UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

NATIONAL ORGANIC STANDARDS BOARD

+ + + + +

SPRING 2023 MEETING

+ + + + +

PUBLIC COMMENT WEBINAR

+ + + + +

TUESDAY
APRIL 18, 2023

+ + + + +

The Board met via Videoconference, at 12:00 p.m. EDT, Nathan Powell-Palm, Chair, presiding.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

NATHAN POWELL-PALM, Chair
MINDEE JEFFERY, Vice Chair
AMY BRUCH, Secretary
BRIAN CALDWELL
JERRY D'AMORE
CAROLYN DIMITRI
KIMBERLY HUSEMAN
ALLISON JOHNSON
NATE LEWIS
DILIP NANDWANI
LOGAN PETREY
FRANKLIN QUARCOO
KYLA SMITH
WOOD TURNER

NOP STAFF PRESENT:

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	12:05 p.m.
3	DR. TUCKER: Thank you, Michelle.
4	Hello everyone. I'm Jenny Tucker, Deputy
5	Administrator of the National Organic Program.
6	Welcome to all our National Organic Standards
7	Board members and our audience. We continue to
8	be grateful in our ability to engage in these
9	virtual sessions, which connect us through both
10	time and space.
11	I would particularly like to welcome
12	our two new Board members, Franklin Quarcoo from
13	Tuskegee University in Alabama, and Nathaniel or
14	Nate Lewis from Washington Farmland Trust in
15	Washington state. They just recently joined the
16	Board, and let's give them a Zoom round of
17	applause like this. Welcome.
18	To our public commenters, thank you
19	again for engaging in this process with us. I
20	also thank our audience. You continue to be an
21	important part of the public meeting process.
22	This webinar opens two days of public webinars

1 this week. We then reconvene next week 2 Atlanta, Georgia in person. 3 We also plan to livestream that meeting as we did last fall. Meeting access 4 information for all meeting segments is posted on 5 6 NOSB meeting page on the USDA website. 7 Transcripts for all segments will be posted once This meeting, like all other meetings 8 completed. of the National Organic Standards Board, will be 9 run based on the Federal Advisory Committee Act 10 11 and the Board's policies and procedures manual. 12 I will act as the Designated Federal Officer for meeting segments. Nate Powell Palm, 13 our Board chair, will take the helm for this 14 15 We remind everyone that in an open, session. transparent process mutual respect is critical. 16 17 We ask you in advance to avoid personal attacks 18 and disparagement. 19 This extends also to chats you share. 20 Even if you disagree with a speaker's position, in a public process they deserve the same grace 2.1 22 and respect you would want for yourself. To

1	close, I thank the National Organic Program team,
2	an amazing team that I'm honored to work with
3	every day. So Michelle Arsenault, Jared Clark,
4	Andrea Holm, Johanna Mirenda, and our Standards
5	Director, Erin Healy.
6	I also want to introduce Fred David,
7	our new Assistant Director of Standards, who
8	comes to us from a sister agency at USDA. Let's
9	give the Board, the NOP staff, the audience and
LO	all of our speakers a big round of applause.
L1	Thank you to all of you.
L2	I'm going to now hand the mic back to
13	Michelle, who will a roll call of NOSB members
L 4	and NOP staff. Thank you all for being here.
L5	MS. ARSENAULT: Thank you Jenny. All
L 6	right, Board members. If you could shout out
L7	verbally. There's a whole lot of people on my
L 8	screen now, and I can't see you all. Amy Bruch.
L 9	MEMBER BRUCH: I'm here.
20	MS. ARSENAULT: Good, welcome. Brian
21	Caldwell.

MEMBER CALDWELL: Here.

1		MS.	AR	SENAUL'	Т:	Hi	Brian.	Jerry
2	D'Amore.							
3		MEMB	BER	D'AMORI	Ξ:	Good	morning,	here as
4	well.							
5		MS.	ARS	SENAULT	7:	Good	morning	Jerry.
6	Carolyn Dir	nitri	. •					
7		MEMB	BER	DIMITR	I:	Good	afternoo	on.
8		MS.	AR	SENAUL'	Т:	Hi	Carolyn	. Kim
9	Huseman.							
10		MEMB	BER	HUSEMA	N:	Hello).	
11		MS.	AR	RSENAUL	Т:	Hi	Kim.	Mindee
12	Jeffery.							
13		MEMB	BER	JEFFER	Υ:	Good	morning.	
14		MS.	ARS	SENAULT	· :	Hi M	indee.	Allison
15	Johnson.							
16		MEMB	BER	JOHNSO	N:	Good	morning.	
17		MS.	ARS	SENAULT	: 1	Welcon	ne. Nate	e Lewis.
18		MEMB	BER	LEWIS	:	The	spacebai	r thing
19	didn't wor	k, pr	ese	ent.				
20		MS.	ARS	SENAULT	':	Welco	me Nate.	Yeah,
21	it doesn't	alwa	ys	work.	Di	lip Na	andwani.	
22		MEMB	BER	NANDWA	NI:	Good	d morning	J •

1		MS.	ARS	SENAU:	LT:	Good	morn	ing,	Dilip.
2	Logan Petr	ey.							
3		MEM	BER	PETRI	EY:	Here.			
4		MS.	ARS	SENAU1	LT:	Hello	Loga	n, we	elcome.
5	Nate Powe	11-P	alm.	•					
6		СНА	.IR	POWE:	LL-PA	ALM:	Pre	sent,	, good
7	morning.								
8		MS.	I	ARSENZ	AULT:	:	Hell	Ο,	hello.
9	Franklin Q	uarc	00.						
LO		MEM	BER	QUAR	C00:	Here	•		
L1		MS.	ARS	SENAU:	LT:	Excel	llent	. We	elcome,
12	Franklin.	Kyl	a Sm	mith.					
L3		MEM	BER	SMI	TH:	I'	m h	ere.	Hi
L 4	everybody.								
L 5		MS.	AR	RSENAU	JLT:	Hel	lo K	yla.	Wood
L 6	Turner.								
L7		MEM	BER	TURNI	ER:	Here,	good	morı	ning.
L 8		MS.	AR	SENAU	LT:	Good	morr	ning,	Wood,
L 9	and Javier	Zam	ora.	. I k	pelie	eve Ja	vier'	s not	c going
20	to be with	us	toda	ay, bu	ıt I	didn'	t wan	t to	ignore
21	him on the	e li:	st.	All	righ	nt. 3	Javie	r is	absent
22	todatz so	fo	r t	-ha t	ranc	crint	ionie	+	Jenny

1	already introduced the NOP staff, so I won't do
2	that again. Instead, I'm going to turn it over
3	to you Nate, to get the meeting started.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Well
5	happy spring everybody. I am so excited to see
6	all of your smiling faces, and even more excited
7	to see you all next week in person in Atlanta.
8	So we have a slide, I think that is coming up
9	here.
10	All right. So all speakers will be
11	sorry. All speakers who will be recognized
12	signed up during the registration period.
13	Persons must give their names and affiliations
14	for the record at the beginning of their public
15	comment. Proxy speakers are not permitted.
16	Individuals providing public comments
17	shall refrain from making any personal attacks
18	or remarks that might impugn the character of any
19	individual. Members of the public are asked to
20	define clearly and succinctly the issues they
21	wish to present before the Board.

This will give the NOSB members a

comprehensible understanding of these speakers' 1 I will be -- I will call on speakers 2 concerns. 3 in the order of the schedule and will announce the next person or two, so they can prepare. 4 5 We're going to say the speaker's name and then on 6 deck, and then in the hole as number three. 7 Bringing a little colloquial barrel racing to this experience. 8 9 Please remember to state your name and affiliation, and then we'll start the timer. 10 11 Board members will indicate to me if they have 12 questions, and I will call on them and Board 13 members, please just use the raised hand feature and if I don't hear you, give me a shout out and 14 15 I will make sure we get over to you. Only NOSB members are allowed to ask questions. 16 Our first speaker is going to be Ellie 17 18 Hudson, with Marni Karlin on deck and Michael 19 So any questions from the Crotser in the hole. 20 Board before we get started off? Alrightee. Well with that, let's get kicked off with Ellie 2.1 22 Hudson. Ellie, please state your affiliation and

1	we'll start the timer.
2	MS. HUDSON: Ellie Hudson, Executive
3	Director with Accredited Certifiers Association
4	or ACA.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Go right ahead.
6	MS. HUDSON: Hello NOSB members, NOP
7	and members of the organic community. I'm Ellie
8	Hudson. I work remotely from Traverse City,
9	Michigan, which occupies illegally taken
10	ancestral lands of the Neshnabek Three Fires
11	Confederacy of Ojibwe, Odawa and Potawatomi
12	people.
13	ACA is a non-profit that exists to
14	benefit the accredited organic certifier
15	community and the organic industry. We envision
16	a world in which the USDA organic label is always
17	trusted and valued. Our mission is to ensure
18	consistent implementation of the regulation
19	through collaboration and education.
20	Today I'd like to share some of ACA's
21	strategic priorities in our mission of service.
22	Broadly, we look to develop certifier resources

that can alleviate the pressure often germane to 1 a regulatory environment, and we proactively seek 2 3 ways to add, improve and innovate the value of ACA membership. 4 Currently, a lot of discussion 5 is about the Strengthening Organic final rule or 6 7 With funding from a cooperative agreement SOE. between NOP and ACA, we are aiming to quickly 8 create many avenues for collaboration, discussion 9 10 and alignment around SOE. We are generating new 11 and best practices through several resources 12 working groups. One early focus will be personnel 13 training and qualification or Section H of the 14 15 rule. A needs assessment will inform which resources are most valuable for implementing the 16 17 requirements, while minimizing administrative 18 responsibilities for certifiers and their teams. 19 Also funded through our cooperative 20 partnering agreement, with we are International Organic Inspectors Association or 21 22 IOIA around mentorship of aspiring organic

inspectors. A 2023 mentor cohort will be formed 1 through a request for proposal from qualified 2 3 inspectors. will compensated for 4 Mentors be 5 tracking activity toward developing a mentor job 6 task analysis. The data collected will assist us 7 in creating new resources. We may be able to adapt this pilot program 8 into a long 9 solution for addressing the persistent shortage 10 of available mentorships. Board also identified 11 The ACA 12 strategic need to better understand our 13 supportive membership category, available those who are not accredited certifiers, but have 14 15 an interest in supporting ACA's mission. 16 committed to continuous improvement of member 17 benefits for this and all categories. 18 These initiatives will all be 19 delivered and assisted against a backdrop 20 envisioning an environment where barriers and implicit bias have been eliminated, and where 2.1

everyone has the resources they need to live up

to their full potential. 1 In closing, I thank the NOSB for the 2 3 opportunity to offer this comment. Going first today, means I can be the first to thank you for 4 giving your expertise, time and more, of which we 5 6 all benefit. Thank you. 7 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you. questions from the Board for Ellie. Amy, please 8 go ahead. 9 Ellie, thank you for 10 MEMBER BRUCH: 11 kicking us off here with our public comment 12 process. I really appreciated your information and just kind of the status update you provided 13 on implementation of SOE. 14 That's on everybody's, you know, short list of just, you know, trying to 15 wrap our heads around it and then get ready to 16 execute it. 17 18 I was just curious. On the certifiers 19 located abroad, how is the outreach happening for 20 I know they are members or most of them them? are members of ACA. But I just wondered, just to 2.1

make sure that a consistent implementation is

happening, not only on our shores but globally as 1 well. 2 3 MS. HUDSON: Yeah, I didn't mention our international outreach efforts, but we do, 4 have placed a strategic priority on that. 5 member -- accredited certifiers that are members 6 of ACA receive a lot of communication from us as 7 a matter of course through newsletters and things 8 9 like that. We also discovered recently a fixed 10 11 something that was plaguing access in specific 12 countries. There's not much we can do about countries like China, where the barrier is coming 13 internally. But we were -- our website was not -14 15 - we weren't able to access everything, members couldn't and we recently resolved that, 16 17 which is kind of exciting. 18 And then for NOP supported activity, 19 we work with Robert and David and their teams to 20 sure that like anything that's funded make through this cooperative agreement is available 2.1 22 to all accredited certifiers, SO that

1	communications get out. NOP helps us with that.
2	MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah, I appreciate
3	that.
4	MS. HUDSON: Yeah, me too.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
6	questions from the Board?
7	All right, Ellie, we really appreciate
8	your time. Thank you. Next up we've got Marni
9	Karlin, with Michael Crotser on deck and Heather
10	Spalding in the hole. Marni, the floor is yours.
11	MS. KARLIN: Thanks. Hi, I'm Marni
12	Karlin and I am also here today on behalf of the
13	Accredited Certifiers Association. I want to
14	thank you all again for the opportunity to
15	comment today. I'm pleased to share with NOSB
16	members the NOP and the organic community as a
17	whole, a little bit more about the work that ACA
18	is doing in service of consistency and
19	collaboration and organic certification.
20	I first want to talk a minute about
21	our new lunch and learning series. We launched
22	this last month and we're hosting a series of one

hour sessions on topics of critical importance to 1 entire inspection certification 2 the and 3 community, and the series is open not just to ACA members but to inspectors and certifiers across 4 the board. 5 Last month, over 200 certification and 6 inspection professionals participated in a deep 7 dive into SOE, helping to identify areas of the 8 rule, where they have questions or saw value in 9 collaboration on best practices and other work 10 products. 11 The appetite for this conversation was 12 huge, and the responses generated have given us a roadmap for our SOE work, which Ellie highlighted 13 a little bit and I'll talk a little bit about as 14 15 well. 16 Upcoming lunch and learns include one 17 newly developed livestock present the 18 directive cross-check template for certifiers. This one assured that certifiers' cross-check 19

requests to each other are consistent, efficient,

clear and reflect the NOP livestock directive

requirements.

20

21

1	We'll also offer a lunch and learn
2	diving into the personnel training and
3	qualification requirements, as Ellie discussed
4	briefly a minute ago. As you can tell, this year
5	we're focusing a lot on providing value to
6	certifiers and inspectors surrounding SOE
7	implementation.
8	We also plan to host a deep dive into
9	Section A interpretation, questions related to
10	certification and extensions, as well as efforts
11	on meeting supply chain traceability
12	requirements, and understanding the nitty-gritty
13	of certificate generation in the OID.
14	But of course it's not all SOE all the
15	time. Related to some of the transition efforts,
16	we are working to identify and then address the
17	barriers that organic and transitioning producers
18	face in accessing non-NOP USDA resources. It
19	could be challenging for organic and
20	transitioning producers to access resources at
21	USDA that live outside of NOP.
22	They can face duplicative paperwork

1	requirements, staff who may not always understand
2	organic, their centralized resource hub, and a
3	bureaucracy that at times makes it easier for
4	producers to give up than to pursue the crop
5	insurance, conservation or FSA supports for which
6	they qualify.
7	So our group is diving into these
8	barriers and trying to develop solutions that
9	could help to ease those barriers and increase
10	that access for organic and transitioning
11	producers. We look forward to reporting back on
12	what the group does soon.
13	In closing, I would like to thank you
14	again for the opportunity to comment today, and
15	in particular I'd like to thank each of the NOSB
16	members for choosing to serve our organic
17	community in this way. I know that at times your
18	service may feel under-appreciated, and I want to
19	be certain to say we appreciate you and thank
20	you.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Well, we
22	appreciate that. Thank you very much for your

1	comments Marni. Any questions from the Board?
2	All right. Thank you so much, Marni. Oh, I'm
3	sorry, one moment. Kim, please go ahead.
4	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Thank you, Nate.
5	Sorry for the late hand there, and thank you
6	Marni for your comments today. Can you tell me,
7	what would you say I know you're waiting for
8	the report back, but just initial high level,
9	what would you say would be one of the most
L 0	glaringly obvious transition barriers for farmers
L1	today that you are looking to help bridge?
L2	MS. KARLIN: That's a great question,
L3	and of course you're right. We're working with
L 4	our working group of certifiers and inspectors.
L 5	We're hearing from also producers. We're going
L 6	to engage with USDA to make sure we're getting a
L7	well-rounded assessment.
L 8	So I'll frame all of what I'm about to
L 9	say in the context of I really want to work
20	through the process and hear what folks say, and
21	I will not avoid your question. And so I will
22	say you know I think one of the things that I

that we are hearing, and maybe I mean two of the 1 things that we're hearing that are barriers for 2 3 both transitioning farmers and existing organic farmers in accessing NOP resources. 4 One is around duplicative paperwork 5 6 requirements, and the idea that if we could only 7 figure out a way to write something down once and sort of use it across USDA, wouldn't that sort of 8 9 make it easier and shouldn't be we be able to 10 figure that out. So that's one piece that I'm 11 hearing a lot of. 12 Another piece I'm hearing a lot of is be 13 around how tough it can sometimes producers to navigate resources living in all 14 15 different places, right? Different websites, different phone numbers, different people to talk 16 17 to, etcetera. 18 And while I don't believe that we can 19 solve necessarily sort of the silos that live by 20 virtue of just how large USDA is, I do think we can think about some sort of centralized resource 2.1

hub that folks can go one place to find all of

Τ	the places they need to go.
2	So those are the things I am hearing
3	so far, but I do want to make sure that I say
4	again that I'm looking forward to hearing more
5	from the folks who are really engaging this on
6	the ground.
7	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Fair enough. Thank
8	you. I really appreciate your response.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Logan has a
10	question for you.
11	MEMBER PETREY: Hi. Thank you Marni
12	for coming on. I appreciate that. I am curious.
13	Are you giving the producers are you asking
14	producers or certifiers or inspectors about the
15	transitioning?
16	MS. KARLIN: So where we're starting
17	is a working group with certifiers and
18	inspectors. But we have on our list to make sure
19	we hear from producers, and we're kind of
20	navigating right now, okay how do we how do we
21	best do that to get a representative set? Do we
22	go through certifiers and inspectors to figure

1	out who to talk to, etcetera. So that's a next
2	step that we haven't put into play yet.
3	MEMBER PETREY: And I was going to ask
4	too, are the when you ask what are the
5	barriers, do you have list of central barriers,
6	or are they open-ended and people just opt in?
7	MS. KARLIN: So the first meeting that
8	we had, the first conversation that we had about
9	this, it was open-ended. I didn't sort of cede
10	anything because I didn't want to influence
11	anything, and now I'm taking what has been given
12	to us and I'm using that and I'm continuing to
13	ask the question, and I'm using what we've heard,
14	you know, in the conversation.
15	But the very first I didn't precede
16	anything, because I didn't want to influence it
17	with my thoughts.
18	MEMBER PETREY: Thank you.
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
20	questions for Marni? All right. Oh Carolyn,
21	please go ahead.
22	MEMBER DIMITRI: Oh hi Marni, it's

good to see you. This is a topic that I've 1 thought quite a bit about, and I wonder, the 2 3 hardest part is to find the right producers to talk to, and like really how do you identify 4 who 5 producers might want to transition actually haven't made any like steps forward. 6 7 So I'm just wondering if you can give a little bit more background about how you're 8 really trying to reach that particular very hard 9 10 to find group. Thank you. 11 MS. KARLIN: And thank you, and it's 12 good to see you too. You know, I think I don't have an answer to that yet I think right now, 13 because we are thinking about this work not only 14 in the context of transitioning producers, but 15 also existing organic producers. 16 17 So we have, we don't have an answer to I will say that one of my thoughts is 18 that yet. 19 to engage with those regional leads across the Transition to Organic Partnership Program, 20 probably have a closer handle on what's going on 2.1 22 in their regions, and have probably dove a little

1	further into this question of how do we get to
2	folks and how do we match folks up in farmer to
3	farmer mentoring and those sorts of things.
4	So I think, rather than recreate the
5	wheel, that would be a good resource for us to
6	turn to first.
7	MEMBER DIMITRI: Thank you.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy, please go
9	ahead.
10	MEMBER BRUCH: Hi Marni, so nice to
11	see you. Carolyn's comment actually made me
12	think of this. This topic is really near and
13	dear to a lot of our hearts, is the barrier to
14	transition and then, you know, the continuancy of
15	organic producers to stay into the program.
16	I wonder, do you have access to
17	information that shows how many acres are not
18	getting renewed into organic, and then being able
19	to deep dive into those producers, to then ask
20	them questions, why they are not continuing on
21	with their certification. I feel like that's a

valuable resource right there, to just go into

our network and see what those numbers are and 1 2 how they fluctuate potentially. 3 MS. KARLIN: That is super-I have not -- in my thinking about 4 interesting. keeping folks from the 5 what's non-NOP USDA 6 programs, kind of I have not been thinking about 7 I've been thinking a lot about how do we, how do we figure out in your world of organic 8 9 producers who ought to be getting more support from NRCS or RMA and FSA and is not, and sort of 10 11 why is that, and kind of navigating that path. 12 I like your suggestion too though, and I think that whether that's squarely in the work 13 as we've framed it so far, or whether that's a 14 15 really important additional step. Why do folks -- whether it's access to other NOP, other USDA 16 programs or not, why do folks sort of opt out at 17 18 some point, and is there something that we could 19 do to ease that? 20 That's really interesting. I'm going to write that down. So I don't have a good 2.1 22 answer for you, but that's a great question.

Yeah, no problem. 1 MEMBER BRUCH: Ι appreciate you looking into this. Thank you. 2 3 MS. KARLIN: Uh-huh. CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Allison, please go 4 ahead. 5 6 MEMBER JOHNSON: --my mute button. 7 Good morning. Thank you so much, Marni. This is really exciting to hear, that you're working on 8 9 transition and hear more about you're thinking I'm looking forward to the results 10 about it. 11 that you pull together. 12 I'm curious. As someone who has sort of seen the inner workings of USDA from a lot of 13 different angles, I'd like to hear from you how 14 15 you think the NOSB could be most useful here, you There's a lot of action around the Farm 16 know. 17 Bill; there's a lot of action through the USDA 18 Organic Transition Initiative, and I'm real 19 excited this year to try to put our heads 20 together to think about what more we can do as an organic community to feed those efforts through 2.1

the NOP and through other channels to USDA.

So I'd love if you have any thoughts 1 about where we as a board should focus our 2 3 attention to be additive to those other channels. MS. KARLIN: That's a great, that's a 4 5 great question too, and it's nice to see you. think, you know, I don't have a great answer for 6 7 it yet. I do think that the NOSB obviously plays such a critical role in advancing organic policy 8 and advancing organic across the board, and that 9 there could be opportunity if we find some 10 11 solutions. 12 I don't know what the solutions are 13 yet, but if we find -- if we identify some 14 barriers and some potential solutions, and then 15 there are some bumps in the road in getting those solutions moved forward, perhaps some pressure 16 17 And by pressure, I guess I mean -from NOSB. 18 I've lived in D.C. for too long, so I speak D.C. 19 sometimes. 20 I just mean, you know, maybe a letter or maybe some sort of discussion in a meeting 2.1 22 that says hey, this is -- this is important. We

1	should do this. Maybe that's the kind of thing
2	that would, that would kind of loosen the spots
3	where things were sticky and navigating whether
4	that's at USDA or whether that's, you know, in
5	Congress.
6	I think I am as someone who has
7	worked at both of those places, I am hopeful that
8	we can find some solutions that don't require
9	Congress to act to try to sort of loosen things
LO	up, and I believe that we can. I mean I believe
L1	that there's stuff that we can do outside of the
12	Farm Bill and other legislative processes.
13	But stay tuned, because I as I, as
L 4	we identify what the potential solutions are, I
L5	promise we'll also identify who other organic
L 6	stakeholders and voices are who can be kind of
L7	pushing for them if they so desire.
L8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Well
L 9	thank you very much, Marni. I appreciate your
20	time.
21	MS. KARLIN: Thanks guys.
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up we have

1	Michael Crotser, followed by Heather Spalding and
2	then Amalie Lipstreu. Michael, please go ahead.
3	MR. CROTSER: Good morning, good
4	afternoon. Can everybody see and hear me?
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We can.
6	MR. CROTSER: That's great. I'm Mike
7	Crotser. I'm the certification director at CROPP
8	Cooperative. We appreciate the work of the NOSB
9	and the NOP to support organic agriculture, and
10	thank you for the opportunity to speak.
11	It's spring and the grass is growing
12	and the daffodils have already bloomed. As we
13	enter a new age of enforcement, it also feels
14	like a new season for the organic industry.
15	First, I want to thank the Board's attentiveness
16	to address human capital management, oversight
17	improvement to deter fraud, climate-smart
18	agriculture, sunset review and being the
19	industry's primary voice at the NOP.
20	We also want to mention the importance
21	of the NOP organic livestock compliance
22	initiative, to ensure that ruminant animal

operations meet the requirements for grazing, 1 feed, living conditions, health practices and 2 3 origin of livestock. From our perspective, it appears that 4 this endeavor has expanded to assure slaughter 5 6 eligibility. Supply chains from farm packaging are being looked at to prevent misuse 7 of the organic seal. This eligibility should be 8 9 traced and balanced to origin of livestock records, livestock lists and health records. 10 Purchasers of live animals should have 11 12 certifier-approved fraud prevention measures to keep non-organic meat from entering the supply 13 We support enforcement to determine that 14 15 livestock are under continuous organic management from the last third of gestation. 16 17 The organic beef industry, including 18 our subsidiary, the organic meat company, will see direct benefits from enforcement. 19 It's also 20 the one-year mark since the implementation of the organic livestock rulemaking, which 2.1 clearly 22 aligns with public opinion.

That being said, we have further work 1 to swiftly implement the final organic livestock 2 poultry specifically 3 standards rule, addressing livestock living conditions, health 4 care, humane animal treatment and outdoor access. 5 This is what the public expects and what the 6 7 consumers are looking for. We want to compliment the agency on 8 the publishing of SOE and its goal to reduce 9 fraud and improve operational compliance, and to 10 address the increasing complexity of our supply 11 12 From our perspective, we have concerns on 13 how farmers will adapt to the new rule. Regulatory support and guidance will be needed 14 15 for farmers to develop robust fraud prevention plans and certifier paperwork will be critical to 16 achieve these goals. 17 18 Additionally, focus increased on 19 traceback and mass balances may take farmers by We look to accredited certifiers to 20 surprise. work cooperatively to develop consistent, sound 2.1 22 and sensible templates for these plans.

1	Finally, I want to thank the NOSB and
2	the NOP and the organic industry for the time to
3	speak today, and with that, I'm happy to answer
4	any questions from the Board.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you for your
6	comments. Any questions for Michael from the
7	Board?
8	I want to thank you Michael for giving
9	us a highlight of all that has been accomplished
10	in this last six months. It's really pretty
11	incredible, and we wish you well with your
12	spring.
13	MR. CROTSER: Yep. Thank you
14	everyone.
15	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you. Next
16	up we have Heather Spalding, followed by Amalie
17	Lipstreu and then Julia Barton. Heather, please
18	go ahead.
19	MS. SPALDING: Good afternoon Chairman
20	Powell-Palm and members of the NOSB. I'm Heather
21	Spalding, Deputy Director of Maine Organic
22	Farmers and Gardeners Association, MOFGA. We are

working to create a food system that is healthy
and fair for all. We really appreciate the
opportunity to speak, and thank you so much for
your amazing service.

As this is a Farm Bill reauthorization year, we're supporting several important mark-up bills related to your work, and we describe those in our written comments. I'd be happy to elaborate on that if you have questions, generally we want to see restoration of organic cost share, reduction of barriers organic farming, especially for BIPOC disadvantaged historically communities, addressing the backlog of NOSB recommendations, emergency support for organic dairy, expanded research for organic production, support for climate-smart organic practices, organic literacy throughout USDA's conservation programs, elimination of harm from racist hemp production laws, and relief for farmers hit with PFAS.

We also support federal action to protect organic farms from pesticide and genetic

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

drift, prohibit genetic engineering in organic 1 agriculture and prohibit hydroponic farming under 2 3 the organic label. Regarding your own work plan, we urge 4 you continue collaboration with certifiers, to 5 6 develop consistent templates and guidance for 7 interpretation of new rules, restore in-person oral comments for future NOSB meetings but keep 8 this online opportunity as well. I appreciate 9 it, since I wasn't able to be there and I won't 10 11 be able to be there next week with you. 12 Promote racial equity and access to NOSB initiatives, and consider the impact of NOSB 13 recommendations on historically disadvantaged 14 15 communities; initiate discussion on reducing plastic in organic production. 16 17 I also wanted to mention a couple of 18 things specific to the proposals. We do support 19 the organic and climate-smart agriculture 20 proposal, though we do have concerns about the push for the universal organic system plan, which 2.1

may become too simple, lacking opportunity for

1	detailed explanations about management practices.
2	We support consistent location
3	identification, so that inspectors and others can
4	easily locate a producer, and we wouldn't want
5	this to be a burden on farmers who would like
6	clarity on the expected precision location.
7	We have concerns about using newspaper
8	and other recycled paper as weed barriers, mulch
9	or compost. We're not opposing that
10	recommendation, but we urge ongoing scrutiny to
11	ensure that paper used for these purposes is free
12	of plastic, PFAS and other toxic persistent and
13	bioaccumulative chemicals.
14	Similarly, we have ongoing concerns
15	about the use of plastic mulch. Microplastics in
16	our environment is a serious problem and recovery
17	of plastic mulch is a challenge. Though we
18	support relisting plastic mulch and covers, it is
19	clear that the broader organic community must
20	develop a plan to find ecologically friendly
21	alternatives.
22	MOFGA supports (audio interference)

1	dish liquid. I'm out of time. I just
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Go ahead, finish
3	up.
4	MS. SPALDING: Okay, thank you so
5	much. We just wanted to ensure there's a
6	limitation that only sourced from fish waste
7	bycatch or basin species.
8	The last thing I just want to mention
9	is we continue to work on the impacts of PFAS in
LO	our food and agriculture system, and one thing
L1	that each of you could do is to contact your
L2	members of Congress and encourage their support
L3	for the relief for farmers with the PFAS Act. So
L 4	thank you so much for your time and commitment.
L5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you. I have
L 6	a question from Amy for you.
L7	MEMBER BRUCH: Heather, thank you for
L 8	your time and your written comments as well. I
L 9	really appreciate them and thanks for definitely
20	shining light on this issue with PFAS. I did
21	have a question. Are you seeing on the lands
22	that are contaminated with PFAS, do they also

1	have a similar level of contamination with heavy
2	metals? I see a lot of communication about the
3	PFAS. I just didn't know with the sludge if
4	they're going hand in hand, or if they're not
5	seeing necessarily those correlations.
6	MS. SPALDING: That's a really
7	important question. I appreciate it. I don't
8	have a clear answer for you. The focus really
9	has been on testing for levels of PFAS in the
10	soil and water, and also in farm products, and
11	even in the body burdens of the farmers
12	themselves.
13	But we know that heavy metals,
14	dioxins, furans, many persistent chemicals have
15	been used in sludge, you know, or are found in
16	sludge and also have been used in various
17	materials historically on farmlands. So it is
18	very important, but our focus really has been on
19	PFAS.
20	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you.
21	MS. SPALDING: Uh-huh.
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other

1	questions for Heather?
2	I have a quick question for you,
3	Heather.
4	MS. SPALDING: Sure.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Given your very
6	comprehensive list of items that you are
7	supporting or that you'd like us to work more on,
8	could you elevate the one thing that you think
9	for Maine farmers is most important for keeping
10	current organic farmers on the land, and driving
11	demand so that we have market demand for more
12	farmers, more organic farmers to be on the land?
13	Could you speak to that at all for your region?
14	MS. SPALDING: Well, I think that
15	there are several crises that we're facing right
16	now, and we have a challenge with labor and
17	training the next generation and the next, the
18	labor workforce is really important. Addressing
19	farm labor laws is something that we're
20	continuing to work on as well.
21	Access to land is incredibly
22	important. These are bigger issues, so these are

But I heard that 1 not to your work with NOSB. 2 that's what you're asking, like the bigger 3 questions. CHAIR POWELL-PALM: It is. 4 5 MS. SPALDING: Okay, and so access to 6 land, access to labor and also support 7 dealing with climate change and the challenges that come with dramatically shifting weather 8 9 patterns. Drought is a huge concern for all of the sectors of agriculture in Maine. 10 11 And then I would say that, you know, 12 we have -- we're a small state. We have a really 13 good relationship with our, with our public service providers, with our -- with NRCS, with 14 15 the USDA offices. I think that we may, maybe are not in the same boat that many of the farmers 16 17 across the country are, some of the challenges 18 they're facing with organic literacy, 19 example, in the USDA offices and state offices. 20 But we definitely need more support and we need more resources, technical assistance 2.1

capital

and

access

to

and

22

to

access

1	infrastructure. That is, we have invested pretty
2	heavily in Maine in helping farms scale up their
3	infrastructure, but there was a program to
4	distribute \$20 million to farmers in Maine.
5	It went very quickly, and there was
6	probably closer to \$180 million worth of very
7	legitimate applications needing infrastructure.
8	So it's all of the above, but we really are
9	grateful to you for the work that you're doing to
10	defend the integrity of the organic standards,
11	because in the end, that's really the most
12	important thing that farmers have is their label.
13	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We really
14	appreciate your time. Thank you.
15	MS. SPALDING: Thank you so much.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up with
17	Amalie Lipstreu, followed by Julia Barton and
18	then Jay Feldman. Amalie, the floor is yours.
19	MS. LIPSTREU: Thank you, Nate. Good
20	afternoon. My name is Amalie Lipstreu, and I'm
21	the Policy Director for the Ohio Ecological Food
22	and Farm Association.

As an organization that is a certifier 1 as well as an educator and a policy shop, we 2 3 benefit from input along many areas of the chain, 4 organic supply from supporting transitioning utilizing 5 producers to USDA 6 programming, understanding roadblocks and 7 opportunities, and often the larger existential threats to the viability of the National Organic 8 9 Program. You're going to hear from a number of 10 11 OEFFA farmers this week, sharing important 12 reflections they have as practitioners. Thev're The first is that this 13 engaged for two reasons. is their livelihood. For our farmers to have a 14 living into the future, the integrity of organic 15 agriculture is paramount. 16 17 second farmer But the reason our 18 are engaged is that OEFFA has staff members 19 dedicated to pulling folks together, providing 20 background materials and fostering discussions. This takes time and is work we invest in to help 2.1 22 inform both the Board and the NOP.

broader feedback 1 Тο foster with additional 2 farmers, please consider the 3 suggestions presented by my colleague, Barton, who will be speaking next. Thank you for 4 keeping organic as climate-smart front and center 5 6 on the Board agenda.

It will be incumbent upon all organic growers and advocates to illustrate how the holistic suites of synergistic practices that is organic agriculture provides more than the sum of its parts. USDA likely will not come easily as industrial agriculture, which has been more of a contributing factor than a solution to climate change. It's still well-entrenched at the agency.

But you are already lifting up voluntary and solutions nature of organic. We thank you for leading the way and encourage your persistence. And remember, advocating for organic to be considered climate-smart cannot be done effectively or with moral authority unless organic agriculture remains а soil-based

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1	standard.
2	There are likely even fewer studies on
3	the full life cycle, energy analysis of
4	hydroponic growing systems than there are studies
5	showing the climate benefits of organic farming
6	and ranching. Hydroponic growing systems have a
7	place, but not in organic or in climate friendly
8	production. Thank you.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any questions for
10	Amalie? And I apologize, I think it's a hard
11	"A." So Amalie. If I keep getting this wrong,
12	please correct me.
13	MS. LIPSTREU: Okay.
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Jerry, please go
15	ahead.
16	MEMBER D'AMORE: Yes, hello. A quick
17	question in terms of hydroponics not having a
18	place. Is there any thought that it may not have
19	the current thought of a place? But I mean would
20	you would one, should one argue hydroponics in
21	places where you just flat can't grow in the

desert? We've had a very narrow band around the

world where conventional agriculture actually 1 Outside of that, doesn't hydroponic have 2 3 a home? I think hydroponic does MS. LIPSTREU: 4 have a place. I think that the problem comes if 5 6 we try to apply the organic certification moniker 7 on the hydroponic, and the idea of, you know, where we're looking or climate-friendly solutions 8 to types of systems approaches that will help 9 both mitigate and adapt to the climate crisis. 10 11 We definitely need to lift up organic 12 I don't think hydroponic necessarily is systems. something that is a climate friendly practice per 13 I think we do need more full life cycle 14 se. analysis of hydroponic production systems to look 15 at all of the kind of energy demands relative to 16 production output as well. 17 18 MEMBER D'AMORE: Well thank you for I would just say that there's -- it's a 19 that. big world out there, and to say categorically 20 that it doesn't have a place is perhaps limiting 2.1 22 what we might be looking at. Thank you very

1	much.
2	MS. LIPSTREU: Yeah, and just to be
3	clear, I said it doesn't have a place in organic
4	or climate-smart. I didn't say it doesn't have a
5	place. I said it does have a place.
6	MEMBER D'AMORE: Yeah, then I thank
7	you. And then I'll correct myself and suggest
8	that it might have it in those two places too if
9	we're broader in the way we look at it. Thank
10	you.
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you for the
12	question Jerry, and your time Amalie. Any other
13	questions from the Board?
14	All right, thank you. Next up, we
15	have Julia Barton, followed by Jay Feldman and
16	then Abby Youngblood. Julia, the floor is yours.
17	MS. BARTON: Hi, thank you. Can you
18	hear me okay?
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yeah, thank you.
20	MS. BARTON: Okay. My name is Julia
21	Barton with the Ohio Ecological Food and Farm
22	Association. We appreciate the opportunity to

participate in this important public process. 1 think this process is so important that we want 2 3 to make sure as many organic farmer stakeholders opportunity to participate 4 the possible. 5 6 OEFFA's comments are informed by 7 several work groups, an organic work group, a crop insurance work group and the Ohio Organic 8 9 Farmer Researcher Network, which we co-facilitate 10 along with our partners at Central State 11 University and the Ohio State University. 12 the past, you have heard from Ιn several OEFFA members and as Amalie said, you'll 13 14 hear from some more this week, some new, some 15 We thank you for holding these returning. virtual comment opportunities. 16 Let's hold them in the in-person meeting too. 17 18 Comments, whether shared in person or 19 online, should all be treated the same, and the opportunity for engagement with the Board should 20 be open in both venues. We also have a few ideas 2.1 22 to help increase access to farmers and community

members. We ask you to consider the following 2 suggestions: 3 We wonder if the open docket could be greater use, to keep the lines 4 put to 5 communication open between the spring and fall meetings, with questions for the community in 6 7 areas where the Board needs more information, especially at times when farmers are more likely 8 9 to be able to participate. We request structured opportunity for interaction with the 10 Board in the winter. 11 12 One OEFFA farmer, Corey Struck, suggested a winter listening session. 13 session could be timed to help inform 14 15 meeting materials for the fall meeting. 16 detailed and swiftly published Subcommittee 17 These would help us to follow along with 18 the thinking of the Board, and to take time to 19 discuss ideas amongst our work groups while you 20 all are discussing them in committee. 21 We need access to the meeting 22 materials for a longer period of a time ahead of

comment submission. We are wondering could there 1 be a soft publishing say, of the discussion 2 3 documents and proposals ahead of the Federal Register notice? We can anticipate the materials 4 that will be on the agenda, and we can reference 5 6 previous information in this regard. 7 But we cannot anticipate your ideas discussion documents when it comes to 8 and We want to put the time in to provide 9 proposals. you with substantive feedback, and we need more 10 time with full information in order to do so. 11 12 you know, robust group process and thoughtful discussion takes a lot of time. 1.3 An additional arena in which we need 14 15 to increase access has to do with racial equity. We support NOC's racial equity comments and we 16 17 have two specific asks. First, please conduct 18 anti-racism and cultural sensitivity training for 19 NOSB members, and secondly, please add racial 20 equity as a work agenda item under the CACS Committee. 2.1 22 This agenda item is needed to help

2	through the many efforts of the NOSB, with the
3	goal of challenging rather than repeating
4	patterns of structural racism in USDA programs.
5	We appreciate your efforts and your (audio
6	interference) this process increasingly
7	accessible to stakeholders. Thank you.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you for your
9	comments. Any questions for Julia? Nate, please
10	go ahead. Oh sorry. Nate, then Allison and Amy.
11	MEMBER LEWIS: Had to find my raised
12	hand button. Hi Julia, good to see you.
13	MS. BARTON: Hi Nate.
14	MEMBER LEWIS: I'm curious. I've seen
15	the comments reference the CACS Committee,
16	Subcommittee for Racial Equity component. I'm
17	curious the thinking behind that particular
18	committee as opposed to all the committees or the
19	policy committee or whatever. I just want to
20	stand on that a little bit.
21	MS. BARTON: Yeah. We had floated
22	this previously as potentially like just an

ensure that racial equity is a thread woven

1	addenda topic for the whole board, and we had
2	heard feedback that it might fit better in the
3	CACS Committee. So we call it CACS. What do you
4	all call it?
5	MEMBER LEWIS: CACS.
6	MS. BARTON: Okay, CACS. We'll go
7	with that, yeah. We had heard that it may fit
8	better over there. So we're open to whatever.
9	We just our experience with working groups as
10	maybe analogous to your experience with
11	committees is that when we start sitting around
12	talking about things together, we figure out a
13	lot of barriers and solutions. But we'd like to
14	see some specific attention paid in that regard.
15	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up, Allison.
16	MEMBER JOHNSON: Thank you. Thanks so
16	much for your comments, Julia. I really
17	much for your comments, Julia. I really
17	much for your comments, Julia. I really appreciate your continued attention to racial
17 18 19	much for your comments, Julia. I really appreciate your continued attention to racial equity, as well as the work that you've been

1	And I'm curious if you could speak a
2	little bit to the connections that you see
3	between needing the Board to focus on racial
4	equity and how that relates to continuing to
5	build a strong organic movement.
6	MS. BARTON: Sure. That's a big one.
7	So the movement is built on the practices of
8	indigenous peoples all around the world, right,
9	and they often don't get credit for it because
10	much of our white supremacist focus is on things
11	that are written down, and the practices of
12	indigenous peoples all around the world that are
13	the foundation of organic agriculture and the
14	movement are frequently not written.
15	So we have an inherent bias in terms
16	of privileging information that's written down.
17	We forget sometimes to honor the big picture
18	global organic movement in our discussions that
19	often focus on specific standards and kind of set
20	aside the four IFOAM principles.
21	But I think it's a good reminder to
22	connect ourselves to the foundations of the

movement, and honor the work of people that came 1 2 long before us and the people that will be here 3 long after we're gone. So I don't think the connection could 4 5 really be any closer. This is just a thing that 6 we have to spend time on and that we owe it to 7 ourselves to spend time on, to make our movement more accessible to all people, including the 8 people on whose backs it was built. 9 10 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy has a question 11 for you. 12 MEMBER BRUCH: Julia, thanks for your time today. Thanks also for OEFFA's outreach to 13 14 farmers and just getting them into 15 That's really important, and I'm conversation. excited to ask them questions later on on some of 16 17 the topics, the crop insurance especially. 18 But I wanted to ask, looking 19 at just standardizing the location, consistent 20 location information, there was some comments about members in the community that don't have 2.1 22 access to technology or limited access to

technology. And you know, there was information 1 on how addresses are getting, getting collected 2 from those individuals. 3 I wondered, is it possible to get the 4 legal addresses? Is that something that is -- is 5 it common communication structure with folks that 6 don't have access to technology? Are they still 7 leveraging the legal address system, the township 8 9 range, etcetera? 10 MS. BARTON: Yes. They're a little 11 bit more about the legal address system. How is 12 that different from like a typical mailing address, Amy? 13 14 MEMBER BRUCH: Oh sure. A mailing 15 address, you know, could be like 1318 Row B, for example, where a legal address on a parcel would 16 17 be like a township and range, so that that parcel 18 could be like 3411-1, where you'd have your --19 just a different method to communicate parcels, 20 which you know, that's essentially what assessor is used to identify with the location, and you 2.1 22 pay property tax based on that information,

1	etcetera.
2	And it's the system that, you know,
3	indirectly is used or directly is used by FSA and
4	RMA as well.
5	MS. BARTON: Okay, sure. So that
6	helps me a little bit. I will state first of all
7	that my colleague, Sal Pinkham, will be speaking
8	to this topic specifically, and would be a good
9	person to ask our certification programs
10	perspective.
11	I will share that in our work groups,
12	the folks that are working with FSA said it would
13	be great if the certifiers and the FSA could go
14	ahead and talk to each other, you know, if USDA
15	programs could communicate and collaborate. That
16	was a big, you know, like they'll make us give
17	you this information again.
18	If we've already registered with FSA,
19	pull it from their database. And then in terms
20	of the technology use, we'll have two clean
21	community members will be commenting on Thursday,
22	who have, you know, will be speaking their own

1	thoughts on this topic.
2	Right now, OEFFA uses primarily
3	mailing addresses and maps, and those maps are
4	sometimes FSA maps, NRCS maps, Google maps,
5	sometimes they're hand drawn. So that's what
6	we're using presently. But Sal will have a lot
7	more detailed information on this for you.
8	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay, excellent.
9	Thanks so much, Julia. I appreciate it.
10	MS. BARTON: Thank you.
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Mindee, please go
12	ahead.
13	MEMBER JEFFERY: Thanks Julia so much
14	for all your work. To be clear, were you
15	suggesting earlier that a winter listening
16	session specifically for farmers could
17	potentially resolve the tension around the timing
18	of the meeting and be a great compromise? I'm
19	not sure if there's a path for that, but we've
20	got what you were meaning.
21	MS. BARTON: So that was a
22	recommendation that came from a farmer in

1	Illinois Corey Struck, who's a member of a couple
2	of OEFFA's work groups, and I thought it was a
3	really creative idea. We are solutions-oriented
4	at OEFFA, right? So we look for barriers and
5	then we look for ways to get them out of our way.
6	We heard that you all put your due
7	diligence, especially Michelle, and we appreciate
8	you Michelle, but her due diligence into that
9	effort around the timing of the meetings. And so
L 0	we wanted to think about other ways that we could
L1	make this work. Hence, our list of needs there
L2	Mindee.
L3	So if, you know, if you all are able
L 4	to work that into your schedule, that would work
L5	great for us. So but we're looking for multiple
L 6	access points, like a web of access if that could
L7	be imagined.
L 8	MEMBER JEFFERY: Thank you.
L 9	MS. BARTON: Thank you.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Thank
21	you so much Julia.
22	MS. BARTON: Thank you.

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up we have
2	Jay Feldman, followed by Abby Youngblood and then
3	Terry Shistar. Jay, please go ahead.
4	MR. FELDMAN: Hi, I'm Jay Feldman,
5	Executive Director of Beyond Pesticides, and a
6	former NOSB member. Thank you for your service.
7	This meeting of the NOSB affirms the critical
8	role of the Board in engaging the public in a
9	transparent process governed by stakeholders that
10	is unique in the governmental regulatory system.
11	Unique by design to think and operate
12	holistically outside the silos of individual
13	practices or exposure to individual chemicals.
14	NOSB authority establishes a credibility and
15	integrity that is often lost in the typical
16	governmental processes. We must celebrate what
17	has been achieved under the Organic Foods
18	Production Act, OFPA, and fiercely defend it as
19	well.
20	As members of the NOSB, you are not
21	just fulfilling a role in a niche market. You
22	are affirming and defending methods that are

1	intended to establish integrity, incentivize
2	innovation, challenge critical conventional
3	wisdom our cutting edge and established public
4	trust in the organic label.
5	With your statutory
6	authority, you can advise the Secretary that any
7	efforts to weaken this authority limit the
8	leadership role of the Board or fail to carry out
9	National List decisions and undermining of your
10	authority and public trust. You have our
11	submitted comments on all the issues before you.
12	I'd like to focus on the petition and
13	technical review for potassium sorbate, KS, as
14	both instructive and affirming of the critical
15	role of the NOSB. You have the authority to
16	reject KS for the proposed use. The TR clearly
17	defines the elements of review not addressed by
18	the petition, that are integral to organic
19	systems, effects to health, environment,
20	compatibility with organic, essentiality.
21	Let's take soil. The discussion
22	document states "KS antimicrobial properties and

1	characteristics could alter the microbe bio in
2	the soil. It is reasonable to expect that it
3	would inhibit the growth of soil microorganisms
4	and a significant number of organisms regarded as
5	beneficial are suppressed."
6	The authority vested in this Board
7	under OFPA to ensure soil management as part of a
8	biological system that replaces dependency on
9	petrochemical pesticides and fertilizers, is a
10	principle found nowhere under policies of other
11	statutes governing acceptable levels of
12	purposefully added toxins in agriculture, the
13	food supply and the management of land.
14	The petition process, the sunset
15	review as originally conceived by Congress, and
16	the TR review put the NOSB in key leadership
17	position to take on the current existential
18	health crises, biodiversity collapse and the
19	climate emergency and ensure a livable future.
20	Organic must lead in how we manage the
21	soil, suppress the carbon, take petrochemical
22	pesticides and fertilizers out of land

1	management, and then under continuous
2	improvement, how we move to eliminate plastics
3	and adopt non-polluting disinfection practices.
4	Without a strong OFPA and NOSB we will not (audio
5	interference) future. Thank you.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you so much
7	for your comments. Any questions for Jay? I
8	have a quick question for you, Jay. Given your
9	earlier part of your comments, if we were to stop
10	needing to look and hunt for existential threats
11	from USDA (audio interference) the NOSB, what
12	would be strongest and fastest way to drive
13	organic demand in the marketplace?
14	If we see unsatisfied six percent of
15	the market being organic, how do we talk about
16	organic and where would you say are the greatest
17	(audio interference)? I'm not sure what the
18	MR. FELDMAN: Yeah. I mean I think
19	that's a really great question, because you know,
20	like you I'm sure you sense, like I do, a fair
21	amount of frustration on the part of the public
22	as to what we can do as individuals, as part of

these existential crises. 2 3 We really see, as I tried to convey here, that organic intersects with mitigation of 4 So when we're talking about the 5 these crises. 6 standards that you review, say I used potassium an example of a petition because 7 sorbate as you're looking at health, health impacts. 8 You're 9 looking at biodiversity impact. You're looking at compatibility with organic systems, which are 10 11 biological systems, soil systems, microbios like 12 the TR identifies. And so I think to the extent that we 13 a community that 14 message as this 15 solution and it's cross-cutting, it's intersectional, we have a huge opportunity to 16 17 really get the public behind this. Remember of 18 course, that organic happened through voluntary 19 action by consumers in the marketplace. As we 20 ramp up public understanding of the value, I think we grow the market. 2.1 22 But the issue of integrity, Nate

communities, as part of organizations, to effect

1	behind all this is critical. The label has to be
2	viewed with trust. So what you guys
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Hold on one
4	second, Jay. Michelle, is it possible to mute
5	everybody.
6	MS. ARSENAULT: If I mute everyone, it
7	seems like they keep being
8	PARTICIPANT: You guys have some major
9	Zoom bombers in here, just so you know. You've
10	got to lock it down.
11	(Off record comments.)
12	MS. ARSENAULT: We will, when we
13	identify whose mic it was, we are muting them and
14	we will
15	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thanks, Jay.
16	Brian has a question for you.
17	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yeah. Thanks, Jay.
18	I'm very much receptive to all the issues with
19	plastics that have been raised and all the
20	comments that we've received, and but it's an
21	incredibly entrenched and difficult issue.
22	I would just wonder if you have any

ideas on how we could start to address it, or if 1 you don't, I would just really strongly suggest 2 3 that Beyond Pesticides and a bunch of the groups that we've heard from, MOFGA if you're 4 still listening and other farmer and consumer 5 6 groups, could really try to look at sort of a 7 fast forward for this, because I can't see it personally myself very clearly at all, but I 8 9 would love to hear your comments and others. 10 MR. FELDMAN: Yeah. Well, great 11 question. I really think it is going to have to 12 be collaborative effort on everybody's part, and 13 the great thing again about the holistic approach that you all take as a board and, you know, the 14 15 organic systems approach takes, we're looking at cradle to grave issues. 16 17 We're considering not only production 18 practices and plastic there, we're considering 19 So we have an opportunity to packaging as well. 20 start in every area to question what alternatives are available. We write extensively and have for 2.1 years on mulching systems that are not plastic-22

2	We've talked about, you know,
3	packaging that is not plastic oriented and
4	container liners and so forth and so on. So I
5	think we could piece it, you know, apart, take it
6	apart, look at the various venues in which we as
7	a community engage, from production through
8	packaging, through handling you know, and look at
9	all those points along that continuum in which we
10	are utilizing plastic.
11	I think we can do it. Again, this to
12	me fits under the rubric of continuous
13	improvement, which is part of our ethic, right?
14	So if we start small, we can grow it out in a
15	pretty short period of time I believe.
16	MEMBER CALDWELL: Great, thank you.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, thank
18	you Jay. Next up we have Abby Youngblood,
19	followed by Carrie Shistar and then Pryor
20	Garnett.
21	MS. YOUNGBLOOD: Good afternoon. I am
22	Abby Youngblood, Executive Director at the

based.

National Organic Coalition or NOC, and today I'd 1 like to address three topics, in-person oral 2 3 comments, additions to the NOSB work agenda and NOC's Farm Bill advocacy. 4 I would like to applaud the National 5 6 Organic Program for expanding the opportunities 7 for stakeholders to participate virtually, first by creating the oral comment webinars several 8 years ago and more recently by providing the NOSB 9 10 meeting livestream. 11 These virtual opportunities increase 12 public participation, but thev are not substitute for in-person connection. 13 I urge the Board to return to the hybrid approach that was 14 15 used before the pandemic. Please give public stakeholders choice, either webinar 16 а 17 comments or in-person comments. They are the 18 only participatory part of the NOSB meeting, and 19 they do (audio interference). 20 MS. ARSENAULT: Abby, can you hang on one second please? 2.1 I just muted the entire 22 group. Hang on one second while we manage some

1	hackers here.
2	(Pause.)
3	MS. ARSENAULT: All right. I think we
4	have it managed. I'm going to ask you to unmute
5	yourself again, Abby. I need to give you
6	permission to do that. There you go. Okay,
7	sorry for the interruption.
8	MS. YOUNGBLOOD: Thank you, Michelle.
9	Of course, the worse nightmare for the
10	organizers, but good job managing the situation.
11	So I was talking about in-person comments as the
12	only participatory part of the NOSB meeting, and
13	they give attendees and especially farmers a
14	reason to come to the meeting.
15	I'd like you to know that both last
16	fall and this spring, we did have significant
17	farmer interest in NOSB participation and in the
18	scholarships that we provide to farmers to
19	attend. Farmers who take time away from their
20	operations to attend the NOSB meeting should have
21	a chance to speak directly to the Board, to the
22	National Organic Program and the full community

about the issues they care about during in-person meetings.

Second, I want to address several topics for inclusion on the NOSB work agenda. We are looking forward to the organic livestock and poultry standards rule being finalized very soon we hope. But that will just not fully address humane management of organic swine. This topic should be added to the NOSB work agenda, to give all stakeholders the chance to participate in the development of standards.

Next, NOC is concerned about the lack of standards for greenhouse and container The NOSB must begin work on this production. topic to ensure consistency across certifiers, and the NOSB should address topics such as the disposal of effluence from containers, certifiers treat land that's been converted to container production, and the use of greenhouses where prohibited material was applied to previous crop.

22 Another area of concern, as you've

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

been hearing about and talking about, is the use 1 of plastics and organic. We would like to see 2 3 the organic movement out in front of reducing environmental contamination caused by plastics. 4 5 We recognize that we can't remove all plastic use 6 overnight, but we want to see the organic 7 community make some progress. CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All 8 right, we appreciate your comments, Abby. Questions from 9 10 the Board. Allison and then Jerry, please go ahead. 11 12 MEMBER JOHNSON: Thank you. Thanks so 13 much for your comments Abby and for your grace in 14 handling the interruption. If you had a few more 15 seconds of anything you wanted to close out, we would welcome you to do that. 16 17 also wanted to recognize Ι 18 comments on racial equity. You did a great job 19 summarizing past comments and the sort of 20 trajectory that we've been on, and I'm curious if you could take a moment to speak to the outreach 21 22 that you've been doing and what you're hearing

particularly from producers of color about their 1 interest in organic or lack thereof, and what 2 3 you think the NOSB in particular can do to help facilitate a more open dialogue and participation 4 over a wider range of producers in organic. 5 6 MS. YOUNGBLOOD: Thanks for the 7 question Allison, and I just want to start by recognizing the work of NOC's Racial 8 Equity 9 Committee in thinking about those issues, 10 thinking about the role of the NOSB and putting 11 together the comments. is part of a group of 12 NOC many 13 different organizations in the organic community that are exploring how we can build deeper 14 15 partnerships with organizations that serve black farmers, indigenous farmers, other farmers of 16 17 color. 18 We're kind of at the beginning stages 19 of deepening those relationships, but one of the 20 things that we're finding is there's a lot of interest in using organic practices and, 2.1 22 example, there was a survey done by National

Coalition the survey 1 Young Farmers and 2 respondents report a very high percentage, above 3 percent using regenerative or sustainable less than 30 4 practices, but percent 5 certified as organic. So in terms of organic practices and 6 7 the benefits that come from those practices, I think there's a lot of interest among diverse 8 9 I think that part of the gap is a farmers. little bit what my colleague Julia was referring 10 11 to, kind of lack of acknowledgment of where our 12 movement comes from and lack of connection to 13 some of those practices. But I think the -- I guess the other 14 15 thing I'd say is we are committed to having more 16 conversations about this topic, and the next conversation that we're planning will 17 be 18 Atlanta on April 24th, so next Monday. In the 19 pre-NOSB meeting, we'll be hearing directly from 20 farmers in the southeast region, and it's a very group farmers from different. 2.1 diverse of

backgrounds.

1	The theme of that farmer panel is
2	helping more farmers go organic. So I think
3	we'll be hearing more from farmers who are using
4	organic practices, most of whom are certified
5	organic, but they're thinking about how to help
6	more farmers from diverse backgrounds pursue
7	organic certification. I think we can learn a
8	lot by listening to farmers at this stage.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Jerry, please go
10	ahead.
11	MEMBER D'AMORE: Yeah. Hey Abby, I
12	just want to thank you for the way you positioned
13	your comments regarding greenhouses and
14	containers. You left the door open for
15	discussion, and I appreciate that. Thank you.
16	MS. YOUNGBLOOD: We look forward to
17	the leadership of the NOSB and fostering more
18	discussion in that area. So thank you for
19	considering that topic.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Carolyn, please go
21	ahead.
22	MEMBER DIMITRI: Hi Abby. I want you

to speculate about something which I don't think 1 anyone has the answer to. But do you think that 2 3 there is any value -- oh, not value. If say the -- we could have greenhouse 4 know, 5 container standards, that you 6 through the typical process and are made into, you know, rulemaking and everything, do you think 7 that that would like help settle a little bit 8 some of these divisions that we're seeing in the 9 10 organic world now because of the hydroponic situation? 11 12 MS. YOUNGBLOOD: Thank you for the I'll go on record stating what I think 13 question. most of you know, the National Organic Coalition 14 15 does not believe that hydroponic systems should be certified as organic. I will also say that we 16 do have to think about which kinds of production 17 18 systems are soil-based systems and which are not. 19 And so figuring out where we draw that 20 line is a challenge, and I think the Board can play a role in helping to figure that out. 2.1 22 course, the Board has worked on this issue

1	before, but I do think it's time for the Board to
2	work on the issue again.
3	I think that there is a need for more
4	clarity around some of the situations that I
5	mention in my comments, where there is not
6	consistency from one certifier to the next.
7	It's pretty egregious for us to ignore that
8	inconsistency. So we have to talk about and work
9	on these issues, and find a path forward.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Jerry, go ahead.
11	MEMBER D'AMORE: Yeah. A quick
12	comment to what's been said is I think part of
13	the problem is is that we have failed to
14	segregate under the broad term CEA, the fact that
15	we're dealing with two different issues entirely.
16	One is climate control, a structure, and one is
17	a delivery system for nutrients, etcetera.
18	So there's a lot to tease out here,
19	and I think there is a lot of room for good
20	discussion. Thank you.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Thank
22	you so much for your comments, Abby. We really

1	appreciate it. All right. Next up we have Terry
2	Shistar, followed by Pryor Garnett and then Kate
3	Mendenhall.
4	(Pause.)
5	MS. ARSENAULT: I just need a sec to
6	get your slides up and then we can start.
7	There's a little bit of a delay sometimes.
8	Thanks. I believe we can see the slides now.
9	MS. SHISTAR: Okay. My name is Terry
10	Shistar, and I'm on the Board of Directors at
11	Beyond Pesticides. I'm going to address four
12	issues today. Climate change is an emergency
13	that deserves to be met with the sense of urgency
14	that we don't see from NOP. For organic to be
15	climate-smart, NOP and certifiers must hold
16	organic producers to the letter and spirit of
17	OFPA, which requires that organic production be
18	soil-based, incorporate diversity and protect the
19	environment.
20	Operations based on hydroponics or
21	confined animal facilities and those that replace
22	native ecosystems with organic farms do not meet

1 these requirements. The NOSB has made its position clear 2 3 on these issues, and must insist that NOP and certifiers consistently enforce the law, for the 4 sake of reducing climate change, biodiversity 5 6 loss and human health impacts, as well It is critical that NOP asks what more 7 fairness. should USDA be doing to advance organic? 8 9 Because ion exchange creates chemical change, all organic ingredients processed in this 10 11 manner must be subject to review by the NOSB. 12 Please see our written comments for application of the materials classification guidance to ion 13 14 exchange. 15 Chemicals and the ion exchange resins may leak into the food product. 16 The Handling 17 Subcommittee proposal to allow any and all resins 18 without review or disclosure to consumers is 19 unacceptable. To maintain the integrity of the 20 organic label, resins must be subject to full

National List review, rather than establishing a

blanket allowance in organic processing.

2.1

Only resins approved for this 1 should be allowed in organic food processing, and 2 3 only when they and the treated ingredients are approved and listed on 605(b). Chemicals added 4 5 during the ion exchange process must be listed on the label. 6 7 Plastic mulch is part of a larger issue relating to the use of plastic in organic 8 production and handling. Awareness is growing 9 about the impacts of plastic and the microplastic 10 11 particles resulting from its use on human health 12 and the environment. Plastics manufacture requires transportation of hazardous chemicals, 13 such as those involved in the recent derailment 14 15 in East Palestine, Ohio. Plastic mulch should not be relisted. 16 17 The NOSB should initiate a strategy to eliminate 18 all uses of plastic in organic production and 19 packaging. Finally, phase out materials on --20 (Simultaneous speaking.) --are produced using 2.1 MS. SHISTAR: 22 chemical pesticides and fertilizers with the

1	attendant dangers to people, the environment and
2	the climate. Materials should not remain on 606
3	if they can be supplied organically. The NOSB
4	should ask what are the barriers to providing an
5	organic form of this ingredient, and could the
6	need be met if the organic form is required?
7	Thank you.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you for your
9	comments. Any questions from the Board? Allison
10	has a question.
11	MEMBER JOHNSON: Thanks so much Terry.
12	I am wrestling with the same issues that you
13	raised around ion exchange. I was pretty
14	convinced by the comments in the fall that the
15	resins are inert and are intended to not interact
16	with the materials that pass through, and that if
17	they're properly functioning they shouldn't.
18	But we do have, you know, knowledge
19	about plastics reaching lots of vessels that hold
20	materials, actually interacting (audio
21	interruption).
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Please continue on

2	MEMBER JOHNSON: Yeah, just waiting
3	for that to silence. And so I'm curious where
4	you think we can practically draw the line. I
5	absolutely agree that over time, we'd like to see
6	a phase out of plastics. We'd like to see a
7	phase out of materials that we know can have
8	chemical interactions.
9	But I'm also very sympathetic to the
10	practical need to draw a line somewhere, and here
11	to me I'm mostly comfortable with the resins
12	being in a place where we can say, you know, it
13	may not be perfect, but let's keep an eye on it.
14	Let's see if there are testing options
15	that we could use to ensure that we're confident
16	that there is no interaction, but to make a
17	decision at this point based on the best
18	knowledge that we have and the intended use of
19	these products as being simply something that a
20	material passes through.
21	So I'm curious if you could speak to
22	your take on how we can do that line drawing,

Allison.

keep the organic industry functioning and moving 1 forward and also sort of use our best judgment to 2 revisit these issues in the future? 3 Okay. Well you -- you 4 MS. SHISTAR: the and 5 know. with both plastics the ion 6 exchange, I think we're talking about things that 7 are pre-existing problems. We're not, we're not gatekeepers in 8 beina the in this, these 9 situations. We're now looking at things that are out there and we're discovering that there may be 10 11 bigger issues than we ever thought there were. 12 And I guess I'm old enough that I've been through the plastics revolution, right? 13 When I was younger, a lot of things that we now 14 15 use plastics for we don't -- we didn't use plastics for then. 16 17 And so I quess I tend to think hey, 18 there's a real possibility that we can, we can do 19 without plastic. I think there definitely are 20 things where it's embedded, like underground, where we've got PVC piping that's delivering our 21 22 water. We get, you know, we're not going to do

1 much about that.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

Ion exchange is another thing where I 2 3 think it's kind of crept into organic, and we weren't really aware that this was an issue. 4 don't think we were aware that, at least I wasn't 5 6 aware, that these fruit juice sweeteners were 7 going through an ion exchange process, that all the sugar that was -- all the organic sugar goes 8 9 through several stages of ion exchange.

And you know, again, I'm old enough that when I was -- when I was starting to eat organic food, I didn't have sugar in my food. I didn't have these processed sweeteners. If I wanted something sweet, I had real fruit or honey, you know, something that was not a process additive.

But I think that to what -- to your point, to getting -- if we want to get to the point where we can use a resin, we need to do -- we need to do the testing. We can't just approve all the resins without doing any kind of testing to see what might be happening, and just kind of

1	because and approve essentially we're
2	approving it because it's already there. It's
3	always been done, and we're closing, you know,
4	closing the door behind the horse or whatever
5	that is.
6	MEMBER JOHNSON: Are you aware of any
7	tests that we could use? This is one of the
8	questions that we posed to stakeholders, because
9	I don't know that we have a good sense of whether
10	there is a way that we can do a little bit more
11	digging to figure out whether there is some sort
12	of material leaching.
13	My understanding is you need to test
14	for something specific, and so we'd need to have
15	a sense of what we are looking for and get
16	specific, and I'm curious from you and anyone
17	else who is commenting, if there is anything
18	specific that we could be looking for, to give us
19	some assurance and comfort?
20	MS. SHISTAR: I think that the I
21	think that the technical review, that Amalie
22	raised some issues about what might be coming

1	through. And if you look at her written
2	comments, you might there are some references
3	there. I can try to get back to you with more
4	specifics, but I don't have it off the top of my
5	head.
6	MEMBER JOHNSON: Okay, thank you.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Franklin has a
8	question. Franklin, please go ahead.
9	MEMBER QUARCOO: Yes, I have a
10	question. In cases where there are organic
11	alternatives, is efficacy part of the
12	consideration in terms of how well must an
13	alternative do in order for us to consider it a
14	viable alternative? So I just wondered on your
15	views on organic alternatives and is efficacy a
16	consideration?
17	MS. SHISTAR: Well efficacy is a
18	consideration in the sense that in order one
19	of the criterion, criteria for approving a
20	material is whether it's, whether it's essential
21	and it can't be essential if it doesn't work.
22	But then there's, as I think you're

1	getting at, there's a line where something may
2	be, may be effective and may be and then we
3	have to judge this. We have to make a judgment
4	as to how needed is it, how necessary is it. I
5	think that in the past, the NOSB has done a good
6	job of evaluating that question.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
8	questions for Terry?
9	I have a quick question for you,
10	Terry. Given the issue of plastics in organics,
11	if we're to take the stance towards resins that
12	you're suggesting, should we be testing all
13	plastics that come in contact, be it packaging or
14	irrigation lines or any of the plastic that comes
15	in contact with organic food?
16	MS. SHISTAR: Well, some things are
17	easier to test than others. But yes, I think
18	that that's a good place to start in developing
19	some kind of priority system for deciding which
20	things we get rid of first.
21	I mean obviously things that are
22	releasing toxic chemicals into the food are going

1	to be something that's going to be a higher
2	priority than something that's not. It's all
3	then plastic that's only a problem in the, in the
4	disposal stream, for example.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: If we think
6	practically, is your how would you describe
7	your goal for the industry? Should we be as pure
8	as we possibly can be and not interested in
9	growth, or is there a pragmatic balance?
10	MS. SHISTAR: I think that as much as
11	we can adhere to organic principles, we're going
12	to grow more. So I don't think that that's a
13	valid dichotomy.
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Brian, please go
15	ahead.
16	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yeah thanks, Terry.
17	Just a quick clarification. In terms of you
18	mentioned testing which seems like a good idea in
19	a lot of ways, but I'm wondering if you are
20	referring to like a testing of every organic
21	operation and every, you know, every farm, or if
22	you're talking about researchers should start

1	testing about testing this and just
2	determining whether these are this is an issue
3	or not?
4	MS. SHISTAR: Mostly the latter. I
5	mean that's why I say we should be listing resins
6	individually on the National List, based on the
7	testing that we see or, you know, how you know,
8	what leakage and what might be coming through.
9	The same thing with plastics. There
10	is a lot of research out there about what is
11	getting into food from, you know, like BPA that
12	might be in your in plastic or plastic liners
13	of cans or something. So yeah, I think there's a
14	lot of room for testing as far as research. No,
15	I'm not talking about going out and testing every
16	farm to see
17	MEMBER CALDWELL: Great, thank you. I
18	just wanted to be really clear on that. Thank
19	you.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, thank
21	you for your comments. Next up we have Pryor
22	Garnett, followed by Kate Mendenhall and then Dan

1 Langager. 2 Well good afternoon, MR. **GARNETT:** 3 thank you NOSB members and NOP staff for your service to organic agriculture, and for hearing 4 me out today. My name is Pryor Garnett. I chair 5 6 the Organic Farmers Association's Policy 7 Committee and I farm in western Oregon. I'11 addressing 8 Today, be three 9 issues, organic and climate-smart agriculture, the greenhouse and container production standards 10 11 and crop insurance. OFA members agree with the 12 NOSB that certified organic production should automatically be considered climate-smart and 13 eligible for all funding and support through 14 climate-related USDA programs. 15 agriculture 16 Organic has tremendous potential to address climate change, but only if 17 18 the USDA effectively protects the integrity of 19 That integrity is essential the organic label. 20 to maintaining the label standing and preference

with consumers, to ensuring a level playing field

for organic farmers in the broader agriculture

2.1

sector, and to make sure that organic methods 1 provide the maximum benefit in addressing the 2 3 climate crisis. Enforcing the organic livestock 4 5 standards is important to climate-smart agriculture, because pasturing and real outdoor 6 7 enrich soil, biology help access and soil structure, and enrich the animal's welfare. Soil 8 9 health is a foundational principle of organic 10 agriculture. The NOP's decision to allow hydroponic 11 12 operations to be certified organic, interpretation 13 inconsistent of quidance on container operations, has caused both farmers and 14 15 consumers to question organic as a regenerative 16 agricultural system. NOP must clarify that organic farming only occurs in the soil, and 17 18 ensure that all organic certifiers consistently 19 apply this requirement. The NOP should return this topic to 20 the NOSB agenda, so that organic as a climate-2.1 22 smart leader is clear and consistent.

Second, OFA urges the NOSB to 1 resume work on its agenda item for field and 2 3 greenhouse container production. We support organic certification of crop production where 4 5 terrestrial plants are grown to maturity in the 6 ground with no barrier between top soil, subsoil and bedrock. 7 standards for the 8 Current organic production of crops and containers and in outside 9 10 greenhouses limited, and has led are to 11 widespread certifier inconsistency. The NOSB 12 needs to resume work on container production. Third and finally, I'll talk a little 13 14 bit about crop insurance again. We appreciate 15 the Board's work on this important topic. OFA's farmer members have a wide range of experiences 16 with crop insurance. 17 There's broad frustration, 18 especially with the whole farm revenue program. 19 New farms have it the hardest, but 20 even established farmers struggle with it. We 2.1 need to educate insurance agents on organics, 22 because they rarely understand organic systems

1	and methods. In our written testimony, we've
2	outlined the number of improvements, and we also
3	point to the comments submitted by the Ohio
4	Ecological Food and Farming Association. Thank
5	you very much.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you for your
7	comments.
8	MR. GARNETT: You're welcome.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any questions from
10	the Board? Amy, please go ahead.
11	MEMBER BRUCH: Pryor, thank you for
12	joining us today. Thanks for your information.
13	I have a question about crop insurance, and I
14	really appreciate all the comments that you have
15	made and others. There are some good points that
16	your organization makes.
17	One point I didn't necessarily see
18	discussion on was about T yields, and the idea
19	that the T yields, I just want to make sure.
20	You're familiar with T yields? Otherwise I could
21	or maybe not.
22	MR. GARNETT: I'm afraid you'll have

1	to explain that Amy.
2	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay. Well hey, no
3	problem. You know, my it's a very specific
4	question, so I might hold off and ask another,
5	another representative potentially, because it
6	does get in the weeds a little bit. So I
7	apologize for that Pryor, so thank you. Thank
8	you for your time. I'll hold my question til
9	later.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. We
11	have another question for you Pryor. Dilip,
12	please go ahead.
13	MEMBER NANDWANI: Thanks for your
14	comment. I just want to have a quick
15	clarification on your greenhouse production, and
16	I think your and an earlier speaker also
17	mentioned. I think you are mentioning including
18	high tunnels, body house and any kind of indoor
19	production or, if you want to say something else
20	on this, when you say about greenhouse
21	production.

And also can you tell a little bit

about the greenhouse plant in the ground, in the 1 soil also, or on the aerial and other aspects. 2 3 So can you please a little bit something about on that. Thank you. 4 5 MR. **GARNETT:** Thank you for your 6 question. Yes, I'd be glad to speak to this. 7 The foundational principle that OFA is asserting here is that most organic production should have 8 the roots of the plants in direct contact with 9 the soil, and through that down to the bedrock. 10 11 Now there are a few exceptions that we 12 recognize. For example, if plants are being sold So to being sold to consumers who are 13 as starts. then going to plant the tomato plant in their 14 container. We recognize that that container 15 production is not necessarily going to be in full 16 contact with the soil and bedrock. 17 18 But in, for example, a high tunnel, as you mentioned, where it is simply a shelter over 19 the soil with the plants in the soil and their 20 roots extending directly down from there, 2.1 that that is certainly appropriate for 22 think

1	organic certification.
2	On the other hand, you have an open
3	field where let's say blueberry plants are
4	growing in containers, with their primary
5	nutrient source being delivered via drip
6	irrigation, that is not appropriate for organic
7	certification. I hope that those two examples
8	help clarify our remarks.
9	MEMBER NANDWANI: Thank you. That
10	really helps. Thanks.
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate, please go
12	ahead.
13	MEMBER LEWIS: Hey Pryor, good to see
14	you, and thanks for bringing crop insurance to
15	the table here at the Board meeting. I wanted to
16	home in on one of the elements in the OEFFA
17	comments about the Good Farming Practice Handbook
18	and OSP, and in my work on this topic, RMA has
19	not really accepted the argument that anything
20	included in an OSP should be considered a good
21	farming practice.
22	I think there's some merit to that,

where you can have a complaint system plan 1 without necessarily being a good farmer 2 3 following good farming practices. So I'm curious you've done some thinking on how to maybe 4 identify some of the elements in an OSP that 5 would be areas for folks to -- for RMA to look 6 7 at, or just if you all have talked about that tension between the OSP and the Good Farming 8 9 Practices manual. 10 MR. **GARNETT:** That's a very good 11 point, Nathan. Thank you very much for raising 12 it, because we clearly believe that the organic certifiers, in reviewing and ultimately approving 13 the organic systems plan for a given producer, 14 have established that that plan, as a whole, is a 15 good farming practice. 16 17 And that a second review, almost an 18 independent review by an insurance agent or by the Whole Farm Program, is unnecessary. 19 There is 20 no analog to the organic systems plan in what we

call conventional agricultural today, and there

So in that environment, I think

is no review.

2.1

1	assessing good farming practice is important.
2	But where we have the
3	independent review of an organic certifier
4	approving an organic systems plan, I think it's
5	not necessary.
6	MEMBER LEWIS: Great, and just as a
7	maybe a follow-up comment on that I think, as you
8	know, the Board advises the NOP but we also
9	advise the Secretary. So I can see a role the
10	Board could play in communicating with RMA on
11	those specific points, and how OSP and the Good
12	Farming Practices manual can overlap. So thanks
13	for bringing that up. I think it's an actionable
14	area.
15	MR. GARNETT: Yes, I appreciate your
16	doing that, and I would strongly encourage the
17	Board to take that action.
18	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
19	questions for Pryor?
20	All right. Thank you very much,
21	Pryor. Next up we have Kate Mendenhall, followed
22	by Dan Langager and then Jaydee Hanson. Kate,

2	MS. MENDENHALL: Thank you NOSE
3	members for the opportunity to speak before you
4	today. My name is Kate Mendenhall. I'm the
5	Executive Director of the Organic Farmers
6	Association. OFA represents a strong national
7	voice for domestic certified organic farmers.
8	Today, I will be addressing oversight to deter
9	fraud, phosphoric acid and organic swine
10	management.
11	Preventing organic fraud has
12	consistently been a top priority for U.S. organic
13	farmers, and we appreciate the Board's work or
14	this important topic. While we see value in
15	adding GIS data to farm and field location in the
16	Organic Integrity database, we want to
17	acknowledge that adding GPS coordinates would be
18	an additional tracking to what is currently being
19	done on most farms, and requires access to
20	technology.
21	All farmers do not have the
22	technological expertise to provide this

please go ahead.

information to certifiers, or in some cases as in 1 the plain community, they may be opposed to using 2 3 the technology. So assistance for farmers with limited access to and experience with technology 4 must be part of the recommendations. 5 6 Perhaps provisions could be taken to 7 require more technological GIS data for farms that pose a greater risk, that may manage maybe 8 9 or -- more than one one two or two farm 10 locations, so that we minimize the burden on 11 small farms. 12 Regarding the 2025 livestock sunset 13 review, OFA requests that phosphoric acid be relisted as a synthetic sanitizer disinfectant. 14 15 It's used to remove deposits on milk lines of bulk tanks, and it can -- and it's necessary to -16 17 - it's used to remove deposits on milk lines of 18 bulk tanks, and it cannot be removed without 19 other detergents and acids. the 20 So buildup creates conditions where bacteria can rapidly multiply, impacting on 2.1 22 safety and quality. OFA dairy farmer members

compatible 1 report more substances are not 2 available, and without the use of phosphoric they 3 acid. would need to leave organic production. 4 We do acknowledge the 2018 concerns 5 raised by the National Organic Coalition about 6 7 consistency as to whether certifiers were or were after 8 not requiring а rinse use, and we 9 understand this is still a current issue. relist phosphoric acid 10 request is to sanitizer disinfectant with an annotation that 11 12 requires a rinse after use. Both the livestock and handling annotations should align in this 13 14 way. 15 NOSB prioritize We urge to 16 comprehensive review of sanitizers, disinfectants and cleaners to inform decision-making when a new 17 18 material is petitioned, or a material is reviewed 19 at sunset. 20 Finally, OFA requests that NOSB prioritize adding organic swine management to a 2.1 22 future agenda. In review of the OLPS, it was

1	evident that guidance on organic swine management
2	is behind animal welfare and other national
3	organic standards. In order to reduce the burden
4	of duplicative certifications and ensure consumer
5	confidence in organic swine management, we
6	request that the NOP and NOSB place swine
7	management on the NOSB work agenda.
8	Thank you for consideration of our
9	comments.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And thank you for
11	joining us today. Any questions for Kate?
12	All right. We appreciate your time.
13	MS. MENDENHALL: Thank you.
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up we have
15	Dan Langager, followed by Jaydee Hanson, and then
16	Michael Sligh, and then folks, thank you for your
17	patience, we're going to take a break. So we
18	will, after the break, start with Harold Austin.
19	But Dan, please go ahead.
20	MR. LANGAGER: Thank you so much.
21	Hello everyone. My name is Dan Langager, and I'm
22	with the Northwest Horticultural Council based in

1	Washington state. We represent the growers,
2	packers and shippers of apples, pears and
3	cherries in the Pacific Northwest. Our growers
4	produce the majority of organic tree fruits here
5	in the United States.
6	I'd like to direct you to the
7	Northwest Horticultural Council's extensive
8	written comments for the Pacific Northwest tree
9	fruit industry's perspective on the various
10	sunset materials before the Subcommittees, as
11	well as the research priorities for handling, and
12	the organic is climate-smart proposal from CACS.
13	I'm going to highlight some materials
14	under crops that are of particular importance to
15	organic tree fruit growers. Ethanol and
16	isopropanol alcohols are critical tools for
17	orchardists to both decontaminate the lines of
18	irrigation systems, and to disinfect a variety of
19	on-farm components.
20	So if irrigation lines aren't
21	decontaminated from things like biofilms and
22	microorganisms, the emitters can become clogged,

and that not only causes damage to the system, 1 but an unequal supply of nutrient solution to the 2 3 crop, which impacts the plant's growth. And then these alcohols are also used 4 5 to clean the pruning shears when removing chutes infected with cider 6 or branches blights prevent the infection of the shears themselves. 7 It can further spread the pathogens to other 8 9 chutes during subsequent cuttings. Plastic mulches and covers are for 10 11 newer fruit tree production benefits. 12 them on bird nets, wind screens, shade cloths, weed mats and actually by covering the weeds, 13 they've proven a really useful deterrent for 14 15 insect leafhopper various pests in cherry orchards, actually reducing leafhopper numbers by 16 80 to 90 percent. 17 18 The leafhoppers, they can transmit the 19 causative pathogen called middle cherry disease, 20 which is epidemic in Washington state. Tt.'s resulted in significant loss of cherry production 2.1

acreage.

And then ground covers, they can also reflect light up into the tree canopy, and this is done only in the season to promote bloom and then before harvest to help the fruit gain some additional coloration and maturity.

for organic tree fruit production. It's used to control pest mites that damage leaf tissue. This leads to less fruit or potentially fewer blossoms the next season. It is also a critical tool in controlling disease pathogens like scab and brown rot. It's one of the few options our growers for treating powdery mildew.

And then elemental sulfur is also used to adjust soil pH, to ensure better nutrient uptake, water penetration, just overall enhance the plant and soil health. And then finally lime sulfur is used by the vast majority of organic tree fruit growers. It's a well-known source of calcium and sulfur. It controls blight, mildew and scab, and it helps control various orchard insect pests. Lime sulfur is applied from the

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1	dormancies through bloom stages of the crop, and
2	that's really to control insects or pests or
3	pathogens that may have overwintered in the
4	blocks.
5	I want to thank you so much for the
6	opportunity to provide input from the organic
7	tree fruit growers to the NOSB, and thank the
8	Board members for their service.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Right on time.
10	Thank you for your comments. Any questions from
11	the Board?
12	All right, Dan. Thank you very much
13	for joining us today. Oh I'm sorry, one second.
14	Brian, please go ahead, and then Amy.
15	MEMBER CALDWELL: Thanks Dan. I know
16	that fruit growing is really different in
17	different regions of the country. I've been
18	curious about hydrated lime, and here in the
19	east, at least the way I understand it, hydrated
20	lime would just be used in Bordeaux mix, although
21	maybe are there other pesticide formulations
22	that use hydrated lime? That's sort of the first

2	The second question is with Bordeaux
3	mix, again the way I understand it is that the
4	other copper products are a lot more effective
5	and safer. So why are people still using
6	Bordeaux mix, and maybe I'm wrong on that. Maybe
7	in your situation is that those, those are not
8	the case. So if you'd just talk a little bit
9	about that, I'd appreciate it.
10	MR. LANGAGER: Sure. I can answer
11	what I can answer your first question. Yes, I
12	believe there are other formulations and mixtures
13	that growers can use. But I am going to defer to
14	one of my colleagues. You're going to hear from
15	a tree fruit grower, Harold Austin here in just a
16	bit, and he is going to know those formulations
17	much better than I do.
18	MEMBER CALDWELL: Great, thanks.
19	MR. LANGAGER: Thanks.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy, please go
21	ahead.
22	MEMBER BRUCH: Hi, Dan. Thank you for

question.

question 1 your time today. I had a about 2 potassium sorbate. I don't know, maybe that's 3 to be tackled by the next presenter potentially, is that right? Okay. 4 MR. LANGAGER: I'll try. 5 6 MEMBER BRUCH: Or you'll try it, okay. 7 It was noted in your comments that the growers in your group decided that that would be very 8 9 beneficial to mitigating plant diseases, having 10 access to potassium sorbate. We've heard from 11 previous comments and others extreme concerns with that substance in the environment used in 12 13 this petition faction. 14 And there's also many alternatives 15 that currently exist. There was questions also on the efficacy of some of the trials that were 16 listed in the petition, that maybe the substances 17 18 that they were trialing against aren't commonly 19 used. Ι was just wondering, you know, pushes your growers to want this to be accepted 20 as a National List product, just because there is 2.1 22 limited information on potassium sorbate used

Τ	specifically as petitioned, as the active
2	ingredient?
3	MR. LANGAGER: Right, and I believe
4	that the Subcommittee talked about the need for
5	more research into this product, and I think
6	that's something that our industry would like to
7	see as well. We're always supportive of those
8	types of efficacy trials to see exactly how it's
9	working and in what circumstances. And like you
L 0	said, climates and growing regions.
L1	We are very fortunate in the Pacific
L2	Northwest with our climates and our soils that we
L3	have here. I know that, as you said, it does
L 4	help with controlling certain post-harvest
L5	diseases, post-harvest in both right after it's
L 6	packed and then as it's going or after it's
L 7	harvested and then it's going to packing. Those
L8	are very big issues.
L 9	So I would also say it fits into that,
20	as many tools in the toolbox as our growers and
21	packers have. If the studies show that this is
22	efficacious, then we would like to see it as, you

1	know, part of the toolbox that our growers and
2	packers produce.
3	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
5	questions from the Board.
6	All right, Dan. Thank you very much
7	for your time.
8	MR. LANGAGER: Thank you so much.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up we have
10	Jaydee Hanson, followed by Michael Sligh. We're
11	going to take a break, and then it will be Harold
12	Austin, followed by Mark Kastel. Jaydee, please
13	go ahead. And you are muted.
14	MS. ARSENAULT: Hang on, Jaydee. We
15	have to get you unmuted here.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And folks just a
17	quick note. Because of the interruptions before,
18	we have everyone muted, and we will have to have
19	you unmute as we request you to unmute. So sorry
20	for that little bit of an added barrier.
21	MS. ARSENAULT: Jaydee, you should see
22	something called open your screen, the host has

1	asked you to unmute. Do you see that? It
2	doesn't look like it's working, apologies. Let's
3	see what we can do here.
4	(Pause.)
5	MS. ARSENAULT: Option to unmute him.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: There should be a
7	host message asking you to unmute button Jaydee
8	popping up on your screen.
9	MR. HANSON: There it came. All
10	right, thank you. I am glad to speak to you
11	today or pleased that the NOSB has lifted up the
12	importance of organic agriculture is a means of
13	slowing climate chaos. We feel so strongly about
14	this at the Center that we formed an
15	international coalition to promote organic at the
16	international climate conferences.
17	We don't think that the USDA and the
18	National Organic Program have adequately promoted
19	that organic producers are already actively
20	employing multiple climate-smart practices.
21	Organic producers deserve to be rewarded and
22	acknowledged for consistently implementing these

1	practices in their production models.
2	Certified organic farmers should
3	automatically qualify and be approved for any
4	climate-smart label when the term is codified by
5	the USDA. We don't think that water-based
6	growing methods like hydroponics meet the test
7	for being climate-smart, and should not be called
8	climate-smart.
9	(Pause.)
10	MR. HANSON: Excuse me. There is
11	currently no climate-smart plan across all
12	organic certifiers, and this impedes farmers
13	seeking access to USDA climate-smart funding.
14	They shouldn't have to apply twice to be
15	considered climate-smart. All organic
16	certifications should require annual reporting of
17	key climate-related data such as soil organic
18	matter, nitrogen levels, phosphorous levels,
19	potassium in soil, just to name a few.
20	Next topic, organics should not have
21	ortho-phthalates, bisphenol and PFAS in them.
22	We've been urging the NOSB to take a lead on

1	this. There are individual companies that are
2	leading on this. Annie's Organic has taken
3	ortho-phthalates out of their products. Other
4	manufacturers like REI and Patagonia have taken
5	plastics out of their clothing.
6	This is a huge problem. Collectively,
7	these three classes of chemicals, bisphenols,
8	ortho-phthalates and PFAS need to be out of
9	organic production, out of food. If we don't get
10	them out, it will damage the organic brand.
11	Finally, I appreciate the Materials
12	Committee working through the last few
13	excluded methods. You've got my comments in
14	writing. I think I'm at the end of time.
15	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We appreciate your
16	comments. Mindee has a question for you.
17	MR. HANSON: Sure.
18	MEMBER JEFFERY: Thank you so much
19	Jaydee for your long history of work, especially
20	in the excluded methods realm. I'm wondering if
21	given all the work of the NOSB recommendations
22	and the work that's left on the TBD list, if you

1	have some perspective of the horizons of the
2	excluded methods issue and if there are things
3	coming toward us that we should be really looking
4	at next?
5	MR. HANSON: Well, I mean the big
6	issue really is the what is being called gene
7	editing. There's a number of different ways to
8	do this, but even with the even with the
9	procedures that we looked at at this meeting,
10	several of them can be combined with gene editing
11	to so you really are going to have to have a
12	couple of things excluded at the same time, you
13	know.
14	You can't just say this is a non-
15	excluded method if you also somewhere else allow
16	gene editing of that method.
17	MEMBER JEFFERY: Thank you, Jaydee. I
18	was thinking more along the lines of insects and
19	sprays in the field, and technologies we may not
20	have addressed yet that are appearing in the
21	marketplace.
22	MR. HANSON: Well, there are some that

aren't quite in the marketplace yet that are RNAi 1 pesticides and RNAi fertilizers that are applying 2 3 for experimental use permits at the EPA, and I and several other folks have been trying to meet 4 5 with the EPA about this. The good news is the 6 EPA hasn't approved this yet. 7 The bad news is it -- because of the small scale, it's going to be very hard to track 8 if the companies that are doing this move ahead 9 and do it. To some extent, it's some of the same 10 11 technology that companies have figured out how to 12 use in drugs. They just want to use it on a mass 13 scale on the landscape. It's very different. 14 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Allison, please go 15 ahead. JOHNSON: 16 MEMBER Thanks for your comments Jaydee. I'm curious to dig in a little 17 18 bit more into your comment about climate-smart 19 agriculture and the role of soil-based systems on -- as an organization that works on pesticides in 20 2.1 particular. I think about soil as an important 22 part of a farming system and its relationship to

1	climate, but I also think a lot about reduction
2	of synthetic inputs as a key piece of the climate
3	as well.
4	So I'm curious how you think about
5	balancing those two interests when we think about
6	the relationship between organic and climate.
7	MR. HANSON: Well, most of what we're
8	talking about is how much climate gets into the -
9	- how much carbon gets into the atmosphere, and
10	so you know, whatever, whatever assessment you
11	do, you're going to have to look at that. The
12	Center for Food Safety is, you know, aggressively
13	opposed to spraying pesticides everywhere.
14	But the, you know, it's not that
15	you know, if we eliminated all pesticides, there
16	would still be significant additions to the
17	climate from methane and carbon dioxide and a
18	handful of other chemicals. So when we're
19	dealing with, dealing with climate, we've got to
20	deal with the chemicals that cause most of the
21	change in the atmosphere.

CHAIR POWELL-PALM:

22

Dilip, please go

2	MEMBER NANDWANI: Thanks Jaydee for
3	your valuable comments, especially on gene
4	editing. I really appreciate that. I don't have
5	any question, just to appreciate your thoughts
6	you mentioned. I see that it's going to be a big
7	topic of discussion among the Board also on gene
8	editing.
9	So I really appreciate your comment
LO	that product should not be allowed at one place
L1	and be restricted another place. So really
L2	thanks again. I appreciate that.
13	MR. HANSON: Yeah, thank you. And
L 4	there's actually an interesting argument between
L5	the USDA and the FDA on gene editing and how you
L 6	regulate that. So it's one that I think the NOSB
L7	will have to pay attention to.
L 8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Well
L 9	we thank you for your comments today.
20	MR. HANSON: And thank you all for
21	your good and long work. Much appreciated.
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Absolutely, thank

ahead.

1	you. Next up we have Michael Sligh. We're going
2	to follow Michael's comments with a ten minute
3	break, and then we'll have Harold Austin, Mark
4	Kastel and then Angela Wartes-Kahl. Michael, the
5	floor is yours.
6	MR. SLIGH: Good afternoon. My name
7	is Michael Sligh. I'm a member of the founding
8	NOSB from 1992 to 1997. We were responsible for
9	the original recommendations that established the
10	program. I rise today to strongly urge the
11	reinstatement of in-person NOSB comments,
12	restarting with this fall meeting.
13	While I strongly support the continued
14	remote testimony opportunities as well as the new
15	video streaming, for the many who cannot attend
16	in person these are very positive additions and
17	should be continued as well. However, in person
18	public comment at the beginning of each NOSB
19	meeting is not a random tradition.
20	But it's one that we established on
21	purpose at the very beginning to anchor, to shape
22	and to ensure that this vital program is

participatory and is guided by the stakeholders
who choose to adhere to these rules. In fact, I
would argue in-person testimony is one of the
reasons this program receives strong and robust
public support.

Of course, you're not there solely for your own opinions and experience, but because representing one of the you are legislative stakeholder categories, and public engagement with them is essential. Having in-person stakeholders set the tone, present critical concerns and recommendations at beginning, demonstrates transparency, ensures accountability and provides for more consistent outcomes.

These pillars are essential to the ongoing future of the NOSB-NOP credibility and public support. You cannot know what you don't know, and hearing directly from the organic community at the beginning of the meeting ensures that strategic issues are raised, acknowledged and hopefully addressed in a timely manner.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Please reinstate in-person NOSB public comment.
2	Thank you.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thanks for your
4	comments. Brian has a question for you.
5	MR. SLIGH: Sure.
6	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yeah, thanks
7	Michael. I totally understand what you're saying
8	in terms of the in-person meetings, but the
9	concern that I have is that basically it costs
10	about, I guess about \$2,000 for just the normal
11	person to attend a meeting say in either Atlanta
12	or Sacramento or wherever it's going to be, and
13	lodge themselves and all that sort of stuff.
14	And doesn't that skew the input and
15	the close interpersonal contact to basically
16	funded organizations and not and away from say
17	a farmer who might not have \$2,000 to spend or
18	that?
19	MR. SLIGH: Well, I think it's not ar
20	either/or. I think in the beginning, we didn't
21	have the Internet, so we had to have written
22	comments that we read ahead of time, and then we

1	had people show up. We moved the meetings around
2	the country to ensure greater access, so that
3	farmers locally, producers, operators locally
4	could come and attend maybe just for the one day,
5	you know, because maybe it's a drive in.
6	So I think in this environment, where
7	we now have the ability of Zoom and
8	livestreaming, that I think helps balance that
9	issue. Certainly if only it was for those who
10	could afford to come safely, yes it could skew.
11	But having public
12	Written comments helps do that, and in
13	my experience the personal part we do not want to
14	lose entirely, because we are a hyper-
15	participatory community, and I think being able
16	to engage in person is valuable and something
17	that really helped us as the original NOSB to
18	really be in tune with what was the pulse of the
19	people.
20	If they were willing to put out the
21	effort to show up, that's telling you a lot.
22	MEMBER CALDWELL: Great, thank you.

1	Yeah, I totally agree with what you just said
2	there at the end, and it's a balancing act. I'm
3	almost wondering, I know that I know that NOC
4	gives some scholarships for attending maybe their
5	meeting and stuff, and maybe somehow that could
6	be, that could be part of the whole picture. I
7	don't know, but I really appreciate your input.
8	MR. SLIGH: Sure, thank you to that,
9	and I appreciate all of your sacrifice to do
LO	this. I know it well, so thank you.
L1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
L2	questions for Michael?
L3	I will keep mine very brief for fear
L 4	of holding us from our break any longer.
L 5	Michael, what do you see as the difference
L 6	between in-person comments and how we receive
L 7	comments virtually?
L 8	MR. SLIGH: Well, I mean Zoom has been
L 9	a blessing in many ways during the pandemic, and
20	it has helped expand participation. But I think,
21	I think we don't live in a virtual world, and
22	having the personal contact, being able to talk

to someone in the hall, be able to say hey, I 1 know you, it is a -- it is an essential thing 2 3 that this community does not become isolated or only virtual. 4 So I think we can't lose the human 5 6 touch, which is quite important in terms of the values and the tradition that we are trying to 7 We're very unique among -- I've served on 8 hear. 9 many USDA advisory boards, and this one is unique 10 on purpose. I think being able to come there and 11 in person and tell your story is really 12 irreplaceable. I worry that we're 13 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: conflating two things. You can still come to the 14 15 meeting and take us to lunch and talk to us in the hallways as a farmer at every meeting. 16 17 But sitting there for MR. SLIGH: 18 hours and hours and not being able to 19 say anything is incredibly frustrating, and also 20 you may actually be the one person who knows the answer to a particular question, that would be 2.1

brought up at the beginning of the meeting that

1	may not have occurred in the written comment, and
2	may not have occurred in your research prior to
3	that.
4	I've seen that happen many times. So
5	I just think you can't, it's not either/or. I
6	think let's expand access, let's do the virtual,
7	let's do any way we can to get people's access,
8	but let's not close off the opportunity for me to
9	drive in my truck, which I will (audio
10	interference). So don't close that option out.
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate, please go
12	ahead.
13	MEMBER LEWIS: Yeah. I'm sorry to
14	keep us from a break. I realize this is a
15	challenging position to take as a new Board
16	member. But I'm curious about trying to find
17	the right balance here, because I agree with you
18	100 percent, like all that nothing beats in
19	person. We've been reminded of that through this
20	pandemic and the isolation and the damage that
21	can occur.
22	And I also have been really heartened

by the level playing field that Zoom offers. 1 really ensures that those with privilege don't 2 3 aet undue influence on the Board, personally know is the case when we rely entirely 4 5 on in-person comments. So finding the right balance is the 6 key, and I'm curious -- just what inspired my 7 question is just your comment about taking a 8 drive, that perhaps the in-person comments, as we 9 10 continue to move around the country, are limited 11 to those who are local or within a radius, 12 that we, you know, try to find that balance and 13 encourage the engagement of the local community. I don't know if that thought has crossed your 14 15 group's perspective. But again, finding the balance is what I'm looking for. 16 17 Yeah, I hear that. MR. SLIGH: 18 don't think we've discussed that, but I would 19 certainly be encouraging all the groups that I 20 work with to take that topic up. I think we don't want to lose the in person. 2.1 I also don't 22 what to be the barrier between you and a break.

1	I know how valuable that is as well.
2	But I think you also would know the
3	Hot Mike a little quicker if he was in person as
4	well.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Oh. Well, thank
6	you for your comments, Michael, and with that we
7	are going to go to a break folks. We are going
8	to come back at 20 after the hour, 2-0. After
9	our break, we're going to start with Harold
LO	Austin, followed by Mark Kastel and then Angela
L1	Wartes-Kahl. We'll see you all in just about ten
L2	minutes.
13	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
L 4	went off the record at 2:09 p.m. and resumed at
L 5	2:20 p.m.)
L 6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, and we
L7	are back. First up, we're going to have Harold
L8	Austin, followed by Mark Kastel and then Angela
L 9	Wartes-Kahl. Harold, the floor is yours.
20	MR. AUSTIN: Okay, can you hear me?
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We can. Please go
22	ahead.

All right. 1 MR. AUSTIN: Clear the screen here. Hi, good morning everybody or good 2 3 afternoon I guess, depending on where you're at. My name's Harold Austin, and I'm a former member 4 of the NOSB and a lifelong member of the tree 5 fruit industry here in the Pacific Northwest. 6 7 Welcome to our two newest members of the NOSB, and my heartfelt thanks to all the rest 8 9 of you for all that you do on behalf of organic 10 stakeholders across our country. Please refer to 11 written comments and those also of МУ the 12 Northwest Horticultural Council, for more detailed set of comments on the various materials 13 currently under sunset review and discussion this 14 15 spring by the members of the NOSB. 16 For crops, I would like to voice my 17 support for the continued listing of the two 18 alcohols, the mulches and plastic covers, liquid 19 fish products, ethylene, elemental sulfur and Regarding sulfuric acid on-farm 20 lime sulfur. generated, this material -- this is one that I'm 2.1

very familiar with, having used it for over 25

1	years on our company's conventional orchards and
2	on our organic orchards once it was approved.
3	In this process, we burn a 99 percent
4	pure elemental sulfur in what's called a sulfur
5	burner, which are high pH irrigation waters and
6	passthrough. This process helps us to reduce
7	high pH water.
8	Normally we begin around 8.3 to 8.5
9	pH, brings it to a more neutrally balanced pH,
10	while at the same time it helps us to remove high
11	mineral content out of the water, especially in
12	our case, high levels of calcium carbonate.
13	This allows us to take marginal soils
14	with extremely poor drainage, and when we combine
15	this, the use of this benefit from with the
16	inclusion of our composts and our mulches, it
17	helps to turn these marginal soils into very
18	robust and productive organic farmland, that
19	truly embraces the very fundamental principles of
20	organic farming.
21	This process also helps us to protect
22	our fruit finishing by removing the calcium

carbonate from the water. In the summertime when 1 2 reach triple digit temperatures, we use 3 overhead cooling to take and help keep the apples With the calcium carbonate in the from sunburn. 4 5 water, a lot of time it makes some of that fruit 6 virtually non-packable. 7 Lime sulfur is also important an material for organic tree fruit production. 8 This is one of our most important materials to assist 9 us early in the season for control of 10 fire Bloom time 11 blight, both in apples and in pears. 12 is one of our most critical times of the growing 13 cycle for control of mildew and fire blight. As we move into a more semi-dwarfing 14 style of tree and new varieties, varieties I 15 might add that are consumer-driven, they tend to 16 be highly susceptible to fire blight. We find it 17 18 now even more important than ever that maintain a solid plan of action for control of 19 blight. 20 This is especially true beginning with 2.1 22 the bloom period of fruit development, because if

1	blight enters the tree through the blossom, we
2	will be fighting it the entire season or longer.
3	For handling, I support the continued
4	listing of phosphoric acid, nitrogen and
5	ethylene. One area of importance for phos acid
6	is the cleaning of our packing equipment, helping
7	to remove the calcium carbonate buildup on our
8	cups and belts. This is by far the most superior
9	material for this step of cleaning in our packing
L 0	facilities.
L1	I also support the continued
12	revisiting of in-person, at least modified in-
L3	person presentations at the meeting. The benefit
L 4	of that I can't say enough about that, the
L 5	interaction that you'll have if you do that.
L 6	Thank you.
L 7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you
L 8	for your comments. Brian has a question for you,
L 9	followed by Nate.
20	MR. AUSTIN: Brian.
21	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yeah, thank you
22	Harold. A couple of questions. First of all,

1	about the sulfur burning, that is just to treat
2	the irrigation water, am I correct about that?
3	MR. AUSTIN: Correct.
4	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yeah, because there
5	was one comment in our written comments that
6	seemed to think that it was about like basically
7	trying to change the pH of the soil via that
8	method, and that's not what it's all about, the
9	way I understand it.
10	MR. AUSTIN: Well no, but Brian, in
11	part we are essentially changing the pH of the
12	soil to some degree, because we're taking a
13	neutral-based pH water, applying it to the soil,
14	rather than a water that's at pH of 8.3 to 8.5-
15	8.6. So in fact we are, you know, we're not
16	adding to the pH levels, but we are in fact
17	helping to reduce it to some extent, because
18	we're adding a much lesser pH water to it.
19	MEMBER CALDWELL: So does that say
20	neutral water actually tend to bring the pH down
21	of the whole field?
22	MR. AUSTIN: Well it's not, but it's

1	not, it's not bringing it up, and I guess that's
2	the point to make.
3	MEMBER CALDWELL: Right, right, yeah
4	yeah.
5	MR. AUSTIN: We can make the
6	corrective actions with what we do otherwise, but
7	at least when we irrigate or we're running frost
8	control or cooling water in the summer, we're not
9	elevating that because of the water that we're
L 0	applying.
L1	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yeah good.
L2	MR. AUSTIN: The other part of that is
L3	the calcification. So it's, you know, by having
L 4	a more neutral water without that calcium in it,
L5	it's also lending itself to better penetration
L 6	for the water, as well as the nutrients that
L7	we're applying.
L8	MEMBER CALDWELL: Great. And the
L 9	second question was I noticed you didn't mention
20	hydrated lime as in particular something that you
21	were supporting. I'm trying to get a handle on
22	how much use there actually is for hydrated lime.

1	To me in my mind, it's kind of an old-fashioned
2	material that's been superseded.
3	But one of the previous speakers said
4	that they thought it was used in other materials
5	or products besides Bordeaux mix, which is I
6	think the main, main use of it. So I'm just
7	trying to get a handle on how sort of essential
8	it really is.
9	MR. AUSTIN: Yeah. As far as approved
10	listings, it's really the Bordeaux mix is where
11	the hydrated lime's coming into play. And
12	that's, that's going to be in some of your
13	colder, wetter, older growing climate areas. I
14	know that there's areas in California I think
15	they still use it.
16	New York, Michigan if I'm not
17	mistaken. I think there's some areas that are
18	it's still used there. Here in the Northwest
19	Pacific, we use the other forms of copper, to be
20	honest. All the years that I've been a
21	consultant, I've never written a recommendation
22	for Bordeaux mix. We don't use it.

1	MEMBER CALDWELL: Okay. Well thank
2	you. I appreciate that.
3	MR. AUSTIN: You're welcome.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate, please go
5	ahead.
6	MEMBER LEWIS: Hey Harold, good to see
7	you. I have a couple of questions, one on the
8	sulfur burners. I know that Washington state
9	grows right around half or maybe a little bit
10	more of the organic blueberries grown in the
11	U.S., and that's been where we've seen the
12	biggest expansion of the crop is in Washington.
13	From what I understand, it's entirely soil-based.
14	Can you talk about how important the
15	sulfur burners have been to that growth and
16	production of organic blueberries in Washington?
17	MR. AUSTIN: Yeah. The sulfur burner,
18	the sulfuric acid's been fundamentally one of the
19	cornerstones of us being able to expand our
20	organic crop production. We're hot, and like I
21	said, we're dealing with pHs in a lot of our
22	growing areas that are 8.3 to 8.5-8.6.

While the use of the sulfur burners 1 isn't elevating the pH, it's not contributing to 2 3 because we're applying a balanced water. Blueberries really want to be grown in a pH 4 5 that's going to be more down around 5.2, 5.5 or 6 maybe slightly lower than that. So the burners 7 also, if it gets hot, we're going to have to run some overhead water to help keep the berries from 8 mummifying on us from the sheer impact of the 9 10 heat. 11 So having, having the sulfur burners 12 getting the pH balance, but also getting the mineral deposits out of the water by that process 13 helps to take in and provide a balance and a 14 15 clean water source that's really beneficial to the blueberry plants, as well as our other tree 16 fruit crops, especially apples, especially these 17 18 newer types of apple trees that we're farming. 19 MEMBER LEWIS: Okay thanks, and then 20 just another question on it. You mentioned the fire blight. I guess I'm just very curious how 2.1 I mean I'm encouraged to hear about 22 it's going?

1	the planting of resistant root stocks you're
2	talking about, like and the continuing modeling,
3	the need for lime sulfur, you know. Without
4	antibiotics, I mean just how's it going in
5	managing fire blight in the Pacific Northwest?
6	MR. AUSTIN: You know it's based off
7	of year, based off of location. Some areas it's
8	better than others. Last year, one of the
9	challenges we're finding ways to do it. We're
10	planting, if we can find them, we're planting the
11	more resistant root stocks to fire blight.
12	But the roots themselves may be fire
13	blight resistant, but the top part of the tree is
14	not. And that's where when we're using the lime
15	sulfur at bloom time to take in and get in there
16	to take and not give the virus or the bacteria a
17	place to get rooted, it's important, especially
18	with these semi-dwarfing types of trees.
19	Our older traditional plantings, we
20	had a tree that spanned 32 feet wide. Our new
21	trees, and we were 168 to 200 trees per acre.
22	Our new trees, we might be 1,200 trees per acre,

1	we might be 3,100 trees per acre. We're dealing
2	with a tree that's got a root bulb that will fit
3	onto a saucer, and a tree girth and width on the
4	limbs themselves that might only be two feet
5	wide.
6	So if we get fire blight started in
7	these types of trees, it's going to ravage us. I
8	mean it's going to you know, the older trees,
9	we could maybe cut 18 inches ahead of it and get
10	it under control before it ran the tree. These
11	newer trees, if we cut 18 inches we're cutting
12	into the trunk of the tree, and I mean we're
13	decimating our blocks.
14	So it's still a challenge, and a lot
15	of the newer varieties that the consumer, the
16	organic consumers are asking us to plant are
17	really high susceptible to blight. So we're
18	doing everything we can, and it's it's
19	working. But you know, under the right scenario,
20	the right conditions, it could be devastating.
21	So having as many tools in the toolbox
22	so that we can have expanded, you know, ways to

1	protect, especially in the spring and the bloom
2	time, so we don't ever let it get started in the
3	tree. I think that's the key, it's what we can
4	do on the front side will make it a lot easier
5	for us to deal with later on the growing season.
6	MEMBER LEWIS: Thanks for that. I
7	appreciate it.
8	MR. AUSTIN: Yep.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Jerry has a
L 0	question for you.
L1	MR. AUSTIN: Hi Jerry. You're muted,
L2	Jerry.
L3	MEMBER D'AMORE: Okay thank you, and
L 4	good to see you Harold. I'm going to try to
L5	thread the needle a little bit on sulfuric acid.
L 6	By and large, there's not much opposition to it,
L7	but there is some opposition done by a good
L8	group, a group that I certainly pay attention to,
L 9	and it struck me that what they were saying was
20	sort of negated by how you opened up your
21	statement.

What they oppose or don't feel good

1	about is when sulfuric acid is used to sort of
2	mask poor soils, and the soils are not being
3	taken care of. The way you opened yours was it
4	was part it was a two-pronged step, where you
5	were regenerating your soils or improving,
6	continuously improving your soils the best way
7	you can, and then you have sulfuric acid for pH
8	control, but not as a masking agent for a problem
9	that's left unaddressed. Is that
10	MR. AUSTIN: Yeah no, that's correct
11	Jerry.
12	MEMBER D'AMORE: Okay.
13	MR. AUSTIN: I mean it's dealing with
14	helping us to reduce the pH of the water, so that
15	we aren't putting a high pH water onto the soil.
16	It's also helping us to reduce the mineral
17	contents, especially calcium carbonate, so that
18	we're not, we're not taking and dealing with soil
19	that's going to get compacted because of that,
20	and is going to create drainage issues, water
21	penetration, nutrient penetration issues.
22	

1	process, and if we're going to use this right,
2	we're dealing with the water, the impurities of
3	the water, the pH levels of the water. This is
4	not a soil amendment to take and modify our pH.
5	By giving us a water that's a balanced pH, we're
6	not negatively impacting the pH.
7	I think that's the important thing for
8	everybody to understand. This is not a mask.
9	This is part of a process. We still have to take
10	and apply our mulches, you know. All of our
11	produce get mulched up and applied back into the
12	field. If we need compost, we'll bring in
13	compost and we'll do that.
14	So it's part of an organic systems
15	process and plan that we firmly support and
16	believe in.
17	MEMBER LEWIS: Thank you very much.
18	Appreciate that.
19	MR. AUSTIN: You're welcome.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy, please go
21	ahead.
22	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes. Thanks, Nate.

1	Thanks Harold for your time. Again, a question
2	on sulfuric acid and these sulfur burners. I
3	appreciate your time with that. There was a
4	comment by a group and it's an alternative to
5	sulfurous acids, actually a device instead of a
6	material. So it's out of our purview per se to
7	review that, but there was interest
8	internationally.
9	I think Spain's organic program
10	approved this, but it is using instead of
11	sulfurous acids, it's using just water, air and
12	electricity to alter the pH. I mean it probably
13	wouldn't get out the impurities like you were
14	mentioning before to other commenters.
15	But I just in general, those types of
16	technologies, do you see them being a beneficial
17	type of innovation in this sector, since it seems
18	like there's a reliance on sulfur burners?
19	MR. AUSTIN: You know, I'm never going
20	to never to anything (audio interruption) to
21	anything that can help us improve what we're
22	doing out on our farms organically. We've looked

at a lot of different things in lieu of or in 1 place of our -- what we can do with the sulfur 2 3 burner, and the sulfur burner is by far, for what getting doing with the oil and 4 5 impurities out, and in giving us more neutralized 6 water. I don't -- there is nothing that we 7 have looked at yet that replaces this particular 8 function, and if we were to lose sulfur burners, 9 10 I mean we've got one location I know. We would 11 take out a couple of thousand acres of organic 12 apples and blueberries and cherries immediately, because there's no alternative. 13 14 you know, not --Ι have 15 experience with the process that you're talking about, but based off of what you've said I don't 16 17 think it's a panacea or a replacement completely 18 for what we do with the sulfur burner. But it 19 may be a tool for in other areas where we don't 20 need to accomplish exactly that. It might be beneficial and it might be 21 22 something that we could incorporate into our

1	organic farming production.
2	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay, thank you Harold.
3	MR. AUSTIN: You're welcome.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Logan, please go
5	ahead.
6	MEMBER PETREY: Hi, thank you Harold.
7	I was actually just going to mention too about
8	an alternative. We had carbon dioxide on it, so
9	it was petitioned and passed as a pH water
10	regulator. Didn't know if you'd used that or if
11	you saw that coming now that we have that passed
12	and in the working?
13	MR. AUSTIN: You know, we've yeah,
14	and I've been following that along as well.
15	Again, as a pH, I think it's one thing. I think
16	the other thing is the water conditioning factor,
17	that we're getting the impurities. Calcium
18	carbonate plugs or emitters if we have it you
19	know, in our drip systems, if we have it in the
20	systems.
21	It also is a fruit finish. We get in
22	our Columbia Basin area, our water is heavy,

1	heavy to calcium carbonate in the water. It's
2	just these are white chalky residue that at
3	the packing houses we can't get it out of the
4	fruit. So you end up with high cullage, because
5	you've got now a piece of fruit that's not
6	presentable for the consumers willing to accept
7	it. So it's going to get diverted to process.
8	So the calcium carbonate is really one
9	of the primary reasons that we use it, along with
10	making sure that, you know, we're getting a water
11	that is, you know, that pH is down there in that
12	more neutral area so it's not negatively
13	impacting our soil pH.
14	So you know, I think it would help us
15	with the pH part of it, but I don't think it
16	would give us the benefits that we're looking at
17	as far as the calcium carbonate goes.
18	MEMBER PETREY: Okay, thank you.
19	MR. AUSTIN: You're welcome.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. We
21	really appreciate your comments, Harold.
22	MR. AUSTIN: It's a pleasure. You're

2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up we have
3	Mark Kastel, followed by Angela Wartes-Kahl and
4	then Emily Moyer. Mark, the floor is yours.
5	MR. KASTEL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
6	My name is Mark Castel. I'm Executive Director
7	of OrganicEye, a farm policy research group
8	that's known as an organic industry watchdog.
9	How's organic doing? Based on data from the
LO	USDA's National Agricultural Statistics Service,
L1	in 2019 just nine giant livestock factories in
L2	Texas no, I don't call them farms produced
L3	1.5 times more organic milk that 530 farms in
L 4	Wisconsin, 1.5 times more.
L5	Fast forward to 2021, the most recent
L 6	mass data. There are now 13 dairies in Texas
L7	certified as organic. They are currently
L 8	producing 2.8 times more milk than the 407
L 9	remaining family farms in Wisconsin. During that
20	couple of years, 123 family farms in Wisconsin
21	went out of business, and hundreds elsewhere in
22	the country.

welcome. Thanks guys.

1	Just as important, over the last two
2	years literally thousands of conventional family
3	dairy farms have gone out of business that could
4	have converted to organics. But the CAFOs have
5	flooded the market. What's the difference with
6	these farms?
7	When I polled organic farmers, they
8	were moving their cattle in and out pasture and
9	milking them twice a day, averaging one cow per
10	acre. How does the certification of those giant
11	dairies work? One cow per acre. Try five to ten
12	cows per acre, many times in desert-like
13	conditions in the Southwest. In technical terms
14	at OrganicEye, we call that an awful stretch.
15	However, stay tuned. The story gets
16	better. According to nutrient management plans
17	filed with the states, most of these dairies cut
18	feed off the same ground they're calling pasture.
19	We don't know the percentage of the feed that
20	they're harvesting for winter use, but let's
21	pretend it's 50 percent.
22	That would equate to an effective

1 stocking rate of not one cow per acre, but 10 to 2 20 cows per acre. In technical terms, we call 3 that a joke, and the joke gets even better. They're milking three and four times a day, not 4 5 twice, and transferring their cows out to pasture 6 on paper. 7 Legitimate organic producers get the How come the processionals at some of the 8 ioke. certifiers and the USDA have such a poor sense of 9 10 humor? If you're attending these meetings and 11 participating in the organic regulatory theater 12 without speaking up about the injustices that real farmers are facing and that the betrayal of 13 consumers who built this values-based industry, 14 you're nothing more than an enabler of injustice 15 and marketplace fraud. 16 17 Questions from the Board, I'm ready. 18 Questions from the organic community 19 Ιf you'd stakeholders? rather have questions and concerns voiced in private, 20 2.1 confidence, please feel free to contact me at organiceye.org. 22 Thank you very much.

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any questions for
2	Mark?
3	All right, we appreciate your time.
4	MR. KASTEL: Thank you.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up we have
6	Angela Wartes-Kahl, followed by Emily Moyer and
7	then Adam Seitz. Angela, please go ahead.
8	MS. WARTES-KAHL: Hi, can you hear me?
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We can.
10	MS. WARTES-KAHL: Okay, great. My
11	name is Angeles Wartes-Kahl from the Organic
12	Integrity Cooperative Guild. I'm based in
13	Poulsbo, Washington, on ancestral and occupied
14	Suquamish tribal land. My comments pertain to
15	the Handling Subcommittee proposal for ion
16	exchange filtration process.
17	The Organic Integrity Cooperative
18	Guild is a cooperative of organic inspectors,
19	reviewers and consultants who also farm. We have
20	
20	come together to further professionalism in the
21	come together to further professionalism in the organic integrity sorry, in the organic

trustworthy organic marketplace.

2 We strongly agree with the 3 Subcommittee's decision to favor Option 1. specifically net resin in materials do not need 4 to be listed on the National List. 5 From our own 6 collective experience, both having reviewed and 7 different inspected dozens of operations utilizing this technology, we concur that ion 8 9 exchange resins do not meet the definition of an 10 ingredient or a processing aid.

They are reviewed as part of the certifier's initial and annual organic system plan review process. They're also reviewed as part of -- as where certifiers -- verifying that each specific resin brand formulation is approved by FDA as a food contact substance. Confirmation that each material is FDA-approved is completed through a review of label specification sheets provided by the materials supplier.

Certifiers and inspectors annually verify that recharged materials are not only consistent with the National List, but also the

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

brands and specific formulations are tracked as 1 2 part of the operator's list of allowed materials. 3 Some commenters even at this late date continue to repeat the erroneous idea that ion exchange 4 5 columns could be subject to leakage. Please see our comments from the fall 6 7 2022 meeting, where we along with the Organic Trade Association point out that the notion of 8 leakage arise 9 column appears to from 10 misinterpretation of the publication of 11 exchange for dummies. As they explain, 12 concept of leaking is not from the ion exchange columns but rather the possibility of undesirable 13 compounds that were previously removed from the 14 15 food itself. 16 And so working back into the product 17 flow. Think arsenic that was removed from apple 18 juice or rice syrup. The concept of leakage has 19 nothing to do with the degradation of the ion 20 exchange feeds themselves. Their capacity might be full and need a recharge, but this does not 2.1

result in the resins themselves entering the

2	I would encourage the Board to
3	consider the broad use of ion exchange technology
4	for water treatment plants. Do we plan to list
5	municipal water sources on the National List as
6	allowed or not? And finally, organic is climate-
7	smart and yes to GPS or township and range
8	coordinates on every organic certificate. Thank
9	you for your time in these matters.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And thank you for
11	your comments. Questions from the Board for
12	Angela? Kyla has a question for you.
13	MEMBER SMITH: Hey Angela, thanks for
14	your comments. Based on your experience
15	inspecting operations that may use ion exchange
16	systems, am I correct in the assumption that
17	through that verification of adherence to their
18	organic system plan, as well as other federal and
19	state authorities that regulate food safety, that
20	there is a lot of oversight into use of these
21	systems? Is that an accurate assumption?
22	MS. WARTES-KAHL: Absolutely. I mean

final organic product.

1	it's quite a technical process and so there needs
2	to be SOPs in place to make sure that their
3	recharged units are correctly monitored and are
4	working and functioning properly, just like there
5	would be with any QA system for the entire plant
6	operation.
7	I mean we're talking like molasses
8	filtration. I mean it's huge. It's not
9	they're not small home-based systems. I mean
10	maybe they could be, I don't know. Things we've
11	seen is much bigger. Industrial process, yeah.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Allison, please go
13	ahead.
14	MEMBER JOHNSON: Thank you, Angela.
15	This is really helpful. I mentioned earlier, I'm
16	still trying to sort of understand how resins fit
17	into the scheme of just materials that come in
18	contact with organic products, analogous to a
19	plastic or something else where there may be a
20	real risk of something leaching out of it,
21	understanding of what you just laid out.
22	But a properly functioning resin is

not intended to have an interaction with the 1 materials that are being processed through ion 2 3 exchange. I'm curious if you could speak to anything you know about that risk, and any way 4 that you 5 we might provide, know, further 6 assurance or further monitoring to keep tabs on if and how that may be a risk that we should be 7 concerned about. 8

MS. WARTES-KAHL: I'm not familiar with any testing available that would show that there was a possibility of a filtration bead in a finished organic product, because there's more filtration that happens after the ion exchange, like things to take out other debris or, you know, sediment, sludge, leaves, all kinds of different stuff.

So if it was free and floating in the pre-organic product, then it would probably be caught again by another saver filtration system past the ion exchange. So it's not like it's -- you're going to drink apple juice and there's not going to be a plastic bead sitting in it. That

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

Τ.	seems rearry unitikery.
2	MEMBER JOHNSON: I'm really worried
3	about you know that a particle that can be
4	physically filtered out, but analogous to a
5	plastic degradation product or something like
6	that, or like a chemical leaching. Some of us go
7	back.
8	MS. WARTES-KAHL: Yeah. I mean it's -
9	- their action is to pull out. Like their
10	action, their action is to grab and pull out the
11	impurities. And so then they themselves need to
12	release from those impurities in a recharged
13	system to be able to function properly.
14	The plastic used is highly stable. I
15	don't the likelihood of it occurring, like
16	being able to find it later in an organic product
17	through a test is so small. I don't even, I
18	haven't been able to find anything that shows
19	that there's a test for that I guess is my short
20	answer.
21	And then for the testing that we have
22	seen, it's mostly about whether or not the

seems really unlikely.

1	recharged unit is working correctly with the
2	cations and ions being interchanged between the
3	two. Like is it properly functioning, and you
4	can do tests to determine that aspect of it, and
5	the overall, I would say like
6	I guess I can't go into greater
7	detail, but I feel like there is information out
8	there specifically around water treatment
9	facilities, and how they test the accuracy and
10	success of their systems that we could maybe
11	adopt for organic. It seems far-reaching and
12	expensive, I guess. That's my, yeah.
13	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Brian has a
14	question for you.
15	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yeah, thanks Angela,
16	and I must say that I am not as up reading this
17	voluminous literature that we've received on this
18	topic as I probably should be. But are these
19	beads, are they pure resin or are they, like many
20	other plastics, a composite with a lot of
21	different materials in them, in addition to the
22	active ingredient, which is the resin?

1	MS. WARTES-KAHL: They're a polyblend.
2	So yeah
3	MEMBER CALDWELL: I'm sorry. Would
4	you define that? I don't, I don't know what that
5	means.
6	MS. WARTES-KAHL: Poly, hold on one
7	second. I'm not a very I'm not, I have a hard
8	time
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Well, we can also
10	have you follow up with Brian too.
11	MS. WARTES-KAHL: Exactly the word
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We're not going to
13	put you on the spot
14	MS. WARTES-KAHL: I'm going to have
15	like 100 pages open on my laptop of so many
16	different parts of ion exchange technology. And
17	so I'm like okay, now I have to find the exact
18	words that you're looking for. If I could pass
19	on that and send it in the chat, just because I
20	can't do it as quickly as you might need. And
21	then also
22	(Simultaneous speaking.)

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: If you'd send it
2	to Michelle, that would be great, and then she
3	could pass it on to the Board.
4	MS. WARTES-KAHL: Okay, let's do that.
5	Yes.
6	MEMBER CALDWELL: Great.
7	MS. WARTES-KAHL: Sorry for not being
8	up on it. I apologize.
9	MEMBER CALDWELL: The reason I mention
10	it is that so many times, you know, we get, we
11	might get focused on the active ingredient, but
12	there may be other things going on too, and it
13	would be good to have as big a picture as we can
14	get.
15	MS. WARTES-KAHL: Understood, yes.
16	MEMBER CALDWELL: Thank you very much.
17	MS. WARTES-KAHL: For sure.
18	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
19	questions for Angela?
20	All right. We appreciate your time
21	today, Angela. Thank you.
22	MS. WARTES-KAHL: Thank you all for

1	your work.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up we have
3	Emily Moyer, followed by Adam Seitz. Emily,
4	please go ahead.
5	MS. MOYER: Hi everyone, thank you.
6	My name is Emily Moyer, and I am the Vice
7	President of Regulatory Compliance and Global
8	Food Safety Standards for the International Fresh
9	Produce Association. As always, thank you first
10	to the Board for the extensive amount of work
11	that you do outside of your day jobs in reviewing
12	and considering all of these inputs on the sunset
13	list, as well as your consideration of the
14	stakeholder comments that you've receive each and
15	every year.
16	IFPA represents every segment of the
17	global fresh produce supply chain, with
18	approximately 3,000 member companies, over 500 of
19	which are directly involved in the organic fresh
20	fruit, vegetable and floral supply chain. For
21	the sake of time, I'll be touching on just a few

inputs under sunset consideration, but IFPA has

21

1	submitted written comments to the docket with our
2	support and feedback on additional inputs as
3	well.
4	Being a food safety person by
5	background, I'll start off first and foremost
6	with IFPA's support to maintain bulk ethanol and
7	isopropanol on the National List on algaecides,
8	disinfectants and sanitizers. Coming from a
9	produce industry perspective, when food-borne
L 0	illness outbreaks occur, they don't just impact
L1	the implicated firm itself, but they have a
12	highly negative impact on that commodity industry
L3	as a whole.
L 4	For that reason, it's critical that
L 5	organic producers and handlers have access to a
L 6	variety of inputs to sanitize their tools and
L 7	surfaces, and maintain their irrigation lines,
L 8	all in all helping to prevent cross-contamination
L 9	and ultimately protect public health.
20	And even if certain sanitizing
21	products aren't used as the primary sanitizing
22	agent it's important to maintain this list of

options, so that operations have the ability to 1 rotate their use of sanitizers as needed. 2 3 We also support maintaining plastic mulch and covers on the National List for weed 4 barriers, which is one of the most challenging 5 6 and costly components of organic production. 7 Plastic mulch also helps with moisture conservation in the soil and generally helps 8 9 improve crop yield and quality. And for that reason, plastic mulch is 10 11 used widely across our industry. In absence of 12 equally effective alternatives and innovations being currently available, the loss of plastic 13 mulch would be extremely economically damaging to 14 15 the industry. 16 And although it may not be used as 17 plastic, maintaining much also support we 18 newspaper or other recycled paper for these 19 purposes as well, again in support of maintaining 20 options for growers of all sizes and in all regions, so that they can determine really what 2.1 22 is best for their operation.

Τ	Later today and on Thursday, you'll be
2	hearing from some IFPA organic community members,
3	as well with their own feedback on inputs of need
4	for our industry, including but not limited to
5	elemental sulfur, lime sulfur, liquid fish
6	products, sulfurous acid and aqueous potassium
7	silicate. And so with that, I thank you again
8	for your time and consideration today.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And we thank you
LO	for your comments. Any questions for Emily from
L1	the Board? Franklin has a question for you.
L2	Franklin, please go ahead.
L3	MEMBER QUARCOO: Yeah. I'm interested
L 4	in finding out what your views on the
L5	biodegradable plastic mulch is from I've heard
L 6	different things from farmers on that. What's
L7	your view on that?
L8	MS. MOYER: Thank you, sorry. I muted
L 9	myself and had to get unmuted. Yeah, this is
20	something that we did also comment on last year,
21	as it was under, in discussion in the past
22	meeting. And I would also say I'd turn to both

1	Emily Musgrave and Russ Hamlin, who are on our
2	Organic Committee, who will be speaking later in
3	the day.
4	But in general, we were supportive of
5	maintaining BBMF as another option or
6	alternative, recognizing that the existing
7	plastic mulch, it is a lot of plastic in the
8	environment. I think if those alternatives were
9	available, absolutely our growers would want to
10	use those. But it's a matter of for BBMF,
11	making sure that option is available so that also
12	the developers have the ability and really the
13	incentive to be able to innovate those products.
14	So if in the future it is a reasonable
15	alternative, that growers would be able to switch
16	to that if it works for them.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Wood has a
18	question for you.
19	MEMBER TURNER: Thanks for your
20	comments, Emily. I'm just curious. I appreciate
21	your comments about plastic mulch and covers, and
22	I just wanted to ask you, and I totally get the

feedback you're giving about the need and how 1 important it is for growers. 2 But I'm also interested in whether 3 your conversation with your growers, with your 4 members sort extended to 5 has of anecdotal 6 information about plastics that get left behind, the need to, you know, plastics that break down 7 and get left behind on the farm, the need to find 8 9 better solutions for recovering some of that 10 material and not assuming that it's 11 degrades, ends up in a landfill. 12 I'm just curious sort of the level of 13 engagement that your organization is doing to kind of think about that, and how you, how you --14 yeah, your thoughts on that need. 15 16 It is certainly part of MS. MOYER: 17 the conversation. I think our growers right now 18 are just in a tough position, because there just 19 are not those alternatives available and I think 20 from a just financial standpoint, it would be incredibly economically difficult, or 2.1 really

would not be very viable for producers to be able

Τ	to make the yields that they need for production,
2	without the use of plastic mulch.
3	So I'm not as familiar in terms of
4	just what exists right now, in terms of what do
5	we know about the breakdown in soils. Again,
6	that would be something I think maybe is better
7	for our committee members who can speak to that
8	as well in their specific uses.
9	But it is something that we're, I
10	think consistently engaging with the providers as
11	well, to say okay, what, what's new, kind of
12	what's the status and what's the efficacy at this
13	point for all this.
14	MEMBER TURNER: Yeah, I agree with
15	you. I agree with your point about alternatives.
16	I do believe that the conversation about end of
17	life needs to be a lot more robust here, and I'm
18	that's a very real concern of mine, so I
19	appreciate that. Thank you.
20	MS. MOYER: Absolutely, uh-huh.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Any
22	other questions for Emily from the Board?

1	Thank you, Emily, for your time and
2	contributions today.
3	MS. MOYER: Thank you, everyone.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Next,
5	we have Adam Seitz, followed by Orsi Deszi and
6	then Mollie Morrissette.
7	MR. SEITZ: Good afternoon. Adam
8	Seitz here, calling in from State College, PA.
9	I'm a senior technical reviewer for Quality
LO	Assurance International, a leading provider of
L1	organic certification services worldwide.
L2	My comment focuses on the Handling
L3	Subcommittee's current ion exchange resin
L 4	recommendation, which QAI supports based on the
L 5	extensive comments we've submitted on the topic.
L 6	Examining comments that oppose the
L 7	recommendation, there's a perspective that ion
L 8	exchange resins are functionally different than
L 9	other food compact substances, and that they are
20	designed to facilitate chemical changes in
21	organic foods.

I disagree. There is a change in the

1	makeup product process via ion exchange
2	filtration. However, the only substance added to
3	product during ion exchange filtration is coming
4	from recharged materials. This is why the
5	recharged materials do need to be on the National
6	List. Ultimately, resins are regulated by the
7	FDA as food contact substances. They do not
8	qualify as ingredients or processing aids, and as
9	such are outside the NOP's regulatory authority.
10	Additionally, ion exchange filtration
11	is commonly used in the purification of several
12	non-organic National List substances, including
13	those classified as non-synthetic and
14	agricultural. Ion exchange filtration is
15	referenced in several of the TERs NOSB uses to
16	classify materials, including for citric acid and
17	non-synthetic and for agricultural forms of
18	glycerin.
19	The assertion that organic food
20	processed with ion exchange filtration is
21	synthetic is not consistent with previous NOSB or
22	NOP classification determinations or official

Per NOP Guidance 5033, Section 4.4, 1 quidance. "Classification guidance does not determine the 2 3 eligibility of а substance for organic certification." 4 processed 5 Organic food with ion exchange filtration is organic food, just like 6 7 organic maple sap processed via reverse osmosis filtration through semi-permeable membranes made 8 9 up of thin film polyamide composite, with a poly, soft foam porous overlayer makes for delicious 10 11 organic maple syrup. 12 In contrast to concerns about the 13 hypothetical contamination of organic product by properly maintained ion exchange systems, 14 15 exchange filtration can be and is often used to remove contaminants from substances. 16 17 The EPA drinking water treatability 18 database notes that though typically used for 19 water softening, ion exchange filtration is more 20 frequently being used for the removal ofcontaminants such as arsenic, chlortetracycline, 2.1

chromium, cobalt, cyanide, fluoride, mercury,

1	nitrates, PFAS, perchlorate perfluorooctane
2	sulfonate, radium and other environmental
3	contaminants.
4	To be clear, the question at hand is
5	not just about ion exchange resins; it's about
6	the 5,000 plus other food contact substances that
7	are approved by the FDA as such. Does FCN No.
8	2074, consisting of a tungsten carbide alloy used
9	in food equipment wear parts, meaning it breaks
10	down, require National List inclusion? How about
11	FCN No. 2226, a complex polymer used in the
12	manufacture of coatings for repeated use food
13	contact articles?
14	These, like ion exchange resins, like
15	pneumatic ingredient batching systems, like the
16	referenced maple sap RO membrane, like other food
17	processing equipment and food contact substances,
18	are outside the scope of regulatory authority,
19	since they are neither ingredients nor processing
20	aids. Thank you much for your efforts and the
21	opportunity to comment.
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And thank you for

Τ	those comments. Brian has a question for you.
2	MEMBER CALDWELL: Thanks, Adam. I'm
3	still trying to understand a lot of this. Again,
4	I really need to read more about it and I will,
5	certainly before the fall meeting. But anyways,
6	you said that there's not a chemical change and
7	you were sort of implying that the only thing
8	that would be happening would be that the
9	recharged materials might be added to the, to the
10	product, and that's why they had to be, they had
11	to be approved.
12	But actually, isn't it that the
13	recharged materials would be separated into their
14	ionic forms and there would be an exchange, for
15	instance taking arsenic out of the solution and
16	adding another ion from the recharged material,
17	not the whole recharged material because it would
18	only be like say the positive ions that would
19	have to be exchanged.
20	So wouldn't that be considered I
21	mean I think that's pretty clearly a chemical
22	change in my mind. That may not be the critical

1	issue here, but I really don't see how you car
2	say that there's no chemical change that is
3	happening in the product.
4	MR. SEITZ: Yeah. I think most forms
5	of food processing result in chemical changes,
6	meaning you know, mixing any ingredients together
7	are going to result in at the base a chemical
8	change. So yeah, the ion may be coming from the
9	recharged material. I guess view that in my
10	previous comment, tried to equate that to say a
11	batching system where you dissolve citric acid
12	into a solution and the individual ions are being
13	batched into the organic product.
14	So yeah. I mean chemistry is going or
15	in all aspects of food processing. Thermal
16	degradation denatures proteins, you know. It's
17	all, all
18	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yeah, and I mear
19	that's right, and that's again, this may not
20	be the critical issue here at all. But that's,
21	that is our criterion for deciding whether
22	something is synthetic or not, and maybe Kyla's

1	going to help me with this. But yeah. I'm out
2	of my just trying to sort it all out and
3	thanks for your comment.
4	MR. SEITZ: Yep. I would to just
5	reiterate that that classification guidance for
6	determining synthetic/non-synthetic, ag/non-ag,
7	which we use all the time, get very in deep in
8	the review of substances. That doesn't apply to
9	determining whether something is acceptable for
L 0	organic certification.
L1	Very clearly stipulated within that
L2	guidance document that that does not pertain to
L3	assessing a product as far as whether or not it
L 4	can be certified.
L5	MEMBER CALDWELL: Thank you.
L 6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Kyla, please go
L7	ahead.
L 8	MEMBER SMITH: Thanks, Adam. You
L 9	always seem to pack in so many things into your
20	comment, with so many more than like three
21	syllable words. That's quite impressive. So my
22	questions for you based on your written

comments, it's my understanding that QAI 1 2 follow the process that's outlined in the 3 proposal. And so I just want to confirm a few 4 5 things based on your experience involving that 6 process. So am I accurate to say that the resins 7 that QAI currently allows are not a mystery. They are publicly listed on the FDA's inventory 8 9 of Effective Food Contact Substances Notification 10 database, the Inventory of Food Contact or Substances listed in 21 C.F.R.? That's the first 11 12 part of my question. Secondly again, as part of the review 13 operations organic 14 of system plan an 15 evaluation of adherence to that organic system plan, the onsite inspection, again just assuming 16 17 or is it a safe assumption that operations are 18 incorporating good management practices and 19 adherence to other regulatory requirements 20 related to food safety by federal and state 2.1 authorities part of this review as and 22 verification?

Meaning that again, there's lots of 1 oversight occurring here. So just if you can 2 3 speak to those points, that would be great. SEITZ: Yeah, definitely. 4 You yes to both of those for sure. 5 So you 6 specifically at QAI, our operations 7 document resins within their OSP, specifically within our addendum materials list, where we list 8 -- asked, ask folks to list out all sorts of 9 10 materials they're using and equipment. 11 They also specify how they're used, 12 where they're used in the process flow, what 13 inputs are used in their maintenance including 14 the recharged materials. We get spec sheets and 15 manufacturer's supporting documents for the and verify they are considered 16 resins contact substances using those publicly available 17 18 databases. 19 You know, adherence to OSP gets Traceback audits are 20 verified at inspection. always a great tool for verifying organic control 21 22 points are implemented, especially on a per batch

1	basis. So that would include verifying that the
2	resins used to process a particular product and
3	the recharged materials are documented in the
4	records, and as reported to QAI.
5	So trace a product back through the
6	production records, there should be records
7	showing what resins are utilized, what recharged
8	materials are utilized, and those things are
9	physically observed onsite of course.
10	Verifying proper maintenance
11	definitely I'd say largely falls under the
12	purview of federal, state and local food safety
13	inspections.
14	So there's that layer of verification.
15	Verifying an operation is current and in good
16	standing on the required food safety inspections
17	is one means of ensuring, you know, say ensuring
18	compliance with 205.272 with regards to potential
19	contamination via food processing equipment.
20	This is verified during every
21	inspection, you know. It's baked into our
22	inspection checklist. I'm pretty it's baked into

1 most inspectors' checklists. We also verify whether there are outstanding requirements from 2 3 food safety inspections, with implications on organic integrity, meaning if maintenance of ion 4 systems 5 exchange filtration were deemed 6 inadequate during food safety inspections, 7 definitely something we'd be following up on. You know, we have -- our inspectors, 8 of course, take a look at, you know, to make sure 9

of course, take a look at, you know, to make sure equipment's well-maintained and such onsite. But largely that, that falls under food safety inspections, and whether federal, state, local food safety inspections.

You know, as far as oversight goes via testing of the resins themselves, that's come up a lot and we don't see any testing of the resins Though to be fair, outside of the on the ground. pesticide residue testing we and other certifiers don't test for conduct, we contaminants specifically from food processing equipment, packaging and similar since this really aligns moreso with federal food safety requirements and

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

their approval of materials.

You know, I believe there are resin 2 3 testing requirements from a safety perspective incorporated into the FDA's safety assessment for 4 food contact substances, which does offer 5 6 additional layer of oversight. This morning at 7 the mention of testing of the resins, did a little search through literature and just kind of 8 wanted to see more thoroughly what these food 9 contact substances go through in order to get 10 11 approved by the FDA.

I guess I'd recommend the Board take a look at Preparation of Food Contact Substance Notifications Toxicology Recommendations Guidance For Industry.

