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(8:02 a.m.)
MR. DELGADO: Good morning.
Just as a reminder for our
visitors, we do have a sign-in sheet at the back of the room, and we are required by higher powers that everybody has to sign in to have a record of who attended. If you don't agree with me please talk to Katherine, she'll give you the details. But please do sign in.

And we are going to start now with the third day of our meeting. We had the last two days to present our proposal to receive public input, and definitely had a long night, some of us, last night, to incorporate public comment into our recommendations.

And the time has come to discuss those and propose them as recommendations for the board to consider.

Just to remind the board, every by rules and regulations, two-thirds votes is what we need to pass a motion. That's for
recommendations going out to the program. For those recommendations that deal with the running of the board itself, that we only need a majority.

Joe, you have a question.
MR. SMILLIE: Yes, I just want to clarify it. That means if a person is absent that it would require 10 votes?

MR. DELGADO: That is correct. We do have 14 members present today, and twothirds would be 9.3, so -

MR. SMILLIE: Right, so if someone said, well, I'm one-third in favor of it and two-thirds against it, that would -

MR. DELGADO: Hopefully we won't get to that situation.

MR. SMILLIE: I'm not fooling around here. I'm serious. I mean if people really want to vote against something, they can't split their votes?

MR. DELGADO: No. They are whole votes, and it's two thirds votes passed. So
if somebody decides to abstain we will have to turn on the calculator and find out what of two-thirds we have.

All right, any questions? Yes, sir.

MR. KARREMAN: How does it work with abstentions in the count? Because at that Penn State meeting I thought we switched something about things go when abstention happens.

MR. DELGADO: If you recall our policy manual does state that it will be counting on the cast votes, and that does not include abstentions. If someone is abstaining, we will have to count the number of actual votes, and consider that as part of the count. Okay. So absentees, abstentions, are not counting toward the vote that CAS number. Is that clear? MS. JAMES: But you said cast votes under your -- numbers that represents a majority of the people in the room, but it's
not a yes or a no. It is that we voted.
MR. DELGADO: Any other questions?
MS. JAMES: I have one, Mr.
Chairman. If you could please also clarify on the votes if a recommendation came from the committee as voting against something, then that means you are voting for that recommendation or for a position. So if you could clarify that.

MR. DELGADO: The recommendations from the committee will always come as stated by the petitioner.

MS. JAMES: Right. So you are either voting for or against the committee -

MR. DELGADO: No, you are against the material.

MR. DELGADO: And the motion will be stated as -
(Simultaneous speakers.)
MR. DELGADO: Do we have a question
here? Look, if there is a petition - we'll come up with an example to make things clear -
if there is a petition to include material $X$ on the list, the motion presented by the committee will be, in that situation, right, we move to approve the listing material $X$ on the list, section 202, so and so, right, regardless of what the committee's vote was. Now I urge you to consider what the committee's vote was, because that will give you an indication of what was the feeling in the rationale for that vote. The committee might have said yes, which essentially was approving what the petitioner was requesting. If the committee said no, then they would be going against what the petitioner said or requested. So yes, any questions? Julie.

MS. WEISMAN: Just to add to the clarification that this is because a decision was made in the last couple of years to always pose the recommendation as a recommendation for listing, so that it would always be consistent with the quorums and the yeses and
the noes and all that stuff.
MR. DELGADO: That's very good.
Thank you. Any questions.
(Simultaneous speakers.)
MS. WEISMAN: That's part of the reason. It's so that the whole board can vote.

MR. DELGADO: And another point to clean up is, once the committee presents a recommendation to the board, at that point it is out of the hands of the committee. It forms part of the board in any amendments can be actually incorporated into that document.

Obviously the committee will have the right to declare that in a friendly amendment or not, and that will determine whether we are going to debate or not, adding that amendment. So if it's a friendly amendment we will skip the debate, if it's not we will have to vote on considering that amendment. Is that clear?

Any other questions on the ground
rules? Yes, our executive director seems confused.

MS. FRANCES: No, you mentioned that the first thing up is the technical corrections, recommendation that there were changes on it, that what you gave me did not I don't have anything that indicates changes to that recommendation. It's only changes to the technical review I think. So I think that is where I think the confusion is. Because I looked at the junk drive gave me - so you said the first one up was the technical corrections, and that there was a change, but there is no change. So I just wanted to make sure we are clear on that.

MR. DELGADO: I think we're fine. And we'll rely on Barry to guide us through that if there are changes.

I have my cheat sheet here as to votes cast that our parliamentarian - that our unofficial parliamentarian has kindly shared with us. And here is a way quickly back to
the number of votes, if we have 14 cast votes, the two-thirds will be 10; if we have 13 cast votes the two-thirds will be 9; 12, 9; 11, against the votes cast, the two-thirds will be 8 ; and if there were only 10 votes cast, twothirds would be 7. Thank you for that. That's going to be our cheat sheet there. Any questions before we proceed with the board?

Okay, and again urging members of the public who came in late, please sign in, and we'll start with the process.

On that note then we are only nine minutes behind schedule, we will start with the Policy Committee, and Dr. Flamm, if you're kind enough to walk us through the process.

JOINT POLICY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MR. FLAMM: Good morning.
The policy committee met with materials, represented by the Chair, Dan, last night, and reviewed both public comments on the policy committee's recommendations, plus
the comments that we received from the board, and also we reviewed comments in the comments from the board in our joint recommendations Dan will cover later. At the same time the recommendations are packaged, and we'll just call for a vote on the total package. We'll start the ballot with the technical corrections. If you would go to the recommendations, there were no changes made in that document so what you have in your package is what we will be presenting as our recommendation.

I won't - my eyes are still blurry so I won't even try to read that to you. I hope you can see it.

Okay, there are no changes, so let's go to the next recommendation, which is - which is that one? Help me out. Okay, and I don't believe we had any changes on that one either, is that correct?

So let's move to the next one.

Okay, election of officers, we did have some changes there. Dee, do you know what those changes were, if you would just summarize it? MS. JAMES: Under bullet point number two, we accepted the board members' recommendations that clarify that the newly appointed officers will resume their positions at their conclusion of the trial board meeting pursuant to the election.

So that was the change. We took out - we took after the fall board meeting, and replaced it with the conclusion.

MR. FLAMM: Just to clarify when the meeting officers actually took their seat.

MS. JAMES: When the gavel goes down, people take over.

MR. DELGADO: We have a question -Julie?

MS. WEISMAN: Just, as I read it it should be, they will assume their position after the conclusion because they are newly appointed, not recent.

MR. FLAMM: We'll accept that as a friendly amendment.

MR. DELGADO: All right, would you move to the next one please.

MS. JAMES: The next one is under point $B$, the counting of the votes. We moved that the executive director may be given the opportunity to vote to break a tie, and we just clarified that the re-vote will take place until the tie is broken, or a candidate will be given the opportunity to withdraw at their discretion.

MR. DELGADO: And those were the only changes?

MS. JAMES: Those were the only two changes.

MR. DELGADO: Any changes? Are those changes clear to the board? Any questions? Can we move on to the next recommendation?

MS. JAMES: Committee work plans.
MR. FLAMM: Committee work plans.

MR. ENGELBERT: Can we back up one moment? Whose responsibility is it to count the votes?

MS. JAMES: The secretary.
MR. ENGELBERT: Then I would recommend that the votes be disposed of by the secretary, not the chair, or secretary, to make sure that that responsibility is delegated and doesn't get neglected.

MR. DELGADO: So there is a comment here regarding votes.

MS. JAMES: It says under point D votes will be disposed of by the chair or secretary.

MR. ENGELBERT: And I would recommend that that be set just be the secretary's responsibility. That's the person responsible for counting the votes -

MS. JAMES: The chair and the secretary count together.

MR. ENGELBERT: They both count?
MS. JAMES: Yes.

MR. ENGELBERT: Okay.
MR. DELGADO: Any other questions?
Are you satisfied?
MR. ENGELBERT: Yes, I thought the secretary alone counted the votes, but they both do, that's fine.

MS. JAMES: Under step one we accepted the friendly amendment from Tracy, the third bullet point down, clarification. We've eliminated special petitions from the national organic program such as clarifications on a particular issue or guidance on enforcement, and we replaced that with requests for suggestions from the NOB.

And that is the only change.
MR. FLAMM: Okay, can we move to the next one, Valerie, please?

MS. JAMES: I think the next one is sunset procedures.

MATERIALS COMMITTEE
MR. FLAMM: The next one is sunset?
MS. JAMES: Oh, the structure
recommendations.
MR. FLAMM: I don't believe there were any changes on structure recommendations. What we presented is a - is what the committee is still presenting as a recommendation. I think we'd move to the next one, please.

MR. DELGADO: And that's sunset?
MR. FLAMM: Sunset.
MS. JAMES: And perhaps Dan or Hugh has the changes on that.

MR. FLAMM: Yes, there were clarification changes, recommended by the materials committee on - just on the front page, on the background, yes, thank you Dan. And it was reworded - oops, what happened to it.

Okay, actually there were no changes. We agreed to a little clarification on the listing material. It was just a language clarification that Dan had suggested. But there is no substantive change in the sunset procedure.
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Oh, yes, thank you, Dan. Again, this is something I guess we had implied in our wording we really intended, and Dan pointed out that it was missing. We want in looking at the sunset material we want to look at all sorts of information including what the committee considered in the initial review. So we put that in to make sure that it was clear that that would be looked at. So I don't know what happened.

MR. DELGADO: Dan, can you give
your -
MR. GIACOMINI: I didn't mark down exactly where you plugged it in.

MR. FLAMM: Well, it's right at the right point there, following this includes, and then the wording is missing. MR. GIACOMINI: It should be, this includes the original recommendation from the board to list. From the board. MS. JAMES: Valerie, are you
tracking this?

MS. FRANCES: It came up red, so I'd say track changes may not be on since all the font there is red. But it did come up underlined, so I'm not sure.

MR. DELGADO: And you are keeping track of those changes, right?

MS. FRANCES: Well, I just highlighted it in yellow for you.

MR. FLAMM: That was the only changes on sunset. Go to the next one please, Valerie.

MS. JAMES: There's the new member guide.

MR. FLAMM: Yes, new member guide. There's no changes in that.

MR. DELGADO: So Mr. Chairman, you have reviewed the changes that you make to the three documents from your recommendations for the policy and procedures manual?

MR. FLAMM: That is correct. And I move that the board accept these policy committee recommendations and add these
amended recommendations to the policy development - policy procedure manual.

MS. JAMES: Second.
MR. DELGADO: The motion has been moved and been seconded. It is moved and seconded to accept changes to the policy and procedures manual and its highlighting as described by the chair of the policy committee.

Discussion? Are there any questions or discussion on the topic?

Are we ready for the vote? The vice chair is asking if $I$ need the remind the board members of any potential conflict of interest. I don't think it is proper or necessary at this point given that it is an internal work document, so we will move on, and I appreciate that.

Ready for the question? The question is on the motion - do we have a question here? The question is on the motion to accept the changes to the policy and
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procedures many as described by the chair of the Policy and Development Committee.

And we'll start taking the vote this way from aisle C with Dr. Karreman.

MR. KARREMAN: Clarification
please.
MR. DELGADO: Yes.
MR. KARREMAN: I just want to make sure that people know that there were two, three, four, five, there are six different documents for the policy procedure manual, and we are voting on all those changes at once.

MR. DELGADO: Thank you for that clarification. Any other questions on that point?

We'll begin the vote.
Dr. Karreman?
MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Kevin.
MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: Yes.


MR. MOYER: Mr. Chairman, that is
14 yeses; one absent. It passes.
MR. DELGADO: The ayes have it, and the motion is agreed to.

Let's move on to the next topic, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FLAMM: We have one recommendation for inclusion in the new member guide. It involves training. And I don't believe, Steve, there are any changes in that.

So I move that the policy committee's recommendation on training additional to the new member guide be approved.

MS. JAMES: Second.
MR. DELGADO: It is moved and second to approve changes to the new member guide as described by the Policy and Development Committee chair.

Discussion? Any questions?
Waiting for the question. The question is on the motion to approve the
updates to the new member guide as described by the Policy and Development Committee chair.

And we will start our vote with Kevin.

MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Steve.
MR. DeMURI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Julie.
MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Tina.
MS. ELLOR: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
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MS. MIEDEMA: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Joe.

MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Barry.
MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: And the chair votes yes.

MR. MOYER: Again, Mr. Chairman, that's zero noes, 14 yeses, one absent.

MR. DELGADO: The ayes have it, and the motion is agreed to.

Does that conclude your presentation, Mr. Chairman?

MR. FLAMM: That concludes my presentation.

MR. DELGADO: Thank you very much. Congratulations.

Let's move on to the next point, which also includes the policy committee, but I understand that the chair of the materials committee will be handling this matter, Mr. Giacomini.

MR. GIACOMINI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The document or procedure for handling technical reviews. A few changes. At the introduction adding the information possibly requested in the technical review for a third party specializing in the scientific know-how or with market availability on the issue.

Going to the next, top of page two, Valerie, procedure of the NOSB, the first section, the last sentence was obviously an artifact from somewhere. And we're looking to remove that.

The material review process, adding the qualified of $N L$ on national list, and adding the sentence dealing with the clarification on petition to change annotation as it essentially is a petition to add or remove a substance.

Technical advisory panel
definition removing the - where are we here? -
changing that it is convened by the board, and deleting the last sentence.

Yes?
MS. WEISMAN: A question. Does eliminating that other language by the substitution, I just want to make sure that that does not in any way - what's the right word? - that the NOP is still obligated to use the funds that are - they must still hire a panel, an expert panel?

MR. GIACOMINI: Do you sign the check? Yes -

MS. WEISMAN: I just want to make sure that this does not get interpreted as changing any of the current responsibilities that resides with the NOP for making funds available through the National Organic Program to pay for such expert panels.

MR. DELGADO: Dan. Dan you respond to that?

MR. GIACOMINI: No, I believe this is just a clarification requested by public,
in public comment, clarifying that we convene it, but they are certainly the ones that sign the contract - make the contract and sign the check.

MR. DELGADO: Julie, does that answer it?

MS. WEISMAN: Frankly, can I propose a friendly amendment?

MR. DELGADO: Yes. Well, actually
on this one we can't because we are still in the clarification process.

MS. WEISMAN: Okay.
MR. DELGADO: So you will be able
to once -
MS. WEISMAN: Okay.
MR. GIACOMINI: Phase three -
MR. DELGADO: And just for clarification this is an internal document. It is part of the workings of the board and should not be considered as affecting the workings of the program.

MR. GIACOMINI: Phase 3, Valerie.

The first bullet point there, scroll up, Valerie, the first bullet point I believe was moved to the end of phase 2 . That's dealing with a notification between the program and the petitioner. It belonged up in phase 2 rather than the section dealing with the third party expert.

Let's see, after phase 6, and then the procedures for handling technical reviews, the bottom of that page, the bottom - up where did we go? On two - oh, no, my mistake. Next page.

In the request of information regarding combination with other materials, we are confining that request in general to other materials that are on the national list in the same section; no need to look for combinations of materials between Section 601 and 605. That is the change in Section - in B and in the new $C$ or the old $D$.

The old C and the old E requesting information on the combinations of all the
things in the universe seemed way too broad and way too burdensome to be a reasonable request.

And then on the last bullet point there, modifying that slightly, environmental risks and hazards including but not limited to legalese language.

Following down on that same page, number three, as regarding requesting of a third party expert, the requesting of the technical review, there are times - generally that is done by the chairman of the committee reviewing that material, but sometimes it's done, and it's allowed to be done by the materials committee.

Down - I believe that is - no, we have one more. Oh yes, we haven't gotten there. A clarification on number four, the decision to define the expertise needed, and the third party expert is the responsibility of the committee reviewing the material or issue.

And I think that was it.
Mr. Chairman, if Julie could -
okay. Are you happy?
MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: We'll be able to make any corrections once we have moved it.

MS. WEISMAN: No, I'm not going to move. I'm staying right here.

MR. DELGADO: All right, state the motion.

MR. GIACOMINI: Mr. Chairman, I move we accept the - where is my - it's not on there. I need to get to the beginning of the document so I know what it's called. I move we accept the recommendation to amend the policy and procedure manual regarding the procedure for handling technical reviews. MR. FLAMM: Second.

MR. DELGADO: It is moved and seconded to amend the policy and procedures manual to - Barry seconded and it is moved and seconded to amend the policy and procedures
manual to include the section called procedures for handling technical reviews.

Discuss. Now at this point we can make amendments, clarify it, any questions?

Ready for the question? The question is on the motion to amend the policy and procedures manual to include a section called procedures for handling technical reviews.

And we will start taking our vote with Jennifer.

MS. HALL: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Steve.
MR. DeMURI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Julie.
MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: Yes.


MR. GIACOMINI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The parliamentary procedure of bringing some sidetracked petitions back into consideration in - due to the fact that they were formally - had been formally tabled by the board.

We have no changes in this
recommendation.
I move that we accept the recommendation to take from the table the petition materials.

MR. DELGADO: Is there a second?
MS. ELLOR: I'll second.
MR. DELGADO: Tina has seconded.
It is moved and seconded to take from the table the list of selected materials as discussed by the chair of the materials committee.

Discussion? Bea?
MS. JAMES: Dan, CCOF had made a
really good point in their public comment about, take from the table, that in the past
tabled materials were incomplete, and that they actually shouldn't have been tabled, but they said they should have been rejected, but they didn't have the terminology at that point.

And also Whit Wave suggested that we should check with the petitioner to see if the material is still necessary or there is an interest for it to be brought back. And I believe that items tabled for so long should follow some kind of reinstatement or some kind of a process that you might want to address in the policy and procedures manual. But something about pulling these in and reinstating them just doesn't really quite seem to be following an accurate process to me.

MR. GIACOMINI: The use of the procedure to table is classically a procedure to kill. So it may have been that that was some of the intention. However it's difficult to sometimes pull that out of the record.

In an effort to expedite the situation due to the continuing request from the public to deal with all of these old petitions, we felt that it was an action that was reasonable to take at this time in being able to just bring them back and look at them.

Now regarding the next point, none of these will automatically go onto a committee's work plan. They are all going back to the program. The program will look at them and evaluate them. If there are multiple petitions, they will just be rejected. If they are - the old petitions that are not multiple will be - the petitioner will be contacted. The normal procedure from that, if it's a real old petition $I$ would assume the program may even suggest that a new petition be submitted.

We decided to go with the entire group that we knew at the time, and we hope that we don't find more, we decided to go with the whole group so we would not be - so it
would be as transparent as possible and not be accused of trying to bury certain things, and certain old things. This was the list we found. There may actually be none of them that ever come before this board again based on this petition. It's just a procedural way of bringing it back to reconsider and look at it.

MS. JAMES: So can I ask you what your position is on the public comment that stated that there are nine other materials dating as far back as 2002 that weren't on your current take from the table but are still out there in cyberspace or wherever.

MR. GIACOMINI: We have not had an opportunity to look at each one of those through transcripts and records. I believe that we did find a couple of them that it was not a formal full board tabling that was the final action. Again if it's tabled at the committee level, then it's the committee that can do that.

These are just the ones that we found that were done at the final board. We will review those lists, and again, we think the public comment that brought all those lists to us for further things for us to look up and try and track down. And hopefully we will resolve all of these old petitions that have gone by the wayside, fallen through the cracks. And we are not looking to increase the workload. We are simply looking to respond to the public comment that said go back and deal with these issues.

This was a procedural thing that was done that we came across at the full board level that technically to be correct required full board action to bring them back into play.

MR. DELGADO: Okay.
MS. JAMES: Yes, I definitely
appreciate that the materials committee did that. I guess I would like to hear from the program as far as what their thoughts are on
resuming old petitions that have been out there for five or six years that we are now looking at again. Can we do that? Do they need to be re-petitioned?

MR. MATTHEWS: Well, first of all, I don't think you are re-looking at them. I think what Dan has said is that he's sending us a list of them, and he wants us to check on the status, and to advise the board on what that status is, and then the board can make up its own mind as to what it wants to do there.

Yes, Barbara is right, it's a housekeeping activity to make sure that something that should have been done but hasn't been done would get done if it needs to be. So it's a housekeeping.

MR. DELGADO: Joe followed by
Kevin.
MR. ENGELBERT: Dan would it be appropriate in your motion to not list one of the following -- and include the others that were brought forth that haven't been missed so
you can just say you are going to do this with all that you find, or else list every one of them that you know of right now?

MR. GIACOMINI: I'm the most comfortable only doing the ones we know of. I don't know how proper it would be to just include a blanket statement that between now and the next meeting, anything else we find is considered removed from the table.

MR. DELGADO: Do you want to make that amendment?

MR. GIACOMINI: I don't think anybody is going to sue us over it, so we'll go on.

MR. DELGADO: Was that a yes?
MR. GIACOMINI: Is the program
comfortable with that amendment?
MR. DELGADO: Okay, so it is amended.

MR. GIACOMINI: So it'd be these and anything else.

MS. FRANCES: Can you clarify the
amendment for me?
MR. GIACOMINI: I think maybe the easiest way to do that, Valerie, is just on the bold area, hopefully I'm not saying anything from the rest of the thing, but just in the bold area if you just put, identified at this time.

MR. DELGADO: Kevin, is that
suitable?
MR. ENGELBERT: That satisfies it.
MR. DELGADO: Very good.
MR. GIACOMINI: And we are not trying to undo any action of former boards to kill these. We are just trying to respond to deal with things - housecleaning of things that went by.

MR. DELGADO: Very good. Did you have a question?

MS. JAMES: So I just want to get clarification from you, Dan, on the backgrounds, the last paragraph.

A positive vote on a motion to
take from the table these petition materials will allow the NOSB to resume consideration of the materials within proper parliamentary procedures.

So maybe you could explain to me a little bit about - just because you are looking at them doesn't mean that a petition is all of a sudden going to be - you mentioned earlier that you were going to contact the petitioner?

MR. GIACOMINI: The action by the board is all of these petitions are sent back to the program.

MR. DELGADO: And what is going to happen once it reaches the program?

MR. GIACOMINI: The program will reject the multiples, and will contact the petitioner. We may even try to see if we can - well, actually now that we are taking from the table, it would be difficult to undo that in the sense of whether it was the intent to kill. But nothing is going to be taken up by
the board immediately. It's going to be rereviewed, house cleaned up by the program, and if it's considered complete and ready for the board to deal with then it will come back to us.

But the first action by the board and the materials committee will be sending it back to the program.

MR. DELGADO: Bea, did you have any
question or was that clear enough?
MS. JAMES: It is. I'm not so sure it's clear how it's stated in that sentence I just read. But I'm willing to just -

MR. DELGADO: Okay, any other questions? Comments?

Ready for the question? The question is on the motion to take from the table a select list of materials highlighted by the committee chair as well as the amendment to that list.

And we will start our vote with Steve.

|  |  | Page 44 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MR. DeMURI: Yes. |  |
| 2 | MR. DELGADO: Julie. |  |
| 3 | MS. WEISMAN: Yes. |  |
| 4 | MR. DELGADO: Dan. |  |
| 5 | MR. GIACOMINI: Yes. |  |
| 6 | MR. DELGADO: Jeff. |  |
| 7 | MR. MOYER: Yes. |  |
| 8 | MR. DELGADO: Bea. |  |
| 9 | MS. JAMES: Abstain. |  |
| 10 | MR. DELGADO: Jerry. |  |
| 11 | MR. DAVIS: Yes. |  |
| 12 | MR. DELGADO: Tina. |  |
| 13 | MS. ELLOR: Yes. |  |
| 14 | MR. DELGADO: Tracy. |  |
| 15 | MS. MIEDEMA: Yes. |  |
| 16 | MR. DELGADO: Joe. |  |
| 17 | MR. SMILLIE: Yes. |  |
| 18 | MR. DELGADO: Barry. |  |
| 19 | MR. FLAMM: Yes. |  |
| 20 | MR. DELGADO: Hugh. |  |
| 21 | MR. KARREMAN: Yes. |  |
| 22 | MR. DELGADO: Kevin. |  |

MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: And the chair says yes.

MR. MOYER: Mr. Chairman, I have zero noes, 13 yeses, one abstention and one absent.

MR. DELGADO: The ayes have it, and the motion is agreed to.

Back to you, Mr. Chairman.
MR. GIACOMINI: I believe I'm done.
MR. DELGADO: You are done? Well, thank you very much, and we are actually ahead of schedule, and thank you for your time and clarification.

Moving on to the next point, it is the compliance and certification committee, and if Mr. Smillie, the chair, can be so kind as to walk us through the motion.

COMPLIANCE, ACCREDITATION AND CERTIFICATION COMMITTEE

MR. SMILLIE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
The first item we are going to consider is our first recommendation, certifying operations with multiple production unit sites and facilities under the National Organic Program.

We have a number of edits to make to the document. They are not exhaustive. MS. FRANCES: Okay, I didn't get one with that.

MR. SMILLIE: We will have to do it on - I don't think it will take a lot of time. And I will ask Tracy to lock the board and Val through some of the --

MS. MIEDEMA: Thank you very much.
We have five minor copy edits that are significant in their meaning, and I have marked up these five edits and numbered them as such, and I'm going to hand that to you, Valerie, and then that will facilitate this editing process a little bit.

The first edit is based on Stan's
suggestion yesterday that we remove the words, or eliminate, in discussing the role of the ICS and its implications having to do with inspection. So that is on page two I believe. The next four edits are all very similar, and it was a clarification to the word, handling, that was aptly pointed out by the National Organic Coalition and others, to change the words, handling, proposed harvest handling.

The wordsmithing involved in making these four changes varies only slightly in their syntax to make the sentences flow. So there are four instances, and Valerie, I'll let you speak each of those.

MS. FRANCES: So handled postharvest handling.

MS. MIEDEMA: The editor number, one through five. So if you'd just go to each one.

MS. FRANCES: That's what I'm
asking. Was the ones that are handled, post-
harvest handling?
MS. MIEDEMA: Yes. In that one, remove the word, handled. Well, that one Mr. Chair, do you mind if $I$ stand next to Valerie to make this as painless as possible.

Handled post harvest. And later in this paragraph the word, handling, becomes post-harvest handling.

MS. FRANCES: We're almost there, folks. If you can jump back to page two, Dan just pointed out another instance of the words, or eliminated, that $I$ would also like to strike.

Which paragraph was that Dan?
MR. GIACOMINI: Second to last line of the text before the footnote.

MS. MIEDEMA: We've already removed that.

MR. GIACOMINI: Okay.
MS. MIEDEMA: We welcome language from the minority opinion to be incorporated into the document as part and parcel of the
document, if any member of the minority opinion would like to propose that language. MR. DELGADO: You have to move it first. It has to be submitted open for questions.

MR. SMILLIE: Mr. Chair, I would like to move this recommendation.

MR. DELGADO: Is there a second?
MS. MIEDEMA: Second.
MR. DELGADO: It is moved and seconded. And the motion was to improve the document called Certifying Operations with Multiple Productive Unit Sites and Facilities Under the National Organic Program.

Discussion. This one we can entertain changes, and there is a motion from Jennifer.

MS. HALL: I would like to make a friendly amendment from the minority opinion. MR. DELGADO: State your amendment, please.

MR. SMILLIE: I'll second that.

MR. DELGADO: No, let's make sure that the proponent of the motion agrees with the amendment, and if you can state the amendment.

MS. HALL: Okay, I would like to, instead of consider new entrants to the production unit a risk factor, I would like to incorporate it into the document as mandatory inspections in their inter-year.

MR. SMILLIE: And you accept that as a friendly amendment.

MS. MIEDEMA: Jennifer, would it be acceptable to excerpt the second to the last paragraph of the minority opinion and insert that directly back into the document?

MR. DELGADO: The minority opinion, second to last paragraph, and that should be at the very end.

MS. MIEDEMA: I'll say that - first let's get to that paragraph at the very end of the minority opinion.

MS. HALL: Sure, we can do that.

MR. DELGADO: So what is it that we are looking for?

MS. MIEDEMA: Would you like to read that?

MS. HALL: It states: all new entrants to a producer unit should automatically qualify as a high risk location if an automatic external inspection for each new member. This process would train all new entrants immediately as to the importance of organic certification, and prevent any new and less familiar producers in the group from not passing it.

