

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

-----X  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON :  
BIOTECHNOLOGY AND 21ST CENTURY :  
AGRICULTURE :  
-----X

A meeting in the above-entitled matter was held on  
March 15, 2016, commencing at 9:07 a.m. at 1400 Independence  
Avenue S.W., Jamie L. Whitten Building, Room 107-A  
Washington, D.C. 20250.

Russell C. Redding, Committee Chair

Michael G. Schechtman, Executive Secretary

**DEPOSITION SERVICES, INC.**  
12321 Middlebrook Road, Suite 210  
Germantown, Maryland 20874  
Tel: (301) 881-3344 Fax: (301) 881-3338  
info@depositionservices.com www.DepositionServices.com

APPEARANCES

Russell Redding, Chair

Michael Schechtman, Executive Secretary

Committee Members:

Isaura Andaluz

Paul C. Anderson

Laura Batcha

Charles Benbrook

Barry Bushue

Ron Carleton

Lynn E. Clarkson

Leon C. Corzine

Douglas Goehring

Gregory A. Jaffe

David W. Johnson

Alan Kemper

Mary-Howell R. Martens

Angela M. Olsen

Betsy Rakola

Jerome B. Slocum

Latresia A. Wilson

1           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Good morning, everyone. I hope  
2 everyone had a good evening last night and thought about the  
3 information that was discussed yesterday. Thank you for all  
4 of your continuing efforts with the AC21. As Secretary  
5 Redding mentioned yesterday, I'll be chairing the meeting  
6 today until his hopeful return later today. We wish him  
7 well in his state hearing. Just, just a note for  
8 information, my chairing this meeting is exactly what is  
9 called for under FACA, the Federal Advisory Committee Act,  
10 in circumstances just like this one. But having said that,  
11 I'm obviously not the secretary, so please bear with me.

12           I'll first note that we will be having some  
13 additional documents today. Diane -- Leon, have the  
14 additional documents arrived? I just saw you outside there.  
15 No? You didn't see me.

16           MS. OLSEN: Well, I just peeked, and they were not  
17 there.

18           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Okay. They should be down any  
19 minute. The additional four documents are the redline  
20 comments provided by Angela Olsen on the framework that was  
21 submitted by Lynn Clarkson, as well as Paul Anderson's  
22 attempted rearrangement, or --

23           MR. ANDERSON: It's out there.

24           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Oh, it's out there, they're out  
25 there now?

1 MS. OLSEN: No, no. Paul's has been out there.

2 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Oh, Paul's has been out there.

3 MR. ANDERSON: That one's out there.

4 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Okay, sorry. That one is already  
5 out there. Rearrangement of the elements of the document  
6 that Lynn provided. I should just note right now, again,  
7 these are for your information. There will be a new  
8 framework draft, which I and the chair will be working on,  
9 attempting to address all of the issues that are raised in  
10 comments and to help us go forward. I hope that you'll have  
11 that within a week or 10 days. In addition, copies are  
12 being made of the two PowerPoint presentations that were  
13 given by our two external speakers yesterday from the  
14 National Association of Conservation Districts, and from  
15 NASDA. And hopefully they will help us in our discussions  
16 today as well.

17 Now, I was recently at an international meeting  
18 just a few weeks ago where the chair of the meeting in  
19 perfect diplomatic form complemented participants on the  
20 day, previous day's discussions and said that we had a, they  
21 had a rich discussion. And that was a work I had never  
22 heard used for, in that context before. But I think our  
23 discussions yesterday were also rich discussions. As, as  
24 the committee is moving forward towards common themes and  
25 understandings. Clearly we have a number of unresolved

1 issues and a few places where there are divergences of views  
2 on the scope of, on the scope of the discussions, on how and  
3 where to discuss seed purity, and how to reference previous  
4 AC21 work on that subject, and a few other things.

5           But clearly, also, there are many common themes.  
6 We've heard about the importance of communication and  
7 farmers engaging with each other, shared responsibility, and  
8 the desire of farmers to be good neighbors, the  
9 acknowledgement that this work is not going to solve all  
10 potential problems and maybe can't offer resolutions when  
11 conversations don't necessarily do the trick.

12           But I think everyone around this table pointed to  
13 the value of farmer-to-farmer interactions, so that we'll  
14 need to find a roadmap, one with lots of options that can be  
15 tailored to local needs, that can be offered to help bring  
16 folks together and guidance to help farmers identify some  
17 critical factors that can impact their ability to grow their  
18 crops and meet their contractual needs. Importantly, I  
19 think we were reminded yesterday that the committee is not  
20 seeking to educate farmers or to teach them how to farm.  
21 We, I think the hope of what this work is, is to be able to  
22 provide a resource for farmers and communities to bring  
23 folks together.

24           We discussed two valuable models yesterday that  
25 our outside presenters offered. And I think they offer some

1 valuable parallels. What makes the MP3 work, I think, is  
2 common interest around bee health. There is perhaps a  
3 similar common value for producers around coexistence  
4 discussions, about the importance of food and feed, and the  
5 importance of economic opportunities for, for all farmers.

6 Both the MP3 and the conservation district models  
7 point out that there is some value in knowing who is  
8 responsible at the state and local level for doing what, and  
9 perhaps it will be important in these efforts to stress that  
10 the roles of all the players in our discussion, in the  
11 discussions that we will be describing need to be clearly  
12 articulated up front. I think we also heard some  
13 interesting possibilities for roles both for conservation  
14 districts and for state agriculture officials in supporting  
15 and perhaps sometimes convening some of these efforts.

16 So, today we'll dive into some of the more  
17 difficult issues. Not that we've been avoiding them. Up to  
18 this point, scope of guidance, how to bring folks together,  
19 what a model for these discussions might look like. Well, I  
20 think the intent is to work through these things,  
21 recognizing that as we try to parse them out separately,  
22 they do all overlap. And, and that we will try to, when  
23 there are, difficulties or disagreements, we'll try to  
24 articulate them and then see how we can move forward. But  
25 again, I need to ask everyone to try to find common ground

1 and move forward. Thank you.

2           Okay. So the first topic for discussion today --  
3 an again, these, the intent for today, we have set up a  
4 series of different topics. But again, they all overlap.  
5 If we move from one to another, if we spend more time on one  
6 or less and the discussion flows in different directions,  
7 that will be okay. But I just want to make sure we get all  
8 of the topics out on the table so we can see where we are.

9           The first one for today is this discussion around  
10 the scope of farmer-to-farmer dialogues. I think the  
11 committee has noted a few fundamental facts, such as the  
12 fact that most farmers try to do the right thing and try to  
13 be good neighbors. As in all walks of life, some farmers  
14 are more difficult than others. And some have different  
15 constraints than others. Farmers may not always have the  
16 information they need about the critical factors involved in  
17 producing their crop to a particular specification or for  
18 that matter those that are critical to their neighbors'  
19 production.

20           Farmers don't necessarily even know what their  
21 neighbors are producing in all circumstances, or may not  
22 inform their neighbors about their intended planting. In  
23 the concern that has been discussed over pollen movement,  
24 it's clear that encouraging farmer-to-farmer dialogue or  
25 participation in coexistence-related discussions, that that

1 encouragement may be challenging because the issue may be, I  
2 think we've heard, of more inherent concern to an IP  
3 producer than to his commodity-producer neighbor.

4           So, at the last meeting, I think the AC21  
5 uncovered a bit of a tension over keeping discussions  
6 focused on pollen movement, and perhaps not providing enough  
7 incentive for full participation by commodity producers,  
8 versus broadening the discussion among farmers to include a  
9 broader set of issues that would include additional topics  
10 of concern to those farmers that may not be specifically GE-  
11 related. And that in the interest of getting more of a  
12 back-and-forth discussion of topics of concern to each side,  
13 issues around soil movement, weed and pest management, water  
14 issues, and pesticide use are examples of broader issues  
15 that were mentioned previously that might in some instances  
16 be considered as topics that could be under discussion.

17           So the question here today is how can the  
18 committee resolve this issue so that there can be a specific  
19 recommendation to states and localities, or is this an issue  
20 you want to in fact punt to those localities to decide for  
21 themselves, or is there a particular resolution or  
22 compromise that can be reached here?

23           Before I open it up for discussion, I should just  
24 mention that Commissioner Goehring sent me earlier a  
25 document which was circulated that provided his thoughts on



1 what these discussions might include, and that was provided  
2 to you as a meeting document. It's up to the AC21 of  
3 course, to decide what use if any that document might be put  
4 to or how it might be modified for discussions, and whether  
5 it would be of use for some or all of the coexistence after  
6 all the discussions we talked about yesterday. So with  
7 that, I will open up for comments and thoughts.

8 MS. BATCHA: Apologies.

9 MR. BENBROOK: Good morning. I'll start with what  
10 I was going to say last night, but the time had passed. I,  
11 I think that restricting the scope of farmer-to-farmer  
12 discussions about managing pollen flow, for example, or  
13 comingling, does a disservice to the contribution that the  
14 AC21 can make to dealing with the, the, this, I would argue  
15 expanding set of issues around the impacts of GE technology  
16 on U.S. agriculture that we sort of think of as coexistence.

17 I for one think that it, it's unfair to expect  
18 farmers in, in neighborly dialogue to work out all of the  
19 problems that are being imposed on the agricultural system  
20 by the tensions around this technology. Now, whether you  
21 believe that those tensions and, and the controversies are  
22 misguided or appropriate and overdue, they exist. And they  
23 are making the, they are broadening the dimensions of the  
24 coexistence challenge. They're raising the stakes. And I  
25 think it's, I think, I would like to encourage the AC21 to

1 point out in its report that there are aspects of the  
2 broader coexistence challenge that simply cannot be solved  
3 by even the most cordial and cooperative farmer-to-farmer  
4 cooperation. And that, in fact, if some of these other  
5 dimensions of coexistence are not managed in a way to reduce  
6 their spread and strength, if you will, this whole issue  
7 that we're trying to, to deal with will become increasingly  
8 unmanageable.

9           So I, while we all have recognized that there is  
10 certain responsibilities at the farm level and communicating  
11 with neighbors and, and taking the practical, on-the-ground  
12 steps that are well-accepted to, to prevent pollen flow from  
13 a GE field into a non-GE field, I think there's also  
14 important responsibility for this in the input sector that,  
15 that needs to be highlighted. I know Alan and Leon have  
16 spoken up many times about the issue of synchronous  
17 approvals in international markets. I, you know, I think  
18 that I would certainly agree that that's an important issue.  
19 But there are many other aspects of how this technology has  
20 been introduced into the market and, and played itself out  
21 in, in, in the policy arena and the market that's making the  
22 coexistence challenge ever-more difficult to manage.

23           And I, I think we would be remiss to not  
24 acknowledge that in our report. I am sure we're not going  
25 to be able to come up with the solutions, but at least if we

1 can highlight the fact that this is a, this is a dynamic  
2 issue, and, and there, there are really new, new avenues  
3 and, and facets of it coming at us at a fairly rapid pace.  
4 So I, I think that would be appropriate and helpful.

5 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you, Chuck. Next, we have  
6 Angela.

7 MS. OLSEN: Thank you. I wanted to discuss the  
8 substance of, of what you're asking us, Michael, the topic  
9 that you're asking us to discuss. But before that, this is  
10 a very complex issue, as we all know. If this were easy, we  
11 wouldn't all be in the room addressing the topic. So in  
12 terms of, you know, I think that in an introductory  
13 paragraph, I think that that's really what we want to say,  
14 really frame up the report and say what this is and what  
15 this isn't.

16 This report isn't going to address everything.  
17 There are a lot of challenges in agriculture. And so, you  
18 know, to a lot of the points Chuck is bringing up and that  
19 have been discussed around the table, I think we have a  
20 limited amount of time. We have a narrow charge. And I  
21 think the points are all valid, but then, you know, really  
22 framing it up as here's what the report is, and here's what  
23 it isn't.

24 You know, Michael, I think you did a nice job at  
25 the beginning of saying this isn't to educate farmers. So,

1 when people do read the report which aren't, which are going  
2 to be plenty of people that aren't sitting around this table  
3 that haven't had the benefit of the conversation, they'll  
4 understand what this is and what this isn't. We're not, we  
5 don't mean for this to be all-inclusive of, of, of every  
6 topic that could be touched here because we could be here a  
7 long time discussing those various topics. So, you know,  
8 that may be a way to just acknowledge there are other  
9 issues. But here, specifically is what we're addressing in  
10 the report.

11 In terms of the substance and Commissioner  
12 Goehring's proposal, it seems, I think it's, I think it's a  
13 great starting point for us, for our discussions. I also  
14 look at it with regards to the NCGA proposal that Leon, that  
15 also is available to us outside and that Michael has  
16 circulated. And it seems that components of this may work  
17 very well in Commissioner Goehring's model. I'd be  
18 interested in hearing from Commissioner Goehring about how  
19 does this, how, how similar is this to the MP3 model? Are  
20 there, because I, I had a lot of energy for that model  
21 yesterday and the other speaker that we heard about as well.  
22 That could be a really great model. It seems that there are  
23 components of this that are modeled after that. So I'd be  
24 interested in hearing how similar is that, were there things  
25 that maybe didn't work that we could improve upon here for

1 this purpose, could I, could I ask Commissioner Goehring to  
2 talk about that a little bit?

3 MR. SCHECHTMAN: He's up --

4 MS. OLSEN: Or, okay, we can wait.

5 MR. SCHECHTMAN: If you're okay, Mary-Howell with  
6 letting --

7 MS. MARTENS: I'm okay with that. Mine's a  
8 different topic.

9 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Okay. Go ahead. Go ahead,  
10 Commissioner.

11 MR. GOEHRING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Actually,  
12 a lot of what I put out in that, that particular sheet of  
13 paper was an outline. It's a format along the same lines in  
14 which we developed the MP3 program and pollinator plan. So,  
15 it's kind of a guideline that once you identify what your  
16 issue is, what are the concerns, what are some of the  
17 mitigating strategies that you can put together to address  
18 some of those things.

19 If I can also refer back to something that Chuck  
20 said. And it has to do with our conversation this morning  
21 about that farmer-to-farmer dialogue. I wouldn't want  
22 anybody to walk away and think that after all of our work  
23 we're going to have farmer-to-farmer dialogue. I don't  
24 think hardly any farmer-to-farmer dialogue is going to  
25 happen.

1           But I will tell you what I do believe. If you  
2 create a venue, you create a public meeting, and you present  
3 information, you present an outline like this with a  
4 narrative on these, these areas, you give counsel and  
5 guidance to those that are probably interested in addressing  
6 this issue. And it has to be a two-way street when we talk  
7 about coexistence. It's not one way. Because I can tell  
8 you when you have a meeting, and if you're going to frame it  
9 up, and it's all about coexistence, you're probably only  
10 going to get one, you're probably going to have a couple  
11 types and groups of people that attend the meeting. But you  
12 may have very few farmer neighbors that are going to attend.

13           So, when you're going to frame it up, a lot of  
14 thought has to be behind how are you going to extend that  
15 invitation, and what is that conversation going to be?  
16 Because coexistence is a two-way street, and I think you can  
17 frame it up around identity preservation, identity products.  
18 And you're going to get a lot more participation, and you're  
19 going to put on the table mitigating strategies. I think  
20 you're going to invite a lot of conversation, invite a lot  
21 of people to raise awareness, to also inform them. And it  
22 doesn't mean that anybody is dumb or not insightful. This  
23 is, we live and work in our world. We know what issues we  
24 have to contend with. But we might not understand what  
25 somebody else has to contend with. And that will certainly

1 get people thinking about, oh yeah, that, I can see that  
2 being an issue. And I think I know how to resolve it.

3           So if you provide the outline with a bit of the  
4 narrative to kind of foster and develop more thinking and  
5 awareness, you'll provide a lot of, a lot of good material  
6 for, for that group to discuss during that period of time.  
7 And like I said, whether we're talking about pollagen  
8 (phonetic sp.), or pollen or pathogen movement, it works  
9 both ways. And it will get the attention of everybody. And  
10 it will certainly help to a great degree. Everybody will  
11 feel included because they will feel like they may have a  
12 dog in the fight, a stake in the game. So with that, if  
13 there's any other questions, I'll certainly entertain them  
14 or answer them. And that, I kind of included my comments in  
15 theirs, what I wanted to day.

16           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Okay. Thank you. You reminded  
17 us that this is a significantly a discussion about all kinds  
18 of IP production. That's a, a helpful thing. Mary-Howell.

19           MS. MARTENS: I don't appear to have a working  
20 microphone.

21           MR. GOEHRING: Is it dead already?

22           UNIDENTIFIED MALE: They didn't even turn ours on,  
23 did they?

24           MS. MARTENS: I was in communication with a seed  
25 company, one of the seed companies that sells organic seed

1 last night. They do a really good job. They do some  
2 production on their own. They do buy and resell. They also  
3 sell conventional seed. This is really, really critical for  
4 our overall discussion today. This is, this is sort of the  
5 core of it all.

6           What I was told last night was, they will not,  
7 they suspect that most of the seed, the organic seed they're  
8 selling, is going to be somewhere around 1 percent AP. From  
9 the get-go, that's not going to meet this contract. If it  
10 goes up from there due to pollen drift or combine cleanout,  
11 or anything else, it goes up. It doesn't go down.

12           They also won't put that as a guarantee on the  
13 label. That's what they try to achieve. But the problem is  
14 that the inbreds themselves that they're making the hybrids  
15 out of, they have to license, and very often the inbreds  
16 themselves are carrying AP percent. So, this is an organic  
17 seed company that is doing their very best for organic  
18 farmers. This isn't a non-GMO market. It is absolutely  
19 imperative for a farmer to be able to know what their  
20 percent that they start with is. Because if then they  
21 harvest their corn and they take it to Lynn, and Lynn  
22 rejects it, they are immediately going to blame their  
23 neighbor. It came from pollen drift. It was because of Joe  
24 over on the other side of the hill. When indeed, it was  
25 not. They may, they'll, it'll cause friction between



1 farmers by casting aspersions on neighbors, when the problem  
2 started with the seed that was planted.

3           So if we're going to foster coexistence between  
4 neighbors, the person trying to achieve a non-GMO status  
5 needs to know from the get-go that the seed that they are  
6 planting, if they get no further contamination, or AP, they  
7 can meet a contract for .9 percent. If they can't know that  
8 information, it's going to make it very, very hard for them  
9 to then feel cooperation with neighbors because they're not  
10 going to know -- that's a huge gap of knowledge.

11           So, seed is where it starts. Percent AP in the  
12 seed needs to be a piece of information that any farmer  
13 trying to meet a contract knows before they put that seed in  
14 the ground. It needs to be labeled. It needs to be  
15 verified. It needs to be guaranteed. And I understand it's  
16 a real problem with inbreds that are being licensed, because  
17 that is something that the seed company might not have  
18 control over. But it is, it is something that if we're  
19 going to foster coexistence, seed has to be where it starts.  
20 Because, the information I got last night was, to me, quite  
21 alarming.

22           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you, Mary-Howell. Laura,  
23 please.

24           MS. BATCHA: Thank you. I'm going to follow  
25 Alan's lead from yesterday, maybe surprise you all by, I'm

1 going to agree with Doug this morning to get out of the  
2 gate. And I, I want to say that at our first meeting we had  
3 conversations, and I know Commissioner Goehring brought up  
4 this idea a number of times about us needing to have  
5 something for everybody on the table to get people to the  
6 table.

7           And, you know, I will admit that honestly the  
8 first two to three passes at that, I was resistant to the  
9 idea. I think in, in working with my subgroup and learning  
10 a little bit more about how we might cobble together  
11 something that, that could potentially help smooth some  
12 things out, not as a silver bullet, but help bring this  
13 conversation back to the people who are practical and able  
14 to solve the conversation. I'm increasingly embracing the  
15 idea that Doug's put forward about how we position this.

16           So, I just want to communicate that to the group.  
17 And I really like the idea of it being positioned around IP,  
18 because it can be positioned around IP as opportunity,  
19 particularly in this environment where there are low  
20 commodity prices, and challenges of IP and how you work  
21 within your community to not only be good neighbors but  
22 explore your opportunities within, within that. And I think  
23 maybe that is a more inviting way to bring people to the  
24 table because I think one of the things with this very  
25 narrow charge that if it, if it does mean something after we

1 do work as a committee, it has to be something that others  
2 have a conversation about, that we stimulate something for,  
3 for people. And we can't control that all the way down to  
4 every meeting room, every gathering. So, I wanted to share  
5 that.

6           As far as I look at the, the models and what Doug  
7 laid out, and then the two models that we looked at  
8 yesterday, and Lynn and Angela's drafts, there's a couple  
9 things that I just want to flag. I, I don't have any real  
10 issues with the outline that, that Doug presented. I think  
11 the considerations and challenges is one piece of it. I  
12 think what Lynn put together could evolve into sort of a BMP  
13 set of statements along the lines of what we find in the  
14 North Dakota Pollinator Report. I think what the pollinator  
15 model doesn't include that we saw in the Conservation  
16 District presentation that I think is important for us to be  
17 looking at is resources towards incentives and supports to  
18 do these things. There's nothing in the pollinator thing  
19 that points back to other resources for you to improve your  
20 practices.

21           And I think with the learning yesterday around the  
22 funding for buffers and hedgerows, I think sort of pulling  
23 together a piece of what the Conservation District model is  
24 on the, on their working groups where a lot of what they're  
25 doing is when they convene people is pointing them to

1 resources through NRCS and helping them navigate how to  
2 cobble together the available resources that solve other  
3 problems but also solve the problem they're trying to solve  
4 I think would be an important piece to add to that. So I  
5 think we could meld those together.

6 My last thought this morning is that I know the  
7 seed discussion is going to be our most challenging pitch  
8 point likely as a committee. But I encourage us to press on  
9 because I think without having something in there around  
10 seed and some mechanisms for visibility on seed, I do think  
11 a lot of what we will present in the end will be  
12 disingenuous because it doesn't acknowledge that starting  
13 place. So, I understand it's going to be the difficult  
14 place for us, but I think let's try to come to something on  
15 that. Because I think to leave it off the table I think is  
16 going to be, we'll be underserving the people we're trying  
17 to serve.

18 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you, Laura. Next we have  
19 Leon.