It goes through what they would like to see for these safety assessments, I believe goes over safety testing recommendations, minimum taste testing recommendations, safety testing protocols, application of the testing recommendations, genetic toxicity testing recommendations, safety narrative, comprehensive

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1	toxicology profile, determination of non-observed
2	effects, all sorts of stuff that is above my pay
3	grade.
4	But these things are looked at and
5	assessed by the FDA as they are approving these
6	food contact substances.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate, please go
8	ahead.
9	MEMBER LEWIS: Hey Adam, good to see
10	you, and thanks for referencing my favorite part
11	of the NOB Handbook, classification of materials.
12	And just so just back to the conversation we
13	were having about just the classification and ion
14	exchange columns' impact on whether something
15	would be considered synthetic/non-synthetic, my
16	understanding so for example citric acid you
17	brought up as a non-synthetic material in 605.
18	The reason it's still considered non-
19	synthetic is because of 4.6 and the three
20	categorical elements that ion exchange columns
21	would be an example of. So the end of the
22	extraction process, there hasn't been a chemical

change: it's not been altered into a form that 1 doesn't exist in nature, and anything that's been 2 3 used to isolate it is not -- doesn't have a functional or technical effect on the final food. 4 So am I in the right place there for 5 6 like how we would send something through an ion 7 exchange column as a non-synthetic and it would result still in a non-synthetic? Am I -- is it 8 at least your understanding? Would you be in 9 10 agreement with me on that? Well, we've got to 11 ask you to unmute. 12 MR. SEITZ: That's correct, yeah. So 13 there are many substances that go through pretty 14 complex processes to be extracted and isolated 15 and purified, to get to this final ingredient that's being utilized. 16 So yes, those are the 17 criteria we are looking at. 18 And you know, I'll be the first to say 19 classification is not perfect. There are 20 discrepancies baked into the regulation, looking at pectin. Like you're in the definition of --2.1 22 is it synthetic or non-synthetic, yet classified

1	as something otherwise? It's been a while since
2	I've looked at it. But it's not perfect. It's
3	guidance that we use to make determinations for
4	sure.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, Adam.
6	Well I will echo Kyla. Thank you for fitting so
7	much into such a short period of time, and thank
8	you for joining us today. Next up we have Orsi
9	Deszi, followed by Mollie Morrissette, and then
10	Alice Runde. Orsi, or have I got your name
11	MS. DESZI: You've got the first name
12	right. It's no worries. My name is Orsi Deszi,
13	and I am the Executive Director of OMRI. So on
14	behalf of OMRI, thank you to the NOSB for their
15	advocacy of transparent and trustworthy
16	verification at every level of the organic
17	industry.
18	Fulfilling its role to review and
19	recommend, the NOSB has called upon the NOP to
20	implement a formal accreditation program for
21	material review organizations. Now it's the
22	NOP's turn to act.

1 Consumers trust the organic label, 2 producers rely on the judgments of accredited 3 certifying bodies, and the NOP verifies competency of certifiers in accordance with the 4 Organic Foods Production Act. These multilevel 5 6 checks are vital to maintaining producers' and 7 consumers' confidence in organic products. But there's a crucial link missing 8 9 from this chain of oversight. An array of inputs 10 are needed to produce any organic product. 11 Nearly three decades ago, OMRI was founded to 12 respond to the challenge of coordinating input Today, producers and certifiers 13 material review. like OMRI to verify that the 14 depend on MROs 15 inputs used in their farms and factories comply with NOP requirements. 16 17 And yet more than a decade since the 18 NOSB's recommendation, MROs themselves lack 19 accreditation oversight from the formal NOP. 20 Accreditation is vital to support and ensure the consistency and transparency of material review, 21 to provide legal protection and a firm legal 22

1	foundation for MROs and their product listing
2	decision, to provide the NOP with legal authority
3	over MROs, including the ability to suspend
4	accreditation and issue non-conformances, and
5	above all else, MRO accreditation sends a message
6	to organic stakeholders that all aspects of the
7	organic sector are under direct USDA oversight.
8	With the work being done on the USDA
9	Farm Bill by the organic industry and the renewed
10	focus on preserving organic integrity at all
11	stages of certification through the strengthening
12	of organic enforcement rules, materials cannot be
13	left out of this discussion.
14	Accordingly, OMRI adamantly affirms
15	the NOSB's 2011 recommendation that the NOP
16	directly accredit MROs. This is the best and
17	clearest path forward to achieve consistency and
18	transparency around input material review, and to
19	bring the organic industry into alignment when it
20	comes to materials.
21	The time has come for the NOP to
22	accredit MROs for a stronger and more supported

1	industry. Thank you so much.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And thank you for
3	comments. Any questions for Orsi?
4	All right, thank you. Oh, let's see.
5	Amy, please go ahead.
6	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you, Nate. Thank
7	you Orsi. That was really interesting about your
8	comment on accreditation for MROs. I'm thinking,
9	is there much cross-collaboration with MROs
10	internationally? I know OMRI's expanding their
11	presence internationally, Mexico and Canada.
12	But I'm just thinking on a global
13	stage, you know, we're just fortunate to have you
14	guys and the others domestically to help us out.
15	But I just wondered about that communication
16	chain internationally?
17	MS. DESZI: For clarification,
18	communication chain amongst MROs or with
19	MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah, yeah. Sorry,
20	exactly, the first one. Just because, you know,
21	we have agencies like ACA that are, you know,
22	cross-collaborative with other certifiers under

1	the NOP program. But I just didn't know if there
2	was a forum for MROs to cross-collaborate.
3	MS. DESZI: There isn't a formal forum
4	just for MROs, but we definitely participate in
5	global initiatives, where we talk about
6	materials, input materials and how they're
7	reviewed and the various requirements and
8	recommendations for them. So you know, we
9	attended, were part of IFOAM where we discuss
LO	that quite a bit, and OEFFA, that's something
L1	that gets discussed. But there isn't just a
L2	forum specific to material review organizations.
L3	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you. Thanks for
L 4	all your work.
L 5	MS. DESZI: Thank you.
L 6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
L7	questions from the Board?
L 8	All right. Thank you, Orsi. We
L 9	appreciate your time today. Next up we have
20	Mollie Morrissette, followed by Alice Runde and
21	then Oren Holle. Mollie, please go ahead.
22	MS. MORRISSETTE: Hi. My name's

I'm a regulatory advisor to 1 Mollie Morrissette. 2 OFGO, FDA and the CBM, and I'm a consumer 3 advisor for safe pet food. The organic pet food market in 2022 in the U.S. is worth \$2 billion, 4 and the global organic pet food size was valued 5 at 18 billion, 18.7 billion in 2021. 6 7 despite Yet these numbers and consumers' growing interest in organic pet food, 8 9 there are no USDA NOP standards for pet food 10 In 2008, the NOSB provided -- sorry today. 11 approved a recommendation for organic standards 12 specific to pet food. Yet 14 years later, 13 standards still need to be developed to provide clear and consistent composition, processing and 14 15 labeling requirements for organic pet food. 16 According to OFGO, organic 17 regulations, pet foods claiming to be organic 18 must meet its human food regulations. Yet in a 19 recent discussion with the USDA, I learned that 20 food certification, certified organic pet operations and organic certifying agents follow 2.1

for

organic

regulations

organic

22

livestock

1 production, handling and processing.

2 Here's the problem. Ι found 3 patchwork of confusing and conflicting interpretation of certifying pet food 4 in For example, I 5 research on certified pet food. 6 learned that some accredited certifying agents 7 are certifying pet food under a combination of human food and livestock rule, and another ACA 8 certified pet food used part of the livestock 9 10 rule as the basis for certifying pet food, and 11 was oblivious to the human grade pet food law. 12 Because the NOP doesn't have 13 regulatory quidance on organic pet food,

Because the NOP doesn't have regulatory guidance on organic pet food, certifiers determine whether the standards are for human food, livestock feed or a combination of both. Likewise, state feed control officials need help to regulate organic pet food claims.

To preserve the integrity of the USDA organic program, the NOP must clarify the requirements for the organic production of pet food, so that certifiers follow the same rules and consumers can be confident that the pet food

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1	they purchase is made of human food and not
2	animal feed rules. Thank you very much for
3	listening.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you for your
5	comments. Any questions for Mollie? Nate,
6	please go ahead.
7	MEMBER LEWIS: Yeah. I just want to
8	make sure Mollie that you are tracking that NOSE
9	has made recommendations on pet food in the past,
10	passed along and NOP has promised a proposed rule
11	for some time now, which I understand is in its
12	marking rule. So we're waiting with baited
13	breath, and we agree with you 100 percent that we
14	need unified organic standards for pet food. So
15	thanks.
16	MS. MORRISSETTE: Right, thank you.
17	Yeah, it's particularly important because every
18	year, the market keeps increasing and unless we
19	have clear definitions, we're kind of at a loss
20	or the consumers are at a loss to what they're
21	actually getting.

Particularly what a lot of people

1	don't understand is that when you're
2	manufacturing pet food, if it's if it's if
3	it is organic, it has to be made to human food
4	standards, which means it has to be made in a
5	human food processing plant. Most pet foods are
6	made in pet food processing plants, which are
7	under a completely different set of regulations.
8	(Simultaneous speaking.)
9	MS. MORRISSETTE: Yeah, sorry. Go
LO	ahead.
L1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Kim, you can go
L2	ahead.
L3	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Hi Mollie. I really
L 4	appreciate your comments today. This might be a
L5	somewhat silly question. When we define pets,
L 6	are we speaking very specifically to cats and
L 7	dogs, or are there other extensions to pets which
L8	you were referring to in your comments?
L 9	MS. MORRISSETTE: Kimberly, that is a
20	great question, and since I didn't have enough
21	time, you know, I only had three minutes, I
22	narrowed my focus to pet food. But actually, the

1	law has to include animal feed, which is a whole
2	other it's for livestock. But it's just,
3	it's not just cats and dogs. It's also they're
4	called small animals, gerbils and what-not. So
5	you know, yeah.
6	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Okay, thank you very
7	much.
8	MS. MORRISSETTE: Yeah.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
10	questions from the Board?
11	All right, Mollie. We appreciate your
12	time. Thank you.
13	MS. MORRISSETTE: Thank you.
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up we have
15	Alice Runde, followed by Oren Halle and then John
16	Foster. Alice, please go ahead.
17	MS. RUNDE: Hi, thanks. Good
18	afternoon. My name is Alice Runde. I'm the
19	coalition manager for the National Organic
20	Coalition. My comments today pertain to three
21	topics, racial equity, participation in the NOSB
22	process and publication of notes and TRs.

1	On racial equity, in our comments we
2	emphasize two things that NOSB could immediately
3	prioritize. First, anti-racism and cultural
4	sensitivity training for NOSB members. NOSE
5	members should have a good understanding of the
6	history of racism and oppression that has led to
7	today's landscape, who has access to land,
8	resources, USDA programs and organic
9	certification.
10	This training would allow NOSB members
11	to build a critical lens when advising the NOP.
12	These trainings would also help NOSB members
13	build a culture of support and inclusion on the
14	NOSB. NOC recommends that the NOP resource the
15	NOSB appropriately for the training, and that
16	this be an intentional, deliberate process rather
17	than just checking the box for equity training.
18	Second, including racial equity as a
19	work agenda item on the CACS Committee. We
20	understand the cumbersome effort of establishing
21	a fully independent subcommittee within the NOSB.
22	We recommend that racial equity be included as a

work agenda item in the CACS Committee. We also
want to clarify that NOC recognizes other systems
of oppression are very much at work in our
communities, including discrimination based on
gender and sexual orientation.

As a coalition, we have deliberately equity for focused our work on racial because of the demonstrated need for the organic acknowledge the history community to oppression and discrimination in the institutions we work closely with. This does not mean other systems are oppression are less important, and we look forward to focusing on additional equity issues in the future.

On participation in the NOSB process,

NOC recognizes that the Board has put effort into

whether meeting dates could be changed to

facilitate farmer participation, and that it

would be very difficult to do so. If the meeting

timing cannot be changed, we need to continue to

brainstorm ideas to involve farmers that have

difficulties making comments during their busiest

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1 times.

2.1

At a minimum, we ask that some form of communication be set up whereby questions to the Board, the questions the Board is deliberating on could be publicized in between meetings. Farmer work groups could chew on those questions and give feedback, even if they are not able to do so during the formal NOSB meeting schedule. This issue could be put on the PDS agenda.

And finally on publications of notes and technical reports. The NOSB and stakeholders need to think creatively as to how to transparently share information with all, so that stakeholders can give their best input to the NOSB.

Likewise, technical reports that the Board references in documents should be available to the public when those documents are published. We ask that if technical reports are not yet publicly published by the time an NOSB proposal is released, that the agenda item should be carried over to the next meeting. Thank you

very much for your time and for listening to our 1 2 comments. I look forward to seeing you next 3 week. CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We appreciate --4 5 thank you so much. Allison has a question for 6 you. 7 MEMBER JOHNSON: Thank you Alice. am excited and interested in the proposal to 8 provide equity training for the Board, and I also 9 recognize that it's kind of an amorphous or new 10 11 idea for folks who haven't gone through something 12 like that. I wonder if you could, oops sorry -if you could sort of give an example or speak to 13 some of the takeaways that NOC has valued from 14 that type of training, to sort of illustrate for 15 and the public what the value of equity 16 training might be, and what it could look like. 17 18 MS. RUNDE: Yeah. Thanks for that 19 question Allison, and I'd love to give a more 20 formal answer to the Board. The one thing that comes to mind is that we have hosted a couple of 2.1

trainings that were funded by the Human Capital

1	project that was funded by the NOP, really
2	focusing on the history of racism in U.S.
3	agriculture and focusing on organic.
4	That was a training that was very well
5	received, and it was followed up with some in-
6	depth training for certifiers and inspectors, to
7	kind of have some self-reflection on how that
8	history impacted some of the work that they were
9	doing. So that's something that comes to mind.
10	I know that the NOP is supporting some
11	of these trainings through Human Capital Projects
12	and through TOP and moving forward, and so the
13	Board's sharing some of those training
14	opportunities and some other reflection questions
15	and things that we took away from those trainings
16	with the Board.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
18	from the Board?
19	(Pause.)
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I have a quick
21	question for you Alice. When you speak about
22	equity and talk about in-person public comments,

I am still having a hard time reconciling how a \$2,000 expense does not elevate certain farmer voices over others.

Isn't that an evolution in the right direction hear to all participants' public comments, in the same forum with the same access, is something you can call in which from a How do we move towards change and tractor? recognizing that maybe it's good change?

I'm sorry, I had trouble MS. RUNDE: unmuting. That's a really great question, and I think something that I would like to go back to our coalition with. But I think something that we've talked about in the coalition is having two modes of having public comments, one being these virtual opportunities that allow more equitable participation and less -- allow people who don't have the opportunity to fund their travel all the way to the NOSB meetings to be able to provide comments, without taking away the opportunity for these personal connections happen in to relationship, in the same physical space.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Absolutely, but if
2	I may push a little further, it seems like those
3	who show up in person with the \$2,000 plane
4	ticket, they're still going to have an advantage,
5	even if it was equitable access.
6	So giving folks with resources the
7	chance to have more direct access seems to be in
8	conflict with equity. Am I missing something
9	here?
L 0	MS. RUNDE: I don't think you are, but
L1	I will go back to the coalition and maybe ask
12	Steve Ela and Abby Youngblood, who are commenting
L3	next, to respond to that question.
L 4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I really
L 5	appreciate it. Thank you for your comments
L 6	today. Next up we have Oren Holle, followed by
L7	John Foster and then Jane Sooby. Oren, please go
L 8	ahead, and you are muted Oren. Let's get you
L 9	unmuted.
20	MR. HOLLE: There we go. All right.
21	I'm Oren Holle. I am commenting today on behalf
22	of the Organic Farmer's Agency for Relationship

1	Marketing, more commonly known as OFARM. I
2	operate a small certified organic farm in
3	northeast Kansas, and I serve as president of
4	OFARM, and I offer comments today on behalf of
5	field crop producing membership.
6	The majority of our membership
7	consists of smaller operations, which fall in the
8	category of what is being referred to as
9	underserved. Our primary emphasis is cooperative
10	marketing for our membership. We are pleased to
11	have been accepted as a partner and were recently
12	awarded a climate-smart ag and forestry grant,
13	and will also be partnering with the Transition
14	to Organic Partnership Program in two regions.
15	These will give us an opportunity to
16	showcase the benefits of the climate-smart
17	practices of organic farming, and provide an
18	opportunity to educate and assist transitioning
19	producers and serve them in the marketing arena
20	as well. It's ironic to us that after more than

two decades of the National Organic Program being

an arm of the USDA, that we still need to defend

21

1 our climate-smart status. Surely all the production elements of 2 3 the Organic Foods Production Act should make that issue clear. As we did in our written comments, 4 we want to commend the NOSB on the well-drafted 5 6 document defending organic as climate-smart. 7 It's our hope that this proposal will heighten the recognition within the USDA. 8 9 Another issue that has become apparent 10 in this, the same companies that dominate the 11 non-organic food market continue their inroads 12 into the organic market. Market fairness will 13 likely become a more prominent issue, and the NOSB might do well to place firmly on the radar 14 15 screen. climate-induced 16 We appreciate the risk insurance discussion 17 farming and crop 18 While many elements still beg further document. consideration, this serves as a platform to 19 consider further discussion and action to revise 20 for maximum benefit for organic producers. 2.1 We

see that some of our producers recognize the risk

effectively for their own operations. 2 We also see the attention that the 3 CACS Compliance Subcommittee is 4 providing 5 regarding oversight improvements to deter fraud, the consistent location identification discussion 6 7 document. With the standard of organic 8 having become reality, enforcement now this 9 certainly provides many opportunities to provide 10 much greater involvement. 11 While this document doesn't exactly 12 reference the issue of import certificates, it 13 still appears that there remains a shortfall in 14 requirements to assure that pending import 15 shipments are identified as organic prior to This is a concern as our producers are 16 arrival. constantly affected by oftentimes huge shipments 17 18 of organic feedstuffs. 19 We believe the NOSB Compliance 20 Subcommittee might do well to engage in 2.1 application of the many SOE elements. The 22 testing of incoming shipment protocols

mitigation IMA can provide, and they're using it

1	particular attention. As we consider the many
2	research priorities that are being championed by
3	various organizations representing diverse
4	community. Time's up.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: If you'd like to
6	finish, go ahead.
7	MR. HOLLE: Just a final comment.
8	It's our understanding that the NOSB is obligated
9	to evaluate issues based on an interpretation of
10	the Organic Foods Production Act. It appears
11	that there may be a need to apply some apply
12	that principle to some more fundamental
13	procedures. Thank you for the opportunity to
14	comment today.
15	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And thank you very
16	much for your comprehensive comments. Amy has a
17	question for you.
18	MR. HOLLE: Yep.
19	MEMBER BRUCH: Oren, thanks for time.
20	Thanks for your written comments as well and
21	your involvement in the organic grain sector. I
22	really appreciate that being a grain farmer

mvself. I saw in your written comments you 1 requested that NOSB work on a resolution to 2 3 tiahten timing requirements for the certificates, and that's a part of the SOE. 4 Ι 5 was just curious on timina frequency, what you potentially had in mind for a 6 7 better solution there. MR. HOLLE: Well, there was indication 8 9 Glasgow met with us at our annual when Mr. 10 meeting this last February, that there are still 11 opportunities where the import certificates and 12 the timing of those filing would allow shipments to actually be unloaded and then enter the 13 commerce stream before that import certificate is 14 15 fully represented. 16 There again, when I'm reading through the details of the SOE, I see that that's still a 17 18 gray area at this point. And so I think that's 19 one of those things that really needs attention. 20 It doesn't make any sense to me when this stuff is coming from halfway around the world, that we 2.1 22 can't see an import certificate and know that

1	it's coming before it ever arrives, so that the,
2	you know, the necessary scrutiny can be put into
3	place.
4	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you. I
5	appreciate that comment.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you very
7	much for your comments, Oren. We appreciate
8	them. Next up we have John Foster, followed by
9	Jane Sooby and then Margaret Scoles.
10	MS. ARSENAULT: Wait just one second
11	while I'm getting John's slides up.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Okay.
13	MS. ARSENAULT: There will be a little
14	delay. Thanks.
15	(Pause.)
16	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
17	went off the record at 3:34 p.m. and resumed at
18	3:36 p.m.)
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Oh John, you are
20	muted.
21	MS. ARSENAULT: Now we're muted. It
22	may be

1	MR. FOSTER: How about now?
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Still have an
3	echo. Try it out real quick.
4	MR. FOSTER: How about now?
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Good.
6	MR. FOSTER: All right, thank you. I
7	appreciate the opportunity to speak with you all.
8	I look forward to meeting you next week in
9	Atlanta. Thanks to the Board members, and
10	especially welcome to two new Board members.
11	It's going to be fun ride. Thanks to the
12	program. Without all of us and all of you
13	especially, none of this works. So thank you for
14	that.
15	We also provided some comments for
16	review. My name is John Foster. I'm with Wolf
17	and Associates. We're a very persistent
18	consulting firm that specializes in all things
19	organic. So with that, let's go to the first
20	slide. So a big priority for us is supporting
21	more organic acreage, getting more organic
22	ingredients in circulation and getting all the

1	organic goodness to as many as possible.
2	So these three bullet points that I'll
3	talk briefly to in a minute are really
4	intentioned, the intention is to bring those
5	priorities forward.
6	So next slide, please. On the
7	National List, this is more of an ask or a
8	reminder, that when I was on the Board years ago,
9	I was really useful for you to remember that our
10	criterion of essentiality was intended to be
11	contextual, not universal, right. And so
12	material on the National List exists in a vacuum.
13	It's always in the context of the practice
14	standard.
15	And moreover, any material used that's
16	on the National List, it's the certifier's job to
17	make sure that that material is used in the right
18	context relative to the OSP.
19	So as you're reviewing materials to
20	stay on the List or new materials, I would just
21	ask that the need by a few for a material ought
22	to be enough if the material meets the remaining

criteria. It shouldn't have to be needed by
everyone or a whole lot of people, because the
need of the few is just as important to those few
as the needs of the many.

Next slide, please. This idea of a registry or compendium of commercially available materials is something I talked about last year, and I've kind of refined the idea. But my hope registry that includes is that a all the allowances certifiers have allowed under t.he commercial availability provisions, whether it's ingredient or seeds or others, would be an compiled in one spot.

And I don't see another way to allow a consistent application for ACAs of the commercial availability clauses without a single source of truth about knowing what's out there. Right now, my observation is that there's a lot of inconsistency in how those clauses are applied, and I think a single registry which seems a bit fantastic I know at the moment, but a single registry would do the trick.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1 Organic seed use would be a great 2 place to start. It's a place where the current 3 system really hasn't done justice to increasing significantly organic seed use. So I think of 4 5 this as a regulatory matter, not a -- not a nice 6 to have. Next slide, please. 7 So it sounds kind of radical at first, but the idea of commercial 8 availability, of being applied broadly to 605 is 9 really just a half step from the familiar. 10 We 11 have mechanisms in place to, what, to use this 12 and it would create an incentive for development 13 of new organic ingredients to replace non-organic ingredients. 14 15 And a good example of that just came up recently in comments on citric acid. 16 I can talk about that more as an example of why organic 17 18 citric acid should be used instead of organic, but there's no incentive to do that. 19 20 I'll leave it there. Thank you for your time. 21 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you for your 22 comments. Any questions for John from the Board?

Τ	Let me see. Okay. Sorry folks. Kyla, you have
2	a question.
3	MEMBER SMITH: Okay, hi. Hi John.
4	Thanks for comments. My question is really to
5	the 606 like registry, and who or and you also
6	mentioned seeds in there. So commercial products
7	that require commercial availability. Who do you
8	envision is the overseer of said database,
9	because there are I believe there is a
L 0	database for feeds. I don't again, like
L1	they're I think that that's used, but anyway,
L2	how do we ensure that people are really using it?
L3	And then there was, I believe at some
L 4	point in time, a 606 database as well, and that
L5	sort of whittled, fizzled out I guess is what I
L 6	want to say. So who best to be the keeper of
L7	said registry?
L8	MR. FOSTER: Yeah. So I've thought a
L 9	lot about this, and although I know there's
20	resistance to it for very good reason, but I
21	don't see a better place than the NOP using a
22	similar backbone as the Organic Integrity

1	database, in large part because I've kind of
2	thought through how it would need to be it
3	would need to be a neutral party, right, for two
4	reasons.
5	One, it would need to be something
6	organized at that level because everyone's
7	service agreement with certifiers, the certifiers
8	are saying we're not going to reveal XYZ
9	information unless we're under a court order to
10	do so, right? That wouldn't be the case here.
11	That's in part why I see this as a compliance
12	issue.
13	So I see the shorter answer would be
14	as an extension of the of OIP, it would have
15	to be, because there's no private entity that
16	will get sufficient information from all
17	participants. That's the shortest possible
18	answer for me.
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Wood, please go
20	ahead.
21	MEMBER TURNER: Hey John, thanks for
22	your comments. Just a quick question about your

points about essentiality. Is that, is there 1 anything specific that you're referring to there? 2 3 I mean is there a perception that you have that certain, you know, there have been some reviews 4 5 and materials where there have been a, there's 6 been а different, а different approach 7 essentiality taken by the Board than what you described. 8

I feel like I've, we've had a lot of conversations about it, but I feel like we're, you know, in violent agreement even on some level. So I just wanted to -- I wanted to make sure we sure we're not missing something.

MR. FOSTER: That's a good one, and a fair clarification. What I hear often, I have heard and this goes back -- I mean I started paying attention to NOSB comments, I don't know, mid-2000's and definitely when I was on the Board starting in 2010 and since, is a lot of comment kind of it presupposes that a certain number of people or a certain percentage of operators need a material in order to justify its use.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

And that's -- my observation since 1 2 certainly the last decade or so are that the 3 underlying assumption is that many people should need it, and for more specifics, comments often 4 come up like my grandfather or my grandmother 5 raised chickens and didn't need, fill in the 6 7 blank, right? And the sometimes spoken, sometimes 8 9 unspoken implication of that is that no 10 should need to fill in the blank, because my 11 experience is this. I think that that experience 12 was true for those people in that time. I'm not 13 questioning that. I'm just -- I would like to get away from the idea that what's good for me or 14 15 what's useful for me or essential for me is the same thing for everybody else. 16 17 Laddered up even moreso the was 18 magnitude when we're talking about application of 19 NOP standard globally, when one thing on the list 20 that's available to me in California isn't available in Mexico or Chile or Australia. 2.1 So

the idea that any one thing, one solution to one

1	production problem is enough on the List
2	presupposes that one thing is available to
3	everyone who wants it.
4	And I hear a lot of public comment
5	that uses that operating assumption, and that
6	worries me because, because mostly I don't want
7	the National List to be a tool for exclusivity.
8	That's my main thing. And that's why I get kind
9	of emotional about it, because I think the
L 0	National List should be an inclusive list. It
L1	should drive inclusivity and availability, not as
L2	a not as a tool, particularly out of context,
L3	to keep people out.
L 4	Yeah, I'll leave it there, sorry. I
L 5	could go on and I won't. Sorry.
L 6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy has a question
L7	for you John.
L 8	MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah, thanks Nate. Hi
L 9	John, thanks for your comments today. I have a
20	question. It falls in line of what you're
21	speaking about, the commercial availability. In
22	vour written comments, vou mention there's ten

other items that have a potential to be produced 1 organically, and you don't have to share them 2 3 now. But I was hoping maybe you could share 4 them with Michelle, so we could have access to 5 You mentioned flavors and 6 that information. 7 yeast, but then say there's ten other ones that are on the radar. So that information will be 8 9 super-helpful. I will do that. 10 MR. FOSTER: T']] 11 generate a list and send it to Michelle. 12 exempt, you know, collagen gel is the other one that's called out, and oddly enough dioxide 13 indirectly. 14 That's an odd one, because you 15 generally don't think of mineral. But there's the rice hull demand there. 16 17 But since it came up just recently in 18 the back and forth here, citric acid. For 19 example, there is certified organic citric acid on the market today. Very hard to find, even by 20 very motivated people and it's very expensive 21

because it's only made to order. And it's only

1	made to order because there's no market
2	incentive. There's no sorry, there's no
3	regulatory incentive to drive people there,
4	right.
5	Like 606, you have to look for
6	something and show it. Not true. So my, yeah.
7	That would be one example, and I'll include
8	citric acid on that longer list.
9	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you so much,
10	John.
11	MR. FOSTER: You're very welcome.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Kim, please go
13	ahead.
14	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Hi John. I keep
15	raising and lowering my hand, thinking well maybe
16	this was already partially answered, but maybe
17	not. But do you see any parallels with
18	essentiality and commercial availability from the
19	perspective that commercial availability should
20	then negate essentiality of a product that, you
21	know, someone might say is essential in non-
22	organic form because of where they live versus

1	having commercial availability to the masses in
2	organic form.
3	Maybe more food for thought, but I was
4	just trying to I was just trying to drive a
5	parallel between those two, and I don't know if
6	it's there.
7	MR. FOSTER: Yeah. So can I I have
8	a short response to that, is I don't think it's a
9	parallel but an interdependency. There's
LO	definitely an interrelatedness there where and
L1	it is, it can be local. It could be state, it
L2	could be regional because if an item is on, is
L3	available in one part of the country or a country
L 4	and not somewhere else, then the context of
L5	commercial availability changes. The
L 6	availability changes as a function of location,
L7	say.
L8	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Yeah.
L 9	MR. FOSTER: And so there is an
20	interrelationship for sure.
21	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Well, I appreciate
22	your perspective very much so, and I do like the

1	idea of a database for multiple things. But I do
2	think that having some sort of a resource for, if
3	nothing else, for people to use almost as
4	advertising, of "we have this in organic form."
5	It has a nice appeal to it. So I appreciate your
6	comments.
7	MR. FOSTER: You're welcome.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate Lewis, please
9	go ahead.
10	MEMBER LEWIS: I couldn't resist
11	extending story time with Uncle John here. So
12	John, the thing I wanted to just you touch on
13	something that I think is really important about
14	organic seeds, and the commercial availability
15	aspect of that. There's a lot of barriers and
16	challenges, I realize, to getting organic seed
17	more widely adopted.
18	I think the sort of mixed vegetable
19	side of things has done a pretty decent job
20	pulling it into farmer's markets where primarily
21	they're using organic seeds, or at least have
22	access to them. But I, you know, like out here

1	processing vegetables, you know, they're
2	proprietary of one hybrid. So you're talking
3	three years of planning and all this stuff.
4	It's a it's a seemingly
5	insurmountable barrier. But I was wondering if
6	you had thoughts on sort of how the current
7	iterations of the regulations guidance, just kind
8	of how certifiers deal with that issue may be
9	contributing to the problem, as opposed to
LO	pushing farmers or pulling farmers in the
L1	direction of utilizing more organic seeds.
12	MR. FOSTER: Yes.
13	MEMBER LEWIS: And sort of
L 4	incentivizing that market.
L5	MR. FOSTER: Yes, thank you. I would
L 6	first kind of let everyone remember last year, a
L7	year ago at the last previous spring meeting,
L8	Kiki Hubbard provided a State of Organic Seed,
L 9	right, for 2022. There was a lot of good
20	information there and as I recall, unanimous
21	engagement from the Board about that content.
22	So I would put people back. That's

1 where data would come from to support this. the concern I have is that now we're 20 plus 2 3 years into the regulation, and there are tons of organic seed that aren't used because 4 current system doesn't, doesn't provide that in a 5 single place, right. 6 7 The information about what organic seed, two things. One is available, but more 8 9 importantly what is needed, because if I were a seed breeder and I could go to my CFO and say 10 11 look, here is a need for 400,000 pounds 12 organic Conquistador celery seed, right? the market, and if we have it, we can charge 13 whatever we want for it. Here's the regulation 14 15 that mandates that. 16 But if I'm, if I'm just out in the 17 field and I don't have that data, I'm not going 18 to be able to convince someone to go to produce So that's one value of the list. 19 that. The way, 20 the way the current system hasn't worked is that -- careful I frame on this. 2.1

if someone waits long enough to

order that seed, to order organic seed, there's a 1 relatively high assurance that that person who 2 3 the distribution chain well, they've been ordering seed for a long time, knows 4 5 the right time to make that request, right? 6 And then you get your letter from the distributor and everyone's happy. But that's an 7 intent -- in my opinion, that's an intentional 8 avoidance at best, but it's something -- things 9 like that are quite common I hate to say it. 10 11 another is, as you mentioned, it takes a 12 time to breed organic seed that's appropriate for 13 processing specs. 14 MEMBER LEWIS: Agreed. 15 I know from experience MR. FOSTER: when I was at Earthbound Farm, we had a seed 16 company come to us and say if you give us this 17 18 contract for organic seed, I'll use spinach as an 19 example, we'll supply X number of tons of organic 20 spinach seed. We quarantee the same performance characteristics, but we need that contract first. 2.1

much seed

grow that

We

can't

22

the

without

1 contract.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

And that, it really disallowed that

system. Really there was no way to promise that.

No one wanted to promise first basically. And

so I feel like, and I think that's fair, that

makes sense. If I were the seed company, I

wouldn't want to invest those millions of dollars

either without a guaranteed sale.

So what this list I think would do is it's the combination of commercial availability and a registry for this. It's give that data so everyone knows how much of this seed is needed, and everyone knows — then the certifier would go to that list. If I were a grower of celery and I didn't order one of these tons of organic Conquistador celery, there better be a really good reason I didn't get that.

And it's got to be a much higher, I think a much more demonstrable standard, not higher, but more demonstrable than is the current case now. I don't see, given the failure of past seed registries and there have been three

1	attempts that I know of, and not one has
2	survived. I think that's because it has not been
3	a non-regulatory environment.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. I hate
5	to be the one to break story time with Uncle
6	John.
7	(Simultaneous speaking.)
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We do really
9	appreciate this. This is an exciting high level
L 0	discussion for how we can think about, maybe not
L1	as a standards solution to this, but something
L2	even bigger than that. So thank you for bringing
L3	this, John.
L 4	MR. FOSTER: You're welcome.
L 5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up we've got
L 6	Jane Sooby, followed by Margaret Scoles and then
L7	Bill Wolf and Jo Ann Baumgartner before we jump
L8	to the next break. So Jane, the floor is yours.
L 9	MS. SCOLES: Thank you Nathaniel and
20	good afternoon everybody. I'm Jane Sooby with
21	CCOF. I want to thank National Organic Standard
22	Board members and NOP staff for your hard work to

1 maintain organic integrity and for thi
2 opportunity to comment.
3 Today, I will focus on the importance
of organic research and the research prioritie
5 put forth by the Materials Subcommittee. First
6 I'd like to thank the Subcommittee for compiling
7 and sharing organic research priorities
8 Publicly funded agricultural research i
9 something that conventional producers can take o
granted, while historically the percentage o
USDA research dollars invested into organi
research has been lower than the percentage o
organic market share.
But over the years, we have
accumulated a strong body of basic organi
research, and this is why we can state with
confidence that organic agriculture is playing
key role in mitigating climate change and shoule
be acknowledged for it.
Organic farming builds healthy soil
that store carbon, does not rely on fossil fuel
derived fertilizers and pesticides, and thi

1 reduces its energy use and greenhouse gas 2 emissions.

Because research clarifies the benefits of organics and provides the basis for extension and outreach, advising growers on how to optimize crop and livestock production, CCOF with other partner organizations joins advocate for increased organic research funding in the upcoming Farm Bill. The Subcommittee's list of research priorities is а valuable resource in guiding scientists toward doing work that will address organic producers' needs.

This year, as we all know, policymakers and legislators are working on a new Farm Bill. Some of you may be surprised to learn that the research title of the Farm Bill is where organic has made the most strides in terms of funding. The 2018 Farm Bill included the firstever baseline funding for an organic program, and that was for the Organic Agriculture Research and Extension Initiative, an organic research and extension funding program.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

Baseline funding is mandatory and it's 2 subject to annual appropriations. In not 3 addition, programs with baseline funding automatically carried over into the next Farm 4 So it will be important to protect this 5 Bill. 6 gain. 7 The Subcommittee prioritized numerous important research areas, all of them which are 8 We'd like to add a couple of different 9 needed. 10 priority research areas, including investigating 11 organic pastured poultry production, expanding 12 sources of domestic livestock and poultry feed, optimizing cell nutrient cycling and recycling. 13 As noted by the committee, studying 14 15 the nutritional composition of organic compared with conventional foods and publicizing those 16 to increase consumer confidence that 17 results 18 they're purchasing high quality and nutrient 19 dense products. 20 We also need economic analyses of the projected effect on organic prices by widespread 2.1 22 entry of new farmers into organic through USDA's

1	Organic Transition Initiative, and we'd like to
2	see documentation of the contribution to state
3	and national economies by the organic sector.
4	The organic supply chain contributes a lot.
5	I encourage organic stakeholders to
6	use the Materials Subcommittee's research
7	priorities discussion document and other
8	resources to advocate for organic research in the
9	Farm Bill. Thank you.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you for your
11	comments. Questions for Jane from the Board?
12	Franklin has a question for you.
13	MS. SOOBY: Hi.
14	MEMBER QUARCOO: Yes. I am
15	particularly interested in this as a researcher
16	myself. The grant-based research is a problem.
17	You start the research, you wait, that grant
18	expires and then you're waiting for the next
19	source of funds to do the research. So I want
20	you to go into it a little bit more about the
21	need for more funding, not just more funding for

research but also I'm talking about these breaks

1	in between funding cycles.
2	Where do these researchers find money
3	to keep research going during these breaks? And
4	one of the things is that, you know, organic
5	agriculture are our province. We don't have all
6	these quick fixes.
7	So we need the data long before the
8	problem arises. So I want you to go into it a
9	little bit more, not just the quantum of funds
10	available, but you know, that kind of continuity
11	for researchers to keep doing what it is that
12	they're doing.
13	MS. SOOBY: Yes, thank you. Thank you
14	for raising that concern, Dr. Quarcoo. I hope
15	I'm pronouncing that correctly. That has been a
16	long-standing challenge, and kind of a
17	dismantling of the soft funding for research,
18	specifically for agricultural research in the
19	land grant system.
20	That was occurring decades ago, and
21	I'd love for more advocacy work to be aimed at
22	that, and to for there to be more

1	institutionalized research funding and capability
2	through land grant system.
3	Unfortunately, they made a decision a
4	long time ago to move towards this competitive
5	model, and one of the solutions is to advocate
6	for longer-term research funding, say at a
7	minimum three years, three to five years. But as
8	you know, it's really unusual for grants to offer
9	that long-term funding.
10	But really at a minimum, it should be
11	at least for three years, in order to have
12	sufficient data to conduct your analysis to be
13	able to publish those results.
14	I don't know what else to say, except
15	that agricultural research has been
16	institutionalized, specifically organic research
17	has been institutionalized in some states that
18	have set up research stations that are dedicated
19	to organic research, and that may be one approach
20	to working on that problem.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Other
22	questions for Jane?

1	Thank you, Jane. We appreciate your
2	comments.
3	MS. SOOBY: Thank you.
4	MEMBER QUARCOO: Excuse me. I have
5	one comment before she gets off, if you don't
6	mind.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yes, please go
8	ahead.
9	MEMBER QUARCOO: Okay. So I had an
10	economic impact of new farmers into the
11	transitioning. Can you elaborate on that a
12	little bit? What kind of economic impact that we
13	is there a fear by the existing group of
14	farmers that that will negatively impact them or
15	what is, what are we looking at with that
16	economic impact analysis?
17	MS. SOOBY: So you know, I wouldn't
18	know the details of that economic analysis. I'm
19	not an economist. However, USDA has made the
20	remarkable step of acknowledging that it's really
21	important to have more organic in the country,
22	and they've established a \$300 million Organic

1 Transition Initiative.

Actually, CCOF is playing a role here 2 3 in the Southwest region on this effort. also heard from some of our producers, and most 4 of our research priorities come directly from our 5 6 producers expressing their needs to us, that they 7 have concern that especially at periods of time when prices can be kind of low and some producers 8 having to sell their products 9 into the 10 conventional market or at conventional prices, 11 that bringing in a lot of new organic producers 12 lower prices even further, or lead to mav 13 increased competition. So I'm talking about this as a way. 14 15 You know, we really need to look at our market development side of that equation, and also know, 16 understanding clearly what we're getting into, 17 18

development side of that equation, and also know, understanding clearly what we're getting into, bringing these new farmers in. Of course we, CCOF completely supports the Organic Transition Initiative, and the transition of every new acre -- sorry, under organic certification.

But we think we should, you know, have

19

20

2.1

1	our eyes wide open as we enter that phase.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, great
3	question Franklin. Thank you, Jane. We
4	appreciate your comments. Next up we have
5	Margaret Scoles, followed by Bill Wolf and Jo Ann
6	Baumgartner and then Dana Perls, and then we're
7	going to take a break. So Margaret, please go
8	ahead.
9	MS. SCOLES: I'm Margaret Scoles,
10	International Organic Inspectors Association.
11	Hello to the members of the NOSB, NOP, friends
12	and colleagues. IOIA is the leading worldwide
13	training and networking organization for organic
14	inspectors. We represent about 200 inspectors in
15	more than a dozen countries, plus many supporting
16	members.
17	We have already submitted written
18	comments on the CACS discussion document,
19	oversight improvements to deter fraud, consistent
20	location identification. I will speak to two
21	others things.
22	First, IOIA is heartened to see how

1	much has happened within our community since the
2	NOSB prioritized human capital and the NOP
3	followed with the funding initiative, and it
4	isn't all NOP funding or initiatives. The entire
5	community has really stepped up to address the
6	human capital problem.
7	IOIA's current human capital priority
8	is developing and supporting apprenticeship for
9	organic professionals. About two years ago,
10	Organic Valley agreed in principle to help us
11	launch an industry-supported apprenticeship
12	program for inspectors. You probably heard that
13	announcement at an NOSB meeting. Livestock had
14	been identified as a key area where
15	apprenticeship was especially needed.
16	I'm proud to say that with a Farmers
17	Advocating for Organic grant, IOIA and FAPPA will
18	be co-sponsoring a livestock apprenticeship
19	intensive the last week of July in Wisconsin, the
20	first of what we hope will be many.
21	I also serve on the board of IFOAM
22	North America. The reason our president,

Jennifer Taylor is not commenting this round is 1 because she's so busy organizing workshops on 2 3 BIPOC farms in Virginia this coming weekend with IFOAM North American Projects, funded by Southern 4 SARE and OFRF. 5 We see SO much positive 6 collaboration happening.

> Second, IOIA is pleased to have developed a policy comment process and decision tree for choosing how and when we comment to public requests for comment. We prioritize those issues of direct concern or impact for have a highly engaged inspectors. We and knowledgeable group of inspectors on our Policy Comment Committee. If necessary, we survey our members when consensus cannot be achieved among our committee.

> The committee's draft policy is sent to our board of directors for review. In 2022, we added a Policy Comment Committee facilitator to assist their work. We feel we are well organized to provide meaningful input to the NOSB process. However, when we are given less than

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	one month to prepare comments, it's quite
2	challenging.
3	There was no time to conduct a survey
4	and the board received the committee comments for
5	review about two days before the submission
6	deadline, very little time for meaningful
7	discussion. We ask that you set a goal to
8	provide the NOSB meeting documents farther in
9	advance if possible. Thank you.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you for your
11	comments. Questions for Margaret from the Board?
12	I have a quick question for you,
13	Margaret. Were you able to read or are you part
14	of that drafting process of IOIA comments, or is
15	that just the Policy Committee?
16	MS. SCOLES: I read it three times
17	today, but I did read it.
18	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Okay.
19	MS. SCOLES: I did read it and I
20	realized my signature's on the bottom. But yes,
21	I read it.
22	(Simultaneous speaking.)

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: One question I do
2	want to pose to you is we are in the CACS, we
3	have a geolocating question that would across the
4	industry, there's the (a), concern that
5	certifiers don't necessarily know where all the
6	fields they certify are actually located or have
7	a consistent way to find them. There's been a
8	lot of concern about tech and different
9	communities having different tech allowances.
L 0	But as an inspector with a Smartphone,
L1	do you think it's fairly reasonable to say that
L2	the tech won't be that big of a deal if we're
L3	able to get the same GPS locations that we would
L 4	be going to if we visit every field with a
L 5	Smartphone in hand, and most if not all
L 6	inspectors have a Smartphone?
L7	MS. SCOLES: The simple answer is yes,
L 8	I agree with you. Of course, our comments do
L 9	point out that there are some challenges and but
20	we recognize that there's great inconsistency
21	between the location information that different
22	certifiers maintain and provide to inspectors

1	But we have six pages of comments that basically
2	yes, we think that's probably the best.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Perfect, I
4	appreciate that, and thank you for your comments.
5	Any other questions from the Board?
6	All right. Thank you, Margaret.
7	MS. SCOLES: Thank you.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Next
9	up, we'll have Bill Wolf, followed by Joan
LO	Baumgartner, then Dana Perls, and then we'll
L1	break.
L2	(Pause.)
L3	MR. WOLF: Can you hear me?
L 4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We can. Please go
L 5	ahead.
L 6	MR. WOLF: Awesome. I'm Bill Wolf,
L7	with Second Star Farm and Wolf and Associates.
L 8	The topics you tackle are more complex and
L 9	diverse than any other federal advisory
20	committee, and I thank each of you for this
21	amazing work. I especially welcome two brave new
22	members, Nate and Franklin.

I've been farming, launching organic 1 enterprises and helping organic growers 2 3 projects for 15 years. I served as OMRI's founding president and as president of OTA. My 4 consulting firm has 27 subject experts helping to 5 implement SOE, fraud prevention, stronger OSPs 6 7 and more. Slide 2, please. I want to address --8 I ask that you read our written comments, with 9 10 special attention to essentiality criteria, which 11 John discussed. We ask that you measure 12 essentiality wisely and broadly in voting on National List materials. Also, a shout out for 13 good work on the ion exchange resins. 14 15 Now, I'd like to share some ideas for organic 16 increasing acreage and organic 17 marketplace in the U.S. 18 Slide 3, please. Organic has grown 19 exponentially, but U.S. organic acreage has not 20 kept up with demand and imports have filled the These are some thoughts on how the NOSB 21 gaps. 22 can help increase organic acreage. Publish, get

1	the organic pet standards published, which will
2	utilize organic byproducts, increase economics of
3	organic crop production.
4	Speak out about the importance of more
5	emphasis on organics in the Farm Bill. Ask
6	Secretary Vilsack for five percent, not .03
7	percent, of all research and education dollars.
8	Recommend an organic marketing order, and not on
9	this slide, but consider establishing the in-
10	transition labeling again.
11	Slide 4. Consider how you as a board
12	can make messaging about organic stronger. We
13	need to own the markets we've created by
14	screaming out that organic is already non-GMO,
15	regenerative and sustainable. The community
16	needs to unite about trusting organic as the only
17	inspected food system in the world from seed to
18	table.
19	Slide 5 please. Earthworms are our de
20	facto mascot of organic agriculture. They thank
21	you for your time and consideration.
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And we thank you

1	for your time, Bill.
2	MR. WOLF: Thanks, Nate.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Questions from the
4	Board?
5	I have a quick question for you, Bill.
6	In looking at your last slide, your first and
7	last slide for screaming out our message, how
8	would we both think critically about continuous
9	improvement, while not throwing the baby out with
10	the bath water?
11	When we think about the entire
12	industry and all that we have to offer as a
13	solution to climate change, as a solution for
14	rural, rural depopulation and a solution to
15	producing really good clean, healthy food.
16	How do we have these smart discussions
17	internally, but not have that become the
18	publicly-facing story of organics, that we're not
19	good enough? How do we scream that we are the
20	best, while also engaging continuous improvement?
21	MR. WOLF: Well, I actually think that
22	recommending getting an organic marketing order

back on the table and making that an initiative of the organic community as a unified effort, and understanding that the processing industry would handle a bulk of the cost of it, and not opposing it in a fractured way the way it happened last time.

We came very close to having a marketing order, and that gave us -- that would have given a baseline for communicating the unified message about the benefits of organic and shouting it out consistently. So I really, I really think that's -- that is something that the Board could create a task force to look into, you know, or take, figure out a way for that to be an agenda item to start pursuing.

I think that all of the points I was trying to make are things that the Board can take an initiative on. I don't know how much there's been discussion during Board meetings or Subcommittee meetings about the Farm Bill. But we're in the midst of the Farm Bill debate, and Organic Policy Week is coming up in three weeks

2.1

1 in D.C.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

There will be over 200 visits to the 2 3 Hill to talk, and a lot of that talk will be about the Farm Bill. The Board has a huge 4 ability and power to talk to the -- directly to 5 6 the Secretary about not just giving organic sort of a passing look, but about all the things we've 7 been talking about, the fact that it is a 8 powerhouse for climate change. 9

I mean the research that's been done about humic acids and the humic compounds that are on organic farms that aren't found on non-organic farms is not being publicized. It isn't being talked about, about the fact that organic farming methods can collect more carbon, dramatically more carbon by its very nature of the structural dynamic of how we farm.

So there are many things the Board can be doing. I realize you have a huge agenda. Just take dealing with managing the National List and all the debates about it. In fact, the reason we talk internally quite a bit about

1	public comments and written comments and oral
2	comments for this upcoming meeting, in fact in
3	our quarterly all-in advisors group, we said well
4	what are the two big issues that
5	Because this Board meeting this time
6	next week is not having huge voting issues.
7	You're not voting on 100 materials questions.
8	You're considering them well in advance, which is
9	awesome. It's really good that they're on the
10	table to discuss and you have time for them. But
11	we decided wow, let's start talking about the,
12	some of
13	This gives us an opportunity to
14	comment about some of the bigger strategic
15	issues. How do we get more acreage and can the
16	Board somehow allocate some time to that. Does
17	that at least
18	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I so appreciate
19	all of that, and I want to especially highlight
20	thank you for the very succinct bullet points to
21	get across for what we could be doing at a high
22	level So T really thank you for your

1	presentation and your comments just now.
2	MR. WOLF: Thank you, I appreciate it.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Carolyn has a
4	question for you.
5	MEMBER DIMITRI: Yes. So Bill, I
6	wonder how you see balancing like risk mitigation
7	and ensuring the viability of existing organic
8	farms with bringing new farms on board?
9	MR. WOLF: When you say are you
10	saying that you're concerned that bringing more
11	acreage on board might adversely affect the
12	current farms?
13	MEMBER DIMITRI: Well, okay. Well
14	maybe, but I also see that we have a lot of
15	existing organic farms that really could use the
16	benefit of like stronger engagement in farm
17	programs, if that's what they want, or stabilized
18	markets or like better ensuring the economic
19	viability of the existing farms.
20	Like, so like how do you think about
21	stabilizing those farms and improving the
22	economic position of the existing organic farm

Τ	sector, while at the same time talking about
2	expanding acreage?
3	MR. WOLF: Good question. That's a
4	long conversation. I think, I think there are a
5	lot of things to protect the current organic
6	farmers that isn't being done as well as it
7	could. One of the presenters earlier today was
8	talking about the challenges of the crop
9	insurance program, and that the OSP should be ar
10	automatic go-to to qualify for crop insurance.
11	There are numerous places where the
12	current farmers should get a free pass, and we
13	haven't really understood some of those. One of
14	them is the marketing of the chain of custody of
15	local and U.S. food into processed foods, and
16	encouraging more local well, domestic
17	purchasing that is starting to happen in the way
18	USDA is starting to fund transition money and
19	education money.
20	When I look at the research, the
21	research funding for organic, it is so tiny it's
22	embarrassing, at university level and at the USDA

If we're, you know, between five and 1 seven percent of the food dollar, why isn't the 2 3 USDA putting money into where the growth is? That's what any good business decision says. 4 started trying to say that to USDA 15 years ago, 5 6 and we've begun to get a little bit of funding. That kind of initiative will help the 7 farmers. I also think an 8 current organic marketing order would help the organic current 9 farmers because they'd have a seat at the table 10 11 and how that marketing money would be spent. 12 MEMBER DIMITRI: Nate, can I just make one more comment or question? So like what I've 13 learned through some of my research with organic 14 15 farmers is they don't feel that USDA really hears them or understands them or is there for them. 16 17 So like I mean so then if -- like so 18 how does that fit into this? These are the 19 things that I think about in my spare time. It's very hard to like untangle, so you have more USDA 20 money coming to help transition people into like 2.1 22 а sector where they don't feel that USDA

supports them. So like will this make things worse, 2 3 or how -- like how would you have this change coming from like maybe the small to mid-scale 4 organic farmer to like instead of being like 5 6 we're not part of like regular agriculture. 7 You're sort of asking them to like jump on board with marketing orders and farm programs 8 and stuff. 9 Well, you've sort of 10 MR. WOLF: Sure. 11 touched on one of my pet peeves about the Organic 12 Foods Production Act. The small farmers who go 13 to the farmer's markets, who aren't certified 14 should have been given the opportunity to 15 continue to use the term "organic," the exemption shouldn't have been at \$5,000. It should have 16 been if you are truly direct selling person to 17 18 person to the farm. 19 And that was one of the proposals in 20 front of the Senate Ag Committee in 1990. Tt. I think reopening OFPA to make that 2.1 failed. 22 change would reopen the door to the small farmers

1	respecting organic again. I'm just throwing an
2	idea out there, if we're going to reopen OFPA to
3	some things that will broaden the understanding
4	of the benefits of organic.
5	MEMBER DIMITRI: Okay, great. Thanks.
6	I do see we could talk about this forever. Nate
7	probably won't let us. Thank you.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And you can talk
9	about it next week. So this is, I think, a great
10	example of how a comment made, follow-up in
11	person. So thank you so much for your time,
12	Bill. We really appreciate it.
13	MR. WOLF: Thank you all. Take care.
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up we have
15	Jillian Baumgartner, followed by Dana Perls, and
16	then we'll break. After our break, we'll have
17	Jane Stevens, Malaika Elias and then David Meyer.
18	So Jo Ann, please go ahead.
19	MS. BAUMGARTNER: Thank you, yes, and
20	thank you to the NOSB for your hard work. I'm Jo
21	Ann Baumgartner, Executive Director of Wild Farm
22	Alliance. We have been advocating for the NOP to

implement the NOSB's native ecosystem protection since 2018, when the recommendation was made.

I want to dispel any misconceptions that we are a consumer organization that does not work with many farmers with the same concerns.

Our main constituents are farmers. Our recent hedgerow video we made had over 10,000 views. We work to help farmers support and benefit from wild nature. Our mission states that we promote a healthy, viable agriculture.

bring this up because organic growers need native ecosystems for their farms to function well. Many farmers we work recognize that they shouldn't cut off their nose to spite their face. Destroying existing native habitat and ecosystems nationally and internationally to quickly produce certified organic crops threatens the integrity of organic farming practices, weakens the environment that rely on for pollinators and natural farmers enemies, and removes valuable habitat from many kinds of wildlife.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

There are 4,000 native bee species in 1 the U.S., and while some can be supported by 2 3 organic farms, we need to conserve a diversity of native ecosystems to provide habitat for the 4 overwhelming majority of them. 5 The same is true for beneficial insects and birds. 6 7 Ladybug beetles will overwinter native deer grass and other native plants, and 8 conserving native ecosystems means that farmers 9 can count on these beneficials to be around when 10 11 they need them. 12 A pair of barn owls and four young will eat up to 3,400 rodents in a year, but they 13 only spend a third of their time on the farm, and 14 15 require grasslands, woodlands and riparian areas all made of ecosystems for the rest of their 16 Native species have nowhere to go 17 sustenance. 18 when the habitat is destroyed. Niches are almost 19 always filled, meaning that there is no room if 20 they try to make a living elsewhere. They inevitably compete with residents 2.1 22 and the strongest wins out, but the world loses

1	as our biodiversity dwindles. Most organic
2	farmers that had to transition their land for
3	three years do not think it's fair for others to
4	be certified quickly after destroying a native
5	ecosystem. The transitional farmers had to
6	forfeit organic premiums while they increased the
7	environmental quality of their land.
8	Meanwhile, the farmers destroying
9	ecosystems make more money while they
10	significantly decrease the environmental value.
11	The NOP needs to eliminate the incentive to
12	destroy native ecosystems, making a more level
13	playing field for farmers and conserving the
14	biodiversity necessary for pollinator and natural
15	enemy health on functioning organic farms. Thank
16	you.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any questions for
18	Jane? I apologize, Jo Ann. I made that too
19	long.
20	All right. We appreciate your
21	comments today. Thank you. Is Dana Perls still
22	on?

1	MS. PERLS: I am, thanks so much.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Please
3	go ahead and then we'll break.
4	MS. PERLS: Thank you. I know I'm
5	blocking your break. My name is Dana Perls. I'm
6	the food and technology manager with Friends of
7	the Earth. Thank you for the opportunity to
8	provide some comments. I'm going to speak about
9	the Materials Subcommittee's excluded methods
10	list.
11	Friends of the Earth really
12	appreciates the NOSB's careful examination of
13	emerging technologies, particularly those derived
14	from genetic engineering and we are concerned
15	with one thing in particular, which is the
16	induced mutagenesis and ask the NOP to include
17	this in the list of excluded methods.
18	We appreciate the NOSB has named that
19	if the mutagen is developed using in vitro
20	nucleic acid techniques, it would constitute an
21	avaluded method Hoveron valve a hit concerned
	excluded method. However, we're a bit concerned

synthetic chemicals, irradiation or environmental 1 stressors like heat, cold, increased salinity. 2 3 We believe that if the mutagen is a chemical or irradiation, such changes in mutagens may not 4 respect the genome as indivisible, and therefore 5 should be considered an excluded method. 6 7 Additionally, the chemical mutagens would be considered synthetic chemicals. 8 But there may be types of mutagens that would not be 9 10 considered, such as if the mutagen is an 11 environmental stressor, environmental and 12 stressors, as I said, might be cold or heat or salinity and are naturally occurring, and these 13 should be an allowed method. 14 15 The use of UV light is a form of 16 environmental stressor. SO it should be 17 considered an allowed method. But if the induced 18 mutagenesis involves a chemical or irradiation 19 that would impact in vitro nucleic acids, 20 should be an excluded method. I hope that's There's kind of some that would be left 2.1 clear.

out and some that wouldn't.

1	So we encourage the NOSB to clarify
2	the kinds of induced mutations that would
3	constitute an excluded method versus those that
4	would be allowed. So that's it. Thank you for
5	your consideration of these comments.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And thank you for
7	your comments. Questions for Dana? Mindee,
8	please go ahead.
9	MEMBER JEFFERY: Dana, thank you so
LO	much for your relentless pursuit of how the
L1	biotech industry has entered the food system. I
L2	definitely would be undereducated without all the
L3	work you guys do.
L 4	MS. PERLS: Thank you.
L 5	MEMBER JEFFERY: Yeah. So again,
L 6	looking at the horizon, I worry about developing
L7	technologies entering the food system and how do
L8	we trace them, and I think we all lived in the
L 9	pain of what some of those first versions of
20	genetic modifications did to organic systems and
21	how hard we had to work to figure them out and
22	clean them up.

It was a backtrack process, and I'd 1 love it if we could avoid that. And so if you 2 3 have the ability to help us position emerging technologies like sprays and insects, and how far 4 away from the organic system those are, that 5 would be immensely helpful to our future work. 6 7 MS. PERLS: Yeah, thank you. one of my really significant concerns about how 8 new and emerging genetic engineered products that 9 10 are designed to spread or that will spread 11 through the environment will impact organic, like 12 RMAI sprays that are being proposed as pesticides and that can drift and directly alter people's 13 14 crops and then become property of agribusiness company or farm, and genetically 15 engineered soil, microbes 16 that could through the soil. 17 18 So these are all things that I think are really essential, and the NOSB and 19 the NOP really grapple with, either testing or 20 How are we going to know if organic 2.1 research. 22 has been contaminated and what kind of change of

1	regulations do we need to make sure that doesn't
2	happen?
3	So really I would be honored to work
4	with you on thinking through what that means, and
5	how we might address it.
6	MEMBER JEFFERY: Thanks. Do you mind
7	a follow-up question?
8	MS. PERLS: Of course, go for it.
9	MEMBER JEFFERY: Yeah. So if we're
10	where to track, how and who is that FDA, APHIS?
11	Do you have a quick list for us?
12	MS. PERLS: Yeah. It's going to
13	for the RMAI pesticides, that's going to be the
14	EPA currently, and for the soil microbes, that's
15	going to be the EPA. I think that there's it
16	depends on what the use is, and so it may be the
17	EPA, it may be the USDA. There's questions
18	around genetically engineered animals, which
19	would be the FDA.
20	So it's going to depend a little bit
21	whether that's going to fall under the EPA or
22	USDA and in some cases it may be the FDA So

we're trying to figure that out. There's a lot 1 2 of comments to all those agencies about the 3 confusion in which agency each thing, you know, goes into. 4 So I can sort of lay out what are the 5 6 things on the horizon, and what agency we think 7 that those will be going into, but it's very confusing. 8 9 MEMBER JEFFERY: Thank you so much. 10 I'm sorry. If you don't mind indulging one more. 11 Do you think that the -- we sort of a few months 12 ago, like maybe in last September there was that presidential order for the harmonization 13 I'm wondering if there's any 14 biotechnology. 15 silver lining for us, that maybe we'll achieve some interagency transparency and participation 16 and talking across those systems, to help us gain 17 18 access as these technologies are entering? 19 MS. PERLS: That's а tough 20 Unfortunately, some of the heads of the agencies, are really pushing for 2.1 including the USDA, 22 decreased transparency and deregulation, which I

think is a real serious threat. 1 I think that 2 there are opportunities that we're trying to push 3 for for consistency across agencies definitions. 4 5 So for example, the NOSB 6 definition of genetic engineering that's 7 internationally aligned with modern biotechnology And currently the FDA is close to 8 and codex. 9 that definition, but EPA and particularly the USDA is actually pretty far from that. 10 11 So one of the things that is possible, 12 though it's not mandated in any sort of way by the executive order, but one thing that we can at 13 least try to do is get the other agencies to move 14 15 towards a definition like that, that the NOSB 16 uses. 17 The deregulation is going to be a big 18 challenge, particularly because it means that 19 things like RMAI spray or the soil microbes and 20 new genetically engineered plants that contamination might 2.1 higher risk of not 22 regulated or even registered as fly in under

1	grass.
2	I'll try and think of some silver
3	lining and we'll send it to you. I know that
4	there's something there, and I'm going to find it
5	so that we can have a positive note to really
6	look at.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Brian, please go
8	ahead.
9	MEMBER CALDWELL: Thanks so much.
10	Quick question about mutagenesis, induced
11	mutagenesis and UV radiation. What about sort of
12	like really high levels of UV radiation that
13	would be way beyond what we've given the
14	sunlight, that will induce a lot of, you know,
15	random mutations throughout the genome, which is
16	kind of what they're shooting for there. But is
17	that, is that something that we would not
18	consider excluded?
19	MS. PERLS: You know, there is a
20	concern about what happens with those higher
21	levels of UV light, particularly I think the
22	thing that we're looking at is whether or not

1	this would alter the, alter the genome.
2	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yeah.
3	MS. PERLS: Would it and in that
4	case, and particularly if it isn't a natural
5	level of UV light, I think that is something a
6	little bit tricky that we should address. I'd
7	love to give you a little bit more information.
8	I may need to follow up, because it gets into
9	some pretty nitty-gritty details.
10	But I think in general, what you're
11	getting to is that need to really make clear
12	distinctions about what would be allowed and what
13	wouldn't be allowed, and that level of detail is
14	going to be pretty important. So if it's
15	possible to follow up with you about what that
16	level of distinction might be, then I would be
17	honored to work again with you on this as well.
18	MEMBER CALDWELL: That would be great,
19	and I think if you could send a note to Michelle
20	about that, that would be great, and then maybe
21	she would forward it to everybody.
22	And speaking of following up, if you

1	all would have some really great ideas on how to
2	address these, some of these, you know, new
3	decisions on excluded methods that are going to
4	be coming up in all the germ plasm that's
5	already out there, that would be great.
6	But we don't have time for that now,
7	but I would love to hear a lot of comments on
8	that too. So thank you very much.
9	MS. PERLS: Okay. Yeah, thank you so
10	much. I will make a list of all the follow-ups.
11	Appreciate that.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Al right. Thank
13	you so much, Dana and thanks for sticking with
14	us.
15	MS. PERLS: Thank you.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: As we go into our
17	break, we are going to have Jane Stevens, Malaika
18	Elias and David Meyer after the break. I just
19	want to take a moment to remind folks that
20	excluded methods as a category are prohibited in
21	the regulations now. So it's saying here these
22	very, very in the weeds conversations, but I want

1	to take a little bit of a reminder that we
2	already have a blanket prohibition in the
3	regulations now.
4	So off to our break. We'll see you in
5	ten minutes.
6	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
7	went off the record at 4:36 p.m. and resumed at
8	4:46 p.m.)
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. It
10	looks like we're missing Jane Stevens, so we're
11	going to get started off with Malaika Elias,
12	followed by David Meyer and then Dave Chapman.
13	Malaika, if you're there, the floor is yours.
14	MS. ELIAS: Yes. Can you hear me
15	okay?
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yes. Please go
17	ahead.
18	MS. ELIAS: Great. Hi everyone. My
19	name is Malaika Elias. I'm a food and tech
20	campaigner with Friends of the Earth. Thank you
21	for this opportunity to provide comments to the
22	NOSB. I will comment on two different issues.

second, chemicals in food and packaging and 2 3 production. So Friends of the Earth commends the 4 5 NOSB recommendations to promote and fund organic agriculture as the leading ecological approach to 6 for meeting climate 7 agriculture appropriate change problems. As the Biden administration 8 allocates funding for what they call climate-9 10 smart ag, it's imperative that the USDA advocate 11 for organic agriculture as a climate solution. 12 The science is clear, as folks have mentioned earlier in the call, that organic 13 farming systems can help mitigate climate change. 14 15 Many of the practices that have been found to foster soil carbons, sequestrations such as crop 16 17 cover cropping and composting rotation, 18 central to organic ag. Research has found that 19 organic soils sequester more carbon on average 20 than conventional soils. Organic farming also helps mitigate 21 22 the effects on climate change on farmers, since

First, organic as climate-smart agriculture, and

healthy soils conserve water and significantly 1 increase farmer's resilience in the 2 3 climate-related droughts and floods. agriculture reduces energy use and greenhouse gas 4 emissions by eliminating synthetic fertilizers 5 and the vast majority pesticides. 6 7 Pesticides and synthetic fertilizers, like other synthetic chemicals, come from oil and 8 9 fossil gas and play a role in driving the climate 10 crisis, and studies show that organic systems 11 require 15 percent less energy than conventional 12 systems, with some organic systems using as much as 70 percent less energy than their conventional 13 14 counterparts. 15 Additionally, it's imperative USDA recognize organic pasture-based and mixed 16 17 crop livestock systems as climate solutions. 18 Industrial meat and dairy production are major 19 culprits in the climate crisis as well, as 20 livestock production accounts for roughly 15 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions. 2.1 22 Conversely, well-managed, pasture-

1	based systems can help sequester carbon. So it's
2	more important than ever that the NOSB recommends
3	that the USDA unequivocally promote and push for
4	increased funding of organic agriculture as a
5	climate solution.
6	And on a different note, Friends of
7	the Earth appreciates the NOSB's ongoing
8	discussion about chemicals used in food packaging
9	and processing. As Friends of the Earth has
10	identified in previous comments, BPA and PFASs
11	are toxic chemicals and should be prohibited from
12	organic operations and the resulting food
13	products.
14	BPA and PFASs are found in the organic
15	food supply through packaging and production as
16	many of you all know, and PFAS has been shown to
17	cause endocrine disruption and immune
18	dysfunction, and BPA has been associated with
19	reproductive and endocrine-related health
20	effects.
21	We appreciate the NOSB recommendation
22	to the NOC that this is a research priority, and

1	we continue to urge deeper research into plastic
2	alternatives.
3	More broadly, it's important that the
4	NOSB recommend that the NOC respond to PFAS
5	concerns. Thank you for your consideration of
6	these comments.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And thank you for
8	making them. Questions for Malaika? Please go
9	ahead, Wood.
10	MEMBER TURNER: Thanks, Malaika, great
11	comments. I just wanted to ask you restate the
12	point. I was interested that you mentioned the
13	energy intensity of sorry, the energy
14	intensity of conventional farms versus organic
15	farms I believe in your remarks, and I was just
16	curious.
17	Can you say that again, and do you
18	have anything what is it attributable to? I
19	just want to make sure I understand that. I had
20	never heard that, that statistic before, and I
21	want to lean into it a little bit.
22	MS. ELIAS: Yeah. I'm, so I am more

1	than happy to maybe go back to my notes and
2	documents and folks on my team that actually work
3	on this issue, to get a better clarification. I
4	want to be as thorough as possible for you, and
5	this is not like my topic of expertise or
6	something that I work on directly.
7	MEMBER TURNER: Great. Well, I'd love
8	to have that data point, and just not just
9	MS. ELIAS: If you can follow up via
10	chat now, I can ask folks or I can follow up via
11	email. I think my colleague Dana who spoke a
12	couple of minutes ago said she'd send some things
13	via email. So I'm happy to send clarification.
14	MEMBER TURNER: And it's not just the
15	number but what it's attributable to. If you can
16	go deeper on that, that would be great. Thank
17	you.
18	MS. ELIAS: Absolutely, thank you.
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Right. Other
20	questions from the Board?
21	All right. We really appreciate your
22	time Thank you Next up we have David Meyer

1	followed by Dave Chapman and then Sal Pinkham.
2	David, the floor is yours. Oh, we've got some
3	slides. All right.
4	MR. MEYER: Excellent. I've got a
5	couple of slides here. First of all, I want to
6	thank the Board and everyone this afternoon for
7	your time. I really appreciate this opportunity
8	to speak to you and offer some comments.
9	We have submitted written comments as
10	well, and I am here on behalf of CP Kelco, which
11	is the company that I work for. We are
12	manufacturers of hydrocolloids, and xanthan and
13	high acyl gellan gum. Both fit as
14	hydrocolloids.
15	So next slide, please. To me, this is
16	a lot of fun, but I love to talk to students and
17	talk about what hydrocolloids do and what they
18	are. So xanthan gum is produced by fermentation,
19	and I like to tell people it's kind of like, you
20	know, if you've ever seen vats of brewed beer,
21	that's what we do.

We brew this hydrocolloid xanthan gum,

1	and it is currently allowed under 205.605(b),
2	synthetics allowed, and it does some great things
3	for product developers who are working to make
4	organic foods. It provides thickening when
5	needed; it provides suspension. It provides
6	cling. It's cold solubles. You don't have to
7	heat something up.
8	So if you're putting a beverage
9	together, it's really useful for that. Or if you
LO	were putting, you know, a dry mix beverage
L1	together, that works really well too. Excellent
L2	syneresis control.
L3	People, a lot of people don't know
L 4	what syneresis is, so I like to explain it.
L 5	That's like if you've ever opened a yogurt, a
L 6	personal yogurt container and you see all the
L 7	whey, the whey off on top, that's syneresis. The
L 8	whey proteins squeeze out the extra liquid, and
L 9	xanthan gum can help with that.
20	It provides emulsion and air
21	stabilization. It works on a really wide range
22	of pH temperature, enzyme stable and it provides

1	really high viscosity at really low
2	concentration. Usually the use level is less
3	than half a percent, and it's not chemically
4	modified.
5	Next slide, please. So where is it
6	used? All sorts of products, dressings, sauces,
7	syrups, baked goods, bakery fillings, beverages,
8	dairy, confectionary, batters and breadings, low
9	fat spreads. You've seen it all over, and then
10	it also can be used in consumer products as well.
11	But some of my favorites are on there, gummy
12	bears, the fruit preps for yogurt.
13	So that's xanthan gum. If you go
14	ahead, we'll talk about gellan gum as well. It's
15	also by fermentation. It fits under 205.605(a),
16	non-synthetics allowed, and the difference here
17	is that gellan gum is really, really good at
18	suspension. So we use it in a lot of beverages.
19	It's used both in dairy and non-dairy milks, and
20	it will suspend things that normally won't
21	suspend, like vitamins, minerals, cocoa.
22	A lot of people don't know that cocoa

1	doesn't suspend and melt by itself. If you mix
2	it up, it will fall to the bottom.
3	Go ahead, next slide and I'll
4	finish up and just talk about where we use high
5	acyl gellan gum. These dairy beverages, the
6	plant beverages, yogurt, dressing, sauces, and
7	then there's some personal care products also
8	that use it. Once again, thank you so much for
9	your time. We appreciate the opportunity to
10	comment, and please refer to our written comments
11	for anything further.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We appreciate the
13	comments. Thank you so much. Questions from the
14	Board?
15	All right. Thank you, David.
16	MR. MEYER: Thank you.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up we have
18	David Chapman, followed by Sol Pinkham and then
19	Edward Maltby. Dave Chapman, the floor is yours.
20	There we go, all right.
21	MR. CHAPMAN: I'm working on it.
22	Thank you, Nate. Okay. Hello. I am Dave

I'm a farmer and co-director of the 1 Chapman. Real Organic Project. Real Organic was created 2 3 as a response to the failures of the National Organic Program. As most of you know, we are an 4 add-on label to the USDA organic program. 5 We certify over 1,000 U.S. farms, and we have a 6 7 joint venture with the German-based certifier Naturland. 8 9 Naturland, which is also an add-on, certifies over 140,000 farms around the world. 10 11 Our standards are simple, affirming what has been 12 laid out in the Organic Food Production Act. here today to call on the NOSB to push for the 13 end of hydroponics being certified as organic, in 14 15 keeping with the 2010 recommendation. 16 This is not a settled issue. 17 USDA will join the world that the 18 movement in rejecting hydroponic. In the last 19 year, the USDA has given billions of dollars to 20 so-called climate-smart agriculture. support 2.1 Only a tiny amount of that money went to organic 22 production. All the rest went to what is now

being called regenerative agriculture.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

Regenerative is rapidly coming to be defined by the largest food and ag companies on the planet. It is the same companies that have caused so much of the environmental and climate destruction, and they are the same companies that organic is meant to be an alternative to.

They insisting that now are our regenerative, because NOP's movement is not organic certification is no longer based on soil health or pasture-raised livestock, and they are You can be running a certified organic right. hydro operation with no regard to the complex interactions between plants and living soil.

Such hydro producers are no longer small outliers. Such companies are now the biggest players in certified organic berries and tomatoes. Peppers and greens are coming fast. Three years ago the director of marketing for a very large conventional hydro tomato company, which has a small organic spinoff, stood in front of you in the Pittsburgh meeting and mocked my

1	earlier comments on the magic of soil and the
2	soul of organic, calling them "bits of marketing
3	fluff."
4	Soil is a bit of marketing fluff?
5	Really? Where is our outrage. The NOP has a
6	wound that won't heal. The hydroponic issue is
7	not going away. A large majority of American
8	organic farmers do not believe hydroponics should
9	be certified as organic. But public trust in
10	organic will go away if we don't fix this. It
11	was laboriously built up over many years. Please
12	don't let that happen.
13	Let us acknowledge that a mistake has
14	been made. The organic brand is too precious to
15	squander. Our movement is too important. Please
16	dig in and fight for what is right. Thank you.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you for your
18	comments. Questions from the Board for Dave? I
19	have a please go ahead, Brian.
20	(Simultaneous speaking.)
21	MEMBER CALDWELL: Okay, here we go.
22	All right. Thanks, Dave. I'm feeling like you

1	guys might be a source of some of this
2	information, but if you have any scientific
3	studies that are like life cycle studies of
4	energy use or carbon impacts from conventional
5	versus hydroponic operations or even, you know,
6	hydroponic versus organic, which is I think
7	there's much less likelihood that there will be
8	research on that.
9	But anyways, if you have any of that,
LO	if you could forward them to us, it would be
L1	great to look at that.
L2	MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah, great Brian. I've
L3	seen such a study from Cornell about vertical,
L 4	vertical farming, the vertical grains, and it
L5	wasn't good for vertical grains in comparison.
L 6	There must be stuff about hydroponic production,
L7	but I have not seen that study. If I find it, I
L8	will send it to you.
L 9	MEMBER CALDWELL: Okay, sounds good.
20	Thank you very much.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I have a quick
22	question for you Dave, and then we'll go to Jerry

1	and Nate. I think there's another commenter
2	today who made the same statement you just made,
3	that basically the conventional regenerative
4	folks are coming for organic, because we have
5	hydroponics.
6	I'm trying to figure out, I've never
7	heard that. I've only ever heard that our
8	tillage is the reason that they're saying that,
9	and I think hydroponics would be the opposite of
10	tilling. So I feel like if anything, it would be
11	an asset to their perception of what regenerative
12	is. Do you, I mean who's saying this, the
13	"they"? Who is the they?
14	MR. CHAPMAN: Well, the nastiest big
15	voice I know of is Syngenta, in terms of
16	attacking organic while defending regenerative
17	and they've been very upfront about it.
18	(Simultaneous speaking.)
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM:attacking it
20	because of organic, because of hydroponic? I
21	think that's
22	MR. CHAPMAN: No, no, no. They're

attacking it because they believe that the world 1 will starve if we go organic. 2 3 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Sure, sure. So when you say that we're losing consumer and, you 4 5 know. sort of the culture debate with 6 regenerative, you said it's because of 7 hydroponic. Who is saying that? MR. CHAPMAN: Ι don't mean only 8 9 because of hydroponic "they." But I believe that that is part of it because it's very hard if 10 11 you're in a public discussion with such a group 12 to say well organic is all about soil health, when it clearly isn't, not USDA's organic. 13 We've got a billion dollars by the 14 just not. 15 claim of the hydroponic lobby of stuff being certified as organic that is hydroponic. 16 no soil involved. 17 18 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: One follow-up to 19 that, do you -- I address this to a few folks. 20 Do you have any data on economic harm because of hydroponics? Is there anywhere we can go to say 2.1 22 so, so many dollars left soil-based farms over to

1	hydroponics. You know, I think when we talk
2	about dairy, which is a big crisis, when we talk
3	about any farmers struggling in our space, we
4	want to be very clear about what that source data
5	is so we can hunt it up and understand it.
6	MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Could you point to
8	that data?
9	MR. CHAPMAN: I can tell you my
10	thoughts about it Nate, which is the nature of
11	this conversation and I have really been in it
12	from the beginning, is that it's impossible to
13	say what the impact is because the major
14	hydroponic producers publicly insist that they're
15	not hydroponic.
16	And you know that the biggest berry
17	producer and the biggest tomato producer who are
18	growing hydroponically say we are not growing
19	hydroponically. We're growing in containers, and
20	that immediately becomes a very complicated
21	conversation for somebody who doesn't really know
22	a lot about this subject.

1	So I don't think any data at all, and
2	I don't think there could be because where would
3	you get the numbers? Who would you say well this
4	is hydroponic?
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I would think that
6	the farmers would be similar to the dairy space,
7	self-reporting their loss of market share and
8	folks like, you know, more regional organizations
9	like say MOFGA or Montana Organic Association,
10	anyone who's very close to the farmers would be
11	able to have a beat on that. If you're able to
12	get that for me, that would be great.
13	MR. CHAPMAN: I can give you that
14	right I can give you one good one right now,
15	which is that there's a growers coop in Vermont
16	called Deep Root, and they reported to me that
17	they lost a half million dollar tomato contract
18	with Whole Foods. They were given about two
19	weeks' notice, and they switched to Mexican
20	hydroponic.
21	And this was back in the early days.
22	This was about 2015 or 2016. But that was a

definite example of a significant shift in the 1 marketplace. For Vermont, half a million dollars 2 is a lot of dollars. 3 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Sure, absolutely. 4 5 Nate, please go ahead. 6 MEMBER LEWIS: Hey Dave, good to see 7 Thanks for comments. It's good to go out and interact with the community again. 8 Just wanted to -- I'm not sure if you were kind of 9 following the certification, but my wife and I 10 11 got real organic certified at our farm, and just 12 wanted to throw that out there, acknowledging 13 that it really does seemingly hinge on the traceability and transparency elements that NOP 14 15 provides. anyway, I just wanted to share 16 17 But you know, my question was about the 18 crops you had identified, and I was -- you were 19 going a little guickly and I was taking notes as 20 primarily the hydroponic. Tomatoes and berries I know are the capstone, but then you had a couple 2.1 22 of other ones that are not far behind I think is

1	what you said. If you could repeat those, that
2	would be great.
3	MR. CHAPMAN: Sure. What I said is I
4	think coming fast, coming soon.
5	MEMBER LEWIS: Oh coming fast, yeah,
6	yeah.
7	MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah. It's growing
8	rapidly, greens and peppers.
9	MEMBER LEWIS: Greens and peppers.
LO	Okay, thanks.
L1	MR. CHAPMAN: I do know of several
L2	pretty large-scale hydroponic greens operations
L3	that are certified as organic, and these are, you
L 4	know, the classic pond system where you float
L5	across and three or four weeks later you harvest
L 6	from the other edge of the pond. And yeah,
L7	they're growing quickly and dramatically. I
L8	think that they're going to be a major market
L 9	force soon.
20	And peppers, well from the beginning,
21	we've been importing hydroponic peppers from
22	Holland, but I'm seeing a lot coming in from

1	Mexico now too.
2	MEMBER LEWIS: Great.
3	MR. CHAPMAN: By the way, nice-looking
4	are those blueberries behind you?
5	MEMBER LEWIS: Yeah. Well, this is
6	eastern Washington, where yeah, I guess we grow
7	over half the organic blueberries in the country
8	and they're all soil grown.
9	MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah, yeah. They look
10	great.
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: One final question
12	for you Dave. Given the outcome of the lawsuit
13	with USDA, essentially allowing certification of
14	hydroponic operations to go forward, what
15	constructively would you say NOSB can be doing to
16	try to keep going forward with the system we
17	have, and shaping the world we want to be in as
18	best we can?
19	MR. CHAPMAN: Well, it would be very
20	wonderful if you, if you pushed the NOP to act or
21	the current recommendation, which is the 2010
22	recommendation. And that grants that hydrononic

1	absolutely cannot be certified as organic. I
2	think if you urge them to action on that one,
3	that would be marvelous and, you know, very
4	meaningful.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And possibly a
6	discussion for later, but with the outcome of the
7	lawsuit, we're looking at hydroponics will be
8	certified, and that's from the very clear line,
9	to work with the clay we're given, not to mix my
10	metaphors. Is there a certain, a certain avenue
11	when we think about writing standards for
12	greenhouse and container production, or should we
13	be looking at other questions?
14	I think your question about Mexican
15	tomatoes coming in raises a big question about
16	trade in general. Can we think bigger than just
17	standards to protect markets, and is there some
18	way that has a bigger lever than just eliminating
19	hydroponics within our standards?
20	MR. CHAPMAN: Well, one point of
21	clarification. The lawsuit, the outcome of the
22	lawsuit did not rule that hydrononics are

1	qualified for certification. It ruled that the
2	court would not challenge the USDA on this. They
3	wouldn't challenge the USDA decision, not that
4	hydroponics clearly met the rules of the Organic
5	Food Production Act.
6	It was published in a way that they're
7	making clear it was not a precedent. But if the
8	USDA changed their mind, then the law would not
9	disagree with that decision at all. In terms of
10	trade, it will be interesting to see when the new
11	trade deal is negotiated with the EU. There's
12	been considerable energy saying that EU will not
13	respect America's hydro allowance in a trade
14	agreement. That will be a new ball game also.
15	I don't know what will come of that,
16	but of course Mexico is a big question, yeah.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Franklin has a
18	question for you.
19	MEMBER QUARCOO: Yeah, I'm curious.
20	How do you compare hydroponics to conventional
21	agriculture in terms of the impact that it has on
22	the environment, energy, footprints and all of

1	that?
2	A second part of that question is do
3	you think that hydroponics is a viable option,
4	just that you don't want it labeled as organic?
5	Is it a food production practice that you think
6	contributes significantly to agriculture, and
7	when you compare that with conventional?
8	Do you have issues just with the
9	labeling as organic? Would you be okay with it
10	as a method of producing food if it was not
11	labeled organic?
12	MR. CHAPMAN: That's a lot of
13	question. So I think that hydroponic that is
14	unsprayed is really much better than hydroponic
15	that is.
16	I think that hydroponic is a very
17	viable way of producing food. I would rather see
18	organic production in the ground. I think that
19	would be better for everybody, but hydroponics
20	certainly works financially in this world, and it
21	can be pretty reasonable about avoiding

22

pesticides.

it's not. t.hat. 1 So it 2 necessarily involves a lot of pesticides. Ιn 3 terms of energy, it does not do well compared to field production. So if we're looking at carbon 4 footprint, it's not a big winner. I'm not trying 5 6 to shut down hydroponic. As I say, I think I 7 said it. But I will say some of my best friends 8 9 are hydroponic producers, and some of them are very large-scale hydroponic producers. 10 11 common friends with Jerry on your Board from his 12 hydroponic past. We're not trying to get rid of 13 hydroponics. That would be crazy. That's like trying to get rid of beer. 14 It's not going 15 anywhere. It's a major, major world food 16 industry. 17 But it should not be called organic, 18 and only in America is it certified as organic. 19 It's not allowed anywhere else, and I believe 20 that it seriously undermines our ability to take America from one percent organic land to 30 2.1 22 percent where it ought to be or 50 percent,

1	because it's pretty hard to build a movement
2	that's standing on such a shaky foundation.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
4	questions for Dave? Jerry, please go ahead.
5	MR. CHAPMAN: Hi Jerry. You're muted,
6	Jerry.
7	(Pause.)
8	MEMBER D'AMORE: Thank you for that
9	and good afternoon to you. I've put my hand up
10	and down at least ten times during your
11	conversation here, and I took it down finally
12	because I found that I really did not have a
13	question. I had a strong, strong desire to
14	debate and so that generates a question, which is
15	will you be in Atlanta?
16	MR. CHAPMAN: I am not planning to be
17	in Atlanta, although I would love to come and
18	have a conversation with you. Your boss says hi,
19	you know, we have friends.
20	MEMBER D'AMORE: Oh my God. That
21	takes me back 40 years.
22	MR. CHAPMAN: I know.

1	(Simultaneous speaking.)
2	MEMBER D'AMORE: Yes sir. Okay, well
3	I yeah. The only thing that prompted me to
4	raise my hand the first time was the statement
5	that you made, that you couldn't find a lot of
6	information on hydroponic production. I was
7	going to volunteer to help you out of that
8	dilemma, but anyway.
9	MR. CHAPMAN: That's good, that's
10	good. You know, there's so much information of
11	course out there, you know, studying hydroponics
12	has not been my, and the energy input and output,
13	has not been my mission in life. But I agree
14	with you, that there's a ton of research, has to
15	be.
16	MEMBER D'AMORE: Yeah. Okay. Well
17	again, if we were given another 30 seconds, it
18	would take three hours. So I'll say thank you
19	for your contribution.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Thank
21	you Dave for your comments.
22	MR. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Nate.

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up, we're
2	going to have a little quick switch. Next up is
3	going to be Matt Begley, followed and then
4	Edward Maltby and Sandra Remilien. So Matt, if
5	you want to go.
6	MR. BEGLEY: Hi. Yes, thanks. My
7	name is Matt Begley. I am a materials review
8	specialist at OEFFA. I'd just like to address
9	some of the concerns that we have regarding the
10	phosphoric acid listing at 603(a) and sanitizers
11	in general.
12	We would like to see a broad review of
13	sanitizers. There is some inconsistency among
14	certifiers as to when or whether to review
15	inactive ingredients, when the active ingredients
16	are on the National List.
17	Some of these inactives are addressed
18	in technical reports, but their inclusion in
19	these products, which is needed to create
20	effective products, can create difficulty for
21	operations to find approved sanitizers.
22	We have experienced that our farmers

do not always considered milk bulk tanks to be part of the milking equipment, and different sanitizers are used for bulk tanks and milking equipment and lines. This has led to bulk tanks often not getting rinsed, even when used with products that would require one under NOP regulations.

An industry sales rep informed us that chlorine materials are incompatible to bulk tank cooling plates over the long term, and parasitic acid can taint the flavor and smell of the milk. Farmers are in a bind because the effective sanitizers require rinsing under NOP rules that based on their labeling cannot be rinsed under PMO rules.

There are few options for farmers to remain in compliance with their state milk inspectors, as well as the NOP. Phosphoric acid is the preferred choice for sanitizing bulk tanks in many cases in rinsing, and is potentially counteractive to the sanitizing process and may be in direct violation of the product's labeling.

2.1

We have two EPA-registered phosphoric 1 acid sanitizers in use by our operations, at 2 3 least two that clearly indicate to let air dry before use of equipment. They contain only 4 phosphoric acid as the active ingredient 5 6 inactive ingredients which are not the 7 National List. Therefore, we would require these operations to rinse these products before contact 8 with milk. 9 Phosphoric acid alone may satisfy NOP 10 11 requirements for a sanitizer, but it may not 12 properly sanitize the milking equipment without the presence of these inactive ingredients. 13 We would like to see discussion around the use of 14 15 phosphoric acid-based and other sanitizers that could be approved for use without a rinse based 16 17 on current formulations to meet NOP and PMO 18 compliance. 19 Most or all certifiers would allow 20 milking powder wastewater to be applied organic fields due to limited rural options for 2.1 22 wastewater disposal, usually via manure lagoon or

1	septic tank and sometimes directly through
2	irrigation. Does the annotation at 603(a)(25)
3	allow rinsed phosphoric acid to be applied to
4	land?
5	One solution would be to clarify that
6	products with phosphoric acid as the active
7	ingredient are allowed without a rinse. Then it
8	would not wind up in wastewater and no land
9	contact would occur. We want to ensure that our
10	daily operations are able to continue producing a
11	safe, high quality product.
12	We would appreciate further discussion
13	on phosphoric acid and other sanitizers so they
14	may be reviewed in light of industry practices
15	and provide a path for dairy operations to meet
16	their multiple compliance obligations. Thank
17	you.
18	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you for your
19	comments. Questions for Matt from the Board?
20	All right. Thank you, Matt. Next up
21	we have Ed Maltby, followed by Mike Dill and then
22	Jackie DeMinter.

MR. MALTBY: Hi, good afternoon. 1 quite good evening, but you stayed the course 2 3 well, and I'm glad that Dave doesn't want to get rid of beer. And I'd like to thank the Board for 4 5 their patience today, and for the incredible work 6 they do in ensuring the integrity of the organic 7 seal. The NOSB, as an independent body, is 8 an important and invaluable part of the process 9 10 that consumers and producers count on, to ensure 11 that their voice is heard, that regulations are 12 practical and workable on the farm, and that decisions made reflect the intent and law of the 13 Organic Foods Production Act. 14 15 agree with Dave and many, many others, that organic certification is soil-based. 16 17 I also think that NOSB members need greater 18 support for their work. NOSB membership is time-19 consuming and often requires -- reduces not unlimited resource members to hire labor to work 20 their farms or other jobs during their service. 2.1 22 The Board members work throughout the

year on committees plus research, and in order to 1 quarantee that serving on the NOSB 2 is 3 effectively restricted to those with full-time salaries, and recognizing the restrictions of 4 FACA regulation, USDA needs 5 to explore any 6 opportunity that these expenses can be reimbursed 7 or prepaid in some situations. Looking back into organic integrity 8 and the ability for one type of practice, which 9 is certified organic, ruining the reputation of 10 11 product, we have only to go to look at organic 12 dairy and to see what happened when factory farms like Aurora Dairy and those in Texas were able to 13 undercut the whole market and reduce certified 14 15 organic milk, which didn't match any of the certification criteria and definitely didn't meet 16 consumer expectations. 17 18 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I will ask not to 19 name folks in particular. Speak broadly. 20 MR. MALTBY: Okay. My apologies for It's a well-known company, but and to come 2.1 22 back to the in-person meetings, when I first

1	attended the in-person meetings, I was not very
2	forthcoming and I learned how to be a policy nerd
3	at those meetings. I had some great mentoring
4	there, and from the point of view of cost, no
5	meeting I ever went to cost \$2,000.
6	I know some cheap motels out near the
7	airport in D.C., and can always go to a Subway to
8	get a sandwich. So I think that when we look at
9	that issue, look at how if I can just finish
10	this sentence look at how, you know, access is
11	not universal.
12	Even in Vermont, you don't have
13	universal. So in some cases it's very difficult
14	for producers, especially those at the age that
15	I'm at, to adapt to speaking into the camera
16	poised on the end of the computer screen. So if
17	we're talking about equality in representation,
18	we need to have both sets of attendance at
19	meetings. Thank you.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We appreciate your
21	comments, and any questions from the Board?
22	Ed, on organic dairy, real quick I

1	have a question for you. It seems that we have
2	put a lot of eggs in the baskets of standards, in
3	the basket of standards. They were hoping that
4	the grazing rule will fix our oversupply problem.
5	We're hoping that animal welfare, the origin of
6	livestock, will fix the welfare problem, or will
7	fix the oversupply problem.
8	At what point do we start looking
9	bigger, and start figuring out that if we looked
10	30 years ago, if organic had looked at small,
11	conventional dairyland and as friends and
12	neighbors, as opposed to as rivals or not good
13	enough, we would have seen that dairy is prone to
14	oversupply, that it seems that there's just
15	incessant whiplash in this market without
16	something like a quota, say, that Canada has.
17	How do we start looking at driving
18	more demand, rather than just constricting
19	supply, as a way to keep farmers on the land?
20	And we can have both. It's not an
21	either/or, but what is that means of driving
22	demand and how do we get it so that organic milk

makes up half of America's milk market, or that 1 we see we have growing opportunities? How do we 2 3 get it so that the Farm Bill requires that ten percent of all school milk is certified organic? 4 How do we build our coalitions to be more broad 5 6 than just saying standards are going to save us? 7 Well, this Committee MR. MALTBY: maybe has gone on for longer than anticipated, 8 9 but I have been known to talk to four or five 10 hours about these answers to the many problems 11 out there. 12 the point of view $\circ f$ From 13 conventional dairy is heavily subsidized and that's why we're putting together a request to 14 the Congress to have a safety net program for 15 organic dairy, that will quarantee a minimum 16 price. 17 18 this point, organic dairy At 19 heavily consolidated, as are the processing restrictions. When you look at the pasture rule, 20 then you have got the origin of livestock. 2.1 The 22 origin of livestock and the intent within the

1	original rule was that it would take three years
2	to transition. You had enough initiative to
3	build the organic herd that would take one year
4	to transition. That could have been phased out
5	or should have been phased out.
6	But what happened, what you had was a
7	massive growth in 2015, because the origin of
8	livestock rule was not implemented equally across
9	the country. So it's again consistency of
10	standards, consistency of implementation and
11	enforcement, you know. The SOE does address some
12	of that enforcement when you come to risk
13	analysis on large-scale dairies.
14	I would challenge any of the
15	certifiers as to whether they have inspectors
16	that qualify enough to go out and inspect a
17	10,000 cow dairy and get a good balance of what
18	comes in, what goes out, where it comes from, you
19	know, is it pasture-based? So I think what has
20	happened is that the standards
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And I apologize
22	for time, Ed. How do we increase demand?

1	MR. MALTBY: How do we increase
2	demand? By highlighting the qualities of organic
3	milk, and organic milk is going to be more
4	expensive because it costs more to produce. It
5	doesn't mean the producer is not going to get
6	more.
7	We should also look at more
8	regionality in organic milk, so that you can cut
9	down the cost and the carbon footprint of
LO	trucking milk from the southwest all the way up
L1	to the tip of Maine.
L2	So it's ensuring that the integrity,
L3	integrity, integrity of the organic certification
L 4	is held out there, without any opportunity for
L5	somebody to undermine it as they have done in the
L 6	past.
L 7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Well, we
L 8	appreciate your comments today. Thank you.
L 9	MR. MALTBY: Thank you.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up we have
21	Mike Dill, followed by Jackie DeMinter and then
22	Sal Pinkham

Hello. 1 MR. DILL: My name is Mike 2 Dill, and I'm representing the Organic Produce 3 Wholesalers Coalition. OPWC is comprised of certified organic businesses that distribute 4 fresh organic produce to retailers, restaurants, 5 6 food buying clubs and processors. 7 My comments today are on the proposal for 8 organic as climate-smart agriculture, oversight improvements to deter fraud and the 9 petition for potassium sorbate. 10 11 OPWC agrees with the intent of the 12 climate-smart ag proposal, which is to quote in the packet, "sends a clear signal to the greater 13 USDA that certified organic production should be 14 15 automatically considered climate-smart, therefore eligible for funding 16 any and all 17 opportunities and support through USDA programs." 18 The letter in the Board's proposal 19 will serve as the official statement from the 20 collective organic community that organic is climate-smart. Therefore, it. 2.1 we feel is important that the letter (1) be accurate, 22

Τ	(2) incorporate leedback from the organic
2	community.
3	Unfortunately, this is not what we see
4	in the proposal. We do not find that any
5	stakeholder feedback following the fall meeting
6	was incorporated into the draft shared for this
7	meeting. What's even more concerning to us is
8	the lack of acknowledging that the community's
9	feedback is the letter still contains multiple
10	false and misleading responses.
11	For instance, the response to the
12	Question No. 2 in the letter asks what USDA
13	should prioritize to demonstrate the efficacy of
14	organic farming as climate-smart agriculture.
15	The written response states "Climate benefits of
16	zero synthetic fertilizer use. The NOP
17	standards prohibit crop production using
18	synthetic fertilizers, herbicides and
19	pesticides."
20	As mentioned in our written comments,
21	it's common to see organic production described
22	in popular articles as being pesticide-free or

1	not using any synthetic inputs. But we in this
2	virtual room are familiar with the National List.
3	OPWC asserts that the NOSB, the body required by
4	federal law to review and approve the synthetic
5	material, synthetic materials allowed in organic
6	production should not perpetuate this
7	misconception.
8	On oversight improvements to deter
9	fraud, a/k/a the GPS discussion, we're not
10	opposed to the idea, simply because of the new
11	FISMA traceability rule, that it contains a
12	similar requirement for many specialty crops.
13	However, we note that FISMA has included field
14	level identification as a way to react or respond
15	to a food outbreak event.
16	Therefore, we agree with some
17	commenters who question how this will proactively
18	deter fraud better than we're able to now under
19	current systems, and we look forward to learning
20	more about this in Atlanta.
21	Then finally, we are unclear why a
22	discussion document for the petition of potassium

1	sorbate was issued prior to the release of the TF
2	that has specified and are specific to the use
3	being petitioned.
4	This material does show some promise
5	for controlling pests and that heavily impacts
6	the crop and deserves a fair trial. We ask that
7	the Crop Subcommittee review the updated TR dated
8	March 8th, 2023, and then update the discussion
9	document.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you for your
11	comments. Amy has a question for you.
12	MEMBER BRUCH: Hi Mike, thanks for
13	attending today. I actually have several, but
14	I'm going to reduce it to one. But I wanted to
15	ask a little bit more on the potassium sorbate,
16	just the last piece that you mentioned. You said
17	it does this product potentially does show
18	some promise for fighting disease and insects.
19	I did read the article that you
20	included about from the Cornell Cooperative
21	Extension. We have the petition. We have also
22	the technical report that's available. Is there

1 any other research that you can point to that can help substantiate that idea, that there's promise 2 3 here for being a solution? For this petition 4 source. 5 MR. DILL: Yeah, yeah. For, I mean 6 for other resources, no. I think what we want to 7 really find out is, or kind of clarify some of these speculative statements that were in there, 8 9 such as folic acid should inhibit the growth of There's a lot of shoulds and 10 soil bacteria. 11 coulds and then a little bit more about, know, the fact that it contains urea. 12 13 So I think we -- we want to have a 14 little bit more time with this, and we spent, you know, the bulk of our review time going off of 15 the old information, you know, the TR from what 16 was it, like 2002. And then it wasn't until we 17 were at the stage where comments were -- we were 18 19 presenting them to our whole coalition and getting all the member feedback and we got that. 20 21 So everyone approved them and then we looked back and then 22 saw them for the new

1	petition. So we didn't have a chance to
2	incorporate any of that information or really
3	review it. So what we really wanted, you know,
4	to give this a fair trial, not dismiss it based
5	off of old information, because I mean powdery
6	mildew, if anyone's grown, you know, cucumbers or
7	pumpkins, squash, anything, you've dealt with
8	powdery mildew. I guarantee it.
9	So I think knowing that there's a
10	potential for this to work against powdery
11	mildew, just that alone, you know, is worth
12	looking into, you know. We'd love to have more
13	tools in the toolbox, but again only if those are
14	compatible with organic systems and they meet all
15	the requirements.
16	We don't we don't want every tool
17	in the toolbox but, you know, if something meets
18	requirements and it's a great alternative to what
19	we have right now, then I think we should
20	consider it, or at least look into it.
21	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you, Mike.
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions

I've got a couple for you, Mike. 2 3 your written comments, you had singled out one of members' statement of "voting with their 4 5 I was wondering what is a good enough 6 threshold to describe how we incessantly canvass 7 constituents everv dav, live with our constituents every day, and how would you like us 8 9 to better orate and articulate whom we spoke with before we vote? It seems like we'd like to get 10 11 this right. 12 MR. DILL: Yes. Well, it's a heavy 13 question, but I think what I have seen as being 14 missing from, you know, the last several NOSB 15 meetings, you know, before your time, Nate, is that we don't hear a lot anymore about the 16 17 stakeholder or the groups that the chairs 18 represent.

for Mike from the Board?

1

environmental groups and the consumer interest

say climate-smart agriculture proposal, I would

know,

So you know, when we're talking about

а

love

to

hear, you

19

20

2.1

22

lot from the

groups on what they're, they're hearing. Or you 1 know like, you know, I don't want to give out any 2 3 examples. But it just seems like, you know, 4 5 hearing that let's say Jerry for instance, you He wrote all of the comments and this is 6 7 what he feels is the consensus amongst the crop producers or the wholesalers or the handlers. 8 So 9 really get sense that this iust to а 10 represents the group that you're representing, 11 you know, the seat that you hold on the Board. 12 And you know, and I guess I apologize for using that exact quote. But I think that 13 helps illustrate the point that that could have 14 15 been an opportunity to say like my vote, my heart is here, but this is what this means to the group 16 17 that I'm representing. And they could be the 18 same, you know, or it could have, you know, the 19 vote with my heart factored into this decision. 20 But to set that vote solely on like myself, this is what I feel and my heart is 2.1 22 telling me, even though I've read countless, you

1	know, thousands of comments and pages and pages
2	from stakeholders.
3	That's what I'd like to see a little
4	bit more of is, you know, the handlers feel this.
5	The retailers feel this. The crop producers,
6	this is their feedback and then we debate that
7	and hear like okay, well you know, this group
8	said this, this is important to these
9	stakeholders. How do we come to consensus or is
LO	there a middle path or how do we get to that
11	vote.
L2	So I don't know if that's the best way
L3	to describe that, but so to answer your question,
L 4	that's the best I got.
L5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Brian, please go
L 6	ahead.
L7	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yeah, thanks Mike.
L 8	Just a quick follow-up to that. Do you think
L 9	that the consumer is by far the biggest numerical
20	group of stakeholders?
21	MR. DILL: I mean by number I would
22	say yes but I, you know, they're not the ones

that are all responding here. So that's, I mean 1 that's a really interesting question. 2 3 MEMBER CALDWELL: So I represent the, you know, consumer and public interest, and there 4 5 are a lot of responses from consumers in our 6 written comments. Just putting out a little 7 perspective there. Sure, and I'm not trying to 8 MR. DILL: 9 suggest that one outweighs the other, if that's what you're kind of asking. So but this Board 10 11 represents, you know, 20 to 30 thousand certified 12 operations, \$60 billion industry, you know, and millions and millions of consumers. 13 So it is a balance, but that's why we'd like to just see a 14 15 little bit more, you know, kind of clear. 16 Like if you were sharing out Brian, 17 you could say, you know, I focused a little bit 18 more on the consumers. Not necessarily the 19 certified operations or the farmers, but this is 20 what the consumers were telling me. These were the comments that stuck out to me from consumers, 2.1 22 because you're probably all going to read the

1	same comments on the topic, but then you could
2	summarize your group; someone else could
3	summarize their group.
4	That would be helpful for us, to hear
5	a little bit more about what you're hearing from
6	different constituents, from different groups.
7	(Simultaneous speaking.)
8	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yeah. We try to
9	read a bunch, as many comments as we can. But we
10	can't get through them.
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
12	questions for Mike? Mindee, please go ahead.
13	MEMBER JEFFERY: Thank you so much,
14	Mike, and I apologize because there was one
15	section of your comments that I need to re-read.
16	But just in case, I'll have the opportunity to
17	ask you a question. Were you suggesting that a
18	TR template should be developed solely for the
19	excluded methods questions, a separate template?
20	MR. DILL: It's been a while since
21	I've thought about that one. Not, not specific.
22	If I recall, it's not specific to excluded

1	methods, but that would be included into the
2	regular TR.
3	MEMBER JEFFERY: Okay, great. I just
4	wanted to make sure I didn't misread you there.
5	I appreciate your responses today. Thank you so
6	much.
7	MR. DILL: No problem.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
9	questions for Mike?
L 0	All right. We appreciate your
L1	comments. Thank you all. Next up, we have
L2	Jackie DeMinter, followed by Sal Pinkham and then
L3	Colehour Bondera. Jackie. Jackie, you're there.
L 4	The floor is yours.
L5	MS. DeMINTER: Can you hear me?
L 6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We can. Please go
L7	ahead.
L 8	MS. DeMINTER: Wonderful. Good
L 9	afternoon. My name is Jackie DeMinter. I am the
20	certification policy manager at MOSA. Thank you
21	for the opportunity to comment. MOSA certifies
22	almost 1,900 organic operations throughout the

1	U.S., including over 700 crop, livestock, 875
2	crops and 325 handling operations.
3	I am commenting today primarily on the
4	discussion document for technical reports. We
5	use technical reports to gain a deeper
6	understanding of materials on the National List,
7	and to review why some materials didn't make the
8	cut.
9	The current format is easy to follow
10	and we find all the information, information
11	sections very helpful to understand the material.
12	We also use TRs to support our decision-making
13	on materials, and think they're especially
14	helpful in the decision that's tricky to make.
15	We regularly reference the petitioned
16	substances database. Being able to follow a
17	material through the process is a very helpful
18	understanding to have, and a consolidation of the
19	petition technical reports, all the NOSB work in
20	the final decision and place for each material
21	and scope is considered as extremely useful.
22	We appreciate this easily accessible

1 resource. A similar approach to review excluded methods would seem as if it could work, 2 3 and also be very helpful information to have. would appreciate the resource. Thank you for the 4 work you have put into developing and maintaining 5 the excluded methods chart. 6 7 include chart We in our excluded methods form and use it as a reference in MOSA 8 9 decision-making. In one circumstance, a client 10 indicated they used an induced mutagenesis 11 process and assumed that it was prohibited. 12 However, after a more careful review chart's exclusions from induced 13 oft.he 14 mutagenesis, additional follow-up with 15 manufacturer and discussion with OMRI, determined that the type of induced mutagenesis 16 used was chemical, and therefore not currently 17 18 prohibited. 19 Thank you again for maintaining this 20 very helpful resource. We support using a 2.1 technical report approach to gather additional 22 information on excluded methods when deemed

1	appropriate. We also submitted a letter or
2	sunset materials, including information about our
3	client's use, and answers to the stakeholder
4	questions relevant to our work as a certification
5	agency.
6	Finally, we want to be a voice of
7	support for continuing all public comments
8	virtually. The elimination of public comments at
9	the in-person meeting has not seemed to reduce
10	the effectiveness of the overall meeting
11	proceedings. We appreciate that the NOP has the
12	same period of time to consider all public
13	comments before discussion begins.
14	Thank you again for all of the work
15	you do and for the opportunity to comment.
16	Please let us know if you have any questions.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Questions for
18	Jackie? Questions for Jackie? Thank you for
19	your comments, Jackie. Questions for Jackie from
20	the Board? Mindee, please go ahead.
21	MEMBER JEFFERY: Hi Jackie. Thank you
22	so much for all of your hard work. I was

1	wondering in the question with the person who was
2	using the induced mutagenesis, if they gave you
3	any idea of how long it would take and like what
4	the implications are, because I have a maybe
5	vague understanding of seed development, and like
6	that it could have a very big implications though
7	we might need a long lead time to change those
8	things, because the seed varieties take a while.
9	If you don't have perspective, that's
10	totally fine, don't worry. I was just if you
11	did.
12	MS. DeMINTER: I don't think we do
13	have additional perspective, and I would have to
14	dig back into that documentation. But the point
15	that I wanted to make being that the way the NOP
16	or NOSB is included those exclusions right in the
17	excluded method chart was very helpful as we dug
18	into that topic, into the actual process that
19	they were using, because at face value, it seems
20	like it was prohibited.
21	MEMBER JEFFERY: Thank you.
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Jackie, I just

1	want to grab on that little nugget you left us
2	with on virtual comments. You represent a really
3	big group of farmers.
4	MOSA has a ton of farmers who have a
5	lot of input and lot of stake in these meetings,
6	and I think you hit on something that's very,
7	very interesting to this equity question, giving
8	everyone the same amount of time between when we
9	hear the question or the comment and when we
10	vote.
11	I think that is not to be undersold,
12	that if you're in the ears of the Board five
13	minutes before they voted because you've got ar
14	extra two grand to get over to the meeting, that
15	does elevate your position just in the memory of
16	how folks are processing. So I think that is a
17	really important point, and I really appreciate
18	you bringing it up.
19	MS. DeMINTER: Yes, thank you Nate.
20	Very important consideration.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
22	for Jackie?

1	All right, Jackie. We appreciate your
2	time today. Thank you for your comments.
3	MS. DeMINTER: Thank you very much.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up we have
5	Sal Pinkham, followed by Colehour Bondera and
6	then Kristen Adams. We are getting to the end of
7	the wire folks, so bear with us. Sal, the floor
8	is all yours.
9	MS. PINKHAM: Thank you. Can you hear
LO	me?
L1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yes.
L2	MS. PINKHAM: Wonderful. Hi, my name
L3	is Sal Pinkham. I'm the certification program
L 4	manager, OEFFA Certification, and I'll comment on
L5	two topics today.
L 6	First, consistent location
L7	identification. We appreciate the Committee's
L8	continued efforts at fraud prevention, but this
L 9	proposal raises logistical and equity concerns.
20	OEFFA OSPs do require lots of locations for all
21	organic and transitioning fields, and locations
22	for all conventional fields. Usually locations

1 are street addresses.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

OEFFA farmers in our organic work group do not mind sharing GSP coordinates, noting they already provide this information to Farm Service Agency. We encourage interdepartmental collaboration at USDA, so that they are not required to double report this data.

However, we also certify hundreds of community plain farmers who engage less frequently with FSA and utilize technology selectively in accordance with their religious beliefs and culture. It would be a heavy lift for us to collect GPS coordinates from farms in this community.

It's common to have 20 or more fields in an OSP, and taking time during inspection to locate the exact center to verify or provide GPS coordinates would greatly increase time spent inspecting. Field boundaries would be more useful for fraud prevention, especially for large fields or fields with pollinator, habitat or other buffers, but walking all the boundaries of

every field would be even more time-consuming. 1 2 OEFFA does require inspectors to visit 3 each certified or requested field every year, but specifically seeking the center of the 4 would distract important 5 from tasks like 6 assessing buffer adequacy, crop management and 7 soil health. OEFFA contracts with several 8 inspectors who are consultants in the plain 9 community, add unique qualities who and 10 perspective to our inspector pool. 11 plain inspectors However, do not 12 typically use GPS technology, and it would be exclusionary to require GPS use at inspection. 13 Certifiers who work with plain inspectors would 14 15 logistical burden, face an extra to assigning them new operations or operations with 16 17 new fields. 18 And if previous land use affidavits 19 must include GPS coordinates, operators in the 20 community plain face а greater barrier, particularly if they acquire land from others in 2.1 the plain community who also do not use GPS 22

1	technology. Our written comments include
2	additional logistical and practical concerns.
3	Second, we again urge NOSB to activate
4	the latent agenda item field and greenhouse
5	container production. Because aeroponic,
6	hydroponic and crops grown to maturity in
7	containers do not comply with OFPA, and because
8	there is significant inconsistency in the way
9	these forms of production are being handled by
10	organic certifiers, we urge the Board to call for
11	a moratorium on the certification of new
12	hydroponic and aeroponic operations, and crops
13	grown to maturity in containers, until we can
14	utilize our existing NOSB and rulemaking process
15	to move forward with greater consistency.
16	The future of organic integrity
17	depends on how we handle this topic, not to
18	mention our assertion that organic is climate-
19	smart. It's hard to say you take care of the
20	earth when you eliminate it from your growing
21	system.
22	Thank you NOSB members for your

1	service, your efforts to protect organic
2	integrity, and the opportunity to offer comments
3	today.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Questions for Sal
5	from the Board?
6	I've got a couple for you. As a proud
7	former OEFFA organic inspector, I like how you
8	noted that we do visit every field every year.
9	We'll I'll definitely make sure about wording.
10	We are not proposing middle of fields. We are
11	proposing that we have any idea on paper anywhere
12	where fields are. Given those hand-drawn maps
13	that we accept, I'm really as an inspector
14	completely at the mercy of the farmer, to show me
15	which field is which.
16	There's not consistent data to show
17	that we have an idea, especially as a certifier
18	but definitely as USDA, where all these fields
19	are, where they are and consistently how we track
20	them. When we think about perfect being the
21	enemy of the good, if we have three, even ten
22	plain community inspectors, should we base a

1	policy on those three out of maybe 300 inspectors
2	in the country? Why don't you answer those two
3	first?
4	MS. PINKHAM: Great, thank you. I
5	want to tackle the second one first, because it's
6	interesting to me from an equity perspective. We
7	heard a comment recently, I think it was from
8	Wolf and Associates, about how essentiality is
9	determined for materials, and that just having a
10	few people using a thing or launching a thing
11	shouldn't prevent us from accepting that material
12	in organic production.
13	I think a parallel can be drawn here,
14	that we don't want to be excluding groups from
15	inspections or certification or organic
16	production more broadly. I think it's really
17	important for not necessarily to shoot down any
18	proposal to use technology, because some people
19	don't use it, but to really consider the impacts
20	of such a proposal.
21	And in our written comments which are
22	much more detailed than what I said today, OEFFA

did not say we absolutely will not collect GPS 1 coordinates. We said we have some concerns about 2 3 this will be used and how it will think it will 4 collected, and we disproportionate impact on the farmers that 5 6 certify and on also the certifier that does work 7 with a higher proportion of plain community inspectors than most certifiers do. 8 9 To your first question, or your first 10 point was about the center of the field, yeah. 11 So the -- oh, and the hand-drawn maps, which are 12 troublesome and delightful in equal measure. OEFFA does require an address if possible for 13 We require like how many acres is 14 every field. 15 it, how far is it from your main farm, how do we get to it? 16 17 we run into a concern where we 18 can't find field, а we do require 19 from the operation until information 20 independently locate it. Yes, hand-drawn maps 2.1 are sometimes not as good as GPS maps, 22 sometimes they're much more detailed and they

1	actually help you understand where fields are
2	relative to each other, and how the farm operates
3	as a whole.
4	So from the principle that organic is
5	a okay, here are our standards. Show us how
6	you meet I think we should continue to accept
7	hand-drawn maps and field addresses
8	(Simultaneous speaking.)
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I'm sorry not
LO	love a good hand-drawn map. Not meaning to get
L1	rid of them at all, but when that's the only
L2	thing you have. It seems like we are just we
L3	have a short ability to be able to have good data
L 4	on where are all these fields? If there's a
L5	massive spray event, something happens where we
L 6	have a big contamination event or we have a
L7	really big question about a given county,
L8	understanding where these fields that we certify
L 9	are located seems to be a point of improvement,
20	that we don't really have.
21	And I guess this will be my final
22	question for you. Can OEFFA tell me exactly

1	where every field is?
2	MS. PINKHAM: We currently do track
3	every field and every OSP. We have an ability to
4	find it. It's true that if there were a spray
5	event such as the spraying for eastern equine
6	encephalitis that happened in Indiana a year or
7	two ago, we did get in touch with all of the
8	farms in that area who may have been impacted by
9	that spraying event.
10	We know county level and city level
11	and zip codes of where the farms are located, and
12	we know the distance from the main farm. We have
13	street addresses. We don't currently track all
14	of those street addresses in our database,
15	because of the time commitment it would take to
16	track it relative to the perceived benefits.
17	We're open to changing that if we can
18	be convinced that it's sufficiently worthwhile.
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I appreciate you
20	accepting so many questions from me all at once.
21	I'm going to hand it over to Jerry real quick.
22	MS. PINKHAM: Jerry, you're muted.

1 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: You're muted.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

MEMBER D'AMORE: My question of you Nate, was are you going to hand it over real quick, or are you going to make Jerry be real quick? I'd like to note that there's been 12 mentions just today of hydroponic growing in containers, and I'd like to also then note that it's very gratifying that nobody's yelling at anybody.

I sort of like the idea that we're talking, and so I have a very specific question of you, if I may. Were you to get information that the, you know, the low profile NFT hydroponic that's been in existence here for 40 years, 50 years that I know, because I've been involved in it, which is the production of head lettuce, were you to have a definitive study that showed you that for each acre of that system that was under cultivation, you could give back 25 acres of field production, would it take a little bit of the sting away from what hydroponics does or doesn't do for the field?

So that's the -- or for soil. 1 So that's the first one, and what I just mentioned 2 3 is a study that was done by Rutgers and given to me in 1979, saying this is what you've got. 4 5 if you can take -- and then I think you can take 6 this vertical farming to some mathematical extremes, where that could be as much as a factor 7 of 200. 8 9 Is it -- would it take -- would it 10 just give a different view of this soil-bound soil, 11 piece and how good one is to the if 12 literally you could give back 25 acres for every one you put under cover? 13 14 MS. PINKHAM: So just to be really 15 clear, I do not personally, nor does OEFFA as a certifier or as a membership organization, have a 16 17 problem with hydroponic production. The quibble 18 that we have, and it's a significant one, is that 19 under the Organic Foods Production Act, soil is a 20 mandatory component of an organic production system, and it's written into the regulations in 21 22 several parts.

It's impossible for us as a certifier 1 to hold all farms to a consistent standard, which 2 3 is the whole point of our certification program, if some of them are growing in soil and some of 4 5 them are not, because there aren't standards. 6 Which is why we're asking for the field and 7 greenhouse container production to get back on 8 the agenda, so that we as the community can 9 forward, figure really move out what our 10 container-growing standards are. 11 Maybe ultimately the result will be 12 let's change OFPA and let's change the 13 regulations to cover hydroponics. But currently they don't allow for it, and the fact that it is 14 15 being certified leads to а great deal inconsistency in the marketplace. 16 17 MEMBER D'AMORE: Thank you so much for 18 that comment. Ι'd like to make one more 19 observation, which is that, you know, the 20 National List is part of that same document, and if National List is a list that gives tools 2.1 22 founded on exceptions to people to do what we

Τ	nope they can do. I'm just wondering if that,
2	you know, did that go stagnant somewhere back in,
3	you know, 20 years ago?
4	Are we no longer willing to say hey,
5	this has value and we're going to we are going
6	to give you those tools through the National List
7	to engage. That it's just another one of the
8	points where I think that there's more room, and
9	by the way you can read things differently and
10	I'm not going to tell you that I've read, I've
11	read things better than you have at all. But,
12	and that's going back to OFPA.
13	But in terms of just having a mind
14	that's open enough to say there's that that we
15	organics are founded on a system that allows us
16	to have exceptions, can't we be that generous
17	going forward too?
18	MS. PINKHAM: I really appreciate
19	where you're coming from with this, and I think
20	it's very important that I mean speaking with
21	my certifier hat on, because I have to make
22	actual policy decisions when somebody applies for

certification to say can my farm comply? 1 cannot in good conscience, based on the actual 2 3 wording in the regulations or the law, certify a hydroponic operation because it's simply not 4 5 supported. 6 That's not to say that we as 7 industry can't have an open-minded conversation about well, what is organic really about? 8 We 9 care about the planet, we care about people, we care about food, let's move it forward. 10 11 under -- as it currently exists, it's very clear 12 that the law and the regulations do not support it, and until we as an industry are conversing 13 about it with the fact that it is, I don't think 14 15 we can move forward productively about we might incorporate other types of farming into the 16 organic umbrella. 17 18 MEMBER D'AMORE: Well again, thank you 19 As I said in the beginning, I had 12 very much. 20 reasons why I wanted to at least mention it, and founded in the fact that all 12 of them were 2.1

well-reasoned responses or deliveries.

22

You just

1	made the 13th, so thank you very much.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you so much,
3	Sal. Folks, we have five commenters left, and I
4	just want to give a huge shout out to all of you
5	for sticking with us. These have been some of
6	the best conversations I've heard while during my
7	time on the Board. So I really appreciate your
8	grace for letting us go a little bit over.
9	So we'll try to keep moving along
10	here. So thank you again Sal. Next up we have
11	Colehour Bondera, followed by Kristen Adams and
12	then Emily Musgrave. Colehour, please go ahead.
13	MR. BONDERA: Okay, am I good?
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yes, we can hear
15	you.
16	MR. BONDERA: You guys can hear me
17	fine? Okay. Hello. My name's Colehour Bondera,
18	a former NOSB member and a long-time small scale
19	diversified beetle organic, certified organic
20	farm, Kanalani Ohana Farm in Kona, Hawaii. Today
21	I'll provide some thoughts about overall organic
22	integrity, and specifically Handling Subcommittee

Τ	procedures and Crop Subcommittee's consideration
2	of plastic mulches.
3	Organic farmers are looking out for
4	the whole system that they live in, and moreso
5	the whole ecosystem where located. This is not
6	only my thought, but it's also what OFPA
7	requires. The USDA via NOP, via NOSB reviewed
8	system has cycles. In our context, it's called a
9	sunset.
LO	Since everything permitted for use in
L1	organic must be fully reviewed every five years,
L2	do we agree at a serious level to allow things to
L3	remain on the National Organic List, or must we
L 4	seek constant improvement? Everything cannot and
L 5	should not be organic without oversight.
L 6	Our responsibility is to ensure that
L 7	the activities remain as healthy to the
L 8	ecosystem, to the farm, to ourselves, to soil
L 9	microbes, to consumers, etcetera as possible.
20	Therefore, we must monitor and limit
21	and be careful with all inputs which are
22	permitted. Within the Handling Subcommittee,

are two items that deserve attention. 1 2 First that 205.606 states that up to five percent 3 non-organic processing ingredients can be used if organic is not available. 4 Since these ingredients are available 5 6 in organic form, close that loophole. 7 permit these unneeded exceptions. Second is that the chemicals 8 and 9 chemical change via ion exchange resins, so I've throughout today 10 listened and Ι know that 11 different testimony has said different things, 12 they might affect food products. These resins must each be carefully reviewed to be included in 13 organic product, and not permitted via a blanket 14 15 allowance of ion exchange in organic processes. Keep organic what it's meant to be. 16 17 Do not permit synthetic ingredients which result 18 from chemical change via their inclusion. Each 19 item must be reviewed and not put under a blanket or simply because allowed via FDA approval. 20 is similar to frankly my college days with inert 2.1 22 ingredients in pesticide formulation.

1	They're often not inert. Just because
2	the EPA said that they were okay, it doesn't mean
3	it's true. We need to look at full formulation.
4	Next is that the Crop Subcommittee
5	will again be dealing with the topic of plastic
6	mulch. This has gone on for much too long for
7	me. When our family moved to our already-
8	certified organic farm over 21 years ago, I was
9	disturbed to see that the previous farmers had
L 0	been using plastic mulch.
L1	Upon review at that time, I found out
L2	that it was still permitted. As is common, full
L3	cleanup had not been done, which is why we found
L 4	remnants of plastic sheets on our farm. Why?
L 5	Frankly, this type of experience was a strong
L 6	motivation for me to serve on the NOSB. Why
L7	could or would people who care about Pele, a wise
L 8	earth goddess, think about Mother Earth, even
L 9	consider to use and leave plastic mulch?
20	I don't comprehend it. While on the
21	NOSB I was surprised in 2011 and 2015 when
22	relisting of plastic mulches was passed by NOSB

1	vote because of continued dependency. Decades
2	passed, and there seems to be a (audio
3	interruption). I guess I'll just wrap up and say
4	please uphold the integrity of organic, and vote
5	to let plastic mulch leave organic with the
6	setting sun. Thank you.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you for your
8	comments. Any questions for Colehour?
9	All right; We appreciate you. Next
L 0	up we have Kristen Adams, followed by Emily
11	Musgrave, Bradley McNeil and then we'll follow
L2	the day with James Riddle. Kristen.
L3	MS. ADAMS: Hi, thank you for your
L 4	time. My name is Kristen Adams. I'm affiliated
L5	with MOSA Certified Organic. So MOSA certifies
L 6	about 1,930 producers, 55 we also work with 55
L 7	contract inspectors and represent a staff of 40
L 8	employees.
L 9	I will let you know my thoughts today
20	are very candid at this late hour. I have been
21	listening and have some specific things that I'd
22	like to respond to.

But before we get into the off the 1 book conversation, I definitely just want to 2 3 thank Jenny and her staff for their work on SOE, federal registry notice, that 80 4 5 document. provided amazing comments 6 foundation for MOSA to be able to start 7 interpreting the rule and changing our forms, updating our OSPs, our inspection reports, and 8 get communication out to our clients 9 really 10 quickly. 11 So all of that work has already been 12 done. It's been a hot minute or two since SOE So now we can actually like move into 13 dropped. implementation periods, and start working with 14 15 the ACA groups and working collaboratively to make sure that we're all aligned. 16 17 A couple of notes that I wanted to 18 share from our clients. They are asking for 19 So I think it was, let's harmonized paperwork. 20 see, Carolyn who had a question about how could we increase producer confidence in USDA? 21 If we 22 think about like some of the burdens in organic,

first of all like field production system could 1 be considered a burden. 2 3 The second largest burden or possibly the first major obstacle to overcome is the 4 So if we recognize that our farmers 5 paperwork. 6 and our producers, our handlers are investing 7 time, resources into that paperwork, let's like make that as applicable across the USDA system as 8 9 Let's value it as much as possible, possible. 10 and reduce the need for redundant paperwork from 11 one agency to another agency. 12 Let's like formally honor the work 13 that they're putting into their paperwork, by 14 giving it increased value. One stop shopping, 15 folks. I think that there are a number of 16 17 initiatives that have rolled out recently that 18 have the potential to compete with each other 19 unintentionally. So let's also make sure that 20 these initiatives to increase organic acreage, bring folks into the transitional world and 2.1 22 increase market access are harmonized from one

2	So that again looks like some sort of
3	standardized paperwork, which I cannot believe
4	I'm saying out loud. Several months ago I was
5	like no, don't take MOSA's individual voice away.
6	(Audio interruption.) Sorry I didn't get to my
7	hydroponic comments.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: That's okay. I
9	have I have a quick question for you, but I'm
10	going to let everyone go first real quick. Oh,
11	Jerry, go ahead.
12	MEMBER D'AMORE: I'd love to hear your
13	hydroponic question.
14	MS. ADAMS: It's maybe not a question,
15	but a comment. MOSA does certify hydroponic
16	operations. We believe that we do so in
17	compliance with the standards. We also believe
18	that in this day and age, we need creative,
19	flexible solutions that bring as many people to
20	the organic table as possible.
21	We need all of the elements at the
22	table. We talk a lot about soil, what is soil

agency to another.

1	without water, etcetera, etcetera. So one of the
2	ways for us to start really having full
3	conversations about how hydroponics can offer a
4	solution, they're not the answer to everything,
5	is to invite hydroponics formally, comfortably,
6	publicly to the organic table.
7	MEMBER D'AMORE: I'm glad I asked the
8	question. Thank you.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I am too. A great
LO	answer. So Kristen, I realize that it's late,
L1	but I'm going to take advantage of the fact that
L2	you're in candid mode. Does MOSA, when you say
13	harmonized documents, are you saying universal
L 4	OSP?
L 5	MS. ADAMS: Yes. Nate, thank you very
L 6	much. I dare to say yes. Harmonizing, either a
L 7	harmonized OSP or some form of like addendums
L 8	that work together, that just reduce
L 9	redundancies. It also probably looks like cross-
20	training and collaboration across agencies. So
21	it's not just about the paperwork; it's about
22	understanding each of the siles and how they all

1 work together. So in the creation 2 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: 3 of that universal OSP, do you think it should be private companies building them and then pitching 4 them to the USDA, or do you think -- who do you 5 think should make this universal OSP and how do 6 you think it should be stewarded? 7 Well, I have been recently 8 MS. ADAMS: 9 like honored enough to be in some conversations that are talking about like full stakeholder 10 11 engagement. So one example is like ACA. There's 12 a couple of working groups about increasing 13 access to government funding, technology, innovations in inspections, and those folks are 14 else besides ACA accredited 15 saying who or certifiers needs to be part of this conversation? 16 there's Ι think а number 17 So solutions. I don't have a magic answer for you. 18 19 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: No, no. Yeah, great starting point. Any other questions for 20 Kristen from the Board? 2.1 Thank you, really

Next up we have Emily Musgrave,

appreciate you.

1	followed by Bradley McNeil and then we're closing
2	the day with James Riddle. Emily, the floor is
3	yours.
4	MS. MUSGRAVE: Great. Can you hear me
5	okay?
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We can.
7	MS. MUSGRAVE: Great. Good afternoon.
8	My name is Emily Musgrave. I'm the organic
9	regulatory manager at Driscoll's. As always, I
10	would like to thank the NOSB for their tremendous
11	commitment by serving on the Board.
12	My comments focus on the continued
13	allowance of plastic mulch and covers, and I will
14	state that Driscoll supports the relisting of
15	elemental sulfur, liquid fish products, lime
16	sulfur and sulfurous acid on the National List as
17	well.
18	Additionally, I am a volunteer member
19	of the International Fresh Produce Association's
20	Organics Committee, and Driscoll supports the
21	comments made by IFPA. Driscoll supports the
22	continued listing of plastic mulch and covers on

the National List, as they are an essential tool 1 of 2 for organic cultural control weeds and 3 disease. There are numerous agronomic benefits of plastic mulch including reducing nitrogen loss 4 from the beds, and limiting the amount of water 5 infiltration during extended rainy seasons. 6

During the cooler months, plastic mulch also promotes plant growth and soil microbe activity by keeping the soil warmer. The color of the plastic mulch is also important. Darker colored mulch allows for an earlier crop, because increased microbial activity from warmer soil temperatures helps convert more readily available nutrients that the plants can uptake quicker.

Conversely, using white or silver plastic mulch helps reduce the soil temperature in the warmer summer months, when excess heat can stunt or stress strawberry plants, also helping to conserve water and moisture during hot temperatures. Another benefit of plastic mulch is that it keeps the berries and plants from having direct contact with the soil, reducing

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1	fruit rot and other fungal pathogens, because the
2	fruit and leaves rest on a clean, dry surface of
3	the mulch rather than the moist soil surface.
4	Plastic mulch is currently not widely
5	recycled. However, Driscoll's is working on
6	recycling pilots in California and Baja that have
7	had some success. The widespread practice of
8	recycling plastic mulch throughout the industry
9	is years away.
10	But there is hope on the horizon.
11	There's increased interest and investment from
12	growers, shippers, some manufacturers and
13	distributors to make the recycling of plastic
14	mulch possible on a larger scale. NGOs and
15	foundations also want to solve this issue.
16	Because of these increasing pressures
17	from the organic industry, as well as consumers
18	to reduce plastics in the organic supply chain,
19	we anticipate industry coalitions will form to
20	develop solutions needed to drive the increased
21	adoption of plastic mulch recycling.
22	Driscoll's will continue to partner

1	with leaders on this issue, to develop innovative
2	ways to accept push the recycling of plastic
3	mulch forward to become an industry-wide
4	practice. In the meantime, the loss of plastic
5	mulch as a tool would be catastrophic for the
6	organic berry industry, and we urge the NOSB to
7	relist it.
8	Driscoll's thanks the National Organic
9	Standards Board for the opportunity to comment,
10	and their commitment to protecting the integrity
11	of the program.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you for your
13	comments. Wood has a question for you.
14	MEMBER TURNER: Thanks, Emily. Why do
15	you think the why do you think it's years away
16	that we're going to be able to recover plastic
17	mulch? And we've been having this conversation
18	for as long as I can remember. I think I talked
19	about ag plastics 15 years ago at least, and it's
20	been long. I'm sure it's longer than that.
21	And so I just can't if it's 15
22	years from now, that feels like that's too long.

1	So I don't, I don't know where we are on this.
2	So I'm curious specifically for a big grower like
3	Driscoll's, you know, what is the impetus, what
4	is the role, what is the push that your
5	organization is really doing to kind of drive
6	this?
7	Talk to me more about the details of
8	where the barriers are and sort of what's
9	actually happening. Is it dirty plastics? Is
10	that the issue? Is it something else? Like
11	what's going on?
12	MS. MUSGRAVE: Great question. So a
13	few things. So I said years, and actually really
14	much, much less. Like we're thinking less, you
15	said 15 years. When I've talked to our R&D
16	folks, it's maybe more like three to four years
17	to become widely for the recycling of plastic
18	mulch to be something industry-wide.
19	So the biggest even like two years
20	ago, the biggest reason we have talked to I
21	think Driscoll's talked to over 50 recycling
22	companies in the U.S., and this was like two and

1	a half years ago, and they all would not take it,
2	would not take the plastic mulch simply because
3	it was too contaminated, right, with dirt and
4	soil.
5	So I think what is literally this
6	was about two years ago I think I commented to
7	the Board. It was like nobody is taking the
8	there's like nobody is taking the plastic mulch
9	to recycle it because of the contamination. So
10	what I have literally seen in just the past two
11	years, recycling companies are now
12	I think they're making it into like
13	low grade, like making twist ties or low grade
14	other things. They're somehow able with the
15	technology, things are coming through where they
16	are able to do something to recycle the plastic
17	mulch, even though it's still contaminated with
18	dirt and soil. So it's getting there. We're,
19	like I said, we're piloting with some processors
20	and recycling companies, and it was successful
21	this year.

They have recycled plastic mulch. I

1	have heard from R&D folks, you know, we're making
2	progress in actually recycling some of the
3	plastic mulch used in strawberries in California
4	and Baja this year and last year that was not
5	getting recycled at all. Years before, those
6	went straight to the landfill, and now a
7	percentage with these partners is getting
8	recycled.
9	So I think Driscoll's, on our scale of
LO	piloting, we just want to push that pilot program
L1	upward, and then we're hoping well, when I
12	talked with our R&D folks they're wondering, you
13	know, with it industry-wide, if it can be not 15
L 4	years. We're talking about maybe, you know,
L 5	within the next three to five years could be
L 6	possibly, you know, more widespread recycling.
L 7	MEMBER TURNER: Thanks, great answer
L 8	Emily. Need your muscle, need you guys' muscle
L 9	on this big time.
20	MS. MUSGRAVE: We're on it.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Jerry has a
22	question for you, yeah.

Yes. I'd like to 1 MEMBER D'AMORE: 2 follow on what Wood just started and concluded 3 for his topic, by sharing with you that I and others on the Board have had a frustration with 4 5 the knowledge that no matter how hard we work, if 6 were to get something done in the organic 7 world, what would we have accomplished? We would have accomplished, you know, 8 9 getting rid of three percent of plastics. 10 question would be you as the organic person and 11 talking about your R&D, can we assume that where 12 you're going with all of that would have a conventional component too? 13 Because that would It would be wonderful just to hear 14 be wonderful. 15 that. Absolutely. So I think 16 MS. MUSGRAVE: our -- nobody, I mean none of the 17 of 18 growers, conventional, organic, nobody wants to 19 be seeing plastic mulch going to the landfills. So I absolutely think we will be trying this with 20 both organic and conventional growers, and if we 2.1 22 can get conventional plastic mulch being recycled

1	too, I mean yeah, definitely the case. That's a
2	great question.
3	MEMBER D'AMORE: Thank you.
4	MS. MUSGRAVE: Okay, thank you.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Brian, please go
6	ahead.
7	MEMBER CALDWELL: Hi Emily. Thanks a
8	lot for your comments, and I asked this question
9	of another person as well, but I know that
10	Driscoll's has a lot of container berry
11	operations and acres.
12	Do you think do you have any life
13	cycle analyses of the energy or carbon balances
14	over the life cycle of these, of these you know
15	systems, that would compare to, you know, in the
16	ground kind of growing?
17	And if I was thinking that if you
18	could possibly look for that and then just
19	forward it to Michelle, that would be great,
20	because I know you don't have it right on, you
21	know, with you right now.
22	MS. MUSGRAVE: Yeah, yeah Brian. I

Τ	believe we do. I believe we've been looking at
2	that. So I can get in touch with the right folks
3	and forward you the information.
4	MEMBER CALDWELL: That's fantastic.
5	Thank you very much.
6	MS. MUSGRAVE: You're welcome.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
8	questions for Emily?
9	All right, Emily. We appreciate your
LO	time.
L1	MS. MUSGRAVE: Thank you very much.
L2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Okay. Next up we
L3	have Bradley McNeil, followed by James Riddle.
L 4	Bradley, the floor is yours.
L5	MR. McNEIL: Yes, can everyone hear
L 6	me?
L 7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We can. Please go
L8	ahead.
L 9	MR. McNEIL: Okay. So B.J. McNeil
20	with Rocking Z Acres, Wessington, South Dakota.
21	I've got two things I'd like to address today.
22	Number one, both will concern federal crop

insurance. Number one thing I'd like to address 1 is a topic called trend line yield that is used 2 3 in crop insurance. What trend line yield does is 4 5 allows a producer who has grown a crop within a 6 four-year period, continually within a four-year 7 period or once within a four-year period, to get the trend line yield on that crop, meaning that 8 hybrids, 9 corn corn management continually 10 increases, which is increasing yield. Because 11 that happens, you're allowed to take a trend line 12 yield bump within that county for a said crop. Now as an organic producer, where we 13 have long-term rotations, some of them up to six 14 15 years, that limits us because we then cannot take advantage of that trend line yield. 16 So if we have let's say alfalfa in our 17 18 ground for four years and then we want to plant 19 corn, well you no longer get trend line yield for corn like some of the other counterparts might, 20 2.1 who are planting a corn-bean-corn rotation or 22 corn-corn or anything where they had corn

So that's kind of a negative 1 within four years. effect on a lot of organic producers. 2 3 The other thing, if you could move the slide ahead please? We can see here that crop 4 5 recognizes organic as а different We have to keep different books, we 6 practice. 7 have to have buffer zones, all that to stay obviously within the rules of organic production. 8 9 If you could forward please. here, this slide just kind of -- this is all data 10 11 that my insurance agent helped me get out of the 12 crop insurance book to show -- out of RMA's book, to show how trend line yield is used and how it 13 isn't, as you can see, just have the crop planted 14 in one out of four years to get that trend line 15 vield. 16 If you could go ahead, please. 17 18 second issue I would like to talk about is 19 organic management not being recognized in enterprise unit situation. So if I'm a producer 20 and I have an organic crop growing in a section 2.1

of ground or a unit, and I have a conventional

crop growing in that same unit, once I harvest 1 those bushels, I'm not allowed to view those 2 3 bushels as separate. In other words, they're thrown into a 4 pile and they're allocated to whatever my whole 5 production insured was on that field. 6 I can't 7 separate my organic bushels from my conventional bushels. Now the reason I don't understand this, 8 as you can see in my examples here, RMA allows 9 you to recognize winter wheat different from 10 11 spring wheat. You can insure them separately in 12 an enterprise unit. 13 It allows you to, you know, separate all the dry beans, you can separate pinto beans 14 15 separate from black beans. Same thing with sunflowers. You can insure your confectionary 16 17 flowers separate from your oil types. But as you 18 can see -- and then if we go to the next slide 19 please? You can also see where they allow you to 20 separate your management practice of irrigated versus non-irrigated, all within the same unit. 21

So I don't understand why we are not

1	allowed to look at organic practice and insure
2	that separate from conventional practice, or why
3	we're not allowed to insure organic corn versus
4	conventional corn. Thank you very much for the
5	time.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you for
7	those slides. This is really great, and thank
8	you for bringing such actionable questions to us.
9	I know that we have an expert in Amy, but this
10	is really exceptional work and thank you for the
11	time that went into preparing that presentation.
12	We have a question for you from Kim. Kim,
13	please go ahead.
14	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Hi BJ. I just have
15	one quick question for you here. With the
16	understanding of how its yields are determined
17	and so forth in the conventional space in the
18	rotation from an organic perspective, how would
19	you suggest that be redesigned then for the
20	organic farmer, to determine for crop insurance
21	and yields?
22	MR. McNEIL: Well, I mean that's a

great question, one that's really complicated to 1 But I just feel, I mean if we're looking 2 answer. 3 at this, they're giving you a trend line yield to management practices, and what they're 4 5 saying is you've grown corn multiple years, so 6 you know how to manage it better, so therefore 7 we'll give you this bump in coverage, right? Well, if I'm an organic producer, and 8 9 this doesn't affect just organic, but it just affects us more than conventional. 10 Τ think 11 conventional has the same argument, okay. It's 12 just that it affects us because we do longer 13 rotations in organics. So if I do four years of alfalfa and 14 15 then I plow that alfalfa and plant corn, odds are I'm going to have a more sustainable corn crop in 16 ground than maybe the neighbor 17 that alfalfa 18 organic farm. Even though he's planted corn two 19 out of the last four years, my corn crop is probably going to outyield his where he's done 20 corn on corn out of the last two years. 2.1 But yet I'm penalized and they're saying well, this guy 22

Τ	has been using it more, so therefore he's going
2	to have a better crop.
3	Well that's just not the way it is in
4	organics, you know, and we can extrapolate that
5	in conventional too. But I mean it just seems
6	like an unfair advantage, because I can give you
7	several examples in my field this year, where we
8	lost up to 18 bushels of coverage because I
9	hadn't had corn in that unit one out of four
LO	years.
L1	So if I had 150 bushels APH, if I put
L2	it at trend line, I would have got 168 on my
L3	insurance to guarantee. But because I hadn't had
L 4	corn there, I get the 150. For the neighbor
L5	across the road, he got 168, you know. It seems
L 6	like an unfair advantage.
L7	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Yeah, I understand
L 8	the gap. It's just the solve, right?
L 9	MR. McNEIL: Right, right, right.
20	MEMBER HUSEMAN: The awareness and the
21	attention is greatly appreciated. So good luck
22	on planting this year as well. I know you guys

1	are getting closer to that date that moves up in
2	the U.S., so I just want to say good luck in your
3	planting intentions as well.
4	MR. McNEIL: Thank you very much.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We have another
6	question for you from Nate Lewis.
7	MEMBER LEWIS: Yeah, thanks BJ. Yeah,
8	these crop insurance issues are really
9	complicated, and everyone in various cropping
10	systems and across the country have different
11	experiences.
12	What I'm trying to home in on is your
13	opinion or your experience around the issues
14	being a policy or a structure in RMA, or
15	ignorance or naivete is probably a better, more
16	flattering term for the adjuster in your area
17	about organic systems.
18	Because I've, I've encountered where
19	both are the issue, where one's the issue, the
20	other's the issue and I think they both they
21	require different solutions. Sometimes the RMA
22	policy works, but the adjuster doesn't know what

1	they're doing or doesn't know organic, and
2	sometimes it's the other way. Sometimes both
3	things are not working well. So I'm curious what
4	your experience has been in.
5	MR. McNEIL: My experience is it's
6	been more RMA. Normally, I can teach or show my
7	adjuster. They're normally in my corner. I mean
8	every adjuster I've ever dealt with is always in
9	the farmer's corner when it comes to those
10	things, and if I can show him in the rules. I
11	have a great agent. The agent will pull the
12	rules out, show it to the adjuster, whatever.
13	So I've never had a problem with
14	adjusters, and I've never had a problem with RMA.
15	I just don't always understand the thoughts
16	behind the rules when, you know, I mean I get
17	originally how we a lot of times what it feels
18	like is, you know, the whole big egg wants us to
19	plant corn, right?
20	So why do we have we have these
21	policies that continually favor corn, and I just
22	think that needs, you know, are we going to cull

1	that out of the system? No. But I wish they
2	would recognize that maybe there's an exclusion
3	in that trend line yield, that four-year rule in
4	organics.
5	Because it is a different system than
6	conventionals. I mean it's different practice.
7	They recognize it's different practices, as you
8	can see on my slide. So I just think we need to
9	recognize that hey, it's a different practice and
10	there needs to be a few tweaking of the rules.
11	You don't need to go change and build a whole new
12	set of parameters or rules. But there needs to
13	be little tweaks in here, and I think that's a
14	big one, the trend line yield deal.
15	MEMBER LEWIS: That's interesting.
16	Thank you very much.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
18	for BJ?
19	All right. Really appreciate your
20	time, both for preparing that presentation and
21	meeting with us today. So thank you.

