

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
June 14, 2016, commencing at 9:07 a.m. at 1331 F Street NW,
Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20004.

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:

Alan Kemper

Josette Lewis

David Johnson

Charles Benbrook

Angela Olsen

Laura Batcha

Leon Corzine

Lynn Clarkson

Melissa Hughes

Jerome Slocum

Keith Kisling

Paul Anderson

Latresia Wilson

Barry Bushue

Other USDA Participants:

Douglas McKalip, Senior Advisor, Office of the Secretary

Betsy Rakola, Organic Policy Advisor, Agricultural Marketing Service

P R O C E E D I N G

1
2 MR. REDDING: Okay. Good morning, everybody.
3 Again, thank you very much for serving on AC21, very much
4 appreciate the continued work. As we noted yesterday, sort
5 of we're in the final leg of this relay of trying to finish
6 up the new charge and, as we talked about, time line, which
7 we'll revisit here today a little bit, but again, just a
8 note of thanks. I also want to say thanks to, to Michael, a
9 very nice evening, hospitality, and a new adventure but
10 particularly enjoyed the chance to catch up with members of
11 the committee and visit a little bit.

12 I thought we had, you know, a very good discussion
13 yesterday on the draft guidance document, the models
14 document, and that short list of the difficult issues. I
15 feel pretty comfortable, and my sense is that most around
16 the table are comfortable. We can certainly talk about
17 these a little more, but just the takeaway yesterday, I
18 think we were getting to the point there in the afternoon
19 where there was an acknowledgment of sort of the content,
20 where we had some identified gaps but also some support for
21 what was on the table and before you in terms of the draft
22 documents, so I appreciate that. We can certainly revisit
23 that today.

24 We do, we do need to look at, you know, the
25 outline, revised outline. I know Michael has circulated

1 that. So hopefully you have a copy in front of you. I want
2 to take a look at particularly the, the introduction and
3 make sure it's clear to the farm community the purpose of
4 the report and the resource documents, also need to talk
5 about recommendations. We had mentioned that yesterday but
6 want to make sure that we can capture -- are capturing
7 recommendations for the Secretary.

8 End goal, what we produce, we want to make sure
9 it's viewed as advancing the conversation on coexistence and
10 advancing agriculture. I mean, I always come back to that
11 and say, are we advancing those conversations, not simply
12 cataloging them and noting them, but advancing them? So I
13 want to make sure that our work today and certainly the
14 report to follow, draft reports to follow will live true to
15 that, I think, the expectation from the Secretary, but
16 certainly, everybody here at the table wants to do that as
17 well.

18 The -- went back and I looked at the November 2012
19 report. You know, there were a lot of conversations
20 yesterday about agriculture and the changes, and some of
21 that is in the framing of our introduction, but I went back
22 and read the, you know, the first eight pages of the
23 November 12th document. It was actually pretty helpful
24 because some of those foundational concerns and
25 acknowledgments that we had identified in the first report

1 are, of course, you know, themes of this, of this report and
2 then the task that's before us. So it was helpful to look
3 at that again.

4 It is also worth noting, you know, the very
5 positive future that we see for production agriculture.
6 Right? This is not, again, simply looking at the
7 complications and, you know, how, how difficult it is -- by,
8 by way of example, yesterday of Oregon. I mean, there are
9 certainly issues out there but, overall, very positive about
10 American agriculture.

11 The -- as we look at the, sort of the next step, I
12 think, just for all of us to be mindful that this document,
13 it will be important to read this one in tandem with the
14 November 2012. And, you know, I keep -- it's just not a
15 stand-alone; it's simply another installment on our work but
16 important to sort of look back. And I think just in the
17 outline, Michael, I see sort of those, sort of, plans to
18 sort of reach back, at least make reference to, you know,
19 our original report and the work. So that is good, as well,
20 and that whatever we produce, I think, just making sure it's
21 both advancing the issue of coexistence but, again, as we
22 talked about briefly yesterday, just raising this awareness
23 of the importance of coexistence, you know, what we've got
24 to do, you know, between production methods and respecting
25 each of those.

1 We also have to make sure that we're building the
2 confidence of the farm community to respond to coexistence,
3 to engage in it, talk about it, be comfortable talking about
4 the technologies that they've adopted, the practices that
5 they've adopted, being able to translate that for both the
6 benefit of neighbor but also the benefit of consumer -- and
7 if there's one thing I've learned in the last years of being
8 Secretary, there is no more credible source about food and
9 agriculture than the person who's growing it -- and making
10 sure that in this conversation, where there are questions
11 about what we're doing and how we're doing it, we've adopted
12 those, they are good practice and we respect it, but I think
13 in this conversation it's being able to step one, one step
14 beyond that and make sure that we're also building the
15 confidence of those who are in production ag to both talk
16 about what they're doing and feel very confident about what
17 they're doing, and that needs to be a part of whatever this
18 mix of conversation that we're going to have or expected to
19 have. Right? Does that make sense?