20 MR. CORZINE: I'm Leon. Good morning, everybody.  
21 I, a couple things that I, I'd like to bring out. One of  
22 the things that we toyed with in our subcommittee and Doug  
23 has, has addressed it, how you, how you structure meetings  
24 where you get folks there. I think in our discussions, you  
25 know, that's where we came up with a neutral party. And

1 maybe whether it's, if there's a new product or somebody  
2 wanting to do something different, you have to create  
3 interest to see how that's going to affect the neighborhood.  
4 But I think, actually, for my part, and being on the far,  
5 what you have to first do is, I think a step even before  
6 that is if, if you're going to have a product that, that,  
7 that your, that is an IP product, and so you've got to do  
8 some things for your preservation of the identity, it's a  
9 farmer-to-farmer thing. You don't need a meeting of the  
10 community.

11           You know, there are some things maybe you do, but  
12 I think we'd be remiss if we left out the part that it's  
13 just the farmer's talking, me talking to my neighbors. I've  
14 grown regulated products. And so I talk to the guys around  
15 me as far as what the buffer needs to do. Lynn's idea was  
16 they send a letter to some, I guess. I, we have not done  
17 that in my neighborhood. But it, but that is a step if you  
18 have trouble getting a hold of folks. But those are steps I  
19 think that maybe we need to make note of that, that is not  
20 necessarily a community-type meeting.

21           I think, you know, and maybe I would appreciate  
22 feedback, if now, later. If you haven't looked at it, what  
23 our NCGA proposed policy is, because it goes through steps.  
24 And part of that is, in the first line, has to do with Mary-  
25 Howell's concern as far as the seed purity because the goal,

1 one, is to understand the contract requirements and  
2 practices to meet those obligations. And I think that the  
3 deal is, and you know my thoughts on organic policy, you  
4 know, with, with, with the very tight tolerances that some  
5 of these contracts are doing, if you are, if you are signing  
6 a contract, whoever it is you're signing it with, if they  
7 want something that tight, then they should be helping you  
8 secure the seed. That should be part of the deal.

9           And if you can't, you can't. The folks that I  
10 deal with, they help us with the seed, or they provide the  
11 seed even. So, so that is an important part of the process.  
12 And so I agree with Mary-Howell, but there are things that  
13 we can't do about that other than to remind producers,  
14 farmers signing these contracts what it's going to take to  
15 meet that contractual obligation. Because that's a  
16 contract. It's a private contract.

17           So anyway, and then, part of, of what I did with  
18 the NCGA proposal is you know what it might take for  
19 setbacks so that you can go through an evaluation, and then,  
20 then you decide can I, can I meet this or not. And if you  
21 know you can't get the seed for that purity, and, and  
22 whoever is wanting you to grow that product for that purity,  
23 if, if you can't do it, you can't do it. If you can do it  
24 and there's a lot of extra cost, well, what's the premium?  
25 You know, it's kind of like just going through the steps.

1 So, that's what I tried to do with this. And then if you go  
2 through the steps and you say, yep, I can meet this, we can  
3 do this here. Then you talk to your neighbors and let them  
4 know and see what it, what it takes.

5 I know folks who have done a very, very tight IP,  
6 a very, and they, and they have a product that absolutely  
7 could not be, they had to contain it all. And it got beyond  
8 their own borders, and, but it was very high-value. They  
9 paid the neighbors. Okay? If I'm going to get a very high-  
10 value product, and it's going to take my neighbor, you know,  
11 and you know, it's going to vary on what the product is.  
12 But I think that's something that needs to be a concern as  
13 you go through this. So, I think these type of things need  
14 to happen. And, and I would appreciate feedback sometime as  
15 we integrate that.

16 And then we look, but there are things, too, then  
17 that Doug's model outlines the community type meetings,  
18 which are fine. But I don't see that happening in every  
19 community until there is something that, that necessitates  
20 that or something that is going to change. Because, and  
21 that's not saying that anybody is anti-coexistence, because  
22 there's coexistence going on now. But to enhance  
23 coexistence, that's what we're all trying to do with this.  
24 Thank you.

25 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you, Leon. Can I just

1 follow up to ask you a question? Is what you're talking  
2 about, and again, what you've presented from that NCGA  
3 policy proposal under discussion, is, is that similar to  
4 best management practices being thought of under sort of a  
5 guidance document? Is there some similarity between what  
6 you're talking about and what the other guidance document  
7 would be, the framework thing that Mary-Howell has talked  
8 about as well? Do you see, do you see a similarity there?

9 MS. MARTENS: I actually agreed entirely with what  
10 Leon just said. So.

11 MR. CORZINE: New best friends. I, but I think,  
12 yeah, I think you can, I don't know if I specifically put  
13 BMPs there. But, I mean, you could certainly do. It's,  
14 because that's all around what it takes to grow that  
15 product.

16 MS. MARTENS: Can I see that?

17 MR. CORZINE: Sure.

18 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you. Alan, do you want  
19 to --

20 MR. CORZINE: Thank you.

21 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Do you want to hop right, hop in  
22 here now? Actually, you're next on the list anyway.

23 MR. KEMPER: Okay, thank you.

24 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Anybody else who wants to  
25 comment, just let me know.



1           MR. KEMPER: I would, I would like to start, Mr.  
2 Chairman, this morning first of all agreeing that the  
3 Commissioner from North Dakota's paper is good. Although I  
4 would just kind of stop this paper after the first paragraph  
5 and let us write the rest of it. Voluntary in nature, and  
6 that's about where I would stop and say we need to go on. I  
7 have a little problem with your best management strategies.  
8 I would actually call it sustainable cropping strategies or  
9 something like that instead. But, I want to add some new  
10 things, Mr. Chairman, to the table's discussion this  
11 morning. If you care to take notes, that's fine. I'm going  
12 to go slow because I want to get this right.

13           According to a person that I visited with who was  
14 one of the past presidents of NASDA, as well as knowing the  
15 seed labeling laws, as well as industry standards for maize,  
16 i.e. corn, here are some facts and figures. Seed corn  
17 today, according to him, GE-bred, GE-modified, has to have a  
18 98 percent trait purity. That's either herbicide or, or  
19 insecticidal traits. Of that, it has to have a 95 percent  
20 variety purity. If it's any less than a 95 percent variety  
21 purity, it has to be listed as blended, and they have to  
22 list what other varieties it's blended with.

23           Seed law allows up to 5 percent of off-types in  
24 all grades of corn, corn convention, organic, and GE. The  
25 organic and GE and conventional off-types can be any other

1 corn. So, i.e., a GE off-type could also be organic or  
2 conventional or a GE, or a -- or organic rather, corn off-  
3 type could be a GE or conventional, up to 5 percent. On  
4 conventional corn, non-GMO, still the same varietal, 95  
5 percent, otherwise it has to be called blended. There is  
6 called a premium conventional, which means it has to have a  
7 less than .9 percent off-typing. And that gets a \$20 per  
8 unit premium for that. And that's based on 80,000 kernel  
9 count. And those off-types, again, can be organic or GMO  
10 and conventional.

11           Then you go to organic seed, still the same 95  
12 percent variety. Must be, the 95 percent must be that  
13 variety, and up to a 5 percent off-types, which can be any  
14 of the three. Industry strives, like Mary said, to have a  
15 less than .9. Recognizing all of that, Mr. Chairman, I  
16 think it is a point that either we footnote or put a  
17 sentence in the preface, preface, or whatever, saying  
18 something like seed industry strives to have pure seed.  
19 But, however, today's U.S. seed laws allows up to a 5  
20 percent off-type. Or whatever.

21           I don't think we need to get bogged down telling  
22 farmers what they have to do or what has to be on the label,  
23 because that's already the law. And, Mr. Chairman, I might  
24 be off a percent or two, so we want to research it if we're  
25 going to actually use the word seed law or whatever.

1           Lynn, I don't know if that clarifies it. It  
2 clarified a lot for me, because I, even as a farmer, I  
3 didn't realize what the off types may be. I also didn't  
4 know the purity of a, a trait, insecticide or herbicide was  
5 a 98 versus a 95. I always, I saw it on the bags. And  
6 maybe that, Doug, is part of our educational process for the  
7 farmers in some of these meetings, you know. Not  
8 necessarily in the document, but once you have those  
9 meetings, whether that is on buffers or whatever, farmers  
10 need to recognize that. So, Mr. Chairman, I don't know if  
11 that helps or hurts. But I wanted to add that to the  
12 discussion. Thank you.

13           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you. Isaura, please.

14           MS. ANDALUZ: So, like, when you were talking  
15 Mary-Howell about you don't know if the contamination  
16 would --

17           MS. MARTENS: What's that?

18           MS. ANDALUZ: So when you said that maybe if corn  
19 is contaminated, it wouldn't necessarily be from the  
20 neighbors. It probably came from the seed --

21           MS. MARTENS: Yes.

22           MS. ANDALUZ: And you really don't know until you  
23 test to see whether it --

24           MS. MARTENS: But you have to test before you  
25 plant it.

1 MS. ANDALUZ: Well, you have to test after you  
2 grow, also, to see if it's contaminated, right? So, so it's  
3 not dumping it all on the seed. But that, but it is a  
4 problem. I mean, this is why I've been so concerned all  
5 along is because I do not want any contamination in my seed.

6 And, you know, organic seed grower trade  
7 association, our thing is we want zero detect contamination  
8 in the seed. Because if you start with contaminated seed,  
9 odds just increases. It is a huge problem the United States  
10 has, the contamination in breeding lines. That's huge,  
11 because you're starting from a contaminated point. And I  
12 think there are other countries in the world that, that, you  
13 know, it eventually could severely impact our, our, our  
14 trade, if they don't want any contamination, and all we have  
15 is contaminated seed to start with.

16 We, at Cuatro Puertas we have the largest  
17 collection of drought-tolerant seeds and native seeds to  
18 southwest area. We've been trying to breed these out to  
19 bring them back to the communities. And the other thing is  
20 that these land-based varieties have a huge resiliency. So,  
21 for example, as the climate has changed, like in our area,  
22 for like I'd say for peppers, in the last three years, I've  
23 seen 10 degrees higher, 10 degrees colder, and they're still  
24 doing great. And so this is the type of genetics that we  
25 have to preserve. And so I, you know, we want zero

1 contamination. So somehow, these plants, there has to be, I  
2 mean, we cannot grow them in greenhouses, because it is,  
3 they're not growing out in, in the natural environment.  
4 These seeds have to be grown out in the natural  
5 environments.

6 But we need to be very conscious that there are  
7 places that, where people can still grow the seeds. And I  
8 don't know, I mean, I mean I don't know. There has to be  
9 something, something done because we cannot just have every  
10 seed in this country contaminated with GE traits.

11 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you, Isaura. Next we have  
12 Angela, please.

13 MS. OLSEN: I want to address two points, one  
14 being seed, and then the other is I wanted to make a few  
15 comments on top of Laura's comments that I agreed with as  
16 well. So, starting with seed, nobody disputes that, that  
17 seed is important. And so I agree with Alan that having  
18 something in the report acknowledging the importance of, of  
19 purity in seed is important. However, we did hear from Lynn  
20 and others that there are companies out there, if, it's a  
21 business model. And so there, certain companies have  
22 decided that they will include that GE content on the label.  
23 And so perhaps those are the companies that, if you want the  
24 seed and you want the GE information, and you have a  
25 certain, very set purity, maybe those are the companies to

1 purchase the seed from.

2           And, you know, again, it's a business model. We  
3 can't force all seed companies to go in that direction. But  
4 again, if there is a great need for it, maybe that's a model  
5 that some seed companies will choose to enter into.  
6 Obviously, they would, you know, probably be charging a  
7 premium. I think we heard from Alan it's like \$20 extra a  
8 bag. I don't know. I don't have that information  
9 firsthand. But that could be an opportunity for certain  
10 seed companies. So, again, seed purity is important.  
11 Nobody is disputing that. I think that we can address that  
12 just maybe in a sentence in the, in the preface section, in  
13 the, in the, in the introduction. We don't want to give  
14 people the impression that that isn't something that's  
15 important.

16           But it's part of the education in terms of maybe  
17 understand what you're buying, what it is, what it isn't.  
18 You know, ask around. What are those additional resources?  
19 Maybe work with ASTA. Are there are some great business  
20 opportunities for certain, for seed companies that they can  
21 enter into, you know, that will do that testing, and then  
22 you have that on the bag as well. That's not required by  
23 law. But again, it can be a business model that certain  
24 companies choose to enter into. And we heard, and again, I  
25 don't know this firsthand, but we heard that certain

1 companies are doing that. And I know Lynn has that  
2 firsthand experience as well.

3           So, then in terms of Laura's comments. I like  
4 Laura's comments a lot about overlaying some of the good  
5 concepts from the NACD model over Commissioner Goehring's  
6 draft. Because I think that there's so many very good  
7 components in his draft. I do like the idea of resources  
8 from the NACD model as well, so people know, you know, where  
9 you can go. Maybe there's different funding mechanisms. I  
10 don't know. But, but I liked that concept. So I think that  
11 there's, we can start with Commissioner Goehring's model,  
12 you know, which is based on the MP3 model, but then overlay  
13 some of the really good contributions from the NACD model as  
14 well.

15           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Great. Thank you very much.  
16 Barry, I believe, is next. Who else do I have here?  
17 Isaura, are you, are you back up, or are you down?

18           MS. ANDALUZ: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

19           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you.

20           MR. BUSHUE: Mine's relatively quick. Doug and,  
21 and Alan both mentioned something about strategies. And  
22 while I may be the outlier here, the term BMP is of great  
23 concern to me. It has, it has, what word am I -- I can't  
24 think of the right term, but it has implications of what is  
25 absolutely best, and therefore becomes in effect a default

1 agricultural practices act. I'd much prefer us to talk  
2 about strategies, management strategies, mitigation  
3 strategies, sustainable strategies for the record. Thank  
4 you.

5 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you very much. And could  
6 you repeat all of those other options, so we can be sure we  
7 got them down?

8 MR. BUSHUE: I think one of them was mitigation  
9 strategies. Alan, I can't remember what you called it.  
10 Sustainable District --

11 MR. KEMPER: I call it the sustainable cropping  
12 strategies.

13 MR. BUSHUE: There you go. I, you know, pick one,  
14 anyone except BMPs.

15 MR. KEMPER: BMP, you open yourself up to  
16 litigation.

17 MR. BUSHUE: Yeah. Okay.

18 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you. Laura, are you back  
19 up?

20 MS. BATCHA: I'm back up.

21 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Okay.

22 MS. BATCHA: But I'm after Doug.

23 MR. SCHECHTMAN: You're after Doug. Sorry, I  
24 didn't get you down there. Doug, please. Doug, please.

25 MR. GOEHRING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A couple



1 things. And I, I agree that I think having some things  
2 outlined within the model that would suggest resources are  
3 incentives is good. Probably one of the things that becomes  
4 a bit of a challenge is how do you do that? So then maybe  
5 the best way to talk about incentives or resources is to  
6 make sure that we're keeping it at the local level. And  
7 understand, when I say local level, I mean state level.  
8 Because in some states, there's more 319 funds available,  
9 for example. In some states, there are --

10 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Would you remind us what 319  
11 funds are again? I know they were mentioned yesterday.

12 MR. GOEHRING: Yes. 319 funds are funds that come  
13 from EPA. They're generally used for different practices.  
14 They're given to different organizations. For example, in  
15 the State of North Dakota, we use 319 funds with the Ag  
16 Department, Stockmen's Association, and the Health  
17 Department to deal with livestock pollution prevention  
18 programs. So, we assist farmers in the engineering and  
19 technical assistance in that respect. There has been 319  
20 funds made available to certain soil conservation districts  
21 in our state at one time. And each one of those soil  
22 conservation districts determined how to best use those.  
23 And because there's such a wide array of topography, soils,  
24 and conditions, in some of those places, they actually help  
25 fund the purchase of no-till equipment or conservation

1 tillage equipment. But it's very specific. That's why I  
2 think in the narrative you put in parenthesis when you talk  
3 about resources, leave that up to those local counties and  
4 the state to determine what resources exist.

5           We have a lot of foundations in this country. And  
6 a lot of those foundations don't target the entire United  
7 States when they want to do something. They will target  
8 areas, regions. Sometimes they'll even get down to  
9 townships. We've had numerous foundations that actually  
10 target North Dakota, but they will target what they would  
11 call the Coteau Plateau. Not the entire state. It's a very  
12 specific area where they'll put money into types of  
13 programs. For example, winter cereals. So, again, I think  
14 it's wonderful because that's where you can access some of  
15 those funds. But I think identifying that in this document,  
16 in this model, you search for resources by identifying what  
17 resources would exist, and then, i.e., in parenthesis, these  
18 would be examples, some NRCS programs, some EQIP dollars,  
19 whatever that might be. Keep it general. Keep it at a  
20 higher level. And let those, those states, those counties,  
21 soil conservation districts, extension, deliver on that by  
22 providing some of that information.

23           The other thing, and I believe from what I'm  
24 seeing here when we talk about some different models or  
25 different formats, the one that I provided is probably very

1 specific to farmers. If you're going to invite farmers to  
2 the table, and to a meeting, this would be the type of  
3 document they'd be interested in because this is what they  
4 do every day. I love the conversation that's going on about  
5 marketing and seed, and that's all relevant. But most  
6 farmers' eyes are going to glaze over because they have  
7 nothing to do with it. They don't care. They won't show up  
8 at a meeting, or they're going to get up and walk out.

9           But those that are involved in it, maybe in our  
10 narrative, we identify that crop improvement associations,  
11 maybe marketing groups, seed companies, anybody that's out  
12 here working with identity preserve crops, they should think  
13 about having meetings to talk about contractual agreements,  
14 to talk about seed purity. But that doesn't have to be the  
15 full part of this because they're getting into something a  
16 little bit different than the rest of the Ag community  
17 doesn't deal with. It's of interest. It's of interest to  
18 those that are doing it, to those that you might be farming  
19 next to. But most of the farmers would show up to talk  
20 about mitigation strategies and sustainable cropping  
21 strategies, because this is relevant. This comes down to,  
22 and I, it's what I talked about earlier when I said  
23 coexistence is a two-way street.

24           I think at any one time, we may all feel harmed,  
25 we may feel disrespected, dishonored, because we feel like

1 something else has happened to us in our agricultural  
2 operation on our farm that we really didn't have any control  
3 of. And quite frankly, we don't have control of much.  
4 There are so many inherent risks in agriculture. But if you  
5 want to get them to the table because they might feel like  
6 somebody's weed seeds or soil-borne pathogens or plant  
7 pathogens might be affecting their crop, they now have to  
8 spray a fungicide because my next-door neighbor won't keep  
9 control, and, and management what's going on over in his  
10 field. And they feel a little frustrated by that.

11           But this is an opportunity to come to a meeting  
12 like this and to think about things in a bigger picture,  
13 understanding a little bit about what's going on in their  
14 backyard, because they know a lot about what's going on in  
15 their backyard, but they haven't put it in the context of,  
16 well yeah, if I plant over in this area, I'm probably going  
17 to be less susceptible to some other issues.

18           I deal with this with sunflowers, for example. I  
19 plant sunflowers. And I happen to be in the flightway where  
20 there is a lot of sloughs that bites the heck out of  
21 sunflowers. And unless I can get about five of my neighbors  
22 to plant thousands of acres too, I just give up on it,  
23 because I'll get attacked, and they'll take 60 percent of my  
24 crop. So I have to think about, every year, if they're not  
25 going to plant, I have to change at the last moment and move

1 sunflower production 27 miles away from home to some other  
2 fields that I have to make it work.

3           But it's about knowing your environment. And you  
4 do end up visiting with your neighbors. And that farmer-to-  
5 farmer talk, this is just giving them the tools to think  
6 about, oh yeah, this might be another strategy I could  
7 implement to make work. So, I just wanted to clarify that  
8 this document is more about that farmer-to-farmer group  
9 discussion because it helps feed that farmer-to-farmer  
10 discussion when they have to have it together. Because  
11 someone will say, I went to this meeting and I saw some  
12 mitigation strategies that would work. Or at least I think  
13 they would. What do you think? This is what I was thinking  
14 about doing. Thank you.

15           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you very much. You  
16 covered a lot of things. I was particularly pleased to hear  
17 that you have uncovered some additional thoughts about  
18 incentives, which is, was one of the challenges that we've  
19 had in this discussion. So, more, more food for thought in  
20 these discussions. Now, I think I have the order right  
21 here. The next I think is Laura.

22           MS. BATCHA: So, I hope I'm building off of the  
23 conversation we're having here. I tried to get my mind  
24 around preferences around nomenclature and recognize that.  
25 So, I'll go to management strategies. For the purpose of

1 this discussion what I think, you know, we'll have to, we'll  
2 have to wrestle that to the ground at a certain point.

3           One of the things that, that I thought was  
4 particularly nice about the North Dakota pollinator plan was  
5 that it wasn't just farmer management strategies as Doug  
6 laid out sort of narrowly. And not that that's not sort of  
7 perhaps the bulk of what it would include. But I liked how  
8 it talked, and they used the language BMP, so I'm quoting  
9 them, not, not me, beekeeper BMPs, and then, you know,  
10 landowner, sort of residential. So they didn't just take a,  
11 a narrow view. They did provide an opportunity to sort of  
12 put out that there are other stakeholders in the mix, and  
13 that there would be management strategies there. So I'd  
14 like to see us stay open to a, a broader set with the sort  
15 of, the farming strategies at the center of that.

16           And go to the seed question again. So, we think  
17 about management strategies. And Alan, thanks for doing the  
18 research that you did to lay that out for us. And I think  
19 clarifying what the law is in a footnote is, is entirely  
20 appropriate. I'd like to see that alongside, these are  
21 general ideas that I think would obviously need to be worked  
22 a little bit further. But could folks imagine some  
23 management strategies being laid out on the grower side, a  
24 little bit if an evolution of something that Leon laid out,  
25 which is, I think it's not just a contract, but if you have

1 a market expectation for a threshold, because I think not  
2 everything is sold on contract. And increasingly, the stock  
3 market trades on the .9 as well.

4           So I think we have to open our minds to the fact  
5 that that's not only a marketplace threshold that happens in  
6 a contract, that it's to your advantage to know what you're  
7 starting with in your seed. Right. Put a statement out  
8 there. And then management practices on the grower side  
9 might be asking your seed provider what the level is. Just  
10 start having that conversation. Maybe we can scour, I still  
11 haven't given up hope that there might be some resources out  
12 there available to help provide affordable testing to the  
13 grower if they get in a pinch and that's the only way they  
14 can get the information. I think we, I'd like to see us  
15 continue to look at that.

16           And then management strategies for seed companies  
17 might be a recommendation that if people ask you, that you  
18 be able to provide specific purity levels on, on lots rather  
19 than general ranges as a way to foster coexistence and the  
20 marketplace. So those are some ideas that could be  
21 accompanied with a footnote, that Alan laid out about, you  
22 know, oh, by the way, this is the law. Right? And  
23 everybody is already complying with the law kind of thing.  
24 I think that there's no reason why that wouldn't be an  
25 appropriate thing to include.