MR. McNEIL: Thank you.

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Our last commenter
2	for today will be James Riddle. James, the floor
3	is yours.
4	MR. RIDDLE: Okay, thank you. My
5	name's Jim Riddle, and I'm a former NOSB member,
6	former chair and founding president of the IOIA.
7	I currently serve on the Policy Committee of
8	NOFA New Hampshire, and from personal experience,
9	I understand that serving on the Board is much
10	more than just an honor; it's a lot of work. So
11	I really thank you for your service to our
12	country and to our earth.
13	I'd like to comment today on the CACS
14	proposal organic is climate-smart agriculture,
15	which states "While all certified organic
16	production is climate-smart, not all climate-
17	smart production is certified organic." The NOSB
18	should revise that sentence to read "While soil-
19	based certified organic production is climate-
20	smart, not all climate-smart production is
21	certified organic," since as far as I can see,
22	all of the research that you cite in your

1	excellent paper is based on soil-based organic
2	production.
3	And that term "soil-based" was
4	officially used by the NOP last year when they
5	announced a new online course, "Organic Field
6	Crop Practices," and they stated the following:
7	"Soil is a critical resource, and the USDA
8	organic regulations emphasize the need to
9	maintain or improve the natural resource of the
10	operation, including soil and water quality.
11	"For soil-based operations, this
12	includes cultivation practices that maintain or
13	improve the physical, chemical or biological
14	condition of the soil, minimize soil erosion, as
15	well as managing crop nutrients and soil
16	fertility through rotations, cover crops and the
17	application of plant and animal materials." Now
18	that's climate-smart.
19	But that's not what organic is these
20	days. The soil-based operations comply with all
21	the provisions of OFPA, including 6513(b)(1),
22	which states "an organic plan shall contain

1	provisions designed to foster soil fertility,
2	primarily through the management of organic
3	content of the soil through proper tillage, crop
4	rotation and manuring."
5	Water-based operations, including
6	hydroponic and container systems, do not grow
7	plants in soil. They deliver highly soluble
8	nutrients through aqueous solutions to produce
9	crops such as tomatoes, peppers, cucumbers,
10	greens and berries. OFPA contains no language
11	that allows for organic crop production plans
12	which do not foster soil fertility.
13	There's no language in OFPA that
14	supports organic certification of water-based
15	operations. NOP has issued no rules, no
16	regulations or even online courses to guide the
17	organic certification of water-based operations.
18	They're totally dependent on external inputs.
19	They do not foster soil fertility, use
20	crop rotations, sequester carbon, protect natural
21	resources or foster cycling of resources, promote
22	ecological balance and conserve biodiversity as

1	required by the definition of organic production.
2	They are not climate-smart.
3	I have one more point. I see my time
4	is about up. You've been pretty generous with
5	other presenters, so I'm hoping I can make my
6	final point.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Please go ahead.
8	MR. RIDDLE: Thank you. I call on the
9	NOSB to investigate just how much of the U.S.
10	organic market is comprised of products from
11	water-based crop production systems, and how much
12	of that production is imported from countries
13	where the products couldn't even be sold as
14	organic in those countries of origin, but yet
15	they're being dumped on the U.S. market.
16	I think the NOSB needs to get the
17	facts on how much is soil-based and how much is
18	water-based. We have two very different systems
19	of agriculture being certified as organic under
20	the U.S. right now. Thank you.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any questions for
22	Jim?

1	Seeing none, all right, Jim.
2	MR. RIDDLE: Thank you very much.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Oh, Mindee
4	(Simultaneous speaking.)
5	MEMBER JEFFERY: Honestly, I wanted to
6	say thank you for your service and thank you for
7	your patience today, and everyone else who went
8	real late and hung in there with us. I really
9	appreciate it. I know you all have busy lives.
10	So thank you Jim and everyone else.
11	MR. RIDDLE: Yeah, well thank you.
12	And I really encourage consumers who are
13	concerned about this to use the USDA, the NOP's
14	official complaint system if they think products
14 15	official complaint system if they think products are not being produced in compliance with OFPA,
15	are not being produced in compliance with OFPA,
15 16	are not being produced in compliance with OFPA, with the soil requirements. That's what it's
15 16 17	are not being produced in compliance with OFPA, with the soil requirements. That's what it's there for; use it. Thank you.
15 16 17 18	are not being produced in compliance with OFPA, with the soil requirements. That's what it's there for; use it. Thank you. CHAIR POWELL-PALM: So Jim, real
15 16 17 18 19	are not being produced in compliance with OFPA, with the soil requirements. That's what it's there for; use it. Thank you. CHAIR POWELL-PALM: So Jim, real quick. That raises one question for me. Have

1	MR. RIDDLE:by data. But yeah, we
2	have
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I have one follow-
4	up question to that. What is the propensity to
5	be a conspiracy if we don't, and so an anecdote,
6	if we don't have data? And I sort of meant that
7	just to Dave Chapman as well. If we aren't
8	talking data, how do we make policy decisions?
9	Otherwise it's, you know, sort of
10	(Simultaneous speaking.)
11	MR. RIDDLE: That's why I'm calling on
12	you to find the data to know just how much, and
13	the certifiers have this. They know which
14	operations they certify which are soil-based, and
15	which ones are water-based, you know. So you can
16	get it from the accredited certifiers to begin
17	with.
18	But from personal experience, we have
19	a certified organic, Blue Fruit Farm in
20	Minnesota. So many consumers ate our organic
21	berries and they say we always buy organic, but
22	we've never had such flavorful such rich flavor

1	even though we buy and I won't say the brand
2	names, but big brands of USDA-certified organic
3	blueberries.
4	That's where I think we need to look
5	at nutrient density comparisons. These aren't
6	the same. When you grow things in healthy,
7	biological soil, they're going to have much
8	richer bioflavonoids. We've seen research from
9	University of California, ten-year research
10	looking at conventional versus organic, and
11	showing that the levels of bioflavonoids as well
12	as vitamins and minerals just keep going up in
13	healthy soil, whereas they stay flat when they're
14	on a conventional nutrient path.
15	And so I think we need to take that
16	type of research and compare soil-based organic
17	versus water-based organic. We do need the data.
18	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: all right. Well,
19	we appreciate your comments.
20	MR. RIDDLE: Thank you.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you.
22	MR. RIDDLE: Have a good time next

1	week.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We appreciate it.
3	So we've got this one in the bag. Thank you
4	everybody for sticking with us. We're going to
5	do this again on Thursday, same time, same place.
6	Please join us. On Thursday we're going to get
7	kicked off with Garth Kahl, followed by Sam
8	Welsch and then Laura Holm. So we're excited to
9	see you there.
10	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
11	went off the record at 6:32 p.m.)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

NATIONAL ORGANIC STANDARDS BOARD

+ + + + +

SPRING 2023 MEETING

+ + + + +

PUBLIC COMMENT WEBINAR

+ + + + +

THURSDAY APRIL 20, 2023

+ + + + +

The Board met via Videoconference, at 12:00 p.m. EDT, Nathan Powell-Palm, Chair, presiding.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

NATHAN POWELL-PALM, Chair
MINDEE JEFFERY, Vice Chair
AMY BRUCH, Secretary
BRIAN CALDWELL
JERRY D'AMORE
CAROLYN DIMITRI
KIMBERLY HUSEMAN
ALLISON JOHNSON
NATE LEWIS
DILIP NANDWANI
LOGAN PETREY
FRANKLIN QUARCOO
KYLA SMITH
WOOD TURNER

STAFF PRESENT

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	12:05 p.m.
3	DR. TUCKER: I'm Jenny Tucker, Deputy
4	Administrator of the National Organic Program. I
5	want to welcome everyone back, so welcome to all
6	of our Board Members and our audience. Thanks
7	for returning to the second day of public
8	comments where we are now reconvening here.
9	We, as I mentioned the very first day,
10	continue to be very, very grateful for everyone's
11	ability to engage in these sessions. It really
12	does help us connect through both time and space.
13	And I, again, want to welcome our two
14	new Board members, Franklin Quarcoo from Tuskegee
15	University in Alabama and Nate Lewis from
16	Washington Farmland Trust in Washington State.
17	They, again, just recently joined.
18	So, again, we want to give them a very warm
19	welcome, warm Zoom welcome.
20	To our public commenters, thank you
21	for engaging in the process with us. And thank
22	you to our audience. You are a vital part of

Τ	withessing this event together in the public
2	space and the public sphere.
3	This webinar continues our two days of
4	public webinars this week. We'll convene in
5	person in Atlanta, Georgia next week. We plan to
6	live stream that meeting as well as we did last
7	fall.
8	Meeting access information for all
9	meeting segments is posted on the NOSB meeting
10	page on the USDA website. And transcripts for
11	all segments will be posted once completed.
12	This meeting, like all other meetings
13	of the National Organic Standards Board will be
14	run based on the Federal Advisory Committee Act
15	and the Board's Policy and Procedures Manual.
16	So, I am the Designated Federal
17	Officer for all meeting segments. And Nate
18	Powell-Palm, our Board Chair will be taking the
19	helm again today.
20	We remind everyone that in an open,
21	transparent process, mutual respect is critical.
22	We ask you in advance to avoid

1	personal attacks and disparagement. This extends
2	also to any chats that you share.
3	So, even if you disagree with a
4	speaker's position, in a public process, everyone
5	deserves the same respect and grace you would
6	want for yourself.
7	I want to, again, thank the National
8	Organic Program team. You guys are amazing. I
9	was very particularly impressed on Tuesday when
10	we did have the Zoom-bombers. We haven't had
11	that happen which is really remarkable given how
12	public this meeting is.
13	And so, the team's ability to problem
14	solve in the background while also continuing to
15	run the meeting is truly impressive.
16	And this team works like that every
17	day. They are problem solvers. They are
18	achievers and, often, overachievers. And I'm
19	very, very grateful for all of their work.
20	There have been many, many successes
21	from the program over the past six months since
22	we convened in California. And the team that's

1	supporting you as a community today is, in large
2	part, responsible for many of those successes.
3	So, I want to thank them for their
4	work.
5	So, Michelle Arsenault, who you all
6	know well, Jared Clark, Andrea Holm, Joanna
7	Miranda, and our new Standards Director, Erin
8	Healy. We also have a new Assistant Director of
9	Standards who I introduced last time, Fred David.
L 0	And so, I would appreciate if we could
L1	all give the NOP team a big round of applause.
L2	They are a huge part of getting us here.
L3	And a huge round applause for the
L 4	Board itself, who listens constructively and
L 5	thoughtfully, and is a incredibly collaborative
L 6	group.
L 7	So, I'm going to hand the mic back to
L 8	Michelle who will do a roll call of NOSB Members
L 9	and NOP staff.
20	So, thanks so much. Oh, I guess she's
21	not doing NOP staff because I just did that,
22	right?

1	But Michelle, take it from here.
2	MS. ARSENAULT: Thank you, Jenny.
3	Thank you, I'm glad you reiterated
4	that, actually.
5	All right, you guys, I'm not on
6	camera. I have the speaker timer on camera now.
7	So, I will still call roll.
8	Nate Powell-Palm?
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Present. Hello,
10	hello.
11	MS. ARSENAULT: Welcome.
12	Mindee Jeffrey?
13	MEMBER JOHNSON: Colored pens ready to
14	go.
15	MS. ARSENAULT: Excellent.
16	Amy Bruch?
17	MEMBER BRUCH: I'm here.
18	MS. ARSENAULT: Good morning, Amy.
19	Brian Caldwell?
20	MEMBER CALDWELL: Here. Hi,
21	everybody.
22	MS. ARSENAULT: Hi, Brian.

1		Jerry D'Amore?
2		MEMBER D'AMORE: Good day, here as
3	well.	
4		MS. ARSENAULT: Welcome, Jerry.
5		Carolyn Dimitri?
6		MEMBER DIMITRI: Hi, everyone, good
7	afternoon.	
8		MS. ARSENAULT: Hi, Carolyn.
9		Kim Huseman?
10		MEMBER HUSEMAN: Hello.
11		MS. ARSENAULT: Hello, Kim.
12		Allison Johnson?
13		MEMBER JOHNSON: Here, good morning.
14		MS. ARSENAULT: Welcome, Allison.
15		Kyla Smith?
16		MEMBER SMITH: Hi, everybody, I'm
17	here.	
18		MS. ARSENAULT: Hey Kyla.
19		Nate Lewis?
20		MEMBER LEWIS: Present from the
21	Northwest.	
22		MS. ARSENAULT: Welcome, Nate.

1	Dilip Nandwani?
2	MEMBER NANDWANI: Good morning, all.
3	MS. ARSENAULT: Good morning, Dilip.
4	Logan Petrey?
5	MEMBER PETREY: I'm here, good
6	afternoon.
7	MS. ARSENAULT: Hello, Logan.
8	Franklin Quarcoo?
9	MEMBER QUARCOO: Present.
10	MS. ARSENAULT: Welcome, Franklin.
11	Wood Turner?
12	MEMBER TURNER: Here, good morning.
13	MS. ARSENAULT: Good morning, Wood.
14	And I believe Javier Zamora won't be
15	with us today.
16	So, for transcription purposes, we'll
17	mark Javier absent.
18	I'm waiting for him to yell out, just
19	in case.
20	(No response.)
21	MS. ARSENAULT: Nope, okay. All
22	right, and as Jenny said, she already introduced

1	all of the NOP staff so I won't do that again.
2	Now, I'm going to hand off the mic to
3	Nate Powell-Palm, Chair of the National Organic
4	Standards Board.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, thank
6	you, Michelle, and welcome back, everybody.
7	Just to get kicked off here, I really
8	wanted to say thank you to everybody, the Board,
9	NOP staff, the whole community for letting us run
10	a little long on Tuesday, but it was worth it.
11	Those were some great conversations. I'm really
12	looking forward to having similar conversations
13	today.
14	For brevity, I will remind my fellow
15	Board Members, if you can keep it to questions as
16	opposed to comments, that will save some time.
17	But don't hold back. That was a really nice
18	conversation and I hope we get to have that again
19	today.
20	We do have a slide for our Policy and
21	Procedures Manual about public comments.
22	All speakers who will be recognized

1	signed up during the registration period.
2	Persons must give their names and affiliations
3	for the record at the beginning of the public
4	comment.
5	So, when I call on you, I'll state
6	your name, but if you would state your
7	affiliation, that'd be great.
8	Proxy speakers are not permitted.
9	Individuals providing public comment
10	shall refrain from making any personal attacks or
11	remarks that might impugn the character of any
12	individual.
13	Members of the public are asked to
14	define clearly and succinctly the issues they
15	wish to present before the Board. This will give
16	NOSB Members a comprehensive understanding of the
17	speaker's concerns.
18	I'll call on speaks in the order of
19	the schedule and will announce the next person or
20	two so they can prepare.
21	Please remember to state your name and
22	affiliation and then we'll start the timer.

1	Board Members will indicate to me if
2	they have a question and I will call on them.
3	Only NOSB Members are allowed to ask questions.
4	So, with that, our first speaker today
5	is going to be Garth Kahl followed by Sam Welsch
6	and then Laura Holm.
7	Garth, the floor is yours.
8	MR. KAHL: Hello, good day. Thank you
9	for your service. Thank you NOP staff.
10	I represent the Organic Integrity
11	Cooperative Guild. The Organic Integrity
12	Cooperative Guild, OICG, is a cooperative of
13	organic inspectors, reviewers, and consultants,
14	all of whom either own or work on certified
15	organic farms.
16	And we have come together to further
17	professionalism in the organic industry and
18	promote dynamic growing and trustworthy organic
19	marketplace.
20	Next slide, please?
21	So, CACS, we need clear and distinct
22	locations and fields for performing unannounced

1	inspection. This is the perfect example on
2	calling out this certifier because they do a
3	great job.
4	This is a perfect example of what we
5	can do at the beginning on an OSP parcel
6	document. You'll see that they ask for not only
7	the GPS coordinates, but they also ask for
8	township and range.
9	This is critical because plain people
10	may not have access to GPS or a smartphone. They
11	certainly can go to their county and get a
12	township and range.
13	Next slide, please?
14	With that township and range, then
15	anybody, myself or someone in the certification
16	community, can use a free document, convert
17	township and range to GPS coordinates.
18	Here's what another outstanding CB can
19	do with that information.
20	So, you can see there, I can go, if
21	I'm the inspector, I can go directly to the dairy
22	in question. I can hop on a four-wheeler. I can

1	drive around the fields.
2	If there's a problem, I can
3	immediately pull out my smartphone, locate where
4	I am, and describe in the report where the issue
5	is.
6	This kind of program also includes the
7	shape of the fields and the area.
8	Next slide, please?
9	Here is an example of what me, a
10	simple, humble organic inspector can do with free
11	software, i.e., Google or Pro. I can take those
12	GPS coordinates, I can make a map. I can draw a
13	map with my smartphone or a tablet. I can
14	describe to the certifier exactly where an issue
15	is and I can compare that field area to what's in
16	the OSP.
17	So, great way to improve organic
18	integrity without a lot of lift.
19	Next slide, please?
20	Okay, so, you're close, you're almost
21	here. Let's get this ion exchange issue
22	resolved.

1	Ion exchange resins do not need to be
2	listed. The recharge materials are already
3	listed.
4	As you can see, this is the kind of
5	document that we see at every organic inspection.
6	We can review this. We can see the specific
7	name brand and the FDA statement verifying that
8	it is, indeed, compliant. It's been reviewed.
9	It's not a heavy lift, let's get it
10	done.
11	And I would refer you also to Adam
12	from QAI's comments on Tuesday.
13	Last slide, please?
14	Okay, so, this basically says it all,
15	climate smart and sunset. Keep all the tools in
16	the toolbox. And yes, we could, even though it's
17	an anathema, have organic Twinkies. Why not?
18	Let's push the climate smart benefit of organic
19	agriculture, even if it includes organic
20	Twinkies.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you very
22	much for your comments.

1	I'm going to sit here and really
2	imagine eating an organic Twinkie now. And I
3	want us all to let our worlds be so large.
4	Amy has a question for you to get
5	kicked off.
6	Please go ahead, Amy.
7	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you for your
8	public comments and for attending our session,
9	starting us off here.
10	I really appreciate your information,
11	it was really helpful. We all think organic
12	we all refer to it as the gold standard.
13	And it was interesting in your written
14	comments how you mentioned about the Mexican
15	Organic Standard and how they are not only
16	tracking, but verifying or not only receiving
17	these coordinates, but verifying these
18	coordinates and tracking them.
19	Could you speak more on to the Mexican
20	Organic Standard and how they're able to execute
21	that across the countryside?
22	Because I'm sure that they run into

1	similar situations that we have been hearing
2	about.
3	MR. KAHL: Yes, absolutely.
4	And actually, Mexico is the perfect
5	example of why this is so necessary.
6	If you've traveled or worked in
7	Mexico, addresses are, at best, kind of a
8	suggestion. So, it may be, you know, 500 meters
9	past the blue house on the right in terms of a
LO	field description.
L1	So, they saw very on when they
L2	implemented their national law, that this was
L3	critical to allow inspectors to verify parcels to
L 4	perform unannounced inspections.
L5	What they do as a certifier accredited
L 6	to the National Organic Standard, the Ley de
L7	Productos Organicos, you have to receive this
L 8	information, every parcel as part of the OSP has
L 9	to have GPS coordinates.
20	It's tracked, so you have to
21	demonstrate during your accreditation audit with
22	the national body, with the Secretariat of

Agriculture.
You, as the certifier, need to show
how you're tracking this field information. And
it actually appears on certificates as well.
So, if you look at a certificate that
is issued by a certifier for an operator that's
accredited to the Ley de Productos Organicos, it
will list the specific field information.
So, it's just another just the way
we would track a name or the products that are
certified, it just tracks these they call them
geocodes. But it's basically the way Google
Earth, you know, has digitized latitude and
longitude.
It's simple. It works. And again, it
works in Mexico. Anybody with a cheap smartphone
can record this information and/or can look on
with free software, can pull up on their
smartphone and see where they are and see where
they need to get to with Google Maps, for
example.

So, it works really well. It hasn't

22

1	been, again, even with impoverished communities,
2	even with, you know, communities, most people
3	have a smartphone. They may not have a car, they
4	may, you know, they may literally still be
5	farming with oxen, but almost everybody's got a
6	smartphone.
7	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you for
8	elaborating more on that.
9	And thanks, also, for sharing how you
10	are using, from an inspector point of view, the
11	geocoordinates to then lay out the fields into
12	GIS type systems.
13	So, thanks, again, appreciate that.
14	MR. KAHL: Yes.
15	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
16	for Garth?
17	I've got one for you, Garth. Do you
18	feel like there is consistency amongst certifiers
19	that you've worked with or that you've consulted
20	with in how they track internally where their
21	fields are? Do you feel like that you've seer
22	folks be able to know where all the fields they

1	certify are in a consistent format:
2	And if we were, through this document,
3	just to recommend that we get a consistent format
4	where they're able to aggregate that data
5	internally, not necessarily in public facing,
6	that that would be an asset to the integrity of
7	our industry.
8	MR. KAHL: And so, and to answer your
9	first question, no, there is not consistency
10	across certifiers.
11	Some certifiers don't have this. Some
12	certifiers literally that I've seen have all
13	fields tied to a specific address. So, that
14	might be the home farm.
15	Other certifiers just have, you know,
16	a rough address that may put you a quarter mile
17	away or at, you know, the other end of the
18	section.
19	And then, some certifiers, as I've
20	shown, are tracking this very closely.
21	I think it is absolutely would be an
22	improvement to demand some consistency across the

1	board with certifiers.
2	As you say, it doesn't need to be
3	public facing as long as they're tracking it.
4	And the reality is, you know, everybody's
5	virtually everybody's got a smartphone. And if
6	they don't have a smartphone, if they're plain
7	people, they can get the township and range
8	information.
9	I don't think it's a heavy lift for
LO	certifiers to do this. And consistency would be
L1	really good.
L2	I cannot tell you the number of times
L3	I have basically tried to, you know, compare the
L 4	map in the OSP and then open Google Maps on the
L5	other, you know, on the other document, like on
L 6	my computer and have the map open and try to
L7	basically find some landmarks in Google Maps
L8	exactly where the farm is far more times than I
L 9	care to recount. But it's a very common
20	occurrence.
21	So, yes, again, it's an easy lift to
22	really improve organic integrity and to

1	facilitate unannounced inspections which is what,
2	of course, the rule requires.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Fantastic, I
4	really appreciate that insight from an inspector
5	point of view.
6	One last question for you, how do we
7	explode the demand for organic foods?
8	MR. KAHL: Wow, easy question there,
9	Nate.
10	We I think we explode the demand
11	for organic foods by bringing organic foods to
12	everywhere the consumer is.
13	So, the consumer is not just at
14	farmer's markets, they're not just at specialty
15	shops. They're shopping in Walmart. They're
16	shopping in Target. They're shopping in
17	convenient stores. That's the sad reality with
18	food deserts in this country.
19	I think we explode the organic the
20	demand for organic food by keeping a full
21	toolkit, by having stable regulatory compliance
22	so processors don't see changes coming down the

line all the time. 1 And by basically pushing the climate 2 3 benefits or organic food. Organic food means less dead zone at the mouth of the Mississippi. 4 It means less carbon footprint in general. If you look at the carbon footprint 6 7 for synthetic nitrogen compared to the carbon footprint of organic, it is vastly lower and it's 8 9 even lower when you include long supply chains, 10 which, obviously, aren't ideal. 11 should have local organic food 12 everywhere. But even taking into account global 13 supply chains, organic foods still beats conventional, local conventional with synthetic 14 15 nitrogen hands down if you're talking about carbon footprint. 16 17 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And that's a great 18 get started off today. We really 19 appreciate your comments. Thank you so much and 20 I hope you have a very successful calving season. It looks like your babies are doing well in that 21 2.2 photo.

1	So
2	MR. KAHL: Well, thanks and thanks to
3	all the NOP staff and the Board Members for all
4	your work.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, take
6	care. Thank you.
7	Next up, we have Sam Welsch followed
8	by Laura Holm and then Gwendolyn Wyard.
9	Sam, the floor is yours. Please state
10	your affiliation.
11	MR. WELSCH: Hello, I'm with OneCert.
12	I'm going to start by talking about
13	something just very important, consistency.
14	As you deliberate today, it's
15	important to remember the purpose of OFPA.
16	One, to establish national standards
17	governing the marketing of products as
18	organically produced products.
19	Two, to assure consumers that those
20	products meet a consistent standard.
21	And three, to facilitate interstate
22	commerce.

1	Unfortunately, the assurance that
2	organic products meet a consistent standard is
3	not being achieved. Inconsistent implementation
4	of USDA organic regulations by certification
5	agencies has two main causes.
6	One, lack of specific regulations,
7	this includes the absence of regulations USDA
8	said it would publish by October 2002, such as
9	apiculture, greenhouse, pet food, mushrooms.
10	It also includes the absence of
11	regulations for the certification of
12	non-agricultural substances like yeast and
13	flavors.
14	There's also the ambiguous or vague
15	requirements and unclear definitions, that's the
16	second cause.
17	Another item that's also a big
18	contributor is inconsistent enforcement by the
19	USDA which also contributes to the lack of
20	consistency.
21	I want to mention on ion exchange and
22	remind you that OFPA, in 6517B requires that each

1	substance be listed. The list established under
2	Subsection A shall contain and itemization by
3	specific use or application of each synthetic
4	substance permitted under Subsection C1 or each
5	natural substance prohibited.
6	The word each is used here means that
7	each substance must be identified and listed
8	separately.
9	Ion exchange resin should not be
10	listed as a collection. They should be listed
11	individually.
12	Ion exchange is a process that
13	chemically changes the product that's being
14	produced.
15	That ion exchange resins and recharged
16	chemicals are not simple food contact substances.
17	They're intended to change the organic product.
18	As others have pointed out, actual
19	food contact substances are intended to have no
20	effect on the food.
21	Certification of non-agricultural
22	substances, there are many that are not on the

1	list that are still being used as ingredients in
2	organic products.
3	The value of organic certification is
4	based on the premise that organic products are
5	distinct from non-organic products. But
6	non-agricultural substances are being certified,
7	it diminishes the value of organic certification.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Appreciate your
9	comments.
L 0	Questions for Sam?
L1	Allison, please go ahead.
L2	MEMBER JOHNSON: Thank you so much for
13	your comments, Sam.
L 4	I am still trying to tease out this
L 5	ion exchange issue. My current understanding and
L 6	what I think the proposal reflects is that we're
L 7	drawing a distinction between the recharged
L 8	material which is intended to have this back and
L 9	forth interaction with the product and then the
20	resin that holds it in place.
21	Is your understanding that there is
22	some chemical or anything other than like a

1	contact interaction between the resin itself and
2	the organic product?
3	MR. WELSCH: Yes, it's my
4	understanding the resin is what captures the ions
5	in the products being processed. And it's the
6	recharged materials then wash that those
7	captured ions out so that the resins are able to
8	capture more ions in the next round of
9	processing.
10	MEMBER JOHNSON: So, the resin, in
11	your mind, by pulling something out of the
12	product, the resin is having an interaction. But
13	it's not that the resin is putting something into
14	the final product, right?
15	MR. WELSCH: Well, it's creating a
16	chemical reaction. That's why it's called ion
17	exchange. And ion exchange is a chemical
18	reaction.
19	So, we're chemically altering the
20	products that are in there. Sometimes, they're
21	trying to remove, you know, ions that are in
22	solution, but other times, they're actually

1	altering chemistry of the product that's being
2	processed.
3	So, it is a the ion, you know,
4	process does, you know, the substances that are
5	used in ion exchange also degrade over time. So,
6	they do result in quantities over time starting
7	to be included in the product that they're
8	processing.
9	Those things don't last forever.
10	They're not like a stainless steel food contact
11	surface, you know, that's good for decades. You
12	know, these are substances that degrade in use
13	and they do, you know, so portions of those
14	resins do end up in the organic products.
15	MEMBER JOHNSON: I see Kyla's hand up
16	so I bet she has another question. So, I'll
17	leave it at that.
18	Thank you.
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, Kyla,
20	please go ahead.
21	MEMBER SMITH: Okay, a couple things.
2.2	Juice that goes through an ion

1	exchange filtration process, when it comes out
2	the other side is still chemically juice,
3	correct?
4	MR. WELSCH: Well, it's still juice
5	but it's not
6	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
7	MR. WELSCH: the same juice that
8	went in there. It's
9	MEMBER SMITH: Okay, and the resin
LO	could not perform its function without the
L1	recharge material. So, the resin itself, the
L2	polymer bead, is not functional without the
L3	recharge. The recharge is what is performing the
L 4	action.
L5	MR. WELSCH: Yes, but
L 6	MEMBER SMITH: Without the recharge,
L 7	there is no function.
L 8	MR. WELSCH: I think the thing should
L 9	be looking at is, is this a necessary is the
20	ion exchange necessary for organic processing?
21	There are other filtering aids already
22	listed on the national list that are also doing

Τ	the same thing that the ion exchange process
2	does.
3	And we've had operations using those
4	processes in substances that are on the national
5	list to achieve the, you know, purposes of
6	filtration and clarification that is cheaper to
7	do with ion exchange but without the risk of
8	contributing ion exchange resin and recharge
9	chemicals to the products that are being
LO	processed.
L1	MEMBER SMITH: That was not the
L2	mandate that the NOP tasked us with. The mandate
13	was to decide whether or not ion exchange or the
L 4	components thereof needed to be on the national
L5	list.
L 6	Thanks.
L7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy, please go
L8	ahead.
L 9	MEMBER BRUCH: Sam, hi, thanks for
20	your time today. I really appreciate it.
21	I'm going to switch gears, you
22	mentioned consistency. And that is a really

1	strong word, and I love it, actually. I think
2	it's real important. And that's been kind of
3	something we've taken to task I believe with the
4	CACS committee with some of our work agenda
5	items.
6	And I wanted to ask you, from your
7	certifier background, your thoughts on just
8	because we have received feedback with this, do
9	we want to be clear in our recommendations almost
10	to the point we're getting feedback on the
11	prescriptive nature or do we want to be less
12	descriptive?
13	And then, that's, I think, where maybe
14	consistency can, you know, deviate a little bit.
15	So, what's your thoughts on how much
16	prescriptive nature we should be aiming for to
17	get consistency?
18	MR. WELSCH: Well, I think if you're
19	clear in what you want to achieve, you know,
20	there are sometimes more than one way, you know,
21	to get to a destination.
22	So, if the purpose is clear, like as

1	Garth was mentioning, clear identification of
2	each parcel that's being certified organic.
3	GPS is a great tool. He mentioned
4	the, you know, township and range, the maps that
5	you get in the U.S. from your farm service
6	office. You know, those are always to get, you
7	know, and identify the parcels. And that's what
8	we want to achieve.
9	It may be that different certifiers
10	use different types of documents to achieve that
11	or using all of them in our work.
12	In our international work, we use GPS
13	because that's more universally available. The
14	other, you know, the township and range like we
15	have in the U.S., you know, is not as you
16	know, they don't have similar things in other
17	countries.
18	So, we use GPS a lot and the maps.
19	The maps are very important and the Google Maps
20	are a great tool to identify that.
21	You know, that's something we look at
22	first if we're having someone who wants to

1	certify some operations, especially in growing
2	groups, we get the GPS coordinates and we want to
3	see that they're actually close enough physically
4	that it makes sense to certify them as a group,
5	for example.
6	Or even operations here in the U.S.,
7	we have some that are trying to certify the same
8	as a single farm, operations and have fields
9	hundreds of miles apart. You know, in our mind,
10	you know, it's farmers are not traveling that
11	far. Those are separate operations, even though
12	they might have the same owner.
13	They're using different equipment,
14	different workers, you know, the locations can be
15	quite different.
16	So, we try to look at this in as fine
17	a grain as possible and make sure we clearly know
18	what's being certified.
19	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you, Sam, thanks
20	for providing the international examples also. I
21	appreciate that.
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Kyla has a

1	question for you.
2	MEMBER SMITH: Sorry, going back to
3	resins.
4	You were starting to talk about
5	degradation and I just wanted to know if you had
6	any data that supported the claim that the resin
7	itself degrades and ends up in the product? And
8	if so, if you could please send that to Michelle?
9	Because we've had we've seen no
10	such data to support that.
11	MR. WELSCH: Well, I'm not the
12	scientist on that, but I have talked to those who
13	deal with these and I don't know why the data
14	hasn't been made available to you, but these
15	things do degrade and they get replaced which is
16	a good indication of that it's not maintaining
17	its integrity.
18	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Okay, thank you,
19	Sam, for fielding all those questions in several
20	different categories.
21	I have just one sort of just bigger
22	picture question for you. And that's, when we

1	think about, going back to my question for Garth,
2	how to drive demand, availability of organic
3	food?
4	Do you see organic as the gold
5	standard for clean food? And from that, do you
6	think that if we can have something in the
7	toolbox that's going to make sure that when a mom
8	in a grocery store is looking for the right baby
9	food, she knows that there is going to be a
LO	guarantee of cleanliness because there's all of
L1	the tools in the toolbox for organic processors
L2	like ion exchange?
L3	Or do we want to set a standard of
L 4	purity that limits that toolbox?
L5	Where do you how do you think that
L 6	should be compromised and explored?
L7	MR. WELSCH: Well, in my view, and I
L 8	was an organic consumer for decades before
L 9	organic certification, you know, was even a
20	thing.
21	So, it's important to me, personally,
22	to have as much organic food available as

1	possible, preferably local food. But that's not
2	always possible and we do certify a lot of food
3	that gets traded in international markets.
4	I think the value of organic
5	certifications, you said people want pure food.
6	They want something that's wholesome and healthy,
7	you know, it's got that strong connection.
8	When you start to include processes
9	and substances that are the same as conventional
10	like the substances created with ion exchange, I
11	think you diminish the value of organic.
12	And it gets its value because it's
13	different than conventional. And if we try to,
14	you know, change the regulations so that every
15	conceivable product that can be made
16	conventionally can also be made organic, I think
17	it really loses its value. And it's not what
18	consumers want.
19	I always look for whole foods,
20	minimally processed because that's healthier for
21	us.
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I'll follow up

1	with one quick question. Do you think this
2	entire debate is sort of about carrying a purity
3	assessment for what we hope or think organic
4	should be rather than the actual science? Or are
5	we thinking that we're going to see degradation
6	or loss of product, loss of resins into the food?
7	Is this somewhat of a higher debate
8	that we're just couching into this discussion
9	that we don't want processed foods in organic?
10	MR. WELSCH: No, I think there's a
11	genuine concern that these things do degrade, you
12	know, just like there's concerns about the
13	plastics we use whether it's in production or in
14	packaging.
15	You know, we have found that there are
16	certainly types of plastics that contribute
17	substances to the foods that we don't want to be
18	eating and consuming.
19	So, those are issues and I think it's
20	important for organic to take a and I don't
21	see anything wrong with a pure approach. We want
22	our food to be pure.

1	I remember when I first started
2	beekeeping 50-some odd years ago. You wanted to
3	have pure honey because it had been adulterated.
4	And so, having the word pure on there
5	was meaningful. And I think the same thing is
6	true for organic. It should be pure food, it
7	should not be adulterated with the substances
8	used in processing.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I appreciate your
L 0	comments today. Thank you.
L1	Next up, we have Laura Holm followed
L2	by Gwendolyn Wyard, and then, Angela Schriver.
L3	Laura, when you're ready, the floor is
L 4	yours. Please state your affiliation.
L 5	MS. HOLM: Hello, I'm Laura Holm,
L 6	legislative and farm policy associate of the
L7	Organic Trade Association.
L8	Thank you for the opportunity to
L 9	provide comments on organic and climate smart
20	agriculture.
21	OTA is the membership based business
22	association for organic agriculture and products

in North America. We are the leading voice for 1 promoting and protecting organic trade in the 2 3 United States representing organic businesses across all sectors in all 50 states. 4 5 Organic is the original climate smart commercial agriculture and it is a system rooted 6 7 in indigenous cultivation practices. OTA celebrates the compliance 8 9 accreditation and certification subcommittee's 10 continued advocacy that USDA fully recognize the 11 impact of organic. And we support 12 subcommittee's proposal, organic is climate smart 13 agriculture. producers 14 Organic should be automatically recognized as climate smart 15 receive default eligibility for all climate smart 16 17 funding and opportunities administered by the USDA. 18 19 Organic farmers are federally required 20 to maintain or improve the nature resources of 21 their operations, including soil and water 2.2 quality.

1	Organic farmers must maintain or
2	improve soil health.
3	Organic farmers must implement tillage
4	and cultivation practices that maintain or
5	improve the physical, chemical, and biological
6	condition of soil and minimize soil erosion.
7	Organic farmers must manage crop
8	nutrients and soil fertility through rotations,
9	cover crops, and the application of plant and
LO	animal materials.
L1	Organic farmers must implement a crop
12	rotation, often cover crops, green manure crops,
L3	and cash crops that maintains or improves soil
L 4	organic matter.
L5	These requirements are in the organic
L 6	regulations.
L7	The climate smart techniques
L 8	recognized by NRCS practically mirror the organic
L 9	regulations and can be found in organic system
20	plans across the country.
21	Organic systems have the power to
22	reverse the effects of climate change while

1	increasing farm resilience in the face of
2	droughts and floods.
3	We are optimistic that USDA will
4	increase their support of organic farming as the
5	climate, economic, and health benefits of organic
6	systems are continuously revealed.
7	On behalf of our members across the
8	supply chain and the country, OTA thanks the
9	National Organic Standards Board for your
L 0	commitment to furthering organic agriculture.
L1	Thank you.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you for your
L3	comments.
L 4	Questions from the Board for Laura?
L 5	(No response.)
L 6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, we
L7	appreciate, thank you for joining us.
L 8	MS. HOLM: Thank you.
L 9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up, we have
20	Gwendolyn Wyard followed by Angela Schriver, and
21	then, Scott Myers.
22	Gwendolyn, please state your

Τ	affiliation and the floor is yours.
2	MS. WYARD: I'm going to do a quick
3	sound check, yet, don't start that timer. All
4	good? All right.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All good.
6	MS. WYARD: Okay, getting myself
7	positioned here, and one, two, three, go.
8	All right, good morning, NOSB Members.
9	My name is Gwendolyn Wyard. I'm vice president
10	of regulatory and technical affairs for the
11	Organic Trade Association.
12	And I want to thank you for this
13	opportunity. We appreciate you and we want to
14	welcome the new members, Mr. Nate Lewis, and Dr.
15	Franklin Quarcoo.
16	I'm really excited to see everyone in
17	Atlanta next week.
18	All right, you have our written
19	comments on organic is climate smart. Thank so
20	much, Laura Holm, natural flavors up for sunset
21	and ion exchange resins.
22	So, today, I will touch on the latter

1	two.
2	We support the continued listing of
3	natural flavors on the national list at 605(a).
4	Our goal, however, is to fuel the successful
5	growth development and use of organic flavors.
6	OTA was the petitioner of the
7	annotation change that requires the use of
8	organic flavors when they're commercially
9	available.
10	So, until December 2019 when that
11	ruling went into effect, there was no requirement
12	to use organic flavors, despite the growing
13	availability in the marketplace.
14	We acknowledge that the sunset
15	evaluation for natural flavors is challenging
16	because the listing literally covers thousands of
17	distinctly different types of flavors ranging
18	from agricultural to non-agricultural.
19	So, in our comments, we have provided
20	a flavor types 101 that should help you navigate
21	this very complex flavor map.

There is an extensive history on why

22

1	NOSB decided to keep flavors on 605 and
2	collectively assign commercial availability to
3	them all.
4	And there is a very good reason for
5	why we should keep the listing as is because it
6	would be very impractical to try to list every
7	flavor on the national list.
8	So, to get to the point, the
9	requirement to use organic flavors is still
10	relatively new. And while the availability of
11	organic flavors is good, it's certainly not good
12	enough across all flavor categories and in all
13	food and beverage situations to remove the
14	listing all together.
15	So, as we've stated in our written
16	comments, our ability to succeed in terms of
17	growing the organic flavors sector comes with
18	responsibility that relies heavily on robust and
19	well documented commercial search efforts by
20	industry, us, and robust and consistent review by
21	the certifiers and oversight from the NOP.
2.2	So, for this reason, OTA and the

1	Accredited Certifiers Association have developed
2	guidance on vest practices for sourcing and
3	reviewing flavors for compliance.
4	They're two separate documents. They
5	were developed to help ensure a rigorous and
6	consistent approach to determining commercial
7	availability.
8	We think they're excellent and they're
9	complimentary. But we also think they would be
10	furthered if NOSB and/or NOP could elevate their
11	visibility through a formal adoption process.
12	Last but not least, OTA strongly
13	supports the subcommittee's proposal on ion
14	exchange resins.
15	We've carried out a thorough review
16	for three and a half years now since NOP sent the
17	memo in August of 2019, complete with extensive
18	stakeholder feedback and a very comprehensive
19	technical review.
20	We believe you have an obligation to
21	complete your recommendations to NOP at this
22	spring meeting so the program can address

1	inconsistencies between certifiers and provide
2	greater certainty to organic businesses.
3	Thank you.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We appreciate your
5	comments.
6	Questions for Gwen?
7	Kyla, please go ahead followed by
8	Logan.
9	MEMBER SMITH: Hi, Gwendolyn, thanks
10	for your comments.
11	My question is related to the ion
12	resin composition. There was some questions
13	about that yesterday. And I wasn't sure if you
14	could speak to that because I know you have
15	talked about that in your written comments.
16	MS. WYARD: Sure, absolutely, I'll do
17	my best.
18	So, resins, resin composition, there's
19	a lot we know about the resins, so I want to
20	start by saying I, you know, I kind of heard
21	reference to these novel resins and we don't know
22	much about resins.

1	But we actually know a lot about
2	resins and, while there are many different
3	variations of the resins, they are mostly, like
4	90 percent of the resins that are out there, they
5	are what we refer to as copolymer or a
6	polystyrene, a cross-linked polystyrene.
7	So, what that means is that this
8	resin, this little, itty-bitty, tiny little
9	plastic bead, about 90 percent of it is a styrene
LO	that gets cross-linked, polymerized with
11	divinylbenzene. So, those are the two components
L2	and that cross-linking, that polymerization is
L3	done to make them tough little beads and make
L 4	then totally insoluble.
L5	So, then, there is a covalently-bonded
L 6	functional site that's put on to this backbone,
L7	right, this cross-linked backbone.
L 8	And it's that functional site, that's
L 9	where the exchange occurs. That functional site
20	is charged.
21	So, that's your basic makeup of about
22	90 percent of the resins that are out there.

1 There that acrylic are some use 2 instead of the styrene. But that's pretty much 3 what you're looking at. Now, how they start to differ is that 4 functional site and whether it's a anion or Whether it is a positive charge or a 6 7 negative charge, depending on the charge that you're trying to take out of the product that's 8 9 being treated. So, if you're trying to take arsenic 10 11 out, that's a negatively charged ion, so you're 12 going to have an anion that's going to want to capture that arsenic and it's going to replace it 13 with a different negative ion. 14 15 That replacing, that negative ion that goes into the juice, that's the ion that needs to 16 17 be on the national list. That's the recharge 18 material. 19 That that functional site, that 20 covalently-bonded to the resin. It does not go 21 into the product. It stays there. It does come 2.2 with a ion that has to get replaced, but that's

Τ	what needs to be on the national list.
2	So, that's essentially what we're
3	looking at are these little polymer, tiny, tiny,
4	tiny little plastic beads.
5	MEMBER SMITH: Thank you.
6	I'll let some other people go and I
7	might have a follow up.
8	Thanks.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right.
10	Please go ahead, Logan.
11	MEMBER PETREY: Hi, thank you. And
12	thank you for all of the information on flavors.
13	If it weren't complicated enough, there's
14	definitely a lot there.
15	So, just a couple questions for you.
16	I know that you said there were some products I
17	saw that in the fall, you're going to have an
18	update survey of what it's I guess the
19	difference, maybe, the progress that's been made
20	over the last few years. Is that correct?
21	MS. WYARD: That's correct, yes. I
22	think that it's due. You know, when we put the

Τ	petition together, that was in 2014. Everything
2	went through in 2018, then it was effective in
3	2019.
4	So, data from 2014 is getting a little
5	old. And in that data that we put into the
6	petition, OTA worked with the ACAs. And so, we
7	used the ACAs database, all the information that
8	we had to look at all of the flavors across the
9	board, how many were certified organic.
LO	You know, we could even drill down,
L1	you know, a little bit further.
L2	But I think, you know, unfortunately,
L3	we don't have that data here for this spring
L 4	meeting. But I think that that would be a great
L5	effort.
L 6	So, we can just get an idea to see,
L7	you know, how we're progressing with the growth
L8	and speed requirement in 2019 to use organic went
L 9	into place.
20	MEMBER PETREY: Right, do you think
21	that it'll be able to show not just growth in
22	maybe the industry, but growth like if more

1	people are using organic, is the percentage
2	better?
3	Do you think that it'll be able to
4	show that, that they're relying on more organics,
5	not just that more is used, maybe there's more
6	business, you know, available and the percentage
7	is the same?
8	But do you think the data will be able
9	to show that there's been more reliance on
LO	organic versus the natural flavoring?
L1	MS. WYARD: We'll have to look at that
12	and see what the comparison would be because you
L3	can see the actual, you know, growth in the
L 4	availability of organic flavors. And then,
L 5	there's the use, right?
L 6	And so, that's where, and I don't
L 7	know, Kyla might be able to jump in on this, but
L 8	you see with a lot of the comments that you'll
L 9	receive on sunset materials from certifiers, they
20	can, you know, use their systems to say, we have
21	X number clients that are using, you know,
22	percentage, et cetera, et cetera.

1	So, you know, we're going to have to
2	be able to make sure that we collected that data
3	back in 2014 and have something to compare it to.
4	But, you know, Kyla, maybe you I'm
5	going to have to like bring the question back to
6	you, but in terms of what certifiers are capable
7	of doing in terms of, you know, monitoring and
8	measuring an increase in the use of organic
9	flavors.
10	It would be similar to measuring an
11	increase in the use of organic seed, right, over
12	time and see the sort of continuous improvement
13	is there.
14	Look at me, I'm asking questions.
15	MEMBER PETREY: Yes, I can see Kyla's
16	head going back and forth. I think I've got an
17	idea of what that is.
18	MEMBER SMITH: We're going to try to
19	do that, Logan. We're going to try to do that.
20	MS. WYARD: Okay, sure.
21	And then, sorry, just another one, so,
22	if we can eventually get to where flavors are

1	organic, in your comments, you mentioned that
2	like flavor isolates are not going to be
3	organically produced or, you know, there's I
4	guess some other flavors.
5	Would you recommend those being
6	petitioned on there as synthetic sources that,
7	you know, kind of segregating the flavors out or
8	being able to break that down to where we can
9	really, I guess, shrink the flavor section if
10	we're able to get to the organic side?
11	MS. WYARD: I'd like to see a day
12	where we could reconvene the task force, kind of
13	similar to what we did and give another go at
14	trying to parse out and say, okay, here are all
15	these agricultural, truly, you know, simple,
16	agricultural flavors, the extracts, the essential
17	oils, and we're good.
18	We've got, you know, organic
19	availability.
20	But then, when it gets to these
21	isolates, maybe that, you know, we're not quite
22	there yet, but we can start to separate out those

1	isolates and say, you know, these isolates here,
2	they're non-agricultural. Like they should
3	always be on 605, you're never going to be able
4	to get an organic form.
5	But some of these other isolates that
6	go through a number of steps, they're coming from
7	a natural, as long as it's an agricultural
8	source. Right?
9	They're going through multiple
10	mechanical, physical, fermentation, isolation,
11	you know, a little bit harder, but you could get
12	there.
13	So, I'd like to imagine that we're
14	going to have to do a kind of a categorization at
15	some point to be able figure out a way to say,
16	for these low hanging fruit, right, extracts, the
17	essentials oils, you have to use organic. And
18	then, we're still working on these others.
19	MEMBER PETREY: Right. And I'm sorry,
20	last question. I think you're the only flavor
21	commenter.

MS. WYARD: I love flavors.

22

1	MEMBER PETREY: Do you see any
2	questions that we missed on the sunset that you
3	think would be beneficial for us to gather from
4	our stakeholders?
5	MS. WYARD: Gosh, I think that no,
6	I think those are actually the right appropriate
7	questions.
8	You know, I'd like to see industry
9	doing a better job of, you know, getting out
10	there with more information about the organic
11	flavors that they're that are available.
12	So, you know, for whatever that's
13	worth.
14	MEMBER PETREY: Okay, thank you so
15	much for your time, appreciate it.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Allison, please go
17	ahead.
18	MEMBER JOHNSON: Thanks, Gwendolyn.
19	It's really helpful to hear your
20	specific explanation about the resin structure.
21	And I think the question that I'm
22	wrestling with is, I'm convinced that the resin

1 is not intended to have like а chemical 2 interaction with the handled product. Ι 3 understand that that's the recharge material. do worry about is 4 I potential 5 there's some to choose better for resin and whether 6 material the that's 7 something we can be incentivizing or otherwise influencing through this decision. 8 9 I'm curious if you have much So, 10 knowledge about -- you mentioned a few different 11 compositions of resins -- if there are merits to 12 some over others as far as food safety or risk of 13 -- I think we're using -- various people are 14 using words in similar ways to mean different things, but the analogous risk to some plastic 15 16 materials, whether it is actually a chemical leaching or like over time a breakdown of a 17 18 material in a way that is not intended to be the 19 functional use of that material? 20 Curious if you can speak to any more information you have about the resins and whether 21 2.2 there's some merit to scrutinizing them so that

one might be chosen over another? 1 2 MS. WYARD: Well, I think, you know, 3 as I mentioned, they are -- most of them are pretty much the same, right? 4 The differences comes down to, you know, how much cross-linking 5 takes place because that also determines how 6 7 porous the resins are. And so, depending on the type of, you 8 9 know, liquid that you're working with, whether 10 that's water, whether it's something that more 11 thick like syrup. 12 But, you know, there's not a lot of 13 choice when it comes to just that basic structure. Like I said, that basic structure, 14 15 it's a tough little bugger. It is totally 16 insoluble and really that gets to the maintenance, the, you know, how these resins are 17 taken care of in storage, in handling, and then, 18 19 of course, in the processing. 20 And that's where, you know, we moved to the, I think the recommendation where it does 21 22 the right job of, you know, this is something

that is part of the inspection. This is part of 1 the certification process that's 2 looking at 3 contamination prevention. You know, we're moving now away from 4 whether something should be on the list or not to 5 discussion plastic 6 around and leaching 7 Right? And I think that we're all in migration. agreement with environmental contamination and 8 9 the more we learn about PFAS that, you know, we 10 want to continue to do a better job, you know, 11 avoiding the types of plastics and materials that 12 are going to, you know, get into our food system 13 and impact our health. I think that maintenance is absolutely 14 15 critical to when we talk about, you know, 16 degradation of the resins, nobody wants Primarily, doesn't 17 the processor want 18 because the minute those resins start to degrade, 19 they start to become ineffective and it's an 20 extremely expensive process.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

about removing impurities, and the last thing

So, this is a whole process that's

21

2.2

anybody wants to do is introduce a new impurity. 1 They want this to be like, you know, clean, like 2 3 well working, perfect system. And so, the health of that resin is 4 5 critical. Once they start to degrade, they don't And when they start to degrade, before 6 use them. 7 they start, you know, falling apart, you know, or leaching or migrating into the product, they 8 9 start losing their effectiveness. 10 There's a bunch of signs that, you 11 know, you're going to -- you're not going to be 12 using that resin when it gets to the point where 13 it's, vou know, starting to breakdown and actually get into the product. 14 That's just --15 that doesn't happen. 16 So, what I will say, though, is that the process for applying to get an approved food 17 18 contact substance goes through a very rigorous 19 review. 20 And FDA is asking for all sorts of 21 testing data and information to analyze exactly 2.2 what you're asking about. Thev have

requirement to submit all sorts of chemistry and 1 toxicological information to analyze what the 2 3 potential migration could be, might be, has been, possibly could be again, on these resins. 4 5 have meet various And thev to 6 parameters to ensure that these things aren't 7 going to migrate into the product. I've gone through and 8 And as 9 looked at all of the resins that have been 10 approved by FDA, consistently, in every single 11 case, each one says that there's no expectation 12 that these resins would get into the 13 product. They're looking more at how they're 14 15 disposing of the impurities, the arsenic that's 16 being taken out of the product. They're looking 17 all other types of manufacturing at 18 considerations of environmental where 19 contamination would occur. 20 But the levels, I think if you were to test, it would be non-detectable. 21 I mean, I 2.2 don't even know where you would go like, are you

talking about zero tolerance or, you know, what 1 those detection levels would be? 2 But I think 3 right now what we're finding in terms of the research that's being done and what's being 4 submitted for those approvals 5 is that it's 6 non-detect. 7 that is being done. I think So, there's a lot that we need to -- we've got to 8 9 look to FDA and that 120-day approval process 10 that they go through with their panel of experts 11 to determine what the safety is of these resins. 12 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Brian, please go 13 ahead. MEMBER CALDWELL: Gwendolyn, thanks so 14 15 much for all your comments and I think this 16 really helps to clarify and elucidate 17 things. 18 But I'm wondering if there -- if say, 19 90 percent of the resins are basically 20 structural unit, one type of material, there's probably some, you know, a few more in 21 22 that last 10 percent, but it sounds like there's

1	not really that many of them.
2	So, why not just put them right
3	through the sunset review process and if they're
4	real safe and everything, seems like they'd zip
5	through and be one of our no-brainers, and why
6	not just do that?
7	MS. WYARD: So, there's many, many
8	variations just in terms of the amount of
9	cross-linking that's done and the charge groups.
10	Right?
11	When I say, you know, they have a
12	functional group side, they're a cation or an
13	anion, you might have 20 different cation forms
14	and another 20.
15	So, it's not that there's just three
16	or four resins out there, it's that there are a
17	couple, you know, the primary structure that's
18	used, that backbone doesn't vary that much, the
19	backbone itself.
20	But then, you have lots and lots of
21	variations.

So, I think --

22

1	MEMBER CALDWELL: Just question to
2	follow up on that, but I thought that the
3	variation would be the recharge materials, not
4	the actual, you know, background structure.
5	MS. WYARD: Well, the
6	MEMBER CALDWELL: I mean, they're the
7	ones that have the anions and cations, the
8	recharge materials, not the styrene, you know,
9	material.
10	MS. WYARD: The functional group is a
11	charge, right, the functional group and it will
12	have they'll use different types of charges to
13	attract what they're after.
14	So, maybe they'll use an iron oxide
15	functional group that will attract arsenic. So,
16	the actual resin itself has a charge and then,
17	there is an ion, right? So, if it has a positive
18	charge, there'll be an ion like sodium chloride
19	will be the ion that's going to exchange with the
20	arsenic that's coming out of the product.
21	So, the resin itself has many, many
22	charges all over it that are either positive or

1	negative and they designed those resins to be
2	able to attract the impurity that they're trying
3	to take out of the organic product.
4	So, the resin itself has a charge and
5	then, there's an ion that comes with it and you
6	have to recharge it, right, the recharge
7	materials, it comes with that ion and then you
8	need to reapply it because, after a while, I
9	mean, it's all gone. Right? It's lost, it all
10	exchanges into the organic product.
11	So, the functional site and the
12	charge, there's a lot of different types of
13	charges that they create there specific to the
14	impurities.
15	So, I think
16	MEMBER CALDWELL: Okay, good
17	MS. WYARD: we wouldn't want to put
18	them on the national list. We've done a thorough
19	review, right? I mean, we've got like the
20	amount from the technical review to the years
21	of discussing this, when we look at the
22	definition of a resin, we look at how it

1	functions.
2	We look at the language in OFPA and I
3	would have to disagree with Sam Welsch that what
4	goes on to the national list would be an
5	ingredient or processing aid. And I do not think
6	that the resins meet the definition of an
7	ingredient or a processing aid.
8	So, if we put resins on to the
9	national list, then we're setting a precedent and
10	NOSB is signing up to be evaluating an putting
11	food contact substances, in general, on the
12	national list.
13	And so, I think we want to be really
14	clear about why we would put it on the national
15	list. And if so, what those implications would
16	be?
17	And so, we're really trying to draw
18	the line and say, we can do a thorough review
19	like we're doing now and that review is going to
20	continue at the certifier and inspector level.
21	But these little buggers, they don't
22	need to be on the national list according to the

1	law.
2	MEMBER CALDWELL: Okay. So, it
3	sounds, from what you're saying, to me, that the
4	resins have besides the structural backbone
5	material, they have quite a few potentially
6	different other chemicals that are added to them
7	to allow them to be exchanging the proper anions
8	and cations and that kind of thing.
9	So, they actually they're actually
10	quite a few more of them than just the backbone
11	structure would sort of indicate.
12	MS. WYARD: Yes, correct, correct,
13	Brian.
14	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yes, okay.
15	MS. WYARD: The backbone structure,
16	but
17	MEMBER CALDWELL: But just
18	MS. WYARD: they're
19	covalently-bonded so, just to be more
20	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yes, so, just to
21	take that one step further, though wouldn't that
22	I mean, if we just give a blanket

1	essentially a blanket approval to resins by not
2	reviewing them, you know, couldn't that be really
3	questionable?
4	Other materials that are added to
5	these backbone resin structures that we might not
6	want in there?
7	MS. WYARD: They are all going to need
8	to be approved through the food contact substance
9	approval process. And in order for a certifier
10	to allow the ion exchange and the media resins
11	and recharge materials, that would have to be
12	included in the organic system plan.
13	And then, Kyla would need to review
14	that organic systems plan. And they would look
15	to that food contact substance approval and say,
16	okay, this has been reviewed and approved by FDA.
17	FDA has looked at all of the
18	components of that resin and they've done their
19	testing looking at migration and potential harm,
20	safety evaluation.
21	So, it's not that the door is just
22	wide open, right? It's not like just any old

1 resin can be used. It has to be approved by the certifier and that's based on that food contact 2 3 substance application and approval process by FDA. 4 And I think if you dig in and you really look at all of the guidance that FDA has 6 7 for all of the information that they are asking requiring when somebody applies 8 or 9 approval of a food contact substance, it 10 extensive. 11 And I would even say that it goes 12 beyond the information that we receive 13 technical reviews and the type of review that NOSB would carry out. 14 15 So, I think it's pretty impressive. And could it be improved? 16 Yes, and should we 17 always be looking for improvements to make sure 18 that we are reducing any potential exposure to 19 harmful substances? Yes. 20 We're not living in a perfect world, but I think that this system that we're looking 21 2.2 at right now in its totality, especially with

1	this recommendation, if we can get all the
2	certifiers on the same page with the same
3	approval process, we're going to be in really
4	good shape.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Kyla
6	MEMBER CALDWELL: Thank you very much.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: please go
8	ahead.
9	MEMBER SMITH: Yes, I was going to
10	circle back around to flavors.
11	I think you answered my question, I
12	just or the question I had, so I just wanted
13	to clarify.
14	The question I was thinking of was
15	based on all the different types of flavors that
16	are in the 101 that you submitted.
17	Is there a functional path forward for
18	like further annotating to get it like narrowed
19	down?
20	And what I heard you say was, yes,
21	perhaps there is. But that would take, perhaps,
22	reconvening the task force and more data

collection and then, perhaps there could be some 1 further annotating or relisting in some form or 2 3 fashion to narrow the current listing of flavors. Is that accurate? 4 I mean, I would like to 5 MS. WYARD: If you recall, going years back when 6 think so. 7 NOSB first started grappling with this, they said, gosh, we probably should have task force 8 9 that, you know, looks at all of these different 10 flavors and, you know, figures out how we can 11 separate out all of the different types and put 12 some on 605, some on 606. 13 And so, we did that, we being the Organic Trade Association. 14 We had an amazing 15 task force for two years and our recommendation 16 that we made to NOSB was to keep them all on 605 because, as we started to go through thousands of 17 flavors and do -- run them through the ag and 18 19 non-ag decision tree and parse them all out, it 20 was kind of a nightmare. But I think that it's always good to 21 2.2 look at something again, particularly if we are

1	finding that there are flavor categories that the
2	availability organic is there, right, there's no
3	need to even provide an option for commercial
4	availability, then we should look at a way to
5	somehow capture on the national list to say, if
6	you're using an agricultural essential oil or
7	extract, it must be organic so that we can, you
8	know, pull off the ones that we know for sure
9	have, you know, gotten over the finish line.
LO	MEMBER SMITH: Thanks.
L1	Yes, we were trying to tease that out
L2	a little bit like with our question specific in
L3	the TR. But it is a big topic.
L 4	So, again, I appreciate your efforts.
L5	MS. WYARD: All right, well, you guys
L 6	have given me
L7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, thank
L8	you, Gwendolyn.
L 9	MS. WYARD: All right, thanks so much
20	everyone. See you in Atlanta.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right.
22	Next up, we have Angela Schriver, who

1	I think is going to be joining us by phone, and
2	then, Scott Myers and Brad Cessna.
3	Angela, if you are there, please go
4	ahead and hit star six and it should unmute you.
5	MS. SCHRIVER: Good?
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Go ahead, yes.
7	MS. SCHRIVER: All right, Angela
8	Schriver from Schriver Organics, member of OEFFA
9	Grain Growers Chapter.
L 0	Yesterday, I heard a lot of talk on
L1	what would be the strongest and fastest way to
L2	drive organic demand. And that demand has
L3	possibly become stagnant.
L 4	Now, I don't know what would increase
L5	demand for organic products, but I do know what
L 6	would hurt demand and that would be a cared label
L7	approach of organic, kind of sort of organic, and
L8	not really organic, but we didn't want to be
L 9	exclusionary, all this in an effort to include
20	hydroponics under the USDA organic label.
21	One of the things we think of when we
22	hear organic is nutrient dense food. Why? What

Ţ	creates nutrient density?
2	Googling the phrase soil health and
3	nutrient density, you find soil health and
4	nutrient density, preliminary comparison from the
5	National Institute of Health whose findings
6	suggest soil health is an underappreciated
7	influence on nutrient density.
8	You also find nutrient density, know
9	the facts from Rodale that states plants get
10	their nutrients from the soil and that healthy,
11	nutritious foods have healthy soil, among many
12	other examples.
13	The common thread being soil,
14	specifically healthy soil.
15	The comparison for always between
16	regenerative farms, specifically that use cover
17	cropping and diverse crop rotation and
18	conventional farms that use synthetic fertilizer
19	and herbicides.
20	Discussing whether regen fix is a step
21	towards organic is not my discussion point, but
22	obviously, in these cases, the cover cropping and

1	diverse crop rotation are a substantial component
2	of an organic system.
3	Instead, I want to focus on
4	conventional ag. The premise of conventional ag
5	is inserting fertilizer into a growing medium in
6	order to produce a crop, providing most, if not
7	all the nutrients a crop needs to grow. Sounds a
8	lot like hydroponics to me.
9	Not using synthetic fertilizer does
10	not make you organic.
11	The beauty of a healthy soil system is
12	the diverse microbial life that is acquired
13	through biodiversity.
14	I don't think discussing the delivery
15	system of nutrients in hydroponics will be able
16	to address the lack of microbial life there is
17	there that is inherently present in healthy soil
18	systems that is the hallmark of organic.
19	It is the specific healthy soil system
20	that NOP established and by requiring crop
21	rotations among the other pillars of soil heath.
22	And going through the typical process

of rule making will not hydroponics organic. 1 Additionally, organic production that 2 3 is soil based incorporates diversity and protects the environment is exactly why organic is climate 4 smart. utilize 6 And to true organic 7 agriculture systems fight climate to change should be met with immediate action. Ιf 8 9 don't immediately resolve the discrepancy between 10 true organic systems and hydroponics, you will 11 lose the opportunity to say organic is climate 12 And missing that opportunity would leave climate 13 the term smart accessible for conventional farming to highjack. 14 15 There is no getting creative in how we look at hydroponics as it will never align with 16 organic standards. 17 18 I think the NOSB needs to put a hold 19 on certifying hydroponics until you decide if 20 NOSB wants to advance what we call organic if you want to truly advance organic policy because they 21 are not the same thing. 2.2

1	Thank you.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We appreciate your
3	comments.
4	Questions from the Board?
5	(No response.)
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, thank
7	you.
8	Next up, we have Kim Bayer, and I
9	think I saw Kim on.
10	MS. BAYER: I am on, I'm just trying
11	to
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right.
13	MS. BAYER: figure out the video.
14	I'm in my home office.
15	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Excellent, I see
16	you, see you and hear you.
17	MS. BAYER: Not in the farm office.
18	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Go ahead, all
19	right.
20	MS. BAYER: In my car.
21	So, my name is Kim Bayer from Slow
22	Farm. It's an organic it's my organic

you-pick farm in Ann Arbor, Michigan. 1 right now, we're 2 And working 3 preparing our fields for planting, but having the opportunity to say something in this forum about 4 what matters to organic farmers like me feels like an opportunity that's important enough to 6 7 leave my farm fields at what's a critical time for us. 8 9 So, there's a Paul Harvey quote that 10 says something like humanity, despite the 11 sophistication and many accomplishments, owes its 12 existence to a six-inch layer of topsoil and the fact that it rains. 13 All the best farmers that I know and 14 15 the farmer that I aspire to be we're not crop farmers, we're soil farmers. 16 I submitted to the difficult process 17 18 of becoming a certified organic farm because of 19 the guarantee provided to me and to my community 20 that our commitment is to caring for and demonstrably improving the health of the soil. 21 22 Health of our soil is what everyone

everywhere depends upon. So, farming inside of a 1 plastic buckets on top of plastic sheeting or in 2 3 some witches brew of chemical nutrients is not organic farming. It's not developing the health 4 of the soil. And in fact, it's degrading the health of the soil. That needs to stop. 6 7 I would ask that the NOSB remove the organic label from that type of farming and, 8 9 develop consistent instead. measures for 10 identifying markers of soil health and milestones 11 for organic farmers to work toward in 12 health. This would strengthen the integrity of 13 the organic label that has begun to erode under 14 15 the current conditions. The other comment that I would like to 16 17 make in this forum is in regards to racial equity. 18 While antiracism cultural and 19 sensitivity training for NOSB members would be a 20 minimum starting point, and adding racial equity as a work agenda item to committees is probably a 21 22 good idea.

1	I would ask that in all of the work of
2	the NOSB, that a racial equity lenses is applied.
3	That means, in hiring and in
4	leadership, in policy, developing policy, and
5	committee inclusion, considering impacts, and in
6	language of publication and outreach, that the
7	NOSB is a leader in living and promoting racial
8	equity and works diligently to undo the shameful
9	history of systemic racism in USDA programs.
10	As a farmer who proudly supports what
11	the organic label stands for in this country, I
12	work every day to grow soil health and
13	biodiversity on my farm and to strengthen my
14	local food system and improve the health of my
15	community and future generations.
16	I want to know that the NOSB, my
17	organic certifier, the National Organic Program,
18	and the USDA are also making sure that we work
19	toward the best that we can aspire to and not the
20	least that we can get away with.
21	Thank you so much.
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you,

1	especially for joining us from the farm. That's
2	one of the cool things about this tech. So,
3	thanks for taking time away, love it, love it.
4	You have a lot less snow than I do
5	today. So, I'm jealous that you're able to get
6	in the field. It is about six inches on the
7	ground this morning, so we are waiting to see.
8	MS. BAYER: It stopped here earlier.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Excellent.
LO	Well, we have one question for you,
L1	Nate Lewis, please go ahead.
L2	MEMBER LEWIS: Thanks.
L3	Yes, I acknowledge your working from
L 4	the farm office, I love that.
L5	So, I work in the space of farmland
L 6	preservation and land access. And I appreciate
L7	there's a diversity of opinions around
L8	hydroponics and soil-less farming in its place or
L 9	not in organics.
20	And one of the problems I'm or one
21	of the issues I'm trying to wrestle with is we
22	all know that there is inequitable access to

1	land. And trying to square a racial equity
2	approach and support for making organic inclusive
3	while also making land ownership or land access a
4	requirement, that's something I'm having a hard
5	time to square up.
6	And I'm curious if you can sort of
7	help share with me some of the thoughts you have
8	that?
9	MS. BAYER: I can see how you're like
10	seeing how those things come together in ways
11	that seem like they are against each other.
12	I guess I would say that I think that
13	they're pretty separate issues and that they need
14	to be solved separately.
15	I would say that in terms of land
16	access, that that is kind of a universal problem
17	everywhere among beginning farmers and especially
18	among farmers of color who have had their land
19	systemically taken from them.
20	And so, I guess I would like to see
21	not that those problems are conflated and put
22	together, but that they are each approached

1	separately for the unique issues that there are
2	with both of them.
3	MEMBER LEWIS: Okay, thank you, I
4	appreciate it.
5	MS. BAYER: And I'd also like to say
6	that I really support what Angela had to say.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, we'll
8	we appreciate you taking the time to speak with
9	us today, thank you.
10	MS. BAYER: Thank you.
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up, we have
12	Scott Myers followed by Brad Cessna and then,
13	Corey Struck.
14	Scott, please go ahead.
15	MR. MYERS: All right, hello, my name
16	is Scott Myers from Woodlyn Acres Farm here in
17	Dalton, Ohio. I certify my farm with OEFFA and
18	the Real Organic Project. I'm also a member of
19	and participate in their crop insurance work
20	group and I'm also a member of the Organic
21	Farmers Association where I serve on the policy
22	committee.

My farm is a fourth generation family 1 farm raising organic grains and hay over 2,500 2 3 acres in northeastern Ohio. I appreciate and thank you for the 4 opportunity to participate in this important 5 public process, although I would much rather be 6 7 in person speaking with you, this is the best option for a farmer in the middle of the spring 8 9 season, as we just heard on the last one, too. 10 We're actually sunny and 80 degrees 11 outside. So, my employees are going hard today. 12 So, but anyways, I would like to start 13 out by talking about crop insurance related to organic farming. 14 15 We use whole farm, multi-peril and the pasture range land and forage policies to protect 16 our farm. 17 submitted 18 OEFFA written has some 19 comments about our crop insurance view which I 20 fully support. I do want to emphasize that whole 21 farms still has many issues and hurdles to 2.2 overcome, including paperwork reduction

1	education of underwriters and agents.
2	But I do feel that this product has
3	the potential to be the best coverage for
4	diversified organic farms in the future.
5	Another question that always comes up
6	is about T yields and they have been also
7	discussed in respect to multi-peril products.
8	And this is an issue that not only affects
9	organic and transitioning farmers, but also all
10	new farmers in general, putting them at an
11	economic disadvantage to established farmers with
12	good APH histories.
13	So, moving on to another hot issue, as
14	an organic farmer, I'm appalled by the inclusion
15	of non-soil based systems in my industry.
16	What happened to the idea that soil is
17	the foundation for organic agriculture?
18	This is just simple common sense.
19	First, it's written in the organic regulations.
20	But second, and more importantly, soil
21	is the basis for organic farming. Soil microbes,
22	earthworms, cover crops, green manure crops,

increasing soil health, all of these pertain to 1 soil and cannot be found in a hydroponic or 2 3 container system, but are necessary in an organic 4 system. Hydroponic systems are a revolutionary 5 way of growing food in places that may not be 6 7 suitable for soil based food production. And I do feel they have a place in 8 9 supplying food to consumers. But they are not 10 soil based and, therefore, they have no place in 11 the organic industry. 12 There is no reason that these systems feel need to use the organic label other than 13 They should continue to sell their 14 15 hydroponic production as conventional and push the benefits that they can bring in that area and 16 not try and confuse the consumers. 17 18 We simply need to enforce the rules we 19 already have in place on organic. 20 So, I ask that you please work to add field and greenhouse container production back to 21 2.2 the OSB work agenda and lead our a community in a

Τ	discussion on this important topic.
2	The future of organic integrity
3	depends on it.
4	I'd be happy to discuss any of these
5	issues further with you if I can be of any help.
6	And thank you for your time and service to the
7	organic community.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Well, thank you
9	for joining us today. We certainly have a
10	question for you.
11	Brian, please go ahead.
12	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yes, Scott, thanks
13	so much. I know it's a busy time.
14	I'm just my sort of bigger picture
15	type of question is how can we get more field
16	crop and grain farmers to get into organics?
17	Just very briefly, and you can't spend all day on
18	this, but just a few quick thoughts, please.
19	MR. MYERS: Yes, sure.
20	So, I'll use our farm as an example.
21	This is our seventh year certified organic. We
22	were a similar size, actually larger conventional

1	operation before this.
2	And in our local community, we have a
3	lot of support for the organic. We sit in one of
4	the larger organic valley dairy areas. And so,
5	those dairies need feed and so, then they go out
6	to the other farmers and they've got to switch.
7	But the key that I've found for
8	switching is to have a good mentor. Other
9	organic farmers that you can look to to see how
10	they do it.
11	I'm very, very fortunate that I have
12	our seed salesman, actually, has been a mentor to
13	many different people in the area. And so, I
14	have that.
15	And I have an organic farmer that's
16	been organic since the >80s beside us. And we've
17	watched them and learned from them. So, if I
18	have a question, I just go across the road and
19	ask him.
20	So, it seems like once have a good
21	organic farmer established in this area in an
22	area, then it kind of grows.

1	And we're finding that ourselves as we
2	have transitioned over to organic, people watch
3	us and we have more and more people that stop in
4	and start that switch over.
5	MEMBER CALDWELL: Thanks so much.
6	Yes, that's a great comment and we
7	I've seen the same thing here in New York State
8	with Clawson and Mary Helm Martin who you may
9	know, I don't know.
10	But yes, appreciate that.
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy, please go
12	ahead.
13	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes, thanks, Nate.
13	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes, thanks, Nate. Thank you, Scott, so much for
14 15	Thank you, Scott, so much for
14 15	Thank you, Scott, so much for attending our session today and all the work
14 15 16	Thank you, Scott, so much for attending our session today and all the work you're doing in the organic community and your
14 15 16 17	Thank you, Scott, so much for attending our session today and all the work you're doing in the organic community and your work on the working group for crop insurance. We
14 15 16 17	Thank you, Scott, so much for attending our session today and all the work you're doing in the organic community and your work on the working group for crop insurance. We really appreciated the detailed comments that
14 15 16 17 18	Thank you, Scott, so much for attending our session today and all the work you're doing in the organic community and your work on the working group for crop insurance. We really appreciated the detailed comments that were also provided us on that work agenda item.

1	farmer, but you mentioned the comment about
2	diversified operations. And that, we see a lot
3	in the written comments.
4	And you mentioned that whole farm
5	works better for diversified operations.
6	Can you tell me why the revenue
7	protection and general federal crop doesn't work
8	for diversified producers?
9	MR. MYERS: So, we've had multi-peril
10	crop insurance on our farm since 1988, actually,
11	even when we were conventional. And so, we use
12	that very strongly and went through the
13	transition process with it.
14	One of the biggest problems is, when
15	we started when we became switched over to
16	organic, we do all our transitioning with hay, so
17	that is a non-crop that we have to worry about
18	with multi-peril.
19	But when we switched over organic, we
20	basically became a new farmer. And a new farmer
21	has to start with a yield that is given to them,
22	called a T yield. And that is basically based on

a county yield. 1 2 And we actually met with RMA 3 yesterday, or the work group did, and I learned a lot more about T yields and they're not very 4 interested in changing them, as I found out. 5 they're not very up to date. 6 7 We were -- I think our T yield in our county's like a 100 bushel acre, or APH, when we 8 9 were conventional was like 170 bushel acre. we consistently raise 150 to 200 bushel acre 10 11 organic corn. So, it doesn't offer much help. 12 So, that's why we look at whole farm, whole farms revenue base. And like I said, there 13 still are some problems with whole farm, but it 14 15 allows us to quarantee that we're going to be 16 able to -- it doesn't matter what crops we raise, but, you know, we get discount for the more crops 17 18 we raise. And then, it also allows us to operate 19 20 another year. I mean, it says, okay, if we have, you know, a million dollars worth of guaranteed 21 22 revenue is what's expected, and our

our

1	five-year historical revenue is \$900,000, we can
2	then ensure 85 percent of that if we want to.
3	So, that would allow us to make sure
4	that, hey, we know all our costs are covered, our
5	bank payments are made, and we will we live to
6	work another year basically.
7	And that's the ultimate goal of crop
8	insurance in my well, it's not trying to
9	profit off of things as some of these policies
10	look at and some of these especially
11	conventional farmers look at. Oh, we can make a
12	profit, we can guarantee a profit. That's not
13	what crop insurance should be.
14	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes, that's absolutely.
15	And thanks for highlighting about the T yields.
16	That's really important because basically the
17	difference in not or having that discrepancy
18	in your T yield and your actual production
19	history is essentially farmers are self-insuring
20	that gap.
21	So, I appreciate you highlighting
22	that.

1	I wondered, in your county
2	specifically, are you facing that certain crops
3	you want to rotate into or not necessarily have
4	the capability of getting insured through federal
5	crops on your rotational small grains and some of
6	the different legumes? Are you experiencing that
7	challenge as well?
8	MR. MYERS: Yes, pretty much other
9	than corn, soybeans, and wheat, we are unable to
LO	we're using federal crop to insure anything.
L1	We raise ten different crops and we
L2	have raise sunflowers for four years and we
L3	could get a written agreement, but that is just
L 4	very, very complicated to get and not really
L 5	satisfactory on the farmer's end.
L 6	We also raise canola which is a newer
L7	crop in this area and barley and, yes, like you
L 8	said, a lot of small grains.
L 9	So, and the hay we use, it's called
20	pasture, rangeland, and forage land, PRF policy,
21	that's actually worked very well for hay. We've
22	been in the hay business for 20 years and you

1	originally use the non-insured crop program
2	through FSA for that.
3	And tried this PRF program and it is
4	worked better than I expected. It's one of the
5	better and simpler programs that I've ever used
6	with crop insurance.
7	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes, that is a really
8	good program. And I think we need to highlight
9	that one more.
10	Last question, sorry, I'm peppering
11	you with all these, this is really helpful for
12	your information.
13	You mentioned you met with RMA the
14	other day, talked about T yields. Do you have
15	any ideas how to convey some recommendations on
16	how T yields can be changed or modified?
17	MR. MYERS: So, yes, so we had a
18	really good discussion yesterday with the group
19	from RMA. And they pretty much told us that the
20	T yields are kind of off the table in some sense
21	now for changes because they have all this data
22	that backs up how they figure them and

1	everything.
2	To be totally honest, though, I still
3	think they're flawed.
4	One thing, though, that we need to do
5	with T yields and we need to make sure organic
6	farmers and farmers all farmers need to return
7	the question sheets from NASS, National Ag
8	Statistics Service.
9	When I was, you know, 10, 15 years
LO	ago, conventional farmer, we used to laugh at
L1	those and throw in the trash because I'm like,
L2	well, we don't want them.
L3	But now that I see the value of those,
L 4	everybody needs because that's where they get
L5	their information. That's where they get the T
L 6	yields from. It comes from that kind of
L7	information.
L 8	I wish they would not they need to
L 9	use more information than that, in my book. I
20	think it would be a better way. You know, use
21	that information but then also use they have
22	crop insurance information usually for the

2	They a lot of times, they have
3	information to FSA. Anymore, we have to, you
4	know, we have to report a lot of yields to the
5	Farm Service Agency, and we're reporting there as
6	well.
7	So, I wish they would kind of use a
8	whole, you know, a lot more options there.
9	And I wish there was a way that we
10	could use our conventional T yield going in,
11	maybe like a percentage or something. I mean, I
12	don't expect to have 170 bushel T yield my first
13	year of organic. That's insane. Okay? I
14	realize that. I'm learning, I'm new to it.
15	But I also don't expect to have 100
16	bushel T yield.
17	And then, if you throw in the whole
18	transition yield thing in there which lays I'm
19	going to stay out of, but that's a whole other
20	crop insurance issue there. It just makes a big
21	issue.
22	The other problem with all of that is,

county.

1

Τ	is because we're organic and we have such a
2	long-term rotation, we have a seven year
3	rotation, sometimes ten year rotation.
4	APHs take five years of raising a crop
5	on a farm or on a unit, a crop unit that they
6	call, you have to have five years of yields to
7	have, you know, the APH off the T yield part.
8	And that's really hard to do when you have a
9	seven year rotation. That could be up to 35
LO	years just to get my APH correct and get rid of
L1	all my T yields.
L2	So, that is a whole other issue.
L3	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes, thank you so much,
L 4	very articulate, Scott. I appreciate it.
L5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Kim, please go
L 6	ahead.
L7	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Hi, Scott, thank you
L8	so much for the information that you've given us
L 9	today.
20	I'm going to be very brief here and
21	just tell you how appreciative I am of you
22	stepping out of the comfort zone of some of the

1	traditional grains and legumes and hays and
2	trying other products, too, even without some of
3	the support that I think is overwhelmingly needed
4	in this space.
5	Having farmers be willing to enter
6	into those arenas are greatly appreciated as
7	these products are definitely needed in this
8	space as we work through it on the policy side.
9	And just want to say good luck to you
10	and your planting season this year.
11	MR. MYERS: Thank you.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Carolyn, if you're
13	there?
14	MEMBER DIMITRI: Hi, I'm sorry about
15	that, someone was asking me a very important
16	question.
17	Scott, thank you so much for your
18	greatly detailed information on crop insurance.
19	And I'm especially interested in the
20	whole farm revenue crop insurance and wonder if
21	you can speculate as to why, even though this is
22	supposed to be the ideal instrument for organic

1	farmers, like why is the usage just decreasing
2	year after year after year?
3	MR. MYERS: Well, that's a very good
4	question because actually, with my agent, I've
5	had the discussion and a couple days ago, we're
6	still going through the paperwork process and
7	trying to go back and forth with underwriting to
8	get this year's policy approved.
9	One issue why people don't do it is,
LO	first of all, the agents don't push it because it
L1	takes a lot of time on the agent's part and they
L2	do not they make a lot more money selling
L3	multi-peril year after year where it's just easy.
L 4	You send in your information and you're done.
L5	This you almost have to have an
L 6	accounting degree to do some of this stuff. In
L7	fact, we had a discussion, accounting I don't
L 8	have an accounting degree, but it's kind of my
L 9	I love accounting and I love statistics.
20	And I actually had a little got
21	with the underwriter the other day and I'm like,
22	you guys aren't even using general accepted

1	accounting practices in crop insurance.
2	So, that's an issue and it's a
3	paperwork thing. I mean, I am fortunate that I
4	have access to a lot of this paperwork. Some of
5	the things they ask for, even though they were
6	supposed to get rid of the expense requirement
7	and all that, I'm finding out that, even though
8	they did get rid of the expense requirement, they
9	are still allowed to ask for those which I got
10	asked for.
11	And when they want expenses on that
12	many different crops, on that many different
13	things, and proof of revenue and stuff, it can
14	get really daunting at times.
15	MEMBER DIMITRI: Nate, can I have a
16	follow up
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yes, go ahead.
18	MEMBER DIMITRI: question?
19	Okay, Scott, so what do you see as
20	like what is like a reasonable way to reduce
21	that barrier? Is it like I never I hate
22	the phrase like educate the insurance agents.

1	I mean, obviously, I think they're
2	pretty smart and if they wanted to learn how to
3	do it, they would be able to do it.
4	So, like what's the way forward here?
5	Or a way forward?
6	MR. MYERS: Yes, yes, you know, one
7	of them, and I had this discussion yesterday was,
8	I provide so, we have loans with Farm Credit
9	we use for our bank. And I have those loans
10	already. And at the end of the year, I provide
11	them balance sheet information, inventory
12	information, production, all this information and
13	that's exactly what they should be using for
14	whole farm.
15	But for some reason, instead of just
16	using that information, now they have to twist it
17	and turn it to fit into their stuff.
18	And it's like, guys, if I can, you
19	know, secure my farm loans and my bank's
20	comfortable with that using that, all of that
21	information, it should be allowed also at that
22	not have to basically, I have to redo it all

1	so it fits their set up.
2	So, that would make it a lot easier
3	because a lot of people have loans. People go to
4	their banks and do that stuff every year. That's
5	a required thing if you have a loan with a bank.
6	So, that would be one.
7	Another would be to look at the
8	paperwork reduction they did to the micro-farm,
9	part of it, to 35,000 and less. And there was a
10	when they made those changes, there's a lot
11	less paperwork.
12	I was shocked when I found out how
13	much less paperwork those people have, you know,
14	those applicants have to do.
15	And I'm really disappointed right now,
16	too, that a lot of the agents don't realize that
17	difference yet. That was yesterday, they told
18	us about their traveling road show or whatever
19	RMA did and I didn't even know about that.
20	And so, they talked about that and I
21	asked my agent had he heard about that and he
22	said, no. And they sell whole farm. And he's

1	like, we didn't even know about that.
2	So, back to the education, I know
3	that's not perfect, but it seems like maybe
4	they're just preaching to the choir sometimes and
5	they're not going out here and getting to the
6	people they really need to be getting to as well.
7	But, yes, using documents we already
8	have, I think that's a big deal.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy, I'm going to
LO	say, like really quick, please.
L1	MEMBER DIMITRI: Oh, gosh, Amy, could
L2	I ask one more really fast question?
L3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Very fast, please.
L 4	MEMBER DIMITRI: All right.
L 5	This may be an academic question, but
L 6	like couldn't we just get rid of all crop
L7	insurance and just use whole farm for everyone?
L8	MR. MYERS: That is, to be totally
L 9	honest, I am all for that. I think whole farm is
20	the perfect crop insurance. It fits everybody.
21	And I think that's where all the money should be
22	spent, all the subsidies should be spent.

1	Somebody with 10, 20 crops, you know,
2	some of these vegetable crops have 30, 40, 50
3	crops, they're the chances of that paying out
4	are so slim, they should be getting it for almost
5	nothing because it's just keeping the goal is,
6	if they have a total disaster then, yes, they're
7	going to be able to live to fight another year.
8	So, yes.
9	MEMBER DIMITRI: Thank you, thank you.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy, please go
11	ahead.
12	MEMBER BRUCH: Just a quick question,
13	yes or no on whole farm, when you are
14	implementing whole farm, or the history of it,
15	were you expanding your operation during that
16	insurance policy? Yes or no?
17	MR. MYERS: Yes, yes, we actually had
18	whole farm six or seven years ago and went
19	through that and that's why we quit whole farm
20	for a while because it didn't work like it
21	should.
22	So, that is another issue when you're

1	expanding or taking on crops that are higher
2	value, even if you're not expanding acreage wise,
3	but expanding financially, I guess I would say.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Scott, you rock.
5	Thank you for taking so much time of your day to
6	speak with us and providing so much information.
7	Really appreciate you.
8	MR. MYERS: Thank you guys very much.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, is Brad
10	Cessna on the line? Don't think we saw you. If
11	you're here, please just go ahead and unmute and
12	let us know.
12 13	let us know. (No response.)
13	(No response.)
13	(No response.) CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right,
13 14 15	(No response.) CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, otherwise, we're going to go to Corey Struck
13 14 15 16	(No response.) CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, otherwise, we're going to go to Corey Struck followed by Russell Hamlin and then, Steve Ela.
13 14 15 16 17	(No response.) CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, otherwise, we're going to go to Corey Struck followed by Russell Hamlin and then, Steve Ela. Corey, if you're there, please go
13 14 15 16 17	(No response.) CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, otherwise, we're going to go to Corey Struck followed by Russell Hamlin and then, Steve Ela. Corey, if you're there, please go ahead.
13 14 15 16 17 18	(No response.) CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, otherwise, we're going to go to Corey Struck followed by Russell Hamlin and then, Steve Ela. Corey, if you're there, please go ahead. MR. STRUCK: Hello, good afternoon.

1	of transition and I'm an OEFFA member and I'm
2	participating in their crop insurance and
3	research working groups.
4	I work together with my family to grow
5	crops on 450 acres here.
6	I'm here today to comment on three
7	topics, crop insurance, farmer access to NOSE
8	meetings, and geotagging.
9	The biggest one is crop insurance.
10	So, right now, current constructs are scaled
11	based on acres which gives larger safety nets for
12	larger farmers.
13	They incentivize the shorter cropping
14	cycles with less cash crops and APH rules are
15	less effective with longer cropping rotations
16	under these constructs.
17	And the large portion problem with
18	them when it applies to organics is that if you
19	do not have a history, you get 65 percent of your
20	conventional counted T yields right off the bat,
21	kind of no matter what.
22	So, recommendations, one

1	recommendation is to have a graduated subsidy
2	where a large producer can actually become
3	unsubsidized by buying so much insurance and not
4	taking as much of the risk out on their own.
5	Add provisions where if you don't have
6	for our climate, a small grain or something
7	that is out of your normal season crop to add
8	diversity, you're not eligible for subsidies.
9	Also, re-evaluating only getting 65
10	percent of your county T yields, as we progress
11	down the organic pathway, we're seeing the yield
12	gap between organic and conventional closing.
13	And not necessarily the rules as they apply to
14	subsidies closing that gap at the same rate.
15	Also, finding a way to speed up APE
16	building and then enterprising by practice for
17	farmers who want to keep both organic and
18	non-organic operations.
19	For farmer access to NOSB meetings,
20	you guys are holding your meetings at pretty busy
21	times for farmers who are kind of the base of the
22	organic system, especially for smaller operations

1	that can afford less time away during planting
2	and harvest seasons.
3	And my recommendation would be that
4	you potentially add extra listening sessions in
5	addition to your regular meetings if it when
6	it's too cumbersome to move them.
7	And finally, geotagging, my
8	recommendation is that FSA maps already have to
9	be geotagged or they couldn't mark them out in
10	our GIS format. So, don't put that on the farmer
11	to go do that, but try and make that relationship
12	with FSA happen.
13	And also, to make sure that it is
14	mandatory and enforced for all imports that come
15	into the country where we would actually see
16	benefit from that.
17	Thank you for your time and your
18	service to the organic community.
19	Do you have any questions for me?
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We do, questions
21	from Dilip and then Nate.
22	Please go ahead.

1	MEMBER NANDWANI: Hi, thank you for
2	your comments.
3	And you had mentioned a lot of good
4	recommendations.
5	I'm just wondering, and you mentioned
6	that you are in second year of transitional
7	phase.
8	So, I'm more on the production side.
9	So, can you tell me what one or two challenges in
10	terms of product you face or being a transitional
11	grower, what can you suggest or have one or two
12	recommendations for NOSB to look into to help
13	transitional growers?
14	And you know, that last year, USDA has
15	released a lot of funding for transitional
16	growers. So, I'm looking into that aspect and
17	asking you.
18	Thank you for your comments, again.
19	MR. STRUCK: Okay, so, as far as I
20	know, the only piece of that pie that I would
21	have access to as a transitional grower is TOGA,
22	which is also crop insurance subsidies. And that

1	was 10 percent of what I could do.
2	So, my state actually has a program
3	where you get \$5 per acre if you plant cover
4	crops, right, which is integral to at least my
5	fertility management and also my weed management.
6	And that \$5 is substantially more, on
7	the order of three to four times more than
8	anything I would be eligible for under TOGA.
9	So, for me, picking a practice that
10	helps me get to where I want to go, actually
11	helps me better than the larger TOGA funds.
12	And the only other thing that I really
13	know about these funds is they were put out there
14	in \$300 million is a good sum, but they didn't
15	necessarily have an action plan behind them of
16	how to get them implemented and into peoples'
17	hands which I think is definitely something that
18	needs to be changed with how our well, with
19	how we dole out money at a governmental level and
20	any sort of process.
21	But that's does that answer your
22	I got one recommendation. Does that answer your

1	question, though, sir?
2	MEMBER NANDWANI: Yes, you did, I
3	understand that.
4	Thank you.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate, please go
6	ahead.
7	MEMBER LEWIS: Yes, appreciate you
8	bringing up APH and I'm curious if your committee
9	talked about including yields during transition
10	years? I know many folks transition with hay, so
11	it's not always works there.
12	But there are some folks who choose to
13	transition with cash crops.
14	And whether you've discussed or had
15	any reaction from RMA about using yields obtained
16	during transition years that later establish an
17	organic APH or at least make an argument that you
18	shouldn't be subject to that 65 percent discount?
19	MR. STRUCK: so, I have not engaged
20	with RMA or anybody specifically from RMA about
21	those specific points.
22	MEMBER LEWIS: Okay, yes, I was

1	curious. In your committee you were talking
2	about like different options on APH saying
3	whether that transition year yield could be of
4	value?
5	MR. STRUCK: I mean, yes and no,
6	right? So, organic's a system that only gets
7	better over time as long as you're adhering to
8	the principles. Right?
9	So, you're transitional years are
LO	going to be your lowest. And honestly, my first
L1	year of transition, so and that's cutting
L2	everything off cold turkey and my nutrient plan
L3	is pretty low nitrogen. Like I didn't go out and
L 4	dump four tons of manure out on my fields or
L 5	anything like that.
L 6	And my yields were still where they
L7	were expected to be, which is pretty amazing.
L 8	So, especially going through the D-1 drought in
L 9	our little area as well.
20	Like it's, I don't know, I think that
21	correlating your percentage of T yield and making
22	that movable as to what you're actually seeing in

1	data as opposed to what we saw in data whenever
2	they made that rule, which was probably prior to
3	2018, right, would be more helpful.
4	MEMBER LEWIS: Thank you.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I just want to
6	thank you so much for joining us today. And I
7	want to especially highlight, thank you for
8	coming up with solutions, well considered,
9	actionable solutions and not just raising
10	problems in your comments.
11	So, really appreciate you taking the
12	time from your farm to join us today.
13	Thank you.
14	MR. STRUCK: Thank you.
15	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up, we have
16	Russell Hamlin followed by Steve Ela and then,
17	Ginny Olson.
18	MR. HAMLIN: All right, can you hear
19	me, Nate?
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We can, please go
21	ahead.
22	DR. HAMLIN: Hey, I want to thank you

1	and the NOSB for the opportunity to speak today.
2	My name is Dr. Russell Hamlin. I'm
3	the vice president of farming for Grimmway Farms
4	in Bakersfield, California.
5	I'm also the chair of the
6	International Fresh Product Association's
7	Organics Committee.
8	And my comments today will be on
9	behalf of the IFPA. I'll be making a few
10	statements about climate smart agriculture and
11	the sunset items that are under review.
12	With respect to your climate smart
13	discussion, the IFPA believes that organic crop
14	production is inherently climate smart and that
15	certified organic producers should automatically
16	be eligible for all climate smart funding
17	opportunities administered by the USDA.
18	With respect to a few of the sunset
19	items, the IFPA believes that all of the
20	following materials should continue to be allowed
21	for use in organic farming, plastic mulch covers,
22	elemental sulfur, sulfurous acid, lime sulfur,

1	liquid fish products, potassium chloride, and
2	aqueous potassium silicate.
3	Plastic mulch covers are essential for
4	many organic farmers across the country for weed
5	control. Without them, their weeding costs will
6	skyrocket and the overall success on with
7	organic farming will decrease.
8	If we're serious about helping farmers
9	transition from conventional to organic farming,
10	allowing them to use plastic mulches is one of
11	the ways that we can help.
12	It's also a harsh reality that if we
13	take away plastic mulch covers in organic
14	farming, many people will go out of business.
15	Potassium chloride is an important
16	low-cost organic fertilizer that supplies two
17	needed essential elements for plant growth,
18	potassium and chloride.
19	I would urge the NOSB not to oppose
20	the use of chloride in organic farming. It is
21	essential for the evolution of oxygen in plants
22	and is, therefore, responsible for our ability to

1	breathe.
2	Elemental sulfur, lime sulfur, and
3	aqueous potassium silicate are all important for
4	disease and insect control in organic farming.
5	Elemental sulfur and potassium
6	silicate, in particular, are used extensively by
7	organic vegetable producers to control diseases
8	like downy mildew.
9	Lime sulfur is used extensively by
10	organic tree, vine, and small fruit crops in
11	order to combat overwintering fungal diseases.
12	But elemental sulfur is of particular
13	importance because it also is one of the few
14	materials that can be used in organic farming to
15	lower soil pH. It can also be used in sulfur
16	burners to create sulfurous acid to lower
17	irrigation water pH. And both of these can be
18	essential for maintaining proper plant and soil
19	health.
20	Lastly, I want to comment on liquid
21	fish products. They are important components of
22	many organic fertility plans. They are

1	particularly important to those farmers that use
2	drip irrigation and need liquid fertilizers to
3	inject for crop nutrition.
4	That's the end of my comments. I'll
5	be glad to answer any questions that you have.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, we
7	appreciate your comments.
8	Wood has a question for you.
9	MEMBER TURNER: Thanks, Dr. Hamlin, I
10	appreciate the comments.
11	I'll ask a question I asked a large
12	grower yesterday as well, can you tell me about
13	IFPA's engagement and also your company's
14	engagement and kind of solutions for plastic
15	mulch recovery and what you're hearing from the
16	ground in terms of the ability to get that
17	material off the ground? How it's functioning
18	sort of in a live environment and sort of what
19	they what kind of pathway you're seeing for
20	better recovery of that material?
21	DR. HAMLIN: Well, I mean, it's true
22	that, you know, I'll speak from the Grimmway

1	perspective. I don't know that the IFPA has
2	specifically discussed that topic.
3	But you absolutely see more equipment
4	that is being used to help retrieve that
5	material. Anybody that's used plastic
6	understands that it can be a difficult thing to
7	get it all up out of the field.
8	But that's what I would say is that
9	the equipment used for getting it out of the
10	field is more developed and you tend to have a
11	better success getting it out if you use better
12	equipment.
13	I don't know if that's a great answer,
14	but that's the one that I've got.
15	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Franklin, please
16	go ahead.
17	MEMBER QUARCOO: Yes, I know you said
18	that there are climates some farmers who go
19	out of business without the plastics.
20	Do you have some concerns down the
21	line when it comes to plastics and if you have an
22	ideal situation of what the future should look

1	like? What should be going and what should we do
2	about plastics?
3	DR. HAMLIN: Well, I stand by my
4	comment that some people would go out of business
5	without the plastics. That's the first thing
6	that probably needs to be said.
7	The reason it has to do with the
8	tremendous costs associated with weed control.
9	And so, I think that plastic mulch covers need to
LO	continue to be used in organic farming.
L1	I think that the point that, you know,
L2	you can leave plastic behind and that is a
L3	problem is valid. It needs to be worked on.
L 4	You know, I'm not sure if, you know,
L5	what the future could be for biodegradable
L 6	plastic mulches that may not leave a residue for
L 7	long periods of time. I'm not sure if they're
L 8	even allowed for use in organic agriculture. But
L 9	I've seen them in conventional agriculture.
20	And so, possibly coming up with
21	something that's as effective as a plastic mulch
22	cover but has the ability to biodegrade would be

1	something that would be good.
2	But I think that the plastic mulches
3	are essential. Not everybody you can lay that
4	plastic mulch for \$300 to \$400 an acre and it can
5	cost \$3,000 to \$4,000 an acre to weed that land.
6	And so, it is a tremendous barrier, particularly
7	to people who are trying to transition.
8	And I would strongly urge that we keep
9	it.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate, please go
11	ahead.
12	MEMBER LEWIS: Sorry, finding my mute
13	button there.
14	I'm just a quick question, how
15	often are you hearing from producers that are
16	using liquid fish products and liquid seaweed
17	extracts in combination for a drip program? Is
18	that a common combination or are they one or the
19	other? Or where's the potassium coming from or
20	those kind of?
21	DR. HAMLIN: Yes, I would think that,
22	you know, we don't particularly use a lot of drip

1	irrigation at Grimmway. A lot of people that do
2	will place the potassium under the plastic as a
3	pre-plant and they can put it down as a hot mix
4	or a bed mix.
5	And so, they're typically getting up
6	front.
7	You may also be able to take the
8	potassium chloride and melt it down a little bit
9	and get a dilute solution of potassium that could
LO	then be injected through the drip.
L1	But for sure, the fish products are
L2	absolutely depended on by people who are drip
L3	irrigating organic vegetables. But it's not a
L 4	tremendous source of potassium, as you alluded
L5	to.
L 6	MEMBER LEWIS: Okay, thank you.
L7	DR. HAMLIN: Yes.
L8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We really
L 9	appreciate your comments today.
20	DR. HAMLIN: Thank you.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up, we're
22	going to have Steve Ela followed by Ginny Olson

1	and then, Jefferson Dean.
2	Steve, please go ahead.
3	MR. ELA: All right, can you hear me,
4	Nate?
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We can, thank you.
6	MR. ELA: All right, good.
7	Well, howdy, everybody, here we go for
8	another round. It's great to see all your faces.
9	My name is Steve Ela. I'm both a
10	grower and representative of the National Organic
11	Coalition. My position with NOC is to work
12	directly with the NOSB on behalf of our members.
13	And I want to reiterate that NOC is a
14	consensus organization. Our comments to you are
15	the results of a 14 member process of shared
16	ideas.
17	Today, I want to cover three topics,
18	ion exchange filtration, surprise, the range of
19	topics that are presented by stakeholders to the
20	NOSB, and organic is climate smart and the
21	related discussion on a universal OSP.
22	Food contact materials are inherently

1	designed to be inert with regards to their
2	interaction with an organic food.
3	On the contrary, ion exchange resins
4	are fundamentally designed to work in conjunction
5	with recharge materials to alter the chemical
6	makeup of the product being filtered.
7	They are ionically charged and they
8	are not inert. And so, I would contend that that
9	puts them in a different category from food
10	contact substances.
11	Without significant testing, the
12	organic community has no idea whether there is
13	chemical leakage from resins into a product or
14	not.
15	Many resins might be perfectly find
16	but we do not know that. We continue to find
17	that even minute quantities of certain materials
18	can be detrimental to human health.
19	The recent EPA limitation on PFAS
20	chemicals in drinking water is a case in point.
21	And according to the TR perfluorinated compounds
22	are used in some resins.

1 Moving on, I'd like to address why we 2 -- NOC gives a broad range of comments to the 3 NOC believes it's important for the NOSB to be a venue for stakeholder engagement with 4 both the NOSB and the NOP. While 6 comments may address issues 7 outside the immediate topics of discussion before the NOSB, they have relevance for past and future 8 9 NOSB These work. comments from range 10 informational background that gives Board Members 11 information about the broader organic landscape 12 to suggestions for future work agenda items, to 13 references to past decisions that have not been 14 acted upon. We hope that Members will utilize the 15 16 stakeholder knowledge of past NOSB actions and and recognize that the 17 decisions NOSB 18 primary public forum for organic stakeholders to 19 give input to the NOP and the USDA. 20 You are an important conduit for this 21 wonderful community and help shape our own 22 future.

1	As has already been noted, NOC concurs
2	with other that the proposal that organic is
3	climate smart references soil growing systems.
4	We also ask that the call for
5	universal OSP be separated from the climate smart
6	discussion.
7	While we can see value and a common
8	framework for the OSP, it's important to make
9	sure that all OSPs get to the heart of why a
LO	producer is doing something not just what they
L1	are doing.
L2	An OSP must be rich with knowledge and
L3	information and justifications for practices.
L 4	Furthermore, universal OSP can work to
L 5	force certifiers to certify practices that are
L 6	outside their comfort zone.
L7	I don't have time right now to give
L 8	comments on the equity discussions about in
L 9	person oral comments, but I'd be happy to address
20	some of that if we have a chance.
21	With this, I'd like to as a member
22	of the National Organic Coalition, I'd like to

1	finish with a knock-knock joke.
2	So, Nate, knock-knock.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Who's there?
4	MR. ELA: Ion.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Ion who?
6	MR. ELA: I and others don't want you
7	to change the transparency and everyone knowing
8	the materials used in organic processes for the
9	filtration of only certifiers and handles having
10	that information.
11	Let stakeholders be able to evaluate
12	materials themselves.
13	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Well done.
14	Any questions for Steve?
	Any questions for steve:
15	Kyla and then Dilip.
15 16	
	Kyla and then Dilip.
16	Kyla and then Dilip. MEMBER SMITH: The FDA websites are
16 17	Kyla and then Dilip. MEMBER SMITH: The FDA websites are public. So, is that information being behind a
16 17 18	Kyla and then Dilip. MEMBER SMITH: The FDA websites are public. So, is that information being behind a firewall to certifiers when that is a public
16 17 18 19	Kyla and then Dilip. MEMBER SMITH: The FDA websites are public. So, is that information being behind a firewall to certifiers when that is a public database available to everybody?

1	It's the same problem with the inerts.
2	How many inerts are in the, you know, the public
3	database? Hundreds.
4	And organic, you know, is only used in
5	some. And so, for an organic stakeholder to go
6	to the USDA website and realize that an organic
7	handler is using a specific materials is almost
8	impossible.
9	So, what we're really would like to
10	see is have transparency and have a list, you
11	know, even if you if you don't list the
12	resins, at least let us know what they are so we
13	can have a chance to evaluate them and give our
14	input rather than having that be behind some kind
15	of firewall.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy, please go
17	ahead?
18	MEMBER BRUCH: Steve, hi, welcome.
19	Thank you for joining us today.
20	I believe you're the last NOC
21	representative that's speaking and in oral
22	comments. So, you get the brunt of my two

1	questions here just so I can better understand
2	NOC's written comments and their opinion.
3	So, I know it's kind of an aggregated
4	format, but your name is signed to these. So, I
5	hope that you will know these answers.
6	The first one's about potassium
7	sorbate and I was just curious, NOC's position
8	with the was that there was limited efficacy
9	data.
10	And some of the industry standards
11	that were used in the petition to do some of the
12	research and analysis were not necessarily what
13	NOC claimed were general industry standards.
14	So, when I look back at some of the
15	testing that was done or the products, a couple
16	active ingredients that I found was wettable
17	sulfur and also or sulfur that was wettable
18	and then potassium, aqueous potassium silicate.
19	Are there other products that we
20	that should have been used then from NOC's
21	opinion there?
22	MR. ELA: Yes, that's a great

1	question, Amy.
2	And one of the issues we have, well, a
3	couple issues is, one, is the technical report
4	wasn't actually publically released until pretty
5	late in the comment process.
6	So, I'll be honest, we did not have a
7	chance to read that and fully evaluate it. So,
8	there may be information in the TR that is not
9	part of our comments. And so, that's one reason
10	we actually asked for the discussion to be
11	continued so we can read that extensive TR.
12	But in the petition itself, at least
13	one of the products, and I can speak both as a
14	grower and for NOC comments, one of those
15	products is not a product I would use on my farm
16	anyhow.
17	So, it's, you know, it may be an
18	industry standard because it's out there and
19	listed for use, but it's not one I would choose
20	to use, in part, because of efficacy issues.
21	So, I guess we'd like to see, and it
22	may be in the TR, I honestly don't know, we'd

1	like to see more efficacy data to show it as
2	actually essential.
3	Sulfur is a big one, of course.
4	Cooper is another one, aqueous potassium
5	silicate, and then, we use there are some
6	other biologicals that are useful.
7	But really, sulfur is a big one for us
8	with respect to powdery mildew.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Allison?
10	(Simultaneous Speaking.)
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Sorry, were you
12	done?
13	MEMBER BRUCH: Oh, I had a second one,
14	but Allison, take over.
15	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Oh no, go ahead,
16	no, no, no, go ahead, finish yours, Amy, and
17	then, we'll move on. I just heard a pregnant
18	pause, so I want to keep us moving.
19	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay, anyway,
20	consistent location or consistent location
21	information that we're trying to get some
22	additional opinions on, NOC had mentioned that

1	for ten years, they've ran into significant
2	roadblocks just being able to geolocate some
3	fields, and this was from the dairy perspective.
4	So, I wanted to really parcel out that
5	information a lot more. It talked about that
6	dairy farmers end up changing or adding to their
7	field list frequently, if they leased fields, and
8	it's just really hard to track where these fields
9	are at.
L 0	And I was just wondering, I mean, I'm
L1	not a dairy farmer myself, but on my OSP, I have
L2	to be able to define of my leased land, have to
L3	be able to articulate where it is.
L 4	And then, there's field history and a
L 5	long list of questions that I have to answer.
L 6	So, I was just wondering if there was
L7	challenges also from a certifying point of view
L 8	to get the field level information for previous
L 9	field use and things like that, if the location
20	data was truly a challenge?
21	MR. ELA: And, thank you, Amy, with
22	respect to that particular reference, that was in

1 the plain community where the use of technology 2 is low or even frowned upon. 3 So, that change of fields, especially previous field history if somebody -- because of 4 religious beliefs or whatever, somebody doesn't 5 believe in using technology and it's hard to give 6 7 GPS coordinates for a field that wasn't required to have that before. 8 9 I also think that, you know, the NOC 10 comments really -- the problem we had was to just 11 geolocate a field, if it's larger, isn't that 12 But when you get down to specialty crop growers, on my 100-acre farm, I have 40 different 13 14 blocks that I manage. 15 And so, to geolocate each one, and 16 they change, and I'm a perennial fruit grower, not an annual fruit person, it gets really hard 17 18 to micro manage that. 19 So, I think we're just asking for some 20 scale issues, some risk issues. But, you know, 21 in general, yes, we need to know where the fields 2.2 are, if that can be done. But let's not get too

1 down in the weeds on it, and especially with 2 religious communities. 3 I think OEFFA brought up the issue of 4 having inspectors that are from the plain 5 community that also may not believe in technology and that, you know, that limits the use of those 6 7 inspectors if they're being asked to try and geolocate fields. 8 9 So, it's not that we're completely 10 against it, it's just that there are some devil 11 in the details of how to implement and whether 12 it's looking at a farm or on a per crop basis or 13 a per variety basis of how far down in the --14 well, not in the weeds you go, but in the crops 15 you go. 16 MEMBER BRUCH: And just to clarify, 17 it's not on a per farm or a per crop basis. 18 the geolocation should never move of that farm, 19 essentially. 20 MR. ELA: Yes, we just want 21 clarification to make sure that we didn't get down into an area that was just going to be 2.2

1	onerous for the certifier and for the grower
2	themselves.
3	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay, thank you, Steve,
4	I really appreciate it.
5	MR. ELA: Thank you.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Allison, please go
7	ahead.
8	MEMBER JOHNSON: Thanks for your
9	comments, Steve.
10	I have two questions for you, so
11	first, on ion exchange. You can probably hear
12	from my questions, the thing that I've been
13	grappling with is a concern that it'd be good to
14	have more information about these resins, but as
15	a practical matter, don't want to open the door
16	to scrutinizing every substance that comes into
17	contact with a product if it's not intended to
18	have a functional effect in the product that it's
19	being used with.
20	And so, it sounds like NOC is drawing
21	a distinction with the resins because there is a
22	charge to them.

1	And I'm curious if you are aware of
2	any other processing equipment or materials where
3	that might be a similar distinction. It's not a
4	way that I had thought about it until you said
5	that. So, I appreciated the comment and would
6	like to think through it a little bit more.
7	MR. ELA: Yes, sure.
8	I mean, I think, you know, for me, and
9	you know, we're a handler as well on our own
LO	operations and NOC members are as well, is that,
L1	you know, food contact substance generally is
L2	supposed to have the very, quote, unquote, inert
L3	in terms of its interaction with that whatever
L 4	organic product's going through it.
L5	And inherently, an ion exchange resin
L 6	is supposed to have contact with that food so
L7	that the ions can be exchanged.
L 8	And so, to me, that puts it in a
L 9	fundamentally different category.
20	The other thing is, and this is where
21	we disagree with some of Gwen's comments,
22	respectfully, because Gwen knows her stuff very

well, but our members found that -- and we put 1 this in our comments last fall -- that the review 2 3 process for a food contact substance really is kind of at the manufacturers discretion. 4 And so, they could ask for something 5 to be listed as a food contact substance and 6 7 there wasn't all that much rigorous testing. The testing is done, you know, with 8 9 some of the secondary food contact substances and 10 some of these other issues. But we just felt 11 like there should be more transparency. 12 You know, there's lot а of 13

You know, there's a lot of stakeholders out there that are really good chemists and really knowledgeable on this. If they know what the materials are, they can look at it and they may be perfectly fine, but to leave the barn door wide open and say we can use any resin without knowledge, you know, and to Kyla's question, you know, maybe 15 are used, maybe 30 are used, maybe 50 are used, but we just don't know which ones are going into organic products.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

1	And the same thing would be the
2	problem with packaging materials. Nobody thought
3	bisphenol A was going to be a problem. That was
4	approved by FDA.
5	So, the organic community has a long
6	history of being more restrictive than FDA
7	practices and this is one where we feel that's
8	important as well.
9	MEMBER JOHNSON: That's all, thank
10	you.
11	If there's no questions, can I
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Oh yes, go ahead,
13	go ahead, yes.
14	MEMBER JOHNSON: Thanks.
15	Alice mentioned yesterday that you may
16	be able to speak more to the questions that were
17	raised around this balance between access through
18	virtual public comments and the costs of
19	traveling to NOSB meetings in person and the sort
20	of access and privilege that may come with having
21	the resources to be able to do that.
22	And I was curious if you could speak

1	to that today?
2	MR. ELA: Yes, certainly.
3	And I think, you know, one of NOC's
4	goals is to create access in any way possible for
5	people to participate with the Board.
6	And so, for some people it works well
7	as a webinar. Some people prefer in person
8	comments.
9	So, let's, you know, to us, it's
10	having access in many different venues.
11	I heard last on Tuesday, you know,
12	the \$2,000 attendance for a meeting, you know,
13	kind of being thrown around, that's not
14	necessarily true. We had NOC offers
15	scholarships for people to come to the in person
16	meetings.
17	We had one person ask for \$90 to be
18	able to attend the in person meeting and that was
19	going to make the difference between them coming
20	and not. So, it's not \$2,000 necessarily, it
21	depends how you want to do it.
22	I also would say that some people

1	there's a very real difference between giving a
2	comment in person and even by webinar. And it's
3	kind of like voting, you know, you can vote in
4	person, you can vote by mail. One person wants
5	to do another one, one wants to do the other.
6	And when you're in front of the Board
7	and you and giving those comments, it's a very
8	visceral back and forth.
9	And I and we've seen people get
10	hooked into that and saying, wow, what a powerful
11	process to talk to the National Organic Standards
12	Board and it keeps them involved in the future.
13	And so, we feel that's very important.
14	And the other thing I'm just going to
15	say is that you don't know what you don't know.
16	This Board has not done in person oral comments.
17	Kyla has, Nate Lewis has beer
18	involved. But you know, give it a try for a
19	couple times and see.
20	But I really have enough faith in you
21	as Board Members and I have faith in the Board I
22	was on that, you know, you're all smart people

Τ	and the undue influence, I think you see through
2	that pretty quickly.
3	You have the ability to sift and
4	filter, you know, comments and who's wanting one
5	thing or another. But having that richness of
6	the in person experience, it's just it's really
7	powerful.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate, please go
9	ahead.
10	MEMBER LEWIS: Well, thanks for the
11	compliment, Steve. I don't know if I'm
12	necessarily a smart person, but I'll take it.
13	So, I just want to keep honing in the
14	ion exchange resins and their proper place in the
15	listing.
16	So, you know, it is my opinion that
17	they are neither a processing aid nor an
18	ingredient. And those are the two slots that we
19	have for items on the national list.
20	And so, while I totally appreciate the
21	need for transparency, that's what industry's
22	founded on. And I take you at your word that

1 there are consumers out there who care which type of resin is in the ion exchange column that's 2 3 filtering their juice or what have you. I'm not convinced that the national 4 list as it currently stands is the best tool for 5 6 delivering that transparency. And I think it 7 opens up a bigger issue on plastics, cutting boards, all the other food contact surfaces and 8 9 substances that we do have in our process food 10 industry. 11 But that's what I'm trying to wrestle 12 with and I'm curious your thought on like what is 13 the best way to provide that transparency since the tool we have, the national list, doesn't 14 15 really seem to fit the nature of the substance 16 resins at this point. At least that's my opinion and I'm curious your reaction to that? 17 18 Yes, I mean, we've gone MR. ELA: 19 round and round and when I was on the Board as 20 well, secondary through contact substance, food, 21 secondary food additive, food vou know, or 2.2 contact substance.

1	You know, the NOP went to FDA and
2	asked them to clarify that. And they basically
3	said, we really can't. They gave a very nebulous
4	answer.
5	And to me, that nebulous answer back
6	from FDA was the key. They don't have a good
7	classification for these. It depends on what
8	somebody wants to ask for.
9	We already list charcoal. We already
L 0	list some of these other physical filtration
L1	devices. So, it doesn't seem to me to be that
L2	out of line to say that this that these
L3	actually should be listed.
L 4	I truly feel they are fundamentally
L5	different than just a straight food contact
L 6	substance because they are designed to be
L7	interactive with the product. They are designed
L 8	to have that, you know, that ion exchange
L 9	surface. And that is very different than what a
20	normal food contact surface is.
21	So, you know, it's a gray area,
22	there's no doubt. And the three and a half or

1	four years of deliberations have very much
2	exposed that it's not a slam dunk.
3	So, I because of that, I tend to
4	fall on the side of transparency. And you know,
5	let stakeholders be educated. Let them give
6	feedback.
7	But without knowledge, you're putting
8	all the onus on the stakeholders to try and
9	figure out what resins are being used and if
L 0	there might be a problem after they're being
11	used.
12	And once they're being used, it's
L3	almost impossible to get rid of them. So, we'd
L 4	rather have there be and up front process in the
L 5	evaluation.
L 6	MEMBER LEWIS: Thanks for clarifying
L7	that opinion, I appreciate it.
L 8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Kyla, please go
L 9	ahead.
20	MEMBER SMITH: What's the difference
21	on the national list of any material and whether
22	or not it's being used? No one knows. The

1	certifier does and the inspector knows, but the
2	public does not know what specific materials
3	you're using on your farm.
4	They can look at the list and see
5	everything and they can look at the food the
6	FDA food contact substance database and see all
7	of the things that are allowed.
8	That's they would have the same
9	visibility on whether or not they are listed on
LO	the FDA list versus the national list.
L1	So, what's the difference?
12	MR. ELA: So, I can only use things
L3	that are on the national list on my farm if I'm
L 4	going to use a synthetic.
L5	So, you do you narrow down the
L 6	number of things that are possible very quickly
L7	there.
L 8	In terms and again, I mean, I said
L 9	why I feel that they are different and why NOC
20	members feel that these are different than actual
21	food contact substances. And you can buy that
22	agreement or not.

1	But I think they are fundamentally
2	different because they do interact with the food
3	product.
4	So, I guess it does, you know, the
5	national list does narrow things down for people.
6	It does limit the number of things that are both
7	used and that the stakeholder evaluates versus
8	going to, you know, and FDA list that is I
9	don't know how many substances are on that and I
10	have no way to parse that out.
11	So, I mean, on IOSP, you know, I have
12	to justify when I'm going to use something and
13	it's I think it's pretty transparent.
14	I may not be answering your question
15	quite the way you're asking it, but I'm trying.
16	MEMBER SMITH: Yes, I mean, the same
17	would be true to of an operating using a resin.
18	They would have to justify it and then the
19	certifier would be evaluating whether or not it
20	was on this closed list of an FDA within an
21	FDA database.
22	And then, I had another question.

1	MR. ELA: I'm just trying to narrow
2	down the number of things that people can
3	evaluate and having knowledge of what is actually
4	being used.
5	MEMBER SMITH: Oh, the other thing I
6	was just going to clarify is that in the FDA
7	response back, they had advised us to use our own
8	definitions and that's what the proposal is
9	doing.
10	Thanks.
11	MR. ELA: Yes, and respectfully, our
12	members disagree with that. And so, you know,
13	and it, you know, it's obviously a gray area and
14	it's obviously been a long debate.
15	So, you know, we're going to fall on
16	the side of transparency.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We have another
18	question for you from Kim.
19	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Hi, Steve, just a
20	quick question, I'm going to shift gears
21	completely here.
22	We've heard a lot of comments back and

1	forth about how what platforms to use for
2	public comment and what is fair, what is
3	equitable.
4	And I've heard a few people within NOC
5	say that there's scholarships that are offered.
6	But I'm just curious, are the
7	scholarships offered to anybody or just NOC
8	members?
9	MR. ELA: Anybody, yes, they are not
L 0	limited to NOC members. Since NOC membership is
L1	are organizations and are affiliates, not
L2	individual people, and those scholarships are for
L3	local farmers to be able to attend those
L 4	meetings. So, it's an open ended process.
L5	And you know, I'm just going to say, I
L 6	have to say it because the NOSB is such a cool
L7	venue for organic stakeholders to have input and
L 8	it's one of the more notable boards of USDA
L 9	because of that.
20	And having a room full of people there
21	really brings home to USDA what you guys are
2.2	doing and the stakeholder input.

1	And having in person public comments
2	fills that room up and that may not be the only
3	reason, but it gives you guys an ability to do
4	things that you might not otherwise have. And I
5	think that's just really important.
6	It's a very visceral demonstration of
7	stakeholder involvement. And the groups that are
8	there, you know, I represent NOC and other
9	people, OTA, other OFA, all these other groups.
10	They are bringing voices of farmers
11	and consumers to that table in that room.
12	And so, you know, I push back on the
13	influence peddling of that. I think it's much
14	more dynamic and much more open than that.
15	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Thanks, Steve.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
17	questions for Steve?
18	(No response.)
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, we
20	appreciate your time.
21	MR. ELA: Look forward to seeing you
22	all next week. Take care.

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Take care.
2	Next up, we have Ginny Olson followed
3	by Jefferson Dean and then, Justin Raikes.
4	And after Justin, we're going to take
5	a break, folks.
6	MS. OLSON: I have a quick question,
7	do I move the slide then or does somebody move it
8	for me?
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Somebody will move
10	it for you, just say next slide when you're
11	ready.
12	MS. OLSON: Great, okay. And then
13	okay.
14	So, hello, my name is Ginny Olson and
15	I'm a crop insurance agent. I've been selling
16	crop insurance for over 20 years.
17	Next slide, please?
18	Okay, so transitioning to organic is a
19	huge financial risk, especially if it's a new
20	grower.
21	So, typically, a farmer is assigned a
22	county T yield and the conventional T yields are

1	quite higher than organic. And so, in my slide
2	here, you'll see that conventional corn has 194
3	bushel T yield, whereas transition corn has a 136
4	bushel.
5	Next to the county T yield, there's
6	also the values of the crop. So, you can see how
7	much lower the transition is valued at.
8	Why this is significant is that
9	lenders look at this value to determine if they
LO	will give an operating loan to the farmer so that
L1	he can transition to organic.
L2	Next slide, please?
L3	Actually, sorry, can I back up one?
L 4	One of the possible solutions for this
L5	would be to provide the producer with the option
L 6	to buy up their transition or organic T yield.
L 7	So, take their historical conventional
L 8	yields and combine it with the county T yields
L 9	and give the option to buy up their T yield.
20	Next slide?
21	Claims, the big thing with claims is
22	that organic claims are worked the same way as

1	conventional claims are, which means quality can
2	be vastly different.
3	So, if there is no yield loss, but the
4	organic buyer deems the organic grain has damage
5	and won't purchase it, the farmer is forced to
6	sell the organic food grade as feed grade, which
7	is a huge loss for them.
8	And so, what I'm recommending is that,
9	instead of using conventional guidelines to work
10	organic claims, why not create quality adjustment
11	factors to reflect more organically.
12	Or look at the price contract to
13	determine what the quality should be and then
14	work the organic claims off that.
15	Next slide, please?
16	This one, enterprise units, this is
17	huge. What we really need is enterprise units by
18	planting practice. So, we need EU by
19	conventional, EU by transition, and EU by
20	organic.
21	That way, the farmers can keep all of
22	their acres on one policy and not have to take

1	out two different policies.
2	Next slide, please?
3	The NOP guidelines do not match RMAs.
4	This is very frustrating for farmers. So, for
5	example, this fall, if a farmer is considered
6	transition right now, and this fall, he'll be
7	organic, I have to insure him as transition and
8	he can sell the crop as organic this fall.
9	I can't insure him as organic until
10	next year.
11	The other thing is, is the crop
12	insurance rules do not match USDA's but NOPs, so
13	we
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Go ahead and
15	finish.
16	MS. OLSON: Okay, thank you.
17	So, the farmers, I've asked the
18	farmers to submit their certificates by July 15th
19	and they oftentimes do not get them until the
20	fall.
21	Crop insurance rules require that you
22	have that contract in place before you file a

1	claim. So, if it's a fall claim, no big deal.
2	But if it's prevent plant, replant, or if they
3	want to destroy their crop, they have to have
4	that certificate in hand.
5	And my recommendation is could we like
6	consolidate? Could RMA and NOP get together and
7	consolidate the rules?
8	Thank you.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you.
LO	Oh, I'm taking those slides and
L1	reviewing them three more times, that was great.
12	Really appreciate you coming to speak with us.
13	Kim has a question for you.
L 4	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Hi, Ginny, thank you
15	so much for the slides that you've presented and
L 6	also the solutions that you suggested. I think
L7	that's very helpful.
L 8	My question is around quality. And
L 9	so, if I used a conventional product versus an
20	organic product and we're trying to determine
21	quality, can you expand a little bit more what
2.2	vou were what vou mean by the varying degrees

1	and how they should be not equitable between
2	conventional and organic?
3	MS. OLSON: Sure.
4	So, I'll use corn because that's
5	probably the easiest one, or well, okay, all
6	crops are easy when it comes to organics.
7	The test weight is a huge, huge I
8	see a huge difference in test weight. And then,
9	I also see a huge difference in just like the
10	kernel or whatever they consider as damage.
11	What would be accepted as conventional
12	is not necessarily accepted as organic.
13	And so
14	MEMBER HUSEMAN: So, are you saying
15	that organic has stricter test weight and the
16	damaged kernel or is it feed grade versus food
17	grade quality?
18	MS. OLSON: The feed and food is the
19	big one. So, Amy can help me answer this because
20	now I should have your example up. That happened
21	to us a couple years ago.
22	But the food and feed grade, that's a

1	huge thing. I guess where it's frustrating for
2	me is that we're stuck on the fact that, okay,
3	you've got the yield out there. So, go sell it.
4	You know, so a conventional corn
5	grower can sell it, you know, for ethanol. But
6	does an organic corn grower really want to sell
7	it as ethanol? But they're probably going to
8	have to because it was reduced down.
9	The buyer, you know, the buyer won't
10	accept it.
11	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Right
12	MS. OLSON: And so, the farmer
13	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Could I offer one
14	example possibly something from my field to crops
15	to see if it lines up with what you're saying?
16	If I have a contact for 13 percent
17	protein organic wheat, but then, I have to for
18	some reason, I get a lot of moisture and that
19	protein content goes down, it only hits 9 percent
20	which is not really going to make food grade in
21	most applications for baking.
22	It'll go into the feed market and

1	there may not even be a feed market for organic
2	available to me.
3	So, we have a gap of insurance where
4	we don't have products that really cover us given
5	all of the scenarios that may happen in a given
6	season.
7	MS. OLSON: Absolutely, absolutely.
8	Because when they're working the claim, they're
9	looking at the quality, right, to determine if
LO	your yield is going to be decreased.
L1	And so, they can apply the same
L2	conventional quality factors to it and your yield
13	might decrease a little, but it doesn't take into
L 4	account what happens to you when you try to sell
L 5	it.
L 6	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Okay.
L7	Yes, so, and I can be I mean, on
L 8	board with it would take it out of, I'll say,
L 9	organic status from a selling perspective.
20	But let's take like aflatoxin, for
21	example, you know, if the rules are I can see
22	a if the rules are the same for conventional

1	as they are organic and it falls outside of that
2	spectrum, from a quality perspective, I struggle
3	with redefining the rules just for organic
4	because quality can impact regardless if it's
5	organic or conventional.
6	If it has a 50-pound test weight, it
7	becomes a problem in a feed formula, I'm see that
8	with aflatoxin or if it's going to be used for
9	milling wheat or if it's going to be used for
10	feed wheat.
11	So, I just wanted to I see where
12	you're coming from and some of the perspectives
13	you have as far as it would fall out of organic
14	status based off of a quality or if it's just
15	MS. OLSON: You know, I'm sorry, I'm
16	interrupting, but you know what? I don't know if
17	that I guess I go back to the days like way
18	back when I used to insure sugar beets and
19	potatoes and, you know, I do canning crops,
20	right? We have process for contracts. The
21	adjusters have to refer to those.
22	So, what I'm saying is, could would

1	RMA entertain looking at the contract?
2	So, if a farmer has a contract and it
3	outlines what's expected of them to deliver, you
4	know, could we play within that guideline? Not
5	necessarily reinvent the wheel, I'm not saying
6	that. I'm just saying, hey, there might be a
7	simplistic solution here.
8	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Awesome.
9	Your information's been very valuable
10	today and I really appreciate you coming on and
11	taking the time to spend with us.
12	So, thank you.
13	MS. OLSON: Yes, thank you.
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: One quick question
15	for you, Ginny.
16	In this scenario that Kim was
17	exploring with you, in a big tent sense, it
18	doesn't have to just be organic. We could have
19	this contract addendum for quality B conventional
20	as well.
21	If you lose the opportunity to sell
22	food grade conventional, you're going to lose

1	value even in conventional or organics.
2	So, kind of, it can be anything for
3	anybody, right? It doesn't have to just be
4	organic. Would you agree with that?
5	MS. OLSON: Depending upon the crop,
6	yes.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Okay, yes, yes.
8	All right, we really, again,
9	appreciate your information and expertise today.
10	Thank you.
11	MS. OLSON: Thank you, have a good
12	one.
13	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up, we have
14	Jefferson Dean followed by Justin Raikes and then
15	we are going to break.
16	After the break, we're going to have
17	Alexis Dragovich, Harriet Behar, and then, Bryce
18	Irlbeck.
19	So, Jefferson, please go ahead.
20	MR. DEAN: Hello, I'm Jefferson Dean.
21	I'm an organic grain farmer. I farm with my
22	son, Timberlane Organic Farms.

1	I've been certified 30 years now and
2	I'm certified through OFA. And I'm also active
3	with OFA and the OFA Organic Grain Growers
4	Chapter.
5	First of all, I'd like to thank all
6	the Board Members for their service in NOSB.
7	It's I'm sure it's a lot of work and not a lot
8	of reward. So, I appreciate that.
9	Unfortunately, I think your
L 0	predecessors kind of did you a disservice by not
L1	addressing a lot of issues early on.
12	One of the issues is these meetings
L3	and the time frame for them. You know, they set
L 4	this up a long time ago to have these meetings in
L5	the spring and the fall and most of us farmers
L 6	are busy.
L 7	And it's very aggravating to us to
L 8	take off time, you know, it's a beautiful, sunny
L 9	day here and I should be out on the tractor right
20	now. And here I am, you know, figuring out what
21	I'm going to say and how I'm going to say it, and
2.2	you know, participating.

1	And I appreciate participating. In
2	fact, I my first time speaking to an NOSB was
3	through a NOC scholarship in Colorado a few years
4	ago. So, you know
5	And I believe the in person meetings
6	are very important and can't stress that enough.
7	So, I would like to see some kind of a
8	change in how farmers can participate in the
9	meetings. I'm sure a lot of farmers out there
LO	right now that would love to have their input.
L1	And they just can't. They're just too busy.
L2	You know, this time of year, we do the
L3	same thing in the fall all over again.
L 4	And I've been talking about this issue
L5	for quite a while.
L 6	I think Corey Struck's idea of having
L7	a winter listening session is a great idea. It's
L8	a great step and maybe you guys can take that and
L 9	run with it.
20	Maybe if you had more farmer
21	intervention in the beginning, and I'm not saying
22	you Board Members because this goes way back

1	maybe we wouldn't have this issue with the
2	hydroponics being certified when they don't deal
3	with soil.
4	You know, and right in the organic
5	regulations, it says we're required to have soil
6	and build soil and have crop rotation and
7	everything we need to have healthy soil and
8	healthy crops so we have healthy people from
9	organic food.
10	And here, you know, we're certifying
11	hydroponic operations that don't have soil. It
12	doesn't make any sense.
13	Maybe, you know, we needed more farmer
14	input back then, I don't know.
15	You know, it took ten years for, you
16	know, to write the regulations. You know, it
17	took a long time and they purposefully made a few
18	exceptions for crops without soil, some seedlings
19	and stuff.
20	They did not make any exception for
21	hydroponics. You know, that was on purpose.
22	It's ten years of everybody talking about it. So

1	
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We appreciate your
3	comments.
4	Any questions for Jefferson?
5	(No response.)
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I just have one
7	quick question for you, Jefferson. We've heard
8	very consistent messaging from NOC and from OFA,
9	I think both of whom are kind of aligned in this
10	messaging.
11	We have a very finite amount of time
12	to fix a lot of problems in the world as like a
13	species. We've got a lot of things staring us
14	down.
15	How do we not lose the forest for the
16	trees, taking time to comment about structure? I
17	liken it to, how do we go into a building and
18	solve the world's problems rather than looking
19	around saying we don't like the color of the
20	paint inside?
21	And so, when folks are coming to bring
22	us ideas, and this is something I request to

1	everyone, bring us your big ideas. I think, you
2	know, you have brought this up many times, but we
3	didn't get the chance to hear, what is actually
4	harming your farm?
5	You've kind of taken on the wedge
6	issues like hydroponics, but what's actually a
7	challenge on your farm as a grain producer in the
8	Mid-Atlantic Region? What's causing you pain and
9	what can we do about it?
10	And so, I would love to have you and
11	all the farmers that you come with send us these
12	ideas. I love the idea of a listening session.
13	I think it's great. But what would you say
14	during that listening session?
15	I think we talk constantly about how
16	do we get more farmers' voice, but we don't
17	necessarily hear from farmers those really well-
18	articulated solutions from what they'd like us to
19	do. What is our mandate? And send us forward.
20	So, the more we can get that, the more we can do
21	with it.
22	MR. DEAN: One of the things I would

1	like to say, the only thing that we have as
2	organic producers is our integrity. And when we
3	have things certified that are not organic, the
4	rest of the world points it out.
5	That's the first thing that goes to,
6	they say, oh, these guys are using this, they're
7	doing that and try to shoot down our integrity.
8	And that's all we have. And that's what we rely
9	on.
10	That's all the industry has. And if
11	that is hurt by certifying things that aren't
12	organic, then it hurts us. It hurts the whole
13	industry.
14	So, yes, I know it's a wedge issue,
15	but it's very important that we uphold the
16	integrity of organic so that we can continue as
17	an industry and continue to sell our crops.
18	Because if we can't sell our crops,
19	you know, with the organic label, then we won't
20	be organic farmers any more.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Have you heard or
22	have you experienced any loss as a grain farmer

1	or any conventional farmers to hydroponics? And
2	have you experienced any customers coming to you
3	saying that they feel like they've lost integrity
4	due to hydroponics being certified?
5	And if you do, I would love a summary
6	of those descriptions.
7	MR. DEAN: I can't speak to that
8	personally right now. I have had instances with
9	consumers in talking about that and other many
L 0	times, other grain producers pointing out all the
L1	kinds of little intricacies like hydroponics, you
L2	know, many times.
13	And a lot of times, it's like, well,
L 4	there's no sense in transitioning, you know, my
15	fields because it's not really organic anyway.
L 6	Look at all the stuff they allow, that type of
L7	thing.
L8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, well,
L 9	we always appreciate your comments. Thank you
20	for making the time. I hear it's a sunny day in
21	Ohio, so thank you for stepping away from the
22	field

1	MR. DEAN: Beautiful weather, thank
2	you.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yes, all right, be
4	well, thank you.
5	Next up, we have Justin Raikes, and
6	then we're going to take a break.
7	After Justin, we have Alexis
8	Dragovich.
9	Justin, please go ahead.
10	MR. RAIKES: All right, how about now?
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yes.
12	MR. RAIKES: Perfect, thanks. Well,
13	hey, thank you to the NOSB Board. I know that,
14	yes, this is a big time commitment.
15	Justin Raikes from Ashland, Nebraska.
16	You guys, you know, make possible what we do, so
17	appreciate all that.
18	We're a fifth generation grain farm on
19	2,500 acres going into year five of organic. We
20	produce corn, soybeans, alfalfa, rye, triticale
21	and buckwheat, some seeds, some other forages,
22	and we raise some conventional cattle as well.

1 You continued know, we owe our 2 existence and success to the organic program and 3 really become the leaders in its fundamental principles. So, again, just want to say thank 4 you to all of you. 5 We also want to continue to grow in 6 7 this program, both on the livestock side and with 8 further product areas. 9 Two areas, and I'll try to brief, I know I'm the last one before our break, the first 10 11 one, we strongly, strongly encourage the Board to 12 continue to work towards, you know, parity and 13 enforcement on the import side. That is an area of direct harm to us. 14 15 We 100 percent supporters are 16 geotagging. You know, agree with previous comments made on this. It's 17 an issue of integrity, 18 which is really fundamental to 19 everything that we're doing here. 20 We can't have a system where we're 21 staring down the barrel of going to prison for 2.2 fraud if we cheat or do something like that.

1	there is, you know, absolutely no corresponding
2	penalty of any kind to any importer who's
3	actively doing the same thing.
4	So, we are all in favor of parity in
5	the standards and enforcement in any and all ways
6	possible. You know, geotagging, like I said, a
7	100 percent in favor of.
8	And then, you know, any other ideas to
9	add information to the certificate that the Board
10	thinks will work.
11	There's I'll cut my comments on
12	this really short, there's been a lot of good
13	discussion on crop insurance, really agree with
14	several of the last speakers.
15	The percent of APH approach, I think
16	is that's a good idea. And if there'd been a,
17	you know, I think Ginny had a bunch of great
18	suggestions. Just want to continue to encourage
19	you guys to keep working in that area.
20	You know, there was a little bit of
21	discussion about what it would take to bring more
22	producers in. And honestly, I think the crop

Τ	insurance thing is kind of a big deal on that.
2	You know, there's probably a lot of
3	issues that would prevent Midwest grain people
4	from continuing to come in.
5	You know, the risk management thing is
6	a big deal. They're going to be staring down the
7	barrel of, you know, looking at, you know, a
8	really strong APH they've spent 20-plus years
9	building and then have to throw that in the
10	garbage to start over and do organic.
11	So, again, appreciate you guys,
12	everything you do. And I'll cut it there.
13	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And we appreciate
14	you. Thank you so much for joining us today.
15	Questions from the Board?
16	Amy, please go ahead.
17	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes, thank you, Nate,
18	and thanks, Justin, for joining us here today.
19	Appreciate your comments, I really take them to
20	heart.
21	The one question I do have for you or
22	the risk management, you mentioned the incredible

1	amount of diversity that you have in your fields.
2	I was just curious, are you able to
3	get crop insurance for all of those rotational
4	crops outside of corn and soybeans, organic crop
5	insurance?
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Oh, you are muted,
7	Justin.
8	MR. RAIKES: Here go, sorry.
9	Yes, no we are not, Amy.
L 0	MEMBER BRUCH: And then, on your corn
L1	and soybeans, and I know past speakers have
L2	talked about this, but the yields then which you
L3	have, is it the price that's a problem with the
L 4	crop insurance on corn organic corn and soy or
L5	is it the actual level of coverage?
L 6	MR. RAIKES: I would say it's the
L7	level of coverage. Yes, I think the T yield hit
L 8	that you take is significant. And then, you
L 9	know, you're ability to carry forward any, you
20	know, any previous history at all.
21	I mean, the complete restart, I think,
22	is a real challenge. And what it has done is

1	forced a self-selecting group of people who are,
2	you know, very risk on and how they look at life
3	maybe and how they look at their operations, and
4	say, you know, let's screw it, we'll just throw
5	all that in the trash and give this a shot and
6	take what comes.
7	And so, you know, if we want to expand
8	beyond that, I think that the reality is the, you
9	know, the APH thing is a big deal.
10	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you, Justin.
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We really
12	appreciate you joining us today, Justin. Thank
13	you for your comments.
14	All right, folks, let's take a break.
15	We'll come back in ten minutes. So, ten minutes
16	to the next hour, hope you get some water and
17	we'll see you here in just a bit.
18	After the break, we're going to have
19	Alexis Dragovich, Harriet Behar, and Bryce
20	Irlbeck.
21	All right, see you in a bit.
22	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter

1	went off the record at 2:40 p.m. and resumed at
2	2:50 p.m.)
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Alrighty, Alexis,
4	when you are ready, the floor is yours. Please
5	go ahead and state your name and affiliation, and
6	can't wait to hear your comments.
7	MS. DRAGOVICH: Hi, I'm Alexis
8	Dragovich. I'm with Mud Run Farm, and I'm also
9	an OFA member. I'm from Northeast Ohio, and I'm
LO	a second-generation farmer and I co-manage a
L1	certified organic farm with my dad.
L2	Since 2007, we have been certified for
L3	vegetables, row crops and chicken eggs, and in
L 4	2020 we obtained the certified Hamlin certificate
L5	when we started an on-farm flour mill.
L 6	We sell direct to consumers via
L7	farmer's markets and independent grocers.
L8	As you can imagine and everyone has
L 9	been talking about, this is a really busy time
20	for us and other farmers, and to be honest, I
21	almost failed on presenting any comments here
2.2	today, because it's currently 77 degrees, sunny

1	and dry outside, and I'm still a little out of
2	breath because I ran up here, because I almost
3	bailed again because this session is running 90
4	minutes behind. But I'm here, I'm a little out
5	of breath, and am okay.
6	But I decided against it because there
7	are some things that I care about, first of those
8	being farmers access to these types of
9	conversations.
10	Spring and fall are less than ideal
11	when you are competing with the weather and have
12	short windows to get things done, as well as
13	sprinkling my passion and attention elsewhere, as
14	I'm thinking about all that needs to be
15	accomplished.
16	And not offer a November through March
17	calendar, which could offer more inclusivity.
18	The next item I'd like to speak to is
19	that of crop insurance.
20	Now, our farm does not use crop
21	insurance. On our farm we instead focus or
22	diversity. We don't have any one main cash crop,

1	which actually makes things a lot harder.
2	Different crops mean different
3	planting and harvest times, different planting
4	and harvest equipment, and it would be nice if
5	there was crop insurance that was available for
6	farms our size, so that we can utilize the safety
7	net that works.
8	And my final comment is on that of
9	hydroponics being certified organic. I was
10	recently asked to be on a panel where we
11	discussed things that the NOP has gotten right,
12	and things that may have been wrong.
13	And the number one thing that was
14	mentioned as what were right were the standards,
15	the rules for all of us to follow.
16	And they are the same rules, no matter
17	what you grow, or the size of the operation.
18	What are the standards for
19	hydroponics? How can they comply with Citation
20	205-203, soil fertility, and crop nutrition
21	management, and how can they maintain or improve
22	soil organic matter when they have none.