20 I just worry a little bit about you can make a
21 long list of conveners and all of that; at the end of the
22 day, the person who's adopted the technology and is doing it
23 and earning a living from it is really the most credible
24 source to talk about what it is that they're doing and why
25 they're doing it. I think that's part of what we have to

1 look at here, going forward.

2 So, anyhow, so with that, maybe I'll ask Michael
3 just for a quick recap, and then we can get some
4 observations and feedback from you as well, just overnight
5 thoughts. We were expecting Mary-Howell today. I have not
6 seen her yet, so hopefully she will be here.

7 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Good morning, everyone. Let me
8 first note for you that there are two new documents in case
9 you didn't get them on the desk. One is a document that
10 Chuck alluded to yesterday regarding measures that USDA had
11 announced; this is a couple of years ago. At the same time
12 as EPA announced its, its policy to address
13 herbicide-resistant weeds, USDA announced some complementary
14 steps that we were taking to, to help in that process. And
15 second, there is a revised version of the draft Notional
16 Outline for, for the report, just sort of listing how the
17 pieces, the main topics would be rearranged based on my
18 hearing of what folks had said yesterday. So those two
19 documents are there.

20 In terms of what we talked about yesterday, a
21 brief recap -- you heard one recap of the morning when
22 Secretary Redding arrived yesterday; I'll make that part
23 shorter for now -- again, we had updates on the regulatory
24 developments at APHIS, on the efforts to update the
25 coordinated framework, and on a report that came out from

1 the National Academy of Sciences a couple of weeks -- a few
2 weeks ago. The subgroups gave reports on their efforts, and
3 they were all very helpful, and their work was very well
4 received and useful in our drafting process.

5 We talked about -- we talked in detail about two,
6 the two stand-alone pieces, so to speak, the guidance
7 document, and there was quite -- there were a few minor
8 changes to the guidance document, and then there was one
9 issue that was not entirely resolved which was an issue
10 about the subject of seed and the term characteristics that
11 was in there. So we sort of need to, to quickly revisit
12 that issue and see if we can, if we can put that topic to
13 bed.

14 On the Local Coexistence draft, there was some
15 rearrangements that were suggested in some of the sections
16 and a few small modifications, but basically, people were
17 pretty comfortable with where that is. It'll get, it'll get
18 a little more polished. It was a, it was a quick draft, and
19 we will do a little bit more work on checking some of the
20 information around some of the potential funding topics that
21 either were just alluded to or were not alluded to because
22 we weren't sure about them. So there'll be a little bit of
23 fussing with that, but that document is pretty -- is, is
24 further along than I had thought it might be at this point.
25 So, so that is good.

1 We talked about the outline, and in the outline
2 there was, there was some suggested rearrangements of
3 pieces, and you have the new version of that and that's
4 something we need to check back with you to see that we
5 captured what, what members' desires were for, for how the
6 report should be structured. We have, as yet, as our chair
7 indicated, to talk further about the piece on Complex Issues
8 as well as what recommendations will be, and we have the
9 revised time line. So I think that's where, I think that's
10 where we are and we can go on.

11 MR. REDDING: Great. Yeah, thank you. Let's,
12 let's open it up. I mean, observations from day one,
13 thoughts? Keith, you want to lead off? Thank you.

14 MR. KISLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Keith Kisling.
15 Off the record.

16 (Discussion off the record.)

17 MR. KISLING: Back on the record. Mr. Chairman, I
18 sat here yesterday and watched the discussion that we had,
19 and I, you know, in my situation I don't raise organic and I
20 don't raise GMOs. So I kind of don't have a dog in this
21 fight other than to, to be sure that for the wheat people we
22 don't do something that later on is going to affect us, but
23 I didn't see anything in the discussion yesterday that
24 would, that would make me wonder if we have some issue among
25 ourselves that we can't get together on today.

1 And I think what happens and as we went through
2 the day yesterday, it looked like we got into the weeds so
3 deep, with wording and trying to rearrange things, that it
4 slowed the whole process down a lot and we lost our focus.
5 And our focus is that we develop a joint coexistence plan at
6 the state or local level and, if so, what can the federal
7 government do to assist in that process, and we don't want
8 to get away from that, and I think the more we lug ourselves
9 down on the small issues it's going to happen.

10 So I would suggest to the committee today that as
11 you do start to discuss, its issues that you have circled
12 that we can discuss and decide on -- we've all been together
13 now a lot of years, and we ought to be able to do that --
14 discuss those issues that are pertinent to the charge of the
15 Secretary and let's move forward. Let's get out of here by
16 noon.