MS. MIEDEMA: The section that you identified as that - that would fit is on page seven under inspection sampling and risk analysis.

MS. HALL: Dan, do you have a
comment?
MR. DELGADO: Dan, you have a comment?

MR. GIACOMINI: Just for
clarification, do you want the new member inspections as a separate subject, or do you want them included as the proportion of high risk? I mean they'll definitely be done, but do you want them to be considered a portion of the high risk or a totally separate group?

MS. HALL: That's a good clarification. They are a separate group in my mind.

MR. GIACOMINI: I think that brings them in as part of the high risk group.

MS. HALL: Okay. I have other language that we adapted that might work as well. Are you willing to entertain that.

MR. DELGADO: So let's look basically at another way of going. And we will phrase it the way you want it, Jennifer, and we will see if the proponent of the motion agrees, and we will move forward.

MS. HALL: Under Section D,
Inspecting the Producer Group Operation, the second paragraph, the end of the first
sentence, it ends with meaningful sample of subunits within - I'll read the whole sentence. Verification of the OSP is largely accomplished by a thorough audit of the functioning of the Internet control system. The company by a physical examination of every producer unit. Generally the headquarters are a common regional handling or collection facility, and a meaningful sample of subunits within any given production unit.

I would like to add, parentheses, with one exception, and insert, all new entrants to a production unit must be inspected in their first year with the group. In subsequent years all successfully certified operations will be inspected per the sampling method described below. MS. FRANCES: Go a little slower. MS. HALL: Sorry. Must be inspected in their first year with the group, period. In subsequent years, comma, all successfully certified operations will be
inspected per the sampling method described below.

Keep the last sentence. And then under number one, inspection sampling, enriched analysis, no go back up, sorry, just right in that paragraph, it starts, the certifying agent must have policies and procedures for determining how many of the subunits within a production unit must receive an annual inspection by a certifying agent.

Right here I'd like to insert one sentence - or part of a sentence. Are you ready?

In addition to mandatory inspection of new entrants to the production unit, comma, and then just change the T to a little t.

MR. GIACOMINI: Did she get the first part of that?

MS. HALL: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jennifer, does that conclude your -

MS. HALL: It does. I mean that's
in addition to the new entrants, and then there is identifying the harvest population.

MR. SMILLIE: Well, I say it's acceptable in the presumption that then at this point in time, once we agree to this change, then the minority opinion as an attached document will disappear.

MR. DELGADO: So we're beginning the minority opinion document. Did you have a question, Jerry?

MR. DAVIS: Just a grammatical question on that very last entry you made. If you could go back up to that when you get a chance.

MR. DELGADO: Any other questions?
Very good. Any other discussion? We are in the discussion of this motion. Clarifications? Questions? Jeff?

MR. MOYER: Yes, Joe, I'm wondering
if your committee gave any consideration to the discussion we had yesterday regarding some
sort of concession on the idea of a $\$ 5,000$ limit. Although I know internationally that seems like an arbitrary number, internally with our program it does alleviate some of the fears that I have that there could be some very large growers lumped in with some very small growers, which could indeed have many employers escape inspection.

I'm just wondering what you guys think about that.

MR. DELGADO: Joe?
MR. SMILLIE: Well, two different responses. One, I'm not sure that I can speak for the committee, because I think we did talk about it.

My opinion is that although in
essence I wouldn't personally have a problem with it, because I think, you know, some of the growers that we're tied in with, if they could pay $\$ 5,000$ they'd be in hog heaven. So I don't think in essence it's become an issue. But it does become incredibly burdensome and
difficult and almost like cultural imperialism from my point of view to start to put arbitrary U.S. dollars on that. The idea, the intent of that, I think, is good. But to try and put that in the regulation I think would be burdensome and difficult, and I wouldn't want to do that with this recommendation.

MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: To your specific question, Jeff, of whether we discussed it yesterday, we have actually discussed it for 18 months, that very question, with great detail with literally people all over the world, in meetings all over the world.

So it has been very well vetted, hashed, discussed. And one thing to keep in mind when you think about that, it is a tremendous disincentive for a smallholder to succeed if they reach - they sell one too many tomatoes, and they lose their status as being part of a group.
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Now assuming that a flag bearer role in their group is actually someone who is doing well, they would be a knowledge holder and a leader, and putting in a disincentive threshold like that would be counter to the group itself.

MR. DELGADO: Jeff, followed by Jerry.

MR. MOYER: I don't understand how that is any more of a disincentive than it is in this country where if you earn more than \$5000 you have to be inspected.

And as Joe said there aren't that many. But I don't see that - I think it alleviates - it certainly alleviates my fear, I don't want to speak for anybody else.

MR. SMILLIE: I understand that, Jeff. My understanding is that it wouldn't necessarily put them out of the group. It would just necessitate that they have boots on the ground.

MR. MOYER: No, not at all. In my
opinion it would not put them out of the group. What - it would put them in the group that is inspected.

MR. DELGADO: Jerry followed by Jennifer. Jennifer?

MS. HALL: I just wanted to mention that we did have that conversation quite a bit. And I think there is an equal part of the community that is a little bit frustrated with how arbitrary the 5,000 has gotten, because it hasn't been updated, and so instead took the tack of trying to add more rigor, which we didn't focus on a lot. WE focused a lot on the risk factors that help identify the sampling unit;. But we did not talk much in this discussion about the rigor of how you qualify to even come together as a cluster, and how those - how those operations have to meet qualifications to become a group, and then once they do, it is really part of the certifiers job to also keep an eye on how realistic that is.

And the last sentence in Section C, it should be, at the top of page seven on my - it does say that an upper limit on the number of members or subunits included in a given production unit should be based on the feasibility of effective oversight by management personnel and factors such as size and acceptability of the subunits.

So there is more in there than I think got its due attention as to the different roles, and how that needs to be administered. But I understand the point.

MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: Regarding one thing that Jennifer just said there, and I'm not saying that I don't think this will change the committee, but the 5,000 is in OFPA. It's set by Congress. It would have to be changed by Congress. Like I say, I would be comfortable if we say that each subunit is held to the same standard for inspection as required by OFPA, however we want to put that. That would
allow for Congress to make an amendment to bring that more into modern dollars if that ever occurs without us having to go back and change this recommendation.

MR. DELGADO: Joe.
MR. SMILLIE: Our opinion, and I think the absolute majority consensus opinion is that this truly is covered under risk analysis, as Jennifer clearly pointed out. We think it's covered, and we think it's a better way to do it than the $\$ 5,000$ - that's what we arrived at in consultation with a lot of different people.

MR. DELGADO: Huge followed by
Jerry and Tracy.
MR. KARREMAN: I'm just wondering,
is this only for outside the U.S. in developing countries? Or could this be in the U.S.? Because I'm just asking, what if there is a farmer who is cooperative in the U.S., and it's really large, and they got people. And then they say, well, as a coop we have
these certain protocols and ICS and all that, I'm just wondering, would this apply to them as well?

MR. DELGADO: Clarification, Tracy?
MS. MIEDEMA: There's no
limitations on who - what nationality would get to use an internal control system.

MR. SMILLIE: As Barbara said, Indiana or India, it's the same regulation. MR. DELGADO: Jerry.

MR. DAVIS: So I defer initially waiting to hear comments like what Jennifer said. That portion of the document that she cited is really the only part of the document you think that covers that concern of how do you keep a large grower from plopping himself into a grower group?

MR. SMILLIE: I believe the entire
document covers that, the entire scope and intent of the document, properly executed by a trained certification agent, covers it. In many more ways than an arbitrary number figure
would.
MR. DELGADO: Clarification by the executive director?

MS. FRANCES: I would encourage you to perhaps read this list out loud, the criteria for clustering.

MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: In response to your question, Jerry, as well, the entire presentation and clarification process are further checks on what you are saying. If a certifier were to wantonly - you know had some hodge-podge internal control system with a faulty organic system plan, puts their very status as an agent of the government at risk.

So I mean we have multiple, multiple layers of checks built in. And then when we drill down into the detail level, the criteria for clustering these members into subunits takes into accounts details that would cover something like what you are talking about.

So I can read this list, or you can read this list. We can also read through the list of risk factors. But we have got a macros system, and we've got the micro details, and we really - I think someone said it very eloquently a day or two ago that we can't constantly live in fear of the offenders. We have to write rules assuming that the enforcement capabilities sitting here at the table in front of us will do their job just like it's our job to help give the guidance.

MR. DELGADO: Tina.
MS. ELLOR: But the enforcement people are telling us, Richard and Laura, that you don't see any reason why any size growers can't form their own group.

MR. DELGADO: Richard.
MR. MATTHEWS: Well, I'm not an attorney, but I think an attorney would drive a semi right through this thing, and get a huge grower group, a coop. I mean you heard
from one commenter yesterday that was a coop for pears that had 100 units. So what is going to stop that one from doing it?

This - this - I don't see that this would stand up in a legal challenge. But I'm not a lawyer. I'm not an attorney. I'm not a lawyer. But that's my belief.

MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: When we talk about inspection, we always talk about sampling. And there is a semi truck that could be driven through every 5,000 acre farm in the United States that has one member and one organic system plan. And if what we are saying is, we are so afraid of fraud that our intent today is to disallow market access to small holders around the world, then we should embrace this sort of fear, right now today, we have small holder operations around the world that are strong and rigorous and important and they belong. We are strengthening the ability of our program to oversee these operations
through this document. They already exist, and we are making it stronger today.

We are not throwing care to the wind here. We are strengthening what already exists, and we are providing a legal means for this to carry on and even get stronger.

The National Organic Program can take our recommendations, they can dot more I's and they can cross more T's, but we have got to bring this group certification into the National Organic Program as a legitimate means of certification going forward.

MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: Tracy, I couldn't agree with you more that when it comes to small holders I think your point is very well made. When it comes to large holders, I don't think your point is well made. I think that I am not still naive to think that the Richard Bransons of his world who are forming large grower groups in India with literally millions of acres, turning millions and millions of
dollars that want to drive through the loophole that Richard just identified over there.

I am not willing to take that risk, and I would hate to throw out the baby with the bathwater on this, and that's why I'd like to consider putting in a - I know the 5,000 seems globally arbitrary. I understand, I was at the IFOAM conference too. I understand what is happening at the IFOAM level.

But this is the US, the aid program, and this is the National Organic Standards Board, and we do as Dan mentioned have a number that we could all argue is arbitrary or outdated. But we do have a $\$ 5,000$ number that in this country is applicable. I don't think it's imperialistic to place that on international growers that want to do business in this country. If they are making more than that, it in no way disparages from getting to that
size. They are just going to get inspected. What is the fear in getting inspected? I don't have a problem with that, and at some point I'm going to make a motion, probably unfriendly, to insert that language. MR. DELGADO: Tina, and then Dan. MS. ELLOR: I actually like the way Dan put it. Maybe you could restate that, Dan, about we are not necessarily saying 5,000, but holding everyone to the same standard. MR. DELGADO: Dan? MR. GIACOMINI: Boy, I'm lucky to get something out once. So I have a different way of looking at it right now, if you would like me to address that issue.

Joe, is it correct that all high risk subunits get inspected?

MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
MR. GIACOMINI: Okay, if you were saying that everybody over $\$ 5,000$ would be in the high risk group, they would get inspected,

## correct?

MR. SMILLIE: It's quite possible.
Let me just go back a second on the 5,000, okay. Right now what you are doing is comparing apples to oranges here, and I just want to point it out. People under 5,000 in the U.S. don't get inspected, and can legitimately sell as organic.

We are talking about these people being inspected, okay.

MR. GIACOMINI: No, what I'm talking about is the public relations semi truck train wreck that could occur on this thing when it comes out in the New York Times that product selling in the United States from someone in China making over $\$ 10,000$ a year is not being inspected, when a grower in Vermont making 5,000 and 1 is having to. That is what I'm comparing. I'm not comparing apples and oranges. I don't see it's imperialistic. I don't even see it's arbitrary. It's the law. And if they are already going to be part of
the high risk group in whatever high
percentage of times, $I$ don't see the problem with separating them out and saying it to prevent that wreck from occurring, which I can see occurring in absolutely no time at all.

MR. DELGADO: Let's have a response.

MR. SMILLIE: It would take me about a day to respond. The whole point of this is that you have to understand how certification works, and we have to go back to the very beginning of this argument. We are not talking about not inspecting again. We are not talking about - we are talking about a different system that complies with the law that throws the full force of vigor of the regulation into play. And right now you are talking about a detail of it.

I don't know what to do with it.
So it's a big picture discussion. And you are focusing on one of the details.

Again, the fear that seems to be

1 driving - and you have expressed it clearly, it's fear - we are afraid of a scandal, we are afraid of a train wreck, and all that sort of thing. And if you try to over-regulate, I guarantee you people, you will cause the train wreck by overprescriptive - and I think we are seeing that happen.

That is just a - let me finish.
Basically what you have to do is look at the document that we have created. I do not think large growers are going to try and get into groups that have to follow a single OSP. As I talked about yesterday, they have to follow the same OSP, and I don't think they are going to want to get in, and even if they do, if you look at the risk factors, I think they will be identified as a risk and have that additional third party inspection. That's what this document does.

MR. GIACOMINI: Then why are you afraid of separating -

MR. DELGADO: We have Jennifer,
followed by Craig.
MS. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
At the outset, Joe, I heard you say that you were open to the $\$ 5,000$ limit, and just - let me finish - so what I heard Dan saying as a bit of a concession that he is not saying that there needs to be a dollar limit on who clusters together, but if they do, and they do reach over 5,000, then it's a mandatory inspection, which seems to be a feasible compromise, and taking into the reality of different sorts of currency, wherever, however.

MR. DELGADO: Joe, do you want to respond to that?

MS. MIEDEMA: Okay. Esteemed
colleagues, I implore you to curb the hyperbole and come back down to earth and look at what the real implications are of this recommendation.

What Dan I believe is referring to is a fundamental misunderstanding of consumers
today of all inspections. The scenario he describes of consumers being aghast of a field not getting looked at where some fraudulent products came from exists today. Those of us with 1,000-plus acre farms are very aware of where the inspector is on inspection day. A lot of that time is in the conference room. And that does not diminish the strength of the organic system plan or what inspection really is.

But let's face facts: inspection
is not well understood by consumers. So the fear that Dan is expressing exists already today completing setting aside grower groups. Five years ago my husband and I had a small under $\$ 5,000$ organic farm. We sold our products into restaurants, and it was a nice back of the trunk bring organic produce into restaurants. It was wonderful. And if we had sold too many herbs and flowers we would have got bumped up above that, and we would have felt a little pain that we would
have had to pay that inspection fee. That is the scenario here in the U.S.

The scenario that you got into, the woman who is farming coffee organically and who has access to the U.S. organic market through her certification and earns \$5,001 and now is denied access to the U.S. market because she sold one pound too much coffee is a completely different scenario.

So when you start putting these thresholds in and calling these two scenarios equal, we are talking about two separate things. Because if you are talking about she has to now at the $\$ 5,000$ point pay for an outside Western inspection every year - I see a lot of heads nodding.

MR. DELGADO: Can you finish your statement.

MS. MIEDEMA: The comparison you are making is not equal.

MR. DELGADO: Tina.
MS. ELLOR: But if I understand it
correctly, she wouldn't be bumped out of the group and have to pay the inspection. It's just that as part of the group she would be inspected.

MR. DELGADO: Is that clarification

MS. MIEDEMA: Well, what we're capturing with that is the cost being allocated. Maybe they will get spread throughout the group. It could bring a burden to bear exponentially when that is the entire market access to organic.

And what is inherently more risky about running $\$ 5,001$ on one of these group certification operations, so why would we arbitrarily assign that as always being higher risk.

MR. SMILLIE: You have to know that we are certifying the group. These people are subunits or members of the group, okay. So if the group makes the money, they pool together, they sell the coffee or whatever it is and
they all get the money. Each member of that group gets their share of the total income less the fees to the group.

If you try to do record keeping for each member of the group, to try and force it, it would be possible, and I think the system could accommodate it as a risk factor. And I believe it is in there. I believe your concerns are addressed in this document.

MR. DELGADO: Dan followed by Julie and then Jennifer, Kevin.

MR. ENGELBERT: I'm trying to get around this, and all the work that you have done and I appreciate it. But we still have maybe we could drop this $\$ 5,000$ impasse by simply having every production unit inspected every year.

I understand where you are coming
from with the thousands of acres. Counting all the acres on my farm, pasture, woodland, cropland, we have 1,400 acres under management. In another country that might
support 3,000 people. We still have to have every acre looked at every single year.

So you still have an open-ended system where in your proposed recommendation a farm could never be inspected by - based on random sampling.

But theoretically that is another train wreck waiting to happen. If you have a product coming into this country that is contaminated that is traced back to an organic farm subunit that has never had an inspector walked by and look. And trained inspectors can notice different things on different farms simply by driving through.

It seems like it's just a time factor that you are saying, we can't inspect every subunit every year. It can't be done. But I don't like that as an excuse.

MR. DELGADO: Point of clarification.

MR. MOYER: When you say inspected, you mean third party inspection, not internal
control system inspection?
MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Julie, followed by Jennifer.

MS. WEISMAN: My point that I wanted to make was actually following up on Tracy's point, although $I$ think that this is an important line of discussion and I am sort of reluctant to interrupt it.

But I also wanted to point out that outside of this - there are certain crops which vary widely in very short periods of time, vanilla being one of them, cocoa being one of them. So factors that don't have anything to do with anything that the farmer did, in other words, from one year the value of the crop - of every person in that production unit would go up and push them over that $\$ 5,000$ mark, and though individual farmers are not necessarily the ones that are seeing that value.

So I just wanted to point out that
there are factors, global factors of changes in exchange rate, and that certain commodities vary wildly from year to year that will cause additional undue burden to people in those groups.

MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: On that same point, and
I recognize that it does change around the globe, but I also understand the hesitancy of people who are trying to grapple with it, because it is a global thing. So if it is applied here, in that scenario, at least they don't get bounced out of the group. If the FOPA rule is assigned as a risk criteria, and they may be more expensive within that year, which is unfortunate, in that they would have to have a higher level of inspection. But at least here, when it is applied, there would be parity, and at least that loophole is eliminated ideally.

MR. DELGADO: Any other questions, comments? Barry?

MR. FLAMM: I had originally the same concerns about size and dollar amounts as Jeff, and Dan, and others have raised. And I guess I still have some of those concerns.

I became convinced that the structure of this covered it, and that provided the flexibility. But the trouble is, we need flexibility but we don't need loopholes either. And that is where I'm struggling with. I guess I'm still attracted to the suggestions put forward by Jeff and Dan and expressed by Jennifer as a possible alternative to this.

But I think what Joe says in terms of - it's filled in, the committee hasn't ignored these concerns. It's just not as specific as others might like.

So that's all I have to say right now.

MR. DELGADO: Joe.
MR. SMILLIE: I'm going to take Valerie's suggestion. Could you just scroll
down to the risk analysis - down a bit, actually, you are close.

Val often has many good words of wisdom; I should learn to pay more attention to her. The number of production units and production subsites and facilities, participating in the -

MR. GIACOMINI: Can you go back and tell us what this list is?

MR. SMILLIE: Oh, I thought you all had been very conversant with the document.

Oh, boy, my eyeballs. The certifying agent must have policies and procedures for determining how many of the subunits within a production unit must receive an annual inspection by the certifying agent, in addition to the mandatory inspection of new entrants into the production unit. The certifying agent must also have policies and procedures for determining which subunits present the greatest risks of noncompliance.

Various risk assessment methods
are used, and I refer again to the reference material at the end of this document, are used to both determine sample size and select the appropriate subunits to examine. Higher levels of overall risk for a production unit would dictate a higher proportion of components to be sampled.

The factors below will assist inspection both in determining the sample size and in deciding which components he/she should inspect annually.

It is a responsibility of the ACA to instruct the inspection on which high risk subunits must be inspected, and the number of lower risk subunits that should be sampled, based on their determination of the group's overall risk. The ACA will ensure that this protocol is transparent.

And again this system, all certification systems, rely on the competence of the certifying agent, and their monitoring by the program. And we are seeing that today
as we go through the five year renewal.
The program staff has increased the compliance and enforcement section dramatically and significantly, and we have to keep the faith that everybody in the system is going to do their role, and we can't overprescribe for anyone else what they need to do.

It's not Sunday, is it? Okay. Here are some of the risk factors. The number of production units and subunits, sites and facilities, participating in the producer group operation. How big is it? That's important.

The size of the average production unit and subunits, there we go; that is one of the first indicators. We are going to look at the size of them. If there are eight guys that have a hectare and one guy who's got four hectares, he's going to get the visit, in my opinion, my opinion as an ACA.

Maybe somebody else may else may
not look at it that way. I don't know. The size - the degree of uniformity among the subunits within the production - the degree of uniformity. Those eight guys are all on a hectare. They've all got the same amount of bananas. The other guy, he's got bananas, and he's got more. So again he's not uniform. You know it's the nail that rises above the rest. Obviously another reason, that you are going to look at the uniformity. If somebody is not uniform, they are going to be a risk factor.

The complexity fo the production system. These guys just harvest their coffee and take it to the grinding machine that takes the cherry off the coffee. This guy has got his own grinder. It's a little different. He's following the same OSP, but he's got his own, whatever it's called, that machine that takes the cherry off the coffee.

Anyhow, the complexity of the production system, the management structure of
the internal control system, how do they function. One of the things that is really important for a certification agent is not just the subunits which everybody is focused on. They are going to focus on the internal control system. They are going to examine that internal control system with a fine-tooth comb, because that is one of their keys. And how that internal control system functions is also going to dictate where the risks show up. Prohibited materials applied adjacent to a subunit within the previous year, again, that is for every farm, as you know, Kevin. If you've got a neighbor that's spraying on your border, man, that inspector better check out that border real well. Same thing here.

The new entrants - well, now
that's enshrined institutionally. Significant expansion of the size of the subunit, obviously a big risk factor, if all of a sudden there was a split or parallel
production. Again, split means two different crops, parallel same crop; conventional and unconventional - well, that is obviously a huge risk factor. That's got to be taken into account right away.

The number of years the producer group has functioned - you know, their training. I mean let's face it, an inspector goes on a farm, if it's like, you can see the weed control machinery out there. It's all shiny. It's been worked. You see the wheat in the field. You start to get real comfortable.

You go to a field that's got no weeds, and the discs are rusty, you are not comfortable; you start digging. And that's what inspectors do; that's what ACAs do. The same thing applies here. They dig. They do their job.

It is the rate of growth in new members, previous problems with the functionings of the ICS. They are
accountable; they are responsible. They are watching staff turnover. ICS totally changes, whoa, we got a problem.

These are all key elements in how risk is assigned.

Potential conflict of interest:
all of a sudden there are three brothers on the ICS, and that family, you know, hm, better look at that. Complexity in the types of subunits and/or products marketed - again, there is your indication once again that those larger over $\$ 5,000$ U.S. units are going to be identified.

The prevalence of conventional production of the same type in the region very important obviously for everything whether post-harvest handling or livestock facility is included. Any of the big - you know, let's just use coffee as our favorite example, although maybe we should use ginger and china, it might be more appropriate consider the signs of the times - but whatever
it is, you look at whatever is going to be the hot ticket item. And again, any facilities within the group are going to be boots on the ground third-party stuff. They are not going to skip those.

Okay, compliance with internal
frame. You know the ICS takes their job seriously. And everybody has got this idea that the ICS is like, oh yes, I'll take it, don't worry about it. No, these guys are serious. These people are serious. They are protecting the investment and the work of their entire community. If somebody screws up in that group the whole gang can go down. These people are pledged to protect that; that is their job as an ICS. They take it seriously. They know more about what's going on in that community than any parachuted gringo will ever know. Trust me on that. Well, you don't have to trust me. Legislate it.

Frequency of minor noncompliances.

We see a lot of minor noncompliances. Well, they didn't do this, they didn't do that. Bang, sampling size goes up. That is the job of the ACA. That's what ACAs do, and that is what they are accredited to do.

And again, one of the pleas that perhaps if there is a real problem with this document, to me what you pointed out is not a real problem - it's a problem but it's not a real problem - the real problem is, I think we need a separate scope of accreditation for certifiers that - you know there are crops, livestock processing, and there should be also multi-site. It should be a separate scope of accreditation, taken very seriously. A number of organizations are currently doing it that don't have a big volume of it. They realize what's involved. They say, we're out of this. Let the professional ACAs who do this work all over the world carry it out.

Sorry for the long-winded thing, but as always, Valerie had a valid point.

So that's the answer to your questions the best way that we can phrase it.

MR. DELGADO: Huge.
MR. KARREMAN: Thank you, Joe, for going through that. That is very reassuring except on one point, and maybe it's just me, but I am very concerned about having a split operation in a grower group. Can you address that? I just - either - well, I'm just very concerned about that.

MR. DELGADO: Joe?
MS. MIEDEMA: Well, it's addressed in a couple of ways. One is, all of the organic product must be sold only through the group. And where I heard this come up was the acknowledgment of family sustenance, and not necessarily a strict adherence to organic practices for their own food to eat. They're a coffee grower, but you know, they have got a little patch of corn or something. And I feel maybe a little - to speak to this more clearly - but this was really left in as a survival item.

MR. KARREMAN: This is in the U.S. as well. I understand - I mean I understand what you're saying. That's totally fine. But there is something just to me that - I know split operations are allowed and everything. But they ought to be raked over the coals. Every single one of them in this country or elsewhere. Because there are some sitting on farms that really need looking at real hard if they are split operations.

MS. MIEDEMA: I work for a split operation, and am aware of how clearly delineated organic borders need to be, and the extra scrutiny that comes from that, and if that is represented by the notation here as that being an additional risk factor.

MS. JAMES: Well, I think one of the elephants in the room here is that we have to look at economy and supply scale. I'm not an inspector, I'm not a farmer. But I do represent the endpoint where a lot of these
products are sold. And currently 100 percent inspection of all farms is not something that is being practiced. And I would be very concerned that if we couldn't come up with a multisite recommendation that the program as well as the board is comfortable with, that it's going to cloud the system. That if all of a sudden we turn around and we say, 100 percent inspection of all farm sites, that would seriously affect the supply.

And I am not opposed at all - I think I probably side with Barry a little bit - I think some of the feedback has been really good, and especially if the program is sitting over there telling us that we can drive a semi truck through this recommendation, that we shouldn't hold onto it so tightly that we are not willing to look at ways that we might be able to change it so that the rest of the board felt more comfortable with it.

And I want to point out some things that I heard in public comment, and
that I read in a lot of the comments that were posted, and that is, that I think there is a serious concern about sites exceeding a long time limit, without being inspected. I think that that is something that we need to possibly look at.

I think that the definition of selection unit, that maybe we need to look at the idea of that not exceeding 100 individual growers.

I think we also - we did make a we did acquiesce by adding in the minority opinion which I think is great, that new sites are under a high risk. And defining the size of the average production unit is probably something that should be addressed as well.

Because my concern is that if this recommendation passed and went to the program that they would reject it and then here we are back at ground zero.

So I just want -
MR. DELGADO: Do you have a quick
response, Joe?
MR. SMILLIE: No, nothing is going to be quick here.

MR. DELGADO: Okay, a response to the point.

MR. SMILLIE: Number one, that kind of wholesale reexamination we can't do today. So let me just try and point out one big thing. If we do this, you will be drinking sustainable coffee, not organic coffee. You will be having sustainable vanilla and sustainable sugar; not get a recommendation through that allows for group certification.

Just be very clear what the
ramifications of this are internationally and for the entire organic industry. I would just urge you to think about that.

Number two is, if in order to get this through, and I love open transparent democratic processes, we have to make a deal to include in the risk factors that mandatory inspection for anyone exceeding \$5,000 U.S. -
luckily that is dropping like a stone everyday

- if that is the deal-breaker, then we are willing to discuss it as - to put it in the risk factor, not as mandatory, but to add it specifically to the risk factor. Any member or subunit making more than $\$ 5,000$ is highlighted as a risk factor; I'm willing to consider that as a friendly amendment.