1	On our farm, soil health and land
2	stewardship offers a great sense of pride for us
3	and something we work at everyday.
4	And as a consumer, when I buy
5	something with the organic label, I assume that
6	they were grown outside. And when I learned that
7	they are actually grown in containers or in a
8	building, it feels a little bit like a trick. My
9	dad actually calls these CAFO lots for plants.
10	So, to us organics is all about the
11	soil. And I think hydroponics does have a place
12	in agriculture. I just don't think that place is
13	in organics.
14	So, thank you for your time and your
15	service to this Board.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And gosh dang,
17	thank you for running of the hills to talk to us.
18	That's great. I mean, that is huge.
19	MS. DRAGOVICH: Okay, so my face is
20	all red and
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: That's a moniker
22	of pride. Nice work. Thank you for being able

1	to make it over.
2	Are there questions from the Board for
3	Alexis? I just have a quick question for you,
4	Alexis.
5	How does information flow to you from
6	OFA? So, we had an exhaustive analysis done on
7	the timing of the meeting, and unfortunately, it
8	came to, for a lot of reasons given it being a
9	national board and many other factors we
10	landed on the only times that work are this
11	April/October, which sets for all of us who are
12	in the upper two-thirds of the country. But it's
13	just sort of how it is.
14	Has OFA not explained that to you? Or
15	what are you missing on that? I love the idea
16	that all of you have said about the third listing
17	session, but we did so much work it took a lot
18	of Board time to do that analysis at the
19	request of OFA farmers.
20	And it seems like that may not have
21	made it back to you. I was just wondering if
22	you've heard about that analysis?

1	MS. DRAGOVICH: Yeah, OFA does great
2	giving us information. It still doesn't work
3	though. I mean, it's still planting season.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Mm-hmm, mm-hmm.
5	Would you rather me to take a week away well
6	actually, I have a theoretical for you.
7	If we had the in-person during April,
8	is it easier for you to get here on Zoom, or
9	would you be able to take a week away, if April
10	and October are immovable?
11	MS. DRAGOVICH: Would I be able to
12	take a week away in October, or in April? I
13	mean, I don't know.
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Okay.
15	MS. DRAGOVICH: Perhaps, probably not.
16	I mean, if this April's like this April.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yeah. And so, do
18	you feel like if your comment is heard now, along
19	with everybody else's, virtually, that it's fair
20	to all farmers, to some farmers who can get away,
21	come and have their voices elevated by them
22	giving in-person comments, given the timing of

1	this meeting?
2	MS. DRAGOVICH: I think of all the
3	people that we're missing, that could be here if
4	it wasn't in April.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: So, just virtual
6	versus in-person, if April's not up for debate.
7	Well, do you feel like it's a point of equity to
8	make it so that everybody can run in from their
9	farms, call in from the tractor, and let their
10	voice be heard?
11	MS. DRAGOVICH: Yes, I think that's
12	important.
13	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Okay, we really
14	appreciate your time today. Thank you so much.
15	MS. DRAGOVICH: Thank you.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, next up
17	we have Harriet Behar, followed by Bryce Irlbeck,
18	and then Linley Dixon. Harriet?
19	MS. BEHAR: Can you hear me? Yes, I'm
20	off mute.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yes, please go
22	ahead.

1	MS. BEHAR: Okay. Hello, my name is
2	Harriet Behar, and I'm affiliated with the
3	Organic Farmer's Association and the National
4	Organic Coalition.
5	I'm a past chair of the NOSB, a
6	long-time organic inspector advocate, and an
7	organic farmer in Southwest Wisconsin, who just
8	ran up from the greenhouse.
9	The petitioning process for
LO	ingredients listed on 205-606 needs to be
L1	improved.
L2	The NOSB and the public should not
L3	have to spend their time reviewing an
L 4	agricultural ingredient for 606 without a clear
L5	presentation by the petitioner, of what are the
L 6	barriers to overcome other organic production for
L7	that ingredient, and what has been done by the
L 8	petitioner to overcome those barriers, before
L 9	they feel they should be listed as not
20	commercially available.
21	In my written comments, I refer to NOP
2.2	Guidance 3011, which should be improved to

1	include additional questions that must be
2	answered in a petition.
3	Is there a need to pre-contract with
4	organic growers? Do minimum runs at
5	manufacturing facilities affect the availability?
6	And what has been done to overcome this?
7	If the quality of the organic product
8	is an issue, what is being done to work with
9	suppliers to meet their product specifications?
L 0	These are just examples of what the
L1	petitioner should do, and not wait for the NOSE
L2	review of a petition, and then these questions
L3	are asked.
L 4	This improvement is needed to free up
L5	NOSB and NOP to deal with more complicated
L 6	issues.
L7	While more tools in the toolbox are
L 8	seen sometimes as positive by many producers, I
L 9	would like to challenge that assumption.
20	Unless the tools are systems-based
21	approaches, and not just input substitution
22	between non-organic and organic production, our

1	regulation requires cultural, mechanical, and
2	biological activities be performed before the use
3	of approved synthetics.
4	Organic agriculture respects and
5	emulates natural systems, rather than
6	manipulating the web of life.
7	Diverse crop rotations, improvement of
8	the ecology, and biodiversity on the farm, all
9	contribute to long-term success that I have seen
10	and experienced on mature organic farms, instead
11	of the destructive, toxic materials and GMOs used
12	on most non-organics farms.
13	Reliance on an ever-increasing list of
14	approved synthetics in organic discourages
15	research and experimentation into the
16	systems-based approaches that we need for
17	long-term productivity.
18	I am not against all synthetics, but I
19	encourage the NOSB to prioritize promotion of
20	organic systems over materials, when you are
21	reviewing.
22	Organic agriculture offers the wrong

1	solutions to many of our environmental woes.
2	Continuous improvement is needed within the NOP
3	regulations, to remove the incentive to destroy
4	native ecosystems to more quickly access the
5	organic market.
6	Inappropriate organic hydroponic
7	systems, including the thousands of acres
8	containers to produce perennial crops, needs to
9	be added to the work agenda, using the ways of
10	how they meet the band-aid of soil and
11	biodiversity improvement, and not just that they
12	use approved materials. Thank you.
13	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We appreciate your
14	comments. Any questions for Harriet from the
15	Board? All right, Amy. Oh, sorry, not Amy.
16	Mindee, please go ahead.
17	MEMBER JEFFERY: Thank you for your
18	comments, Harriet. Do you think that updating
19	the petition template would be the best way to
20	address your suggestion?
21	MS. BEHAR: Yes.
22	MEMBER JEFFERY: Thank you.

1	MS. BEHAR: And that it be returned to
2	the petitioner if they haven't answered the
3	questions.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, thank
5	you, Harriet. We appreciate you.
6	MS. BEHAR: Back to the greenhouse.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All righty. Next
8	up we have Bryce Irlbeck, followed by Linley
9	Dixon, and then Tim Cada. Bryce, the floor is
10	yours.
11	MR. IRLBECK: Thank you. My name is
12	Bryce Irlbeck and I'm owner of AgriSecure, data
13	apply and farm management. I've worked with
14	farmers across the U.S. when we're getting
15	certification, and also an organic farmer in Iowa
16	and Nebraska.
17	I would first like to thank everybody
18	on the Board for holding these comments and
19	having them online, because the accessibility, as
20	a farmer, is great. I don't have time to travel
21	and do this, so I want to say thank you for doing
22	this.

1	And I could get onboard with changing
2	time, but everybody's busy year-round, so you can
3	change time a million times and not make
4	everybody happy, but the accessibility has been
5	great.
6	But today I want to talk about two
7	things: strengthening the organic enforcements,
8	and the foreign imports and the GO reference to
9	those foreign imports.
LO	And so, the first item is
L1	strengthening organic enforcement, and I believe
L2	we are headed in the right direction. We just
L3	need to move faster than we are right now.
L 4	And the way we're moving, and more
L5	paperwork, more documentation, that seems to not
L 6	be working, in terms of from the American
L7	farmers' side and the import side.
L 8	So, I think there's other ways to do
L 9	that, and we'll get to it later in the
20	presentation. And if we do not move quickly, I
21	have a fear. I work with farmers, and we are
22	seeing a severe reduction of organic acres coming

1	down the pipeline, and I think that we'll
2	continue to see that if we don't get this
3	straightened out.
4	And just to put this in perspective,
5	this morning I had had a higher bid on non-GMO
6	soybeans and organic soybeans. And this is an
7	economic type of situation.
8	The second part of this is GC
9	referencing. I think it's just a small start,
LO	but I highly agree with it. I think it's a good
L1	thing to have and have as an organic producer,
12	and as an organic certifier, to mark those fields
L3	and know where they are.
L 4	My next comments are going to be a bit
15	facetious, but just kind of the overall thought
L 6	process of what we're thinking about with
L 7	stronger enforcement of organic.
L 8	But I'd like to have GO reference
L 9	fields, because I'd like to go meet the producers
20	that are producing for half the cost of what we
21	can in the United States in some of these
22	countries.

1	I'd like to learn their economic ways,
2	their technology and their expertise, that we
3	just don't have in the United States because we
4	can't produce them that cheap.
5	Again, I think we look at this as a
6	picture. And I will read three countries that
7	we're importing from right now: Togo, Africa;
8	Ghana, Africa; and Tanzania, Africa, which is my
9	favorite because I farm there and been there. I
10	have a 12,000-acre rice farm there.
11	And just in order, Togo, 23.8 percent
12	malnutrition; Ghana, 24.2; Tanzania, 34 percent
13	malnutrition.
14	We are importing food from those
15	nations that can't feed themselves. So, morally
16	and socially, if we don't think it's fraudulent,
17	then we are doing the right thing as organic
18	producers, importers, in the whole system.
19	So, I will stop there. Again, I hope
20	the higher picture is to look at this as the
21	totality, and think about it.
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We really

1 appreciate your comments and, again, as a farmer taking the time out of your busy schedule. 2 Ι 3 realize you probably have many other things to be, other places to be, and thank you for joining 4 Questions for Bryce from the Board. 5 us. a quick question for 6 have 7 Bryce. When we talk about the sort of the ethical obligation of possibly beina 8 net 9 importer of grain from food-insecure countries to 10 feed our organic livestock, or our other 11 ingredient industries, it seems like that's going 12 to fall outside the scope of standards, which is 13 what this Board is in charge of. How do we start to think bigger than 14 just this Board, as far as building coalitions to 15 16 put pressure on the right agencies, the right 17 aspects of USDA, and just the organic community 18 in general, to start tackling issues that are as 19 big as this? 20 MR. IRLBECK: Yeah, so I think there's 21 multiple ways to do that. But as farmers, it's 2.2 starting to make people aware. And farmers are

1	at the point where we are going to take it on
2	ourselves to make people aware of what's going
3	on.
4	And I think it's a social issue that
5	drives down from the brands on down, that people
6	are purchasing organic for the right reasons
7	and I think they do but I don't think the
8	brands would be happy to know where it's coming
9	from and what we're doing in the importation of
10	that from these third-world countries.
11	And so, I think it's a three-pronged
12	approach, with brands, the farmers, and the
13	regulatory people.
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Really appreciate
15	that.
16	MR. IRLBECK: These people in Tanzania
17	and Togo I name a few of them, but there's a
18	lot. There's a lot of countries like this. They
19	aren't making more money because they're getting
20	organic. It's not helping them out.
21	I've lived there and seen it. It is a
22	handful of people getting rich moving products an

1	ocean. And I'm not going to say whether they're
2	organic or not. We can all make up our minds on
3	that.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy has a question
5	for you.
6	MEMBER BRUCH: Bryce, hi. Thanks for
7	your time today. I just had a quick question.
8	You had a lot that you conveyed to us. I
9	appreciate your comments.
10	I wanted to ask about farmer retention
11	you mentioned. I know you interact with a lot of
12	producers, and you mentioned that we're losing
13	acres.
14	Can you quantify that a little bit
15	better for the Board?
16	MR. IRLBECK: Yes. So, I would say in
17	our network, which is pretty large producers that
18	spent a lot of money to get into it. It's ten to
19	twenty percent of the acres.
20	And I would say on our own farm, we've
21	already probably taken out ten percent of the
22	acres. It just doesn't make sense not

1	economically, and not socially to do it for
2	what we're doing. So, I'd say it's anywhere in
3	between the ten to twenty percent.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Franklin has a
5	question for you.
6	MEMBER QUARCOO: Yes, in some of the
7	countries that you mentioned, one of the main
8	things is that labor is a lot cheaper. Are there
9	other reasons that you think makes the prices
10	more competitive, apart from labor?
11	MR. IRLBECK: Yes, so I completely
12	understand the labor is cheaper. And then we
13	cheapen up the product.
14	There's other things that are more
15	expensive in those countries as well getting
16	seed and fertilizer and technology, and all that
17	stuff.
18	So, I think it's offsetting. And so,
19	it's not clear to me why they can produce a lot
20	cheaper. And in talking into some of those
21	countries, I wonder if they're actually getting
22	more for their grain organically than what we're

1	seeing.
2	So, I don't have a clear answer on why
3	it is cheaper.
4	MEMBER QUARCOO: Thank you.
5	MR. IRLBECK: Yep.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
7	for Bryce. Bryce, just as a farmer, what do you
8	see as one of the biggest opportunities to drive
9	demand and expand the organic marketplace?
10	MR. IRLBECK: Stability. Instability.
11	And it comes from chickens to dairies, to making
12	milkshakes. Stability drives business.
13	And whether you have \$40 soybeans, and
14	then you go down to \$20 soybeans, and it really
15	drives the stability if people do not make and
16	actually pull out of it, because the natural
17	human reaction is, when it's unstable, you don't
18	do it.
19	And so, it's along the entire chain.
20	And that's not to say we can't import stuff. I
21	think \$20 soybeans are not profitable in the U.S.
22	vast majority of operations. \$25 to \$35 works in

1	a lot of operations. It works with dairies, it
2	works with chickens, it works with and that's
3	probably where they should be, if you let the
4	natural markets forces react to it.
5	And so we see these wild things from
6	\$20 to \$40. They'll go back up to \$40 sometimes
7	when they shut down those routes that they've
8	popped up after India.
9	And so, you're going to see these
10	instability swings, and you're going to see
11	people not invest into the marketplace.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Huge. Thank you
13	for that. Kim has a question for you.
14	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Yeah, just a quick
15	follow-up question. And, Bryce, I really
16	appreciate you coming on as a farmer today and
17	speaking to us. Continue to grow those crops,
18	please.
19	My question is, is it a target dollar
20	figure that's creating the increase or decrease
21	of acres, or is it relational to the other
22	opportunity costs? And how can we attack back,

1	if that's possible?
2	MR. IRLBECK: Yeah, so it's always in
3	relation to other opportunity costs. If I can
4	grow non-GMO soybeans, and spend half of my
5	personal time actually, probably 80 percent
6	less than my time doing that at a higher
7	dollar figure, in America we're going to do that.
8	And that's just the capitalist way.
9	And so, it's priced in its
10	relationship to what are the other opportunities
11	in the growth. And so, I think it's both of
12	those.
13	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Would it be helpful
14	to have more marketing tools that would be
15	aligned at a percentage above conventional? Do
16	you think that would give some stability to the
17	market?
18	MR. IRLBECK: I wouldn't be in favor
19	of that. I'm in favor of free markets. And it's
20	just if we enforce the rules that we have, free
21	market would play.
22	And we can still import. I'm not

1	saying that those countries are in, some people
2	are doing it right and some people are doing it
3	wrong.
4	It's just when you dump more soybeans
5	in the U.S. market than you can actually handle,
6	you drop these prices down. And some of them
7	aren't organic.
8	I'm not going to reference the
9	percentage, but we get dumped on, and now organic
10	is very difficult to make work on a farm, in
11	terms of soybeans.
12	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Thanks.
13	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Carolyn has a
14	question for you.
15	MR. IRLBECK: I think you might be on
16	mute. There you go.
17	MEMBER DIMITRI: I've got it. Thank
18	you, Bryce. I don't actually have a question.
19	It's more of a comment. It seems like these
20	issues that you raise have been embedded in our
21	truth system for so long, and I think that's kind
22	of where the original farm bill came in, trying

1	to help support farm viability and farm just
2	like the existence of farms.
3	And as you were talking, I was
4	thinking, maybe one thing that we like, I
5	don't think this is anything any one of us can do
6	anything about.
7	But it's like that tradeoff between
8	having a resilient food system, versus one that
9	sort of responds really quickly to changes in
10	prices.
11	So, I think because we have this very
12	natural response to price changes, which
13	obviously they make sense, what we have at the
14	end is so much less resiliency in our food
15	system.
16	And, I mean, I think it's a huge
17	social problem. And I personally don't have any
18	of the answers for this. But I appreciate you
19	bringing up the topic.
20	MR. IRLBECK: It's not an easy one, I
21	can tell you that.
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: But raising it is

1	so important. So, I really appreciate you
2	bringing it to us. I think this is one of those
3	issues that it doesn't happen overnight, but it
4	does give us something to chew on.
5	If and when and this goes to all
6	farmers and everybody on the call if and when
7	you come up with solutions, send them to us.
8	Like, we want your solutions, and we want to be
9	able to try to do things with them.
10	So, we really appreciate the time, and
11	the time it's taken to consider this and so
12	clearly articulate the problem, Bryce. Really
13	appreciate it.
14	MR. IRLBECK: Thank you. I appreciate
15	every one.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, take
17	care.
18	Next up we have Linley Dixon, followed
19	by Tim Cada, and then Steve Spreinkel.
20	Linley, the floor is yours.
21	MS. DIXON: Perfect timing, speaking
22	of solutions. My name is Linley Dixon. I'm the

1	co-director of the Real Organic Project. I own
2	an organic vegetable farm in Southwest Colorado,
3	specializing in soil-grown tomatoes, greens,
4	cucumbers, peppers, berries, and herbs.
5	These are the most profitable crops
6	for a diversified vegetable farm. They're also
7	the same crops whose markets are being flooded
8	with hydroponics certified as organic.
9	I'd be happy to talk about the
10	economic impact in the Q&A.
11	The Real Organic Project was formed to
12	provide greater transparency and integrity to the
13	organic label. It was formed because right now
14	we don't know if our organic blueberries come
15	from operations that raise their container six
16	inches above the land, on plastic stands, so they
17	can spray prohibited herbicides immediately
18	before getting certified.
19	These are the industry workarounds to
20	the rules. And this is the insanity that results
21	from certifying operations that don't foster
22	healthy soils.

1	Real Organic was formed because when
2	we buy organic milk, we don't know if it's coming
3	from the ever-expanding CAFOs in the arid West.
4	Consumers want to support organic
5	dairy without also depleting their aquifers.
6	Consumers want to support organic dairies that
7	don't get drought exemptions for the DMI grazing
8	requirements year-after-year.
9	As wonderful as reform of the NOP
LO	would be, it's Real Organic Project's immediate
L1	goal to ensure that people can identify the food
L2	that they actually want to buy.
13	We've approved over 1,000 farms to our
L 4	add-on standards. That number will continue to
L5	grow.
L 6	Our certified farmers include many
L7	farmer NOSB members, many organic pioneers, and
L8	new organic farmers, across the country.
L 9	Our soil health standards require what
20	is actually written in the law. If you read
21	OFPA, you know that organic is so much more than
22	food produced with inputs from the national list,

1	which is more and more what it's becoming.
2	We simply need better enforcement of
3	OFPA from the NOP, and we need enforcement from
4	the NOP on certifiers.
5	There are certifiers that would never
6	approve the CAFO dairies that are certified by
7	the Texas Department of Agriculture, organic
8	certifiers, Oregon Tilth.
9	There are certifiers that would never
LO	certify disposable plastic container farms.
L1	Instead of enforcing the law, the NOP
12	is citing certifiers for refusing to certify
13	these operations.
L 4	Remember, OFPA calls for the
L5	establishment of an NOSB not only to approve
L 6	substances for the national list, but also to,
L 7	quote, provide recommendations to the secretary
L 8	regarding implementation of the act. Things have
L 9	not gone well for a long time, and the community
20	is skeptical about the future.
21	We're at a critical moment in organic.
22	Farmers who can afford to, are walking away.

1	But we're here. Real Organic has not
2	walked away. Many of our farms depend on the
3	organic seal, even though it no longer represents
4	the way they farm.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any questions for
6	Linley? Allison, please go ahead.
7	MEMBER JOHNSON: Thanks so much for
8	your comments, Linley. I'm in the, I guess,
9	fortunate position of having joined the Board
LO	after this issue came up previously. So, I'm a
L1	new face in kind of uplinks. I've been following
L2	along, but don't have a position formed yet.
L3	And you touched on one of the issues
L 4	that I think is really important, and that I'm
L5	weighing as I'm listening to everyone today and
L 6	on Tuesday, and looking through red lines.
L7	And that is the issue of pesticide
L8	use. So, I care about organic for many reasons,
L 9	but very high on the list is reducing use of
20	pesticides.
21	And I'm curious what you think how the
22	tradeoffs play out. If we're worried about

1	applying an herbicide before a hydroponic
2	operation is set up, but then that operation
3	cannot use pesticides to produce the products
4	that it sells, if we take away the option of
5	being certified organic, will they use those
6	pesticides?
7	Are we losing an opportunity to at
8	least reduce pesticide use, even if we're not
9	maximizing the full potential of organic benefits
10	in that operation?
11	MS. DIXON: No, there's a lot there.
12	There's something that we've noticed, and that a
13	little slogan that we say, which is, allowing a
14	cheaper form of production actually ends up
15	mandating it.
16	It doesn't create a bigger tent. It
17	actually puts a lot of farmers out of business,
18	and especially if it's not an organic production
19	practice by law. We've seen it with CAFO poultry
20	porches. It's very hard to find a pasture-raised
21	organic egg out there.
22	So, you have this concept of

1	continuous improvement. If organic doesn't do
2	it, another label will come out. There's lots of
3	labels on the marketplace right now.
4	There's no reason why a hydroponic
5	nose spray, or approved spray label, can't come
6	out that differentiates themselves. It's simply
7	not an organic way of producing food, and
8	allowing it is mandating it.
9	So, to watch all of these organic
LO	farmers go out of business who are it takes
L1	money.
12	All we think about is how to foster
L3	our soils, the fertility in our soils, in an
L 4	environmentally sustainable way.
L5	Especially, we all got into this for
L 6	principles, so talk about organic really being
L 7	relevant and growing into the future.
L 8	Our last person who testified said it
L 9	was stability. I believe it's integrity and
20	continuing to improve in the face of climate
21	change.
22	In the face of training aguifers

1	organic needs to stay relevant. So, I don't
2	believe it's going to result we also mentioned
3	that they spray herbicides before putting the
4	pots up. And also, they're spraying pesticides
5	to transition greenhouses.
6	They take them out of organic
7	production, can spray anything they want, and
8	then put it back in.
9	So, it's just insane that this is not
10	an organic system. It's definitely the result of
11	no rules around how do we even have oversight
12	over hydroponic systems? I'll stop there.
13	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Brian has a
14	question for you.
15	MEMBER CALDWELL: Thanks, Linley.
16	Just wondering, I'd like to hear some of the
17	specifics about impacts of hydroponic producers
18	on your operation.
19	MS. DIXON: My operation in
20	particular, so we compete, we wholesale cherry
21	tomatoes, and so we compete in the marketplace
22	for shelf space there.

1	We definitely have not we had a
2	boom right after COVID hit, and put in another
3	greenhouse. And we have had trouble wholesaling
4	those since COVID went away.
5	There are these weird spikes talk
6	about resilience where all of a sudden the
7	stores can't get cherry tomatoes, for some
8	reason, from somewhere else.
9	And there's this huge demand for them
10	and they give us a call. But we actually
11	we're not going to expand our operation right
12	now. Our markets are really, really tight, and
13	they come and go.
14	We heard from another farmer that's
15	part of the Real Organic Project, that sells
16	cherry tomato pints twelve per flat or something,
17	I'm not exactly sure how she phrased it.
18	But for twelve cherry tomato pints, it
19	was \$15 for those twelve pints. And she can't
20	let it go below \$15, in order to make it work,
21	and it's now coming in below \$15.
22	So, it's definitely impacting

1	soil-grown cherry tomatoes across the country.
2	But we can actually start asking a lot more of
3	that data before the fall, if you'd like, of our
4	farmers.
5	MEMBER CALDWELL: Great, thank you.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
7	questions for Linley? I have a good question for
8	you, Linley.
9	We're thinking about the next version
LO	of organics. And I knew the Board getting 2.0,
L1	3.0, that's all already been taken sort of
L2	another name for it.
13	But realizing that standards aren't
L 4	going to save us, standards are going to be a
L 5	nice way for us to catalyze and organize.
L 6	But when we look at every conventional
L 7	dairy that's gone out of business in Wisconsin,
L8	in Montana we used to have 1,300 areas in my
L 9	valley, we have four now and there's bigger
20	market issues that are plaguing us.
21	And it seems intellectually dishonest
2.2	in our community to not tackle those, similar to

1	how and I don't know if this is a stretch
2	saying to a worker, you should just get more
3	education if you want to raise your wages,
4	versus, you should just unionize, and then you'll
5	be able to have some bargaining power.
6	At what point do we embrace collective
7	action as a means to build selling power for
8	farmers, versus throwing stones at each other and
9	saying that some of us aren't as good as others?
10	And I think you can kind of bucket it
11	as scale, right? Big vs. little, and little
12	needs to get together. Needs to get together to
13	be able to form some market power.
14	And so, how do we build that market
15	power, and how do we build coalitions that says,
16	we've got standards as one bucket, but and I'm
17	here to tell you, not that hard to meet the
18	30-day grazing rule. It's just not. It's pretty
19	low.
20	So, lots of dairies could do it.
21	Really big dairies. But is that the question?
22	Or is the question, even if they can meet it, we

1	still deserve to have small dairies in business.
2	We still deserve to have family farms.
3	Actually, the reality for a lot of American
4	communities.
5	So, how do we expand our tent to make
6	it so that we are working with coalitions who are
7	thinking about organizing farmers, unionizing
8	farmers, building market power, in addition to
9	being organic?
LO	MS. DIXON: Nate, that was a lot to
L1	respond to. I had many thoughts as you were
L2	speaking. Let's see what I can make of them all.
L3	You brought up dairies. I guarantee
L 4	you if we would get rid of those CAFOs in Texas
L5	and my home state of Colorado, we would see a lot
L 6	more of those small dairy farms in Wisconsin.
L7	Mark Kastel gave very good data on that. So,
L 8	it's important
L 9	(Simultaneous speaking.)
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: If I may, that
21	doesn't answer my question, and just for time.
22	So, say those folks are out. You're still going

1	to run into that we have very few options to keep
2	small farms going.
3	Even there's no cheating in
4	conventional. Everyone's got the same rules and
5	the bigs still win. So, big is going to win if
6	not given some sort of organizing.
7	So, how do we bring in that organizing
8	component into our movement, to say that organic
9	and organizing go together? There is a marriage
10	there.
11	MS. DIXON: Yeah, I think Real Organic
12	Project is doing that, so it's a great question.
13	Maybe that's why you're asking me.
14	I think continuous improvement has
15	always been part of the organic movement, and the
16	NOSB was created to actually implement that
17	continuous improvement from the organic
18	stakeholders.
19	And when that started to go away wher
20	we actually saw it getting worse and the system
21	not working, the organic farmers came together
22	and said, okay, well, we could do this as a

1	standalone.
2	Many people wanted that, much like
3	when OFPA was first formed, many people wanted to
4	do this without the government. But we said, no,
5	this is something that we need to do in order to
6	get help from the government.
7	You've touched on a lot of things. I
8	understand that capitalism is a problem. I'm not
9	going to take down capitalism.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Never mind
11	capitalism, but I just how do we I haven't
12	heard Real Organic
13	(Simultaneous speaking.)
14	MS. DIXON: You know, I think it's
15	you spoke quite a bit, so I'll go ahead and
16	respond.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I haven't heard
18	Real Organic Project give a solution to how we
19	organize, other than just the standards. Is
20	there a way we go beyond the standards, instead
21	of saying, organizing is tough. Forming co-ops,
22	forming unions, tough.

1	MS. DIXON: Well, I actually think we
2	do organize beyond the standards. We put on all
3	these symposia, and produce a lot of videos to
4	educate the world about what organic means and
5	the principles, and we form alliances around the
6	world.
7	So, I think that was very much a part
8	of the organic movement. I think we need to
9	continue doing it. And I think when we started
10	to lose that, the Real Organic Project formed.
11	So, we do do a lot more than just
12	standards. We do a lot of educational and
13	bringing the community together.
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We appreciate your
15	time today. Thank you. Next up we have Tim
16	Cada, followed by Steve Spreinkel if you're on,
17	and then Meggan Hain. Tim, if you're there, the
18	floor is yours.
19	MR. CADA: Just listening to the last
20	gal talk, integrity is 95 percent of organics.
21	Anyway, my name is Tim Cada.
22	(Audio interference.)

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Oh, we're losing
2	you, Tim.
3	MR. CADA: Oh, can you hear me now?
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We can. You're
5	very quiet. If it's
6	(Audio interference.)
7	MR. CADA: If I could get off this
8	speaker, I would. But I don't know how to do
9	that.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All good. Go
11	ahead, go ahead.
12	MR. CADA: Okay. My name is Tim Cada.
13	My wife Kris and I converted our farm to 100
14	percent organic in 1994. Our youngest son Matt
15	has jumped onboard as of four years ago.
16	Today, we farm around 500 acres, and
17	ranch a bit more. We're certified by OneCert and
18	Real Organic.
19	I would like to talk crop insurance.
20	Dairy, wind and hail insurance, as we
21	have those issues here in Northeast Nebraska,
22	dairy PRF for rainfall, our dry land farmers, and

1	the only way we know to insure our alfalfa and
2	pastures, dairy Federal Crop.
3	Federal Crop will cover our soybeans
4	just fine. If we have a low yield, they write
5	the check.
6	We insure our winter wheat with
7	Federal Crop. Our yield has a lot of history.
8	We cannot insure our spring wheat.
9	(Audio interference.)
10	food grain corn, primarily yellow,
11	mostly blue the last few years.
12	Inter-production or revenue. I'm
13	finding out, as (audio interference), those will
14	not help us if we have an aflatoxin or a
15	vomitoxin, or other disease problem.
16	Corn is corn in the Federal Crop
17	Insurance's eyes. If we have a toxin problem,
18	our corn is more or less unsellable. Contracts
19	pricing does not help us.
20	Take a really bad year for our farm,
21	therefore, we take whole farm income as well.
22	It's pretty pricey, but it's our insurance

2 Federal Crop does not help our contract pricing because of their conventional 3 mentality. We pay their premium, but could be 4 if 5 really hit hard their our crops meets standards, and only their 6 standards, not the 7 food-grade buyer standards. Now taken Federal Crop since 1982, 8 9 organic started at the same rate as our federal 10 crop did. Eventually, they added five percent 11 for a few years, and now there's Federal Crop for 12 organic. It's just not complete, in my opinion. 13 It doesn't cover me good. Organic and conventional both can have 14 15 quality problems. Bryce was talking before -and I don't know Bryce -- conventional problems 16 17 usually aren't that big of a deal, because it 18 might be a dollar or two difference in price 19 between conventional and conventional food-grade, 20 while organic can be up to 50 percent or more in price differential. 21 22 And if I'm counting on the organic

1

against our insurance.

1	price and I have to sell it as conventional, that
2	really, really hurts. Therefore, we go back to
3	PRF insurance.
4	Last thing I'd like to say is blue
5	corn is not considered corn by the USDA.
6	(Audio interference.)
7	Thank you for your time, you guys.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you. And
9	thank you so much for making it work. We really
10	appreciate it. I think I caught most of
11	everything, so if anyone has any questions, we
12	can confirm with Jim, but Mindee, if you want to
13	go and ask him a question, please go right ahead.
14	MEMBER JEFFERY: Yeah, Tim, thank you
15	for your comment. I caught you at the part where
16	you said, the last thing I'd like to say is blue
17	corn is not considered corn by the USDA. And
18	then I couldn't hear what you said after that.
19	Would you mind reiterating?
20	MR. CADA: Red corn is corn. I think
21	they consider blue corn an ornamental. There's a
22	fair amount of people in Nebraska that grow blue

1	corn for correct specialty grades, and he ships
2	it all around the world. It shouldn't be treated
3	any differently.
4	MEMBER JEFFERY: Got it. Thank you so
5	much, Tim.
6	MR. CADA: Yeah. Is this better?
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: This is so much
8	better. Oh, gosh.
9	MR. CADA: I am so sorry, you guys.
10	I'm not a genius on my phone yet.
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Not a worry. I
12	think we mostly got it. Does anyone have any
13	other questions while we've got a good signal
14	from Tim? Oh, Nate Lewis has a question for you.
15	Go ahead, Nate.
16	MEMBER LEWIS: Yeah, hi. Quickly,
17	sorry, couldn't get my hand up quickly.
18	Tim, in the blue corn insurance case
19	you said, have you all pursued a contract price
20	addendum approach to that?
21	MR. CADA: I did. I get contract
22	pricing every year. But if I would have an

1	aflatoxin in my corn and my buyer will not take
2	it, it doesn't meet his quality, what am I going
3	to do with, give or take, let's say 10,000
4	bushels of blue corn?
5	I can go to my local feed yard, I can
6	find an organic dairy someplace to buy it, but if
7	they're going to buy my blue corn, I'm going to
8	sell it at a really bad discount, because they
9	know that I'm having problems moving my corn.
10	(Simultaneous speaking.)
11	Federal Crop, they will not pay my
12	full contract. Well, they may pay the full
13	contract price, but their standards are
14	different.
15	You have the corn. That's all that we
16	care. If you're going to key 100 bushel and
17	acres, you can leave your 100 bushel and acres.
18	They do not care about the quality.
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Right. Kim has a
20	question for you.
21	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Thanks, Tim. I just
22	want to clarify this point. So, from a quality

1	standpoint, let's use aflatoxin as an example.
2	Do you have the same quality standard
3	for conventional aflatoxin as you do organic
4	aflatoxin, I guess is what I'm trying to ask. Is
5	there a
6	MR. CADA: I believe we do.
7	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Okay.
8	MR. CADA: It's a very low number.
9	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Right. Because I
10	know, like, in dairy there's only so much that
11	can be accepted, because humans consume milk, and
12	every species, there's just a certain amount that
13	can be accepted, regardless if it's blue, white,
14	red, yellow, number two, wheat food, I mean,
15	there's standards, right?
16	Okay, and so from a quality
17	standpoint, do you see discrepancies you said
18	that you can, like, lose up to 50 percent of the
19	value of your organic grain. Is that because
20	you're selling it as conventional? Or is that
21	because the quality scale is different for
22	organic than it is for conventional?

1	MR. CADA: Quality scale is a little
2	bit different for organic. I mean, your buyer
3	has such lines that you have to reach and meet.
4	You know, fifty-six pound minimum corn.
5	But I can ask neighbors ten, eleven
6	years ago, we had really bad aflatoxin
7	everywhere. My buyer took his corn, and we were
8	80 or 86 parts-per-million. There was a lot of
9	that.
10	A lot of it's overlooked. I was lucky
11	that year it didn't go for food-grade. Wasn't
12	contracted that way.
13	Okay, what happened the next year is
14	the blue corn or the white corn, my buyer
15	wouldn't have taken it. Then it has to go for
16	feed. I have to go farther for my market, so my
17	shipping is going to cost me more.
18	And like I say, the dairy probably
19	won't take the blue corn unless they're desperate
20	and they know that there's an issue because I'm
21	selling it for feed. So, we'll give you \$5 for
22	it instead of \$10.

1	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Thank you for
2	clarifying that, Tim. And good luck with
3	planting this year. And I hope that everything
4	goes very well with your crops.
5	MR. CADA: I hope it rains this year.
6	Thank you.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, Tim, we
8	appreciate you taking the time to talk to us
9	today. Thank you. Next up we have Meggan Hain,
10	followed by Joel Kurtz, and then Robert Rankin.
11	DR. HAIN: Perfect. Thank you very
12	much. So, my name's Dr. Meggan Hain. I'm
13	actually one of the veterinarians, and the animal
14	care specialist at Organic Valley, where I'm
15	responsible for upholding our animal health and
16	welfare on our 1,700 organic certified livestock
17	farms, in 32 states.
18	And it's in that capacity that I'm
19	coming to talk about livestock sunsets that are
20	under review by the NOSB.
21	Of the items that are under review,
22	there's two that I wanted to address. First was

1 aspirin, which, along with other pain 2 medications, current approve the use of organic 3 as essential for controlling pain and preventing suffering. And I think maybe we should even 4 consider adding additional pain control options. 5 The second item is vaccinations. 6 7 the NOSB reviews the continued use as of vaccinations, I ask that they keep two key things 8 9 in mind. 10 First, that vaccinations are still one 11 the safest and best tools for preventing 12 disease and suffering, and then secondly, that 13 there's never a good reason for allowing animals suffer die 14 t.o and from somethina 15 preventable. 16 So, many of our organic producers are already confused about vaccinations, so they 17 18 don't know that vaccinations are actually allowed 19 under organics right now. Many of them don't 20 know what vaccinations are best for their herds, let alone having an understanding as to determine 21 2.2 what the vaccine manufacturing methods are, and

Τ	whether they'd be allowed.
2	So, we already see too many herds that
3	lose large numbers of animals from outbreaks,
4	from things that could be prevented. And I
5	really worry that if we put additional
6	restrictions on, that we could see more.
7	So, on the question of excluded
8	methods and active ingredients, or inactive
9	ingredients, I feel that there is a concern
10	related to these in releasing or decreasing their
11	options that are available for farmers, if we do
12	put restrictions in there.
13	By restricting excluded methods or
14	ingredients, we could push farmers to have less
15	options. By pushing for natural methods, we're
16	also pushing towards things that are potentially
17	less effective, or could be more reactive.
18	So, all vaccinations on the market
19	right now go through extensive testing, to ensure
20	that they're safe and effective. And it is
21	actually this extensive testing that also makes
22	it difficult for us to change the vaccine

Τ	markets.
2	So, I think by trying to push, like we
3	did for the seed standard, and that for
4	additional options, we're not going to change the
5	market there.
6	It is also putting certifiers, if we
7	put in restrictions, in a difficult position,
8	because they don't necessarily know the methods
9	of vaccine-making. And as a veterinarian, I also
10	think we shouldn't put them in that position,
11	because they're not in a position to prescribe or
12	determine what's right for animal health.
13	Other international organic standards
14	do not restrict excluded methods for
15	vaccinations, because they recognize the
16	importance of having effective vaccines.
17	As the NOSB reviews the vaccine use
18	and guidance, I'd like to ask them to not make it
19	more difficult than that for us and our farmers
20	to prevent diseases.
21	So, thank you very much.
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you for your

Τ	comments. Questions for Dr. Hain.
2	Just a quick question for you. You
3	were saying that producers are confused. How can
4	NOSB, and I'd say even NOP, do a better of job of
5	explaining vaccines?
6	Just as a quick anecdote, I think the
7	first time that I was asked about my organic
8	status as a 13-year-old at the Kennedy Fair, my
9	provider said, that just being you're too lazy to
10	vaccine, Nate. Is that what organic is? And the
11	fact that possibly organic farmers might be not
12	so clear either, how can we do better? What
13	messaging can we use to make sure that the
14	toolbox is known to farmers?
15	DR. HAIN: Certainly. And I think a
16	lot of that falls on sort of our side. And for
17	folks that are working within the organic
18	industry and advising organic farmers, we can
19	come out and say, right, this is what's allowed
20	and not allowed.
21	What I'm asking from the NOSB is that
22	we don't make it more complicated. As farmers,

1	as you guys all know, have a very limited
2	capacity, and it's one thing to say, yes, this is
3	allowed, or, no, it's not. It gets more
4	difficult when you say, well, this is allowed,
5	but not these methods.
6	So, I think we can do the education
7	part. I'm just asking we don't make it more
8	complicated.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right,
10	question for you from Kim.
11	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Yeah, I'm actually
12	going to break the rules here for just a second,
13	Meggan. It's really not a question, but it's
14	more of a shout-out.
15	I think having the voice of the
16	veterinarian community is very valuable to us on
17	the Board, and we don't get enough of that.
18	So, I appreciate you taking the time
19	today to come and speak to us, and take your
20	comments very wholeheartedly, and put weight into
21	those. So, thank you very much for doing that
22	today.

1	DR. HAIN: I appreciate it. And we're
2	doing everything we can to increase the organic
3	knowledge across the veterinary industry as well,
4	with sort of lectures at vet schools, and then
5	veterinary organizations.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Well, we really
7	appreciate your time today. Thank you so much
8	for your presentation.
9	DR. HAIN: Thank you.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Take care. Next
11	up we have Joel Kurtz, followed by Robert Rankin,
12	and then James Swartzentruber. Joel, if you're
13	there not popping up yet. Oh, yes, go ahead.
14	MR. KURTZ: Can you hear me now?
15	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yep, yep.
16	MR. KURTZ: Good. I'm concerned about
17	my tablet, so I'm trying to do it by phone, if
18	this works.
19	Anyway, Joel Kurtz is an agronomist at
20	Maysville Elevator in sunny Ohio today. I'm also
21	a contract inspector in the Plain community for
22	OEFFA. I was a vegetable farmer and had a CSA in

1	the past.
2	Two comments I would like to share on.
3	Number one is on consistent location
4	identification. Although I understand the logic
5	behind utilizing technology and using GPS data
6	for consistency of certifiers, requiring GPS for
7	individual field would create a burden to the
8	producer, inspector, and certifier, and may be
9	enough to encourage producers to find alternative
10	non-certified markets because of increased cost
11	and labor to meet this requirement.
12	For example, can producers change
13	their field layouts we've heard about this
14	before too based on crops grown each year?
15	Many farmers may have, like, five to
16	twenty different fields that will change in field
17	size area, an area based on what crop is being
18	grown each year.
19	So, if the center point of each field
20	would need updating each year, along with the
21	acreage, someone would need to step into the
2.2	center of each field each year to update the

1	changes, which would create another layer of time
2	consumption.
3	This is being done already on the
4	updated maps sent to the certifier with renewal
5	applications.
6	A single address, GPS location for the
7	farm, with foyer maps, is what OFPA requires. I
8	find that worked very well when I did the
9	inspections, to find the farm and to find fields.
10	The next comment is on the
11	hydroponics. Nutrition from microbial
12	metabolites in soil is a big difference from
13	ionic nutrition and hydroponics.
14	In light of nutritional integrity tied
15	to organic production, I do not believe that
16	hydroponics has a place in certified organic
17	production.
18	In light of sustainability, if we
19	continue to improve plants' immune function and
20	nutritional integrity through soil health, this
21	will allow crops within extreme weather to do
22	much better.

1	For example, many organic-influenced
2	cells are high in aluminum, which is creating
3	toxicity that prevents immune function and
4	nutrient density in plants.
5	From a biological perspective, it
6	would be evident that the microbiological content
7	would be completely different in soil-grown crops
8	compared to hydroponically grown crops.
9	Evidence would suggest that this has
LO	health implications. For example, food
L1	sensitivities and immune function, etc.
L2	I thank the NOSB for the hard work
L3	they're doing and all the time they spend working
L 4	these things out. Thank you.
L5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you. We
L 6	really appreciate your comments. Any questions
L7	for Joel? Oh, go ahead, Amy.
L 8	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay, Nate, that's
L 9	fine. I'll go after you for once.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Just a quick
21	question for you, Joel. I think we would be very
2.2	interested in getting the language right in this

1	discussion document.
2	I think the word fields might be
3	confusing. Would it be better if you use the
4	word parcel? What we're saying, it's a legal
5	entity, a legally defined boundary.
6	And you might subdivide it in many
7	different ways in a given year, but you're not
8	going to move on to your neighbor's side of the
9	fence. Is that a better word to use, so that we
10	kind of clear up this confusion?
11	Because you would have to conduct a
12	subdivision with legal review to change the unit
13	that we're describing in this paper. Would
14	parcel make more sense?
15	MR. KURTZ: Exactly. I think it
16	would. And I had a little bit of a question of
17	that in my mind myself. So, the farm, from my
18	perspective, is when we go out and inspect a
19	farm, the farm has a physical address, a street
20	address.
21	So, I use a GPS to find that street
22	address. When I get there, there's the

1	application and OST already has a map of the
2	fields for that farm.
3	So, one individual GPS location for
4	that farm or parcel could very well be possible.
5	What I understood before, was that
6	each individual field will need GPS coordinates
7	to be able to be found. But I understand that
8	this language is here. Thank you.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Super appreciate
LO	the clarification. We can definitely update
L1	that. I think, hearing from many, many folks
L2	this week, I think, wow, what the difference a
13	word can make.
L 4	One more question for you and mad
L5	respect as a fellow inspector, that we don't
L 6	want to overburden the process. Got a lot of
L 7	work to do, it's a busy season every year.
L 8	So, when we're thinking about the
L 9	value of being able to find these fields, and not
20	at least around much of the country fields
21	don't have addresses. This seemed to be a point
22	of confusion for OFPA in the early part of our

1 discussion on Tuesday. Fields don't have addresses. Houses 2 3 have addresses. And most farm fields don't have houses, depending on where you're at in the 4 country and your scale. 5 If I have 40 different fields, right 6 7 now, as an inspector, I'm sort of reliant on the honesty of the producer to show me where that 8 9 field is, relatively, especially with hand-drawn 10 maps. 11 If we just have a drop pin, much like 12 you would use to find the houses your on 13 inspection, a drop pin for GEO location, on every 14 legal parcel, does that seem like expectation for standardizing the data gathered 15 16 on where these fields are that are certified. 17 18 MR. KURTZ: If those fields are away 19 from the central location, from the main farm --20 let's say that the field or the parcel is not combined, or not joined to the main central farm 21 2.2 -- then yes, I can understand them having a pin

1	for that location. Exactly.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Super. We're
3	going to update that as well. I love this
4	clarification. Thank you so much for bearing
5	with me. Amy has a question for you, and then
6	Jerry.
7	MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah, Joel, thank you
8	so much for your time today calling in. And I'm
9	glad that we worked through some of those
10	clarifications.
11	So, thanks for working with Nate on
12	that as well.
13	Joel, I wanted to ask you a question
14	with members that have no access to technology,
15	or low access to technology.
16	Is it common we've heard a couple
17	of commenters mention the concept of legal
18	address, so the township range section.
19	Or, also, there was another idea in
20	written comments about using an assessor's parcel
21	number (the APN) that you would work with at the
22	county assessor's office.

1	Are either of those two ideas
2	workable, Joel?
3	MR. KURTZ: They certainly are. Ever
4	property has a parcel number. Absolutely.
5	MEMBER BRUCH: Awesome. Thank you. I
6	appreciate your time.
7	MR. KURTZ: You're welcome.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Joel, I'm just
9	going to jump in one more time, Jerry, real
10	quick.
11	Joel, how do we get better at
12	organizing folks to come, when there's these very
13	little things.
14	Like, the fact that I feel like
15	there's been a placeholder for lack of
16	technology. Sort of confusing, that folks in the
17	Plain community still buy property. They still
18	have these, deeds still have legal descriptions.
19	And so, I feel like it was a little
20	bit of an underselling of there's a certain
21	baseline that we all operate with. And how can
22	we get better just kind of, like, speeding this

1	process up?
2	I feel like we're taken a lot of time
3	when it was a one-word question. And hearing
4	from you, this is actually going to work just
5	fine. Any suggestions for how we can improve the
6	process?
7	MR. KURTZ: I'm almost having to think
8	to answer that one. But as far as improving the
9	process, when somebody hears something from a
10	regulatory agency, they're always thinking of the
11	devil in the details. Right? Things behind the
12	words that are being said.
13	So, I think maybe bringing out
14	real-life examples how farms and situations may
15	help. That's what drew our conversation here to
16	what we're talking about was, actual,
17	on-the-ground, real-life situations.
18	I was telling you from my perspective
19	how I look at it when we go to the farm, and that
20	brought the thought up in your mind of
21	wood-knocking about the language issue here,
22	whatever.

1	So, I think bringing people together
2	with actual scenarios of how this would work,
3	when I read the paper here and the information on
4	GEO location, it looked like a very complicated
5	process that is being built, that will just
6	simply be too much of a burden for people.
7	That's what it looked like when I read
8	the information. It did not necessarily have
9	on-the-ground, real-world example in there, of
10	what people are looking at. If that helps.
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Absolutely that
12	helps. We can give you some examples, no
13	problem. Thank you. Thank you so much for that.
14	Jerry's got a question for you.
15	MEMBER D'AMORE: Yeah, hi Joel. I
16	hear you very well now. It was sort of hard to
17	hard to hear you when I was phoning in, on what I
18	found to be very interesting, which is, I think,
19	a comparison between hydroponics and organic on
20	the end product, in terms of nutritional value.
21	And if I heard that right, I don't
2.2	want the explanation now. I would just love to

1	have a way of getting the information to this
2	team through Michelle, if that's possible.
3	MR. KURTZ: Getting that information
4	to this team? Exactly.
5	So, the real information would come
6	from testing. Correct? So, nutritional testing,
7	if we're going to show data of microbial
8	populations, we will have to go to the people who
9	are doing that testing, to get the data.
10	Personally, I don't have that in hand
11	now to give it to you. But it is being done, it
12	is being tested, it can be tested, and so that
13	information can be made available. I just don't
14	have it in front of me, or the contact
15	information.
16	MEMBER D'AMORE: Sure, sure. And I'm
17	not asking for it. But I guess that now, my
18	follow-on question is, is there someplace that I
19	should be calling, rather than having you chase
20	it down?
21	MR. KURTZ: Exactly. Start with
22	Bionutrient Food Association.

1	MEMBER D'AMORE: Thank you. Okay,
2	perfect. I said Nate, thanks.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, thank
4	you, Jerry. Any other questions for Joel?
5	Joel, this has not been the first time
6	that you have been a wealth of information. So,
7	really appreciate you joining us and providing so
8	much insight. And thank you for your
9	contributions.
L 0	MR. KURTZ: You're welcome. I should
L1	just mention that I was riding around. I do
L2	grounding work so I was driving around, meeting
L3	farmers today in between these meetings. It was
L 4	not a day to interrupt the farmer. Sunny in
L5	Ohio. But we got it done. Thank you.
L 6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We hear you. It's
L7	the magic of the phone. All right, thank you,
L 8	sir.
L 9	Next up we have Robert Rankin,
20	followed by James Swartzentruber, and then,
21	folks, we're going to break. So, Robert, if
2.2	vou!re there, the floor is vours.

1	MR. RANKIN: I'm here. Good
2	afternoon, thank you. Robert Rankin, Executive
3	Director, International Food Additives Council.
4	I first want to thank NOP staff for
5	rearranging my talk from Tuesday to today, based
6	on a last-minute conflict.
7	IFAC is an association representing
8	manufacturers and end-users of food ingredients,
9	including a number of substances permitted for
10	use in organic handling.
11	As such, we strongly support the
12	relisting of gellan gum and potassium chloride at
13	205-605A, alginates, glycerides, mono- and
14	di-phosphoric acid and xanthan gum at 205-605B,
15	as well as gums, water-extracted-only, arabic,
16	guar, locust bean and carob bean, and lecithin
17	de-oiled at 205-606.
18	These ingredients are safe used in
19	alignment with organic principles, and are
20	essential to organic food crunching.
21	Gellan gum remains essential, based on
22	its unique properties, to formulate products

1	across a wide range of applications, and because
2	there is no commercially available source of
3	organic gellan gum.
4	Potassium chloride is an important
5	tool, introducing the sodium content of foods,
6	and also will help to support U.S. policies
7	around sodium reduction.
8	Alginates are a versatile ingredient
9	that provide unique stabilizing and thickening
L 0	properties.
L1	In response to handling subcommittee
L2	questions, IFAC expects there will be increased
L3	organic community interest in sodium alginate in
L 4	particular, based on its use in meat alternative
L 5	products.
L 6	Mono- and diglycerides remain an
L7	important ingredient for the drum-drying of food.
L 8	We are not aware of any alternatives for this
L 9	application.
20	The use of phosphoric acid in various
21	sanitizers and hard-surface cleaning applications
22	remains essential, due to its functionality,

Ι	versatility, and food safety properties.
2	Xanthan gum has unique properties,
3	including cold water solubility, viscosities,
4	suspension, mouth-feel, and syneresis control,
5	that continue to make it an essential ingredient.
6	Water-extracted gums, including gum
7	arabic, guar gum and locust bean gum/carob bean
8	gum, all have unique properties that make them
9	essential. There are no commercially available
10	organic forms of these gums.
11	De-oiled lecithin also remains
12	essential for organic food production, while
13	organic sunflower and canola oil are used to
14	produce the oil lecithin. Supplies of these oils
15	are limited, due to origination challenges.
16	In addition, by rule, only non-GM soy
17	can be used as a source of de-oil lecithin in
18	organic foods.
19	Thank you for your attention. That's
20	all I got.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, we
22	appreciate you. Any questions for Robert? All

1	right, Robert, thank you for your time.
2	MR. RANKIN: Thanks, everyone.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Take care. Next
4	up we have James Swartzentruber. Is James there?
5	All right.
6	MR. SWARTZENTRUBER: Can you hear me?
7	There we go.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yes, we can.
9	Please go ahead.
10	MR. SWARTZENTRUBER: So, thank you for
11	the opportunity to speak today. My name is James
12	Swartzentruber. I work for Green Field Farms.
13	We're a farmer-owned cooperative that markets
14	organic vegetables for our members.
15	And I'd like to comment about the
16	discussion on the geolocations. I had some notes
17	and some thoughts on this.
18	But in the past hour, there have been
19	some good conversation that's changed some, based
20	on the conversation we've had. So, I'll go
21	through, I had some notes, but I also have some
22	other comments to add to previous conversations.

1	So, like a lot of other small
2	cooperatives, our farmers are certified organic.
3	They have small acreage, two to fifteen acres of
4	farmland.
5	We're located here in Wayne County,
6	Ohio, and like a lot of the surrounding states,
7	there's a lot of plain people Amish people,
8	conservative Mennonite people, farm with horses,
9	and we generally don't use technology cell
L 0	phones, computers, Internet, GPS.
L1	Here at the co-op office, we obviously
12	do. You see me here, right?
L3	But on the farms that's not used, up
L 4	until now. It's relatively easy to comply on the
L 5	farms using horses to farm, horse-drawn farm
L 6	equipment, pen-and-paper for recordkeeping, and
L7	that's been very, very vital for us to continue
L 8	farming in our communities.
L 9	We did see some issues with the GPS
20	coordinates. We had a very good discussion here
21	with Joel Kurtz. I know Joel, I appreciate Joel
22	very much. He's just a couple of miles across

1	the road here.
2	The obvious issue in the Plain
3	communities. So, obviously here in Wayne County,
4	Ohio, is probably the largest Plain community,
5	but Pennsylvania, Indiana, Wisconsin, there's a
6	lot of communities throughout the United States.
7	Just simply, as simple as it may
8	should to just drop a pen in the center of the
9	parcel, or the field, or whatever, that would be
10	an issue.
11	Just simply, how do you do that if you
12	don't have the technology available to do it?
13	There's obviously the potential
14	workaround. So, maybe the auditor or the
15	certifier would do it. And then we need to
16	managing a database.
17	So, there would definitely be a
18	concern about, is adding cost for the organic
19	farmer to their organic certification, would have
20	to pay for that management, or additional tying
21	it? The certifiers are already very busy, some
22	of them almost to the point of being overwhelmed,

1	and the timely audits and timely certifications
2	are obviously very important for the organic
3	community.
4	If there was a technological
5	requirement to maintain organic certification,
6	there would be a huge percentage of the Plain
7	community that could not certify.
8	And I see I'm out of time. So, I'll
9	divert to questions. I'll just say I agree with
LO	what Joel and our conversation was on using
L1	partials.
L2	I don't know how it is across the
L3	United States, but in Ohio every parcel has a
L 4	parcel number. That's the simple part.
L5	The more complicated thing I see is
L 6	what if I farm half my parcel, and my neighbor
L7	rents the other half and farms that? And then
L 8	you need to somehow manage that. Right?
L 9	That's where it becomes complicated,
20	though I do see that being a very real and
21	that happens. I mean, it happened within our
2.2	co-op members.

1	To farmer members that live
2	side-by-side, this one has ten children, this one
3	has two. The two-children guy has more land than
4	the ten-children guy, so guess who benefits from
5	that? They work together.
6	(Simultaneous speaking.)
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yes. And we so
8	appreciate that point. Just to clarify, there is
9	no technological requirements for certification
L 0	for farmers. That has nothing to do with what it
11	is. We worry that that has been conflated in
12	this discussion.
L3	As an inspector, it'll take me less
L 4	than 30 seconds to drop a pin on your farm, as
L 5	it'll take every single or for getting
L 6	inspected with a smartphone.
L 7	And for those without a smartphone,
L 8	we'll figure it out. Amy, please go ahead.
L 9	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes. James, thank you
20	so much for joining us today and bringing us the
21	point of view. I really appreciate it, and I'm
22	glad we were able to clarify some points that

1	were confusing.
2	We actually were going to use the word
3	parcel, and we thought that would be more
4	questioned than the words that we chose. But
5	we'll do their job in the future. That was great
6	feedback with Joel to get some more concrete
7	examples.
8	And I just wanted to make sure, it
9	sounded like you agreed with what Joel said, but
10	on the parcel, or is it the township range
11	section? Is that common information as well? Or
12	is a parcel number, is that more leveraged?
13	MR. SWARTZENTRUBER: The county parcel
14	numbers is the public information in Ohio.
15	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay.
16	MR. SWARTZENTRUBER: Around here. I
17	don't know about the rest of the country, but
18	around here that's easy public information, the
19	parcel number. You go on our county auditor's
20	website and you can find it if you know my name
21	and the street I live on. That's easy.
22	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay. Thank you again.

1	I appreciate it. Thanks for the points about
2	parcel splitting, and that was helpful to hear
3	that as well.
4	MR. SWARTZENTRUBER: Definitely.
5	Thanks.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Well,
7	we really appreciate you taking the time to be
8	with us today, James, and for the comments. So,
9	thank you very much.
10	MR. SWARTZENTRUBER: Absolutely.
11	Thank you.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you. With
13	that, folks, we are going to take a ten-minute
14	break. We'll be back eleven after the hour.
15	We're going to start after the break with Kelly
16	Skoda, followed by Aaron Zimmerman, and then
17	Michael Hansen. So, see you all in ten minutes.
18	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
19	went off the record at 4:01 p.m. and resumed at
20	4:11 p.m.)
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, folks,
22	we are back. First up is going to be Kelly

1	Skoda, followed by Aaron Zimmerman, and then
2	Michael Hansen.
3	Kelly, the floor is yours.
4	MS. SKODA: Can you hear me now?
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We can, yes.
6	MS. SKODA: Good afternoon. I'm Kelly
7	Skoda, a certification specialist at CROPP
8	Cooperative. Thank you for the opportunity to
9	speak today.
L 0	My comments are regarding sub-sets of
L1	handling substances on the national list,
L2	specifically gellan gum, and flavors at 605, and
L3	water-extracted gums, and de-oiled lecithin at
L 4	606.
L5	CROPP strived to use certified organic
L 6	ingredients whenever possible to produce the
L7	highest quality products, and to meet consumer
L 8	expectations for such, and crop limit fees for
L 9	national list substances when possible.
20	However, gellan gum is one of these
21	listed substances that is an important ingredient
22	for us. It is used to maintain suspension and

and it delivers more 1 creaminess, desirable 2 viscosity and stability over other gums. 3 Gellan gum is used in Organic Valley whipping flavored 4 heavv cream, creamers. 5 chocolate milk, and seasonal egg nog, all of which are award winning and popular retail items. 6 7 Our sweet cream and French vanilla creamers were recently awarded 2023 Product of the Year, USA, 8 9 conducted by Kantar, the largest consumer-voted 10 awards program highlighting product innovation 11 and excellence. 12 At the 101st Los Angeles International 13 dairy competition last week, heavy whipping 14 cream, flavored creamers, and chocolate milk all 15 received gold medals. Chocolate milk received silver medal for best of class. 16 The annual sales impact of these products with 2023 17 18 projections is over \$13 million retail units with 19 \$15 million in revenue. 20 The removal of gellan gum would have a 21 significant impact business on our and our 2.2 product line. We of are unaware any

1 environmental or health concerns with gellan gum. 2 We are also unaware of organic available 3 options. However, when available, we would run trials in our product formulas. At this time we 4 support the continued listing of gellan gum. 5 Regarding flavors, we currently use 6 7 organic flavors in formulas and do not have challenges sourcing these. if 8 However, 9 developing new products, and an organic flavor 10 option is not available, we would use an approved 11 non-organic flavor while working with vendors to 12 develop an organic version. We support listing of non-organic 13 continued flavors to address organic unavailability. 14 15 Moving to water extracted gums, we use 16 two of these, guar gum and locust bean gum, 17 Organic Valley egg bites and cottage cheese. 18 However, we use organic versions of these gums. 19 While we have been able to source organic quar 20 locust bean qums without issue, gum and 21 continue to evaluate availability and have not 2.2 yet determined whether to support re-listing or

1 re	emoval of these gums. I look forward to our
2 cc	omments in the fall.
3	Lastly, de-oiled lecithin, CROPP uses
4 0	organic sunflower lecithin and a glomeration of
5 wh	ney protein concentrate to increase solubility
6 an	nd product performance. The lecithin we
7 pu	archase primarily comes from organic sunflowers
8 gr	rown in Ukraine. We did have supply chain
9 ch	nallenges when the war began, however these
l0 ch	nallenges have since been alleviated.
L1	The price of organic sunflower
l2 le	ecithin is drastically more expensive now, but
l3 av	vailability has not been a concern. We will
L4 cc	ontinue to evaluate availability and submit
L5 ad	dditional comments at the fall meeting. Thank
L6 yc	ou again for the opportunity to speak today.
L7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We appreciate your
L8 cc	omments. Questions for Kelly? Amy, please go
l9 ah	nead, followed by Kim.
20	MEMBER BRUCH: Kelly, hi. Thanks for
21 yc	our time today. I have kind of a broad-based
22 qu	uestion for you, because the world of dairy

1	really impacts us grain farmers. And you kind of
2	you kind of were quantifying a little bit of the
3	dairy industry in how, you know, if gums weren't
4	available as a national list item, that would
5	impact your industry.
6	But those numbers, you know, year to
7	year are we growing market share in organic
8	dairy, or what does that look like. Can you
9	speak to that?
10	MS. SKODA: I can maybe speak to that,
11	and maybe I can get you back some better answers.
12	So in 2014 we had similar comments. During that
13	time, we also had additional products that we
14	have since discontinued. So compared to the 2014
15	numbers we gave, it's actually a little bit
16	less.
17	But I would say that we would like to
18	see our market share growing. And these products
19	that we like heavy whipping cream has been a
20	really stable product for us for many years and
21	is one of our most popular retail items.
22	And I think we innovate, you know, we

1	continue to innovate. And so I think it's hard
2	to say, but I can definitely try to, you know,
3	bring you a better answer either next week or in
4	a different way.
5	MEMBER BRUCH: Oh, I would really
6	appreciate that. I'm sorry to put you on the
7	spot with a question in a different area. I
8	appreciate it, thank you.
9	MS. SKODA: Uh-huh.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Kim has a question
11	for you.
12	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Hi, Kelly, I really
13	appreciate you spending time with us today and
14	your comments, both written and orally. On the
15	topic of lecithin, have you tried to use, in your
16	guy's production, other oil/seed origins, so
17	either canola or soybean, or has it been very
18	specific to sunflower?
19	MS. SKODA: That is another question
20	that I could give you a definite answer, but what
21	I believe is that we used to use sunflower, or
22	sorry, soy lecithin. But since the industry, in

1	some regard, is trying to get away from that
2	because of allergies, I realize there are also
3	sunflower allergies, but I think more prominently
4	there are soy allergies for folks.
5	So, yeah, again, I can get you a
6	better answer on what we've tried as I consult
7	with our product development team.
8	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Thank you.
9	MS. SKODA: Yeah.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Franklin has a
11	question for you.
12	MEMBER QUARCOO: Yes, in your written
13	comment you noted that there is a discrepancy in
14	the way phosphoric acid is listed as a cleaning
15	agent, as a sanitizer. Can you throw more light
16	on that end, ma'am? What you are suggesting
17	MS. SKODA: Yeah.
18	MEMBER QUARCOO: as the best way to
19	move forward?
20	MS. SKODA: Yeah, we actually reached
21	out to Kyla about his earlier this week just to
22	get further clarity. And I think that we were

certifiers 1 if reviewing these unaware are 2 products consistently. 3 And one of our questions specifically to how phosphoric acid is listed as 4 a cleaner on the national list. And, you know, 5 it's specified as a cleaner, and why not list it 6 7 as a sanitizer instead? And so our understanding is, because 8 9 it's on the national list, it should be used as, or it should be available and allowed as a last 10 11 step product. But it opens the door for 12 interpretation confusion and when it says 13 cleaner. And because phosphoric acid has both 14 15 cleaning applications and sanitizer applications on some product labels, so it can be used as 16 17 And so our questions were really to the 18 Board on is there inconsistency in review in the 19 industry, and is that why these questions 20 being asked if the annotation should be amended 21 to provide more clarity. So I think we would 22 like to see it's an annotation, provide more

Τ	clarity if there is confusion in the industry.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Jerry has a
3	question for you.
4	MEMBER D'AMORE: Thank you, Nate.
5	Kelly, thank you for your comments. During your
6	quick rundown on lecithin, I lost my way a little
7	bit. So if you take Ukraine out of your supply,
8	are you willing today to say that there is a, you
9	know, a predictable, stable, availability of
L 0	accessible supply?
L1	How do you feel about that, also
L2	taking cost out of the equation too? Take the
L3	Ukraine out and take cost out. Can one expect to
L 4	have a reliable source of supply?
L 5	MS. SKODA: I'm not sure. I think
L 6	that a lot of sunflowers are grown in Ukraine or
L7	in other parts of Europe. And I'm not sure what
L 8	domestic, you know, supply is like. So again,
L 9	we can look into that. We are continuing to
20	assess availability, and we've got, you know, a
21	whole team dedicated to sourcing ingredients and
22	looking at different vendors.

1	MEMBER D'AMORE: Without leaving the
2	witness here, so at this point would you be
3	willing to say, hey, we're not robust about
4	telling the world that we have a reliable source
5	of supply?
6	MS. SKODA: Probably today, yes.
7	MEMBER D'AMORE: Okay, thank you so
8	much, do appreciate it.
9	MS. SKODA: Uh-huh.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
11	for Kelly?
12	All right, we really appreciate your
13	time today, Kelly. Thank you.
14	MS. SKODA: Thank you.
15	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up we have
16	Aaron Zimmerman followed by Michael Hanson, and
17	then Megan Vaith.
18	MR. ZIMMERMAN: All right, you got me?
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, we've
20	got you. Please go ahead.
21	MR. ZIMMERMAN: All right, thank you.
22	Hi, everybody, thanks for listening to all of us

Τ	today. I know this is a very big undertaking
2	with all these voices you've got to hear.
3	I really don't have too much to say.
4	I just wanted to talk about two things primarily,
5	crop insurance and, I guess, well, let's just
6	start there.
7	You know, we have about 2,500 acres in
8	northeast Nebraska of certified, irrigated
9	organic. We're about five years into it. I've
10	been around chemicals my whole life, and I got to
11	tell you, I'm never going back. This is a very,
12	very exciting market.
13	But as far as the crop insurance goes,
14	the little bit that I've seen that seems kind of
15	strange to me is basically how it's calculated
16	and, well, with the yield and what not. And I
17	get the fact that it's a different practice.
18	So obviously you get X yield when
19	you're doing it conventionally, and now when you
20	go into organics it's different. I get that. So
21	I have a standard, I mean, you would have to have
22	the, you know, go off the county T yield which is

1 usually kind of crummy. I don't like or really understand why you do it that way. 2 3 When I do get through transitioning or become certified, I got to start back over with 4 5 the county T yield again. So that's kind of a bummer, so it'd be nice if we can change that. 6 7 And Ι then quess, you know, enforcement and accountability, and I think you 8 9 -- I was looking at the list here. There's a guy 10 named Craig that's going to be speaking here 11 later that has some really neat slides that I 12 happened to get me eyes on. 13 And, I mean, I'm just a farmer from northeast Nebraska, I really don't know what's 14 15 going on in the world, especially now that I'm in So when I started seeing a new market, right. 16 how the grain flows across the globe it's just --17 18 was actually mad. Like, how are these countries that B- they just want food, even if 19 it's out of a garbage can. You know, they don't 20 21 even really care what it is. How are these guys 2.2 growing organic food and sending it over to us?

1	And I saw first hand what that does
2	for a market. Because last summer we had, you
3	know, 30-some, \$40 soybeans. And all of a
4	sudden, this market gets opened back up and it's,
5	wham, we're back down in the lower 20s. That's a
6	huge revenue fluctuation for me.
7	So think about And I think somebody
8	was talking about, you know, consistency in a
9	market. That's when something's crazy, and you
10	can't get a bead on it, you know, for me as a
11	producer I'm, like, okay, am I going to grow
12	soybeans? I don't know if I want to. I think
13	I'm going to grow something else, because I don't
14	know if I can trust this market to actually be
15	there when I come time to harvest it. So I guess
16	that's my comment on that.
17	I wish I had a solution of how to, you
18	know, deal with imports and have that
19	accountability that I used hold. Now I'm just a
20	small farmer from Nebraska. So that's really all
21	I got, guys.
22	I appreciate it. If you have any

1	questions, I'll try my best to answer them.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Well again, thank
3	you so much for joining us today. Questions for
4	oh, Amy's got a question for you.
5	MEMBER BRUCH: Aaron, thank you for
6	joining us today. We really appreciate your
7	comments on two really big, important issues.
8	I just wanted to ask you, you mention
9	some of the challenges with the soybean market.
10	And then we talked about crop insurance. So
11	bringing those two together, what crop would you
12	rotate into if you don't have soybeans? And
13	would that, you know, for a legume, per se, in
14	your county, and then would that have an
15	insurable attribute under the Federal Crop
16	Program?
17	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Well, see, that's it.
18	I'm glad you kind of refreshed my memory.
19	Because that's the only thing I'm learning, is
20	here in Nebraska, I don't know, I can't speak for
21	other states, but pretty much if you want
22	insurance it's corn and soybeans.

1	And with organics, I mean, corn and
2	soybeans are just a drop in the bucket for what
3	we can all grow. And so for us, where we would
4	like to have grown a lot of soybeans this year,
5	we've instead, we're going to try and do a double
6	crop thing where we planted yellow peas. We just
7	got done doing that a couple of weeks ago.
8	We're going to stake those out and if,
9	you know, weather allows and everything looks
10	right, we're going to follow it up with
11	buckwheat. But, you know, neither of those crops
12	are insurable. So I'm assuming a lot of risk,
13	whereas I wouldn't have if I could have just done
14	soybeans.
15	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you for bringing
16	up that point. I appreciate it.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Kim has a question
18	for you.
19	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Hi, Aaron. Outside
20	of crop insurance, what other risk management
21	tools do you have?
22	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Ha, ha. You know,

1 Ι don't rely too heavily anymore on crop I think we just tried to do things 2 insurance. 3 the right way, you know, financially the right way, and trying not to live day to day, borrowing 4 money at the bank. You know, I think that's the 5 best thing, to systematically chip away so you 6 7 really don't have much of an operating line of credit. 8 9 And so you can't afford to take risks,

And so you can't afford to take risks, risks with other crops. That's probably the biggest thing. That's why it's really important to have these premiums in place for the organics, because there is a lot of risk. And you don't have much coverage with insurance, so it needs to be worth something to justify it.

MEMBER HUSEMAN: Right. Yeah, the volatility in the space is very significant, whether you're a producer, an end-user, a feeder of the animals, a consumer, et cetera. And I'm curious the other ways to close the gaps with a lot of the price volatility. So it's the reason why I asked the question. So thank you very

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

1	much.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
3	for Aaron?
4	Not wholly related to your comments,
5	Aaron, but possibly tangential, could you speak a
6	little bit to how is organic perceived in your
7	banking community? When you're working with
8	lenders, how hard is it to explain what organic
9	is and if it's a good or risky bet?
10	MR. ZIMMERMAN: You know, I'm glad you
11	brought that up. Because I think I've been
12	pretty fortunate where I work with bankers that
13	are pretty open minded. I actually kind of got
14	pushed into this sector by my banker, because he
15	had been seeing what some of the other producers
16	were, you know, obviously they see the numbers
17	on the back end, right. And they're, like you
18	really need to look into this.
19	And it's been something I've been
20	thinking about for many years, because I've been
21	eating organically myself. And then I see myself
22	going out and spraying chemicals on other

1	people's 100d. It just doesn't make sense.
2	So they finally gave me the nudge, and
3	they actually worked with me. I think we did
4	interest only payments for the transition years,
5	so that kind of helped, you know, bridge that gap
6	because it is But you need to have that
7	barrier to entry because, well, A, it makes sure
8	the people that are in it are serious, and
9	they're not going to just going to bounce in and
10	out, you know, which way ever the wind blows.
11	So no, that actually worked out really
12	well. And I think, by and large, I think
13	bankers, they see that that's kind of the future.
14	And so I think, in my opinion, they're
15	supportive.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Awesome. That's
17	great to hear. I really appreciate that insight,
18	yeah. As much as we can, I mean, we have a lot
19	of work ahead of us trying to figure out how to
20	catalyze more folks into organic.
21	But these boring pieces that are not
22	wedge issues, this might be what actually

1	catalyze us getting into organic. And so things
2	like banking, insurance, not super-sexy, but very
3	important, so thank you for your insight on that.
4	All right, appreciate your comments today.
5	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Next up thank
7	you, we have Michael Hansen, followed by Megan
8	Vaith, and then Byron Wiemer. Michael, please go
9	ahead.
10	MR. HANSEN: Hello, I'm Michael
11	Hansen, senior scientist for Consumer Reports, an
12	independent non-profit organization that works
13	side by side with consumers to create a fair,
14	safer, and healthier marketplace.
15	I will speak on the excluded materials
16	document on the four techniques. First,
17	eco-tilling is not an excluded method, since no
18	mutagens are used. Tilling where the mutagen is
19	environmental stress is also not an excluded
20	method since such stresses are naturally
21	occurring.
22	Tilling where chemicals or irradiation

are used as a mutagenic compound should then be

considered as an excluded method, since they

violate the first criterion for determining if a

method should be excluded since it could be

argues that chemicals and irradiation would not

respect the genome is indivisible.

Second, for double haploids there are in vivo and in vitro methods. For the in vivo methods, particularly the use of haploid inductor or inducing lines, those could be considered not to be using an exclusion method as long as none of the ingredients used in the in vivo methods are produced using modern biotechnology or are unapproved synthetic chemicals.

For the in vivo methods that use irradiated pollen, we consider the use of irradiation would violate the first criterion.

If any of the inputs used in the in vitro double haploid system are produced using modern biotechnology, then those inputs would make the system an excluded technology. If the synthetic phytohormones or colchicine are not

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

produced using modern biotechnology, then those 1 synthetic chemicals would have to be permitted to 2 3 be used before this in vitro technology could be considered not an excluded method. 4 Third, induced mutagenesis where the mutagen is a chemical or irradiation should join 6 7 in vitro method -- should join in vitro nucleic acid techniques as an excluded method. If the 8 9 mutagen is an environmental stressor or UV light, then those would not be considered an excluded 10 11 method. 12 Fourth, transposable elements, TEs, where their movement is a result of a chemical or 13 irradiation should join in vitro nucleic acid 14 techniques as a excluded method. 15 If the of 16 movement is а result an environmental stressor, then those should not be considered an 17 excluded method. 18 19 should be pointed out that TEs, 20 once thought to be, quote, junk DNA, are now 21 known to play a major role in driving genome 2.2 evolution. In addition to causing mutations,

1 transposable elements induce epigenetic can alterations that modify gene expression which can 2 3 result in phenotypic variation and adaptation distress in rice. 4 Recent research has shown TEs are the 5 main source of epigenetic changes and form a 6 7 substantial part of the plant genome such as 85 percent in maize. Our recent review found, 8 9 quote, these TE-mediated epigenetic modifications 10 lead to phenotypic diversity, genetic variation, 11 and environmental stress tolerance. Thus, TE12 methylation is essential for plant evolution and 13 stress adaptation. And I think this new research shows 14 15 that using transposable elements in environmental 16 is probably going to be а lot important in breeding techniques. 17 Thank vou. 18 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you for your 19 comments. We have a question for you from Dilip. 20 MEMBER NANDWAN: Thank you for your 21 and they are really valuable comments, 2.2 Board, as we are reviewing these. And this is

1	going to be a lot of work for the Board members.
2	One big clarification, I couldn't
3	catch your point on excluded methods using in
4	vitro IM using chemicals such as colchicine. I
5	am aware of that, one of the chemicals they use
6	to make double haploids. I am sure you are aware
7	of that.
8	MR. HANSEN: Yes.
9	MEMBER NANDWAN: So could you please
10	mention sorry, I didn't get your point that if
11	there are any chemicals involved in double
12	haploids, are they going to be like excluded
13	methods or something else?
14	MR. HANSEN: No. What I said is the
15	phytohormones, for example, and the colchicine,
16	
	those would need to be, since they are used in
17	those would need to be, since they are used in the double haploid method, in one of them, those
17 18	
	the double haploid method, in one of them, those
18	the double haploid method, in one of them, those would need to be permitted synthetic chemicals.
18 19	the double haploid method, in one of them, those would need to be permitted synthetic chemicals. And there's a process for that.

1	some of these techniques. And so what I was
2	saying is just make those two a permitted
3	synthetic, and that should be fine to go.
4	MEMBER NANDWAN: Okay. Thank you very
5	much. I appreciate that.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We have a question
7	for you from Brian?
8	MEMBER CALDWELL: Thanks, Michael,
9	really appreciate your insight in all this. Very
10	quickly, why should colchicine be allowed as an
11	inducer of, you know, of mutations, and as a just
12	sort of a generic manipulater?
13	MR. HANSEN: Well, no. That's just
14	look, they had said double haploids in the past
15	have been considered, quote, a traditional
16	breeding method, right? So they weren't
17	technically excluded. So all I'm saying is this
18	is what would have to be done. Because right now
19	you couldn't use them, right?
20	MEMBER CALDWELL: Okay.
21	MR. HANSEN: I would have pushed more
22	if you're going to do the, you know, double

1	haploids. The ones where there are these inducer
2	lines, right, then you're all fine. But for some
3	other crops you might have to use, you know,
4	phytohormones.
5	And if organic wants to go down that
6	road, then I'm just saying that at least the
7	colchicine and the phytohormones have to be
8	considered approved. Because again, there were
9	actually some technical people in the organic
10	community that told me that their dream is to
11	actively do some double hapload on some crops for
12	organic. And they said likely then we use
13	colchicine.
14	And all I said, well, if there's
15	enough interest in that you're going to have to
16	that should go through the process of being
17	considered an approved synthetic, if people want
18	that. If folks don't, that's fine as well.
19	MEMBER CALDWELL: I see, okay. That
20	makes a lot of sense.
21	The other question I had was, and this
22	may be to big of a question, but how can we

1 some of these techniques have been on the TBA list for a long time. And of course even before 2 3 that, the reason they were put on TBA list was because there were a lot of varieties in the 4 pipeline, and in use, that used them. So if we decide to make some of these 6 7 excluded methods, how do we go through -- should just say from this point forward they be 8 9 excluded methods, or should we actually try to retrieve them from all the varieties that we have 10 11 them? 12 MR. HANSEN: It's unclear to me, for 13 example, if many -- of the double haploids. Ι think where this comes into it might be with the 14 15 mutagenesis, the past use of irradiation chemicals. But now what's interesting is this 16 brand new, in the last three or four years, this 17 18 information about transposable elements is really 19 fascinating. 20 Because besides regular mutations, 21 this whole area of epigenetics where, actually, 2.2 you're not changing the DNA at the nucleotide

1 base level, you're sort of tagging it. That could actually have heritable effects on all 2 3 these other things, and science didn't really understand that. 4 5 beginning to understand now and what's fascinating is transposable 6 7 elements are actually playing a role in that. finding And thev're out that, under 8 9 conditions, that the transposable elements are 10 not only creating mutations, but they're actually 11 changing things to make the plant more 12 adaptable. 13 That was the rice research, and then there's this other research in the last three 14 15 years. So these people are realizing, 16 transposable elements are way more important than we thought. 17 18 So using them in breeding, and again using environmental stressors, like putting them 19 20 in extreme heat and other conditions, previously people said that was crazy, because that would 21 2.2 imply there's Lamarckianism, right, the inherence

1	of acquired characteristics.
2	We now know that epigenetics is
3	actually what that is, and we're now coming to
4	realize that one of the main mechanisms is
5	through these transposable elements.
6	So that means doing breeding, rather
7	than using all these chemicals and other things,
8	it's going to be the transposable elements that
9	are going to be creating all this variation not
10	only, as I said, just that mutational stock, but
11	all how the genemome is regulated and turning on
12	and off. That's what's really special here.
13	Because, for example, with the maize genome,
14	evidence of 85
15	MEMBER CALDWELL: So, Michael, this is
16	going to take too long. I'm going to just yield
17	to Mindee here. But I appreciate that that's
18	going to be an important method. But we are a
19	little short of time, so sorry.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Go
21	ahead, Mindee.
22	MEMBER JEFFERY: Thank you so much,

1	Michael, for your comments and for your long
2	history of keeping track of these issues with us.
3	If you want to send us some of that literature,
4	please do send it to Michelle, because we'd love
5	the references.
6	MR. HANSEN: Yeah, the two of them,
7	most of these are since I drafted NOC comments.
8	Most of those technical ones of are there, but
9	this review article that I was quoting from the
10	end isn't. So I'll send that, and I can actually
11	send a few more.
12	MEMBER JEFFERY: Great. We will love
13	that. Thank you so much.
14	My question is has Consumer Reports
15	considered or conducted, like, a newer consumer
16	survey on whether or not people understand the
17	proliferation of biotechnology in the food
18	system.
19	MR. HANSEN: We haven't done, no,
20	newer surveys on that. But every time we did
21	them, that was actually, particularly for people
22	that were buying organic, that was an important

1	consideration.
2	And our surveys tend to show that
3	people think it's all genetic engineering, not
4	these new terms of CRISPR-Net. These are all
5	just forms of genetic engineering.
6	MEMBER JEFFERY: Yeah. The reason I
7	asked is because I think, especially of the
8	plant-based movement, we're growing so much
9	before the pandemic. And thinking of how
10	consumers fit with the food system during and
11	post-pandemic, I don't feel like I've necessarily
12	been able to gain perspective on some of, like,
13	updated consumer thinking.
14	And I'm not sure where I can get that
15	perspective from in the sense of are people being
16	educated on where these new technologies come in.
17	Because there's a lot of counter-pressure to
18	allow them into the organic space and the natural
19	food space. But I'm really just interested
20	MR. HANSEN: Right.
21	MEMBER JEFFERY: in what consumers
22	know and what they, you know, what are they

1	really thinking about from a neutral place of
2	understanding consumers. So
3	MR. HANSEN: Right. I mean
4	(Simultaneous speaking.)
5	MEMBER JEFFERY: Thank you so much for
6	answering your
7	MR. HANSEN: Yeah, we'll be trying to
8	I will be encouraging Consumer Reports to
9	actually redo some of these surveys, and
10	hopefully I can be successful on that.
11	MEMBER JEFFERY: Yeah, thank you so
12	much, Michael.
13	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We have one more
14	question
15	MR. HANSEN: You're welcome.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: for you from
17	Dilip.
18	MEMBER NANDWAN: Thanks, Nate. Sorry,
19	it should be quick. Michael, can you please tell
20	us a little bit about two other topics, or you
21	can send us the literature.
22	One is protoplast culture or

1	protoplast fusion and also embryo rescue. If you
2	have any thoughts, please share. If not, please
3	sent the literature later, because of the time
4	constraint. Thank you again.
5	MR. HANSEN: Yeah, just very quickly
6	for protoplast fusion, as long as it's below the
7	level of plant family that has been considered
8	conventional breeding, and because the issue
9	there would be a lot of the cold crops. Those
10	are how those are being developed. And I can
11	send you some information on cell fusion too.
12	MEMBER NANDWAN: And embryo rescue.
13	MR. HANSEN: Oh, and embryo rescue.
14	MEMBER NANDWAN: Thank you again.
15	MR. HANSEN: Well, actually, that is
16	the use of colchicine and all those other things.
17	That's part of what embryo rescue is. Because
18	you're doing the embryo rescue, that's part of
19	the double haploid system.
20	MEMBER NANDWAN: Correct
21	(Simultaneous speaking.)
22	MEMBER NANDWAN: is there,

1	integrated, kind of they are connected in one or
2	other form. I'll stop there. Thank you again, I
3	appreciate that.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, and
5	thank you, Michael. We really appreciate your
6	comments and joining us today.
7	Next up we have Megan Vaith, followed
8	by Byron Wiemer, and then Phil Vavarchek. Sorry
9	if I $B-$ I'm an equal opportunity name-butcherer,
LO	so please forgive me.
L1	Megan, please go ahead.
L2	MS. VAITH: Can you hear me, Nate?
L3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We can.
L 4	MS. VAITH: Perfect. So bear with me,
L5	I'm going to talk fast. My name is Megan Vaith,
L 6	and I'm with Northbourne Organic Crop Insurance
L7	where I work with multiple organic farmers on the
L8	insurance options that are available to them.
L 9	Crop insurance has been an important
20	risk management tool used for years that's
21	progressively become more popular in the organic
2.2	industry. According to the RMA back in 2013.

1 just over 694,000 acres were covered under crop insurance. And in 2022, that number grew to just 2 3 under 2 million acres. provided 4 According to data bv 5 Mercaris, nearly 8.3 million acres of certified organic grain was harvested in 2022. 6 This means 7 there is a gap of over 6 million organic acres not being covered by the Federal Crop Insurance 8 9 Program. 10 While I do want to recognize there are 11 multiple ways to mitigate risk, and crop 12 insurance doesn't need to be used on every 13 operation, I think it's time we take a step back 14 and start to analyze why this subsidized program 15 is not used more widely among organic growers 16 like it is for their conventional counterparts. 17 In turn, organic farmers experience 18 higher loss ratios on average than conventional 19 farmers. Over the last ten years, RMA's data 20 shows that the average loss ratio was 1.58 on 21 organic versus 0.8 on conventional. Crop 2.2 insurance is supposed to be actuarially sound,

meaning over time it showed a loss ratio of 1.0 1 2 as every dollar paid into the program is supposed 3 to be a dollar paid back out to farmers through losses with the exception of a small cushion. 4 This presents a problem in itself as the crop insurance program is not staying true to 6 7 the original intention. But also, if the loss ratios are that high in organic why do we see 8 9 such a large number of farmers not utilizing it? I believe this can be attributed to a 10 couple of different reasons. Number one, organic 11 12 farmers not knowing that crop insurance options 13 are available for them and, two, crop insurance simply doesn't work for them. 14 15 Here is one of the areas I would like 16 shed light on. When a farmer begins to transition to organic, they have to forego their 17 18 conventional history and start over with a county 19 transitional yield which sets a baseline for what 20 the farmer is quarantees will be. These yields, 21 transitional known Τ vields, as 2.2 typically set at 65 percent of the conventional

T yields. 1 2 History has proven that organic 3 farmers can raise more than 65 percent of the conventional yield. So why is the T yield so 4 Along with that, after the transitional low? period when they become certified organic, they 6 7 have to start over again. Because they are technically starting a new farming practice. 8 9 It takes four years of planting the same crop to the same field to flesh out the 10 low 11 T yield making insurance inadequate for the 36 12 months to transition along with the first four 13 years of planting that crop while being certified 14 organic. 15 I worked with a farmer in South Dakota 16 whose conventional average yield was 252 bushels When he transitioned to organic, he was 17 of corn. forced to use a yield based on 124 bushels. 18 19 Suggestion, if RMA is stuck on using the 65 percent factor, why not allow established 20 farmers to use 65 percent of their conventional 21

This would have increased that farmer's

history?

2.2

1	yield from 124 to 164 and made his policy more in
2	touch with a yield potential?
3	Trend adjustment is an option farmers
4	are able to add onto their policy to increase
5	their guaranteed yields. In order to qualify for
6	this beneficial option, you have to have planted
7	the same crop on the same field over the last
8	four years.
9	This works great for the traditional
10	corn and soybean farmer, but when you get into
11	more diverse crop rotations, like the options in
12	organics, farmers are not planting the same crop
13	every four years making them ineligible or this
14	option and thus having less crop insurance
15	coverage.
16	PM CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nice work if
17	you're done, if you're not, keep going.
18	MS. VAITH: I have one sentence. I
19	suggest RMA changes the guidelines for organic
20	farmers as long as they can prove their
21	multi-crop rotational system. And I'll end it.
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Boom. All right.

1	Questions for Megan?
2	Megan, I was wondering, we've talked a
3	lot about crop rotation, do you have any
4	resources that you'd point folks to where just
5	the basic fundamental anatomy, access, all the
6	rules around crop insurance for organic
7	producers, somewhere that they can go to learn
8	more about it?
9	MS. VAITH: As far as crop rotation
10	for how that works for the crop insurance?
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Or rather just for
12	organic crop insurance in general.
13	MS. VAITH: Well, I do not have any
14	resources at the moment. But we are creating
15	some with OATS, the Organic Argronomic Training
16	Service, so more to come on that this summer.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, we'll
18	
19	MS. VAITH: So that will be really
20	good for, yeah, information for them.
21	And as far as, like, the crop
22	rotational system with the trend adjustment and

1	all that, that doesn't just apply to organic
2	farmers. I think that's really a disadvantage
3	for farmers that are also like, in western
4	South Dakota conventional farmers have multiple
5	crops in their rotational system. And so it
6	doesn't work for them either. So it's not a
7	blanket works for conventional and not organic.
8	I think the whole thing needs to be re-looked at.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I love that. It's
10	sort of the big tent approach where we could
11	benefit all farmers if we were moving in this
12	direction, really appreciate that.
13	Amy has a question for you.
14	MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah, Megan, thank you
15	so much for your time today, and joining us, and
16	providing your perspective. Two questions, you
17	had a lot of data about, you know, the
18	distribution of how many farmers are doing crop
19	insurance or participating in the program and how
20	many aren't in the organic space.
21	Do we know where those numbers are
22	distributed, I mean, and who has adopted the

1	organic crop insurance, and who hasn't, and what
2	type of farmer profile that is so we can
3	understand.
4	You know, you said it was they
5	don't know if it's available is why they're
6	potentially not participating or it doesn't work
7	for them. So then we can start getting after,
8	you know, root causes and solutions for those.
9	MS. VAITH: Yeah. There is
L 0	information on the RMA website about what crops
L1	are insured and what states that have the
L2	insurance options available to them. Of course,
L3	there is no, like, good data as to why they're
L 4	not purchasing crop insurance.
L5	I think a lot of it is misinformation
L 6	or just not having enough information out there,
L7	like I said. But there is the data showing where
L 8	the crop insurance policies are located, I guess,
L 9	and what crops.
20	MEMBER BRUCH: Awesome, that's great.
21	And my second question is we heard from quite a
22	few producers about they want to rotate into

1	crops, but they can't get crop insurance on in
2	their counties. But they're not necessarily
3	exotic crops, they're normalized crops.
4	Can you just talk to the Board here
5	about the process, the written agreement process
6	and what all goes into that so a producer could
7	buy to get these crops put on their insurance
8	list?
9	MS. VAITH: Yes, good question, Amy.
10	So written agreements is a process that organic
11	farmers can go through in order to obtain crop
12	insurance on their crops that don't have crop
13	insurance readily available, very common process
14	for organic farmers.
15	Usually it gets a bad rep that farmers
16	are just not wanting to go through that process
17	or maybe the agents don't want to do it, because
18	it's extra work, and a lot of paperwork involved.
19	So some of the restrictions that they
20	need in order to obtain insurance is you need to
21	submit the biggest one, I guess, if you need to
22	have some sort of crop history. And it doesn't

need to be history on the crop that you're
planting. Like maybe buckwheat, for example, you
want to plant buckwheat, you don't have any
history of buckwheat.

In order to get insurance you can
submit this written agreement and say that you
have a crop history of a similar crop to what

buckwheat is. And there's an entire handbook

9 that lists what similar crops can be classified

10 as so that you can use it. It can be a

11 combination of -- there's probably even ten

12 different crops you can use on that in order to

obtain the insurance.

8

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So a lot of farmers think that, oh, this is too hard. Like, I don't have the three years of history on that crop, so I can't get crop insurance. But they really need to go down the written agreement route and realize they probably have the history in just another crop which will qualify them to submit the written agreement and get crop insurance coverage.

Is it going to be great crop insurance

1	coverage, you don't know until you get the offer
2	back. But it's worth going through the process
3	just to see what they're willing to offer you for
4	coverage and if it's worth it and beneficial for
5	your operation.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Awesome. Any
7	other questions for Megan?
8	Megan, you packed a bunch into a very
9	short period of time, but we can't thank you
LO	enough for joining us today. Thank you so much
11	for the time
12	MS. VAITH: Thank you.
13	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: it took to
L 4	prepare that, and for your expertise, and for
15	helping organic farmers find crop insurance.
L 6	Thank you.
L7	Next up, we have Byron Wiemer,
L 8	followed by Phil Vavarchek, and then Doug
L 9	Currier.
20	MR. WIEMER: Yes, I'm Byron Wiemer.
21	I'm actually a crop insurance agent in Nebraska,
2.2	in eastern Nebraska based out of Utica. was asked

1 to visit with you all. I'm going to sort of 2 piggyback on Megan and Aaron both. You talked 3 about crop insurance, but my discussion was going to be on the T yields that you guys have to start 4 5 out with, you know, to get started in organic farming. 6 7 And just an example would be like in York County, Nebraska, for irrigated corn, 8 if 9 you're conventional corn, you start out at 223 10 bushels. For organic transitional, you start out 11 at 156. So, you know, that's a 67 bushel 12 difference. This year, corn price was set at So, you know, if you use 591 you're short 13 591. \$400 an acre difference, 396. 14 15 Soybeans are sort of the same thing. You know, if you're a conventional person, it's 16 67 bushels that you start out with. 17 If vou're organic transitional, you've got 47. 18 So it's a 19 20 bushel different. Price we're using this year is \$1,376 so, you know, you're looking at \$275 20 21 difference. Then wheat, you know, you start out 2.2 if you're a conventional farmer, you start out at

55 bushels, organic transitional it's 36. 1 So at 877 for 2023, you know, you're \$167 an acre 2 difference then, you know. 3 Like both Aaron and Megan related to, 4 5 start out with these transitional vou it's four 6 vields, you know, vears. So 7 depending what kind of rotation you're in, varies. It could be, you know, you have to --8 9 every time we turn an actual yield in, we get rid 10 of one T yield. 11 So in a tier crop rotation you're 12 talking eight years. If you're a three-crop 13 rotation it could be 12. So, you know, it's a 14 long process to get to where you actually get to 15 use your own yields. And as far as the crops are available, I mean, that varies by county. 16 17 know, when I looked at You 18 County, basically you have corn, you've 19 soybeans, you've got grain sorgum, popcorn, and 20 And so you're so limited on the coverage oats. 21 that's available. And like I said, you know, 2.2 you're stuck with those yields for four years.

1	So it's, for people going into it, you
2	know, it's sort of a tough pull, because you are
3	taking, like Aaron said, you're taking quite a
4	bit of risk on yourself. And that's something
5	that we're going to, you know, we all need to
6	help to address so that we can offer better
7	coverage for you.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Well, we really
9	appreciate these comments. Questions for Byron?
10	So, Byron, I have a question for you.
11	MR. WIEMER: Yeah.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Do you think it is
13	just a missed opportunity to assume, with
14	probably some good data, that good conventional
15	farmers who are good operators become good
1 6	
16	organic farmers who get good yields? Is that
17	organic farmers who get good yields? Is that something that you think is a true statement,
17	something that you think is a true statement,
17 18	something that you think is a true statement, good farmers
17 18 19	something that you think is a true statement, good farmers MR. WIEMER: Yeah.

that farmer that takes pride in his operation, you know, whether you're farming conventional or 2 3 you're farming organic, you're going do everything in your power to produce a good crop 4 5 and have something that you can drive by, your neighbors can drive by and be proud of. 6 7 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Absolutely. And so it seems like we are dismissing that in, you 8 9 know, RMA's analysis of how a farmer becomes an 10 organic farmer. They have to go through sort of 11 this, you know, for lack of a better term, 12 de-robing period where they don't get to have any 13 of their history or any of their techniques 14 recognized, that they know how to get yields, and they're going to be able to transfer 15 that. 16 So I really appreciate your insights 17 18 here in how T yields are, I mean, in a way, those 19 numbers that you gave us are really quite a barrier for thinking that it's a good bet to make 20 21 that jump over to organic. 22 I'm going to hand if off to Amy.

1

1	please go ahead.
2	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes, Byron, thank you
3	so much for joining us from your mobile office,
4	appreciate that. I wanted to ask you a question.
5	That data was really helpful where you
6	communicated about the T yields.
7	Just to clarify if, for example, if I
8	was a first year conventional farmer, would I be
9	able to get a larger coverage level than a farmer
10	that had 15 years experience farming
11	conventionally and then decided to switch to
12	transition? Is that an accurate statement?
13	MR. WIEMER: No. I mean, basically if
14	yeah, I mean you're a beginning farmer, you
15	know, like I said, and you have no yield history
16	for corn, soybeans, or whatever the crop, you
17	start out in what they call T yields.
18	And like I said, for irrigated corn it
19	would be 223, irrigated soybeans would be 67.
20	The only way you would ever get higher yields in
21	that to start out with would be if you were
22	renting on shares and your landlord was willing

1	to share, if he had higher yields, you know, in
2	his ten-year database, you would be able to use
3	those yields if he agreed to share them with you.
4	But that would be the only way you could do it.
5	Did that answer your question or not
6	answer your question? I'm not sure.
7	MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah, it did. The
8	transition is not a it's not for a transition
9	producer. It's for a person that doesn't have
LO	any practice history automatically gets that
L1	data. Yes?
L2	MR. WIEMER: Correct.
L3	MEMBER BRUCH: That answered my
L 4	question, thank you so much.
L5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
L 6	for Byron?
L7	I'll echo Amy, Byron. Thank you so
L 8	much for making it work to join us today.
L 9	MR. WIEMER: Well, thank you for
20	(Simultaneous speaking.)
21	MR. WIEMER: thank you for the
22	opportunity.

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Absolutely. Take
2	care.
3	MR. WIEMER: You too. Thank you.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you. Next
5	up we have Phil Vavarchek and then Doug Currier.
6	And we're ending today with Alan Lewis.
7	Phil, if you're there, the floor is
8	yours.
9	MS. ARSENAULT: Nate, Phil is on the
10	phone only. And I don't know which number
11	belongs to him. He may have to hit Star 6 unmute
12	himself.
13	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: So, Phil, if
14	you're on the phone, and you want to hit Star 6,
15	that should unmute you, if you can hear us. And
16	we can certainly circle back.
17	Amy, do you see him online?
18	MS. ARSENAULT: If you could just let
19	me know the last four digits of your photo list,
20	so we know which line to unmute, that would be
21	awesome.
22	MEMBER BRUCH: 1909, I believe.

22

1	MS. ARSENAULT: Got it.
2	MR. VAVRACEK: Okay, can you hear me
3	now?
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yes, we can.
5	Please go ahead.
6	MR. VAVRACEK: Okay, sorry about that.
7	Yeah, this is Phil Vavracek. I'm a producer
8	over here in Nebraska, eastern Nebraska. And we
9	got into the organics here. We've grown two
10	certified crops and went through the transition
11	period.
12	And I've listened to two of your prior
13	callers, so my topic I was going to bring up was
13	callers, so my topic I was going to bring up was about the T yields as well. So I'm probably not
14 15	about the T yields as well. So I'm probably not
14 15	about the T yields as well. So I'm probably not going to get into that too much. They gave a
14 15 16	about the T yields as well. So I'm probably not going to get into that too much. They gave a good explanation of that.
14 15 16 17	about the T yields as well. So I'm probably not going to get into that too much. They gave a good explanation of that. But my thing was it is here I'm going
14 15 16 17	about the T yields as well. So I'm probably not going to get into that too much. They gave a good explanation of that. But my thing was it is here I'm going to say where that 150 is our T yield for our
14 15 16 17 18	about the T yields as well. So I'm probably not going to get into that too much. They gave a good explanation of that. But my thing was it is here I'm going to say where that 150 is our T yield for our county average. And with us, our first year of

back to corn, and it was 224. We followed up 1 2 with another good yield. 3 So with that being said, with the the proven history, we're 4 four-years to get 5 obviously going to need to go to a different We're going to go to soybeans, and then we 6 7 might go to a small grain like wheat and then back to alfalfa. 8 9 Our concern or reason for that is that 10 the alfalfa with weed control, then rotating the 11 crops because of disease, insects, and soil 12 So if we start getting into three or health. 13 four crops, you know, over three or four years, your period of time, then you're talking 12 to 16 14 15 years before we have the four years of proven 16 history. There was a little bit of talk about 17 18 maybe some producers doing all that they can, you 19 know, to push that crop to get a better yield. 20 I'm not taking away from anybody, but you have 21 that in conventional too. So if you have a

producer that's willing to put a little more out

2.2

1 and do a little more than his neighbor, 2 wondering, he should almost be rewarded for 3 that. So if there's some type of way to use 4 your proven history of conventional, and use a 5 6 percentage of that to support or to prove a T 7 yield, or not T yield, excuse me, a proven yield that you could use for your organic, just taking 8 9 a percentage over your 10, 15, or how many ever 10 years you've been farming conventionally, just to 11 reward maybe, I don't want to say maybe a better 12 producer or someone that, you know, has a little 13 better history of yield. I guess that's one thought, one idea. 14 15 Because our organic was just as good as our 16 conventional and actually better than some of our other conventional fields, or whatever, where 17 we've had some disease and some other issues. 18 So 19 that was one thing we were looking at. 20 Another thing I guess I wanted to 21 bring up that I kind of read about is maybe the 2.2 imports of organic crops (audio interference),

1	you know, are they legitimately doing everything
2	that we are here in the United States? Or are
3	they just, you know, is it getting looked at as
4	hard as maybe we are in all the processes that we
5	have to go through.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Read you loud and
7	clear. Yes, thank you so much for your comments
8	today. Questions from the Board for Phil?
9	I just had a quick, making sure I got
LO	the numbers right, Phil, you said that your
L1	organic field that first year out-yielded some of
L2	your conventional fields?
L3	MR. VAVRACEK: Correct, yes.
L 4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Awesome.
L5	MR. VAVRACEK: Obviously it was an
L 6	irrigated field, and we had come right out of the
L 7	alfalfa. So we kind of did that for weed
L 8	control, and we did that for soil health, was our
L 9	thinking.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I think that is a
21	great opportunity in these meetings to hear some
22	real on the ground data of how folks are doing

Τ	out there. So I really appreciate you sharing
2	that with us. Thank you very much. And thanks
3	for joining us with your comments today.
4	MR. VAVRACEK: Yeah, thank you. And
5	I guess I'd just like to say lastly, you know,
6	thank you and the Board for all that you are
7	doing. We really appreciate that.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Appreciate you.
9	Take care.
10	MR. VAVRACEK: All right, thank you.
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Michelle, is
12	Xavier Barraza on?
13	MS. ARSENAULT: If so, only on the
14	phone. And I don't know the phone number, so I
15	don't know which one may belong to them. Trying
16	to unmute phone lines.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Xavier, if you're
18	there, and on the phone, and want to hit Star 6,
19	we'll be able to hear you. Otherwise we can come
20	back.
21	Let's jump to Doug Currier, and then
22	Alan Lewis, and then we'll come back to Xavier.

1	Doug, if you're there, the floor is
2	yours.
3	MR. CURRIER: Thank you, Nate. Hi,
4	Board members. My name is Doug Currier. I'm
5	presenting comments today on behalf of the
6	Organic Materials Review Institute where I work
7	as technical director. I'm presenting comments
8	today on ion exchange resins.
9	I want to start by recognizing that
10	having an understanding of what ends up or
11	potentially ends up in organic food is valid.
12	This concern is baked into our current policy on
13	ion exchange technology.
14	As stated in previous comments to the
15	Board, OMRI's policy on the technology has
16	remained unchanged since 2004, both the resin and
17	the recharge material used with the technology
18	must be on the national list.
19	This policy is largely based on the
20	fact that ion exchange resins qualify under a
21	variety of FDA definitions such as secondary
22	direct food additive, processing aids, and food

1 contact substances.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

The pre-approval of exchange resins by
the FDA, just like the many thousands of other
substances that are introduced into food, either
intentionally to accomplish a technical effect,
or adventitiously as a component of an added
substance, or inadvertently through contamination
resulting from processing, must include estimated
dietary intake or EDI reporting.

These EDIs are estimates of the probable consumer intake of the additive as an indicator of the risk of adverse effects of human health. These are essentially toxicological assessments considered during FDA review and approval of these substances in food production in the U.S.

Details on the structural characteristics, use limitations, and pre-food production calibration requirements of the resins, which is something I don't think we've talked about much, approved for use in food production in the U.S., are found in 21 CFR. So

1 some amount of these structural components or 2 their byproducts could potentially end up in food 3 products. testing these foodstuffs 4 Yes, identify components originating 5 these from exchange resins is possible. And that would seem 6 7 true for any food contact substance with the EDI, including the mvriad of other 8 substances, 9 including other plastics currently used in USDA 10 organic production. 11 With that said, OMRI supports the 12 subcommittee's recommendation that ion exchange resins do not need to be added to the national 13 list for their use to continue for two reasons. 14 15 One is migration of chemical elements originating 16 from exchange resin to food is a potentiality. It's not quaranteed. 17 We consider it low risk because of 18 19 that EDI and that work that FDA has already done. 20 I think other commenters have pointed out too that the intention is not to have those elements 21 2.2 migrate to their organic product.

1	And second, we are concerned about the
2	precedent, a recommendation that resins be on the
3	National List sets for future NOSBs in the
4	broader organic sector.
5	So thank you for your time, and I will
6	end it there.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, we
8	appreciate your comments. Question for Doug?
9	Nate, please go ahead.
10	MEMBER LEWIS: Hey, Doug, appreciate
11	the comments. OMRI always tends to bring the
12	technical refresh to the conversation that we all
13	need. So I appreciate that.
14	The second element of your comments
15	related to precedent. Is it accurate to sort of
16	extrapolate from that the, let me just get my
17	words together correctly, but is it accurate to
18	extrapolate from that that it's your judgement at
19	OMRI that the resins are neither a processing aid
20	nor an ingredient. And therefore, we don't have
21	a place on the national list for these
22	substances?

1	MR. CURRIER: Yeah, I think that's
2	true. I think that, you know, making it clear
3	what is within the scope of the Board and what
4	isn't, is important here. And I think that is
5	the precedent that we're concerned about setting.
6	And, you know, having the Board tied up in the
7	future for other similar items is a concern. So
8	yeah, I think that's true, Nate.
9	MEMBER LEWIS: Thank you, appreciate
10	it.
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy, please go
12	ahead.
13	MEMBER BRUCH: Doug, thank you for
14	joining us today, we appreciate your comments and
15	information. I had a question for you about
16	another person's written comment. And this was
17	on liquid fish products. And the reason why I'm
18	asking you is because we talked about this, a
19	similar situation with folic acid and
20	fortification of essentially some of the
21	solvents.
22	So the written comment discusses that

1 high quarantee of phosphate thev've seen a 2 relative to nitrogen and some of these liquid 3 fish products. So they're seeing, like, a 140 or potentially 250 indicating that there's 4 possible, you know, larger amounts of phosphorous 5 or phosphate in these products than just enough 6 7 to, you know, get the pH in line. the So question is soil 8 was 9 test being performed by OMRI, phosphate for 10 example, to verify that these conditions aren't 11 occurring, that more phosphate's added, and then 12 other products are introduced into the overall 13 product to get the pH back in line with the annotation. 14 15 CURRIER: So not so much the 16 phosphorus testing at the final product level. We are very much looking at that pH requirement. 17 18 And we ensure that, you know, for formulated 19 products we're making sure that that pH test is 20 representative of the fish ingredient, so the stabilized fish ingredient, and not looking at, 21

you know, making sure that testing happens prior

2.2

1	to formulating with other ingredients.
2	You know, a lot of these products are
3	HNLF, so they're getting that extra scrutiny too,
4	going onsite and doing trace back audits. And
5	so, you know, we're very much focused on that pH
6	requirement.
7	And, yeah, beyond that, if they're
8	meeting that standard, you know, I think maybe
9	your question is more about the label claims
10	perhaps, or the NDK on the final product and how
11	some of that comes from that lab synthetic. But
12	yeah, we're very much focused on the pH and
13	making sure that's being met as annotated.
14	MEMBER BRUCH: Thanks. Just a quick
15	question, would the testing that wouldn't be
16	required the, the soil phosphate test, is that
17	something potentially that could be executed if
18	there was more indication that this fortification
19	was happening?
20	MR. CURRIER: Yeah. I might be
21	missing something here, but I think that the
22	fortification would come out in the pH, the pH

1	lab requirements. So the fortification, you
2	know, if they're not meeting that pH requirement,
3	yeah, then there's cause for concern for the
4	fortification. But they may be out for another
5	reason.
6	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay. So you think the
7	pH is a good indication for the moment?
8	MR. CURRIER: I would think so.
9	Because that's showing that it's meeting the
10	standard.
11	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay, thank you, Doug,
12	appreciate it.
13	MR. CURRIER: Yeah.
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We have a question
15	for you from Brian, sorry.
16	MR. CURRIER: Okay.
17	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yeah, thanks, Doug.
18	And boy, I want to thank all the work that OMRI
19	puts into our technical reports which I think
20	have been fantastic in the last few years. So I
21	really appreciate that.
22	MR. CURRIER: Great.

1	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yeah. Before my
2	real question, I actually did not understand what
3	you were talking about there with fish products
4	and the pH. You're saying that the pH is tested
5	before something like phosphoric acid is added so
6	that you would know how much phosphoric acid
7	would need to be added to bring it down to 3.5.
8	Is that what you're saying?
9	MR. CURRIER: So there are fish
10	products that are 100 percent fish products, or
11	stabilized fish products. But then there's
12	products that are formulated with fish products,
13	stabilized fish products. So for those
14	formulated products, we are ensuring that the pH
15	test is of that formulation ingredient.
16	And so you don't get the chance to
17	acid-stabilize twice. So you can't stabilize
18	your ingredient and then stabilize again to
19	reduce the pH again after formulation. So that
20	is something that we've worked hard to ensure
21	people are aware of. And it's more about the
22	double-dipping, I guess, for the acid

1	stabilization.
2	MEMBER CALDWELL: Okay. Yeah, I think
3	the kind of double dipping that I was thinking
4	about, and probably I think Amy was too, is that
5	basically before the final product is, before
6	it's finished, a lot of phosphorus, a lot of
7	phosphoric acid is added.
8	And then something else is added to
9	bring the pH back up to 3.5 so that it passes the
10	test. I think that's the concern. You know,
11	that would be the way of juicing it with
12	basically chemical peat.
13	MR. CURRIER: Sure.
14	MEMBER CALDWELL: So anyway, okay,
15	let's just put that aside. And my real question
16	was going to be in terms of the ion exchange. It
17	seemed like the first part of your comments was
18	very strongly in favor of listing resins. And
19	then the second part of your comments was the
20	opposite. So did I get that right?
21	MR. CURRIER: Yeah, and sorry for the
22	confusion, everybody. And I debated on whether

1 iust lead with for to our support the 2 subcommittee's recommendation and, in retrospect, 3 I maybe should have done that. But yeah, I think what -- and this has 4 been the issue all along, you know, it's kind of 5 defending where our policy is right now, and has 6 7 been for a long time, but all at the same time being open to adjusting our policy, you know, 8 9 based off of all the conversations that have been 10 had over the past three years. 11 So I think that the first part of the 12 comment is very much talking about where we're 13 coming from with our current policy, you know, talking about how these ion exchange resins would 14 15 meet a variety of different FDA definitions that would also be shared by things on the national 16 And I think that's maybe the confusion 17 list. 18 that we've been dealing with. But these are looked at by FDA in a 19 20 And that doesn't necessarily particular way. mean that we have to look at them in the same 21 2.2 And knowing that there is, and Gwendolyn way.

1	was talking about this earlier, knowing that
2	there's that FDA food contact substance process,
3	you know, where they're assessing that migration,
4	inadvertent, I think, potential migration is
5	something that they're doing.
6	And so just to clarify, we do support
7	the subcommittee's recommendation that these
8	don't need to be on national list. But my first
9	part of the comment was trying to, you know,
10	address some of the current policy that we have
11	and, you know, kind of connecting the dots
12	between what FDA is doing and, yeah, just trying
13	set the standard here or set the level here for
14	what the FDA is doing.
15	MEMBER CALDWELL: Thanks, Doug, really
16	appreciate it.
17	MR. CURRIER: Okay.
18	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Franklin, please
19	go ahead.
20	MEMBER QUARCOO: Yes, my question is
21	maybe a follow-up of what was already asked, but
22	it's still on the ion exchange filtration process

1	asking the terms leaking and leaching use
2	differentiates things between them. Is leaching
3	an actual issue as the reports that's around, it
4	goes into the exchange material. It doesn't go
5	into the product $B-$ it goes into the product.
6	So we are interested, particularly
7	interested in knowing what you think about is
8	leaching an issue.
9	MR. CURRIER: So, yeah, there's a lot
10	of the terminology for those terms being used.
11	And I think hopefully it's been we're arriving at
12	this point of recognizing that the resin, and the
13	makeup of the resin is not meant to interact with
14	the organic food or the foodstuff.
15	It's there to make sure that the ion
16	exchange technology is effective. But there is
17	this migration potential, you know, for there to
18	have some of these materials in the resin ending
19	up in food. That's what the FDA is looking at
20	when they look at their approval of food contact
21	substances.
22	There's calculations, but that's the

1 estimated dietary intake. You know, there has to be some kind of acknowledgement that there's a 2 3 potential for these elements in the resin to It's not just resins though, it's many 4 migrate. other food contact substances. 5 And one quick thing about this pre-use 6 7 calibration requirement, so there's requirements in the FDA regulations even before you started 8 9 using the technology. So you have to meet 10 certain standards. 11 And, you know, running kind of the 12 simulations of what the actual filtration 13 going to be, so that's what I'm calling these calibration requirement. And those are all in 21 14 15 CFR too. And these folks are going through all 16 of this even before they start into food production. 17 18 Again, Gwendolyn, I think, was hitting 19 on that. It's like these meant to be highly 20 calibrated, know, efficient, effective you 21 technology. So I know I'm saying maybe two 2.2 things there, but yes, I think there's

1	potential for migration. It think that's what
2	the food contact substance process is all about.
3	But, you know, certifiers making sure
4	things are in good working order onsite, going
5	onsite every year, I think, is a big part of
6	ensuring that these are working the way they're
7	meant to work.
8	MEMBER QUARCOO: Quickly, I wanted to
9	find out if I may, this estimated dietary intake,
LO	is it data driven? Is it supported by available
L1	enough data to make this EDR estimate be
12	relevant?
13	MR. CURRIER: From what I know, yeah.
L 4	Because it is part of the assessment FDA is
L5	doing as they look at potentially new food
L 6	contact substances. And so there's a lot of FDA
L7	resources that are there to really outline what
L 8	is required from these manufacturers.
L 9	And that is a calculation that they
20	are very much looking at, of what amount could
21	reasonably, at the highest level, kind of,
22	depending on how much someone is ingesting, how

1	much would potentially appear in one of these
2	foodstuffs.
3	MEMBER QUARCOO: Thanks.
4	MR. CURRIER: Yes.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, Kyla,
6	did you have a question?
7	MEMBER SMITH: I did. Sorry, I put my
8	hand down too soon. Sorry, I was already late to
9	coming in.
LO	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Go ahead
L1	MEMBER SMITH: Hi, Doug, thanks for
L2	your comments.
L3	MR. CURRIER: Yeah.
L 4	MEMBER SMITH: Two things, just wanted
L5	to sort of set the record straight on
L 6	terminology. So as I understand it, leakage
L7	really is referring to, like, ion capacity. And
L8	when the resins get at capacity those, like,
L 9	things that are meant to be being removed are
20	going further into the product.
21	So is that your understanding? I just
2.2	want to make sure that we're talking about the

1	same words here, terminology.
2	MR. CURRIER: I would agree with that,
3	yes.
4	MEMBER SMITH: Cool, okay. Second, in
5	regards to your, like, first part of your
6	comment, talking about, like, you know, term. I
7	know that Nate had asked about our terms, so
8	that was confirmation for me.
9	And I was just looking back at OTA's
10	written comments from, I think it was the fall.
11	And so I don't know if you have any knowledge of
12	this or not, but according to those comments
13	since the FDA Modernization Act in 1997, FDA has
14	been processing all resins through the FCN
15	process. And so they're all listed as a food
16	contact substance now at 21 CFR 173.25.
17	And so while the FDA, like I was
18	saying, it could be these other things in actual,
19	practical process there, like managing them
20	through the FCN process. Is that your
21	understanding?
22	MR. CURRIER: Yeah, that is. Yeah, 21

1	CFR 173.25
2	MEMBER SMITH: That's right.
3	MR. CURRIER: is very interesting,
4	because all of the components of these resins are
5	very clearly outlined, along with their
6	pre-production calibration requirements, use
7	limitations, things like that. But yes, that is
8	my understanding of the FDA process for these.
9	MEMBER SMITH: Thank you.
10	MR. CURRIER: Sure.
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
12	for Doug?
13	Well, Doug, I really appreciate OMRI.
14	The technical experts in the room agreeing with
15	the subcommittee's proposal, I think that gives
16	us a lot of clarity. So thank you so much for
17	coming on today.
18	MR. CURRIER: Sure, absolutely. Thank
19	you.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you. Lastly
21	I think, unless Xavier Barraza is on, I think we
22	are on our last speaker folks. So let's go with

1	Alan Lewis. Take us out, Alan.
2	MR. LEWIS: All right. Well, I'm
3	going to make some general comments about the
4	slippery slope that slides us down to the
5	slippery cliff. And this has to do with the
6	example of hydroponics.
7	Not long ago, a couple of families
8	came into our community and said that they had
9	accidentally, surreptitiously been certified on
10	hydroponic operations. And therefore, it was
11	essential to them to have hydroponics approved.
12	And by hook or by crook, with the help of
13	Stabenow, and Congress, and USDA, and NOP, and
14	one particular set of NOSB votes, that passed and
15	became the standard.
16	So let's do a check-in and see where
17	that slippery slope led us. Currently, for
18	instance, in Mexico 292 certified berry
19	operations, most of those in the last eight
20	years, primarily certified by CCOF.
21	What does that look like? That is
22	relatively strong corporations going into

communities, moving the residents off the land, 1 bulldozing it into flat fields, just tearing up 2 3 landscape, covering that with plastic, bringing in berry plants that are in plastic 4 containers with coconut fiber, digging a 50-foot 5 deep trench to collect the ground water from 6 7 neighboring wells in order to provide water to the bushes, bringing in outside labor for 8 9 dollar or two a day. 10 But that's not paid in pesos 11 or dollars. It's paid in company script at the 12 company store. So those workers end up living in slums causing crime and pollution problems, and 13 putting heavy stress on sanitation, and public 14 15 services, and even schools. 16 So eventually all those berries mature, and they're packaged up by some very big 17 international corporation that we're all very 18 19 familiar with, and they're trucked up to the 20 U.S. with a premium price. And our beloved USDA seal shows up on the packaging. 21 Wow, are we

And the day of reckoning is coming.

vulnerable.

2.2

1	Now I know that's water under the
2	bridge. I don't know how to take that back. But
3	my point here is that the slippery slope to the
4	slippery cliff on gene editing and genetic
5	manipulation is taking the same path. So when we
6	started talking about essentiality for one,
7	remember that that means allowable for every
8	operator. And we need to proceed with the utmost
9	caution.
LO	I will stop there, and give you guys
L1	30 seconds back. Thank you.
L2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I appreciate it,
L3	and we appreciate it. And we appreciate you,
L 4	Alan.
L5	Questions for Alan from the Board?
L 6	Mindee, please go ahead.
L7	MEMBER JEFFERY: Hi, thank you so
L8	much, Alan, for your commentary. And I was in
L 9	Wichita last summer, and I was so grateful to be
20	shopping in a natural grocer, so way to go,
21	developments in the Midwest.
22	And I, you know, thinking about it a

1	lot, I feel like the California experience of why
2	the organic consumer is there is very different
3	from other places in the country. And I think,
4	you know, I've been looking to catchup on
5	consumer thinking, because I feel like we're in a
6	very big societal shift post pandemic.
7	And I was wondering if Natural Grocers
8	has done any surveys or if you have any
9	perspective on the unusual markets of organic or
10	developing markets of organic, and tell us why
11	that consumer is here now? The new organic
12	consumer, and there're not a really liberal
13	market, like, why do they show up at Natural
14	Grocers?
15	MR. LEWIS: I think the short answer,
16	if I understand your question, is nobody feels
17	well, everybody's sick, conventional healthcare
18	is too expensive. And you can't get well if you
19	are poisoning yourself with dirty air, dirty
20	water, and dirty food.
21	And so that, I think, is the accepted
22	wisdom in the marketplace right now for why

1	cleaner food and better-for-you food is much more
2	popular post-pandemic. People definitely circle
3	back to what causes the root cause of disease and
4	illness. And there were plenty of people saying,
5	yeah, well, we already know that. So do your
6	best when you can to afford clean food and water.
7	MEMBER JEFFERY: Thank you, Alan.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
9	for Alan from the Board?
10	I have a question for you, Alan. And
11	
12	MR. LEWIS: Oh, no.
13	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: you just gave
14	me
15	(Laughter.)
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: you know, just
17	gave me real Ernie Ford vibes there with the
18	company store. So I'm going to let Dilip go
19	first. But the then I'm going to circle back.
20	MEMBER NANDWAN: Thank, Nate. I'm
21	not going to take long. And I know this is the
22	last commenter.

1	In your comments the last sentence,
2	you know, on gene editing, kind of caught my
3	attention. I'm still asking a direct question.
4	I would rather ask you, if you can tell just a
5	very vaguely about those couple of sentences you
6	mentioned, a little bit elaboration on gene
7	editing and the other biotech too. Thank you.
8	MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Dilip. What
9	we've been hearing over the last three for four
LO	years is individuals representing different
L1	interests saying gene editing is necessary. Gene
L2	editing is organic, certain operations will
L3	require it to survive drought, to survive
L 4	flooding, to survive new pest threats, or
L5	whatever.
L 6	So that's my parallel to the
L7	essentialism of one which caused hydroponic to
L8	sneak its way in. That's obviously my opinion.
L 9	When we start looking at how we're going to
20	develop seeds for organic, we're already so
21	vulnerable in many regards to criticism from
2	friends and enemies about the value of organic

1	and its integrity. If we start allowing
2	particular techniques for seed development, I
3	don't see how the brand recovers and survives
4	that. It's just GMO without pesticides.
5	That's my worry. I think that's my
6	most direct and forceful comment I can make to
7	you. This is moving forward in backroom
8	conversations. It's in testimony. And I hear it
9	among the original organic pioneers. They said,
10	oh, we used all those techniques back then to try
11	to find new varieties.
12	If we do that, we have to pay
13	attention to the consequences. Every exception
14	becomes the rule. And that's my gentle but
15	forceful warning about the process that we're
16	into.
17	MEMBER NANDWAN: Yes. I have you.
18	And thank you. That's really helpful. Thanks.
19	MR. LEWIS: Thank you.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
21	for Alan?
22	MR. LEWIS: Nothing big, Nathaniel,

1	nothing big. Ha, ha, ha.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Not quite, I
3	wouldn't say it's big but going back to Mexico
4	example, I feel like there are so many themes in
5	how you described corporate consolidation coming
6	in, displacing farmers.
7	And, you know, a farmer getting
8	displaced in Mexico has a lot in common to a
9	farmer getting displaced in Wisconsin, different
10	reasons, maybe different tactics by corporations,
11	but the same result of a diminished quality of
12	life for the rural world. And what is our role
13	in that?
14	My question for you, first question,
15	is are we misplacing hydroponics as the culprit
16	of berry companies going in and bulldozing
17	Mexican villages when it's something else?
18	And so the only reason I ask this
19	question is, and I said this a few times before,
20	we have so little time to figure out how to make
21	big changes that, if we're pointing at the wrong
22	culprit that's affecting the world that we want

1	to live in, we're not probably going to see those
2	changes actualized.
3	So wouldn't those berry companies be
4	doing that even if they are soil-grown. Is there
5	something about hydroponic? And then, let me
6	just jump to the next piece, are we basically
7	having hydroponic be the boogeyman for corporate
8	consolidation?
9	That we are concerned that a little
LO	farmer with an acre isn't going to be able to
L1	have \$50 million to make a booming one acre under
L2	glass shop. But we're, for some reason, scared
L3	of just saying we don't like corporate
L 4	consolidation. No one should like corporate
L5	consolidation. And why don't we just call a
L 6	spade a spade?
L7	MR. LEWIS: Yeah. Like that's not a
L 8	big question. Okay.
L 9	(Laughter.)
20	MR. LEWIS: All of these operations
21	could be extractive hydroponic berry operations
22	without the USDA seal on them. That migration,

those 260-plus operations, were certified in the 1 last eight years, in fact, half of them since 2 3 2019, no surprise there. So we can take organic out of it and 4 talk about corporate consolidation, talk about 5 Mexican laws and corruption, not that we are 6 7 immune to that up here. I think I'm going to circle back the global principles 8 to of 9 sustainable development and the global principles 10 of environmental, social, and governance 11 disclosures. 12 We're looking at a place where that 13 unnamed great big conglomerate that sells berries all over the place with a USDA logo on it is 14 15 going to score so low on its ESG, environmental, 16 social, governance disclosures and yet we, as a community, are putting our seal on there, or have 17 allowed it to be used on there. 18 19 So trying to get to that big question, 20 all of to aspire to sustainable us try development goals, even though they don't all 21 2.2 apply to the global north, or not well.

all try to manage the environment, and social issues, and governance issues to the benefit of society, and animals, and workers, and lands, and communities.

I don't think that the organic law captured enough of that, or very much of that, or any of that in a lot of ways. So we, as a community, need to wrap ourselves in an additional set of principles. And if I had my way, we'd start judging our own practices and strategies according to those principles. Alas, you all are not subject to my whims.

13 (Laughter.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIR POWELL-PALM: But if we're thinking that, yes, you want to engage those principles, at what point do we say, you know, organic standards, they're great. They're fine. Let's go work on bigger things. Like, let's go and figure out how we have more pressure on corruption practices in supply chains, how we have stronger, dare I say, protectionism for our American producers.

1	Let's just call it out again. How do
2	we help protect American producers? This is
3	what, behind all this veil, this is what we're
4	talking about, folks. We're saying that we don't
5	want foreign berries to impact our producers. I
6	don't see why we don't say it. We don't want
7	Vermont milk to be impacted by a Texas milk. We
8	want to protect markets.
9	Why do we have such a hard time just
LO	saying that, and why do we keep just throwing
L1	around things like we need more certifications,
L2	we need more standards, and not just say we need
L3	to organize?
L 4	MR. LEWIS: Yeah, if you're looking
L5	for my agreement, I agree with you.
L 6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, well I
L7	wasn't just fishing for a compliment, Alan. I
L8	was looking for a little call to action. But
L 9	maybe if you see you in LA then we can continue
20	this discussion.
21	MR. LEWIS: Thank you.
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Jerry, I

1	apologize. Jerry has one question for you. I
2	thought you were off the hook, but one more.
3	MR. LEWIS: Okay.
4	MEMBER D'AMORE: I'm just going to
5	follow on with what you said. I firmly believe
6	that, when you take one issue and make it the
7	boogeyman for all your concerns, that you dilute
8	the ability to address the individual concerns
9	well. And that's where I feel hydroponics is.
10	And, you know, it's not a mystery, I
11	made my living for many years as a hydroponic
12	farmer. But it should also be noted that I did
13	that so long ago that I didn't need the organic
14	seal, because it wasn't even there.
15	But I've set this room for real
16	discussion with real goals in front of it. And
17	if we start throwing everything in one pot and
18	make it we're just not going to tease it out
19	and make it right.
20	MR. LEWIS: Agreed. Yeah, thank you.
21	MEMBER D'AMORE: Thank you, sir. No,
22	great talking to you, appreciate it.

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Carolyn told me at
2	the fall, I know it's the meeting that I need to
3	cry less. So I'm going to practice that now.
4	MEMBER DIMITRI: Thank you.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Because I really
6	
7	(Simultaneous speaking.)
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I really
9	appreciate the conversations these past two days,
10	folks. This is has been truly wonderful. We ran
11	hard, we ran fast, we ran long. But we really
12	covered some great ground. So thank you to my
13	fellow members who asked some fantastic
14	questions. I was taking notes furiously, because
15	there were so many good ideas.
16	And thank you to everybody who
17	participated, especially those farmers who got of
18	the tractor, got on the horn, and told us what
19	you thought. So thank you everybody. And we are
20	just so stoked to see you next week. So travel
21	safe, everybody, and take care for now.
22	MEMBER D'AMORE: Nate, from a

1	colleague let me say, tears or no tears, great
2	job. Well done.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you. I
4	appreciate it.
5	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
6	went off the record at 5:38 p.m.)
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

+ + + + +

NATIONAL ORGANIC STANDARDS BOARD

+ + + + +

SPRING 2023 MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY
APRIL 25, 2023

+ + + + +

The Board met at the Crowne Plaza Atlanta Midtown 590 West Peachtree Street, NW Atlanta, Georgia, at 10:00 a.m., Nathaniel Powell-Palm, Chair, presiding.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

NATE POWELL-PALM, Chair
MINDEE JEFFERY, Vice Chair
KYLA SMITH
AMY BRUCH, Secretary
BRIAN CALDWELL
GERARD D'AMORE
CAROLYN DIMITRI
KIMBERLY HUSEMAN
ALLISON JOHNSON
NATHANIEL LEWIS
DILIP NANDWANI
LOGAN PETREY
FRANKLIN QUARCOO
WOOD TURNER

NOP STAFF PRESENT

MICHELLE ARSENAULT, Advisory Committee Specialist JARED CLARK, National List Manager FRED DAVID, Assistant Director, Standards Division ERIN HEALY, Director, Standards Division ANDREA HOLM, Agricultural Marketing Specialist ALEXIS McINERNEY, Program Analyst Agricultural JOHANNA MIRENDA, Marketing Specialist JENNIFER TUCKER, Ph.D., Deputy Administrator ROBERT YANG, Director, Accreditation Division PENNY ZUCK, Agricultural Marketing Specialist

AGENDA

Call to Order 4
Agenda Overview 6
NOP Introductions 8
Welcoming Remarks
Secretary's Report
Chair's report
USDA/AMS/National Organic Program Update and NOP - NOSB Q&A113
Compliance, Accreditation & Certification Subcommittee (CACS) Update 155
Adjourn

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(10:06 a.m.)
3	DR. TUCKER: All right, so we are now
4	officially opening the meeting. Good morning,
5	everyone.
6	We have a contingent online now? Yes?
7	Yeah, people are joining on Zoom? Okay, I'm
8	getting some head nods so that's good.
9	So good morning, everyone. I'm
10	Jennifer Tucker, Deputy Administrator of the
11	National Organic Program. Welcome to all our
12	board members and our audience, both in the room
13	and we do have an audience online, on Zoom. So
14	thank you for being here both in the room and
15	online.
16	It is my honor to officially open the
17	Spring 2023 National Organic Standards Board
18	meeting. I would like to particularly welcome
19	our two new board members, Dr. Franklin Quarcoo
20	from Tuskegee University in Alabama and Nate
21	Lewis from the Washington Farmland Trust in
22	Washington State.

1	They just very recently joined the
2	Board, and let's give them a big round of
3	applause. There's Nate and Franklin. If you're
4	on Zoom, you can clap like this. We are
5	observing you in spirit. Okay.
6	This is our second meeting in-person
7	and broadcasting online in the post-pandemic
8	world. So we look forward to continuing this
9	cadence of engagement.
10	Let's start with some official
11	business. This meeting, like other meetings of
12	the National Organic Standards Board, is being
13	run based on the Federal Advisory Committee Act
14	and the Board's Policy and Procedures Manual.
15	I am your designated federal officer.
16	And transcripts for all segments will be posted
17	once completed.
18	Now we'll take a quick look at the
19	agenda and I'll introduce members of the NOP
20	team. I'll then turn the floor over to Nate
21	Powell-Palm, Board Chair, for Board
22	introductions.

1 So first, the agenda. This morning will include introductions, some welcoming talks 2 3 from the Southeast Region Transition to Organic Partnership Program or TOPP, some board reports, 4 a program update with questions and answers from 5 6 the Board. We'll break for lunch and then we'll 7 We'll 8 return to begin the subcommittee work. 9 continue subcommittee work through tomorrow along 10 with update from the USDA National an 11 Agricultural Statistics Service or NASS. The work will continue into Thursday and we'll close 12 with some board business and a look ahead. 13 14 Ι close want to the segment by 15 thanking the National Organic Program team. So first, let's all thank Michelle Arsenault, our 16 17 advisory board specialist. She provides exceptional support for the board. 18 19 We also have a number of team members from Standards and from the broader NOP team here 20 21 to support the meeting and, for some of them, to 22 So folks who are in the room, please learn.

1	stand and wave when I call your name.
2	So we have Standards Director Erin
3	Healy. There's Erin. We've got Assistant
4	Director Fred David. Fred's new to the program.
5	Jared Clark, next to me, is our National List
6	Manager. Andrea Holm, with our Standards
7	Division. Johanna Mirenda, our latest addition
8	to the program.
9	Penny Zuck and Alexis McInerney, who
10	are both with our Office of Deputy Administrator.
11	And we have Robert Yang, our Director of
12	Accreditation Division. Robert may be engaged in
13	oversight meetings.
14	So next I'm going to turn the mic over
15	Nate Powell-Palm, our Board Chair. He'll be
16	introducing Board members. All of these members
17	devote hours and hours of volunteer time to serve
18	the organic community. Let's please give them a
19	big round of applause and appreciation.
20	Nate, thank you for your leadership.
21	You have the floor.
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you so much,

1	Jenny, really exciting agenda for today. Excited
2	to hear from folks local to this area and really
3	appreciate everyone making the time to join us.
4	For a round of board introductions,
5	I'm hoping we can just go around and say where
6	we're from, the seat that we sit in and what
7	we're excited about this spring. I feel like it
8	has been a long, hard winter for a lot of us.
9	And I think that this meeting represents a bit of
LO	a renewal.
L1	So Carolyn, can we start on your side
12	and then we do have, for everyone's information,
13	we are experiencing a bit of a Meta situation
L 4	where we have Mindee and Allison in the hotel,
L5	but they're going to be on Zoom because neither
L 6	are feeling well today.
L7	So we're going to go around and then
L8	we'll have them give their introductions last.
L 9	So if you'd get us kicked off, Carolyn?
20	MEMBER DIMITRI: Sure. Good morning,
21	everyone. I'm Carolyn Dimitri. I'm a professor
22	at New York University. I sit in oh, here,

1	let me start again.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: There we go.
3	MEMBER DIMITRI: Hi, I'm Carolyn
4	Dimitri. I'm a professor at New York University.
5	I sit in a consumer's seat and I'm excited about
6	the spring flowers.
7	MEMBER PETREY: Hi, I'm Logan Petrey.
8	I am in the farmer's seat. I work for Grimmway
9	Farms, the organic farm manager there. And I'm
10	excited this is my first in-person meeting, so
11	I'm excited to see how all this plays out.
12	MEMBER TURNER: I'm Wood Turner. I
13	lead impact efforts for Agriculture Capital based
14	on San Francisco Bay area, Berkeley. And I'm
15	excited about just being somewhere where there's
16	a real spring. It's great.
17	MEMBER QUARCOO: I'm Franklin Quarcoo.
18	I'm an entomologist by training. I work at
19	Tuskegee University as a faculty member. And I'm
20	on the Environment, Transportation and National
21	Resources. I'm just excited to be here. This is
22	my first board meeting and my first big meeting.

1	So, yeah, thank you.
2	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Hi, good morning.
3	I'm Kimberly Huseman. I sit in a handler's seat.
4	I am the Director of Organic & Specialty
5	Ingredient Purchasing for Pilgrim's Poultry
6	Company. Let's see, coming from Colorado, I am
7	really excited to get some spring planting
8	underway and to see some fields being worked. So
9	it's going on somewhere in the U.S., just
10	definitely not in my state right now.
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I'll go last. Do
12	you want to go, Amy?
13	MEMBER BRUCH: Good morning, all. My
14	name's Amy Bruch. I'm a 6th-generation farmer.
15	My family farms are located in Nebraska and I've
16	had both domestic and international experience
17	farming. Let's see, what I'm excited about?
18	Well, there's so many things. With spring,
19	brings a lot of potential.
20	But coming off of our most recent oral
21	comments, I'm really excited to continue to
22	represent the farmer voice. We had a lot of

1 representation with our oral comments and written comments about -- from farmers -- and I'm just 2 3 really excited to be here to represent their voices. Thank you. 4 5 MEMBER SMITH: Good morning. My 6 Kyla Smith. Ι am sitting 7 certifier's seat. I work for PCO. We're a 8 certifier based in Central Pennsylvania. We 9 certify nationwide but mostly focused in the 10 mid-Atlantic. Ι am based in Central 11 Pennsylvania. We're not far from our office in 12 State College. 13 And I am excited to see how certifiers 14 work together to implement strengthening organic 15 enforcement. It's equally, like super exciting 16 and terrifying all at the same time. And PCO is 17 also one of the top regional leads and I'm excited to continue that work as well. 18 It's been 19 such a great partnership thus far. And so those are two really exciting opportunities for the 20 21 industry. Thanks. 22

MEMBER D'AMORE:

Good morning, Jerry

1	D'Amore here. I sort of see the light at the end
2	of the tunnel with my fourth year in the
3	handler's seat. Didn't know it would go so fast.
4	
5	I live in North Monterey County in
6	California and, which is the strawberry capital
7	of the world, the garlic capital of the world and
8	the artichoke capital of the world, a lot going
9	on in specialty crops there.
LO	I've been involved in food production
L1	and marketing for nearly 50 years. Half of that
L2	time I was an owner/operator in the hydroponic
L3	systems growing a wide range of low-profile crops
L 4	and also vine crops.
L5	The last 25 years I have been involved
L 6	in post-harvest activity including cold chain
L7	management and go-to-market operations. I'm just
L 8	excited to be here. Thank you.
L 9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you.
20	MEMBER NANDWANI: Good morning. My
21	name is Dilip Nandwani. I'm a professor at
22	Tennessee State University, Department of

1 Agriculture. And I'm sitting here in scientist seat on the Board. 2 3 And I'm based in Nashville, Tennessee and very much excited attending second in-person 4 meeting in second year and meeting all these, our 5 stake holders and our colleagues here. 6 7 be here. Thank you. MEMBER LEWIS: Hey, folks, Nate Lewis 9 sitting in the Resource Conservation seat. 10 work for Washington Farmland Trust, Agricultural 11 Land Trust in Washington state dedicated to preserve Washington's Ag lands and keep them in 12 13 working condition and available to farmers. 14 We preserved over 30 -- or 3,000 acres 15 in 30 farms across primarily western Washington. And this spring I'm excited about closing a new 16 17 project using some state funds that are kind of 18 unique in the country where it allows land trusts 19 to participate on the open market with affordable 20 loans. 21 And we're working with the Black Food 22 Sovereignty Coalition there to get their flagship

1	farm set up in Centralia, Washington, about
2	halfway between Seattle and Portland.
3	MEMBER CALDWELL: Hi. I'm Brian
4	Caldwell. I'm in a consumer and public interest
5	seat. And I'm very grateful to and I'm based
6	in central New York. I live in central New York,
7	have a little farm there, been certified since
8	1986.
9	And I'm very grateful to Nate to give
10	us that he gave us a easy ice-breaker because
11	I remember last year it kind of fried my brain
12	early in the meeting.
13	But as excited as I am to be here, I'm
14	even more excited that in 10 days my son is
15	getting married, and I'm that's really psyched
16	about that.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Mindee, online,
18	are you able to
19	VICE-CHAIR JEFFERY: Hi, pleased to be
	viol cimility officially, produced to loc
20	
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Go ahead.