1           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you, Laura. Barry, are you  
2 back up?

3           MR. BUSHUE: I am, thanks. I kind of wanted to  
4 follow up a little bit with where Doug was at. I would  
5 agree, if this, if you're going to get the people to the  
6 table that are going to make the difference, it's going to  
7 be the farmers. And the way to do that is to make sure, and  
8 I would warn us that, to be cautious in how we proceed and  
9 how we invite them and include them. The folks that I'm  
10 honored to represent, when I talk to them at length, their  
11 biggest fear of government is that they just want to be left  
12 alone. They want to farm. They're tired of overregulation.  
13 They're tired of being told what to do, how to do, where to  
14 do it, and when to do it.

15           If that is the way in which the meetings are  
16 portrayed, and I'm not saying anybody's saying that, but I'm  
17 saying we have to be cautious that these things are viewed  
18 as an opportunity, as Doug said, for farmers to have open  
19 and frank discussion without the fear of someone telling  
20 them to be and how they're going to have to do it.

21           You pick an acronym in a federal agency right now,  
22 and they're all basically effectively trying to do what they  
23 can to put agriculture out of business. That's my opinion,  
24 take it or leave it. But, with the exception, frankly, of  
25 USDA, and I give, I give Mike and I give the Secretary a lot



1 of credit. They've done a lot of work to reach out to the  
2 industry and try to be partners instead of, instead of  
3 adversaries.

4           But, when I look at Doug's, when I look at Doug's  
5 proposals about making sure it's farmers at the table, I  
6 bristle a little bit at the community aspect of these kind  
7 of meetings that it appears that the pollinator task force  
8 are having. And I think in that case, it's probably more  
9 valid. But I think in the case of biotechnology and  
10 coexistence, it's important that, number one, the community  
11 has no stake in this. They have no, they have nothing,  
12 nothing invested in this. It's not their livelihoods that  
13 are at risk. And there's no shortage of folks in our  
14 community that have no interest or actual experience in  
15 agriculture that want to tell us how to do it.

16           So I'm really pushing where Doug was going to in  
17 terms of us making sure that these are meetings where  
18 farmers are, are free of challenges and transparent enough  
19 to have discussion around the things that will impact them  
20 and their neighbors. The one thing that I do have a concern  
21 about, and this is maybe just from my experience in Oregon,  
22 if you start talking to people about pesticides, they're  
23 going to view it, if you have that on the list, they're  
24 going to view that as here's somebody else trying to take my  
25 ability to use pesticides. That worries me.

1           Not that it's not an important discussion to have,  
2 but it becomes part and parcel of a suggested, suggested  
3 topic to discuss. I think a lot of my members, anyway, are  
4 going to feel very uncomfortable about that because, let's  
5 face it, right now there's a lot of attempts to do just  
6 that. Both, more importantly in the People's Republic of  
7 Oregon, but elsewhere as well. So, with that, I'll stop.  
8 Thank you.

9           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you, Barry. Let me just  
10 stipulate that all of the credit to USDA goes to the  
11 Secretary and not to me. Alan, I believe you're next.

12           MR. KEMPER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As Barry  
13 said, not only farmers, but a lot of property owners get  
14 extremely nervous about private property rights and the  
15 infringement thereof. But a couple of other thoughts as  
16 we're discussing today, one, a lot of farm bills in the  
17 past, and other laws have been enacted do a rollout  
18 provision in various selected territories or states on  
19 various models. Whether that's crop options, whether that's  
20 other things, so, just a point of consideration.

21           As Betsy and us talked yesterday about enhancement  
22 plans for CRP on some of the more buffered areas versus an  
23 IP crop or organic crop, we might want to select a state or  
24 allow states to opt into a program on coexistence as a trial  
25 basis, so we don't, even though the document might be

1 generic enough that it handles the whole U.S., we might  
2 footnote or caveat spots where it may work or may not work,  
3 and that would be up to the commissioners of Ag states.

4 I'm sorry, folks. We keep getting down into a  
5 maize category that I don't see listed on the charge. The  
6 charge is generic enough to address livestock producers or  
7 states that are having trouble ash borers keeping their  
8 farmer neighbors from having those trees next to them  
9 without getting proper cut, it addresses a citrus greening  
10 in Florida that's affecting the citrus industry and having  
11 that coexistence plan. It affects the orchards around the  
12 arctic apples. It affects vegetable legumes, and, and other  
13 crops. We keep getting down to just pollen drift in maize.  
14 Folks, I only have so many hours in a day. We've already  
15 recognized the fact that all seed, unless it's in a seed  
16 bank like Summit is, has some has genetic flaws. Let's,  
17 let's put that in our document, and let's move forward  
18 addressing all general Ag, which was our charge to start  
19 with. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

20 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you. I'm just looking to  
21 see, ah. David, thank you. Thank you for waving your flag.

22 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. David  
23 Johnson. I was really struck when the Secretary came and  
24 visited us with, a couple of meetings ago when he talked  
25 about the importance of diversity in American agriculture,

1 and that that was one of our strengths. And I think one of  
2 the things I've enjoyed most about being a part of this  
3 group is our discussions about diversity, the different  
4 cropping systems, the different production methods, the  
5 different crops that we grow.

6 I was, I was impressed with Barry's story  
7 yesterday about just how diverse his farm is and the pride  
8 that he takes in that. And so I think that as we think  
9 about this subject, we really all should embrace, and I  
10 think that we all do embrace that concept of the diversity  
11 in American agriculture. When people are on trade missions  
12 and they're in certain countries, they can promote organic  
13 production systems. They can promote certain technologies  
14 that work well in those environments. And so I'm really  
15 excited about that.

16 The other thing I was really excited about was how  
17 fast the MP3 plans have rolled out across the country. When  
18 I listened to Dr. Glenn yesterday, she indicated that I  
19 believe seven states are done, let's see, I think nine  
20 states are close, 20 are in development, 10 are to be done,  
21 and only four weren't doing something. That's a 92 percent  
22 adoption rate in a relatively short period of time. So I, I  
23 think as I look at this, and as we look at it as a group, I  
24 think NASDA offers a nice place for us to go. It offers  
25 something that they're, they're deeply committed to within

1 MP3. And this is an extension of MP3, the way I look at it.  
2 I'm really impressed with the one-page summary that  
3 Commissioner Goehring put together in terms of its  
4 simplicity.

5 I serve on the models group. One of the things I  
6 would volunteer the models group to do is take the NCGA,  
7 the, the document that we have on coexistence that Paul put  
8 together, Dr., or Commissioner Goehring's document, is try  
9 to maybe even craft or develop a base MP3 plan that we could  
10 share with NASDA and let NASDA decide if there are any  
11 states that would be interested in crafting it for their own  
12 state and, and taking it. That she, she offered that  
13 commitment to work with us.

14 The seed purity thing, I've been in the seed  
15 industry 20 years. I grew up on a farm. And, and there's  
16 reasons why the seed law is written the way that it is. And  
17 it's because we all live in a biological world. It's a  
18 biological system. There's wind, there's rain, there's  
19 environment. And so there's, there's these provisions in  
20 the seed law to allow that. And I think even when Alan  
21 mentions 98 percent trait purity, well why don't we put 100?  
22 Well, because it goes both ways, right? And so I think we  
23 have to recognize that.

24 And the other thing that I think I'm most  
25 impressed about the MP3 plan was when Commissioner Goehring

1 summarized to us that when people came together from all  
2 parts of agriculture, in fact the people that were farm,  
3 farm owners, you had the house owners coming there, the  
4 beekeepers come in there. They all learned in this  
5 conversation. And, because when I look at this, when we're  
6 trying to protect diversity of American agriculture, it's  
7 really about food. And everybody at this table, everybody  
8 in this room, everybody in this city, everybody in this  
9 country, everybody around this planet has a vested interest  
10 in food and food production. I mean, we're trying to feed 9  
11 billion people by 2050.

12           And so I, I think that we want to keep this  
13 conversation broad, and we want as many people to understand  
14 what each party is up against. And it's not just about  
15 farmer-to-farmer communication. It's really about what we  
16 as consumers want to consume as food, too. And so I think  
17 keeping it broad, like the MP3 did, that allowed states to  
18 quickly roll this out. I mean, the adoption rate of how  
19 they're rolling those plans out, I'm, and this is voluntary.  
20 So, I just wanted to, to comment on a few of these things.  
21 I think the models group, I could sure get behind helping  
22 craft something. I'd like to volunteer Commissioner  
23 Goehring to do that, but I'm not, not going to do that. I  
24 don't have the authority to do that.

25           But I think that the models group, if the

1 committee thought that that was important enough, if we  
2 could sit down and start to bring this together, and then  
3 share it with NASDA and let NASDA take it to its membership  
4 and see what they would like to do with it at the local  
5 level. Thank you.

6 MR. SCHECHTMAN: If I can just amend that. I  
7 think anything that the models group would do would need to  
8 be brought back to the Committee before, and again --

9 MR. JOHNSON: In full agreement.

10 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Yeah. Now, the drafting, I mean,  
11 we'll get recommendations from you, but we're still going to  
12 try to take the pen out of your hand so that we don't have  
13 fighting over every comma.

14 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah. And probably Michael and  
15 Russell would, would do that fine tuning. But, but as a  
16 models group, we would be, I think our group would be more  
17 than willing to take a stab at that, to bring to the  
18 committee.

19 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Okay. Greg, I think -- oh, I'm  
20 sorry. Greg, I think, is next. Then Lynn, and Laura. Lynn  
21 then Laura.

22 MR. JAFFE: Thank you, Michael. I guess I wanted  
23 to bring up a point that I think we haven't discussed very  
24 much that I think is still part of our charge. And the  
25 history of our charge was that, you know, we made some

1 recommendations in our other report, and the Secretary sort  
2 of said, well, they couldn't do this. So let's look at  
3 states and other places to do it. But the last part of the  
4 charge says, if so, how might the federal government assist  
5 in this process.

6           And I guess I think a critical part of our report  
7 is to reiterate I think what we had said before, which is,  
8 you know, leadership comes from the top. And I think that,  
9 you know, the secretary and whoever the future secretary is,  
10 and the undersecretaries at USDA needs to make this a  
11 priority. Because if they make it a priority, then it comes  
12 down to NASDA and others making it a priority. And I can't  
13 speak for the pioneer plan but I think that's been a  
14 priority and discussed a lot by the leadership at USDA. And  
15 they've had, you know, they've given that priority, made  
16 that a priority, and therefore the states and others,  
17 whether it's voluntary or not, make it a priority.

18           And so I think we can do all we want about writing  
19 models and farmer-to-farmer discussions and things like  
20 that. But it, there has to be, I think a role for USDA to  
21 play. And I, and I think that's important that our report  
22 include something to do with that. And I don't think we've,  
23 I'm not sure what those recommendations are at this point  
24 yet. I think we have to discuss that. But I think we  
25 probably all agree that if USDA doesn't make this a policy



1 priority for itself, even if it can't, if it doesn't have  
2 the money to do the incentives or it doesn't have the legal  
3 authority to do these things, it clearly has the, when, when  
4 USDA talks to farmers, to extension, to states, and things  
5 like that, it clearly has the ability to make things a  
6 priority at those levels.

7           And so, I guess I don't want to miss that as a  
8 critical part, I think, of our report is, is that last  
9 sentence there and not get, we -- and so, anyway, I'll leave  
10 it at that.

11           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Greg.  
12 Good point. I believe it is next, Lynn.

13           MR. CLARKSON: Jerry Slocum and I at this table  
14 both involve ourselves with marketing grain on a daily  
15 basis. And I listen to Barry's comments about being made  
16 uncomfortable by people trying to tell the farmer how to  
17 farm. And Jerry and I have to deal every day with the  
18 markets. And the consumer has become very much an element  
19 in defining what those markets are. And as Jerry and many  
20 have conversations on the various links in the food chain,  
21 at least I've been greatly impressed that the farmer knows  
22 very little about the linkage beyond Jerry or Lynn. And the  
23 buyers know almost next to nothing about the links on the  
24 other side of Jerry and Lynn. And somehow we need to hold  
25 hands there.

1           So, again, I look at this as, as a critical effort  
2 to maintain market access to beneficial markets for U.S.  
3 producers. Jerry and Lynn, especially Lynn perhaps, deals  
4 with clients that are tough. We want .9. Get it for me. I  
5 don't care whether it's a problem for you. I don't care  
6 whether it's a seed problem. You know you can get pure seed  
7 out of Europe. So either get me the corn out of Europe, get  
8 me the soybeans out of Europe, get me the X out of Europe,  
9 or you buy the seed and bring it over here. I don't want to  
10 listen to excuses. I don't want to listen that this is  
11 inconvenient for you. So that's the hard reality with the  
12 merchandising part of the link deals with on just a daily  
13 basis.

14           So, the significant point is we're trying to  
15 preserve the opportunity for the U.S. to participate in  
16 those markets. It's kind of amazing to me that we're  
17 already ceded over 50 percent of our organic seed market to  
18 other countries. And I expect we're going to be bumping 50  
19 percent to other countries in corn in the near future. So,  
20 we have to fight standards that people set, not either  
21 knowing or particularly caring about the difficulties that  
22 may cause the farm. And if they can find it anywhere in the  
23 world, they will. We're increasingly an instant  
24 marketplace.

25           So, Jerry and Lynn and everybody at this table to

1 some extent has this dilemma, how do we support the market?  
2 If you throw a market meeting today that involves farmers,  
3 I'm not surprised you're going to have people there telling  
4 you they don't want pesticides, they don't want this, they  
5 don't want that. They feel that they're part of every one  
6 of those conversations. We're their food chain, and they  
7 want us to pay attention.

8           So, I'm not really saying what should happen. I'm  
9 just telling you we at this table have a market dilemma that  
10 we need to keep our eye on. And we, and the seed industry I  
11 think does a really excellent job. But now we have  
12 criteria. We are being asked for a marketplace we've never  
13 had before at purity levels that are extraordinarily  
14 difficult to do unless you're isolating an entire production  
15 area, like the Europeans have essentially done. So it is a  
16 daily puzzle here that this conversation feeds into. And  
17 hopefully we'll soften some of these hard edges. Thank you.

18           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you, Lynn. I think that  
19 we're having a great discussion. And what I want to do is  
20 to get all of these comments, then take a break, and then  
21 come on back. So for additional comments, we'll just take  
22 them after, after we have a coffee break. But now, Doug, I  
23 believe.

24           MR. GOEHRING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Going  
25 back to a few things that have been stated here. And I

1 think they're important, and they are things to think about.  
2 I know Greg from where USDA would probably need to be  
3 politically, I think you're right. I think if they were to  
4 come out and say that AC21 has addressed concerns concerning  
5 coexistence, and I believe if they were to say here are some  
6 things to consider about mitigation strategies and pass that  
7 off, that's where you get the buy-in, because they're still  
8 a federal government. So if they were to go out and use FSA  
9 or USDA and say here's some things we want you to talk  
10 about, here's some public meetings we want to have, I  
11 believe a lot of farmers are going to feel this is  
12 prescriptive and it's coming from the top down.

13           Where if you have this other entity, whether it is  
14 extension, the Ag Department, whether it is our soil  
15 conservation districts saying we understand the concern that  
16 exists out there, here are some tools that have been  
17 developed or things to consider, that's one of the greatest  
18 roles that USDA can hang their hat on. And politically, it  
19 puts them in a position where they're not out front and  
20 they're going to get criticism about. They're just going to  
21 say, hey, the AC21 group, this diverse cross-section in the  
22 United States that are concerned about coexistence, just put  
23 some thoughts together, some things to consider in every  
24 community.

25           And there's going to be different things to

1 consider. It's probably going to be one of the best places  
2 for them to be. And it still puts those other entities in  
3 every one of those states in a position to look at it and  
4 say, yeah, this is, this is relevant, this isn't relevant,  
5 and develop from there. Because here's the format. Here's  
6 the outline. Here's things to consider. And I believe that  
7 the narrative that would get put together would give them  
8 examples of why they need to think about things in this  
9 manner. Because it's a farmer-to-farmer thing, but it's put  
10 in a public meeting setting. And this is what I commented  
11 about yesterday, why I love the fact those that aren't  
12 involved in the industry, they sat back, and they were  
13 spectators. And they learned so much about what's going on  
14 because they aren't intimate with our industry. And it  
15 helped them, and they walked away with a different  
16 perception of the challenges that, that farmers and ranchers  
17 and the industry deal with. And they stopped trying to  
18 point the finger and tell us what to do. Because they went,  
19 oh my God, it's a lot more complex than I thought.

20           And in the same respect, so is this. Because it's  
21 going to be different in every county. It's going to be  
22 different in every township. So, I think USDA would have  
23 something to hang their hat on here. And they could do it,  
24 and it would be the one area in all of federal government  
25 that most people are going to look at and say, geez, we can

1 continue to trust USDA and the things that they're doing on  
2 behalf of the people, because that doesn't exist everyplace  
3 else. But if they showed up and said, you know, we're going  
4 to host these meetings, it's not going to go over well. At  
5 least not in my state or my region. Thank you.

6 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you, Commissioner. David.

7 MR. JOHNSON: I didn't put my hand up.

8 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Okay. Alan.

9 MR. KEMPER: I'm going to switch gears. Lynn, I  
10 was going to make a couple of comments that, that reference,  
11 when you reference one of those meetings and that farmers  
12 don't know how to market. It just kind of got me a little  
13 bit. I deal with options and multimillion dollar contracts  
14 and stuff, so let's not go there.

15 But I always appreciate Commissioner Doug because  
16 he keeps us, one, at a statesmanship level, and two, at a  
17 higher plane. I deal in a couple states, Indiana for one.  
18 And Ted McKinney, Commissioner of Ag for that state, is  
19 excellent. In Florida, you have Adam Putnam, who is an  
20 outstanding commissioner. So I think, Greg, as we talk  
21 about it, I think it's really brilliant if we can talk about  
22 the teamwork approach of USDA and then the state departments  
23 of agriculture to help roll things out.

24 Further, you meet people that they do not enjoy,  
25 one, crowds, or two, being told what to do with that. And,

1 and so if you're working a team-ship (phonetic sp.) approach  
2 like Doug is talking about through the NASDA, or, or through  
3 the conservation districts, I think you'll go a lot farther.  
4 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you very much. Why don't  
6 we take a 15-minute break. We moved seamlessly from the  
7 first topic into the second topic. I didn't even have to  
8 introduce it. So, I think that was great, and these were I  
9 think really productive discussions. So, come back at  
10 10:45, please. Thank you.

11 Whereupon, at 10:29 a.m., a brief recess is  
12 taken.

13 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Okay. Let's get started again.  
14 First let me let folks know that the documents that I  
15 alluded to before have arrived. They're outside. Next  
16 thing, we've just been called. Secretary Redding has  
17 finished his hearing and will be on his way back. I think,  
18 I think we will have some good things to report to him,  
19 particularly if we keep this, this positive work going.  
20 What is next on the agenda is talking about the guidance  
21 document and the work of the three subgroups. But first,  
22 additional comments that folks may have on where we were  
23 before. I see we have Barry up first.

24 MR. BUSHUE: I really appreciated the camaraderie  
25 and the collaborative work we've done here. And I don't

1 want to upset that. But I, I cannot, I'm sorry, Lynn, but I  
2 can't let your comments go unanswered. Everything I sell on  
3 my farm is directly to consumers. I understand consumers.  
4 I understand the needs. We spent 18 years trying to  
5 understand them and model our farm for things that they  
6 would understand and appreciate. 85 percent of all products  
7 in Oregon are sold outside of our state, much of it overseas  
8 to the Pacific Rim. 35 percent of agriculture in the United  
9 States of America is exported overseas. American Farm  
10 Bureau's priorities have always been trade and the  
11 importance of trade in the entire food chain.

12           To make assumptions that farmers are really not  
13 educated or smart enough to understand the markets beyond  
14 you I think is disingenuous, and I can't let it go unsaid  
15 that my members would not be happy with those kind of  
16 comments. I don't know what drives them. I don't know what  
17 motivates them. I don't know who you deal with or how many  
18 farms you deal with, but I deal with thousands. They're  
19 smart. They're intelligent. They do well. They understand  
20 the chain. They look for markets outside. And to make an  
21 assumption of anything else, I can't let go unsaid. I'm  
22 sorry.

23           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you, Barry. Next we have  
24 Greg, I believe, and then Chuck.

25           MR. JAFFE: Yeah, I just wanted to respond before,



1 because there were a couple of comments that were made that  
2 sort of suggested that, that I was suggesting somehow that  
3 the Secretary should have meetings and get everybody  
4 together and start the coexistence dialogue as USDA-  
5 sponsored activities. And I don't think I was saying that.  
6 What I was saying was, I think there should be some  
7 leadership from the top to make this a priority, whether  
8 that's at NASDA, whether that's at states or otherwise, and  
9 then they can go and do all of that detail. So I wasn't  
10 suggesting that USDA was getting into the weeds in this, and  
11 it was a federal mandate or a, or a Washington mandate.

12 But I do think that there are lots of priorities  
13 for farmers, and lots of things that go on. And, and  
14 coexistence can get lost in the mix if we don't have some  
15 priority-setting and some statements and involvement from  
16 USDA. And that's what I was trying to get at. So I think  
17 we still need to impress upon USDA in our report that they  
18 need to show the farmers, the bureaus, the extension,  
19 everyone out there that this is a priority, that this is an  
20 issue that's not going to go away and needs to, and, and  
21 could, could use dialogue and help on. So I just wanted to  
22 clarify that.

23 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you, Greg. Chuck, I  
24 believe, is next.

25 MR. BENBROOK: Two things. You know, it's a big

1 country. And agriculture producers relate to their  
2 neighbors and markets differently. Different parts of  
3 agriculture are much more dependent on government policy  
4 and, and farm bills. Where Barry and I live, farmers have  
5 had a much more intimate and ongoing relationship with  
6 markets, with others, other people that live in the state.  
7 And I think we've seen this greater camaraderie in Oregon  
8 play a constructive role in dealing with some of the, you  
9 know, the, the more contentious issues. And I, Jackson  
10 County passes, you know, passed the county-level ban on  
11 GMOs, but then things kind of got worked out so that nobody  
12 had to tear out any fields of alfalfa. And while it  
13 certainly wasn't a perfect resolution from the perspective  
14 of a lot of people, it worked out more smoothly in Oregon  
15 than I think it would in Ames, Iowa.