MR. DELGADO: I'd remind the board, speaking of action items, we haven't considered any amendments, unfriendly or friendly, after the first two. So that is a way to get things through.

So if I understand correctly, are you making an amendment yourself?

MR. SMILLIE: I don't think I can.
MR. DELGADO: You can, because this
now is a document before the floor.
MR. SMILLIE: Okay, if I could recognize myself as friendly. Gets a little schizzy on that.
(Laughter.)
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MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: Joe, while I had jotted down a comment, I would like to make an amendment to your document. But based on just your recent comment, I don't know if you will like it or not. Because I was not going to call it a risk factor. My suggestion is to put it in the paragraph right above this unit. So my motion is to accept this language placed in page seven, D1 following the - right in the center of the paragraph right in front of where it says, various, is where the sentence would go. And this is the sentence I'm proposing as a motion.

All subunits that gross over $\$ 5,000$ in organic sales in any year must be inspected by third party during the next inspection cycle - that's in U.S. dollars.

MR. GIACOMINI: Second.
MR. DELGADO: Second. Is that a friendly amendment?

MS. FRANCES: Can you repeat that,
please?
MR. MOYER: I certainly can.
The sentence that I wrote said:
all subunits that gross over $\$ 5,000$ U.S. dollars in organic sales in any year must have third party inspection at the next inspection cycle.

MR. DELGADO: And that is an amendment to assert.

MR. MOYER: And that was seconded by Dan.

MR. DELGADO: Seconded by Dan. Is that a friendly amendment?

MR. SMILLIE: Can we have the discussion first?

MR. DELGADO: Absolutely. It's been moved and seconded. And it's going to be followed by a discussion. So it's been moved and seconded to amend by inserting the words: all subunits that gross over $\$ 5,000$ U.S. in organic sales in any year must have third party inspection in the following year.

MR. MOYER: I said in the following inspection cycle.

MR. DELGADO: And discussion on the amendment?

Tracy followed by Tina then Joe.
MS. MIEDEMA: I believe this is overly prescriptive, and that we are going to prescribe ourselves out of the construct actually working the way it does now, and should continue to work around the world. And just a quick history on this issue, folks. This board cast a recommendation on criteria for certification of grower groups in 2002. It was quite rigorous, and in fact, in its entirety it has found a home in our recommendation.

It did nothing to prevent the plug being pulled on grower groups around the world, and frankly, whatever we send to the program today they are still going to be able to make mincemeat of - they are going to be able to take or leave. We are giving a
recommendation.
But if our intent today is to tear apart what's happening out there in the world right now, then we should start layering in items like this. If we are to make it more rigorous and give the program our intention, then we should move forward with what it is.

I think our recommendation would not be weakened by including the 5,000 threshold as simply a risk factor, and leaving discretion in the hands of certifiers. In our system, we here, USDA organic, we embrace an organic system plan that is flexible and melds to every farm here in the U.S., single operations. We do not have a one-size-fitsall organic system plan. Let's keep it as a risk factor and allow our spirit of organic to live in the same way in these groups.

Have it be a risk factor and not a prescription.

MR. DELGADO: Tina.
MS. ELLOR: Yes, from some of the
comments we heard, I am a little bit concerned that this would be very very onerous in terms of record keeping. So I'm comfortable with making it a risk factor myself.

MR. DELGADO: Huge.
MR. KARREMAN: Yes, I'd be comfortable with risk factor as well, and I think $\$ 5,000$ is in OFPA. I think it's fine to have that in there, as some kind of awareness level. But in your sentence, Jeff, if it sits in there or it goes down into the risk factors, the third party inspection following inspection cycle they have to have. But they they are kind of in the risk - not the risk but the general random samples after that inspection, is that what you were saying? Oh, every year - okay, I gotcha, I can read that. MR. DELGADO: Jim.

MR. MOYER: Well, just so we're clear that if you put this into the list of risk factors, it just gets pooled with the many. It could mean that a farm that earns -
that makes $\$ 400,000$ may never get inspected by third party inspection. It just - if - Joe, if there are 10 farms that all earn that much in a large coop, that could easily happen. You are telling me it can't happen?

MR. SMILLIE: The laws of economics, those guys are not going to get together as a group. They are going to get individually certified.

MR. MOYER: They don't have to.
MR. SMILLIE: No, it's much more difficult -

MR. MOYER: I didn't say it's not difficult.

MR. DELGADO: Bea, followed by Tracy.

MS. JAMES: I have a question that maybe you can answer, Joe. Is having a \$5,000 sales, would that basically pretty much say that in the United States it's 100 percent inspection?

MR. DAVIS: Grower groups in the
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MS. JAMES: Yes, grower groups in the United States, would that be pretty close to creating a 100 percent inspection
framework? Close to it?
MS. MIEDEMA: If it's a risk factor, or if it's -

MS. JAMES: No, if it's listed like it is now.

MR. DELGADO: Tracy, you want to clarify that?

MS. MIEDEMA: Most likely if that were listed as Jeff was lining it out, it would do just exactly what it says it's going to do. But it sounds like we are starting to gain some consensus around the idea that there is some riskiness. It's an indication of being bigger. It's an indication of risk; let's let it be that, and add it where it sounds like we are getting some agreement on. MS. JAMES: Well, my question is really around whether or not we are excluding
the United States from a multi-site framework because of that?

MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MS. JAMES: Can Joe?
MR. GIACOMINI: If I can respond to Bea, what I see it doing is, it puts the producers in the U.S. in line with federal law. It - there is nothing within that regulation that prevents them from forming a production unit, a grower group. It doesn't prevent them from doing it. It's just that if they are in a group, they conform to the law of if they are over five grand they get inspected. They can still be part of it; they can still benefit from the ICS. They can still have all those benefits, but they get inspected.

MR. DELGADO: Tina, followed by
Jerry.
MS. ELLOR: So I'm still not clear
where - neither one of these seems to solve both of the problems, the record keeping
problems we heard about and the hole that the truck can drive through. Neither one of those seems to me to address those two issues.

Is there some way that you can think of that we -

MR. DELGADO: I'd remind you that we are considering an amendment, and we should focus on that.

On that note, if you want to chime in and provide comments?

DR. ROBINSON: First of all, if you are below $\$ 5,000$ in the United States or any place else for that matter you do not have to get inspected or certified; you are exempt from this law, except for record keeping.

Secondly, if you do not give us anything, no one will be driving a truck through anything at all. The longer you delay, the longer you wait, and that's Rick's opinion off the top of his head about whether or not you drive a truck through something. We got to walk down the hall and
go sit down and talk with legal counsel about what you give us. This is a pretty hefty document. And one of the things $I$ hear up here that I don't really like what I hear is statements to the effect of this: well, since we can't do complete inspections today, why don't we just concede the point that we can't completely do inspections, and just - we'll do something like less than full inspections. And consumers are being misled anyway, so we are going to do something a little bit different.

I don't really like that sentiment
about this program. That is not the way this law was written, and that is not the way this regulation was developed. And I hope that is not what consumers are being informed about, because the fundamental - the fundamentals of this program are that it is about inspection. It is about an annual inspection in this program.

It is true, no one expects that an

inspector walks up and down each foot of each acre of each farm; yes, of course not, that is kind of ridiculous. Nobody expects that. I don't think anybody is that naive.

But the fundamentals of this program are that an inspector comes out to every operation every year. You know I get I'm constantly called by the media, and one of the things I am always asked is, how do consumers know that somebody - that a product or that an operation is in compliance with this program? And my standard answer is, because a certifying agent sends an inspector to an operation. We don't certify the product; we certify the operation. It's the operation that we hold accountable.

So I really don't - I'm sorry, I know this is a little bit of me being on my soapbox, but I don't like hearing that, well, you know, accreditation - I mean certification that just takes place in a conference room. Our auditors don't think it takes place in a
conference room. In fact they write up noncompliances if they hear the inspector say, I don't have to go out on the processing floor. I don't have to go out on the field; I was there last year. That's considered a noncompliance and they get written up for it. MR. DELGADO: Joe, followed by DR. ROBINSON: I'm sorry, I wasn't done, Rigo.

So I don't like to hear that just because you can't walk the field, or just because we can't inspect we shouldn't inspect. We do inspect in my opinion. In the program's opinion.

Now how we inspect, how thoroughly we inspect and what we do I'm not saying that inspection is not also a sampling process. It is. The thoroughness of it, and we can take this recommendation and we can do something with it. We can work with the board, and we can work with our attorneys. And yes, risk factors are important. Income can be a risk
factor. The degree of uniformity in my opinion can encompass size and income.

But you know, you guys, you got to come up with something, you have to give us something or we are not going to get anywhere.

MR. DELGADO: Just in the interests of time and moving forward, I want to highlight those points from Barbara. If we give something to the program, we can work on it and perfect it and come up with an end product. I think that was a point to highlight.

Joe, followed by Jerry.
MR. SMILLIE: Thank you, Barbara.
I couldn't agree more. I cannot accept this as a friendly amendment.

MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. SMILLIE: To finish that, I could accept it as an addition to the risk factor grouping. But I would like it removed from -

MR. DELGADO: Well, we do have an
amendment - a motion to amend that is already moved and seconded. So it stands as it is, so we are going to vote.

MR. SMILLIE: No, I have a right to deny it as a friendly amendment, don't I?

MR. DELGADO: Not after it's been moved.

MS. MIEDEMA: An outside person can't simply amend -

MR. DELGADO: Yes, they can. This document now before the board, it was made by Jeff, seconded by Dan. And -

MS. MIEDEMA: The person who made the motion has the discretion of whether to accept it - even after seconded.

MR. DELGADO: As a friendly
amendment. Which you did not, so we are going to vote. You just stated that it's an informal amendment. You don't agree with it. But it is now before the board, and it's been stated, and we had a discussion about the amendment, and after the discussion we'll put
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Yes.
MR. DAVIS: That goes to my question of the procedural question, as a voting member of the board, do we have to vote yes or not on that particular amendment, or can it be simultaneous with the idea that there is going to be this other amendment -

MR. DELGADO: No. We have to vote on this amendment, approve it or reject it. If it is approved it will be incorporated into this document, and then if there is no other amendment, we will have to vote on that document as it is.

Any other clarifications? Hugh?
MR. KARREMAN: What Barbara just said, I think that that amendment Jeff made has to stay in there, because $\$ 5,000$ is the threshold for inspections. And if the whole program is based on inspections, or is a fundamental part of it, if you are making more than five grand, you've got to get inspected.

MR. DELGADO: Any other comments or questions?

MR. SMILLIE: Sorry, back to basics again. This is a unit. This is being inspected. The group is a production unit; it is being inspected. What you are talking about is subunits, members of this production unit.

The unit -
MR. KARREMAN: I'm saying a subunit
of some 100 unit coop if some subunit is making more than five grand they should get inspected every year.

MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: In agreement with you and agreement with Jeff I second the motion, the subunit in question here is the farmer. The grower group is not the farmer. That's the ICS; that's the group; that's the over thing, just as we talked about, whether we do it in the coop. This is the farmer; this is the guy at five grand that I think
should be inspected to be in compliance with federal law and not have the train wreck that will occur when something happens.

MR. DELGADO: Any questions?
Any other comments? Are we ready for the question?

The question is on the motion to -
MR. GIACOMINI: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. Clarification: would this be considered a substantive motion at this point, the act of the amendment?

MR. DELGADO: Substantive motion?
Can you clarify?
MR. GIACOMINI: Substantive motion of issues going to the program are two-thirds. Just for clarification, typically an amendment is a majority. I think I would be considered to have a conflict of interest, but in my experience with parliamentary procedure, and I believe in past references with the program on amendments, they are not considered substantive motions that require two thirds.

Do you agree?
MR. DELGADO: I agree with your intent. This is going to be a majority vote. It is an amendment. We are still working on an internal document that has not been presented to the board.

MS. FRANCES: So Dan has a conflict of interest?

MR. GIACOMINI: No, my conflict of interest was in my interpretation of parliamentary procedure, since I have - I believe in one side or the other. So that is where someone could say, well, you have a conflict of interest so your interpretation of parliamentary procedure is not as valid. So I just wanted to qualify that. But I do not have a conflict of interest regarding voting on the amendment.

MR. DELGADO: And once again I'll
put the question. The question is on the motion to amend by inserting the words, all subunits that grossed over $\$ 5,000$ U.S. in
organic sales in a year must have third party inspection in the following inspection cycle. And that will be inserted in paragraph one, inspection, sampling and risk analysis.

And we will start taking the vote

MS. FRANCES: For clarify, we are voting that this would be added?

MR. DELGADO: For clarify purposes you are voting on the amendment -

MS. FRANCES: - to add that?
MR. DELGADO: - to amend by
inserting that sentence.
And we will start with - are there any questions on that regard before we start the vote? Yes.

MR. KARREMAN: I'm not sure if you said it or not, but in that location.

MR. DELGADO: In that location as stated in the screen.

We will start the vote now with Julie.
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MS. WEISMAN: No.
MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: No.
MR. DELGADO: Tina.
MS. ELLOR: No.
MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: No.
MR. DELGADO: Joe.
MR. SMILLIE: No.
MR. DELGADO: Barry.
MR. FLAMM: Abstain.
MR. DELGADO: Abstain.
Kevin? Hugh - sorry.
MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Kevin?
MR. ENGELBERT: Abstain.
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MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: No.
MR. DELGADO: Steve.
MR. DeMURI: No.
MR. DELGADO: And the chair votes yes.

MS. WEISMAN: Let's see, we have two abstentions, one absent, and seven noes, and four yeses.

MS. JAMES: I count eight noes.
MR. DELGADO: So the noes have it, and the motion to amend by inserting the statement already described is lost.

Going back to the discussion, Tracy followed by Joe.

MS. MIEDEMA: I would like to propose a friendly amendment that we add to our list of risk criteria the factor that any subunit or member earning \$5,000 or more per year presents a higher risk.

MR. DELGADO: Second?
MR. SMILLIE: Second.

MR. DELGADO: Can you state specifically where you want that?

MS. MIEDEMA: I'll restate that that should be listed among the risk factors for inspection.

MR. DELGADO: Let's talk about the document location specifically.

MS. MIEDEMA: That would be number one, page seven I believe, sampling and risk analysis, the bulleted list.

They are not in hierarchical order.

MR. DELGADO: And it's going to be in exactly the same sentence we had before, correct, Tracy?

MS. MIEDEMA: Yes. Actually to be consistent with the way this list is written, it should say simply, earning $\$ 5,000$ per year or more.

MS. FRANCES: Grossing?
MS. MIEDEMA: Grossing.
MR. DELGADO: Clarification from

Julie, yes? Tracy, are you aware of that, 5,000 or more? Right?

MS. MIEDEMA: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Okay, it is moved and seconded to amend by inserting the sentence, grossing $\$ 5,000$ or more in U.S. organic sales per year in the section titled, one-point inspection, sampling and risk analysis. Discussion? Steve followed by Gary?

MR. DeMURI: I like this
compromise. I think it's a good place to put it. It puts the onus on the certifiers where it belongs. I think they are all
conscientious; they want to do the right thing. And I think this is a great compromise. We need to give the program something they can work with.

MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN: I'd like to call the question at this time.
(Simultaneous speakers.)

MR. DELGADO: The previous question you're talking about?

MR. KARREMAN: The vote. I'd like to vote on this document.

MR. SMILLIE: I will accept that as a friendly amendment.

MR. DELGADO: Okay, you accept it as a friendly amendment. So we don't have to vote -- we do have a second, so we do have to vote and proceed.

Plus I want to make sure that we have the previous question. Was that the intent of your previous question?

MR. KARREMAN: I apologize, Joe, I thought that it was seconded, and we were in discussions, to discuss this. And I said I'd like to call the question on the whole document.

MR. DELGADO: We are doing an amendment.
(Simultaneous speakers.)
MR. DELGADO: If it is agreed with
by the board, we can consider this an amendment and forget about --

MR. SMILLIE: I accept it.
MR. DELGADO: Any other - yes, sir.
MR. GIACOMINI: I just had one question. We've had the change underneath that. I was wanting to ask Valerie if she could scroll down and see what essentially the replacement to that first sentence has become.

The highest risk subunits are identified and inspected.

MS. MIEDEMA: Actually that is striked out, and we are voting on -- it begins --

MR. GIACOMINI: No, no, no, once the annual inspection for fringe rate is determined the highest risk subunits are identified and inspected.

MR. SMILLIE: That's correct.
MR. DELGADO: Questions? Do you have a specific question?

We do have a friendly amendment,
and it's been stated, and now we have - you are calling the previous question? Now we are talking about the whole document here. Hugh had called for the previous question.

MR. KARREMAN: Yes, I even have a second.

MR. DELGADO: Called and seconded. The previous question has been ordered - has been moved.

All those in favor of voting on the previous question -

MR. SMILLIE: I'll defer to Dan, but once he calls the question.

MR. DELGADO: The previous question has been moved on.

Yes?
MR. GIACOMINI: If there is - it was not a motion to call the previous question. It was calling for the question. Unless someone speaks up and continues debating, you can call it without the added vote.

MR. DELGADO: I'll take that as a direction, and I'll open the questions to the board of any opposition to the previous question?

If not, I'll put the question. And the question is on the motion to approve the document called Certifying Operations with Multiple Production Units, Sites and Facilities under the National Organic Program as described by the chair of the CACC, the committee.

And we will start our vote with Dan.

MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: No.
MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Tina.
MS. ELLOR: Yes.
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MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Joe.
MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Barry.
MR. FLAMM: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Kevin.
MR. ENGELBERT: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MR. DELGADO: Steve.
MR. DeMURI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Julie.
MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: And the chair votes yes.

MR. MOYER: Okay, Mr. Chairman, we have two noes, 12 yeses, and one absent.

MR. DELGADO: Okay, the yeas have it, and the motion is agreed to. And congratulations to all of us for what
wonderful discussion.
We can move on to a well-deserved break. WE are way behind schedule, and we'll take - oops, sorry, that's right, I guess we have a request from the chair of the CACC, and you want to proceed with the next.

MS. FRANCES: I need a break.
MR. DELGADO: Make it quick.
MR. SMILLIE: At this time the committee in its meeting has reconsidered our recommendation for 100 percent, and we'd like to withdraw that recommendation and take it back to committee for further use based on the excellent public input we got on that.

So we'll bring that forward at the spring meeting.

MR. DELGADO: And it is the understanding that you will add that to your work plan.

MR. SMILLIE: Absolutely.
MR. DELGADO: On that note, let's take a well deserved break. Five minutes.

We'll see you in here at 10:23.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:20 a.m. and resumed at 10:33
a.m.)

MR. DELGADO: All right, we are continuing with our program, and now it's the turn of the crops committee to discuss the proposals. And on that note, Mr. Davis.

JOINT CROPS \& COMPLIANCE, ACCREDITATION AND CERTIFICATION COMMITTEE

MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
The first action is a joint crops and CACC committee document with further guidance on commercial availability of organic seed.

The joint committee would like to present a couple small edits to the document which Valerie should have on screen.

The only changes are on page four

- no it's actually on page five, the last page. I pointed out yesterday there is kind
of a relict artifact left from a previous addition of this. So the sentence was deleted as shown in strike-through there: producers using nonorganic varieties not appearing on the database will need to provide justification for such use. It does not make any sense in there anymore. Once we - that's from a previous addition and now does not belong there any more.

The only other change would be in point number two there on the same page, where it says, buyers of organic agricultural products. For additional clarity we wanted to add, buyers and/or processors. Processors are buyers, but some of the public comment kind of pointed out that that was an important point, so we added that. And again, two other places in that same paragraph: buyer/processor was inserted there.

Other than that we are satisfied as a joint committee with this document, and I move that the board accept this
recommendation.
MR. MOYER: I'll second that motion.

MR. DELGADO: It is moved and seconded to approve the document called: Commercial availability guidance regarding the sourcing of organic seed.

Discussion? Any questions?
Steve.
MR. DeMURI: I would like to hear your thinking behind the additional processor statement in the organic seed.

MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: The thinking is that in that section it involves the buyers of organic agricultural products. We feel that by adding that extra statement, processors, it's not changing anything. The processor in this case is the buyer. It's just whether - it doesn't change it at all, it just highlights the processors as one example of a buyer.

MR. SMILLIE: And it brings them
into the picture, also. We want them to be -to share the pain, or the gain.
(Laughter.)
MR. DELGADO: Thank you. Any other
questions? Comments? Ready for the question?
And the question is on the motion
to approve -- guidance regarding the sourcing of organic seed, Section 205.204.

And I'll start taking the vote with Dan - I'm sorry, Jeff.

MR. MOYER: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Bean.
MS. JAMES: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Tina.
MS. ELLOR: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Joe.
MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Barry.

MR. FLAMM: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Kevin.
MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Steve.
MR. DeMURI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Julie.
MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: And the chair votes yes.

MR. MOYER: Mr. Chairman, we had zero noes, 14 yeses, one absent.

MR. DELGADO: The ayes have it, and the motion is agreed to. Let's go on to the next point. We continue with the crops committee.

MR. DAVIS: The next one would be
materials. The first one on the list would be tetracycline, tetracycline hydrochloride to be specific. The committee met this morning and discussed the public comment that was received and the discussions yesterday on the relative merits of leaving the petition as is for - as a petition for adding tetracycline oxytetracycline hydrochloride specifically, for fire blight control only on the national lands to apply 601I leaving it as it stands versus the idea of changing it to amend the annotation of the existing material on the list, which is tetracycline - oxytetracycline calcium. This is a different material, different CAS number, we felt it would be problematic to go about it that way to list to present it as a - just an addendum change an annotations change, excuse me - and prefer to just let it go forward as is. MR. DELGADO: So you want to state the motion?

MR. DAVIS: The motion would be to
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MR. DELGADO: You are moving to add? You are going with the addition of this material, correct?

MR. DAVIS: Right. The motion is to add this material to the national list as stated on the recommendation.

MR. MOYER: I'll second it.
MR. DELGADO: Seconded. It is moved and seconded that - you have a question? State the question?

Let me state the question. I was confused by the indication there. It is moved and seconded to add tetracycline -
oxytetracycline hydrochloride for fire blight control only onto the national list, Section 205.601(I).

Discussion? Joe?
MR. SMILLIE: Sorry, but I'm a little bit confused on this in two areas. The first area is, and correct me where I'm wrong, Jerry and Jeff, but the first area is, if we
added it as an annotation which you are not going to do, but if we had done that then it would provide a level playing field for the petitioner but would not extend the use of tetracycline in general; it would sunset at the same time as the current material is going to sunset; is that correct?

MR. DAVIS: That is correct.
MR. SMILLIE: But you decided not to do that? You have decided not to change the annotation?

MR. DAVIS: We went with the original petition which was to add this material?

MR. GIACOMINI: Could we check with
the program on that issue? It seems to me a reevaluation of this substance and this listing by the board could reset that clock.

Could we please ask the program for clarification on that?

MR. DELGADO: Certainly -- comment
on that for us. If we change the annotation
would it extend in anyway the sunset
provisions on that? Of the calcium materials in this case?

MR. GIACOMINI: If it's a reevaluation of an existing list to change an annotation, is that considered a review by this committee of this substance? And if that annotation is changed in the Federal Register would that reset the clock?

MR. MATTHEWS: We don't believe it would.

MR. DELGADO: The program does not believe that would be affected. So Joe, with that statement, is that clarified?

MR. SMILLIE: Rather than get caught up in parliamentary language, here is my intent, and sorry, maybe I'm not phrasing it properly. My intent is to offer a level playing field to the petitioner. That doesn't extend to the use of tetracycline. So my vote would be, $I$ want to see the petitioner get a level playing field, but if that means
extending the use of tetracycline I would vote no.

So I want to vote my intention, which is to give the petitioner a level playing field with a competitor who uses the same product currently allowed under the regulation, but if that's best accomplished by adding this material, then I could be comfortable with that. But if by adding the material we move the sunsetting of that tetracycline farther along then I wouldn't be comfortable.

Am I explaining myself correct?
MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN: I understand what you're saying totally, Joe, and as to the rationale, I feel the same way. I think that we need to look at this material in the way we're looking at it, and it's tetracycline is the active compound. The salt of this particular tetracycline is kind of to level the playing field, but the active is
tetracycline. So if it doesn't reset the clock - and it shouldn't, it should not, because tetracycline is already on there, and we are just kind of saying, well, this color of tetracycline is -- not to get any color, sorry, sorry -- but you know that this is just embellishing what is already there, but the main top one is going to go away, whenever it does. I agree with that and I hope it is that way, if that is the motion; I want to hear that for sure.

MR. DELGADO: Dan and Jeff.
MR. GIACOMINI: I agree with Joe and Hugh, and I think that as Gerry described, whether it was problematic depends on how the annotation is attacked. If the annotation is attacked by adding this substance to the list that is already there, of adding a second item in the parentheses, you have a CAS number problem, and you have other problems.

If the annotation is attacked by deleting that in the parentheses, I don't
think you have that problem. I think you accomplish the same thing. I think you level the playing field, and I am - maybe I'm being a little schizophrenic, but I have a problem adding a separate listing. I'm not comfortable adding another item in the annotation. I'm very comfortable deleting that between the parentheses, and at the same time I have no problem at all if at the next meeting we have a petition to remove tetracycline, and I vote for that to happen. I have no contradictions in all those things.

MR. DELGADO: Joe.
MR. MOYER: Yes, two points. One is, I believe at the last meeting when this was discussed, the program did tell us that it reset the clock. So I do think I'd want a clarification on that before we vote.

The second point is, I think removing bracketed information on annotations is a little bit of a risky slippery slope.

There are reasons that many of these annotations were put on, and different formulations of different material react differently in the environment, and within the context within which they are being applied.

And I just think we have to be
careful as we look at all these materials that we don't just look at base ingredients and assume that everything else that is being done there is okay moving forward.

MR. DELGADO: Bea followed by Hugh.
MS. JAMES: I would agree with what
Jeff just said, and because it was clear
yesterday during comment that it was a
separate CAS number that it should be looked at separately.

MR. DELGADO: Hugh?
MR. KARREMAN: I'm not an
agronomist, obviously, but I would honestly, I understand what you are saying, Jeff, but it's tetracycline; it's not the hydrochloride. And it's a different CAS number. It could
reset the clock. I would rather just see that parenthesis taken out of there. And it's tetracycline, whoever set it, let's kill it soon, but let's not reset clocks and all that if we don't have to.

MR. DELGADO: Barbara?
DR. ROBINSON: Well, I think to your point, Jeff, on the annotation, I think the point is that the annotation is for the purpose of the tetracycline, and the purpose is for fire blight control only. That's really what you are annotating here. It's tetracycline for fire blight control; that's what you want.

MR. DELGADO: It's actually not the annotation. Just for clarification, it's actually the title -

DR. ROBINSON: The original
annotation says, tetracycline in parenthesis, oxytetracycline calcium complex. What you want - what you'd be doing is just removing that parenthetical, oxytetracycline calcium
complex. So you'd be left with tetracycline for fire blight control only, which would allow the forms of tetracycline, which is what the petitioner has asked for: tetracycline.

MR. MOYER: But it does have a separate CAS number, and is for all intents and purposes.

DR. ROBINSON: Right, but EPA says that these forms are all functionally equivalent for fire blight control. That's what the petitioners said, so that's what we'd be allowing under the same clock.

MR. MOYER: And the second question
was whether the clock will be reset as you stated, Jeff, and the question again is no the answer is no.

DR. ROBINSON: And that's what we would put in the rule. That the clock does not change.

MR. DELGADO: The clock does not change. Bea followed by Jennifer and then Jerry.

MS. JAMES: So my question for Jerry then is, by creating this level playing field are we then making it so that there are two forms of tetracycline that are being used?

MR. DELGADO: Jerry?
MR. DAVIS: Effectively I think the petitioner stated it accurately when they said that there would be two forms of tetracycline, but the overall use pattern of tetracycline would not increase. There would just be a substitutionary effect at the whim of the marketplace on which one they wanted to choose.

MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: Just for clarification, the -- is not here, did - oh, he said he was leaving, sorry - he did assess this and say yesterday that he did not intend to reset the clock; that the standing sense, that was fine.

