE: You know, and I can support
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

```
deferring it; I just don't have a lot of confidence in this
 1
 2
    particular -- you know, our contractor to follow through.
 3
              MS. OSTIGUY: Well, they have been done -- doing
    a much better job generally and a much better job when we
 4
 5
    ask for information when it's been incomplete.
 6
              MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, but I look at the -- yeah.
 7
    Some of these others, the urea one is not very helpful
 8
    either.
 9
              MS. OSTIGUY: Yeah.
                                    They have -- they have,
10
    though, improved. And it may be that this is actually a
11
    non-synthetic, you know, that -- it may be that
12
    fundamentally inaccurate of a TAP.
13
              MR. SIEMON: That was my question.
14
              MS. OSTIGUY: Yeah.
15
              MR. SIEMON: You were not able to determine that
16
    this is a synthetic?
              MS. OSTIGUY: Well, that was where we went around
17
18
    and around in the conversation this morning, was: is it a
19
    synthetic? is it a non-synthetic?
              MR. SIEMON: Okay. Then we're stuck.
20
21
              MS. CAROE:
                          Well -- I mean, logically, it's -- to
22
    me, it's a non-synthetic, because it's --
23
              MS. OSTIGUY: After hexane extraction?
24
              MS. CAROE: It's not molecularly changed.
25
    extraction is simply a method in order to take out a piece
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

of the original plant. It's not changed. 1 2 MS. OSTIGUY: Andrea, there was disagreement, 3 that's all I can tell you. MS. CAROE: Well, I can tell you I believe it's 4 non-agricultural. I mean, it's been manipulated in a way 5 6 that it is -- no longer has its agricultural identity, but 7 it's not synthetic. 8 MS. OSTIGUY: Andrea -- yes, I hear what you're 9 saying. We had -- there were people that were -- stated 10 your opinion, there were people that stated others. 11 was no conclusion that we were able to reach, as a 12 committee. Richard? 13 MR. MATTHEWS: Yeah. I need a bit of a 14 clarification on something. This is Richard Matthews, 15 Program Manager, National Organics Program. 16 I'm not sure I heard correctly a few moments ago when there was discussion about the fact that there was a 17 18 question written onto the sheet and Nancy says she knows 19 the answer? MS. OSTIGUY: I know the answer, but I -- I could 20 not -- this is not a test for them, but I'm not the one 21 22 that's supposed to be supplying everybody with the answer. 23 Now, I could write those out. 24 MR. MATTHEWS: Then I think you should, because 25 this Board has the responsibility for reviewing the R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

material, this Board is appointed --1 2 MS. OSTIGUY: This --MR. MATTHEWS: Wait a minute. 3 MS. OSTIGUY: This is not --4 5 MR. MATTHEWS: Let me finish. 6 MS. OSTIGUY: -- going to finish the questions, 7 though. 8 MR. MATTHEWS: That's okay. Let me speak my 9 piece. 10 This Board is appointed because of expertise that 11 they have, and I have serious problems with a board that 12 would take the attitude that they know the answer to the question that wasn't answered by the scientists but they're 13 14 not going to answer the question because they're not paid 15 \$4,000 to do TAP, and that is exactly what was said. 16 MS. OSTIGUY: That is not what I said. MR. MATTHEWS: So, folks, if you know the answer 17 18 to something fill in the blank, if there's something you 19 don't know the answer to you can't fill in the blank, then send it back, but don't send it back, because you don't 20 want to fill in the blank. 21 22 MS. OSTIGUY: That is not what was said, Richard. 23 The reason for sending it back was lack of information. 24 There are some things in here that they did not answer, 25 that yes, I can't answer, and I would be willing to write R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

those down.

CHAIRMAN KING: I would entertain a motion to consider.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Specifically what's the information that's --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: There is a motion on the table.

VOICES: No.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Oh. No, okay.

MS. KOENIG: May I just say one thing, you know, as a comment to Richard and Nancy. I think -- you know, and I understand Nancy's point, and I don't -- I think -- I guess what we want to say is that we can supply information, but part of a technical review is actually to review the literature. I mean, it may be my opinion, and it may be Nancy's opinion. I mean, I have had basic bio--- you know, we both have Ph.D. shift in sciences, but I'm not going to write down "Rose says" -- you know.

In order for me to document that and do it as a scientist, I would have to do a literature review and do a comprehensive analysis of those things, and I think what Nancy is saying is that she knows, you know, based on her scientific background -- just like I said, carbon-to-nitrogen ratio -- but, you know, to be -- to do a scientific evaluation, as a scientist, it's our job to go

into the literature and referee publications and document that fact. That's part of the scientific process.

So Richard, we will do our job and we will supplement information, but in order for us to do a literature review on things, it's a considerable amount of time, and what we're saying is that we can look at data -- I mean, to me, our role -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- is to use our expertise to analyze documentation, to see if we can support it or not support it.

If there's areas that we don't support, then we need to confirm that. But I think what's Nancy's saying is it's -- you know, if we have time, we can do some literature review, but the idea of contracting out that information is for a contractor to actually gather that information and do literature review.

So -- that's just my comment.

CHAIRMAN KING: Is there a motion to consider?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Let George have his (inaudible).

MR. SIEMON: I just had a basic question, that maybe is too basic, but: If it was synthetic, is it possible for you to consider this as a fertilizer? Because one of the TAP reviewers says no, you can't, if it's -- so I just need that clarification.

MR. RIDDLE: Well, that's -R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

MR. SIEMON: If it was declared synthetic, is it possible to consider it as a fertilizer? I just need an -- I don't -- that's the basic -- I've read the law here, under what they refer to as -- 6508(b); I just need to know what ya'll -- I need some help.

MS. KOENIG: Can I -- just from the basics of the committee, if it was a synthetic, if it stays within that category -- and again, this is my opinion after sitting on conference calls and getting kind of a general feeling of the group -- it would end up being synthetic, not allowed, because there's plenty of natural sources of nitrogen out there. Okay?

All the reviewers said it was synthetic. You know. So if we use the documentation provided to us by the contractor, then we would go the route of: synthetic, not allowed.

What we're saying, as a committee, is: hey, this may actually in fact be a natural, and we may not even have to go there, but from the information that was provided, we see there is an extraction method involved in that, and we place — there is some concern that there perhaps are other materials that could be used in an extraction process that may warrant us to look at it as a non-synthetic but, however, may stick it in a "prohibited" category, with an annotation only allowing certain extraction methodologies.

So that is really, you know, kind of where the 1 2 committee stands in terms of thinking at this point, but none of us were comfortable based on the lack of 3 information and not having the ability to go into 4 5 textbooks, at this point, to make a decision at that point, we did not think that that was, you know, in the best 6 7 interests of the industry or the petitioner. 8 MR. RIDDLE: I move we defer. 9 MR. SIEMON: Second. 10 CHAIRMAN KING: It's been moved and seconded that 11 we defer, moved to Jim Riddle, seconded by George Siemon. 12 Further discussion? (No audible response.) 13 14 CHAIRMAN KING: Hearing none, for a vote, we'll 15 start with you, Ann, this time. 16 MS. COOPER: Yes. 17 MS. KOENIG: Yes. 18 CHAIRMAN KING: Andrea? 19 MS. CAROE: I'm going to abstain. MR. SIEMON: Yes. 20 MR. CARTER: Dave, yes. 21 22 MR. RIDDLE: Yes. 23 CHAIRMAN KING: Mark, yes. 24 MS. DIETZ: Yes. 25 MS. OSTIGUY: Nancy, yes. R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

1 MR. O'RELL: Kevin, yes. MS. CAUGHLAN: Goldie, yes. 2 3 MR. LACY: Mike, yes. MS. GOLDBURG: Becky, yes. 4 5 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: That's 12 yeses, 1 abstention, and 1 absence. 6 7 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: 12 yes and 1 --8 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: -- 1 abstention, 1 9 absence. 10 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Why was it deferred? 11 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Inadequate TAP. MS. OSTIGUY: Additional material. 12 MR. RIDDLE: It's in the committee's report. 13 14 CHAIRMAN KING: "Additional information needed." 15 MR. RIDDLE: "Details to be provided by 16 committee." 17 MS. OSTIGUY: Okay, 6-benzyladenine. 18 everybody ready? Okay. The committee discussed the public 19 testimony that was presented yesterday. After the discussion the committee voted that the material was 20 synthetic and rejected its addition to -- its addition to 21 22 the National List because hand pruning is an alternative 23 practice that is currently available and currently used. 24 The vote to reject -- or the vote to add was: 25 zero to add, 4 no's, and zero abstentions. Discussion? R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

1 MR. SIEMON: I just -- is there anyone that can 2 confirm that people already hand-thinning? I heard yesterday that was the only way. Is that -- it is? Rose. 3 MS. KOENIG: One of the -- you know, again, in 4 5 committee discussion, the -- the alternative hand thinning 6 came up as a discussion item, that we thoroughly discussed, 7 and one of the benefits of placing this on the web was we 8 were hoping we were going to get public comment from 9 farmers who felt that this was errone- -- you know, not erroneous, but it over- -- you know, a tax [phonetic] that 10 11 was just too much, that they really needed these things. 12 The only public comment that we received was that of the petitioner, which really was a repeat of the same 13 14 reasonings for including it. 15 So based on the fact that there was no public 16 comment from farmers and producers stating they needed this, we assumed our -- that that alternative was not 17 18 needed. 19 MS. OSTIGUY: Jim? MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. In order to have a vote, I 20 move that it be added to the List. 21 22 CHAIRMAN KING: Is there a second? 23 MS. CAUGHLAN: In order to have a vote I'll 24 second it. 25 (Laughter.) R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

1	CHAIRMAN KING: It's been moved by Jim Riddle
2	that we add 6-benzyladenine to the List, and seconded by
3	Goldie Caughlan. Discussion, further discussion?
4	(No audible response.)