17 MR. REDDING: Thank you. Other comments, thoughts
18 of day one? Angela.

19 MS. OLSEN: I went back last night and looked at
20 the charge again, and I think Keith is right. I went back
21 and looked at the charge, you know, because I think that
22 there are a lot of topics we're all very passionate about,
23 we're interested in; it's an interesting topic, so we want
24 to talk about it. And I went back and looked at our charge,
25 and it seems to me that, you know, we don't want to lose our

1 focus on what the Secretary is asking us to do, and we put
2 together two very good documents that I think we can all be
3 proud of, which are the guidance document but then, also, I
4 don't know, I can't recall the official name, but the Doug
5 Goehring document with Michael's edits, with Michael's good
6 additions, and I think it's a -- again, those are two
7 documents that we can, we can all get around, and to me that
8 seems to be our report.

9 There needs to be initial framing up front about
10 what the Secretary asked us to do, what this report is, what
11 it isn't. We need to refer back to our November 2012
12 report, but it seems that those are the two work products.
13 And, if that is the bulk of our report, then the next phase
14 would be advising the Secretary on what our recommendations
15 would be to use that report, how does he implement it, does
16 he send a letter, who does he send it to, you know, and
17 having that discussion. And to me that really seems to
18 answer the charge, and it was helpful for me to go back and
19 look at our charge last evening. So interested in others'
20 thoughts.

21 There's a lot of things we can say about
22 agriculture. I know we're all very interested in the topic.
23 There's a lot of, lot of different tangents we can go on.
24 People have the opportunity in their comments to talk about
25 things that they feel, you know, need to be a part of the

1 report as well, but to me -- you know, originally I was
2 thinking those would be two final, you know, almost annexes,
3 you know, like here's a rip-off and, you know, that farmers
4 could take, but the more I went back and looked at the
5 documents and the charge, the more to me it seems that that
6 is our report.

7 So interested in what others think, as well, and
8 very interested, Russell, with your comments about, you
9 know, nobody's more -- there's no more credible source than
10 the folks that are actually growing the crops. So I'd like
11 to really hear from the growers what they think, as well, on
12 the charge.

13 MR. REDDING: Thank you. Leon.

14 MR. CORZINE: Well, I was reviewing last night
15 too, and I, and I think -- I was really pleased with, with
16 what we, what we had or, as we talked as we left, as far as
17 this new outline. I thought that kind of gets it, and I've
18 been pleased about the, what the charge is because we're
19 finally maybe getting some rubber to hit the road, if you
20 will, or working towards getting some things that actually
21 relate to the farm and where USDA can possibly offer
22 assistance in all the venues that we talked about, but then
23 some of the things we're getting to in this, those things we
24 haven't -- it's too easy for us to lose our focus and get
25 off of that.

1 I think, you know, we were talking about the Seed
2 Purity Issues and the Functional Trait issues. I mean,
3 there's a place for part of that, but I don't -- you know,
4 to keep the document concise so it will be useful, we don't
5 need a page on everything, and if we need to massage a
6 little bit what's in -- we already have those things talked
7 about in the guidance document. So where else would we put
8 them or why do we need, pick your issue, why do we need it
9 listed in every single thing, because, too, if you go back
10 -- and I think everybody in the room was involved in the
11 last document -- and if we need to refer people back to that
12 document, rather than repeat it all again, I think that
13 really was the intent of the Secretary when he gave us this
14 charge, to not -- we don't need to list and go through all
15 that discussion that wasn't an easy discussion. We don't --
16 why do we need to do that again? Why can't we move forward
17 with something that really is going to be useful, and like
18 Keith said, I think we can do that pretty quickly.

19 If we look at this guidance document, in
20 particular, if there are things that you think need added,
21 maybe that's what we talk about. I can see us really
22 getting bogged down in some of the discussion of those -- of
23 this other, I guess we don't call it a document, we call it
24 a parking lot or whatever it is.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The Complex Issues?

1 MR. CORZINE: Yeah, the Complex Issues thing,
2 because they are addressed, to both sides of the table, I
3 would say, in other parts. So that's my thought. I think
4 for use -- for what the real intent is of our charge, we've
5 got to keep this thing concise, or you know, it doesn't
6 matter if it's a farmer or if it's an extension service guy
7 or somebody in the FSA office; they see this thing and start
8 through all this language that if we're going to add, if you
9 don't get beyond what we've tried to do in this outline with
10 an intro, out it goes, and I, as a farmer, will do the same.

11 So thank you. I think you've done a great job of
12 quickly putting together this outline, and I think we stay
13 on that one and it works.