MR. DELGADO: Steve.
MR. DeMURI: Jerry, there are other members that are experts in this area, are
there other forms of tetracycline that would fall into this category later on?

MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: I can't state that for sure. I don't remember from the EPA documents that we went over whether there are additional forms. You'd have to ask that maybe of the petitioner if you wanted to know that. There's none on the marketplace that I know, but I don't know if there are technical forms that could arise.

MR. DELGADO: Could the petitioner please address that question?

MR. RICHARDSON: Paul Richardson with AgroSource. And there are currently only the oxytetracycline base material,
oxytetracycline hydrochloride and oxytetracycline calcium registered with EPA. And those are the only forms that I would be aware of that would potentially be used in agriculture, and even the base is not used in agriculture, because its form is really just
the hydrochloride or the calcium.
MR. DELGADO: Tina.
MS. ELLOR: And that was basically question and what came up in our discussions is that we didn't know how many forms there were, and if you took the parenthetical, you know -- we didn't know what kind of door we'd be opening, and really felt like we had to review all of those individually for their effects on the environment.

MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MR. DAVIS: In reading the EPA
documentation they do not delineate the different forms of tetracycline as having any different environmental or human health effects.

MR. DELGADO: Bea?
MS. JAMES: My question is, why do we want to create a level playing field for a material that we don't think should be on the list anyway - some of us?

MR. DELGADO: Joe.

MR. SMILLIE: Because it's just fair.

MS. JAMES: In one aspect.
MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN: Bea, I guess the intent, roughly stated by a few of us here, is to get rid of tetracycline. His petition and his public comment basically said, he's squeezed out of market price because - it's to be just and fair. That's why I agree. And I'm not even in favor of this material, but $I$ agree with that rationale.

MS. JAMES: So is our duty to be just and fair to the manufacturer or to the organic principles?

MR. KARREMAN: Well, right now, an organic producer, whatever the crop it's used on will be buying it from the other guy. It's not like they are not going to use it. He's just asking that he has fair competition in the marketplace. It's not like it's not allowed right now in organic production; it
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MR. DELGADO: Barry.
MR. FLAMM: One of the things we discussed at length in committee was the intent to remove them - these substances through the sunset process. And in that connection we discussed what kind of message approving any new form.

And the petition we had before us is what we addressed, and addressed carefully the second go-round. We did it at the last meeting, and then pulled the vote at the last minute, and we are sort of going around the same block again.

I'm concerned if we change the committee's deliberation on this.

MR. DELGADO: Barbara.
DR. ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman, we just consulted with our attorney, and it will change the clock. It will change the clock. It will change the clock. Your annotation change does change the clock.

MR. MATTHEWS: Yes, it's considered - even by removing the annotation it's looked at as if you have reconsidered the material and therefore the clock resets.

DR. ROBINSON: I apologize.
MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: If we are held to the standard of only reevaluating new material at sunset, and I understand that everybody is allowed to make their vote - I'm not aware of a lot of new information that has come to light or will or likely will come to light. We know what this does, and we would like to get it off. The way to get it off is a petition to remove. It's still a matter of what is fair and just and equitable. We're not adding anything new.

I question whether we are affecting the rate - the point in time when we can remove it by the fact that we are changing - resetting the clock and redoing sunset. I still think it's the right thing to do. I
still hope somebody submits a petition to remove it.

MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN: When is the sunset when will the current listing go?

MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: Just to follow up on what Barry said, I think as a board we have to be careful about the message we send to the community when we reevaluate this, and that is what we are doing is reevaluating it and extending the life expectancy of this material for another two years, we have to be careful about that. And that did come up in our deliberations in our committee - five more years. Three from the previous.

MR. DELGADO: Any other questions or comments?

The motion stands then as it is? Okay, I'll put the motion, and the question is on the motion to list tetracycline oxytetracycline hydrochloride for fire blight
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control only on the national list, Section 205. 601 .

And we'll start taking the vote

MS. JAMES: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: No.
MR. DELGADO: Tina.
MS. ELLOR: No.
MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Joe.
MR. SMILLIE: No.
MR. DELGADO: Barry.
MR. FLAMM: No.
MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN: No.
MR. DELGADO: Kevin.
MR. ENGELBERT: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: No.
MR. DELGADO: Steve.
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MR. DeMURI: No.
MR. DELGADO: Julie.
MS. WEISMAN: No.
MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: No.
MR. DELGADO: And the chair votes no.

MR. MOYER: Mr. Chairman, we have one yes, 13 noes, and one absent.

MR. DELGADO: The noes have it, and the motion to list tetracycline oxytetracycline hydrochloride in Section 205.601(I) of the list is lost.

Let's proceed with the next.
MR. DAVIS: The next material is sorbitol octanoate, and the petition is states, to add sorbitol octanoate as insect control on the national list, Section 205.601(e).

We have no further statement to
make about this as a committee. We believe that to add it because it is like sucrose octanoate ester a little bit, and that it's some of the reasoning that was presented in public comment is not sufficient to overturn our original recommendation, and would like to present - have it be accepted by the board for a vote.

MR. DELGADO: Okay, make the motion, please.

MR. DAVIS: I move that we vote on adding sorbital octanoate as an insect control on the national list, Section 205.601(e).

MR. DELGADO: Any second?
MS. ELLOR: Second.
MR. DELGADO: Seconded by Tina. It
is moved and seconded to add sorbital
octanoate as insect control on the national
list on Section 205.601(e).
Discussion?
MR. SMILLIE: Was there a TAP done on this?

MR. DELGADO: Jerry?
MR. DAVIS: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Any other questions?
Comments?
Ready for the question? Joe? No?
The question is on the motion to
list sorbital octanoate as an insect control
on the national list, Section 205.601(e). And we will start taking the vote with Jerry.

MR. DAVIS: No.
MR. DELGADO: Kristine.
MS. ELLOR: No.
MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Joe.
MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Barry.
MR. FLAMM: No.
MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Kevin.
MR. ENGELBERT: No.
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MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Steve.
MR. DeMURI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Julie.
MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: No.
MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: No.
MR. DELGADO: And the chair votes no.

MR. MOYER: I have seven noes, seven yeses, one abstention - I'm sorry, one absent, not abstention.

MR. DELGADO: The noes have it and the motion to list sorbitol octanoate as insect control on the national list, Section 205.601(e) is lost.

Go on to the next section, please.
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Jerry, you seem to have a question.

MR. SMILLIE: I just wanted to review it. The motion was to list, and the motion did not gain two thirds?

MR. DELGADO: Correct. We had seven -
(Simultaneous speakers.)
MR. DELGADO: The motion was lost. The motion was to list, and did not have the necessary votes for that.

Any other questions on that matter? Very well, let's continue with the next point, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DAVIS: The next petition is for adding pelargonic acid as an herbicide in farm -- maintenance, roadways, ditches, right of ways, building perimeters, and ornamental crops on the national list, Section 205.601(e)(1).

I have a question for the materials committee chair. On this material,
premeeting the petitioner anticipating - well, after seeing the board - I mean the committee recommendation and that this committee was rejected at the committee level had asked that it be removed from consideration. And the committee considered that and discussed it.

Your thoughts on that topic?
MR. DELGADO: So the petitioner, just to clarify, the petitioner would withdraw the petition?

MR. GIACOMINI: The petitioner requested to withdraw the petition. I'm not aware of anything in either from the program or within our policy and procedure manual which gives us definitive direction on that matter. I would think that serious consideration should be given to the wishes of the petitioner in this type of request.

However, I believe that all the matters involved should be considered in granting that request. The petition is in the hands of the committee right now for a vote as it was at
the last meeting when the committee was going to recommend a no vote. Is that correct?

MR. DELGADO: Yes.
MR. GIACOMINI: And the petitioner withdrew it at that time. They brought it forth again with some new information. The committee has again voted to not recommend; the petitioner has decided to withdraw it again.
While I fully respect the - I
think the committee and the board should fully respect the issues of the petitioner, there are certainly considerations in regard to work hours, man hours performed, effort put into this petition, the extended review that has been done twice, and the potential whiplash effect that we could be feeling as a board if it got to the point where every time a petition was coming up no, it'd just get pulled back and resent in at the next meeting.

So with no specific guideline to follow I think that is pretty much in the
hands of the crops committee.
MR. DELGADO: I'd like to ask the policy committee chair if he has any input in the matter.

MR. FLAMM: I'm trying to confirm whether the policy manual says any thing specifically on this point. But I know this is one of the work items for spring to clarify the handling of petitions and so forth.

I think I'll have to defer, and have to leave it up to the chair to call it, which I think has been called already by the committee.

MR. GIACOMINI: Mr. Chairman?
MR. DELGADO: Yes.
MR. GIACOMINI: Did you ask the program if they offered any guidance on this matter?

MR. DELGADO: Barbara, would you like to add to this?

DR. ROBINSON: I apologize, I was conferring with Rick about something - another
option that we could consider, and another vote that we had already made. So I don't know what your question is?

MR. GIACOMINI: We have a petition that has been reviewed now twice, and each time it gets to the board level with a recommendation to not list it, the petitioner pulls it back.

We acknowledged that request the first time and did not vote. There wasn't anything formal. To do that I think we should generally acknowledge and recognize requests by petitioners, but in consideration of manpower and potential down the road of continuing whiplash I think it's up to the chairman of the cross-committee to decide whether to proceed with that vote or not. DR. ROBINSON: I would concur with that.

MR. DAVIS: With all that being
said the crops committee discussed that request from the petitioner, and for the
reasons highlighted by Dan, we decided to proceed with presenting this making the motion to present this recommendation and be accepted by the board.

MR. DELGADO: Okay, can you state the motion, please.

MR. DAVIS: The motion is, again, to add pelargonic acid for use as an herbicide in farmstead maintenance, roadways, ditches, right of ways, building perimeters, and ornamental crops on the national list, Section 205.601(b)(1).

MR. DELGADO: Is there a second?
MR. MOYER: I'll second that.
MR. DELGADO: Seconded by Jeff.
It's been moved and seconded to add pelargonic acid for use as a herbicide in farmstead maintenance, roadways, ditches, right of ways, building perimeters and ornamental crops on the national list, Section 205.601(b)(1).

Discussion? Tina, followed by Tracy.

MS. ELLOR: This is more a concern, and maybe the policy committee can take this up, that did petitioner know we could not withdraw the petition? The petitioner knew we were going to consider it at this meeting?

MR. DELGADO: Tina, can you get closer to the microphone?

MS. ELLOR: Did the petitioner know that we were going to be considering this at this meeting?

MR. DAVIS: It's on the agenda.
MS. ELLOR: Oh, okay, that's fine.
MR. GIACOMINI: Mr. Chairman, the request to withdraw was only, what, two weeks ago? About? Since all of this has been published.

MR. DELGADO: So the committee knew the outcome of the committee decision for a considerable time.

MS. ELLOR: Okay.
MR. DELGADO: Okay, we're going back to Tracy.

MS. MIEDEMA: During the
intervening two weeks was the petitioner notified that we were in fact going to proceed with the vote so they knew to be here today to provide additional information?

MR. DELGADO: Valerie, can you answer that question?

MS. FRANCES: Bob just said that Fisher was invited to the meeting via the meeting notice.

MR. DELGADO: Does that clear it up, Tracy?

MS. MIEDEMA: I guess I feel the petitioner should be granted due process, and they did fulfill their end of the bargain. They withdrew their petition. They came back with additional information in the process, and seemed to be indicating that they believed they can continue to flesh out their case. And it's quite a burden on the petitioner to do this. I don't know that we are going to see a rash of people that would be this
engaged.
But I do understand what we are kind of setting ourselves up for. In any event, $I$ am going to abstain from this because I feel $I$ don't have enough information from petitioner.

MR. DELGADO: Very well. Jerry,
would you like to comment on that?
MR. DAVIS: No, I think the
discussion is health, and am willing to let everyone state their case.

MR. DELGADO: Okay, any other questions? Comments? Ready for the question?

MR. DAVIS: I would say one thing.
MR. DELGADO: Yes, Gerry.
MR. DAVIS: I am concerned that considering that this is - the petitioner is Dow Chemical I believe, very large company. I'm shocked that they did not come. So I think that in a way makes a statement that perhaps they are under the impression that it was not going to be voted on and given serious
consideration.
MR. DELGADO: Any other questions, comments? Ben?

MR. GIACOMINI: I think we need to recognize that there - within the motion there is no statement - no vote to withdraw. Even an abstention is just setting yourself aside and calling yourself absent - I mean calling yourself present, and allowing the rest of the vote to go to two thirds. It is still an up or down vote of whether it is listed or rejected. It is not within the motion that we are considering right now to have the option to withdraw, and to not take action at this time. Second time they've done it.

MR. DELGADO: Yes, Valerie.
MS. FRANCES: I would just like for the committee to state for the record whether they thought the additional information provided by the petitioner for this second review of this material was truly new information.

MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: In our opinion, no.
The information they submitted was not new information. We asked them to - well, let me back up just a little bit. This section of the national list pertains to herbicides, and specifically soap-based herbicides. So far at least that is the only classification of synthetic herbicides on the national list. So which is why it has the non-crop usage and ornamental crop only designation on it.

The additional information we asked for was, can you tell us if this is a soap? Can it be classified as a soap? And they never answered that question. They did submit more information, but it was more of the same. It was additional information, label information, various things. But it didn't address the question of, where do we put this? What part of the list does this go on?

And through our own study on what
soaps are, and particularly since we had it in another petitioner, petitioning ammonium nonanoate, it's a soap. That's a soap; that fits within the EPA classification of a soap. But we don't understand why the petitioner for pelargonic acid never said, no, this really isn't a soap, or it is. They just did not answer the question.

MR. DELGADO: Dan, you want to
clarify?
MR. GIACOMINI: Just for
clarification on what Jerry just said, the listing of soap-based herbicides is a listing - specific listing on the national list, but it's not just a listing on a national list. It is the listing within OFPA of allowable herbicides, allowable synthetic herbicides. So not being a soap is not just a matter of what we already have on the national list; it is significant implications to OFPA. MR. DELGADO: Kevin followed by Joe.

MR. ENGELBERT: I just want to reiterate to the board the amount of time that has been spent on this. And there are a lot of other materials that we have to deal with in the crop committee, and the time spent on this takes away from that. If the motion continues through and this is defeated, it's not gone forever. It can be re-petitioned at some point. That's why the board has decided to move forward. We've put a lot of time and effort into this. A vote needs to be taken in our opinion, and then if there is new information available at some point in time, it may come back.

But we think this is one of those things that as you were talking about earlier about pulling things off the table, it's time for a full board vote on this item for this material.

MR. DELGADO: Can.
MR. GIACOMINI: But the way this
vote is, that will be a precedent setting
action of either listing or denying. That's different than as I talked about on the tabled issues, just moving to lay this petition on the table would essentially kill it and set it aside and we never have to see it again, until a petition is refiled. But that would not have the same precedent-setting status of having been rejected at the board level. MR. KARREMAN: Sorry for being a little slow, Dan, following you, but could you repeat what you said about how this affect OFPA, or somehow the interaction there, please?

MR. GIACOMINI: Well, the listing
in OFPA, the soap-based herbicide is the category listing in OFPA. It's not just that it's a current category on the national list. It's OFPA. And that is the only listing of herbicides I believe for synthetic in OFPA. So the fact that it is not a soap is significant.

MR. DELGADO: Jeff.

MR. KARREMAN: So it's not a soap.
MR. MOYER: Thanks, Dan, that's what I was going to say. This is not a soap; it's an acid. And they could not prove to us that it was a soap, so there is no place to put it. It's not allowed even in OFPA. There is no category to put it under.

MR. DELGADO: Any questions?
Barbara, you wanted to add to the comment?
DR. ROBINSON: The production contains an active synthetic ingredient in one of the following categories and soaps is one of them.

MR. DELGADO: Barbara, can you get closer to a microphone.

DR. ROBINSON: Oh, sorry. Hugh, in order to be put on the national list in crops, the substance is used in production under the law, the substance is used in production and must contain an active synthetic ingredient in one of the following categories, and one of those is soaps.

Well, it is a soap. I mean it would have to be a soap, or it would have to fall in one of the other categories. And that was the question, that was apparently the question the petitioner failed to answer.

MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: It's a problem of nomenclature a little bit. I was handed a document that has on the EPA 40 CFR what is that 180.950 listing of inerts of minimal concern for the ammonium nonanoate. And right next to it they put in parentheses, pelargonic acid. Now I'm totally confused, because they are not identical, but nomenclature wise it seems like there is a little bit of overlap here. I really wouldn't mind asking a question of Brian Baker if you had any comment at all on helping us sort this out?

MR. DELGADO: Brian?
MR. SMILLIE: I just want to double check. You had a TAP on this, right?

MR. DAVIS: Oh, yes.

MR. SMILLIE: And the TAP didn't answer that question?

MR. DAVIS: The TAP did not support it was a soap.

MR. SMILLIE: Oh, so the TAP
asserted it was not a soap?
MR. DELGADO: Brian Banker, please, step up to the microphone.

MR. BAKER: Brian Baker, research director, Organic Materials Review Institute. We've looked at this particular active substance. It is OMRI's opinion that soaps are alkali salts of fatty acids, and that the fatty acid component by itself is not a soap. It is OMRI's opinion that pelargonic acid is not a soap.

MR. DELGADO: Thank you. Jerry?
MR. DAVIS: Yes, that repeats our
concern at the committee level of venturing into new territory, trying to add a material that does not fit an OFPA category because it is not a true soap-based herbicide. And that
is why we did not want to deal with it and just let it be withdraw. We wouldn't like to see a future board have to go through this all again, because it is quite confusing and not easy to sort out. I thought it was time to deal with it.

MR. DELGADO: Valerie.
MS. FRANCES: In EPA's own document it declared that pelargonic acid is not a soap. They indicate it's a precursor, can be used as a precursor to a soap, and they do indicate that. But clearly the board needs to get clarification from EPA as to why it is on the inert of minimal concern there as a parentheses. Is that something that you feel is essential to the question.

MR. DAVIS: That is brand new
information that was just handed to me.
MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN: Thank you for that,
but I don't think that is germane to this petition not being a soap to get on OFPA. It
is interesting, but that is not the question right here.

MR. DELGADO: Clarification -- Any other questions? Comments? Joe.

MR. SMILLIE: Call the question.
MR. DELGADO: The question is on the motion to list pelargonic acid for use as a herbicide in farmstead maintenance, roadways, layaways, building permitters and ornamental crops on the national list, Section 205.601(b)(1).

Start the vote with Tina.
MS. ELLOR: No.
MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: No.
MR. DELGADO: Joe.
MR. SMILLIE: No.
MR. DELGADO: Barry.
MR. FLAMM: No.
MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN: No.
MR. DELGADO: Kevin.
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MR. ENGELBERT: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.

MS. HALL: No.
MR. DELGADO: Steve.
MR. DeMURI: No.
MR. DELGADO: Julie.
MS. WEISMAN: No.
MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. SMILLIE: No.
MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: No.
MR. DELGADO: And the chair votes no.

MR. MOYER: Mr. Chairman, you have 14 noes and zero yeses, and one absent.

MR. DELGADO: The noes have it, and the motion to list pelargonic acid in Section 205.601(e)(1) of the list is lost.

The next item.
MR. DAVIS: The next material is ammonium nonanoate, which does involve a change - excuse me just a moment - which we presented yesterday as a change, so we can proceed. I don't need to go over that again. Just a nomenclature change. It was originally an ammonium salts of fatty acid, which is what showed on the meeting notice. The petitioner asked it be changed to ammonium nonanoate. We did that nomenclature change and also added the CAS number on the recommendation.

This material is a soap-based herbicide. It does fit the classification. And because of that, that is part of our explanation on the recommendation. We put in there that since this material is a soap-based herbicide, the current listing in 205.061(b)(1) as annotated would apply to this material which was part of their request is initially, it was only the potassium salts of fatty acids that were listed prior to this.

And they wanted their ammonium salts of fatty acids considered the same.

Again, we made our presentation yesterday and have not changed our - as a committee changed our stance on this, and would move that the board adopt the recommendation for to add ammonium nonanoate CAS number 63718-65-0 to be allowed as herbicides in organic crop production - excuse me - yes that is the way the petition reads. They want it for all crop production, not just farmstead maintenance.

So the motion is to add ammonium nonanoate to be on the national list as herbicide in organic crop production on the national list 205.601.

MR. DELGADO: Is there a second?
MR. MOYER: I'll second that.
MR. DELGADO: It is moved and seconded to add ammonium nonanoate as a herbicide in organic crop production, CAS number specified by the chair and listed on

Section 205.601(b)(1) of the list.
Discussion? Jeff?
MR. MOYER: Point of clarification. Jerry, according to what our working committee came to the conclusion, this material can already be used for farmstead maintenance.

MR. DAVIS: Correct.
MR. MOYER: As it is it already is on the list and can be used. What they are petitioning for is to now use it on all crop land.

MR. DAVIS: Yes, to use it within crops.

MR. MOYER: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Any questions on that clarification? Dan?

MR. GIACOMINI: I understand, Jerry, I understand you are not a regulation writer, but how do you envision that - I mean is understanding how this would be listed, does that matter - Barbara, I guess, I'll ask you the question.

The request is - they are looking at it under (b)(1), and (b)(1) is specifically for homestead. It seems it would have to be in a separate section besides (b)(1) if it was going to get generally used.

DR. ROBINSON: Correct. I mean if
you want - what, the petition is to add it, say, to be used as an herbicide.

MR. DAVIS: No restriction.
DR. ROBINSON: So you'd be changing the annotation?

MR. DAVIS: Essentially, yes.
DR. ROBINSON: Yes, and then of course we'd be resetting the clock.

MR. GIACOMINI: Well, but they don't want all herbicide soap based. They are specifically only requesting their substance. And they are specifically - they are not wanting this annotation anyway to the overall group.

DR. ROBINSON: What does the current annotation say?

MR. GIACOMINI: Well, the current annotation is listed under B, which is, as herbicides, weed barriers, as applicable. And then one is herbicide soap based for use on farmstead maintenance, roadway ditches, right of way, closing perimeters, and ornamental crops.

I'm just confused how this - not that it really matters to us - but I'm not clear how this would be listed if it did pass.

MR. DELGADO: Jeff?
MR. MOYER: Well, you bring up a very good point, Dan. I mean as a committee reviewing this material there is no allowance in the material for using soaps on crops.

MR. GIACOMINI: There is an
allowance within OFPA though.
MR. MOYER: It's not stated within
OFPA. It just says soap-based herbicides allowed. It says, for farmstead maintenance. And then we look at what the rule is trying to say. We are looking at a system that is based

1
on a set of production practices, not on products. So there are many other things you can use, and we state those in our evaluation of the petition.

There is no allowance in the rule for -

MR. GIACOMINI: Well, there is a restriction. In OFPA there is no restriction. MR. MOYER: In the rule there is no allowance.

MR. GIACOMINI: Right, there is no place currently to put it.

DR. ROBINSON: It's being used as an herbicide.

MR. GIACOMINI: Yes, but not within any of those qualifying -

MR. MOYER: But not in crops.
DR. ROBINSON: On ornamental crops.
(Simultaneous speakers.)
MR. DELGADO: Point of order.
MR. DAVIS: In OFPA soap-based
herbicides is a potentially exemptable
synthetic material. That's all they say about it. The previous board dealt with one form of a soap-based herbicide previously and added it to the list based on OFPA, with that annotation restricting it to noncrop or no crop use only.

So we don't want to get confused between what OFPA says versus what is in the regulations.

DR. ROBINSON: OFPA - set aside OFPA, that is the authorization. In order to put it on the national list it had to be in the law, okay? That is the criteria. Now under the regulations there is an allowance for soap-based herbicides. The use is for farmstead maintenance and ornamental crops. And these are herbicides. It is to be used as an herbicide. What has the petitioner asked for?

MR. DAVIS: They want to use it -
to have that restriction removed.
DR. ROBINSON: Without restriction.

Without restriction. So you are in effect considering a soap-based herbicide without restriction? All right, so that is what you are being asked to vote on. MR. MOYER: That's a synthetic soap-based herbicide, yes.

DR. ROBINSON: Sure.
MR. MOYER: It's a synthetic herbicide.

DR. ROBINSON: That's what you are voting. MR. DELGADO: Tracy. DR. ROBINSON: Now you can do that. You are not being asked to replace something here - whatever - you can just vote on that. MR. DELGADO: Tracy. MS. MIEDEMA: It seems like the regulation has laid a contour to OFPA already , and that that clearly guides our way on this petition, that it cannot be used on food, and on organic crop production. It's very clearly contoured to be as Barbara said ornamentals
only.
DR. ROBINSON: And to some extent what you could be saying, the regulation already permits soap-based herbicides to be used on ornamental crops. You are being asked whether or not you want to expand the use of soap-based herbicides. You could - in effect you could say, well, there is already an allowance; we don't need to expand it any further. Or: yes you do want to expand it. That is the question before you. MR. DELGADO: Hugh.

MS. FRANCES: Although the petitioner did narrow the question to not all soap-based herbicides but just theirs.

MR. DAVIS: That will invite other forms of the soaps and fatty acids to say, okay, us too.

MR. DELGADO: Any other questions or comments? Bob?

MR. POOLER: Bob Pooler, National Organic Program. A couple of points of
clarification here.
MR. DELGADO: Use a microphone.
MR. POOLER: A few points of clarification here. I believe with the annotation that is currently listed in the regulation reflects EPA's restrictions, and that's why that particular annotation was inserted into the regulations.

The question is, the question to you is, did the petitioner get an additional allowance from the EPA, and I don't know if that information is within that petition or not, and the petitioner is not in the room to answer that question.

MR. DELGADO: So just to clarify, the petitioner does not have that allowance from the EPA?

DR. ROBINSON: I don't know that, and that is something I assume that you - that I have not received.

MR. DELGADO: Question from Gerry
MR. DAVIS: I'm unclear on what Bob
was just saying. Are you talking about the mishap with the listing as approved for organic on the product label. Or are you talking about just general crop usage for nonorganic purposes?

MR. POOLER: Well, EPA restricts herbicides, soap-based, for farm use maintenance and for ornamental products. That was the EPA's restrictions on soap-based herbicides.

MR. DAVIS: Historically.
MR. POOLER: Historically.
MR. DAVIS: And you are saying that is what covered the initial board's - that was part of the consideration for why they put that annotation on there?

DR. ROBINSON: Correct; this is EPA's restriction.

MS. ELLOR: I'd like to request Emily Brown Rosen to address the board on the subject.

MR. DELGADO: Emily, if you could
approach a microphone.
MS. ROSEN: Emily Rosen, PCO. The petitioner's label, $I$ don't know, it should be in your packet, it's this product Razor. They do have a label that says for use on crop production. Originally I think in `95, when the board first looked at soaps, there was not a label for crop production. But this one has a label on crop production.

And also the Razor label says that EPA approved it for organic production, even though that was a mistake.

MR. DELGADO: Valerie?
MS. FRANCES: If I may offer or submit a comment by a couple of commenters and attached to regulations.gov comments that you may have reviewed, or EPA did this, and it was brought up because people were concerned about it, not because they were in favor of it, but a concern..

MR. DELGADO: Jerry, any comments?
MR. DAVIS: I think it's very clear
what we face here. Bob did clarify that the reason for the original annotation which is new information to me and the committee, I believe, we did not go over that, the new information that we are receiving is that that annotation for noncrop usage only was based on a previous EPA restriction for all crops, organic or not, and that is in a period of time changed to where for conventional crops there is now a labeled usage of this within crops, and that's what - probably why we are being asked to consider the change for organic. It's up to the board to decide if they think that is a valid request.

MR. GIACOMINI: Does that affect the Crop Committee's desire to proceed with this motion or potentially to withdraw it? MR. DAVIS: It doesn't prompt - you
either withdraw it - but it does definitely provides new information that we did not include within our recommendation, historical information on where the original annotation
came from.
MR. DELGADO: Do you think there is a need to withdraw the recommendation now and study it further? That's Dan's question.