5	CHAIRMAN KING: Hearing none, we'll proceed to
6	vote, beginning with Becky.
7	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: That doesn't work.
8	Start with Rose. Just alternate.
9	CHAIRMAN KING: All right, we'll start with her.
10	MS. KOENIG: No.
11	CHAIRMAN KING: Rose says "No."
12	MS. GOLDBURG: No.
13	MR. LACY: No.
14	MR. RIDDLE: No.
15	CHAIRMAN KING: No.
16	MS. CAUGHLAN: Goldie, no.
17	MR. O'RELL: No.
18	MS. OSTIGUY: No.
19	MS. DIETZ: No.
20	MR. CARTER: No.
21	MR. SIEMON: No.
22	MS. CAROE: No.
23	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: 13 no's, 1
24	abstention.
25	CHAIRMAN KING: 1 absence.
	R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
	5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

1 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Absence, I'm sorry. 2 MS. OSTIGUY: The next one was urea. Urea, the committee discussed, there was no additional information 3 that was presented. Urea was petitioned for a use that 4 doesn't exist with EPA, so we really can't even consider 5 6 it. 7 MR. SIEMON: And this, used in a trap, is 8 required for EPA clearance? 9 MS. OSTIGUY: Yes, it is. As an attractant, it 10 does have to be listed. Now, it's probably not a difficult 11 listing to do, but somebody would have to go through that process; and if somebody did, we have all the materials, 12 then, to add it to the List at that time. 13 14 MS. DIETZ: Yeah. And this -- historically, 15 we've done this before, we just archive the petition and 16 archive all the information, that if it does come back up, then we can re-review the material, but it's just 17 considered archived. 18 19 MS. KOENIG: I make a motion to archive it. MS. DIETZ: I'll second. 20 21 MS. OSTIGUY: Okay. 22 MR. SIEMON: Do we need to vote on it? 23 MS. DIETZ: Yeah, I quess we do have to vote. 24 MR. RIDDLE: Well, it's clear, it's in the 25 record --R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

CHAIRMAN KING: And I would entertain a motion to
add to that that we're accepting the committee's findings,
so if we could
MR. RIDDLE: You accept that as a friendly
amendment?
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
CHAIRMAN KING: So it's been moved that we
archive the information on urea and accept the committee's
findings. I'm not sure who made the motion. Rose made the
motion.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Archive what?
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Archive the petition
and the TAP report.
CHAIRMAN KING: And accept the committee
findings. Do we need an individual vote on this?
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: And who made the
motion?
CHAIRMAN KING: Rose.
MS. OSTIGUY: Rose, seconded by Kim. Question,
when you say you're accepting the committee findings,
you're referring to the committee findings that it is not
EPA-approved?
CHAIRMAN KING: Yes.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: The whole review and
everything.

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

```
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: We haven't really
 1
 2
    detailed it.
 3
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: We have not, no,
 4
    received a report on their actual findings beyond
 5
    (inaudible).
 6
              CHAIRMAN KING: My understanding is we're
 7
    accepting the finding that it's not a legal EPA label
 8
    claim.
 9
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: That's correct.
10
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: That's what I wanted
11
    to clarify.
12
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: And it's --
    basically, the committee recommended for deferred, so
13
14
    deferred and we're archiving it.
15
              CHAIRMAN KING: Okay. We're going to start with
16
    Andrea this time.
              MS. CAROE: Yes.
17
18
              MS. GOLDBURG: Yes.
19
              MR. LACY: Yes.
20
              MR. RIDDLE: Yes.
              CHAIRMAN KING: Yes.
21
22
              MS. CAUGHLAN: Yes.
23
              MR. O'RELL: Yes.
24
              MS. OSTIGUY: Yes.
25
              MS. DIETZ: Yes.
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

```
1
              MR. CARTER: Yes.
 2
              MR. SIEMON: Yes.
 3
              MS. KOENIG: Yes.
              MS. OSTIGUY: Last one, for crops --
 4
 5
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: What's the vote,
 6
    please?
 7
              MS. OSTIGUY: 13 yes, zero no, no abstentions, 1
 8
    absence.
 9
              MS. CAUGHLAN: No, it's 12, 1, and 1. I mean --
              CHAIRMAN KING: No, 13 --
10
11
              MS. CAUGHLAN: You're right. I'm sorry.
12
              MS. OSTIGUY: 13 yeses, zero no's, 1 absence, no
13
    abstentions.
14
    (Pause.)
              MS. DIETZ: Come on, girlfriend (inaudible).
15
16
    (Laughter.)
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Oh, but our table's
17
18
    not ergonomically correct.
19
              CHAIRMAN KING: Pressure. Pressure.
    (Laughter.)
20
21
              MS. OSTIGUY: Okay, the committee considered the
22
    information that was provided yesterday during public
23
    testimony, and also the public comments that were received
24
    on hydrogen chloride's use for de-linting cotton seed.
25
              A motion was made -- I believe by Rose, I don't
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

```
remember who seconded it now -- to add hydrogen chloride to
 1
 2
    the National List, with the annotation "for de-linting
 3
    cotton seed for planting."
              The vote was 4 yes, zero no, zero abstentions.
 4
              MS. DIETZ: I just want to make sure that you
 5
 6
    incorporated my changes into the original document, that I
 7
    asked.
 8
              MS. OSTIGUY: Yes, it'll be going in.
                                                      Any other
 9
    comments?
10
              MR. SIEMON: This hydrogen chloride is the same
11
    thing that was with the soy product; right?
12
              MS. DIETZ: No.
13
              MS. OSTIGUY: No.
14
              MR. SIEMON: No?
              MS. OSTIGUY: Are you thinking of hexane?
15
16
              MR. SIEMON: Well, okay --
17
              MR. RIDDLE:
                            It's one of the materials, yeah.
18
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: It's one of the two
19
    materials in the extraction process, yes.
              MR. SIEMON: That's what I mean.
20
21
              MR. RIDDLE: After the hexane, then the other
22
            Yeah, you're right.
    steps.
23
              CHAIRMAN KING: Okay.
24
    (Pause.)
25
              MS. OSTIGUY:
                             Is there a motion?
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

```
1
              MR. RIDDLE: I move approval, with the annotation
 2
    as stated by the committee.
 3
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: I'll second it.
 4
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Can you read the
 5
    annotation again, please.
 6
              MS. OSTIGUY: "For de-linting cotton seed for
 7
    planting."
 8
              CHAIRMAN KING: Okay, it's been moved and
 9
    seconded, and we're voting on hydrogen chloride, with the
    following annotation: "for de-linting cotton seed for
10
11
    planting." So we'll start with George.
12
              MR. SIEMON: Yeah -- yes.
13
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Was that two votes or--
14
    (Laughter.)
15
              MR. SIEMON: Well, I'm trying.
16
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: You're here in Chicago;
17
    you never know.
18
    (Laughter.)
19
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Yes.
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Yes.
20
              CHAIRMAN KING: Yes.
21
22
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
23
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
24
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Yes.
25
              MS. OSTIGUY: Yes.
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

1	UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Yes.
2	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
3	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
4	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
5	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: And yes.
6	MS. DIETZ: I just want to commend that process
7	on that material, because that was one that I think we
8	remember it was originally a "No," we got public comment,
9	and thank the committee for taking that back, that was
10	MR. RIDDLE: And what about your comments on the
11	language, that's just between the rest of us don't need
12	to review that?
13	MS. OSTIGUY: Yeah, we've done that. GRAS.
14	There was just comments
15	UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Not now, you voted on
16	it.
17	MR. RIDDLE: I know, we already voted, and
18	(inaudible)
19	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: I trust that
20	(inaudible).