16 In, in the Midwest, where Lynn does business with  
17 a lot of farmers and is trying to establish linkages between  
18 IP markets outside the U.S. and Midwestern farmers, there  
19 are farmers that don't have the same kind of interactions  
20 with both value chains and urban people as is much more  
21 common in the West. And so I can, I can understand how  
22 Barry feels, but I also understand where Lynn is coming  
23 from. I do think there, for commodity producers in the  
24 Midwest, you know, they harvest their crop and they haul it  
25 to the local elevator. And certainly there's some farmers

1 that pursue other markets, but, but there, there's a much  
2 less intimate relationship between farmers and end-users in  
3 major commodity states than on the coast where producers  
4 tend to be closer to their markets.

5           You know, having said that, and just in the hope  
6 that we, as a committee, we can understand that things are  
7 different around the country, and the, and the issues are,  
8 are going to be different, as well as the institutions and  
9 political dynamics of dealing with them. I think we all  
10 sort of get that intuitively. But, I just want to reiterate  
11 my view that the, the, the scope and seriousness of  
12 coexistence issues have both grown during the tenure of our  
13 committee. I think they're going to continue to get more  
14 serious and have the potential for more collateral damage on  
15 communities, on the relationship between the general public  
16 and the agricultural sector, on, on our access to high-value  
17 markets.

18           And that one of the messages that I hope to see  
19 from this to the secretary is that as a nation, we have to  
20 pick up the pace at which we deal with these underlying  
21 tensions that, that exist and, and are impacting this  
22 technology. Again, irregardless of whether you think they  
23 are, they are well-grounded or based on good science or  
24 whatever, they exist. And to ignore that they exist is  
25 really quite foolish, in my opinion. And I, I feel that

1 until the root causes of the tensions around this technology  
2 are dealt with in a more effective way, the coexistence  
3 problems and the costs of dealing with them are going to  
4 continue to, to go up.

5           And I, I urge and challenge my colleagues on this  
6 committee to, to be as forthright as possible in expressing  
7 the view that, you know, we could have all the farmer-to-  
8 farmer meetings as we can imagine. And, and really perhaps  
9 not even keep up with the, the flow of events that are, that  
10 are, are really making it more difficult for farmers to, to  
11 coexist, through no, no fault of their own. And, and by  
12 virtue of the fact it's not, it's not a problem created by  
13 farmers, it's also not a problem that farmers can solve by  
14 themselves.

15           MR. SCHECHTMAN: My apologies. I missed the last  
16 sentence. I was trying to see about something I shouldn't  
17 have been seeing about.

18           MR. JAFFE: Your microphone is not on.

19           MR. SCHECHTMAN: My apologies. My phone, my phone  
20 buzzed and I was trying to see something.

21           MS. BATCHA: I think I was in the queue.

22           MR. JAFFE: Oh, you're right.

23           MS. BATCHA: I was in the queue ahead.

24           MR. JAFFE: Laura is ahead.

25           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Okay. So I have folks in the

1 queue. I didn't have the order for the folks. If you're,  
2 if you are next, Laura, I apologize. And I apologize for  
3 missing your last sentence, Chuck.

4 MS. BATCHA: So, when Alan was talking earlier  
5 about sort of remembering this isn't about pollen flow and  
6 referenced citrus greening, it reminded me of something that  
7 we worked on or are continuing to work on over the last  
8 number of years that I think could be considered sort of a  
9 coexistence example and maybe a model. So I thought I'd,  
10 I'd share it with, with, with the group.

11 While there is not currently genetically modified  
12 root stock on the market for citrus, there's a tremendous  
13 amount of research and innovation. Citrus greening disease  
14 is devastating. The organic citrus market is primarily  
15 focused in Florida and California. And our growers are  
16 desperately trying to stay alive just like the neighbors who  
17 are non-organic growers. Everybody is under a tremendous  
18 amount of pressure.

19 The different states and the different communities  
20 have responded in, in different ways. And starting about  
21 three years ago, as this issue was emerging, there, there  
22 immediately became tension between growers in, in  
23 neighborhoods around production methods. Organic growers  
24 don't use the neonic pesticides that are primarily the, the  
25 treatment to knock back the psylla populations that

1 established the disease in the tree. So under a lot of  
2 pressure for fear of losing, losing markets, there became a  
3 lot of finger-pointing with the neighborhoods about issues  
4 that Doug's been raising on coexistence, which is that it  
5 goes both ways. Are your, are you fostering psylla  
6 populations by not spraying that are then impacting my  
7 groves.

8           In California, as the psylla started to be found,  
9 they instituted mandatory spray programs in zones which were  
10 knocking organic production out of compliance and losing  
11 certification on, on crops because of mandatory sprays in  
12 areas. And so there was a tremendous amount of tension.  
13 Both communities worked on it a different way, but they both  
14 followed a path like we're talking about, about getting  
15 stakeholders together. But it wasn't just farmer-to-farmer  
16 discussions that was able to shift the table.

17           So, in Florida, the discussion expanded between  
18 farmer-to-farmer and included Texas A&M, the land-grant  
19 university got brought in. APHIS agents on the ground got  
20 brought into the discussion. And they started exchanging  
21 psylla counts and treatment methods amongst neighbors. And  
22 it was determined that the organic production areas that  
23 according to APHIS test, APHIS's tests, without the neonics  
24 have lower psylla counts than their neighbors did.

25           Nobody was curing citrus greening disease. So

1 don't pretend like, you know, that's not, I'm not making a  
2 statement about where, where the solution is. What I'm  
3 saying is that by having those parties at the table and  
4 having data available and exchanging information, everything  
5 calmed down considerably within the communities looking to  
6 each other for solutions. So now some of the non-organic  
7 growers are like, what are you doing for micronutrients in  
8 your soil, what are you doing for, for protocols. And Texas  
9 A&M is involved in a long-term research project on compliant  
10 cures and what that could contribute to citrus.

11           In California, with the mandatory sprays, we had a  
12 harder problem. But the state department of agriculture  
13 there, CDFA, played an important role, gathered stakeholders  
14 together, including the state marketing board for citrus,  
15 land-grant universities, growers on both sides. Input  
16 suppliers came to the meetings that we held in three places  
17 all over the state, shared the data, and the state was able  
18 to get to a place where they were comfortable with certain  
19 protocols to not impose mandatory sprays on organic  
20 production.

21           Nobody solved citrus greening in either place.  
22 But I do think we made a tremendous amount of progress in  
23 the area, but it did take having more than farmer-to-farmer  
24 discussions at the table, but they were local, primarily  
25 locally driven. Everybody knew each other for the most part

1 or knew of each other in terms of the players. Well-  
2 respected, and it wasn't a judgmental conversation. So, I  
3 had forgotten about it in the context of this. Thank you  
4 for that.

5 MR. KEMPER: See, we're working on this together.

6 MR. SCHECHTMAN: I like it. Thank you. Okay.  
7 I'm not sure of the order, but let's say Mary-Howell I think  
8 is next.

9 MS. MARTENS: Barry, I do think we're seeing  
10 different parts of the same elephant. I may be the only one  
11 in the room who is dealing with a population of consumers  
12 who are now asking for no soy animal feeds. And that has to  
13 do with a nutritional philosophy that's going around. Well,  
14 now it's not just no soy. Now they want no corn. And last  
15 week, I had someone come in who said they wanted no soy, no  
16 corn chicken feed that also had no gluten.

17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No chickens.

18 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh, my God.

19 MS. MARTENS: Oh, my.

20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What do you want to feed these  
21 chickens?

22 MS. MARTENS: And therein lies the challenge of  
23 consumers, buyers who don't, don't realize the agricultural  
24 reality of what they're asking and really don't care. Lynn  
25 is right. They have their philosophy about what they want,



1 and that's what they're going to be asking for. At the  
2 break, Jerry and Lynn and I, well, I was listening in. They  
3 were talking about the unique challenge of, of being sort of  
4 the pivot point between buyers who have a perspective on, on  
5 what they want, and they're going to get it, and farmers who  
6 have a perspective on what they can produce. But those two  
7 groups aren't necessarily sitting down and looking at each  
8 other. Those two groups are, have their own worlds that  
9 they're living in, and then there are a few buyers who are  
10 in the pivot points. And, and that is, that is a unique  
11 position. That is, that is a position of a fair amount of  
12 difficulty in, in satisfying both sides.

13           Therein lies a bit of a challenge for coexistence.  
14 We are as a world, as producers here in the United States  
15 dealing with a buying population, a buying, consumer crowd  
16 that is becoming more educated, but not necessarily, they're  
17 becoming more opinionated I guess is a better way of putting  
18 it, on what they want. And they're going to continue to ask  
19 about it, ask for it, demand it, be willing to pay for it,  
20 but demand it. That may be increasingly difficult for  
21 American farmers to do.

22           Coexistence between parties is important. I will  
23 go back to a point where we have to start. If we're going  
24 to try to meet a particular market, we have to know that the  
25 seed that we're starting with, if nothing else goes wrong,

1 will be adequate to meet that. And then we have to have the  
2 tools to, to not increase our risk. But, this, this is  
3 something that is going to continue to get worse. As, as  
4 Chuck said, the dynamics have changed a lot in the past five  
5 years. The number of consumers that I have coming into my  
6 feed mill right now who are experts on all matters of  
7 nutrition is a great deal more than five years ago. And it  
8 is making it very difficult to be cooperative, to not stand  
9 there and laugh at them. But also to, to do my best to, to  
10 satisfy their demands.

11           This is not going to stop. This is not going to  
12 get less. It's only going to get more.

13           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you, Mary-Howell. I  
14 believe Jerry, then Leon.

15           MR. SLOCUM: Thank you, Michael. Jerry Slocum.  
16 And most of what I was going to say has been said by Lynn or  
17 Barry or Chuck or Mary. But, I think, I think what it all  
18 points out is, is, is that the difficulty of what we're  
19 trying to do, and there's no doubt that buyers and  
20 consumers, whether they're consumers of food or they're  
21 consumers of animal feeds, whatever, are becoming more  
22 discerning and more demanding. And we are offering them  
23 more choices. There's no doubt about it. And that speaks  
24 to the, the strength and the versatility and the diversity  
25 of the American agricultural system.

1           What the Secretary has asked us to do is to  
2 facilitate that diversity and facilitate those different  
3 offerings. And communication is simply the key to it.  
4 We've got this simple problem in the Deep South. Now, we  
5 can't raise soft red winter wheat. We can't raise Number 2  
6 SRW, the simplest stuff in the world to raise, easiest thing  
7 you can possibly farm. Because all of a sudden we've got  
8 test weight problems. We've got vomitoxin problems. We've  
9 got fumonisin problems. We've got problems that we didn't  
10 even test for four and five and six years ago. And this  
11 year, there will be another animal in that mix. I'm  
12 certain. I just don't know what it is.

13           So our small elevator chain began to write letters  
14 to our customers that raise soft red winter wheat. And we,  
15 we prefaced it last fall when they started planting a wheat  
16 crop. And wheat is dirt cheap now. Respectively, it's  
17 \$4.50 a bushel instead of 8.50 that it cost three years ago.  
18 And we're not trying to tell our customers how to grow  
19 wheat, because they know how to grow wheat. But we're  
20 trying advise them that there are things that they have  
21 never had to consider before and that there are production  
22 techniques that perhaps they ought to explore and adopt that  
23 could prevent some of the horrendous market discounts. If  
24 your wheat comes into our elevator at 57.9 test weight this  
25 spring instead of 58, the prevailing discount now is 40

1 cents a bushel, 40 cents a bushel. If it's 56.9, it's 80  
2 cents a bushel. So you're turning a 4.50 crop, which is  
3 below the cost of production, into a 3.70 crop, which is way  
4 below the cost of production.

5           So there was this need for a conversation, not to  
6 teach farmers how to grow it, necessarily, but to apprise  
7 them of new market conditions that they are probably not  
8 aware of, because Delta Farm Press is not writing about it.  
9 Prairie Farmer is not writing about it. Corn and Soy Digest  
10 are not writing about this, this new paradigm we find  
11 ourselves in. But it's reality. And buyers become more  
12 discerning. They become more demanding. And, it's a global  
13 marketplace. If we don't sell them SRW, the Ukrainians do.  
14 Somebody sells them the wheat that they want. And for us to  
15 compete in that global marketplace and domestic marketplace,  
16 it makes no difference, we've got to adopt this, this  
17 strategy of, of a, of a supply chain from the guy that sells  
18 the input to the guy that makes the final process product,  
19 whether it's a food product or whether it's a raw vegetable  
20 or a raw citrus product, or if it's a processed feed. The  
21 conversation has to become, it has to encompass the entire  
22 chain I think.

23           The piece the Secretary is asking us for is a  
24 relatively small piece of that chain right now. Okay? It's  
25 about how can we foster this diversity at the farm level.

1 Okay? So I, I encourage us to try to get back into that  
2 frame. Mike was reminding us, time is short. Time is  
3 short. The calendar is ticking. They want this done before  
4 the election. So, we, we, I think we need to maybe try to  
5 refocus on our narrower charge, if we might. Thank you.

6 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you very much, Jerry.  
7 Leon, please.

8 MR. CORZINE: I'm going to try not to regress too  
9 much here. But I, so I can just make a comment. I, you  
10 know, Charles, your comments get under my skin, and, and  
11 Lynn somewhat saying the farmers don't know their markets or  
12 know their end user. Now, there may be an element of that,  
13 but there's also an element of maybe whatever you want to  
14 choose that don't know the chain. But I know who my market  
15 is. I know who I grow for. We look at contracts. And you  
16 don't, and that's it. We're kind of off target from what  
17 we're supposed to be working on here, actually. So, I  
18 think, I think with all these market opportunities, and  
19 Jerry said it, we're offering more choices all the time. So  
20 that's a credit to us and the diversity that we have. There  
21 is going to be a point, and I think you have reached your  
22 point that it's incumbent upon someone talking to whoever  
23 that middleman is, that you say, you know what, you can't,  
24 you can't do that. Maybe Mary-Howell's chicken farmer says,  
25 you know, may say, you know what, you've got to go, do you

1 want third world chickens, or, or do you want, you know, do  
2 you want any meat on those chicken wings.

3           You know, there's going to -- the point is, there  
4 is a point that I think maybe everybody in the food chain  
5 has needs to do some information on the other end. But that  
6 being said, what I see our charge and what we're trying to  
7 do here is to provide a pathway, or, to where, when a farmer  
8 does see an opportunity, maybe the middle man. Maybe  
9 Clarkson Grain, maybe Mary-Howell's, maybe Jerry's, maybe my  
10 local elevator, maybe my ADM, maybe Tate & Lyle whoever,  
11 they come to me and say, you know what, we've got this  
12 opportunity. And, and we want to know if you'll do it,  
13 because we've worked with you before. You can segregate.  
14 You've got grain, you've got the infrastructure on your,  
15 and, you know, so you go through that. And that's kind of  
16 the process, if you look at what I did on the NCGA thing, if  
17 you look at what Doug has put together, the MP3. I think we  
18 need to get back to, back to where what are, what are the  
19 ways that we can coexist when we're trying to provide those  
20 kind of opportunities. But let's not say things that I  
21 consider inflammatory or disingenuous to the farm community  
22 that we don't know about our markets. But let's help them  
23 take a look at, at what, and move forward with what our  
24 charge is. Thank you.

25           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you very much, Leon. Alan,

1 please.

2 MR. KEMPER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3 Occasionally, a light bulb goes off with me. And it's kind  
4 of rare, I think. So I kind of think it's cool. First of  
5 all, I agree with Mary. We have to definitely recognize we  
6 have a changing society with changing needs and consumer  
7 moods with that. We have a lot of drivers, including  
8 Google, Wal-Mart, and others that do food consortiums and  
9 others that's going to drive what ingredients we feed our  
10 livestock as well. And Mary, I think you would agree with  
11 that.

12 Here comes the light bulb. We have to embrace  
13 change. And one thing I have not heard here, change has  
14 already happened. We've got to catch up. Delta Press can't  
15 do it because they're in print. I would suggest to you the  
16 physical means that we're talking about are in the past.  
17 The millennials will not come. The farmers my age will not  
18 come because we're too busy. You can either give us a  
19 Webinar, you can do it email jointly, you can do all types  
20 of group texting. You can do Facebook groups, and all of  
21 those will build the coexistent verbiage we need without  
22 having a physical meeting.

23 And I suggest to you the sons and daughters of my  
24 area, everybody keeps talking, sometimes Maine Farm Bureau  
25 even does that, that all, you know, agriculture is aging,

1 and the median age now is 62.3. I would suggest to you Main  
2 Farm Bureau's statistics are way wrong considering our area  
3 the average age of a farmer is 35.4. And so that means we  
4 have to really stretch on what we're going to put out there  
5 for the coexistence areas of knowledge and meetings with  
6 that because the groups that I deal with are all under 40.  
7 All under 40. And their communication is a whole lot  
8 different than Doug or mine. We still enjoy having a beer  
9 together. They do too, but they don't want to talk about  
10 coexistence having a beer. They've already done that on  
11 LinkedIn or, or Facebook or something like that. So just a  
12 thought, Mr. Chairman. But I think it's a thought we really  
13 need to think about.

14 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Here, here.

15 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you. I think that's a  
16 very, a very interesting thought. Despite the fact that I  
17 know if the Secretary were here, he would reiterate the  
18 point about his statistics on the aging of farmers. And we  
19 need to get those other, those other folks here.

20 MR. KEMPER: Right, right. Well, I do appreciate  
21 the Secretary, but what I have to suggest to you, a lot of  
22 times USDA data is out of date.

23 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Okay. Mary-Howell, please.  
24 Thank you.

25 MS. MARTENS: I agree with you, Alan, on one



1 point, one point difference though. Of the farmers in my  
2 area, the average age is probably in the, the 30s to 40s,  
3 and absolutely none of them except for a very small handful  
4 are online.

5 MR. KEMPER: Because they're Amish and --

6 MS. MARTENS: Because they're Amish Mennonite.

7 MR. KEMPER: Right. We have to recognize that.

8 MS. MARTENS: And they will never be reached by a  
9 Webinar.

10 MR. KEMPER: Right.

11 MS. MARTENS: To lower the, the energy level a  
12 little bit here. It, it really in a lot of ways doesn't  
13 matter. This guidance document, we all, I think we'll agree  
14 on the major points. Wordsmithing to include or not include  
15 our pet projects probably will not change the topics of  
16 conversation in the neighborhoods much. The topics of  
17 conversation aren't going to exist. How it's going to be  
18 done, you know, we can, we can come up with models, whether  
19 they're going to be used or not may or may not matter.

20 The point is to get something done in the next few  
21 months that will be not useless, because the USDA hasn't  
22 called us down here to do something useless. And to do it  
23 so that it gets done, it gets out there, and we all more or  
24 less agree on it, and we can have something just done. The  
25 point is not to make it too complicated or make it too

1 simple, but just get it done.

2 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you very much. I think  
3 that actually makes for a wonderful segue into the topic of  
4 the guidance document, which is the next thing on the  
5 agenda. We've, we've talked about the framework documents  
6 that exist. And there is a redline document out there, as  
7 well as the other two formats. I don't think at this point  
8 we want to talk about the details of the redline documents.  
9 There's going to be a new version that's attempting to pull  
10 all of this together and address comments within 10 days.  
11 Well, I will commit to that.

12 I think what we need to do is to talk in sort of a  
13 more general term, terms about sort of what Mary-Howell  
14 alluded to, which is the level of detail that we're going to  
15 have in this document wasn't entirely resolved in subgroup  
16 discussions, and of course we would have had to come back  
17 here anyway. Again, I think one of the places where there  
18 was some tension in the discussions in the subgroup was  
19 around a couple of specific, sensitive subjects like the  
20 level of detail about things like the exact size of buffers,  
21 recommendations on what farmers or others should do with  
22 regard to seed purity, as well as whether there are  
23 practices that might be provided that would be so specific  
24 they wouldn't apply it all over the country, versus a desire  
25 to be more principle-oriented, perhaps providing additional

1 references to things like the question of what, what  
2 information there is around, around buffers, for example.

3 Another topic on the subject of the guidance  
4 document that was raised in discussions in the subgroup was  
5 this concept that there might be flowcharts for addressing  
6 some questions. If this is the case, then is this, is that  
7 something we would want, or is that, in fact, two  
8 prescriptive and looking too much like something coming from  
9 the government. I've been re-sensitized to that in these  
10 discussions today. But it is a topic that has come up in  
11 those discussions. And any other guidance you can offer on  
12 the, on the guidance framework. I will say --

13 MS. BATCHA: Can you remind us of the nature of  
14 the flowchart? Is it about the points of entries --

15 MS. MARTENS: Control points.

16 MS. BATCHA: Yeah, thank you.

17 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Okay. So, again, the initial  
18 intent on this is to produce this draft guidance framework,  
19 which will not be entire, obviously not be entirely fleshed  
20 out, within, based on what we hear here, getting that back  
21 out to you quickly, and then to work out fleshing it out  
22 subsequently via information we get via email or vial  
23 additional meetings of the subgroup. And again, how much  
24 flesh we need to put on those bones of that framework is  
25 what we wanted here -- and those are not chicken bones --

1 here from, from people around this table. And when, after  
2 this discussion, sort of a little more generally on what we  
3 want the various subgroups to be, to be doing after this  
4 meeting.

5 MR. BENBROOK: Process question, Michael?

6 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Sure.

7 MR. BENBROOK: Is there a distinction between  
8 guidance document, as you're using that term, and the final  
9 report of AC21 to the Secretary in response to our current  
10 charge, or are they the same thing?

11 MR. SCHECHTMAN: That's, that's a very good  
12 question that I had teed up for a little later in the  
13 meeting. I will give you sort of my, my sense for this.  
14 There are a few pieces that are being talked about. There  
15 is a report that provides some context. There is a  
16 structure for meetings. There is a guidance document. The  
17 exact, and there may be one more that I can't think of at  
18 the moment, the exact relationship between the pieces and  
19 the sort of guidance that we provide on when, for example,  
20 public meetings might be invoked and who might decide to do  
21 that, and how that process might get kicked off, still,  
22 still to be decided. But I think we have a few different  
23 pieces that will be all part of, in quotes, the report. But  
24 the relationship of the pieces I think are things that we'll  
25 need to talk about subsequently in this, in this group. I

1 think it's a, it's a fine question, and we need to tee up,  
2 because we've been talking about different parts of that  
3 elephant.

4 MR. BENBROOK: And Michael, just one more thing.  
5 You're the FACA expert. What is the status of AC21 the day  
6 after the inaugural of a new president? Do we still exist?