MR. GIACOMINI: Can I do it
differently?
MR. DELGADO: Yes.
MR. GIACOMINI: Mr. Chairman, I move that we postpone the vote on this matter until after the Crops Committee has a chance to review the EPA listing on this issue.

MR. DELGADO: We have a motion pending, so we will have to -

MR. GIACOMINI: The motion pending is a general motion. This is a superseding motion that if it's seconded it would go for a vote.

MR. DELGADO: Okay, do we have a second? The motion is for later discussion. No second? Proceed. Steve, you have a question.

MR. DeMURI: Just because the EPA
changes its position it doesn't change OPFA's position.

MR. DAVIS: The only change that I see that's new is that perhaps, and I don't know this for a fact unless someone in the audience was actually there at the NOLB meeting where this was approved, as annotated. We don't know if the - we don't know if the original board - if it had been allowed for crop usage how they would have voted, whether they would have annotated it that way, or if it's only annotated that way as a result of the EPA restriction, just as a matter of course.

> As far as I know what the
committee believes about this material, and we really vetted it and went over and over it, it's another material that got considered twice. It's not like we haven't gone over it a lot. The reason question still remains: this new information is interesting. It might color the vote a little bit and change
people's mind, but still the basic question is the same. Should we allowed general use of soap-based herbicides within organic crops. MR. FLAMM: The committee carefully reviewed this material and I don't think this information from Bob would change our decision whatsoever. The impacts, the criteria we went through, I don't think would change at all. MR. DAVIS: That's what I just - I appreciate you backing me up on that. The rest of the Crops Committee is free to chime in.

MR. DELGADO: Kevin. MR. ENGELBERT: I would chime in also, and it doesn't change my opinion at all. I'd also like to read a quote from Barbara Robinson from a year ago, at an NOSB meeting, when we were considering sodium carbonate or oxyhydrate, our original crop recommendation was to not approve that for admission. We moved during a meeting that could substitute for copper sulfate in rice production. And we
all know the consequences of the continued of copper sulfate.

And Jeff made a statement that the Crops Committee tends to be prejudiced toward putting synthetics on the national list. And that was just simply our position. And Barbara replied: I really want to applaud the committee for exactly what you did. I understand and the board should be prejudiced against synthetics. That is the nature of that your charge by law. You are supposed to be prejudiced against putting synthetics on the national list. I hope you are.

We take that to heart.
(Simultaneous speakers.)
MS. MIEDEMA: I'd like to call the question.

MR. DELGADO: Calls the question.
The question is on the motion to
list ammonium nonanoate on section
205.601(b)(1) with applications described by the chair of the Crops Committee.

And we'll start taking the vote with none other than Tracy.

MS. MIEDEMA: No.
MR. DELGADO: Joe.
MR. SMILLIE: No.
MR. DELGADO: Barry.
MR. FLAMM: No.
MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN:
MR. DELGADO: Kevin.
MR. ENGELBERT: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: No.
MR. DELGADO: Steve.
MR. DeMURI: No.
MR. DELGADO: Julie.
MS. WEISMAN: No.
MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: No.
MR. DELGADO: Bea.
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MS. JAMES: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: No.
MR. DELGADO: Tina.
MS. ELLOR: No.
MR. DELGADO: And the chair votes no.

MR. MOYER: Mr. Chairman, you have 13 noes, one yes, and one absent.

MR. DELGADO: The noes have it, and the motion to list ammonium nonanoate on Section 205.601(b)(1) of the list for uses described by the chair of the Crops Committee is lost.

MR. DAVIS: That concludes our presentation.

MR. DELGADO: That concludes the documents presented by the Crops Committee.
(Simultaneous speakers.)
MR. DELGADO: And that earns us the right for a lunch break. We'll resume at 1:00 o'clock so we can continue on with livestock
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followed by handling.
Thank you.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:41 a.m. and resumed at 1:03 p.m.)

MR. DELGADO: Board members, please take your places. We are about to resume the next portion of our meeting. We seem to be on schedule, very surprised and happy.

Before we proceed I would like to make a special parentheses here to recognize a very special person on our team. On behalf of the organic community, Paula and board members, we'd like to recognize our esteemed executive director, Valerie Francis.
(Applause.)
MR. DELGADO: Let's move on to our
next topic. But before that, it is my understanding that the chair of the Materials Committee would like to make a special motion; is that the case?

MR. GIACOMINI: Mr. Chairman, I move to reconsider the vote on the listing of tetracycline.

MR. SMILLIE: Second.
MR. DELGADO: It is moved and seconded to reconsider the vote on tetracycline.

MR. FLAMM: Discussion? Mr. Chairman, would you please explain the reasoning for that?

MR. GIACOMINI: We have new information regarding possible action on this petition that we think is worth considering at this time.

MR. DELGADO: Can we have background about the new information? And I would request the program to address that.

MR. GIACOMINI: Do we want to address that now or do we want to do that at the point in time that that further motion is made, the motion to reconsider?

MR. DELGADO: To reconsider, we'll
do that and then we'll go on to vote that if the motion passes.

Any questions? Are we ready for the question on the motion? The question is on the motion to reconsider tetracycline.

This is the vote that we just took. Is there any doubt on the part of the board as to what we are doing?

Okay, and the question is on the motion to reconsider the vote on tetracycline.

And I'll start the vote with Joe.
MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Barry.
MR. FLAMM: We're not going to have an explanation of why we are doing that?
(Simultaneous speakers.)
MR. DELGADO: Once again we are going through the motion to reconsider evidence on tetracycline.

Once we have approved the motion, if it is approved, then we will continue on to reconsider the motion and do the vote again.
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That's where we are.
It is the understanding -
(Simultaneous speakers.)
MR. FLAMM: Abstain.
MR. DELGADO: We'll continue then with Hugh.

MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Kevin.
MR. ENGELBERT: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Steve.
MR. DeMURI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Julie.
MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: Abstain.
MR. DELGADO: Jerry

7 yes.

MR. DAVIS: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Tina.
MS. ELLOR: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: And the chair votes

MR. MOYER: Okay, Mr. Chairman, we have 11 yeses and one absent and two abstentions.

MR. DELGADO: The yeses have it, and the motion is agreed to.

MR. GIACOMINI: Mr. Chairman.
MR. DELGADO: Let us just confirm that we have the right number here.

The yeses have it, and the motion is agreed to.

And we'll start immediately with a motion, tetracycline if that's the case. Are you going to move that?

MR. GIACOMINI: I move to amend the motion on the listing of tetracycline to read,
to change the annotation - the listing and annotation of tetracycline to read:
tetracycline for use only in organic crop production for fire blight control until October 21st, 2012.

MR. DELGADO: Is there a second?
MS. MIEDEMA: Second.
MR. DELGADO: It is moved and
seconded to - and let me make sure that I state this right - remove the annotation and replacing that with, for use - tetracycline for use only for fire blight control until October 21st, 2012, as listed on the national list, Section 205.601(I).

Is that correct?
MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: But we are replacing that with the annotation that it can be used only until October 21st, 2001. You have it there? Great.

Any other questions. Barry.
MR. FLAMM: Does that mean that all
forms of tetracycline? And that changes the current list? And how do we do that?

MR. DELGADO: Good question, dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: This motion to
change the annotation does a couple of different things, how many depends on how you add them up. The first thing that it does is, it removes the qualifier of what type of tetracycline can be used at this time.

The next thing that it does is, it
sets an expiration date for the use of tetracycline in crop production for fire blight control.

The implication of that is that it pulls tetracycline out of the normal sunset process, and - i.e. think Methionine - it is now an expiration date for the use of tetracycline for this use. It is not a sunset item. And in order for it to continue use after that date it would have to be repetitioned, as we do with methionine, as we did at the last meeting.

Those are the things that this amendment would accomplish.

MR. FLAMM: But just for the record and for clarification, what we're voting on is all forms of tetracycline that will have the expiration date as listed; therefore, not requiring the normal sunset process.

MR. GIACOMINI: It moves it out of the normal sunset.

MR. FLAMM: Okay, so our vote would be based on those conditions.

MR. GIACOMINI: The first vote is the amendment to change the original motion. If this fails we would then need to revote on the original motion because we are looking to reconsider it. So the first thing is whether we are agreeing to change the original motion. The next vote that will be required is to vote on the new listing motion.

MR. FLAMM: But I think we ought to be what's in the record, what we are intending to do, so that it doesn't get changed down the
road somehow.
MR. DELGADO: Okay, so with the comments of the materials chair, the intent is clear.

Would you like to add another just as a comment. Kevin?

Can you repeat that, we are having problems hearing you?

MR. ENGELBERT: I'm just concerned about the process that we're going through putting it back on the table after it has already been voted down.

MR. DELGADO: Hugh followed by Judy.

MR. KARREMAN: Let me ask this. If we are opening this back up, can we - I apologize for my scratchy voice today - okay, we put the date whatever it is something 2012, I mean technically right now could we make it 2010?

MR. GIACOMINI: The date - we could make it any date we want. The date chosen is the expiration date of the current sunset. MR. KARREMAN: So in other words if this is alive and well right now it may not be shortly. If I were to make an amendment to make it die in 2009. I mean is that possible to do at this time if we are opening this back up? I just wanted to know that.

MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: I support Hugh's suggestion.

MR. DELGADO: You haven't made an amendment, have you?

MR. KARREMAN: I just wanted to know if it's possible. I did not make an amendment. I just wanted to know if it was possible.

MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN: All right, I will make an amendment. I will move that tetracycline's expiration date be changed from what's showing on the screen, if you could show that please, Valerie, from October 21st,

2012, to December 31st, 2009.
MR. DELGADO: Dan?
MR. GIACOMINI: I don't oppose it, but I think it's worth a board vote on that, so I'll say no.

MR. DELGADO: Okay. So we have a friendly amendment. Is there a second?

MS. JAMES: I second it.
MR. DELGADO: It has been moved and seconded to amend the motion by striking out the date of 10/21/2012 by December 31st, 2009.

Discussion? Jerry?
MR. DAVIS: I can appreciate the board members who really would like to see this material be off the list. I do not think that is fair to the pear growers to - unless they supposedly should have been, could have been, maybe found some other alternatives by now but they haven't. They are in their infancy in the alternate control measures, and they could really use the extra time to get it done.

MR. DELGADO: The program, followed by Joe.

DR. ROBINSON: Well, now you are going to veer off into some other areas, once you do this. Now you - a couple of things. Number one, if you do this, and you are successful just as a practical matter you are pushing the program on the rulemaking side of things, 2009.

And number two, the original tetracycline was on until 2012, even if we were successful in getting the rule out, first of all we'd have to answer to OGC as to now why we are doing that, and then you are liable to get a lot of push back in public comment for why you are interfering with an existing annotation there. It looks a little arbitrary and capricious on that side. Whereas before you were just taking advantage of an opportunity to do what - to eliminate a synthetic that you don't what on the list.
So - yes.

MR. DELGADO: Joe followed by Hugh.
MR. SMILLIE: I agree with what Gerry and Barbara have got to say. I think that the key, though, that's going too far, it's not being fair. Think about the methionine, that's an example, I think about this case. And we are going to act judiciously. We all agree we want it to go, but I don't think we should use this to push back. We've got 2012 already. We are sticking with 2012. We're just leveling the playing field. But then we get a drop-dead date, which is better than where we were before.

MR. SMILLIE: I agree with that, and if possible, I guess I will withdraw that amendment, if that's parliamentary -possible, and stick with the date that we have here to allow the growers to hopefully find substitutes for that material prior to the end of 2012.

MR. DELGADO: Do you agree to
withdraw the motion?
MR. KARREMAN: I am withdrawing the motion. If it is possible.

MR. DELGADO: It is possible. You have to have agreement of the second to do so. Any pressure?

MS. JAMES: I feel a lot of pressure, because I don't see what the benefit is of us making this change and reopening it if we -

MR. DELGADO: Tina?
MS. ELLOR: The benefit would be that it would no longer be subject to the normal sunsets, and it would drop off. To me, that's a pretty significant benefit.

MS. JAMES: Well, I guess in my
short time in observing sunset, things don't just drop off. And there's no point in not agreeing to go ahead and withdraw it, because if everybody else is saying, let's do it, it'd be a waste of a vote. So I accept that.

MR. DELGADO: It is withdrawn, and
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we're going back to the original motion of October 21st of 2012.

MR. KARREMAN: Is that date, correct date, program?

MR. DELGADO: It's been confirmed by the director.

Tracy, you had a question there?
Any other questions on this motion
to amend? And I have to clarify that. Your motion was to amend the --

MR. GIACOMINI: The recommendation.
MR. DELGADO: -- the
recommendation. So, and I want to make sure I understand, because your motion to amend the recommendation presented by the Crops Committee, once it's amended, we'll have to do --

MR. GIACOMINI: We vote on the new recommendation as amended.

MR. DELGADO: Perfectly stated, and we'll do that.

So ready for the question. The
question is on the amendment - on the motion to amend by adding the - by adding tetracycline for fire blight control only on the national list 205.601(I) until October 21st, 2012.

And we'll start our vote with
Barry.
MR. FLAMM: Could you please
restate the motion?
MR. DELGADO: We are voting to consider a motion to amend the recommendation of the Crops Committee by adding October 21st, 2012, as -

MR. FLAMM: And eliminating the -
MR. DELGADO: - and eliminating
the different forms of tetracycline.
MR. KARREMAN: And eliminating sunset too.

MR. FLAMM: And all forms of tetracycline will be subject to this expiration date?

MR. DELGADO: As it's stated in the
motion, you will have that expiration.
MR. FLAMM: And that expiration
date is?
MR. DELGADO: October 21st, 2012.
MR. FLAMM: I just want to make sure it's in the record.

MR. DELGADO: Any questions from the rest of the board?

We'll start with the vote. Barry?
MR. FLAMM: I vote yes.
MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Kevin.
MR. ENGELBERT: Abstain.
MR. DELGADO: Kevin abstain was the
last one?
Jennifer.
MS. HALL: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Steve.
MR. DeMURI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Julie.
MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
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MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER:
MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Tina.
MS. ELLOR: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Joe.
MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: And the Chair votes yes.

MR. MOYER: Mr. Chairman, we have 13 yeses, one abstention, and one absent.

MR. DELGADO: The motion to amend is agreed to. Now we can go on to a discussion of the recommendation as amended.
(Simultaneous speakers.)

MR. GIACOMINI: We have amended the recommendation. Now we have to vote on the amended recommendation.

MR. DELGADO: It's procedure so, Mr. Chairman would you like to submit the amended motion.

MR. GIACOMINI: It is on the record as - the motion has been made as it is.

MR. DELGADO: Without amending, before we amended it.

MR. GIACOMINI: The motion is in play. The motion is on the table already.

MR. DELGADO: The motion is on the table. So we don't have to present it to the board. Our parliamentarian here is stating that we have it before the board. So we have discussion -- it has been stated. Now the motion is to set - to list tetracycline adding tetracycline for fire blight control only on the national list 205.601(I) until October 21st, 2012. That's the motion.

Questions?

MR. GIACOMINI: Clarification, is
that the proper wording for the program to recognize that as an annotation change, saying, adding rather than - and that it's any kind of a separation.

DR. ROBINSON: We'll just change -we understand it. It just changes the annotation. We got it.

MR. DELGADO: Questions? Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: Why is the 2012 date not attached to the part directly --

MS. FRANCES: It's just formatting.
MR. DAVIS: No, I mean why is it not part of that upper sentence?

MR. GIACOMINI: She just rewrote it under your other vote.

MS. FRANCES: That was an earlier committee vote.

MR. DAVIS: Okay, I get you. It's not going to show in two places when we're done. That's my question.

MS. FRANCES: I mean, obviously

1 you're going to give me a final version of this.

MR. GIACOMINI: It'll only have one line saying what it is not. MS. FRANCES: We'll get all this right.

MR. DELGADO: Ready for the question?

The question is on the motion to add tetracycline for fire blight control only on the national list Section 205.601(I) until October 21st, 2012.

And we'll start our vote with Hugh .

MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Kevin.
MR. ENGELBERT: Abstain.
MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Steve.
MR. DemURI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Julie.
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MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Tina.
MS. ELLOR: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Joe.
MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Barry.
MR. FLAMM: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: And the chair votes yes.

MR. MOYER: Mr. Chairman, we have 13 yeses, one abstention, and one absent.

MR. DELGADO: The ayes have it and
the motion is agreed. Right.
Well, that concludes our discussion and presentation on crops related materials, and we are free to continue on with livestock, and Dr. Karreman.

## LIVESTOCK COMMITTEE

MR. KARREMAN: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
We have - our first action item we're going to vote on here today will be the proposed fish feed and related management issues. It is posted up there on the board, on the screen. Beside the colors aren't exactly right.

But anyway, first I'd just like to say last night the Livestock Committee had a meeting after we all had convened, or the audience did. We had another two hour meeting between 9:00 and 11:00 to discuss aquaculture. And I just want to say that the livestock committee is an excellent excellent team. I mean we all really did well.

And I don't know if this will
pass, but it is really a pleasure to work with everybody and the good collegiality and constructive input.

So with that said we did take into account input, written input, up to the time of this meeting, public comment, everything. And the only changes, we made a couple of changes that in our view tighten this up even further. And we can go through them.

They were passed by the committee last evening.

So one thing we did was we changed the kind of minor thing, off, wherever it says aquatic livestock we changed it to be aquatic animals. That was something the AWG wanted, and we thought that was pretty neutral, we did.

And then on to page let's see, the recommendation itself. I'm scrolling down on my computer, I apologize. If you could go to page four, Valerie, the recommendation.

We didn't do too much with it. Actually on page six we inserted a letter, M, and this had to do with basically testing for environmental contaminants, that unfortunately fish in the ocean and farming, and whatnot, can be exposed to, just as regular livestock I think can as well. But anyway we reinserted what the AWG wanted to have in there. It's not much different from what we had, but it's what the AWG wanted in there, as well as what the Ocean Conservancy wanted in there, so we put that in.

And then letter N we added in so that it is very peculiar that fish meal and fish oil cannot be derived from forage fisheries nor or non-organic aquatic feed products not specifically allowed in this section. Okay? So that was another addition.

Okay, besides little aquatic animal insertions there. Okay, on page eight -- yes, Jennifer.

MS. HALL: My question here is
whether or not we want to strike forage fisheries, because further edits will show that we actually strike their availability totally.

MR. KARREMAN: For clarity's sake, you're saying, right?

MS. HALL: Right.
MR. KARREMAN: Okay, for clarity and technicality, yes.

Okay, so then on page eight, regarding the potential labeling of fish, potentially certified organic fish, from using the step-down fashion that we have - we have shown - we want to propose a label that says, environmentally responsible wild-caught fish. The environmentally responsible is from the Ocean Conservancy, that term. That's George Leonard's group that he's with now.

And then more aquatic animal insertions there.

So on 612(a) essentially we were just tightening it up with aquatic animal
insertions again. And then the exception -okay, so 612(a) is -- I'll read that.

612 says, non-synthetic substances prohibited for use in organic aquatic animal production.

The following non-synthetic substances may not be used in organic aquatic animal production: A, fish meal and fish oil from wild caught fish and other wild aquatic animals except if produced from environmentally responsible food grade wild caught fisheries and fed in the following step-wise levels, a maximum combined total of 25 percent during one year, one through five, after this regulation is implemented. A maximum combined total of 15 percent during the year six through eight, and a maximum combined total of 10 percent during the year nine through 10, and a maximum combined total of 5 percent during the year 11 and 12.

And the rest stays the same. And that was from the Ocean Conservancy, so it's
not like 25 percent, 25 percent, but it's all a combined number.

MS. HALL: Sorry, one more question. Since we are explicitly saying nonsynthetic substances that are not allowed, do we want to add the forage fisheries?

MR. KARREMAN: Sure, we can do that. I mean it is already in there in a sense but we can explicitly say that.

MS. HALL: I mean that is our
intent?
MR. KARREMAN: That is our intent, and it should be explicit in there.

Sorry, okay, for 612(b), where it says, B to Z reserved, Jennifer is suggesting that we have 612(b) to reiterate that feed from foraged fisheries is prohibited. From 612 itself the whole heading is non-synthetics that are prohibited from use. So in a sense we don't need it, but we can put it in.

MS. HALL: That's up to you. If
you feel it's clear.

MR. GIACOMINI: I don't think we need it there, but if you don't want it in the other place that's fine.

MR. KARREMAN: That's fine with me. Are there other livestock people? Okay, just for clarity and reinsertion. Okay.

Well, that is the document.
So the motion on the floor then is
to accept the proposed organic aquaculture standards for fish feed and related management issues as presented here at this time.

MR. MOYER: I'll second.
MR. DELGADO: Jeff seconds, Hugh moved, and it is moved and seconded. Discussion?

Steve.
MR. DeMURI: How would the committee define environmentally responsible?

MR. KARREMAN: I think that is mentioned earlier in the document before the recommendation itself in the background. In the discussion section $I$ think.
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MR. DELGADO: Jim, I believe what you are looking for is in - Jim.

MR. MOYER: In section 205 and 252
$L$ and $M$, those discuss that.
MR. KARREMAN: Okay, and therefore, Steve, that document that Jeff is talking about is a net-pen document.

MR. MOYER: It's right here.
MR. KARREMAN: Oh, sorry.
MR. MOYER: If you look at L, it discusses -

MR. KARREMAN: Yes, correct.
MR. DELGADO: Steve, is that clear. We have Jeff followed by Dan.

MR. MOYER: Yes, just to respond to Steve's question again, $I$ think what we're trying to do is avoid the word sustainable and sustainability, because those words have a lot of baggage. That can mean many things to many people. Environmentally responsible is not completely cool; we understand that. But it certainly looks like a duck and quacks like a
duck and we think we know it when we see it kind of thing. And it really does address the word environmental, which is what we were trying to get at.

MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: I'd just like to touch on that other amendment; where did you put that one? The one that Jennifer changed? Regarding the restriction - there we go, that one - it came to our attention as we were working on this, actually we just sort of remembered, at the aquaculture symposium one of the presenters that was a researcher, they had done work on the 12 and 12, fish meal and fish oil, research, and almost all his work unaccounted to that but in addition was a certain percentage of $I$ believe it was squid meal. And we just wanted to make sure that those kind of soft issues were taken care of and not considered potential loopholes down the line.

MR. DELGADO: Thank you, Dan.

Any questions?
MS. JAMES: I'm just wondering if the committee could respond to how much public comment there was with the opposition of wild feed? I think I counted 14 witness-submitted comments from the public who all adamantly opposed that. And then we also heard yesterday that there were a lot of petitions that were signed in opposition to that.

MR. KARREMAN: I'll try to answer that. Basically we believe at the Livestock Committee that we are promulgating OFPA, the section that talks about wild seafood. This is the promulgation of that part of the Act, and it is only to be - and we believe we have outlined it well here, bright line around it that it's only to be considered for the byproducts of edible fish, and it shall never be for, as outlined in our document here, never shall wild caught be considered as primary food for humans. It's only to feed certified - potentially certified organic fish
to help the industry get going.
And there is one thing that is pretty important to consider, and that is, a lot of fish need marine oils in their diet, and even if only vegetarian type raised fish are used in the future to provide -- their byproducts to provide feed for certified organic more piscivorous fish, that they will not be providing essential lipids that those piscivorous fish need. And that's something that I don't think was taken into account by the commenters that were talking about that issue.

MR. DELGADO: Any other questions?
Ken?
MR. GIACOMINI: I think I'd like to continue on with Hugh's statement there regarding the fish oil. If you don't do the test fish oil, they won't have fish oil; they'll have something else. If you give fish corn oil, they pretty much have corn oil. So if we want the organic fish to be fish and
provide the benefits in the human diet that people are eating then we have to provide that to them. We did consider that and all the comments that were made. We reviewed as many of them as we could, and we certainly can't do anything other than take the number of signatures at face value.

But those have been part of the ongoing discussion from the day we started this process, and the day each one of us entered it, that's pretty much the first set of questions we asked.

And for the most part the information provided in those arguments at this meeting did not constitute any new information that we have not considered in our own deliberations.

MR. DELGADO: Kevin.
MR. ENGELBERT: I also would like to expound on this for the whole board. The day - I believe the day after I was lucky enough to be appointed to the NOSB, the new
members of the livestock committee received emails from Hugh, telling us, you've got to read through this. This aquaculture issue is huge. It takes a long time to get up to speed. And in the nearly three years that I have been studying this we have never had one presentation from anyone telling us how we can get these marine oils and these lipids into organic production in any other way. We have bounced off every possible wall and direction that we could think of, and this is the only solution that appears to be viable by the program. And we have tried to take a long term approach to this. We are not trying to deceive the public. If people don't want to buy these certified organic products that have been fed wild fish they don't have to. But in 12 years from the time of implementation there will be certified organic fish on the market that have been fed nothing but certified organic feed.

We couldn't find any other way to
get to that point and improve the conditions of the aquaculture industry. It seemed to be our only option. We have never been presented with another viable one. We are confident in the work that we have done. We think we have reached, again, without patting ourselves on the back, we think we have reached the best possible conclusion.

MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: Well, first of all I
respect how much work and time has gone into this recommendation. I would like to hear from the committee how to address consumer perception of organic fish not being fed organic food. But that I think at the end point of where this product is going to go is what we end up having to address, what we end up trying to communicate to the consumer that the USDA organic really does mean organic, but I'm sorry, this is different, and it doesn't have organic feed.

And I know you need this time
stretch, but there is - you say you weren't proposed any possible scenarios on the fish oil, but there is the action of not having this organic fish. That is another option.

MR. DELGADO: You want to respond to that? Go ahead, Kevin.

MR. ENGELBERT: I agree. But we don't know what the program will do. We don't know for sure that this is a viable option, but this is the best that we have been able to come up with. And what the program does with it after this, after consulting with their lawyers and everything, that will be the final determining factor.

MS. JAMES: Well, just to respond to that really quickly, I would say that the program relies on us to help bring forward something that we think is credible in the eyes of the consumer. And if we are not ready to be able to do that, that's when we get them in trouble. So we are putting forward something to them and asking them to make the
final decision with their lawyers on whether or not we can really do this as organic.

So -
MR. DELGADO: Jeff, followed by Dan.

MR. MOYER: Well, I had another comment, but $I$ will quickly respond to Bea, in that if you look at 205.301 - I'm sorry, 203, we did put in there that this material that is fed in with this system must be labeled as such so that consumers - at least it's as transparent as we can make it so that consumers know they are presumably ingesting some wild-caught material through the organic process. So that they are made aware that we did not want it to be slipping through in some way that we are somehow being perceived as I don't want to say duping, but not being fully forthright in the labeling.

So we are requiring that this material be labeled at the point.

MS. JAMES: I want to respond to
that. As a retailer, that is what we - if that passes, that is going to be a very difficult thing to have to confront the natural food stores. There is so much confusion around organic fish in the first place, and how we educate them on the differences between sustainable and organic and non-organic, that that - it's a setup for really pointing the finger at, we are coming forward with saying something is organic when it is truly - I mean livestock doesn't get away with this in a lot of their areas, and I think that we need to be careful about what we are doing with fish when there are other criteria that the consumer expects around what the final product is really -

MR. DELGADO: Dan. MR. MOYER: Well, the point I wanted to make is, it relates to this feed document, and it's going to relate again to the net-pen document, and that is, that these standards we feel at least at the Livestock

Committee level are extremely difficult for the livestock - for the aquatic animal industry to meet and adhere to. This is not going to be an easy breeze walkthrough that we have created - I don't think - at least we didn't attempt to try to create something. And we're hearing push back from the AWG quite a bit that this is going to be tough if they can even do it. And they think they can, but it's difficult. And I want to be fair to the committee to say we have gone well out of our way to try to find something that they could possibly do but was not by any stretch of the imagination easy. And just to respond to your comment on feed, I do think the consumers are going to decide ultimately if this is a doable system or not. MR. DELGADO: Dan. MR. GIACOMINI: A couple of things. Number one, to follow on in the part of the discussion that Kevin had regarding the fish oil, on the fish meal side the alternatives we
were presented with were either cholesterol slaughter byproducts or significant amounts of synthetic amino acids. Neither one of those seemed viable or acceptable to anyone in any part of the industry.