21	MR. RIDDLE: Okay.
22	CHAIRMAN KING: Okay.
23	MR. RIDDLE: Yeah.
24	CHAIRMAN KING: Is there anything else from you?
25	MS. OSTIGUY: No.
	R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
	5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

CHAIRMAN KING: Okay. That concludes crop 1 committee materials. And next is livestock. 2 3 MS. OSTIGUY: I get to do more. CHAIRMAN KING: Yeah. It's just a little 4 5 marathon, Nancy. 6 MS. OSTIGUY: Yes. Yes. Well, yeah, when you 7 let Kevin go first, I was wondering if I'd lose my voice. 8 The first one on the list is moxidectin. 9 a couple of changes on the evaluation criteria, I have no 10 idea how the errors came up, but they -- I made them. All 11 I can say is that they happen on occasion. 12 On Category 1, Number 3, the documentation has that the half-life of moxidectin is up to 6 months; actual-13 14 ly the citation in the TAP, on Pages 5 and 6, is 2 months. 15 So that shows up again in Question 8, Category 1, and 16 Question 9, Category 1. In addition -- well, no, it does have "binding 17 18 tightly to the soil, " so it -- it basically doesn't go 19 anywhere. The committee, when evaluating this material, 20 found that it was synthetic and voted to add the -- and in 21 22 the vote to add the National List, the vote was 5 yes, zero 23 no, zero abstain, with the annotation: "control of 24 internal parasites only." Comments. 25 (No audible response.)

> R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

1	MS. OSTIGUY: Motion. The annotation, again, was
2	"control of internal parasites only."
3	CHAIRMAN KING: Is there a motion to consider?
4	MS. GOLDBURG: I so move.
5	CHAIRMAN KING: It's been moved by Becky.
6	Second?
7	MS. COOPER: Second.
8	CHAIRMAN KING: Seconded by Ann.
9	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: And the annotation
10	again? I just want to make sure (inaudible).
11	MS. OSTIGUY: "Control of internal parasites
12	only."
13	CHAIRMAN KING: Dave, you're on the hot seat.
14	MR. CARTER: Okay. And starting off let me just
15	say, this one causes me more trouble than any, just
16	CHAIRMAN KING: Oh, this discussion.
17	MR. CARTER: the whole parasiticide no,
18	this is about this is just explaining my vote, but
19	The fact that ivermectin is allowed kind of
20	shades everything else, so I will vote Yes.
21	MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, I'm torn on this one too and,
22	yeah, share Dave's concern that ivermectin is on the list.
23	From all that I've read, gathered, this is a more
24	environmentally sound substance than ivermectin, but I do
25	still have some concerns about its environmental impacts
	R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
	5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

```
and also just the cultural practices that we really base
 1
    organic livestock production on, I don't think we've done
 2
    near enough to prevent parasites, and I don't -- that
 3
    hasn't been discussed at length in the TAP, I don't think.
 4
 5
     And, yeah, I've come to the very firm conclusion that I'm
 6
    going to abstain on this.
 7
    (Laughter.)
 8
              MR. RIDDLE: I'm not going to oppose it, but I
 9
    just can't bring myself to support it.
              CHAIRMAN KING: Well, I'd like to thank Jim for
10
11
    having the longest recorded in history (inaudible) --
12
              MR. RIDDLE: (Laughs) To abstain.
              CHAIRMAN KING: Yeah.
13
14
              MR. RIDDLE: Non-vote.
15
                              Yeah, non-vote, exactly.
              CHAIRMAN KING:
16
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: It's a vote with the
17
    majority.
18
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yeah.
19
              CHAIRMAN KING: Okay, I'll vote no.
20
              MR. RIDDLE: We're not voting yet, are we?
              CHAIRMAN KING: Yes.
21
22
              MR. RIDDLE: Oh, that was the vote. I abstained.
23
     I thought we were just still discussing.
24
              MR. CARTER: It seemed like it.
25
    (Laughter.)
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

1	CHAIRMAN KING: If someone wants to move to
2	reconsider, that's fine.
3	MR. RIDDLE: No, no. I abstained.
4	CHAIRMAN KING: All right. So: no.
5	MS. DIETZ: Kim, yes.
6	MS. OSTIGUY: Yes.
7	UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Yes.
8	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
9	UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Yes.
10	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
11	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
12	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
13	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
14	UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Yes.
15	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: 11 yes, 1 abstention,
16	1 absence, and 1 no.
17	MS. OSTIGUY: Okay. Last one is proteinated
18	chelates, and there was some additional discussion this
19	morning, when I was busy with the crops committee, so I do
20	not know what happened with this one.
21	MR. SIEMON: We added an annotation, but
22	otherwise everything remains the same.
23	MS. OSTIGUY: Well, I don't even know what the
24	annotation is, so somebody's got to do this
25	MR. SIEMON: I can tell you what the annotation
	R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
	5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

```
was: protein source must be of mammalian or poultry --
 1
 2
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: I can't hear a word
 3
    you're saying.
              MR. SIEMON: Okay, Nancy's going to lead us
 4
 5
    through this, but we did add an annotation today that said:
 6
     the protein source must not be of mammalian or poultry
 7
    origin.
 8
              MS. OSTIGUY: Okay, I can finish up that. Okay,
 9
    what the committee recommended was that chelated minerals
    be added to the list, that it is a synthetic, with the
10
11
    annotation: "Protein sources must not be of mammalian
12
    or" --
13
    (Pause.)
14
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: -- "poultry origin."
15
              MS. OSTIGUY: -- "poultry origin." The vote --
16
    George, do you know what the vote was? -- because I wasn't
17
    there.
18
              MR. SIEMON: It was 4-0, in favor.
19
              MS. OSTIGUY: And the committee vote was 4 yes,
    zero no, zero abstentions. Discussion? Kim.
20
21
              MR. SIEMON: It was 5-0, excuse me.
              MS. OSTIGUY: Oh, 5-0?
22
              MR. SIEMON: I'm sorry. We didn't -- we had 2,
23
24
    then 3. It was 5-0, committee.
25
              MS. DIETZ: My question, as the same as
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

yesterday: is this material commercially available for all 1 farmers with this restrictive of an annotation? -- and I'm 2 not a livestock expert, but -- I mean, I assume you're 3 having to supply a bunch of farmers or livestock people 4 with this material, and is it commercially available, do we 5 know that for sure, with this restrictive of an annotation? 6 7 MR. SIEMON: We had the same concern, but we had 8 a document from someone who did research and said it was, 9 so it's not like two -- two sources, but we had one written 10 source that there was, so -- it's a good challenged. 11 MS. OSTIGUY: Jim first, and then Andrea. 12 MR. RIDDLE: And it --MS. DIETZ: Nationwide? I mean, I hate to --13 14 MR. RIDDLE: Well, it -- yeah, and from the

MR. RIDDLE: Well, it -- yeah, and from the information that was provided, the animal-origin sources would be very rare, that's not what's typically out there, so what is available is the vegetative sources of protein, but for cautionary purposes we are saying that the animal-origin sources would not be allowed. So it's not like we're taking something away.

MS. OSTIGUY: Andrea.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CAROE: My question is: Is it easily identifiable, which materials don't contain --, I mean is that information that the vendor of the product will have, or -- I mean, you're saying that the protein generally

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

doesn't come from them, but is it all -- I mean is it --1 2 does anybody know where that is and where that isn't? mean, if you can't identify -- if you can't justify that 3 you're within the restriction, then you can't use it 4 5 because you --6 MS. CAUGHLAN: I don't (inaudible). 7 MS. CAROE: I'm just asking. I could see that 8 that might be a problem, for people to actually get the 9 documentation that verifies that they are working within that restriction. 10 11 MR. RIDDLE: Well, I'd just respond, you know, 12 that that's always a problem with any material, just -making sure that it is from allowed substrates or allowed 13 14 ingredients. So I don't see the burden of proof here any 15 different than for other synthetic substances that are on 16 the list currently. 17 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: With annotations. 18 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, with annotations. 19 MS. CAROE: With annotations. But that doesn't 20 always mean that this is going to be -- I mean, just 21 because we've always done it before, I don't know if 22 it's --23 Well, yes --MR. RIDDLE: 24 Especially --MS. CAROE: 25 MR. RIDDLE: -- from -- the information from the R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

petitioner is that yes, that information is available. Whether that is available -- or the information is readily available for everyone in the industry, I really can't answer that, but it is for the petitioner, and therefore, once it becomes an annotation, it is something which can be complied with.

MS. CAROE: The reason that I'm asking is because if you're saying it's rare that it would be from those sources and it's difficult to find, how much are we gaining by putting people through that extra rigorous step, to -- do you see what I'm saying?

MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. Well, it's a precautionary -- UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Yeah.

MS. OSTIGUY: Kim.

MS. DIETZ: I'm going to wait (inaudible).

MS. OSTIGUY: Dave.