7 MR. SCHECHTMAN: It's a great question.

8 MR. BUSHUE: We just disappear, Chuck.

9 MR. BENBROOK: Well, we were appointed by  
10 Secretary Vilsack.

11 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Okay.

12 MR. BENBROOK: And he won't be Secretary anymore,  
13 so.

14 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Okay. So this is, it's a fine  
15 question. This is a discretionary committee, which means  
16 that this committee exists not under statute but entirely at  
17 the discretion of the Secretary. The charter for this  
18 committee has to be renewed every two years. And the  
19 charter goes until February of next year. We, I will try to  
20 get the charter renewed before this administration, or, or  
21 get the process going so that hopefully it's renewed before  
22 the administration leaves, as I did the last time around so  
23 that the new Secretary, whoever it is, can decide what he or  
24 she wants to do with it.

25 My experience is that discretionary advisory

1 committees are typically not the first things that new  
2 administrations have to think about. Having said that, in  
3 addition, some member, a good number of members on this  
4 committee may be time-limited for having served for a number  
5 of consecutive years on this committee. Even though we  
6 didn't meet for a while, you were still on the committee.  
7 So the likelihood is that there would be a very significant  
8 turnover on the committee as well.

9 MS. BATCHA: What's the time limit? Remind us.

10 MR. SCHECHTMAN: I believe it's six consecutive  
11 years. But, but that, that addresses the question of the  
12 committee's -- and typically it has varied from  
13 administration to administration as to how different  
14 administrations have wanted their committee dealing with  
15 biotechnology to be. This committee deals with big picture  
16 issues on biotech. Originally, it was called something  
17 else. It was called the ACAB instead of the AC21. At one  
18 switch of administrations, there was a change of name and a  
19 slight change in, in focus, and a significant change in size  
20 of the committee. But there's always, there's virtually  
21 always a hiatus.

22 Let's see. So, I lost track of where I was.

23 COURT REPORTER: Your mic is off.

24 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Angela? Thank you.

25 MR. BUSHUE: What was the, what did it stand for?

1           MR. SLOCUM: It was Advisory Committee on  
2 Agricultural Biology. Biotechnology.

3           UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It was in the year 2000 when  
4 we got started.

5           MR. BUSHUE: Year 2000?

6           MR. SLOCUM: Yeah. Advisory Committee on  
7 Agricultural Biotechnology.

8           MS. OLSEN: So I wanted to address your question  
9 about flowcharts and just give a reaction to that. I'm  
10 generally a big fan of flowcharts. But after, you know, and  
11 hearing the discussion today, and then our workgroup, I  
12 really like Doug's model. Again, with the, you know,  
13 overlaying some of the, the good learning from other models  
14 as well. And I, I like the idea of keeping it high level so  
15 that the local level solutions, whether they be pathogens,  
16 whatever the topic may be, could be addressed. And I think  
17 that a flowchart gets us into being too prescriptive when  
18 we, you know, now I have an appreciation for how different  
19 things are in different geographies on different farms,  
20 whatever contracts people are trying to enter into. It's a  
21 very complex topic. So I think it would be difficult to do  
22 a flowchart, as much as I like, personally, flowcharts.

23           But that doesn't mean at a local level that those  
24 couldn't be created. If there's a particular issue that  
25 they're trying to solve, and again, I think Doug has got a

1 laundry list in his, you know, on his exemplar that he  
2 handed out to us, his, his model draft. It could be any one  
3 of those topics. And so that doesn't mean that a local  
4 level flowchart could be developed if that was useful. But  
5 I think that for our purposes, and it's Mary-Howell's really  
6 good provocation to all of us, you know, we need to get this  
7 done, and how to be something useful, but not too, too  
8 detailed and prescriptive, but also not so broad where it's,  
9 it's not helpful. But I'm interested in everybody else's  
10 reaction as well.

11 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you. I'm not sure what the  
12 order is here. I have Doug, Laura, and Chuck.

13 MS. BATCHA: I think you were next.

14 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Doug, you're next. Okay.

15 MR. GOEHRING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's  
16 actually what I was going to refer to was the flowchart. So  
17 the flowchart model probably works, but I would, I'm neither  
18 opposed nor very supportive of it. But the concept in  
19 general, and I think that's talking about potential  
20 solutions. Anybody that's a farmer goes to the operator  
21 manual when you're having problems in your combine, trying  
22 to clean the drain. It gives you a bunch of different  
23 considerations, things to look at. Now, ultimately, if none  
24 of those are doing it, and all of a sudden you by and you  
25 see you've got a bearing out, that might be your problem.



1 But it's going to give you considerations.

2           And I, I believe maybe, again, the flowchart  
3 concept without necessarily creating the flowchart, you  
4 could certainly have just considerations in the narrative,  
5 i.e., what kind of things are you considering, what are you  
6 looking at? Have you considered the timing of, of when you  
7 are doing planting, when you are trying to manage pests,  
8 when your crop is going to pollinate, what type of barriers  
9 or buffers exist, natural and manmade. Those are just all  
10 types of things that once you say that to a farmer, the  
11 light goes on. Oh, yeah. That's, maybe that's something I  
12 need to think about. Overall, I think that's a lot of what,  
13 when we put the pollinator plan together, it was mitigation  
14 strategies. It was thinking about if I do this, what kind  
15 of effect happens from this to myself or to others.

16           So I just throw that out on the, the flowchart  
17 issue. Again, I'm neither opposed to it, and not  
18 necessarily supportive of it. But I think conceptually,  
19 it's part of what we can write into a narrative on each one  
20 of these areas. Again, not being prescriptive. Just saying  
21 these are considerations, or these things that you've  
22 thought about.

23           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you, Doug. I think it's  
24 Laura, then Jerry.

25           MS. BATCHA: I want to comment on the, the

1 flowchart and the, and the level of detail. I want to  
2 start, I'll start with the level of detail. I really like  
3 the approach in the North Dakota plan in terms of level of  
4 detail because I think it's not too long, number one, but it  
5 does introduce sort of, you know, why this is being done.  
6 It sets up sort of background, what they've described as  
7 challenges, right? Sort of so to put the issue on the map  
8 about some known knowns. And I think that that is helpful  
9 when you get into, well, the discussions with stakeholders,  
10 farmer-to-farmer but also that broader stakeholder group so  
11 that, you know, we have an opportunity to sort of put some  
12 basic things, basic things in writing that will help  
13 encourage folks to pick up the conversation without  
14 rehashing a bunch of stuff if, if it's there. Right? So, I  
15 think that would be helpful. And then I like, again, what  
16 the North Dakota plan calls BMPs, which we will call  
17 something else. But, just sort of short paragraphs, and  
18 then opportunities to point out to what our details are.

19           So, for example, if it's about the size of the  
20 buffer strip, there could be some general statements about  
21 the, the importance of the buffer strip, the range and the  
22 size, consult here for the best available data on crop and  
23 trait combinations and recommendations for buffer strips.  
24 Or you can drop out to it.

25           On the flowchart, I like the flowchart for a

1 couple of reasons. I think if you look at what the North  
2 Dakota plan has as sort of challenges, I think there's a,  
3 there's a place in, in this to sort of, again, identify the  
4 known knows, not that, not that farmers don't know this  
5 already, but if you put it in a, in a visual, in writing,  
6 and you identify the, the points, to your point, Doug,  
7 where, you know, these are, these are the first five things  
8 you look at, and then if that doesn't work sort of go from  
9 there. I think, I think it would be a little bit of  
10 glossing over to not just sort of put that down. I think we  
11 can get to something that we agree to that would allow some  
12 structure to how you might think about where to look.

13           And then I think my last point is, I have a little  
14 concern in our discussions where our traction is on details,  
15 that we've lost a little bit of sight of the charge in that  
16 we've been asked to work on this whole idea in the context  
17 of joint coexistence plans, and that's part of the charge.  
18 So, I, I, I am going to remind us of this so that we don't  
19 succumb to the idea of a management plan for the IP  
20 producer. Because that's not what the, the charge is. So  
21 let's just sort of keep, try to remember that.

22           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Laura.  
23 Doug, I believe.

24           MR. GOEHRING: Oh, I'm sorry.

25           MR. KEMPER: Jerry. Jerry.

1 MS. BATCHA: Jerry.

2 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Jerry. My apologies.

3 MR. SLOCUM: Thank you, Mike. I would speak in  
4 support of a, of a document that was more general in nature,  
5 more principle-based than prescriptive. I think that's what  
6 the Secretary is asking us for. I don't know how we would  
7 write a prescriptive document. It would become a BMP there,  
8 is what it would become. And I don't think that's our, our  
9 charge.

10 I like the idea of, of some different levels of,  
11 of a, of a plan because it, and tell me if I'm wrong,  
12 because I don't, I don't grow anything. I did try to grow  
13 some GMO soybeans, GMO-free soybeans. And we, we ran out of  
14 seed stock, basically. And it's a self-pollinating crop.  
15 But we just couldn't, we couldn't maintain enough purity in  
16 what we were trying to grow to grow it anymore and premiums  
17 went from \$2 a bushel to \$1 a bushel to 75 cents a bushel to  
18 40 cents a bushel, to essentially no premium at all.

19 So, and so, but I think there, there are levels of  
20 specificity that, that the people that want to participate  
21 in this, and remember, we're going to be talking to an  
22 audience that we've never talked to before about  
23 coexistence. You're going to be talking to a guy that's a  
24 commodity crop grower, whether it's conventional seed or GE  
25 seed, and he's not concerned with pollen drift. So you're

1 going to be, because it's a joint plan, so you're going to  
2 be talking to a guy that is just not aware of all these  
3 issues.

4           And, so it's got to be general enough in nature,  
5 but it's got to be, and maybe it's not a flowchart, but it's  
6 like, it's sort of like a flowchart in the sense that if  
7 this is what you're trying to do, you, you go down this  
8 avenue. But if you're trying to do more than that, you try  
9 to go down this avenue. And it's, you check this box, and  
10 you check the next box, and if that question doesn't  
11 pertain, you check the next question. It's that kind of  
12 plan, I think.

13           But it has to be, in my mind, it has to be at a  
14 very general level of conversation. And it points into the  
15 different resources that are already developed. No reason  
16 for us to regurgitate. And we couldn't bring them all of  
17 them to start with. But they are there. And every plan, I  
18 would think, is going to be somewhat different based on  
19 topography, climate, what they're trying to accomplish, what  
20 they're not trying to accomplish. So I think we have to be  
21 a principle-based document, and it has to be at a pretty  
22 high level. And then it points to places where they can go  
23 and tailor these plans to suit their specific environments  
24 and their specific needs.

25           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you, Jerry. Mary-Howell.

1           MS. MARTENS: Here's an idea that we don't have  
2 time to do. But it really goes along with what Jerry just  
3 said. I was at a conference in Pennsylvania in February.  
4 And, and I was part of a workshop on putting together a  
5 computer-based model for helping farmers evaluate their risk  
6 for climate change impacts. And Pennsylvania and Cornell  
7 are actually putting together a really nice program online  
8 that farmers can participate in where they can go through  
9 the kind of decision-making tree like Jerry was talking  
10 about and identify control points on their farm that might  
11 indeed be, give them, give them more vulnerability. And  
12 then get information on what they can do at each point to  
13 lessen their, to increase their resilience and lessen their  
14 risk.

15           This is something that I think would be ultimately  
16 a tool that USDA or other cooperating groups would really  
17 benefit for producing. I certainly don't have the  
18 expertise, but there are people out there who do to try to  
19 put together a computer model that can guide farmers through  
20 the process of asking questions of control points where  
21 they're, they, they need to make some decisions and then  
22 give them some insight as far as if they make this decision  
23 or that decision, what the likely outcomes are.

24           We can rough something like that out by hand by,  
25 you know, some set of control, some set of flowchart. But

1 eventually it would be really a terrific tool if, if USDA  
2 could put together a, an online program that would help  
3 guide farmers and farmer groups through this kind of  
4 decision-making process.

5 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Can I ask one thing? So I've  
6 heard a bunch of different views on the flowchart issue. I  
7 think what I'm hearing is that a flow, any flowchart-y thing  
8 that would be produced would not be if X do Y. It's think  
9 about this, and then if this way, have you thought about  
10 this, and if this way, have you thought about that. And  
11 that could be either with arrows or in text as Commissioner  
12 Goehring has said.

13 So I think it might be that we sort of have the  
14 idea of the conceptual piece that, what, what needs to be in  
15 there in terms of guiding the thinking, whether it looks  
16 better in a figure or in text, you know, would be up to  
17 folks to decide when we get some of this stuff down on  
18 paper. Is that, is that a fair -- if, if we have to draw  
19 flowcharts, that will exceed my computer skill. We'll get  
20 someone else to, you'll, you'll get the stickman figure  
21 version of that drawn on a piece of paper from me, and  
22 someone else who is more adept at those things can deal with  
23 it. Does that make sense?

24 Commissioner.

25 MR. GOEHRING: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. I

1 think you're, you're touching on that, that those that would  
2 be facilitating and operating these meetings, if you have  
3 some things kind of spelled out in a text, they're smart  
4 enough to grasp that. And although, and no one ever wants  
5 to in a meeting raise their hand and, and ask necessarily,  
6 so, what do you mean, why are we talking about this. But  
7 I'll give you a case in point. Crop rotations. In many  
8 areas of the country, if you start doubling up on certain  
9 crops, and I'll use pulses for example, they become very  
10 susceptible to white mold, even though our humidity is less  
11 in the northern region, you could probably do soybeans after  
12 soybeans three years in a row and be fine, because there's  
13 been enough resistance that has been bred into soybeans that  
14 they can manage it. But if you do two pea crops back to  
15 back, you get some serious issues. And sometimes people  
16 aren't even aware, why did that happen.

17           Now, it's becoming more and more of our second  
18 nature to start thinking about those things. But sometimes  
19 just spelling out in the considerations that you could end  
20 up with some problems if you don't think about your tillage  
21 methods, your crop rotations, some of the issues that might  
22 cause yourself problems and maybe even your neighbor because  
23 as spores leave and move, they present another problem for  
24 your neighbor when it comes to plant pathogens. So, I raise  
25 that, that we don't have to be too prescriptive, but it's



1 one of those moments where people think about, oh yeah, I  
2 should think about that before I do that on that field this  
3 next year.

4 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you. Jerry.

5 MR. SLOCUM: No, I'm sorry, Michael.

6 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Okay. So, I think we've gotten  
7 enough information on the general direction that the  
8 guidance document framework is supposed to go. I think what  
9 would be useful at this point would be to have a brief  
10 discussion on the work of the workgroups, how they  
11 intersect, what tasks we see for the workgroups going  
12 forward, do, are we at a point where they need to be talking  
13 to each other more? So we've heard one suggestion already  
14 today about having the models group work on combining  
15 elements from the MP3 and the letter from the National Corn  
16 Grower Association, and the model that Doug provided in  
17 coming up with material that the committee could consider as  
18 something that they may want to have in their report, and  
19 then that could conceivably go to states later down the  
20 road.

21 But I want to hear what folks think about whether  
22 the work of the workgroups should be continuing, and what  
23 each of the workgroups should be working on. Thank you.  
24 Leon. Leon, and then Laura.

25 MR. CORZINE: Leon. Thank you, Michael. I think

1 our, our venues workgroup, Latresia, I don't know if we have  
2 any more work to do. I mean, we kind of compiled a list.  
3 I, whether we need it all or whether you want to, if there's  
4 danger in dispersing us into other committees, and you just  
5 as soon have us just idle on the sidelines, we can do that.  
6 But I really don't know that there's any value in, in trying  
7 to have that venues group going further. Thanks.

8 MR. SCHECHTMAN: I would only wait to see if the  
9 committee has another task that they may want to set forth  
10 for you. But, we'll wait and see where the discussion goes.  
11 Laura.

12 MR. CORZINE: Okay. The point is, the only point  
13 is that in the venues part, now if you want to change our  
14 mission, I guess that's fine. Because we have a fine group,  
15 if we get together.

16 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Okay. Thank you. Laura.

17 MS. BATCHA: So, I'm on the, on the models and the  
18 incentives, and I'm going to pick up on the, on the idea  
19 that Dave had in how, how we might think about this. Sort  
20 of sketching again, I keep coming back to this great North  
21 Dakota pollinator plan. And not that we would write a plan  
22 for a state. That's not what that, that I'm thinking of.  
23 But I like the framework and how the subgroups could work  
24 into it. So if, if we just look at this, in the  
25 introduction, this is where the state talked about how they

1 sort of did convening, et cetera.

2           So I'm, what I'm wondering is if we put together  
3 this as a template that the models subgroup could sort of  
4 begin to shepherd with the pieces coming in from the other  
5 subgroups. So, so our introduction might be about  
6 recommendations to state and local areas around convening,  
7 right? And we take that group and that workgroup, and we  
8 put it there. So we're not being prescriptive, but we're  
9 talking about the important role that state and local  
10 entities are going to play in this discussion, and some  
11 ideas from that group about how to convene.

12           And then we go into sort of what is this previous  
13 section that I think is something that could be worked by  
14 the full group because this is sort of where we get into  
15 positioning and language and everybody needs to be  
16 comfortable. So, are we putting on the table the idea of  
17 coexistence from a crisis perspective? Are we putting it on  
18 the table from IP market opportunity and the future of  
19 agriculture, which might be more inviting. Sort of how do  
20 we sort of cast the next there.

21           And then this plan piece I think that's built out  
22 from the work of the guidance group around the management  
23 strategies and those bullets that I think Lynn and Angela  
24 sort of started to work towards, and that kind of drops into  
25 that section of the plan, and that this be, that it, we add

1 a section in the end around resources, because we've been  
2 charged with incentives, and we haven't quite, we've got to  
3 merge that into here.

4           Greg's idea on leadership, maybe it's a letter  
5 from Secretary Vilsack based on our recommendations about  
6 why it's important or something, and that at that point then  
7 the document can be something that could be handed off as a,  
8 as a resource for others to get going. So, that's sort of  
9 how I've marked up this.

10           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Laura.  
11 That, that is a wonderful job of segueing into all of the  
12 other interrelated topics of incentives as well as the  
13 relationship between the various pieces that we're talking  
14 about. So thank you. Angela.

15           MS. OLSEN: In following on what Laura was saying,  
16 I think that kind of structure could work very well for  
17 this. And I'm wondering, Michael, I know that, you know,  
18 we're not merging documents, that you're, you and Russell  
19 are going to take the pen on the work product of the various  
20 workgroups, and then send that back out to the workgroups.  
21 Maybe it might make sense for the various workgroups to,  
22 like I know from the guidance group, to take whatever new  
23 document that you're drafting, Michael, we can get together,  
24 discuss that document, but then if you, if you, if you and  
25 Russell wanted to sort of weave together the document that

1 Laura is talking about, and again, I think that structure  
2 can make very good sense.

3           You know, but again, it's not simply dropping in  
4 work product that we already have right now. So how do you  
5 see that, what, how would that work best for you, Michael?  
6 Is it doing it as individual pieces, we meet again as  
7 workgroups on those individual pieces, and then they get  
8 dropped into the document, and then we can figure out what's  
9 the next step to review that? Or do you see already you  
10 dropping those pieces into the, the framework that, again, I  
11 like that framework a lot. What, what would work best from  
12 your perspective? Because I know you're going to be  
13 drafting whole new pieces based on the discussion.

14           MR. SCHECHTMAN: I, I do think that I like, and  
15 again, it's you all, what you like for this. But, but for  
16 me, I like the approach that Laura has, has put forward.  
17 The one thing I would say is that it's a little bit the cart  
18 before the horse because I think we first have to get the,  
19 the sort of revised model structure, that part done, and  
20 then the context setting, which is a little bit of other  
21 pieces, and assembling, you know, I think is going to happen  
22 in a, probably a joint effort with the models and conveners  
23 group. But obviously everyone is going to be very  
24 interested in seeing all those pieces as, as they emerge.

25           So, I, and, and again, the, the question of the

1 guidance group, because obviously that's a piece that is  
2 very central to this, and we need to see how that workgroup  
3 is going to continue working on this. So if there are  
4 thoughts about that. I think we just have to get some of  
5 the smaller pieces. But I think the overall concept that  
6 you laid out, Laura, is something that we can work with, if  
7 other folk on the committee are happy with that. Obviously  
8 there's going to be issues around, as always, setting the  
9 context and how broadly things are framed, and how narrowly  
10 things are framed. And we've heard some of those  
11 discussions. And we will be doing our best to pirouette  
12 around all of those issues in a way that, that everyone can  
13 live with. With, with reservations, of course.

14 MS. BATCHA: Can I just clarify one thing about  
15 the idea that I shared? And I wanted to check with you,  
16 Michael. I'm imagining that, like, this work product would  
17 exist within the AC21 report back to the Secretary. Because  
18 we report back to the Secretary. And I think that report is  
19 where we can, as a committee, either agree altogether to  
20 make statements, or agree to sign on and add additional  
21 statements like we did last time around. And that's where  
22 we can get into some of these ideas about why we think it's  
23 important, what do we think hasn't been done yet that needs  
24 to be perhaps be considered in the future, and that kind of  
25 thing. Because I think there's an opportunity to report

1 back to the Secretary where we reflect on the charge and we  
2 do all those things like we did in, in the last report, and  
3 that's a little bit different than sort of the product  
4 that's in the report. At least, am I missing something that  
5 is sort of nested?

6 MR. SCHECHTMAN: I, I think the point is well  
7 taken. I think we're going to have, all of a sudden we're  
8 having many more levels of nesting. I think we have the  
9 guidance document, we have a model for discussions, we have  
10 the context that that is going to be put in for, that may be  
11 of use to, to states and localities, and then we have the  
12 report on top of which that goes. I think, I think it can  
13 be done. I think it, the more, the more layers of the onion  
14 you add on, the more, the more complicated it's going to be.  
15 Our time is short. Whether we have to shrink that down a  
16 little bit, I think we'll wait and see where we are at, at  
17 the end of the next meeting. But, but in principle, I see  
18 that it, I see the logical sense to it.

19 Angela.

20 MS. OLSEN: I wonder, in looking at the, you know,  
21 the model outline, I understand it's not in final format,  
22 that, that Doug had, had circulated, I wonder whether  
23 concepts from the guidance group and the guidance document  
24 could really be folded into that. We are seeing the, the,  
25 you know, the overlap of the various groups. I think that's

1 quite obvious to a lot of us. But I'm, so I'm wondering if,  
2 you know, a lot of things that are in, you know, my  
3 document, Lynn's document, my redlines to Lynn's document,  
4 Paul's document, a lot of these concepts could be folded  
5 into this model that, that Doug had circulated. So, I  
6 wonder if maybe, you know, Michael, if when you do the, the  
7 rewrite of the various sections, if it might make sense to  
8 fold that in. So really we're dealing with one, you know,  
9 one document.