Regarding the label I think I was probably the person on the committee who was the least comfortable with the label, not that I have any problem with what this label says, but what it's not saying. Because if you have any of these fish and you don't feed them fish meal and fish oil, the diet they are getting is not a natural diet. So we are having a label that is making something look - in order to be transparent we are having a label to explain what something is and how the consumer may want to consider that; at the same time we don't have a label that says - what the meaning of the other side is.

So I understand what you're saying, Bea, and it's just one of those things. We are trying to be transparent. We
are trying to be up front. We don't even know if it will fly with legal. But we did the best we could.

MR. DELGADO: Julie. MS. WEISMAN: Yes, and actually I'm not on the committee, so you asked for an answer from someone on the committee. But I feel because I am not on the committee it helps me take a step back. And when we talk about terrestrial organic agriculture, there are organic products. There is also - we struggle often around the issue of consumer perception. But there is not, for instance, a guarantee that organically farmed products will be pesticide free. We just aren't going to do anything - we are going to do the least amount possible to make a worse problem than exists in conventional agriculture.

And I think consumers, notwithstanding all the comments that we have heard, and there have been many many of them, I do also feel like there are a large group of
consumers who may not be as vociferous, who would much rather have a choice of these -- or organically raised fish according to a standard like this than having to buy conventional fish.

MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: This is not new but just kind of a rephrasing of it. Because I completely hear Bea and the consumer end of it. And so I would start with our original intent to try and establish a label in lieu of there not being one and that being confusing, because there are other products with an organic label that is not USDA, so trying to find one that delivers that expectation while also still being quite rigorous.

So on the feed end where we did end up is exactly how Dan said, that our overriding desire is to try and establish as much of a natural diet as possible, given that there is no supply to do that effectively right now, trying to phase that in. And I
will admit, I am the champion of the label from a consumer perspective of trying to be transparent in that. So there isn't an explosion when that gets uncovered, and then there is like this whole, "Oh my gosh, you duped us again."

And so giving them the choice up front, and hopefully that the education piece being that our number one priority being that they have a natural diet, and that we are fighting that in so many other arenas where organic is trying to bring animals back to that, and that this is a new regulation overall. So we saw an opportunity to make it fairly strong, and over time get better at it. MR. DELGADO: Bea.

MS. JAMES: Okay, going back to Dan, I guess I respectfully agree to disagree around the recommendation. And that I think I -- maybe my position is truly representing a lot of what we heard from consumers, and that saying that the best we can do is not a
standard for organics. That organic standards are organic standards and if we can't meet those then we shouldn't put forward a recommendation saying, here is an organic standard, because then it is truly not.

In response to Julie, saying that consumers want this instead of nothing at all, our consumers want organic, and if we don't provide them with what we know is true to be organic according to regulations, then to Jennifer's point, there will be an explosion -- I think we got a little piece of that here at this meeting.

So I'm just raising a red flag. I
think that the recommendation has a lot of really excellent components to it, but maybe perhaps it's not for all kinds of fish, and that we really need to look at managing a recommendation that, no matter how long it takes, that will truly provide in the end an organic product labeled as organic that's organic.

MR. DELGADO: Dan followed by Joe. MR. GIACOMINI: One of the things that we did a number of years ago when we first started looking at fish oil, and I think it's relevant to any explosions and other things that can happen, was "That's the response from the rest of the industry, and how you feel about this." And frankly, in all this time we really haven't heard any.

So I think that is a significant aspect.

The other part of what organic is organic and all these things, I mean even the things that we have dealt with in the last two meetings, we don't have labels on everything, on any parts of the industry that have been allowed to use tetracycline, which is an antibiotic, which is probably -- while there is the big three in the rule, there's also probably the big three for the consumer, and that is one of theirs.

We don't have a label in any part
of the poultry industry that they are adding synthetic methionine.

I think you know I think some of that is real and some of that becomes created.

MS. JAMES: Are you suggesting that that is what we need?

MR. SMILLIE: Tell me if I'm mistaking what you said. The regulations were created by the NOP out of OFPA with our input. In OFPA there exists from what I understand grounds to create an organic aquaculture regulation. When the NOP with NOSB advice created the current regulation, they for whatever reasons didn't choose to make the aquaculture regulation.

Now it's come up. They are asking for our advice to go back to OFPA and create an organic regulation for aquaculture.

So to say that this recommendation doesn't meet the regulation, that would be correct, because the regulation didn't include aquaculture. But this regulation goes back to

OFPA and with our advice gives the program something so that they can create an organic aquaculture regulation.

MS. JAMES: Well, I get that, but we're talking about the standard itself.

MS. MIEDEMA: What I really like about in this recommendation and also the netpen recommendation is that it does bring us to a crossroads finally. And it's a vastly improved version of aquaculture for both the feed and and for the net-pen situation. And if what we can do is tremendously raise the bar, we've seen this in terrestrial agriculture, where the conventional folks really take a page from our book. And we have the opportunity to tremendously raise the bar. And to know, it's not perfect. Just like aspects of terrestrial organic farming are not perfect. We drive tractors full of diesel, etcetera. And that's real life; that's real food production. But at least we now have the opportunity at this
crossroads to build a vastly improved, yet imperfect, version of aquaculture or decide not to have organic aquaculture. We can decide that today too. If we don't think we want to go with something that is less than perfect then we can say no today. But it seems like we have actually arrived here, and we can move this forward.

MR. KARREMAN: I guess Bea, in response, to being right out of the retail on the floor there, 2107(c), wild seafood, in the Organic Food Production Act, in general, notwithstanding the requirement of Section 2107(a)(1)(a) requiring products be produced only on certified organic farms, the Secretary shall allow through regulations promulgated after public notice and opportunity for comment wild seafood to be certified for label as organic.

> Wait wait, let me just add on,
sorry. And we are limiting that to not only
the byproduct of human grade fish, we are recycling it. And we think that is environmentally responsible. We feel that this, what I've just stated from OFPA fits, and we are doing exactly what the NLSB is supposed to do on anything regarding OFPA. I don't understand. I guess I just see the cup half full, not half empty. DR. ROBINSON: As I said to you earlier today on the multi-site recommendation, let me just say one more time, and particularly in this case, you know, we asked you to develop or to propose standards, which you appear to be close to doing.

You can continue to work on these;
that's true. You can also give it to the program, and we may - yes, there is controversy with this; that's clear and that is evident. If you are not satisfied with your work at this point you can pull it back. You can also give it to the program. We can proceed for example with an ANPR, and an
advanced notice of proposed rulemaking.
You know we aren't going to rush out the door with this thing in a week. You know us. We obviously move at glacial speed and sometimes not that fast.

An ANPR, asking the industry, asking consumers, should we proceed with rulemaking, should we not, you have given us grist for the mill.

Again, I guess what I'm saying is, maybe you should set aside the issue of should we or should we not; that is the program's -actually that is our responsibility. That's the question we then go out and ask on everyone's behalf, should we open up this rule.

You provided suggestions. The question is not done by a long shot.

MR. GIACOMINI: Okay, I wanted to respond to something Joe said and clarify what Hugh just read.

First of all fish were not
included in OFPA 90; fish were included in a later amendment. In the later amendment fish used for food were added as a part of the livestock definition in OFPA, okay.

Then, from what Hugh read, the promulgation of the consideration of wild seafood to be considered as organic. We need to be clear what we are doing here. That is not what we are doing. What we are allowing as feed for organically raised fish is the trimmings from environmentally sourced wild caught fish within the same category that wild caught fish have been considered from the inception of the rule, and that is, as a nonagricultural. We are listing it in the section of 612, which is the same as 602 and 604, the restriction of non-ag. What we are doing is initially allowing a significant part of the diet, granted, to come from this source with a step down to the point that is actually probably more restrictive than it would be if we had just left it out.

Is that -- do you understand what we are saying? We are allowing 25, but we are actually getting to the point where it may be zero, even though it stays, never becoming certified organic wild caught. We are never saying that. We are saying that this wild caught from this group of fish is non-ag, and it only that small part of it is allowed as feed.

MR. DELGADO: Jennifer followed by Hugh.

MS. HALL: Small correction on what Ann just said, and that is where we are allowing it is as a nonsynthetic, not as a non-ag.

MS. JAMES: I wanted to respond to Barbara's comments, because yes, I totally and fully trust when our recommendations go into the hands of the program that they are meticulously gone through so that a final recommendation is put forward that represents what the industry wants.

I do feel somewhat protective about how recommendations from us are given to you because I think we are seen as giving you the beginning starting point of that deliberation. And if we are telling you that here is a proposal for you to create an organic product that's not fed organic feed, that in essence we are telling you that that's acceptable. And I'm just - I know I'm in a minority here, but I'm just saying that for me, from a consumer standpoint, that that would be unacceptable. And I think that's what we saw in comments from consumers as well.

MR. DELGADO: Any other questions?
MR. MOYER: I just wanted to follow up on what Tracy is saying in that even if we vote this down, farm-raised fish are going to take place. Consumers say they want that product; they are buying it today. This standard that we are proposing here on both the feed and the net-pens sets the bar
extremely high, and I agree with Tracy, what it will do hopefully is drive the conventional market in this direction, because they are going to see how high this standard is. And if there is a preference shown in the marketplace for this product, they will have to begin to move in this direction.

And I think if our goal is to part of our goal is to improve the environment this certainly goes a long way toward doing that.

It's like if we vote this down there will be no fish being fed. They will be fed, and they will be fed in net pens. So this raises the bar very high.

MR. DELGADO: Any other comments, questions? Are we ready for the question?

The question is on the motion to approve the document titled, "Proposed Organic Aquaculture Standards, Fish Feed and Related Management Issues.

MS. FRANCES: Question - I'm sorry to interrupt.

MR. DELGADO: Yes.
MS. FRANCES: I went through, and you had not corrected every aspect of this document in regards to the use of the term, environmentally responsible food-grade wildcaught fish, in all the little label cases in the 301, and I went through with that - I don't want to interrupt as I'm doing this - I just wanted to clarify that I did that.

MR. MOYER: It was late at night.
MS. FRANCES: I understand.
MR. DELGADO: And it was the intent of the committee.

MS. FRANCES: Yes, sorry.
MR. DELGADO: Thank you for that.
Going back to putting the motion is to approve the document titled, "Proposed Organic Aquaculture Standards, Fish Feed and Related Management Issues" as described by the chair of the Livestock Committee.

And we'll start our vote with Kevin.

MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Steve.
MR. DeMURI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Julie.
MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Tina.
MS. ELLOR: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Joe.
MR. SMILLIE: Yes.

MR. DELGADO: Barry.
MR. FLAMM: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: And the chair votes yes.

MR. KARREMAN: This chair votes not at all though.

MR. DELGADO: Yes, Hugh.
MR. MOYER: Mr. Chairman, we have 13 yeses, one no, and one absent.

MR. DELGADO: Then the motion is agreed.

MR. KARREMAN: Thank you, Mr.
Chair. The next topic is the other document for dealing with aquaculture today, "Proposed Organic Aquaculture Standards for Net-Pens and Related Management Issues."

Once again this was worked on a little bit last night. We don't believe there is substantive changes; more just kind of tightening of things, raising the bar higher. Again, really good input from Carrie Brownstein, George Leonard at the Ocean

Conservancy, public comment, and the AWG, taking that into account, areas highlighted in blue are what we added since we talked about this at the discussion yesterday.

The first one, Valerie, is on page five of 10, I believe, under the section 253(c), the producer of organic aquaculture products must not -- (7) whether or not diseased fish are treated they may not be sold as organic. Does that need some syntax changes? But the idea is that you just cannot sell diseased fish as organic, whether or not they are treated.

The next addition we put in to clarify things for the act is under point two 54 aquaculture living conditions, the first sentence saying, a comprehensive integrated predatory management plan which employs nonlethal deterrence as the first course of action shall be developed and implemented as part of the organic system plan.

And we added under there on (b)(3)
we added - okay I'll read three altogether:
lethal measures may be taken only when predators threaten human safety or are necessary for predator welfare, and must include appropriate documentation. Lethal measures must be in compliance with local laws and the laws of the United States.

And this is what we added last evening: there is an absolute prohibition on predator mortality if the species is listed nationally or globally as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, i.e. present on the IUCN red list.

Yes, Valerie?
MS. FRANCES: What does IUCN -
MR. FLAMM: International Union for
Conservation of Nature.
MR. DELGADO: Barry, could you
repeat that?
MR. FLAMM: It stands for International Union of Conservation of Nature. Actually the name is a little -- the official
name now is longer, but anybody would know -conservation of nature.

MR. KARREMAN: And number four right below that, the next number is four, we added number four. This would be underwater acoustic deterrent devices of any kind shall not be permitted. I guess I'll have to watch where they site pens or whatever with the navy.

The document is for net pens, okay, so everybody should keep that in mind; it's not for ponds or containment tanks.

The next part we added to clarify something was at 255(g)(1), little "I", Becky Goldberg mentioned this. We made a performance target of recycling, a minimum of 50 percent of all nutrients which we did hear from public comment is possible but very difficult but possible. And we added in nitrogen and phosphorous.

MR. GIACOMINI: We should delete the "all."

MR. KARREMAN: Say what?
MR. GIACOMINI: We should delete the "all" for quantifying as nutrients such as nitrogen, phosphorus.

MR. KARREMAN: Okay, yes. So let's delete "all" in front of nutrients and put nitrogen and phosphorous. Should we just have 50 percent of nitrogen and phosphorous.

Going down to $K(2)$, this is where it gets more specific on open water net-pens. And this number two here, just so people know, is that this is so that conventional industry right now uses a lot of Atlantic salmon in the Pacific. This here number two will prohibit that. It would have to be Pacific salmon in the Pacific only, okay? So just want to -- go ahead.

MR. GIACOMINI: Pacific salmon in the Pacific that have not been significantly bred out of captivity.

MR. KARREMAN: So let me read it then. That's why we put this in here, so
we're not getting what's happening in the conventional industry at all.

Number two, only native fish of local genotype shall be cultured. Non-native species or native species with significant genetic divergence compared to wild stock, i.e. due to selective breeding or other processes, may not be certified as organic if produced in net-pens. Operations with escapes greater than 0.5 percent of cultured stock within each containment device over the course of the growing season shall have their organic status revoked.

That's pretty clear I think. All right?

The next section -
MR. DELGADO: Question from the program.

MR. MATTHEWS: If we could go back up to what you were just doing.

MR. KARREMAN: You don't like that "revoked."

MR. MATTHEWS: No, no, operations with escapes greater than a half a percent of cultured stock within each containment device - I could read that to mean 5 percent each. Are you saying that - half a percent of each. Just clarify for me, if they've got 10 containment devices, what would trigger the revocation.

MR. DELGADO: Hugh?
MR. KARREMAN: I know the intent there. I mean maybe revocation is too strong a word for what we are creating here. But go ahead.

MR. MOYER: I think what we've done is, we have got the wrong word in there. Instead of saying, within each, it should say, within any. If it said within any containment device, then it's the individual containment device that we are concerned with. So you can't have one containment device that's leaking, and seven others are all good. I see what you are getting at. Each should be any.

MR. KARREMAN: All right, so let's tighten that up. The next area would be -MR. MOYER: Hugh, while you are still back on that other spot, we should mention that there was concern and discussion among the group talking about the native fish and genotype rule, because it pertains specifically to some other fish that could be raised in net pens. Net pens aren't only in the salmon. I mean there are other fish in other bodies of water. They could be in bays, they could be in lakes, they could be in rivers, could be in other areas. I think there was concern about that, and maybe we want to discuss that further.

I mean the idea of not being able to raise tilopia anywhere but Egypt or wherever they came from is a little disconcerting.

MR. KARREMAN: It is, but then the tilopia people can come back and ask for what they need.

MR. MOYER: Well that was our discussion yesterday that who's going to come back? You have heard me saying that it's certainly possible that those could still come back to us and say, "Okay, there is no room for us in here." I suppose that could be done. But that discussion did take place at length.

MR. DELGADO: Okay, that's a good clarification. Can we continue with a description?

MR. KARREMAN: Okay, (7)(i): If a species of aquatic plants and animals are used, they must be native species or local genotypes, and that has to do with the recycling of nutrients.

Number (8), farm level effluents and the potential influence of other aquatic farms must be shown not to exceed the natural assimilative capacity of the surrounding ecosystem.

Number (9), in all cases benthic
habitats surrounding net-pens, not just below net pens, surrounding them - must be shown to have significant measurable changes in chemistry and biodiversity. To not have -- I apologize. To not have.

And I do believe that would
complete the document and the changes we made last night. Yes.

MR. DELGADO: So would you like to make a motion?

MR. KARREMAN: Yes, I move that the "Proposed Organic Aquaculture Standard for Net-Pens and Related Management Issues" be -I move that we vote on that.

MR. DELGADO: Is there a second?
MR. MOYER: I'll second it.
MR. DELGADO: There's a second to approve this document entitled "Proposed Organic Aquaculture Standards for Net-Pens and Related Management Issues."

Discussion? Questions? Barry.
MR. FLAMM: From my standpoint, and
from an ecological, biodiversity conservation standpoint, this is the most important decision that we're facing at this meeting. And I recognize there has been a tremendous amount of work done on this, but I have a great reservation about net-pens themselves in terms of the risk involved, the biological risk. I have particular concerns with netpens in marine environments, but most concerned with the consequences to the salmon fisheries.

And I'm just wondering what consideration the committee most recently made of perhaps this initial go-round of restricting or limiting at least net-pens to certain species in certain areas where the environmental risks are less. MR. DELGADO: Jeff.

MR. MOYER: Yes, Barry, I think the committee was extremely sensitive to that discussion, and we've been working on it as you know for years. If you look at Section
205.255(k), we do specifically try at least to discuss the location of these net-pens, making it we felt an extremely high bar for anyone to come into an organic operation of this type to adhere to.

We also are aware of course that we have no control over the conventional netpen industry, and those are existing or growing without this type of high bar standard that again we are putting in front of the board.

Our goal would be that down the road those conventional net-pens would have to begin to adhere to this standard if they intend to sell fish into the market.

So if you read that, we are very
sensitive to that, and did try to take the environment and the location of those pens into consideration. It's going to be difficult to locate them and satisfy this rule.

MR. DELGADO: Dan.

MR. GIACOMINI: Yes, just to be a little more specific, Barry, under that item, (k), number one, affects where we could put the net-pens, specifically out of the migratory routes. I believe it's the new number two specifies what they can put in the net-pens, native species not bred to be significantly different than the native populations.

Then we have the recycling issues. We did the disease issues, the anti-fouling, we've done -- we could not come up with a reasonable way that we felt we could justify to say, okay, everything but salmon. So we worked extensively to make it as -- if salmon can do it within these regulations these come as close to satisfying all the arguments -most of the arguments that we heard that we could conceive.

MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: I would like to echo some of Jeff's comments, and actually as the
squeaky wheel on the committee, really, I'm grateful for the sensitivity that has been shown in this document, and it's everincreasing strength, and I'm glad that there are portions of the aquaculture industry with what has been passed so far that can get into action.

That said, I still really wrestle with the difficulty between deciding between tighter control of inputs and outputs that are a component of closed containment systems, versus a desire for aquatic animals to have their most natural environment, and the everincreasing demand for seafood overall, versus protecting the environment.

And despite the strong controls that are in place in this recommendation, at the end of the day there still is waste added, and more aquatic species considered predators that could be potentially killed as a result of the presence of net-pens.

And I am not comfortable at this
point with that being considered certified organic net-pens, and I would prefer to start a little bit slower and allow the whole industry time to begin the certifier and producer community to gain some experience and perhaps add a member to the board who brings some expertise to the area.

And while I do believe the
recommendation improves conditions from present reality, and I know that is not going to stop, I cannot in good conscience incentivize more of it by putting a seal of organic on it.

MR. DELGADO: Any other comments or questions?

Bea?
MS. JAMES: Well, I have a question for Hugh, because he is the champion behind committee standards, what your position would be for net-pens for fish? I mean do you see that as a place where they would be exercising their natural behavior?

MR. KARREMAN: Well, I think more than in containment tanks. And that's already allowed. But I actually was thinking earlier in discussions, I think a year or more now, stocking density for the net-pens. And yet we were -- we've learned from the people in the industry that apparently very very light stocking densities are not -- I forget the reason - good for the health of the fish. I forget what it was, to be honest, Bea.

Schooling behavior, okay, yes. So
I kind of said, "Okay, fine." And I'll be honest, I've kind of been on the fence with the net-pens, but the way this document is written now, especially with what we put in last night, like Dan was saying, we can't really say -- maybe we could say, no salmon, but this is pretty tight. And like you can't site pens in a migratory route; that cuts out that whole Broughton Archipelago that we talked about so much in the symposium. There will not be certified organic net-pen salmon
or any net-pens probably in that area, from this, from what we put in.

So you know, and then like Jennifer was saying, I have to kind of balance out the wild caught, everyone -- there is a growing demand for fish in the world. What are we going to do, just overfish the wild caught out there? And then the other end of the spectrum is, you know, the conventional net-pens which don't look too good.

And so I do believe this strikes a balance in the favor of the environment, and as far as -- back to what you were saying, I apologize, the humane treatment of the fish, net-pens -- I've used this before in public comment with someone -- it does help you manage those fish better than just wild caught. It's a perimeter that you say, okay, that's that unit, we can really manage them and watch them and check for them, pull fish out and look at how they are doing. So I think it really does help with the health of
the animals. Stocking density I was in favor of, but I don't know, it's not good for the schooling behavior, I guess. MR. DELGADO: Jeff. MR. MOYER: Well, just to address that, if you look at 205.254(a)(2) three little i's, we do address stocking densities right there. We talk about under the living conditions appropriate population or biomass densities as recommended by species. So each species would have individual stocking densities that fit within their own cultural -- natural cultural behavior that promotes the behaviors of limited aggressiveness, dominant behavior, you can read it for yourself.

But we do address that in there by each species. And further up in that document, in 205.254(a), just "a" in general we talked about the living conditions in the organic system pen, how that has to work into accommodating the health and natural behavior of fish. In two we talk about the need for
exercise, their normal swimming behavior.
So I think we have tried our best to accommodate all of those natural living conditions.

MR. KARREMAN: But as far as you know 254(a)(2)iii, the -- maybe we could insert something at this point that the least possible stocking density should be done. I don't know.

MR. KARREMAN: Yes, I like
appropriate.
MR. DELGADO: Kevin.
MR. ENGELBERT: I am personally convinced that with this document we are not creating net pen capos. We are not creating concentrated animal feeding operations through these net pens. It will not be allowed. MR. DELGADO: Bea. MS. JAMES: Would you consider not pushing this recommendation, this part of the recommendation forward for further work?

MR. KARREMAN: To be honest, Bea, I
want to have a vote on this document. If it passes, it does; if it doesn't, it doesn't. We have worked on this for eight years with Agriculture as the NOSB. This I really don't think -- you could give us the next 20 years, Bea, and go around and around in the room with everybody and everything, but we really thought about this a lot of different ways, and there is -- the short answer is no.

MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: I think the no A is that we did talk about this, the option to not take this to a vote is putting it on a shelf for probably at least two years. With the make up of the livestock committee right now really feels that they have done -- we've done what we can on it, and we don't see a lot of progress being made to continue working on it. In consideration for the manpower that it takes to work on this project and the other issues regarding livestock that are not being dealt with.

And I think that until there would be a fairly significant turnover of members on the livestock committee, I am not sure it would be worth the time as compared to other issues to just turn it over again and try to come back next time.

MR. DELGADO: Barry.
MR. FLAMM: I agree with what Dan and Hugh said about the vote. I think there's been a tremendous amount of work, and I appreciate the efforts last night to try to make this more environmentally sensitive.

I think the vote comes down to how much risk the committee wants to take. Because there are in this system environmental, ecological and risk to biodiversity.

And I wish that we were only
talking about starting a net-pen industry. Of course it's already there, and this proposal no doubt vastly improves what is going on. So I'm torn with the fact that maybe this -- I
mean this will make -- the organic part would make things better and less environmentally impact -- so that is very compelling. On the other hand from an organic standpoint, the high bar that we have on all things organic, this in my opinion doesn't meet that, and frankly I don't think especially for -- I never can pronounce anadromous. What is it? It sounds like I'm talking about love rather than fish that go upstream to spawn. But in any case, salmon and steelhead and those kind of fish, I don't know if they would ever fit this.

I'm a great supporter of aquaculture, and for certain systems, I've been around it in tilopia and carp and all these things, and they are really an important protein source. But this net-pens in marines and open waters really bothers me, and I don't know if I could -- no matter how long you worked on it $I$ don't know if $I$ could in due conscience ever vote for it.

But I'm torn, because $I$ know this
is going to do a better job than maybe, as Tracy said, it will pull the other system along. But I guess I have to stay with the high bar, and if we can't do what we think is right for organic, then it shouldn't be labeled organic.

MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: Mr. Chair, I'd like to call for the question.

MR. DELGADO: I was hoping you would.

MS. MIEDEMA: But I realize there are other colleagues of mine in line.

MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MS. FRANCES: I have a question I
would like to ask the livestock committee. In your preparation, up until the creation of this document before posting it, you were considering language on the genotype and origin of aquatic animals in fact going back to the hatchlings, and that you did not want
to do this part just yet because there was so much more to consider.

And I just wonder if you really are ready to do this one little section, K(2).

MR. GIACOMINI: We discussed that. We did have an overall consideration for the origin of livestock for all of aquaculture that we were considering up that point which we pulled out. This is a specific aspect relative to net-pens. This is not an overall origin of livestock, origin of aquaculture animals. It's just specific, so it is in addition to what we currently have, which is from some metamorphic stage. This is not changing that aspect. It's merely saying what the genetic background of the animals that go into the net-pens is going to be, and we did not feel that that was out of bounds in dealing with specifically the net-pen issue.

Regarding, Barry, I go through
many of the same things that you - concerns that you have with this, Barry, and I hear all
of the public comment regarding organic principles, and we can make a list of 1,000 organic principles, but for me it comes down to one thing, and that is, the overall sometimes gradual sometimes quick improvement of the way things are now.

And if organic farming can make those improvements from over conventional farming and conventional agriculture and conventional aquaculture, I am very comfortable with even small progress that is being made.

MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN: I guess I would ask
you, Barry, and Bea and Jennifer, is it the net-pens themselves - I kind of know your answer, Jennifer, from us talking - but is it the net-pens themselves, or is it the salmon net-pens which we have heard loud, loud and clear. Because if it's the salmon net-pens we can make a deal happen, but if it's net-pens in general that is a philosophical change that
we just won't be able to bridge I think.
MR. FLAMM: Hugh, as I said before,
I do have a problem generally with net-pens, but I think those are -- many of those are -can be dealt with. I don't believe in the salmon pen they can be dealt with. So I will separate the two. Am I making myself clear, that if salmon was adequately addressed or eliminated I would have much less trouble with the net-pens.

MS. HALL: For me it is definitely net-pens overall, and their environmental impact on the fragility of the marine system.

MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: I would second that.
MR. DELGADO: So in conclusion, in answer to your question, we do have two who would vote on concern about the concept of net-pens and a third who would assent.

MR. FLAMM: Well, I do have concerns about net-pens. I'm saying that that would have to be addressed on an individual
species, and practices might deal with those. But $I$ can't see it being dealt with at all in salmon fish.

MR. DELGADO: Is that a call to any action, or can we proceed with voting.

MR. KARREMAN: No, that can go to vote.

MR. DELGADO: The question is on the motion to accept the document entitled, "Proposed Organic Aquaculture Standards, Netpens and Related Management Issues as described by the chair of the Livestock Committee."

We will start the vote with
Jennifer.
MS. HALL: No.
MR. DELGADO: Steve.
MR. DeMURI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Julie.
MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
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MR. MOYER: We have four noes, 10 yeses, and one absent.

MR. DELGADO: The yeses have it, and the motion is agreed to.

And does that conclude, Mr. Chairman, with your topics?

MR. KARREMAN: Yes, thank you.
MR. DELGADO: Okay, we are somewhat behind schedule, and we are going to move right on to the Handling Committee with Ms. Weisman.

Julie, do you need extra time?
MS. WEISMAN: Let's take a break now, but it doesn't need to be 15 whole minutes.