MR. CARTER: On this particular issue, yeah, I think the precautionary principle is prudent for us to follow. And I think that on the area of animal-source products in any feed or feed supplement is going to be more -- there's more and more pressure on FDA and the like to start getting into that and to go into things that ranchers and farmers have normally assumed were not sourced from animal sources and to begin looking at that, and so I think we need to establish where we're going to -- where we're

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644 going to draw the line on that, because -- I think from the standpoint of the integrity of the system, and particularly, the organic consumer out there expects that we are not going to be using anything from animal sources in feed.

MR. SIEMON: I hope -- I don't think it's been said already, but I just want to make sure everybody's clear that these -- these materials are actually presently allowed, and we -- we thought we ought to review them to see, because of the FDA, so we went through them, to see, and we're actually continuing to allow them except now we're offering this annotation. It's a little bit different, but it's already allowed.

MS. OSTIGUY: Kim.

MS. DIETZ: I just sense a lot of restlessness in the audience when we gave that annotation, and I am really uncomfortable voting on an annotation on a material we already allow unless I'm really confident that that's available to everybody. So if it's currently allowed, then -- I'm just not convinced that that -- that's true, and I -- we had people coming up here, we had everybody chit-chatting, and I just am not comfortable knowing that that's really the proper annotation, with that much restlessness, and without hearing the public comment on it, so I don't -- I don't understand that. There's not a motion on the table yet, obviously, so if someone wants to make a motion --

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

1	MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. Well, I move that proteinated
2	chelates be placed on the list, with the annotation:
3	"Protein sources must not be of mammalian or poultry
4	origin."
5	MR. CARTER: I'll second it.
6	MR. SIEMON: Is that the right motion just so
7	we're really clear since it's already allowed through
8	the one
9	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: I think you're just
10	adding an annotation.
11	CHAIRMAN KING: So the specific motion is only to
12	add the annotation?
13	MR. RIDDLE: Well, no, it's to it would be to
14	add it to the list under the feed supplements section.
15	CHAIRMAN KING: Okay.
16	MR. SIEMON: Yeah, because it would be added, to
17	be annotated.
18	MS. KOENIG: I guess I'm I'm confused. So
19	you're saying that we voted on this was one that we
20	voted on prior? No.
21	MR. RIDDLE: No, no.
22	CHAIRMAN KING: No, no. That's what I was
23	clarifying.
24	MS. KOENIG: So why are you saying that it's
25	already on the List, then?
	R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

MR. SIEMON: Because it's an FDA vitamin and 1 2 mineral allowed under the Rule. It's already (inaudible). 3 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: It's implied, you say, by -- because it's under a category that's --4 5 MR. SIEMON: Yeah. A broad category. So my interpretation of this vote is really about adding the 6 7 annotation or not. If it fails, it's still allowed, it's 8 just not allowed -- I mean, we need to clarify it, because 9 we could get in trouble here. 10 CHAIRMAN KING: That's right. 11 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Well, what --MR. SIEMON: We should vote on the annotation, in 12 my opinion, so we don't get in any confusion here that a 13 14 "No" vote means it's not allowed at all. 15 MS. DIETZ: Right. If I really had the right 16 intention, I would have made the motion without the annotation, we'd have voted on it. So right now we have a 17 18 motion on the table, with the annotation. 19 MR. SIEMON: Okay. So -- then if this gets voted 20 down, then we'll have another vote going the other way, no 21 problem. CHAIRMAN KING: So let's review the motion, once 22 23 again, please. Jim, if you could. 24 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. Well, the motion would be to 25 place it on the National List, with the annotation: R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

"Protein sources must not be of mammalian or poultry 1 2 origin." 3 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: And who was the 4 seconded vote? 5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: 6 MR. CARTER: Second. 7 MR. SIEMON: Maybe before we vote: Is there 8 anybody in the audience that knows anything about the 9 availability? -- because I hear a lot of cautions here about non- -- according to what we're doing here. 10 11 MR. ENGEL: Thank you for asking. I don't know 12 anything about availability --MR. RIDDLE: Identify --13 14 MR. ENGEL: Oh. I'm David Engel, dairy farmer 15 from Wisconsin. 16 I don't know anything about availability, but I 17 want to repeat the question that I asked the committee 18 earlier, in maybe a little bit different context. 19 Chelated proteins are so prevalent in the industry that I -- and I asked you specifically, when you 20 21 quoted, Jim, Mr. Walker as a proof that there was 22 availability of non-animal-sourced chelated proteins, that 23 it was -- you could get them. I don't know. You guys 24 Be really careful with this. don't know. 25 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Right. R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

1 CHAIRMAN KING: Okay. 2 MR. SIEMON: Okay. UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Kelli. 3 CHAIRMAN KING: Kelli. 4 MR. SIEMON: I would have called that an opinion 5 6 versus information, myself, but --7 MS. SHEA: Kelli Shea. Thanks for asking for 8 input. 9 Because I don't believe we really addressed varying sources of this product, I really think it's a good 10 11 idea to look at the annotation like you are, but I don't 12 believe you have the information to do it. 13 Because this product is currently allowed for 14 use, did you consider deferring the vote until you could 15 get additional information on whether or not it is 16 available in the preferred source you're discussing? 17 would not cause harm to farmers because it currently is 18 available, you would be able to do due diligence, get the 19 information you need, to make the wise choice. 20 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Time to vote? CHAIRMAN KING: Is there a motion to strike? 21 22 There's a motion on the table, there's a motion on the 23 table that's been seconded. 24 MR. RIDDLE: Well, yeah, I just want to respond 25 to those comments, because, you know, I think there's no R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

1	way we want to be allowing animal-origin supplements here
2	anyway. I mean, this this petition has been before us
3	for quite a long time, and I think, in an abundance of
4	caution, in today's environment, we do have a reason to
5	move forward.
6	So I call the question and go to a vote.
7	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: It starts with you.
8	MR. RIDDLE: That's right. I vote yes.
9	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Who did the second on
10	this?
11	MR. CARTER: I did.
12	CHAIRMAN KING: Dave Carter did.
13	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: All right. Okay, go
14	ahead.
15	CHAIRMAN KING: I abstain.
16	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: No.
17	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: No.
18	UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: No.
19	MS. OSTIGUY: Yes.
20	UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: No.
21	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
22	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
23	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Okay, wait, wait one
24	second.
25	MS. COOPER: Yes.
	R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
	5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

1	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Wait one second,
2	please. I've got to go up. So Ann, yes. Rose?
3	MS. KOENIG: Yes.
4	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
5	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Andrea?
6	MS. CAROE: No.
7	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: George?
8	MR. SIEMON: Yes.
9	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Dave?
10	MR. COOPER: Yes.
11	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: 7 yeses, 5 no's, 1
12	abstention.
13	MR. SIEMON: Chair, what's the vote required?
14	CHAIRMAN KING: Two-thirds, I believe, or
15	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: It doesn't pass,
16	because it's 8 to 5. Abstention goes majority.
17	CHAIRMAN KING: Let me pull out the calculator.
18	We need a two-thirds.
19	UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Two-thirds of 13.
20	CHAIRMAN KING: Yeah. Motion fails. Seven comes
21	out at 53 percent. We had 7 yeses.
22	MR. RIDDLE: And the abstain goes with the
23	majority.
24	CHAIRMAN KING: Abstain does go with the
25	majority.
	R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

1	MR. SIEMON: Yeah.
2	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes, it does.
3	UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Did you count that,
4	eight?
5	CHAIRMAN KING: No, I did not.
6	UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Yeah, it's still 62
7	percent.
8	CHAIRMAN KING: Yeah, still not enough. We
9	needed nine.
10	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Motion fails.
11	MR. SIEMON: Okay, is there another motion?
12	MR. RIDDLE: Well, I move to
13	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: (Inaudible).
14	CHAIRMAN KING: Hold on.
15	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Can you summarize
16	what's going on, please?
17	CHAIRMAN KING: The votes were it was 8 to 5
18	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: It was 7 yeses
19	CHAIRMAN KING: 1 abstention. Go ahead.
20	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: 7 yeses, 5 no's, 1
21	abstention, 1 absence.
22	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Okay.