1	hear me? Thank you.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yes, we can.
3	VICE-CHAIR JEFFERY: My name is Mindee
4	Jeffery and I sit in the Retailers seat. I work
5	for Good Earth Natural Foods in Northern
6	California. And as much as I have been so
7	grateful for the rain, I am more grateful that
8	the rain has slowed down and we have great
9	flowers.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Wonderful.
11	Allison, are you there?
12	MEMBER JOHNSON: Hi. Good morning,
13	everyone. Can you hear me?
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We can.
15	MEMBER JOHNSON: Okay. Hi, I'm so
16	sorry to not be with you in the room today but
17	hopefully tomorrow. I'm Allison Johnson. I'm a
18	senior attorney with the Natural Resources
19	Defense Council and I sit in the Consumer Public
20	Interest seat.
21	A lot of my work focuses on expanding
22	support for organic agriculture through public

1 policy, and so I'm very excited this spring is full-blown from this season in addition to coming 2 3 up on planting season. So I'm going to be looking at ways to 4 bring more resources to Organic this year through 5 federal policy. And I hope to be there with you 6 7 all tomorrow. 8 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank vou. And 9 I'm Nate Powell-Palm. And I'm based out of 10 Bozeman, Montana. I sit in one of the farmer 11 seats. And I raise a couple thousand acres of grain crops -- beef cattle hay. 12 13 And I am really excited for our two 14 new members. And I want to welcome them again. 15 But it's really exciting to see so much future 16 leadership potential. Our pipeline is full, folks. 17 18 We've got so many excellent members. 19 And I think it's -- something is going right when 20 I think of myself as not the smartest person in 21 the room, that we have a lot of brilliant people on this board doing great work. 22

1 And I'm grateful for all of the work that they put into it. I think that there's also 2 3 a lot of evidence of hope in our community, that I'm really excited to see TOPP are allowed, 4 really excited to see quite the optimistic, that 5 the administration sees organic as something to 6 7 celebrate, something to point to as a means of 8 addressing a lot of our concerns environmentally 9 and agriculturally. 10 And I think all of that compounds into 11 why we meet here today, to continue this work. So thank you for being here. And with that, I'll 12 hand it back to Jenny. 13 TOPP OVERVIEW 14 15 TUCKER: Okay, I'm going to be DR. 16 introducing our welcoming speaker chair. 17 Before we do that, I just want to say, let's give a thanks to the AV folks, the fact 18 19 that at the last minute we added two folks that 20 are projecting in the room and we're broadcasting 21 on Zoom and in the room. That actually -- you 22 don't just do that. So, guys, thank you so much,

yeah. 1 Okay, we are so lucky to be where we 2 3 are in this time and place. Last fall, the administration announced something called the 4 Organic Transition Initiative or OTI. So we have 5 all sorts of new acronyms for our vocabulary. 6 7 OTI is Organic Transition So It is a \$300 million initiative to 8 Initiative. 9 support existing and transitioning farmers who 10 want to explore and engage in the organic option. 11 So to be here today, six months later, and to be able to hear from members of one of our 12 six regions who have already stood up their 13 14 program are already doing field days is really 15 remarkable. 16 And so the Transition to Organic 17 Partnership Program, TOPP, T-O-P-P, is \$100 18 million program of that broader OTI, Organic 19 Transition Initiative program. We have sat up 20 six regional partnerships across the United 21 States. 22 And those partnerships, each of those

partnerships includes states that already have a 1 number of organic farmers and states that don't, 2 3 so states that are under-represented in organic. So today, for welcoming 4 going to be hearing from some of the 5 you're 6 partners in the Southeast region. And they have 7 a very, very impressive team. They, again, have 8 already, in just six months, stood up a program 9 and are already doing field days and are really 10 having the difficult conversations about what is 11 going to get funded and how are we going to serve this community best. 12 So the five areas for each region is 13 14 each region is setting up a mentor/mentee program 15 connecting local farmers in organic with 16 farmers who are new to organic, interested in 17 potentially transitioning to organic. 18 second piece that's There's а 19 emphasis on local technical assistance. So local 20 field days of bringing folks together on the 21 ground to find out what are they growing, what 22 are their past management techniques, what are

1 their crop rotations. Where do the markets live, so it's 2 3 also about business planning and market understanding how development, to negotiate 4 contracts with local supply chains, international 5 supply chains, all of the things that go into 6 7 organic farming. 8 It's not just the regulations but the 9 whole picture of what it takes to be successful, 10 really that local support and technical 11 assistance. A third area is workforce development, 12 so that's developing expertise in organic farms 13 14 but also the generation that will oversee those 15 organic farms for inspectors and certification staff. 16 17 There's also a community building 18 And we're talking about real aspect. 19 community building where organic folks can find each other in communities of interest within 20 21 their region. So there are a lot of partners to

do this.

22

1 The fifth area is data reporting, what kind of impact are we having. We are right now, 2 3 as organic, a fairly small proportion of the acreage in the United States. How do we get that 4 And so for folks to say, but Jenny, 5 number up. you're just talking about numbers, numbers are 6 7 part of this. 8 How do we get more farmers into the 9 pipeline? How do we get more acres into the 10 pipeline for organic because it's good for the 11 planet. It's good for people. It's climate-smart agriculture, right. So how do we 12 13 support this community in growing and growing 14 both our numbers and our acreage. 15 So there is lots of goals in there for 16 the transition program. So I wanted to give that 17 broad view from kind of the federal program. 18 are running TOPP out of the National Organic 19 Program. 20 And so, again, we're incredibly lucky 21 to have the Southeast region that is doing such a superb job of standing up a program and is here 22

1	to talk to you about it.
2	And so I'm going to, in the interest
3	of the partnership, I'm going to share the names.
4	But then they're going to talk more about what
5	they're doing and their affiliation.
6	So the first speaker is going to be
7	Billy Mitchell. And Billy's actually the project
8	manager for the TOPP, a program in the Southeast
9	region. And so Billy will be introducing the
10	rest of his team.
11	He's with Florida Organic Growers.
12	Each of the regions has a lead partner that holds
13	the agreement with USDA. And they're responsible
14	for building the partnerships within their
15	region.
16	So Florida Organic Growers is the
17	largest non-profit certifier affiliated
18	association in the Southeast. So they are
19	leading that team. And so Billy will be
20	introducing Roland McReynolds, Donn Cooper,
21	Michael Wall, Paul Sorah and Dr. Shandrea
22	Stallworth.

1 And he'll say a little bit more about they're with and then they will each be 2 3 speaking with you today. So I want to really thank the panel for being here. You guys are --4 you're building this and it's really -- it's very 5 moving to see this work happening. 6 7 To go, again, from six months, from an 8 announcement, to having you here to talk about 9 what you're doing is just phenomenal. So thank 10 We're grateful. Billy, come on up and take 11 the mic. MR. MITCHELL: All right, we are good. 12 13 Good morning, you all. It's good to 14 everybody here. We do have some slides, if we 15 want to use them. Oh, it's on mute. That's why 16 we don't see it. It's good when the problem is 17 you instead, Ms. Taylor Swift's song. Here we 18 go. 19 So I do want to say good morning again 20 and just, on behalf of Florida Organic Growers, 21 FOG for short, and TOPP, I'm so glad to welcome 22 you all to the NOSB meeting here in Georgia.

1 Georgia's a place that's very close to my heart and it's just an honor to share the stage with 2 3 some friends and colleagues that I've made doing this work in Georgia. 4 In order of appearance, Donn Cooper 5 6 Georgia Organic Peanut Association, 7 Shandrea Stallworth from Rodale Southeast Organic 8 Center, Roland McReynolds from the Carolina Farm 9 Stewardship Association and hometown Michael Wall, from Georgia Organics. 10 11 I also just want to recognize the rest Working directly on TOPP 12 of the team at FOG. 13 there's Executive Director Ramkrishnan and you 14 all might know him as Ram; Education Outreach 15 Specialist Juan Carlos and Project Manager Kyndra 16 Love. 17 And thank you, Jenny, for giving the overview on TOPP because I can skip this slide, 18 19 but we're going to come back to it. In the Southeast, FOG is just working 20 21 alongside this amazing collection of partners in seven states and two territories. Our partners 22

1 include community-based organizations like Fresh Central in Louisiana and the Virgin Island Farmer 2 3 Alliance and universities like NC State, University of Florida, Alcorn and Tuskegee. 4 And this work is led by organizations 5 and producers that reflect the communities that 6 7 they serve. And we continue to seek and engage 8 new partnerships including groups that work with 9 and live in tribal agricultural communities. And so I'll come back to what we're 10 11 going to cover. And our session today is ended 12 by Paul Sorah of Hearts of Harvest Farm. 13 like to highlight the work that Paul and his crew 14 already do to provide some of the examples of the 15 work TOPP will do and support. And so the first is mentorship. 16 And 17 like so many farmers and producers you 18 in conversation with know, is always 19 producers, receiving and giving unpaid advice and 20 support. 21 And this Farmer-to-Farmer mentorship 22 program, supported by organizations like Georgia

1 Organics, the University of Puerto Rico, Organic School, provide transitioning Growers' will 2 3 farmers like Paul formal paid and sustainable mentorship from certified organic producers. 4 5 The second piece is community 6 building. And Hearts of Harvest, they just 7 attend fact-to-face networking opportunities and 8 they host events on their farm. You also just 9 see them out at market and you'll see their 10 produce at community events. 11 And organizations like ASAN in Alabama and SAAFON, who cover the Southeast will continue 12 build community with their 13 producers in similar ways, hosting on-farm gatherings 14 15 connecting their producers with resources. 16 The next part is technical assistance 17 and training. In Hearts of Harvest, their crew, their farmers, they trust their service providers 18 19 and they share the challenges that their farms fact but also the on-farm solutions that they 20 21 develop. And that informs field days. Later today, you'll see a photo of a 22

1 field day that Paul and I were at just a couple And that trust just build better weeks ago. 2 3 resources, better education. And some of our partners, like Florida A&M and NCAT, they have 4 that level of trust with their producers and they 5 barriers. 6 collaborate to identify 7 practical solutions and translate all these rules 8 and regulations into plain language. 9 And this level of engagement will 10 producer-led and producer-informed create 11 technical assistance resources and events that are going to benefit our entire region and I 12 13 think the community nationally. 14 The last piece I want to touch on with 15 Hearts of Harvest is workforce training because, 16 you all, Hearts of Harvest cultivate this 17 positive and sustainable environment for their They educate future growers and they 18 19 provide great jobs. 20 And, like, word is out in our farming 21 community. People want to work at their farm. And their high quality products, then, created 22

1 and support jobs across the industry. There's staff, market aggregators in all the 2 jobs 3 involved in their future certification. And partners like Emory Oxford Farm 4 and Valencia College, they're going to research 5 and provide the education and support needed to 6 7 help fill these vital roles across the organic workforce. 9 And this is unrelated but 10 important, is Hearts of Harvest farm strawberries 11 are like out of this world, delicious. And Carolyn, you should know that their flowers --12 well, everybody -- will take your breath away. 13 14 They are just beautiful. 15 And I want to end by saying thank you 16 to the USDA for providing this opportunity and 17 funding to meet the challenges that the organic 18 sector faces build and to stronger 19 regional and national organic communities, 20 communities committed to organic practices. 21 And this is not just me buttering up 22 the USDA's biscuit. Like, we truly believe our

1	partners and producers are going to create
2	long-term meaningful change.
3	And so with that, I'll pass the mic to
4	Donn Cooper and then Shandrea and Roland and then
5	Michael and Paul. So thanks, you all.
6	MR. COOPER: Good morning, everyone.
7	I don't have any slides. I just want to give you
8	a brief introduction to the Georgia Organic
9	Peanut Association. Good morning. Thank you for
10	having us here today.
11	My name is Donn Cooper. I am the
12	former Programs Director for the Georgia Organic
13	Peanut Association, GOPA for short. We are a
14	not-for-profit farmer-owned cooperative organized
15	here in the state.
16	I work alongside my wife, Perri, who
17	unfortunately could not be here today. We do
18	have a name for her. And my wife and I, apart
19	from, we fell in love working on organic peanuts.
20	And so this is a dream come true to be
21	able to present to you about this today. She's
22	actually at home with our 10-month-old baby.

1 Otherwise, I know she really wishes she could be here. 2 3 Unfortunately, not only could she not be here today but neither of our farmers could be 4 here as well. Our board members are all farmers. 5 They are back in southwest Georgia and they are 6 7 preparing their fields and prepping to plant over 8 the next couple weeks. 9 The cooperative was formed in 2019 to 10 help farmers market certified organic peanuts and 11 other commodities. Georgia's the largest peanut-producing state in the U.S. but until GOPA 12 13 there were no organic peanuts being 14 commercially at scale in the state. 15 much We are very а startup 16 organization with all the promise and problems 17 that you can imagine. But individual farmers and 18 supporting groups such as Georgia Organic have 19 been working for over a decade to bring this 20 industry to fruition. There's still extensive work to do and 21 we are grateful to a part of the TOPP initiative 22

1 to help move certified organic agriculture forward in Georgia and the region. GOPA 2 3 purchases certified organic peanuts from farmers in Georgia, Florida and Alabama. It aggregates 4 5 that crop and it has it processed through shelling and blanching and then markets the final 6 7 product. It sounds very simple but nothing could be farther from the truth. 8 9 The certified organic supply chain 10 would not exist without the efforts of GOPA and 11 its farmers but it is still extremely fragile. There's currently only one certified organic 12 seller in the state. Obviously, if they lose 13 14 their certification, there is no organic peanut 15 industry. 16 And further, processing is 17 limited. And organic peanut production in the subtropical environment of Georgia presents some 18 19 very daunting challenges, some which are 20 daunting, in fact, that our farmers have walked 21 away from fields in the middle of the season because there was no -- they could not harvest 22

the peanuts. 1 Our farmers are fortunate to yield a 2 3 quarter of what the best conventional peanut grower can yield in Georgia. And it would be --4 it's very good if we can get a ton an acre. 5 And a very good conventional peanut farmer will grow 6 7 8,000 pounds an acre. 8 Facing these issues to the organic 9 industry and to the organic systems, GOPA's mission and work is as much about outreach and 10 11 education. Certified organic peanut production presents an opportunity for beginning, smaller 12 13 and under-served farmers to enter the market and 14 to maximize their revenue. 15 However, there is а very steep 16 learning curve, particularly with regard 17 seeding and weed control. And we need mentoring and education-led and farmer-led research and 18 19 innovation for both new farmers and transitioning 20 farmers. 21 need to continue our research. 22 processors and the supply chain to educate them

1	about organic certification and the demand for
2	organics in general. Lastly, we must continue to
3	invest in farmer-led research to develop
4	productive crop rotations and resilient organic
5	systems in our soils and our climate.
6	TOPP will enable us to do this work.
7	And we want to thank Florida Organic Growers for
8	including us in this exciting project.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And to the Board,
10	if you have questions for our speakers, let's
11	take them in real time. Go ahead, Jerry.
12	MEMBER D'AMORE: Thank you. I'm
13	sorry, I sort of zoned out when you went over the
14	statistic of pounds per acre between conventional
14 15	
	statistic of pounds per acre between conventional
15	statistic of pounds per acre between conventional and organic. And it struck me, what I did hear,
15 16	statistic of pounds per acre between conventional and organic. And it struck me, what I did hear, as it being pretty phenomenal. Could you repeat
15 16 17	statistic of pounds per acre between conventional and organic. And it struck me, what I did hear, as it being pretty phenomenal. Could you repeat that?
15 16 17 18	statistic of pounds per acre between conventional and organic. And it struck me, what I did hear, as it being pretty phenomenal. Could you repeat that? MR. COOPER: A good conventional
15 16 17 18 19	statistic of pounds per acre between conventional and organic. And it struck me, what I did hear, as it being pretty phenomenal. Could you repeat that? MR. COOPER: A good conventional peanut farmer in the state will grow 8,000 pounds

1	are weeds. Our weeds are unbelievable in
2	southeast Georgia and we have no effective
3	herbicides. So we have to get a stand, very
4	good. That needs to spread and we have to
5	mechanically cultivate quite a bit.
6	And the last couple years, it's rained
7	30 days straight in June and July. And that's no
8	
9	MEMBER D'AMORE: Thank you. That's an
10	uphill battle you got there.
11	MR. COOPER: Yeah.
12	DR. STALLWORTH: Good morning. I'm
13	Dr. Shandrea Stallworth with Rodale Institute.
14	And I serve as our southeast organic consultant.
15	First, I want to thank Billy Mitchell
16	for including Rodale Institute in this
17	partnership as we continue to build organic in
18	the southeast.
19	I come from a weed science background
20	so hearing our farmers discuss the pressures that
21	happen in the southeast, I'm very familiar with
22	it. I trained at Mississippi State University

1 where I worked directly with weeds in developing and identifying genes that we can use instead of 2 3 applying herbicides in fields. We know that we have a large amount of 4 competition that exists. And Rodale Institute 5 saw the value in the skills that I brought and 6 7 decided to bring me on as a consultant. So unfortunately, my slides did not 9 make it in, but with the southeast TOPP program 10 will be offering 450 hours of technical 11 service to our farmers. These services cover a 12 wide range of consulting services from agri-economic assistance to site visits to help 13 14 our farmers get ready for certification. 15 Our consultants have been trained by 16 Nate Powell-Palm in organic inspection. That's 17 one of the things that we value and stand on, is that our consultants know what is needed to be 18 And we want to be able to have that 19 certified. 20 hand for our organic producers. 2.1 In my slides, you would see my team 22 has now grown to 13. We're very young. We have

1 been with Rodale now going on four years. And in those four years, we've gone from two consultants 2 3 now to what you see here in the photo. recently added one in the last three months. 4 Ben will be servicing our Iowa area. 5 6 And we try to place our consultants anywhere that 7 we have a south -- or a organic resource center. 8 So right now we have five of those across the 9 U.S. 10 our concentration in the 11 northeast, so we have two of those, one in 12 Pennsylvania where we're headquartered. 13 our Poconos research center that does a lot of 14 our hemp research. 15 Here in the southeast we're focusing 16 on vegetable production and identifying what 17 varieties do well for our organic producers. We're also trying to reduce the use of plastic 18 19 mulch in organic production. We have a number of grants that are being serviced outside of our 20 Southeast Organic Center. 21 That's located less than 25 minutes from Atlanta. 22

1	We have these that range all the way
2	over to our newest acquisition with our Pacific
3	Northwest Center that we will be now developing.
4	And so one of the great things about this is
5	that Rodale is also a part of the TOPF
6	discussions going on across the U.S.
7	And so we're happy to be here and be
8	able to help our farmers understand the NOP and
9	help them succeed in a way that we know they can.
10	And being in the southeast and recognizing the
11	challenges that come with organic production, I'm
12	just happy to be a part of it because the
13	southeast is home for me. Thank you.
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Real quick, any
15	questions for Dr. Stallworth? All right, thank
16	you so much.
17	MR. McREYNOLDS: Good morning,
18	everyone. My name's Roland McReynolds. I'm
19	Executive Director with Carolina Farm Stewardship
20	Association.
21	Thank you very much to the National
22	Organic Standards Board, the National Organic

1 Program for being here. Thank you all for being a part of the meeting. And thanks to Florida 2 3 Organic Growers for involving our organization in the Southeast TOPP Program. 4 Just a little bit of background about 5 Carolina Farm Stewardship Association. 6 7 member-driven, farmer-driven, we are а member-based 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization 9 serving North and South Carolina with a mission to help people grow and eat local organic food. 10 11 We've been around -- next year will be 12 our 45th anniversary of existence And we provide a range of services 13 organization. 14 to support farmers and businesses entering the 15 markets for local organic products in the Carolinas. 16 We actually began our organizational 17 18 history as an organic certifier prior to the 19 establishment of the National Organic Program. 20 And since the establishment of the program, we have focused our work more in terms of education 2.1 and support for farmers. 22

1 So, for instance, we host a couple of different conferences annually for organic and 2 3 transitioning farmers including conferences that are focused on small scale vegetable producers 4 and conferences focused on mid-scale commodity --5 6 producers of organic commodities. 7 We support research and conduct on-farm -- work with farmers to conduct on-farm 8 9 research activities such as variety trials. We 10 run an organic certified farm incubator in the 11 Charlotte, North Carolina area, the Elma C. Lomax Research & Education Farm. 12 And that is also a conduct 13 facility where we some of our 14 participatory research programs. 15 partner in couple We're а а of 16 different climate-smart commodity partnerships to further advance that research in the southeast. 17 wide of 18 we provide а range technical 19 assistance and consulting services for farmers in 20 North and South Carolina in terms of helping them 21 to adopt organic high-tunnel farming practices, conservation practices, helping them to draft and

22

1 develop organic systems plans. We're certified as a technical service 2 3 provider with the Natural Resources Conservation Service, and have done that for at least seven 4 5 years, to support farmers. So our role in the Transition to 6 7 Organic Partnership in the southeast is as sort 8 of a sub-regional convener for North and South 9 Carolina. The Carolinas have a constellation of 10 existing NGOs and land grant institutions that 11 have been working to promote organic agriculture and support small-scale and mid-scale farms for a 12 13 long time. 14 A measure of that success that, in the 15 it has been the growth of organic past, 16 agriculture in North and South Carolina. And as 17 you may be aware, North Carolina is the eighth 18 ranked state in organic production -- by sales --19 in the country and the leading state in the 20 southeast TOPP region for production for organic 21 sales. 22 What we're excited about with the

southeast TOPP program is that it is providing us and those partner organizations greater bandwidth for us to collaborate in a holistic manner to further expand opportunities for organic agriculture in North and South Carolina.

> Issues that are collective have identified in common that are necessary to support the increased adoption of organic production, especially for small and mid-size farms, supply chain infrastructure from increased on-farm packing and storage for small-scale producers vegetable to local organic marketing facilities -- I'm sorry, my notes are kind of scratchy here -well and as as independent livestock and poultry processing capacity.

> As well, other issues that we are looking forward to addressing for the program are increase in small and mid-scale farms' access to conservation program funding that supports the transition to organic, providing farm business decision support tools that allow farmers to sort

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	of pencil out how they're going to be successful
2	in organic production and increasing access to
3	risk management tools that are scale-appropriate
4	for small and mid-sized farms in particular.
5	This programs presents a great
6	opportunity over the next five years. We're
7	really thrilled to be a part of it. And we look
8	forward to continuing to report to you all on the
9	progress. And I'm glad to take any questions.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yeah, Amy then
11	Kyla, then Jerry.
12	MEMBER D'AMORE: Yeah, just a quick
13	question oh.
14	MEMBER BRUCH: Go ahead, no, no.
15	MEMBER D'AMORE: Oh, no, no, no.
16	MEMBER BRUCH: Go ahead.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We'll go Amy,
18	Kyla, Jerry.
19	MEMBER D'AMORE: No, no, please.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Go ahead.
21	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay, thank you so much
22	for your time today and your

1	MR. McREYNOLDS: Sure.
2	MEMBER BRUCH: information. You
3	mentioned about increasing access to risk
4	management tools. Can you define that a little
5	bit more for me, please?
6	MR. McREYNOLDS: You know, it comes in
7	different shapes. I was having a conversation
8	with a small farm operator just recently who I'd
9	been trying to talk to about, well, have you
10	looked at, you know, certain FSA loans or whole
11	farm revenue insurance.
12	And he said, you know, I can spend
13	\$800 on row covers to double row covers for my
14	crops and I will get more I will guarantee
15	more my production out of that than I will paying
16	for an insurance policy that may, if it pays,
17	will pay next year, after I file my taxes and
18	after I've already had to start farming for next
19	year.
20	So I think it's not just the insurance
21	tools and the loans. It's also how do we support
22	farmers to do practical scale-appropriate things

1	that are more about their production systems,
2	supporting their production systems so they
3	reduce their costs of production and therefore
4	make it easier to adapt to the risks in
5	agriculture.
6	MEMBER BRUCH: Great, thank you. Yes,
7	I appreciate just kind of talking a little bit
8	more about the FSA component too. And one thing,
9	and maybe your group is exploring this already,
10	but for the FSAs they have this thing called
11	storage loans which is
12	MR. McREYNOLDS: Yes.
13	MEMBER BRUCH: if you have
14	inventory okay.
15	MR. McREYNOLDS: Yes.
16	MEMBER BRUCH: Is it being looked at,
17	that these storage loans need to reflect
18	transition or where organic pricing they are
19	available to organic producers. However, they
20	default on the loan value of conventional
21	commodities. Is that a component that's being
22	looked at?

1 MR. McREYNOLDS: Tt. is and in 2 particular our experience in looking at that 3 program is more with respect to small-scale fruit and vegetable producers. So where, you know, who 4 are going to be serving in an organic or a local 5 6 market, you know. 7 So it's a little bit more cut and 8 paste in terms of the cost. You know, a cool bot 9 and a nicer packing facility and better walls to 10 ensure a little bit longer life on the product is 11 what those folks are looking for. But certainly, when you're talking 12 about grain storage facilities, you know, your 13 14 point is definitely something that -- you know, 15 higher cost facilities. The folks we're 16 working with would love to go those micro-loans 17 with FS -- or farm storage facilities, less than \$100,000. 18 19 MEMBER D'AMORE: Okay, thank you. 20 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Kyla next and then 21 Jerry and then Carolyn. Did we have Kyla there? 22 I just -- it's okay.

1	MEMBER D'AMORE: There's no way I'm
2	stepping in front of you, so.
3	MEMBER SMITH: Thanks, Roland.
4	MEMBER D'AMORE: Hi.
5	MEMBER SMITH: Hi. I wondered, you
6	spoke to being a TSB and also producers fill out
7	their OSPs. And so I wondered if you could share
8	your thoughts on the idea of the common OSP and
9	the benefits or lack thereof if you on the,
10	like the benefit that would provide the producers
11	for access for programs across the agency and
12	burden reduction and things like that. So any
13	thoughts?
14	MR. McREYNOLDS: Well, that's great.
15	I certainly didn't we did provide any
16	testimony on that subject in terms of written
17	comments to the Board previously. So I would say
18	that at our annual conferences in the past, we
19	have put on pre-conference workshops that, you
20	know, it's all-day intensive, how to fill out
21	your application and your organic system plan.
22	And it's only moderately useful

1	because every certifier has a different form. So
2	we can certainly see some utility in terms of a
3	farmer's ability to pick amongst certifiers to
4	sort of eliminate that as one of the obstacles.
5	But, you know, I think there's a lot
6	more that we need to understand in terms of how
7	it would or learn from farmers in terms of how
8	that change would affect other aspects of their
9	operations.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Jerry, if you
11	would?
12	MEMBER D'AMORE: Thanks. Now I just
12 13	MEMBER D'AMORE: Thanks. Now I just have got to question that matches all that drama.
13	have got to question that matches all that drama.
13 14	have got to question that matches all that drama. I know North Carolina as a premier producer in
13 14 15	have got to question that matches all that drama. I know North Carolina as a premier producer in terms of both volume and quality of blueberries.
13 14 15 16	have got to question that matches all that drama. I know North Carolina as a premier producer in terms of both volume and quality of blueberries. MR. McREYNOLDS: Right.
13 14 15 16 17	have got to question that matches all that drama. I know North Carolina as a premier producer in terms of both volume and quality of blueberries. MR. McREYNOLDS: Right. MEMBER D'AMORE: And I'd say the same
13 14 15 16 17	have got to question that matches all that drama. I know North Carolina as a premier producer in terms of both volume and quality of blueberries. MR. McREYNOLDS: Right. MEMBER D'AMORE: And I'd say the same thing about sweet potatoes. What are your top
13 14 15 16 17 18	have got to question that matches all that drama. I know North Carolina as a premier producer in terms of both volume and quality of blueberries. MR. McREYNOLDS: Right. MEMBER D'AMORE: And I'd say the same thing about sweet potatoes. What are your top crops that you deal with?

you know, and they are pursuing crop rotation and 1 so that is -- the majority of our members are 2 3 sort of operating in that space. But certainly, you know, we have seen 4 there is a large sort of contingent of sort of 5 mid-scale operations in the Carolinas that, for 6 7 whom organic sweet potatoes, organic wheats and 8 organic tobacco are a very important sort of 9 rotational series. So that has been important to the growth of organic agriculture in 10 11 the Carolinas, sure. Carolyn, please go 12 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: 13 ahead. 14 Hi, Roland. MEMBER DIMITRI: You 15 really --MR. McREYNOLDS: Hi, Carolyn. 16 17 MEMBER DIMITRI: -- covered so many 18 But the one that grabbed my attention topics. 19 was the on-farm research activities. And so I'm 20 interested in how do you develop 21 partnerships and how -do you follow the standards for peer-reviewed research? 22

1	And, I mean, I just think on-farm
2	research activity is really, like an important
3	way to feed into the OREI funding and these
4	MR. McREYNOLDS: Right.
5	MEMBER DIMITRI: broader range
6	projects that could have wide-scale implications
7	for organic. So I wonder, some of my scientist
8	friends say things like
9	MR. McREYNOLDS: Right.
10	MEMBER DIMITRI: Yeah.
11	MR. McREYNOLDS: So that's a really
12	interesting question. And I would say, I mean,
13	first of all, we many of our land grant
14	partners have some, you know, really excellent
15	OREI programs. And there's some really excellent
16	work going on in that regard at Clemson, at NC
17	State, at NC A&T and South Carolina State as
18	well.
19	Second, I would say that, for our
20	work, you know, we don't compete. We're not able
21	to compete for those sorts of grants. So it's
22	specialty crop block grants, right, that are like

the main source for a lot of the things where 1 we're doing variety trials. 2 3 And, you know, that's not a lot of money to do peer-reviewed research. And it's 4 really more focused and our 5 emphasis is 6 applied research, you know. 7 And actually, I mean, I will tell you 8 we did, one of the trials that we worked on that 9 both involved doing some trials at our Lomax 10 research farm and some on -- individual farms was 11 tomato grafting, right, taking heirloom root stock and grafting it to, you know, hybrid roots 12 -- heirloom tomatoes grafted to heirloom root 13 14 stocks. 15 And, you know, the five-page report 16 that we produced on that was the most read report 17 by my Board of Directors of any report that we've 18 ever published because that was the kind of 19 practical information that they really love. So 20 we're very much focused on supporting applied 2.1 research. 22 MEMBER DIMITRI: And I just have a --

1 so one interesting thing I've observed is, if you look at the results of the on-farm trials that 2 3 are done at universities and then you look at what happens like from USDA data will tell us 4 really happens on organic farms, there is this 5 6 gap between like yields and 7 production and everything. And so I do think on-farm research on 8 9 real farms is a really important way to go. So 10 do you so, like a way ahead to maybe make that 11 more accessible to more farmers? MR. I think incenting our university 12 McREYNOLDS: of it 13 partners to do more there 14 disincentives to applied research for land grant 15 researchers who are looking to, you know, advance 16 along the ten-year track. 17 And so -- because it's a pain in the 18 You got seven different farms and butt, right. 19 you want them -- and they all have to make sure 20 that they follow the protocol. So it's not --21 know, we have to make those incentives 22 stronger for academics to pursue that, would be

1	our recommendation.
2	MEMBER DIMITRI: Thank you.
3	MR. McREYNOLDS: Sure.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
5	questions for Roland? Thank you.
6	MR. McREYNOLDS: All right, thank you
7	all very much.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Appreciate it.
9	MR. WALL: Good morning. Just to
10	clarify, I'm not talking about TOPP. Is that
11	okay? Okay, cool. And I have 20 minutes. Is
12	that correct? Okay, cool.
13	I'm Michael Wall. Good morning. I'm
14	the Director of Farmer Advocacy at Georgia
15	Organics. I'm not talking about TOPP. Just want
16	to make sure you all are aware of that, although
17	I could talk about TOPP. I love TOPP. Excuse me
18	while I try to advance the slide.
19	DR. TUCKER: Guess that's a neat way
20	of saying talk about TOPP.
21	MR. WALL: TOPP is great. There we

Here's what I -- I'm talking about Ag in

go.

22

1 Georgia. I want to tell you a little bit about Georgia Organics, a little bit about the history 2 3 of Georgia and what the state organic Ag is in Georgia. 4 And just a heads-up, we will get into 5 a little bit of uncomfortable territory here. 6 7 We'll -- I'll feel it. You're probably feeling a 8 little uncomfortable. That's okav. The 9 uncomfortableness is also growth so embrace that. 10 Georgia Organics is a lot like CFSA. 11 Farmer Roots started in the 70s and officially incorporated in 1997. There's roughly around 12 13 1,200 farmers in our network. When we have an 14 annual conference, which we did in February --15 January -- earlier this year, we had about 500 farmers show up, so that's kind of an idea of how 16 17 big we are. 18 I have to disclose that I often copy 19 and paste Roland's great ideas and Karen's great 20 ideas for Georgia Organics. So I definitely 21 appreciate what they've done. We're very similar organizations. 22

1 Just some of the highlights about what we do that focuses on farming, on farmers. 2 3 have an annual conference, like I said. an accelerated program which is a small cohort of 4 They get about \$10,000 for strategic 5 farmers. on-farm investments, access to business coaches, 6 7 soil coaches. 8 We do field days. We have a Farmer 9 Champion program. I hope when you're out and 10 in town you'll see our Farmer Champion 11 sticker on the restaurants that you go to. We have a -- one of my favorite programs is the 12 13 Kaiser-Permanente Bridge program. It provides 14 two years' worth of free health insurance for 15 eligible farmers. And the Farmer Fund started out as a 16 17 natural disaster relief program and has expanded into emergency relief. 18 So it 19 include anything from the pandemic to medical And during December we were hit by 20 expenses. 21 Winter Storm Elliott, and through the Farmer Fund we were able to distribute over \$250,000 to 22

1 farmers who were hit very badly by that freak cold storm. 2 3 So, yeah, that's an overview of what I'm not going to talk about Georgia we do. 4 Organics a lot, but it does relate to what we're 5 talking about today. 6 7 So let me tell you a little bit about 8 I've been in Georgia Organics for 15 years. 9 I was a journalist for ten years before that. Forgive me for that. And I'm a 7th generation 10 11 Georgia family farmer. So what does a family 12 mean? 13 I would consider myself a learned man 14 when it comes to agriculture, and my family 15 doesn't care. They do not listen to me. 16 what a family farmer means in my -- in fact, I've 17 been talking to you all for three minutes and 15 seconds and you all have graciously given me more 18 19 attention than my family does, so thank you for that. 20 21 I've helped 30 farmers transition to 22 organic agriculture. I've helped dozens

1 farmers navigate NRCS and FSA. And I appreciate you looking at me and listening to me about my 2 3 opinions on agriculture, so thank you. So here's where we're going to get a 4 little bit more into the uncomfortable part, 5 6 certainly, for me. Seven generations, it sounds 7 really neat but it also means -- I'm going to 8 read this. Don't -- I don't want to read to you 9 all a lot but I don't want to get this wrong. 10 ancestors used a captive labor 11 force of Africans and descendants of Africans on 12 their farms. I just wanted to prove I can read, and I didn't want to get that wrong. 13 That's 14 something that I carry with me in this work and 15 something I carry with me everywhere I do. 16 So now I'm going to give you some of 17 the history of Georgia. Founded as a colony in 1611 by Oglethorpe. From 1611 to 1751, slavery 18 19 was banned in Georgia. It was the only colony 20 that had it on paper, in the rules, that you 21 could not have slaves in the colony of Georgia. That stopped in 1751. I don't have 22

1 time to go over that, but it's a cool story. So slavery takes root in Georgia 1751. 1776. 2 3 have America. And then in 1793, the cotton gin was invented in Georgia. I don't know if you all 4 knew that but it was not far from Savannah. 5 lot of this stuff happened really close to the 6 7 coast. 8 And the cotton gin, as you history 9 buffs know, really accelerated, Ι 10 monoculture, King Cotton, and with that came the 11 institution of slavery. So when you look at these numbers you 12 13 can see that cotton was a bountiful crop for the 14 early United States of America and the colonies. 15 And that led to ever-increasing numbers of using 16 forced slave labor on agricultural lands. So 17 that's a big growth because of cotton. 18 And it wasn't just -- exploitation 19 took on many forms here. So I think we need to 20 acknowledge we're on land that used to be held by 21 the Cherokee people. They were relocated out of the state in the Trail of Tears because of the 22

1	Treaty of New Echota in 1835. One second. I'm
2	pushing the button.
3	The next slide will tell you that the
4	Trail of Tears was because of cotton agriculture.
5	So agriculture in Georgia started off exploitive
6	and it's still, I would say, in many ways
7	exploitive today. Thank you. Thanks, AV team.
8	Appreciate it. I didn't do that.
9	DR. TUCKER: It's needing it.
LO	MR. WALL: Maybe, what do you want me
L1	to say about TOPP? I'll just say it and then we
12	can thank you, Nate and thank you, Allison for
L3	having me. Allison, I hope you feel better.
L 4	So this is a slide of counties in
L5	Georgia and the southeast that show the density
L 6	of slave population per capita from 1860, from
L7	the 1860 National Slave Survey.
L 8	Do you see that swooping line that
L 9	goes down from Mississippi, across Alabama and
20	then goes from that goes northeast from the
21	middle of Georgia? That's a pattern that you'll
22	see in other slides. And that's about geology,

plate tectonics. 1 I wish I had time to tell you about 2 3 that. Maybe at the reception tomorrow night we can nerd out over it. But please pay attention 4 to the brighter colors. The higher, the brighter 5 6 the color, the higher the concentration of slaves 7 in 1860, because that corresponds to StrikeForce 8 counties. 9 How many people in this room know what 10 a StrikeForce county is? The southern people 11 know what a StrikeForce county is, and Ms. 12 Tucker. I'm happy to see that. a StrikeForce county is a USDA 13 14 designation. And you can find it on the USDA's 15 website to varying degrees of ease, depending on 16 the administration and other programmatic 17 changes. But a definition of a StrikeForce county, roughly, is 30 percent of the population 18 19 lives below 30 percent of the federal poverty 20 line -- and has for 30 years. 21 So this is entrenched poverty that It doesn't care if there's a 22 doesn't budge.

1	republican in who's governor or president.
2	This poverty doesn't care if there's a democrat
3	who's a governor or a president. It's not
4	moving.
5	And I can't point to it right now, but
6	my family farmland is in StrikeForce counties.
7	That's where I grew up, in StrikeForce counties.
8	I didn't know they were StrikeForce counties at
9	the time.
10	But just imagine. I think, actually,
11	I'll paraphrase Amber Bell, who used to work at
12	the Southwest Georgia Project, Ms. Shirley
13	Sherrod's group in Albany, Georgia.
14	She said, people think when you
15	think about poverty in America, you'll think
16	about the Mississippi Delta or you think about
17	the Appalachian Mountains. And you don't think
18	about south Georgia because of Atlanta. But the
19	poverty in south Georgia and this is prime
20	farmland this is all farmland is intense
21	and not budging.
22	What does this have to do with organic

1 agriculture? I'm getting there. So I also wanted to point out that the water withdrawal 2 3 permits for Ag irrigation is in that same zone. And I -- these two slides that you've seen and a 4 couple more were put together by Donn Cooper. 5 Ι totally stole them from him. 6 7 you'll see the same swooshing. You'll see that 8 This is glyphosate use in 2015. 9 same swooshing pattern here in the dark areas of glyphosate use in that predominantly row crop 10 11 part of Georgia where the StrikeForce counties 12 are. 13 There they are again. You can see the 14 shapes of the white area in the middle of the 15 StrikeForce counties in the bottom left, 16 southwest Georgia. That's around Albany. And 17 there's some factories and industry there that aren't necessarily related to agriculture. 18 19 So I work on spreading the organic 20 industry because of the organic hot 21 philosophy, because of the research that found that it makes a difference when it comes to the 22

1	economics of a region that has enough organic
2	agriculture within a certain county.
3	So if you could see, like what would a
4	\$2,000 median income household boost mean to a
5	family in a StrikeForce county. I would mean a
6	lot. It would change lives. Poverty rate's down
7	1.35 percent in a StrikeForce would change lives.
8	It would change the state of Georgia.
9	It's not enough to lift them
L 0	completely out of poverty. But enough organic
L1	industry with stacked with, say, the
L2	recommendations of the USDA Equity Commission,
L3	that would also have a longer lasting impact.
L 4	Say it was stacked with reparations.
L5	True reparations for the state of Georgia would
L 6	mean justice for those StrikeForce counties.
L7	Let me tell you about the organic
L 8	growth in Georgia. This is the organic industry
L 9	between 2012 and 2020, a 121.4 percent increase.
20	Our farms are pretty similar. Trying to advance
21	here.
22	The number of farms in the state of

1	Georgia grew at a very commensurate rate. It's
2	125 percent growth in the number of certified
3	organic operations in the state of Georgia,
4	around the same timeframe. And TOPP is great.
5	DR. TUCKER: Those are farm sales.
6	MR. WALL: For the industry, yeah
7	for the nation, not for Georgia.
8	DR. TUCKER: Oh, right.
9	MR. WALL: I know, yeah, that's Sed
10	Rowe and his buddy on our organic peanut field.
11	Sed Rowe's a celebrity. And that's Julia
12	Asherman in that, in the masked photo, who was
13	part of the panel yesterday.
14	So, yeah, similar growth between the
15	organic industry and sales and a similar growth
16	in the number of certified organic operations in
17	the state of Georgia.
18	So we're hoping for some of those hot
19	spots to happen in southwest Georgia, especially
20	around peanut processing.
21	So this is related but kind of
22	tangential. Lauren mentioned this yesterday in

1 one of our groups. I don't know how or why but for some reason 51 percent of black farmers that 2 3 are active in our network are land owners, which is very similar to white land owners that are 4 active in our network. 5 That blew my mind. I don't know why 6 7 that is, but that is a crazy statistic and we 8 need to find out why that is and replicate it as 9 much as possible. 10 So that's true about land ownership 11 but when it comes to other things farm related, our black farmers are behind white farmers in 12 terms of infrastructure, especially around cold 13 14 storage and post-harvest handling. 15 is Georgia Organics' official 16 equity statement. Recognizing historic 17 current injustices, Georgia Organics prioritizes 18 black services -- I'm sorry, prioritizes direct 19 services and resources to black, indigenous and 20 Latino/Latina farmers. That's Georgia the 21 Organics statement. 22 Georgia Organics uses the term equity.

1 I would use -- my heart would tell me to use the word justice. But I completely understand why 2 3 Georgia Organics uses the word equity. okay with it. 4 So we do have some efforts that are 5 6 pointed towards equity. At least 50 percent of 7 our accelerator farmers must be BIPOC. We have a 8 Black Farmer Prosperity track at our conference 9 that is managed and led by black farmers with 10 Georgia Organics staff. 11 And then 25 percent of the cost-share I didn't mention this, but in our organic 12 transition program we provide the remaining 25 13 14 percent cost-share to farmers their first year. 15 For BIPOC farmers they're able to access that 16 remaining 25 percent every year. 17 And on this slide I just want you to see, this is the Farmers' Services team. 18 19 to be a part of the Farmers' Services team. 20 I do farmer advocacy. But these are the folks 21 that are working with our farmers on a daily, constant basis. And they'll be at the reception 22

1	Wednesday night. I hope you can meet them.
2	That's it. I'm early. I finished on
3	time. Before I introduce Paul, are there any
4	questions? Yes, sir?
5	MEMBER NANDWANI: Wonderful
6	presentation, lot of good information. Quick
7	question on cost-share. Are your slide one of
8	the showed Go Organic and mention about
9	cost-share. And just then about cost-share 25
10	percent.
11	So the question is, how much
12	percentage of cost-share you offer to organic
13	growers? I think the USDA Farm Services
14	insulate. I'm giving example in Tennessee's 50
15	percent because they reduced from 75 percent to
16	50 percent.
17	And I think I learned yesterday
18	something, that it can vary with the state to
19	state. I'm not sure. What can you tell us about
20	that?
21	MR. WALL: Yeah, it can vary a lot.
22	In Georgia, it's 75 percent, up to \$750, but you

1	have to apply twice. I understand that you don't
2	have to apply twice in other states.
3	So there are two application processes
4	that our farmers have to go through. They have
5	to do their paperwork two different times. One's
6	for \$500 and the other one's for \$250. But you
7	can access \$750 if you do it twice.
8	MEMBER NANDWANI: And the 25 percent
9	you mentioned in the last, that is only for the
10	first year.
11	MR. WALL: That comes from Georgia
12	Organics. That's not an FSA program or USDA
13	program. That comes from Georgia Organics'
14	private fundraising.
15	And that is for the first year for
16	non-BIPOC farmers so they can see, you know, how
17	the barrier reduced, not all the way down to
18	nothing. But the financial barrier is reduced
19	very much.
20	And then if they see the value,
21	hopefully, they'll stay in the program and remain
22	certified. For BIPOC farmers, they get that

1	reimbursement at 25 percent every year.
2	MEMBER NANDWANI: Thank you.
3	MR. WALL: Yes, sir.
4	MEMBER QUARCOO: Now if you have to
5	mention one thing that we need to look at in
6	order to provide more resources and increase
7	participation for BIPOC farmers, what would it
8	be?
9	MR. WALL: Thank you. Thank you for
10	that question. I would recommend reading the
11	Equity Commission's recommendations. Have you
12	all done have you all talked about those yet?
13	MEMBER QUARCOO: Mm-hmm.
14	MR. WALL: I think I was just last
15	Thursday I was down in Albany with Ms. Sherrod at
16	the Southwest Georgia Project. And Dr. Dewayne
17	Goldmon, the Assistant Secretary for Racial
18	Equity at the USDA was there telling us how
19	they're going to implement those racial equity
20	recommendations.
21	The implementations the way they're
22	going to implement it, using the four regional

1	hub models, it's very USDA and very questionable.
2	But, you know, it's better than nothing. But
3	the recommendations themselves are there's
4	value there.
5	I was hopeful when I read the
6	recommendations themselves. So I think I hope
7	the USDA, all employees, every program is really
8	leaning into those recommendations and thinking
9	hard about how to get that, get those
LO	recommendations implemented sooner rather than
L1	later and, you know, as thoroughly and as broadly
12	as they can.
L3	DR. TUCKER: Could you highlight a
L 4	couple of them?
L5	MR. WALL: The training for the staff,
L 6	especially the FSA staff, was a great idea.
L7	There was might be getting it confused with
L 8	something I read that Nock recommended yesterday.
L 9	
20	But I do believe racial equity
21	training for all USDA staff is a great idea,
22	especially the ones that are on the local level,

1 the ones that are behind the doors when you open the FSA office or the NRCS office at a county 2 3 level. You can have, you know, a top-down or 4 a really great leader that's really committed to 5 anti-racism in DC and even at the state level. 6 7 But if it doesn't filter down to the county 8 levels, it doesn't do anything. 9 You know, some -- I've heard some 10 people say it's a new day at USDA. But behind 11 those doors, on the county level, are the same 12 faces. 13 MEMBER CALDWELL: Thanks for this 14 presentation, Michael. Can you talk a little bit 15 about the appetite for doing organic research at 16 Georgia's main grant universities, if there is 17 just heard about weed control any? Ι It'd be great if one of the land grant 18 19 universities took that on. 20 MR. WALL: Yeah, we definitely need it 21 in cotton. So amongst the organic researchers 22 that I know, that I work with, they are very,

1 very, very passionate. But I feel like -- I think we -- so, I mean, conventional agriculture 2 3 dominates Georgia physically and politically. And I think that is true in the land 4 I think that is true when it comes to 5 grants. That's the way it is. 6 extension. And we're all 7 trying to build a patchwork of support services 8 to make up for that for organic growers. 9 We want to be organic extension. We 10 have some cohorts, you know, some partners 11 crime within the land grants that are working on organic research and doing it passionately. 12 13 they're on shoestring budgets and they aren't 14 necessarily embraced and supported by the full 15 university. 16 I hope I can say that. I don't --17 those are my observations. I don't want to put 18 their mouths, they're words in but 19 passionate and they nerd out about the right 20 things, like the right kind plans, the right kind of rotations. 21 22 But, yeah, I wouldn't say that they're

1	embraced and supported and highlighted by the
2	conventional structure there.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
4	questions for Michael?
5	MEMBER CALDWELL: Thank you.
6	MR. WALL: Thanks.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I have a quick
8	question for you, Michael. When you look at
9	those, the farm numbers that you presented, how
10	it grew from 72 to, I think it was 162 farms, as
11	we look to TOPP and the goal of getting more
12	organic acres into certification or more acres
13	into certification, do you feel like the current
14	organic farms are thriving or that we're missing
15	some key infrastructure?
16	And if so, what would that
17	infrastructure be? And how do we build a
18	resilient marketplace to both bring in new folks
19	but also support the folks who have already
20	transitioned?
21	MR. WALL: Thank you, Nate. No, I
22	don't think they're thriving financially. I

1 think they're thriving in other ways. But I don't think there's a thriving farm. 2 3 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Good point. MR. WALL: I don't think -- I mean, I 4 would call the reality of farming right now a 5 You know, profits aren't there. 6 7 stability is there. not Ι mean, forget 8 prosperity and thriving. Just stability would be 9 nice, and that's a rarity. 10 But the truth is, it depends. 11 and it -- the closer you are to Atlanta, if you're an organic farmer, the better. 12 organic marketplace is -- and Athens marketplace, 13 14 that corridor is good for farmers. There 15 are restaurant sales. There are Atlantans and 16 Athenians who have disposable income and can 17 afford organic prices. But the further you get away from Atlanta, the tougher it is. 18 19 The further you have to travel, the 20 mean, if you fewer the -- I look at the 21 StrikeForce counties, those people are not buying 22 or even thinking about organics in the Harveys or

the Piggly Wigglys. 1 So -- and then what infrastructure we 2 3 need, so when it comes to talking to farmers about transitioning to organic, they're not going 4 to do it if they don't feel financially stable, 5 if they're able to take a risk and try something 6 7 new. 8 But I think that's also true from the 9 consumer's perspective. Ιf they aren't financially stable, they're not going to try this 10 11 new thing. So economic development would grow both consumer desire for organics and the ability 12 13 think for а farmer to about organic 14 transitioning. 15 I've spent a lot of time going to 16 StrikeForce counties and trying to recruit folks 17 to transition to certified organic. And there are folks who -- they do it for a couple of 18 19 I have heard, I want to be organic so reasons. 20 that I can finally make money. 21 I've heard, I want to do this so that I can take a stand and let my neighbors and the 22

1	USDA know how I'm farming. I'm paraphrasing.
2	That's like 15 different farmers saying something
3	similar and putting those words together.
4	And then other people are doing it
5	because they see their neighbor doing it. And
6	they talk to their neighbor about it. Or they
7	see a farmer that they respected for a long time
8	do it and then they start thinking about it.
9	That has happened in peanuts in the past.
10	And what they need, I think they need
11	more markets like the Atlanta market. They need
12	consumers with disposable income who are willing
13	and able to afford organic produce. And it'd be
14	great if they had access to a local market, a
15	farmers market.
16	There's a lot of farmers markets
17	around here. But when you get outside of Atlanta
18	and Athens, the numbers go down a lot. There's
19	some. They're just not as plentiful and the
20	prices aren't as bountiful.
21	But the growing is just as good. The
22	soil's different. The pressures are different.

1	But we can grow year-round in this state, in
2	almost every county, although it's getting hotter
3	and wetter and stranger by the day.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I have a follow-up
5	question from
6	MEMBER HUSEMAN: I
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM:Allison. Oh,
8	I'm sorry, Kim. Go ahead.
9	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Oh, okay. Is that
10	okay?
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yeah, totally.
12	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Okay. Hi, Michael.
13	MR. WALL: Hi.
14	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Can you speak to the
15	Farm-to-School program that was on one of your
16	first slides?
17	MR. WALL: A little bit. I wish I
18	could tell you everything about it. Right now,
19	the Farm-to-School program has shifted over to
20	Farm-to-Early Care Centers. And they're doing
21	some pilots called the Family Farm Share in Ware
22	County, Waycross, Georgia, where I was born.

1 So that is working with local growers and helping them with production, helping them 2 3 scale up, helping them with their post-harvest handling and their food safety. And then 4 aggregating those -- that produce and providing 5 it for a very, very discounted price to families 6 7 at the Farm-to-Early Care Centers, which is 8 Those are daycare centers. That's the 9 thrust of it now. 10 But we also have lots of campaigns 11 that encourage Farm-to-School across the state. 12 October is Farm-to-School month and we pick out a theme for kids to get really excited about. 13 14 of them have been, like Leave it to Spinach, Kick 15 it Kale, things like that, things that are to get kids excited about. 16 17 Taste-testing in the cafeterias, the school garden's kind of like the carrot to get 18 the kids and the new school nutrition directors 19 and the teachers excited about it. 20 I can't 21 remember what the theme this year is. It was super cute and I wish I could remember what it 22

1	was because it was adorable. Oh, it was
2	LAUREN: Pepperpalooza.
3	MR. WALL: Thank you. Yeah, I was
4	about to get Pepperpalooza. Thanks, Lauren.
5	Thank you.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: As we visited a
7	couple of farms yesterday, I think Georgia
8	Organics members, Love is Love and Grateful
9	Pastures, a theme seemed to arise that there was
10	a lot of incubation from one member to the next
11	making kind of spawning more and more organic
12	farms that exist in this network where they're
13	supporting each other, buying and selling to each
14	other, forming new businesses together.
15	Do you have any thoughts on how or
16	if you already do how we can track that
17	effect, that networking effect that Georgia
18	Organics has had on the local food economy and
19	organic ecosystem as farms break off and
20	organically expand?
21	MR. WALL: That's a good question.
22	It's tough.

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: It's Allison so
2	I'll credit it to her.
3	MR. WALL: Makes sense, yeah. She's a
4	smart one. That is you're talking about
5	and we struggle with this. We struggle with this
6	constantly, like impact tracking?
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Mm-hmm.
8	MR. WALL: I believe, like the
9	networking that we have at our conference is the
10	most one of the most valuable things that we
11	offer. The social resilience of that network,
12	the Farmer-to-Farmer network, that is so
13	important and I have no idea how to track that.
14	I have no idea.
15	I need a sociologist and Ag economists
16	that can help us with that. So if you have any,
17	send them my way. Make sure they work for free.
18	It'll take five years.
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Please?
20	DR. TUCKER: This is Jenny. I want to
21	thank you for saying that because you have the
22	program level, well, how are you going to track

1	the impact of TOPP? And we're really encouraging
2	we're working on, okay, what are the numbers,
3	right, the metrics that we need to do.
4	But we're also really encouraging all
5	the partners to feed us stories, the real life
6	stories of those impacts. And I think your
7	region's already fed up some it is captured in
8	pictures. It is captured in those
9	MR. WALL: Yes.
10	DR. TUCKER: more qualitative for,
11	you know, those of us who love sociology, that
12	balance between quant and qual of telling the
13	story and having the numbers.
13	story and having the numbers. And I think that's a real challenge
14	And I think that's a real challenge
14 15	And I think that's a real challenge with TOPP, so appreciate that you said it's hard,
14 15 16	And I think that's a real challenge with TOPP, so appreciate that you said it's hard, because it is hard. And I think saying it's hard
14 15 16 17	And I think that's a real challenge with TOPP, so appreciate that you said it's hard, because it is hard. And I think saying it's hard gives us an opening to start working on the
14 15 16 17	And I think that's a real challenge with TOPP, so appreciate that you said it's hard, because it is hard. And I think saying it's hard gives us an opening to start working on the problem better, so thank you.
14 15 16 17 18	And I think that's a real challenge with TOPP, so appreciate that you said it's hard, because it is hard. And I think saying it's hard gives us an opening to start working on the problem better, so thank you. MR. WALL: You're welcome and, you

1	You'll see those, you'll see the number of farms
2	and you'll see the acreage come into that.
3	But besides just the acreage increase,
4	there is a safety buffer, a risk management
5	because of those relationships. And it happens
6	all over the state, yeah.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
8	questions? All right, Michael, we really
9	appreciate your presentation.
10	MR. WALL: Thanks for having me,
11	appreciate it. About Paul, first time I mean,
12	Billy's already talked to him. But let me tell
13	you the first thing I thought when I met Paul,
14	which was at a food safety training that Billy
15	and I were doing together.
16	The first time I saw Paul, I thought,
17	what is Jason Momoa doing in this food safety
18	training? And I thought, don't make him mad.
19	He's so big. But he is the sweetest, nicest guy.
20	And Billy already told you a lot about him so
21	and Paul's going to tell you a lot about his
22	great farm.

1 MR. SORAH: It's a pleasure to be here with everybody today. Thanks for all the work 2 3 that everyone's doing and hearing out try to problems and helping find 4 us some See if this will cooperate. 5 solutions here. 6 There we go. 7 All right, we got -- my name is Paul My wife and I, along with our best friend 8 Sorah. 9 and business partner, Mark Golden, started Hearts 10 of Harvest Farm in 2018. We are in Arnoldsville, 11 Georgia. It's about 15 minutes east of downtown We're in Oglethorpe County. 12 We are entering our sixth season. 13 We 14 have a acre and a half at our home. And then we 15 purchased 108 acres and deer-fenced in the first 16 30 acres of that that we're expanding on now. 17 We are a diversified fruit, vegetable, flower operation. We grow any vegetable that'll 18 19 grow in season. We grow lots of flowers. 20 the fruit world, right now we grow a 21 strawberries but we are putting in like what I 22 would call a micro-orchard on our new property,

1	focusing on growing organic fruits for kind of a
2	small market.
3	Right now, we're at two weekly farmers
4	markets on Saturdays. We're at the Athens
5	Farmers Market and then we do the Peachtree Road
6	Farmers Market here in Atlanta and Buckhead.
7	And we work with Fresh Harvest, which
8	is a subscription box service. They're providing
9	about 3,000 boxes delivered to people's doors a
10	week. And we're one of the farms that sells to
11	them.
12	And we have between 7 and 10
13	restaurants that we're working with and
14	delivering to on a weekly basis.
15	You know, when we started our farm,
16	the joke I tell is, like all I'd ever done was
17	kill houseplants. I was a I got my degree in
18	music and was a touring musician for ten years,
19	living all over the world in buses and vans and
20	planes and things of that nature.
21	And after about 10 years of that, my
22	wife and I were living here in Atlanta and we

1 decided that it was time to change the pace and So we moved out to Arnoldsville and slow down. 2 3 we were going to build a studio. And then we were playing a music 4 festival at a guy named Jeff Poppen's farm and 5 He's a fantastic guy. 6 The Barefoot Farmer. 7 he gave me one of his books on organic and 8 biodynamic agriculture production. 9 And I started reading it and it just 10 began blowing my mind. It was like, opened up a 11 whole new world to me. And then I did the typical U-2 wormhole and the Curtis Stone, the 12 13 Jean-Martin, the Conor Crickmore. Well, I can 14 make \$100,000 on a half an acre. 15 And the thing that those books don't 16 tell you is, Georgia's a lot different. The 17 weeds, the pests, the disease, the rain, 18 it's a whole experience. We literally waves, 19 dumped our life savings into starting a farm and we kind of haven't stopped since. 20 21 As I mentioned, our business partner, Mark, he toured with me. And I called him one 22

1 day and I was like, hey, why don't you move from Nashville down to Arnoldsville and start a farm 2 3 with me? He came down a week later and then the 4 week after that, he called back and he said, all 5 right, my wife signed off on it. We're coming. 6 7 thev lived in their with And ___ their 8 six-month-old baby in our house with my wife and 9 I and our three children for six months while 10 they were trying to get a house. 11 But we've been just really, really 12 getting after it ever since. You know, 13 diversity of our production, I realized very 14 early that that was going to be critical for us 15 to have any shot at financial success because, as 16 you're all aware, the ebbs and flows of vegetable 17 production is -- it's guite volatile, to say the 18 least. 19 And for us, having flowers has been 20 the, like most crucial parts of our one of 21 business. It earns the best on a per square foot And the overhead of labor versus revenue 22 basis.

1 return is a much better margin than the vegetable production side of things. 2 3 So as we grew, our first year, you know, we were doing about a half-acre. 4 was pregnant, had our son in July and it was a 5 So I was really -- you see how 6 heck of a time. 7 happy we were at the beginning. And then the 8 realities begin setting in. 9 But no, it's -- you know, we started a 10 half-acre, to two, convinced went my 11 father-in-law to buy a house a mile from our 12 house with eight acres on it. So we started 13 farming that. And then now we'll be 25 to 30 14 acres this year. 15 You know, and with that became kind of the -- well, here's a few, the first truckload of 16 17 vermiculite and first high tunnel. I had a -- we 18 ordered a greenhouse and it showed up in my 19 driveway on a semi-truck. And the guy dropped it off and said, I'll be back in a week. Good luck. 20 21 And I had never built anything in my 22 life so we started building a high tunnel in

1 shin-deep mud in February. And that was its own experience as well. 2 Some pictures of 3 displays and whatnot at markets, some nice sweet potatoes, my wife's beautiful work with flowers. 4 Flowers have really expanded for us. 5 We started with just maybe a handful of beds but 6 over 7 now we've 2 acres in flowers got in 8 production and we're doing wedding design and 9 markets and special events which has been a 10 really, really nice development. 11 Yeah, but kind of getting into the upscaling piece of it is the labor which becomes 12 a big challenge because, you know, with the way 13 14 that I look at managing my farm is these people 15 are in my circle, you know, and my circle's 16 tight. But when you're in, you're in. 17 I'm very loyal and I take care of my people. 18 19 pay well. We take care of them or if they are, 20 you know, sick and they need, we do whatever we 21 can to help them. But, you know, the cost of labor and organic systems is a reality. 22

1 you know, yeah, there And, are machines that we're trying to invest in but those 2 3 can come at \$30,000 and \$40,000 a pop. that's kind of a big barrier that I feel like 4 that we've found, is in this hybrid space, we 5 were just straight farmers markets but now we're 6 7 expanding into a wholesale/retail hybrid. 8 And the processes and systems that you 9 need just for like a market production are 10 totally different than growing, you know, acres 11 and acres of wholesale. So where we've tried to get to is 12 shrinking our full-time staff down and keeping 13 14 them on a very sustainable wage with a path for 15 financial growth moving forward while now trying to be more strategic in our investments and to 16 17 infrastructure and tractor-based harvesting and planting equipment that can help us eliminate 18 19 more of the kind of seasonal labor hours. 20 And on the bottom left is a picture 21 of us with one of our employees. She's been with us for -- this is her fourth season now but she 22

1 was diagnosed with Stage 3 breast cancer at 31 years old. 2 3 And within six weeks we put together a huge concert at our farm and had the Drive-By 4 Truckers come out and play and a bunch of other 5 folks and ended up raising like \$15,000 for her 6 7 and her treatment in about a six-week period. 8 that was cool. 9 Yeah, so I don't know. And I think 10 just echoing, too, I kind of had a plan but 11 didn't know this was going to be what I feel like this theme of 12 coming too. But I 13 networking and community is a pretty powerful 14 thing and in our area, especially, because like, 15 when I started, I knew nothing. I was just reading books and watching 16 YouTube videos. But there's like five or six 17 18 solid farms really in our Athens area, 19 they're really good people. And I've learned a 20 ton from them. We're always kind of sharing 21 information and throwing in on bulk orders and

trying to keep our costs down and, you know,

22

1 helping each other when we can. And then that extension too, to like a 2 3 group like Georgia Organics, who've been helpful for us, well, you know, we lost over 4 \$100,000 in two nights, basically, in the storm 5 in December. 6 7 And, you know, when they stepped up to 8 provide assistance, it was like, they're the only 9 people that did anything for us. And that was a 10 pretty dark time. 11 And then, you know, the accelerator 12 we were a part of that, which we transitioned into growing some mushrooms as well. 13 14 We have a indoor mushroom production and that's 15 something that's really nice that we can produce year-round, 365, climate controlled. 16 The 17 same with our indoor micro-greens production, indoor, under lights year-round, 365, just trying 18 19 to build in some layers of revenue that can be resilient against the ebb and flow of what our 20 21 business really is. Strawberries. We do have a bunch of 22

1	blueberries we planted too. We're waiting on
2	them to come along. Yeah, we planted about
3	10,000 strawberries this year. So finally
4	they're starting to come along.
5	And then, you know, the planning for
6	the future through the accelerator program with
7	Georgia Organics, we got to work with Ellen
8	Polishuk who's just incredible. She's such a
9	great mentor to us. She's really helped us in
LO	this transition to a retail/wholesale model.
L1	You know, the reality though, the
L2	investments of taking a brand-new piece of land
L3	with zero infrastructure and bringing it into a
L 4	farm, you know, it gets pretty intense.
L 5	And we did work with the USDA and FSA
L 6	on our real estate loan and our infrastructure
L 7	loan. But, you know, those things can be
L 8	challenging too with the amount of time that it
L 9	takes to have those things go through.
20	But nonetheless, we are grateful. We
21	got our deer fence up, a really good well. And
22	our wash/pack is being built now so that's kind

1	of where we're at. And, well, back, I guess.
2	
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Well, thank you.
4	MR. SORAH: Yeah, yeah. Thank you
5	all. Thank you. Yeah, if anybody's got
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Go ahead, Logan,
7	your question.
8	MEMBER PETREY: Hi. Thank you, Paul.
9	That was
LO	MR. SORAH: Yeah.
L1	MEMBER PETREY: It was great. Got a
L2	question. Do you use plastic mulch?
L3	MR. SORAH: I do.
L 4	MEMBER PETREY: Okay, so that's a
L5	material for sunset. And there's a lot of debate
L 6	about that and the importance of it. And could
L7	you state what kind of an impact it would have on
L 8	you if we did not have plastic mulch as a
L 9	material?
20	MR. SORAH: Well, I know, you know,
21	there's just certain crops that I don't know
22	how you'd do it.

1	MEMBER PETREY: Which crops?
2	MR. SORAH: I would say anything
3	that's going north and south, right, like if
4	you're talking about twining or stringing or
5	fence method tomatoes, you know, you could get in
6	there with a tractor-based cultivation system for
7	maybe two or three weeks.
8	But once those plants hit this, you
9	know, they're hitting the tractor and then
10	MEMBER PETREY: Yeah.
11	MR. SORAH: you're talking about
12	either having to set up your spacing, you know,
13	eight feet apart to where you could get a tractor
14	between the rows. And then you're giving up an
15	entire bed of production or paying people to
16	physically go in and scuffle hoe. And that's
17	just like the worst use of funds ever, is manual
18	weeding.
19	You know, we've invested into a, like
20	a old belly-mount cultivating tractor. And this
21	year we're experimenting with some stuff on a
22	tractor-based cultivation system. But, yeah, I

1	mean, like tomatoes, eggplants, peppers, you
2	know, it'd be tough.
3	MEMBER PETREY: Yeah, and I've never
4	even considered the or thought about the
5	clearance on the tractors that you don't have and
6	the cultivators to reach that, so that is a great
7	point.
8	Another question, how do you clean
9	your carrots? They are so clean. I'm a carrot
10	farmer and I can't I mean, that takes
11	MR. SORAH: I just I've got a
12	MEMBER PETREY: It takes some work.
13	That's hard. I'm just going to tell you. I
14	mean, I you have to scrub them for pictures
15	for sales and all that, so I'm impressed.
16	MR. SORAH: Yeah, we just we got
17	one of those high pressure nozzles and just
18	MEMBER PETREY: Man, that's
19	MR. SORAH: blast them off.
20	MEMBER PETREY: It's good though.
21	MR. SORAH: I'm pretty anal about my
22	roots being super clean.

1	MEMBER PETREY: Yeah, I can tell.
2	It's a lot of work.
3	MR. SORAH: I mean, that's why and
4	when you got those things stacked up at market,
5	like that's as long as you got the stacker
6	coming in all day.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Franklin, go
8	ahead.
9	MEMBER QUARCOO: I don't know whether
L 0	I heard you correctly, but did you say that some
11	of the existing farmers added you to their bulk
L2	purchases when we're buying something? Because
L3	for a smaller, limited resource farmers, a number
L 4	of times they are so small, if they have to buy
L 5	their materials in small quantities, that makes
L 6	the cost of production even higher for them.
L7	So are they, apart from existing
L 8	farmers, this kind of network, adding you to the
L 9	bulk purchases. Are there other things that you
20	think would help small, limited resource farmers
21	to have an easier time getting into organic?
22	MR SORAH· Yeah T think iust

1 organizing any kind of community-based cooperative seems to be very effective. 2 3 know, we just did an order with Georgia Organics where we all threw -- in a bunch of farms bought 4 these slings of potting soil and seedling mix. 5 And we were able to get the cost down 6 7 like 40 percent, I think, on the bags. And then 8 it cut the shipping in half. And Georgia 9 Organics facilitated the order, had it dropped 10 off at a location, had a forklift there and 11 loaded up everyone's trucks or trailers as they 12 came. 13 And, you know, that's a -- I think we 14 ended up paying like \$250 for a yard. And if I 15 would have just bought the yard myself and had it shipped it was going to be like \$380. 16 So, you know, 130 bucks is, if you're going to go through 17 18 five or six yards a year, that adds up. 19 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Could you, Paul, 20 speak a little bit more to this idea of building 21 cooperatives and building, buying and selling 22 power?

1 It seems like this was, again, through-line, Love is Love. That's a 2 formal 3 cooperative. Have you explored becoming a formal Or what resource did you feel like cooperative? 4 you need to further that evolution of building a 5 stronger more resilient network? 6 7 MR. SORAH: That's a good question. 8 You know, I think with all of us, there's like a 9 few of us in the area that are going into this 10 place of beyond like 5 to 7 acres, that are going 11 into this place of 25, 30, 40 acres of 12 production. 13 And the reality of that is the note on 14 the land. You know, like if you have to generate 15 a ton of revenue to do that. But I think it's difficult, like for us evolving into this place 16 17 not really knowing how to access those aggregates 18 or how to access a distributor who could get our 19 food out further into different areas. And then, you know, when we're -- for 20 21 like 25 and 30 acres feels huge right now. 22 in the grand scheme of like farming in But

1 America, like we're just a garden to people still. You know what I mean? 2 3 Like, so to be able to provide organic food from actual, like real local farmers in the 4 community, I think it's, like we have to almost 5 look at each other's farm as part of the greater 6 7 farm and trying to find a way where we could pull 8 five or six farms together as a cooperative and 9 then have like an aggregate help us organize crop 10 planting where could be to we larger 11 distribution model. But, you know, if someone needs 5,000 12 13 lettuce heads, well, that's -- if four people 14 could contribute 1,250, you know, that's a little 15 more economical. But when I think you start 16 getting into some of these numbers, it forces you 17 into a more like narrow production model because you need to invest in specific equipment that 18 19 harvests this specific thing plants and 20 efficiently as possible for it to be profitable 21 at a wholesale margin. 22 So I think developing a cooperative in

1	that way, which I know there's something like
2	that in North Carolina with New Sprout because we
3	buy all of our potato seeds from them. But the
4	other side of their business is like a
5	cooperative of multiple large organic farms. And
6	they're distributing to grocery stores all up and
7	down the East Coast.
8	But we don't have that thing here in
9	Georgia.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Go ahead, Logan.
11	MEMBER PETREY: A question on the
12	cooperative, like when you're saying so right
13	now you're very diverse. And if you were to join
14	with other farms, one thing that I think you do
15	have to stay is diversified for your own sake.
16	But you're right. You do have to
17	simplify if you're going to scale up, you know,
18	for the equipment. Do you think that that could
19	be a problem or something that we just need to be
20	aware of, that we don't need you to just become a
21	lettuce farmer?
22	Because you still need the rotation,

1 the crop rotation. Because I feel like if you start joining then everybody would be like, well, 2 3 you're really good at doing radishes so we're just going to let you do all the radishes. 4 Yet, you really need that diversity 5 within your own farm for you to be -- I feel like 6 7 that when you start segregating that, that can 8 potentially be a problem. 9 MR. SORAH: Absolutely, and that's one 10 of the challenges I feel like we're facing right 11 now, entering into this hybrid model. Of, like 12 we're going to do our farmers markets, right, 13 because the Buckhead Market at Peachtree Road is, 14 I mean, incredible. We -- that's a fantastic market for 15 16 And we need that diversity. We need that 17 not only for sales but just diversity for the health of the farm and the health of the soil. 18 19 But then kind of like looking at my farm as, 20 okay, this seven acres, I'm thinking of as like 21 my high-rotations diversified market/restaurant 22 production.

1 And then maybe I'll have this 10 acres in one-acre blocks on high rotation and cover 2 3 cropping which would be like so essential to what we're doing as the cover cropping piece, like to 4 we could still remain diversified and 5 where collaborate where it's not like I'm just growing 6 7 radishes. 8 It could be like, all right, I'll take 9 radishes April, Week 1 and you take radishes 10 April, Week 2 that --11 MEMBER PETREY: Maybe you could share 12 equipment too. 13 Yeah, it's -- and then, MR. SORAH: 14 you know, the infrastructure that comes into 15 place when you're trying to produce on like a large scale like that, growing your farm, you 16 17 know, is the packing, you know, being able to wash and pack efficiently that much produce. 18 19 And then if it's not just being field 20 packed or picked up the day of harvest, you know, 21 it's storing that and having the proper cold 22 storage for food safety and shelve life and

1	quality of product. I think those are kind of
2	big barriers there.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Franklin, go
4	ahead.
5	MEMBER QUARCOO: Yes, I am
6	particularly interested in what you have to say
7	about cooperatives. The problem with a number of
8	cooperatives is that they are, from what I have
9	observed, they are not able to stay together for
LO	long.
L1	People form cooperatives to take
12	advantage of some of these benefits you've talked
L3	about. But they just fall apart. Most of the
L 4	time the technical assistance we give them, we
L5	tell them how to manage best how to do this.
L 6	But we sort of ignore group dynamics
L7	training. How do you stay together as a group,
L 8	conflict resolution. I mean, contracts that
L 9	ensure that things are done properly.
20	So I think that with all these
21	cooperatives and things that we want to do to
22	help small farmers, I think that there is more

1 need in terms of technical support and training to make sure they stay together. 2 3 Do you see that? Have you come across cooperatives that, they come together for the 4 5 right reasons but they are unable to stay 6 together? 7 Yeah, I do and it may just MR. SORAH: 8 be a shift in what we think of as a cooperative 9 or how we're defining it or identifying it, you 10 Because, for instance, with Fresh Harvest, 11 which is a company we work with, they do home delivery of subscription boxes, over 3,000 boxes 12 13 They deliver every week, right. across Atlanta. 14 And there's like ten of us farms that 15 grow with them and sell to them. And we crop 16 plan and they pay fair prices and they take the 17 product. They handle all of the boxing, 18 packaging and delivering, right. 19 So it's not like it's official but it 20 is, like we are all working together to supply 21 this company and the Atlanta community with food. 22 And so I think like maybe that hub piece is kind

1 of what's important because, like there are growers in my community where we're not going 2 3 anyway. You know, we're entrenched into this 4 business and we're growing. We're growing on 5 scale. And I think if the hub piece is there and 6 7 the ability to distribute more and more product, 8 I don't think a farm -- the farms in my community 9 wouldn't turn down or get out of that situation 10 because that's what we're all looking to do, is 11 expand and sell more and be able to move more 12 product. 13 And, you know, the group dynamics of 14 it, I think that's always going to be a thing. 15 And maybe there needs to be more technical assistance and research done in how to make that 16 effective. 17 18 But for us to be able, I think, 19 the financial future that farms like us need to 20 not only just pay the mortgage and hope and pray 21 to make а dollar but to actually thrive 22 financially is going to be this access

1	distribution that's not just all tied to large
2	farms on the West Coast.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
4	for Paul? I just have a quick question for you,
5	Paul. What is the value that being certified
6	organic brings to your farm? How would you
7	describe why organic?
8	MR. SORAH: Well, we're actually
9	putting our new property in certified. We
10	I've been operating under the NOP OMRI organic
11	standards since the very beginning.
12	But honestly, when we were starting
13	our farm and really up until this year, it's just
14	been a little overwhelming for us on a data
15	paperwork piece of it where it, you know, we have
16	it's just that piece has just been very
17	intimidating for us.
18	And when you already feel like you're
19	burning at both ends and working 60 hour weeks
20	and then you want to like, you know, like you
21	got to come in and input data, you know.
22	So we've been certified naturally

1	grown but are now working transition in the new
2	property and organics with the state of mind for
3	that wholesale distribution and the reality of
4	that price point difference of having the
5	certification and the label and what that means
6	in the wholesale marketplace compared to even
7	if you operate organically but you don't have a
8	label, you're just still going to be getting
9	conventionally price points.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you.
11	MR. SORAH: Yeah.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
13	questions for Paul? I want to hand it over to
14	Jenny real quick.
15	DR. TUCKER: I just want I want to
16	thank the entire Welcoming Panel for being here.
17	The TOPP investments are designed to really
18	harness the power of partnerships that are
19	already there and that have already been working.
20	And I think that this really
21	illustrates why the program was able to stand up
22	quickly, is you already had those relationships

1	started and so to come here and share the
2	richness of your experience today, I invite all
3	of us around the table and folks at home.
4	These are the folks were serve. So
5	let's give them a big round of applause.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you so much,
7	Paul.
8	MR. SORAH: Sure.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Really appreciate
10	your time.
11	MR. SORAH: Absolutely.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: So we are up to
13	the Secretary's report. Madam Bruch?
14	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay, fellow board
15	members, so happy to be with you in-person today.
16	And we're going to tackle the meeting minutes
17	from our October meeting. You all have received
18	the minutes from our meeting that occurred in
19	October of '22. Does anybody have any
20	corrections or concerns from these minutes?
21	All right, seeing none, they are
22	approved as written. Thank you.

1 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right thank Short and sweet, moving right along. 2 3 -- I'll just give a guick Chair report and then we'll break. So we're doing well on time. 4 The day before I left for Sacramento 5 6 it snowed in Montana. And it has not stopped snowing, even till now. And I think all of my 7 8 fellow westerners can sympathize with it's been a 9 really cold, hard winter. 10 It's been hard to keep calves alive. 11 It's been discouraging not being able to get into 12 the fields. And we, as a Board, have through a lot over this last six months. 13 It's 14 been a very dynamic and challenging time. 15 And I look to all of my fellow board 16 members as examples of how we embody resilience. 17 And I think that there's something to be said when we were on the farms yesterday talking to 18 19 Love is Love and Grateful Pastures. And they 20 were talking about, if you're not a sustainable 21 business there's no way you can be a sustainable 22 farm.

1 And I think if we're not a sustainable Board, there's no way we can be a sustainable 2 3 industry. And I think over the past six months, we've been able prove that, through 4 to 5 challenging times, by holding space for each other and being really concerned and empathetic 6 7 and conscientious of the work and the sacrifice 8 and the time that this board takes, we've come 9 through a lot. 10 want to give a really big Ι 11 shout-out to our former colleagues, Liz Graznak. 12 As you see, we have two new resource 13 conservation people, one Nate Lewis and one 14 Franklin Quarcoo. 15 And Liz came from a very dynamic 16 vegetable production farm. She's growing her 17 operation, a first generation farmer. And at the last meeting, she came to leadership and said, 18 19 this is great. This Board's incredible. 20 just don't have time for it. And I think that's the embodiment of 21 22 the sacrifice and bravery that it takes to truly

1 serve this community. And I want us all to just recognize that Liz served us so well and then 2 3 handed off the baton when the time was right so that we could keep going and the community could 4 be served. 5 And I think that is something that we 6 7 don't talk about when recruiting, that it might 8 not be the right fit when you get here and how do 9 we, through the whole process, make sure that 10 everybody knows that we are grateful for all of 11 your service and it's all right if it's too much. But I think that that is -- the fact 12 13 that were all still here, that we have such great 14 new members and that we've returned after such a 15 long, hard winter is the fact that this community 16 is going to last. 17 And it's really going to stick it out. And I think we get like wonderfully contentious 18 19 in our public comments. We have such great 20 transparent debates. And we all land in the same 21 spot together. 22 And I that that is something that has

1	been a long time coming. But it's also evidence
2	that the work we're doing is in the right
3	direction. And we are really putting our best
4	foot forward.
5	And so I want to thank you all, to the
6	community but especially to my fellow board
7	members, really, really grateful for how much you
8	put into this work and to the program.
9	I think that we spent a lot of our
10	lives in organic, protecting what we saw as our
11	seal in a way from the USDA, that we weren't sure
12	about USDA as a partner. And I think that we
13	have an incredible partner in Dr. Tucker. And
14	MEMBER CALDWELL: How about just,
15	here, here.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And I would just
17	encourage everybody, we might we won't always
18	have her. And even though she can't get
19	everything done that we want to get done and the
20	program can't do everything and be everything to
21	everyone, it can get a lot done.
22	And I think taking that really to

1 heart, that we have an incredible partner in the current program and how can we get as much done 2 3 as we possibly can in the time we're given. So I encourage you all to bring your 4 Now is the time to think really big 5 big ideas. 6 of what do we want to accomplish together and 7 figure out -- do your homework -- how can we, as 8 the Board, serve you, where can we work, where do 9 we need to go to the Farm Bill, where do we need to build coalitions to create selling and buying 10 11 power amongst growers. Who has the right skill set and the 12 right authority to certain work? But we can get 13 14 an incredible amount done together. And then the 15 folks in this room, I think, are doing that work 16 as evidenced by everything we heard today. 17 So thank you. And let's take a little break. 18 19 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter 20 went off the record at 11:54 p.m. and resumed at 21 12:23 p.m.) CHAIR POWELL-PALM: So 22 next up we're going to start one of my favorite

1	parts of every meeting, which is the Board's Q&A
2	with Jenny or when I cry, depending on how
3	Carolyn sees the meeting.
4	So to get kicked off as we work our
5	way back to our seats, this is one of my favorite
6	parts of transparency where we get to hear
7	directly from the program any questions the Board
8	has.
9	So we can start in any order, but did
10	you want to get it kicked off, Jenny? Please go
11	ahead.
12	NOS BOARD UPDATE
13	DR. TUCKER: Okay, I do have a short
14	presentation because I'm hoping we'll be able to
15	address some of the Board's questions through the
16	presentation.
17	Okay, and we're calling this Part 2
18	because Part 1 of the NOS presentation is in the
19	Learning Center. And so this is something we
20	kept from the pandemic that I think actually
21	works really well in the interest of what Nate
22	was just saying.

1 We used to come here and talk for like 45 minutes during this meeting which left, what, 2 3 ten minutes for questions. Instead, I'm only going to talk for a few minutes and then we're 4 going to open it up for questions because the NOP 5 update in the Learning Center gives a good long 6 7 presentation about everything that we have been 8 working on. 9 Now I know that not everybody gets to 10 look at full updates so I do take the things that 11 the Board would most likely ask questions about and I do review them in the room to see if we can 12 13 answer those questions in advance. 14 So usually get asked about the status 15 of rules so I think that's probably a question And so I wanted to give a quick 16 from the Board. 17 reminder on the rule-making process and on that 18 map, where we are with some of our different 19 rules. 20 And right now we have rules that are 21 in every stage of the rule-making process from pre-rule activity all the way to enforcement. 22

1	And in fact, tomorrow morning, there'll be a box
2	under public comment. We will have something
3	opening for public comments on preview today for
4	the community to comment on.
5	So lots of rules in the pipeline. And
6	this gives a overview of where we are, and then
7	we're going to work our way backwards. So
8	Strength in Organic Enforcement has been
9	published. We're now in Communications and
LO	Implementation.
L1	We are talking with certifiers about
12	what it means. I'm going to talk a little bit
L3	more about that in a couple of seconds because I
L 4	know there's a lot of interest in SOE.
L5	Origin of Livestock, we've officially
L 6	moved into the enforcement phase. Everybody got
L7	time to implement the rule. We're now enforcing.
L 8	And so we've asked certifiers to give us their
L 9	updated systems with how they've implemented
20	Origin of Livestock requirements.
21	And the surveillance team has it on
22	their schedules to go out this spring, summer and

1	fall and actually assess compliance on that rule.
2	Working our way backwards, Organic
3	Livestock and Poultry standards, OLPS, this is a
4	final rule that is now in legal review which
5	means we have finished the drafting process and
6	the first stop of a multi-step clearance process
7	is legal review. So that rule is under review
8	right now.
9	Before that is public comment.
10	Tomorrow we'll be opening a it's related to
11	Origin of Livestock. It has to do with
12	information collection, so new information that
13	must be collected to verify compliance with
14	Origin of Livestock.
15	Part of the clearance process revealed
16	that we needed to update our information
17	collection as a program. That will be on it's
18	on public display today for public comment.
19	Working our way backwards, we are
20	working on a proposed rule for a Nitrogen Rule.
21	That is a very recent NOSB recommendations
22	related to nitrogen fertilizers.

1 We're also continuing work on a market development rule that addresses pet food and 2 3 mushrooms. An I am going to have a slightly longer update on inerts ANPR in just a couple 4 minutes. 5 Do want to emphasize the importance of 6 7 strengthening organic enforcement final rule. It will reduce the number of uncertified entities, 8 9 require the use of electronic import 10 certificates, number of provisions to has a 11 strengthen record keeping, supply chain 12 traceability and strengthen oversight of 13 accredited certifiers. 14 This is a -- it sounds -- it is 15 game-changing. And so that's a term we've been 16 using and it really is. And it changes the game 17 in that certifiers going to are need 18 comprehensive update to their entire 19 systems depending on risk. 20 It is a very risk aware rule in that 21 it addresses challenges in traceability mainly in the middle of the supply chain. 22 So brokers,

1 previously uncertified handlers, importers, people working along complex long supply chains 2 3 are the ones most impacted by this rule. One of the big asks with SOE 4 as a community, help us 5 please, emphasize certification. 6 need for One oft.he 7 important parts of the rule is the fact that a 8 lot of previously uncertified handlers need to 9 get certified -- brokers, commodity brokers need 10 to get certified. 11 Anyone who is actively engaged handling and arranging organic trade needs to get 12 13 certified. There are now very, very, very few 14 And so it's important for folks to exemptions. 15 read the rules to determine the impact on their 16 systems and then start soon to complete 17 certification. 18 I do want to remind the community how 19 you can continue to learn where we are 20 progress on NOSB recommendations. There are four 21 key ways, our NOP updates for the NOSB that we 22 post in the Learning Center before each meeting.

1 publish NOSB recommendation We do These are all the recommendations that 2 indices. 3 have come from the Board. We actually keep a scorecard on how we're doing. And that's part of 4 how we get assessed, is how many recommendations 5 6 have we implemented. 7 And so we keep track of where we are 8 and the different types of recommendations. So 9 you can check that. You know, we update it after 10 each meeting. 11 We also report back to the NOSB in memos to the Board that we issue after each 12 13 meeting. We've recently, in the last 14 meetings, added a new section to the end of the 15 memos called regulatory priorities. 16 And that's going to be the area where 17 we will report back to you on what our top priorities are until the next meeting. 18 So it's 19 sort of a six-month work plan, this is our 20 priority for the next few months. 21 And I think, if you look at 22 rule-making slides I just covered, that's what we

1	said our priorities were going to be last spring.
2	And sure enough, they're moving their way
3	through the system.
4	And then finally, there's the OME
5	regulatory agenda which is issued every spring
6	and fall. That's a government-wide tool to
7	communicate to folks what our key priorities are
8	across the federal government for rule-making.
9	Okay, I have a few updates on specific
10	topics. And again, I think these are things that
11	the Board has questions about, so I figured I
12	would preemptively answer some of them.
13	The first one is on inerts. And I'm
14	going to pull up a different file because I want
15	to make sure that I cover this. And I'm going to
16	do a huge thank you to the Standards Division,
17	particularly Jared who I think did a lot of this
18	work. Yeah. Yay, thank you.
19	Inerts is a really complicated topic.
20	And I wanted to lay out what the next steps are.
21	This was issued as an advanced notice of pubic
22	rule-making after many, many years of work by the

1 Board, by a lot of people in this room who have contributed to problem solving around inerts. 2 3 And so inerts, just going to give a bit of an overview here, so everybody take a deep 4 All right. 5 breath, okay? So inerts are pesticide 6 ingredients other than active 7 ingredients in pesticide products. 8 Right now, our regulations allow 9 substances on EPA Lists 3 and 4 as inert 10 ingredients. Unfortunately, the EPA no longer 11 supports those lists. They've not been updated in like a long time, okay, a long time that we've 12 13 had these inactive lists. 14 These are difficult because there are 15 a lot of materials on these lists, on Lists 3 and 16 4 that farmers rely on every single day. And so we issued, after a lot board recommendations on 17 this, we issued an advanced notice of propose 18 19 rule-making to sort of outline the work that had 20 been done and ask stakeholders which to 21 alternatives could replace Lists 3 and 4. 22 in the rule a We put number of

1	alternatives to consider and asked for input. We
2	got almost 400 public comments in response to
3	that ANPR. And the good news is about 70 percent
4	of our problem looks like we've got solutions
5	for.
6	About 70 percent of the problem,
7	meaning the items on lists 3 an 4 we have
8	solutions for. That's actually there's broad
9	agreement on. So let's celebrate that. We've
10	got about 70 percent of the problem we know what
11	to do about. Yay.
12	That leaves the other 30 percent,
13	okay. And so the next step is that we are going
14	to be providing a work agenda request to the
15	Board, likely be this summer, where we're going
16	to summarize what we believe the four key options
17	are or might be based on public comment.
18	So it's going to lay out what the four
19	key items are with some pros and cons. So it's
20	an analysis of the advanced notice of proposed
21	rule-making.
22	Based on those four options, we're

1 going to ask the Board to make recommendations to the program on how we're going to -- on different 2 3 options for addressing this kind of 30 percent that we need an answer on, okay. So that'll be a 4 work agenda item for the Board. 5 We are going to put a time limit on 6 7 So you're only going to get, you know, a it. 8 certain number of meetings to work on this 9 because we all want to get this done before these Materials Lists 3 and 4 come up for sunset again, 10 11 okay. So we heard loud and clear, this is 12 really important. We don't want to continue to 13 14 rely on Lists 3 and 4 which means we have to get 15 to a final rule within a certain time period or 16 else we're all going to be right back where we 17 started, okay. 18 So we've got to work expediently to 19 get to an answer and a final rule before these 20 Therefore, I am asking the materials sunset. 21 Board, please, please, please, when vou're working on recommendations, give us all possible 22

options that you think are feasible, okay. 1 So we're going to lay out four options 2 3 for you. What we want is as many of those in a recommendation as you think are feasible, okay. 4 We can't 5 And this is why. something, a 6 synthetic, to the National List without you. 7 We need a recommendation from you 8 to put a synthetic on the National List. 9 give us a recommendation that ends up being 10 untenable in terms of time cost or or 11 implementation feasibility, we're going to 12 right back where we started from. 13 So rule-making has to, for example, 14 take into account costs and benefits. What are 15 the costs going to be to the farmers and to the 16 processors that rely on these materials, I guess 17 as farmers -- yeah, the farmers that rely on these materials. 18 19 So we need something that we can get 20 through rule-making that takes into account those Now what's different from the criteria 21 costs. 22 you folks need to work with at the Board level,

1 but we need as many options as possible because I can't do something without you, okay. 2 3 So that's kind of the framing. I'm happy to take any specific questions on that, 4 but as many recommendations as you think you can 5 give us where you could live with the outcome, 6 7 that's what we're going to be looking for. 8 Okay, next item, technical support. 9 You guys need help. And I think we've heard for 10 years that the Board needs help and the Board did 11 really, really good work some on а 12 recommendation. This came out of the Human Capital Initiative but it's been a conversation 13 14 for years. 15 And so we appreciated all the dialogue 16 and public comment and discussion from the Board 17 on this topic. We are ready to give you some 18 help, okay. 19 We also appreciated that you gave us We are working in a fairly large 20 options. 21 complex federal system that has pretty strict hiring rules and some strict budgeting rules on 22

1 how we deal with this. So what we have done at this point is 2 3 we. have written what's called а position description for staff members that would be able 4 to help you, to provide a technical report with 5 the items that you put in your recommendation to 6 7 us. 8 So that's doing research for you, 9 reviewing the public comments, providing input 10 into your work process, to provide you with that 11 staff level support. We are, for a lot of different sort of 12 13 hiring reasons, proposing to start with those 14 positions within NOP that we already have staff 15 providing you extensive technical that are 16 support. 17 A lot of them are here today. 18 those folks will need to help you in a way that 19 can also support the rule-making process down the road who are informed on that and educated on 20 21 that. 22 And so we are proposing to recruit two

1 folks to stop with within NOP to provide you that technical support. We're already working with 2 3 Human Resources. Once the position descriptions are finalized, we do plan to announce it in our 4 recruiting activity and could have people 5 place by summer using this approach, okay. 6 7 So that's our update. I would love to 8 have folks in place to support your by this 9 summer should the federal hiring gods align, 10 okay. 11 Organic Transition Initiative, you heard a great update this morning. 12 I want to thank again our panelists for being here today. 13 14 Market development, I also want to 15 give an update on an upcoming additional part of 16 -- just a second, I got to get to that page in 17 the play book here, there we go -- because I have some specific information to share. 18 19 shared earlier, this is \$300 а 20 million initiative. A lot of the pieces 21 been announced so TOPP has been announced. NRCS 22 did a launch recently in the last couple of

1 weeks. piece There's another on market 2 3 development. There is an upcoming competitive grant request for application. So we're going to 4 be offering this request soon to solicit grant 5 proposals. It will be a competitive process with 6 7 external peer reviewers. 8 So we are looking for organic experts. 9 If you're interested in serving as a reviewer, 10 there is information on the AMS website. I think 11 if you do a Google search on AMS Grants Peer Review you should be able to find it. 12 13 In general, grant application periods 14 are open typically 60 to 90 days. Funds are 15 available once awards are made following peer review panels and then internal administrative 16 17 processes. 18 lot of the areas that would be 19 addressed for market development grant program 20 are those that were focused on during the fall 21 listening session on this topic. You can find

the slides for that on the AMS website.

22

If vou

1 to go to USDA Organic Transition Initiative you can get to the slides for this. 2 3 The pinpointed markets are grain and feed, legumes and other rotational crops, organic 4 ingredients, organic dairy markets and dairy. 5 6 The program is planning be 7 primarily regionally and/or crop specific. Ιt 8 will be targeted to key markets to ensure 9 meaningful impacts. There's that word again-10 impact. Investment will fund activities outside 11 the organic certification process because we don't want to duplicate the cost/share program. 12 13 So that's some information to start 14 thinking about. It will be announced sometime 15 this spring. But thinking through what kind of 16 partnerships you might want to develop to apply 17 for some of those grant programs. I think that 18 will be an important program to round out the 19 Organic Transition Initiative. We also do continue to coordinate with 20 21 NRCS and MRA on these initiatives and trying to figure out how to reduce the multiple avenues in 22

1 reporting. That is -- every program has slightly different rules based on funding sources 2 3 regulations. And so I think those partnerships are 4 And so I wanted to highlight that 5 getting built. we do have very frequent communication with those 6 7 groups. 8 I also want to emphasize that even 9 though we talk about strengthening organic 10 enforcement being in the implementation period, 11 there's a lot we're doing right now to protect the market and compliance and enforcement, from 12 13 surveillance at country level to complaint 14 investigations, certifier directives on а 15 risk-based level, legal penalties covered by trademark protections, significant fees and fines 16 17 or civil penalties and the fees that customs and 18 border protection levies when they hold something 19 at the border for a trademark violation, okay.

And so it's not our civil penalties, it's also customs and borders fees and penalties if you break their rules. And we have even seen

20

21

22

1 sentencing with prison time for organic So there are lots of agencies out 2 violators. 3 there working side by side with NOP to support the market. 4 USDA is a federal mark which means it 5 is federal crime to break the organic rule. 6 7 that is pretty special for this seal. 8 I want to highlight Human Capital 9 Initiative Resources. This has been a big point 10 of emphasis. And insider came out yesterday 11 emphasizing some of the work we've been doing in 12 this area. 13 number of projects funded a 14 couple of years ago that are now yielding new 15 modules within the learning centers. You want to 16 start an apprenticeship program? Here's some 17 You want to start an internship program 18 for the next generation? Here are some modules. 19 We've just published a Diversity, 20 Equity, Inclusion, Accessibility Resources for 21 the Organic Sector. That is in line with the Equity Commission recommendations. So we are 22

does emphasize technical assistance. So things you've been hearing today through TOPP are aligned with the equity and inclusion emphasis points of the Department where we're able to touch those through programs like TOPP. And that's it. So I'm going to turn it over for the questions now. CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Questions for Jenny from the Board. Solid work. Go ahead, Kyla. MEMBER SMITH: Hi Jenny. So in my opening I said I was equally excited and terrified for SOE and you've encouraged us all to read the rule, which we are all doing. It answers a lot of our questions and certifiers still have questions, so I was wondering if you could speak to if and when we might see additional training resources in the	1	working hand in hand with USDA goals related to
So things you've been hearing today through TOPP are aligned with the equity and inclusion emphasis points of the Department where we're able to touch those through programs like TOPP. And that's it. So I'm going to turn it over for the questions now. CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Questions for Jenny from the Board. Solid work. Go ahead, Kyla. MEMBER SMITH: Hi Jenny. So in my opening I said I was equally excited and terrified for SOE and you've encouraged us all to read the rule, which we are all doing. It answers a lot of our questions and certifiers still have questions, so I was wondering if you could speak to if and when we might see additional training resources in the	2	equity in issuing these types of training which
through TOPP are aligned with the equity and inclusion emphasis points of the Department where we're able to touch those through programs like TOPP. And that's it. So I'm going to turn it over for the questions now. CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Questions for Jenny from the Board. Solid work. Go ahead, Kyla. MEMBER SMITH: Hi Jenny. So in my opening I said I was equally excited and terrified for SOE and you've encouraged us all to read the rule, which we are all doing. It answers a lot of our questions and certifiers still have questions, so I was wondering if you could speak to if and when we might see additional training resources in the	3	does emphasize technical assistance.
inclusion emphasis points of the Department where we're able to touch those through programs like TOPP. And that's it. So I'm going to turn it over for the questions now. CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Questions for Jenny from the Board. Solid work. Go ahead, Kyla. MEMBER SMITH: Hi Jenny. So in my opening I said I was equally excited and terrified for SOE and you've encouraged us all to read the rule, which we are all doing. It answers a lot of our questions and certifiers still have questions, so I was wondering if you could speak to if and when we might see additional training resources in the	4	So things you've been hearing today
we're able to touch those through programs like TOPP. And that's it. So I'm going to turn it over for the questions now. CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Questions for Jenny from the Board. Solid work. Go ahead, Kyla. MEMBER SMITH: Hi Jenny. So in my opening I said I was equally excited and terrified for SOE and you've encouraged us all to read the rule, which we are all doing. It answers a lot of our questions and certifiers still have questions, so I was wondering if you could speak to if and when we might see additional training resources in the	5	through TOPP are aligned with the equity and
And that's it. So I'm going to turn it over for the questions now. CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Questions for Jenny from the Board. Solid work. Go ahead, Kyla. MEMBER SMITH: Hi Jenny. So in my opening I said I was equally excited and terrified for SOE and you've encouraged us all to read the rule, which we are all doing. It answers a lot of our questions and certifiers still have questions, so I was wondering if you could speak to if and when we might see additional training resources in the	6	inclusion emphasis points of the Department where
And that's it. So I'm going to turn it over for the questions now. CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Questions for Jenny from the Board. Solid work. Go ahead, Kyla. MEMBER SMITH: Hi Jenny. So in my opening I said I was equally excited and terrified for SOE and you've encouraged us all to read the rule, which we are all doing. It answers a lot of our questions and certifiers still have questions, so I was wondering if you could speak to if and when we might see additional training resources in the	7	we're able to touch those through programs like
it over for the questions now. CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Questions for Jenny from the Board. Solid work. Go ahead, Kyla. MEMBER SMITH: Hi Jenny. So in my opening I said I was equally excited and terrified for SOE and you've encouraged us all to read the rule, which we are all doing. It answers a lot of our questions and certifiers still have questions, so I was wondering if you could speak to if and when we might see additional training resources in the	8	TOPP.
CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Questions for Jenny from the Board. Solid work. Go ahead, Kyla. MEMBER SMITH: Hi Jenny. So in my opening I said I was equally excited and terrified for SOE and you've encouraged us all to read the rule, which we are all doing. It answers a lot of our questions and certifiers still have questions, so I was wondering if you could speak to if and when we might see additional training resources in the	9	And that's it. So I'm going to turn
Questions for Jenny from the Board. Solid work. Go ahead, Kyla. MEMBER SMITH: Hi Jenny. So in my opening I said I was equally excited and terrified for SOE and you've encouraged us all to read the rule, which we are all doing. It answers a lot of our questions and certifiers still have questions, so I was wondering if you could speak to if and when we might see additional training resources in the	LO	it over for the questions now.
Go ahead, Kyla. MEMBER SMITH: Hi Jenny. So in my opening I said I was equally excited and terrified for SOE and you've encouraged us all to read the rule, which we are all doing. It answers a lot of our questions and certifiers still have questions, so I was wondering if you could speak to if and when we might see additional training resources in the	L1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right.
MEMBER SMITH: Hi Jenny. So in my opening I said I was equally excited and terrified for SOE and you've encouraged us all to read the rule, which we are all doing. It answers a lot of our questions and certifiers still have questions, so I was wondering if you could speak to if and when we might see additional training resources in the	L2	Questions for Jenny from the Board. Solid work.
opening I said I was equally excited and terrified for SOE and you've encouraged us all to read the rule, which we are all doing. It answers a lot of our questions and certifiers still have questions, so I was wondering if you could speak to if and when we might see additional training resources in the	L3	Go ahead, Kyla.
terrified for SOE and you've encouraged us all to read the rule, which we are all doing. It answers a lot of our questions and certifiers still have questions, so I was wondering if you could speak to if and when we might see additional training resources in the	L 4	MEMBER SMITH: Hi Jenny. So in my
read the rule, which we are all doing. It answers a lot of our questions and certifiers still have questions, so I was wondering if you could speak to if and when we might see additional training resources in the	L5	opening I said I was equally excited and
It answers a lot of our questions and certifiers still have questions, so I was wondering if you could speak to if and when we might see additional training resources in the	L 6	terrified for SOE and you've encouraged us all to
certifiers still have questions, so I was wondering if you could speak to if and when we might see additional training resources in the	L7	read the rule, which we are all doing.
wondering if you could speak to if and when we might see additional training resources in the	L8	It answers a lot of our questions and
might see additional training resources in the	L 9	certifiers still have questions, so I was
	20	wondering if you could speak to if and when we
learning center to help support certifiers for	21	might see additional training resources in the
	22	learning center to help support certifiers for

implementing the rule. 1 Yeah, we will be putting DR. TUCKER: 2 3 a training into the learning center. I think right now we're scheduled for this summer. 4 working on some support resources. 5 I do want to emphasize, though, this is a very broad-reaching 6 7 rule and every certifier system is different. This is an area where I think we have 8 9 to be very, very careful with how we think about 10 consistency because I think there are some folks 11 who are really scared that this is going to have 12 impact on small farmers and handlers that they won't want to do it and they 13 14 won't drop out. 15 I want to make sure we have our voices 16 over here from Georgia Organics and Carolina 17 Stewardship and all of Rodale. All the folks who 18 are telling us about the challenges for small 19 farmers. We don't want SOE to adversely impact 20 that in the search for consistency. Right? 21 The market is really trying 22 regulate us where the risk most lies which is the

1	middle of long supply chains and complex supply
2	chains. It's those uncertified handlers where
3	there is such an abstraction of the market that
4	it introduces a lot of risk. We're not talking
5	about local those are not the risk areas as
6	much.
7	I think it's very, very important for
8	certifiers in the community to keep that in mind
9	of what we are trying to go after. I want to be
10	careful not to put so much abstract information
11	out there that everybody over-interprets what the
12	actual impact is for small farmers.
13	And we will put something in the
14	learning center. I think the Accredited
15	Certifiers Association is doing a good job of
16	setting up sessions on that as well.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate, please go
18	ahead.
19	MEMBER LEWIS: First of all, I just
20	want to commend the program for strengthening the
21	organic enforcement rule. It's quite an
22	undertaking and the biggest change in the

1 regulation since it was launched 20 years ago. I just wanted to acknowledge that. 2 3 And also acknowledge that it's the type of rule that its success means we don't 4 actually see anything in the news. 5 Like I always said about food safety. Like food safety is 6 7 boring because when it succeeds, nothing happens. 8 I hope that is the outcome from this 9 that we don't have news stories about how smooth 10 and efficient and with integrity the supply chain 11 now is. It's not a very good news headline. I'm clearly not a good journalist. 12 Anyway, I just 13 wanted to commend folks on that. 14 My question relates to the President's 15 executive order related to racial justice and its 16 work through the federal government. Ι see 17 ourselves as part of the federal government so it's our obligation to do our work in that part. 18 19 I encouraged to see the program taking on some of 20 the racial equity recommendations from the Equity 2.1 Commission. 22 found USDA's response their to

1	interim report somewhat underwhelming but still a
2	good first step. I see a few things in the report
3	that the Board can take on right now in its work
4	through the Policy Development Subcommittee and
5	I'm excited about that.
6	But I'm curious from the program what
7	help or what you see we can do to help you
8	integrate some of those recommendations into your
9	workforce or to help support your work at the
10	Board level.
11	DR. TUCKER: So I appreciate that. I
12	think true change happens both at personal and
13	system levels. Right? And so we look at actions
14	we can take at the program level in supporting
15	the broader USDA. I think each of us needs to
16	look internally at what actions we can take.
17	At the AMS level, that's the agency
18	that we are part of, our agency was ahead of the
19	curve on this in that they had already set up a
20	diversity group that three folks on the program
21	were part of for agency level.
22	I meet with Civil Rights every quarter

to look at our workforce distribution. We do 1 active hiring through a lot of different types of 2 3 recruiting mechanisms we just converted. example, somebody from 4 For the Colleges 5 Hispanic American and Universities Program as a full-time employee. We are about to 6 7 bring on another veteran. We have strong veteran 8 hiring. 9 These are core values for us as a 10 program and that I believe our agency has as a 11 program. Certainly remote work has actually helped us in diversity and having access to more 12 13 resources, both to resources in terms of vehicles 14 to hire people through, but also just people, 15 different types of people in different parts of 16 the country. We've looked at our job requirements 17 18 in different ways. There have been a lot of 19 observation that organic is not particularly 20 That has been a challenge for diverse. Riaht?

we

We took a good hard look at our position

were

descriptions because

us.

21

22

realizing that

almost every job we were hiring for needed organic experience which meant we were closing ourselves off to sources of diversity.

We've done some rework of position so we can get more diversity, a broader pool of diverse candidates to pull from for some of our positions, the ones that really provide an opportunity to learn organic. You don't have to walk in the door knowing it. I would say I've also as an executive within AMS have been going to trainings and have become aware of things I wasn't aware of before.

I entered the world as a woman with disabilities so I see the world through the lens of having wondered, for example, well, did I get this job because I'm a girl and because I have disabilities, or did I get it because I was qualified. I really like the fact that I think I got the job because I'm qualified, I hope. I think everyone with sources of difference wants to feel that way.

22 And when we look at our own behaviors,

1	the training I've gone to has helped me be more
2	sensitive to things that maybe I didn't notice
3	before. So there is something, in fact, I
4	noticed this morning. As a Board I invite you to
5	work on, if you would like to work on this issue,
6	to work on it.
7	But also I would ask you to look at
8	yourselves and how you approach your world as
9	individuals. I want you to think back to the
10	panel and who was on the panel and who got asked
11	the questions and who didn't. That's how we show
12	up for each other and for a broader diverse group
13	of people who want to be part of the organic
14	movement.
15	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We're going to go
16	Allison next and then Brian.
17	Allison, if you want to go ahead.
18	MEMBER JOHNSON: Thank you, Nate. And
19	thank you so much, Jenny, for all of this
20	information and your continued leadership. We
21	really appreciate you.
22	We heard overwhelming support in the

1 public comments for further recognition of organic as a Climate-Smart Agriculture within 2 3 USDA. I'm wondering if you can offer any advice or insight to the Board and to the organic 4 community about how we can advance that priority 5 within USDA in addition to the proposal that we 6 7 will be voting on today. DR. TUCKER: Yeah, I think that's been 8 9 a very important conversation over the past 10 couple of meetings. I would encourage you to 11 keep having the conversation. You can give us a recommendation. There are certain items on the 12 13 work agenda that we keep open like import 14 capital, Climate-Smart oversight, human 15 These are important conversations to have. 16 A number of people today have been 17 talking about really devastating things they are 18 experiencing on their farms, right? So I welcome 19 the Board's continued work on that and your 20 continued work on that. We do bring that work 21 back to USDA. 22 We keep in close connection to the

Τ	team working in Climate-Smart Ag and the Climate
2	Commodities Program. There are organic groups
3	that are part of those grant programs. So
4	keeping yourselves at the table, and
5	participating in broader USDA programs. It
6	doesn't just have to be within the organic
7	community. There are lots of programs to have
8	your voices heard in.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Brian, and then
L 0	Amy.
L1	MEMBER CALDWELL: Thanks, Nate.
L2	Jenny, I want to thank you and your
L3	team for moving forward on so many fronts that
L 4	are really wonderful for us. It's been great.
L 5	I have a very specific question. Last
L 6	year, or last fall, I brought up the issue of the
L7	accreditation of the status of the Texas
L 8	Department of Agriculture's certification
L 9	program. As I understand it, the certification
20	the accreditation of that program was
21	withdrawn but then appealed. I just wonder if
22	you have any updates on that.

1 DR. TUCKER: T do. Let's see. Ts There's Robert. Okay. 2 Robert here? I just want 3 to highlight the accreditation. Robert is our Accreditation Division director and they are the 4 ones who oversee the certifiers. 5 And so the 6 Department of Agriculture received 7 proposed suspension so they had received a lot of 8 feedback over a time on how they needed to 9 improve their accreditation program. 10 They received a proposed suspension of 11 their accreditation from us. They did appeal 12 The appeal was denied so an independent entity heard that appeal and denied upholding the 13 14 suspension agreeing should that Texas be 15 suspended. TDA, this is all due process in the 16 regulations. This whole process is regulated by 17 the regs. 18 They requested -- TDA has requested a 19 hearing in front of an administrative law judge so when an appeal is denied, this is true at the 20 21 operation and certifier level, that they 22 request a further appeal step. That is now with

1	the administrative law judge within USDA. A
2	hearing for that is expected in early 2024.
3	MEMBER CALDWELL: Thanks very much.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy, go ahead.
5	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you, Nate.
6	Jenny, thank you so much for just
7	articulating the progress that's been made on
8	many fronts, including enforcement and also as
9	well as TOPP. I did have a question with market
10	development component within TOPP.
11	It's a very critical component that I
12	do believe will increase adoption to organic
13	production methodologies, as well as retention,
14	which is also really important within our former
15	base.
16	I wanted to highlight two specific
17	needs from the heartland to promote a successful
18	deployment market such as grain and feed which
19	really needs special attention. I do believe
20	that they require federal licensing and better
21	financial oversight.
22	There has been an extreme impact to

1 our organic community in the grain sector with facilities going bankrupt and issuing clawbacks 2 3 as well as large payments that farmers, even though they delivered grain, need to pay back the 4 money they receive for that grain just due to the 5 6 bankruptcy laws. 7 really Thev are set up against 8 They are not farmer friendly. I think 9 that's one thing I want to make sure when we are 10 approving these grants that there is 11 consideration for just the financial wherewithal of these companies. 12 Secondarily would be 13 just overall 14 market development. I think half the battle with 15 the crops that are the focus area is finding that 16 landing spot, but the other piece of that is just 17 crop insurance protection. There is so much risk within organic farming so it's good to reduce 18 19 market risk with some of these landing spots. 20 With that, we are almost encouraging 21 producers to grow non-insurable crops which is conventional 22 different than verv our

1 counterparts. I think there needs to be cross-collaboration with Risk Management Agency 2 3 when we are looking at expanding markets for organic and transition producers. 4 DR. TUCKER: I really appreciate the 5 6 They touch on so many different 7 There is the market development grants things. 8 really are focused on building that 9 infrastructure and the ability to get from farm 10 to market, the coordination with RMA. 11 I think the fact that you folks have 12 been engaging in the crop insurance, you know, 13 there are several years where that term would not 14 have been brought up by a board. I think this 15 Board is getting more involved in the broader set of USDA activities. I think the timing of that 16 17 absolutely right to be raising is these questions. 18 19 I do want to emphasize also that the 20 top technical assistance element, while it 21 certainly is about sort of pests and weeds, which we heard about this morning, but it can also be 22

1	about market savvy and market development and
2	business planning and what questions you want to
3	ask and what kinds of provisions are in different
4	contracts.
5	How do you protect yourself as a
6	farmer going into the market. I do think that is
7	a critically important part of technical
8	assistance. How do you navigate the economic
9	landscape in a way that keeps you that
10	minimizes risk as much as possible and keeps you
11	safe.
12	I think if there are folks out there
13	who have expertise in that area, getting that
14	expertise to the right people so people are
15	asking, the sellers and the buyers know what
16	tools might available and how to ask the right
17	questions through that process. That can also be
18	part of technical assistance.
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
20	from the Board. All righty. We are just slaying
21	it on time.
22	Do you have another question?

1	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Okay. Well, we
3	might not now.
4	(Laughter.)
5	MEMBER BRUCH: I have several.
6	Jenny, I would also like to ask you a
7	question about enforcement. I'm really excited
8	for the implementation of SOE. With the
9	globalness of our program, I was just wondering
10	what collaboration happens amongst our
11	equivalency partners because I do think fighting
12	fraud is not only the actions we do, but it's a
13	very large endeavor. I just wanted to understand
14	how we work with our equivalency partners when we
15	do these enforcement acts.
16	DR. TUCKER: Yeah, it's a great
17	question and it's an important part of what the
18	program does. In fact, we've got a whole group
19	of international activities that this is what
20	they do.
21	Equivalence for folks who are not as
22	familiar with these topics is when we agree with

1 another government that standards are are equivalent meaning they achieve the same goals. 2 3 They don't have to be equal or identical, but they do need to be equivalent, fair to everybody. 4 interesting when the 5 It's initial 6 equivalency arrangements were done early in the 7 program they were very focused on materials and 8 on practice standards and such like that. 9 when we look at equivalency, we're really looking 10 at a much broader control system perspective so 11 how do they do enforcement and how do they do compliance. 12 13 There have been countries that we have 14 chosen not to do equivalent arrangements with 15 because they are not equivalent in those systems 16 of oversight. In those countries you have to be 17 certified to the USDA organic to sell to the 18 United States. 19 think one of the things that 20 strengthening organic enforcement does that we 21 haven't really talked about is it will spark a 22 relook at all those equivalency --equivalence

1 arrangements to determine whether governments are still equivalent. 2 3 We have been growing as an industry. We've also been growing in oversight, right? NOP 4 is now significantly larger than it was four or 5 five years ago to respond to market growth. 6 7 One thing we need to look at is how if 8 other governments are growing in operations, are 9 they also growing in oversight? Are they also 10 able to protect. If they are certifying in other 11 countries, how do they protect those markets? We have been doing some -- we have 12 а lot of technical conversations with other governments. 13 14 We've recently entered into some very 15 in-depth technical conversations, for example, with Canada doing supply chain audits where we 16 have taken certain commodities and traced them 17 back through the supply chain to see, okay, where 18 19 are the systems strong, where are they weak, and 20 what do we need to do accordingly. 21 I think there is a lot of learning 22 that's been produced out of that. the ΕU

1 recently published new legislation, new regulations, so we will need to engage with the 2 3 EU as well because of their time line. A 1 1 governments that we have equivalence with we need 4 to renegotiate. 5 6 We did terminate a trade arrangement 7 so we ended the arrangement with India. It was a 8 recognition arrangement where India was 9 authorized to accredit certifiers who then went 10 out in certified farms and we found that control 11 system was not adequate. We had an 18-month transition which 12 13 gave legitimate farmers a good period to be able 14 to get certified under our standards. Then 15 Robert just had four folks over in India for a 16 full month doing unannounced inspections, reviews of the certifiers working there to oversee that 17 Trade notices that. 18 market. 19 A few years ago I was told India is 20 the wild wild west of organic. I got a call a 21 couple of weeks ago saying, you know what? 22 not the wild west as much anymore. You've done

1 good work there. We are making a difference in these import oversight programs. 2 3 Are there still challenges around the In many countries, yes, there are. world? 4 We now have more tools than we had before. 5 will 6 certificates be an added benefit. of7 visibility and transparency into the market. 8 One of the challenges we have are operations 9 that get kicked out of the program like suspended operations, but they stay in the game. 10 They keep 11 shipping product to us even though they are Import certificates will top that. 12 suspended. We have much better network of folks 13 14 on the ground now. Certifiers have upped their 15 We've upped our interaction with FAS desk 16 officers. They were a huge help in India and 17 have been a big help in other countries as well really understanding the dynamics on the ground. 18 19 Import oversight is a big part of what As Nate said, you're not going to always 20 21 hear the good news stories that come from that. 22 I'm much more confident in the system than I was

1	a year ago, two years ago, three years ago, five
2	years ago.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Carolyn, please go
4	ahead.
5	MEMBER DIMITRI: Thanks for giving us
6	all the dirt, Jenny. Several commenters asked us
7	to try to accommodate farmers' schedules a little
8	bit better. One suggestion we had was having
9	like a January virtual listening session. I'm
LO	wondering could you explain like the time line or
L1	like what that process would look like if that is
L2	a direction that we thought would be useful?
13	DR. TUCKER: Yeah. So if the Board
L 4	were interested in exploring that option, we are
L5	happy to explore that with you. I think there is
L 6	kind of a repeatable calendar that happens every
L7	six months. The time of that meeting we've heard
L 8	this feedback a lot over the years.
L 9	I think at the last meeting Michelle
20	put up a chart that kind of showed all the
21	different possible time periods and why we ended
22	up where we ended up on that. I think if the

Board wanted to supplement that with a fall -sorry, with a winter event, we would simply need
to articulate what are the goals of doing that,
how does that fit in that would be between the
fall and the spring meeting.

would it either Howinform Board deliberations for supplement your the spring. We probably want to make it a separate federal register announcement because these are public meetings so we would have to in openness and transparency publish that in the federal register which would also then be associated with a written comment for people who couldn't make the oral comments.

deeply appreciative of are community's desire to engage in the process, equally respectful of your time we I think we will leave it to volunteers. Board to balance how you would like to proceed with that idea as a program. We are happy to collaborate with you on thinking through mechanics of how it would need to be

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	administered. That was probably more than you
2	wanted.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
4	from the Board for Jenny? All right. Any
5	objection to breaking for lunch early? Okay.
6	So, folks, we're going to come back at 2:45 and
7	we are going to get kicked off with CACS
8	Subcommittee. See you all at 2:45.
9	DR. TUCKER: Thank you very, very much
10	everyone.
11	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
12	went off the record at 1:07 p.m. and resumed at
13	2:45 p.m.)
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: back here. And
15	we are getting kicked off with CACS. We still
16	have Mindee and Allison on Zoom. And so, we'll
17	be recording their vote for this afternoon just
18	at the end of the line.
19	Hope everyone had a good lunch. And
20	I'm going to hand it over to Amy to get us kicked
21	off.
22	MEMBER BRUCH: All right. Welcome

1	back. Hopefully everybody had a great lunch.
2	I'm excited to have the time that we set aside
3	for CACS. We have three great topics to dive
4	into that are on our work agenda.
5	But before we get started I have three
6	additional topics to discuss as my intro. First
7	off, I wanted to thank all the members of the
8	CACS Committee.
9	This is, I guess last year we added
10	another meeting so we would have more time to
11	take on issues that mattered. So, I appreciate
12	the flexibility of our team to do that, and the
13	diverse perspectives out team brings.
14	Secondly I wanted to just say wow. We
15	had a lot of great public comments, both written
16	and oral about our work agenda items. Having
17	voices on all sides of the equation are really
18	important. Because that helps us make more
19	robust recommendations. So thank you to the
20	community for that.
21	Thirdly, I did want to highlight
22	additional work agenda items that we're planning

1 on taking on in addition to any follow-ups from today's Board deliberations. 2 3 So, the three additional work agenda items fall into the categories of enforcement, 4 organic and climate smart agriculture, and human 5 6 capital. 7 So, the first one on enforcement, we 8 are looking to expand residue testing for our 9 global supply chain. The goal of that is to 10 provide a recommendation that ensures testing 11 remains а relevant and effective tool for compliance verification in the organic global 12 supply chain. 13 14 Our second topic that we're going to 15 be taking on as a CACS Committee is organic and 16 climate smart agriculture. What and why organic. 17 The goal of this, and some of you have heard 18 Nate's questioning. 19 The goal of this document is t.o 20 summarize the infrastructure behind the program, 21 and promote the organic program's competitive 22 advantages.

1 And thirdly, under human capital we have a work agenda item approved for supporting 2 3 the transition of producers. So, the goal of this work agenda item is to determine effective 4 tools, resources, and alignment strategies to 5 support organic transition, and requirements for 6 7 participation in programs that support the 8 organic transition. 9 So, without further ado let's get 10 started into our current work agenda items. 11 Nate, I'll have you kick us off with the proposal on organic as climate smart. Thanks for your 12 expansive work on this topic. 13 14 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you. Sure. 15 was actually a topic prompted by Dr. And it was a, it started off as a 16 Dimitri. 17 letter to the Secretary when received we 18 information about the new administration's goals. 19 Climate change and responding to 20 climate change through agriculture was a top 21 priority. So, we wanted to make sure that 22 organic was contextualized as being a really

1	reasonable option for addressing that concern.
2	The administration responded with, in
3	the program, with a list of questions. I think
4	it was 17 questions to specifically inquire for
5	the entire rest of USDA, how is organic climate
6	smart?
7	So, we were given a very specific set
8	of prompts to answer. And that's what we did in
9	this document. And so, our answers were because
10	of the questions.
11	There wasn't a lot of latitude to
12	explore all of the reasons, all of the fantastic
13	reasons that organic is the most climate friendly
14	farming option out there. But I think we got a
15	lot in the bucket that was provided to us.
16	In the, you know, preparation for
17	climate smart commodity partnership, which was a
18	funding program, about \$3 billion dollars
19	released by USDA to different grant
20	opportunities, to explore and execute climate
21	smart research and climate smart project.
22	We had a deadline with this project.

1 Our job with this paper was to communicate to the USDA why is climate, why is organic climate 2 3 smart? And with that we met that deadline. A lot of organic project, I might say 4 not enough, but a lot of organic projects got 5 through the climate 6 smart commodity 7 project partnership. And so, this is a standing work agenda item. 8 We get to talk about this 9 more. 10 The idea with this paper is that we 11 tried to meet this deadline so that the program would have NOPs voice 12 as to why we consider organic a climate smart option, and why 13 14 they should be an automatic shoe in for the 15 climate smart designation for grant funding or 16 future programmatic designations. 17 With this document we are finished up with answering these questions. The program was 18 19 really great about having a very quick turnaround 20 for the questions. 21 Dr. Dimitri posed that we were 22 interested in working in it. And the program

1 turned around with these 17 questions, saying tell us more. 2 3 From that we answered them. But it's not the end of the game. We get to keep working 4 This is an open work agenda item. 5 on this. so, all of you brought a lot of questions about 6 7 how do we expand further? How do we slice and 8 dice what being climate smart means to organic? 9 With this particular document I feel 10 like the end has come for the questions. 11 answered the questions. It's not a vehicle for 12 getting all of the information that we want to 13 brag about in organic on to this one work agenda 14 item. 15 We get more work agenda items that are 16 a better fit, a better prompt for being able to 17 capture all that is relevant to organic and being 18 climate smart. 19 And so with that I would open it up 20 for questions from my fellow Board members. 21 have moved this to proposal. We are now prepared to vote on it. So, let's discuss this. 22

1	please go ahead.
2	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yes. Thanks, Nate.
3	I'm not feeling too good about this. I feel
4	like I'm going to throw a little monkey wrench
5	into the works.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Love it.
7	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yes. And I think
8	that the proposal as written applies really well
9	to about 90 percent of certified organic
10	operations.
11	However, I am really reluctant about
12	this. And I really struggled with this. But I
13	really don't think that several classes of
14	organic farms should automatically qualify for
15	climate smart status.
16	And I can just mention a few of them
17	that seem to be, at least the way I understand
18	climate smart. In other words, a farming system
19	that actually is positive in terms of responding,
20	creating a positive response to climate change.
21	A few of them are, that I don't think
22	qualify. One is what we call deep compost

1	vegetable production, which a lot of our small
2	scale farmers do in the Northeast and the Midwest
3	I believe. And actually can be quite successful
4	with it.
5	But compost is applied at
6	approximately ten times the amount or more than
7	is actually needed for nutrients. But it's used
8	as a weed preventive mulch. So, it's like a
9	surface mulch.
10	And this, if this is done year after
11	year, which is in these systems generally, it's
12	just like an incredible input of carbon materials
13	that is not, are not coming out in the output.
14	So, I don't see how that one is going to qualify.
15	Another one is hydroponics and
16	container production. Very energy and plastic
17	intensive producing high yields of kind of very
18	high value crops. But again, I don't think
19	there's a positive balance there in terms of the
20	climate.
21	Dairies, livestock operations, dairies
22	and poultry operations that import the majority

1 of their feed, and don't have acres to apply the manure to, and make a, sort of an internally 2 3 recycling system, I don't think they will make it. 4 And finally, the use of heavy amounts 5 of plastic mulch in some of our berry 6 7 vegetable operations. Again, that input, throw 8 away, you know, high energy and carbon intensive 9 mulches every year. I just don't think the 10 balance is there. 11 And so, I'm certainly open to the fact, I would, or open to the possibility. 12 13 would love to hear other people's thoughts on 14 this. I believe that we really do need more 15 life cycle analyses of these kinds of systems. 16 Almost all the research that's done on climate 17 18 smart organic is done with basically soil based 19 systems, standard cash grain rotations, and that 20 sort of thing. with done 21 Tt's not these more specialized facets of organic, which are part of 22

1	our organic system. But I think don't really
2	make it in terms of the climate.
3	So yes. And I just want to reiterate
4	that I really do believe that 90 percent of our
5	organic farming operations are very climate smart
6	and climate friendly.
7	But I just really balk, I really
8	struggle, and don't feel comfortable with this
9	blanket sort of recommendation that all certified
LO	organic farms automatically qualify for climate
L1	smart.
L2	So, I guess what I'd like to see is
L3	this to go back to the subcommittee. I believe
L 4	it wouldn't take too much, it would take some
L5	serious thought.
L 6	But it wouldn't, it's not a big huge
L7	hurdle to fix this, and make it so that it really
L 8	reflects kind of the climate smart status of
L 9	organics. So, thanks.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Not a wrench at
21	all. Amy, please go ahead. No, I'm serious. I
22	think, I don't have a direct response to it.

Τ	But, Amy, go anead.
2	MEMBER BRUCH: I actually have a
3	question for you, Brian. Because I'd like to
4	have some dialogue here and open it up to the
5	full Board as well.
6	I think we're very fortunate to be
7	organic farmers. Because our standards are
8	clear. I am just questioning, when you say
9	climate smart there isn't currently a one
10	definition for that word.
11	So, I'm curious, when you're
12	mentioning it for your comment, what is your
13	definition, so we can calibrate as a Board what
14	we're talking about?
15	Because climate smart has different
16	facets to it. So, I'm just curious for your
17	interpretation.
18	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yes. That's, I
19	struggled with that one too. And I don't know if
20	I can articulate it perfectly. But it's
21	basically a farming system where the input, when
22	you balance the inputs of energy and carbon, and

1	the, again, the kind of the life cycle of the
2	inputs, in terms of the energy that's required to
3	create them, and you balance that with the
4	outputs of the system, that, including the
5	buildup of carbon in the soil, which is a big
6	part of what we're doing here.
7	And we got to remember that that, the
8	input for that is the sunlight from the sun that
9	is the driving force of this plan. That's the
10	carbon that we're really trying to fix into the
11	soil, right.
12	Anyways, our inputs minus our outputs,
13	it needs to be a balance where the outputs are
14	bigger than the inputs. So, that's the way I'm
15	looking at it.
16	And I would love to hear some other
17	takes on it. Because that would really change
18	basically my conclusions on this I think.
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yes. Go ahead,
20	Logan.
21	MEMBER PETREY: Okay. This is like
22	share material now. So, a question like the

1	inputs and the outputs. Is that per, in your
2	mind is that per season or per year? Because of
3	rotations we, you know, we rely on. And the
4	cover crops that come after the plasticulture,
5	you know.
6	And so, organics is the entire system.
7	And yes, strawberries or tomatoes, like Mr.
8	Paul, you know, mentioned, got to be on plastic
9	for the type of production.
10	But is it more climate smart than the
11	conventional counterpart, you know, its
12	counterpart there because of the entire system
13	that organics has built into the OSP?
14	MEMBER CALDWELL: Well that, thanks,
15	Logan. Yes. I think that's one of the ways that
16	this proposal could be I believe improved. And
17	that is that I think almost any organic system is
18	going to be more climate smart than its
19	conventional counterpart.
20	And certainly you want to use the
21	whole system. You don't want to just look at,
22	vou know, one short season crop, and then forget

1 about all the other good things that happen in the rotation. It's got to be the whole rotation 2 3 and the whole farm. But we are, so, in terms of suggesting 4 that all certified organic operations should be 5 eligible for Government climate smart systems, 6 7 we're not saying that, you know, that they're 8 better than their non-organic counterpart. 9 saying that they are climate smart. And I don't 10 think, I don't feel good about that. I don't 11 think that's quite right. 12 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I think Dilip and 13 then Carolyn. 14 MEMBER NANDWANI: Thanks, Nate. This 15 rather a clarification, maybe to Amy 16 somebody else from the Board. This proposal is, 17 are we going to suggest that organic agriculture 18 in general is climate smart? 19 Or we are talking that each organic 20 agriculture or organic management practices, like 21 say whether the use of cover crops, or manure, or compost, is climate smart, and certain organic 22

1	management practices are not climate smart?
2	Are we doing that part? Or we are
3	just proposing this about in general organic
4	agriculture is climate smart? That's, I just
5	want to understand here what you're, thank you.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: To answer these
7	questions that were posed by the administration,
8	we're posing that the regulations are climate
9	smart, not that the interpretation down the line
10	always lands how we want it to land.
11	But that as we look through where
12	we've cited the different points of the
13	regulation we were given if you turn to Page 3 of
14	the proposal.
15	When we look at the questions the
16	administration prioritized very specific
17	practices, cover crops, low till or no till,
18	nutrient management, buffers.
19	We were asked what of these qualifies
20	in organic? How does organic interact with these
21	very specific practices? And we're saying, per
22	the standards they all do. Or I think at least

1	13 of the 14 are all baked into the standards.
2	And so, when we're looking to, is
3	organic generally, should it be considered
4	climate smart, they were not asking are there
5	specific practices that should be excluded.
6	They're asking, are these specific practices
7	included?
8	And that was the prompt. It's not a
9	freeform essay. It's a, we asked, we answered
10	very specific questions by the administration
11	about where do you fall on these particular
12	practices?
13	So, cover cropping, and pasture
14	practices. And organic resoundingly is head and
15	shoulders above, if I dare say it, it's not the
16	administration saying it, it's me saying it,
17	above conventional.
18	And if we can't say that, folks, we've
19	got a bigger problem on our hands. And so, if we
20	are going to message that internally and very
21	transparently, we're going to dice out the
22	details.

1 But for this one we're saying, practices 2 these requested organic is the 3 solution. And any time you're going to make an organic claim for grant funding or NRCS programs, 4 or anything, organic folks who are certified are 5 going to be considered. They're not going to be 6 7 put into the back of the line. And that's a risk. 8 9 And frankly, it is an organic versus 10 conventional. That's what we're up against. 11 are up against a question of is organic even at And the jury is still somewhat out 12 the table? with the administration. 13 14 This doesn't suddenly make everybody 15 love organics. But it was our attempt to try to 16 really clearly message that for what you're 17 considering climate smart these questions, which frankly just don't address the concerns that you 18 19 raised as far as practices that you would want to 20 push out of that, off the table. 21 For these practices organic has baked in. Organic was the original climate smart 22

1	solution. When they were thinking about what is
2	climate smart, really they just plucked from the
3	organic standards, which we should be singing
4	with our greatest praise, Hallelujah, because it
5	actually works.
6	Our system works. We have a market
7	for it. We should all be with one voice shouting
8	from the rooftops that we have something that
9	actually works, as opposed to having to reinvent
10	the wheel.
11	So, that question to Dilip, I'm sorry,
12	this is a very long answer to Dilip's question is
13	that we were asked about these particular
14	practices.
15	How do they correspond to the climate
16	smart prompts? And we answered that they're
17	baked right into the regulations.
18	MEMBER NANDWANI: Thanks, Nate.
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you. Nate,
20	or I'm sorry. Carolyn and then Nate.
21	MEMBER DIMITRI: I was starting to
22	think you were passing me over on purpose, Nate.

1 So first I want to say something to you Nate. I really admire and respect your desire to have no 2 3 conflict. And I do think that there is been a 4 history of conflict on the NOSB and in organic. 5 And it comes out loud and clear in our public 6 7 comments, and many other areas. 8 like I recognize that you are 9 trying very hard to like navigate us through kind 10 of what could be land mines. So, I do think like 11 everyone on the Board that, well, there's nothing 12 Anyway, I don't think we're going to 13 14 personally, this Board will have a giant falling 15 out over this particular proposal. But that said I do have some comments. 16 17 So, one is like just in interest of full disclosure, also there are some new people 18 19 on the Board. When we got the 17 guestions I 20 came back with a very snarky academic answer to 21 17 questions, which basically were 22 USDA, go ask your staff all of these questions.

1 And don't ask us this. And Nate was much more diplomatic, and wrote out point by point answers. 2 3 And I do see what you're saying about practices and organics. But I have, what, two 4 thoughts, well, three thoughts actually. 5 So one is, when people read this, 6 7 people aren't going to be thinking we're talking 8 about the practices. They will think that this 9 is statement on anything that's certified 10 organic by USDA. So, I think it's important to 11 keep that in mind. Two, I think that, I agree with Brian. 12 I think that there are some cases where it's 13 14 just not going to be true. And I think in, and 15 those are the cases that I worry about. 16 I think that often those types of facilities are 17 able to produce at much lower cost а of 18 production. 19 And then there's this competitive 20 advantage that they have in the market. And they 21 make it harder for the other farms to compete in 22 the marketplace. And I think you see this in

1	organic berries very clearly, right.
2	If we're just going to think about the
3	western operations, and the issues about lower
4	feed costs, and what this means for higher levels
5	of profitability. And that concerns me.
6	And I also think the climate smart
7	phrase is not defined yet. But there are plenty
8	of companies that do a really great job at
9	marketing based upon climate smart agriculture.
10	And so, I guess I don't really want to
11	add anything to some company's ability to say
12	that some hydroponic facilities, sorry Jerry, is
13	going to be climate smart, and that consumers
14	will be able to see it on a product and buy it.
15	And so, I don't know whether the right
16	thing is to send it back to committee. Maybe we
17	could make some small tweaks, so that it would be
18	more acceptable.
19	Because this is part of the public
20	record. And people are not going to like sit and
21	think about like all of the angst every one of us
22	has gone through as we look at this.

1	So anyway, those are my thoughts.
2	Thank you for listening.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Sure. Nate.
4	MEMBER LEWIS: Yes. I think I'm
5	trying to synthesize my thoughts into something
6	not too raggedy.
7	But I hear you loud and clear, Brian.
8	And, Carolyn, you have repeated it as well, that
9	there are likely going to be some operations that
10	don't provide a net carbon sink, which I think is
11	a way, one way of describing kind of your
12	concern, as you've got production of food that is
13	continuing to mine the soil for carbon, or not
14	absorb more carbon than it's emitting in its
15	production practices.
16	And I'm not sure if I think that every
17	organic farms needs to be a carbon sink in order
18	for that organic farm to be climate smart.
19	And I certainly think that the
20	regulations as they are written have the
21	potential to be applied on any farm to be a
22	climate smart option.

1 reason I'm supportive So, the getting this back to the USDA is because they've 2 3 provided us an opportunity to weigh in. they're seemingly trying to draw a circle around 4 everything that's climate smart. 5 And if we don't jump in that circle 6 7 the ship's going to be out of the harbor. 8 then we're going to be kind of like clawing back 9 with, you know, we just do more hand wringing and say, these types of operations, or this thing, or 10 11 that thing. And we parse it out like we usually 12 do. 13 I'm concerned we're going to miss the 14 ship, and we're not going to get included in the 15 VENN diagram like we are in a lot of other USDA programs, where we're now trying to do little 16 17 fixes at RMA for crop insurance. We're trying to do little fixes at FSA 18 19 to actually get our cost share program. Or, you know, all these different things. I feel like 20 21 getting on the bus early is really critical with 22 USDA.

1	We can come back and say, and actually
2	these types of operations, soil based operations
3	that don't cover crop enough I think could
4	potentially be not climate smart.
5	There's a lot, there's a whole bunch
6	of potential opportunities there to sort of carve
7	folks out. But I don't think we need to do that
8	before we respond to USDA about all the things
9	that already exist that meet what they seem to be
10	implying is their definition for this.
11	So, I want to get on the bus. I want
12	to be on the front of the bus. And we can kick
13	people off if we need to. But yes, I think I'll
14	just leave it there.
15	That's sort of the driving force
16	behind why I want to move this forward, no matter
17	how imperfect it may be. I think it's actually a
18	really good proposal. Thanks.
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Wood, please go
20	ahead.
21	MEMBER TURNER: I just, I really like
22	Brian's definition earlier about sort of what

1	climate smart means to you, in terms it's for
2	that carbon balance, if you will, on an
3	individual farm.
4	I just want to sort of, from my
5	standpoint, and I know this is neither here nor
6	there. But I think the frame is bad. I don't
7	love the frame. I don't love the fact that the
8	question we were asked is something related to
9	something a little bit buzzy called climate
L 0	smart.
L1	I mean, I, the only, I fundamentally
L2	believe that responsible agriculture should be
L3	focused on storing as much atmospheric carbon as
L 4	it possibly can, period, the end.
L 5	But I don't like thee frame. I don't
L 6	like the, this sort of in or out climate smart
L7	issue. And for me, you know, I look at Page 3 of
L 8	the proposal. And, you know, the chart that's in
L 9	the proposal is called principles of regenerative
20	agriculture.
21	And I guess the point that I want to
22	make is that I wish the paper were more about

1	organic being regenerative. Organic is
2	regenerative.
3	I feel like there's so much
4	conversation from so many different angles in the
5	community about, you know, what we, you know,
6	what is this regenerative? What does that mean?
7	What does this mean?
8	And honestly, I feel like for me
9	fundamentally the issue that matters the most to
10	me, not whether organic is climate smart. And I
11	get the frame. I don't like the frame. Is
12	simply that organic is regenerative, period, the
13	end.
14	We should be singing that from the
15	rooftops in every way possible. And I wish we
16	were spending more time focused on that
17	particular issue, which I think is so clearly
18	outlined in the table on Page 3. So, I just
19	wanted to say that.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you. Kyla,
21	please go ahead.
22	MEMBER SMITH: Thanks, everybody, for

1	your conversations on this topic. I was sitting
2	here reflecting, and sort of landed similar to
3	what Nate Lewis had said. So like now we have to
4	say NPP or Nate Lewis, Nate 1, Nate 2.
5	Anyway, I'm thinking about unintended
6	consequences and timeline. So, that was what I
7	was thinking about too. And is it better to move
8	forward with the proposal and have a seat at the
9	table?
10	Or, and what's the unintended
11	consequences of that option and that action,
12	versus sending it back to Subcommittee, not
13	having a seat at the table. And what are the
14	unintended consequences of that action?
15	So, I generally, yes, Carolyn, if you
16	want to speak to that. That's an open question
17	anybody can respond to.
18	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Sure. I think so.
19	Yes.
20	MEMBER DIMITRI: Okay. Jenny, I guess
21	I'm curious. It seems to me that USDA is down
22	the climate smart road already. And like,

1	they're not waiting for this, are they?
2	DR. TUCKER: Well, waiting for it.
3	They're very interested in hearing from the
4	community. There are folks with, USDA is through
5	this work agenda item trying to help you tell the
6	story of organics. And there's a lot about
7	organics that is climate smart. And so, I can't
8	advise you what to do with this proposal.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: No, no, no. No
10	worries.
11	(Laughter.)
12	DR. TUCKER: Really. I mean, really.
13	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you. Jerry,
14	please go ahead.
15	MEMBER D'AMORE: Yes. I've got a
16	really simple question. And sometimes things
17	come down to one word. When we first started
18	this, and it was under Carolyn's pen, I asked the
19	question about unintended consequences, and what
20	do we want of this document?
21	And what I got back made tremendous
22	sense to me at the time. And maybe life has gone

1 on, and we've got other things we're talking about. 2 3 But the answer was, we want to get in the queue. We want to be in the queue that we by 4 and large, as the organic stepchild are not in 5 6 the queue. 7 You take a look at conventional and 8 what goes to conventional. And then you look at 9 organic and its, what it's contributing both in 10 terms of dollars and what's being planted to it. 11 It's, those are two different, those are vastly different things. 12 So, it made a lot of sense to me then. 13 14 Now, to Brian, I'm sitting back. I'll take us 15 back to our oral comments just last week. I'm going, holy crap, hydroponic, hydroponic, 16 17 hydroponic. 18 Are we, first quarter of our time we 19 had 12 references to hydroponic. And I 20 sensitive to that. And where I todav got, 21 because I was going to follow on to that, to, and say, okay, hydroponics is part of the discussion. 22

1	I was going to contribute that I went
2	through and saw four different references out of
3	our oral comments that directly linked
4	hydroponics to climate smart agriculture and
5	said, doesn't work.
6	So, where am I going with all of this?
7	I'll take it back to your opening comments. And
8	if I misheard them then my whole speech here is
9	not worth much. But we've got a living document
10	here, do we not?
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: No.
12	MEMBER D'AMORE: What's that?
13	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: No.
14	MEMBER D'AMORE: That means this is
15	it?
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: This is it. We
17	have a living work agenda item. But for these
18	questions
19	MEMBER D'AMORE: Okay. Excuse me.
20	That's where, I beg your pardon. A poor choice
21	of words. We've got stuff to do on this
22	document.