10           It just, there's so much overlap, that's why I was  
11 wondering, to try to peel back the onion, not to add more  
12 layers.

13           MR. SCHECHTMAN: I guess -- I'll go to Barry in  
14 just a sec. But I guess the, the different pieces have sort  
15 of different functions. There is a piece sort of describing  
16 how sort of a way that conversations might be started if, if  
17 states and localities want to do that. There is a piece  
18 about things for farmers to think about which would be sort  
19 of contained within that. But the context of having the  
20 meetings is a little bit different. There, and that is all  
21 going to be embedded into a report that says this is why we  
22 did this. This is responding to your charge because of X.  
23 We think that these other things, Y and Z, are important,  
24 and we want you to know that. And we think that the way  
25 that these pieces might be used is the following. And, by



1 the way, we think you should write a letter telling folks  
2 how important we think this is.

3           So, I think the pieces have different functions.  
4 There may be some repetition in there. But they may go to  
5 different audiences. But again, it's going to be up to  
6 folks to look at the pieces when they come together and see  
7 what you think.

8           Barry.

9           MR. BUSHUE: Thank, Michael. I liked your  
10 explanation. I agree with you. It's, it's kind of  
11 multifaceted. If you look at the overall report that will  
12 come out, it's somewhat philosophical, as was the original,  
13 or previous report. This one has to have a piece at some  
14 stage, whatever format it takes, that is going to be  
15 understood, straightforward, and welcome by farmers if we're  
16 going to get them to the table. Whatever format we use to  
17 get them to the table, whether it's state, whether it's some  
18 type of an MP3 knockoff, whatever we want to do to get them  
19 there, but the document itself that, that provides for the  
20 basis of discussion, has to be, I think, fairly  
21 straightforward and usable. And that's why I kind of like  
22 Doug's format. I, I have tremendous respect for the people  
23 who put this document together, the amount of work that went  
24 into it. But when I look at it, it makes my head hurt.

25           I don't have light bulbs like Alan. I, they don't

1 turn on very often. And that's not a criticism of the  
2 document. It's a very well-done document. But if, if this  
3 is kind of what, you know, multiple pages of things that are  
4 going to be given to people that have open up a discussion,  
5 I fear that, you know, they're just going to say, really,  
6 I'm going to go home and plant. So.

7 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you. Other questions,  
8 comments, at this point? Doug, please.

9 MR. GOEHRING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do  
10 agree, I, I like the document and some of the things it gets  
11 into. And I'm, I'm wondering for the same reason, if we  
12 keep it simplistic and we keep it targeted at farmers, then  
13 we have an addendum for another piece to this, and maybe  
14 that's part of what that subgroup would do is put this into  
15 a text form or keep it the way it is, because the other  
16 element here that we're working with --

17 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Which document are you referring  
18 to?

19 MR. GOEHRING: Oh, I'm, I'm referring to the one  
20 that was submitted by Angela, and also I got, I had a chance  
21 to see the one from NCGA. We pulled that together to talk  
22 about those issues concerning seed varieties, seed purity,  
23 things, some of your contractual obligations, that's  
24 targeted at a different audience. And that is going to draw  
25 a different crowd. But it's something to think about. It's

1 something else that they can consider as they move forward  
2 to address some of their, their issues.

3           Because it goes back to what Lynn was talking  
4 about earlier. You have, you have those farmer-to-farmer  
5 discussions about what you're doing on your farm. I think  
6 overall, and it's probably what I, it's what I brought  
7 together as, you're going to raise the awareness by having  
8 an overall big meeting, but it gives you the outline, it  
9 formats the discussion to talk about coexistence and joint  
10 coexistence plans. That's going to be something a little  
11 bit different. This just raises awareness that gets, this  
12 gets the conversation going and helps you frame up what  
13 you're going to want in a joint coexistence plan, because  
14 some things just aren't going to be relevant in some areas.  
15 But at least it gives you an overall, general concept  
16 providing flexibility.

17           MR. SCHECHTMAN: So, so let me follow up a little  
18 here, because I think there are potentially, at least some  
19 shades of difference in how the thought of this document  
20 being used. If we're talking about the guidance document,  
21 in the one sense, it's informing conversations, but in the  
22 other sense there was a, there was a big bit about trying to  
23 provide farmers with information that they need to be able  
24 to be sure that they're thinking about all the things that  
25 are important for them to, to think about. So I just want

1 to make sure that the two are reconciled, because in the  
2 subgroup, at least, there had been the thought that we would  
3 work from Lynn's general framework, though obviously there  
4 were lots of comments about the topics.

5           And now I'm hearing working from the, from  
6 Angela's version, combined with core words, what I want to  
7 take everyone's temperature on where we are and which  
8 framework we're going to be starting from, recognizing that  
9 whichever one we put in, we're going to try to fit pieces  
10 in.

11           MS. ANDALUZ: So you're going to merge these two  
12 together?

13           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Well, again, they're not going to  
14 be, it's not going to look like either one because there are  
15 lots of comments that were received in both the subgroup  
16 meeting as well as in the redline document that, that we  
17 received. So I just want to get a sense of where folks are  
18 most comfortable, starting from recognizing that other stuff  
19 is going to be associated with this material as well.

20           And I talked so much that I didn't see which order  
21 the cards came up. So let me go around this way. Mary-  
22 Howell.

23           MS. MARTENS: I think you and Russell are best  
24 suited because you don't have any vested, commercial  
25 interest in this, to take a moderate stance between

1 something that is detailed to the point of usefulness and  
2 maybe doesn't say everything that could, it could say. But,  
3 I think it's really important when you all are writing this  
4 to make sure that it, it does give enough detail so that the  
5 conversations between farmers can be sufficiently informed  
6 with information and not just general. But, but, you know,  
7 let's get, let's see what you can come up with. And then we  
8 can probably micromanage that further. But, definitely it  
9 needs enough detail to be useful, and I'm worried if, if we  
10 allow everybody's commercial interest to dictate what is or  
11 is not in there, we will end up with something that is  
12 perhaps not useful.

13 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Well, thank you for the vote of  
14 confidence, I think. Onto Alan.

15 MR. KEMPER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think as  
16 long as we keep this at the 35,000-foot level, the documents  
17 will recognize that within various regions of the country,  
18 the methods may vary for implementation of this type of  
19 coexistence communication would be great. I think we have  
20 to definitely also recognize in general that the agriculture  
21 is so diverse in this country that it can be used from Santa  
22 Barbara to Orlando do Des Moines with that. And some of  
23 Lynn's document can handle that. I mean, with the smoothing  
24 out the words and things like that. I think we need to  
25 concentrate on the procedures and the pathways forward in

1 that document, not necessarily the specifics of what crop  
2 does what. Thank you.

3 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you, Alan. Greg.

4 MR. JAFFE: So I guess I was a fan of, of Lynn's  
5 draft. I thought it was good and gave lots of examples.  
6 And I guess I think, you know, just having broad statements  
7 without examples is, it makes something hard for people to  
8 then deal with in practice. But I guess, so I care less  
9 about whether all those issues that Lynn raises are in the  
10 guidance part of the document. But I think they need to be  
11 in whatever we're, the total of what we're providing to the  
12 Secretary.

13 So, to me, that's important, that we don't lose  
14 sight of if, if we end up making the guidance document more  
15 general and more procedural, as Alan said, or other things,  
16 I don't want to lose some of the issues that are in Lynn's  
17 thing that I think then need to be put in other parts of  
18 the, of the report to the secretary of some things. I  
19 guess, I look at, at what we have here as issues of where  
20 things go, not getting rid of certain things, and type of  
21 thing, if that makes any sense.

22 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you, Greg. Next, I see  
23 Latresia, I think.

24 MS. WILSON: I'm not sure if this is more of a  
25 question or a comment. But what I'm hearing here, it seems

1 like there may be a, a breakout document, something that the  
2 farmers can go home with, as opposed to just our report.  
3 And so maybe there is a method whereby we can, we can have  
4 items or special areas that can actually just be a tear-out  
5 that can be given to the, the modelers or the interveners  
6 and so forth that, that are running these meetings. Because  
7 I'm kind of hearing both, something that we're going to give  
8 to farmers and something that we're not, so.

9 MR. SCHECHTMAN: I -- thank you for that,  
10 Latresia. I think what I'm hearing is there's a guidance  
11 document. And that's going to be given to farmers. We  
12 haven't quite figured out when, if, if that's only going to  
13 be whenever these public meetings happen or what else or how  
14 else that information gets disseminated. But that certainly  
15 is something that is a document that will be on your Twitter  
16 account or whatever it is at some point in the future, even  
17 though I have no idea how to do one of those.

18 MR. KEMPER: You don't Tweet?

19 MR. SLOCUM: Betsy won't teach him.

20 MR. SCHECHTMAN: But, but I did, there, there are  
21 different sets of pieces in this that are destined for  
22 different audiences. And I think, I think you're very right  
23 about that.

24 Laura.

25 MS. BATCHA: I think my preference is to, as the,

1 the place to springboard off of Lynn's document as well with  
2 provisions based on the conversation from the group, and, I  
3 don't have a strong opinion as to whether the details there,  
4 whether you drop to the detail, I think that, that all gets,  
5 that all gets worked out. I think I would say is the top of  
6 Page 2, as a springboard, I think there is an opportunity  
7 based on these conversations that we try to frame this in a,  
8 and I keep coming back to this, frame it in, in an  
9 opportunity way, because I think we can make that a little  
10 bit more friendly and set the stage about there being  
11 something in it for, for everybody in terms of joint plans,  
12 because it opens up opportunities. So that's I think my  
13 only point about, about that. I think that's, for me, this  
14 is the document to start from.

15 MR. SCHECHTMAN: I think, again, caution, folks.  
16 We're not going to be, you know, we're going to be combining  
17 these materials. And it's not, we're not going to be really  
18 starting from one or the other. We're going to try to, let  
19 me, I'll just finish that. We will try to incorporate all  
20 of the pieces in a way that addresses the concern about it  
21 not being so complicated that it makes farmers' heads hurt,  
22 nor inflammatory, but find a place to address somewhere in  
23 the report issues that people think are important. I think  
24 Lynn certainly laid out a lot of very important pieces that  
25 are going to be, be in there, whether they will be



1 specifically here or again moved to other places. We just  
2 happen to do a little bit of, of work on it.

3 I certainly take the point about desire to start  
4 from the content, from a lot of the, the issues that Lynn  
5 has raised. But we're going to try to do some work on, on  
6 melding them together.

7 MS. BATCHA: I just want to clarify, I understood,  
8 Michael, the question you just asked us was which place to  
9 start from. So I intended to answer your question, not take  
10 you down a place that was dictating your work. I was just  
11 answering your question.

12 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Laura. A  
13 fair point. I don't know which of you is next. Go ahead.  
14 Your finger is on the microphone, his is not.

15 MS. OLSEN: Mine, mine will be short. I have full  
16 confidence in you and Russell to, to write a piece that will  
17 include all of the various viewpoints, keep it high-level,  
18 and also take out some of the inflammatory language. My  
19 problem is all the redline that you all have. And there was  
20 some philosophical differences. But also, I did try to take  
21 out some of the, some of the negative sentiment to keep this  
22 in a very, you know, positive document, to incentivize folks  
23 to want to come to the table, et cetera. But Michael, I  
24 leave it to you and Russell. You did a great job on the  
25 last report. So, you know, take obviously all the input

1 from the meeting, the NCGA document. Paul also, you know,  
2 took a stab at rearranging. So I think that there's a lot  
3 of good tools to work from. But I just wanted to point out  
4 to folks, I also was trying to take out some of the  
5 negativity in, in the document, in addition to the  
6 philosophical differences that I've expressed at the table.

7 MR. SCHECHTMAN: And I do want to not overlook  
8 Paul's, Paul's effort. Some of that, I think that  
9 rearrangement is useful, is useful as well. Chuck.

10 MR. BENBROOK: I, I'm a little concerned about the  
11 expectations of some people about what this farmer guidance  
12 document is. And I, I think that the reason that the  
13 pollinator plan started to really get some traction and, and  
14 be of some value is that they, they evolved organically in  
15 different areas of the country. I don't think it's possible  
16 for this, this committee to produce a farmer guidance  
17 document that's going to be equally useful everywhere. I  
18 think we can describe what a set of materials ought to, you  
19 know, try to address for farmer-level meetings, but I, I  
20 don't think we can actually prepare those materials. I  
21 think that has to be a task taken on by people closer to  
22 where the communication is going to, to happen, because I  
23 think there is such great diversity. And if we try to craft  
24 something that will, that will be, you know, useful  
25 everywhere, it will be sort of irrelevant everywhere.

1           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Chuck,  
2 very much. I think it's Leon, and then David.

3           MR. CORZINE: Thank you, Michael. Like Laura,  
4 I'll try and answer the question on where to start. I  
5 guess, and I, and I'm not sure whether you're talking about  
6 two things, because we're talking about the models document,  
7 and then the guidance document, right? So the models  
8 document I, I would suggest starting from Commissioner  
9 Goehring's -- okay.

10           MR. SCHECHTMAN: I was referring to the, to the  
11 guidance document.

12           MR. CORZINE: Okay. On the guidance, well there's  
13 already been some work. And I haven't had much chance to  
14 look at it, but I would start from the redline because  
15 that's kind of a combination. So that's just my suggestion.  
16 And I'm sure you will carry on and do well. Thank you.

17           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you, Leon. David.

18           MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. David  
19 Johnson. I want to support what Chuck just brought up  
20 because, you know, I, I think when I was mentioning about  
21 the models group taking that on, it's really when I, when we  
22 look at the front cover of the North Dakota plan, it says on  
23 there, prepared by. And it has a guy from the Pesticide and  
24 Fertilizer Division, a guy from, a gal from the Plant  
25 Industries Division, another guy from Plant and Fertilizer,

1 another gal from Plant Industries Division. And, and so I'm  
2 in agreement with Chuck that we really want to just provide  
3 something, maybe initially to NASDA, that can be shared with  
4 whichever states want to take this on. Some will, some  
5 won't. And then they will have the expertise at the local  
6 level to develop it for that area. And I, I think that's  
7 where my comments were hopefully going earlier this morning.  
8 And, and so I wanted to chime in that.

9 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you. I think we have a  
10 sense of, of how to go forward on this. We have a sense of  
11 the work of guidance group, when we'll get a framework back  
12 out to you and reconvene some meetings to discuss the  
13 framework and then what additional flesh might go on that  
14 framework, and how much flesh is too much flesh. And then,  
15 we have an idea for the models group, and they will be  
16 important in the coordinating of the, of the pieces. But  
17 we'll first look at crafting the, this combined model  
18 working from what the commissioner has provided and what  
19 corn growers have also provided to us and seeing if, what  
20 can be assembled from that.

21 I haven't heard any new proposals for work from,  
22 for the venues and conveners group. Do we, are there any  
23 topics that we want to direct them, or do we want to just  
24 recommend that they, that I split them up among the other  
25 two groups, and they can participate as they, as they wish,

1 or not?

2 MR. BENBROOK: I think splitting them up is an  
3 excellent idea.

4 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Okay. Any other thoughts on  
5 that? No. Then, I would like to take just a one-minute  
6 break to check something, and then I will return for the  
7 last, little bit of discussion, maybe some more discussion  
8 on eliciting support from stakeholders and buy-in from  
9 potential venues and conveners. So just give me one minute,  
10 please.

11 Whereupon, at 12:16 p.m., a brief recess is  
12 taken.

13 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Before we continue on this quick,  
14 quick discussion, I want to just check people's departure  
15 schedules so we know where we are and what time we can plan  
16 to wrap up this meeting. Hopefully, we will have Secretary  
17 Redding back here, and we can report glowingly to him on  
18 where we are. Can I see how many folks are likely to be  
19 leaving before 3:00?

20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: By 3:00.

21 MR. BUSHUE: Do we get a job if we stay?

22 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Not one you would want. You know  
23 the way this works, Barry. Those that leave early get the  
24 jobs.

25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We'll leave before 3:00.

1 MR. KEMPER: 2:45. Yeah.

2 MR. SCHECHTMAN: 2:45?

3 MR. KEMPER: Yeah, somewhere in there.

4 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Okay. So what I would suggest, I  
5 want to have a little, a very short discussion now on this  
6 topic of eliciting support and incentives. We heard some  
7 interesting ideas this morning. We can come back to this  
8 this afternoon. What I would propose is that we shorten our  
9 lunch. So if we go just until 1:30, we can come back and  
10 resume these rich discussions.

11 MR. KEMPER: I like that. Yeah.

12 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Okay. So, I think we heard some  
13 interesting suggestions this morning about the idea that  
14 some localities may have some potential sources of funding  
15 that we don't know about, but that we might allude to in  
16 this discussion around the models for interaction or  
17 starting these discussions. I think it's a question of  
18 whether it's going to be easy or difficult to get all of the  
19 various players that Workgroup 3 or the venues and conveners  
20 group, identified, will, will it, will this offer something  
21 that they're, they're going to want to get involved in, and  
22 how do we get them involved in this. And are there other  
23 incentives that we can talk about?

24 I know we had certainly mentioned the FSA program  
25 this morning as something, and potentially some other NRCS

1 things that have been mentioned that are things for folks to  
2 consider looking for as sources of support for some of these  
3 activities. But I open up the, the floor for these  
4 discussions. And I see Chuck first, and then Barry.

5 MS. WILSON: Chuck Berry.

6 MR. BUSHUE: Don't you got a meeting?

7 MR. BENBROOK: Chuck, Chuck Benbrook. My  
8 expectation is that the ability of federal and state  
9 government entities to constructively address and solve this  
10 problem is, is somewhat limited by a number of factors. But  
11 I think there is untapped opportunity to facilitate some  
12 constructive and innovative efforts through the private  
13 sector, and in particular entities that are imposing  
14 standards and criteria and thresholds and contract  
15 provisions on agricultural producers on the value chain.

16 And I, I think that it, it is an appropriate role  
17 for the Department of Agriculture to interact with these  
18 other entities and, and try to provide some, some guidance  
19 on constructive ways to address the concerns that are out  
20 there in the marketplace. And also maybe some innovative  
21 ways to foster a more proactive role by buyers, for example,  
22 in promoting coexistence through opening up this, this new  
23 component of the CRP to regional projects that involve a  
24 processor buyer partner in the project. There's been some  
25 really constructive things going on in, in South Central

1 Idaho that have been if not fully led by buyers, partially  
2 supported by them in supporting more diverse rotations and  
3 adoption of cover crops, and greater water use efficiency.

4           And, you know, I, I think that there's a sense out  
5 there that cooperative models involving the food industry  
6 and buyers working directly with farmers can get things done  
7 faster and better and more efficiently than, than when  
8 government is involved. So, I'd like to see our report  
9 address that role for the Department of Agriculture in, in  
10 interacting with the value chain.

11           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you. Interesting ideas.  
12 I'm going to take half a second and write it down, so.  
13 Next, Commissioner -- or, next Barry, and then Commissioner  
14 Goehring.

15           MR. BUSHUE: Do you want me to wait, Michael? All  
16 right.

17           MR. SCHECHTMAN: I'm done. I'm done. Good, thank  
18 you.

19           MR. BUSHUE: I think that incentives are  
20 important. If there's financial incentives out there,  
21 that's great. If there's grants out there that are, that's  
22 great. I just hope that we can provide something that will  
23 move forward if there are no financial incentives. Because,  
24 we all see that there is less and less and less money  
25 available from all aspects, the private sector, the



1 government sector, whatever. So I hope it stands alone.  
2 But there are other incentives, I think, aside from just  
3 financial ones. Chuck just mentioned a couple. Tractor  
4 dealerships, all the other kind of, all the other kind of  
5 infrastructure folks that support agriculture are often more  
6 than happy to have a group of farmers come into a showroom  
7 to talk about issues, hoping that they'll actually buy  
8 something.

9 I think that incentives, if you look at groups  
10 like extension, they're always willing or wanting to have  
11 something they can hang their hat on in terms of relevancy.  
12 And if this becomes relevant, and I kind of jump back, I  
13 kind of support where Greg was coming from in terms of  
14 having some type of, of prioritization within the  
15 Department. Talk about that this is an important issue. If  
16 that's the case, then that kind of follows down to the  
17 groups like extension and, and the crop protection  
18 associations and some of these other groups that have been  
19 mentioned. So, incentives might be nothing more than  
20 political incentives to engage with these. So, anyway,  
21 thank you.

22 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you very much.  
23 Commissioner Goehring, and then Laura. And then we'll wrap  
24 it up for the, for the morning.

25 MR. GOEHRING: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 Talking a little bit about incentives, and I know we, we  
2 started on this conversation talking about there's USDA  
3 programs that certainly could be available to help people  
4 accomplish some of the things they wish to, or maybe through  
5 much of our guidance document, we'll be able to point out  
6 some things that they need to consider or should consider.  
7 We also talked about those incentives that could be 319  
8 funds that are available in some states, some watersheds,  
9 some areas, and grants and foundations.

10           And I think what's a key piece here, and it's  
11 probably why I've mentioned it before, and I've heard it  
12 many times around here from the agriculture community's  
13 perspective why they would probably want to have this third  
14 party entity facilitating some of these meetings, such as  
15 extension or a soil conservation district, or maybe a state  
16 Ag department would want to take this on is because they  
17 feel, first of all, they probably understand the culture.  
18 They probably understand some of the challenges and some of  
19 the considerations. They also understand some of the  
20 priorities in particular areas, in watersheds and, and  
21 concerns in certain regions.

22           But with all of that, at least it happens in my  
23 shop, a lot of the foundations and groups out there that  
24 have grant dollars available, they will come to you.  
25 They'll ask you do you know of anybody that would like to

1 access some of our funds. And you have the really heart-to-  
2 heart conversation about, well, what's your goal, what's  
3 your mission here. And the Ag community, on any given  
4 occasion when you get in front of them will ask you point  
5 blank, so what's behind this? The real opportunity comes in  
6 trying to vet that out and trying to have that discussion to  
7 make sure.