23	CHAIRMAN KING: The motion does not carry.
24	MR. SIEMON: And I'm looking for a new motion.
25	MS. KOENIG: I'll make a motion to defer the
	R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
	5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

material. 1 2 MR. CARTER: I will second it. CHAIRMAN KING: Rose has made the motion to defer 3 4 the material, Dave Carter has seconded. Discussion. 5 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Are we going to defer 6 based on request for more information? 7 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Well, that's what 8 we're going to discuss. 9 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Motion to defer, 10 second by Dave. 11 CHAIRMAN KING: Correct. Is there discussion? 12 Rose. MS. DIETZ: Yeah. I based the deferral on 13 14 gathering information on the commercial availability of 15 plant -- non-mammalian sources of -- of the protein, 16 proteinated chelates. 17 CHAIRMAN KING: So Rose is specifically saying 18 the deferral is to gather more information concerning the 19 sources indicated. (Pause.) 20 CHAIRMAN KING: Is there discussion? 21 22 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. So who's going to do this 23 gathering, and how -- I mean, this is not to send it back 24 to the TAP contractor, correct, this is for the Board to solicit the information? 25 R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

MR. SIEMON: (Inaudible) two confirmations, I 1 2 quess. 3 If we -- this is just going off the MS. DIETZ: top of my head, but if we go back through and put this on 4 5 the recommendation sheet for the next meeting, that the motion was to defer based on information on commercial 6 7 availability, then we see what kind of public comments that 8 we get, and we could use that information. 9 So I urge the community and the livestock industry to comment and to find out whether or not you have 10 11 commercial availability sources based on that original annotation, and let's be specific in the document from the 12 livestock committee. 13 14 CHAIRMAN KING: Rose. 15 MS. KOENIG: But I would also urge the committee 16 to do just minimal research (inaudible), you had one 17 source, you said, try to get, you know, that three sources, 18 just in case public comment doesn't come in, so we can 19 proceed. 20 CHAIRMAN KING: Are you agreeing to do minimal research, Jim? 21 22 MR. RIDDLE: No, I'm just agreeing with what she 23 was saying. 24 CHAIRMAN KING: I'm just kidding. 25 (Laughter.) R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

```
UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: (Inaudible.)
 1
 2
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Okay, I'm ready.
 3
    File the motion.
              MR. SIEMON: We'll seek public comment.
 4
 5
              CHAIRMAN KING: Okay. Question's been called.
 6
    We begin with me. The motion is to defer. "Yes."
 7
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
 8
              MS. OSTIGUY: Yes.
 9
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Yes.
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
10
11
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Yes.
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
12
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
13
14
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
15
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
16
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Yes.
17
              MR. CARTER: Yes.
18
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Yes.
19
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: 13 yeses, no no's, 1
    absence.
20
              MR. SIEMON: Mark, it was the committee's will to
21
22
    make a statement about the antibiotic directives, so is
23
    this the time to bring that up? -- I was told.
24
              CHAIRMAN KING: Sure.
25
              UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: It is?
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

1	MR. SIEMON: I don't know.
2	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: (Inaudible) voting?
3	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: On the
4	recommendations.
5	MR. SIEMON: I'm
6	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Are we on committee
7	reports, or where are we at?
8	UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Yeah, it's still
9	committee reports.
10	CHAIRMAN KING: We're on livestock.
11	MR. SIEMON: Okay.
12	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Is this it for
13	materials?
14	CHAIRMAN KING: No, no, no. We still have more
15	materials; we're just finishing up livestock.
16	MR. SIEMON: This just a resolution the committee
17	put forward
18	UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Actually, we're done
19	with materials.
20	UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: We're done with
21	materials.
22	CHAIRMAN KING: Oh, we are, that's right.
23	UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: That's right, we're
24	done with materials.
25	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Unless there's a
	R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
	5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

1 policy material. 2 CHAIRMAN KING: A policy material? 3 (Laughter.) CHAIRMAN KING: Dave, do you --4 5 (Laughter.) MR. SIEMON: Okay, the committee put forth a 6 7 resolution, a simple paragraph, to revisit this, which I'll 8 be glad to read, and then a series of background, why they 9 felt this was proper to send this message forth. So I'll 10 read the paragraph; even though you all have it, I'll read 11 it for the audience. 12 "The National Organic Standards Board respectfully requests that USDA National Organic Program 13 14 withdraw the 41304 Antibiotic Guidance Statement and work 15 collaboratively with the NOSB to develop policy quidance 16 with is consistent with the Livestock Healthcare Practice standard, statements made by the NOP in their preamble, 17 "NOSB Recommendations, Consumer Expectations, and the 18 19 Principles of Organic Livestock Production." 20 MS. DIETZ: A question on process. I haven't seen this document --21 22 MR. SIEMON: Yeah. 23 MS. DIETZ: -- and you're asking the Board to 24 vote on something that we've never seen and it's just been 25 put forward in front of us, so -- again, I'm a stickler for R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

```
giving me time to read (inaudible) --
 1
 2
              MR. SIEMON:
                            I agree.
 3
              MS. DIETZ: So I can't support it.
              MR. SIEMON: That was my concern, about process,
 4
 5
    too, but --
 6
              MS. DIETZ: Yeah.
 7
              MR. SIEMON: -- but it is just a paragraph that
 8
    we're putting forth, but --
 9
              MS. DIETZ: It just goes to -- you know, we're
    asking the NOP to give us time and -- to look at things and
10
11
    to look at policies and to follow process, and we're not
    doing it; I just disagree. Not that I disagree with the
12
    contents, that I'm aware of [phonetic].
13
14
              CHAIRMAN KING: So, point of clarity: George,
15
    you're just forwarding the paragraph, the resolution, with
16
    the statement you just read; correct?
17
              MR. SIEMON: Correct.
18
              CHAIRMAN KING: The rest is background
19
    information, supporting information.
20
              MR. SIEMON: Uh-huh.
21
              CHAIRMAN KING: So technically that's what we
22
    would be voting on.
23
              MR. SIEMON: I believe that was the committee's
24
    vote, uh-huh.
25
              CHAIRMAN KING:
                              Okay. Rose, then Dave.
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: So you're only sending this, you're not sending the whole thing?

MR. SIEMON: Well, we are sending the whole

thing, but the -- what we need to vote on is the resolution, again, because of the time to look at it. Now, we could wait to tomorrow, I guess. I don't know how to deal with this, this just --

MS. KOENIG: Well, I think that the spirit of the intent is good, you know, and I think that there's more than one directive out there. I think it's the role of the Board to look at all of the directives and compose a letter really fully commenting on them, in a constructive way.

So it's not that I'm not -- you know, again, I agree with the spirit of it; I just don't think that this is the process by which we want to communicate and I think it's something that we could handle, you know, perhaps in an executive committee meeting and people could work on the ways to compose a document and then put it forth with more thoughtful ways of addressing the issue.

So my -- again, I -- I'm -- I guess I move to -to just -- to keep -- the issues are there, and we're all
aware of them, but, really, think about the process by
which we want to address it.

MR. SIEMON: I don't know if we need a movement

-- I mean, a motion, do we need a motion or not, just -- to

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

1 not --

CHAIRMAN KING: Did you move to consider the resolution?

MR. SIEMON: No, I (inaudible).

CHAIRMAN KING: Rose, are you moving that we consider this an executive committee call?

MS. KOENIG: I'm moving to accept the document as a point of reference for the entire Board, but any action should be taken at a later point, through the executive committee process, to really consider, you know, what -- how we want to deal with the policy directive.

CHAIRMAN KING: Second?

MR. RIDDLE: Could you restate your motion, before I can second it? I'll second it, I think.

MS. KOENIG: All right, let me clarify.

CHAIRMAN KING: Perhaps in ten words or less.

MS. KOENIG: Yeah. I'm asking -- basically, the motion is: to defer the issues to the -- to defer the issues at this meeting and allow the executive committee to process all the policy statements and come up with a format to address the issues.

MS. DIETZ: I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN KING: Does anybody have this motion down? We're going to ask you a third time, Rose. Is the spirit of the motion -- and Nancy, could you say that, I

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

```
think you've succinctly --
 1
              MS. OSTIGUY: Move to defer the motion and send
 2
 3
    it to the executive committee for consideration.
 4
              MS. KOENIG: I'm saying to --
              MR. SIEMON: Well, there wasn't a motion that you
 5
    can defer.
 6
 7
              MS. OSTIGUY: Or move the resolution, whatever,
 8
    the topic, issue.
 9
              MR. RIDDLE: As I first understood Rose, what I
10
    heard her saying was to -- the Board to vote to accept the
11
    committee's resolution and forward it to the executive
12
    committee for action.
13
              MS. KOENIG: What I'm saying is that: accept the
14
    document --
15
              MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. Okay.
16
              MS. KOENIG: -- we're accepting the submittal of
17
    the document, similar to: we accept a task force --
18
              MR. RIDDLE: Right.
19
              MS. KOENIG: -- as an internal document, or as a
    document --
20
              CHAIRMAN KING: Do you consider this --
21
22
              MS. KOENIG: -- but it's not a policy, it's not
23
    our view on policy.
24
              CHAIRMAN KING: Do you consider this a friendly
25
    amendment to your motion?
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

```
MS. DIETZ: I don't, as a seconder, I'm going to
 1
 2
    take back my second on that motion. It's not what I
 3
    thought, so --
              CHAIRMAN KING: The second has been withdrawn.
 4
 5
    Could we restate the motion. Are you sorry you made the
    motion?
 6
 7
    (Laughter.)