MR. DELGADO: Okay, let's break for
10 minutes, 10 real minutes.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 2:45
p.m. and resumed at 3:03 p.m.)

HANDLING COMMITTEE
MR. DELGADO: Okay we are about to
start with our next topic, which is the handling. Members of the body, please be quiet.

We need to continue with our agenda, conscious of the fact that we are behind schedule.

And Ms. Weisman, if you will be so kind as to proceed with the topics of the Handling Committee.

MS. WEISMAN: We have some
materials that we have recommendations on.
Everyone heard discussions yesterday, and I'm going to start with materials petitioned for Section 205.605(b), non-agricultural materials that are synthetic, the first of which is calcium from seaweed.

And it was in brief the Handling committee's recommendation is that calcium seaweed derived, as petitioned, does not need to be considered for addition to the national list since the use of this material is currently allowed through the existing listing
of nutrient minerals on the national list.
Also on 205.605(b) this recommendation passed at committee, five yes, zero no, there was one absent, and we heard from the petitioner yesterday that the petitioner even agrees, is satisfied with this recommendation.

I do also want to mention that one of the concerns raised by my fellow board member was not wanting to set a precedent for the interchangeability of synthetic and nonsynthetics, and we were assured that it is only because of an FDA rule applying to this category, nutrients and minerals, that this what appears to us to be a non-synthetic is covered under a category listed on synthetic lists. So it would not apply to all of 605 to address that concern.

So therefore, until -- I never get these procedures right, but I always know Dan or Rigo is going to get me right.

Are we ready for a motion?

MR. DELGADO: Yes, we are.
MS. WEISMAN: I move that we accept the recommendation.

MR. DELGADO: Which is?
MS. WEISMAN: That calcium seaweedderived does not need to be considered for addition to the national list, since it is use is already covered through existing listing.

MR. DELGADO: That is moved.
MR. MOYER: I'll second.
MR. DELGADO: It's moved and seconded to agree that calcium seaweed derived in this petition does not need to be considered for addition to the national list in Section 205.605(b).

That is what we are voting on. To support the statement that we do not need to list it, correct?

Discussion? Any questions? Are we ready for the question?

The question is on the motion to recommend that calcium seaweed derived as
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petitioned does not need to be considered for addition to the national list in Section 205.605(b), and we'll start with Steve.

MR. DeMURI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Julie.
MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Yes.
MR. MOYER: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Tina.
MS. ELLOR: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Joe.
MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Barry.
MR. FLAMM: Yes.
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MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Kevin.
MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: And the chair votes yes.

MR. MOYER: Mr. Chairman, there are zero noes, 14 yeses, one absent.

MR. DELGADO: The ayes have it, and the motion is agreed to. Let's continue on to the next topic.

MS. WEISMAN: The next item on the agenda is sodium chloride acidified, and that was as we mentioned yesterday that is deferred at this time. There will be no vote. And the same is true for propionic acid. Those are both high on our list of materials for - well, they are on our list; they are definitely on our list, our work plan.

MR. DELGADO: Let's proceed then
to the next item to vote on.
MS. WEISMAN: Right. Our next
item is ethylene for pears, also to be petitioned for Section 205.605(b).

And this is actually a proposal to amend the current listing of 205.605(b) which is ethylene to include the post-harvest ripening of pears. It currently reads, tropical fruits and degraining of citrus. And this would add to that annotation, the ripening of pears post-harvest.

This is also something that we have heard a lot of public comment about. A lot of it has been in favor, but also valid questions have been raised about the need to add a synthetic for the purpose of extending the marketing season. This material actually passed at the committee level by a vote, five yes, zero no, and there was one absent. So I do put forward the motion now that the listing of the ethylene on 205.605(b) be amended to include the post-harvest ripening of pears.

MS. MIEDEMA: Second.
MR. DELGADO: It's moved and seconded to amend the listing of $205.605(b)$ to include ethylene for ripening of pears.

Discussion?
MS. HALL: Based on some of the comments yesterday $I$ question the necessity for it from the perspective of, many of the requests were based on improving the experience at the consumer level, yet despite a large supply, the same commenter also said that they consistently sell out.

So I don't see where the problem is right now.

MR. DELGADO: Any other questions or comments? Jerry.

MR. FLAMM: While it's clear it's not necessary for either pear production or pear marketing or handling, as a pear grower myself I never found it necessary to use ethylene. Certain smaller growers don't have the facilities. It's only a benefit perhaps
to some of the largest producers of pears, and if anything it just gives an advantage to the large over the small.

MR. DELGADO: Any other questions?
Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: I'm from a peargrowing state, Oregon, and what I heard yesterday is that there are 30 percent more organic pear trees in transition. There is a tremendous amount of fruit that all comes to the market at the same time, and this substance, which we heard yesterday, is precisely the same thing that would show up if you put your organic pears in a bag. It helps these organic farmers who are committing to converting more acreage to have a market to sell their products.

And from a consumer perspective, and as a mom that buys an enormous amount of fruit for her kids' lunch bags, I really don't plan well enough on Sunday night when I'm grocery shopping to have pears in the lunch
bag on Monday morning. And all this sounds really sort of petty or irrelevant until you think about how consumers really behave out there, and what we are trying to create, an entire system from the organic farmer to the consumer. And it seems like a very benign tool to continue growing this organic crop.

MR. DELGADO: Julie.
MS. WEISMAN: I have a question, actually, and I hoping some of the pear growers in the room, someone will be able to come forward. If extending the market -

MR. DELGADO: Can you state your name, please?

MR. GONSALVES: Yes, my name is Ron Gonsalves from Peshastin, Washington.

MS. WEISMAN: My question is, would the extension of the marketing period for organic pears if they were available in a more usable form for more months of the year, would that have any impact on the amount of organic pears that maybe are coming from outside the

United States?
What market would it be taking away from?

MR. GONSALVES: I don't think it would take away from either market, because I think right now the amount of pears that we have we are marketing in basically a six-month window, say a seven-month window. So as the crops continue to grow as it was stated with the production increasing in the transitional acreage, what we intend to do is that we will continue to market the northwest pears in that same seven-month window. So as these crops get larger we are not looking to extending the marketing in the sense of taking pears further into the spring. We are looking to - our challenge would be to market increased volumes of pears in that same seven-month window that we are currently marketing pears into.

So following that seven-month period is where we start to see the increase in imported pears.

So we are really not taking away from any market. We are actually looking to market increased pears in that same window.

MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: Yes, we just heard yesterday, and we heard yesterday, I believe it was from you, that you are already selling out of pears, and you are selling everything you have currently.

MR. GONSALVES: Well, we do sell out of pears. We sell out of as I mentioned earlier, not to confuse the two items, but we currently harvested the largest apple crop ever in the Northwest, and we will sell all the apples at the end of the season. We will sell all the pears that we are currently growing right now. But at the same time the use of ethylene isn't to extend the marketing; it's to enhance the quality of the pears that we deliver to the market in the same market window.

So we are not looking to change
the window at all; we are looking to - we are looking to market a pear that's been enhanced by conditioning the same way.

So I think there is some
confusion, and I think some of the letters that were written that talked about extending it, it was never the intention of the industry to look to extend the marketing window of pears, but actually to, the pears that are currently being marketed in that seven-month window, to enhance the pears that are delivered to the retailer and ultimately the consumer.

MR. DELGADO: Jerry - Kevin.
MR. ENGELBERT: I have two
questions. Are there currently organic pears being imported into the United States during the periods of the year that you do not have organic pears available?

MR. GONSALVES: There is a substantial amount of import, mostly coming from South America, that begin arriving in
that April time period. So as the Northwest pear crop dwindles, because our ability to store - we are obviously able to store conventional pears longer than we are able to store organic pears. So as the organic pear comes to an end in April, just due to condition issues, the imports begin to show up from South America. And we are beginning to see increased volumes of imported pears. If you are buying a pear - I would say if you are buying a pear from May to August, more than likely you are buying an imported pear. MR. ENGELBERT: Do you known the companies that import conventional pears into the United States, what they produce their ethylene from?

MR. GONSALVES: For imported pears?
MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.
MR. GONSALVES: I don't know with any certainty that imported pears are being conditioned prior to coming into the United States. A lot of the retailers today, a lot
of your conventional retailers, as well as your organic retailers, have the ability to ripen pears on site in their distribution centers.

So as pears are being delivered to them, as pears are coming into the ports, the imported pears, those pears are then delivered to the distribution centers of your major retailers, and conditioning is taking place on site similar to bananas. Bananas are being conditioned domestically as bananas arrive in the country, and it's the same thing with imported pears.

MR. DELGADO: Steve.
MR. DeMURI: My question was pretty much answered by Kevin's question. But let me ask it a different way. Certain times of the year, are there organic pears and conventional pears side by side, and the conventional pears are of better quality, and you believe the consumers are picking the conventional over the organic because of that?

MR. GONSALVES: If the consumer goes in there, the consumer has identified the fact that their preference is a conditioned pear, I do feel that, over time, that consumer is going to buy the pear that they prefer, which is a conditioned pear, over an organic pear.

MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN: So then I just heard you say that bananas that are coming into this country are conditioned with the ethylene once they are here at the port? Is that correct?

MR. GONSALVES: Yes, that's
correct.
MR. KARREMAN: I thought the ethylene was being used in the other countries so that they would survive shipping to here.

MR. DELGADO: Joe, would you like to clarify that?

MR. SMILLIE: You wouldn't want to ripen them, and then ship them. You want to ship them green, and then ripen them.

MR. KARREMAN: Okay, so basically it's like the ethylene is being used already in this country for certified organic bananas, and you are asking for the certified organic pears which would also be in this country.

MR. GONSALVES: Correct. If you had an opportunity to visit a distribution center of a major retailer in this country, you will see all of them have onsite banana conditioning rooms. And as far as conventional pears, that is where the majority of pears are being conditioned is on site at distribution centers prior to going into retail stores.

MR. DELGADO: Jim?
MR. MOYER: I'm just trying to
understand what the ramifications of this whole thing might be. If what you're saying is that the treatment with ethylene gets you into the market earlier --

MR. GONSALVES: That's one of the benefits, yes.

MR. MOYER: What does that do to local tree-ripened fruit on a small scale?

MR. GONSALVES: Well again, you have to take into it the the question that was asked yesterday about the scope of the industry. You know, I visited the Whole Foods down the street this morning, and there was Northwest pears in there. So our Northwest pears are being distributed all across the country. The fact that we have tree-ripened, and pears don't really tree ripen, because of the way that the climatic conditions -- they don't really tree ripen.

So we've got to continue to have markets for those pears, those small growers that are growing and satisfying local fruit stands. But at the same time, we're talking about the Northwest pear industry that is transitioning more fruit into the organic arena, and is generating and growing more organic pears that are being sold from coast to coast domestically from the Atlantic to the

Pacific, to the north to the south, as well as exported to Europe and to the UK.

So we are talking about a major industry that is looking to utilize a tool that is currently certified already for the use of organic bananas and other tropical fruit as well as citrus. We are just asking to be included in there, because we do think that it will benefit the industry in the long run as well as provide the consumer an enhanced product.

MR. MOYER: Quick follow up. You don't see that that is going to displace - I want to recognize the ramifications of my vote on local pears, small scale local pear growers.

MR. GONSALVES: No, I don't see where it would impact the small grower as well as the grower who takes his fruit to the local fruit stand to retail. I don't see that is where it's going to challenge them.

MR. DELGADO: Okay, Jennifer.

MS. HALL: I just want to ask a little bit more on this, because typically in a marketplace the first one to market commands the higher price, and people are anticipating a product that has seasonality to it.

And do you not believe then that on a local grower level - that would potentially not afford them some of that premium?

MR. GONSALVES: No, because the grower, I think that local grower, the local fruit stand grower has a secure customer base. I don't think we are looking to change his opportunities as far as competing with him. We're looking to be able to satisfy the movement of a large volume of pears.

Because that local grower, if he's a five or 10-acre grower, he is going to continue to succeed. We have small growers within our coop as I mentioned yesterday, we have over 200 growers. We have small and large growers within that mix.

Some growers, some small growers choose to retail their apples or pears or soft fruits at a fruit stand. Other small growers choose to become part of the greater system to where their fruit is all pooled with larger growers and take advantage of that market as well.

So the small and the large isn't just from a fruit stand standpoint; it truly is within the industry.

MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: How many days of ripening do you think that being able to use ethylene would save the tree pears? Because you still can't ship them when they are fully ripe. Any grocery store is going to be bringing them in when they are green enough that they are not going to be damaged in storage.

MR. GONSALVES: You've got to
remember what we are talking about as far as this ethylene treatment is to trigger the
natural production of the ethylene that a pear is going to be emitting itself. So again our process is strictly a triggering mechanism as opposed to a true ripening method. So it takes three days in treatment. The shelf life of that pear isn't jeopardized in the sense that, the pear doesn't arrive to the retailer in a ripened state. The ripening begins - we trigger the ripening, and the ripening begins over that same - because again if we are shipping pears from the West Coast to the East Coast, it's a five-day travel time, that pear is beginning that ripening process similar to what it would be if it stayed in storage for that same 40day period.

MS. JAMES: So for clarification
then, the ethylene for pears is really used to help increase and trigger so that the sweetness -- is that correct?

MR. GONSALVES: It's used to trigger the receptors, the natural receptors
that each pear and apple has - in this case, pears - the natural receptor that then triggers the release of its own internal ethylene that continues the ripening process. And that conversion is ultimately what it's doing when it converts the starch to the sugar, and that's where the sweetness comes in as far as the pears.

MR. DELGADO: Any other questions?
Jennifer.
MS. HALL: Sorry, I just have one last one. I do want to be careful, because it's a product that is big for my area and I want to support it. But I would just be a lot more sensitive if you tell me you are sitting on a mountain of unsold product. I just don't see that for the expansion of a synthetic application. So it's difficult for me, I have to say.

MR. GONSALVES: Again, the
utilization of the ethylene is to trigger the ripening so that we are able to deliver a pear
that is in a state of being able to ripen sooner at the consumer level. The fact that we are not looking to change the marketing window, we are going to sell all of our pears with or without ethylene, so I don't want to confuse that element. I'm willing to say that outright. We will sell all of our pears with or without ethylene. We are looking to have the use of ethylene to be able to enhance the quality of the pear that is delivered to the marketplace earlier in the season. So we are not looking to modify anything that we are currently doing. The crops continue to grow. We will market those crops with or without ethylene. We are looking for the benefit of the use of ethylene to be able to enhance that pear to get a better quality eating pear to the marketplace sooner than we would have. It's used conventionally. The pears that you are buying in retail on the conventional level more than likely have been conditioned. All
of your bananas that you are buying have been conditioned. All of your organic bananas that you are currently buying have been conditioned.

So we are looking to utilize it, to utilize the tool of ethylene in the same manner that bananas and tropical fruit are currently utilizing ethylene in that manner.

MR. DELGADO: Joe.
MR. SMILLIE: So to grow the pear market, you've got so much that you are going to sell as organic, unconditioned or not. To grow a market to those consumers who aren't die-hard organic consumers, they are going to judge the pear on the eating quality, not it's ecological benefit. So therefore to grow the pear market this tool will help consumers get organic pears and help pear growers convert to organic, is the way I look at it.

MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: So just to also to go off on what Joe is saying is that that then --
the organic pear then becomes more competitive in quality with the conventional?

MR. GONSALVES: It allows that pear to be -- the consumer that ultimately purchases a conditioned pear could have that opportunity in the organic arena similar to what we are currently providing in the conventional.

MS. JAMES: As a retailer, I can
tell you that is one of the biggest problems we have with pears is the quality, even though the organic consumer usually doesn't want to trade down for the conventional. But the quality oftentimes isn't there unless it is from somebody who is local.

MR. GONSALVES: And as you all
know, we package to the same grade standards that USDA regulates us in the same grade standards whether we are packing conventional or organic. So we are putting the same product out there as far as appearance. It is internal quality that we are trying to enhance
with having the utilization of ethylene on organic pears similar to what we are doing with conventional.

MR. FLAMM: Well, I wouldn't agree that organic pears have a lower quality or organic pears ripened without artificial ethylene, and have less quality. As a previous pear grower I will admit that growing organic or non-organic pears and ripening without the aid of ethylene takes a little more time and a little more skill and it's a little tricky. You've got to know your species, and you have to know the timing.

But I think you can certainly do it and have a high quality pear.

And in terms of Jeff's comment, I
certainly - in Montana the Washington pears and apples can compete. It depends on the year and the time, especially they compete in the bigger marketplaces.

The same thing, you can develop your niche markets if you work hard at it.

But still I think the small grower is being put at a disadvantage.

MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: So if you come to market earlier, you are - I recently eliminated myself - but saying that organic would be able to displace some conventional sales?

MR. GONSALVES: We sell to
retailers that handle both organic and conventional. We sell to retailers that handle just organic produce, but at the same time it's enhancing the quality of the fruit we are delivering. We are not doing it solely to compete with the conventional, but it will enhance the quality of the organic pear that we are delivering to the marketplace.

And again, back to the small
grower-large grower, as a coop of 200 growers, we have growers in our coop that are pooled with larger growers, that are as small as the growers that Jennifer is concerned with that are currently satisfying fruit stands.

So it's a grower's independent choice whether he wants to sell locally, or whether that small grower wants to pool his fruit with other growers that are then selling across the whole domestic field, or even export.

So the range of growers are still out there, and the fact that we are a coop that work with large growers, because of our make up and the choice of what we have done, we also service small growers that just choose to do their retailing or their actual selling, not their retail, but do their selling through the coop as opposed to local fruit stands.

So we are supporting small growers and large growers with our current makeup.

MR. DELGADO: Jerry followed by Bea and I believe Steve also wants to make a statement. Please identify yourself.

MR. KIHISTADIUS: My name's Dennis
Kihistadius. And I - Ron works basically at the plant, and I get to go travel with
retailers. So I'd like to kind of address what you are saying.

And you are exactly right: the old-time produce men knew what to do with pears. They took them out of the cooler before they put them on the store shelf. I mean they rotated the fruit, and they worked like the fruit stands that's she talking about. We don't have that expertise anymore.

And we are talking about getting into retailers like - Bea likes to hear WalMart, but Wal-Mart does sell organics. And they condition their pears when they come in. And they literally have increased their pear sales double digits in the past five years because of this program. Kroger, Safeway, we just don't have that expertise at store level anymore.

So what we want to do, it's basically priming the pump. We let the fruit get a little bit of ethylene, and then we basically, unlike the banana, we can put it
asleep with temperature. And we ship it to the store cold. And this program is so that when the fruit is on the store shelf, it warms up and it starts to ripen, and then you get a natural rotation as the store level, or if you as the consumer take it home and put it in a paper bag or put it on your shelf, as long as you keep it out of the refrigerator, it will ripen.

So we've lost this produce guy
that was there for 20 - 30 years. I mean in high school I worked for a Super Value, never knowing that I'd work with fruit after I got through with the military. And it's just amazing the expertise that we have lost that's gone to either some of the fruit stands you probably buy your fruit from. And these people know their product. They know how to do it. But the mass market that we are trying to hit it's lost, it's gone. You got a kid in high school working there. MR. DELGADO: Jerry.

MR. DAVIS: Bartlett pears, what's the rule there?

MR. KIHISTADIUS: Yes, Bartlett pears and California -- I worked in both industries. But the California growers' fruit, when it's harvested, it's deed green. It's hard as a rock. And it won't ripen for 21 days on its own even. So the University of Davis, we work real close with Dr. Mitchum there, found that if you can give them an ethylene treatment, you can get them to the market sooner. By that I mean, let's say they harvest on June 30th, instead of waiting until July 21st, when you will have an edible pear, we can shorten that window down to maybe July 10th or July 12th. But it's really critical, on the California river pears, especially the Delta. Lake County, not so much, because of their growing conditions.

MR. DAVIS: So that leads to my next question of, overlap between winter pears - marketing overlap that is - and the early
season small grower in there with Bartlett pears.

MR. GONSALVES: Can I answer that?
MR. DAVIS: Yes, please.
MR. GONSALVES: Most of our pear growers grow winter and summer pears as well, because most of our Anjou pears, which is our primary winter pears are being crosspollinated by the Bartlett pear. So most of our growers that grow Anjous also grow Bartlett. So the sensitivity of overlapping the crops really becomes, what's evolved is a consumer preference. And what is happening is, on the conventional as well as the organic side, we are selling winter pears earlier each year, not to the detriment of summer pears, but we are selling winter pears earlier each year because the consumer preference is there to have both pears available to it. So consumers are purchasing one of two different varieties of pears, and that's where the expansion, and that's where the
growth is coming in to the pear dealers, the consumers would buy one pear on a seasonal basis, a Bartlett, until they ran out; then they would buy a winter pear until late in the season. The consumer's preference now is to buy multiple varieties of pears, and when they go into the store their purchasing habits have changed in the sense that pears have become much more of an accepted commodity for them. So the consumer is looking for more than one pear at a time, and that's what we are trying to do by making winter pears available to them earlier.

MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: Just a couple of points
that I wanted to point out is that we are talking about organic pears, and that a local supplier may or may not be growing organically. And if they weren't, then they would be competing with conventional. And then secondly I would - I know that we talk about a level playing field. And so since we
do get bananas, and we have other categories, this seems like more of a harmless entry to add pears to that.

MR. DELGADO: Any other questions?
MR. KARREMAN: I think ethylene was
reviewed for tomatoes a long time ago. Is
Emily Brown Rosen here? She might know something about that.

MS. ROSEN: Tomatoes?
MR. KARREMAN: Well, it was
reviewed previously.
MR. DELGADO: Emily? Any specific questions, Hugh? Why it was rejected, that's the question. For tomatoes.

MS. ROSEN: I think it was `95, `96 that they were looking at pears, tomatoes, bananas. Tomatoes was rejected because it was felt like it was used to artificially ripen tomatoes, you know, so that poor quality tomatoes would be shipped green, and not have the benefit of ripening. Pears, they felt like it wasn't necessary. Bananas, it was the
only way to get bananas shipped into this country as a -- so that was where it seemed an essential, necessary element. We did later add the de-greening of citrus and the tropical fruits came later in `99, and that was because when they were doing bananas they also were doing the mangoes and the papayas at the same time in these gassing rooms. And it was the same shipping problem coming into the country. But pineapple was never approved for a -- I think someone mentioned that it was mentioned as a possible de-greening use in pineapple. It did not have that use. It only is used in crop production, you know, like a year ahead of when you harvest the pineapples. And I don't think avocados are actually approved either, because they are considered a subtropical fruit, not a tropical fruit.

I may it may something that is done, but it shouldn't be.

MR. KIHISTADIUS: I worked in the avocado industry for 7-1/2 years and they have
been doing it since `92, organic.
(Simultaneous speakers.)
MR. KARREMAN: This sounds a little bit different than what tomatoes were kind of looked at back then. It sounds like a little bit different. You are not speeding up ripening per se. I mean I don't want to go into the details, but there are several different - why it was rejected for tomatoes.

MR. GONSALVES: And I think what you did mention in that same time period, `92 - `93 when pears were looked at previously and said it wasn't necessary. The industry has changed considerably, and the use of ethylene on conventional pears was a minor consideration back in that time period as well.

The increase in the benefits that have been evaluated with ethylene has really taken place in the last five or six years.

MR. DELGADO: Conscious of the time here, do we have any other questions? We are
ready for the question. The question is, on the amendment of ethylene for ripening pears for listing on Section 205.605(b), and we are going to start our vote with Julie.

MS. WEISMAN: I'm going to stick with my original vote, yes.

MR. DELGADO: Thank you. Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: No.
MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: Abstain.
MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Tina.
MS. ELLOR: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Joe.
MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Barry.
MR. FLAMM: No.
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MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Kevin.
MR. ENGELBERT: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: No.
MR. DELGADO: Steve.
MR. DeMURI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: And the chair votes yes.

MR. MOYER: Okay, we have five noes, one abstention, and one absent, and nine yeses. I stand corrected, it is eight.

MR. DELGADO: Okay, the motion to amend for ethylene for ripening pears for listing on Section 205.605(b) is lost. Let's move on to the next topic. Julie.

MS. WEISMAN: Okay, next we have algae - we'll start with chlorella --

MR. DELGADO: Julie.
MS. WEISMAN: Okay, the next
material is a petition for the algae
chlorella. That's how it was petitioned.
I do want to recognize that in the future - it was actually chlorella powder. And I want to recognize that we will make an effort in the future to come up with the names on these types of things.

And it was petitioned to add powdered chlorella to Section 205.606 of the national list. The petition failed. It was zero yes, four no. There were two absent. And it failed to be - basically we were aware that there is certified organic chlorella available, and the petition did not address these specific organic chlorella and why it could not be made into the form that the petitioner required.

And so the recommendation failed at the committee level.

So the motion is for -- to recommend the listing of chlorella to Section 205.606 of the national list.

MR. DELGADO: Is there a second?
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MS. JAMES: Second.
MR. DELGADO: It's been moved and seconded to list algae chlorella powder in Section 205.606 of the list.

Discussion? Ready for the question?

The question is on the motion to list algae chlorella powder in Section 205.606. And we will start the vote with Dan.

MR. GIACOMINI: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: No.
MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: No.
MR. DELGADO: Tina.
MS. ELLOR: No.
MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: No.
MR. DELGADO: Joe.
MR. SMILLIE: Joe.

MR. DELGADO: Barry.
MR. FLAMM: No.
MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN: No.
MR. DELGADO: Kevin.
MR. ENGELBERT: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: No.
MR. DELGADO: Steve.
MR. DeMURI: No.
MR. DELGADO: Julie.
MS. WEISMAN: No.
MR. DELGADO: And the chair votes no.

MR. MOYER: Mr. Secretary, we have 14 noes, one absent.

MR. DELGADO: The noes have it, and the motion to list algae chlorella powder in Section 205.606 of the list is lost. Let's go on to the next.

MS. WEISMAN: Okay, the next is the second algae dumontiacae was petitioned for

Section 205.605 or 606, and it failed - it was determined - it was recommended by committee for addition to 606, however it failed because there was no information in the petition addressing what the obstacle is to the availability of organic.

Not to take up any more time, but
I just want to emphasize for future petitioners to 606 that the committee feels like it's really important that if you are petitioning something and you are going to say it's not available as organic, the petition needs to include information on what the obstacle is. So that 606 listing will be a tool to move the organic industry forward, and include -- and encourage the availability of organic ingredients.

With that I recommend the addition

MR. DELGADO: You move?
MS. WEISMAN: I move to - I move for the addition of algae dumontiacae powder
to Section 205.606 of the national list.
MR. DELGADO: Is there a second?
MR. SMILLIE: Second.
MR. DELGADO: Joe seconded, and the motion has been moved and seconded to add algae dumontiacae powder to the list on Section 205.606.

Questions? Discussion? Ready for the question?

The question is on the motion to list algae dumontiacae powder in Section 205.606 of the national list, and we will start our vote with Jeff.

MR. MOYER: No.
MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: No.
MR. DELGADO: Tina.
MS. ELLOR: No.
MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: No.


Section 205.606 of the list is lost.
Let's move on to the next.
MS. WEISMAN: Okay, the next material that we are going to vote on was a petition for - to add buck hull powder to Section 205.606.

I think that there - that the main issue here was that this was to be used to add color to certified organic buck wheat noddles, and I think it was very well presented yesterday, so all I will say is that the main issue for us was that there is certified organic buck wheat noodles being manufactured and sold in the United States. This was a foreign - petitioner is a foreign manufacturer of that product, who did not do a very good job of explaining why they couldn't source the material.

And it failed unanimously six no, zero yes. There were no absent or abstentions at the committee level.

So at this time I would like to
make the motion for the recommendation to add buck hull powder to the national list on Section 205.606.

MR. DELGADO: Is there a second?
MS. JAMES: Second.
MR. DELGADO: Bea seconds, and it is moved and seconded to add buck hull powder to the national list Section 205.606.

Discussion? Questions? Are we ready for the vote? Tina, did you have a question?

Okay, the question is on the motion to add buck hull powder, black powder, on the list Section 205.606.