8           And when they ask that question, you're in a way  
9 lending some credibility also to this foundation, that  
10 they're willing to put dollars up. And this is what they'd  
11 like to see you do with it. So, maybe it's about planting  
12 trees as a natural buffer. But it also accomplishes some  
13 other things with respect to water quality, or maybe soil  
14 erosion. All of those things can play into this that will  
15 help provide some resources to any of those farmers that  
16 believe they have a problem, believe that they want to  
17 mitigate the problem, and it can be part of the whole  
18 solution. So, I believe that just as been talked about this  
19 morning here, the incentives, the, the resources that could  
20 be available to producers could probably be best distributed  
21 through those public entities that are held accountable. So  
22 it goes back again to soil conservation districts, those  
23 extension agents, departments, and any other of those  
24 entities that we can identify would probably be very good at  
25 delivering on this, providing the deliverables and vetting

1 it out.

2 MR. SCHECHTMAN: So, let me follow up. I'm not  
3 quite sure that I understood. So, these are the entities,  
4 soil conservation districts, extension, et cetera, will be  
5 the folks who would be the vehicles for delivering whatever  
6 funds came from elsewhere? Is that what you are saying? Or  
7 delivering the message, or, I didn't quite understand.

8 MR. GOEHRING: I'm sorry. I was misinterpreted.  
9 I'm working out of what the conveners group did. They  
10 brought so many good entities to the table. They showed  
11 them, I'm, I'm just working out from that. I think those  
12 are some real good deliverables.

13 What I was really getting to the heart is, there's  
14 going to be some pointblank questions from the Ag community,  
15 which is, so if you're saying that these dollars, these  
16 resources are available, tell us about that. Because they  
17 always believe there's agenda behind it. And, quite  
18 frankly, there probably is. There's groups that come  
19 forward, they want to see things happen in a particular area  
20 for different reasons. How can you work with those groups  
21 to say, okay, this may not be able to be accomplished. If  
22 you're willing to change your thought process or your  
23 motives, your grant dollars could be a part of this program.

24 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you. That's much clearer.  
25 Laura, please. Last, last comment of the morning.

1           MS. BATCHA: So, the question on how to illicit  
2 support from stakeholders and potential conveners, and  
3 hearing the discussion, so I'm struck with two things that  
4 bring me back to an idea. I like what Chuck said about  
5 tapping sort of a corporate role in this, because I can only  
6 speak from the organic side, but there is interest in  
7 development of acres and making sure their specs get met, a  
8 preference for domestic, if they can get it right where they  
9 can meet those specs and that kind of thing. So I do think  
10 that there is, there is some good potential there.

11           I think Doug's question about this having to be  
12 queued up to elicit support from stakeholders and venue  
13 conveners, they have to be able to legitimately answer, and  
14 trust the answer to what's behind this. So I do, I think  
15 let's not lose sight of that. That's like learning for me.  
16 I don't have an answer, but my mind is spinning, and I think  
17 you're right on that we need to anticipate that that's where  
18 people are going to go. Nobody wants to get trapped by  
19 something.

20           To that end, I'm wondering if, for both the  
21 corporate folks and the Ag community in addressing the  
22 question about whose agenda this is, there's a, there's a  
23 role for endorsement of a template that might put this on a  
24 little bit more of a neutral frame. And the places that  
25 we've had presentations from and we've discussed would be

1 the Department of Agriculture, obviously with leadership  
2 from the top. And then, this is a question for Doug, or we  
3 can ask Russell when he gets back. Do you see a way where  
4 on our timeline we could get to a place where NASDA might be  
5 able to endorse in theory the value of joint coexistence  
6 plans, the template that's being presented?

7           If we could get strong leadership out of USDA for  
8 the product of our work, an endorsement from NASDA, and an  
9 endorsement from the Association of Conversation Districts,  
10 it might help have corporate folks think, hey, I'm getting  
11 involved in something that has some legitimate vetting, and  
12 it might allow the Ag community to have a, a little bit more  
13 openness around what's behind it. So those are, that's my  
14 idea.

15           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Doug, the final-final word.

16           MR. GOEHRING: I believe that the work product  
17 that comes from us captures some of their concerns and puts  
18 a deliverable out there that I believe the Ag community will  
19 embrace because they see it as being outreach, educational,  
20 and goes towards that goal of coexistence. I can tell you  
21 right off hand there will be about 20-plus state departments  
22 of agriculture that would embrace it and probably want to  
23 see what kind of venues could be created where they could  
24 start reaching out and just provide a resource.

25           Really, what we're talking about doing is creating

1 and providing a tool to assist them. And, I could very much  
2 see that, much like the pollinator plan when it came  
3 forward, they had a chance to think about it. They offered  
4 suggestions. They said, well, there's some things we might  
5 want to take a step further in our state. Absolutely. And  
6 they, they quickly adopted it in concept and moved forward  
7 with it. So, yes.

8 MS. BATCHA: Do you think NASDA would consider --

9 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Microphone.

10 MS. BATCHA: Do you think, could you see a way  
11 where NASDA might consider, you know, adopting a policy to  
12 encourage states to consider that kind of thing, sort of  
13 from, from the association level?

14 MR. GOEHRING: Oh, absolutely. If, again, if the  
15 working --

16 MS. BATCHA: If we get it right.

17 MR. GOEHRING: The work products, yes. In a  
18 heartbeat.

19 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Yeah. Again, I would presume  
20 that that would also have to be dealt with in a larger way  
21 in NASDA at some big, scheduled meeting. So, that's for the  
22 future. But I think conceptually that's a very important  
23 thing.

24 MS. BATCHA: I'm just trying to have us be  
25 cognizant of, of the time line for that with our work and

1 the end of the administration. And I think September is the  
2 next gathering for NASDA at the annual meeting, correct,  
3 Doug? And so then they don't come together again until  
4 February. So just, you know, as, as we think about it.

5 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you. So, we will break  
6 now. I will take folks that are interested over to the  
7 cafeteria in the other building. And we'll try to get back  
8 here at 20 of 2:00.

9 Whereupon, at 12:38 p.m., a brief recess is  
10 taken.

11 MR. SCHECHTMAN: So, I'm very pleased to welcome  
12 back Secretary Redding. You have shown your devotion to  
13 come back for the wrap-up for this afternoon. We all hope  
14 your hearing was as successful as those things can be. I  
15 think probably what we should do for your benefit is to give  
16 you a 35,000-foot version of our discussions this morning.  
17 I think they were really good. We had a lot of consensus on  
18 ways to go forward. I am not going to remember all of the  
19 key features, so please, I will turn it over to other people  
20 to help me summarize some of the things.

21 We have been given, first off, I think great, a  
22 vote of confidence in being able to draw the pieces together  
23 and try to find the appropriate middle ground around some  
24 conflicting issues and to provide context for the various  
25 pieces. We've heard about the guidance document. There was



1 good discussion on how to position the guidance document and  
2 sort of the level at which those, the, the discussion should  
3 be contained. We had a discussion about the relationship,  
4 the role of the various pieces that we're talking about,  
5 which is to say the guidance document, the model, the  
6 creating a model for discussions within localities and  
7 communities.

8           And there was agreement that a model for those  
9 discussions could be put together starting from Commissioner  
10 Goehring's outline and information from the National Corn  
11 Growers as well, and trying to assemble those things  
12 together. There was quite a bit of discussion around the  
13 context in which these documents should be provided, as well  
14 as the fact that both of these pieces are to be embedded in  
15 a report, and that report will address some of the other  
16 issues. We'll call upon the secretary to provide, to  
17 announce his support for work to be taken on based on these  
18 activities at the local level.

19           There was some very interesting discussion about  
20 incentives, and how localities may have, we may be able to  
21 describe some opportunities that localities may have, as  
22 well as some of the caveats and needs for explanation when  
23 some of those potential sources of funding are tapped into.  
24 What else? I am just drawing a blank. There were lots,  
25 there were lots of other things. If folks would like to add

1 some of the other points that were made.

2 We will be redrafting the guidance framework and  
3 providing a redrafted framework within the next 10 days or  
4 so. That will attempt to incorporate all of the, the  
5 comments that we've heard in the session. There was  
6 discussion about the need to make the framework. It's again  
7 the delicate balance between, straightforward enough to be  
8 useful and having enough information to be relevant.

9 MS. MARTENS: And not having too much to be  
10 offensive.

11 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Yes, and not having too much to  
12 be offensive. There was much discussion about positioning  
13 the work in the, that will be offered in the model that we  
14 present as opportunities for farmers of, of all sorts, IP,  
15 organic, and as a means to facilitate conversations between  
16 farmers.

17 Okay, so now tell me all the things I've  
18 forgotten, because I made it up on the spot.

19 MS. OLSEN: That's pretty bad.

20 MS. MARTENS: That was good.

21 MR. REDDING: The redrafting of the guidance  
22 document, is that based on the redline version plus the  
23 morning's discussion?

24 MR. SCHECHTMAN: I mean, I think what we're going  
25 to be doing is we will take into account what we heard on

1 the redline. We will merge the two documents, the two  
2 versions, and we will try to come up with something that  
3 strikes that fine, that fine balance. And there was a  
4 recognition that some of the materials that are in Lynn's,  
5 some of the issues that may be raised in Lynn's document may  
6 not need to be in the guidance framework but may go  
7 somewhere else into, in the report.

8 Commissioner.

9 MR. GOEHRING: Thank you. Going back to a little  
10 bit of what you had said. And I am again probably  
11 interpreting and taking a little bit from our, our  
12 discussions that took place this morning. Keeping in mind  
13 and understanding that we probably have two different groups  
14 we might be targeting. But for the most part, we're trying  
15 to speak to farmers, just to raise awareness, have the  
16 conversation about mitigation strategies. The other  
17 component, which comes from the redline paper, NCGA, and  
18 Lynn's paper, probably is targeting a different group, and  
19 maybe in the narrative we talk about some mitigation  
20 strategies there. But that's going to again be identifying  
21 that other group. Because if you introduce that type of  
22 information at a farmer meeting, most are going to feel it's  
23 not relevant to them. They're here to talk about issues  
24 that they may see or perceive as being issues in their  
25 backyard.

1           So, and, and I guess to that point, Mr. Chairman,  
2 one of the things that we talked about this morning, and I  
3 think we've, we probably all understood this to a great  
4 degree over a period of time, coexistence is a two-way  
5 street, and it may be about how one views what is happening  
6 to them. And you could be a conventional producer, you  
7 could be an IP producer, you could be an organic producer.

8           But I think understanding that brings people to  
9 the table to talk about it. And part of these mitigation  
10 strategies would certainly be able to present it in a way  
11 that just gets people thinking, may or may not be relevant  
12 to their farm, but they probably would be interested in  
13 coming or hearing about it from somebody else that did go,  
14 and say, hey, they have this outlined in this format that  
15 talks about some of these issues that you said you were  
16 having concerns about on your farm. You might want to just  
17 go look at that, that tool, that draft and see. I just  
18 wanted to make mention of that.

19           And also, when we talk about local, and I guess  
20 I've always meant it in this way, so this would just be my  
21 opinion, that I think of local as being state. And I think  
22 this thing has to be, I believe it has to be drafted and  
23 formatted in a way that provides a lot of flexibility and  
24 latitude. And it's general in nature. But that would be  
25 the outline and the, and the format. Certainly when you get

1 it into some regions, some areas, because of topography,  
2 precip, humidity, temperatures, all of those things are  
3 going to be things that farmers have to think about when  
4 they manage and mitigate some of the risk and issues that  
5 they have. But, we're probably going to be able to provide  
6 a lot of information for them to work with.

7 MR. REDDING: But, but it's only one guidance  
8 document, right? We're still, there's, there's one guidance  
9 document that could be parsed out, that would be farmer-to-  
10 farmer, and then there's some others? Just --

11 MR. GOEHRING: Well, I guess part of what we  
12 talked about this morning, or at least I believe, is you'd  
13 have this guidance document that would certainly refer to  
14 that. But there would also be that piece that talks about  
15 there's other issues of seed purity and how you need to look  
16 at contractual obligations and things that need to be  
17 considered that aren't going to be relevant to probably many  
18 in the room. But if you're an IP producer, that's very  
19 relevant to you. So if you get into that stuff, eyes are  
20 going to glaze over. A lot of farmers are going to get up  
21 and leave or say that was just a waste of time. Because  
22 part of that meeting had nothing to do with my farm  
23 specifically.

24 MR. SCHECHTMAN: I would just add one thing, that  
25 there's a guidance document, and embedded in the report,

1 there will be sort of this model for community discussions.  
2 I'm not clear who will necessarily call them, what the, what  
3 the trigger will be to get those. Maybe it's an  
4 opportunity. Maybe it's something else. But sort of a  
5 model for what those discussions might, might cover. And to  
6 a certain extent how, how they might work. But again, not  
7 in a very, not in a prescriptive way, but just attempting to  
8 bring, to bring folks together. And that would be embedded  
9 in the whole report that provides the context. So it's a  
10 little bit like an onion, layers of an onion. But hopefully  
11 with a little different aroma. Chuck.

12 MR. BENBROOK: Yeah. Well, welcome back, Mr.  
13 Chairman. That was a speedy trip. I hope you observed all  
14 the speed limits.

15 MR. REDDING: Every one of them.

16 MR. BENBROOK: Good. First, a procedural request.  
17 I don't think I'm the only member of the committee that  
18 would appreciate receiving from you and Michael sometime in  
19 the next month a prospective calendar for the remaining  
20 steps in the process for bringing our work under the current  
21 administration to a close. Michael, in particular, I think  
22 it would be good for you to make an inquiry to the  
23 secretary's office to, you know, how, how, how much time  
24 before January 22nd would he like to receive the final  
25 report of AC21, in the event that he might want to have some

1 time to officially respond to it. I think we certainly, you  
2 know, owe him that courtesy. So, if he says, oh, I'd like  
3 it by the 5th of January, then you've got a hard date that  
4 you can work back on, you know, where we need to be in the,  
5 in the process of compiling a report.

6           And I, I think that, you know, all of us hope that  
7 we do have an opportunity as a committee to make whatever  
8 kind of final statement that, that we can, and also some of  
9 us may wish to offer additional thoughts, as we did in the  
10 last round. And, you know, I just, I think we, we are  
11 obliged to deliver that, regardless of the content. And I  
12 kind of leave it to you to figure out when you're going to  
13 communicate and how you'll communicate that to us. But I  
14 think everybody would like to know that at some point.

15           Now, to the substance, you know, I, I feel that  
16 there's really, there's very little written material that  
17 will likely end up, you know, being in our final report. I  
18 think there's been thoughts put on paper. I agreed with  
19 Greg's comment from the other day. I mean, none of the  
20 drafts are ready for prime time, and I think they need to be  
21 much farther along before we really start, you know, fine-  
22 tuning the message and deciding whether, you know, important  
23 topics are even addressed.

24           I personally don't think it's useful for this  
25 committee to be thinking about writing a guidance document

1 to, to guide or frame farmer-to-farmer dialogues. I just, I  
2 don't think that we can do that usefully at the, at the  
3 national level to apply to the vast diversity of context and  
4 frameworks in which that local level farmer-to-farmer  
5 discussion.

6 I do think like the, the framework for the  
7 pollinator plans that has been picked up and utilized in  
8 different states and different ways, I think we can in our  
9 report describe a process and some of the central elements,  
10 and some of the important people that need to be around the  
11 table, but I don't, I don't think, you know, we can go so  
12 far as to really provide concrete and specific guidance to  
13 the type of dialogues that, that ought to happen. So I, I  
14 kind of am bristling a little bit at the thought of us  
15 putting out a, you know, a guidance document for farmer-to-  
16 farmer dialogue.

17 So, that's, that's my opinion. And the last thing  
18 that, that, you know, I, I feel that there are, there are  
19 going to be a number of market-related and marketing-related  
20 challenges in the coexistence area. And frankly, those  
21 issues are going to have to be worked out within the private  
22 sector, many of them through the contracting process. And I  
23 don't think that there's a single person around this table  
24 that wants to invite government into a more active role in  
25 trying to work through the challenges that exist at the, at



1 the local level. But the way I see agriculture going, it's  
2 more and more to contracts. Big facilities are getting  
3 built in a particular place when they feel that they can  
4 secure the kind of supplies and cooperation from the  
5 agricultural community in the surrounding area. And a big  
6 part of that is whether the farmers can get along and, and  
7 whether, whether what the needs of the plant or the new  
8 infrastructure, whether those can be reliably and cost-  
9 effectively met by the local area. And that's, that's a, a  
10 discussion that, that's going on all over the country now,  
11 and, and I think more and more of agriculture is moving in  
12 that direction.

13           So, if that's true, then, within the context of  
14 conveners and venues, this member of AC21 feels that it's  
15 the private sector and food companies and marketers who are  
16 going to be a much more important, both convener and venue,  
17 for coexistence issues to be worked out. And I think we  
18 should acknowledge that, and I think we should provide some,  
19 some suggestions and guidance on how that can unfold in as  
20 effective and efficient way as possible. And I would  
21 include that there is some government role in some of that  
22 happening. You know, some of the big, big agreements in,  
23 in, in the Pacific Northwest involve a commitment by various  
24 government agencies to deal with water issues. You know,  
25 let's fix this water issue and know that we're going to have

1 long-term access to irrigation water. And then the big, the  
2 big money gets committed, and everything goes forward. So,  
3 I, I, I would, I would highlight that the private sector  
4 and, and the marketing chain, it needs to play a much more  
5 proactive and significant role in redressing coexistence  
6 issues than, that they have in the past.

7 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Thank you. You had mentioned  
8 that earlier, and I hadn't included it in my summary.  
9 Appreciate it. Doug.

10 MR. GOEHRING: Thank you. I agree that it should  
11 be the private sector talking about these marketing issues.  
12 And maybe in the document itself, that's where you spell out  
13 these are the entities that need to work on and address  
14 these issues because those contractual obligations are going  
15 to be different. There's probably no way you can address  
16 that, but in the sense that, here are those entities that  
17 you point out are going to be working on this issue, it kind  
18 of takes it off the table, then. Because, I will tell you,  
19 government is asked to intervene and step in. And then you  
20 have to remind people, well, there's either legal recourse  
21 here or there's issues you have to, to visit about with the  
22 company, the organization that you contracted with, what are  
23 the parameters, what, where are the discounts, the  
24 thresholds that exist?

25 And I think that's, it's a good point. I mean

1 it's, it's something that could certainly be stated to  
2 clarify so that we aren't delving into that too deep,  
3 because there's so many different standards that you have to  
4 work with. It's like phytosanitary certificates and issues,  
5 it's going to be a different crop, and it's going to be a  
6 different level that you're going to have to meet. So, same  
7 in general, I think can probably state some things.

8           And when it comes to an issue about trying to  
9 draft a guidance document that's going to tell farmers how  
10 to do a farmer-to-farmer conversation, I guess I personally  
11 didn't envision that, because that would be a bit too  
12 prescriptive. You're right, it is very diverse. There's a  
13 lot of diversity out there. I think overall just mentioning  
14 some issues gets them thinking about what's in their  
15 backyard, what's the climate, what's the soil types, what  
16 are the conditions that exist. Those are going to help you  
17 start to manage and think about what is it we can do.

18           MR. REDDING: Yes, I've thought about this going  
19 up and down the road. If we borrow the MP3 model, I mean,  
20 what I really like about that is the level of engagement by  
21 a pretty diverse group of people. Right? And some of those  
22 are, are sort of what I call core, and others are, have a  
23 secondary role to play, you know, either in, either in their  
24 own habits and/or just sort of conservation management  
25 specific to, to the MP3. But there's a, there's a

1 recognition that there's a pretty broad group of  
2 stakeholders in that conversation. Right?

3           So if I borrow that for this, I mean, I really  
4 think this is much the same in that you really want a lot of  
5 people to recognize they actually have a responsibility.  
6 And that maybe at the retail level, it may be extended sort  
7 of business, supply chain, Chuck, somewhere. But there's a  
8 lot of people. And I guess my point, and then there's going  
9 to be at the farm, at the interface, that that will be a, a  
10 farm-to-farm, farmer-to-farmer, right, that's consistent  
11 with our charge. But I think positioning the, the report,  
12 is to also acknowledge that that is key, and that's  
13 consistent with the charge.

14           But there's also some things that we would expect  
15 the larger Ag community going back to our draft and the  
16 context of our report that there's really a pretty broad  
17 recognition that multiple stakeholders have responsibilities  
18 around coexistence, right? So, I'm just sort of laying that  
19 out as a narrative to say does that sound right, right, that  
20 you've got an umbrella piece and you've got a component  
21 that's going to be to the charge, the farmer-to-farmer. And  
22 while we can't prescribe that, there probably are some core  
23 elements that are consistent, context of what it is and the  
24 communication principles, how to engage maybe.

25           So, I'm just trying to process what I've heard the

1 last sort of half-hour or so to say as we approach the  
2 report, and approach the framing, to acknowledge that we  
3 can't tell people how to talk or respect each other, but we  
4 can certainly guide that. Right? And we can lay forth sort  
5 of an expectation by way of what we put in the guidance  
6 document.

7 Does that sound right? Let's do Mary-Howell, and  
8 then Chuck.

9 MS. MARTENS: We have six months to develop some  
10 product out of the amount of time that we have invested  
11 here. To then not produce a product seems like kind of a  
12 waste of money, and our time. I think I would be all for  
13 allowing, encouraging Russell and Michael to develop a  
14 guidance document, and then allow all of us to look at this  
15 as a filter for the nine crops that are currently on the  
16 market that have counterparts that are GE. And then ask  
17 ourselves, is this too prescriptive.

18 Because I think we can't just say in a general  
19 term it's going to be too prescriptive or not enough until  
20 we have something to use as a lens, and then use that to  
21 evaluate corn grown in upstate New York versus corn grown in  
22 Iowa versus corn grown in Oregon, and, and then say is this  
23 appropriate. Do the same for soybeans, do the same for  
24 cotton and canola. Certainly some things like papaya, it's  
25 going to be a little bit, not quite pertinent. But we've

1 got, we've got to have a product to be able to look at as a  
2 lens before we can describe whether it's too prescriptive or  
3 not sufficiently prescriptive.

4 MR. REDDING: All right, Chuck, and then Angela.

5 MR. BENBROOK: I guess the, the dimension of the  
6 coexistence challenge that I, I keep trying to bring up and  
7 I, I just, it's, it's, it doesn't seem to be sticking in any  
8 way. And maybe I'm just not being clear. So let me give an  
9 example. I believe that there is a new transgenic corn  
10 trait that's been approved, and it will be coming onto the  
11 market very soon. I'm, Leon will pick up which one I'm  
12 talking about. I believe it alters the way that pigs  
13 metabolize the phosphorous in the corn. And the approval is  
14 only as an animal feed, not as a human food. And the  
15 stewardship agreements for farmers purchasing the seed are  
16 very restrictive in that the feed has to be grown on the  
17 farm and fed to the pigs on the farm, and blah, blah, blah.