 8
              MS. KOENIG: What I'm saying is -- I mean, I
 9
    think it's --
10
              CHAIRMAN KING: Do you want to withdraw the
11
    motion and --
12
              MS. KOENIG: Okay, I'll restate the motion.
              MR. SIEMON: Are we saying we want to defer any
13
14
    response to the --
              MS. KOENIG: Yeah, it's not --
15
16
              CHAIRMAN KING: Hold on, hold on. I'm asking,
17
    are you restating the motion --
18
              MS. KOENIG: My motion is to -- I guess the
19
    motion is for the executive committee to respond to the
    directives from the NOP and formulate a process and a
20
21
    response based on available information, based on input.
              MS. CAUGHLAN: What I heard you say was all of
22
23
    the recent directives.
24
              MS. KOENIG: Yeah, that they need to analyze it--
25
              MS. CAUGHLAN: This does not relate to that --
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

1 MS. KOENIG: Exactly. MS. CAUGHLAN: -- and just now I didn't hear a 2 3 plural. 4 MS. KOENIG: I'm saying all directives. 5 CHAIRMAN KING: Hold on, hold on. MS. DIETZ: Here was the motion --6 7 CHAIRMAN KING: This is the --8 MS. DIETZ: -- for the executive committee to 9 respond to the directives from the NOP and formulate a process and response based on information. 10 11 MR. SIEMON: Input, maybe. MS. DIETZ: Inputting information, which includes 12 this kind of stuff. 13 14 CHAIRMAN KING: Goldie, are you proposing a 15 friendly amendment? 16 MS. CAUGHLAN: I was trying to clarify, and she just clarified. 17 18 CHAIRMAN KING: Okay. Is there a second? 19 have a motion on the table, and the motion reads: for the executive committee to respond to the directives from the 20 21 National Organic Program and formulate a process and 22 response based upon input information. Is there a second? 23 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Based in input 24 information from whom? 25 CHAIRMAN KING: I'll entertain friendly R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

amendments, but first we need a second to have the actual 1 2 motion considered. Is there a second? 3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Rose is the first? MR. CARTER: I will --4 5 CHAIRMAN KING: Is it a second? MR. CARTER: No, it's not a second. 6 If that's 7 going to tie, I will make a --8 CHAIRMAN KING: Motion fails. 9 MR. CARTER: I will make a new motion: that we direct the policy development committee to bring forward to 10 11 the executive committee a statement expressing the sense of 12 the Board on the directives that have been issued by NOP. MS. KOENIG: I'll second that. 13 14 (Laughter.) 15 CHAIRMAN KING: Dave. Remember, she's typing 16 this in, so --17 MS. DIETZ: Yeah, I'm fast, but I ain't that 18 fast. 19 CHAIRMAN KING: Yeah. MS. DIETZ: Say that again, please. 20 Okay. That this Board directs the 21 MR. CARTER: 22 policy development committee to bring forward to the 23 executive committee for consideration a resolution 24 concerning the sense of the NOSB on the policy directives 25 issued by the National Organic Program. R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

1 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Did you get a second? 2 CHAIRMAN KING: Yeah, seconded by Rose. So it's been moved and seconded that --3 MS. DIETZ: That the policy committee -- direct 4 5 the policy committee to bring forth to the executive committee for consideration a resolution of policy 6 7 directive issues by the NOSB. 8 CHAIRMAN KING: Issued by the NOP. 9 MR. CARTER: Let's do -- bring forward to the 10 executive committee a resolution concerning the sense of 11 the NOSB --12 MR. SIEMON: Sense? MR. CARTER: -- regarding the policy directives 13 14 issued by the National Organic Program. 15 (Pause.) 16 CHAIRMAN KING: Do you want to read it back. 17 MS. DIETZ: Okay, I'll try it again. Direct the 18 policy committee to bring forth to the executive committee 19 for consideration a resolution concerning the sense of the NOSB regarding the NOP policy directives. I hope that's 20 21 good enough. 22 MR. SIEMON: Is the word "sense" (inaudible)? 23 CHAIRMAN KING: Are you okay with that? 24 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, sense of the Board. 25 CHAIRMAN KING: Okay. Discussion. Jim. R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. Dave, you know, this resolution that the livestock committee has brought forward was passed, I believe unanimously, by the committee, and I'm just wondering if your motion would account for or allow this resolution to be fed into the policy committee's

MR. CARTER: Absolutely. No, I think that we would look at this -- the policy development -- I mean, as a point of information, the policy development committee this morning began to draft up a statement along this line but we didn't have all of our committees there so we were hesitant to bring it forward until we at least got it out, because three of our members were in other meetings.

So I think this resolution, as well as the one that we were working on, we would bring together to address the sequence of directives that were issued over the last

MS. CAUGHLAN: Point of information. executive is going to put this together and, to use the USDA word, vet it (inaudible) rest of it to the Board?

MR. CARTER: My thought is that the policy committee would bring this forward to the executive committee. The executive committee is the only committee

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

that is authorized to act in the absence of the full board, 1 2 so the executive committee, you know, can act on it. I thought is for the executive committee -- the role of the 3 policy committee is to do some of that detail work on the 4 5 policy issues and bring them forward, then, to the appropriate committees or to the full board for 6 7 consideration. In this instance it would come to the 8 executive committee. 9 MS. DIETZ: Dave has made the motion. We don't 10 have a second. 11 MR. RIDDLE: Rose did right away. MS. KOENIG: I seconded. 12 MS. DIETZ: I didn't hear that. Okay. 13 14 My only comment, again, is to -- if this board would 15 please give all its members adequate time to review 16 documents and -- so that we make sure we have a very good 17 process and it's consistent. 18 CHAIRMAN KING: Duly noted, but I think in this 19 case it was practically unavoidable, so I do appreciate the work of the committee. Is there further discussion? 20 21 (No audible response.) 22 CHAIRMAN KING: Hearing none, we'll proceed to 23 vote on the motion, beginning with --24 MR. CARTER: We don't need a roll call on this,

> R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

25

this could be --

CHAIRMAN KING: All those in favor signify by 1 2 saying aye. 3 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye. CHAIRMAN KING: Aye. Opposed, same sign. 4 (No audible response.) 5 CHAIRMAN KING: Motion carries. Okay, I think 6 7 that's everything for livestock. Is that correct? 8 9 MR. SIEMON: Yeah. 10 CHAIRMAN KING: Dave, you're still on the hot 11 seat, policy development committee. Is there anything to--12 MR. CARTER: Oh, gosh. Yes. Policy development committee this morning met and reviewed two issues. 13 14 first one are the amendments to the Board policy manual. 15 Two areas of change were made and posted for comment, that 16 being, specifically, the confidentiality requirements in 17 the Board policy manual; and the second one, to address the 18 change in the materials approvals forms that we've been 19 used, to incorporate those and substitute them for the ones 20 that we previously had in the policy manual. 21 So I would move that we amend the policy manual 22 as recommended by the policy committee. 23 MR. RIDDLE: I'll second. 24 MS. OSTIGUY: Second. 25 CHAIRMAN KING: We've got a tie second. R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

take Goldie. 1 2 MS. CAUGHLAN: I think it was Nancy. 3 CHAIRMAN KING: Oh, I'm sorry, Nancy. Dave, seconded. Okay, it's been moved and seconded that we 4 5 accept the proposed amendments to the Board policy manual. Is there discussion? 6 7 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, I do want to just point out 8 that Dave said there's just the two changes, but actually 9 there's a few more than that, there's deleting the whole 10 peer-review section, there's changing the name of the 11 processing committee to "handling," and there's a whole 12 bunch of things that were pending because we didn't deal with any non-material issues in October, so just to be 13 14 clear, but it's all there in your meeting book, so it's --15 it's pretty comprehensive changes. 16 CHAIRMAN KING: And just a point of information, 17 it's my understanding this has been on the -- posted on the 18 web for quite some time, so --19 MR. CARTER: It's not only been posted on the web, it's been color-coordinated on the web. 20 21 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yeah, it has. 22 CHAIRMAN KING: Yes. Yes. The most colorful 23 document. 24 Yes, sir. MR. CARTER: 25 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Call the question. R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

The question's been called. 1 CHAIRMAN KING: All 2 those in favor of accepting the proposed amendments signify 3 by saying aye. BOARD MEMBERS: 4 Aye. CHAIRMAN KING: Opposed, same sign. 5 (No audible response.) 6 7 CHAIRMAN KING: Motion carries. 8 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, and it just -- I'll follow 9 through with sending a cleaned-up copy to the NOP, that 10 actually deletes those green things and adds the yellow 11 things, as they should be, and moves the colors and saves 12 them for another day. 13 (Laughter.) 14 CHAIRMAN KING: It's a colorful comment. 15 (Laughter.) 16 MR. CARTER: Okay, the second item is the 17 compatibility with organic production and handling, and 18 before we go into the consideration of this formally, I 19 just want to recognize that Jim particularly has done an incredible amount of work on this, he has carried 95 20 percent of the workload on this, including developing 22-21 22 and 23-page drafts of material with background, and I want 23 to acknowledge that. 24 This was posted. There were six public comments 25 that were received. All of the public comments recommended R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

that we drop from there Section M, which read "Does the 1 2 substance facilitate the development of new organic products?", so the policy development committee has 3 recommended, then, that we move forward the statement of 4 5 "compatibility with organic production and handling," with the deletion of Section M, and I would so move. 6 7 MR. SIEMON: I'd second. 8 CHAIRMAN KING: Moved by Dave, seconded by 9 George. 10 MR. RIDDLE: And the revised version was handed 11 out yesterday --12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Yes, draft 5. MR. RIDDLE: Right, draft 5. 13 14 CHAIRMAN KING: Okay. So it's been moved and 15 seconded that we accept the report, omitting Section M; 16 right? 17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Well, it's not to 18 accept the report, it's a recommendation. 19 MR. CARTER: Yeah, it's a recommendation. CHAIRMAN KING: Okay. Discussion? 20 21 MS. KOENIG: I just had kind of a question. This 22 is on the OFPA criterias that we use in the materials 23 process, so I was just wondering if there -- do you have 24 any ideas of how we might be able to incorporate these 25 concepts into that, either as an appendix or -- I mean, R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

because we're voting on it here today and kind of gone 1 2 through this process, but how do we translate that to those sheets or get to that information? Kim? 3 MS. DIETZ: I think that when -- at least 4 originally, when we were drafting this document, we said 5 that it would be used as a guidance document in the 6 7 material review process, under compatibility, and -- so 8 that was my understanding of where this would be used, and 9 I think -- and that's why we all supported it, and we've been using it in handling, specifically annotating what 10 sections, so --11 12 MS. KOENIG: So you're saying -- so just keep it in the Board policy manual, with the --13 14 MS. DIETZ: Yes, as a guidance document. 15 MS. KOENIG: Okay, that's just --16 CHAIRMAN KING: Jim and Dave. 17 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, and that's one thing I was going to suggest, if this passes, that I'll add it to the 18 19 version of the Board policy manual that I submit, and then it also should be provided to TAP contractor and reviewers 20 21 so that they have it handy, and then committees should use 22 it when they -- questions come up about compatibility. 23 CHAIRMAN KING: Okay. 24 MS. KOENIG: So I guess -- how would we notify --25 or do you want the materials chair to notify the -- I mean, R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

```
do we have -- you know, we have to somehow move to get that
 1
 2
    -- not a motion, but how do you see --
 3
              MR. RIDDLE: Uh-huh, take action.