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Absolutely.
2	MEMBER D'AMORE: Okay.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Climate change
4	ain't over, folks. This did not solve it.
5	Shocker.
6	MEMBER D'AMORE: So, I stayed quiet
7	until this point because I thought I saw things
8	coming together in a way that made sense to me.
9	And with that, this does make sense to me.
10	I think we need to be in the queue.
11	And the queue makes sense to me. The origins of
12	that make sense to me. We're not in the queue.
13	Let's get in the queue.
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Kim then Amy.
15	MEMBER SMITH: This is not perfect.
16	But I don't know if I can answer Brian's
17	questions and make it perfect in this format, or
18	in taking it back to subcommittee and trying to
19	redefine it.
20	Things that I wrestle with, with being
21	climate smart, as an industry there is a lot of
22	work to do. But this is a starting point to get

Τ	us where we can go.
2	And I just haven't heard enough to say
3	if we take it back. That when we bring it back
4	up in the fall that we present a document. I
5	feel like we'll be six months behind.
6	And we have to start somewhere, I
7	guess is where I'm going with this. And I'm not
8	making, I won't, I hear you, Jerry. It's hard to
9	make sense of it.
10	But at the same time I would say we
11	have to sometimes live in a little bit of grey in
12	order to get to better black and white. And I'm
13	comfortable with this moving forward.
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Oh, I'm sorry,
15	Frank. Amy and then you. That's right.
16	MEMBER BRUCH: I'm glad that this
17	topic and this work agenda item is actually a
18	living one. This topic, and we have to refer to
19	the scope.
20	I agree with what's been said. We got
21	to get on the bus. We got to be in the queue.
22	However, I believe we actually should be leaders

1 in this area, and then in future areas with this subject matter. And Ι think it's really 2 3 important. Carolyn actually I think got us in the 4 conversation. Because there was a letter that 5 6 she wrote to the Secretary of Aq. Because in his 7 initial climate smart agriculture debut there was zero references to organic agriculture. 8 9 We need to be leaders in this sector. And I think we can look at this as somewhat 10 11 iterative as well. I think there's way more to the equation than just carbon when looking at 12 13 agriculture climate smart and regenerative 14 agriculture. And we need to be leaders on those 15 next pillars. This is kind of a grey situation that we need to be able to make black and white. 16 17 Water is an important resource that needs to be considered in here. It's outside of 18 19 the scope. 20 it can be part of the next 2.1 conversation. Social aspects with regenerative 22 agriculture and climate smart agriculture are

1	really important. We need to be leaders in that
2	conversation.
3	And there's so many other subsets that
4	are just not being talked about, because we're
5	only focused right now on carbon. So, this is I
6	believe the first of many conversations. And the
7	organic sector needs to be the leader in this
8	area.
9	That's my thoughts. I'm curious what
L 0	the Board thinks. But then I also have one
L1	question for you, Nate. Based on oral comments
12	there was also a correction
L3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yes.
L 4	MEMBER BRUCH: that in this current
L5	document we should probably talk about the need
L 6	for changes. So, two things there. Thank you.
L7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yes. I'm going to
L 8	go to Franklin, then come back. Franklin.
L 9	MEMBER QUARCOO: So, I'm of the view
20	that with all that is done in organic agriculture
21	we are more qualified than most to be in this
22	category. We don't have to be perfect in order

1	to be in the group. And so, if we want to wait
2	until all the kinks are ironed out we will never
3	get onboard.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Hear, hear.
5	MEMBER QUARCOO: Thank you.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you. Other
7	questions? Other comments? Sure, yes. We heard
8	from the, I need to give the script to ever
9	articular Mike Dill that we have some absolutes
10	that need to be adjusted.
11	And so, synthetic nitrogen instead of
12	synthetic fertilizers. And then most instead of
13	all. And so a friendly amendment in the cover
14	letter to correct those. Brian.
15	MEMBER JOHNSON: Nate, can I jump in
16	after Brian?
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Oh, I'm sorry.
18	Yes. Actually, Mindee and Allison, please go
19	ahead. I'm sorry.
20	VICE CHAIR JEFFERY: Go ahead,
21	Allison.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Okay, thanks. Along

22

1 the lines of synthetic nitrogen fertilizer, I just wanted to raise that the question that USDA 2 3 is putting forward is not necessarily what is the It's just what's climate climate smartest. 4 smarter, or climate smart as a baseline. 5 6 And the production and of 7 synthetic nitrogen fertilizer accounts for 2.4 8 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions. 9 just the simple prohibitions on most synthetics 10 in organic, for me baseline is one of the reasons 11 that we can definitively say that organic is 12 climate smarter when the dominant practices rely on those greenhouse gas intensive inputs. 13 14 And I think one of the reasons that it 15 has been, one of the reasons that there has been soil 16 SO much focus on health and carbon 17 sequestration is that it's a way to avoid talking 18 the greenhouse gas footprint of 19 So, I think it's really important for us inputs. 20 to all remember to mention that key point. 21 And, Brian, I think, I appreciate you raising the sort of range of climate benefits 22

1	that we might see from different types of
2	production.
3	But that synthetic input piece is
4	present for every type of organic agriculture,
5	whether it's, you know, production of animal feed
6	or, you know, switching compost in for other
7	synthetic fertilizers.
8	So, I think we have a lot to stand on,
9	and shouldn't let the sort of dream of the
10	perfect get in the way of touting organics
11	climate benefits across the board.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Mindee, did you
13	want to go ahead?
14	VICE CHAIR JEFFERY: Sure. Thank you.
15	I really appreciate everyone's thoughts and
16	comments, and the great work of this document.
17	And from where I'm standing this is a
18	little bit different than the context that this
19	Board usually engages. Generally we are really
20	engaged with particulars, the weeds and seed, and
21	the minutiae of what it takes to produce food at
22	the scale of nations with a lot integrity.

1 in this moment, with And this 2 document. for me the greater context of 3 concern for the earth and for our future, we have this opportunity to communicate that 4 we understand the scope of the work the USDA is 5 tasked with managing. 6 7 And I have to stand there and step aside from the organic bubble, and really think 8 9 with them. For me it's with a lot of humility 10 and awe around what takes to shape and move a 11 nation. And in this context organic has the 12 potential, like maybe the younger sibling of the 13 14 food system. This is a real opportunity for us 15 to voice the very specific and sound systems 16 approach. 17 That this organic legally enforceable version of food production, it is climate smart. 18 19 And it deserves both the designation and the 20 elevated consideration by the USDA as such. this 21 So for me isn't about 22 politics of the particulars. It's, this document

1 provides those who may not be intimately acquainted with the greater work of organic, this 2 3 provides them with the information they need to produce greater understanding of our work. 4 that this \$60 billion dollar 5 And is moving the needle on being great 6 7 stewards of this our home climate. And that this 8 opportunity to voice that directly to those who 9 are tasked with managing the enormity 10 agriculture in this country for me is, I want to 11 be there. 12 And our voice could be expressed very 13 clearly. And I'm going to really proud to 14 support this document with my whole heart and my 15 vote. 16 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you, Madame 17 Vice Chair. Brian, did you want to go next? 18 MEMBER CALDWELL: Yes. Thanks 19 I really, really appreciate everybody's much. 20 thoughts on this. What I'm hearing is, and I 21 believe Nate has said it several times, that we don't want the perfect to be the enemy of the 22

good. 1 And I'm hearing from everybody that 2 3 it's kind of, maybe in the scientific literature you have to be really careful about what you say. 4 But in communications that are not that parsed 5 6 rigorous а little overstatement 7 necessarily a bad thing. 8 I think that this document has, makes 9 really, really powerful arguments in favor of 10 organic, okay. And I feel like my objections to 11 it are not as important as the goal I see that we can achieve. 12 And you folks have convinced me of 13 14 And I think I'm going to change my mind on this. 15 it. like I say, I really appreciate And 16 everybody's thought. I think that we can say 17 that we put this through the wringer, and really kind of like, you know, kind of pummeled it a 18 19 little bit. But that the main thrust of it and, 20 21 you know, like I say, I'm going to say 90 percent

of the arguments in this paper are just really

22

1	forceful and positive. So, I want to thank you
2	all for that.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you so much.
4	And thank you for the debate. I really
5	appreciate you bringing up these concerns. Nate,
6	please go ahead.
7	MEMBER LEWIS: Yes. Just really
8	quickly. I really like Allison's idea about
9	climate smarter and climate smartest. And maybe
10	we can wrestle that at a future Board meeting.
11	Just some novelty awards as well.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Jerry.
13	MEMBER D'AMORE: Sorry, but Nate
14	prompted this one. And this is probably just an
15	older guy's issues. I've heard in this room
16	today back and forth two things. Organic is the
17	climate smart solution. Or it's a, an. So,
18	which one is it?
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I have to say I'm
20	just an organic guy all the way. So, it's the
21	organic
22	MEMBER D'AMORE: Okay. Okay.

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: climate smart
2	solution.
3	MEMBER D'AMORE: Right. Okay.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other thoughts.
5	Dilip, please go ahead.
6	MEMBER NANDWANI: I haven't seen a
7	clear definition of climate smart yet. I'm not
8	sure I might be wrong. And if we don't have one
9	I'd like to see near future. I don't know, is it
10	the USDA's or NOP's job, or whose exactly?
11	But in the near future I'd like to see
12	a clear definition what we call really climate
13	smart I think. But just thank you.
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I am right there
15	with you. And no, we don't have a definition
16	yet. Other thoughts, folks? All right. With
17	that I'll hand it back to Amy. Brian, to make
18	sure I caught you right, did you want to put a
19	motion to send it back to subcommittee?
20	MEMBER CALDWELL: No.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you. All
22	right. So with that I think we're going to the

1	vote. But
2	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes. Sorry, what?
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yes. So any other
4	discussion before we go to the vote? So we have
5	a motion. It was motioned out of subcommittee by
6	myself, and then seconded by Amy Bruch. And I
7	think actually I'm supposed to hand this off to
8	you now as Chair. So, let me shut up.
9	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay. I guess, are we
10	ready to vote? Or is there a motion to return it
11	back to subcommittee?
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: No motion.
13	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay.
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right.
15	MEMBER BRUCH: Well, I'll just read
16	the motion for the record then. We have a motion
17	to accept the proposal on organic as climate
18	smart agriculture. And we're going to go around
19	at the Board table and vote. And I'll record the
20	votes here.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And we're going to
22	start with Javier Zamora, absent. And then,

1	Allison, i	f you would go next.
2		MEMBER JOHNSON: Yes.
3		CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Brian.
4		MEMBER CALDWELL: Yes.
5		CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate Lewis.
6		MEMBER LEWIS: Yes.
7		CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Dilip.
8		MEMBER NANDWANI: Yes.
9		CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Jerry. Kyla.
10		MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
11		CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy.
12		MEMBER BRUCH: Yes.
13		CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Mindee.
14		MS. LEE: I would like to hear Jerry's
15	vote, becar	use I couldn't, if you don't mind.
16		MEMBER D'AMORE: Yes.
17		MS. LEE: Thank you very much. I want
18	to get the	record right for Michelle. And Mindee
19	is a yes.	
20		CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Mindee is a yes.
21	Kim.	
22		MEMBER HUSEMAN: Yes.

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Franklin.
2	MEMBER QUARCOO: Yes.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Wood.
4	MEMBER TURNER: Abstain.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Logan.
6	MEMBER PETREY: Yes.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Carolyn.
8	MEMBER DIMITRI: Abstain.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And the Chair
10	votes yes.
11	MEMBER BRUCH: All right. We had to
12	tally based on our sheet here. So, we had 12
13	yes. We had two abstentions. We had zero no.
13 14	yes. We had two abstentions. We had zero no.
13 14	yes. We had two abstentions. We had zero no. We had one absent. We had zero recusals. So,
13 14 15	yes. We had two abstentions. We had zero no. We had one absent. We had zero recusals. So, the motion passes. We needed a two-thirds vote
13 14 15 16 17	yes. We had two abstentions. We had zero no. We had one absent. We had zero recusals. So, the motion passes. We needed a two-thirds vote there, two-thirds majority vote. Motion passes.
13 14 15 16 17	yes. We had two abstentions. We had zero no. We had one absent. We had zero recusals. So, the motion passes. We needed a two-thirds vote there, two-thirds majority vote. Motion passes. CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you,
13 14 15 16 17	yes. We had two abstentions. We had zero no. We had one absent. We had zero recusals. So, the motion passes. We needed a two-thirds vote there, two-thirds majority vote. Motion passes. CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you, everyone. Thank you Board. Back to you.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	yes. We had two abstentions. We had zero no. We had one absent. We had zero recusals. So, the motion passes. We needed a two-thirds vote there, two-thirds majority vote. Motion passes. CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you, everyone. Thank you Board. Back to you. MEMBER BRUCH: All right Now we're up

1	lead on this.
2	We had a research forward based
3	approach on this document, the crop insurance
4	work agenda item. And we are looking to build on
5	this to make recommendations for a future
6	proposal.
7	But in the meantime, Carolyn, I'll
8	have you kick us off for the discussion document.
9	Thank you.
10	MEMBER DIMITRI: Thank you. Michelle,
11	where is the, oh, thank you, Michelle. Now you
12	can show me how to use it. Okay. Okay. Thank
13	you.
14	Okay. Thank you, everyone. So, I
15	just have a, like a few background things to say.
16	My professor hat is coming on. So, I apologize
17	for people who hate school.
18	So, partly this is part of a larger
19	research project that I'm working on to try to
20	improve farm programs for organic farmers. And
21	the crop insurance part I think fits really well
22	into the NOSB work.

1 And so, many people on the Board and out here have been interviewed by my team of 2 3 researchers who have been doing a really nice job of tracking people down and asking them lots of 4 questions. 5 Interestingly enough, Liz talked to 6 7 them for three hours, which I thought was so 8 impressive. 9 So, I am going to take us back through 10 time a little bit here. And part, and there's a 11 reason for this. And I think partly looking at how farm programs have evolved over time 12 really helpful when we try to think about how we 13 14 can change them going ahead. 15 So, crop insurance was one of the very 16 first farm programs, created in 1938. The target 17 crop at that time was wheat. And one little 18 known fact that I'm sure Amy loves is that you 19 used to be able to pay your premium in actual 20 wheat, rather than money. 21 But farmers didn't really like crop 22 And there was very slow adoption of insurance.

1	crop insurance over time. And so, in the 1980
2	Farm Bill that bill said that the insurance
3	premiums would be subsidized by the Federal
4	Government.
5	And then at that point in time was
6	created the system that we have now, where you
7	have private sector agents selling the insurance.
8	And still farmers didn't like it.
9	So, in 1994 the subsidy was increased.
10	And then there became a lot of requirements to
11	get crop insurance if you were going to enroll in
12	any farm program. And so, you do see this large
13	increase at this point in time. And again, in
14	2000 the premium subsidies increased.
15	And then we all know when the
16	Agricultural Act of 2014 there was this major
17	shift in farm policy to go from supporting farm
18	income to managing risk.
19	And so almost all of our farm programs
20	at this point in time, you know, are couched as a
21	form of risk mitigation. And there are very few
22	direct payments left.

1	So, okay, let's see. What's next?
2	And just ERS, the economic research service makes
3	these really great charts. And this basically
4	just shows for the main commodity crops, the use
5	of crop insurance by acre.
6	And so, you see between 1994 and 1995
7	there is that big jump in acreage being insured.
8	And that was really because of the tying to
9	being eligible for any farm program at that point
10	in time.
11	Okay. So, if you, so there's a lot of
12	discussion about farm, crop insurance. And
13	there's a lot of, been a lot of discussion about
14	with the risk management agency.
15	And one of the problems is because
16	they're a program agency, and because organic is
17	so small, it's really hard to understand, like
18	what is actually the extent of usage of crop
19	insurance.
20	And so the RMA has this summary of
21	business. And they report kind of weird things.
22	And so, one thing they report is the share of

1	acres insured by crop insurance. And so, the
2	orange bar is conventional, and the blue bar is
3	organic.
4	And so, you see for wheat, and
5	soybeans, and corn I was kind of surprised by
6	apples. You do have almost all of the farmland
7	for conventional under, being insured. And for
8	wheat you actually have a greater share of acres
9	being insured.
LO	And then, there's this part of the
L1	Farm Bill that requires that crop insurance be
12	actuarially fair, which means that the payments
13	that come out, plus some cost of administration
L 4	have to be roughly equal to the subsidies and the
L5	premiums that are being paid.
L 6	And so, the thing that you, I think is
L7	very striking here is, if you look at these loss
L8	ratios Okay. So, if it's one it basically
L 9	means like what's coming in is going out.
20	So, if it's less than one then
21	someone's pocketing some money. And if it's more
22	than one then the federal government, also known

1	as the taxpayer, is paying out money.
2	And so, for organic crops, with the
3	exception of apples, the loss ratios are very,
4	very much higher than they are in the
5	conventional sector.
6	And so, I have a lot of questions
7	about why the risk management agency has these
8	set up as two separate risk pools. But that's
9	what they have.
10	And so, I think when you think about
11	moving ahead, and making crop insurance work you
12	also have to deal with this reality that from an
13	economic perspective it doesn't seem to pay,
14	because there's more money going out than coming
15	in.
16	And so, the, I, people know about this
17	study that NCAT did with this professor, Eric
18	Belasco. And they collected a lot of data using
19	OREI funding, to try to understand why organic
20	farmers aren't using crop insurance.
21	And so, through their survey they had
22	about, I don't, I think like 1,400 farmers that

1 answered their survey. And this reports the percent of their farmers that use crop insurance. 2 3 And so, from the people that they talked to, the field crop, which is 4 surprise, producers were using crop insurance at 5 higher rates than other producers. 6 But you still 7 see it's only about 25 percent. 8 I mean, they could have some 9 sample selection bias, and that's why the numbers 10 are low. But I think overall you see fairly low 11 adoption levels. And something that my research team is 12 trying to do is see if they can look at a state 13 14 county level, to try to compare even а 15 adoption rates by commodity for organic and 16 conventional crop insurance. I'm not sure it's 17 going to be possible. But they're hard at work 18 doing that right now. 19 And the research findings so, 20 regarding the use of crop insurance, most of this 21 work was done by Belasco and Fuller. They really can't say anything about whether the size of the 22

1 farm or the diversity has very much to do with the likelihood of an organic farmer using crop 2 3 insurance. And that basically in order to get 4 conventional farmers to use crop insurance you 5 6 have to give higher subsidies. And pretty much 7 everyone accepts that organic farmers have lower 8 insurance participation. 9 And the reasons that farmers give for 10 not using crop insurance, I think these 11 things that the public comments reflected, and everyone knows this pretty well. 12 It's very expensive, or the farmer's 13 14 not familiar with crop insurance. Or organic 15 farmers don't need it or they don't want it. And this comes from the USDA's organic production 16 17 surveys that they do every couple of through the organic data initiative. 18 19 So, let, oh, so here are the Okay. 20 I guess I have a couple of questions. So, 21 thoughts. And so, when I think of what I've 22 learned as I've gone through this, and from

1	listening to people talk about it is, we have a
2	couple of groups of producers.
3	We have the people who use crop
4	insurance now, like Amy. And there are, that
5	pool of people has, they have very strong ideas
6	about how to make it work better for them.
7	The diversified operations are in a
8	different pool. And I think that there are
9	plenty of them who want to use crop insurance,
L 0	but find it doesn't work for them.
L1	And even though the whole farm revenue
L2	insurance instrument was created for them, what
L3	you see is people are using it like, the usage
L 4	rates are declining over time. And I think
L5	that's problematic. And it also points to the
L 6	complexity of the system.
L7	And I think that there's a group of
L 8	people who think crop insurance isn't suitable
L 9	for them, but do want to manage their risk. And
20	I think about as we go ahead, like thinking about
21	that group of farmers as a separate category.
22	And then, dairy producers. That kind

1	of came to me yesterday in the NOC pre meeting.
2	They need better support as well. And probably
3	their needs are going to be different from say
4	diversified operation needs.
5	So, I have a couple of other thoughts
6	to sort of launch our discussion. So, one is, I
7	do have a lot of research in progress right now.
8	And I think at some point this summer I will be
9	able to share some of that with people.
10	And I have to think about the forum
11	for that.
12	And the other idea that I had, which I
13	think might be a little crazy. But I think it
14	could be really helpful, would be to ask the
15	Secretary of Agriculture to have USDA create a
16	farm policy task force that has representatives
17	from all the different USDA agencies to
18	understand like how to improve the program
19	structure and the implementation.
20	So, I think that means you would have
21	some of the economists from Economic Research
22	Service, who think about farm policy and how to

1	design farm policy from a very broad sense, like
2	what kind of incentives do you want to set out.
3	And then you also have program
4	implementers like the Risk Management Agency, or
5	NRCS. Like, how do they actually make those
6	programs work better?
7	And I guess I would like to see a task
8	force that worked really hard for like a year and
9	then wrote a report. And then we could read it
10	and see what they had to say.
11	But that is just one wild thought that
12	I had. And what I'd like now to do is turn the
13	discussion over to the group.
14	MEMBER HUSEMAN: I have a question for
15	you. If you go back one slide.
16	MEMBER DIMITRI: Let's see. Maybe.
17	MEMBER HUSEMAN: If we were to put
18	that into a pie chart, do you know what that
19	would look like?
20	MEMBER DIMITRI: Yes, I do. It's in
21	the yeah. I think maybe half of the people
22	don't need it or want it. Yeah.

I didn't put it as a pie chart that's why.
MEMBER BRUCH: Carolyn?
MEMBER DIMITRI: Yes.
MEMBER BRUCH: When this chart
here, I do have a question. It's too expensive.
What's the rest of the story? Is it because the
coverage is not adequate, or they don't need it
or want it \mathbf{Y} the coverage isn't adequate? Do we
have kind of the rest of the story with these
reasons in the survey?
MEMBER DIMITRI: No, because I think
when USDA does a survey, they just it's like
check, and people check it. And there really
isn't room to add more information.
MEMBER BRUCH: Okay.
MEMBER DIMITRI: I mean, I actually
haven't looked at the survey instrument, which I
know will be on the USDA website, so that's
something I could do later.
But usually, they ask they give you, like,
four reasons, and then you either you know,
you just pick one of the four reasons.

1	MEMBER PETREY: So if they took out
2	"don't need or want" it probably that just
3	seems that does seem vague that "don't need or
4	don't want" could attribute to those other
5	points.
6	MEMBER DIMITRI: Yeah.
7	MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah. I think there's
8	a lot more to the story there. I guess speaking
9	
10	MEMBER DIMITRI: Oh yeah.
11	MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah. So if it's
12	possible to understand, yeah.
13	From my perspective, you know, I've
14	had experience as a conventional farmer and
15	interactions with crop insurance in my area.
16	I've had those same experiences, interactions, as
17	an organic farmer, and unfortunately, there are
18	two different types of scenarios.
19	And I just think, one, we're looking
20	at recruiting transition more transition
21	producers into our environment. And we have a
22	lot of I call them "figurative risks" when we

1 go into producing crops organically. We have market instability, uncertainty. We -- and I 2 3 do not have transparency with our we conventional producers 4 markets as especially with transition producers. 5 They're 6 committing now, understanding the market 7 situation currently, for what they will do in 36 8 months for their trades. So it's real 9 uncertain process there. We have markets that 10 are -- the handlers are going bankrupt. 11 other figurative storms. So when I think of literal, actual 12 13 storms that occur on our farms as organic 14 producers, we should have coverage that we can 15 count on or at least be able to supplement the 16 gap that was noted by several producers in our 17 public comments. 18 I Right now ___ and realize 19 insurance can be extremely complicated in terms 20 of a subject matter, but I think we all are 21 familiar with insurance whether we have it on our cars, our vehicles, our houses, health insurance. 22

1 When we have an asset worth X dollars -- let's look at a house. If you have a house, 2 3 and you're a conventional producer, that house can get adequate coverage. 4 If you are a organic producer that has 5 a home, you automatically get a discount factor 6 7 that's not associated with anything of your own 8 production history. So I think that really needs 9 to be looked at for potentially even equity, 10 where there's a just a real big disadvantage 11 right from the start when you have production 12 experience, and all of a sudden you say, "I want to transition," versus somebody that has 13 14 production experience that says, "I want to be a conventional farmer." 15 16 We need to provide support for these goes across the board. 17 producers. And it 18 There's several risk-management tools out there, 19 but we're focusing right now on crop insurance,

> are not buying it is not because doesn't function for them.

and we have to make it function, so the reason

people

20

21

1	Thank you.
2	MEMBER PETREY: And this might be
3	or either anybody. So you see it's not
4	working for the farmer and then look at the loss
5	ratio. It's not working for the government
6	either. It's not working for anybody.
7	And so how do we get it to where it is
8	working? Because I would imagine, it's not
9	working for the rent farmer because the payout's
10	not there. But whenever it is used, it's not
11	working for whoever's paying to. At least,
12	that's what I was excuse me comprehending
13	with that. Does that seem right?
14	MEMBER DIMITRI: Yes. And I think
15	that's why I question why they have to be in
16	separate risk pools. Why can't you just throw
17	all the organic farmers and conventional farmers
18	together in the same risk pool?
19	I'm sure there's an actuarial reason
20	why people wouldn't want to do that, but there
21	are not that many organic farmers.
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I'm just going to

1	jump in.
2	One thing about that actuarial data.
3	Amy and I had the privilege of speaking to RMA a
4	couple of times, and a lot of it boils down to
5	that the data set for organics is somewhat skewed
6	in that, one, just the data collection is kind of
7	iffy for getting folks to respond and getting the
8	good numbers.
9	But when we look at who is organic,
10	historically, lots of times, it's just been folks
11	who are on marginal land. They were at risk of
12	almost going bankrupt, and so organic saved them.
13	They're not the banging producers who have the
14	best yields.
15	So as organic grows, and as folks like
16	Amy get in the game, really professional farmers
17	who are doing excellent work getting incredible
18	yields, I think there's going to be a lot more
19	data to support that it is less of a risk.
20	Nate.
21	MEMBER LEWIS: I'm sort of thinking
22	back on my advocacy days in bringing organic

1 farmers to D.C. and setting up meetings with RMA and found them to be actually fairly productive. 2 3 I think for the farmers, they remain frustrated, but we were able to get incremental 4 change from RMA when we sat down, explained the 5 problem very clearly, identified some data that 6 7 they needed to adjust their policies. But those were successful because we heard from people what 9 the specific issues were, and we got them in the 10 room. 11 I think we have a unique opportunity here to advise the Secretary on all sorts of 12 13 risk-mitigation measures that organic farmers 14 And we can play a critical role as the 15 clearinghouse for that. 16 So we're in a Farm Bill cycle. The 17 Farm Bill's going to pass at some point, and then USDA will have the chore of implementing it. 18 19 they have a go-to place for the list of issues 20 preventing organic that farmers from are 21 accessing it, whether it's EPH in western Kansas or T-yields in Michigan, then they can respond to 22

1 us or those farmers with some data requests. And I think that they actually want to 2 3 change to sell more policies. That tends to be I don't particularly want to do their goal. 4 RMA's job for them right here. But I think that 5 may be a good way to kind of think about how we 6 approach it. 7 8 But I also was compelled by Roland's 9 comment this morning, which was that risk 10 management for a small, diversified operator in 11 Georgia may look like row cover. And so I want to think about risk management 12 in a broader category that USA has a suite of programs, and 13 14 they all -- not all of them -- many of them can 15 be thought of as risk management depending on the 16 scope and scale of the operation. 17 So that may be any context within 18 which we look at a whole host of USDA programs 19 then can provide comments to that we 20 Secretary on how best to suit -- to curate those 21 programs to reduce risk for organic producers

regardless of scale, location.

1 Some folks are going to want Other folks 2 insurance. are going to 3 technical assistance through NRCS, whatever the issue may be. So that may just be a framework 4 within which we can continue the conversation and 5 turn it into a productive output that the USDA's 6 7 going to listen to. 8 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I just wanted to 9 elevate one thing you said there, Nate. 10 your experience working on Farm Bill-related crop 11 insurance changes for organic, could you -- do you have a little bit of the history on the 12 contract price addendum? 13 14 MEMBER LEWIS: Yeah, I'll have to sort 15 of dust off those cobwebs. My interactions with 16 RMA were, like, among the first things I tried to 17 forget, I have to tell you. 18 But, no, the contract prices in them, 19 I think, was a tool that they put out recognizing 20 that their -- particularly inorganic -- many of 21 the crops are contracted for or contracted so folks aren't looking for what the price is on the 22

1 Chicago Board for blue corn for corn chips or I don't know exactly what the thing whatever. 2 3 And also folks are reluctant to share too publicly what those contract prices are because 4 those are private business dealings. 5 So RMA was able to sort of bridge that 6 7 gap where enough contracts were given to them in 8 privacy, in confidentiality, that they were able 9 to adjust the caps that they had on the contract 10 price addendum to either create a whole new price 11 selection for a particular variation of a crop or to increase the cap on how much higher than the 12 corresponding commodity. 13 14 So in the case of blue corn, if there 15 isn't a blue corn price selection, which I think there is now, but it would -- you could be up to 16 17 250 percent of the value of yellow corn something like that. 18 19 But it was about, again, getting the 20 right people in the room and getting them all the 21 right information so that they could no longer go back and say, "actuarially sound," which was, you

know, that's what they always say. So asking them, "Well, what do you need to be actuarially sound and do what we want you to do?" and then figuring out, you know, how do you assemble that data.

CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And the only reason I bring that up is I think both of our calls with RMA were extremely productive, Amy and I, and that it really does seem like their inclination is to be very curious as to how to help organics do better and move forward.

And I think, just as evidence, the contract price addendum is the coolest thing that I feel is unique to organic. If you don't know about it, definitely do a little research. worth the read because it is unique to organic that we are able to protest ourselves against a that does contract not extend over conventional. And so it's one thing that actually because of work like this document, the RMA is able to make products that are really uniquely good for us. So I both applaud Carolyn

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	and Amy for the work that has tangible impacts or
2	our communities.
3	MEMBER BRUCH: And one thing to add
4	about contract price addendum, it's not only for
5	organic producers. It's also for transition
6	producers too, so that I agree. That's one
7	recommendation that does provide extreme benefit
8	to our community.
9	And I'm really thankful for the list
10	that different commenters provided us because
11	there are some real detailed ways that we can
12	look to try to improve things.
13	But, Nate, I also agree with your
14	information. We need to aggregate voices and
15	look at multiple methods of risk management here.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Brian.
17	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yeah. I spoke just
18	last week with an insurance agent who was at a
19	meeting, and I was just trying to get
20	information. And I was really surprised that in
21	the whole FARM program, she said that CSAs could
22	not be covered because the record-keeping

1	requirements just did not fit with the CSA model.
2	And so that, certainly, is something that a
3	barrier that could be probably pretty easily
4	overcome.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: That's one good
6	form. We just need one good form to fix that
7	problem.
8	Dilip.
9	MEMBER NANDWANI: One of the point you
10	mentioned, Carolyn, about high ag subsidies for
11	conventional farmers think I read that. Is there
12	any difference in the subsidies for organic
13	farmer? Does it make difference?
14	And the second point, I think, is it
15	acreage because organic farmer, they may have a
16	less ag rate, and that may result in it makes
17	too expensive for them?
18	MEMBER DIMITRI: I'm going to kick
19	those questions over to Amy, who has crop
20	insurance on conventional and organic land
21	crops.
22	MEMBER BRUCH: Can you repeat the

1	question, Dilip, please?
2	MEMBER NANDWANI: Well, I was saying
3	that in one of the points she mentioned in the
4	slide that the highest subsidies for conventional
5	farmers. So is there any difference in the
6	subsidies for organic and organic farmers and
7	conventional or they're applicable to the same
8	subsidies to the organic and conventional. Does
9	it make difference?
10	And the second was the acreage, also.
11	Too expensive, is it because organic farmers,
12	they have less at creating that could be one
13	reason because going for too expensive for them
14	or to afford the crop insurance.
15	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes. Well, and I can
16	just speak to this in my area. And this relates
17	to coverage, subsidies, and your history. And
18	this was an example.
19	One of the public commenters
20	mentioned, the oral commenters, it seems like
21	at least in my general growing area, which is an
22	area that's pretty traditional to grow corn and

1	soybeans there is a discount factor that's
2	provided to transition producers. In my county,
3	it's 65 percent. So if I transition, I get a
4	lower base-level evaluation, my T-yield. It'll
5	be 65 percent of a conventional producer.
6	So, right off the bat, I am starting
7	with less coverage, even though I do have
8	experience because my conventional experience
9	does not relate at all to transition.
10	So I think that getting individualized
11	and I know this is challenging but producer
12	history to factor in does set I think it
13	reduced risk for RMA because T-yield, your
14	transition yields that set the baseline of
15	insurance if you don't have practice history, it
16	can be aspirational for some in different growing
17	areas that aren't used to growing corn. These
18	yields can look aspirational, and that's where
19	you're getting high payouts, high ratio payouts
20	that don't make sense for RMA.
21	And in my area, where the base-level
22	yields that I get assigned are just incredibly

1 depressed from the output that I can produce in field. So I'm in а case where I'm 2 ΜV 3 self-insuring. It feels like I'm farming in Brazil without crop insurance, essentially. Even 4 though I am one of those members that purchases 5 crop insurance, I don't see the benefit if I have 6 7 a climatic event for the crop insurance to cover 8 any amount of my losses. So what I'm investing 9 out of that crop all comes out of my back pocket. 10 Even if I wanted a coverage level, I'm not able 11 to get it, essentially. So it's -- I mean, 12 catastrophic insurance at best. 13 subsidies So the are slightly 14 different -- getting back to your question --15 based on the amount of dollars in coverage that 16 get. So there is а slight we can difference on the subsidies. 17 18 And then the expense of it -- there 19 was a -- one of the survey questions asked for I, in general, and with TOGA, 20 the cost of it. 21 which is one of the organic initiatives 22 transition, it provides us discount а on

1	insurance. I'm not finding that the cost is
2	necessarily the issue. It's the coverage that's
3	the issue.
4	So even though the price for my
5	coverage is pretty nominal, it's actually really
6	expensive because I'm not getting anything for
7	the dollars that I'm spending. So it's just kind
8	of interpretation of the word expense,
9	interpretation of the word subsidy. It really
10	if you're not getting adequate coverage, then it
11	definitely is an expensive product.
12	Did that answer your question?
13	MEMBER NANDWANI: Yes. Thanks for
14	comprehensive answer.
15	MEMBER BRUCH: It can get a little
16	complicated. I try to not get too much in the
17	weeds but thank you.
18	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yeah, Logan, go
19	ahead.
20	MEMBER PETREY: Okay. So do you
21	expect whenever you have crop insurance, I guess,
22	more in the conventional setting, do you expect

1	to use it almost every like, is there going to
2	be a use of it?
3	Like, car insurance I'm probably
4	not going to get my bang out of it, but I hope
5	not. You know? I hope I don't get in a wreck
6	and have to use it, but and so when you're
7	saying you're not it's not justifying that you
8	spent? How often do farmers normally see that
9	payout?
10	MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah. I mean, that's
11	just a matter of the weather.
12	In my area with irrigation, I'm not
13	subject to drought conditions, necessarily. I
14	have to still be a good steward of my water
15	resources, but drought isn't a peril that I have
16	to face compared to a lot of the country. So, in
17	general, my only risk factor with insurance is if
18	it's going to hail or not and to the level extent
19	of damage I might have on my crop.
20	If I have, let's say, 30 percent crop
21	damage, my federal crop policy will not cover any
22	of that damage because I'm over yielding where

1 the trigger comes into play. So, therefore, I consider it expensive because it doesn't provide 2 3 me any value. The 30 percent loss came right out of my pocket even if I wanted to insure my crop 4 with federal crop. 5 if 6 Where Τ was a conventional 7 producer, my history, my yield history, would 8 have provided me an insurance payout if I had 30 9 percent damage because I would have -- I would 10 have impacted the trigger level, the level of 11 support, my safety net. So I don't farm for insurance at all, 12 13 like to do risk management because I do 14 that's one of the, I think, regenerative aspects 15 of being an organic farmer and the legacy factor. 16 I have to make sure my farms are going to be in 17 business next year and factors, climatic factors, outside of my control. I should be able to 18 19 policies that available engage are to conventional producers that 20 are going to 21 adequate for my organic farm. 22 Right. And I'm sure

MEMBER PETREY:

1	banks like it, too, to make sure they're going to
2	get some money back.
3	MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah.
4	MEMBER PETREY: And with the
5	historical yields, what I was learning from some
6	of the commenters, oral commenters, is that it
7	has to be on that field or that farm year after
8	year. And I mean, that does not fit in the
9	organic.
10	So, like, putting them in the same
11	pool, I understand on the money side, but as far
12	as the requirements, I think that that needs to
13	be tailored to organics because that will take a
14	decade to get sufficient information or data
15	yield if they base it on that.
16	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes, absolutely. There
17	is one positive change that did occur. So if you
18	are if your farms, if you're banking on a new
19	transition farm in your particular county, you're
20	able to move over your yield history.
21	So if you have one transition farm in
22	the county, and you've had it a couple of years,

1	you will use that new yield history to then feed
2	into the four numbers of the transition yield
3	that you're given. So you already start
4	replacing. But when you're in transition only 36
5	months, it's really, really hard to build up that
6	APH.
7	And then, again, the clock starts over
8	when you're organic, so I think there's a real
9	yeah challenge there for building that yield
L 0	history with our crop rotations.
L1	MEMBER TURNER: I'm just going to keep
L2	the Amy panel going. I'm going to keep asking
L3	Amy questions.
L 4	Amy, just totally off-topic. Well, a
L5	little bit off-topic. But I'm curious if you
L 6	just thinking about insurance do you find that
L7	there's some built-in resilience to organic
L8	your organic acreage compared to conventional?
L 9	And sort of how do you how does that factor
20	into some of these decisions?
21	MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah. That's a good,
22	good point as well. And I do believe organic

1 systems do have a higher level of resiliency, especially when it comes to drought. 2 3 Building -increasing our soil water-holding capacity is really important, and 4 increased organic 5 with matter, we do have increased water-holding capacity, so 6 Ι 7 fighting drought, we do have some additional 8 resiliency there. 9 In terms of hail, that kind of is a 10 nondiscriminatory, I think, type peril. 11 impacts, I think, everybody the same. Our tools to recover are definitely different than what a 12 conventional producer has. 13 14 do believe, also, wind is a big 15 So the resiliency, I think, of nutritional level in our soils does make more 16 17 resilient crops to handle wind pressure. So I think it just depends on the peril, but there is 18 19 a competitive advantage there. 20 MEMBER LEWIS: I think I'll just add a 21 comment that regardless of a producer's ability 22 to sort of self-insure through multiple cropping,

1 resiliency, row cover, whatever that may be, there's oftentimes a financial reality that you 2 3 can't get your operating loan without insurance regardless of whether it actually 4 5 covers your crop or not. So in terms of sort of the growing the 6 7 acres of concept, there are a lot of folks who are going, "Well, I don't have a choice to not 8 9 get crop insurance," and so, I think, working to 10 making it a more functional product. 11 advocating -- I don't like the insurance industry in general, but it is a necessary element for a 12 13 lot of conventional financing. 14 MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah. There is one 15 other topic I wanted to discuss was diversity. 16 That comment is built into the document quite a 17 bit, and there was a lot of comments on that. 18 I think diversity needs to be defined 19 and interpreted. I actually would love to have 20 more diversity on my farm. But again, for risk 21 management purposes, I try -- I don't do this 22 always -- but I try to plant crops that have

1 insurable attributes. So I am limited extremely what crops I can grow if I follow that 2 3 philosophy. I have one legume that is insurable. 4 The others that I plant, I have zero coverage on. 5 They're important crops, but I think as we're 6 7 looking to build markets for rotational crops, I 8 think I mentioned it in my opening comments, too, 9 that -- or my opening question to Jenny --10 hand-in-hand we have to have RMA as a partner in 11 that. What's 12 normal in terms of 13 rotation for a conventional producer is different 14 than what's normal for a crop rotation for 15 organic producers, and crops that make sense, we need to be able to have insurance for those. 16 17 There is a process currently to be 18 able to get insurance. It's called a written 19 agreement. I've gone through them. It takes --20 usually, you're three years of trying that crop 21 to provide to RMA that history. They often --22 it's kind of the chicken and the egg. They often

1 say, "Well, we haven't had too many requests in that category, therefore, we can't 2 3 blanket coverage in that category." And farmers don't necessarily always want 4 to request insurance that they're not going to be granted, 5 6 or it will be subpar. 7 So I think diversity could increase, 8 but it's also going to take not only markets to 9 increase our diversity but also some crop 10 insurance on things that make sense. 11 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy, on written it 12 agreements, like there's seems real 13 opportunity for either universities or other 14 folks may be in more the research space to start 15 growing every imaginable crop immediately on 16 their farms, reporting it to RMA so that we can 17 get actuarial data across every county. 18 And so for me, I have to do a written 19 agreement on flax. And flax is a crop that's 20 great for my system, really great for my markets, 21 great for my soil, but no one else grows it, so I have to do a written agreement. 22

1	And I'm just thinking how quickly can
2	we as a community come up with solutions to try
3	to figure out what crops could we ever dream of
4	growing in a county and just start growing them
5	to get that three years and to get sufficient
6	acreage to make it so you can get blanket
7	coverage. And that seems something that's very
8	actionable in our community either through
9	universities or just through more strategic
10	planting so that we plant enough acres to start
11	getting actuarial recognition from RMA for every
12	crop.
13	Would you agree with that?
14	MEMBER BRUCH: 100 percent. I think
15	this is just a big community effort. We need to
16	be all talking the same language. It's a
17	complicated issue, but I do think we can move the
18	needle.
19	We've seen some changes that have been
20	very positive that we highlighted here. And we
21	need to articulate a list of additional items
22	that can provide similar type coverage when we

1	are transitioning or when we are organic
2	producers.
3	MEMBER DIMITRI: I'm kind of curious
4	what people think about a USDA Task Force to put
5	some of their highly specialized knowledge to
6	this topic, the broader topic of farm programs
7	for organic farmers, excluding cost share.
8	MEMBER BRUCH: I love Task Force. I
9	think they're great. We need to have
10	cross-functional people on the team, though. We
11	need to be able to look at this through farmer's
12	eyes, through RMA's eyes because it has to work
13	for both. It can't just be one benefits and not
14	the other, so we need those two folks in the
15	equation.
16	We need adjusters in the equation, the
17	insurance adjusters that visit our fields that
18	maybe don't have the knowledge on organic
19	production and the ins and outs of it. And then
20	we need agents, also, in that category.
21	So I would think all four of those
22	representatives are really important with Task

1	Force, and I'm all in favor of that.
2	MEMBER DIMITRI: One of my personal
3	pet peeves is like, I understand how farm
4	programs have evolved over time, but it just
5	seems that maybe organic farmers need something a
6	little bit different than what exists for
7	conventional farmers and their I don't know.
8	I guess I would like to see some
9	creativity in thinking about how to better meet
L 0	the needs of organic farmers rather than tweaking
L1	these systems that obviously every time this
L2	happens the tweaks are not really very I don't
L3	want to say they're not effective, but they don't
L 4	really take care of what is needed.
L 5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Kyla.
L 6	MEMBER SMITH: Yeah. So right now the
L 7	ACA, the Accredited Certifiers Association, has a
L 8	working group going on about assessing resources
L 9	for government programs to help producers better
20	utilize those programs.
21	And so some things that are being
22	so anyway, I wonder if that's a similar idea as

1	this task force that's already sort of underway,
2	and we could see what the deliverables are from
3	that working group.
4	Some things that are being discussed
5	are everybody's favorite topic, the Common LSP,
6	or Universal LSP, as well as just how to
7	streamline resources or anyways, there's lots
8	of ideas floating around, and I don't know.
9	Maybe we could start there, and if that doesn't
10	give us what we are looking for, we can pursue
11	this other idea.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions on
13	crop insurance? Looking at the discussion
14	document, so we've got more of this coming. All
15	right.
16	MEMBER BRUCH: All right. Thank you,
17	Carolyn, so much for leading this very important
18	topic. Looking forward to continuing the
19	conversation.
20	Any final comments?
21	MEMBER DIMITRI: I just want to thank
22	you for all of your wonderful crop insurance

1	experience, yours and Nate's, to just make my
2	hair straight show how important this is.
3	MEMBER BRUCH: Teamwork.
4	Okay. Well, moving on. This is our
5	third work agenda item to tackle. And this is on
6	enforcement oversight to deter fraud.
7	Carolyn, can you pass down the
8	clicker?
9	Okay. All right. And I want to thank
10	members of the Board for providing me farm
11	pictures for this presentation. It's fun to kind
12	of show and tell some of our ag pictures, so
13	enjoy that with the content.
14	And this document is a result of a
15	collaborative effort, both on our subcommittee
16	and as well with my counterpart here, the Chair,
17	Nate. So feel free to jump in.
18	I just have a few slides that kind of
19	organize the discussion document. We'll get into
20	public comments, and then we'll open it up for
21	full-board discussion.

So this particular topic on oversight

to

consistent location information. 2 3 So for certified operations, this is The challenge is location our current state. 4 information must be more consistently recorded 5 and managed across certifiers. 6 The solution 7 consistent location identification for all 8 certified operations domestically and 9 internationally to report the location 10 information by -- we mention in the document --11 GPS coordinates was an example. 12 So, in summary, we're basically 13 building on the basic conditions. In the fall, 14 the NOSB recommended that we record certified 15 on organic certificates. Now acres 16 building on that. Now we're saying we actually 17 need to know by a field-level or parcel-level 18 where these acres are located. So they kind of 19 dovetail together. 20 It's a two-pronged approach, and we're 21 really looking in the goals of all of 22 oversight to deter fraud. Documents are based on

improvements to deter fraud is relating

1 the consistency aspect. In this case, we are recommending that certifiers are deploying the 2 3 same approach, and if that is done, inspectors can spend more time fighting the fraud instead of 4 finding the farm. 5 And then on enforcement, we are --6 7 this document can provide increased robustness of 8 crosschecking among certifiers, and that's both 9 based on reconciling land use affidavits and 10 managing revoked operations. It can facilitate 11 more effective unannounced inspections, finding the certified operation without the inspector but 12 quidelines 13 by following the of unannounced 14 inspections that was pointed out by public 15 We still need to be following those. comments. 16 And then conduct aggregated analysis 17 of high-risk regions or countries. And this can be possible when there's a common language about 18 19 the location of a certified operation. 20 into discussion So getting the 21 document itself, it supports SOE implementation

with crosschecking, unannounced inspections, and

1	verification.
2	The public comments, "Our belief is
3	it's low burden." And there are some certifier
4	comments that mentioned the fact that it was low
5	burden just because it is a one-time collection.
6	"Geolocations do not move around."
7	In scope, for this discussion document
8	is not only fields but production units with
9	grower groups handling locations, facilities,
10	importers, brokers, et cetera, so all certified
11	operations is what we're looking at.
12	And through public comments, we wanted
13	to provide some clarity. One, we're not
14	requiring those who do not use technology to use
15	technology with this discussion document. We're
16	not indicating annually where you plant each crop
17	and measuring the nearest feet. This is just
18	looking at the field or parcel identification.
19	Geocoordinates, uncertified operations should not
20	move around.
21	Privacy, we're not intending that this
22	information be public facing. That was another

1	concern by some of the written comments. We're
2	not indicating that this information be public.
3	Just for certifiers to utilize.
4	And then we still in the
5	discussion, we need to articulate a little bit
6	more. There was confusion around "field" and
7	"parcel" and just the nomenclature around that.
8	So getting into public comments, we
9	had great participation in public comments, and
10	it was really from a variety of different members
11	of our community. Seven certifiers, one
12	inspector group or one inspector plus one
13	inspector group supported this. Several farmers,
14	including two from the Plains community,
15	expressed favor in this discussion document. Two
16	activist groups and three advocacy groups all
17	supported this.
18	There are three commenters that listed
19	limited support. However, I hope that clarity
20	that we provided would garner a little bit more
21	support from those groups.

In general, with public comments, the

1 what of this discussion document seemed to be pretty unanimous. It was more or less the how. 2 3 How are we going to accomplish this? And that's what I also look forward to discussing in this 4 5 group. 6 There were great solutions, 7 no-tax solutions, that were discussed such as 8 approved parcel number or the tax ID, 9 addresses, maps. So basically, trying to get a 10 very similar language so we can manage the data 11 more effectively and do these cross checks amongst certifiers, again, 12 speaking the 13 language. 14 It was mentioned about FSA and RMA use 15 a similar system. And we did look at this in our 16 subcommittee. However, not all producers are 17 doing those farm programs, FSA or RMA, and it 18 isn't necessarily used internationally. 19 were looking for both a system that could work 20 domestically as well as internationally. 21 So that's a brief summary on public 22 I really appreciate the ones that we comments.

1 received. And then one thing to highlight 2 3 public comments provided some of the Stata as well as data that was in our discussion document 4 of the geocoordinates in practice. 5 There are 6 several groups. 7 We want to be the gold standard for 8 doing transparency and verification, and some 9 certifiers are putting the geocoordinates into 10 practice. We learned that the Mexican organic 11 standard requires this from every field-level 12 operation. Europe, some aspects of grower groups 13 within the European community, this is 14 requirement for them to understand where the 15 grower groups are located. 16 Ιt mentioned through public was 17 comments about FDA and their Food new 18 Traceability Rule that some crops and products 19 will have further scrutiny on the traceability 20 and transparency there. 21 And then RMA for organic farms

actually required geocoordinates and maps showing

1	our borders and et cetera. That is a requirement
2	of RMA for our organic producers.
3	And now I just want to turn it over to
4	the Board for discussion. We do have two
5	recommendations within this discussion document.
6	
7	So one about consistency just of how
8	we're communicating location information. And
9	the second one is about land affidavits that they
10	can be reconciled with GPS-type location
11	information as well, so you have that complete
12	tracking history of when a farm comes online to
13	if that same farm switches hands. To other
14	members in our community, that whole history
15	would be available.
16	So, with that, Nate, I want to turn it
17	over to you first. Do you have anything to add
18	before we open it up?
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Can I get the
20	clicker real quick? Just going to go through a
21	couple of these things in the context of public
22	comments.

1 Let's skip forward. In my head, this is a big beautiful 2 3 nothing burger. And I'm always so surprised how you grillers can really make something out of 4 what I perceived to really be nothing. And so I 5 wanted to go over that a little bit. 6 7 appreciate all the groups Ι who 8 represented farmers. It was really nice, but 9 there is a certain piece that I would say if I 10 were hunting through those comments, and I were 11 not in the organic community, I would be like, "It doesn't sound like you guys have any control 12 over the system at all," based on the comments. 13 14 For example, when we say that -- in 15 one of the comments we saw that "Fields might move around, and we might switch in and out of 16 17 organic." Not a great look big picture. And so just thinking about -- and this is where I think 18 19 Amy and I have tried to really say, "Call us, 20 folks." Like, pick up the phone, email us if you 21 have that fixable of a question. 22 We are so excited to help you suss

that piece out because it took all the way
through almost two days of comments for us to
talk to the member of the Plains community who
said for clarification, he said, "Field being
something a little different to us, but parcel
totally makes sense."

And there was a lot of talk about religious persecution, almost saying that we weren't going to be accepting or paying attention to the needs of the Plains community. And hearing from the Plains community directly, it was a very quick fix for that sort of language. So the faster we can do that -- and we do. I mean, we really encourage you to contact us with those sort of questions because it was -- it got very complicated very quickly when it was a one-word correction.

Now, what that word is is still kind of up in the air because as we were talking to our certifier, trying to describe or find a word that is applicable to the world of a unit of land that is sort of legally describable is going to

1 be unique. And I'm glad it's a discussion document because we need your all's input on how 2 3 we can find that right word or that set of terms. And so we look to having the same word a county 4 in Ohio or a county or a province in Ukraine, we 5 want to try to figure out what is that word that 6 7 captures what we're talking about. 8 And what we're talking about is 9 legal tax descriptor, basically. What is that 10 identification that would live with that property 11 when you go to buy it, or you go to sell it that's not going to change until you 12 13 subdivide it? That's what we're after. 14 And a big inspiration for this is that 15 certifiers, if they have a question about a field that's been revoked or a producer that's been 16 17 revoked, and they want to call each other, right now, you basically have to talk in pictures. 18 19 You're like, "This is a picture of the field and 20 This is generally where it is." its location. 21 There's not a good vernacular that's consistent

saying, "This

certifiers

across

22

is

а

1 description. Is so-and-so certifying this with you right now? He sprayed it out last year, and 2 3 so we have some concerns." That's the point of this. 4 And I am eager for happy hour tomorrow 5 for you all to explain to me how we can write 6 7 better so that we can save а ton of time 8 discussing these things that, in my head, 9 very simple. 10 So as we think about going forward, 11 that request remains. How do we come up with the right terminology to describe these units of land 12 13 make SO that we can a recommendation 14 captures the globe? And it might be a set of 15 It might be one term that is more 16 comprehensive, but that's what we're on the hunt 17 We haven't quite come up with it yet. for. 18 This is in no way -- no way -- and has 19 never been -- and this is also something that I'd 20 really love everyone's input on how to write 21 better -- a public-facing piece of data. No 22 public gets to see what these parcel numbers are.

1

This is for certifiers and to help 2 3 certifiers become consistent across each other. And so how we can make that more clear -- because 4 I thought that was clear in the document -- we'd 5 love y'all's input. 6 7 about facilitating Ιn talking 8 unannounced inspections or cross-checking 9 cross-checking is a term that we're getting a lot 10 of action with in SOE. And so how do certifiers 11 talk to each other more effectively to help bust fraud? 12 13 And SO we just said with as 14 cross-checks, we're going to be able to have a 15 common language. Is this field, this identifier, something that you've dealt with, certified or 16 17 certifier, to try to figure out what fields are getting double certified, what fields are coming 18 19 back into organic production a year after being

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

sprayed, how can we get it, so we have a way for

certifiers to better cooperate with each other

that goes beyond just sharing hand-drawn maps or

20

21

Τ	regal descriptions?
2	One note on legal descriptions versus
3	addresses. And I apologize, Madam, I'm going a
4	little long, but I'm almost finished up. When
5	representing stakeholders and I say this with
6	all due respect understanding what is what
7	the sort of ground-truthing comments.
8	So we had a comment that said,
9	"Doesn't every field have an address?" No.
10	Every field has a legal description. Houses have
11	addresses. And so try to, as best as we can, to
12	set a common denominator for what we're talking
13	about when we're talking about this.
14	Again, encourage your feedback on how
15	we can write better because I was surprised that
16	the feedback that we got that it was just
17	confusion about what we're talking about. So
18	possibly more background information can be on us
19	to provide.
20	But it seemed like there was a lot of
21	opinions in public comments addressing this topic
22	that did not necessarily that we could have

Τ	probably brushed over with some better background
2	information. So that's on us.
3	But to facilitate more unannounced
4	inspections, if I'm an inspector, and I have
5	we've received a complaint about a field, right
6	now I'm mostly going to have to go ask that
7	operator, "Where is this field?" There's not a
8	consistent way for a certifier to really know
9	exactly where that field is.
LO	Now, again, legal description, we
L1	don't need to go to the middle. We just need to
L2	know what that legal description is because you
L3	can put that legal description into any county,
L 4	ArcGIS, into any Google Maps, and we'll be able
L5	to go see it. So it just allows us a little bit
L 6	of a backstop, so we're not just being led around
L7	by the nose by a producer who may not be
L 8	following the rules.
L 9	And that's all I've got. I hand it
20	off to the rest of the Board.
21	Logan.
22	MEMBER PETREY: I have kind of a funny

1 comment as far as the terminology and how it can differ across growing regions. And this is not 2 3 pertaining to this. But so, in probably most of the world, 4 when you say "plow" that is to, like, bottom 5 Well, in the southeast sometimes we 6 Okav. 7 think that just means "cultivate." I don't know 8 how that got messed up. 9 And SO we work with California 10 companies in southeast, and so we've had some 11 California folks call over to the Southeast 12 growers and say, "How are your carrots looking?" It's like, "Look great. We're plowing them." 13 14 And they're like, "Why are you plowing 15 them? You're flipping them over, and we're not 16 going to have carrots?" 17 And it can be a major -- I mean, it can be a bad miscommunication. Let's just say 18 19 that. So I completely understand. I can see how 20 people can get flustered with that, but it does 21 happen in the farming. It's actually a joke a lot of times when we see it from the West Coast 22

1	to the East Coast how different our language is.
2	So it can be a big difference.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you for
4	that. Yes, absolutely.
5	We try to teach organic inspectors how
6	to get a grip on sort of colloquialisms, and it's
7	tricky. I mean, a lot of words for a lot of
8	different things, which is why we invite all fill
9	the bucket with what we should be calling these
10	units so that we can try to get it right across
11	the country and across the world.
12	Other thoughts?
13	MEMBER BRUCH: Oh, I was just going to
14	add with that, Logan, I think it's interesting.
15	We have that challenge a little bit here.
16	But listening to the oral comments,
17	there was one certifier that mentioned certifying
18	operations overseas, and he said GPS is the
19	common language overseas, so I thought that was
20	interesting.
21	It's interesting to understand that
22	Mexico actually deploys this, and that's a

1	requirement of their organic program for the
2	GPS-type coordinates.
3	In doing the research to put in our
4	document, I thought it was interesting because
5	the U.S. Space Force is actually the ones that
6	uphold GPS coordinates. And our tax dollars go
7	to supporting GPS systems and that it can be a
8	system that's accessed internationally.
9	So I think, to me, solving it
10	internationally is probably going to be easier
11	maybe than solving it domestically. But I know
12	we can do it, so thank you.
13	MEMBER HUSEMAN: It just sounds like
14	maybe we need a glossary of terms when we put
15	together something.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I love it. Yes.
17	Kyla.
18	MEMBER SMITH: Yeah. So I was going
19	to just sort of say the same thing as what Kim
20	just said is whatever word you land on just
21	provide a definition because the definition that
22	is in the regs currently is "field." There's no

1 definition of parcel. There's no definition of anything else besides field, so if we're going to 2 3 land on a different word, I would recommend a definition. 4 And then the other thing that I caught 5 in the comments, which I'm curious to hear others 6 7 take on is, you know, Amy, you were talking about 8 consistency, and there were some commenters from 9 certifiers about being able to utilize more than 10 one tool. And so I wonder how we can do both, 11 how we can be consistent but not get too narrow that then the how doesn't work. 12 13 MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah. And I'm glad you 14 called that out because I think, definitely, we 15 want to be accommodating to multiple means for 16 the end result. And what's interesting is parcel 17 identification, legal address, or GPS can all get 18 where we need to go, street address, 19 potentially, if there's а street address 20 associated with it. 21 What's interesting, though, a lot of 22 confuse street address with people mailing

1	address. So mailing address and I used to
2	have one of those. That was kind of pre-911-type
3	updates on our address is Route 2, Box 176
4	that will not yield a GPS coordinate at the end
5	of the day. It will not yield the
6	field-level-type information. So I do think that
7	there are multiple ways.
8	And some certifiers listed the
9	different ways they're doing this. I think GPS
10	is more universally, internationally accepted,
11	but I do think that there are a few different
12	ways to ultimately lead to a GPS coordinate.
13	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate.
14	MEMBER LEWIS: Just quickly to add or
15	to Kyla's comment. Field is the defined term,
16	but the land requirements do include farm parcel
17	as a it's field or farm parcel to have the
18	following requirements, so that may be some
19	language to choose from and utilize just to keep
20	consistency with the regulations.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you.
22	MEMBER BRUCH: Perfect. Any other

1	general thoughts?
2	I think I feel really good with
3	providing clarity on the field, parcel. I think
4	that was really helpful and will provide the
5	community with good feedback.
6	Are there any other thoughts on the
7	document itself?
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: One thought on the
9	burden question. Just a little background. I
10	love Kyla's take on this.
11	In bringing on fields, there's usually
12	a few different ways to do it. You might get it
13	at the application period in the very beginning.
14	Get a land application. It might be in the
15	middle of the season that they submit a new land
16	application.
17	We have an annual inspection for all
18	producers, but we oftentimes have spot
19	inspections for a season over where staffers or
20	independent contractors just do a quick check up
21	on something in the field.
22	So I was again interested in how much

1 was made of the concern that we would put Amish inspectors out of work with this possible tech 2 3 integration. And this is where I was hoping to hear 4 more from more certifiers because it is again 5 6 verv doable. Lots of infrastructure, if that 7 inspection, it doesn't get done annual 8 there's a spot inspection afterwards by possibly 9 someone who does have GPS accessibility. 10 Trying to gear up for how we tackle 11 things like this as a community seems like, 12 this was fairly low-hanging fruit, 13 figuring out how we get more folks with big ideas 14 for solutions would just be a request I make to 15 our community as we look to future examples of 16 running through this. 17 think it's problem --And Ι the 18 problem is we don't hear from everybody. We 19 don't hear from all 74 certifiers on how they 20 would maybe go about tackling this, but trying to 21 come up with solutions for us so that we can

parse them out as well would be great.

1	(Off-microphone comments.)
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: You don't have to.
3	MEMBER SMITH: I like how you say I'm
4	going to ask a question and then you just make a
5	bunch of statements.
6	So yeah. A couple of things that I
7	was thinking of is that inspection scheduling is
8	complicated, right? There's a lot of things that
9	go into it to try to match up a qualified
10	inspector with an operation to keep costs low and
11	all the things and also rotate inspectors.
12	And so that's the first thing that
13	sort of came to mind is just that that's like one
14	additional factor that goes into the variables of
15	inspection scheduling, not that it can't be done.
16	It's just devil's always in the details and just
17	like one more thing that we have to figure out
18	the how on and get back there to do this thing if
19	
20	Anyway, that's why I do think that
21	having these more than one tool to get at this
22	information would also help facilitate anyway,

1	just help facilitate the action that certifiers
2	and inspectors are going need to do to implement
3	this recommendation.
4	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you, Kyla.
5	Any more discussion? Okay. Seeing
6	none, thank you very much. I really appreciate
7	it. That is our complete work agenda items from
8	CACS.
9	And I will turn it back over to you,
10	Mr. Chair.
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Thank
12	you, Madam Chair.
13	We are pretty much wrapped up for Day
14	One, folks. We're going to recess until tomorrow
15	at 10:00 a.m. when we'll get kicked off with a
16	introduction from Tony Dorn with NASS.
17	Any questions from the Board before we
18	call it a day?
19	MEMBER DIMITRI: Maybe we can ask Tony
20	about that question about the crop insurance, the
21	vague one: costs too much, don't need it, don't
22	want it. That would be the person to ask.

1	I'm just saying that because I'll
2	forget by tomorrow. Someone else, hopefully,
3	will remember.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: So, everyone, if
5	you would stay. The AV team is going to flip the
6	cameras, and you can all wave to the folks at
7	home and everyone watching. So stay in your
8	seats. Don't run away just yet.
9	Not a lot of waving going on. There
10	we go.
11	All right, team. Thank you so much.
12	Thank you for a great first day. And thank you
13	to my fellow board members. We'll see you
14	tomorrow.
15	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
16	went off the record at 4:44 p.m.)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

+ + + + +

NATIONAL ORGANIC STANDARDS BOARD

+ + + + +

SPRING 2023 MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY APRIL 26, 2023

+ + + + +

The Board met at the Crowne Plaza Atlanta Midtown 590 West Peachtree Street, NW Atlanta, Georgia, at 10:00 a.m., Nathaniel Powell-Palm, Chair, presiding.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT
NATE POWELL-PALM, Chair
MINDEE JEFFERY, Vice Chair
KYLA SMITH
AMY BRUCH, Secretary
BRIAN CALDWELL
GERARD D'AMORE
CAROLYN DIMITRI
KIMBERLY HUSEMAN
ALLISON JOHNSON
NATHANIEL LEWIS
DILIP NANDWANI
LOGAN PETREY
FRANKLIN QUARCOO
WOOD TURNER

NOP STAFF PRESENT

MICHELLE ARSENAULT, Advisory Committee Specialist JARED CLARK, National List Manager

FRED DAVID, Assistant Director, Standards Division

ERIN HEALY, Director, Standards Division
ANDREA HOLM, Agricultural Marketing Specialist
ALEXIS McINERNEY, Program Analyst
JOHANNA MIRENDA, Agricultural Marketin

JOHANNA MIRENDA, Agricultural Marketing Specialist

JENNIFER TUCKER, Ph.D., Deputy Administrator ROBERT YANG, Director, Accreditation Division PENNY ZUCK, Agricultural Marketing Specialist

ALSO PRESENT

TONY DORN, USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service, Chief, Environmental, Economics and Demographics Branch

A-G-E-N-D-A

	PAGE
National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) Census of Agriculture Survey Results	5
Crops Subcommittee	37
Livestock Subcommittee	181
Materials Subcommittee	227
Adiourn	281

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	10:00 a.m.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We are officially
4	back from recess for Day 2. To kick us off,
5	Jerry just had some small announcements. And
6	then we're going to hand it off to our guest
7	speaker.
8	Oh, go ahead, Michelle, sorry. Oh,
9	thank you, for the folks at home.
10	(Simultaneous speaking.)
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Go ahead, yeah.
12	MEMBER D'AMORE: Good morning, all.
13	I'll make an announcement here that some of you
14	are privy to just in terms of the last couple of
15	days. I can now tell my team, the team here, why
16	I'm feeling so bad.
17	I'm going through an allergic reaction
18	to amoxicillin, something I've never, ever taken
19	in my life. It was given to me in a root canal
20	on Thursday. And Monday was brutal for me here.
21	And I'm getting better now, and I'm not
22	contagious. That's what I want to share.

1	(Laughter.)
2	MEMBER D'AMORE: So thank you.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you. With
4	that, I'm going to hand it over to Dr. Tucker to
5	introduce our guest for today.
6	DR. TUCKER: Hello, everyone. First
7	thank you for coming back for Day 2 for folks
8	both in the room and online, so great
9	conversations yesterday. So thank you again to
10	the Board for all your work.
11	I am really pleased to introduce Tony
12	Dorn. He is here to talk about some recent work
13	that the National Agricultural Statistics Service
14	has done. One of the things we often talk about
15	in organic is data and so last meeting we had
16	somebody from the Organic Farming Research
17	Foundation come to talk about some really
18	interesting data.
19	We generate some interesting data in
20	USDA, so this time we thought we'd bring somebody
21	from USDA. So Tony is here to do that with us.
22	He is the branch chief of the Environmental

1	Economics and Demographics Branch of the USDA
2	National Agricultural Statistics Service, NASS.
3	His branch is primarily responsible
4	for the analysis, estimation, and dissemination
5	of NASS statistics for a wide variety of data
6	series, including census of agriculture, organic,
7	the farm labor report, and much more.
8	So Tony has more than 30 years with
9	USDA. He's worked in four of the six divisions
10	within NASS. He's been in the South Carolina,
11	North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Puerto Rico field
12	offices. So Tony's received two USDA Secretary
13	Honor Awards during his time in the branch. So
14	Tony comes with a Master's in Economics from
15	South Dakota State University.
16	So, Tony, thank you for making the
17	trip down here. It is super to have you here.
18	Thank you.
19	MR. DORN: Thank you.
20	(Applause.)
21	MR. DORN: All right, thank you,
22	everybody, good morning. Today I will share with

you the results of the 2021 Organics survey. 1 first I would like to thank all the producers, 2 farmers who responded to this survey, 3 4 really make these results possible. 5 And thank you to the cooperators, including the USDA Risk Management Agency and to 6 other federal, state, and regional partners like 7 yourselves to support organic foods, and the NASS 8 team who helped produce these results. 9 10 As far as the history of the organics 11 data series, one thing to keep in mind is that 2021 was the seventh organic release by NASS. 12 13 The 2021 release was produced in cooperation with 14 the USDA's Risk Management Agency. The 2019 15 organics release was the sixth by NASS, and this was a planned census special study. 16 The 2008 Organics Production Survey was the first organics 17 18 release done by NASS. 19 Other NASS releases on organics 20 include 2011 which included certified organic 21 operations only, 2014 which included certified,

exempt, and transitioning land, and 2015 and 2016

which included certified organic production. 1 Looking at the big picture, the 2021 2 is organics release census of all 3 а 4 operations with certified transitioning or 5 organic production in the United States. sources for the sampling frame were producers 6 identified as certified organic or transitioning 7 to organic certification in NASS's list and the 8 AMS National Organic Program list of farms. 9 10 This release includes data at commodity level for acreage, production and sales 11 for organic crop and livestock commodities, as 12 well as marketing and production practices, crop 13 14 insurance usage, production expenses, and acres 15 transitioning into organic production. Also, all 16 US states were included in this release. 17 As far as response rates like previous 18 years, in 2021 the majority of responses were by 19 39 percent. Phone responses were second 20 with 34 percent, online responses were 20 21 seven percent field percent, and were from

enumeration.

On an additional note, the overall 1 response rates were 42.6 percent in 2021 which 2 compares with 59.4 percent in 2016. 3 Taking a look at certified organic 4 5 farms, the steady increase continued in 2021. There were over 17,000 organic farms, an increase 6 of five percent from 2019. As the chart on the 7 right shows, there's been a steady trend in the 8 increase of the number of organic farms since 9 10 2008. far as total certified organic 11 As land, 2021 showed similar results from 2016 with 12 4.9 million acres, and 11 percent decrease from 13 14 2019. Organic crop land remained strong at over 15 3.6 million acres, a three percent increase from Organic pasture and rangeland decreased 16 2019. over 30 percent which follows the decreasing 17 18 trend since its peak in 2016. As you can see on the bar chart on the right, acreages have varied 19 20 some over time. 21 Considering the top states as far as 22 the number of organic farms, California remains

the top state with over 3,000 farms. 1 The comparison bar shows California's impact compared 2 to the other states. 3 Wisconsin and New York were at second 4 5 and third place, both with over 1,400 Pennsylvania was fourth with over 1,100 farms, 6 and Ohio rounded out the top five. 7 Washington, Indiana, Vermont, and 8 Minnesota rounded out the top ten. Most states increased 9 10 in the number of farms from 2019. 11 Now considering the top states as far as land, California is also the top state with 12 almost one million acres. New York and Montana 13 14 are second and third, both with over 300,000 15 acres. Wisconsin, Texas, Oregon, Idaho, 16 Vermont all have over 200,000. Colorado and Iowa There was a decrease in 17 round out the top ten. 18 organic land in California which led to the overall decrease in the United States. 19 20 Diving into the top states by sales, 21 California was the clear leader at over 3.5 22 million in sales. Washington and Pennsylvania

1 are next with over a billion in organic sales. 2 The rest of the states are fairly close together with Texas, Oregon, New York, Wisconsin, North 3 Carolina, Michigan, and Colorado rounding out the 4 5 While sales in California decreased top states. slightly, sales in Washington, Pennsylvania, and 6 7 Texas showed strong increases. In order to get a geographic idea of organic sales by state, 8 we can see how the leading area is the Pacific 9 10 coast. with California as t.he leader and 11 Washington as second in sales. The northeast and 12 Great Lakes are also strong areas for organic sales with Pennsylvania, New York, Wisconsin, and 13 14 Michigan also in the top ten. These top ten 15 states account for 73 percent of organic sales in 16 the United States. 17 As far the market value of as 18 certified organic products sold, all categories increased from 2019. 19 Crop sales were over \$6 billion, an increase of six percent. 20 Livestock 21 and poultry sales were almost \$2.2 billion, up 32 22 percent. Livestock and poultry, which consists

1 mostly of organic milk and eggs, totaled almost 2 \$2.9 billion, an increase of 15 percent over 2019. Total sales of organics were 3 \$11.2 4 billion, an increase of 13 percent from 2019. 5 Now turning to the sales by top commodities, we see that milk is the 6 largest \$1.6 billion 7 commodity with over in Broilers and eggs are second and third, each with 8 over a billion dollars in sales. 9 Apples and corn 10 next. with over \$400 million each. are 11 Strawberries, cattle, and grapes have over \$300 million in sales, and lettuce and soybeans round 12 13 out the top ten commodities. 14 Looking at the change in sales of the 15 top ten commodities, we see that only grapes and 16 lettuce decreased from 2019 to 2021, but all other commodities increased. At over 17 \$1.6 18 billion, milk increased three percent from 2019. 19 Broilers, eggs, apples, and corn all increased over 30 percent from 2019. 20 Strawberries and 21 cattle had moderate single digit increases. 22 lastly, soybeans increased but were at a level of

sales similar to 2016.

Now turning just to the top crop

commodities, we can see that the sales ranges are

fairly close with apples being the top commodity

with over \$600 million. Corn, strawberries,

grapes, and lettuce round out the top five crop

categories in sales.

As far as the changes from 2019 to 2021, we see that all the top crop commodities, except grapes and lettuce, increased. As mentioned on a previous slide, soybeans had a strong increase in sales. Sales of all crop commodities were over \$6.1 billion, an increase of six percent over 2019.

Now turning to the top poultry and livestock products in sales, we see that milk, broilers, and eggs are the top three commodities, all with over \$1.2 billion in sales. Cattle and turkeys round out the top organic livestock commodities. Sales of all livestock and commodities, and all livestock products, were over \$5 billion, an increase of 22 percent from

1 2019.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

As far as changes from 2019, all the top organic livestock and livestock products increased. Milk increased three percent from 2019, while broilers and eggs increased over 30 percent each.

shifting to organic marketing Now practices, as shown by the instructions and questionnaire at the top, data we have collected edible agricultural products for human consumption, the products that were resold were excluded in the table. And we see that direct to retail markets and institutions, and direct to consumer sales were both marketed by over 3,000 Value-added products are marketed by farms. almost 1,500 farms.

And what stands out in the right column is that direct to retail markets and institutions had a much larger proportion, over \$2 billion in sales, than direct to consumer sales, even with almost the same number of farms. Value added products had over \$700 million in

1 sales. looking 2 Now at the top organic production practices by the number of farms, we 3 see that the top production practices are fairly 4 5 consistent. The top production practice was buffer strips or border rows to isolate organics 6 at almost 11,000 farms. 7 The rest of the top production practices were used by over 6,000 8 farms. 9 10 Comparing 2021 to 2019, we see that 11 all the top production practices increased in 2021 except applying animal manure which was down 12 Use of no-till or minimum 13 slightly. 14 increased the most from 2019. 15 Now we'll take a look at the major 16 challenges for certified organic farmers based on 17 the percent of farms. As you can see, the price 18 issues, and especially market access challenges, decreased from 2019 with market access challenges 19 20 dropping 20 percent. Other challenges that 21 produced this phase remain similar to 2019. 22 Considering the future production

plans for certified organic farms, there wasn't 1 much to change. Most farms plan to maintain the 2 current level of production in the future, 3 percent, which is unchanged from 2019. 4 far transitioning 5 As as land on certified organic farms, both farms and acres of 6 land transitioning decreased from 2019. 7 So while the acreage of organic land will continue to 8 9 increase in the future, it's increasing at a 10 slower rate. 11 There was a 16 percent decrease in certified farms with transitioning land from 2019 12 to 2021 at over 1,500 farms. Both acres of crop 13 14 land and acres of pasture and range land had 15 double digit decreases from 2019. This followed 16 the trend in a decrease in organic land. Turning to non-certified farms with 17 18 transitioning land, we see that there were over 650 farms and over 62,000 acres of transitional 19 land on non-certified farms. Most of the land, 20 21 over 45,000 acres, is crop land, and over 16,000 22 acres is pasture or range land.

While the number of non-certified 1 farms with transitional land decreased seven 2 percent from 2019, acres increased two percent. 3 4 The increase in land was driven by a 15 percent 5 increase in crop land even though there was a 20 percent decrease in pasture and range land. 6 Next we'll take a look at organic 7 farms by sales class. The sales class of less 8 than \$10,000 had the fewest percent of farms at 9 10 11 percent. The sales class of \$10,000 11 \$99,000 had the highest percent of farms at 39 The largest sales class of 12 percent. farms, 13 \$500,000 or more, represented 18 percent of the 14 farms. As far the percent of sales, the sales 15 classes below \$500,000 accounted for a small 16 portion of sales. But the largest sales class of \$500,000 or more had the vast majority of sales 17 18 at 86 percent. 19 And this is the general 20 information in case anybody has questions or 21 anything at any time. And our email's always our 22 first name and last name at USDA.gov. And all

1	other information is available on the NASS
2	website at www.NASS.USDA.gov.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you.
4	(Applause.)
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Questions for Tony
6	from the Board?
7	(Simultaneous speaking.)
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate, please go
9	ahead, then Dilip.
10	MEMBER LEWIS: Thanks so much for the
11	presentation, I appreciate it. So the Board
12	often, or every year provides a list of research
13	priorities to NIFA to shape their grant programs
14	for organic research.
15	And I'm curious if you think that a
16	similar type of recommendation from us around
17	what data collection we need added, or removed,
18	or shaped, what would be useful for these surveys
19	moving forward. Like, how would it be best to
20	package that for NASS so that we can hear from
21	stakeholders what kind of data needs there are.
22	And we can pass that along to you in a way that

1	you can actually utilize.
2	MR. DORN: Yeah, thank you for that.
3	That's a good question. So we do have the
4	ability to the organic survey is usually a
5	census follow-on. But we also do have the
6	special studies, you know, in cooperation with
7	other USDA partners.
8	So if you have questions and data that
9	you need that's not on there, or you think maybe
10	it shouldn't be on there, it isn't needed
11	anymore, there are several ways to approach that.
12	You can contact us directly and make a
13	recommendation, just with an email or a phone
14	call.
14 15	call. Or otherwise we have a Federal
15	Or otherwise we have a Federal
15 16	Or otherwise we have a Federal Register note that goes out and usually is
15 16 17	Or otherwise we have a Federal Register note that goes out and usually is available. I'm not sure if you're aware of
15 16 17 18	Or otherwise we have a Federal Register note that goes out and usually is available. I'm not sure if you're aware of those, but we solicit feedback when we're
15 16 17 18 19	Or otherwise we have a Federal Register note that goes out and usually is available. I'm not sure if you're aware of those, but we solicit feedback when we're prepping for a survey as required by OMB. So

1	Agriculture has a few questions on organics too,
2	so that's another area that would be a little
3	more limited, obviously. Organics is the focus
4	of the entire questionnaire. There'd be more
5	flexibility in the organic survey, but either
6	way, I mean, just contacting directly or through
7	the Federal Register notice, we'll be glad to
8	consider any kind of changes in that too and
9	meet the data needs. Because we want to reflect
10	the current data needs that are out there. So
11	currently we'll entertain those.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Dilip and then
13	Brian.
14	MEMBER NANDWANI: Thank you for the
15	presentation. This is a very valuable
16	information as a researcher and education
17	perspective with the university. Couple of
18	simple question probably, I'm not sure you have
19	those answers but I'll try.
20	So decreasing organic land from 2019
21	to 2021, is that correct? Did I right?
22	MR. DORN: Yes.

1 MEMBER NANDWANI: So what can you tell 2 about any reason if you have come across during that survey? 3 And the second question, does it mean 4 5 the domestic production has decreased past couple And other side we see there is a \$62 6 of years? 7 billion industry is growing. And does that mean increased but the 8 the import has domestic 9 production has decreased? I just want to make 10 sure I got it correct. Thank you. MR. DORN: Yeah. As far as the first 11 question, there was the decrease in land. 12 The pasture land showed a decrease quite a bit. 13 14 as far as acres, really we're looking at acres. So, you know, there's large land, of course. 15 16 know, in some states we have larger acreage and 17 things like that, so just a few changes. 18 Organic is a fairly concentrated 19 So, you know, we can't disclose individual operations or anything like that. 20 21 the responses that we have, you know, when there 22 are changes and everything, large acres, a few

operations in that can really make a difference 1 in the result. 2 And pasture is one area where 3 4 survey results showed there's a decrease. And that led to the overall decrease in land. 5 crop land was increasing. So that's another 6 consideration along that. 7 And I'm not sure I understood the 8 9 second question as far as there was domestic 10 versus import sales. The 11 MEMBER NANDWANI: domestic production has decreased, if I got it correct 12 from one of your slides, from 2019 to 2021. 13 14 we see that the food sales have been increasing 15 constantly past, like, four percent. And latest 16 figure of the survey is, like, \$62 billion. during the COVID time we had increased about 12 17 18 percent from 2019 to 2021. 19 you have any say on this, difference, or anything that could be the reason 20 21 for -- or you may not have covered this in the 22 survey, I believe.

1	MR. DORN: Right. Yeah, I'm not sure.
2	Let's see, there was an increase, yeah, between
3	2019 and >21 was the comparison. So it's just a
4	few short years and everything too. So we'll
5	have more information when the census of
6	Agriculture comes out. So that will also be
7	another indicator of the trend.
8	Since we have so many, unfortunately
9	we have so many years of organics data, we'll be
10	able to tell more of a trend when 2021 comes
11	along too. But yeah, as far as 2019, we did see
12	fairly strong sales in that too. And I'm not
13	sure what specifically, I'd have to look into
14	which commodities you're talking about that might
15	be decreasing.
16	MEMBER NANDWANI: That helps, thank
17	you.
18	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Brian, and then
19	Jerry.
20	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yeah, thanks for the
21	presentation. I'm just wondering, if I
22	understood correctly, the response rate for the

2021 survey was about in the 40's somewhere, 42 1 percent or something like that. 2 And I'm just wondering how do you extrapolate to get the total 3 figures if you only have 42 percent respondents? 4 5 Yeah. Thank you for that MR. DORN: The follow-on, 6 auestion. census when the organics is a census follow-on survey, that's a 7 mandatory survey required by law, like any census 8 2019 wasn't part of that 9 of Agriculture. 10 program, so it was non-mandatory. So that was 11 one of the reasons for the response rates. And even during, you know, the census, 12 we have full documentation in our -- I mean, if 13 14 you are really into getting into the details in 15 the Appendix of our release, we go into full 16 detail about how we do the adjustments for 17 non-response. Obviously not everybody responds 18 to the census of Agriculture and the census 19 products. 20 So what we do, we account for like 21 We use history, we use analysis trends, farms. 22 like that, to account for those that things

1	aren't responding so that we do have a full
2	measure.
3	And that's why, going back to the
4	first slide, responses are critical, you know, by
5	farmers and everything. Because the ground
6	truth from the producers is what really makes our
7	data stronger. And the stronger data we have,
8	you know, the stronger results we'll have. So
9	that's why it's really important. We can make
10	adjustments and do things, you know, the best we
11	can, but having that report by a producer is
12	really valuable.
13	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yes. Thank you
14	that's great.
15	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Jerry?
16	MEMBER D'AMORE: Thank you very much
17	for the presentation. It's nice to deal with
18	numbers.
19	One of the things that surprised me,
20	and perhaps it shouldn't have, is the ratio of
21	specialty crops to commodities being shown there.
22	I thought the commodities were dominating, but

1 I mean, the specialty crops certainly I'm wrong. 2 have their place. And the geographics really surprised me too in terms of where the organic 3 proposition lined up within the United States. 4 5 To Dilip's question, maybe that dip attributable to COVID the 6 was and complete disappearance of the food service market. 7 know, you sort of say, well, if you didn't eat at 8 home or a restaurant -- we lost share of stomach 9 10 during that period of time too, so that may be it. 11 Oh, and the question I have, is there 12 13 any attempt within the greater agency to slice, and dice, and compare the conventional to the 14 15 organic? I mean, these numbers are going to be 16 minuscule against, but I think there might be something here to be learned in terms of what's 17 18 going, you know, what's growing and what's not 19 growing in terms -- go ahead. 20 MR. DORN: Yeah, very good, great 21 So yeah, normally we don't really do question. 22 that on our own, like a special study or report,

things like that. We do have a data lab that's 1 available and a lot of researchers that would 2 come in. 3 It's available to everybody to comes 4 5 in and do -- not necessarily cross-sectional but they can did into the data more deeply 6 7 everything. And of course everything Any individual reports aren't 8 confidential. included. So that's available for researchers to 9 10 come in to do. 11 As far as what, you know, our scope and what we do, necessarily, we really kind of 12 13 produce the reports. The Economic Research 14 Service is one agency. A lot of times, they'll 15 take the reports of NASS and other, well, 16 governmental agencies, and they'll put it 17 together. 18 They might have something where they 19 would compare organics and things like 20 They do a lot of that kind of value 21 reporting based off of the statistics. So they 22 would definitely be an area who might have some

1 information already on that. And if not, I'm sure that might be something they'd be interested 2 in looking into. 3 4 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Oh, Amy, please go 5 ahead. MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah, thanks, Nate. 6 want to prompt Carolyn over there as a 7 Tonv, I 8 reminder for your question that you 9 yesterday. And then I have a question after 10 that. 11 MEMBER DIMITRI: Tony, first, you 12 know, I'm very happy that this data exists. Because I remember, you know, in 2005 when you 13 14 couldn't actually do any research, because there 15 was no data. So I know that there are a lot of 16 imperfections in the data set but, you know, I manage to get a lot work done with it. So thank 17 18 you to you and NASS. 19 Yesterday we were talking about crop insurance as option, and we noticed that the way 20 21 it's reported out by NASS is these very broad 22 categories. And there's one category that says,

like, doesn't need or want. And I wonder if you 1 can talk about, like, what does that mean. Or do 2 you aggregate that up from other questions, or do 3 you just have this, like, check box? 4 5 Anyway, we'd like to know more about that particular piece of information. 6 I know And maybe it's not something 7 it's very weedy. you think about, but it's something we think 8 Thank you. 9 about. 10 MR. DORN: Thank you. I'll have to 11 admit that's something that we haven't really into, more than 12 seen to diq just what was 13 reported and what the results were. 14 that's generally something we haven't -- I know 15 just generally when we get down to the details of farmers responding when we're looking at, I 16 the organics, every type of detailed 17 18 questionnaire, obviously there's a burden 19 farmers to report. 20 down So getting to any more 21 delineation to a question like that, of course, 22 is a respondent burden and harder to do.

haven't looked into that specifically yet, sorry. 1 2 But we'll be glad to. MEMBER DIMITRI: Just one follow-up 3 4 comment, how do you create those questions, like, 5 when you say you have these questions about crop insurance, it's like where do those options come 6 from? 7 MR. DORN: Good question and back to 8 9 the earlier question too. When they first 10 started, we worked with other partners. When we 11 were first starting, one of -- we usually worked with USDA partners. And there will be a Federal 12 13 Register notice where, if everybody sees those 14 and knows that there's a survey coming, we take 15 feedback on what questions to develop and to 16 have. 17 And right now we're taking feedback. 18 If you would submit that as a question we would consider what we could do with that as far as if 19 20 farmers could respond, those added responses and 21 things like that. So it's evolving, and there's 22 always opportunity to change. So it comes from

anywhere and everybody who's interested in the 1 2 data, really. MEMBER DIMITRI: Okay. Just my final 3 question, I used to work for ERS, so I have, 4 5 like, a little bit of insight into the sausage, know there's a lot of agency level, 6 and I 7 complicated, tense discussions about, like, what actually belongs on the survey. 8 And I guess I'm allowed to talk about 9 because I don't work for the 10 that, federal 11 government anymore. But I wonder what you can 12 say publicly, you know. Thank you. And I swear, that's my last comment. 13 14 MR. DORN: Well, I do know, I've been 15 working, you know, in this area for a few years 16 too and everything. And right now we do have a really good working relationship with the ERS, 17 18 which we do the ARMS survey, the farm income and 19 expense survey, the landlord survey, things like 20 that. And we're working really well together. 21 Of course, ERS had a major kind of 22 restructure and everything, so we have a really

good working partnership with ERS and all the 1 other USDAs, but especially with ERS. And we're 2 really working closely together in a very good 3 partnership, because we're both interested in the 4 5 data. And just like us, they get a lot of 6 requests for more data, more information, at a 7 more granular level. So we're all trying to work 8 9 together and making sure that those 10 questions that need granular data are answered the right way. So we're working data well in the 11 12 partnership. 13 MEMBER BRUCH: Okay. Tony, thank you 14 so much for being my table mate and coming here 15 today to share with us this data. Ι am a 16 participant in the phone survey. That's my preferred method to participate in the survey. 17 18 But it's nice to see the summary data. I love to hear that you are working with different partners 19 20 within the USDA. 21 And as Carolyn mentioned, our focus 22 yesterday was crop insurance. I'm just curious.

1 definitely are in need from an organic standpoint, and a transition standpoint, to get 2 sound actuarial data into RMA to increase our 3 4 database so we can improve insurance. 5 Can we rely, can RMA rely on this data improve their actuarial database, or would 6 7 they just reference this data for supporting information? 8 Well, 9 MR. DORN: we're a federal 10 statistical agency which means that we're 11 independent of any type of regulation. So, you know, we won't share individual reports, of 12 course, with RMA or anything like that. 13 14 would not get individual reports from NASS to 15 look at that for auditing or anything like that. 16 So it would just be, you know, what's 17 available really to other agencies really is 18 available to the public. And that's one of the, 19 I guess, transparency that we strive to do in our So what they see is what you see. 20 policies. 21 If there was any kind of special data 22 lab or anything that researchers or anybody would

be looking at, that would be available to the 1 2 public as well. So really globally is what they would, you know, the same type of aggregate data 3 you're looking at is what they would see. 4 So 5 there's not really -- there's no auditing or anything of individual records if that's what you 6 7 mean. No, not necessarily 8 MEMBER BRUCH: 9 individual records, just that aggregated data, on 10 a regional basis essentially, to improve, just information about what's going on in the program. 11 Because not everybody participates in crop 12 But you did say that this survey, 13 insurance. 14 which is great, that it's 100 percent 15 participation going forward. So I just thought, 16 you know, it's supplemental data. Maybe that could be beneficial. 17 18 MR. DORN: Right. Yeah. And with 19 don't have any -- I don't have 20 specifics on RMA, you know, if they're uses that 21 they've looked in, how useful that was. But, 22 like, generally speaking, I mean, the same type

1	of information to the public's available within
2	other agencies.
3	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
5	for Tony?
6	All right, I'm going to hand it back
7	to Dr. Tucker.
8	DR. TUCKER: So first I want to thank
9	Tony. Let's give him a another hand.
10	(Applause.)
11	DR. TUCKER: Second, I do want to
12	comment that we do send, when these surveys come
13	out that are of interest to the organic sector,
14	we do send out organic insiders on that. And so
15	for any groups that are listening, you know, if
16	you can help us to augment those invitations out
17	to your mailing list, I know when we get into
18	rulemaking, this type of data is incredibly
19	important in terms of, well, what is the
20	population that you're impacting with this rule?
21	And, you know, we have to say, well,
22	here was the response rate of that. And so I

think we hear on one side the organic community 1 2 really wants data, data, data. The response rates really need to show that, that you really 3 4 want the data. 5 if there really high Because are response rates on organic data collection, 6 makes it much easier to go and say we need this 7 special study, and look, you're going to get a 8 really high response rate if you do it which, in 9 10 turn, helps us with the regulations and standards that everybody wants. 11 So I do want to make sure we draw a 12 13 direct line between those please, please, please 14 participate back to the rulemaking process that 15 all of us hold dear. So let's connect those dots and get the word out when these surveys come out 16 to make sure that we're getting the farmers to 17 18 the phone, to the paper, to whatever, to have their voices heard. 19 Ιt all matters in the organic system. 20 21 So, Tony, thank you for the work you

do, your team does, for your report, for coming

22

1	down here today and being with us.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. And so
3	we're going to get kicked off today with crops.
4	And with that, I'm going to be handing it back to
5	Amy Bruch who is very generously chairing both
6	the CACS and crops. And so whenever you're
7	ready, Amy, the floor is yours.
8	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay, Nate, thank you.
9	Michelle, I need a clicker, actually. Oh, it's
10	right beside me, thank you. Didn't have to go
11	too far for that.
12	All right. I hope everybody is doing
13	well. Thank you again, Tony, that was a
14	wonderful presentation you provided us with.
15	Before we get started into our work agenda,
16	I actually have, I believe, four points here to
17	bring up and discuss. First, I wanted to give a
18	special thanks to the members of the Crops
19	Subcommittee. We have a very tight network, and
20	as Nate mentioned yesterday, we did have to
21	weather a few member decreases, I guess.
22	Rick, a senior member with a lot of wisdom,

1 left our team which we were sad to see him go. And then Liz with her fresh perspective and 2 energy, she provided a lot to our subcommittee, 3 4 and it was sad to see her go as well. 5 But we picked up a fantastic addition, Franklin, thank you for joining 6 our He's really hit the ground running. 7 were kind of a late addition, but you 8 9 participated from day one. So thank you very 10 much for that. 11 Thanks to the community as really appreciate all of your public comments to 12 It was very helpful to hear 13 our work agenda. 14 kind of, again, both sides of the equation. Ιt makes our recommendations a lot more robust. 15 Third, I just wanted to also highlight 16 a little bit what we're doing internally amongst 17 18 materials, I'll call them the Materials our 19 Review Subcommittee. So that would be crops handling with my table mate partner, Kyla here, 20 21 and livestock with Ms. Kim, and our fearless leaders Mindee and Nate. 22

We have kind of collaboratively worked 1 together and worked kind of across the aisles to 2 try to optimize and aggregate how we do sunset 3 4 We've optimized and believe the management. 5 process a little bit better. I quess I think it's better, but we're still kind of working 6 7 through that transformation. We're looking at planting on an annual 8 basis instead of a semester basis. So that does 9 10 provide us with more opportunities within the 11 meetings to really have those robust It also helps us plan our work a 12 conversations. 13 little bit more effectively. 14 So it mentioned, we're was as 15 volunteers. We all have day jobs. But 16 sometimes there's seasonality with our day jobs, 17 with our farming season at least. I have some 18 off periods, so it allows for me to make more 19 progress on NOSB work agenda items if we know 20 what the calendar schedule is a year in advance, 21 essentially. 22 Ιt allows for us to process TR

1	sufficiencies maybe a little bit quicker. What
2	we've already tackled is the 2026 TR's,
3	sufficiency. So we're a couple of months ahead
4	of schedule on that. So hopefully what the
5	community will see is potentially these TRs in
6	your hands a little bit sooner, just because we
7	are requesting them a little bit sooner.
8	It does take a long time collectively
9	amongst the three subcommittees. We asked for
10	quite a few of them, I think 17 is what we're
11	slated to potentially this year. So we're trying
12	to do that in a very efficient way and look
13	amongst the other subcommittees.
14	Because sometimes these materials that
15	we noticed this time around, we review them in
16	tandem, i.e., phosphoric acid. We're reviewing
17	that in crops and also in handling. So it's good
18	if we do have that partnership amongst the
19	subcommittees.
20	Anything to add, Kyla or Kim, Mindee,
21	with that process?
22	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Yeah. And, Amy,

thank you for taking the lead on pushing us all 1 2 along, pulling us all along. I think the discipline and the forward thinking of sending 3 out an agenda well in advance to try to keep on 4 5 task and be more proactive on that front will be very successful. 6 And I think it's great, not only for 7 the Board members, but also for the community as 8 well, to try to get as much advance information 9 10 as possible as things are coming around. 11 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Jerry? MEMBER D'AMORE: Well, thank 12 Yeah. 13 As one of your more vocal naysayers in the 14 beginning, I would like very much to say yes, 15 this is the way to go. The ability to plan out 16 calendar year is extraordinary in its benefits. 17 18 Ι will say the Germans have an expression, Aller Anfang ist schwer, which means 19 20 beginnings difficult. all are And these 21 beginnings were difficult, and you guys, again, 22 pulled this through. And it's something I think

is really quite good. I like it. 1 2 MEMBER SMITH: I'll just add that within each of the scope subcommittees, crop, 3 livestock handling sort of ebbed and flows on who 4 5 has the, you know, most sunsets. And going into next year's work, handling has 29 2026 sunsets. 6 in order to effectively manage 7 So that, we really had to work collaboratively, 8 because there are members that, you know, are on 9 10 handling and another subcommittee that also has 11 sunsets. And so in order to, anyway, we can't do in a silo, we have to work together, and 12 it especially when the workload in one subcommittee 13 14 is much more substantial than in another. And 15 that, like I said, ebbs and flows. Just another shout 16 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: 17 Amy and the whole team who to 18 materials, when folks don't show up or we have 19 folks drop off the Board, change-over, 20 have reassignment of that means we work 21 And everybody stepped up to inopportune times. 22 grab those materials to keep the process flowing.

1	Nothing got slowed down by it.
2	So thank you to everybody, thank you
3	for the leadership to Amy, but everybody else as
4	well for stepping up and making the semester
5	finish out.
6	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay. Now back to my
7	fourth point on TRs. This was just a response,
8	or this is a response to some of the feedback we
9	did see in written comments. Crops, this year we
10	had four complete TRs and two limited scope TRs.
11	Most of them are available on the
12	Internet. However, we are still waiting, I
13	believe, for one of them, and that's carbon
14	dioxide. We did request, and you'll see this on
15	our work agenda for next semester, carbon dioxide
16	will be reviewed as a petitioned substance, and
17	we'll be reviewing it for the soil amendment
18	addition. And that is going to have a full TR.
19	So mark your calendars for when that comes
20	available.
21	But anyway, our protocol when we do
22	receive a draft TR, if there's not substantive

1 changes, we do begin leveraging that document for 2 our review process. And that was a case, in of feedback 3 particular we heard а lot on 4 potassium sorbate. 5 So we did use the TR to write our We used new information to write that 6 document. So I just wanted to clear up some of 7 the confusion there. Because we do use the draft 8 mode before it is publicly published, just to 9 10 forward our work agenda. And the best thing about all of our 11 documents this time around is they will be viewed 12 Also, we're not voting on any of 13 next semester. 14 them this semester. We're discussing them so you 15 have kind of a longer runway if you look at it 16 with the materials in front of you to be very 17 prepared for the next time we review this and 18 vote on this. 19 And please catch me in between the 20 meeting if there's any more that we can do. 21 subcommittee we did talk about this as well. 22 we decided we are going to prioritize TRs when we

Τ	do receive them ahead of any other work agenda
2	item. That's something we can do.
3	We usually have a pretty long deadline
4	to review them. But we're going to try to move
5	those to the front of the line and get those
6	circulated a little bit faster. So that was
7	another thing we talked amongst our subcommittee
8	members that we could do to help this feedback
9	exchange. But please catch me if you have any
L 0	more ideas.
L1	Okay. And then I did preview the work
L2	agenda for next semester. Currently it's slated
L3	to be reviewing the same topics that we're
L 4	discussing here today as well as, again, that
L5	carbon dioxide petition.
L 6	So first off is the petition for
L7	potassium sorbate. And that actually is my
L 8	document, so I will pass the mic to myself.
L 9	(Laughter.)
20	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay. So potassium
21	sorbate, this was a petitioned substance that our
22	subcommittee reviewed. And we did thoroughly

review this with the materials that were provided 1 2 to us. We had, again, a new TR. We had old This was actually a substance that the 3 material. 4 1995 subcommittee was reviewing or looking at 5 this as well. So there's a history. was interesting to read some of 6 7 those notes on their process. One individual of the NOSB actually camped out at the FDA to try to 8 get information about this particular substance. 9 10 So Τ thought that was really interesting 11 archival history. I'm sure Joanna knows more about that than I do. 12 anyway, to move on with this 13 But 14 petitioned substance, it is petitioned 15 synthetic. And it is petitioned to be used as an 16 insecticide and also as a plant disease control. 17 And so the petitioned summary essentially says, 18 and this information's at your review -- in your 19 review materials. But in summary it's 20 additional tool in a crop disease resistant 21 It has a contact mode of action, and 22 it's contributing not suspected а to

phytotoxicity of crops. 1 And potassium, and review history, so 2 currently is on the National List. 3 synthetic, inert ingredient. 4 So that's why it 5 appears on our National List to be used in that fashion. 6 petitioned Tt's also 7 been unsuccessfully three additional times for the 8 inclusion on the National List, in 1995 as a seed 9 10 treatment, production aid, in 2002 it 11 petitioned in crops as a seed film coating and as a preservative, or as a seed film coating and as 12 a preservative. For livestock, it was petitioned 13 14 for use in organic livestock production as a mold 15 inhibitor. And in all three of those cases, it 16 was not added to the National List. EPA does have this listed as, or it's 17 18 listed on the inert list for ingredients. And it's also exempt from regulations on efficacy and 19 The FDA has it under the generally 20 toxicity. 21 And then international, recognized as safe.

there is no current international regulations

22

that accept the product for the petitioned use. 1 Petitioned use, again, is for insecticide and 2 disease mitigation. 3 4 Environmental and health impact, 5 stated that the degradation of the products of potassium sorbate are more hazardous than the 6 product itself and mainly, primarily focus on 7 sorbic acid. Sorbic acid is reported to have 8 synergistic effects with sodium nitrate and form 9 10 several species of direct-acting mutagens 11 general. And this was also noted with public 12 comments. There is limited information available 13 14 about potassium sorbate in this petition 15 function. However, there is lots of information 16 about potassium sorbate as food preservative or 17 as a post-harvest treatment. 18 So there is information available. But when we look at the information available and 19 20 compare it to how this is petitioned, we don't 21 necessarily understand chemical interactions. 22 don't understand use and conventional

pesticide applications. 1 And these were mentioned that 2 in the TR I'm referencing. We don't understand interactions with soil organisms. 3 4 We have ideas on what that could be, 5 but it's essentially transitive property, because don't have this substance 6 we. that we can 7 necessarily analyze in its current inactive. 8 Environmental, there 9 is reason 10 expect that it would inhibit the growth of soil 11 microorganisms. And also there is a potential to increase the pH of the soil. And that would 12 13 impact the bacterial community and health. 14 It's listed as а low allergenic 15 potential of all the food preservatives that are 16 out there. It is category 2B, serious eye damage 17 and irritation. And most of the potassium 18 sorbate, when it's consumed as food а 19 preservative, is dispelled. 20 There's many alternatives to this 21 substance currently. And some of them actually 22 we will be revealing during our sunset process in

further detail. Potassium sulfate and lime 1 sulfur we'll be reviewing in the sunset process. 2 there quite extensive 3 is а list 4 alternatives. 5 then the discussion document And 6 summary, potassium sorbate is not made with 7 renewable resources. Materials used to produce potassium sorbate are not recyclable. 8 It does not compliment the use of natural and biological 9 10 controls. Many alternatives exist. And then 11 kind of what we've heard with a lot of public comments is just that more research is needed, in 12 13 particular with this substance. 14 So looking at a review of the public 15 comments, we had a lot of participation with public comments on this particular substance. 16 17 Several members had concerns including 18 certifiers and two advocacy groups. Farmers tended to be in favor of this product as well as 19 20 grower groups with one additional farmer 21 encouraging more research and listing if it means OFPA criteria. 22

The majority of the comments in favor 1 or against this material just also seemed to be 2 line with the theme of more research 3 4 One in particular from farmers needed. mentioned, you know, just having adequate tools 5 to control powdery mildew. That's what one of 6 the diseases that this will mitigate, including 7 Insects were mainly the spider 8 downy mildew. 9 mites, so typically in vegetables and in tree 10 fruits. That could see some benefit from this 11 product. People that were in favor also of this 12 product just said, you know, it's being used, 13 14 it's on the National List as an approved inert 15 ingredient. So why can't we essentially move 16 that over to the National List as an active? 17 People that were concerned or against 18 just opposed the listing due to essentiality and They also -- I think this was a 19 efficacy data. really powerful statement, that we know we need 20 21 tools in this area. We're just not sure if this 22 is the right tool for the situation, just based

1	on OFPA criteria.
2	So I think the community, it seems
3	like stakeholders need solutions. With that,
4	I'll just kind of open it up to Board discussion
5	to comment on this particular substance,
6	compatibility with the OFPA requirements, and the
7	potential needs of this product.
8	So thank you very much.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Questions for Amy?
10	Brian, please go ahead.
11	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yeah. Thanks, Amy,
12	that was a pretty thorough review.
13	I have to note that I haven't looked
14	at this in a while, but as I remember, the
15	petition for this product had a lot of paragraphs
16	and parts that were cut and pasted from some of
17	the previous petitions. Is that right? It
18	seemed to me that it wasn't really focused
19	completely on the uses that the petition was for.
20	MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah. There were some
21	references. Again, just research in this arena
22	is fairly limited. So references to it as a seed

1	treatment and a food preservative were also found
2	in the petition.
3	MEMBER CALDWELL: Right, that's what I
4	remember. And I believe there are conventional
5	products that are labeled and used for this
6	purpose. Do we know that? Well, anyway, that's
7	sort of a side point. What I was thinking was
8	that there may be more data coming about efficacy
9	and stuff like that if it's being used in the
LO	conventional world.
L1	And here's a question I have that may
L2	be more for NOP folks. And that is, like, if we
13	vote this petition down, as I remember from the
L 4	past it cannot be re-petitioned for this use. Is
L5	that correct?
L 6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I hand that to
L7	Jared.
L8	MR. CLARK: It would have to have new
L 9	information for you to
20	MEMBER CALDWELL: Oh, okay, new
21	information.
22	MR CLARK. It could be netitioned

again down the road for a different use, or if 1 there's new information that may have changed how 2 vou voted. 3 4 MEMBER CALDWELL: Okay. Fine, so then 5 it's not sort of a do or die thing is we vote It could conceivably come back if 6 this down. there's new information with the petition. 7 those are my questions, just to kind of get the 8 situation clear in my mind. 9 10 MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah. Thank you, 11 Brian. From the data I reviewed, I didn't necessarily see studies for this particular use 12 in conventional fields. I was kind of curious on 13 14 that as well. It potentially could be that 15 there's, you know, different modes of action that 16 are chosen that probably have more octane for 17 conventional growers than potentially 18 substance. 19 did ask the community But we 20 additional resources. And we did get one 21 document on information from an extension that 22 briefly touched on this. But it's a lot of the

1	transitive property. It works for food
2	preservation, therefore it should work in this
3	fashion.
4	So if there is information that we
5	need to look at, kind of a plug to the community
6	on the conventional use, I guess, let us know.
7	But there was a line item in the TR that said
8	that that information was pretty minimal as well.
9	MEMBER PETREY: Jared, when you mean
L 0	new information, could that strictly be efficacy
L1	information that is presented?
L2	MR. CLARK: It could be efficacy, it
L3	could be, you know, environmental health studies
L 4	that are new. It's kind of broad.
L5	MEMBER PETREY: Yeah. It seems like
L 6	it. Thank you.
L7	MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah, that's a good
L 8	question, Logan. There was some efficacy data
L 9	put into the petition itself. And that's what we
20	received comments on, that the substances that
21	were used as industry standards weren't
22	necessarily what industry uses. So the

1 comparisons were, some folks, you know, didn't necessarily move them to think this product would 2 be any more beneficial than the products that are 3 currently available. 4 5 MEMBER SMITH: Besides the research on efficacy, or basically with the question that you 6 had asked, is there any other information that 7 would be helpful to you or the subcommittee to 8 help write a proposal, essentially? What other 9 10 information do you need, or do you feel like you have enough to make a recommendation? 11 Well, public comments 12 MEMBER BRUCH: were helpful. Again, I think there's a need from 13 14 producers for tools. But it's just, again, 15 evaluating does this tool, in its petition 16 source, meet OFPA criteria. So currently, the information that we 17 18 have available is pretty limiting. And 19 originally we did deem the TR insufficient, because this data was not all in the TR. 20 And 21 that was, again, probably one of the items that 22 extended the process of TR evaluation for this

1	particular substance.
2	Because we really were trying to push
3	back to get more specific information. It's just
4	not available, so at least what was found in the
5	TR. This was one of our questions we did ask the
6	community, additional known research or
7	information. So we'll just have to work with
8	what we have.
9	I think what Brian had mentioned about
10	conventional data, we can do another just kind of
11	survey with our own materials internally to see
12	if that data exists. But, you know, stakeholder
13	feedback is going to be really critical in this
14	process, kind of a joint effort as we evaluate
15	the substance against OFPA criteria.
16	Thank you, Kyla.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
18	for Amy?
19	MEMBER BRUCH: I do know the
20	petitioner. I believe he listed into our written
21	comments, sorry, or oral comments. He didn't
22	necessarily provide any written comments. But if

1	he's listening here today and has information
2	that you can provide us, feel free.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Dilip, go ahead.
4	MEMBER NANDWANI: Thanks, Amy,
5	beautiful presentation and good information or
6	petitioned survey. I'm curious, it's a synthetic
7	substance, correct.
8	MEMBER BRUCH: Uh-huh.
9	MEMBER NANDWANI: And there are some
10	alternatives available as well in the slide. I
11	think I noticed there are a few substances. So
12	I'm curious to know that those substances are
13	available as an alternative.
14	How efficiently are oral petition
15	surveys? Because my understanding is that we
16	don't really encourage using synthetic substances
17	in organics. So if we have an alternative as a
18	natural or maybe more effective, why petition
19	survey is we are keeping that. I'm just curious
20	to, you know, understand more. Thank you.
21	MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah, absolutely.
22	That's a good question. And that's something we

into consideration with 1 take OFPA have to 2 criteria, is the essentiality piece and looking at what products are available. I think when it 3 4 comes to organic pest mitigation, multiple tools 5 are helpful. Multiple modes of action are helpful. 6 like. 7 Tt. does seem in terms ofrecommendations 8 naturals, there was ont.he planting certain varieties. 9 alternatives for 10 Also your rotations are a big factor. And then 11 getting into other substances, you know, there's biological controls, there are substances that 12 13 are synthetics that are already on the National 14 I think Brian's going to be reviewing at List. least one of them later on. 15 16 In the sulfur category, there's a lot 17 of products that people are currently using that 18 have sulfur as an active ingredient that's on our 19 National List currently. And we're reviewing So there's kind of a myriad of natural 20 that. 21 alternatives currently, biological, synthetics 22 that are approved on the National List.

So some members of the community ask 1 about essentiality to this. Farmers are kind of 2 on the other side of the equation saying they 3 need additional tools outside of what's already 4 5 approved to be used. Brian? 6 7 MEMBER CALDWELL: Yeah. I'm going to 8 put on my farmer hat for a minute and just say that it's very often the case, and I think it is 9 10 the case for this product, that a lot of the 11 natural alternatives are not nearly as effective as even the synthetics that are allowed. 12 13 And I think we do have some pretty 14 good synthetics. And I'm not sure about the entire range of diseases that potassium sorbate 15 16 might be effective on. But for some of them, particularly powdery mildew that was mentioned 17 18 is, in my mind, a pretty easy to disease to 19 manage. 20 But downy mildew and some of the other 21 ones, for instance if we had some great products 22 for late blight, that would be wonderful.

there is a lack of research, maybe it turns out 1 that this product would be effective against late 2 We don't know. blight. 3 You know, that's sort of part of the 4 5 whole picture for me. I am very much in favor of having tools in the tool box for farmers. 6 But. they need to be tools in the tool box that are 7 health hazards 8 not going to be or have 9 questionable aspects to them in terms of the 10 environment. You know, they have to go through 11 the process. 12 Anyway, I just wanted to kind of, you 13 know, look at it from that perspective. And in 14 my mind, I think there are real questions about 15 this one. And the fact that it can be 16 re-petitioned with new data makes me feel like that's what I would like to see. 17 18 MEMBER NANDWANI: Thanks, Brian. And, 19 I mean, very quick this brings to my next kind of 20 I hope you don't mind. question. Organic 21 versus, sorry, natural versus synthetics. 22 So, if we have natural alternatives

1	available for a material which is synthetic, do
2	we add or list them as a, with restriction of
3	some annotation, some kind of that?
4	And at this point is this material,
5	the potassium sorbate is just a synthetic, or
6	having some listed as a restriction or something?
7	MEMBER BRUCH: I'm going to Kyla, our
8	certifier for the technical information you need.
9	You're making her work. That's good.
10	MEMBER NANDWANI: Sorry.
11	MEMBER SMITH: Sorry. Okay. So, at
12	the beginning of 601 it does talk about certain
13	uses in paragraph, that require that the practice
14	standards at 206(a) through (d) are required to
15	be used prior to using a synthetic on the
16	National List.
17	So, if you read the paragraph between,
18	like, you know, after the 601 listing, before it
19	gets into the list, that's where those natural
20	practices are required to be utilized.
21	So, I don't know that it would be
22	necessary to restrict, or put a annotation or

1	restriction based on that paragraph.
2	MEMBER NANDWANI: Thanks, Kyla. This
3	helps a lot. Yes, thank you.
4	MEMBER LEWIS: One of the elements in
5	the write up that I'm particularly focused on is
6	the, just sort of the registration history of the
7	product.
8	So, I'll just sort of summarize it.
9	It was a EPA registered pesticide until 1989.
10	And then it was put onto, and then it's on List
11	4, which is, you know, outdated. And that was a
12	25(b) pesticide.
13	So, you can sort of read between the
14	lines that, you know, when registrations get
15	cancelled it's because folks aren't using it.
16	There isn't a market for it potentially because
17	of efficacy issues, you know.
18	These are assumptions I'm making. So,
19	I'm not saying that I have evidence to support
20	that. But there's a reason why it was not a
21	popular pesticide in the conventional industry.
22	1989 is pretty early on in the

1	development of IPM. So, the piece that I'm sort
2	of focusing on is like can it be part of a
3	program? And that's the efficacy.
4	So, it's not just I have downy mildew.
5	This is my solution for it. But can it be part
6	of a broader, more complicated set of tools that
7	then can combat a number of diseases, or be part
8	of an IPM program? And that would be the kind of
9	efficacy data I would want to see.
L 0	And then we get into a chicken and egg
L1	issue where if it's not allowed in organic, how
L2	can organic farmers test if on their crops, and
L3	see it's efficacy into IPM?
L 4	So, I tend to want to expand the
L5	toolbox for things that are fairly benign, to try
L 6	to develop that. But also I know we need to be
L7	cautious.
L 8	So, I don't know if that's helpful,
L 9	but sort of part of the elements that I'm
20	thinking about in terms of whether or not it
21	should be allowed.
22	MEMBER BRIICH. Yes Absolutely

That's helpful information. And then there is, 1 in NTR there was, there are some studies. 2 But they're few and far between. 3 4 in terms of efficacy it But was 5 comparing sorbate with potassium potassium understanding 6 bicarbonate. So, maybe the effectiveness of potassium bicarbonate in 7 field can also provide us additional insight with 8 potassium sorbate. 9 10 But in public comments I did ask one 11 commenter about efficacy data. There was the reference to, you know, the industry standards. 12 13 And several people pointed that sulfur is kind of 14 our main go to, and some of these other subset. 15 I don't know if it's part of the 16 rotational multiple months of action. But it did seem like there was maybe more superiority with 17 18 sulfur based products. 19 MEMBER QUARCOO: I have a follow-up to what Brian said earlier. In the petition it says 20 21 that it was compared to conventional products in 22 terms of efficacy.

1	And while it's also scientific, but it
2	was superior to that, and if that's way better
3	than any of their organic alternatives. So I'm,
4	it's, did they supply, did the petitioners supply
5	data to support this efficacy information as in
6	the petition?
7	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes. That's a good
8	point that you bring up. And that's what we're
9	looking at is kind of parallel information to,
10	you know, to support or not support that
11	information in the petition, just independent
12	data.
13	MEMBER QUARCOO: Yes.
14	MEMBER BRUCH: Because the petition,
15	you're right, did supply is with information.
16	And we're just trying to reconcile that.
17	MEMBER QUARCOO: And in reference to
18	what Nate said about if any farmers cannot test
19	the product. Research institutions do that all
20	the time.
21	The farm doesn't have to be certified
22	organic. You can just test it somewhere. You

1	can also do it on an on-farm, as an on-farm
2	research that it's not a certified product. But
3	you can, we can still test that.
4	So this comes back to research
5	institutions, and what they can do to supply us
6	the data that we need to make some of our
7	decisions.
8	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you, Franklin.
9	Also, thank you, Nate. Both of you guys just
10	hitting the ground running. And I appreciate
11	your comments. I'm glad you weighed in.
12	MEMBER PETREY: Amy, I have a quick
13	question. And so, when we're saying it doesn't
14	align with OFPA, that's because of the renewable,
15	not made from renewable resources?
16	Because it like makes mention it is
17	benign, that health concerns were not there. And
18	then also mentioned it's affecting the soil where
19	we kind of expected a big rebound, even though
20	there might be some antimicrobial, you know,
21	inherent properties of it.
22	It's similar to copper, similar to

1	sulfur, you know. And we add those in. Even
2	similar to fumigants that we incorporate in the
3	soil. But we do have, we do expect a rebound
4	there. So, it does seem benign.
5	And so, is, what are the properties
6	that it does not align with OFPA, you know, that
7	may give us more hesitation for that?
8	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes. And that's
9	definitely something that we want to review as a
10	full Board. The list that I provided that you
11	just summarized
12	MEMBER PETREY: Yes.
13	MEMBER BRUCH: is kind of the
14	initial list that we were tackling with crops.
15	But definitely we need to kind of deliberate.
16	MEMBER PETREY: Okay.
17	MEMBER BRUCH: Deliberate specifically
18	on. And your input from Farmers of the South,
19	you know
20	MEMBER PETREY: For sure.
21	MEMBER BRUCH: that could be real
22	important to hear.

1	MEMBER PETREY: That's right. And I
2	need, yes, I need to look into that, and will do
3	so. The diseases that it seems to have the most
4	efficacy on, you know, are not things that I deal
5	with, you know, and the insects that I deal with.
6	And so, usually I'm in very strong
7	support of, you know, of fungicides, having those
8	tools, because of the, you know, the area that we
9	grow. And so, yes, I'll look into those areas.
10	I don't deal with powdery mildew or
11	downy mildew on the crops that we grow in our
12	area. So, I'll look into that.
13	MEMBER BRUCH: Do you have spider
14	mites down there?
15	MEMBER PETREY: There are, yes. And
16	so, that's actually more common in what we would
17	say plasticulture crops. It's like in the, I
18	think in tomatoes or squash, or things like that.
19	We don't, I don't know whether it's
20	because of overhead irrigation. It kind of, I
21	think it alleviates some of the problems for
22	spider mites.

1	Usually plasticulture with drip I
2	think has bigger issues with that. Usually get
3	it in an arid times. And so, yes, when it'd dry
4	you have that.
5	Also, we seem to see flare ups when
6	you're using pyrethroids, you know, in
7	conventional settings, because they're not
8	controlled by those, a lot of the insecticides.
9	And so, you will see kind of a rebound of the
10	spider mites, you know, that come up.
11	But we don't have that in our crops.
12	And so again, these are not things that I'm used
13	to controlling that potassium sorbate is
14	covering.
15	But I know that there's a lot of other
16	growers that probably, you know, are having
17	problems with these types. And I'll look into
18	that.
19	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you. That would
20	be great. Is there any more discussion on
21	potassium sorbate at this point in time. Brian,
22	go ahead.

1	MEMBER CALDWELL: Sorry to add another
2	minute here. But just wanted to point out that I
3	think there is a potential health question having
4	to do with the interactions with nitrates in the
5	digestive process, and that sort of thing.
6	So, it's not totally, it doesn't have
7	a total, you know, green light in terms of health
8	effects, the way I understand it.
9	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes, absolutely. The
10	breakdown products, at least sorbic acid and,
11	let's see, what is it, nitrite, yes. We talked
12	about that extensively in our Subcommittee.
13	There are some negative reactions
14	between those two. And could have, the TR noted
15	that there could be some accumulation in, well,
16	the study that was done it was accumulation in
17	rats. So, that could essentially be accumulation
18	in the body.
19	Okay. Well, thank you for the
20	discussion that we had here. And I think it's
21	very clear to the community that if there is
22	information, tests, studies that you have access

1	to, please send them our way as well.
2	We definitely want to be very
3	collaborative, joint effort in evaluation of this
4	petitioned substance. So, thank you very much.
5	Okay. I'll turn it back over to
6	myself here. Sorry. Got a little silent there.
7	We're going to go on to the next one. We're
8	going to dive into our sunset process here.
9	I'm just going to pull up some
10	information. We're going to start with reviewing
11	alcohols. And public comments actually more or
12	less aggregated their information about ethanol
13	and isopropanol.
14	So, my plan is to review just the
15	overall intro to both substances. But then
16	aggregate the discussion on the comments. And
17	then open it up to discussion with the full
18	Board, if that's okay if we proceed that way.
19	Okay.
20	All right. So, ethanol is listed at
21	205.601, synthetic substances allowed for use in
22	organic crop production. It's listed as an

1	algicide, disinfectant sanitizer, including
2	irrigation system cleaning, irrigation system
3	cleaning systems, alcohol and ethanol.
4	So, the use of ethanol. It's used in
5	organic agriculture as an outside disinfectant,
6	sanitizer, including irrigation system cleaning.
7	Internationally it is accepted by all the
8	individuals that, all the organizations that we
9	review.
10	EPA issues, EPA considers ethanol to
11	be practically nontoxic, based on acute oral and
12	inhalation toxicity tests. Ethanol is
13	biodegradable in the air, soil, and water.
14	The Crops Subcommittee noted that
15	there is little to no environmental or human
16	health impacts associated with the use.
17	Moving on to isopropanol. It's listed
18	at 205.601, synthetic substances allowed for use
19	in organic production. It's also listed as a
20	algicide, disinfectant, and sanitizer, including
21	irrigation systems, cleaning systems, alcohols,
22	isopropanol.

1	The review, the Subcommittee review on
2	this material is that in agriculture isopropanol
3	can used as listed. It's a broad spectrum
4	antimicrobial activity against vegetative
5	bacteria, viruses, and fungi.
6	For isopropyl, for isopropanol, sorry,
7	isopropanol for international acceptance Canada
8	and IFOAM provide guidance for isopropanol
9	alcohol for its use in organic agriculture
10	For environmental issues the EPA
11	considers isopropanol slightly toxic to
12	practically nontoxic on acute oral and inhalation
13	toxicity tests.
14	The commenter breakout, we had great
15	participation with commenters about both of these
16	substances. Four certifiers mentioned that they
17	have a lot of certifying operations using this.
18	Eleven farmers/farmer advocacy
19	groups/consultants supported this. One group was
20	in support if NOSB investigated the availability
21	of organic or non-synthetic alcohols.
22	Farm and farmer groups provided

examples of the use of these. One of the main 1 ones was their tools and pruning shears 2 prevent the spread of diseases such as canker or 3 4 fire bliaht when they're removing infected 5 branches. For drip irrigation lines they use 6 these substances when their lines become clogged. 7 And then for post-harvest handling it's used to 8 sanitize and disinfect equipment. 9 10 When used as labeled the material does 11 not necessarily pose a risk for health And it's not directly applied to 12 environment. 13 edible organic fruits. 14 One commenter had concern that ethanol 15 mav be manufactured from ethylene by The use, the usual feedstock for 16 fermentation. fermentation is corn. could be, 17 So, there 18 genetic engineering could be an issue in this 19 process. 20 The alternatives, there are some that 21 exist, chlorine materials, so other sanitizers, 22 non-synthetic ethanol, essential oils, and heat

1 treatment. 2 Many farmers say though that they prefer alcohols over chlorine materials, because 3 chlorine materials can corrode their tools, their 4 specialty tools, and the alcohols don't. 5 And I thought this was an interesting 6 It's more available in rural areas. 7 comments. Accessibility to these products 8 really are important. And they're easily to be obtained. 9 10 Let's see. We did have one question 11 to stakeholders about requiring organic produced ethanol, if sufficient quantities were available. 12 13 And the comments about that question was, such a 14 requirement would resolve in producers just 15 switching from ethanol to isopropanol, because we were gearing that question directly to the use of 16 17 ethanol. 18 And then it also brought up the bigger issue that we should discuss whether all crop 19 20 input should be organically sourced, and have a 21 bigger conversation, instead of just a la carte 22 per substance.

1	So, with that review I open it up to
2	the Board. Yes, Logan.
3	MEMBER PETREY: Yes. And on that
4	specifically, something that really caught my eye
5	was the compost and manures. It would have to be
6	organically produced, which would kind of just
7	shut us down for a little bit. So, that's how
8	big opening that can of worms would be if we did
9	that.
LO	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes, absolutely. It's
L1	a pretty broad based question when you dive into
L2	it. Okay. Any other discussion on alcohols?
L3	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Just that this will
L 4	also come back up in livestock later on.
L5	MEMBER BRUCH: Thanks for that
L 6	preview. Let's see. Okay. We are going to
L7	table sodium carbonate peroxyhydrate until after
L 8	lunch. We'll tackle this one after lunch. This
L 9	is one of many substances.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And we're going to
21	do that with hydrated lime as well.
22	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes.

1 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Just bump hers to 2 the end, yes. MEMBER BRUCH: She is listening. 3 it will be a more effective discussion with her 4 5 So, we are moving to newspaper, other present. recycled paper without glossy or colored inks. 6 And this is listed at 205.601(b) as 7 herbicide, weed barrier as applicable to mulches 8 and (I) newspaper or other recycled material 9 10 without glossy or colored inks. I'll turn it 11 over to you, Wood. Thanks. MEMBER TURNER: 12 There's a. 13 there's actually two listings. And I'll just go 14 ahead and suggest that we have this conversation 15 at the same time. One is at (b) herbicides, weed 16 barriers as applicable. And the other one is at 17 (c) as compost feedstocks. 18 So, yes, I was really interested in written comments on this material. 19 really appreciated the community kind of leaning 20 21 in on this question. Because I think it raises 22 some interesting issues.

In both cases we're talking about 1 2 paper that's essentially, I mean, newspaper or other recycled paper that's essentially been 3 4 repurposed to support weed suppression in one 5 usage, and as a compost feedstock in the other 6 case. And, you know, I think as outlined in 7 the write-up, I think one of the biggest issues 8 that comes up in this particular case is related 9 10 to the inks associated with the recycled paper. Historically black inks have been, 11 migrated to sort of more water 12 have based So, they're not entirely solvent 13 materials. 14 free. But on the glossy and colored ink side of 15 things it's a much different question. 16 And so it raises a number of issues 17 related to, and certainly as the listing 18 outlines, you know, the listing allows for the use of the material without glossy or colored 19 20 inks. 21 That said, I think there was a lot of 22 about, you know, whether comments you

adequately sort of keep the adverse impacts from 1 those glossy and colored inks out of usage. 2 It's pretty hard to, and I certainly 3 appreciate any view from others on this. 4 It's 5 pretty hard to perfectly regulate the use of that material. 6 7 We. do see some usage of, some 8 permitted use of this, well, permitted use of recycled paper without glossy paper or colored 9 10 ink somewhere in Canada. No other specifications 11 internationally. There's been a lot of discussion over 12 There's a 2017 TR on this 13 the years. 14 outlines a lot of these kinds of issues. And 15 after the 2017 TR the Subcommittee and ultimately the Board unanimously decided to sort of continue 16 with both of these, continue 17 to relist 18 material. I would say on the, and I think this 19 20 fall into sort of does seem to our larger 21 conversations about keeping a closer eye, 22 understanding in more depth the PFAS issue,

sort of whether or not we can sort of ensure that 1 2 that doesn't have adverse impacts on organic or the organic sort of ecosystem. 3 That said, a lot of support for the 4 5 material, maintaining this listing as it's currently articulated. We heard from a number of 6 7 certifiers who supported it, saying something that's very important to users. 8 And they're seeing a lot of, it's showing up on, it's 9 10 showing up in many organic systems. 11 We had support from growers the material. 12 supported the use of Trade 13 associations supported the use of the material. 14 Although I, and I'll just sort of continue with 15 the, sort of the breadth of opinions. There were, the category that I would 16 17 consider to be not opposed to the material. 18 I think one retailer in particular asked a series of questions that would sort of I think push the 19 20 conversation little bit further, which а 21 thought were quite interesting. 22 opposition There was one to the

1	material from a nonprofit organization that
2	encouraged opposition to the relisting, or
3	opposed the relisting. But suggested that the
4	Committee should continue to work on the
5	material.
6	I think the quote was, whether
7	there's, to address whether there's a way for
8	growers and certifiers to identify sources of
9	recycled paper that are compatible with organic
10	principles.
11	Complicated work agenda item for sure.
12	But certainly worth considering. So, I
13	definitely appreciated the breadth of feedback on
14	this material. And would welcome any discussion
15	others might have on the topic.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Brian.
17	MEMBER CALDWELL: So, Wood, thanks for
18	that. A lot of these materials are much more
19	nuanced and complicated than they look, or then
20	they seem at first glance.
21	And I'm thinking that paper, what we
22	call paper now is quite different than it was in

the '70s and '80s when organic producers were 1 using this, and recyclers were doing a lot with 2 it, and everything. 3 And one of the things I'm concerned 4 5 about, well, first of all you mentioned PFAS. And I think there was a recent study saying that 6 some newspapers did have, carry PFAS. 7 know how much. 8 9 But then, the other thing is, I get 10 all this stuff in the mail. And it's like, the 11 paper is like plasticized or something. And it might not be even a glossy color or something. 12 13 it just doesn't feel like sort of 14 fashioned paper. 15 And I'm just wondering are there, are 16 we worried about, you know, plastic fibers or somehow reinforced paper? I don't even know what 17 18 this stuff is. But it just seems like there's a 19 lot more going on with paper than there used to 20 be. 21 MEMBER TURNER: I don't have any real 22 I mean, technically the paper comment there.

1	that's allowed to be used is the non-glossy
2	paper, the non-coat, the paper without coating.
3	So, you know, again, I can't speak
4	necessarily to the certifier sort of world in
5	terms of what they're actually seeing on the
6	ground.
7	But the feedback from certifiers has
8	suggested that it's in wide use, and they're
9	seeing it. It's still something that, as listed
10	the material is important, was notable to me.
11	But I totally agree with the point you're making.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate, and then
13	Allison.
14	MEMBER LEWIS: Just to clarify. Can
15	we talk about the compost feedstock thing as
16	well? Are we doing those both at the same time?
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yes.
18	MEMBER TURNER: Yes. Happy to, I
19	
	mean, I, to me they're, I
20	mean, I, to me they're, I MEMBER LEWIS: Yes, okay.

1	feedstock.
2	MEMBER LEWIS: Yes. So, I think just,
3	this has always been what I, a little bit, sort
4	of problematic to me. Because composters
5	generally don't use paper as a feedstock, but
6	rather as a sort of incidental accompaniment to
7	whatever it is that they're taking in as a
8	feedstock.
9	So, that's nuanced, and maybe parsing
10	out the regulation. And maybe that's just an
11	issue in my brain.
12	But I'm curious if there's discussion,
13	or if there's room for discussion at the Crops
14	Subcommittee about what the risk is in the
15	compost.
16	You know, once the composting is
17	occurring what's at the back end? Is there a
18	contamination concern in the compost? Is there
19	the testing that we need to do?
20	Many states do have a heavy metals
21	test for compost. And so, I think those are,
22	those elements are covered. But are there other

1 contamination concerns that may be worth looking 2 at as a way to maybe start at the back end and move upstream to see what sort of restrictions we 3 4 may or may not need on these materials. 5 Great point. Not to MEMBER TURNER: 6 touch the issue that Logan just raised 7 compost. But it sort of begs the same question, right. I mean, is it, what's coming out the back 8 And sort of how do we work back from that. end? 9 10 So, that's a good point. It's a really good 11 point. CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Allison. 12 MEMBER JOHNSON: Thanks. 13 And then I 14 think Franklin had his hand up. Is cardboard 15 covered here? I see the note about glues, 16 adhesive waxes. But I didn't see the word And I was curious whether that is 17 cardboard. 18 here. like 19 You hear lot about sheet а 20 mulching with cardboard. And folks are doing 21 kind of smaller scale start up type stuff. 22 I'm just trying to understand whether that's

1	within the realm here.
2	MEMBER TURNER: I don't, I'll ask
3	Jared on that. I don't, I'm not, I don't think
4	cardboard is contemplated here.
5	MR. CLARK: Nor do I.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Franklin.
7	MEMBER QUARCOO: Yes. In the report I
8	see a blanket statement that talks about progress
9	towards less toxic materials used in inks.
10	That's so broad. Are we going to just
11	assume that there's a general progress towards
12	these less toxic inks, and then make a decision?
13	And then there are different sources
14	of paper. Plus, there's a lot of advance work
15	done in material science. And now you look at
16	the material, you can't always be sure what has
17	been used to make that material.
18	So my question is, if we say there's
19	been that move towards less toxic materials, I
20	don't think that applies to all the paper that is
21	being made, and all the inks that are being used.
22	So, does that not put us at the risk

1	where we might be allowing things that under
2	normal circumstances we wouldn't, if we didn't
3	put it on this broad category?
4	MEMBER TURNER: Love that. Love that
5	comment. I think it's great, Franklin. And I
6	agree with you. I think that's a blanket
7	statement about a move in, as I mentioned, black
8	inks that are, have, are more and more water
9	based, more and more vegetable based. Less so on
L 0	the colored ink side.
L1	So there is, that's a fair point.
L2	There's some conflation I think here in some of
L3	the, in some of the write up that I should fix,
L 4	and would benefit from your input on that in the
L5	Subcommittee.
L 6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Jerry.
L 7	MEMBER D'AMORE: Franklin, I agree
L8	with you entirely. The only question I would ask
L 9	then of the group here is, if it's not used, what
20	replaces it? And that, you know, I, it's not a
21	theoretical question.
22	Rut it's a question that maybe we just

1	don't, can't answer right here. But is it
2	probable that it might be replaced with something
3	that's quite a bit worse? So, that's where I
4	would go at this point, just asking that
5	question.
6	MEMBER TURNER: Totally fair. And I
7	do feel like I'd love to hear more nuance from
8	the certifier community about what it is they're
9	actually seeing, and how they're actually
10	There is, there seems to be pretty
11	broad support in the certifier community. But I
12	don't, I mean, does that mean we're looking at
13	every piece of newspaper that's been on the
14	ground, and seeing exactly how much colored ink
15	might be on those sheets of paper or not? I
16	mean, that's a complicated thing.
17	And I don't know any newspaper today
18	that doesn't use colored ink. So, if you're
19	using any newspaper you're using colored ink or
20	some, to some degree. So, that's a totally fair
21	point.

And I, there needs to be some nuance.

1	I know, I recognize that certifiers don't really
2	want to take positions on these kinds of issues.
3	And are sort of listing, you know, listing
4	users, folks that are using these in their OSPs
5	are listing these materials in their OSPs.
6	But on some level I think it's helpful
7	for us to understand exactly what it looks like
8	on the ground, in terms of how to, you know, how
9	to regulate.
10	MEMBER D'AMORE: Well, you're right.
11	And the whole discussion around what are the
12	alternatives. It stems in, for me in having
13	worked for six years trying to get a clamshell
14	that was recyclable.
15	And being, and everybody really happy,
16	happy, happy. Yes, we got it. And then the end
17	of the day the glue that applied the label to the
18	clamshell negated the whole dang thing. It was
19	over. There's no discussion. They wouldn't take
20	it.
21	So that's the reason I ask now.
22	Because in my mind back then even it was sort of

1	like, gosh and gee whiz, you got something here.
2	And, you know, what is the alternative? So
3	anyway, thank you. And to Brian's point, it's
4	complicated.
5	MEMBER CALDWELL: It's nuanced.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Just building on
7	that, Wood. Did you glean any information about
8	how common is this product being used? And in
9	what sort of scale of application?
10	Not to lose the forest for the trees,
11	is this something that, you know, these questions
12	are representing, you know, a large material
13	contamination? And if we don't figure it out, or
14	is it who's using this? And I didn't see the
15	answer. But I didn't know if you had
16	MEMBER TURNER: No, I don't know the
17	answer to that. That's a good question. But I
18	feel like that's a clear, that's a question that
19	we could articulate for further feedback in the
20	next few months.
21	MEMBER D'AMORE: Yes. It's mostly not
22	used by itself. It will go under a weed mat.

Τ	And so again, in terms of an inspection process i
2	have no idea how that would go.
3	But in the berry world, in the,
4	particularly the blueberry world it is widely
5	used. But you don't see it, because it's tucked
6	under a weed mat, or used in another, in a form
7	that is not highly visible.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Brian.
9	MEMBER CALDWELL: Just one quick
10	comment about that. And it was mentioned the
11	other day in some comments. And that is the
12	paper pot products.
13	I believe they use recycled paper in
14	one of their constituents. So that would be, and
15	we approved that, you know, thinking that paper
16	was quite benign basically, or recycled paper.
17	And the other place I'm thinking might
18	be in municipal composts. And I don't know,
19	Kyla, maybe you would be able to tell us. Do
20	people, are people allowed, are growers allowed
21	to use municipal type of compost? Yes, okay. So
22	that might be another one.

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Sorry, Kyla, then
2	Nate.
3	MEMBER SMITH: Yes. I was going to
4	just say that when I was looking at the certifier
5	comments to see, you know, based on their numbers
6	provided. It seems to be a little all over the
7	place, you know.
8	Like, I know PCO didn't have a lot
9	that, I think we just had like one. So, anyway
L 0	interesting. I did see, Nate, I think you had
L1	asked about types of producers.
L2	I think one certifier had reporter
L3	smaller scale producers. What type of crops,
L 4	they didn't say that. But I did, scale might be
L 5	a factor. And, Allison, you had asked about
L 6	cardboard. OMRI does list cardboard for this
L7	use.
L8	MEMBER LEWIS: And I'll just add a
L 9	dataset of one that my OSP includes cardboard.
20	And there is a restriction that says no glossy or
21	colored ink. So, okay. Thanks.
22	Well that's not in the annotation.

1	right. The annotation always says glossy colored
2	inks. So glues are not part of the restriction
3	there.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: So, to beef up
5	that dataset, maybe the community could provide
6	some, if you have any data on the application of
7	this material. I think we'd all benefit from
8	that.
9	MEMBER TURNER: Absolutely.
LO	MEMBER BRUCH: All right. That was
L1	great discussion. Thank you, Wood. Thanks,
12	everybody.
L3	MEMBER TURNER: Not sure what to do,
L 4	but it's going to be interesting for sure.
L 5	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes. All right. And I
L 6	did advance the screen so everybody could see the
L 7	second listing. And thank you for noting that,
L 8	Wood, also.
L 9	So, we'll be moving on to plastic
20	mulch next. So, this one is listed at 205.601
21	synthetic substances allowed for use in organic
22	crop production, (b) as herbicides, weed barriers

1	as applicable to mulches.
2	And (ii) would be plastic mulch and
3	covers, petroleum based other than polyvinyl
4	chloride, PVC. Logan, I'll turn it over to you.
5	MEMBER PETREY: Thank you. Might be
6	the alternative that Jerry was mentioning also.
7	But anyway, so yes, this material has multiple
8	functions, including warming soils, a weed
9	barrier, soil fertility, and water retention,
10	pest management, and tunnel production.
11	They're manufactured by melting
12	polyethylene resin pellets intended to actually
13	make the shape, the width that's needed.
14	Many commenters support the relisting
15	of this material, but asking for the research of
16	the biodegradable biobased mulch in conjunction
17	with their support.
18	For example, a commenter said, we
19	support the continued listing of plastic mulch
20	and covers. We support this continued listing
21	while simultaneously anxiously waiting for the
22	biodegradable biobased mulch film.

1 Another commenter saying, we suggest that the NOSB and organic community develop a 2 plan to establish priorities for the reduction of 3 plastic use down the road, while recognizing that 4 5 in some uses it is essential at this time. 6 Τn the meantime support the we relisting of this product. Also when we discuss, 7 you know, what, who are the producers that use 8 newspapers and, you know, things of that, I think 9 10 it would be interesting to ask certifiers to list 11 maybe the acres or the amount of producers that are using plastic mulch. 12 We do talk about it a lot. 13 It comes 14 And just wondering how much of an impact up. this product really is on the organic industry, 15 16 how much food it actually does produce. I think that that would be interesting, to be able to 17 18 identify how many acres is using this type of material. 19 20 I mean, it's enough to be able to give 21 it like a subset name. It's called plasticulture 22 farming. I mean, it's got to be significant.

1	And we need to understand that when we're looking
2	at the research for the biodegradable biobased
3	mulch. How much of that impact, you know, is
4	coming?
5	And, because this is, you know, a
6	concern for our stakeholders, you know, the
7	plastics. And how are we going to, there was a
8	commenter that mentioned a phase out, you know.
9	How are we going to handle this long term?
10	This will sunset again, and it will
11	come back up. So, I think if we can get an idea
12	of how many acres and which crops. Not just, you
13	know, if we do acres overall it's going to look
14	relatively small compared to all the grain and,
15	you know, the row crop commodity, which are, you
16	know, are huge.
17	But if we can look at it maybe on the
18	per crop basis, or how that is. But anyway, so I
19	again, we talk about this product a lot. But
20	I'm going to open it up to anybody for questions.
21	Yes, Nate.

Nate.