We are ready to take our vote, and we will start with Bea.

MS. JAMES: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: No.
MR. DELGADO: Tina.
MS. ELLOR: No.
MR. DELGADO: Tracy.


14 noes, zero yeses, one absent.
MR. DELGADO: The noes have it, and the motion to list buck hull powder, black powder, on the national list Section 205.606 is lost, and we are ready to move on to the next material.

MS. WEISMAN: The next material, just for a point of order, it's black pepper extract powder, and that's an error on my part that it is not listed that way on the committee recommendation. But I think it's important to correct.

And this was - this petition like the last few did not provide sufficient information to demonstrate why this material couldn't be obtained organically in the form that this petitioner needed, because it was again it was readily apparent to committee members that organic pepper is being grown, and also organic pepper extract is available. And the petition did not even acknowledge the existence of these materials much less why
they can't be - much less identifying the obstacles to them being turned into the form that they needed.

So this material also failed unanimously at the committee level.

So at this time I'd like to state the recommendation which is for the addition of black pepper, extract powder, for listing on Section 205.606 of the national list.

MR. DELGADO: It has been moved.
Is there a second?
MR. GIACOMINI: I'll second.
MR. DELGADO: It's moved and
seconded to add black pepper extract powder on the national list Section 205.606.

Discussion? Ready for the
question? The question is on the motion to list black pepper extract powder on the national list Section 205.606, and we will start our vote with Jerry.

MR. DAVIS: No.
MR. DELGADO: Tina.
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MS. ELLOR: No.
MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: No.
MR. DELGADO: Joe.
MR. SMILLIE: No.
MR. DELGADO: Barry.
MR. FLAMM: No.
MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN: No.
MR. DELGADO: Kevin.
MR. ENGELBERT: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: No.
MR. DELGADO: Steve.
MR. DeMURI: No.
MR. DELGADO: Julie.
MS. WEISMAN: No.
MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: No.
MR. DELGADO: Bea.
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MS. JAMES: No.
MR. DELGADO: And the chair votes no.

MR. MOYER: Mr. Chairman, we have 14 noes, zero yeses, one absent.

MR. DELGADO: The noes have it, and the motion to list black pepper extract powder in Section 205.606 of the list is lost.

Let's move on to the next one.
MS. WEISMAN: Okay, now, in case you were all starting to fall asleep here, the next material is dried orange pulp.

Originally the committee voted no because we felt that at the time the petition did not really help us understand why this material given a supply of organic oranges being grown in this country why this material could not be made organically.

And I think that - long story short, the Handling committee met last night, and we voted to reconsider. And we voted five yes, zero no, for this material to reverse our
previous decision, because originally it was a unanimous vote against listing.

The members of the Handling
committee that are here, it was now a unanimous vote in favor of listing this material on 606. And I think it's - we had a few, and this is another good example of how the public comment process works well and does its job, because the petitioner was here. We had an opportunity to ask a lot of questions, get a lot of information over the period of the last three days, or the two days that preceded last night's vote.

So I would like to move now on a recommendation to add dried orange pulp powder to Section 205.606 of the national list.

MR. DELGADO: Is there a second? MR. SMILLIE: Second. MR. DELGADO: Joe seconds, and it is moved and seconded to include orange pulp dried on the national list, Section 205.606.
Discussion? Joe?

MR. SMILLIE: Yes, the reason why I want to open this up is, we are coming - our Handling committee was coming to the conclusion that including - and I want to just put this on the record; you've heard me say it before - but we are coming to the conclusion that listing things on 606 does spur the growth of organic. And in that sense we fully anticipate organic orange pulp to be on the market, whether it includes slightly different formulations, or whether this company sees the opportunity to go organic.

> By listing it we can replace current conventional byproducts that are being used and in the future have organic product in place for the other processing industry.

MR. DELGADO: Okay, Jeff.
MS. WEISMAN: Thank you, because it follows on Joe's point. I think the other thing that was important for me to hear was also that this is replacing - not just conventional but synthetic materials. It will
be replacement, so I see this as an opportunity even before it's there organically, it will open up the possibility that some synthetics we maybe won't have a need for anymore.

MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: My question is for either Julie or Joe. It seemed like yesterday that I heard some discussion that what we are actually certifying is a proprietary process. That of course leads to a product. But it brings up concerns in my mind based on what Grace came up with later when she talked about orange - it's just a little mixed up in my head.

MS. WEISMAN: I think it happens a lot in manufacturing that some very very specific process will be patented, but it does not mean, and I was certainly convinced yesterday by Grace and a few other comments that were made, that other people are in line to make things that are very similar, and will
function in an identical way, even if it's not by the patented process. It will be something very close, and there will be competition in the marketplace.

MR. SMILLIE: And our motion does not include those patent-specific processes. It's simply for dried orange pulp.

MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: I don't know if we can go back to the transcript, or matter of just clarify - I think I heard you say orange pulp - dried orange pulp powder?

MS. WEISMAN: I don't have - it's dried.

MR. GIACOMINI: So just orange pulp dried?

MS. WEISMAN: I didn't pull it up because - yes, and that -

MR. GIACOMINI: I heard correctly when she said powder?

MS. WEISMAN: I meant to. Thank you for that correction.
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MR. DELGADO: Any questions?
Comments?
Are we ready for the question?
The question is on the motion to list orange pulp dried on the list on Section 205.606, and we will start our vote with Tina.

MS. ELLOR: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Joe.
MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Barry.
MR. FLAMM: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Kevin.
MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Steve.
MR. DeMURI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Julie.

1

2

4

MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Dan.

MR. GIACOMINI: No.
MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: And the chair votes yes.

Did I miss somebody? Sorry, that's the second time. Gerry, you said?

MR. DAVIS: Yes.
MR. MOYER: Mr. Chairman, we have 13 yeses and one no and one absent.

MR. DELGADO: The ayes have it, and the motion is agreed to.

Any other materials that we need to discuss, Mr. Weisman?

MS. WEISMAN: That is not the last recommendation on the Handling committee agenda, but it is the last material.

We - I am - yes, I am pleased to
say that we are moving onto pet food after what really has been too long a time, through no fault of the pet food industry or the pet food task force, who did very fine work very early on and then kind of got sidelined in light of other events that happened in the organic industry. And I'm glad that we got back to this, and I especially want to thank Tracy Miedema who embraced this recommendation and breathed life back into it. And for Emily Brown Rosen and Nancy Cook who is not here for helping us do that.

We are introducing this
recommendation after some - I hope I'm not going out on a limb here saying relatively minor edits that were made yesterday. So I would just like to go ahead and move that for the acceptance of this Handling committee recommendation for the adoption of standards for the production and labeling of organic pet food.

MR. GIACOMINI: Second.

MR. DELGADO: It has been moved and seconded, and our friends make a motion to accept the document entitled Organic Pet Food Recommendation as described by the chair of the Handling committee.

Yes, questions? Tracy?
MS. MIEDEMA: I'll just go ahead and point out the syntactical change we made so that it is clear to everyone.

On page five, I inserted a pretty klunky notation to the program in describing how to - how 606 could be parsed to be very clear. The -- potentially commercially unavailable pet food only items should be lined out in the program.

This is per the program's advice, but in our recommendation, I -- let's see, Valerie, it's in subpart B, 105. And why I'd like some help with is just in pulling out the way I had inserted this note. You can see right there in call caps. And actually just showing the way that the sections would be
labeled. It's the same thing that the program suggested to us as a numerical name for the sections.

And then, Val, can you flip to the edits that we just received earlier today. Did you include those earlier?
(Simultaneous speakers.)
MR. DELGADO: Why don't you describe them?

MS. MIEDEMA: I'll just describe them. Actually, Emily, would you please -would you mind approaching, because it's going to be hard for me to pull these out.

So let's get back to that section.
What we're simply doing is
translating the note that describes this to actionable language.

Now while these guys are taking care of business over there, I'll address one other concern that was raised yesterday by Urvashi Rangan about the inclusion of slaughter byproducts. And after having a
conversation with her, and making sure she understood that any items that comprise a small portion, you know, this is either made with or organic, any slaughter byproducts that weren't organic would still have to be on 606. So it doesn't open the door wide open for any conventional slaughter byproducts. They would still have to be listed on 606, one by one.

And after that conversation, Urvashi said, okay. So I wanted to make sure that we skip over that for now.

That was the only concern that I heard in any of the public comments.

MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: Tracy, I was just wondering if you could direct Valerie to point out where it had the section that -- I know Kevin and I wanted to make sure it was in there about feeding pet food to livestock. It's in there somewhere. I just want to double check and make sure for my clarification.

MS. FRANCES: 237(b)7.

1

MR. DELGADO: Thank you.
Ready with those updates? Tracy, could you describe those for us?

MS. MIEDEMA: You know, I don't think we really need to belabor this. Basically what we describe is the parsing of 606, and we made a notation in the document to show it rather than describe it.

MR. DELGADO: So that's the extent of the change?

MS. MIEDEMA: That's the extent of the change.

MS. ROSEN: Including pet food, in the title of 605. And the word including pet food in the title of 606, and then 606 will have a section A, allowed for all processed products; and then $B$, allowed for pet food only. So there would be no confusion where you put things there.

MR. GIACOMINI: So 606 would say
all processed?
MS. WEISMAN: No, 606 will be now
divided into --
MR. GIACOMINI: But 606(a) will say processed product?

MS. WEISMAN: That's what it's for. Handling.

MR. DELGADO: Any other questions?
MR. GIACOMINI: I think I have one.
MR. DELGADO: Yes.
MR. GIACOMINI: I fully support the document. I just want to make a quick statement. There was one issue in this document that I didn't like from the beginning, and I think it's worth saying now.

The document, when it feels like going to 603, it goes to 603. When it feels like going to 605, it goes to 605. When it feels like going to 606. I just wish the document could have been structured to have a little bit more - I understand why you did it.

MS. ROSEN: Yes, that was discussed that maybe - I think what you are referring to is having it all in one separate pet food
section as opposed to being MR. GIACOMINI: Yes, just so it's not - you know, cruising through the regulation, find something wherever you wanted to find something.

MS. ROSEN: We had no problem with it being reorganized like that, the pet food task - this is just the way we did it, and if the program wants to reorganize it for easier reading by the industry or whatever, that can be done.

MR. DELGADO: Richard, do you have a question?

MR. MATTHEWS: Yes, clarification.
Is it intended for, A, all the products used in A to also be used in pet food?

MS. MIEDEMA: Say it again, please.
MR. MATTHEWS: Are you intending
for all the materials in $A$ to also be eligible for use in pet food?

MS. MIEDEMA: There could be a pet food item in A. B is pet food only.

MR. MATTHEWS: Okay, I just wanted to clarify.

MR. DELGADO: Any other questions?
MR. MATTHEWS: And the reason why I was clarifying that is because pet food is also a processed product.

MS. MIEDEMA: Right, and that's just to acknowledge the fact that cats are obligate carnivores, and there are going to be certain items that need to be in there as pets only.

MR. DELGADO: Any questions?
So are we ready for the question?
The question is on the motion to approve the document entitled Organic Pet Food as described by the chair of the Handling Committee.

And we'll start our vote with
Tina. I'm sorry, Tracy.
MS. MIEDEMA: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Joe.
MR. DELGADO: Yes.
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MR. DELGADO: Barry.
MR. FLAMM: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Hugh.
(No response.)
MR. DELGADO: Kevin.
MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jennifer.
MS. HALL: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Steve.
MR. DeMURI: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Julie.
MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. DELGADO: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jeff.
MR. MOYER: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Bea.
MS. JAMES: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Jerry.
MR. DAVIS: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Tina.
MS. ELLOR: Yes.

MR. DELGADO: And the chair votes yes.

MR. MOYER: Mr. Chairman, we have 13 yeses, one absent - I'm sorry, two absent. MR. DELGADO: Can you restate that, please.

MR. MOYER: Yes, we have zero noes, 13 yeses, and two absent.

MR. DELGADO: The ayes have it, and the motion is agreed to. Very good.

Madam Chair, does that conclude your participation?

MS. WEISMAN: That's all.
MR. DELGADO: Well, thank you very much, and congratulations to all of the chairs for the outcome of the voting, and we are late.

Let's move on straight ahead to the next topic which is election of new officers. And following the procedures which we approved this morning, our acting secretary has prepared some ballots.

ELECTION OF NEW OFFICERS
MR. DELGADO: And the order of the election will be as follows. I'm referring to the policy and procedures manual, please correct me if I'm not doing the right job. But we will start with the elections of the chair, followed by the vice chair after the election, and finally the secretary. Right now the secretary is distributing ballots, and we will take nominations. Our director will put those nominations up on the screen. We will be numbering those nominations, and that's how we are requesting that you vote. If you approve of nominee one, two or three, circle that individual on the ballot, fold it, and we'll collect those.

These do not have names. That's why I'm asking the board members to observe the list that we will be posting up there, depending on the nominees for the position.

MS. FRANCES: Starting with the
chair, vice chair and the secretary, in that order?

MR. DELGADO: Start with the chairman. Once we vote on that position we'll move on to the next one.

MR. KARREMAN: And are we -- is the
list -- she's going to type it as we say it, right? It's not the email the other week?

MS. JAMES: Okay, so to clarify, this new and improved organized process for elections is that somebody will be nominated by one of their colleagues, and Valerie will type up nomination -- under chair, she'll say chair one, and then she'll put the name.

So then you don't want to write anything on here. You select the number of the person in order of how Valerie puts it up here for your vote, and then I'll collect them. Does that make sense?

MR. DELGADO: And the whole intent
is to make this process somewhat more professional and efficient. Any other
questions? And we don't have chads here, so -

- questions? Okay, Hugh.

At this point, then, we would like to contemplate nominations for the chair.

MR. SMILLIE: I'd like to nominate
Tracy Miedema for chair.
MR. DELGADO: Very good. Tracy, do you accept the nomination?

MS. MIEDEMA: I accept.
MR. DELGADO: Very good. Hugh?
MR. KARREMAN: I'd like to nominate Jeff Moyer.

MR. DELGADO: Mr. Moyer, do you accept the challenge?

MR. MOYER: I do.
MR. DELGADO: Okay, any other
names? Any questions?
MR. DAVIS: I nominate Dan
Giacomini.
MR. DELGADO: Dan?
MR. GIACOMINI: I would rather not split the voting three ways.

MR. DELGADO: So Dan is declining his name on the list.

So folks, there we have it. We have the two candidates for the position of chair. Please circle the one you are voting for, and fold it, and we'll collect them.

After the votes are counted, we will announce the person with the highest number of votes, and the secretary will discard the votes - the ballots, that is. (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 4:15 p.m. and resumed at 4:15 p.m.) MR. DELGADO: Congratulations, Mr. Jeff Moyer. You have been elected our new chair.
(Applause.)
MR. DELGADO: We will now proceed with the second position, the second officer's position, which is the vice chair. And I remind the board members that we can nominate individuals that had already run for another
position.
So we'll turn the ballot at this point. So at this point, we need a couple of more.
(Simultaneous speakers.)
MR. DELGADO: Okay, at this point I
would like to entertain nominations for those

- the position of vice chair. We'll start with Hugh.

MR. KARREMAN: I'd like to nominate Dan Giacomini for vice chair.

MR. DELGADO: Dan Giacomini is nominated.

Julie?
MS. WEISMAN: I would like to nominate Tracy Miedema for vice chair.

MR. DELGADO: Tracy is nominated.
Any other nominees for this
position?
Dan, you're willing to run? And
Tracy? So there we have it, folks. Number one will be Dan, and number two, Tracy.

So again.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 4:18 p.m. and resumed at 4:20 p.m.) MR. DELGADO: Congratulations to our new vice chair, Mr. Dan Giacomini.
(Applause.)
MR. DELGADO: Our third position is
that of secretary, and I would like to entertain nominations?

Bea.
MS. JAMES: I would like to nominate Julie Weisman.

MR. DELGADO: Julie, do you accept the challenge?

MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Dan.
MR. GIACOMINI: I nominate Rigo.
(Laughter.)
MR. DELGADO: I'm sorry, I have to
withdraw. I appreciate the honor. However, I promised to help Julie - well, strike that
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comment.
Any other nominations?
MS. JAMES: I would just like to ask if Katrina expressed to you, Mr. Chair, any --

MR. DELGADO: She has expressed her wish not to run this year.

DR. ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman, I have to go get my car out of hock, so I'm going to leave you. I just want to say thank you all once again for your service to the department. And goodbye. I'll see you.

MR. DELGADO: Thank you very much for all your support. And for secretary, we only have one nominee. And we won't do it by ballot. Okay, so by voice I guess we all agree that it will be Julie, our new secretary. And I want to congratulate her for that.
(Applause.)
MR. DELGADO: Moving on to the next topic is committee work plans, and we'll start
with those right away.
I warn the board members that we are 45 minutes behind schedule, so this is our chance to make sure that we finish on time. And we'll start with Handling. Do you need more time? You're still with materials? Why don't we stay with materials then while we give time to Julie to -

COMMITTEE WORKPLANS
MR. GIACOMINI: The items for the workplan for the Materials Committee -assuming I'm still Materials chair, Jeff. Anyway, I guess that's still -- we'll work that out.

Okay, in no particular order, because these are all occurring at various times and simultaneously, continuing work on petitions and sunset items and as part of that continuing work to work with the program on old petitions that can be dealt with, would come up, including the list received in public comment.

Continuing to work on improving the tracking system and level of communication regarding petitions, and between the board and the program.

And number three, working with the materials working group and examining the document that we have to see if there is anything we can move forward on at the next meeting, and continuing to work with the group regarding the synthetic-nonsynthetic questions.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
MR. DELGADO: Thank you. We move on then to livestock.

MR. KARREMAN: Thank you, Mr.
Chair.
We will finish up on the bivalves, and also embark upon the animal husbandry animal welfare topic. And I guess poultry outdoor access is kind of part of that.

And then there is one other thing that has come up. I guess it would come under
things that happen out in the organic community. It's a material type thing. So the topic of vitamins and minerals used therapeutically that are not feed additives, but they are injectable. We would like to look at that as a topic. So injectable vitamins and minerals.

MR. DELGADO: Can you repeat that?
MR. KARREMAN: Injectable vitamins and minerals for livestock.

Dan has something there?
MR. DELGADO: Clarification?
MR. GIACOMINI: Yes, the Livestock
Committee will be looking at that. It may
lead us to a point where a petition would need to be submitted for listing on a national
list. We are just looking to - there are some other vitamin and mineral issues that we are sort of going to be grappling with in that whole evaluation.

MR. DELGADO: anything else? Okay, any questions for livestock?

I didn't ask the same about materials. Any questions for the materials chairman?

MR. SMILLIE: I just want to be clear, Hugh, the aquaculture recommendation that passed today which adds on to the previous one, is that moving forward, or does that have to sit and wait until the bivalve piece is added.

MR. KARREMAN: I think the program would have to answer that. But when we were in discussion yesterday I specifically asked that - whatever happened today, that what we already worked in past March, 2007 starts getting implemented, and then with what happened today hopefully everything can. It's not up to me; it's up to the program of course.

MR. SMILLIE: But that is your understanding?

MR. KARREMAN: The intent for us is to get things started now.

MR. DELGADO: Any other questions?
Bea.
MS. JAMES: I'm sorry, Hugh. I
think I captured everything, but did you
mention humane standards for livestock?
MR. KARREMAN: Animal husbandry and animal welfare.

MR. DELGADO: Any other questions for livestock?

Okay, thank you very much. Joe?
MR. SMILLIE: Not necessarily in order, we will prioritize however on our first meeting, but certainly 100 percent on having a recommendation for spring, a recommendation hopefully in spring for biodiversity. We will take up, and again the title is important, retail criteria for certification. Retail criteria for certification - or criteria for retail certification is a better way of putting it. Criteria for retail certification, which as you know is currently exempt or excluded from the regulation.

And the last item is peer review.
MR. DELGADO: Anything else?
MR. KARREMAN: That's it.
MR. DELGADO: Okay, any questions?
Let's move on then to crops. Mr. Davis.
MR. DAVIS: The Crops Committee work plan will be - several petitioned substances, kind of a group of several inert materials, inerts and pesticides. Ethylene glycol, tetramethyl decyne-diol, polycaprolactone, isoparrifinic hydrocarbon, those are the four inerts. And then glycine betaine, peracetic acid, an to expand use petition, and sulfurous acid.

Also we have several sunset materials that are due to sunset in 2011. I don't have them here to list. There's a short list, not many.

Other recommendations we'll be undertaking, we'll be working with in the joint committee efforts on the biodiversity document, and list for inerts and pesticide
formulation document also should be a joint committee with materials I would guess, Dan, don't you think, on the list for inerts and pesticides?

MR. GIACOMINI: Oh, that just sounds like a blast.

MR. DAVIS: We with our resident mushroom specialist on board, in the crops committee we are going to relook at mushroom standards, and also revisit and continue the work on soilless growing systems in terrestrial plants. And that is all that is on the work plan at this point.

MR. DELGADO: Any questions for the chair of the crops committee?

Very good. Let's move on then to Handling.
(Simultaneous speakers.)
MS. WEISMAN: So the Handling
Committee workplan is headed up by work on the clarification of materials, definition of materials on the national list, to now take
the hand off the materials working group on the ag-non-ag suggestions that were made at this meeting, and continue to participate in their process as they start to delve into the synthetic non-synthetic piece of materials on the national list.

And then of course as always we will continue to review petition materials, and on 205.605 we're looking at lecithin bleached, tissue for removal; we will be looking at sodium chlorite acidified, for which we now have the technical review that we had asked for; and the same for proprionic acid for which we now also have the technical review. Yeast is still on the list, waiting I was going to say patiently, but not patiently really, and shouldn't be patiently for the clarification of the Ag/Non-Ag before we can move ahead with the status of that petition.

And then on 606 we have a petition for the removal of fluid lecithin - lecithin
fluid unbleached for removal. We still have the petition for pectic low-methoxy nonamidated, to be moved from 605 to 606. And I think we requested the technical review for that, and I think we will wait for that. I think that is in the pipeline.

And I also have - we have work to do to refine our review of 606 materials, specifically to work on clarifying - some guidance to clarify the use of what we are calling accessory ingredients in formulated agricultural products. That came up when we were adding colored materials onto 606 and realizing that - what's in the marketplace may be one form - something was petitioned with what was considered a relatively benign solvent or carrier, but that was actually being manufactured in a variety of ways, so we want to take a look at that.

We also just to give you a preview we do have some new petition materials in the
pipeline that have already been handed off to the - passed to the Handling committee.

For 605 we are looking at glucosamine, and also propane as a processing aid. That is going to be fun.

And then for 606 we now have a petition for chicory root. And also for - in the category of colors we have a petition for red corn. We have a petition for myrrh essential oil, and for wheat germ.

Then fourth item on our Handling you see we get big things off, but it seems like - we also have materials that are for sunset review in the fall of 2011 . We have nine items. The AMPR for this was already published.

And for 605(a) we'll be looking we'll need to start looking at egg white lysozyme, almalic acid and microorganisms.

For 605(b) we are looking at activated charcoal, and Jerry I feel for you with the pronunciations, cyclohexylamine,
diethylaminoethanol, and octadecylamine, and those are boiler additives. Don't everybody freak out; they are for boilers.

We also have paracetic acid and sodium acid phosphate.

And also continuing to hover here at the bottom of the list structure of the national list, which I believe is going to be part of working with this clarification materials in the definition. It looks like we may have some impact there.

Labor guidance, which I think is also going to be impacted by this Ag/Non-Ag definition. And food contact substances is still on the workplan.

MR. DELGADO: Okay, questions for the board?

Julie, is that it?
MS. WEISMAN: That's it.
MR. DELGADO: Okay, an impressive
list. Any questions for our chair? No?
MR. KARREMAN: I just wanted to add
something for livestock. Kevin brought up here, when I said, we hardly ever have any materials for livestock, after Julie has gone through her list, and Jerry has gone through his list. There may be some sunset materials; I need to look at that. I apologize. We're not used to looking at materials on livestock, plain and pure. MR. DELGADO: Okay, let's move on to policy.

MR. FLAMM: Okay, what I read off is what the committee agreed to and was presented at the last committee meeting, so it won't be new.

The first item is to clarify and define the concept of priority for petitions. I think that came up in our discussion - oh by the way, this is for the policy and procedures manual.

Continue the systematic review of
the policy and procedure manual. We are looking at sections one and two - one and two
has already been done. Reviewing first Section three, and with particular attention to the discussion on meeting sites which is discussed on page 15. Review section four with particular attention to examining what is now the assigned responsibilities of the policy committee to determine whether those are really what the board wants the policy committee to be doing.

And then three is evaluation criterion for - it's in the policy and procedure manual on page 46 , examine that to see that it addresses biodiversity protection needs as may be determined when we make recommendations on the biodiversity paper. So it'll be cross-checked to make sure it gets into the proper place in the policy and procedures manual.

Then under the new member guide -MR. DELGADO: Does that include the criteria?

MR. FLAMM: I'm sorry?

MR. DELGADO: Does that include the criteria for the evaluation of the --

MR. FLAMM: Evaluation, excuse me -- that's just -- there is no attention to it specifically for biodiversity in that listing on page 46.

In the new member guide it's proposed to develop a glossary of acronyms for the benefit of new members; and secondly, chat room, if that's what we continue to call it, procedures and restrictions be included in the new member guide.

MS. FRANCES: Not chat board but bulletin board.

MR. FLAMM: Bulletin board now. I knew we had changed the name. That's all I have.

MR. DELGADO: Any questions for the chair of the policy committee?

Well, then that is it. That concludes our points on workplans. And let's move on to the next item which is other
business.
OTHER BUSINESS \& CLOSING REMARKS
MR. DELGADO: Any other pending
issues that we should be considering? Board members, this is our chance.

Yes, or closing remarks. But I
would like to first of all contemplate if there is any other business that we need to consider at this moment.

Okay, hearing none we will move on to closing remarks.

And Bea?
MS. JAMES: I would like to thank Rigo for his year of service as chair of the board, and you stepped up and did an excellent job.

MR. DELGADO: Thank you very much. (Applause.)

MR. DELGADO: On that note, I guess that's my cue, I would like to say it's been a real honor. And I've been extremely impressed by not only the work within this
group, the board - I think that was expected when you are appointed at this level you are expected to have the highest level of professionalism by most of the press, by the way the community, the organic community, is willing to participate and come out and help us. That public comment, that feedback, that assessment of whatever we do, is unique. I appreciate that enormously.

I want to thank our newly elected chair for his advice and patience and comments as well as Katrina's, the secretary. We will

- and Barry of course - we were having calls every week on Mondays just to stay ahead of the game. We hated pop quizzes; I think that was the issue. And that demonstrated a level of commitment that $I$ have not seen very often.
I think we were successful - I
said this at the very beginning - we implemented new changes that brought us to a higher level. I think we are more efficient. And that is for all of the work that all of
you have given. And I thank you for that.
I know I have 14 friends for life, and many more from the public. And that is fantastic for me.

So have a nice break. I
appreciate that. And if there are no other comments from the public - yes.

MR. MATTHEWS: Just one thing. I understand we want to have a board meeting in April; is that right?

MR. DELGADO: We are looking at the calendar. And the final date of that meeting will have to be defined in the next executive call -- actually the January executive call. So that's an item to be voted on. Is that correct?

MS. FRANCES: Not December.
MR. MATTHEWS: My only point is that we are going to be coming into a time when tourism will pick up again in the spring. We often have difficulty in locating hotels. So the sooner we know the better, so that we
can book a hotel as soon as possible.
MR. DELGADO: We do have a
tentative date in answer to that question. We just need to go ahead and finalize it.

MR. SMILLIE: I think there's lots of room out West.
(Applause.)
MS. FRANCES: On the meeting questions, the January 7 call, if you are really thinking in terms of Apriol, you need to have your agenda pretty much decided in order to get it at all.

MR. DELGADO: Any other questions? If that's the case, I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

MR. DeMURI: Mr. Chairman, I move we adjourn.

MR. DELGADO: Okay, this meeting is
adjourned. Please have a safe trip back home. Thanks again. Happy Holidays.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter concluded at 4:46 p.m.)
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