              MS. KOENIG: Who do you want to get it to NOP to
 4
 5
    make sure that --
 6
              CHAIRMAN KING: Is there --
 7
              MR. RIDDLE: I think the offer from the materials
 8
    chair would be --
 9
              MS. KOENIG: Okay, I'll do it.
10
              MR. RIDDLE: I remember when they testified in
11
    October it was a question they had --
12
              MS. KOENIG: Right.
13
              MR. RIDDLE: -- "What do you mean by
14
    compatibility?"
15
              MS. KOENIG: Okay, I'll --
16
              CHAIRMAN KING: Let's limit discussion to the
17
    actual motion to accept the recommendation. Is there
    further discussion?
18
19
    (No audible response.)
20
              CHAIRMAN KING: No.
21
              MR. SIEMON: Call the question.
22
              CHAIRMAN KING:
                               The question's been called.
23
    Voting on the recommendation, compatibility with organic
24
    production and handling. All those in favor signify by
25
    saying aye.
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
```

1	BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
2	CHAIRMAN KING: Aye. Opposed, same sign.
3	(No audible response.)
4	CHAIRMAN KING: Motion carries.
5	MR. CARTER: That's all for policy.
6	CHAIRMAN KING: Okay. All right.
7	UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: And then the 606 Task
8	Force
9	CHAIRMAN KING: Yeah, we'll do I was going to
10	do Andrea real quick, and then we'll come back.
11	MR. SIEMON: That's fine.
12	CHAIRMAN KING: Andrea, I think you had a quick
13	item that
14	MS. CAROE: Yes. We have draft 8 of the
15	compliance procedures for minor non-compliance, and it's a
16	vote to accept that guidance, and I put that in that in
17	that frame because this is a guidance, this is educational
18	information for certifiers, okay, it's
19	MR. SIEMON: And that's not in here, is it, not
20	in
21	MS. CAROE: No. It was handed out yesterday.
22	Right?
23	MR. RIDDLE: Yes.
24	CHAIRMAN KING: Yes.
25	MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, and there have been no changes
	R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
	5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

to that version that was handed out. 1 2 MS. CAROE: There's been no changes from that 3 version, and that version had very few changes from draft 7, which has been up on the web. Received one public 4 5 comment, and there were -- those few changes that were made 6 were based on the public comment. 7 MR. RIDDLE: So I move the approval --8 MR. SIEMON: I second. MR. RIDDLE: -- of draft 8, I guess it is. 9 10 MS. CAROE: Draft 8. 11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Hard work. CHAIRMAN KING: Moved by Jim, seconded by George, 12 I believe. 13 14 MR. SIEMON: Yes. 15 CHAIRMAN KING: Okay. Is there discussion? 16 (No audible response.) 17 CHAIRMAN KING: Hearing none, we'll proceed to 18 vote. All those in favor signify by saying aye. 19 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye. CHAIRMAN KING: Opposed, same sign. 20 21 (No audible response.) 22 CHAIRMAN KING: Motion carries. 23 MS. CAROE: Just shows you how sexy a 24 certification is [phonetic]. 25 CHAIRMAN KING: Actually, you get the ribbon for R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

most efficient today, Andrea. 1 2 (Laughter.) CHAIRMAN KING: Jim, I believe you have a 3 document from the 606 Task Force. 4 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. Well, I made the presentation 5 6 this morning, there was good robust discussion, and some --7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: (Inaudible.) 8 (Laughter.) 9 MR. RIDDLE: -- and there had -- some public 10 comments as well as Board comments, so there was a need for 11 the task force to meet during the breakout session, and we 12 did some changes, which the members there in attendance all approved, and I redrafted and printed it out and got it 13 14 copied, and it's less than 22 pages, and it's here for your 15 consideration, and I'll just highlight what changes have 16 been made, very quickly. 17 And it's not page-numbered, I apologize for that, 18 but on the fourth page, there's a change, in the middle of 19 the page, which is the end of the "Background" section, and some information that was previously Recommendation 1a has 20 been moved into "Background Information," where it was a 21 22 discussion of some previous NOSB recommendations. 23 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: What? I'm lost. 24 MR. RIDDLE: Okay. The fourth page, you see 25 where it says Recommendation 1a? R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

1 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Yeah.

MR. RIDDLE: The two paragraphs right above that used to be in 1a, in a former life; now they have been downgraded to "Background Information," because they are, really, historical. So they're not part of our new recommendation.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: And that is fair [phonetic].

MR. RIDDLE: Okay. Then in -- la is what used to be 1b, but it hasn't changed content-wise.

Okay, then on the current 1b, the only change there is on the opening paragraph, second sentence, where it says, "In order to be consistent and transparent with the material review process, each substance currently located in 205.606 shall be reviewed for reclassification by the handling committee to determine if the substance" blah blah blah.

So it's just that -- this is not a re-review, not a TAP review, it's just reclassification, and it's a directive or request to the handling committee.

Okay. Recommendation 2, no changes to the first two paragraphs, and there's a change to the large A heading paragraph, to read: "For a non-organic agricultural ingredient used in a processed product labeled as 'organic' to be determined as not commercially available, the

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

applicant or certified operator shall submit," and the rest 1 2 of that remains the same, but just that lead-in to the sentence was something that had been brought up this 3 morning, so that's been added. 4 And then Item Number 4 was changed from "during 5 the inspection" to "during the certification evaluation," 6 7 so that gives the certifier flexibility. Some of this may 8 happen at inspection, some of it may happen in the office. 9 So that was in consideration of comments. 10 MS. DIETZ: Just one question. MR. RIDDLE: Yes. 11 MS. DIETZ: And I'm not sure if this covers it or 12 not, you can tell me if it does, but if -- if -- not during 13 14 the certification evaluation but in mid-year a material 15 becomes -- it's not available organically -- I mean, we 16 have due diligence to contact the certifier and say, "This is what I'm going to do." Is that acceptable in this, is 17 18 it covered during --19 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. My understanding would be --20 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: It's part of 21 evaluation at that point, but the --22 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. 23 MS. DIETZ: Okay.