CHAIR POWELL-PALM:

1	MEMBER PETREY: Oh, I'm sorry. Nate,
2	you got it.
3	MEMBER LEWIS: I think that point you
4	brought up, Logan, is important to consider if we
5	do move forward with something around
6	communication with NASS. So, that would be
7	really important data that they could collect at
8	a future survey. I just wanted to note that.
9	And also note that biodegradable
10	biobased mulch as it currently is listed is not
11	actually an available product. So, it's not
12	something that people can use.
13	It's not something that can actually
14	replace some of these acres. And I think that
15	just needs to be stated again and again, that
16	that product that we have listed doesn't exist.
17	MEMBER PETREY: That's right. Doesn't
18	exist. And there's still contention around that
19	in itself.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Wood.
21	MEMBER TURNER: Logan, I'm wondering,
22	there was one commenter that sort of this cycle

several times in the comments wrote that under 1 2 OFPA all of these listings should say specifically what is the condition. 3 What is the use of the material? 4 What 5 is it, how is it, how should it be applied? is the use? And the lack of specificity around 6 some of these listings is problematic in that 7 reviewer's perspective. 8 And I'm just wondering, do you feel 9 10 like that would be a, something like that would help this particular listing? And then you sort 11 of alluded to it in your comments. 12 But I'm just wondering, like is this 13 14 an example of one where, you know, we're all 15 hearing about, we're all thinking about this 16 plastic issue, and how to rein this in, how to figure out what to do about it. 17 18 Is one of the ways to do it, one way is, is one of the ways to think about it, to just 19 20 start to get really specific about the conditions 21 within which we're talking about allowing these 22 for this material. I don't know.

1	MEMBER PETREY: Sure. Do you mean as
2	like adding annotations for it? Or maybe in the
3	OSP
4	MEMBER TURNER: Yes.
5	MEMBER PETREY: getting something
6	that
7	MEMBER TURNER: I was thinking
8	annotation. But, yes.
9	MEMBER PETREY: Annotation. Yes. So
10	some people really love annotations. And some
11	people are really hesitant to add a lot of
12	annotations to it.
13	So, yes, I guess we can discuss that
14	and see if maybe that is part of, I don't want to
15	say phase out. But maybe that's part of how we
16	can progress with this material.
17	And that, whether it's looking at
18	certifiers, you know, whether they can have
19	restrictions, or that looking at the need basis
20	for their user.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Kyla.
2.2	MEMDED OMITHIA Voc Mond I

MEMBER SMITH: Yes. Wood, I was going

1	to respond to your comment about that comment in
2	several comments. And so, I believe that the
3	reference in OFPA is 75, or 64.17, sorry.
4	And it says, like in (b) the content
5	of the list, the list established under
6	Subsection A shall contain and itemized by
7	specific use or application of each synthetic
8	substance permitted under Subsection C(1), or
9	each natural substance permitted under Subsection
10	C(2).
11	And so, the crops list is divided by
12	use. So, I think, I mean, my interpretation is
13	the way that the current crops list is
14	categorized satisfies that condition in OFPA.
15	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you, Kyla. It
16	sounds like more of a macro, macro definition
17	than potentially Okay. I did have a question.
18	A question that
19	MEMBER TURNER: Thank you for saying
20	that.
21	MEMBER BRUCH: Oh, no problem. I
22	actually had the same question. And I talked to

1	my table mate here prior to the meeting start on
2	that. But it was a good one to bring forth to
3	the community.
4	Logan, I did have a question for you.
5	Just for maybe understanding, we did ask the
6	question on removal of these substances. And for
7	seasonal crops, I mean, I think that's somewhat
8	intuitive on removal.
9	But for trees and things like that,
10	these used in, these plastic mulches used in
11	orchards, do we have an idea of the removal of
12	those plastics? I saw longevity could be, there
13	was another comment on the ten or 12 years. So
14	
15	MEMBER PETREY: Right.
16	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes.
17	MEMBER PETREY: And I know that
18	plastics are manufactured depending on how long
19	you want, you kind of want that in the ground.
20	We might have to move that over to Jerry. Do you
21	have any, because I am not a perennial crop
22	farmer, and don't have that. And so, no, I don't

Τ	nave that.
2	But I'm glad you mentioned the
3	question that we have. I didn't see a reference
4	to that. It was more everybody saying, no, we
5	remove it all, you know. Everybody was saying,
6	no, we get it done. But, Jerry, do you have
7	anything to that?
8	MEMBER D'AMORE: I can't be more
9	helpful than what you just said.
10	MEMBER PETREY: Okay. No, I'll look
11	into it, Amy, over the summer.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate.
13	MEMBER LEWIS: I can provide a little
14	bit of insight from Washington
15	MEMBER PETREY: Oh, thank you.
16	MEMBER LEWIS: in the tree fruit
17	industry that, from my understanding the use of
18	heavier weed mats, which might be in multiple
19	seasons is not a typical practice.
20	There certainly might be some orchards
21	that are doing that. But the typical use of
22	plastic mulches for sort of seasonal weed

1	control, or light reflection, or various other
2	purposes like that, which are, you know, similar
3	to annual crops removed, are easily removable,
4	but potentially could be reused year, after year,
5	after year.
6	MEMBER PETREY: Okay. Thank you.
7	MEMBER QUARCOO: Now, there's been a
8	lot of talk and research about biodegradable
9	biobased mulch. But you talk to some farmers,
10	and I don't know whether there are variations of
11	them.
	01101111
12	You talk to some farmers, especially
12	You talk to some farmers, especially
12 13	You talk to some farmers, especially in hot regions. They say it doesn't last through
12 13 14	You talk to some farmers, especially in hot regions. They say it doesn't last through the years. They put that mat out there. Within
12 13 14 15	You talk to some farmers, especially in hot regions. They say it doesn't last through the years. They put that mat out there. Within a short time weeds are poking out.
12 13 14 15	You talk to some farmers, especially in hot regions. They say it doesn't last through the years. They put that mat out there. Within a short time weeds are poking out. And so, this plastic thing,
12 13 14 15 16	You talk to some farmers, especially in hot regions. They say it doesn't last through the years. They put that mat out there. Within a short time weeds are poking out. And so, this plastic thing, considering there's micro plastics in everything,
12 13 14 15 16 17	You talk to some farmers, especially in hot regions. They say it doesn't last through the years. They put that mat out there. Within a short time weeds are poking out. And so, this plastic thing, considering there's micro plastics in everything, it will have to be dealt with at some point if we
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	You talk to some farmers, especially in hot regions. They say it doesn't last through the years. They put that mat out there. Within a short time weeds are poking out. And so, this plastic thing, considering there's micro plastics in everything, it will have to be dealt with at some point if we keep kicking it down the line.

farmers find it useful. It works for them for 1 2 the purpose of which it was made. PETREY: Yes. So, 3 MEMBER biodegradable biobased mulch, we did have the, in 4 5 the fall we changed to the 80 percent, which we, as Nate said, we do not have that product yet. 6 And you're right. 7 There are, for it, the conventional 8 people who have used And compared to the plastic mulch, from 9 10 what I've experienced plastic mulch users are 11 expecting two seasons out of that, out of the film. 12 And so they'll, they may put it down 13 14 for a high value crop in the spring, like a 15 tomato or a pepper. And then it kind of lasts 16 all summer there. And then they get rid of the 17 crop. 18 And then they plant into it with a lesser value crop, maybe squash, or something to 19 20 try and get the benefit of that, of what's 21 remaining of that, of the plastic. And so 22 they'll use it for maybe a full year, or even

1 more than that. Whereas, from what I understood from 2 organic farmers that are using plastic mulch, 3 4 they're removing at the end of every season 5 because the weed, it isn't keeping the weeds There are holes. There are tears, things 6 back. And so, they're not getting multi 7 that happen. 8 seasons out of one type. So, the biodegradable biobased mulch, 9 10 if it does decompose that, from what I understand 11 from plastic farmers, that's okay. Because they removing it at the end of 12 are the season. 13 They're not counting on it, you know, 14 through the next season. 15 So, farmers that were using it were very eager to, even though they've done maybe 16 some trialing on the conventional round, they 17 18 were eager for this technology to come on so that they didn't have to deal with the plastic and the 19 20 trash and, you know, as the recycling is really 21 difficult for it. 22 MEMBER BRUCH: Any more discussion for

1	Logan? Thank you, Logan, so much. Appreciate
2	it. All right, Brian, you're up. This is
3	aqueous potassium silicate. It is listed,
4	there's two listings for it. Would you like to
5	combine those listings?
6	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yes.
7	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay. I'll read those
8	in the record then. Okay. So we have it listed
9	at 205.601 synthetic substances allowed for use
10	in organic crop production (e) as insecticides,
11	including, let's see, acaricides, I'm assuming,
12	or mite control. Sorry, I'm not familiar with
13	that word as much.
14	Two, aqueous potassium silicate. The
15	silica used in the manufacture of potassium
16	silicate must be sourced from naturally occurring
17	sand.
18	And it's also listed as aqueous
19	potassium silicate under plant disease control
20	(I). So that is, the silica used in the
21	manufacture of potassium silicate must be sourced
22	from naturally occurring sand. Brian, I will

1	turn it over to you.
2	MEMBER CALDWELL: Great. Thanks, Amy.
3	I'll continue our deep dive into materials here.
4	So, yes. This product is used for disease and
5	arthropod management.
6	In the sort of background literature,
7	including the original technical review it's
8	considered quite benign. It's exempt from
9	residue tolerance. It's considered nonhazardous
10	to the public. These are sort of quotes from the
11	TR.
12	In terms of the health environment
12 13	In terms of the health environment impacts were considered negligible. It was
13	impacts were considered negligible. It was
13	impacts were considered negligible. It was nontoxic or/and has a low hazard profile.
13 14 15	impacts were considered negligible. It was nontoxic or/and has a low hazard profile. However, there were some questions about it.
13 14 15 16	<pre>impacts were considered negligible. It was nontoxic or/and has a low hazard profile. However, there were some questions about it.</pre>
13 14 15 16 17	<pre>impacts were considered negligible. It was nontoxic or/and has a low hazard profile. However, there were some questions about it.</pre>
13 14 15 16 17	<pre>impacts were considered negligible. It was nontoxic or/and has a low hazard profile. However, there were some questions about it. And in the previous review some of the commenters were pointing to the, I think it's a 2014 TR, which talked about sort of strange</pre>
13 14 15 16 17 18	impacts were considered negligible. It was nontoxic or/and has a low hazard profile. However, there were some questions about it. And in the previous review some of the commenters were pointing to the, I think it's a 2014 TR, which talked about sort of strange effects on the plants. That it might make the

1 literatures, and looked at some of the studies that were referenced in that TR. 2 And it turns out that actually a lot 3 4 of them, well basically all of them that had 5 these really sort of questionable and bizarre, also growth anomalies of the plants, those were 6 in 7 studies t.hat. were done water solution hydroponic environments where they would actually 8 add silicate solution to the 9 growing water 10 medium, and at much higher levels than would ever be experienced by the plant in a spray kind of 11 situation. 12 13 they were sort of really not 14 looking at the same thing that we're talking 15 about here with using a product as 16 control. And similarly there was, in terms of 17 18 palatability and digestibility, particularly to livestock, one of the studies just noted that as 19 20 livestock feed became over mature, was harvested 21 at different dates and became over mature, it was

less, it higher silica levels in it, and was less

1	palatable. And they were sort of making a
2	correlation there.
3	Again, it was unfortunate to me that
4	that stuff was in the TR. Because it really was
5	not relevant to the products that were being
6	looked at.
7	So, I just wanted to point out that I
8	tried to do some due diligence and really look at
9	these questions that were raised in this review.
10	A new TR was requested. It was very
11	thorough. And one of the questions that it asked
12	was, tried to look at was whether there were
13	hazards to the applicator, particularly a spray
14	applicator.
15	If you're spraying a silica type
16	substance, and it's in really dry conditions, and
17	the water droplets are evaporating, would there
18	be a chance that you would actually be, the
19	applicator could be inhaling, you know, tiny sort
20	of dust particles of this product.
21	And they did some calculations and
22	projections on that and said, no, that is not an

That the size of the particles and the 1 2 droplets of water was such that they would, the particles would always be retained in water 3 4 droplets. And they would make to the plant. 5 that was good to know. But there was one issue that did come 6 And I think needs a closer look. 7 And that is that when this product, when aqueous potassium 8 silicate is sprayed at certain PHs, lower PHs, 9 10 actual, this product, this material actually a, it's not a liquid, it's not a solid. 11 It's a glass. 12 And a lot of times in water solutions 13 14 it doesn't really dissolve. It makes a gel. 15 there are these, you know, it's a little bit different than the way we usually think of a 16 17 dissolved product, or a typical spray material. 18 And so, what were referenced several 19 times in the new TR was that some of it goes into 20 nanoparticle gel form within the droplets. 21 again, in my mind it's like, okay, well, what 22 does that mean, you know, is this a problem or

Τ	not?
2	And I just don't know. So, I think
3	that any kind of input from the community would
4	be great. And we will be looking at that as we
5	move forward.
6	But just to sum up quickly. In terms
7	of relisting on our written comments, four were
8	in favor of relisting, one was opposed, and one I
9	couldn't really figure out whether it was opposed
10	or in favor.
11	CCOF noted that 214 of their growers
12	use this material. And the growers who were,
13	commented in favor of it were pretty enthusiastic
14	about it.
15	So, and I clear, total disclosure, I
16	use it myself. I think it's awesome. And I use
17	it in combination with potassium bicarbonate,
18	which is one of the materials that was mentioned
19	earlier here. And it, you know, it's great.
20	So, yes. I think that's, I'm open for
21	comments on that.

CHAIR POWELL-PALM:

22

Questions for

1	Brian?
2	MEMBER D'AMORE: Yes. I was just
3	looking at the comments from the certifiers. And
4	some like seemed to combine the reporting, and
5	some seemed to split out the reporting from the
6	use.
7	And it seemed like from my read that
8	perhaps it's being more widely used as the
9	insecticide listing versus the plant disease
10	control it seemed. However CCOF did say
11	fungicide insecticide and miticide.
12	So, I guess I was just wondering, I
13	don't know, if there is, if it's more, it's
14	prevalently being used in one listing versus the
15	other?
16	MEMBER CALDWELL: Right, yes. That's
17	a great question. And I don't know the answer.
18	I didn't, wasn't able to parse that out. I use
19	it as a fungicide myself.
20	And I think it's really interesting
21	that so many of the materials we looked at can
22	have affects as plant growth promoters,

1	insecticides, fungicides.
2	You know, they're doing multiple
3	things to the plant organism. And I think that
4	that's fascinating. And sometimes I even
5	hesitate to tease it apart. But I don't know
6	that specific answer.
7	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay. Thank you,
8	Brian. Really appreciate that thorough review.
9	Thank you. All right. Elemental sulfur is next.
10	This was pre-programmed. So okay. Okay. Never
11	mind. All right. We'll continue forward.
12	Elemental sulfur. So we're going to
13	be reviewing the listing at 205.601 synthetic
14	substances allowed for use in organic crop
15	production.
16	And this is, this has three particular
17	listings. I'm going to review all the listings
18	at once, review the comments. And then we'll
19	open it up to discussion.
20	So, this is listed, 5, elemental
21	sulfur (I) as plant disease control, 10 elemental
22	sulfur (j) as plant or soil amendment. And 2,

elemental sulfur. So, basically we're looking at 1 2 it as a soil amendment, plant disease control, and an insecticide. 3 4 Currently, I guess we'll dive into manufacture. Currently the primary source of 5 elemental sulfur is produced as a byproduct of 6 natural gas or petroleum operations in refinery 7 8 processes. 9 International acceptance all across 10 the board. The three uses that we're reviewing 11 here are accepted. Environmental challenges, the 2018 12 technical report confirmed no new 13 information contradicting historical information 14 that characterizes sulfur as an important and 15 relatively safe material for organic agriculture. 16 And then, although low and acute 17 toxicity, sulfur is a respiratory, ocular, and 18 dermal irritant that can significantly impact 19 farm worker health. And farm worker exposure can be mitigated if label recommendations and proper 20 21 PPE recommendations are followed. 22 Getting into the discussion, there was

participation 1 with some great our member community. And the majority of commenters were 2 in favor of this, of relisting for all three 3 And I'll review some concerns as we 4 substances. There was a few concerns expressed. 5 ao. But in general the use of elemental 6 sulfur in organic crop production is one of the 7 8 cornerstones in our farming operation. Alternatives to elemental sulfur do not provide 9 10 the same level of control, and are not compatible with other materials used during the growing 11 12 season. Sulfur has been known and used as a 13 14 pesticide since very early times, as it has been 15 a part of the National List since the inception, 16 since 1995. So, it's a commonly used and very familiar substance. 17 18 And then there was a comment, just a To remove this material would 19 general comment. 20 be, or if this material was removed hundreds if 21 not thousands of acres would be reduced out of 22 production. organic crop So, they were

Τ	indicating just the vitainess of having this as a
2	substance.
3	And again, it was primarily across the
4	board. We got good distribution for comments in
5	support of it continuing with soil amendment.
6	Just saying deficiency in sulfur will affect
7	plant protein, synthesis, structure, and
8	chlorophyll production, making it an important
9	concern for producing high quality crops.
LO	As an insecticide a primary means to
L1	control spider mites. They, the commenters also
L2	mentioned that it's the work horse of a
L3	integrated pest management plan.
L 4	For diseases. It helps control
L5	powdery mildew and a variety of different other
L 6	diseases, brown rot, apple scab, and fire blight.
L7	A few commenters that had concerns
L8	surrounded mainly the issue of health
L 9	environmental impacts. The drift of dust may be
20	harmful to humans, plants, and aquatic systems.
21	And since much of the sulfur is being
22	derived from scrubbing from the burning of fossil

1	fuels there could be the heavy metal
2	contamination associated with this product.
3	There was a group that wanted clear
4	annotations. They actually recommend three. I
5	know that's out of the scope of what we're going
6	to be doing today with the sunset review.
7	But their annotation requests
8	surrounded specific use, the worker protection,
9	and then some kind of limits on heavy metal
10	contamination.
11	We did ask one question to the
12	community about how often wettable formulations
13	were being used. Because in prior Board
14	conversation that was a comment that was
15	mentioned, that there are multiple formulations
16	of sulfur.
17	And this was really interesting from
18	the community, and really insightful. One
19	commenter said they supported it 100 percent,
20	just because of reducing dust, eliminating dust.
21	And then therefore reducing respiratory issues.
22	However, some groups, farmer groups

1	mentioned that having both combinations, they
2	work in tandem, both the dusting applications of
3	sulfur and the wettable applications of sulfur.
4	They have different efficacies. And
5	dusting is preferred over wettable sulfur for
6	powdery mildew. More thorough coverage during
7	application than the wettable sulfur. When fruit
8	is present it can increase the risk of residue on
9	the fruit. So, that was really great insight on
L 0	that.
L1	There was specialty equipment that
12	some fruit producers are using to really
L3	eliminate some of the dust that's in the air from
L 4	sulfur.
L5	And on my particular farm I use it as
L 6	a soil amendment. It, really, we talk about
L7	organic producers, and nitrogen being kind of an
L8	extreme limiting factor with producing crops.
L 9	But sulfur and nitrogen work in tandem
20	with each other. And if you have the right ratio
21	it actually makes your nitrogen more efficient.
22	So, when you kind of unlock more

1	pieces to the puzzle, and apply a systems
2	approach, you can get, you know, more efficiency
3	sometimes if these nutrients are used in tandem.
4	It's a moveable nutrient. So, we have
5	to really make sure we're testing for it annually
6	with our soil sample, just to know if we're
7	deficient or not.
8	And in terms of wheat production it
9	really drives their protein. We talked about
10	this just last night in passing. But the
11	importance of sulfur is really great, at least on
12	Midwest farms for our crop production.
13	So I will, with that I'll open it up.
14	Brian, I'm expecting a question from you. Just
15	kidding. You don't have to. Okay.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right.
17	MEMBER BRUCH: We can keep moving
18	then.
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And folks, just
20	for anyone who is eagerly anticipating bathroom
21	break, or anything, we think we just go to lunch
22	at 12:30. And then, we'll have a hard stop and

1	probably finish up after lunch. And then, move
2	into livestock.
3	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay, Brian, actually,
4	since you had no questions, you're going to go
5	next. No substance there. Anyway, we're going
6	to be moving on to lime sulfur.
7	So it's listed at 205.601 synthetic
8	substances allowed for use in organic crop
9	production (I) as plant disease control, (6) lime
10	sulfur. Go ahead.
11	MEMBER CALDWELL: Thanks, Amy. And I
12	want to say that oftentimes, in actually,
13	researchers' minds, for some reason, in apple
14	researchers' minds, lime sulfur, and sulfur are
15	lumped together. And they're actually pretty
16	different.
17	So I'm really glad that our process
18	regards them as two different materials. And
19	lime sulfur is made from sulfur and limestone ir
20	a very energy heat intensive process.
21	And it results in a product that's
22	very caustic, and very highly alkaline, very

And so it really has different kinds 1 non-acid. 2 of properties than sulfur. Although it's used for a lot of the 3 4 same kind of purposes. However, similarly to 5 sulfur, it's been in use a long time, and a lot of our particularly fruit and vegetable growers 6 really depended on it heavily. 7 In terms of the public comments, they 8 emphasize that, many of them. And they were 13 9 10 in favor of relisting. And one that was in favor 11 of relisting, but also, as Wood pointed out, the same group I'm sure, say that we should specify 12 13 the uses. 14 Which, fortunately, from Kyla's help, 15 we know is already being done by the way that the 16 listing is organized. So I don't feel, I feel 14 in 17 like basically there favor of were 18 relisting and zero opposed, which is the most one-sided I've seen in any of my reviews. 19 So it is, has been in use a long time, 20 21 highly effective. is little Ιt а bit 22 hazardous to the person who's mixing. The

1	concentrated material is really quite caustic.
2	And you can, you know, if you touch your eyes or
3	something, you can really have a major problem.
4	And so, in some States, including New
5	York, it is one of the very few organic
6	pesticides, that is a restricted use material.
7	So you'd have to have a pesticide applicator
8	license to use it in New York State.
9	But it's effective and people are
10	using it, being successful with it, and want it
11	relisted. So I think that's, that's my oh, in
12	terms of the environmental and health effects,
13	basically, once it's been sprayed, it is pretty
14	benign.
15	It is not dangerous to the consumer at
16	all or even the environment. It sometimes has a
17	deleterious effect on beneficial mites, but that
18	is handled by the growers with an IPM system of
19	careful timing of their spraying.
20	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you, Brian. And
21	I want to make note. This also is listed, it has
22	two listings. So I just wanted to make note for

1	the record.
2	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yes, it's an
3	effective microsite and fungicide, basically,
4	yes.
5	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you, Brian.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate?
7	MEMBER LEWIS: Just for the record, I
8	just want to make sure it's captured that it's
9	also an essential element in non-antibiotic fire
10	blight control. Which is critical to what we saw
11	earlier this morning as the number one crop grown
12	in the U.S. is apples.
13	So without lime sulfur, we'd have a
14	lot of challenge, a lot more challenges. And a
15	lot, probably a lot more exiting of apple acreage
16	out of organic and back to conventional because
17	of the loss of antibiotics and the fire blight
18	control.
19	MEMBER CALDWELL: Great, great point,
20	Nate, absolutely.
21	MEMBER JOHNSON: Thank you, Brian.
22	Just to speak briefly to two of the points that

1	you made. I've heard anecdotally that sulfur
2	products are one reason that farm worker
3	organizations have not wholeheartedly gotten
4	behind organic because sulfur is still hazardous
5	and harmful to farm workers.
6	And I've been trying to kind of tease
7	out which products specifically and get a little
8	bit more information to help us assess that as we
9	consider all of these products. And I haven't
10	been very successful in that.
11	So to those of you who are listening
12	out in the crowd, if you do have information
13	about worker impacts of these products, we'd love
14	to hear about it.
15	I think they're, you know, essential
16	in many producers' rotations. But it's something
17	that I'm trying to keep an eye on and learn more
18	about.
19	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yes, thanks,
20	Allison. That's a great point. And I would
21	so in the East, basically, or the Northeast
22	anyways, we don't use sulfur is a dust. But I

think that might be the real issue there. 1 not sure. But in terms of, of lime sulfur after 2 it's sprayed at the rates that I am aware 3 4 of, it's really not hazardous to the workers. 5 MEMBER BRUCH: Yes, and that's a good question, Allison. And it really is applicable 6 7 with elemental sulfur. And the prior listing, in various uses, both as a soil amendment both as 8 9 disease and pest mitigation. In the powder form, 10 when you're applying it, there is dust, and it 11 does cause respiratory issues. There's a couple of studies and we 12 reviewed 13 them in subcommittee about 14 respiratory challenges. And some comments, 15 commenters mentioned that following the label requirements and PPEs, that should help reduce 16 17 challenges. 18 also а study There was and we discussed this in subcommittee, just about maybe 19 there's increased harm to children. And we did 20 21 review several articles looking at that. 22 looking at children in general, and the impact

1	there. Jerry brought that up in our subcommittee
2	review.
3	And there is some studies that show
4	children are more susceptible to respiratory
5	issues. And there's also additional studies that
6	say they may not be more susceptible, per se,
7	outside of they're closer to the ground.
8	They play in the dirt and things like
9	that. So they're just more exposed to those
10	respiratory challenges through their, just their
11	actions. So it is something to be aware of for
12	sure. Thank you. Yes, Dilip?
13	MEMBER NANDWANI: Yes, Brian, very
14	quick. This is insecticide. So any effect or
15	study, are you aware of, of effect on beneficial
16	insects? And second, any alternative to lime
17	sulfur? Thank you.
18	MEMBER CALDWELL: Great, thanks,
19	Dilip. Yes, so I'm not 100 percent sure of this,
20	but I think that the, by far the primary use of
21	lime sulfur for arthropods would be for mites.
22	And yes, it is it is harmful to, it sort of just

1	kills all mites pretty effectively.
2	And so, it kills the beneficial mites,
3	as well. And so, what can happen I think as
4	Logan pointed out, sometimes you'll get a flare
5	up of your pest issue if you've really wiped out
6	all the good guys.
7	And that's very common in conventional
8	agriculture. And with this material, it can be a
9	problem, too. But there are very, quite well
10	documented IPM protocols that will allow you to
11	use it and not flare up your pests.
12	So yes, you are hurting your
	100, 100 000 000 1000 1000
13	beneficials. But if you use it the in the right
13	
	beneficials. But if you use it the in the right
14	beneficials. But if you use it the in the right way, the right timing, you won't have a flare up,
14 15	beneficials. But if you use it the in the right way, the right timing, you won't have a flare up, and you just avoid that that big becoming a
14 15 16	beneficials. But if you use it the in the right way, the right timing, you won't have a flare up, and you just avoid that that big becoming a serious problem.
14 15 16 17	beneficials. But if you use it the in the right way, the right timing, you won't have a flare up, and you just avoid that that big becoming a serious problem. So I don't know about other you know,
14 15 16 17	beneficials. But if you use it the in the right way, the right timing, you won't have a flare up, and you just avoid that that big becoming a serious problem. So I don't know about other you know, more generalist insect predators, or I'm not sure
14 15 16 17 18	beneficials. But if you use it the in the right way, the right timing, you won't have a flare up, and you just avoid that that big becoming a serious problem. So I don't know about other you know, more generalist insect predators, or I'm not sure about that. But it's, you know, it's a harsh, a

1	negative impact on the insect, on the beneficial
2	insects, but it doesn't seem to be, that I'm
3	aware of, a big problem. Not like the beneficial
4	mites, which do get hammered, can get hammered by
5	it, so. So is that?
6	MEMBER NANDWANI: Yes, thanks.
7	MEMBER CALDWELL: In terms of
8	alternatives?
9	MEMBER NANDWANI: Alternatives, yes.
10	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yes, well, I think
11	Nate made a really good point about fire blight.
12	And I would say that lime sulfur is, is a really
13	central material along with copper and some of
14	the biologicals.
15	But each of them has its place in the
16	system of managing fire blight. And its place
17	and in its time. So for the specific uses of
18	lime sulfur, I don't think there is anything even
19	close to being as effective at like, sort of
20	wiping, over overwintering, inoculum, that sort
21	of thing as lime sulfur.
22	And I think that the research that's

1	being done in this area is really pretty
2	intensive. And I'm sure that as time goes on,
3	we're going to have more and more effective tools
4	in the toolbox that are approved for organic that
5	will help us to manage, you know, some of these
6	really problem diseases like fire blight. So,
7	yes.
8	MEMBER NANDWANI: Thanks, Brian.
9	MEMBER QUARCOO: I have a quick
10	comment. When I read about a product that has
11	effects on beneficial organisms, and we are not
12	trying to get products to be 100 percent safe for
13	them. It may not be a realistic.
14	But when I see something that is
15	described as harsh, and has that kind of effect,
16	especially for organic growers, that could become
17	a problem. Because a number of pest problems
18	that we have, is because we were using pesticides
19	to manage pests.
20	And then, we ended up wiping out the
21	beneficials more than the intended benefit. It
22	gave us a initial benefit. Then we wiped out so

1	many beneficials that the first line of defense,
2	when there was a later outbreak, was almost
3	non-existent.
4	And for organic growers, who typically
5	do not have access to quick fixes, like
6	conventional so you get the immediate benefit,
7	but when the blowback comes back, it becomes even
8	more difficult.
9	And sometimes there are insects and
LO	mites, that actually their response when you
L1	expose them to something that doesn't kill them
L2	or wipe them out, is that they increase their
L3	reproductive rate.
L 4	And so, actually, the numbers begin to
L5	go up after you have applied to stuff. So this
L 6	whole beneficial pest balance, I would like to
L7	take a closer look at what the data says.
L8	MEMBER CALDWELL: Thank you, so much,
L 9	Franklin. And we were going to rely on your
20	wisdom and your knowledge very much as we go
21	forward in all this. So appreciate that, yes.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yes. Kyla?

1 MEMBER SMITH: I'm going to make a 2 comment here, too. So we were talking about the practice standard at 206. And so, one of the 3 4 things that it says, that producers must 5 before they're just jumping to use a synthetic on the National List, is that they need to use 6 7 management practices. And in regards to pest problems, one 8 of the mechanical and physical methods encouraged 9 10 for use is the development of habitat for natural 11 enemies. And anyway, just a bunch of other 12 things. 13 And so, the requirement at 202 for all 14 producers to be incorporating biodiversity. So 15 anyway, it's a systems approach. And anyway, it's not perfect, but there are other parts of 16 the regulations that encourage protecting our 17 18 beneficials. 19 MEMBER CALDWELL: Thank you, Kyla. 20 couldn't be more supportive of what I think of a 21 lot of times as deep organics where people are 22 really structuring the system so that it is sort

1	of self-reinforcing and resilient from many
2	different angles. And so, yes, absolutely.
3	That's, I think, I think it's critical for
4	success in organic farming. So, yes.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Jerry?
6	MEMBER BRUCH: Jerry?
7	MEMBER D'AMORE: Yes, I have a
8	question from my friend Brian. And it's somewhat
9	tongue in cheek. So did you use the word harsh
10	to get exactly where you got to right now? Was
11	that, was that delivered? I reach I take it
12	back. I wasn't thinking more than like the next
13	sentence.
14	MEMBER CALDWELL: I wasn't thinking
15	more than like in the next sentence ahead, so.
16	MEMBER BRUCH: All right. Thank you
17	for that review. Thanks for all the discussion
18	on that. We will move forward. We'll try to get
19	at least one more in before we break for lunch
20	here. The next one on the list is liquid fish
21	products. I'll be reviewing that one.
22	It's listed at 205.601, synthetic

1	substances allowed for use in organic crop
2	production, (I) as plant disease control
3	sorry, I didn't mean that, sorry, rewind. Okay,
4	sorry.
5	It's still listed at 205.601,
6	synthetic substances allowed for use in organic
7	crop production, (J) as plant or soil amendment,
8	(8) liquid fish products can be pH adjusted with
9	sulfuric, citric, or phosphoric acid.
10	The amount of acid shall use shall not
11	exceed the minimum needed to lower the pH to 3.5.
12	The use of this product, liquid fish products
13	are used as fertilizer for production of organic
14	crops.
15	They can deliver important nutrients
16	that can reduce certain nutrient stresses, which
17	can in turn improve crop yields. The
18	manufacturer of this product is essentially
19	chopped fish byproducts. That's the component.
20	International acceptance EU does
21	not list liquid fish, but allows fish meals. The
22	rest of our international review partners

1	indicate that they allow processed fish, or yes,
2	allow processed fish into organic crop
3	production.
4	Environmental issues global impacts
5	of commercial fisheries on marine ecosystems
6	include documented declines and, in some cases,
7	collapses due to over-harvesting.
8	In the fall of 2020, the Board
9	proposed approved and recommended to the NOP to
LO	add an annotation to liquid fish products that
L1	adds sourced only from fish waste, by-catch, or
L2	invasive species.
13	So really narrowing down the scope of
L 4	what the initial components to produce liquid
L5	fish products could be. We did receive a lot of
L 6	comments on this particular item.
L7	Six farmer groups, consultants from
L 8	advocacy groups, companies, five farmers, six
L 9	certifier comments. They were all really pretty
20	supportive of this listing.
21	And indicated it's just used widely in
22	the farmer community. Two groups wanted more

1	restrictive annotations, even further than what
2	the Board recommended to the NOP. That's
3	pending.
4	Comments in favor, stated this product
5	is widely used to produce organic tree fruit, and
6	also vegetables and produce. Farmers that use
7	this state that it delivers important nutrients,
8	so not only nitrogen delivers phosphorus and
9	other micronutrients.
10	The concerns essentially, are just the
11	fish, in and of itself, and harvesting, and the
12	impact that the that can have in the environment.
13	Fish that do not necessarily have a commercial
14	value may have an ecological value.
15	So that's another way to look at this.
16	Just because we're using fish waste, that
17	doesn't mean that it might not disrupt the whole
18	ecosystem there. We are preventing fish to be
19	solely used to make this product. We're using
20	fish waste.
21	However, does that provide incremental
22	financial value for the initial harvesting

1	because they have a secondary income source with
2	their waste streams? So that was a concern as
3	well.
4	There was a concern that synthetic
5	liquid fish products are not essential. There's
6	a concern with contamination with PFAS, as well.
7	This was one that I that I did ask one
8	our oral commenters was about concerns with
9	possible fortification with phosphorus, some of
10	the formulations of these liquid fish products
11	and they're kind of, they can be blended type
12	products that are available out there.
13	There is concerns that potentially
14	increased phosphorus levels are used in the
15	initial formulation. And then, ingredients are
16	added after the fact to get the pH back to 3.5.
17	We're testing the final pH of the
18	product, so we don't know the steps in the
19	middle. Could that happen? That was the
20	question by a commenter.
21	And then also we asked about is the
22	annotation clear and easily enforced. We asked

1	our stakeholders. Most certifiers said that the
2	annotation was clear and could be enforced.
3	One manufacturer said 3.5 is too tight
4	of a tolerance, because every batch needs to be
5	formulated with a potential ratio just with what
6	the overall product is and the income stream.
7	So he wanted a more wider type pH
8	range. The pH, getting the pH at 3.5, though,
9	3.5 or a low pH like that, helps with stability
10	of the overall product. That's the reason for
11	needing to get it at that pH initially.
12	There were a few calls to action. I
13	highlighted the, you know, NOP pending
14	recommendation just to restrict down what fish
15	could be used to make this product. So there was
16	definitely community support to mention that.
17	Let's see. And then, there were also
18	two groups that wanted even further restrictions.
19	Again, that's outside of our purview with this
20	review.
21	But they just wanted to make sure that
22	we were not using viable fish to make these types

Τ	of fertilizers. So with that, I'll open it up to
2	any review.
3	MEMBER TURNER: Amy, I think I missed
4	this in the questions for Jenny yesterday. But
5	can you can you remind me why the, what the delay
6	from the October 2020 Board recommendation is
7	about?
8	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay. I actually, I
9	don't remember her mentioning it. Jared, could
L 0	you fill it in here?
L1	MR. CLARK: It'll be a Jenny question.
L2	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay.
L3	MR. CLARK: So I'll have to circle
L 4	back.
L5	MEMBER TURNER: Sorry about that. I
L 6	forgot
L7	MR. CLARK: No, I'll make note.
L8	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes, no, I appreciate
L 9	the comment. It's, it's good. Yes, we can catch
20	her after lunch for that one, put it on the list.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Logan, did you
22	have a guestion? Okav.

1	MEMBER BRUCH: Good question.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
3	questions? Okay, Brian?
4	MEMBER BRUCH: Brian?
5	MEMBER CALDWELL: Sorry, I can't
6	resist. I'm wondering, Amy, one thing maybe we
7	can ask is that stakeholders, next time around,
8	would be if, if we could drop phosphoric acid
9	from the materials that could be used to adjust
10	the pH?
11	Which would, you know, basically, for
12	good or for evil, it would take a little bit of
13	phosphorus out of the final product that the
14	growers probably like.
15	But on the other hand, it might be,
16	they might be putting on synthetic phosphorus
17	that they're not aware of. But anyways, what
18	I'm just suggesting that we could ask them.
19	That could be a question for the
20	stakeholders next, for next comments. Is that
21	there might be a problem with the passing the
22	sunset then if we want to change it, right? It's

1	a title thing?
2	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes, I have a draft
3	work agenda item that's going to go to you all
4	about annotation changes and how we can move that
5	forward, incorporate that into our processes. So
6	anyway, that'll be discussed at the next
7	executive committee call.
8	MEMBER CALDWELL: Great.
9	MEMBER BRUCH: But you are correct in
10	that we are not able to change the annotation in
11	the sunset vote. However, with hopefully this
12	future work agenda item, there would be a process
13	to do so.
14	So it would be useful to have
15	information, sounds like, on which products are
16	using the different types of acids in the
17	annotation, is what I'm hearing you say.
18	MEMBER CALDWELL: Great, that's very
19	exciting news, actually.
20	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes, I like that's an
21	interesting angle, Brian, with your point there
22	with phosphoric acid that would produce potential

1	fortification there.
2	There's one manufacturer that I
3	remember that provided some written comments and
4	he did reference that it was phosphoric acid that
5	was being used in his process.
6	So I'm not sure of, you know, the
7	other manufacturers if they're using the other
8	acids to do the processing, or if it's primarily
9	phosphoric acid. But it would an interesting
10	question and interesting to learn more about.
11	Thanks.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Franklin?
13	MEMBER QUARCOO: So there current
14	restrictions concerning the use of these fish
15	products on land that low storage surface water
16	bodies where runoff could take them into the
17	water body? Are there restrictions because of
18	eutrophication, and stuff like?
19	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes, I'm glad you
20	brought up that point. That there isn't
21	necessarily restrictions via annotation about
22	that.

1	But that was brought up by other
2	commenters as a environmental concern of just
3	nitrogen runoff, in general, if it's excessively
4	applied and not use with good, good farming
5	practices. So that, that is an environmental
6	concern. Thank you.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate?
8	MEMBER LEWIS: In that vein, we'll
9	direct to the practice standard which does
10	require that all nutrients applied on farms be
11	used in a manner that sort of prevents the runoff
12	of those said nutrients. So fish would not be
13	excluded from that general requirement that
14	farmers would need to comply with.
15	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you, Nate. Any
16	other discussion? Okay.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right.
18	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you.
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Let's break for
20	lunch folks. We're going to come back at 2
21	o'clock, so an hour and a half. See you all back
22	here at 2:00 p.m.

1	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
2	went off the record at 12:31 p.m. and resumed at
3	2:03 p.m.)
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, welcome
5	back, folks. We're going to keep going with
6	crops. I'm going to hand it off to Amy.
7	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay, thank you.
8	Welcome back. Hopefully, everybody had a great
9	lunch. To kick things off, we're going to just
10	finalize a conversation on liquid fish products.
11	Wood, actually had a question. And I see Jenny
12	is here. So Jenny, don't get too comfortable
13	over there.
14	DR. TUCKER: Yes?
15	MEMBER BRUCH: Wood, do you want us?
16	Do you want to ask your question? Represent it?
17	MEMBER TURNER: I just was curious
18	about the October 2020 proposal that was, that
19	shows up is on hold. And I just was curious
20	where that sits, the program.
21	DR. TUCKER: Yes, it is on hold. We
22	did a preliminary analysis on that

1	recommendation. It turns out there are a bunch
2	of other questions that would be raised by that
3	related to statutory authority.
4	We are an international you know,
5	operations around the world can be certified to
6	the standard. So there's authority questions.
7	There's also sheer implementation questions on
8	what the impact of that would be, and what the
9	cost would be to trade.
LO	So at the time, there were and I
L1	would say, now, there are a lot of other
L2	regulatory priorities that we are able to move
L3	forward.
L 4	And so, we decided to further to table
L 5	it, and work on original livestock, OLPS,
L 6	strengthening organic enforcement, inerts, and
L7	all the other priorities.
L8	So right now, it's going to remain on
L 9	hold. Because to unpack that recommendation
20	would take some significant staff time that right
21	now, we don't have. That's not where we want our
22	priority to be.

1	MEMBER TURNER: Got it. I don't mean
2	to poke the bear. I just, is it on hold, or is
3	it I mean, is it I mean, what would it take
4	to get off of hold, I guess, is my question.
5	And I know I should have asked you
6	yesterday. And I don't mean to put you on the
7	spot here, but.
8	DR. TUCKER: I mean, I think, if, if
9	we decided to I don't know, as we've made a, I
L 0	don't, we've haven't made a decision not to do
L1	it. I think one of the things I've committed to
L2	through the regulatory priorities programs is
L3	when we decide not to do something, we will add
L 4	something to that recommendation.
L5	And close it, but explain why. That
L 6	we do owe you an explanation. I don't I think
L7	that we evaluated it enough to know, oh, my
L 8	goodness, this is going to be a big deal. Do we
L 9	want to do it? And we said, we're going to table
20	it for right now. But I don't feel like we've
21	made a decision.

MEMBER TURNER: Thank you.

22

1	DR. TUCKER: No, thank you.
2	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you, Jenny.
3	Thank you, Wood. Okay, next up we're going to
4	turn our discussion to Jerry for sulfurous acid.
5	And okay. Do you want to? You can, go
6	ahead. That's fine.
7	MEMBER D'AMORE: Thank you. Sulfurous
8	acid, 205.601, (J), uses a plant or soil
9	amendment for on farm use only, utilizing 99
10	percent pure elemental sulfur. It is used to
11	neutralize and reduce the success of alkalinity
12	in soil and water.
13	This use supports improve crop yields,
14	and reduces soil degradation. Concerning
15	environmental issues, sulfurous acid appears on
16	the EPA non-food inert list and does not require
17	a tolerance or an exemption from a tolerance.
18	Regarding human health concerns, and
19	per the 2014 TR, sulfurous acid is not expected
20	to be carcinogenic. I'm not overwhelmed with the
21	way that was written, but that's what it says.
22	During the Fall 2018 meeting the NOSB

1	voted unanimously to keep sulfurous acid on the
2	National List. And most of the written comments
3	supported the relisting. One commenter at the
4	time wrote that no synthetic fertilizers should
5	be permitted.
6	The written and oral comments
7	submitted for this Board meeting numbered 16.
8	There were 14 comments in support of relisting
9	with one opposed and one undecided.
10	One commenter noted that sulfurous
11	acid could mask poor soil conditions, but that
12	has no intent of being amended. So I guess it's
13	a note to certification that if it's being used
14	for masking poor conditions with no intent to
15	amend, that's an issue.
16	We did receive a limited scope TR in
17	February of this year and declared it to be
18	sufficient during the subcommittee meeting on the
19	9th of February of this year.
20	The authors did a seemingly complete
21	job of listing potential alternatives and then
22	evaluating these alternatives as being less

1	effective than sulfurous acid.
2	In reviewing the respondents, we
3	basically have a who's who of tree fruit growing
4	in the Pacific Northwest, and perhaps you would
5	like to say something to it. And a quick note on
6	the TR ,I'd like to read what we summarized at
7	subcommittee.
8	Attached below is the TR for sulfurous
9	acid. The TR request was a single question. So
10	a limited TR. What alternatives to sulfurous
11	acid exists that could be used for organic
12	production?
13	And they listed actually elemental
14	sulfur with the caveat that the amount needed
15	would be prohibitive, actually hundreds of
16	thousands of pounds per acre.
17	Gypsum effective with high sodium
18	soils, high sodic but less effective in non-sodic
19	soils. If that needs, if that's sodic, someone
20	should tell me.
21	Chelated micronutrients materials do
22	not alter the soil pH but help plants tolerate

1	alkaline soils, plant induced soil changes. And
2	again with a summary saying there's nothing that
3	really can hold a candle to sulfurous acid in
4	terms of effectiveness. And that's, that's what
5	I have.
6	MEMBER BRUCH: All right. Any
7	questions for Jerry? Thank you. I really
8	appreciate that, Jerry. Yes, Nate, go ahead.
9	MEMBER LEWIS: It's more a statement
10	just to illustrate the value in Washington. That
11	Washington, for those of you that haven't been
12	there, we have a wet side of the State and the
13	dry side of the State.
14	And the wet side generally has more
15	acidic soils and historically has been the side
16	that has grown more blueberries. But then we
17	have a lot of other fungal issues because of the
18	wet side. And all the conditions those bring
19	out.
20	The sulfurous acid has really been
21	instrumental in allowing the east side of the
22	State, which is a lot drier, but has irrigation

1	to participate in the blueberry industry.
2	And they, so they are able to sort of
3	mimic some of those conditions that the acidic
4	soils allow the plant growth to occur. But they
5	have a lot less pest and disease issues because
6	of the arid nature of the climate there.
7	So that's really what, the sulfurous
8	acid has kind of opened the door for fresh market
9	blueberries. You know, Washington produces half
10	the value of the crop, or half the volume of the
11	crop in the United States.
12	It's why they are in all the stores
13	these days, and why it's such a popular product.
14	So just using that to illustrate the necessity
15	of the of crop, especially for blueberries in
16	Washington.
17	MEMBER D'AMORE: Could I plead a point
18	of clarification. The statistic given for
19	blueberry production there was what?
20	MEMBER LEWIS: It's half the volume of
21	organic blueberries are grown in Washington
22	State.

1	MEMBER D'AMORE: Perfect. Okay,
2	organic
3	MEMBER LEWIS: At least according to
4	the
5	MEMBER D'AMORE: No, no
6	MEMBER LEWIS: Statistic I just heard
7	about today.
8	MEMBER D'AMORE: dead on, thank
9	you.
10	MEMBER LEWIS: And I'll add, we're
11	number one, and ahead of California, so.
12	Whenever we get to say that, we say that.
13	MEMBER BRUCH: Any other questions for
14	Jerry? All right, thank you. Appreciate it,
15	Jerry. All right, we'll move on to Logan. Let's
16	see you, you're going to ethylene gas.
17	So it's listed at 205.601, synthetic
18	substances allowed for use in organic production,
19	organic crop, (K) as plant growth regulators, (1)
20	ethylene gas for regulation of pineapple
21	flowering.
22	MEMBER PETREY: Thank you. Yes, this

is from the background, from the TR. Ethylene is 1 growth regulator that 2 plant is produced naturally by plants and has effects 3 as many aspects of plant growth, development and survival 4 5 including seed germination, chute growth, route development, flowering, sex determination, 6 fruit ripening, acquisition of leaves and fruit, 7 senescence of flowers and leaves. 8 9 Ethylene also has a role in plant 10 adaptation to a variety of stresses such drought, flooding, pathogen 11 attack and 12 salinity. Its current listing use is to induce 13 14 uniform flowering in pineapples. It is applied 15 seven to 15 months after planting, and it can be 16 used two to three times in a season. The manufacturing of this product is, 17 18 most ethylene gas is manufactured globally, is a product of petroleum 19 from pyrolysis, 20 hydrocarbon feedstocks. Ethylene gas can also be 21 produced in small quantities in onsite fruit 22 ripening facilities by catalytic generators from

1	ethanol.
2	The international acceptance, there's
3	a wide use of ethylene gas in organic production
4	internationally, including the beginning of
5	bananas, avocados, kiwi, citrus, inducing
6	flowering of pineapples, also controlling the
7	sprouting of potatoes and onions.
8	And a lot of that is post-handling.
9	And so I have this material in the handling side,
10	as well. And so, the only, the only use that I
11	see here as a crop input is the inducement of
12	flowering of pineapple.
13	Everything else is a post-harvest, a
14	post-harvest thing. There is little
15	environmental concern. This materials is
16	explosive, and workers must be trained in
17	handling. Otherwise, the material itself is not
18	toxic.
19	So our questions were asking whether
20	there were alternatives to ethylene. In which we
21	received that there are no alternatives to that.
22	And are there any interest in expanding this

1	use?
2	And the answer was, yes, that there is
3	interest in that from a lot of our commenters.
4	But again, I think a lot of those desired uses
5	are covered in the handling side, on the
6	post-harvest side. And so, I didn't see any
7	additional use for in-season crop inputs for this
8	material. But I'll open it up to you guys.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Questions for
10	Logan? All right, back to you.
11	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay, thank you.
12	Jerry, we're going to turn it back to you for
13	microcrystalline cheese wax.
14	MEMBER D'AMORE: You said that so
15	well.
16	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay. See if I can
17	repeat. All right. It's listed at 205.601,
18	synthetic substances allowed for use in organic
19	crop production.
20	(O) as crop production aids, (1)
21	microcrystalline cheese wax for use in log grown
22	mushroom production must be made without either

1	ethylene-propylene, copolymer, or synthetic
2	colors.
3	MEMBER D'AMORE: Thank you, you just
4	read half the report. This is a substance that I
5	particularly get a kick out of because I get to
6	join the club with some of the growers.
7	It's a product that I grew for six
8	years in Virginia. And what I came away with is
9	that it is a high value crop, very reliable. But
10	let me stick to the script here, and then I'll
11	tell you a bit more about that.
12	Microcrystalline cheese wax has been
13	used in organic agriculture as a production aid
14	in log grown shiitake mushrooms since the 1980s.
15	This product is used to seal holes in hardwood
16	logs, most commonly oak after the shiitake spawn
17	is inserted.
18	Microcrystalline cheese wax is a food
19	grade product made up of a mixture of
20	microcrystalline wax, paraffin wax, and
21	petroleum.
22	For the 2018 TR reference studies

1	there have been no reports that indicate the
2	likelihood of the bio-accumulation of either
3	microcrystalline cheese wax or its breakdown
4	products. There are no known health risks.
5	For this session, there were a total
6	of 13 written and oral comments. None were
7	opposed to relisting. One commenter encouraged
8	continued efforts to source a non-petroleum
9	alternative. Another commenter suggested an
L 0	annotation requiring removing the cheese wax
L1	after use.
L2	At the last sunset review, it was
L3	determined that log grown shiitake mushrooms are
L 4	still widely practiced by many small growers.
L 5	And not this go around excuse me.
L 6	Not this go around, but the last go
L7	around, five years ago that became sort of the
L8	argument for not relisting it, that it just
L 9	wasn't used anymore. And to a certain extent in
20	large production, the log has been replaced by
21	bags that have shavings from the hardwood.
22	But I would venture to say there's

1	still hundreds if not thousands of backyard
2	farming groups that are happy to have this as an
3	income producing way of going forward. Let's
4	see. Yes, I just be repeating myself it
5	breaks down readily. Comments okay, that's
6	it.
7	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you, Jerry. Are
8	there any questions for Jerry?
9	MEMBER D'AMORE: Oh, please ask.
10	MEMBER BRUCH: Nothing? Okay. Oh,
11	Allison has one.
12	MEMBER JOHNSON: I love materials like
13	this because I learned something new about our
14	world every day. As a practical matter, could
15	you actually remove it from a log? That sounds
16	extremely labor intensive, and like it would be
17	challenging to do.
18	MEMBER D'AMORE: No, actually, it's a
19	beautiful system. You get a three inch log that
20	you can have probably three feet long, three to
21	four inches in diameter. And you drill holes in
22	it, and you put the spawn in.

1	And you plug it with the
2	microcrystalline cheese wax. And just keep it
3	sprinkled and come back. And they're, they come
4	right out of the logs. They're there just to be
5	harvested. Is that the question you asked or did
6	I miss it?
7	MEMBER JOHNSON: The question about
8	the annotation was about removing the wax after.
9	Can you just go back through and like pull it?
10	MEMBER D'AMORE: Yes. Sorry, I didn't
11	comment to that. And you're right, it is there.
12	In my experience with it, there's nothing to be
13	found by the time you're harvesting it.
14	And another misconception is, is that
15	the shiitakes come out of the drilled hole.
16	It'll come out of anywhere in the log. But by
17	the time you're finished harvest, the log is
18	decomposing, the mushrooms have done their work.
19	And I don't think you could find the plug to
20	take care of.
21	MEMBER JOHNSON: I'm going to ask you
22	one more question. So you have some matter

1	that's left over. Is that then composted or
2	disposed of? Or
3	MEMBER D'AMORE: Yes, normally
4	composted on spot. It's what you just said, it's
5	an oak log, and it finds its way, either with
6	help or without help.
7	We had enough space. We had enough
8	space. We give it a whole lot of help. But you
9	know, five years later, you had nothing to look
10	at anymore. That may not be a satisfactory
11	answer, but that's the way.
12	MEMBER BRUCH: Jerry, I actually had a
13	question for you. In terms of alternatives you
14	mentioned, you know, there's some new methods to
15	still grow these mushrooms that don't involve
16	this process.
17	MEMBER D'AMORE: Yes.
18	MEMBER BRUCH: But some small
19	producers are using this process. But to connect
20	your world with my world, you know, there's just
21	more of an abundance of non-GMO soybeans.
22	And this was a commenter's question.

1	Is there a way to, now, and I believe that, you
2	know, one of the questions that we asked our
3	stakeholders is it, do we think we can start
4	transitioning off?
5	You know, not to a different
6	production methodology, but just to a different
7	wax substance now that there's more of a
8	prevalence of non-GMO soybeans and soy wax?
9	MEMBER D'AMORE: Certainly, in my
10	time, there was no alternative. And what I read
11	here, it didn't strike me that there was really a
12	strong desire. And I may have missed something,
13	Amy.
14	For some to come and say, I can, I can
15	do it. I just don't see that. There's just,
16	there's not a lot of volume to be running after.
17	The plug is about this big, that big around.
18	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes, I think I saw like
19	1.5 ounces or something
20	MEMBER D'AMORE: Right, right.
21	MEMBER BRUCH: of material per log.
22	So it's pretty small.

1	MEMBER D'AMORE: Yes, yes.
2	MEMBER BRUCH: But I was just curious.
3	Okay.
4	MEMBER D'AMORE: Yes.
5	MEMBER BRUCH: Nate's got a question.
6	MEMBER LEWIS: Yes, just to address
7	that question that you had. My recollection is
8	that non-GMO soy wax was petitioned to the Board.
9	It's a synthetic substance once you kind of get
10	it to the wax form it's considered synthetic. So
11	it would require a petition.
12	And my recollection was it did not get
13	the approval vote because it was a very resilient
14	wax, and so it had a decomposition concern in the
15	environment, in contrast to what we have
16	available now. So that was, that's again, a
17	recollection.
18	So it might be worth going back on the
19	record. But it has been petitioned and looked at
20	pretty thoroughly. And at that time, seems
21	incompatible with OFPA in terms of adding that to
22	the list as an alternative.

1	MEMBER BRUCH: Thanks, Nate,
2	appreciate that. Any other further questions for
3	Jerry? Okay, thank you, so much. All right,
4	we're going to turn it over to Wood next for
5	potassium chloride.
6	So it's listed at 205.602,
7	non-synthetic substances prohibited for use in
8	organic crop production, (E) potassium chloride,
9	unless derived from a mined source and applied in
10	a manner that minimizes chloride accumulation in
11	the soil.
12	MEMBER TURNER: So we're going to move
13	into 602 land, which is, you know, it's an
14	interesting listing for me because it's, it's
15	essentially prohibited but then the annotation
16	creates an allowed use. So it's a, yes, one of
17	those brain benders on how these listings occur.
18	So, this is a material that is,
19	obviously, potassium is incredibly important in
20	agriculture, and this is a means of supporting
21	potassium, increasing potassium in soil. It
22	Obviously, potassium can be used by

1 itself. But it can also be used in complexes 2 like potassium chloride, or as an ingredient in fertilizer blends for soil supplementation. 3 4 It's important to note that chloride is also essential for plants. But the listing, 5 you know, it requires that the use of this 6 material involve the monitoring of chloride use 7 to make sure that salinity levels in the soil are 8 not excessive. 9 10 So also interesting to me is the fact that the allowed use is from a mined source. 11 talk about mining all the time. 12 And the fact 13 that a lot of these materials come from mining 14 operations, which in and of themselves have 15 environmental impacts. 16 From an international standpoint, the material as I understand it, as I can understand 17 18 the international standards is allowed for this use in Canada. 19 Canada allows mined sources. 20 The 21 European Union doesn't specify the use of the 22 material. Other international standards do allow

Ι	some, some usage here.
2	The last time this material came up,
3	it was unanimously voted to relist in this way.
4	We did trigger a TR. And that TR is pending. It
5	was sufficient.
6	But we did consider it sufficient, but
7	we did have some additional questions about the
8	emergence of organic alternatives to potassium
9	chloride.
10	And I understand that we did receive
11	that, but after our, after the materials had
12	closed for the semester. And so, I haven't
13	fully, and I don't think the committee has fully
14	discussed that, or internalized that information
15	from the TR.
16	I don't know exactly when the
17	community would have been able to see it, as
18	well. But certainly hope to hear some feedback
19	from folks.
20	There has been some discussion about
21	potassium sulfate as a cost effective
22	alternative, although it does deliver lower

1	potassium, and the sulfate itself can result in
2	acidification of the soil.
3	So there's been some good discussion,
4	I would say from a community standpoint. In the
5	written comments, we got lots of comments in
6	support of this annotated listing as it reads.
7	It appears in a number of ISPs, many
8	folks are using it. So we heard a number of
9	certifiers in that regard. Other organizations,
10	coalitions, and non-profits supported the
11	continued listing as it is, so.
12	And there was no sort of, from my read
13	of the written materials, no sort of argument to
14	change the listing, or to not list it in this
15	way. Which again, is a prohibited use with an
16	annotation that allows it in these forms. So
17	there you go.
18	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you, Wood. Any
19	questions for Wood? Logan?
20	MEMBER PETREY: Just a comment. We do
21	use potassium chloride at times. We haven't had
22	any accumulation or any problems with chloride

1	build up, anything in the soil. It's an
2	essential element we're kind of are lacking on
3	our sandy soils of about everything.
4	And so, we don't have any issues
5	there. It is good to have the product. It is
6	relatively inexpensive so that we can you know
7	have that potassium for our crops that are pretty
8	high demanding of it. And it does leach.
9	Also to have multiple different
10	products. There are multiple, I guess potash
11	sources. But to be able to have that when there
12	are supply chain shortages, and things like that.
13	So to have it as an option. It may
14	not be the preferred, but. Or even if it is, but
15	just to make sure that it is there. Because it
16	is critical to have that macro-nutrient.
17	MEMBER TURNER: Have you ever had any?
18	So you said you had no build up in chloride, but
19	any, any issues at all? Never?
20	MEMBER PETREY: No, none.
21	MEMBER TURNER: Okay.
22	MEMBER PETREY: None.

1	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you, Logan. I
2	actually have a questions for you about this
3	product. Now your soils, I believe, are high in
4	pH, right?
5	MEMBER PETREY: Yes, naturally they
6	are. Yes.
7	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay. So Woods'
8	comment, he summarized, I believe, a commenter
9	that said, you know, I don't want to necessarily
10	use potassium sulfate because it would do the
11	opposite effect because their soil pHs were lower
12	and sulfate would drive that down.
12 13	and sulfate would drive that down. But in your case, would you choose to
13	But in your case, would you choose to
13	But in your case, would you choose to use the alternative of potassium sulfate? I know
13 14 15	But in your case, would you choose to use the alternative of potassium sulfate? I know it's a little bit more expensive, generally, but
13 14 15 16	But in your case, would you choose to use the alternative of potassium sulfate? I know it's a little bit more expensive, generally, but you get the sulfur with it.
13 14 15 16 17	But in your case, would you choose to use the alternative of potassium sulfate? I know it's a little bit more expensive, generally, but you get the sulfur with it. MEMBER PETREY: Yes, definitely,
13 14 15 16 17	But in your case, would you choose to use the alternative of potassium sulfate? I know it's a little bit more expensive, generally, but you get the sulfur with it. MEMBER PETREY: Yes, definitely, preferred to use the sulfate whenever, and
13 14 15 16 17 18	But in your case, would you choose to use the alternative of potassium sulfate? I know it's a little bit more expensive, generally, but you get the sulfur with it. MEMBER PETREY: Yes, definitely, preferred to use the sulfate whenever, and potassium magnesium sulfate. You know, we like

1	have to do it, if we're using the potassium
2	chloride.
3	So there's other avenues of using it.
4	We can put gypsum out, you know, at certain
5	times. But we do, we do like having, you know,
6	sulfur in that product.
7	But again, it is cheaper to use the
8	other if we're on that budget, you know. And so,
9	it kind of depends. But I do prefer to use a
10	sulfated product.
11	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you. Thanks for
12	that. That's very applicable.
13	MEMBER PETREY: And yes, our soils
14	are, they're relatively neutral. I mean, I guess
15	they are higher than your probably ideal six and
16	a half, or you know, or lower sixes. They are
17	higher.
18	We use the elemental sulfur to pull it
19	down every year or tried to. But we, I haven't
20	contributed most of our pH moving because of, you
21	know, products like that.
22	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes, absolutely. Yes,

1	when we were farming further south of you, we
2	were in the eights with pH. It was pretty high.
3	But I had a question for you on, just looking at
4	your crops.
5	After you use one product or another
6	what I've heard from my soil scientists is that a
7	potassium sulfate type product will actually
8	increase more of the sugar, or the sweetness in
9	your crops, versus the chloride will, you know,
LO	make more of a bitter taste.
L1	I didn't know if there was any?
L2	Looking at it, it was more in maybe grapes.
L3	MEMBER PETREY: Sure.
L 4	MEMBER BRUCH: Or you know, things
L5	like that, but.
L 6	MEMBER PETREY: No, I don't know that.
L7	I haven't done any taste test, you know, test
L8	testing. But I mean, I know that potassium is
L 9	important in moving sugars throughout the plant
20	for that.
21	Which potassium is in both of that.
22	So I don't know if the other macros or micros are

1	contributing, that factor. Or whether just the
2	potassium in certain products are holding on a
3	little bit longer. The, you know, the solubility
4	of each of those, if that contributes to it, I'm
5	not sure.
6	MEMBER BRUCH: Thanks, Logan. So are
7	there any other questions for Wood? All right,
8	perfect. Now we have two more in crops. And
9	they're going to be back to back with Mindee.
10	We're going to start off with sodium carbonate
11	peroxyl hydrate. Okay, and just want to make
12	sure I advance the slide.
13	MEMBER BRUCH: This is listed at
14	205.601, synthetic substances allowed for use in
15	organic crop production. (A) as an algaecide,
16	disinfectant, and sanitizer including irrigation
17	system cleaning systems.
18	(G) sodium carbonate peroxyhydrate,
19	Federal law restricts the use of the substance in
20	food crop production to approved food uses
21	identified on the product label. Go ahead,
22	Mindee.

1	VICE CHAIR JEFFERY: Thank you so much
2	for your patience with my allergies in my sinus
3	infection. Sodium carbonate peroxyhydrate is
4	rapidly dissolved in water and disassociates into
5	oxygen, hydrogen peroxide, and sodium carbonate.
6	Sorry, there is minimal concern for
7	environmental or health risks.
8	There are a couple of possibilities
9	for negative impacts but they're pretty minor.
10	In the comments, there are certifiers in the
11	central regions, and the northern Midwest regions
12	didn't see a lot of use of this substance. But
13	in certifiers who are more on the West Coast
14	list, like 127 users.
15	So they are specifically supporting
16	this for use as a copper alternative in their
17	comments. So regionally, this is interesting
18	material from the farmer's perspective. Loss of
19	this naturalist material can negatively impact
20	farm economies and agricultural production.
21	Another farmer expressed support for
22	the listing and the potential for a more specific

1	annotation as an alternative to copper products.
2	A farmer group described SEP as functioning
3	better than copper sulfate for algae control and
4	specifically noted that copper sulfate only
5	reduces bloom, whereas SEP prevents the growth of
6	algae.
7	In the group comments, one group noted
8	that this material's original intention was to
9	reduce the use of copper sulfate as an algaecide
10	and he questioned if this is happening in
11	practice.
12	Which caused this group to question
13	the essential quality and efficacy of the
14	substance recommending de-listing if it cannot be
15	demonstrated that the material is being used as
16	listed in actual practice.
17	Another group had similar sentiments,
18	expressly requesting the delisting unless the
19	NOSB document evidence that it is effective for
20	its intended use as an alternative to copper and
21	rice production.
22	That was their assertion of the

1	original intention of the use, and that the
2	substance should have a more specific listing.
3	So due to those comments, I went back to the 2007
4	crops subcommittee notes in the NOSB
5	recommendation for relisting.
6	And it sounds like the crops
7	subcommittee from those notes saw some
8	incompatibility with the synthetic materials
9	categories listed by OFA.
10	And then resulting public comments in
11	the full NOSB meaning presented additional
12	information that convinced most board members
13	that the material's environmental impacts were
14	minimal and much more environmentally friendly
15	than copper sulfate, now used as the principal
16	farm pond and rice production.
17	So the groups that aren't necessarily
18	in love with this material, also looked at it as
19	not really falling under an awful category. And
20	this is reflected in the TR.
21	But that the minimal concern and the
22	environmentally friendly alternative to copper

1	sulfate is the position that the earlier board
2	took to put this on the list. And then in
3	another public comment, a stakeholder noted that
4	materials should be looked at through a systems
5	lens.
6	So with the you know, Carla's earlier
7	comment, reminding me about how crops list is
8	divided by a particular use. And that the
9	previous board's recommendation helped me
10	rationalize why and how this material is
11	situated.
12	And it's supported for use, and
13	they're showing that they're using it for
14	algaecides in irrigation and in sanitizers and
15	irrigation systems.
16	So I felt a little bit more
17	comfortable with the pressure built by
18	stakeholders and the rationale of previous boards
19	with the essential quality and necessity for this
20	material.
21	And then another group noted that this
22	material breaks down into hydrogen peroxide and

sodium carbonate which further qualifies it as a 1 material compatible with National List evaluation 2 and criteria. 3 4 And so, definitely noted in a couple of different comments about the efficacy and 5 utility of far 6 the substance. As as t.he 7 questions to the stakeholders were concerned, I just want to apologize if that first question was 8 not clear in its request. 9 10 The subcommittee's understanding is 11 that s SEP is sold as an algaecide, but it has been observed with a master label that includes 12 fungicidal use. 13 14 Additionally, the ΕPA Fact Sheet states that sodium carbonate peroxyhydrate is a 15 16 granular chemical, which is the active ingredient in certain algaecide and fungicide products. 17 18 And due to this information, the subcommittee is seeking information as to whether 19 20 there exists a potential for misdirected use as a 21 fungicide. And so hopefully that clears up the 22 reason for the question.

1	So looking forward to the fall
2	meeting. To answer that question of essential
3	quality and efficacy, I think we really looked to
4	the western regions, and the 127 users listed by
5	one certifier.
6	If you guys could reach out and
7	encourage the stakeholders to engage with the
8	NOSB comment process, I think we could get some
9	great examples of the use and specific efficacy
10	of this substance.
11	MEMBER BRUCH: Thanks, Mindee. Thanks
12	for your review and your requests to the
13	community. Any discussion, any questions for
14	Mindee? Brian, go ahead.
15	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yes, thanks, Mindee.
16	I might have missed it. But did you get a
17	specific response to whether it's being used as
18	an alternative for copper and rice production?
19	VICE CHAIR JEFFERY: I don't remember
20	seeing exactly on this one. If they were saying
21	yes, I'm sorry, farmers, a couple of farmers.
22	It's better than copper sulfate for algae growth.

1	And that had, and they supported the specific
2	annotation, so yes.
3	MEMBER CALDWELL: Okay, great.
4	VICE CHAIR JEFFERY: Not very many.
5	But yes.
6	MEMBER CALDWELL: Thank you. Because,
7	you know, especially Jerry has worked for quite a
8	while and quite hard on the copper and rice and
9	copper and other systems. And it's really good
LO	to fill out the whole picture here if we can.
L1	So, yes, thanks.
L2	MEMBER BRUCH: Thanks, Brian. Any
L3	other questions? Okay, thank you, Mindee. We'll
L 4	maintain to you. Let's advance. We're on
L5	hydrated lime next.
L 6	So this is listed at 205.601,
L7	synthetic substances allowed for use in organic
L 8	crop production. (I) as plant disease control
L 9	for hydrated lime.
20	VICE CHAIR JEFFERY: Thank you. So
21	the growers support listing used in Bordeaux
22	mixes as a fungicide for mildew and other

1 funguses. Another cited it's a necessary tool 2 for plant disease critical control. An orchard 3 grower in Washington cited the importance of the 4 5 three remaining nationalist materials left in organic tree fruit production. 6 Hydrated lime is one of these legacy 7 organic controls for diseases. Noting that use 8 9 in Bordeaux mix is important for treating 10 bacterial gummosis in organic cherries. 11 The grower association supported listed horticultural oils and 12 relisting. Ιt elemental sulfur as alternatives, noting that 13 14 they have limited efficacy listed tools 15 integrated pest management including crop 16 rotation, pruning, and variety selection. Another Association 17 supported 18 stressed the importance of the tool. Those are 19 grower associations and a larger association of 20 public commenters noted that again fungicides 21 a foliar application by a tree used as

viable

growers

cited

few

22

to

alternatives

1	controlling various kinds of mildews.
2	Generally, associations were
3	supportive, citing few viable alternatives. They
4	support this restricted use and requested, and
5	one group supports a restricted use and requested
6	annotation for a more specific user application.
7	Again, I think that the way that it's
8	listed implies the specific user application, but
9	I understand the pressure they're putting there.
10	Noted that the hydrated lime's use as a
11	component of the Bordeaux mix is historically
12	acceptable.
13	Members report a wide range of
14	application and for, especially in Bordeaux mixes
15	including uses for fire blight, leaf curl, downy
16	mildew, powdery mildew, peacocks spot, and walnut
17	blight.
18	Certifiers, again this substance is
19	regionally interesting because the certifiers who
20	might traditionally work mostly in the Northeast
21	and the Midwest. in the Upper Midwest don't see a
22	lot of use.

1	But a lot of users in the certifiers
2	from the West are reported as noted for the fire
3	blight and the leaf curl. There aren't a lot of
4	viable alternatives and applications that aren't
5	showing phytotoxicity on either leaves or fruit.
6	General support and good information here about
7	the use and why it's important. And there aren't
8	enough alternatives.
9	MEMBER BRUCH: Thanks, Mindee. Any
10	questions for Mindee? Okay, seeing none. Well,
11	that concludes the spring work agenda items for
12	crops. Thank you for this wonderful discussion
13	and your time and I turn it back over to you,
14	Nate.
15	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, we're
16	going to switch gears to livestock. And between
17	livestock and materials, we're going to take a
18	break.
19	But I want to hand it over to Kim,
20	Chair of the Livestock Committee but also wanted
21	to give Kim a shout-out for also being able to
22	really roll with the punches as we lost folks or

1	livestock and had to pick up extra work.
2	We got it done. And it's we are a
3	small but mighty team of four. So it is a hard
4	pulling group on livestock. And with that, it's
5	all yours, Kim.
6	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Thank you, Nate. And
7	I do like that term small but mighty. So do we
8	need, this is a tough time period to be going
9	through this process. So I almost want to do
10	like a
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Do five?
12	MEMBER HUSEMAN: No, so we'll bear
13	through. So I appreciate the floor. Our
14	livestock workload for this spring has been
15	centered around sunsets.
16	But through public comment and just
17	looking at livestock in general, anticipate that
18	this subcommittee will have a heavier lift,
19	working through this next year and adding more to
20	the work agenda.
21	And so I think, you know, the message
22	was clear that there should be some communication

1	around swine and some other aspects too that have
2	come up.
3	So just want to make that clear, too,
4	that these things are definitely being heard.
5	With that being said, we will kick off the
6	sunsets with the alcohols.
7	You've probably heard this before in
8	crops and the discussion around having some of
9	these substances that you will hear over and over
10	in different subcommittees. I'll turn the floor
11	over to Nate for the sunset review of both
12	ethanol and isopropyl alcohol.
13	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you, Kim.
14	Ethanol, we'll kind of talk about them together
15	like we did in crops. They use the disinfectant
16	sanitizer and medical treatments as applicable.
17	Overall, we had a pretty clear discussion and
18	input from the community that a good robust
19	toolbox of sanitizers is helpful.
20	These are environmentally benign
21	unless you have a really acute spill into a
22	sensitive habitat, but otherwise, fairly low

1	risk. Any questions? All right.
2	MEMBER HUSEMAN: All right. Thank
3	you, Nate. Next on the Sunset Review, we have
4	aspirin. Aspirin as a disinfectant, sanitizer,
5	and medical treatment as applicable, approved for
6	health care use to reduce inflammation. So a
7	handful of comments, all overwhelmingly in
8	support of the continuation of the relisting of
9	aspirin.
10	From a use standpoint, it's used as a
11	pain reliever, a fever reducer in an
12	over-the-counter format. From an environmental
13	issue, essentially that there's rapid
14	biodegradation and hydrolysis of aspirin. Very
15	benign from that perspective.
16	It's important to the humane treatment
17	of organic animals and is commonly used to reduce
18	inflammation. And then if it meets, satisfies
19	all the criteria. Any questions about aspirin?
20	I feel like this one was relatively
21	straightforward. Seeing none, we'll go ahead,
22	and we'll move forwards when that might not be

1	quite as straightforward. I'll let Brian take
2	the floor on vaccines.
3	MEMBER CALDWELL: Great, thanks, Kim.
4	I feel like I'm performing my usual role here of
5	slowing things down and making more work for
6	everybody.
7	So I'll just get into that. The
8	materials is called biologics vaccines. And
9	that's at 205.603a, as a disinfectant sanitizer
10	and medical treatment.
11	Medical treatment is what we're
12	talking about here. So there's confusion about
13	this listing because vaccines are listed twice.
14	And the other listing, I should say this listing
15	would appear to have no, would appear to allow
16	any vaccine period.
17	There's no qualifications for it. And
18	but it's also listed at, let's see, 206.105(E),
19	and that's talking about excluded methods. And
20	there it says that the way it reads is, (E)
21	excluded methods except for vaccines provided
22	that the vaccines are approved in accordance with

1	205.600a, which is that's the process that you go
2	through on, actually, now, I'm blanking.
3	Help me out here. Is that, is that
4	what we do? I'm really going to slow us down
5	now. Throwing that third one in there, just
6	through me.
7	But anyway that's the National List
8	regulations. Okay so in other words, that second
9	listing is requiring that it be on the National
10	List to be used, whereas the first listing
11	appeared to allow any vaccines to be used.
12	Okay, so there are quite a few
13	vaccines in use, and all of them that are not GMC
14	are strongly supported, I believe, by all our
15	stakeholder comments.
16	But this issue of whether or not a
17	GMO-derived vaccine needs to be on the National
18	List is still apparently in, there's conflicts
19	within our certifiers, differences within our
20	certifiers, and how that is interpreted and
21	enforced or applied.
22	So in 2019, the NOSB made a proposal

fix 1 passed that attempted to that was ambiguity problem. And basically, the preferred 2 the desired language would say that vaccines, I'm 3 4 going to read it here. 5 This is under the 206.105(E). that excluded methods except 6 that says for 7 vaccines provided the vaccines produced through excluded methods may be used when an equivalent 8 vaccine not produced through excluded methods is 9 10 not commercially available. So there's a commercially available 11 clause there that would allow vaccines made with 12 excluded methods to be used. 13 That was the 14 recommendation that was the NOSB's attempt to fix 15 this problem. 16 And essentially, that has not been 17 adopted by the NLP and so we're still in the same 18 place that we were before where there are two 19 different listings, and I'm going to read how the different responses fell into this whole matrix. 20 21 And one of them said that that they 22 thought that GMO vaccines should be allowed, but

1	that the 2019 proposal should be implemented.
2	And another one just said, seven more said to
3	adopt the 2019 wording period and they didn't say
4	really much else.
5	One said do not to adopt the 2019 In
6	proposal, because commercial availability of
7	these vaccines may be a barrier for farmers. And
8	then one said, do not allow any vaccines and any
9	GMO vaccines unless they're on the National List.
10	So the upshot is that the wording has
11	not been fixed within OFPA. But that, by far,
12	the majority of the stakeholders essentially want
13	us to continue going forward.
14	And they want to be able to just like
15	continue interpreting it as they please. And you
16	know, most of them are allowing pretty much any
17	vaccine vaccines to be used whether they're GMO
18	or not.
19	So I guess what this just points to
20	is, that is that with one of those places where
21	we run into a snag, everybody understands and
22	agrees that vaccines are absolutely vital for the

Τ	health of the farm enterprise and of the animals
2	and to alleviate animal suffering. That's,
3	that's clear.
4	And I think that barring action by the
5	NOP, I think we're just at this place, and we
6	will probably just continue this listing as is
7	and keep on moving forward and hope that, and
8	just reiterate the request that the 2019 proposal
9	be implemented.
LO	So that's, that's kind of a mess. And
L1	I have slowed things down and so I've changed my
L2	purpose for now, but I'd love to hear more
L3	comments about it.
L 4	VICE CHAIR JEFFERY: Thank you, Brian.
L5	Any questions? Nate?
L 6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Brian, could you
L7	talk a little bit more? You had said that there
L8	are, I think, seven public comments that said we
L 9	should, or if I heard you're right, we should
20	encourage the NOSB or the NFP to adopt the 2019
21	recommendation and one that cited the barrier.
22	Did I get that right

1	MEMBER CALDWELL: Well, there were
2	seven who said that the 2019 wording should be
3	implemented or adopted. But just continue the
4	listing as is, until that point.
5	And then a couple of others were sort
6	of in the different sides of that. And then one
7	said, Do not allow any GMO vaccines unless
8	they're on the National List.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Got it. Thank
10	you.
11	MEMBER CALDWELL: Which they're not.
12	None have been reviewed for the National List.
13	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yes.
14	MEMBER CALDWELL: So just to be clear
15	on that. No individual vaccines have been
16	reviewed.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I think the public
18	comment that hit me hardest on this was by
19	Organic Valley, and by the Organic Valley
20	veterinarian who's gave us public comments in
21	their oral comment session.
22	And just talking about how vaccines is

one of the bright spots in organic that when I 1 have to contend with my conventional neighbors 2 who are skeptical about organic, usually, you 3 know, to be a good neighbor, you definitely don't 4 5 be the disease of want to vector the neighborhood. 6 And so having a really nice fat toolbox of 7 vaccines to make sure you are always a good 8 neighbor and that's never the problem seems to be 9 10 something that we've done well. 11 And the comment in particular from Organic Valley that said, commercial availability 12 13 could represent a barrier for organic farmers 14 from preventative methods which would prevent 15 disease and suffering in their animals. 16 Additionally, there present are of vaccines that have been widely 17 shortages 18 available in the past. I took to heart that 19 comment that we constantly raise the bar in a lot 20 of ways. 21 But this one because we don't have a 22 lot of buying power in organic, probably won't be

able to exert influence on manufacturers who are 1 already slow to develop new vaccines, slow to 2 bring, it's hard to bring new vaccines to market. 3 4 putting commercial availability pressure, I think from what they're saying, would 5 be kind of almost a step beyond what farmers need 6 in that toolbox. 7 And so I think that there's a lot to 8 be said for the current system really working and 9 10 maybe the current system. I'd be interested in everyone 11 else's opinion on this, but possibly the 2019 12 13 recommendation and not being what farmers are 14 asking for. And especially livestock producers, 15 who are who are trying to contend with a range of disease pressures at all times. 16 17 MEMBER CALDWELL: Yes. Thanks, Nate. 18 I agree and that comment certainly jumped out to And I think the point that, that the 19 me as well. 20 industry does organic livestock not have 21 sufficient clout to actually push manufacturers 22 into creating what we want, is very real.

1	Yes. Now, in terms of, well, in 2019,
2	the Board did, you know, went back and forth on
3	this a lot. And, the option of essentially, just
4	allowing anything on the marketplace that's
5	available to be used was one of the options that
6	they did not adopt.
7	So they passed the one that they did,
8	requiring commercial availability. Well,
9	requiring a lack of commercial availability in
10	order to use the excluded method. Thinking about
11	it, it seems to me that the point of the 2019
12	proposal was not to push the industry into making
13	new ones that are not GMOs for whatever, you
14	know, specific disease.
15	It was just to say if they aren't
16	available, you can use the GMO one. So I don't
17	I'm not sure if I see the force of that argument.
18	I get the gist of it, but I don't think in
19	practice that it makes a difference.
20	And what all, I should have mentioned
21	that just about all the commenters were really
22	strong that who were endorsing 2019 proposal that

if that was implemented. 1 It was really important to have a list 2 that was freely, you know, clearly available, of 3 what vaccines are available. 4 Are they GMO or 5 So that, you know, basically everybody was not? working on the same page and able to find stuff 6 that they need. 7 Now, having said that, I don't know, 8 it seems to me that a given farmer and vets if 9 10 they're working together in a given area when there's a disease outbreak or a threat that, you 11 know, is imminent, they might not be able to shop 12 around for a material that's on the list, you 13 know, but is not available right now or in a 14 15 different place or whatever. 16 So I think we have to be really careful with this. And I totally agree with you that it's a 17 18 plus for organics to be good neighbors. We all really want to be good neighbors. 19 20 So it's a tough one. And I should 21 point out this yellow highlighted section there 22 of this review that is, we asked people to

1	comment whether this was okay or not.
2	And I really got very few responses
3	specifically of that but what it does, it
4	basically says that this sunset review
5	encompasses the entire class of synthetic
6	livestock vaccines, including those made with
7	excluded methods.
8	The NOSB encourages the NOP to adopt
9	the 2019 recommendation. In the meantime, our
10	interpretation is that this listing fulfills the
11	requirement for all livestock vaccines.
12	So in other words, they are all
13	allowed to be used with this wording. I think
14	maybe what we'll do, and we would love, of
15	course, more feedback from everybody on this. We
16	can maybe revisit whether it is wise to record
17	required commercial availability or not again.
18	And I don't know whether there has to
19	be that has to be separate from, I guess it is a
20	separate sort of action from approving the
21	sunset.
22	But I think it's, it certainly is an

1	important issue that we need to resolve one way
2	or another. So any more comments? Kyla. Kyla
3	always saves me, it's great. I love
4	MEMBER SMITH: I don't know about
5	that. My question is actually for Jenny. Since
6	this one also is in the recommendations library
7	as on hold, I wonder if you could speak to the
8	status as you did with this.
9	DR. TUCKER: Yes, thank you for
LO	asking. And already my team had let me know what
L1	this was for. Actually, I think that the
L2	dialogue here about, there's not actually
L3	agreement on some of this, these points.
L 4	When we did the regulatory priorities
L5	notice last spring, this item was ranked as a low
L 6	priority. There were not a lot of people who
L7	thought this was a priority that was worth
L8	putting into the pipeline.
L 9	And there are some concerns that have
20	been raised even in this conversation. So this
21	is on hold. I think based on this dialogue, I
22	actually wonder if we should close it, honestly.

1	This was a low priority for the
2	community and the system right now, I'm going to
3	get in trouble for saying this I'm sure, but it
4	seems to be working the best that it can.
5	Because we have a lot of other priorities we need
6	to deal with instead.
7	MEMBER SMITH: Thank you. Allison?
8	MEMBER JOHNSON: Thank you. So you'll
9	apologize for stirring up trouble and I'll
10	apologize for putting on my lawyer hat. I have a
11	history/lawyer question.
12	To me, from a statutory interpretation
13	point of view, taking out the reference to
14	205.600a and inserting the alternative language
15	might imply that it doesn't need to be on the
16	list at all.
17	Does anyone who was here or involved
18	when this recommendation was passed recall if
19	that came up? I would have expected a list it,
20	like go through the process to list it and look
21	at commercial availability rather than a swap.
22	And I worry that that opens up a little, tiny,

1	different can of worms.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Could you say it
3	one more time, Allison? I almost tracked you all
4	the way. Can you repeat it one more time?
5	MEMBER JOHNSON: Yes, I've been
6	sitting here puzzling over it. So if I were
7	going to Court and suing someone over the
8	recommended annotation, I would say we removed
9	the language that said vaccines have to be
10	approved through the National List process. And
11	by striking that the implied intent is that you
12	no longer wanted to require vaccines to go
13	through the National List process.
14	MEMBER CALDWELL: So well, can I
15	answer that quickly? Allison, I think that the
16	answer to that is that in this listing that we
17	are going over now, that is where, boom, they're
18	all being considered. I think that was the
19	response so.
20	MEMBER JOHNSON: So if the
21	recommendation, the new language, I'm looking at
22	commercial availability for excluded methods, was

1	put on, would the implication be that we no
2	longer need the National List line item at all?
3	Just vaccines are fine, just look at commercial
4	availability. And GMOs are excluded methods?
5	MEMBER CALDWELL: I think I'm catching
6	the force now of what you're saying.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: What do you think,
8	Kyla? I mean, I don't want the certifiers to
9	take it off.
10	MEMBER SMITH: I don't know. I don't
11	remember that being, I don't remember the
12	discussion from 2019. I'd have to go back and
13	look at the transcript to see if that was
14	discussed. I totally see where your point and I
15	think it's valid. I don't know.
16	MEMBER CALDWELL: Allison, I did read
17	through those, at least most of those
18	discussions, and that would have, I think, caught
19	my eye if it had been in there, so.
20	And I don't remember it. And I just
21	want to apologize to everybody for getting lost
22	in these regulations there earlier because

1	sometimes they get, I'm not a lawyer, obviously.
2	And they get confusing to me.
3	So, anyway. Yes, I think that we'll
4	move ahead with this feedback. And particularly
5	recognizing what Jenny said, and Alison what you
6	said. And that's going to inform how we can move
7	forward with it, so.
8	MEMBER LEWIS: Yes, just a quick scan
9	of the transcript jogged my memory that
10	MEMBER CALDWELL: Wow.
11	MEMBER LEWIS: I was like, it was
12	because the concern that if every new
12 13	because the concern that if every new commercially available vaccine had to be
13	commercially available vaccine had to be
13 14	commercially available vaccine had to be petitioned and added to the National List it
13 14 15	commercially available vaccine had to be petitioned and added to the National List it wouldn't negate the commercial availability
13 14 15 16	commercially available vaccine had to be petitioned and added to the National List it wouldn't negate the commercial availability element because if there's a whole NOSB process
13 14 15 16 17	commercially available vaccine had to be petitioned and added to the National List it wouldn't negate the commercial availability element because if there's a whole NOSB process and a rulemaking process in order to get this
13 14 15 16 17	commercially available vaccine had to be petitioned and added to the National List it wouldn't negate the commercial availability element because if there's a whole NOSB process and a rulemaking process in order to get this non-GMO back.
13 14 15 16 17 18	commercially available vaccine had to be petitioned and added to the National List it wouldn't negate the commercial availability element because if there's a whole NOSB process and a rulemaking process in order to get this non-GMO back. So if you were going to apply the commercial

1	behind removing the 600a reference in 105.
2	MEMBER SMITH: And 205.105(A)
3	requires, like inclusion at 603, synthetic
4	substances at 603. So I don't think that the new
5	language would trump that requirement, right? If
6	I'm, I don't know. Anyway, that's my non lawyer
7	interpretation.
8	MEMBER JOHNSON: That's helpful.
9	MEMBER CALDWELL: And I don't remember
10	anywhere reading that, to delete this listing. I
11	don't think that was part of the discussion. So
12	well, thanks, everybody. And any more questions?
13	MEMBER HUSEMAN: All right.
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Well, thank you,
15	Brian, for tackling that one. That's not an easy
16	one. So thanks for taking that on.
17	MEMBER HUSEMAN: So Brian, if that one
18	wasn't hard enough, let's talk about
19	electrolytes.
20	MEMBER CALDWELL: Electrolytes, okay.
21	It's interesting these approve, these listings
22	that are for entire classes of things. And that

has worked, I think, well for us, pretty well. 1 2 But it does have the potential for creating a problem at 3 some point. Yes. electrolytes are listed at 205.603(A), basically 4 5 as medical treatments. And this is another one that that is 6 7 widely used. These are materials, there's a whole class of materials that are electrolytes 8 9 that are used in veterinary medicine basically to 10 correct metabolic imbalances in animals. And they have really, they're very efficacious. 11 work fast they relieve incredible distress in 12 animals and everybody who responded, I only got 13 14 seven comments on this. 15 Mavbe because you know, specific comments on this maybe because everybody was so 16 17 in favor of it but they were all to relist. 18 of them just had the wording with one annotation specifying their use, which I think 19 again we've kind of gone through that. 20 21 That is already taken care of in this, 22 in the way that the sunsets are laid out. So

1	strong support for relisting. Basically the,
2	there's basically no animal health downside to
3	these.
4	It's just a very powerful tool to
5	alleviate animal suffering and to basically save
6	the lives of cows and other animals sometimes if
7	they have milk fever or something. So with that,
8	is there anything more that I should cover on
9	this one? But it just seems like one of those
LO	slam dunks, I hope.
L1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: As a cattle
L2	producer with sick baby calves every spring, I am
13	grateful for this listing and grateful for your
L 4	really succinct summary Brian.
L5	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Any other questions
L 6	for Brian on electrolytes? All right, we'll move
L7	forward then. The next sunset item is for
L 8	glycerin listed at 205.603(A), as a disinfectant
L 9	sanitizer and medical treatment. Glycerin is
20	allowed as a teat dip.
21	It must be produced through the
22	hydrolysis of fats or oils. And I say that

1 slowly and very specifically because that 2 where our questions had gone. So essentially, another tool in the 3 toolbox for dairy farmers is to be able to use 4 5 glycerin as a teat dip. It does have a lot of other uses. 6 But in this specific listing, 7 very clear as how it 8 is being used. The discussion component of glycerin is that we do 9 10 know t.hat. there are some other natural alternatives. 11 12 There's some other management tools 13 for controlling mastitis, you know, just proper 14 hygiene and so forth. But then there becomes a 15 time where you need this unique glycerin. being an another effective management tool is 16 17 very important. 18 We did ask the stakeholders for other 19 natural alternatives. There were a couple of 20 commenters that did mention castor oil is one. 21 However, let me get to the rest of my questions 22 here.

1	Even though there are other natural
2	alternatives, the toolbox is good to have. That
3	being said, I would say that through public
4	comment, it sounded as if from a certifier
5	standpoint, it's quite clear how you can go back
6	and ask manufacturers, what is your process?
7	To validate that it's not a synthetic
8	format of how that's being produced that it is,
9	through the hydrolysis of fats and oils. There
10	were, you know, I would say an overwhelming
11	suggestion to continue to keep it on the list.
12	I'm trying to think of anything else
13	here that was mentioned. Really, I will say that
14	from the dairy community, the support was pretty
15	significant. Any questions on glycerin?
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Just to comment, I
17	think that this is a really good example of the
18	role that certifiers play in general being those
19	who invest a lot of time and resources in this
20	due diligence.
21	And that they are this essential
22	investigator for our industry and that I'm really

1	grateful for all of the work they do to make it
2	so that we don't all have to do this every single
3	time as an entire community or every farmer
4	having to do it, that they're doing this homework
5	for us.
6	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Thank you, Nate.
7	That being said, moving forward. Sorry. Hey,
8	everybody awake? Hello. There we go. Thank
9	you, Michelle.
10	Next sunset item up is for phosphoric
11	acid. And, again, these things are full circle
12	and multiple committees. So, Amy, I'll let you
13	have the floor.
14	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you, Kim. And
15	like Kim mentioned, phosphoric acid's also listed
16	under handling. My table mate here that I've
17	been conferring with, she's going to be leading
18	that discussion later on.
19	But definitely Kyla, feel free to
20	chime in here because there's similar community
21	feedback that we both received. So moving into
22	phosphoric acid.

1	It's listed at 205.603 synthetic
2	substances allowed for use in organic crop
3	production. (A) as a disinfectant sanitizer and
4	medical treatments as applicable.
5	(25) phosphoric acid allowed as an
6	equipment cleaner provided that no direct contact
7	with organically managed livestock or land
8	occurs.
9	So phosphoric acid, its used within
LO	livestock. It does have many uses. It's, as
L1	mentioned, a cleaner and particularly in dairy
L2	operations. It's used to remove calcium and
13	phosphate salt deposits from processing
L 4	equipment.
L5	The chemical reaction of the acid with
L 6	the minerals found in deposits makes them water
L7	soluble and thus easy, easier to remove. So it
L8	really has a specific type use method, and it
L 9	operates differently compared to other
20	sanitizers.
21	For cleaning purposes, phosphoric acid is
22	often combined with a surfactant, usually a

There's two ways to create phosphoric 1 detergent. 2 acid, the wet process in a thermal process. International acceptance, Canada and 3 4 IFOAM have similar listings similar to ours to be 5 used on dairy equipment. Europe: CODEX and Japan have this substance listed based 6 do not information from the 2021 handling TR. 7 Environmental issues, so the acid will 8 9 dilute quickly in the environment and there are 10 no toxicity issues directly from its breakdown in 11 products. Effects on human health, the exact 12 really depend 13 dangers on the solution's 14 concentration. Questions to the stakeholders. 15 So really, we were pretty unanimous in supporting 16 this listing. 17 However, unanimous in the need for 18 clarity. The clarity surrounds just its use. Is that a sanitizer? It is it a cleaner? 19 20 really what depends on the definition and that 21 we're consistently defining this is what occurs 22 So if it's a cleaner, it does need a next.

rinse. 1 If it's a sanitizer, it doesn't need 2 to be rinsed. However, there's definitely some 3 confusion that we can help with either through, 4 not in this process, but either an annotation or 5 recommendation for some guidance here. 6 And this was really uniform across the 7 dairy producers, 8 board from cooperatives, advocacy groups. 9 certifiers, They all 10 concerns that certifiers are reviewing phosphoric 11 acid differently. By not having clarity it can actually 12 cause economic harm from a milk tanker being 13 14 passed from one certifier or one certified entity 15 to another. A water rinse will nullify the sanitation process for milking. 16 So there is actually high concerns there. 17 18 One dairy producer mentions that our cleaning protocols limits its use to two times 19 per week. But we believe it's a critical element 20 21 in keeping our milk from being contaminated at 22 the farm level. Our certifier requires a rinse

1	before use and then for this particular
2	operation, they use a chlorine sanitizer rinse.
3	Some organizations note that it is a
4	legal requirement to not rinse to not have a
5	rinse, as per the pasteurized milk ordinance. So
6	that's the PMO.
7	However, others contend that a rinse
8	is not forbidden. So definitely, even when we
9	look at handling, this issue regarding, do you
LO	need a rise or not after use, it just needs to be
L1	cleared up.
L2	There was also, and this again is
L3	outside of the board's scope, but it just kind of
L 4	is additional information about the need for
L 5	clarity here.
L 6	Because additionally, if it is the
L7	policy of a certifier that all ingredients in
L 8	cleaner sanitizer products must be allowed on the
L 9	National List.
20	For the product to be allowed without
21	a rinse, the vast majority of phosphoric acid
22	products will require a rinse because they

1	contain inactive inert ingredients not on the
2	National List.
3	So that again provides another layer
4	to the onion of complexity here that can easily
5	be cleared up. Should the material contain only
6	phosphoric acid and water?
7	Which it sounds like there aren't very
8	many products that are just phosphoric acid and
9	water. But that would supposedly then have some
10	certifiers say it's allowed without a rinse. So
11	we just need to clear things up there.
12	Again, a solution could either come in
13	the form of annotation or through guidance.
14	Commenters raise compelling reasons also for the
15	NOSB to review sanitizer disinfectants and
16	cleaners as a work agenda item.
17	In my time on the board, I guess, I'm
18	sorry, my third year I've heard that several
19	times, we've reviewed lots of different
20	sanitizers and cleaners over the years.
21	So it just seems like that would
22	really help stakeholders in our community out if

1	we took on that type of work agenda item.
2	There's another issue on clarity and this was
3	needed just to determine if a bulk tank, and I'm
4	learning dairy.
5	I'm a grain farmer, but I'm learning
6	the dairy system. So after the milking has
7	occurred, the product then moves to a storage
8	tank and that is referred to as a bulk tank.
9	Some certifiers are not necessarily
10	including that in the review process under this
11	particular listing. Some are opening their
12	viewpoint and including it.
13	So there's just uncertainty what to do
14	at the bulk tank piece as well for rinsing or
15	letting it just be a sanitizer and not rinsing
16	after that.
17	And then the other piece with that is
18	that the rinse aid that's collected if a cleaner
19	if it's viewed as a cleaner and it is washed,
20	that rinse aid goes into a manure pit and then
21	that maneuver then is applied to land.
22	And we need to refer to how this is

1	annotated because it does say that this product
2	cannot have direct contact with organically
3	managed livestock or land.
4	So we just need a little bit more
5	further clarification on that, which it does
6	sound a little complex but actually, I think was
7	some conversation we can get through this really
8	easily and provide the community clarity there.
9	The other thing is
LO	cross-collaboration. The listings for livestock
L1	is a little bit different than handling. The
L2	community said that they wanted that additional
L3	language that we have in livestock here under the
L 4	handling listing, as well.
L 5	So we'll be talking about that in the
L 6	handling review. And that language is that no
L7	direct contact with organically managed livestock
L 8	or land occurs.
L 9	And the problem with that is a
20	producer could claim they're using handling
21	definition rather than using the livestock
22	definition, because it's a little bit of a

1 handshake, in that milking system's scope, to where handling kind of takes over. 2 So a couple of things to clarify, and 3 4 then potentially some work in just clearing up 5 how this is listed on handling is kind of the summary from the community. 6 Any questions? Brian? 7 8 MEMBER CALDWELL: I have a question, 9 and maybe Kyla will be the one who answers this 10 one as well. One of the comments took me by 11 surprise because of how little I know about 12 livestock systems and some of the handling 13 issues. 14 the saying But person was that 15 essentially, any cleanser can be used, whether you know, anything that not on the list can be 16 17 used to clean equipment and, you know, storage 18 equipment or whatever. And then if it's rinsed it, then you 19 20 know, it's okay if it's rinsed. And so I guess I 21 was wanting to ask, is that correct? And also, 22 are there concerns about where the rinse water

1	goes from that?
2	If, you know, I don't know where it
3	would go if it's not into it, like, you know, a
4	sewer system or something like that? So I don't
5	know, Kyler are you the one? Or
6	MEMBER SMITH: I mean, yes, that is
7	correct.
8	MEMBER CALDWELL: Okay. And I
9	realized, again, coming from a cropping
10	perspective, that that's very similar to being
11	allowed, being able to use a dual-use sprayer,
12	which is hardly ever done.
13	But you can use one if it's triple
14	rinsed between the non-organic and the organic
15	uses. So that's the analogous situation which I
16	realized afterward.
17	So are there, I mean, Amy brought up
18	the issue of whether this phosphoric acid rinse
19	could then be mixed in with the manure and
20	applied to the land. How is that handled with
21	another product that, you know, is not on the
22	list that is used?

1	MEMBER SMITH: I think Nate had made
2	reference to this earlier about the practice
3	standard requirement for the operators to, for
4	any input to not contaminate land, essentially,
5	and I've had to look up the exact reference, but
6	that's the requirement.
7	MEMBER CALDWELL: I see, I see.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: 205.200. That's
9	the next T-shirt.
10	MEMBER BRUCH: That's not the one I
11	was talking about. But I do understand your
12	question, just kind of cleaners in general and
13	the formulation.
14	It needs to be reviewed by the
15	certifier. So it has to go through the material
16	reviews process, and if it's not listed on one of
17	the websites, then the certifier does review that
18	cleaner before use.
19	I mean, I'm just referring to mixed
20	production operations in crops using cleaners on
21	the sprayer situation that you mentioned. The
22	farm operation would have to have that cleaner

1	approved on their OSP. And then the certifier
2	would come up with a protocol. Usually, it's the
3	triple rent that you've mentioned.
4	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yes, yes.
5	MEMBER BRUCH: But I don't know that
6	the fluent, I'm not sure what necessarily
7	MEMBER CALDWELL: No, if it's
8	approved, then it seems like it shouldn't be an
9	issue. But if the commenter seemed, who I
10	believe was knowledgeable, seemed to be implying
11	that, that no, it doesn't have to be on the list
12	or you know, approved by anybody as long as it's
13	rinsed off before you know, the organic part
14	starts.
15	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes, I mean, at a
16	minimum, it should be on the organic system plan
17	and reviewed by the certifier.
18	MEMBER CALDWELL: Thank you. Great.
19	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes.
20	MEMBER CALDWELL: You know, nothing
21	goes away, right? Everything goes somewhere.
22	And we've, you know, got to think about it. So

Τ	yes.
2	MEMBER BRUCH: Any other questions on
3	this substance? Kyla, go ahead.
4	MEMBER SMITH: I just have more of a
5	statement or a comment is that, I mean, you did a
6	great job of summarizing all of the comments.
7	And again, very similar comments in handling,
8	which we'll talk about tomorrow.
9	But from my understanding, there's an
10	ACA working group, a materials working group,
11	it's an ongoing materials working group, and they
12	did recently discuss phosphoric acid.
13	My understanding was that there was
14	consensus on the members of that working group
15	have the certifiers for how that substance
16	substances being reviewed and enforced.
17	I personally am not on that working
18	group. So I don't know really all the details
19	that were discussed. However, I can certainly
20	follow up and confirm this to be true and see if
21	and what the remaining questions are.
22	Additionally, this working group does

1	have a best practices document that is available
2	on the ACA's website. I don't know if the plan
3	is to incorporate any of this information that
4	was discussed there in the document.
5	But again, I can certainly do a
6	follow-up and get some more information there.
7	And I would also say that some of your comments,
8	as you indicated, apply more broadly to
9	sanitizers in general. And so yes, perhaps we'll
10	discuss that more as a future work agenda item.
11	MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you, Kyla. I
12	really appreciate that. And I'd love to hear the
13	follow-up so I can include that and embed those
14	links for best practices if they're developed
15	into this document so can be used as a resource
16	to clear up this confusion. So doesn't sound
17	hard to clear it up but it just needs to be
18	cleared up. Nate?
19	MEMBER LEWIS: Just to add into that
20	conversation, the 1999 recommendation originally
21	had some additional language added to this
22	annotation, which clearly didn't make it into at

1	least the regulations we have now.
2	But it had to do about minimizing
3	contamination of surface water. So it sort of
4	acknowledged that it's using a flush system,
5	which may end up in a manure lagoon, which may
6	end up on land.
7	And the need is for the producer to
8	minimize that contamination, or the effects of
9	that contamination rather than us needing to go
10	down into the very nitty-gritty of that.
11	So anyway, we should include that in
12	the subsequent reviews for the fall, sort of the
13	evolution of where it started, where it went, and
14	make sure we're staying in our lane there.
15	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes, absolutely. I
16	really appreciate that archival information. We
17	have a rich history there. And we want to, as
18	you said, incorporate that in future reviews.
19	Thank you.
20	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Anything else? Great
21	review, Amy. And I think you've captured a lot
22	of what was said in public comment and there's

1 more to come as we get close to the fall on 2 phosphoric acid as it pertains to the livestock subcommittee. 3 next we'll 4 move forward Okav, to 5 hydrated lime. Again, another substance that is across multiple subcommittees. 6 Hydrated lime, listed at 205.603(B), this is my substance. 7 topical treatment, external 8 As 9 parasiticide, or local anesthetic as applicable. 10 Very specifically as an external pest control, 11 not permitted to cauterize physical altercations or deodorize animal waste. 12 13 Going through, or I guess taking it back one 14 Essentially, hydrated lime is yet more step. 15 another tool in the livestock toolbox for helping control parasitic mites 16 in sheep, 17 cattle, and other livestock. Mange is not a fun 18 thing to have to manage through. 19 So this has definitely 20 much-needed and welcomed product for helping to 21 have best practices for animal welfare. I would 22 even go to that extent.

In previous sunset reviews, there's 1 2 been a significant amount of support to relist. And I would say that that's not uncommon in this 3 4 particular round for the spring. The majority of 5 the public comment around the utilization of hydrated lime as a parasite control is very clear 6 7 cut. However, in saying that, there is some 8 concern about if the listing is clear enough to 9 10 not use hydrated lime in ways that it's not intended for. 11 For instance, as a deodorizer. 12 Ιt seems to me that in the listing, it's guite clear 13 14 what it is used for. But that there were there 15 were some very specific comments brought up that 16 an annotation reiterating or maybe being more direct with it's not a deodorizer. 17 18 it being used in that in that its 19 fashion and not in intended use? But as it is listed, as it is 20 Questionable. 21 intended it is, it's supported. I'd say there 22 was a handful, maybe, less than ten comments in

1 total. But that's kind of the direction of the 2 comments, but any questions? 3 Statements? 4 right, we'll move forward. For the last sunset 5 item, which will be mineral oil. And Brian, I'll let you conclude us on the livestock side. 6 7 MEMBER CALDWELL: This will be my last stab for the day. Thank goodness. 8 Yes, so mineral oils are another parasiticide. 9 10 thing, 205.603b, and it's for use as, for topical use and as a lubricant. And there's a little bit 11 of confusion about just the sort of duplication 12 almost with mineral oil. 13 14 Because we approved the sunset last year for mineral oil under 605.603(A), which was 15 for 16 internal use of mineral oil. And this is for external use. 17 18 And maybe in the future, we can line 19 them up so they're in the same year but there's just two listings, two different spots. And so 20 21 what we're talking about here is for use as a 22 parasiticide externally.

1 And last year, we approved it for use internally for bloat and intestinal blockage. 2 So for this use, for the external use, there were 3 4 eight comments, all in favor of relisting. 5 And it seems like, again, a very, straightforward, 6 pretty and benign use to alleviate when different kinds of parasites get 7 out of control, you've got to do something. 8 9 again, this is just another tool in the toolbox 10 that can be used. 11 In terms of the questions that we asked for the stakeholders, I believe it was just 12 maybe one or two answered that the 13 14 products that they used specifically were 15 required to be 100 percent mineral oil because 16 one of our questions was is it possible that 17 there were products that were sort of out on the 18 market that were not. 19 And so that was it. One point that was made was that mineral oil is very shelf 20 21 So it's going to be there when you need stable. 22 it from, you know, from three years ago if you

1	didn't need it in between, you can leave it and
2	it's there. It's ready. So any questions on
3	that?
4	MEMBER HUSEMAN: All right, thank you,
5	Brian. If there's no questions from Bryan, we're
6	good. And Nate, I'll turn it back to you. That
7	concludes the livestock sunset review.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, folks.
9	Let's take a 15 minute break. We're going to
10	come back in 15 minutes.
11	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
12	went off the record at 3:37 p.m. and resumed at
13	3:58 p.m.)
14	MR. TURNER: Are you waiting for me?
15	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Not yet. I can't
16	see Jerry, or members, you get back to your
17	seats now. How many extra? We got three extra
18	minutes? Yeah. All right, Wood, it's all yours.
19	MR. TURNER: Thanks, I was chatting
20	with Kim, and Kim wanted me to tell a joke or do
21	something like jumping jacks. I'm not going to
22	do those things. You guys have all done that on

Τ	your own, but.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Well, Kim, do you
3	have any jokes?
4	MR. TURNER: We're trying to get
5	through the afternoon.
6	MS. HUSEMAN: Fine, I'll go ahead and
7	give you one. Okay, this is a quintessential dad
8	joke or mom joke in this case. All right. Nate,
9	do trees poop?
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: No.
11	MS. HUSEMAN: How do we get #2
12	pencils?
13	(Laughter.)
14	MR. TURNER: And that's now on the
15	public record, and so that's
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: That's the fault
17	of the public record.
18	MR. TURNER: And that's great.
19	Fabulous.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Wood, sorry.
21	Wait, before we get started, I just wanted to
22	remind everyone that we have a reception tonight

hosted by Georgia Organics. It's going to be at 1 the Wrecking Bar Brewpub, 292 Moreland Avenue NE 2 at 6:30 -- 5:30, 5:30. Right after this, let's 3 head there, folks. All yours, Wood. 4 5 Thanks. We'll try to MR. TURNER: keep this -- I know everybody's getting tired and 6 it's that time of day, but let's -- we have a few 7 things to discuss in materials. We'll discuss 8 Research Priorities, and we'll talk about the 9 10 Excluded Methods TBD list and our Technical 11 Report Template update. I'll start on Research Priorities. 12 Τ 13 just wanted to, you know, just commend the whole 14 Board for really leaning into this process. Ι 15 think and I definitely feel like a couple 16 years is what the Research Priorities process was sort of intended to do was a little unclear to 17 18 Maybe it was because I was inheriting this me. 19 committee, or I'm not sure what was happening, but it was less clear to me. 20 As we sort of 21 worked through it, and I think, engaged some of 22 the external stakeholders, some of the folks are

actually using these recommendations and really tried to sort of engage everybody on the Board in this process, and I think it's become more clear to me, and I just want to, you know, acknowledge peoples on the Board's efforts to try to invigorate this process. So thank you, there.

I think, you know, this is a -- to remind the community and to remind the Board, this is really a living document for the new Board Members. It's something that is used by funding organizations and research organizations to essentially motivate and inspire deeper organic research on a variety of topics that we the Board and the community, as a whole, feels are important in driving and improving what we're doing here and what our mandate is. really does begin to feel like a living document over time. Ι think we're -- at first, Ι wondered, why do we keep rolling things over year over year, and why do things keep showing up, and why do we keep putting these things on the list every year and every year? And the reason we're

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 putting it on the list year over year is because them 2 thev're important, and we consider important, and we need more research. 3 We want to continue to remind the community at large and all 4 5 the talented researchers out there that these are the things that really matter to our community. 6 7 So I appreciate that. I'm going to start here by the way 8 we're organized is the Materials Subcommittee has 9 10 members and members of that committee liaise to 11 the other review committees and sort of help to stimulate discussions within those committees on 12 13 Research Priorities. And so I'm going to kick it 14 over to Brian for a minute to just offer a view. And you happen to be liaising on livestock and 15 16 crops to the Materials Subcommittee and so I 17 wanted to give you a chance to just speak for a 18 minute about the review process and that discussion on Resource Priorities since our last 19 20 cycle. 21 MR. Great. Thanks, Wood. CALDWELL: 22 I've been at least on the outskirts of Yeah,

academia and have been participating in a lot of 1 organic cropping research over the years and in 2 my previous job at Cornell. And I think that 3 4 these lists that we have are really good. I've also been part of a lot of grower focus groups 5 and things like that where we try to suggest to 6 researchers what we would like to see happen. 7 And these lists are the best that I've ever seen. 8 They're very specific, they're clear, and they 9 10 just zone in on really important issues. 11 And so, rather than getting, you know, a bunch of things, like, oh, yeah, a better weed 12 control. Oh, you know, please help us with, you 13 14 corn diseases. These are really well know. 15 crafted, I think, and so I believe in that living 16 document, Wood, that you're talking about. think it's really, really useful and important. 17 in terms of the Livestock 18 So anyways, 19 Subcommittee, I wanted to just talk about what we have here compared to last year. And basically, 20 21 from the comments that we got last year, we tried 22 to enhance or reword some of these a little bit

to bring forth breeding as being very important. 1 Livestock rations that are regionally based and 2 diversed to support the connections between local 3 4 crop farmers and livestock people. And then the parasiticides is really important. 5 So They got consolidated 6 didn't get changed a lot. and sort of bringing some of those topics to the 7 front. 8

I do want to say we've got a lot of great comments in this round of written comments that we will work hard on over, you know, over the summer, basically, but we haven't digested them yet. So, you know, we just saw them a few weeks ago for the first time. But there's a lot in there and we really appreciate that.

For livestock or for crops, I mean, basically what we've done so far, again from comments from like a year ago, is we've added three more research items to the crop list. And they are research into PFAS alternatives and remediation, which we hear loud and clear. And it's certainly, our friends in Maine are just,

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

you know, that was a total upsetting of the apple cart with their whole ag program, and you know, producers, organic and non-organic.

4 The economic impacts of GMOs on 5 organic crops was added. And finally, the extent and impact of plastic use. 6 And that goes right back to our first question and answer period 7 after the presentation this morning about being 8 9 able to quantify. Somebody had mentioned that we 10 should be able to quantify the number -- oh, yes, 11 Logan, you were talking about that -- how many acres of plastic production are there, and how 12 13 big of a factor is this? And I think, of course, 14 we're going to find that for some crops it's 15 So but we really do need those numbers, 16 and it doesn't have to be university researchers who find out information for this. 17 It can be 18 NASS and other groups that are getting data. So 19 that's a quick one. Wood, anything else that you wanted me to mention? 20

MR. TURNER: No, that's great. Thank you.

1 MR. CALDWELL: All right. 2 MR. TURNER: And I think it's good and I would say similar on the handling side. 3 think we had sort of less or fewer additions to 4 our rolling list. But certainly, your examples 5 are great in terms of just sort of us listening 6 to what we're hearing from the community about 7 how to elevate some of these issues. 8 And so, you know, I think some of the 9 10 ones that we've been focused on in handling, 11 specifically, sanitizers and BPA, ancillary ingredient review process, and other issues, and 12 13 heavy metal contamination, essentiality, have all 14 been important to handling. And you know, I 15 think the Research Priorities that come out of 16 materials specifically related to some of our understanding of Excluded Methods is incredibly 17 18 important, so. Yeah, you know, I think it's a 19 living process. 20 And I would just say, you know, the 21 feedback we've gotten from the community, I just 22 want to offer a little bit of a summary here of

some of the things we've heard. You know, lots 1 2 of support for people who really, really -- I think I'm buoyed by the fact that there's good 3 support from the community as a whole around 4 5 these Research Priorities, which makes me feel a pretty good job 6 like we're doing here of I really appreciate it when 7 hitting the mark. call specific 8 organizations out Research Priorities. 9 10 For example, we've seen references to 11 the one in Livestock around methylamine, and a reference to the one in Livestock around climate 12 13 change mitigation, and a reference certainly 14 concerned about strategies for managing insects 15 and weeds under crops, and we hear that over And which I really appreciate that kind 16 again. Support for continued research 17 of feedback. opportunities in heavy metal contamination and 18 PFAS, of course. 19

good clarification points. I was particularly

interested in the fact that someone commented on

And then, you know, always some really

20

21

the fact that, you know, just talking about carbon sequestration, and just learning about carbon sequestration opportunities in organic is not enough. We've got to be focused on reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and I completely agree.

And certainly, we'll take that to heart I think as we work on this document for the fall.

There's a reference that keeps coming up, and I think there's been some confusion about this, related to a Research Priority on copper sulfate and rice production. We have included that, and it continues to get called out as being something we're not including and has not been rolling over. It is rolling over. And I just wanted to make sure that the community understands that. It's already not only referenced specifically under number 5 in the crops Research Priorities, but there's actually entire section that outlines a number specific issues that we're really particularly concerned about, and not relative to copper usage in organic rice production period, the end. So

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

it's really designed to kind of focus on that 1 2 larger question, and I would encourage the Crops Subcommittee to sort of make sure we feel like 3 4 that's the way we've got it articulated in the 5 is covering that particular document effectively. 6 There was some good feedback as well 7 on potentially thinking about Research Priorities 8 9 related to predator and wild animal management in 10 and around organic farms, racial inclusivity, and research in that area. 11 I did like some of the feedback we 12 heard about 13 sort of trying to formalize our 14 process here about -- I think people, in general, 15 appreciated hearing from NIFA in our cycle and 16 wanting to have some formality to that process 17 maybe every couple of years, and getting NIFA in 18 here so that we can be in dialogue about how this research is being used, and really making sure 19 there's appropriate feedback loops here. 20 21 feedback, Interesting one of the 22 things we try to do in these documents, and I

1 just want to let everyone know, we try and if 2 there's a need, we have a summary section in the Research Priorities, and then we also have a much 3 4 deeper dive in some the categories, as well. 5 Sometimes the summary priority, as written, is 6 enough, I would arque. And sometimes it's intended to sort of be enough. 7 And so I think one organization, in particular, said there's a 8 mismatch between the fact that we 9 have the 10 Livestock Priority Number 2 is not spelled out in more detail. But on some level, I think we felt 11 -- and correct me if I'm wrong on this, Brian, 12 and others on the Livestock Subcommittee -- that 13 14 we'd said enough relative to Number 2, 15 efficacy of natural parasiticides and methodologies under Livestock, and didn't spell 16 that out in more detail. 17 18 So maybe we should be clear about that 19 in the larger document compared to the summary, they're not always intended to 20 sort 21 necessarily have a full sort of spell out of more 22 detail to drive the Research Priority. I'm open 1 to thoughts on that, certainly.

2 There were a few things that, came out of the process. Some of the 3 feedback didn't really feel like -- it didn't 4 5 really feel like they would fall under Research Priorities. 6 You know, should Research Priorities, for example, be focused on domestic 7 sources of organic -- understanding domestic 8 9 sources of organic poultry feed or clarifying the 10 process for annotations. I'm not sure those are 11 research priorities, necessarily, but 12 feedback, and happy to use the Research 13 Priorities process as a means to sort of getting 14 some of that feedback.

So yeah, I really appreciate it, and I really appreciated hearing from the community, and definitely encouraging all of the committees to sort of internalize these comments and see if we can use the next several months to tighten up some of these Research Priorities even further. So that's what I wanted to share. I'm happy to take any questions or any discussion.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy, please ahead. 2 MS. BRUCH: Wood, thanks so much for 3 4 your leadership in this area. I just reviewed 5 all of priorities all of these across subcommittees, and they're incredibly important, 6 7 and the feedback was tremendous, as well, I think my question has always been on 8 that feedback loop. I think getting NIFA here is 9 10 helpful to know how many groups are taking on 11 these issues. I always request the idea of, you know, what's happening with that, and how are we 12 executing on them, and what can we learn about 13 14 Because, especially as a farmer, there's them. 15 some of these that are extremely critical, and I 16 know where a bunch of us are doing our own 17 non-farm research and would love, you know, kind 18 of an aggregated spot for this stuff to land. 19 Ι just think there's huge 20 opportunity for the Board to be more of 21 clearing house for the exchange of information to 22 the community who are requesting this and then to

the community to return this information 1 if 2 possible. And I think I might have -- I don't I've always tried to wrestle with this, 3 and how can we do this? 4 5 But three of these priorities, and two of them are new that I'd like to highlight, but 6 7 three total I think would fit well in the organic transition initiative. This OTI that we talked 8 9 about earlier in meeting. So that's the 10 expanding markets. So I think there's three of 11 them here that maybe we could highlight to the administration and highlight to grant writers, 12 13 please take these issues up. We need them and we 14 want to be able to expand our markets. 15 And the three that I'm mentioning, one 16 is on the Livestock list that's already developed 17 that we did receive feedback on about expanding 18 Livestock rotations -- expanding Livestock feed 19 situations to include rotations that

just kind of paraphrasing that, but essentially,

that they're not just looking at corn and beans

ingredients that are rotational crops.

20

21

22

And I'm

1 for some of their feed rations, that they're 2 looking at rotational crops which really ties back into building the markets. 3 I believe 4 rotational crops were one of the five that were 5 highlighted by the administration. So I would love to get them involved if possible and bring 6 this list to them. 7

The two also that were new, which I thought were really cool, is eliminating the barriers to access organic-produced food. That was a new one, I believe, and I don't think it's on the list, but that one really resonated with me, too, and it ties in beautifully with market expansion.

And the third one is Carolyn's topic, and we have to bring that up. Again, our crop insurance document that we love. To get this actuarial information, this is kind of the part, too. We need to have rotational crops and we need to have markets for them, but we also need to have the coverage for these crops that are common sense crops that producers need to

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2	So I don't know if it's possible to
3	outreach somehow or someway, but I do know
4	there's the grant process that Jenny mentioned,
5	and I think it's going to be conducted here
6	shortly. But maybe incorporate those in the
7	process, potentially. And then also reach out to
8	our private partners to see, you know, our
9	universities or any companies that are working on
10	these initiatives. I know there's a lot of
11	interest in what we're doing for organic
12	production, and I really think getting this list
13	to as many people that can help us, the better.
14	So that's my thoughts on that. But
15	thank you so much because this is incredible.
16	The collection of just needs that the community
17	has.
18	MS. HUSEMAN: I'm sorry. I have a
19	quick question. Can you reiterate the second
20	one?
21	MS. BRUCH: About eliminating barriers
22	to access organic-produced food?

produce.

1	MS. HUSEMAN: Awesome.
2	MS. BRUCH: That was a community
3	comment, and that really resonated with me. And
4	I don't believe it's on our list.
5	MS. HUSEMAN: Yeah.
6	MS. BRUCH: And the crop insurance one
7	isn't on our list either. But they really just
8	dovetail nicely with this overall market
9	expansion umbrella that we're undertaking.
10	MS. HUSEMAN: Excellent. Thank you,
11	Amy.
12	MS. BRUCH: Hey, no problem, Kim.
13	Thank you.
14	MR. TURNER: And for certain those are
15	really catches, Amy. Nate? Sorry.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Oh, thank you. I
17	think Carolyn was next.
18	MR. TURNER: Oh, Carolyn was next.
19	Sorry.
20	MS. DIMITRI: Oh, great. Thank you.
21	So you know Research Priorities always make me
22	happy, as a researcher. But I look at some of

especially, barriers 1 things like, these transitioning to organic production, and there's 2 a lot of research in that general area. 3 wonder how do we bridge the research world -- I 4 5 mean, I actually have several publications in that general area in terms of how handlers can or 6 whether they're helping farmers transition to 7 8 organic production. So I quess, are there 9 creative ways for us to think about connections 10 with researchers who are doing this kind of work because like some of it's done, and people don't 11 really hear or don't know about it. 12 And along those lines, sometimes if 13 you go to OREI with a question like barriers, to 14 15 transitioning, to organic production, you might 16 see like there are 50 papers on that. And I'm just making up the number. And then the panel 17 18 will like, why should we take say, scarce 19 and add more research into resources 20 particular question since we already have looked 21 at it? Thank you. 22 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Allison and then

1 Nate.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Thank you. This is such 2 MS. JOHNSON: an impressive list. I hesitate to offer to add 3 4 more to it, but I'm going to anyways. Amy, I 5 really liked your suggestion of expanding the markets umbrella, and I was thinking along the 6 7 lines. and the points you raised. definitely agree with. 8

I think that under general there is the influencing access to organic foods, and so maybe we'll, like, refine the general category or subset it or something like that.

And the other one that I would add to that list is around markets for rotation crops. You know, we see SO much momentum around plant-based foods right now, but they're often involving excluded methods, and they're looking very carefully at their production systems, and I keep wondering why the organic pulse burger isn't making a big splash on the market. And I think it's for lack of investment and research. So is that something that our

public followers could help create a market for? 1 And the other area I wanted to flag is 2 there's a long-standing push to have our research 3 4 agencies invest more in publicly available and regionally relevant season breeds. 5 And we have some specific breeding asks here but reiterating 6 that community priority on our research agenda I 7 think would be helpful. 8 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: 9 Nate? 10 MR. LEWIS: That mental sky walker is 11 our only hope, kind of thing. I really want to echo commending the group for the synthesis of 12 13 all these ideas. I wondered if the group would 14 be open to also including some input to NIFA on 15 administration of the grants, and I'm mainly --16 specifically thinking about match waivers. 17 Currently, NIFA allows match waivers 18 for a type of research that's applicable to many 19 agricultural commodities, and for also for minor 20 commodities. And I personally would like to see 21 opportunity an additional waiver for 1890 22 land-grant universities kind of in response to

the Equity Commission's suggestion about how 1 inequities and funding for, particularly, 1890s 2 universities has met to missing out on a lot of 3 And while that's not USDA research dollars. 4 5 necessarily the federal government's fault, we can take steps to perhaps ameliorate some of that 6 So the idea would be that inequity in funding. 7 we suggest they add a third potential waiver for 8 match for 1890 universities. 9 10 And I don't mean to put you on the 11 spot, Franklin, but you are a researcher at an 1890 university and if you have any comments on 12 13 difficulties in obtaining USDA research dollars, 14 I think that would help illuminate for me the 15 need to add something like that to this 16 particular document. 17

MR. QUARCOO: Yeah, you and I had talked about it a couple of days ago. Yes, the money is there, and then there are all these requirements that make the money unavailable even though you qualify for it. But what you need to do in order to get the money becomes a problem.

18

19

20

21

1	Then internally you're not trying to find out the
2	match, and so then in seconds. So that's a
3	very important point. The monies is announced
4	and is supposed to be available, but there are
5	institutional differences that make a whole lot
6	of difference in whether you actually get to have
7	assisted advance. So that's a very important
8	point. Thanks.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
10	for Wood or for Brian on Research Priorities?
11	Great. Well, thank you, Wood.
12	MR. WOOD: Great. Thanks. And we'll
13	move to our next agenda item, and thanks for that
14	discussion. I'll turn it over to Mindee who's
15	going to take us through an update on the
16	Excluded Methods TBD list. Are you ready for us,
17	Mindee?
18	MS. JEFFERY: Thank you, Wood.
19	(Off-microphone comments.)
20	MS. JEFFERY: Oh, we'll just do it
21	when we go to the TR template. You should be
22	fine otherwise. Thank you.

1 Thank you everyone for continuing this work together on the Excluded Methods front, in 2 As an introduction on the topic of 3 general. 4 Excluded Methods in organic, I'm going to pull a 5 from a current public comment few excerpts submitted by a retailer. 6 Since the passage of 7 the Organic Food Productions Act, the organic community has made it exceedingly clear that 8 genetic engineering, GE products, and the methods 9 10 they perpetuate, are not welcome in organic. their 11 excerpting here from larger and retailers do 12 Customers not want GE in No exceptions, and no gray 13 organic, period. 14 It is this clear and unwavering bright areas. 15 line that retailers and customers rely on. 16 Later in their comment, they say, with 17 implementation of the National Bioengineered Food 18 Disclosure Standard and infiltration of 19 manipulatable regenerative claims, the bright 20 integrity line and non-GE that organic 21 certification provides has become even more 22 critical to consumers and retailers alike.

the 1 Ι really appreciate absolute 2 clarity from stakeholders on Excluded Methods and NOSB recommendations have 3 always unanimous on this front. And we have heard from 4 5 program repeatedly that GMOs, and gene biotechnologies 6 editing techniques, and are prohibited from use in organic. 7 With that said, as for the TBD list 8 and just for clarity for the community's 9 10 sake, definitely intended to do this we 11 information gathering in the open docket, and an opportunity just didn't become available to us. 12 13 I do understand that the program submitted the 14 request to open the docket in a timely manner, 15 but that didn't work out. So we hustled to meet 16 a deadline for the submission for the discussion So thanks again to the stakeholders 17 documents. 18 who have shown up and consistently providing 19 information at useful depths. 20 As far as public comments go on these 21 documents, the general comments from one group 22 asserted that traditional plant-breeding methods

1 should be allowed and supported while GE 2 technologies should be prohibited under the organic label. A former group commented that 3 they concur that NOP should continue to assert 4 5 that organic is different. Excluded Methods, methods used to 6 including genetically modify 7 organisms or influence their arowth development by means that are not possible under 8 natural conditions or processes, are very clearly 9 10 not allowed or wanted in organic production.

> And then comments from a couple of seed companies were really extensive. One seed company commented that many of the TBD techniques are highly integrated into modern varieties being used in organic crops and that they may otherwise be achieved, these seed varieties, through natural breeding, but it could take five to ten times longer. And they are cautioning that to label some of now Excluded Methods techniques as would mean removing so many current varieties and some used by organic growers. This seed stakeholder both

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

urged the NOSB to make final decisions on the TB
list and encouraged the swift implementation of
the 2018 and 2019 NOSB recommendations for
strengthening organic seed guidance and that
those need to be prioritized.

So there's this tension here being expressed around which work is more functional for organic seed futures and the development and expanded use. This tension of making decisions on the TBD list and strengthening organic seed requirements.

And then another organic seed producer stated that we feel that the stated definitions in the TBD list document are generally sufficient and that there are some minor exceptions. But that's really in the weeds and we'll take that back to the subcommittee. And this commenter stated that as with any scientific protocol, the individual steps in a procedure will vary from one research institution to another, and even between protocols within the same institution depending on the desired outcome. Outlining

1 these steps in more detail than has already been 2 provided by the discussion document is not a useful exercise. importantly, 3 More is 4 consideration that for any of the techniques 5 being discussed in this document, a prohibitive substance could be used to induce the desired 6 mutations, and so too could protocols be followed 7 that do not use a prohibited substance. 8

> So asserting here that they're attempting to list all the plant varieties and all of the ways in which the plant TBD list techniques could be used and documenting all of those things, this seed company sees that as a Herculean task. And the commenter goes on to say that the TBD list techniques are important breeding tools that increase genetic variation and speed up the breeding process. At this point, trying to untangle modern varieties grown in organic systems which have a connection to one of these techniques and their pedigrees puts an undue burden on the system.

22 And then as they have written in

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

the continued focus numerous comments, breeding techniques is taking away precious NOSB resources from the much more pressing issue of addressing the organic seed usage loophole. According to the seed stakeholder, the reality is that all of the techniques in this discussion document are not traceable. Whatever decision the NOSB takes on these techniques will be unenforceable. We need the NOSB's help to close the organic seed loophole, which would provide a signal to the market that investing in organic seed breeding and development is a sound business model.

And then, asserting that as long as conventional seed is allowed in an system, it's not possible to regulate these untraceable breeding techniques. Furthermore, expecting companies such as ours, who develop and sell organic seed to self-prolif our breeding activities to avoid using techniques that have been determined to be excluded by the NOSB but otherwise untraceable are and unregulated,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

provides a significant competitive advantage to 1 2 the seed companies who are selling conventional untreated seed 3 into the verv same organic 4 markets. 5 there all And SO we have the background tensions and possibilities for 6 the Herculean task of looking at the TBD list. 7 at this stage, I'm going to open it up to the 8 Board for general comments. 9 And we have some 10 really amazing plant breeding experts 11 Board, and I'm very excited about that. y'all want to reflect on any of the specifics 12 in public comments 13 you saw about 14 specific techniques and/or the tension of 15 path forwards? 16 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Ouestions for 17 Mindee from the Board? Amy, please go ahead. 18 MS. BRUCH: Mindee, I just want to say 19 thank you for being a champion in this area. 20 This is extremely important to our community and 21 thank you so much for the passion you have behind 22 it to get it over the finish line. I appreciate

it. 1 2 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Hear, hear. Brian, please go ahead. 3 MR. CALDWELL: Well, I want to say the 4 5 same thing. Mindee's leadership has been really wonderful in all this. 6 And I guess I just want to put out 7 there that our stakeholders in the 8 organic 9 community is a really big group. Including the 10 sort of consumers at the base, retailers. 11 farmers, and seed breeders, amongst a lot of other people, handlers. 12 But the organic seed 13 breeding community comes out of a very and sort 14 of like high pressure academic -- most of them, a 15 high-pressure academic furnace, and they tend to 16 see things a little differently than a person like me and maybe many of our consumers do. 17 18

Anybody who thinks that or who would call bombarding a seed with radiation as a traditional breeding method, I think the traditional people of our world would really take umbrage of that because they were the ones that

19

20

21

some of our indigenous cultures for thousands and 1 2 thousands of vears used mass selection techniques, individual, and you know just all 3 kinds of things that a lot of them we don't even 4 5 know exactly how they produced. But they were the ones who bred corn from teosinte, and made 6 7 incredible, incredible leaps and progress terms of the amazing array of foods that we eat. 8 And those are the methods that I would want to 9 10 be called traditional. And so that word bothers me sometimes when I hear it. 11

> I also think that we need to But. whether decide we do want, you know. extremely toxic chemicals to be used in our plant breeding process, and radiation, and other methods like that. And my personal, you know, preference is no. And then we need to decide whether we're going to grandfather stuff in that we cannot, you know, figure out from the past efforts of 30 years or more of what's been done, and say that, okay, from this point forward, organic plant breeding will not have these.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

well, in other words, I think we have to make 1 2 these decisions and not be necessarily swayed by group within the organic community 3 small 4 saying, well, that really puts us or that's a lot 5 work for it feels impossible of us or 6 something. I think we really need to decide what 7 makes sense.

We have to remember that organic farming when it originated 100 years ago or more, and farmers said I don't want to use conventional chemical fertilizers. And that's what they said, and people thought they were completely nuts and out of their minds. And they thought that for 70 years, until then, well, there's this dead zone, you know, at the Gulf of Mexico. And so maybe some of these things take a while before they kind of surface.

So I think, again, we need to be, you know, we need to look inward as much as we can and decide what we really want in the system and then just make it work as best we can, and you know, consider all of our stakeholders, including

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	our plant breeders, but a lot of other people
2	too, anyways.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions?
4	Oh, Nate and then Allison.
5	MR. CALDWELL: Maybe more of a
6	question to the program, but NOSB passed a
7	recommendation related to seeds and the use of
8	non-organic seeds and continuous improvement. I'm
9	curious if there's a timeline on that from the
LO	program.
L1	MS. TUCKER: Yeah, I can give a quick
L2	update on that recommendation. That was in the
L3	Regulatory Priorities process last spring and
L 4	raised by the community as a high priority to
L 5	look at. And so the team did some, amongst all
L 6	this other rulemaking, they managed to do a
L7	really nice analysis piece on all the different
L8	things we could do around that.
L 9	I think there's some rules that take a
20	long time. I do think there's some things that
21	we can actively do before we decide we really
22	need to do rulemaking on this. And so the team

1 has laid out some recommended options for how to 2 proceed. We needed to get through the rules that we've got through. I do think that this topic is 3 4 next to sort of talk about where to go next. 5 do think lot of But Ι а these 6 recommendations may -- well, this particular 7 recommendation related to seed, may actually live more with like accreditation and even compliance 8 9 and enforcement than standards, and so taking 10 action in the right place and at the right time. 11 The team we do have some compliance 12 challenges. Let's see, there have been some 13 complaints, and then the complaint investigations 14 that led to adverse actions related to seed. 15 it is part of the broader and sort of portfolio of complaints in enforcement where we 16 17 don't get to talk about our successes so much, 18 but they actually have been some specifically

I think there continues to be more we can do in that area. We did put training in the Organic Integrity of Learning Center on this as a

related to seed.

19

20

21

And I think certifiers are 1 sort of signal. starting to notice that we've put training in the 2 learning center, and then, you know, we take --3 certain things follow after that, and you know, 4 5 we put training there. It's something that we If we invest in training, we care 6 care about. about it. And that leads to a natural cadence of 7 activity that's next. 8 9 So this is one I am very aware of how 10 high a priority this was for the community. 11 just haven't quite gotten there yet, but I feel like we're getting there. 12 Okay. MR. TURNER: Thanks very much. 13 14 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Allison and then 15 Amy. 16 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. Brian, I 17 really appreciated your comments. And what came 18 to mind for me is the massive loss of 19 biodiversity that we've felt the over century or so and the concentration of a lot of 20 21 the genetics of our current food system in the 22 hands of very few global businesses. And so we

need some sort of strategy to recover from that. 1 And so I'm going to re-plug my previous comment 2 on the research agenda around needing more public 3 investment in the season breeds that we need to 4 be developing. 5 I don't think we should take it at 6 This is hard and it takes a long 7 face value. time, so we don't do it. Or this is hard, and it 8 9 takes a long time, so what other resources do we 10 need to be recommending that we bring to bear to 11 solve the problem? So it's recommendations from 12 us, and it's the Farm Bill moving in tandem. I don't think the sort of current state of things 13 14 should stop us from making recommendations that 15 go toward the heart of OFPA. And if it's going to be challenging, then we also need to think 16 17 about how we overcome those challenges 18 community. 19 MS. BRUCH: Yeah, I just have another Nate, thanks for your comment to Jenny, 20 comment. 21 and Jenny this might also tag on to what Nate

said.

1	I think this is an important request
2	from the community, and I appreciate the
3	attention to it on, you know, just the
4	requirements of organic seed. I wanted to
5	understand though when we had our, oh, just a
6	report from Kiki from the Organic Seed Alliance,
7	we have hardly any data from international
8	producers. So when we're recommending these
9	requirements, which I think are necessary, how
10	does that impact people from overseas? Because I
11	don't think that technology is advancing in this
12	arena as much, and just the accessibility to
13	organic seed right now, we have very little data
14	according to Kiki. So we just need to kind of
15	put the whole big picture in perspective.
16	And I don't know, Jenny, if you can
17	talk, if regulations are being looked at and how
18	that will impact the international community.
19	MS. TUCKER: So any rulemaking we do
20	will impact any operation certified to the USDA
21	standards around the world, and so they'll have
22	to follow the exact same rules. I think one of

1 the -- to get a better sense of where are the 2 actual issues right now, every year, Robert --Robert are you here? There's Robert. 3 Robert and 4 his team identify audit priorities for the year. 5 And so based on community feedback and based on feedback from this Board, a couple of 6 audit priorities over the last couple of years 7 8 have been natural resources and biodiversity and 9 the soil provisions. And so those are things 10 Robert's team looks at when they go out and do 11 audits. Livestock's another big one that we've I do -- I wonder if at some 12 been looking at. point, okay, we have and that has been a really 13 14 important audit priority for natural resources 15 and conservation. I think a lot of that came up 16 with native ecosystems, and so that was something 17 we could do. 18 Now, I think the question is next year 19 do we need to do that again, or? And, you know, 20 now we've issued the non-compliances, 21 if those certainly, we'll check to see 22 non-compliances were corrected in audits,

1	we've got to make space for another priority.
2	There are only so many priorities the auditors
3	can do when they're on the ground looking at all
4	of these full systems, and they also need to look
5	at the origin of livestock implementation next
6	year, and they'll be looking at SOE
7	implementation. And so we need to be very
8	choiceful in the audit priorities.
9	I do think how certifiers are
10	overseeing seed searches, and so the different
11	variables that have been raised in those
12	recommendations. That's the conversation and one
13	of the options that the team has kind of laid
14	out, is what do we need to learn about how
15	certifiers are doing this and where are the gaps
16	that they need to fill. We don't need new
17	regulations to follow the existing regulations.
18	Does that answer the question?
19	MS. BRUCH: Yeah, that insight is
20	helpful.
21	MS. TUCKER: Okay.
22	MS. BRUCH: I think it's just, you

1 know, there's a lot more resources in our nation 2 that are pointed to organic expansion, organic resources, organic tools, or organic inputs. 3 4 maybe aren't as available these resources 5 So even though seed searches are going overseas. to be completed overseas, the accessibility and 6 commercial accessibility to 7 those aren't available, and the data currently isn't 8 being tracked by the Organic Seed Alliance, that 9 10 I am aware of. 11 And I believe I asked that question to don't 12 Kiki, and we know what's happening 13 I think when we look at just -- if 14 this is going to be considered as a priority or a 15 regulation, look at it on a global scale, 16 well. Because as a producer, we want to make 17 sure that everybody is following the same rules. 18 And it's different when we have more resources 19 Our rules actually become more stringent, which I agree with completely. 20 But there's not 21 an ability to follow those same rules overseas 22 just because of the lack of accessibility to 1 these audits.

2 MS. TUCKER: Yeah. Yeah. Again, I want to -- I agree with that statement, and I 3 want to do a shout out for the certifiers who 4 5 you know, trying to figure out how are, anytime you have -- it's a fascinating construct 6 that we're dealing with on most of these topics 7 in that you've got a public-private partnership 8 and so you've got, you know, private sector 9 10 certifiers figuring this out, and oh, by the way, 11 you have operations around the world to certify due to a USDA standard. 12 Ι mean, that's a 13 complex, tough system.

And the work that you do on this Board and these recommendations, impacts and has ripple effects across all of those certifiers and across all of those operations. And how do you make it rigorous and fair? And fair may be different depending on what topic it is and who you're talking about. And so, yeah, I think those are one of the reasons I like to celebrate certifiers and their work because they're on kind of the

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	front line of that every single day, and they are
2	tough decisions.
3	MS. BRUCH: Thanks, Jenny, and thanks,
4	Kyla.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other thoughts
6	or questions? All right, back to you Wood.
7	MR. WOOD: Thanks. Well, I just
8	wanted
9	MS. TURNER: Well, I'm going to just
10	say one thing, if you don't mind.
11	MR. WOOD: Go ahead.
12	MS. TURNER: Honestly, I'm really
13	excited about the possibilities of working on
14	this TBD list because it seems like the history
15	has been a need for expertise. And I think we
16	have the expertise, and I think we have OFPA, and
17	I think we have NOSB recommendations on criteria
18	for evaluating the Excluded Methods. And even if
19	we can't come up with the most hair-splittingest,
20	perfect recommendations, I do think we can make
21	some progress on this list and make some clear
22	recommendations.