18 So it's, there's a whole lot going on with this  
19 particular new trait that could have, if everything works  
20 out, it could have some real benefits for water quality, et  
21 cetera, et cetera. But, it's also got all sorts of  
22 potential problems from past experiences. So I, I think a  
23 part of the coexistence challenge involves how a technology  
24 like that can be responsibly rolled out, and, and used in a  
25 way that, that doesn't lead to trade disruption with China

1 and panic in the street if somebody picks up the gene in a,  
2 in a corn tortilla. So, I, I hope that we have something to  
3 say about that, in addition to this farmer-to-farmer, you  
4 know, communication that has to happen about gene flow.

5 But the, the issue that, that I find very, you  
6 know, very sort of troubling and, and challenging is that  
7 the coexistence challenge is, is rapidly changing as we  
8 speak. And I, and, you know, I agree with Mary-Howell. I  
9 hope our report is actually relevant to the emerging  
10 challenges as well. So, you know, I, I, perhaps that helps  
11 people understand where I've been, been coming from.

12 MR. REDDING: Angela, and then Michael.

13 MS. OLSEN: So I agree with Mary-Howell in that,  
14 you know, after all of this work and these discussions, I  
15 think we can produce a work product. I think we want to  
16 produce a work product. I think the folks around the table  
17 want to produce a work product. And I go back to the  
18 document that Doug had circulated on the MP3 plan and some  
19 of those broad categories. I don't think, you know, is it  
20 necessarily crops that have GE counterparts, I think it's  
21 any IP production. And I think all of the things that we've  
22 been talking about are IP production.

23 And, and a lot of these topics are ones that are  
24 relevant. We talked about how do you bring farmers  
25 together? Is it just one topic, or is a variety of topics

1 that may be important to them on their farms, in their  
2 particular locality. It won't be the same in every state.  
3 It won't be the same even within a particular state. So, I  
4 still believe that we, we can, Russell and Michael, I think  
5 with your, you know, very good, even-handed drafting, I  
6 think that we can produce a work product that will have  
7 enough in it that's a framework. It can't be prescriptive  
8 because there isn't one-size-fits-all.

9           But again, I think it's for IP, which is what  
10 we've been talking about. And I think it's those -- I'm  
11 staring at his because he has the page open. But, you know,  
12 some of these, like pathogens and soil and, you know, just  
13 some of these high-level topics that are really going to be  
14 relevant to, to farmers. But I recognize what Mary-Howell  
15 said. We do have a limited period of time, so. Yeah.

16           MS. ROGERS: So you guys think I haven't been  
17 paying attention. So, one of the questions that I have, so  
18 I look at what the guidance document is, and then I look at  
19 the different conversations about that, and so I hear the  
20 two different conversations have to be in this same  
21 document. And one of them is effectively Leon's idea about  
22 a case study, you know, question, that there has to be a  
23 real application for what's in there or it's just general  
24 talking. All right, so maybe one way of looking at it,  
25 unless this is the teacher in me going back, is you have the



1 guidance, and then you have an inset box that says, you  
2 know, consider the case of this new corn product. What  
3 considerations would go in there? It doesn't necessarily  
4 have to provide the solution to that. It just has to  
5 present the real-world example of why this guidance document  
6 would then translate, you know, into decision-making.  
7 Right? So, there's no flowchart, there's no nothing that  
8 becomes prescriptive. But it's just a good example of we  
9 said this because this real world situation exists, and  
10 these are considerations that apply to that. So, you know,  
11 just a thought.

12 MR. SCHECHTMAN: I wanted to address a couple of  
13 things. First, Chuck, to your point about crops with  
14 specialty uses. I think that was something that Lynn  
15 pointed out in his outline for the guidance document. And  
16 I'm not sure exactly where it will go in the report, but it  
17 clearly is a significant issue that, that will need to be  
18 there.

19 Secondly, I wanted to respond specifically to the  
20 question about timing and, and our thoughts about that. I  
21 think our intent, we'll see if we can, if we can meet it, is  
22 that we would like to have a report in the Secretary's hands  
23 before Election Day.

24 MR. BENBROOK: Before the election?

25 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Before Election Day.

1 MS. MARTENS: Why not?

2 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Is what, yeah, what we would like  
3 is for September to be providing you a report, or excuse me,  
4 the September-slash-October meeting, providing you a report  
5 that you would discuss that we would then amend based on the  
6 discussions that we would then send out. And then shortly  
7 thereafter, send out the folks for concurrence, signing  
8 statements, et cetera. What -- and that's a very tough,  
9 that will be a tough thing to do. I had originally thought,  
10 in thinking about putting this report together, well, at  
11 least it's going to be a lot shorter than our last one. But  
12 as we add more layers to the onion, it gets a little bit  
13 longer. But we're still, still very hopeful.

14 What I would, what I would like us to be able to  
15 provide for you for the next meeting, we will, we will have  
16 more quickly provided a draft, revised draft framework for  
17 the guidance. And I hope that that will get fleshed out in  
18 discussions with the guidance workgroup. And by the next  
19 meeting, there is a rather further-along guidance piece that  
20 can be discussed at the meeting. And I would also hope that  
21 by the next meeting there is a, an outline for the report.  
22 And that may have more in it, including perhaps a draft  
23 version of what this new model will look like, as well as  
24 sort of an outline containing what we think the, the kind of  
25 points that might be, might need to be addressed but not

1 actually how they'll be addressed, necessarily unless we're  
2 really productive by the next meeting.

3 MR. BENBROOK: When is the next meeting?

4 MR. SCHECHTMAN: The next meeting is June 12th,  
5 13th, 13th, 14th, 14th, 15th.

6 MR. BENBROOK: Yeah, June 13, 14, Monday, Tuesday.  
7 Yeah.

8 MR. SCHECHTMAN: So that will be actually quite a  
9 lot to do between now and then. I'm, I'm going to be --

10 MR. BUSHUE: What were those dates again?

11 MR. BENBROOK: June 13, 14, Monday Tuesday.

12 MR. BUSHUE: Okay.

13 MR. SCHECHTMAN: That's, that's the hope.

14 MR. REDDING: Leon, then Barry.

15 MR. CORZINE: Just a point, as you draft this,  
16 Charles brings up a good point. You know, if, you know,  
17 we're talking about corn, a product that was approved for  
18 only feed use didn't work out very well last time. And so  
19 as you draft this, it might be worth a look at corn growers'  
20 policy. I could help you with that because we got really  
21 specific with some things with those limited use products  
22 and how we've worked with the industry to try to do  
23 containment type systems. Just a thought on that, because  
24 that is a very important one. And there could be more of  
25 those as they come along.

1           MR. SCHECHTMAN: I'll just note that I don't think  
2 that's a product that has been approved by USDA as of yet.

3           MR. CORZINE: No. Right.

4           MR. REDDING: Barry.

5           MR. BUSHUE: I just want to know if we're going to  
6 have a discussion about October versus September, or are you  
7 just going to make a call based on the calendar?

8           MR. SCHECHTMAN: What we have to look, we have not  
9 looked through all of those yet. And we haven't seen what  
10 days meeting rooms are available. If there are any days in  
11 October that work, I certainly have heard from everyone --  
12 has anyone not passed in their schedule yet? Lynn?

13          MR. CLARKSON: Yes, I have it.

14          MR. SCHECHTMAN: Please, please do so. If you  
15 can't, if you can't do it today, by the end of the week for  
16 sure.

17          MR. CLARKSON: Sure.

18          MR. SCHECHTMAN: We understand the difficulty that  
19 folks have on this. We want to, again, accommodate the most  
20 folks we can. I will say, it is difficult to get meeting  
21 space that's large enough that we can use. This is, this, I  
22 like this meeting space, obviously. There's one we, it is a  
23 little more comfortable than this one, if we can get it.  
24 This has worked this meeting. We'll see what, what is  
25 available for, for the next meeting. And if, if it turns

1 out that October is worse than September, we will keep the  
2 September dates. But I need to look through it all and see  
3 what, see what else we can get. And of course meeting the  
4 November time frame is a little easier with the September  
5 date, but we'll do what we can. Other --

6 MR. REDDING: Chuck.

7 MR. BENBROOK: Again, kind of on the process. You  
8 know, given, given that the goal is to have a finished  
9 report delivered to the Secretary by Election Day, it would  
10 seem to me that we need at least some preliminary drafts of  
11 the, the difficult issues for the next meeting to talk  
12 about. Not, not to see the first written attempt to resolve  
13 the difficult issues perhaps two weeks before we have to put  
14 a final report to bed.

15 And the other, the other thought I have, I, it  
16 might be useful for everyone on the committee to send an  
17 email to you and the Chairman in the next month with sort of  
18 the, the things that we, we are, are going to argue very  
19 strongly to be reflected in the report. You could almost  
20 think it as a first draft of our minority reports if things  
21 don't get in. Because I'm not so sure, you know, whether a  
22 lot of people might agree with some of the things that I, I  
23 put in. But I just, at the rate we're going with two more  
24 meetings, we're just not going to have time to flesh a lot  
25 of that out. So it might be, it might be useful to the

1 process if those of us that, that, you know, feel that they,  
2 you know, want to get some additional information reflected  
3 in the report, if we put it on the table early so people can  
4 react to it, it might actually get into the report and make  
5 it not necessary to have so many minority reports.

6 MR. REDDING: Alan, then Angela.

7 MR. KEMPER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
8 appreciate over the last two days to have the opportunity.  
9 I'm going to slip out. The cooperation, collaboration, and  
10 consideration of this group is dynamic. This group has  
11 grown in our mannerisms, and I, including myself, so to a  
12 point where it's actually super enjoyable to do this hard  
13 task with that. Michael, I would suggest to you, though, if  
14 we cannot deliver a document to the Secretary by, by  
15 Election Day, we shouldn't be delivering anything really.  
16 Because I think it's only fair to Secretary Vilsack to give  
17 him an opportunity in the last few days to look at it and do  
18 what he wants with it. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 MR. REDDING: Safe travels. Thank you. Angela.

20 MS. OLSEN: Mine is just a, it's a process  
21 comment. I appreciate Chuck's views on, you know, sending  
22 in. I think everybody at the table, though, has had the  
23 opportunity to express what is important to them. I think  
24 Michael and Russell did a fantastic job last time. I think  
25 Lynn Clarkson on one call said well I didn't think we agreed

1 on anything until the report came out last time. And it's  
2 true. I mean, I think they did a, just a fantastic job  
3 really keeping it neutral, keeping it productive, and  
4 producing a good work product.

5           So, I think they've heard the views expressed at  
6 the table during this meeting and the last meeting. And so  
7 I think we should give them a shot at producing a report,  
8 you know, as opposed to us pinging them all with, you know,  
9 additional bullet points, again, just my, my point of view.  
10 I have full faith they're going to do a really nice job on  
11 this. But, Michael and Russell, if you think differently,  
12 and if that exercise would be helpful to you to get emails  
13 from everybody, I'd be happy to send an email. But I, I  
14 think you've heard the various discussion points at this  
15 meeting.

16           MR. REDDING: Yeah. I guess just, just one  
17 comment. And this is, I mean we, we certainly feel the  
18 pressure, right, of both time and content, and not easy to  
19 do. And I certainly look, look to Michael to, you know, to  
20 help sort of do that front-end processing. But just  
21 listening to a lot of the conversation, I think it's  
22 important here that, particularly around this guidance  
23 document that, that, that means a lot of different things to  
24 different people. And having some clarity around what, what  
25 you believe, walking away from here, what a guidance

1 document, a meaningful guidance document as a final word  
2 from this AC21 to the Secretary would look like would  
3 actually be very helpful.

4 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Yeah. I think it's more than the  
5 guidance document. I mean, there's other, there's other  
6 pieces to it.

7 MR. REDDING: Yeah. I just take that as an  
8 example.

9 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Yeah, okay.

10 MR. REDDING: To say, as I listen to it even, even  
11 this afternoon there are, there are variants of what that  
12 guidance document should look like and what that could,  
13 could be, what would be useful guidance to the agricultural  
14 community. So, having some feedback just on that point,  
15 but, but others, right, some reflections on this meeting and  
16 what the final report should look like, I see no harm in  
17 that. Right? Some feedback from committee members is  
18 actually pretty helpful so we can look at it and pick  
19 through it and decide, you know, maybe we've got that in the  
20 agenda, and maybe that informs the outline. Right? Those  
21 kind of things are very helpful. I, I wouldn't view that at  
22 all myself as a waste of time or, you know, and  
23 overreaching, I think, in committee responsibilities.

24 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Yeah. Yeah, I would just add,  
25 you know, we encourage comments from members at any time on



1 stuff that's important to you for the report. I don't  
2 necessarily want to say send us your comments. But we  
3 welcome them at all times. We chose, you were chosen on the  
4 committee because the Secretary thought you had something  
5 important to say.

6 MR. REDDING: Um-hmm.

7 MR. SCHECHTMAN: So, we want to have that  
8 information. As to the point of at the next meeting having  
9 descriptions of the difficult issues in text, I'm not sure  
10 we can do that. But I certainly would strive to get you  
11 more clarity on that shortly after the next meeting so that  
12 it's not two weeks before. I mean, I think, I think, you  
13 know, we'll, we'll be working at full speed trying to do  
14 this. And I don't want to, to, to, the committee to work to  
15 founder on folks having different views of what's most  
16 important and not in what I would call context setting,  
17 important context setting, but nonetheless context setting.  
18 And we need to figure out how to have all of those things in  
19 there.

20 Because, some of these subjects are very important  
21 to biotechnology and to the future of relations between  
22 farmers, but they're not specifically to the language of the  
23 charge. So we need to figure out how to capture those  
24 things in a way that raises them as issues but does not  
25 distract us from getting the report out, in my view.

1 MR. REDDING: Mary-Howell.

2 MS. MARTENS: We need to have some reality checks  
3 built into our process before we release a final document.  
4 And what I would really like to see in June when we come is  
5 to have somebody or some member or some agency provide four  
6 or five case studies of where coexistence, where AP, AP  
7 presence has caused market loss. And then we can look at  
8 that through this, through again, through the lens of this  
9 document of whether, how, how this could have been an  
10 avoidable situation. Is this something that the kinds of,  
11 the kinds of guidance that we're putting together could have  
12 made a difference to, to change anything? We, we really, we  
13 really need a little bit more reality check in our whole  
14 process of what, what is playing out on the ground, where  
15 there is market loss, where is, there is issues, and perhaps  
16 Betsy can help us -- or, no, Cathy, Cathy Greene said that  
17 there was some, some data that she'd gotten in about where  
18 there'd been market loss.

19 You know, it would just, it would just be really  
20 helpful to use real-life case studies to look at our  
21 document as we get toward completion.

22 MR. REDDING: Yeah, Greg.

23 MR. JAFFE: So my suggestion was, it sounds like  
24 we've gotten rid of one of the subgroups, the venues and  
25 conveners one. So we're down to two, one option for getting

1 more work done between us is, is to have another, I mean,  
2 anybody can come to any subgroup anyway. Adding more people  
3 officially to a subgroup I don't think, you know, does much  
4 because they could come anyway.

5           The question is, for maybe some of these more  
6 difficult issues, whether it's seed purity or whether it's  
7 my issue about, you know, recommendations of the, on the  
8 federal level or things like that. Maybe having some more  
9 ad hoc groups, it might only mean one conference call, a  
10 couple of hours, but it would then give Russell and Michael,  
11 both of you, more of, more food for thought for what would  
12 be written on some of those sections.

13           So, my suggestion is either having one or two  
14 other subgroups or just having some subject-matter  
15 conference calls between now and then where whoever wants to  
16 participate can participate for two hours and hash out a  
17 couple of these, I don't know if they're difficult issues or  
18 not difficult issues, but other things that are key issues  
19 that need to start going into the outlines. And maybe that  
20 would just help with the outlines.

21           While we're all working on the manual, while we're  
22 working on the guidance and working on the models, we can do  
23 some of those other things to get some of these other issues  
24 more set so there would be more, a more framed discussed in  
25 June, and we wouldn't just be waiting until September,

1 October to do that. So that's my suggestion.

2 MR. REDDING: Thoughts about that?

3 MR. BENBROOK: I can --

4 MS. OLSEN: Oh, well --

5 MR. REDDING: So --

6 MR. BENBROOK: Are you up? Okay.

7 MS. OLSEN: Yeah. I had a, right, I was going to  
8 respond to, to Greg. One thing I didn't want to lose is  
9 Greg's point about part of our charge was just the federal  
10 government and how, how USDA might help support these  
11 programs. We've heard a lot from Doug on this point as  
12 well. We heard some high-level thoughts. It's one I feel  
13 that we haven't fleshed out as a committee yet, though, is  
14 there, are there additional -- maybe there isn't anything  
15 more, but is, are there additional things that maybe the  
16 federal government could do to help support these programs.

17 We haven't had a lot of opportunity around the  
18 table to talk about it. I haven't put a lot of thought into  
19 it either. But I don't want to lose sight of, of Greg's  
20 point that he made on that. Maybe that's something that  
21 this third group could do. Maybe it's one call. But that  
22 is another part of our charge, and, and I think that could  
23 be productive, particularly if that's expected in our  
24 report.

25

1 MR. JAFFE: The last line of the charge.

2 MS. OLSEN: Yeah, exactly. Exactly.

3 MR. BENBROOK: We started, when we started out,  
4 Michael, in one of our early meetings, we met the folks  
5 starting the, the new Seed Committee, the Germplasm  
6 Committee. Correct? I would appreciate, and I think some  
7 other members who are interested in the seed issue, some  
8 kind of a, if you, if you could send us an email about where  
9 we could find out what they've done in the last two or three  
10 years, that would be helpful.

11 One of the things that the federal government does  
12 is it does testing, and it does monitoring. The federal --  
13 we could ask the Agricultural Marketing Service, or ARS to  
14 do a periodic survey of seed purity and establish some  
15 baselines of, of AP. You know, they test for bacteria in  
16 food and pesticides in water, and lots of things and lots of  
17 things. Why couldn't they start to conduct an annual survey  
18 of AP in conventional seed, especially in the, in the years  
19 following approval of the first transgenic trait. Wouldn't  
20 it be nice data if we had that for alfalfa? So, that is  
21 something we, we could suggest that would be a helpful and  
22 legitimate federal role.

23 And then, back to another process question. I  
24 recall in the early-going of AC21 that I sent either you,  
25 Mr. Chairman, or Michael an email, and then you

1 automatically forwarded it to everybody. Do I remember  
2 that, if we send you a communication, we're supposed to cc  
3 everybody on the committee? Do I remember that correctly?

4 MR. SCHECHTMAN: I mean, certainly I don't, if we,  
5 if we ask you a question about your schedule or your  
6 availability, I don't want that to go to everyone. But I  
7 think for subjects that are, you know, intended to be  
8 relevant to the discussion, it's probably a good thing that  
9 everyone sees them.

10 MR. BENBROOK: Okay. I mean, I agree with that.  
11 But, you know, I just, I think everybody should understand  
12 that if we have a, something substantive to say to, to  
13 either of you, it goes to the whole committee. And then we,  
14 we all know that's the rules of the road.

15 MR. REDDING: Okay. Greg, did you have a comment?

16 MR. JAFFE: Oh, no. I'm sorry.

17 MR. REDDING: Okay.

18 MR. SCHECHTMAN: I'll just say something to the  
19 question of the USDA doing, doing testing. I think that is  
20 something that I'm not sure we have the authority to do.  
21 But, I mean, we can't just go and test proprietary stuff, I  
22 don't think. But this, you know, as a general markets  
23 creed. I don't, but I, but I don't know.

24 MR. BENBROOK: You might be surprised how much  
25 authority you have for, by the Secretary.

1 MS. MARTENS: But they come out and pull seed  
2 samples at my place all the time, you know, it's Ag and  
3 Markets. They're testing for germ and purity. Why not run  
4 a GMO test on it? It would be really easy to do.

5 MR. REDDING: Leon and David, safe travels. Thank  
6 you.

7 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Safe travels. Thank you both.

8 MR. REDDING: Okay. We also need to know before  
9 we -- oh, sorry. Barry.

10 MR. BUSHUE: I just, maybe I got lost in this  
11 conversation. I don't see it as USDA's --

12 COURT REPORTER: Microphone, please.

13 MR. BUSHUE: I don't see it as USDA's  
14 responsibility to be expending taxpayers' dollars on tests  
15 that benefit the market and should be market-driven as  
16 opposed to government-driven.

17 MR. REDDING: Yeah. Any final comments for the  
18 good of the order before we wrap up? I think I have a  
19 pretty good sense of what we need to do. Yeah, I'm not sure  
20 how it all comes together, but, but we all understand the  
21 time line and I think our charge from the Secretary. And  
22 we'll certainly make a good faith effort to pull this  
23 together and inform the discussion and, you know, have it  
24 really at the end of the day be something meaningful that,  
25 that we want to deliver. So, that's our overarching charge,

1 right? So, I would just say to all, as you think about this  
2 issue and, and as you're driving, working, just processing,  
3 you know, think about this conversation of the last couple  
4 of days and, and what you would like to see.

5           Input I think just is accepted, just send us a  
6 note, thoughts, reflections, as you travel back, just to  
7 make sure that we've got a good list of things that you want  
8 to make sure we consider and that we come back to you in  
9 June with having those points sort of captured somewhere.  
10 Okay? It may not be built out as much as you'd like, but at  
11 least making sure the points are on, on paper. We would  
12 appreciate that. Okay? Any final word?

13           MR. SCHECHTMAN: Yeah. I'll just, I will just say  
14 that I thought that the spirit of working together and  
15 cooperation today was, was really strong. And I leave this  
16 meeting scared by the amount of work we have to do, but  
17 really encouraged that it's possible, and having a much  
18 better sense of direction of where, of what it is we need to  
19 do and where we need to go, and what the ideas and thoughts  
20 and critical issues of the members around the table are.  
21 So, for that I thank you all very much.

22           MR. REDDING: End where we began with a simple  
23 thank you. Appreciate the input. Good work. Safe travels  
24 back. Have a safe spring, productive spring, and we'll see  
25 you in June. Okay? Thank you.



1                   (Whereupon, at 2:39 p.m., the meeting was  
2 adjourned.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25                   Digitally signed by Mary Rettig

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

ELECTRONIC CERTIFICATE

DEPOSITION SERVICES, INC., hereby certifies that the attached pages represent an accurate transcript of the electronic sound recording of the proceedings before the United States Department of Agriculture:

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON BIOTECHNOLOGY  
AND 21ST CENTURY AGRICULTURE

By:



---

Mary Rettig, Transcriber