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

MR. RIDDLE: Evaluation is ongoing on something

24

25

like --

MS. DIETZ: Okay. All right. It is considered 1 2 ongoing from a certifier/handler relationship. 3 MR. RIDDLE: Right. MS. DIETZ: 4 Okay. MR. RIDDLE: Whenever there's a change in the 5 6 organic system plan --7 MS. DIETZ: Okay, they have to -- okay. 8 MR. RIDDLE: -- you have to notify --9 MS. DIETZ: Okay. That's fine. 10 MR. RIDDLE: -- be updating your plan. 11 Number 5, at the very last line there, we added 12 amongst -- "The written evidence may include ingredient 13 evaluation reports, " so it says: "Written evidence may 14 include letters, faxes, e-mail, correspondence, ingredient 15 evaluation reports." That could include like certificate 16 of analysis about an ingredient of whatever. So a little 17 more flexibility. 18 And then also, at the top of the next page, the 19 words "as applicable" were added, "a minimum of three potential suppliers shall have been contacted." 20 Then under B-2, there was 2 -- there was 21 Okay. 22 -- previous 2 and 3 have been merged into 1, which now 23 reads -- I mean, you've got to -- in the context: 24 certifier shall validate that the applicant or operator has 25 documented that the ingredient is not commercially

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

available in an organic form by reviewing best available 1 2 information, listing known source of organic ingredients." So it really puts the focus on the certifier to validate 3 the operator's documentation. 4 5 And then the last change is to add a post-script -- I couldn't think of a better word --6 7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Epiloque. 8 (Laughter.) 9 MR. RIDDLE: That is new language, and that is: "The 606 Task Force acknowledges that this recom-10 11 mendation does not apply to organic seed determinations. 12 The Task Force recommendations that the crop committee and/or policy development committee develop a draft organic 13 14 seed recommendation which is consistent with this 15 recommendation." So we just don't want any confusion. 16 And then a similar sentence is added at the very 17 very end, under "Conclusion": "A comparable and consistent 18 recommendation is needed to address organic seed issues." 19 So those are the changes, trying to incorporate as many of the comments as we could. So I move its 20 21 adoption. 22 CHAIRMAN KING: Is there a second? 23 MS. CAROE: I'll second. 24 CHAIRMAN KING: Moved by Jim, seconded by Andrea. 25 Discussion? Nancy. R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

MS. OSTIGUY: I don't understand why Recommenda-1 2 tion 2a, Number 5, the top of the next page, where you have added "as applicable," could you explain what this means. 3 MR. RIDDLE: Andrea, could you explain what this 4 5 means. Sure. This is to accommodate 6 MS. CAROE: 7 situations where the ingredient is very specific and two --8 three reasonable sources are available, so it is a 9 quideline that three is a reasonable or a typical number 10 but there may be situations that require more or less than 11 that. 12 I have to agree with that -- I just MS. DIETZ: see that as weak, I don't know where -- are the certifiers 13 14 able to determine if it's applicable for three potential 15 suppliers, and -- and that would be after the fact, so --16 MS. CAROE: Well, I guess -- I would have to say: in the negotiation between an applicant and certifier, 17 18 that is a discussion that they would have, as far as the 19 applicant coming to them and explaining the challenge. MS. DIETZ: Yeah, I -- I guess, as a handler, if 20 21 I have "as applicable" in my handling plan, I can always 22 make justification as to why I only chose one and try to 23 get that through, so I -- but at the same time, I can 24 understand that if there's not three suppliers, at least I 25 tried for three, you know, and the -- and again, I feel R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

that the industry has somewhat supported a minimum of three 1 2 sources, and so I -- I just -- I think that's too weak and 3 I'm not sure I support it, but I --CHAIRMAN KING: Is there a motion? 4 MS. DIETZ: We have a motion on the table. 5 6 MR. RIDDLE: Well, yeah, and that can be amended 7 to delete if someone --8 MR. CARTER: We could strike that. 9 MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, to strike --MS. DIETZ: I would like to make a motion to 10 11 strike "as applicable" and just put in "minimum of three," 12 and at least you can document where you've tried three different sources and you've only gotten one. 13 14 MR. O'RELL: I would second it. CHAIRMAN KING: So moved to Kim to strike the 15 words "as applicable," and seconded by Kevin. Discussion 16 17 on that motion? 18 MS. OSTIGUY: Kim and I had, I think, different 19 reasons for questioning that one. (Laughter.) 20 21 MS. OSTIGUY: I was actually wondering more about 22 what you were saying earlier, Andrea, about how if you only 23 require three, then that's all that folks are going to do. 24 Kim's amendment doesn't address that issue. 25 CHAIRMAN KING: So you don't support --R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

MS. DIETZ: Well, I can just tell you that we've historically, again -- from the processing group, we have agreed, through our MPPL committees and through lots of different trade -- through the trade organization and through the handling committee, that a minimum of three has been something that our industry could live with, and so that's why we said a minimum of three.

CHAIRMAN KING: Is there --

MS. DIETZ: You have to have a number, if you want somebody to do something, so that's -- that was the magic number that we all said we could live with.

CHAIRMAN KING: Is there additional discussion on the motion on the table to strike the words "as applicable"?

MS. DIETZ: There's a motion and a second.

MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, there's a motion and a second to strike. Yeah, I'd just like to comment on it.

Essentially, it's here as an attempt to compromise, and, you know, that's the role I was playing in chairing this task force. You know, certainly the will of the Board, you know, will be determined here, so -- you know, I think it does -- you know, my personal opinion is that it does weaken it and make it less predictable for both certifiers and operators. That's my personal opinion. Kevin?

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

1	MR. O'RELL: My only comment, to support Jim, is
2	that yeah, I think we added it in there as a compromise.
3	I'm not sure I personally was comfortable with it at that
4	time, and reviewing it, I do agree that I think it's weak,
5	and I think a minimum of three is reasonable for processors
6	who are trying to locate organic sources of materials.
7	MS. CAUGHLAN: Good-faith effort, is that a
8	making a good-faith effort is really what we're saying.
9	What about putting that kind of language in there?
10	MR. RIDDLE: Well, we're trying to quantify what
11	a good-faith effort is. When is it good enough?
12	MS. DIETZ: Okay, call the question.
13	CHAIRMAN KING: The question's been called.
14	We're just voting to strike the words "as applicable." All
15	those in favor signify by saying aye.
16	BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
17	CHAIRMAN KING: Opposed, same sign.
18	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Aye.
19	UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Aye.
20	CHAIRMAN KING: Okay, 12 yeses, and you want a
21	head count or
22	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Do a hand count.
23	CHAIRMAN KING: Let's do a quick hand count. We
24	had two no's, I think, is that correct? All those in
25	favor, signify by raising your one of your hands.
	R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
	5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644

```
1
              MR. SIEMON: I'm abstaining.
              CHAIRMAN KING: We have 1 abstention and 2 no's.
 2
     Okay, so now we're back to the original --
 3
 4
              MR. RIDDLE: Yeah. As amended.
 5
              CHAIRMAN KING: -- motion to accept the report,
    the recommendation, as amended. Is there discussion?
 6
 7
    (No audible response.)
 8
              CHAIRMAN KING: Hearing none, we'll proceed to
 9
    vote. All those in favor signify by saying aye.
10
              BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
11
              CHAIRMAN KING: Opposed, same sign.
12
    (No audible response.)
              CHAIRMAN KING: Motion carries.
13
14
              MR. RIDDLE: Wow, and that task force is
15
    disbanded.
16
    (Laughter.)
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Which means they buy
17
18
    beer tonight.
19
              CHAIRMAN KING: That's right. Does anyone have
    anything else?
20
21
              I would entertain a motion to recess.
22
              MR. CARTER: So moved.
23
              MR. O'RELL: Second.
24
              CHAIRMAN KING: It's been moved and seconded.
25
             Thank you all very much.
    recess.
               R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343
                5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644
```

1

2

3

4

5

(Whereupon, at 5:05 p.m., the meeting was recessed,

reconvening at 8:00 a.m., April 30, 2004 place.)

CERTIFICATE

In Re: NATIONAL ORGANIC STANDARDS BOARD MEETING

Place: CHICAGO, ILLINOIS Date Held: APRIL 29, 2004

Time Held: 8:00 A.M.

We, the undersigneds, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, number 360 through 592, inclusive, is the true, accurate and complete transcript prepared from the reporting by LEAH JOHNSON in attendance at the aboveidentified hearings, in accordance with applicable provisions of the current USDA contract, and the belowsigned persons have verified the accuracy of the transcript by (1) comparing the typewritten transcript against the reporting or recording accomplished at the hearings and (2) comparing the final proofed typewritten transcript against the reporting or recording accomplished at the hearing.

5/5/04 TRANSCRIBER: Debbie Barnard

R & S Typing Service

Signature

5/5/04 PROOFREADER: Sheila Orms

R & S Typing Service

Signature

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343

Signature

R & S TYPING SERVICE - (903) 725-3343 5485 S. LIVE OAK, GILMER, TX 75644