1	So honestly, I'm not daunted by the
2	tension, and I'm really glad that you're asking
3	all the questions about the seed requirements.
4	And thank you for sharing information with us
5	about the progress of that. But for me, I think
6	we can do it, and I'm excited about working on
7	this TBD list. And so thank you.
8	MR. TURNER: Yeah. Thank you for your
9	resolve, Mindee, and the great leadership you've
10	shown on this. And also, I just want to sort of
11	echo Allison's comments to Brian. Brian, I mean,
12	you're a huge player in this committee and a huge
13	player to this work with Mindee, and the wisdom
14	of your comments really resonated with me, so
15	thank you. And we'll move on to the next oh.
16	Go ahead, Kyla.
17	MS. SMITH: Sorry. I wanted to say
18	one last thing. And just sort of, yeah, echoing
19	everybody's support and acknowledgment, Mindee,
20	of your leadership.
21	And I just wanted to quote something
22	out of the ACA Best Practices document on

1	material review on this particular topic, so.
2	Which just underscores that your work, or
3	collectively, the Board's work on this topic is
4	not going unnoticed. And so it says certifiers
5	and MROs should utilize both the Excluded Methods
6	definitions at 205.2, as well as the list of
7	Excluded Methods developed by the National
8	Organics Standards Board to evaluate potential
9	Excluded Methods technology. Excluded Methods,
10	as identified by the NOSB, can be incorporated
11	into affidavits for manufacturers. And so the
12	work of this Board is being utilized currently.
13	MR. TURNER: Thanks for that, Kyla. I
14	appreciate you reading that. So a related topic
15	or a somewhat related topic or a very related
16	topic is work that Mindee has also led us on in
17	the committee on the TR Template update. The
18	Technical Report Template update. Mindee?
19	MS. JEFFERY: Thank you. This is
20	really it's such a great experimenting
21	collaboration because I think I just wrote the
22	document, and I don't feel like I really did the

work, so. First, I'd like to thank the program 1 2 folks. especially Jared, for assistance on getting this project together. 3 Thank you, Jared. And also, thank you for your patience with me. 4 5 And thank you, OMRI so much for your work on TRs in general, and the very extensive and sensible 6 for updating 7 suggestions that OMRI made template when materials first embarked upon on 8 9 this work. So I appreciate you so much. 10 The stated goals of the document were to harmonize the flow of information requested in 11 the petition process 12 the TR with and OFPA criteria, while reducing redundancies and add 13 14 relevant questions and sections to the template 15 for Excluded methods. We didn't get a lot of 16 public comments back. My apologies to the 17 community for how we could present the template 18 with some updated suggestions. And I realized 19 that was hard for everybody, so thank you for your patience with evaluating those two appendix. 20 21 The public comments totally were

initiative

and

this

of

supportive

22

expressed

agreement that it is a worthy project from a functionality perspective and are supportive of the effort to capture information about Excluded Methods risks in the technical reports in a consistent and formalized manner.

> The Material Subcommittee understands that the TR Template is technically a tool for the Board and can be updated by the Subcommittee without a proposal. When we return to the Subcommittee, we plan incorporate to stakeholders' suggestions and move forward with a new template unless the follow-up conversation from the full Board suggests another route. excited about these revisions, especially in light of the consistency issue that may occur around Excluded Methods.

One certifier commented that they are wondering how confident the organic industry is in accepting non-GMO statements, and it's unclear to them if everyone that signs an affidavit is following the same recommended chart to determine what is an Excluded Method and what is not. So

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

thank you, Kyla, for that. A psychic moment a 1 2 few minutes ago. My hope is that we are able to update 3 materials with new TRs, and this is going to take 4 5 So future Board members, I encourage some time. you to be proactive about updating TRs. 6 additional 7 The questions around Excluded Methods in the TR process along with 8 Excluded Methods determinations by this NOSB will 9 10 bolster our ability to protect organic 11 transgressive technologies. One commenter said that they believe 12 13 that the information presented in the TR Template 14 and the drafted new TR Template presents the same 15 information, but organized in a way that easier to understand and apply. 16 In some cases, 17 the new template may prove to be less repetitive, 18 so that was some good feedback. 19 Another group supports the suggested updates to the Technical Report Template, 20 21 they specifically support questions related to 22 the use of Excluded Methods in the creation of

Τ	materials, their presence in raw agricultural
2	materials, and their use and presence in
3	fermentation processes. In addition to the
4	questions on Excluded Methods, they suggested
5	that a question be added as to whether a
6	substance contained nanoparticles as defined by
7	the NOSB and the NOP. Furthermore, this
8	commenter encouraged technical reports to include
9	language about how a petitioned material would
10	fit into an organic production system. Not just
11	whether there are other materials that could be
12	alternatives. This commenter emphasized that
13	organic agriculture is not just input
14	substitution, but rather the integration of
15	materials into a production method and systems
16	approach and noting that all materials should
17	constantly be looked at through a system's lens.
18	A certifier, in their public comment,
19	said that periodically updating templates is an
20	important way for certifiers to continually
21	improve their verification procedures and
22	supports the updated template. This certifier

noted that they use TRs to complete review of materials, and that TRs contain information about ancillary materials and production methods that can be a key to understanding whether a material that an operation wants to use is the same material that appears on the National List. And they also made a very specific suggestion for an edit. So thank you.

Another group likes that we're working to harmonize the flow of information requested in the TR with the petition template and the OFPA criteria, and they concur with the elements of the goals, and both the elements of the goals. And that these revisions will help streamline the flow of information needed at the various stages of the material review process. And that clarity of format and information transmission will help prevent errors and omissions as various bodies and stakeholders participate in the steps of the review process. As far as the questions are concerned, we did receive some great suggestions in specificity around Excluded Methods, and I

those look forward unpacking in to the Subcommittee. Unless anyone wants to dive into suggestions, I can leave it there. appreciate the information given by commenters question of around the TR users because experience has been that system changes go well when consideration is made at the beginning of a process to include the widest possible view of when, where, and who is using the system, and so if anyone was wondering about that question.

And to the last question, is the TR Template functional for all types of materials, methods, and practices, and if not, does the NOSB need to develop another Report Template methods and practices? And the commenters were pretty clear on the usefulness of the TR Template many considerations. And one commenter stated that the template with the additions suggested above, is probably functional as long as contractors are familiar with all of the other organic regulations and NOSB actions and the history of organic production.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	And so we got a lot of support and
2	some great suggestions. And I took particular
3	note of the suggestions that the TR capture the
4	potential for nanomaterials. And they also
5	appreciated the very extensive suggestion for
6	revisions to the petition template.
7	So with that, I don't think I need to
8	take a bigger dive into that. But I'm excited to
9	keep working on this. Anybody?
10	MR. LEWIS: I just have a logistics
11	question. What's the what would we be the,
12	like if, you know, we'll get an updated TR
13	Template, and we'll vote on in the fall, and then
14	it's
15	MS. JOHNSON: We don't have to.
16	MR. LEWIS: We don't have to, it's
17	just
18	MS. JOHNSON: We own this.
19	MR. LEWIS: Yeah. But
20	MS. JOHNSON: But that's go ahead.
21	MR. LEWIS: But is it part of the PPM,
22	or is just a standalone document?

1 MS. JOHNSON: It's a template. 2 MR. LEWIS: Yeah, okay. Yeah. That was 3 MS. JOHNSON: ΜV 4 understanding when we went through the process of 5 from discovery and got support everywhere. Nobody objected to our own ability to fix this 6 But I asked the question about -- we 7 template. asked the question about who uses it because we 8 9 do want to honor its functionality in all ways. 10 And so that information hopefully, as we go back 11 and have a dialogue about this, will keep us clear about making sure we're also considering 12 13 all of the other users. 14 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Logan? 15 MS. PETREY: Which Subcommittee do you 16 think that we're going to have Excluded Methods 17 come up in this process the most? Some of them 18 were looking at prioritizing TRs, you know so 19 that we do say in front of it. Because, you 20 know, if we do a TR, we're saying our standard is 21 every ten years we're going to update a TR. 22 just didn't know if there were certain materials

1	or things that were going to come up that we need
2	to highlight and say, well, if the TR and the
3	template's already going to be used immediately,
4	then that's fine. I was wondering about the
5	logistics of it, and if was going to take some
6	time to get adopted. But I guess that that's
7	going to go ahead and be used immediately.
8	MS. JEFFERY: Yeah. I mean, as fast
9	as we can get together and agree
10	MS. PETREY: Okay.
11	MS. JEFFERY: that this is where
12	we're headed and this is going to be the new
13	template, we can start using it.
14	MS. PETREY: Yeah.
15	MS. JEFFERY: But then that's why I
16	suggested that we and future Board Members should
17	continue to be really proactive about updating
18	TRs so that the rapidly advancing biotechnology
19	can be understood through that process.
20	MS. PETREY: That's right. I realized
21	that my question had been answered as I was
22	asking it.

1	MS. JEFFERY: Yes.
2	MS. PETREY: And that it was going to
3	be already adopted. And I was like, hmmm.
4	Maybe, we don't have to worry about that. Okay.
5	MS. JEFFERY: I mean, I love a
6	question. If I'm unclear, I'm going to ask it
7	again, so.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. Nice
9	job, Mindee. Thank you.
10	MR. TURNER: Thanks, everybody.
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right, that's
12	a wrap. Oh, I saw hand motions. Oh, for the
13	Board, we're going to be doing a group photo
14	tomorrow morning, so pick your fanciest shirts
15	and best smiles. And we're going to get some
16	good lighting. So tomorrow morning well, for
17	the rest of everyone in the audience, we're about
18	to wrap up, but for tomorrow morning, let's plan
19	to be here at 9:30 for the Board, and we're going
20	to start at 10:00, so then we'll have a little
21	time to figure out our photo and not rush it.
22	All right. So one more time, the

1	happy hour over at Wrecking Bar Brewpub, 219
2	Moreland Avenue, NE. It actually started at
3	it starts in three minutes, so everybody rush
4	over there. But it goes until 7:00, so if you
5	want to pace yourself, then you can show up
6	fashionably late.
7	Otherwise, thank you for a great day
8	two, and we're going to jump back in tomorrow at
9	10:00 a.m. And so we'll recess for now. Thank
10	you, everybody.
11	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
12	went off the record at 4:57 p.m.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

+ + + + +

NATIONAL ORGANIC STANDARDS BOARD

+ + + + +

SPRING 2023 MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY
APRIL 27, 2023

+ + + + +

The Board met at the Crowne Plaza Atlanta Midtown 590 West Peachtree Street, NW Atlanta, Georgia, at 10:00 a.m., Nathaniel Powell Palm, Chair, presiding.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

NATE POWELL PALM, Chair
MINDEE JEFFERY, Vice Chair
KYLA SMITH
AMY BRUCH, Secretary
BRIAN CALDWELL
GERARD D'AMORE
CAROLYN DIMITRI
KIMBERLY HUSEMAN
ALLISON JOHNSON
NATHANIEL LEWIS
DILIP NANDWANI
LOGAN PETREY
FRANKLIN QUARCOO
WOOD TURNER

NOP STAFF PRESENT

Committee MICHELLE ARSENAULT, Advisory Specialist JARED CLARK, National List Manager FRED DAVID, Assistant Director, Standards Division ERIN HEALY, Director, Standards Division ANDREA HOLM, Agricultural Marketing Specialist ALEXIS McINERNEY, Program Analyst JOHANNA MIRENDA, Agricultural Marketing Specialist JENNIFER TUCKER, Ph.D., Deputy Administrator ROBERT YANG, Director, Accreditation Division PENNY ZUCK, Agricultural Marketing Specialist

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Handling Subcommittee	4
Deferred Votes	123
NOSB work agendas/materials update	123
Other business and closing remarks	125
Adjourn	162

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(10:00 a.m.)
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right. So
4	we are officially back from recess, finishing
5	up day three. We're going to start off with
6	handling today.
7	We're going to shoot for a break
8	around 11:15 and then we're going to go all the
9	way through to the end. So lunch after we're
10	done here today.
11	With that, I'm going to kick right
12	over to Chair of Handling, Kyla Smith.
13	MEMBER SMITH: Good morning
14	everybody. Okay. We had a great crew on the
15	Handling Subcommittee this past semester which
16	now also includes Nate Lewis, and we were happy
17	to have him join.
18	We had a packed work agenda this
19	past semester. We had 19 sunsets and of course
20	everyone's favorite topic, ion resins. Like I
21	said, we're super grateful to have an
22	additional member as we plan our work for next

1 year.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

We have a few petitions that are in 2 the pipeline. We're waiting on TRs, and 3 4 have 29 sunsets to review. As my table mate, 5 stated, we're working collaboratively Amv across scope -- across the scope sub-committee, 6 7 crops, life stock, handling, to streamline the process such as evaluating the next batch 8 of sunsets for TR determination earlier in the 9 10 that might year in the hopes we TRs 11 earlier.

> I also wanted to reiterate that we too in handling experience receiving some TRs a bit. late in our process and while the subcommittee may not have formally deemed them sufficient, which is the trigger to post them for the wider community, we did have the draft to utilize in the write-up and will ensure full incorporation of the info from the TR prior to the fall vote.

Okay. Now let's get into it.

Kicking off handling with ion resins which I am

1 Okay. So the topic the lead on. of exchange was sent to the board in 2019 by the 2 asked the board to NOP. The memo 3 4 recommendation on "Whether it is appropriate to include these substances on the national list." 5 The Handling Subcommittee decided to split this 6 7 topic into the two components of the ion exchange process, the recharge materials 8 the resins. 9

The recharge materials were voted on at the fall 2022 meeting and recommended to the program that the recharge materials do need to be listed on the national list. Last fall we also presented three options for how to address resins and got feedback from stakeholders.

These options and the stakeholder comments were discussed at the subcommittee and the outcome of those discussions are presented in the proposal before the board today which is to move forward with Option 1, resins do not need to be listed on the national list. The reason for that being that resins do not meet

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the definition of ingredient or processing aid as well as that certifiers and inspectors have oversight and are evaluating operations that use ion exchange systems and they do so in compliance with the organic regulations such as having protocols in place to prevent potential contamination.

We've heard from stakeholders through written and oral comments. Most were favor of the proposal. in Those in favor included four certifiers, a trade organization, international consulting firm, and an inspector co-op. Those opposed were a couple of certifiers, a couple of advocacy groups, and I will say that of the certifiers farmer. that commented, a strong majority were in favor of the proposal.

Comments in support of the proposal to not list resins focused on and agreed with the subcommittee's rationale related to the definitions and the board's scope of authority and felt confident in certifier's ability to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	evaluate through the OSP review and inspection
2	process, and operation's compliance with the
3	requirements to prevent potential
4	contamination.
5	Comments not in support noted that
6	while resins do not meet the definition of an
7	ingredient or processing aid, they are
8	functionally different than other food contact
9	substances. They are in favor of listing
10	resins so that we as a board can review them
11	individually and evaluate compatibility with
12	OFPA and also for transparency to stakeholders.
13	Commentors opposed to the proposal
14	also focused on the theoretical potential for
15	leaching. One commentor also stated that
16	organic food and water that goes through an ion
17	exchange system is synthetic and therefore also
18	needs to be listed on the national list.
19	I'd like to break down break each
20	of these down and provide my thoughts and then
21	I'll open it up for discussion.
22	Regarding definitions. As a

certifier, the organic regulations at 7-CFR
part 205 which includes the definition section
is like my bible. It is how certifiers make
decisions, certification decisions, and enforce
the regulations on the daily. If we aren't
going to adhere to them, what's the point?

After the meetings that the NOP held with FDA, the board was encouraged to use our own definitions in OFPA and the organic regulations such as ingredient and processing aid due to the sorted history with FDA on how they classify resins. This is reflected in the proposal.

law, OFPA, resins don't really Вy have a home on the national list. I would like to acknowledge that there are a few items on the national list that also might not meet those definitions, but Ι think we have opportunity here to not continue to set precedent, not to put bad on top of bad. I'm mostly thinking of equipment sanitizers in this case, by the way.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Regarding leaching, the FDA process 1 for inclusion of resins requires submission of 2 estimation of dietary intake, EDI 3 recording. 4 essentially а toxicological assessment through their 5 evaluated by FDA review and approval process. Restated in their 6 7 comments that "Migration of chemical elements originating from exchange resin to food is a 8 9 potentiality but not quaranteed and is risk." 10 Certifiers 11 and inspectors are 12 evaluating an operations adherence to their OFP describes 13 that management practices and 14 procedures, frequency of monitoring, and contamination and co-mingling prevention, along 15 general, 16 with in assessing an operations 17 adherence to food safety protocols. 18 Regarding transparency, it is true 19 that without listing resins on the national 20 anyone, an educated consumer say, would list 21 pointed to the FDA food contact not be substances database to be able to see all the 22

resins that could potentially be in use. 1 said, that is why the instruction to certifiers 2 such an important part of this proposal. 3 4 Not only will it ensure certifiers will utilize 5 a consistent review process for these resins, it references the FDA database and can serve as 6 7 public-facing transparency the that commenters were concerned about. 8 9 Regarding chemical change and juice 10 synthetic determination, organic that goes through an ion exchange system is still 11 12 There are ions that have been exchanged 13 to filter out certain elements such as heavv 14 metals and other things, but it is still organic juice. 15 Per NOP guidance 5033, Section 4.4, 16 17 classification guidance does not determine the 18 eligibility of а substance for organic 19 certification. And water, which is probably 20 the most common ingredient that is filtered 21 through ion exchange systems is not synthetic. 22 This isn't perfect, it's not а perfect

1	solution, we've heard that theme throughout
2	this week, but it's the best path forward that
3	we have that most aligns with our process and
4	scope of authority and has the least amount of
5	risk.
6	That's my summary, let's hear your
7	all thoughts.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Questions for
9	Kyla from the board. Well, when you answer all
10	the questions in your summary, boom.
11	Amy, please go ahead.
12	MEMBER BRUCH: Kyla, table mate,
13	thank you so much for that thorough review of
14	this topic. It's really interesting to me, I
15	have several questions but the first one I'm
16	going to ask is just international compliance
17	with the subcommittee's recommendation. We
18	mentioned that the resins are reviewed by FDA.
19	I just want to understand a little bit more
20	internationally how our recommendation will be
21	executed.
22	Are resins that are located

1 internationally, are these processes that are completed by manufacturing facilities 2 they internationally, following 3 FDA are 4 compliance first and then also our Because I know they have to be 5 recommendation? reviewed by accredited certifiers, but 6 7 you speak more to that please? MEMBER SMITH: I don't really know 8 are available in 9 if -- what exchange systems 10 the international community. This proposal as require that the written would require, does 11 12 recharge materials be listed on the national 13 list which already approved. we So international certifiers would need to follow 14 that. 15 16 Tt. also would require that 17 resins be listed on the food contact substances 18 database and that would be an instruction to 19 certifiers which the program would follow-up 20 with certifiers to make sure that they're 21 adhering to that instruction. So without those 22 two components, I would think that those resins

would then -- you know, or those systems, 1 if those two things were not true, would not be 2 able to be used. 3 4 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate. 5 MEMBER LEWIS: I'm trvina to assemble my thoughts on the topic. The issue 6 7 of definitions really resonates with me and thanks for kind of honing in 8 on that. 9 Processing aids and ingredients are defined 10 terms, well ingredients are, processing aids are, but ingredients, one of the challenges of 11 12 the organic standards. 13 But I think the importance of being 14 true to those, the way we use those and have historically used those not just relate to the 15 list 16 national but. t.o how certifiers do 17 calculations and label determinations every day 18 on various processed products. And so if we 19 were to suggest that something that wasn't a 20 processing aid should live on the national 21 implications aren't list, just for the the

things that might go

other

22

national

on the

list, but there's implications that extend to 1 how products are calculated, how labels 2 assigned and I think we really just need to, 3 4 whether it's you know, I understand it can be frustrating that if we can't use the national 5 list as a tool to address certain concerns that 6 7 folks may have, we do need to kind of respect the precedent there. 8 9

So I want to just acknowledge that that is a frustration, and I can see how that would make folks want to use the national list But I think it kind of goes back to as a tool. if you're only tool is a hammer, then the, every problem looks like a nail issue. And so don't we have а home for these types of That's unfortunate. materials.

And so where I tend to go with things like that is, what do we have in the standard. And I want to sort of make sure we don't forget that 205.272 requires every producer, every handler to have a system plan that prevents contamination of the products

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that they manufacture. And it's the certifier's job to verify that those plans are in place.

So ion exchange resins are overseen There's really, you know there's a by FDA. public list of things that are allowed as ion exchange resins. There's pretty strict comprehensive testing requirements to ensure that there isn't leaching of these resins. We arque about whether we trust the FDA's approach or not, but they are the scientists there and those things will continue to govern these materials whether they're on the national list or not if they're in contact with any food, organic or non.

So I just want to make sure folks are kind of thinking within that context and perhaps we kind of extend the conversation to how do we support certifiers in their assessments of contamination prevention plans. We have a really good system for supporting certifiers in verifying buffer zones on farms

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

through residue sampling and I would like to 1 see the board spend some time looking at how we 2 can support certifiers of handlers and having 3 4 some additional tools for verifvina 5 prevention -- those contamination prevention plans in a facility. 6 7 And I'd like to kind οf see testing 2.0 element added to our work agenda, 8 9 maybe perhaps within the context of a global supply chain. 10 But there's number а of processes going on in a handling facility that 11 12 have the potential to contaminate products. 13 Operations obligated to prevent are that. 14 Certifiers are obligated to ensure those 15 prevention plans are adequate, and I think a 16 testing component could support those 17 endeavors. 18 So I think for me, you know, 19 intending on voting in support of option 1 20 because I don't believe they belong on the 21 national list. I do recognize the concerns

elevated around contamination and I believe the

way to address those is through the existing regulations and some additional guidance around what tools would be effective in supporting certifiers verifying handlers are doing their obligation of preventing that contamination.

MEMBER CALDWELL: Thanks, Kyla. Ι really appreciate the work that Handling Subcommittee does on this and as I've mentioned before, it's like a whole new world to me. Т defer really strongly to your recommendations, but Ι do have couple questions.

One is that it seems to be that the classification of material is а little There doesn't seem to be universal ambiquous. is agreement as to what it from what. getting here. So I'm not you know, I'm not totally convinced by the fact, well it doesn't have a place on the list because it's defined thusly. But what I wanted to ask in particular when I read through the ion exchange process, it seemed to me there are actually

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

sort of three classes of materials that 1 involved. And one is the resin backbone, 2 second one which is part of the resin 3 4 system is the, basically, these ions that are impregnated into the resin that then serve as 5 exchange sites. And then the third 6 7 material is the recharge materials. And so with the proposal the way it 8 9 is, those first two groups, both the backbone materials and whatever cad ions are affixed to 10 them would not be reviewed at all. And I quess 11 12 I'm wondering -- and it sounds like from some of the stakeholder comments, that there are 13 14 actually not very many of these materials. It's a pretty -- maybe -- I saw the number 15 15 16 total for the, both the combinations 17 backbones and these ions. So it seems like it's not a huge lift to sunset them and review 18 19 them every five years. 20 And I'm just wondering, what is the 21 there since is concern amongst our

stakeholder community, segments of them -- what

1	would be the resistance of just doing that for
2	those 15 or finite number that I guess and
3	I'm going to maybe anticipate your answer
4	they would have to go through a position
5	process, right? And there would have to be
6	some kind of allowance for continuation of
7	what's in use through that. But anyways, what
8	would be the resistance of having those
9	reviewed in the sunset process, sort of
10	regardless of their status, you know, as a type
11	of material?
12	MEMBER SMITH: I think there's more
13	than 15. I saw that number to, but I think I
14	also saw like 30. So I think mostly the
15	resistance from me anyway is because it sets
16	bad precedent and then the potential gets
17	opened up for other things to be petitioned
18	that don't have a home on the national list
19	because they don't meet our definitions.
20	And so it's putting bad on top of
21	bad and it just is bad precedent.
22	MEMBER JOHNSON: Thank you so much

1 for all of your work on this, Kyla. Your presentation was really clear. 2 And Ι also appreciated 3 4 question, Brian because it's the one that I've 5 been sitting with. I think Kyla's answer is spot on and is what leads me to continue to 6 7 support the proposal. I think at the end of the day these 8 9 resins are more like equipment than 10 processing aid or something else that ends up 11 in the product. And if we start to go down 12 that road, what else are we going to start to 13 feel the need to scrutinize. It becomes, I 14 think. an overwhelming and impractical direction to go very quickly. 15 Saying that, I still recognize that 16 17 you know, we have concerns about plastic, we 18 concerns about PFAS, all of 19 materials and this like, track record of, 20 this is fine and safe. Oh, oops, it wasn't and 21 now we have some sort of chemical contamination So I'm sitting with that. 22 problem.

But under the regulatory framework
that we have, I think the proposal that we've

put forward is the most, kind of, reasonable
and practical way to deal with this issue at
this time.

6 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER LEWIS: Brian, I really liked your question. I think it's a good one to consider which is you know, why not. You know, sort of precedent and definitions aside, it is a tool for evaluating materials so why not add it.

And I think my response is that I don't think the national list is structured in way that allows the board to address concerns that these materials raise community. These -- from what I heard from public comment the concerns primarily are degradation of the product and its around unintentional entrance into the food chain, or the food -- you know, the product. And whether or not it's listed on the national list doesn't

1 give us any tools to restrict that because it is all about proper operation and maintenance 2 of the product that prevents that. 3 4 So that's again why I go back to 272 as the place in the rule to address the concern 5 that I heard from the community. And simply by 6 7 putting something on the national list, you don't necessarily have that added definition to 8 9 enforcement. So that would be my reaction to 10 that question. 11 MEMBER SMITH: Yeah. I was going to 12 also add too, that like it's not that these substances or the resins themselves are not 13 14 being reviewed. They are being reviewed by context of their OFP 15 certifiers in the 16 through inspection and ensuring operators adhering to the regulations. So it's not that 17 18 they're not being reviewed, they're just not 19 being reviewed in the context of the national 20 list. 21 MEMBER CALDWELL: Just quick 22 thought I had during the conversation.

trying to think of well, so I mean one of the 1 issues is that these materials are in intimate 2 contact with the product. And I was thinking, 3 4 well what would be another example of that. And of course I'm coming from the crop world. 5 And I'm thinking about salad mix harvesters and 6 7 snap bean harvesters. And when they go through a field, 8 9 they cut everything down and it goes through 10 all kinds of belts and you know, air movement pretty evervthing like that, intimate 11 and 12 contact. So I can see that there is potential for other kinds of things that we might not 13 want to be evaluating on the national list that 14 I hadn't thought of at all before. 15 So anyways, 16 I just wanted to share that idea. 17 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy and then 18 Dilip. 19 MEMBER BRUCH: Okay. This has been 20 really great conversation. I'm a big proponent 21 of basic conditions and definitions as well. Ι 22 think the clarity for me happened in the term

1 "leakage" and really understanding what that term meant in this context. 2 But I did have a guestion. 3 You 4 mentioned you know, option 1 points us to where we need to go because of precedent. I just had 5 quick thing to reconcile though because 6 7 initially this was done based on, or kind of this whole work project began because the NOP 8 issued a memo to all certifiers in May of 2019 9 10 saying actually all these materials needed to be listed on the national list. 11 12 So I'm just trying to reconcile our 13 you know, our vote here today in precedence with what the NOP initially had communicated to 14 the program or sorry, to the community. 15 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: 16 Just because we 17 have the program right here, I feel like we 18 should kick it to them for one second. 19 MEMBER BRUCH: Yes. Perfect. 20 That's fine too, because initially 21 framework was different than potentially what 22 option 1 is telling us to do now, so.

1 DR. TUCKER: Thank you for letting You know, when the community, 2 speak up. when the industry encounters new problems you 3 4 know, sometimes we have to you know, establish 5 new solutions and new processes to make sure we're being really thoughtful about the broader 6 7 industry that will be impacted by any of our decisions. 8 And material conflicts is a big one. 9 10 broadly, when there is And SO а material conflict and somebody says you know, well this 11 12 should be allowed, or this shouldn't be allowed should on the list and certifiers 13 be or 14 disagree it does come to us through a process. 15 And sometimes say, we okay, "Certifier A" yeah, you made a mistake. 16 You've 17 got to change your mind because you 18 mistake. And sometimes it becomes a bit of an 19 irreconcilable difference. Ι think at 20 point thought could answer these we we 21 questions. So this came in, and a team looked 22 at it and said, okay we think that yeah. We

1 think they should be on the national list. And we issued that. That's what you're referring 2 And man, did we get the letters flying. 3 4 That happened three times. were three times where there was a material 5 conflict, we made a decision in the program, we 6 7 put it out there, and immediately we got a , oh my God, you can't do that. This is more 8 9 complicated than you think it is. 10 So we responded with a new process, which actually has led to today. 11 You are the 12 new process. And so I think that initial 13 charge that we gave was based on our best 14 assessment at the time. Whatever you determine as a board is what where we're going to end up 15 because we probably weren't -- we have changed 16 the process so that we have a greater sense of 17 18 humility in putting out decisions related to 19 materials. 20 And we got some pretty clear letters 21 in saying, arguing the opposite side. So no one's view is complete, right? 22

1 MEMBER BRUCH: Sure. No, that's helpful. just trying to reconcile 2 Ι was because the initial decision from the program 3 4 said that these substances, all substances 5 essentially, needed to be on the list including the materials we're talking about today. 6 7 just trying to understand initial that thought process. 8 9 I'm clear about the current process, 10 but I'm just trying to reconcile them. 11 DR. TUCKER: Kyla's hand's up, so. 12 MEMBER BRUCH: Thank you. 13 I'm just like MEMBER SMITH: Yeah. looking at the notice to certifiers here that 14 Amy's referring to. And my read on it is that 15 16 they were equating the entire filtration 17 process to things that were already on -- other 18 filter needs that were on the national list and 19 looking at the whole system. And I think that 20 the community reacted because it's not 21 simple and they were able to provide 22 justification to say, you have to look at the

1 component parts and put the recharge materials on and --2 think the original 3 Anvwav, Ι 4 assessment was based on the whole and then now 5 we're breaking it apart. DR. TUCKER: And can I just say, I 6 7 really this appreciate how much board engaged in this complexity. And honestly, it's 8 9 little there's SO many complicated 10 I feel, frankly, problems. And а little 11 relieved that this has been as hard as it is 12 because honestly, when we had to pull that back up and then I thought, oh my God, I'm a new 13 deputy administrator and here I am pulling back 14 memos already. 15 And to have actually, the validation 16 17 that this isn't as simple as we probably 18 thought it was and it was right to set up a new 19 complicated process. That takes time. So 20 actually I've been really pleased with how --21 although it's long and complicated -- how this 22 has worked. So thank you, again.

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Dilip.
2	MEMBER NANDWANI: Kyla, you may have
3	answered, probably I missed it. Just to
4	clarify, is there any list of resins so far
5	available? I don't know, you mentioned it. Is
6	it like 15 or 30? So do we have a list of
7	resins being used? And any review on those
8	particular resins included in the TR or any
9	elsewhere the information is available, their
10	effects on, whether on plants, and all that?
11	Thank you.
12	MEMBER SMITH: So the list of resins
13	can be found in, and what's recommended in the
14	proposal, is that they be listed either on the
15	inventory of effective food contact substances
16	notification database, or the inventory of food
17	contact substances listed at 21-CFR. So those
18	are the reference points.
19	The TR didn't look at the resins
20	individually, but looked at them more you know,
21	as a class.
22	MEMBER NANDWANI: Okay. Thank you.

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Franklin.
2	MEMBER QUARCOO: Yes. I have a
3	similar question, maybe a follow-up to what
4	Dilip said. What are the tools available to
5	certifiers and inspectors to carry out proper
6	oversight. For example, how many times should
7	you use this column, what flow rate,
8	temperature. What are the factors that lead to
9	more leaching, for example? Is there a certain
10	number of times when, after if you use this
11	product, best practice is that you change the
12	column materials and column sample?
13	So what are the tools available to
14	an inspector to do the oversight? Basically
15	everything is being moved to that side instead
16	of the regulation side. So what are the tools
17	available to the person actually interfacing
18	with the firm and making a decision so they can
19	tell these things are being followed? So
20	that's my main question. Because we're talking
21	about leaching.
22	Also, what amount? Is it 1ppm of

1 leached material? All those values, you know, would like to see more information on what 2 are the effects of people exposed to that. 3 Is there a lot of work on that? 4 5 I would just say that MEMBER SMITH: vou know, the context of the OSP, an operator 6 7 you know, would be describing how, you know, their GMPs, their good manufacturing processes, 8 9 and following and adhering to those. 10 And the FDA is ultimatelv the regulatory authority like, over these, 11 12 а food safety issue. And SO if operator is using these systems, they're going 13 to need to be -- that's the authority, right? 14 And it would be similar to like any other type 15 of equipment, like tubing or, I don't know, any 16 17 other type of food contact substances that are 18 overseen by the FDA. 19 But in an operator's organic system 20 plan it would cover information like that to 21 indicate when they would be needing to change 22 out the columns. PCO doesn't certify

1	operations that use ion exchange so I can't
2	speak specifically from experience on exact
3	type of information that are held within OSPs,
4	but I would imagine they're following you know,
5	user manuals and the like.
6	MEMBER QUARCOO: So you think that
7	certifiers currently have that information and
8	tools to adequately
9	MEMBER SMITH: Yeah. I mean, and I
10	do
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Can I jump in as
12	an inspector real quick?
13	MEMBER SMITH: Yeah. I was just
14	going to say like, I do know that within
15	inspection reports, like the it's common for
16	inspectors to be evaluating that operations has
17	passed like their food safety protocols and
18	that they're you know, getting sort of passing
19	grades in regards to food safety. So I don't
20	know if you want to add anything.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yeah. A couple
22	things. I'll try to keep this all linear. One

comment that was made a few times was this idea 1 that these materials aren't being reviewed. 2 it think sort of shows 3 And Ι 4 misunderstanding of how we operate as an 5 industry. And that misunderstanding is the role that the certifier plays. 6 7 the certifier spends And much SO human capital, money, resources, researching, 8 9 and managing this standard that Nate 10 citing of, we have to prevent contamination and comingling. And because there's a really broad 11 12 world of food contact substances, and I think of you know, the tote bag that holds my own 13 14 wheat. Not something that's going listed, but something that the point, and the 15 16 coolest thing about this industry is a human 17 goes and looks, is that tote bag falling apart into the wheat, and is that an example of it's 18 19 time to be changed out. 20 And so when we think about going 21 through -- bingo -- when we think about going

ability for the

through the

22

certifier

certification industry to manage all of these 1 complex issues, a big component is trusting the 2 certifier as evidenced by the fact that for 30 3 years they have built this infrastructure in 4 5 partnership with inspectors their and own material review teams to make sure that they 6 7 have evidence that we don't have contamination. So as an inspector, when we go on 8 9 site we're going to be looking for 10 things. And this brought me back to that word, "leaching." Leaching, as we heard, refers to 11 when the resin is no longer effective. 12 we're trying to pull arsenic out of a material, 13 it shows that the arsenic isn't getting pulled 14 That's the leaching. It's not that we're 15 testing for or seeing evidence that the actual 16 17 resin is breaking down. 18 And so as an inspector, we would be 19 looking at those certificates of analysis, and 20 they wouldn't be selling that because 21 certificates wouldn't be passing those of analysis. And so when thinking about how does 22

the on the ground work get done, it really is 1 auite simple that we're looking for all 2 these different food tests to come back clean 3 4 showing that the ion exchange is working. 5 And that then we can sav, as an inspector, could you show me the manufacturer's 6 7 protocol for this material in as much as how long does the manufacturer recommend that it be 8 used before being changed out. 9 And then ask 10 the producer, how old is this? How long has it 11 been here? And we can then raise a red flag 12 saying, this material seems a little dated as 13 evidenced by two things. One, it's beyond the life of what the manufacturer recommended, but 14 two, it's not doing its job anymore. 15 And so that human factor 16 is what. 17 this industry so darn cool. There's 18 someone actually checking to make sure the 19 story that's being told stacks up. 20 MEMBER QUARCOO: I have a response 21 if you don't mind. to that So what was

is what

I

thought

defined

as

leaching

22

defined as "leaking" in the report. That it's
no longer able to pull out what -- so the
leaching, according what I read was when the
resins starts getting into the -- unless I read
it wrong. So that's one clarification that I
need on that.

The other aspect of it is, are we saying that -- okay. I was thinking the whole onus was going to be on the certifier, the But hearing what you just said it inspector. it's just now, okay, let's if appears as with the FDA. And I have no problem going So is that the according to what the FDA says. This is FDA approved and that's -oversight? just want to understand that it's not the certifier or the inspector that has to at least make sure that these FDA guidelines are being followed, best practices. So I still think the inspector or certifier has a key role to play in option 1.

21 That is the strong point of option 22 1, is that the things that option 2 and 3 were

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

worried about were going to be looked at by the 1 inspector who interfaces with the producer and 2 makes sure guidelines are followed. Unless I'm 3 4 getting it wrong. SMITH: 5 veah. You're MEMBER So correct in your terms. Leakage I think, is the 6 7 term that you were talking about, not leaching. Leaching Ι do think is like the potential 8 9 theoretical potential for the resin 10 leach plastic, like of know, other types plastic that we talk about. 11 Leakage is what 12 Nate was describing, so you are correct. 13 I think it's both in regards to the 14 oversight, right? So obviously the FDA has oversight of food contact substances. 15 It's a 16 food safety issue, right? The organic 17 certifier and inspector, as Nate described, is 18 looking at an operation's compliance with FDA further 19 well as compliance to as ensure 20 contamination prevention. So Nate's correct in 21 that like, those are the extra questions that 22 would get asked on an inspection. You know,

1	are you following the user manual? The user
2	manual says whatever, you're not following
3	that. Like, what's going on here? So that is
4	the further questioning that would happen. So
5	it's both.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Allison.
7	MEMBER JOHNSON: Thank you. Thanks
8	for those questions, Franklin. I find some
9	theme stands out from every meeting and this
10	one is, we need to be really careful with our
11	words. And this a particularly acute example.
12	So thank you, Kyla for the parsing of "leakage"
13	versus "leaching."
14	The questions that we included to
15	stakeholders were there in part because I did
16	feel concerned about a leaching risk. So some
17	risk of material exposure from these resins
18	that are not associated with the proper
19	functioning of an ion exchange contraption,
20	operation.
21	And I feel convinced from public
22	comments that there isn't anything we can do

1 I'm worried about unknowns, and it's really hard to check for unknowns. We could test for 2 something, but we wouldn't even know what we 3 4 would be looking for. So I did feel comforted by Gwendolyn's comment -- I don't know if she's 5 still here -- but her kind of very detailed 6 7 explanation about the proper working of columns and that if there were some you know, tangible 8 9 problem with column you would start to see 10 impacts in leakage. those So the improper functioning of the equipment before you would 11 12 start to see like a worse breakdown. gives me some comfort. 13 address 14 Tt. doesn't t.he unknown 15 unknowns piece, but I think because these 16 really do function like as equipment, 17 that's a concern for a much wider range of 18 materials that are part of our food processing 19 I'm comfortable being uncomfortable system. 20 with that at this point. 21 But I would hope if someone did find evidence that you know, a particular resin is a 22

1 problem or we're learning more, that people would bring us that information and we could 2 address it. 3 4 MEMBER SMITH: And I would just say 5 too that I think OMRI also spoke to that as well, which I did quote in my opening here. 6 7 That this you know, the potential like leaching is like a potentiality and not a guaranteed and 8 9 it's very low risk based on those EDI numbers. 10 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Mindee, qo ahead. 11 12 VICE CHATR JEFFERY: Thank you. When I was little, my parents only bought salt 13 14 and sugar because we lived close enough to both my grandparent's farms that they mostly could 15 16 grow and can everything themselves. And that's 17 what I want for organic. I want the local, 18 food nutrition for everybody that's 19 certified organic because it's good for 20 politics, but that we'd all get to stay home in 21 our whole food food system, but we don't live 22 there.

1	And so for me, when I face the
2	customer who wants raw, organic coconut water
3	shipped over from Thailand, I have to think
4	about the compromise of the best path in the
5	given reality. And so for me, looking at all
6	of the steps that have been taken to understand
7	option 1 at this level of depth, it's the best
8	process path with the most consistent ability
9	to trace what we're doing and live in an
10	organic system that grapples with industrial
11	reality in the most transparent way it can.
12	And so, thank you so much for
13	everyone who provided so many details in the
14	weeds on this one. I'm really comfortable with
15	option 1 from that process path perspective.
16	MEMBER LEWIS: Just really quick,
17	that sugar probably went through an ion
18	exchange column.
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
20	for Kyla or comments? Feeling good, everybody?
21	All right.
22	MEMBER SMITH: Let me so the

1	motion to approve the recommendation that ion
2	exchange resins used in the ion exchange
3	filtration process are not required to be on
4	the national list, and that NOP provide
5	instructions to certifiers as outlined in the
6	recommendation was motioned by me and seconded
7	by Wood in subcommittee and comes to the board
8	motioned and seconded.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Motioned and
10	seconded. All right.
11	Now that we're all here, and I'm
12	grateful that we're all feeling better, we can
13	all be taking this vote in person. We're going
14	to start again with Allison in the flesh and
15	we're going to work our way around.
16	So Allison, please go ahead.
17	MEMBER JOHNSON: Yes.
18	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Brian.
19	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yes.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate.
21	MEMBER LEWIS: Yes.
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Dilip.

1	MEMBER NANDWANI: Yes.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Jerry.
3	MEMBER D'AMORE: Yes.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Kyla.
5	MEMBER SMITH: Yep.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy.
7	MEMBER BRUCH: Yes.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Mindee.
9	VICE CHAIR JEFFERY: Yes.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Kim.
11	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Yes.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Franklin.
13	MEMBER QUARCOO: I abstain.
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Wood.
15	MEMBER TURNER: Yes.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Logan.
17	MEMBER PETREY: Yes.
18	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Carolyn.
19	MEMBER DIMITRI: No.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Javier, absent.
21	And the chair votes yes.
22	MEMBER BRUCH: All right. The

1	motion passes. We had 12 yes, 1 no, 1 abstain,
2	1 absent, zero recusals.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right.
4	Thank you, folks. And thank you, Kyla.
5	MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah. Great work,
6	Kyla.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: That was a lift.
8	All right. We're going to proceed
9	with the rest of handling.
10	MEMBER SMITH: I forgot.
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I know. I feel
12	like we all just need to take a walk.
13	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. So moving into
14	the 2025 handling sunsets, we will start with
15	calcium carbonate which is listed at
16	205.605(a)(6)(m) non-synthetic allowed. And
17	this is Kim's material.
18	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Thank you, Kyla.
19	Okay. So calcium carbonate as Kyla mentioned
20	where it's listed. It has a wide array of
21	uses. It's used as a dietary supplement, an

antacid, dough conditioner, acidity regulator

22

in wines, food stabilizer, anti-caking agent, 1 gelling agent, the list tends to go on and on 2 this particular material. 3 From the discussion standpoint, when 4 it was reviewed in the fall of 2018 there was a 5 significant amount of approval for relisting 6 7 this material noting it's essentiality organic production with the absence of a lot of 8 -- of a viable option. 9 10 Through public comment, I would say same sentiment resonates. that that 11 There 12 were, I'd say about dozen different а of did 13 commenters, all which support Noting more specific usages such as 14 listing. 15 adjustment to ρH, being utilized in manufacturing of oat milk, soy-based cheeses, 16 17 and also as a stabilizer, anti-caking, and then 18 use in another arena for cleaning mixing 19 equipment. 20 There was one commentor that asked 21 for more specification for its use, to list out all of these different options of how 22

1	being used and not let it be as wide open as it
2	seems to be. It does seem that calcium
3	carbonate though, has not it just has a
4	significant amount of uses. And as a non-
5	synthetic is relatively benign.
6	So that being said, I'll open it
7	back up for any questions.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Questions for
9	Kim? All right. Back to you, Kyla.
10	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Moving on,
11	next up is flavors. Flavors. Flavors are
12	listed at 205.605(a)(12). Non-synthetic
13	flavors may be used when organic flavors are
14	not commercially available. All flavors must
15	be derived from organic or non-synthetic
16	sources only and must be produced using
17	synthetic solvents and carrier systems or any
18	artificial preservative. And this material is
19	Logans.
20	MEMBER PETREY: Thank you, Kyla.
21	Yes, flavor is very extensive. It's
22	pretty broad. A lot of materials in that. In

2014, OTA submitted a petition for -- that is
2 looking more to really get organic flavors,
3 organically made into the industry. And so
4 they added the annotation that, similar to the
5 seed that we have for organic flavors that are
6 commercially available, for those to be used.
7 That was passed in 2018 and the rule

That was passed in 2018 and the rule making was in 2019. They also mentioned in their comments that they were looking for they're going be putting to а survey hopefully this summer, before the fall meeting so that we'll have it to see what the progress has been in the industry and how many more organic flavors have come on board and how that whole process is working.

And so the use of natural flavors, is typically used in very small amounts in products. Natural flavors are widely used in baking goods, dairy products, jams, jellies, snack foods, juice products, and many other foods. The significant function of natural flavors must be flavor rather than nutrition.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The manufacturing of these is very 1 extensive because there's a lot of different 2 So you're looking at cold-pressing, 3 4 steam, distillation, solvent extractions got 5 you've distillates, because extracts, essential oils, so a lot of different materials 6 7 there. At the international acceptance, it 8 9 is internationally used. These are 10 important materials for a lot of products. The 11 finalized in 2019. annotation change was 12 Again, we'll see what that looks like. 13 kind of excited to see how the use for organics has increased. 14 And we asked three questions to our 15 16 commentors or stakeholders. We. had 14 17 commentors on this material. All were in 18 support of it. All said that if we were 19 take the synthetic away, that it would 20 completely disrupt the supply chain of 21 products, so. 22 And then number three I thought was

1 interesting, are there flavors currently used in organic products that cannot be produced 2 organically, including any of these examples. 3 4 Like something from beavers, musk oil, 5 are crazy foods, These deer. okav. But 6 they -- liquid smoke. I've used that anvwav, 7 one. 8 Anyway, so a lot of these products listed as 9 going to be able to be 10 organic because they're not covered underneath regulations 11 the vou know, NOP or non-12 agricultural. So we are always going to have 13 And so that kind of opens up to if we have 14 ever get into, or we commercially 15 availability for organic, we can you break that up and then put certain types, and 16 17 get more specific on flavors. 18 You know, certain things that will 19 be listed as a synthetic list. So maybe with 20 time, this can progress. But right now we need 21 to -- it's stated that it needs to be re-listed Otherwise there's a lot of disruption 22 as is.

1	in the marketplace.
2	But are there any comments or any
3	questions?
4	Yes Jerry? I'm sorry - Nate.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All good.
6	MEMBER PETREY: I don't want your
7	job, I promise.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Jerry, please go
9	ahead.
10	MEMBER PETREY: For the record.
11	MEMBER D'AMORE: In reading through
12	that material and listing to what you just
13	said, it brings me to one other thing that I
14	ran into on an earlier sunset which was colors.
15	And even when you have adequate supply, a
16	seemingly adequate supply of natural
17	ingredients, and I'll take blueberries because
18	I know them best.
19	The issue of batching and mixing
20	becomes complicated just because you have
21	blueberries here and blueberries there. And
22	say, oh good, I've got 100 pounds of

1	blueberries. Well this 50 pounds and that 50
2	pounds don't play well together in terms of
3	varieties and other characteristics. It's a
4	tough nut as far as what I'm concerned with
5	what you're doing.
6	MEMBER PETREY: Thank you. Also it
7	seems like the progress that we make and the
8	growth that we get in organics seems to outpace
9	the availability of these organic products. So
10	we may always see that. But as long as there
11	is you know, one thing that we always want
12	to have for organic flavors is that we want
13	that marketplace to be important and we want it
14	to grow just like the seeds.
15	And you know, so I think it is
16	important to have that annotation to push
17	people in that direction, but we don't want to
18	slow the organic industry down, you know, and
19	captivate it. So that's a great point.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Kyla.
21	MEMBER SMITH: Yes. Thanks for
22	taking on this big topic, Logan. I always am

impressed that you raise your -- you're like, I 1 want the hard stuff. And so thanks for always 2 being willing. I know you just want to learn. 3 4 It's great. 5 So I was encouraged by the comments that were like, we're on the right path, we're 6 7 moving in the right direction, and you know, admittedly wanting that path to move a little 8 9 quicker, right? And so, I don't know that we 10 necessarily have a lot of control about that, by 11 Gwendolvn's but Ι also was encouraged 12 comments that we can continue to like peel back the onion and try to get at more information, 13 14 whether that be through the you know, engaging with the flavor's task force or to try 15 16 to get more narrow in the scope. 17 And I just did also want to remind 18 here that are talking about us we а nonnational 19 synthetic on the list. These are 20 natural flavors and they're not synthetic. 21 MEMBER PETREY: Thank you, Kyla. 22 You are right. I didn't mention the synthetic

1	part, so I apologize for that but yeah. Thank
2	you.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
4	or comments for Logan? All right.
5	Thank you, Logan.
6	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Moving in to
7	gums. I'm going to read all the gums in and
8	then we're going to talk about them as a class.
9	Is that okay, Andrea can you advance
10	the slides? Okay. Perfect.
11	Okay. So we are at 205.605(a),till
12	at non-synthetics, 13. Gellan gum (high-acyl
13	form only). We're also going to talk about
14	205.605, now we're moving into synthetics,
15	(b)(37), Xanthan gum. And now moving into 606,
16	205.606(j) gums, water extracted only (Arabic,
17	Gar, Locust bean, and Carob bean). 205.606(r)
18	tamarind seed gum. And 205.606(s) tragacanth
19	gum. And this is Carolyn, the gum queen.
20	MEMBER DIMITRI: I was going to
21	bring gum for everyone, but I thought, couldn't
22	find the organic kind.

1 Thank you for saving me from having aside from flavors, thank you for reading 2 those seven gums into the record. 3 4 So overall, qums are used to 5 thicken, gel, stabilize products. And as Kyla pointed out, some are synthetic, and some are 6 7 non-synthetic. And they aren't one for substitutes. So each qum has slightly 8 а 9 different property. And in general, I think 10 there is this concern -- you know, there's a growth in micro-biome research which I still 11 12 think is in the very early stages. 13 And there is a body of research that is looking at these types of food additives, 14 they're impact on the micro-biome. 15 And I think all I can say from having looked at it is it's 16 17 just in the very early stages and people can't 18 say anything definitive. 19 So I'll start with xanthan gum. So 20 I will talk about them sort of separately and 21 So xanthan gum is the most widely together. used gum and it's a really important component 22

for gluten free products. And so some of the reviewers wondered why xanthan was -- I forget -- xanthan is synthetic, and gellan is non-synthetic so there was this argument that they are produced by the same type of fermentation process, and a few commenters asked for making that more consistent.

Let's see, what else do I have to sav here? I know I have a lot of notes xanthan gum here. Generally there was Okay. mostly support for relisting this project but a commentors questioned whether qums for handling. actually essential And one commentor suggested de-listing it. And another said they currently don't commentor use product, but they want to be able to use it in the future in case a new product innovation makes it necessary.

Okay. So gellan gum is, there's like low to moderate use of this. Again, the question is whether this should be synthetic. This one there was concern about whether GM use

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

was part of the manufacturing process. And there are currently no organic versions.

Tamarind seed is not used at all, 3 4 it was just recently added to the list. And the reason for adding it to the list was 5 that if it could be -- if the supply of it in 6 7 an organic version became available, maybe it would replace the use of some of the other 8 9 And so, still one commentor said not to 10 relist it because it's not essential. quess I would argue, it hasn't been around long 11 12 enough for people to really incorporate it into 13 their processes.

> then for the Arabic, locust bean, and carob bean gums. They're not really widely used. The Arabic gum is ingredient in natural flavors. So there was really no opposition to relisting but commentors suggested that we separate the gums into different categories. And then there were like mixed comments about organic availability. Some people said yes, it's available. Some

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	people said it's not.
2	And then for Tragacanth gum, that is
3	not widely used and someone one of the
4	commentors argued that we could add an
5	adaptation for the specific use of it.
6	That is all of the facts that I
7	learned about gums from the comments. So I'm
8	open to any questions and I hope Kyla will help
9	me answer them.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate, please go
11	ahead.
12	MEMBER LEWIS: I think the gums are
13	a good sort of exercise in looking at
14	essentiality. Because it's pretty clear that
15	gums of various natures are necessary to
16	prevent say, chalky mouth feel in different
17	products. But then the question is, is it
18	essential that there's the ability to prevent
19	chalky mouth feel in organic products?
20	So it's a nuanced element of that
21	same kind of question, but I think it's just an
22	interesting way to do the exercise about

1	essentiality within the things that are in the
2	national list.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
4	questions or comments for Carolyn?
5	Amy, please go ahead.
6	MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah, Carolyn. Thank
7	you for that review of gums. I just had a
8	question. There was one in particular towards
9	the end, you said some of our stakeholders say
10	this gum is commercially available organically
11	and some do not. Can we get any deeper insight
12	into that? Is it a regional thing? Is it just
13	a quantity thing? Or why would there be
14	disparity in that response?
15	MEMBER DIMITRI: That's a good
16	question, Amy. I don't know. I guess I can
17	look through the comments again and report back
18	to you. Like, that did not pop out at me at my
19	review.
20	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay. Yeah. I think
21	just to me, it just points to the need for more
22	transparency in this you know, commercially

1	available arena for producers to understand
2	what's an option.
3	Thank you, Carolyn.
4	MEMBER PETREY: Thank you.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
6	questions or comments?
7	All right. Thank you, Carolyn.
8	MEMBER SMITH: We are moving to
9	oxygen, 205.605, non-synthetics allowed at
10	(a)(21), oxygen, oil-free grades, and this is
11	Wood.
12	MEMBER TURNER: Thanks. Oxygen is
13	used in modified atmosphere packaging,
14	processing of olives, and by wineries,
15	breweries, and manufacturers of carbonated
16	beverages. It's an odorless, tasteless gas.
17	Thank you, oxygen.
18	It helps to maintain color and
19	prevent pallor in food. It can help prevent
20	spoilage in products that are higher in sugar
21	and water. Very strong support for this
22	material obviously, for a variety of reasons,

1	but we see it across the board, certifiers,
2	producers, non-profits, and the like. So there
3	were no negative comments on oxygen.
4	I will say it again, similar to
5	comments during crops, and we've heard it
6	already this morning, is that getting specific,
7	thinking about specificity of use in these
8	materials, there is a clear interest from at
9	least one organization in the community to lean
10	into that question as we move forward. But
11	that was the only caveat in otherwise positive
12	comments.
13	MEMBER SMITH: Thanks, Wood.
14	Moving to potassium chloride.
15	MEMBER TURNER: I assume there are
16	no questions about oxygen?
17	MEMBER SMITH: Oh, sorry.
18	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I'm concerned
19	that there are no
20	Jerry.
21	MEMBER D'AMORE: Let me just make a
22	comment to support this exchange here.

1 In some industries, it's absolutely indispensable for, as Wood reported, 2 for controlled environment processes of being able 3 And taking again, blueberries 4 to store fruit. 5 as an example, to be able to move, to harvest and then hold product for somewhere between 6 7 four longer and six weeks than you otherwise, takes you from a market perhaps glut 8 to a market of more value. 9 10 So in the industries that I'm involved in, it can be a game changer. 11 12 MEMBER TURNER: Yeah, for sure. For 13 sure. 14 MEMBER D'AMORE: Thank you. 15 MEMBER TURNER: Yeah. It's just the 16 ability -- the role it plays in reducing food 17 waste and food loss and shrinkage. Similarly, 18 it has a sort of -- I was thinking about it as 19 Logan was talking about flavors as well. Ι 20 mean, there's a lot of opportunities here to 21 sort of you know, reduce food waste in the food 22 system so I appreciate that.

1 MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Now we move. 205.605(a)(23), potassium chloride. This 2 is also Wood. 3 4 MEMBER TURNER: Yep. And this is familiar material because we talked about 5 it crops. during Different different 6 use, 7 discussion entirely but effectively part this pending TR that we have, where we ask for 8 specific examples of organic alternatives to 9 potassium chloride. 10 A little different from the feedback 11 12 in the crops setting. All the feedback for handling uses of potassium chloride have been 13 positive among the community. It's used as a 14 15 flavor enhancer, flavoring agent, and does 16 effect -- does improve taste, texture, 17 shelf life of food products. It's mainly used 18 to provide potassium enrichment in foods and is 19 a means of reducing salt content in foods. 20 Like I said, certifiers, users of 21 the material, advocacy organizations all were strongly in support of this materials. 22 So any

1	discussion?
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Questions or
3	comments? All right.
4	Thank you, Wood.
5	MEMBER TURNER: Thanks.
6	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. 205.605(b)(3),
7	Alginates. And this is Dilip.
8	MEMBER NANDWANI: Thanks Kyla. Good
9	morning. So Alginates, 205.605 (b) synthetics
10	allowed. Subcommittee review that uses
11	alginates are used in food production and
12	handling as an emulsifier or emulsifying solid,
13	firming agent, flavor enhancer.
14	But the use of thanks, Michelle -
15	- the use of alginates is not limited to only
16	foods. Industrial use alginates to improve the
17	performance of products such as paper coating,
18	textiles, aerosol air freshener, gels and
19	ceramics. There are also utilized in a variety
20	of ways in the medical field. I'll not go into
21	those details.
22	Manufacture part, alginates are

synthetic derivatives of brown 1 seaweed, and they are produced from algae. And they are 2 usually extracted from the cell walls of brown 3 4 algae, the seaweed. Their extraction process, 5 it renders alginates as synthetic. International acceptance in the 6 7 Canadian General Standard Board, it is listed as permitted in three forms, alginic acid, 8 9 potassium alginate, and sodium alginate. 10 IFOM, International Federation of Organic it is listed Agriculture Movement norms 11 as sodium alginate and as 401 alginate, 402, 12 as approved additives. 13 14 Environmental issues, seaweed largely considered to 15 cultivations is eco-friendly form of agriculture due 16 to 17 look of added inputs for virility and minimal 18 changes in physical landscape and potential for 19 bioremediation of polluted of nutrient rich 20 waters. 21 are not aware of any evidence We that the harvesting practices for brown seaweed 22

are damaging to local ecosystems. Discussion 1 part, alginates were added to the national list 2 in 2022 and have been renewed at each sunset 3 review. 4 Subcommittee received comments from 5 stakeholders and public comments from the 6 7 previous sunset review demonstrated a continued need and relisting for this material. 8 9 One comment was that listing should be broken down by species. They were concerned 10 that some rarer species may be overharvested by 11 12 others maybe for use. Another stakeholder commented that alginic acid like seaweed and 13 fish oil should be reviewed within the product 14 15 context of marrying materials. Additionally, the board was asked to 16 17 consider the addition of an annotation related 18 to harvest restrictions and risk based testing 19 for toxic materials using a decision tree to 20 identify harvesting areas where testing would formed. The 21 need to be or subcommittee discussions entered on the 22 current forms

1 alginate that being used in organic are production. 2 Ouestions we asked to stakeholders 3 4 was, what forms of alginate are currently being 5 used in organic production. And we got public stating that given the arowina 6 comments 7 plant interest in based meat alternatives, sodium alginate would be of particular interest 8 9 of relisting. That's all I have for alginates. 10 Ouestions? 11 POWELL-PALM: Ouestions for CHAIR 12 Dilip? Franklin, please go ahead. 13 MEMBER QUARCOO: Thanks for t.hat. 14 I see some environmental impacts that were stated for alginates for seaweed farming 15 including depletion of nutrients 16 in coastal 17 waters and effects on factor planting and the 18 rest. 19 Then Ι see a suggestion that in 20 order to deal with some of the environmental 21 impact, to move focus on sustainability wild 22 harvest techniques. Yet, the seaweed is also

being used for bioremediation. So if it's 1 being used for bioremediation and then we are 2 doing sustainable harvesting of wild seaweed, 3 4 how does that impact food safety? Especially when the things that are being bioremediated 5 are things that we don't want in our food and 6 7 environment anyway. So that's the question that I have. 8 9 MEMBER NANDWANI: Okav. That's a good question. I would say, so the primary 10 environmental, it sav's 11 impact on it's 12 ecofriendly and environmental friendly. However, it 13 doesn't state that, what 14 described, it comes under secondary farming, 15 environmental impact of seaweed 16 depletion of nutrients, and as you just 17 mentioned that. 18 Given these challenges of managing 19 this non-native seaweed population, some 20 researchers claim that it is preferrable to 21 focus on sustainable wild harvest techniques with regard to mitigating environmental impact. 22

1 That's per the report. think we have in the TR. So 2 that's all I can at this point. 3 share Ι 4 believe that answered your question. 5 MEMBER OUARCOO: It answers part of I'm just looking at if we are using it for 6 7 bioremediation, when it's taking things out of the environment that we don't want in the 8 9 environment, is that what we want to use and 10 process? I know that if I hear an answer like the processing takes that out, then I'll feel 11 12 better. But if we are using something bioremediation __ if 13 the for answer 14 environmental impact of seaweed farming is to use wild, and the wild is -- that's what 15 16 plants do, you pollute the environment is 17 bioremediating, is that what we want to use to 18 do this? 19 Ιf I hear somebody say, okay, 20 processing is done in such a way that yes, it 21 doesn't come back to impact the consumer then

That's my question.

I'll feel better.

1 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Definitely point Anyone want to respond to the question? 2 taken. MEMBER CALDWELL: Yeah. Thanks 3 4 Franklin, that was a really interesting point. 5 And I just assumed, when Dilip was talking that would the bioremediation be iust nutrient 6 7 loading and that would be a good thing to take that out. But if it's other types of pollution 8 9 and mavbe they're mixed in with extra 10 nutrients, you make a very good point. Do we want to necessarily eating that? So thank you. 11 12 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Jerry. 13 MEMBER D'AMORE: Yeah, I have a bit 14 of a history with that in my first year. the thing that struck me then and I think now 15 16 is that the entire industry is sort of young, 17 and sort of an opportunistic, and there seems 18 lot of things that could be be а 19 without a whole lot of work. Like moving the 20 crop out a little bit and into areas that --21 where they don't draw our impurities from the 22 water.

1	The one that we looked at earlier
2	was, it does have some significant benefits
3	against erosion, for instance. So, but I can't
4	be any more specific to your question either.
5	Thank you.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
7	or comments? All right.
8	MEMBER NANDWANI: Thank you. Thank
9	you for your comments and questions. I have
10	made notes of these and will definitely look
11	into that in future when we work on this
12	material.
13	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And if it's all
14	right, Dilip, let's all go ahead and take a
15	break for 15 and then we'll come back with your
16	second material. So we'll be back in 15
17	minutes.
18	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
19	matter went off the record at 11:17 a.m. and
20	resumed at 11:33 a.m.)
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right.
22	We'll get started.

1	Please go ahead, Dilip.
2	MEMBER NANDWANI: Okay.
3	MEMBER SMITH: One second. Let me
4	read the
5	MEMBER NANDWANI: Please.
6	MEMBER SMITH: Read it. Okay.
7	205.605(b)(8) calcium hydroxide and again, this
8	is Dilip.
9	MEMBER NANDWANI: Thanks Kyla. This
10	should be straightforward. Calcium hydroxide,
11	205.605(b) is synthetics allowed, is used in
12	food processing as a pH buffer, neutralizing
13	agent, and firming agent processing. Also used
14	in making calcium acid phosphate.
15	So we do have new TR, I think it
16	just came a few weeks ago, I checked with
17	Gerard, that gives a little more information on
18	manufacturing side, the new techniques for the
19	manufacture of calcium hydroxide and that
20	continue to develop.
21	International acceptance in Canadian
22	Journal Standard Board, it is listed in organic

1 production systems as permitted substances. List lime. In IFOAM, it is listed 2 as lime for the application 3 hvdrated on 4 plant parts only. 5 A very good discussion part during 6 the previous sunset review. Public comments 7 submitted organic manufacturers, bv associations, material suppliers, 8 and certifiers detail calcium hydroxide uses 9 and 10 necessity in the processing. Majority of public comments, I think 11 we received 11 comments, and the majority of 12 13 relisting of supported calcium comments 14 hydroxide. One commentor suggested that the clarifying which 15 list be uses of calcium permitted, 16 hydroxide are specifically 17 calcium hydroxide can be used as a firming 18 agent. Additional commentors stated that they 19 use calcium hydroxide in infant formula. 20 One question we asked to 21 calcium hydroxide stakeholders, is essential for organic food production. 22 And Ι think,

yeah, the second question also was that, since 1 the material was last reviewed have additional 2 commercially available alternatives emerged. 3 So we did receive 11 comments all in 4 favor of relisting of calcium hydroxide but not 5 response received on the question 6 7 A couple of commentors said that they not aware of any commercially available 8 9 alternatives available. So that's all I have 10 calcium hydroxide. for Thank you. Any questions? 11 12 Yes. Nate. 13 Again, just from a MEMBER LEWIS: data set of one, during the pandemic we had a 14 lot of time on our hands, so we started --15 grew some heirloom corn and nixtamalized 16 17 ourselves to make tortillas and compared 18 calcium hydroxide nixtamalization process with 19 the more traditional wood ash process. 20 Ι can tell you that it 21 essential for a good tortilla to use calcium 22 hydroxide. We didn't have very good luck with

1	the wood ash in the mixed nixtamalization.
2	MEMBER NANDWANI: Thanks Nate.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
4	for Dilip?
5	Go ahead, Franklin.
6	MEMBER QUARCOO: I take note of all
7	the things it does and especially the fact that
8	there are no alternatives. I was a little, not
9	a little, I was worried about the, the report
10	itself says that it makes expansive
11	environmental impact, loss of habitat. And if
12	you have effects of pollution of the
13	environment during the mining process. So
14	report says there are no alternatives. Does
15	anybody have any information whether there are
16	other things coming down the line that are less
17	impactful when it comes to the environment?
18	MEMBER NANDWANI: Not that I am
19	aware of. I don't know, anybody else on the
20	board is aware of.
21	MEMBER SMITH: No. There are no
22	other there are no current petitions before

1	the board that would be an alternative to this
2	material.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right.
4	Thank you, Dilip.
5	MEMBER NANDWANI: Thank you.
6	MEMBER SMITH: Okey doke. We are
7	moving to 205.605(b)(14) ethylene, allowed for
8	post-harvest ripening of tropical fruit and de-
9	greening of citrus. And this is also Logan.
10	MEMBER PETREY: Thanks Kyla.
11	Synthetic. Sorry. Got that one right this
12	time. Yeah. Ethylene is used in the post-
13	harvest ripening of tropical fruit and de-
14	greening of citrus. It is produced naturally
15	by fruits, but it's not been commercialized.
16	The amount that is used in algaculture is
17	miniscule compared to the bulk of ethylene that
18	is produced worldwide.
19	The manufacturing of this is,
20	through cracking, through thermal methods,
21	through also dehydration of ethanol. The
22	international acceptance is pretty wide. It's

used for again, the ripening of tropical fruit,
the de-greening of citrus. There's also the
use of sprouting potatoes post-harvest and for
the onions as well. It's also listed here, the
flower induction of pineapple, which we have
that in our crop section.

As far as the environmental issues, it's more related to the manufacturing and the petroleum But ethylene itself it's use. considered harm the environment not to organisms since the substance is not present in quantities or concentrations that could cause long-term harmful effects on the environment or biodiversity.

As far as human health, the main concern is because it is explosive in nature but it's highly regulated through labeling and registration requirements beyond the risk of harm due to explosive accident, over exposure could cause headaches or drowsiness. And so following the label is -- if following the label, there is no harm.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 Let's see, during our discussions, the question of you know, whether alternatives 2 are available, the alternative I guess would be 3 4 just to let things ripen naturally. And that 5 brought brought has been up and up bv commentors, however -- and also the statement 6 7 is that it's not essential to produce the crop, but rather is employed for economic reasons. 8 9 Ιt may not be essential for the 10 fruit to ripen with it, but it is essential to sustain the supply chain to operate. 11 I think 12 that whenever it came up, the sunset on the flowering for pineapples, the 13 presence really relied on 14 farmers that it for their 15 business to sustain Ι think really set 16 precedent that sometimes you know, these things 17 are needed for the business to be maintained. 18 Other alternatives, there а 19 mention of using smoke, but that resulted in 20 decaying of product and low quality of product. We asked what types of organic tropical fruits 21 are currently being ripened. 22 The list

1	bananas, mangos, avocados, and papaya.
2	Are there any questions?
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Jerry, please go
4	ahead.
5	MEMBER D'AMORE: No questions, just
6	some supporting testimony. The banana industry
7	as we know it today would not exist without it.
8	Banana's are harvested absolutely dead green in
9	the tropics, shipped dead green over weeks,
10	usually brought all the way into retail
11	distribution centers and gassed there with the
12	ethylene.
13	We wouldn't have a chance of a good
14	banana where we live without it.
15	MEMBER PETREY: Thank you, Jerry.
16	MEMBER D'AMORE: Certainly.
17	MEMBER TUNER: I agree with Jerry.
18	I'm fully supportive of the material. I just
19	wanted to acknowledge that in the context of
20	our conversations about climate smart
21	agriculture, this is just a great example for
22	all of our reference of the complexity of

1	really managing the full climate footprint of
2	the food industry, the organic industry, we're
3	looking at full scope of gas emissions
4	accounting. You know, this is a factor, this
5	is a material that's in a factor I don't
6	mean to call it out specifically but it is
7	one that sort of leads to an obvious
8	recognition from my perspective. So just a
9	note.
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy.
11	MEMBER BRUCH: Logan, thanks for
12	your thorough review on this, both from a crops
13	perspective and also handling. I might have
14	missed this, but I see that it was petitions
15	for use with pears and it looks to be that the
16	NOSB did not recommend pairs to be added.
17	MEMBER PETREY: Yeah. I'm glad you
18	brought that up. Yeah. So in 2008 they
19	recommended not to put on, you know to have it
20	for pears. That vote was, it was eight yes,
21	five no.
22	It was petitions for that you know,

but in the testimony, it found out that in the 1 industry that people were able to get rid of 2 all of their pears so there wasn't necessarily, 3 it wasn't make or break for the industry like 4 some of these tropical, you know, some of these 5 tropical fruits are. It seemed to be more of 6 7 iust that economic boost that people looking for. And so it concluded on the board 8 9 that it was not necessary or essential for the 10 business, unlike what bananas would be. 11 MEMBER BURCH: Thank you. 12 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions 13 or comments? 14 Jerry, please go ahead. MEMBER D'AMORE: Yeah. 15 I'm not sure 16 why this doesn't get more play. But unless I'm 17 really off on МУ statistics, probably 80 18 percent of all the tomatoes we eat in 19 United States has gone through this process as 20 well. If you get a red tomato without a calyx 21 it, you probably have a gassed tomato as 22 well. Thank you.

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
2	questions or comments?
3	MEMBER SMITH: I might argue that
4	that probably be wouldn't be allowed for a
5	tomato based on the current annotation as a
6	tropical I don't think tomato fits tropical
7	fruit, however
8	MEMBER PETREY: It is for
9	conventional use.
10	MEMBER SMITH: Oh, it's
11	conventional.
12	MEMBER PETREY: I had growers call
13	me and ask like, why aren't tomatoes you know,
14	allowed for organics because it would make our
15	industry so much stronger. Because there's,
16	especially in the south, I think everything's
17	worse in the southeast but especially in the
18	southeast when you're dealing with you know,
19	all the rains and the issues you know, getting
20	that fruit that close to ripe because you
21	really lose a lot of that timing.
22	But no, yeah. In the conventional,

1	it is absolutely used. That is mainstream for
2	conventional tomatoes. So I just want to sign
3	a petition and get it on, see what we can do.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yeah. Go ahead,
5	Kim.
6	MEMBER HUSEMAN: I guess a follow-up
7	question from that is, are there, other than
8	the word "tropical," are is there an exact
9	list of which tropical or which fruits
10	MEMBER PETREY: Sure. Yeah, so it's
11	not defined in the NOP, and I saw that in the
12	TR that it's actually not defined. So I don't
13	know, maybe they can branch out. But that was
14	one of the questions that we were having, and
15	the list that was put out there was bananas,
16	mangos I don't think it's a technical term -
17	- and so but yeah. Avocados, bananas, papaya,
18	mango, so.
19	Kyla, do you have anything on that?
20	Anything more?
21	MEMBER SMITH: No. Just that was
22	noted in the TR. We asked the question.

1	MEMBER PETREY: Yeah.
2	MEMBER SMITH: Those were the
3	answers we got.
4	MEMBER PETREY: Tropical tomatoes,
5	so yeah.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Any other
7	questions? All right. Thank you, Logan.
8	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Moving to
9	205.605(b)(16), glycerides, mono and di, for
10	use only in drum drying of food. This is
11	Allison.
12	MEMBER JOHNSON: Thanks, Kyla.
12 13	MEMBER JOHNSON: Thanks, Kyla. All right. Glycerides are
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
13	All right. Glycerides are
13	All right. Glycerides are components of fats. They're used as an
13 14 15	All right. Glycerides are components of fats. They're used as an emulsifier and a release agent in drum drying
13 14 15 16	All right. Glycerides are components of fats. They're used as an emulsifier and a release agent in drum drying processes that create flakes or powders for
13 14 15 16 17	All right. Glycerides are components of fats. They're used as an emulsifier and a release agent in drum drying processes that create flakes or powders for products that might be used in snacks, soups,
13 14 15 16 17	All right. Glycerides are components of fats. They're used as an emulsifier and a release agent in drum drying processes that create flakes or powders for products that might be used in snacks, soups, baked chips, bakery items, cereals.
13 14 15 16 17 18	All right. Glycerides are components of fats. They're used as an emulsifier and a release agent in drum drying processes that create flakes or powders for products that might be used in snacks, soups, baked chips, bakery items, cereals. And I did think it was noteworthy

for potato flake products. Glycerides 1 are prepared from fats or oils or fat-forming acids 2 that come from edible sources but go through a 3 number of chemical reactions to isolate them. 4 5 an equivalent listing, Canada has but it doesn't appear to be listed on any other 6 7 international organic standards. There aren't particularly significant environmental issues 8 9 aside from being produced from non-organic 10 agricultural which involve sources may synthetic pesticide and fertilizer use. 11 variety of other drying 12 methods can be used to create flakes, but drum drying 13 is apparently particularly effective for potato 14 flakes, although the TR does note that freeze 15 drying could be another option. 16 17 And there also are potential uses of 18 organic rice bran extract, organic SOV 19 lecithin, or qum Arabic. But each of those 20 apparently has some sort of shortcomings. So 21 this again was a lesson in being careful with 22 our words.

1 We wanted to find out what products these glycerides are used in. Didn't specify 2 what organic products, so one commentor listed 3 4 many, many products that have glycerides, but I don't think they were organic products. 5 But their comment did prompt me to do my own Google 6 7 And I did find two brands of organic search. potato flakes that do list glycerides on the 8 9 label. 10 did also find a couple of nonorganic potato products that don't. 11 So maybe 12 it is possible to produce these products without glycerides, but no one spoke to that 13 specifically in public comments. 14 We heard from a few certifiers and 15 16 only one noted that one operation was using 17 them. But several commentors did 18 relisting just to keep options opened. One 19 commentor also suggested delisting because of 20 the potential alternatives that were noted in 21 the TR. 22 We didn't get any specific comments

from producers about why this material and not 1 something else. But the past history around 2 flakes and apparent continued use 3 4 potato flakes leads me to believe that there is still something special about this ingredient 5 for this particular product. 6 7 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Ouestions for Allison? All right. 8 Thank you Allison. 9 Moving 10 MEMBER SMITH: Okay. 205.605(b)(19) magnesium stearate for use only 11 agriculture products 12 labeled made 13 Specified foods organics. food or 14 prohibited in agriculture products labeled This is also Allison. 15 organic. 16 MEMBER JOHNSON: Thank you. And 17 this is another non-particularly commonly used 18 ingredient but is key for a few items. It's 19 typically used as a binding agent in 20 supplements or an anti-caking agent in various 21 It's typically made from powdered products. hydrogenation of fatty acids 22 the that are

derived from edible sources go through and several chemical reactions. 2 Canada has an equivalent listing and 3 4 there was one little oddity, the 2018 TR said 5 that mag stearate was listed in the codex, but I couldn't find the listing, so I don't know if 6 7 something has changed, or if that previous note in error, but it doesn't seem to be in 8 9 and no other mention of it in 10 international organic standards. 11 the glycerides, environmental Like 12 impacts are mostly related to the raw product 13 being produced in conventional agriculture and there may also be some other potential impacts 14 from the substances involved in synthesis, but 15 16 just at high concentration, it 17 shouldn't be an issue with the small quantities 18 that we're talking about here. 19 Heard from a handful of certifiers, 20 few more folks apparently are using this. 21 One certifier noted that it's used particularly 22 as binding agent in pharmaceutical

1	dietary products. And several organizations
2	stated that they don't oppose relisting it
3	particularly because it's limited to made with
4	organic products, so they felt that that was
5	less of a concern for the integrity of the
6	organic label. And one commenter just
7	generally supported relisting to keep options
8	open.
9	Any questions on this one?
10	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Questions for
11	Allison? Seeing none.
12	Thank you, Allison.
13	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Moving to
14	205.605(b)(23) phosphoric acid, cleaning of
15	food-contact surfaces and equipment only. This
16	is my material.
17	Phosphoric acid is, as stated in the
18	annotation is used in organic handling and
19	processing as a cleaning agent for food-contact
20	surfaces and equipment only. It's manufactured
21	using two different processes, the thermal
22	process or the wet process. It used to be, and

the end use used to dictate the manufacturing 1 process however, now due to the thermal process 2 being more expensive, the wet process is most 3 exclusively being used. 4 The TR noted that it had --5 relatively benign in regards to its impact on 6 7 the environment. As far international as acceptance goes, it is similarly listed in the 8 9 Canadian standards but not listed in 10 areas -- and also in IFOAM. 11 And we did ask two questions for 12 this particular use, as this is also listed on 13 the livestock list. So the first question was 14 focused on essentiality. This is widely used, we got lots of comments, so it appears to be a 15 pretty important cleaner/sanitizer. 16 17 One commentor did specifically note 18 that since phosphoric acid acts as a de-scaler, 19 it can help remove biofilms and so the action 20 is different than other sanitizers. And so for 21 that reason, this material is the material of 22 choice in certain situations and may

1 necessarily be part of like a sanitizer rotation. 2 The second question was aimed 3 4 gathering information on a particular sector. 5 And this seems to be pretty widely used, and spans across many different types of operations 6 7 from dairy's to processed product handlers, to post-harvest handling uses. So lots of uses. 8 9 This substance was discussed yesterday by my table-mate Amy. 10 She did a summarizing all the doi 11 of comments. 12 Similar comments were also noted for 13 listing as well. Most commentors seem to be in favor of relisting, but as Amy indicated there 14 questions 15 were lots of raised related So that is certifier consistency 16 consistency. as well as consistency on the listing itself 17 18 and the annotation itself. And as 19 Ι noted yesterday, Ι will 20 follow-up with the ACA materials with that 21 group because I know that they just discussed 22 this material to get more information to see if

1	consensus was reached and if there's remaining
2	questions.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Questions for
4	Kyla? All right. Hearing none.
5	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Moving to
6	205.605(b)(24) potassium carbonate. And this
7	material is Kim's.
8	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Thank you, Kyla.
9	So potassium carbonate is listed
10	with a wide range of uses. Through the write-
11	up, we go through different potential uses that
12	potassium carbonate can be used. We did have a
13	TR; the TR has been completed and was returned
14	and found to be sufficient.
15	Through international acceptance it
16	is listed as an approved substance pretty much
17	throughout. The question that we asked for the
18	stakeholder was since reviewed, are there any
19	other substitute products that are on the
20	market or any other manufacturing processes
21	that could warrant the removal of potassium
22	carbonate.

seems that the most -- what's 1 Ιt used most for potassium carbonate is to lower 2 sodium content in products. 3 Some up 4 percent reduction of sodium. But it was also mentioned in wine production, that it is a pH, 5 that it will reduce the acidity in wines. 6 So 7 it is used in that capacity as well. Of the half a dozen comments that we 8 9 had, there were two that asked for 10 specification and to narrow the scope of the 11 potassium wanting use of carbonate, 12 emphasis on -- to be used when sodium carbonate is not appropriate or to reduce you know, just 13 as a reduction agent for sodium 14 itself. I would like to hear more from 15 16 the community as we get ready for the fall, 17 around some of the other uses of potassium 18 carbonate, maybe more specifically in the wine industry as well. 19 That's what I've got for 20 today. 21 POWELL-PALM: Ouestions CHAIR for 22 Kim? All right. Hearing none.

1 MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Movina to 2 205.605(b)(35) sulfur dioxide for use only labeled "made with organic 3 wine grapes," 4 provided that total sulfite concentration does not exceed 100 ppm. This material is Allisons. 5 MEMBER JOHNSON: And I cannot tell 6 7 you how much my favorite this listing is. have spent many, many, many hours talking about 8 9 sulfur dioxide, and organic and made with 10 organic wine. 11 just start by saying that I**'**ll 12 dioxide is an ancient food additive. 13 It's used anti-microbial been as an antioxidant in food and clean wine since Greek 14 15 and Roman times. Fortunately our wine improved quite a bit since then. 16 17 Ιn wine, it's primarily used to 18 inhibit microbial growth and prevent spoilage 19 and oxidation. It can be made from elemental 20 sulfur, from mineral ores, and apparently waste 21 materials that contain sulfur. But most 22 typical is to burn sulfur to create sulfur

dioxide. 1 It can be added in various forms, 2 such as pellet, liquid as sulfurous acid, and 3 4 as gas. And there are some notes that I'll get to about different forms of, sources of 5 SO2 that may be relevant here and may need some 6 7 more examination. Wine can be made without sulfites, 8 but it typically needs to have other measures 9 10 in place to avoid microbial contamination, to manage fermentation, and to control oxidation. 11 12 So they'll use things like really tight 13 temperature controlled facilities, 14 pasteurization with UV light, and stabled gasses to fill the head space in the bottle. 15 And these wines typically have a shorter shelf 16 17 life. 18 I went into a lot of detail in the 19 sunset document about the international rules 20 for sulfur dioxide in wine because most of the 21 other international organic standards are much

sulfur

permissive of

more

22

They

dioxide.

1	include more forms, so potassium metabisulfite,
2	potassium bisulfite. They allow higher levels,
3	and they allow organic labelling rather than
4	"made with organic".
5	And they also allow it for other
6	fruit alcohols. So things like cider and perry
7	which is interesting, as those are starting to
8	take off as bigger markets in the US.
9	Sulfites get a lot of attention
10	because about one percent of the population are
11	very sensitive to sulfites. Reactions can
12	range from mild allergic reactions to acute
13	anaphylaxis and death. So it's very sensitive
14	if you're sensitive to sulfites.
15	But unlike most chemicals that are
16	harmful to people, there's actually strong
17	regulation and oversight, and sulfites are very
18	clearly labeled on food. So if you are someone
19	who is sensitive to sulfites, you have labels
20	to protect you.
21	And I also wanted to just draw
22	attention to the impacts of the made with

organic portion of the 1 annotation and the 2 impact it may have had and continue to have in the organic wine sector. 3 4 can say just anecdotally from 5 certification, working in handling it's 6 extremely confusing to the wine industry, to 7 consumers. 8 Say this is a product that has all 9 organic grapes but no, you can't label it 10 organic. You it's made with say organic 11 There's a very strict way about how grapes. 12 you write that out, there's а lot 13 interaction of TTB and the alcohol regulation So it is a product of negotiation among 14 side. the community and getting comfortable with this 15 material that has some down sides and up sides. 16 17 But it has resulted in а very confusing 18 framework. conventional 19 And just note, to 20 production of wine grapes involves а huge 21 number of harmful pesticides and so we need to weigh that trade-off as we're thinking about 22

1 the impact of this material. realized my California bias 2 thinking about this 3 showing in material. 4 Because almost no one has clients using it 5 except for our California certifier, CCOF, who has quite a few. And their comments were very 6 7 helpful. They have both organic and made with organic producing clients. And they said that 8 9 they have gotten questions about other forms of 10 sulfur dioxide, so potassium metabisulfite, and potassium bisulfite. 11 12 The -- sorry, I need to catch my I get all excited about SO2, you guys. 13 breath. 14 SO the TR notes that potassium metabisulfite is not allowed according to OMRI. 15 16 But apparently you can add potassium 17 metabisulfite to water and the gas, the SO2 can 18 come off of that and that's a, maybe a 19 area about whether that's allowed. And they 20 also noted that they've heard anecdotally that 21 metabisulfite may be safer to use. 22 And then the TR they noted, which I

1 appreciated, that the TR does address not whether potassium bisulfate is allowed. 2 listed in several international regulations, 3 4 not specifically in the NDR's and not mentioned And they noted that they have heard 5 in the TR. some EU certifiers interpret it as allowed. 6 7 it looks like the So actual composition of SO2 is something that needs more 8 attention from us, maybe in annotation review 9 or through some other channel. 10 11 And several commentors supported 12 relisting. Several noted that they supported relisting because of the made with 13 organic limitation, that draws a distinction around the 14 integrity of the organic label, and they were 15 more comfortable with that. 16 17 One commentor did note that in 18 addition to the risks around elemental sulfur 19 that we touched on yesterday, the farm market 20 risks and the inhalation risks, that using it also presents inhalation risks 21 in processing 22 for workers. But again, that the made with

1 organic annotation gave them comfort some around that. 2 hear directly from didn't 3 We 4 wine makers, and I was really disappointed. 5 I'd love to hear how this listing is impacting the wine industry, what's changed since I was 6 7 kind of deep into it. There is new attention around natural wines that may change how 8 9 feel about this material, so I'd love for the 10 fall, if anyone has winemaker connections, to more directly from folks who are using 11 this material or who have decided not to and 12 13 how that has worked out for their marketing 14 plans. 15 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate and then 16 Wood. 17 MEMBER LEWIS: I may not have this 18 understanding is correct, but my that 19 biodynamic wines require the grapes to be grown 20 organically and do allow sulfites to be added. 21 So I am curious if there is any sort of kind 22 of, market access label confusion elements that

might be worth discussing while we have this in 1 front of us. 2 MEMBER JOHNSON: Yeah. Thanks for 3 4 mentioning that, Nate. I got lost over it just to not to get too deep into all of the other 5 standards. But yeah, sulfur dioxide is also 6 7 biodynamic lines. So I think I allowed in often biodynamic and organic 8 see marketed So then it would be in the made with 9 together. 10 organic, biodynamic camp, I quess. But yeah, 11 that's another data point under what's allowed 12 under other standards. 13 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Wood. 14 MEMBER TURNER: Thank you, Allison. -- anything magical 15 there anything worth about that 100 part per million threshold in 16 17 the listing and is that one of the issues that 18 we should maybe lean into a little bit and try 19 to understand whether there's something there? 20 MEMBER JOHNSON: That's good 21 don't auestion. Ι think there's anything magical about it. My, just like reaching back 22

into my brain, but my understanding is that the 1 current annotation is the product 2 of negotiation. So I imagine that's how we got to 3 4 that number. 5 The EU has kind of most elaborate rules around sulfur dioxide and that mirrors 6 7 how wine is regulated there generally. allow higher amounts in white wines; they can 8 9 be in sweet wines. Lower amounts in red. 10 -- hear me on my sulfur dioxide soap box, is but there's a lot of consumer misunderstanding 11 12 or misperception about sulfite use. 13 When we used to do wine tastings, 14 I'd frequently have people come to me and say they drink organic 15 wine because they're 16 sensitive to sulfites while they were drinking 17 white, made with organic wine that had 18 sulfites. 19 So maybe the lower levels help but 20 consumer understanding of the issue and the 21 of production reality seem to biq have 22 disconnect. There are a lot of made

1	organic wines on the market, so that 100 ppm
2	threshold isn't keeping folks out, but I don't
3	have a great sense of whether, if we played
4	with that number, it would have a significant
5	impact. That would be another great thing to
6	hear about for the fall.
7	MEMBER TURNER: Thanks. I love the
8	nerdiness on wine. It's great.
9	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Other questions
10	for Allison?
11	MEMBER SMITH: I don't have a
12	question; I just have a comment that I was so
13	grateful that you were on the Handling
14	Subcommittee when this material came up because
15	you have some great work. So super fortunate
16	for me.
17	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Hear, hear.
18	MEMBER JOHNSON: And for me. Thanks
19	for letting me work on it.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right.
21	Thank you, Allison.
22	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Moving to

1	205.606(g) fructooligosaccharides. I did it.
2	FOS. We will just say FOS from now on. This
3	is Jerry.
4	MEMBER D'AMORE: I'll take one run
5	at it because I practiced.
6	Fructooligosaccharides. And I'm happy to go
7	with F-O-S as well. Thank you.
8	Okay. FOS is on the national list
9	at 205.606 as a non-organically produced
LO	agricultural product allowed as an ingredient
L1	in and on products labelled organic. FOS is
L2	incorporated into milk products, cakes,
L3	biscuits, cookies, crackers, yogurt, ice cream,
L 4	soup, hard candy, among other foods.
L5	It has two primary manufacturing
L 6	processes, one using inulin-derived called
L7	inulin-derived from a dietary fiber found in
L 8	chicory or Belgian endive, Jerusalem artichoke,
L 9	agave, and other plants. The other one is
20	sucrose derived. Sugar cane, sugar beet,
21	extracted sugar, and fermented with

aspergillus.

22

1	Both processes use heat and pH
2	control to speed up the enzyme reactions.
3	Specifically, adjustment of pH is accomplished
4	using hydrochloric acid, which is a strong
5	acid, and sodium hydroxide, a strong base.
6	Potassium phosphate is also used for pH
7	control. The FOS produced can then be further
8	purified through filtration or further
9	fermentation.
10	Regarding environmental issues,
11	there is no information available from EPA or
12	FDA to suggest that environmental
13	contaminations result from the manufacturer,
14	use, misuse, or disposal of short chain FOS.
15	Ancillary substances, there are no ancillary
16	substances intentionally included in FOS.
17	Discussions. During the last sunset
18	review, FOS remained at I don't want to get
19	into that, that's what I wanted to avoid.
20	Okay. I'm going to read it. During the last
21	sunset review, FOS remained at 205.606 by a
22	vote of 14 to 1. Most stakeholder comments

in support of the continued listing of 1 were Further, there appeared to be no sources 2 FOS. of organic FOS coming out of the latest review 3 session. 4 5 strongest opposition Given the keepina FOS the national list, centers 6 on 7 around the availability of organic supply. Handling Subcommittee will focus this 8 on 9 aspect. 10 Our one question to the stakeholders 11 is availability was, what the current of 12 suitable organic supply for the manufacture of 13 The public comment process yielded not FOS. As a atter of fact, it's the lightest 14 much. return on that I've seen in three and a half 15 16 years. 17 So there were eight respondents. 18 That doesn't minimize the value, by they way. 19 So there eight respondents. Five were 20 supported relisting, two opposed relisting, 21 with one saying that it has never been 22 necessary. The others saying that it is not an

1	agricultural product.
2	I'll spend a little bit of time with
3	these myself. And there was also one
4	organization that is not taking a position.
5	So when I stumbled there for a
6	moment, I thought I was going to bring myself
7	into a position of having to explain the long
8	history of FOS with our program. But if you'll
9	ignore the fact that I stumbled on it, we won't
LO	have to go into that. Because it really isn't
L1	germane. So that's what I have.
L2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Questions for
L3	Jerry on fructooligosaccharides.
L 4	All right. Hearing none, back to
L 5	you Kyla. Thank you, Jerry.
L 6	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Last material
L7	here for handling, 205.606(1) lecithin de-
L 8	oiled. This is also Jerry.
L 9	MEMBER D'AMORE: Thank you. One
20	second please.
21	Lecithin de-oiled, 205.606, non-
22	organic agricultural substance allowed. The

1	major applications for lecithin include
2	margarine, chocolates, in instantizing powder,
3	release sprays, and in baked goods. Lecithin
4	improves water absorption, increasing volume
5	and shelf life as well as improving uniformity.
6	Lecithin is extracted from soy beans
7	and other plants and is then isolated as a gum,
8	following hydration of solvent extracted soy.
9	The wet gums are then centrifuged, bleached,
10	and dried.
11	Environmental issues in the product
12	itself not much, but I'd like to read what
13	hexane plays in this. It's been asked a lot
14	historically and there is a conclusive FDA look
15	at hexane.
16	So under environmental issues,
17	hexane is used to extract crude oils in soy
18	flakes as it gives the highest yield. Hexane
19	is then separated from the soy bean oil in
20	evaporators. The evaporated hexane is
21	recovered and returned to the extraction
22	process. Hydrogen peroxide and benzol peroxide

1 is used in the bleaching process. Increase in environmental concerns 2 usina these chemicals have resulted 3 4 legislation that could restrict processing In 1979, which was 5 operations that use hexane. quite a while ago, a report contracted by the 6 7 FDA concluded that there is no evidence available information on lecithin with hydrogen 8 9 peroxide that demonstrates or 10 reasonable grounds to suspect a hazard to the 11 public levels which when used at are now 12 currently used. 13 Regarding human health, there were no acute exposure studies found for the 14 bean derived lecithin. Lecithin is affirmed as 15 a generally recognized as safe or GRAS with no 16 17 limitations then current good manufacturing 18 practices. 19 Discussion. Oh, ancillary 20 substances. Under current use as an 21 emulsifier, there are no ancillary substances required for the use of lecithin. 22 Discussion

during the last sunset review the NOSB reviewed 1 12-13 to keep lecithin de-oiled in the national 2 list. 3 Stakeholder 4 comments tended to center around the availability of suitable and 5 sufficient supply of organic raw material, 6 7 mostly soy bean or corn. Five years ago it was felt that there not sufficient organic 8 was 9 supply. 10 question of suitable The and sufficient supply material, 11 of raw 12 material, was addressed by the 2022 limited 13 scope TR which was received in February of this 14 year. Although it appears to be some products that are both organic and readily available, it 15 was noted that these alternatives do not result 16 17 in the same quality of finished product. 18 to support that, I took something directly out 19 of our subcommittee meeting, the minutes. 20 The CR not particularly was 21 contentious. It is а limited scope TR and 22 given that we asked for was one specific

question, it was deemed sufficient. We asked 1 for look into organic alternatives 2 а to lecithin list 3 and а was provided. Some 4 products that appeared to be organic 5 readily available, but the list was rendered questionable with а broad statement of 6 7 finished product can suffer with the use 8 these organic alternatives. 9 Okav. This is one is not as light 10 in terms of current stakeholder comments for 11 At the full board meeting this ao around. 12 there were abut 16 total comments with the vast 13 majority being written. Half of the comments 14 were strongly in favor of relisting. One group did not take a position but noted that they 15 16 have 12 registered users. 17 Tying in nicely with the TR that we 18 looked at, three commentors noted that 19 there may, underlined twice, already be 20 adequate suitable supply. Several and 21 adamant that adequate commentors were and 22 suitable supply has not yet been demonstrated.

1	And one major cooperative is not ready to
2	comment to the question of adequate supply,
3	suitable supply, which I think is the
4	overriding question, but will give an opinion
5	before the October meeting.
6	So again, focusing on perhaps
7	suitable, adequate supply. That's what I got.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Wood, please go
9	ahead, then Kim.
10	MEMBER TURNER: Jerry, can you
11	remind me, so it derives from the soybeans
12	are conventional soybeans that it's derived
13	from and not, not there's no distinction
14	between conventional versus non-GMO soybeans.
15	Can you offer any insight into that source?
16	MEMBER D'AMORE: Other than to say
17	that it can go both ways to my knowledge, and
18	no I can't go further than that. Maybe
19	somebody else though.
20	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Kim.
21	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Yeah. I think
22	there is a comment in here about using non-GMO

1	beans. I'd have to look back and see but there
2	is a comment if you look in the notes.
3	MEMBER TURNER: Okay. I'll look
4	again.
5	MEMBER HUSEMAN: Can I finish my
6	oh sorry, are
7	MEMBER BRUCH: Oh, I was just going
8	to say the comment on non-GMO soybeans or
9	organic soybeans was a potential for allergens.
LO	So sorry, go ahead.
L1	MEMBER HUSEMAN: So not only can
L2	lecithin be produced from soybeans, but it can
L3	also be produced from canola, sunflower. In
L 4	fact, we had a public commentor in the oral
L 5	comments talk about using sunflower derived
L 6	lecithin and the supply chain from that regard.
L7	This is another revenue stream for
L8	the organic oil seed industry. Shout out.
L 9	Okay. So I'd really like to hear some more
20	comments before the fall meeting of when we
21	talk about commercial availability you know,
2.2	what can be done. There's crush facilities all

1 over the -- I say all over the US. There's crush facilities verv strategically placed 2 within the US. 3 we talk about 4 can we be, as 5 climate smart there can be logistic some constraints and moving products from one area 6 7 to another, but should that inhibit, when we say, "commercially available," is it regionally 8 commercially available? 9 Is it the incentive to 10 not strip the lecithin? What's the barrier? Because I don't know if you tell me 11 the barrier is because we don't produce it, I 12 don't know if I believe that statement. 13 14 MEMBER D'AMORE: Well again, 15 harkens back to a few other things that we've 16 talked about, and I'll always default to the 17 berry industry, and this one is colors as well. 18 The problem Ι read it as 19 understand it is that yes, there's production 20 and yes, it's regional and yes, it doesn't mix 21 very well. You can't batch it that well. Ιn 22 other words, getting some in Nebraska and then

1	some on the east coast. It to me, has been
2	portrayed as mostly a logistic issue and
3	problem, and a batching problem.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy and then
5	Nate.
6	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay. We're ending
7	on a really good topic here in handling. I
8	have several questions for you Jerry.
9	MEMBER D'AMORE: Oh no, you've got
10	your big book out too.
11	MEMBER BRUCH: I actually do. Okay.
12	I do have a couple questions.
13	One, just to understand. You
14	mentioned in the TR, the limited scope TR that
15	you most recently got, there were questions of
16	quality on the finished product if organic
17	alternatives were used.
18	MEMBER D'AMORE: That's correct.
19	MEMBER BRUCH: Can you elaborate on
20	that first before I ask the other one?
21	MEMBER D'AMORE: Yeah. This morning
22	there's a list of five different things that

were looked at pretty thoroughly. I don't have 1 2 it with me, it's up on my desk, but it's in the And the TR was a little bit of a tease 3 TR. 4 because they were going on and on about -- giving none the sense that perhaps there is 5 here but then they vou 6 path 7 systematically tore that apart by looking to quality of the end product. 8 9 MEMBER BRUCH: Okav. Ι think 10 seeking to understand that piece is really Ι appreciated Kim's 11 important, but comments 12 about just -- and it fits in line, we've had this common theme about market expansion. 13 This perfect example 14 is perfect, here of 15 connecting the pieces. We have -- I actually need a home 16 17 for some of my crops right now, my organic 18 can grow organic soybeans, I have I 19 actually tested on my farm, organic 20 I'd love to produce that. If you look at the 21 latitude of where that crop is produced, I'm 22 right in line with that. Bringing that

1	production domestically would be amazing.
2	As well as sunflowers. I've grown
3	those as well organically. That's we can
4	brin those home. I want to make a comment.
5	There was an indication that there was previous
6	potential supply chain issues with organic
7	sunflowers in the Ukraine but maybe
8	availability is better now.
9	If we look at the timing of the war
LO	that occurred over there, that was February of
L1	last year. Producers had the inputs in Ukraine
L2	to actually produce the crop. The ports were
L3	the challenge. This year will be a potentially
L 4	different story in the Ukraine.
L5	My brother in law used to farm there
L 6	and I have some friends that farm over there
L7	currently that are Ukrainian. They're saying
L 8	they can't get inputs. There's a problem. The
L 9	bottleneck now for production in the Ukraine is
20	inputs.
21	So I think we all need to be on our
22	toes in an organic community about just, when

1 looking globally to we are source these products, you know we might have 2 а lag understanding if they're actually going to be 3 4 available. So Ι think again, availability 5 might be in question for international sources of the base material. 6 7 secondarily, the And then market expansion. This just dovetails in perfectly 8 9 we need to expand the rotational crops 10 that we are able to grow in this country and 11 then meet these markets. So that's kind of a couple things that I'd like to add. 12 13 MEMBER D'AMORE: Amy, could define market expansion for me in the context 14 of what you just said? 15 16 MEMBER BRUCH: When I say, "market 17 expansion" I am just referencing the organic 18 transition initiative which is part of 19 administration's overall growth and transition 20 to organic success. And so what's looked at, 21 the crops that Jenny mentioned in her opening, what's looked at or kind of the main focus is 22

1	grains, it's rotational crops, and it's
2	legumes.
3	And if we look what is needed to
4	make this product happen organically, those
5	base materials. We mentioned sunflowers are
6	kind of
7	MEMBER D'AMORE: Yep.
8	MEMBER BRUCH: That would be a great
9	rotational crop because it's different than the
10	demanding nitrogen consuming crops. It does
11	nitrogen, but it doesn't need as much as corn,
12	it doesn't need as much as wheat. So it really
13	compliments our rotational program great.
14	MEMBER D'AMORE: Good. Thank you
15	very much. What you did was bring me back in
16	line with your thinking which is what I asked
17	for. Which is that there is a supply source
18	right now that is not organic, and you can fill
19	that immediately.
20	I default always to the end product
21	and the pull for the raw material. So I
22	appreciate that, and I understand it and I

1	agree with you.
2	MEMBER BRUCH: Well thank you. I
3	think it's the chicken and the egg. We'd love
4	to grow these crops; we need a market.
5	MEMBER D'AMORE: Okay.
6	MEMBER BRUCH: And then the market
7	needs to understand that farmers can grow these
8	crops and the cycle of the needs are a little
9	bit different with our production, you know.
10	At least in the Midwest. We're a little
11	different than Logan down there that can grow
12	whatever whenever. But we have one opportunity
13	
14	MEMBER PETREY: Still need the
15	market.
16	MEMBER BRUCH: What did you say?
17	MEMBER PETREY: Still need the
18	market.
19	MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah, exactly. We
20	still need the market. We have kind of one
21	time a year to grow certain crops in the
22	Midwest. And we just need to, I just I mean

1	I love this program because it isn't rocket
2	science. We just need to break things down in
3	these very simple components and have some
4	conversations. And we can solve so many
5	challenges and these barriers that are not
6	insurmountable. We can figure this out.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate and then
8	Ryan and then Carolyn.
9	MEMBER LEWIS: Yeah. I just want to
L 0	make sure that we leave the record clear that a
L1	non-organic lecithin would still have the non-
L2	GMO requirement that's applied to all organic
L3	foods. So.
L 4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you.
L5	Brian.
L 6	MEMBER CALDWELL: Thanks Jerry.
L7	This is a good topic to end on. Pretty
L 8	interesting stuff.
L 9	I have two questions. And the first
20	one was about the lower quality that when
21	you first said it I thought it was because of
22	different sort of feed stocks were being used.

But is the lower quality that you were talking 1 about just simply because they're organic? 2 MEMBER D'AMORE: The lower quality 3 4 is the root material. 5 MEMBER CALDWELL: Oh, okav. Yeah, that makes -- I was surprised. Yeah. 6 That 7 And I totally agree with Amy sense. need those markets for those 8 about, we 9 rotational crops. It's a huge piece of the 10 whole puzzle. 11 The second question is about hexane 12 though. And maybe this has been beaten to death in the past, and I'm sure I'm going to 13 14 show my ignorance of handling here, but for instance, in the flavors discussion I was sort 15 16 of under the impression that hexane would not 17 be able to be used to extract those materials. 18 And I'm wondering if for instance soybean oil 19 allowed to be used from soybeans that 20 extracted with hexane? Because hexane's pretty 21 nasty stuff. So, beyond harsh I would have to 22 say, so.

1	MEMBER D'AMORE: I can't help with
2	the comparison between the two. I'm going on
3	the TR and quite a bit of history over a couple
4	of sunsets. So I can't comment to the colors.
5	Sorry.
6	MEMBER CALDWELL: Well I would love
7	to hear from some of the other handling folks -
8	-
9	MEMBER D'AMORE: Flavors. Beg your
10	pardon.
11	MEMBER CALDWELL: Is hexane allowed
12	to be used as an extracting agent for other
13	approved materials, listed materials? Because
14	I don't know, I just thought it was like an
15	automatic no-no, but I guess I was wrong.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Let's go Allison
17	then Kim.
18	MEMBER JOHNSON: I believe
19	everything on 606 is subject to the big three
20	scrutiny's of non-GMO, non-irradiated, no
21	sewage sludge. You need an affidavit verifying
22	that. But then beyond that, if it's not in the

1	annotation, I don't think there's any
2	limitation on how it's produced. So that's
3	where we need to weigh what we think is okay.
4	MEMBER CALDWELL: Yeah.
5	MEMBER JOHNSON: It would be
6	interesting to know if there is an alternative.
7	Like if we could get to the point where we have
8	organic lecithin, it would have to be produced
9	without hexane. So is there a process, and can
10	we head in that direction?
11	MEMBER CALDWELL: That's perfect,
12	Allison. That would be my follow-up too.
13	That's great. Thank you.
14	MEMBER HUSEMAN: And that might
15	actually speak to the difference in quality is
16	because when you use a hexane extraction
17	process it's a very consistent product. When
18	you use an expeller/extruder process you can
19	have more variation. So you have to be willing
20	to take a little bit more of that variation
21	from that process of production.
22	But yes, it is specific to a non-GMO

1	seed. That's where the difference ends between
2	conventional production and the approved used
3	for this. Is you can the manufacturing
4	process is still the same.
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Logan.
6	MEMBER PETREY: Just to reference
7	back on the flavors. Just in the annotation,
8	it's a non-synthetic allowed. Non-synthetic
9	flavors may be used when organic flavors are
10	not commercially available. All flavors must
11	be derived from organic or non-synthetic
12	sources only and must not be produced using
13	synthetic solvents and carriers or artificial
14	preservatives.
15	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Franklin.
16	MEMBER QUARCOO: Yeah. I had the
17	same question about hexane. Normally, my guess
18	is that there are other organic solvents.
19	Maybe the availability, maybe different cost
20	implications. I know that sometimes those
21	things come into play. But I'm also concerned
22	about the use of hexane.

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Carolyn.
2	MEMBER DIMITRI: This is not about
3	hexane. I wanted to follow up on Amy's comment
4	about being able and willing to grow organic
5	canola on your farm if you had a market. So
6	like, we use the phrase, "market development"
7	kind of casually and so like, specifically what
8	would you need to actually grow sunflowers or
9	grow canola's? Like can you operationalize
10	like, what that would look like?
11	So assuming maybe some of this
12	market development money could actually be used
13	in a way that's helpful for producers.
14	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy then Jerry.
15	MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Go ahead.
17	MEMBER D'AMORE: Thank you. I
18	asked, perhaps you even noticed me retreating
19	from the question that you're asking now, and I
20	appreciate that you are asking it. The answer
21	that I got is one that I understand from the
22	prospective of the grower which is that there's

1	a market nere. There is a current market.
2	That current market is being supplied by a
3	current input of materials.
4	Market development to me, and this
5	is where I didn't want to go, is to have
6	something on the far side that says, boy we
7	need a lot more lecithin. Not that we need,
8	you know, not that we need to replace the
9	current supply, the current stock supply. So
10	that's what I got out of it. Sorry for the
11	interruption. You're welcome to answer.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: No worries.
13	I'll hand it to Amy to answer that question
14	from Carolyn, and then Nate.
15	MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah. Carolyn, I
16	appreciate the question. You know, from my
17	perspective, I just need a commitment on the
18	market. These are crops that I really have
19	investigated the ability to bring this
20	production back home. Because I do study how,
21	just kind of the transportation that's
22	happening behind the scenes of organic

commodities, organic oil seeds, organic grains. 1 And just note that I could reduce the carbon 2 footprint if I could grow these products on my 3 4 fields. I'd be closer to where they're being 5 vou know, consumed and taking out the logistical components. 6 7 lot of For instance, organic а is produced in Argentina there's 8 and 9 processing facilities in North Carolina. 10 think I could at least reduce that carbon 11 footprint if I could bring those home. 12 could grow them tomorrow if I had the seed, if 13 market commitment, and then had the 14 commitment from our risk management agency that 15 these are appropriate crops for 16 region and will at least put a safety net. Ιf the wheels come off the bus with a major crop 17 18 storm like hail, at least we'd be able to get 19 whole to be able to farm the following year. 20 So Ι need risk а management 21 component. I need a market component, and the

rest you know, us farmers can take care of.

1	MEMBER DIMITRI: Great. Thank you.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Nate and then
3	Franklin.
4	MEMBER LEWIS: Just to add to the
5	you know, back to the rule, 606 does have the
6	commercial availability requirement. And this
7	sort of relates a little bit back to our
8	discussion yesterday on seed and the board
9	recommendation that gave a little more teeth to
10	the commercial availability seed requirement to
11	try to give certifiers some more teeth in
12	enforcing that commercial availability. And I
13	think that is a potential way that we can push
14	the industry towards seeking this and
15	developing these markets with a little more
16	urgency. So just sort of offering that
17	reminder of the structure within which 606
18	exists.
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Franklin.
20	MEMBER QUARCOO: Yeah. I just
21	realized, right after my last comment the I may
22	have miscommunicated something. When I said

1	"organic solvent" I was defining it from the
2	perspective of chemistry, not organic. And so
3	when I said there are other organic solvents,
4	I'm still basically talking synthetic. So I
5	wanted to be very clear.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you.
7	MEMBER QUARCOO: Because of the
8	community I'm talking to. So like I said, I'm
9	sure there other organic solvents. Not organic
10	as here.
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yes.
12	MEMBER QUARCOO: But it will be an
13	issue of solvency and cost and other things
14	that may make the producers not want to use it,
15	but I'm still concerned about hexane.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Noted for the
17	record. Thank you.
18	Kyla.
19	MEMBER SMITH: Yeah. I just wanted
20	to read from the TR. I don't know if this is
21	helpful or not. But it says, "Though the
22	hexane and acetone extractions both involve the

1	use of chemicals, the removal of these solvents
2	through subsequent evaporation meets the
3	requirements of a non-synthetic extract
4	described by the NOP guidance 5033,
5	classification of materials." I just wanted to
6	put that on the record.
7	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Amy.
8	MEMBER BRUCH: Yeah. Kyla, one
9	question with that. You said it does qualify
10	for the removal. I'm wondering, through
11	testing would trace hexane be noted in the
12	finished product.
13	MEMBER SMITH: Don't know. Good
14	question.
15	MEMBER BRUCH: What?
16	MEMBER SMTIH: I said I don't know.
17	It's a good question.
18	MEMBER BRUCH: Okay. I'd like to
19	have that answered by industry please. Thank
20	you.
21	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Homework for the
22	crowd. Other questions for Jerry? All right.

1	Fun one to end on.
2	Back to you Kyla.
3	MEMBER SMITH: Thank you. That
4	concludes handling, you all. We did it!
5	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: All right.
6	We're going to we don't have any deferred
7	votes. So we're going to go over into the NOSB
8	work agenda/Materials update. Scroll through
9	that. I'm not going to read it out loud,
10	unlike Sacramento. So take a gander as
11	Michelle, do you want to scroll
12	through?
13	MEMBER BRUCH: Could we highlight
14	some of the work agenda items, especially for
15	CACS?
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Sure. Go ahead.
17	MEMBER BRUCH: I think some people.
18	Well no, you can just read them if you want,
19	but I think some people were just coming back
20	from lunch when I made the announcement. I
21	like to make sure that's clear.
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Yeah. So on

1	CACS we're going to be continuing with the
2	oversight improvements to deter fraud,
3	consistent location identification,
4	opportunities in organic support for
5	transitioning producers, oversight improvement
6	to deter fraud modernization of organic,
7	increasing the minimum reporting requirements.
8	Enforcement residue testing for
9	global supply chain. And that's what we wanted
LO	to emphasize there I think. Organic and
L1	climate smart agriculture, climate induced
L2	farming risk of crop insurance, and then
L3	organic and climate smart, what and why
L 4	organic.
L5	Thank you, Michelle. That's the
L 6	list.
L7	MS. ARSENAULT: I've left a couple
L8	on here with question marks because I was
L 9	uncertain what we'll bring to the fall meeting.
20	Just so people know why it says, vote.
21	MEMBER SMITH: Yeah. Those three
22	netitions at the ton there, magnesium

1	carbonate, magnesium carbonate hydroxide, and
2	rye pollen extracts, we're waiting for TRs on
3	all of them. So it will likely depend on when
4	we get the TR and whether or not we'll go to a
5	discussion document or a proposal.
6	And then all those beautiful 29
7	sunsets.
8	MEMBER DIMITRI: Jerry, I want to
9	know if you used Google pronounce to pronounce
10	that very complex word that you had a lot of
11	flair with.
12	MEMBER D'AMORE: I guess before I
13	answer that, I'll ask you, should I have?
14	MEMBER DIMITRI: You're really
15	asking the wrong person.
16	MEMBER D'AMORE: I don't know. I
17	took a look at it and said, I need to master
18	this. And I went somewhere, and had it
19	whispered in my ear, and I thought I had it
20	right. So but I became a big fan of FOS in
21	any case.
22	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And as a

as a

reminder for Michelle that all of this gets
posted on the website. So take your pictures
but if you didn't get it, it's going to be up
there.

All righty. Other business. We had a request from a few advocacy groups that they may not have heard us in the fall, for why we meet when we meet. So I want everyone to take a picture of this slide and send it to your farmers when they ask why do we meet. And it's not a conspiracy to keep farmers out of the room.

And so a big shout-out to Michelle again on this slide, in the spring meeting last heard from farmers we that it's frustrating time of year to meet. And I will just say that I agree. I am not planting my fields right now. I should be. I wish I was. And so for those farmers who But I am here. frustrated giving three minutes of Zoom comments and then rushing out to their fields, I envy you.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

But the reason that we don't meet 1 times of the year, or the reason that 2 other there's a -- it's a tricky schedule trying to 3 4 have it continually moving around -- are shown 5 on the slide as we went through the year. So you can see in January, we start our 6 7 January 24th. And so if members on met January, we would technically 8 earlier in 9 landing before our new members start, which is 10 sort of a funky way to bring on and onboard new 11 folks. 12 We have some federal holidays. are competing with other meetings that I would 13 say a lot of people really love to go to and we 14

don't want to be the party crashers for those meetings. So like the ACA training, EcoFarm event, winter travel for all those who escape to Florida for a minute. farmers All of those things we heard, and we thinking, remember we have to have a six-month delay between meetings to keep them even. And SO if we meet in January and then January

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

doesn't work, that corresponding six-month fall 1 meeting would also be out. 2 So as we look to July. We've got 3 4 Fourth of July. We've got a lot of vacations. 5 try to land on meetings We want to where everybody can come and if we're picking really 6 7 hard to travel months, or months where people are trying to get away, it's not going to be 8 9 good for anybody. 10 And so none of these are great for everybody, and we really acknowledge that. 11 12 as we look through, and as you kind of parse 13 through this slide, there are solid reasons for why the other months of the year were just less 14 good than April and October. 15 And so I had a 16 lot of hope that we could meet in January and July because I'm doing nothing in January and 17 18 I'm really doing nothing in July, so that would 19 be great for me, and then there's reasons that 20 that doesn't work out. 21 again, thank you Michelle for So 22 putting this together and thank you to the

Because the whole board went 1 whole board. through it, we were pulled, we tried to figure 2 for communities, representing 3 our 4 communities, what is the best time. 5 ended up rounding back to April and October are the only best fits. Not great fits, 6 7 they're the best for the options that we have before us. 8

9 Jerry.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER D'AMORE: That was a great 1-2-3 rendition of what we came up with, but I'd still like to do an additional shout out to Mindee and Michelle and tell you that I as somebody without a dog in the hunt, I'm at the point where I'm not -- I really can make things meet. That the thing that was, it sounds very simple, but it was so obvious is that we'd caucus, we'd talk, we'd get one day and say, God, that really works.

And then you know, and you said this, then you move it up for six months. You say, oh come on. That's -- it's right in the

1	middle of the fiscal year of the US Government.
2	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Exactly.
3	MEMBER D'AMORE: So I guess the only
4	thing I'd like to add to it again, as somebody
5	who didn't do any heavy lifting, is I watched a
6	whole lot of heavy lifting and if anybody
7	doesn't believe that this was given as good a
8	shot as we can possibly give, I'll give you my
9	phone number. Thank you.
L 0	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We appreciate
L1	that very much.
L2	Any questions from the board?
L3	Kyla, please go ahead.
L 4	MEMBER SMITH: I don't have any
L5	questions, but I just wanted to say that we
L 6	also are listening and heard suggestions
L7	offered that might get at the continued desire
L8	for access, right? So there was the suggestion
L 9	of a winter listening session, we you know,
20	there's so keep those solutions coming.
21	Because we certainly you know, just
22	because we can't make a different timing of the

1	meeting work doesn't mean we don't want to hear
2	from our stakeholders. And so let's figure out
3	how we get there. And so we certainly are
4	going to have more discussions around that as a
5	board and if there are other suggestions, like
6	please send me an email. I'd like to hear
7	them.
8	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Hear, hear.
9	Yeah, Jerry.
10	MEMBER D'AMORE: Sort of
11	anecdotally, if you want to have a visual that
12	we're confronted with is that I think for most
13	of the session this morning we out numbered the
14	audience. So when we look over there, we know
15	we've got a problem too.
16	So that's to yours, Kyla. And we
17	are seeking and listening to what might be
18	potential solutions. Thank you.
19	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: And I do want to
20	give a shout out to groups who have invited us
21	to meet with them and to discuss their
22	concerns, their pain points. We meet twice a

1	year, but we have the rest of the year to also
2	discuss things. And so please don't hesitate
3	to reach out to anybody on the board about any
4	topic because we're eager for the input. As I
5	said, bring your best and brightest ideas. And
6	whenever you can give them to us, we'll take
7	them.
8	Any other questions or ideas on this
9	topic? All right.
LO	Thank you Michelle.
L1	We're going to do a few things, so
L2	close your marks, the slide will be up there.
L3	Yeah, go ahead Mindee.
L 4	So we wanted to go around, we heard
L5	a lot about coming out of the pandemic, we
L 6	went just out of pure necessity to a virtual
L7	meeting format because we had to. And as we
L 8	experienced that, I think we had five meetings
L 9	fully virtual. And then we started figuring
20	out what are lessons learned from that
21	experience?
22	And I want to go around the room and

get everyone's feelings on this. But for me I 1 noticed a really pleasant result of the virtual 2 experience, was folks got time to process what 3 4 everyone was saying in public comments. was space between when they needed to make the 5 very hard decision for how they're going to 6 7 vote and hearing everything. They had time to digest, process, communicate, talk to their 8 9 fellow board members, and generally just give 10 themselves space to take on the --11 I always almost feel like I have a 12 hangover after public comments because there's 13 so much information and we want to be paying 14 attention so carefully. And a lot of it is like listening to folks' concerns and pain, and 15 16 the hardships that are being experienced. 17 That's internalized for us. We hear that, we 18 feel that. And getting just a little bit of a 19 break over the weekend before then we have to 20 convene and vote, I think it's yielded a very 21 healthy dialogue amongst all of us.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

But I'd be interested in everyone

1 the reason else's take. So that we've continued with that gap is a few reasons, 2 I've expressed before. One being that it's 3 4 worked. It's been a really nice adjustment. 5 And so learning from the pandemic, this is just one good thing to come out of the pandemic is 6 7 just this realization is that the way we've done it is not necessarily the best way for the 8 9 process. 10 too, I think talking But about equity really does speak to, how do we give 11 everyone the fairest shot to have their voices 12 13 heard and not elevate anybody over everybody And so the thought of a farmer being 14 able to call in on three minutes, on Zoom, 15 16 their tractor, with very minimal bandwidth, 17 very accessible. 18 And being able to then say, there's 19 a cutoff, just like in say, public comments for 20 federal rule making. There's a comment period, 21 a cutoff, and then we wright. there's And similar to the board being able to digest all 22

1 of the comments at once, have some space to think about it, and then go into our decision 2 making procedure with the live board meeting 3 4 has been really nice. 5 But let's start with Allison. What are your thoughts? How has this experience 6 7 been for you? 8 MEMBER JOHNSON: It's unfortunate 9 being in the first seat. I reflect 10 a comment receiver position as here comment giver in a lot of other contexts. 11 And 12 I learn from being on both sides of that. 13 what I find as a comment receiver is there's 14 only so much my brain can take in in a given 15 day. have like the pace of 16 And Ι 17 return to our in-person meetings where we're 18 together for five or so hours and there's some 19 spaciousness. Ιt doesn't feel rushed, it 20 doesn't feel overwhelming. I feel like 21 able to be present and think through issues 22 here in the room. And I do worry about trying

1 to cram more in.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

And as a comment giver, I've 2 unusual access to DC from California in a wav 3 4 that was impossible before the pandemic. And I 5 see that starting to disappear as the return to in-person is sort of creeping back in. 6 7 of those things make me lean toward being happy with the rhythm that we've settled into 8 in 9 these last two meetings.

> That said, I'm grateful to those of you who made it through to the mighty end here, but the room is looking sparse. And I do think is value in coming together there community. I feel like I've gotten to know all of you hear on the board and here in the room better, getting to have conversations people, not being like on a timer or on So I guess I'll say my verdict is out screen. but those are my reflections at this point.

20 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Perfect. Thank
21 you so much.

22 Brian, please go ahead.

1 MEMBER CALDWELL: You know, I quess I'm open to having the virtual comments the 2 week before and a targeted session within our 3 in-person meeting for comments. I think the 4 5 point was made to me that it's a powerful image to have a lot of people in this room during our 6 7 It conveys the intense participation meeting. and interest of our stakeholders. 8 9 So if we go through more years and 10 have fewer and fewer people in our live group here, I think that's not going to be as 11 12 strong of a statement as we might like. 13 think that's important. 14 guess one thing I would say is that I would really love it if we didn't have 15 Like if 16 repetitive comments. we have 17 sessions the week before and then a third one 18 that have the same groups here, we 19 multiple comments in all those, I would love it 20 if we could avoid that in some way. But that's 21 the way I'm looking at it. 22 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I appreciate it.

1 Nate.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MEMBER LEWIS: Both those comments 2 I'm generally favorable on 3 resonate with me. 4 having an in-person comment aspect to the 5 meetings, but also acknowledge that not having a rushed meeting or extra-long days makes our 6 7 discussion as a board more robust and cohesive. So I sort of want to try to find the right 8 9 balance there. 10 I think that the elements of, sort of equity in terms of access to the board 11 12 are relevant. And something that you know, as 13

the PDS is looking at updates to our policy manual, the section on public comments and oral comments could probably use a refresh and try to incorporate some of the maybe best practices for board members in terms of how do we ensure that we don't give more weight to in-person virtual, comments versus or just some frameworks within which we think can those things.

22 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you.

1 Dilip. NANDWANI: 2 MEMBER Thank you. Τ started last year on this board and the first 3 4 meeting was virtual, the spring 2022. And then the first in-person meeting in Sacramento and 5 So I do see the big difference, in-person 6 7 versus virtual. lot of things I think I 8 have 9 previously -- because they have already said, 10 and I echo what they have already mentioned the benefits and some of the facts. 11 12 Face to face makes a big difference 13 while talking to our stakeholders face to face, 14 one on one. Even on our networking time, like 15 are having a reception, and you're talking I think these are the great things. 16 to them. 17 I think the first day, some of us, we went to 18 the field. Some of us, we could not make it 19 because we were attending pre NOSB meetings. 20 So that's something also. Some of 21 we discussed if we do next time, see how 22 owe can attend a field day also and all those

1	things. So yeah. So I think in-person, I would
2	support that. That's all. Thank you.
3	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you.
4	Jerry.
5	MEMBER D'AMORE: I'm trying to go
6	through my own mind on how to answer this and I
7	wouldn't want to take you on a torturous path
8	right now.
9	First of all, this question seems
10	pretty innocent but it's highly personal in
11	terms of personal preferences. So I'll say
12	this to begin with is that I get more out of
13	stakeholder comments, both oral and written,
14	than anything else I do. I cherish them. I
15	wait for Michelle to press the button where it
16	comes over and I can start slicing and dicing.
17	Another comment that has impressed
18	me just in the last two weeks. Our oral
19	session gave me great hope that we can really
20	engage, really talk to each other, and not be
21	obnoxious with each other.
22	I've lived this is my I'm

winding down into my fourth year here. Some of 1 the earlier oral, virtual oral, I didn't enjoy. 2 I mean it was just pretty you know -- but this 3 4 time around, people got up, thev talked, opposing views, and I didn't notice one thing 5 that was out of order in terms of behavior. 6 7 So where do I stand? I'll give you my third example here and that's talking to 8 9 somebody in this room that it really resonated with me. 10 So you've got the Zoom, and then you've got the interactive Zoom virtual 11 12 and then you've got what we've got here. tell you that I am so bummed that for three 13 14 nights I wasn't out there with you and just the 15 ability to get face to face right here and 16 really interact, it's -- to use a word that's 17 not horribly masculine, it's precious to me. 18 And I had one person look at me and 19 sort of had this conversation. He said, 20 yeah this is -- it's a progression -- this is 21 what you need to do, because I was complaining

about the population on the other side of the

1	room which dwindled a lot. And the other
2	person said, if you want to rectify that, get
3	in our face more. Make this more interactive
4	on an annual basis.
5	So that's my rambling, thank you.
6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I appreciate it.
7	One question I have for Dilip real
8	quick, on your questions. I think that the
9	idea of meeting in-person is not on the table.
L 0	We're definitely always going to be, as long as
L1	pandemic allows it, meeting in person.
L2	Were you saying that you support an
L3	in-person meeting, or in-person comments?
L 4	MEMBER NANDWANI: In-person
L 5	meetings.
L 6	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Okay. Thank
L 7	you.
L 8	Kyla.
L 9	MEMBER SMITH: I mean, I just sort
20	of want to say ditto. Because I think
21	everybody sort of reflected what I'm thinking
22	about I have been on the audience side of the

table pre-pandemic, but I don't think any of us 1 sitting around this table have experienced in-2 person comments as a board member. And so I 3 4 don't know. It's just interesting, right, that 5 all bringing our experience of are having ever had virtual comments. 6

So the equity piece is compelling to me. I do like that it is an equal opportunity for everybody. I totally agree with sort of the mental health aspects as a board member to give myself time to soak in the vast amounts of comments, written and oral, that we hear the week before.

members, to reach out to commentors, it like gives me that space, gives me time to reflect. I definitely was able to do that in particular with you know, resins where I was feeling a particular, like I wasn't quite understanding one particular commentor's thing and then I had this space and time to reflect upon it and it landed quite differently than me -- and had we

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

had to turn around and had to go straight to a vote in a shorter amount of time, I'm not sure I would have landed there.

And you know, nothing is preventing people from showing up and sitting in the audience and engaging with in other us opportunities. That's a choice that you all made, that are sitting here in the room with us I do acknowledge and understand that make the trip it's for someone to more compelling to be able to tack that on to an inperson comment, but I would argue that I have better connections, and learn more from you all in the hallway and at the other, you know at the receptions and things like that than I just in the three minute comment space.

So I'm not opposed because you know, I have not experienced in-person comments as a board member, so I'm certainly not opposed to it and you know, for all the reasons that I've mentioned, I think I lean a little bit towards keeping it as it is but anyway. Thanks.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you.
2	Amy.
3	MEMBER BURCH: Yeah. Thanks Nate.
4	This is I'm glad we're able to do this.
5	This is, I think, a really important
6	conversation to have. This is really important
7	to the community. I sit in a farmer seat. I
8	feel a large responsibility to represent the
9	farmer voice in this conversation and the
10	farmer voice does appear to be split.
11	We've heard through the process that
12	efficiency is really important. Heard from
13	some oral commentors, it is nice to call in
14	from the tractor, have that availability. But
15	we also heard from farmers that were really
16	sincere in saying, "I want to be present in the
17	process. And that really resonates with me to.
18	As a farmer, to tackle problems, we
19	use multiple modes of action. So potentially,
20	we need to look at this as what are we trying
21	to be, or when we define equity, what is it.
22	If we define equity with accessibility, that

1 might be a different way to look at this. Multiple modes of action. When we looked at 2 the gentleman that spoke about the NASS survey, 3 4 farmers respond in very different ways. 5 respond via the phone, respond via we the 6 internet, we respond via the mail to answer the 7 same question. So maybe access needs to be looked 8 9 defined for equity, not necessarily 10 of action. So Ι having one mode really 11 marinated on this whole topic as well and again 12 trying to take my own personal views out of the 13 equation and just try to understand what the 14 farmers are telling me. that really important 15 was then kind of my third point is just that we're 16 17 stronger together as a community. So I think 18 really need to be able to have compromise 19 potentially in this situation because we have a 20 lot of challenges ahead of us and we need to be

able to tackle those challenges together.

we're definitely listening to all comments

21

22

So

1 this situation. Thank you.

CHAIR POWELL-PALM: I just want to 2 reflect real quick on one point Jerry made, 3 4 that it appears sparse. But a few stats on this week, that we had 92 people on Zoom on the 5 first day. We've averaged about 73 across the 6 7 And that's 93 flights that were three days. not taken. That's 93 folks who will stay on 8 9 their farm and do their work. And I think 10 that's just -- we don't get to see that, just to add a little bit of color to who's 11 12 watching and paying essentially and 13 participating.

14 Mindee.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

VICE CHAIR JEFFREY: Thank you. tend to interview things before Ι do because I understand how my brain works and how my energy works and I'm pretty sensitive. And Ι went to an NOSB meeting to find whether I capable of living in this was And the in-person public comments context. were a level of interpersonal energy violence

that I was shocked by. Honestly, like I was like, I can't live in that context.

I realized it was a pretty intense 3 4 meetina and there was an orchestrated filibuster of public commentors and so it was a 5 little bit of an extreme example. 6 But also 7 like, I'm glad I got to sit in that example because when I chose to do this, I chose really 8 9 consciously what I was going to put 10 through and grappled with that before I chose 11 to do this.

> And so I'm very comfortable in the that we're in right now as a board process member because I need to think a lot about the process because I don't live in this process every day. As a retailer, I'm not looking at 606 and I have to really think my way through things carefully to understand what choosing and so I love the time to study and I love the time to like email someone and ask a question and like, get really clear about within myself and really make sure I'm tracking

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 process well so that I can be great at my job. So that said, my personal preference 2 we're doing it I'm 3 the wav now. 4 compelled by the public comments. I'm compelled by the politics of presence and what 5 that means for organics future and what that 6 7 means for transparency. Because I see really clearly that people who might like 8 organic 9 don't understand the beauty of this process, 10 the level of and engagement, and what 11 public/private can mean in democracy and how we 12 can show that. 13 do think that And Ι SO we need 14 people in this room to gain that understanding, 15 to show that to people. Because the power of democracy is the thing I love the most about 16 17 what I get to do right now. And so for me, I'm 18 very willing to compromise towards in-person 19 public comments if I feel like we as a group 20 are really capable of grappling with that. 21 that might be agenda oriented. if the fall meeting is really 22 So

1	intense and we have a lot of votes and we have
2	big subject matters and we're sitting clearly
3	and strongly as a group, and we can add that
4	extra level of intensity to our process them
5	I'm going to advocate for the compromise
6	towards in-person comments. And maybe that
7	might be the spring meeting because it might be
8	a little less intense as far as agenda and
9	votes are concerned.
10	But just so you know, thank you for
11	causing us to continue to grapple with this and
12	I will advocate for a compromise in the
13	direction of folks asking for more in-person
14	comments and we'll try to do that thoughtfully
15	within what we're capable of.
16	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you.
17	Kim.
18	MEMBER HUSEMAN: That's hard to
19	follow. To not to repeat what I agree with or
20	so many of my fellow board member's comments.
21	I'll try to just pepper in a few additional
22	items of consideration as I've thought about

1 this.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Kvla had mentioned in 2 our last meeting that this is like CSPAN. It's not the 3 4 most riveting meeting and to sit through three days of this from the other side, I've been 5 there, I was there in Pittsburgh. It does have 6 7 different feel to it. But applaud appreciate everyone who is here today, both 8 online and in the audience. 9

We as a board, have tried to redefine this, you know the comments of equity and one of the things that I -- because I was throwing out different places to go for the meetings. Because Denver's fantastic. If we could just do it every year in Denver, that would be great for me.

But Ι don't think that dairy farmer from the Northeast might find Denver to easy to get to or our next meeting is be actually in Rhode Island. My expectation is that unfortunately, the wine community from California is probably not going to bring us

their sulfite free or their potassium as much 1 as we've tried to influence this. 2 But the movement of the meetings to 3 4 try to -you know, we had George Organics give us some very thoughtful and eye opening 5 aspects to what the Southeast region is doing. 6 7 So by moving the meetings from one region to another, my thought and hope is that helps to 8 create the inclusion. 9 10 I'd like to try to find a way that either be regionally pooling or 11 can 12 know, ask the community what other ways outside of public comment can we help to increase the 13 14 stakeholder involvement? Again, everyone has said the same things that I would echo so I'm 15 16 not going to spend time on that. 17 But ΜV question back to the 18 community would be, outside of public comment 19 how that's three minutes of somebody 20 standing up and talking and then getting back 21 their airplane -- how can we have involvement from the community at the meetings. 22

1 How can we be accessible at the meetings face face? Where you actually get to interact 2 someone's 3 instead of when mavbe slightly 4 uncomfortable with the topic, just hide behind 5 their computer, wait for me to finish and then 6 7 Or, that's my ask to the community. If we were to say, okay public comment may not 8 9 be that connector. What would be? And I'm going to leave it at that and say that I'm not 10 11 going to answer the question. 12 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Okay. I would 13 just real quick echo that. That I think that 14 again, there's so many days of the year that we could be hearing from you all and we're not. 15 And we could be having conversations at these 16 17 meetings and how do we increase t.hat. 18 opportunity? How do we have -- and again, I 19 would throw out that for example, Amy and I met 20 with the OEFFA Grain Growers. And just got to 21 hear what's on their mind. And there was just an invitation. 22

I think a lot of us are eager for 1 those invitations to understand how we can be 2 thinking and ideating together more than just 3 4 two times a year. 5 Franklin, please go ahead. MEMBER QUARCOO: This was mv first 6 7 NOSB meetina, mine informed SO is not an perspective. I have no basis for comparison. 8 9 But when we look at the equity issue, so the 10 virtual session, need that so folks we can always participate. But the in-person session 11 12 is great. There are people who communicate 13 better that way. I like meeting people so if there is 14 a way we can have both of them. 15 I don't know what the logistics, what the implications are 16 17 but it doesn't look like an either/or situation 18 I don't know how it works, whether we 19 select one day, one question from somebody in-20 person, one from virtual or if it's a different 21 day. I don't know how it works. But if we are trying to increase participation, let's have 22

multiple means by which people communicate with 1 2 us. We look at the equity issue and if 3 4 we just go virtual and we keep it that way, is 5 that going to effect even the number we are looking at, is that going to bring it 6 7 further? If it brings it down further, we as a board might just do everything online if the 8 9 participation --10 So Ι think it shouldn't be an either/or situation, how do we get both parts 11 12 of this oral comment sessions in? 13 CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Absolutely. I'm 14 always surprised at how many breakfast, lunch, dinners board members 15 and do not receive 16 invitations from audience members to go out and 17 chat. And I think it's a skill to you know, 18 someone to you know, chat and network. 19 It's a skill I think our community really 20 should exercise because there's a lot of time 21 in the day even outside of these sessions that we could be having meetings and talking about 22

1 things.

And I think I've heard from several 2 people here today saying, with a smaller crowd 3 4 lot of you have gotten to talk to every 5 single one else of you. And that itself is probably almost a bigger value proposition than 6 7 just getting to stand at a microphone for three minutes. So that off to the side networking I 8 think is a huge opportunity. 9

10 Logan.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER PETREY: So right now we're looking at a lot of agenda's that were prior to the pandemic. And in 2018 I saw that there was actually call-ins that were a week prior that were on Tuesday and Thursday and then there was in-person meetings on I think Tuesday maybe after the introductions.

And so there was already kind of this outreach for the community it seemed like. I don't know, you guys have a lot more -- or some of these people have a lot more experience than me. So there was already kind of looking

1 at that.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I don't think that we can ever drop 2 comment section because that the virtual 3 4 going to just close that out and I don't think that we need to. I think that we also have a 5 value -- that we understand the value of having 6 7 those people. And so far as saying well inperson is going to be a different outcome than 8 the call-in, I think that we can see through 9 10 We already know that's valuable. that. So I 11 know that that's necessarily something 12 that we need to worry about.

But I think we need to try the inperson. A lot of people in the past have said
that it's important and I think for us to just
ignore that is probably not fair. It's not
wise of us to do. But we also are in a spot
where we still have some time on the board. We
can experience it, see what it looks like and
if it doesn't have value then we can change but
we're not going to have any idea unless we know
and experience it.

As far as accessibility, we did talk 1 the listening session in the 2 winter. Just curious, what about the summer prior to 3 4 going into the fall? You all might be saying, no we don't need any work in between the two. 5 But that might be a time where maybe their 6 7 voice, they feel like it's heard more if it's right before the votes and most of that is 8 9 going into the fall. 10 And then as far as attendance, you know, it's been great, but you can look -- I 11 12 looking at the charts and when you have Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, all the X's 13 14 that are on Monday and then it kind of fades. And I think that's typical for any conference. 15 You're going to get people that have to leave, 16 or you know, that do that. So I think that's 17 18 going to be normal no matter what, we're going 19 to see that consistently. 20 But the relationships that are built 21 at breakfast, lunch, dinner. And board members have to invite themselves sometimes. 22

1	you have to just go in the lobby and you just
2	are going to go with folks. But being able to
3	have that, I feel much more comfortable at just
4	being able to call somebody up and asking them.
5	You know, they're in the community or the
6	stakeholders for help. So I do like that.
7	And if that in-person comment
8	section brings more people in that to open our
9	availability up that it's absolutely worth it.
10	So thank you.
11	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you.
12	Carolyn.
13	MEMBER DIMITRI: As the second to
14	last person, because I know you still have to
15	speak Nate, I really have nothing to add except
16	I really like the virtual comment. It gives me
17	I actually have a research assistant that
18	takes notes so I'm sure that I hear everything
19	that I need to hear. And if we want to add an
20	in-person comment section, that would be fine
21	too. I'll go along with whatever the group
22	wants.

1	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Thank you.
2	MEMBER DIMITRI: If I had the money,
3	I'd bring him really. But I can't.
4	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: Well I really
5	appreciate you all engaging in this process.
6	We want to try to always improve and see what
7	we can do to serve the community better, and I
8	think that this discussion does nothing but add
9	to that process.
LO	For me I think there's a certain
L1	amount of accounting that, again I've never
L2	been on the board during a public comment
L3	period but whatever we're doing, it seems to be
L 4	working in a way. That we have a board that
L 5	really trusts each other.
L 6	When I look back and I was just kind
L7	of scrolling some previous minutes, there's a
L8	lot of disfunction. We are I mean to put it
L 9	lightly and we are super functional now. We
20	have everybody, I think on a really
21	interpersonally healthy basis, able to talk and
22	trust each other. And why that is, we might

1 have just landed with a bunch of nice folks.

2 And I know for one, I am really grateful for

3 all of you.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

think 4 But Ι that when we look 5 through whatever has lead to this point in the board, trying to figure it out, trying 6 7 figure out how we pick out the best path so that we can keep this going. So that we are 8 9 able to have, in ten years, а board that 10 continuously trusts itself and has built this culture of trust and respect and really 11 12 just a brilliant sense of earnest respect for the whole process, for each other, for 13 farmers, for our constituents. 14

And so I'm always just curious as to the "why". How did we get here and did this comment process as it exists, as it might change, how can we influence it for the better? And I don't have the answer to that, but I think just asking that question, I feel like we've landed in a really great spot right now and how can we keep that going. So thanks for

1 the discussion everybody. And with that, I think I'm going to 2 hand it over to Jenny. 3 4 TUCKER: Okav. I have a few I do realize we're about 20 minutes 5 comments. Are they going to kick us out of the 6 7 or can we keep going for a little bit? Great. 8 9 First I want to have all of us give 10 a huge round of applause to Nate. I think he's 11 done a beautiful job here and does a beautiful 12 job as your Chair. This board is remarkably special, and that conversation was just really 13 cool to listen to. 14 You know, for the first time looking 15 around the room, I realize that I was the one 16 17 that called every single one of you to appoint 18 the board and now that I think about it, 19 every time I hung up I thought, oh that will be 20 a really nice person to have on the board. 21 the fact that you are now all around the

room kind of agreeing, wow we're really nice

22

1 people.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

It's really -- that's 2 very, very special to have listened to you as individuals 3 with such shock and surprise and honor to join 4 to board to now be shaping what it is for the 5 future is just really incredible to see so I 6 relationship and 7 cherish that collaboration that you have built together. 8

> And as Nate opened the meeting with, done really difficult you've it on some You have been circumstances. vou had a member, as Nate said right up front, really graciously decide that this was not -- it just wasn't the right time, it just wasn't the right time.

> You have another member who is not here today and who I know that there has been some challenges in managing workload. You had a couple of team members who just joined, so there's a little bit of a gap. So this room has taken on extra work and we at the program are very, very grateful for that. But the way

you have supported each other is just really deserving of applause.

Zoom, there were like 50 folks or something on Zoom, if you could do the Zoom applause, we can see you. And then in the room let's give this group a big hand. You folks have covered your responsibilities and duties to your community with just beautifully and with tremendous grace.

As we look to the future and future nominations to the board, future self-nominations to the board, do listen to this group and kind of what they're doing and what they need to be successful and consider who you want to put forward to be on the board as who could join this group in a way that continues to lift us up as a community while doing the really, really hard technical work.

So it's an honor to have listened to you today. It's also an honor to be able to give our new members, I don't think we've done

this part before, the process has changed a 1 little bit in USDA and then we had a pandemic 2 and now we have two members for the first time 3 4 where we can give you your plagues right here in the room. 5 And so I have here the certificate 6 7 of appointment for Dr. Franklin Quarcoo, and it says, "With appreciation for accepting the call 8 9 serve the nation and the United 10 Department of Agriculture as a member of the Organic Standards Board." And 11 National it's 12 signed by the Secretary of Agriculture, 13 Vilsack. So do you want to come over and get 14 yours? And Nate's says the same thing. We'll take a picture in 15 Thank you. 16 just a second here. Can you hold it? 17 And this one is also the Certificate of 18 Appointment for Nathaniel Lewis. It says 19 same thing, also signed by the secretary. So 20 we'll get up and take a picture here of our new 21 I'm so happy to have you guys here. members. 22 All right. So thank you.

1	And so I think with those thanks and
2	with the deepest appreciation to the board I
3	also want to extend my thanks and appreciation
4	to the NOP team who worked behind the scenes
5	all week to make this all happen. It is an
6	honor to work with you every single day. And
7	with that I think we close. Let's give them a
8	hand. Thank you.
9	And with that, do you have your
10	gavel? Are you ready to go? I think we
11	officially close the meeting.
12	CHAIR POWELL-PALM: We are ready to
13	adjourn.
14	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
15	matter went off the record at 1:25 p.m.)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	