14 MR. REDDING: Okay. Thank you. Alan.

15 MR. KEMPER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Unlike
16 others, I had more to do last night than to read your
17 documents. I actually had a few drinks, a good steak, and
18 enjoyed Washington, D.C. So -- but, but my point is, as
19 just a simple farmer from Indiana, I could probably write
20 this document with two paragraphs, addressing the
21 Secretary's views. I mean, there's a couple key sentences
22 about coexistence and about neighboring farmers working
23 together that sum up what our charge was with that.

24 So I'm having a real hard time with the parking
25 lot document, seeing where it fits in at all. Good

1 executive reports are really brief and concise, and I think
2 we owe that to the Secretary to deliver that. Thank you.

3 MR. REDDING: Thank you. Laura.

4 MS. BATCHA: Laura Batcha. I like where Keith
5 started us off in our comments, and I think for me the most
6 productive use of today -- and I'm not sure about the order
7 -- but I'm most interested in spending some time on the
8 recommendations to the Secretary for what USDA can do to
9 facilitate this process, because I don't think we spent a
10 lot of sort of intentional focus on that conversation. So I
11 think if we did that now, that'll help us move through the
12 rest of our, our time line.

13 I think for me maybe another sweep on the core
14 documents to circle -- to make sure that Michael's got the
15 accurate notes on the circled items that we think we need to
16 see improvement on, just to sort of confirm that.

17 As it relates to the, what's being referred to as
18 the Complex Issues or the parking lot document, whether or
19 not we decide to get bogged down in those discussions today
20 or not, I think I have a different view of the purpose of
21 that document. I don't assume that our recommendation to
22 the Secretary will be that that document get forced out to
23 FSA offices, right, but there's the recommendation to the
24 Secretary and the documents, and then there was what we say
25 you do with them.

1 I think from my perspective one of the purposes of
2 that Complex Issues document from my mind is forging
3 consensus amongst this group so that some of the folks
4 participating don't get left feeling like there are critical
5 issues that were omitted from being included that, that some
6 folks may feel like have a connection to what it is we're
7 doing.

8 So I would encourage us, whether or not we get
9 stuck in that discussion today or not or whether or not we
10 come back to it at the next meeting, that the role of that
11 document might be to help us get to a consensus position and
12 it might be that it's for the Secretary communicating some
13 thoughts from the committee and not necessarily for a
14 handbook for dissemination to farmers or to field agents
15 that work with farmers.

16 MR. REDDING: Good. Thank you. Barry.

17 MR. BUSHUE: I think I disagree with Laura. I'm
18 more inclined to think that we have a very good work
19 product, a deliverable product which will be usable by, by
20 farmers and folks in local communities to be able to address
21 the issues which the Secretary has asked us to address.

22 When I look at the Complex document, or Complex
23 Issues document, what I see is a disproportionate look at a
24 couple of items out of many that we could go on and on and
25 on about, about the challenges and the opportunities

1 provided by any kind of technology, biotech being just one
2 of many. I don't see a lot of purpose in a long
3 dissertation about all the other things that may or may not
4 be included in this. That's not what we were asked to do.
5 As far as, as far as making people feel good about, when
6 they go home, about issues that may or may not be addressed,
7 again, I don't believe that's what the Secretary brought us
8 together to do.

9 And I like the work, the two work documents. I
10 think they're appropriate. We have reached consensus on
11 those, which I think is a good outcome, and the fact that we
12 have consented around all those, those work documents, I
13 think, is a testament to the, to the work of the group and
14 the fact that we're able to, to look at these issues with a
15 clean and transparent eye and come forward.

16 I'm kind of like Alan -- as far as the summary of
17 this, it can be two pages or less: a recognition of the
18 fact the work that the committee did and its recommendations
19 in 2012, a look at what the charge is, a recommendation to
20 the Secretary that he utilizes these two work documents in
21 the way in which the committee has recognized or at least
22 suggested they be utilized. And so from that aspect I, you
23 know, I think that the, I think the large part of our work
24 is generally done.

25 As far as looking back over the two work documents

1 again, I don't have a problem doing that, although I'd hate
2 to readdress them too much because we have ended up in a
3 very good place and, you know, in a group like this, with
4 the challenges and the ideas that we all have, may come
5 unglued. But, you know, I think we're in a good place, and
6 I don't think we need to dwell on much of this too much
7 longer.

8 MR. REDDING: Okay. Thank you. Other comments?
9 Alan.

10 MR. KEMPER: Hopefully, I agree with Laura on this
11 that we need to come back and talk about what USDA is going
12 to be doing and things like that first this morning, because
13 I think we've addressed a lot of the other document. Thank
14 you, Mr. Chair.

15 MR. REDDING: Okay. So why don't we start there.
16 Right? I mean, let's go ahead and just talk about, you
17 know, from your perspective on, you know, what would be the
18 list of recommendations, and then let's use that to inform,
19 you know, the outline, which we want to come back to, the
20 difficult issues that had been noted, and any other, you
21 know, sort of thoughts regarding the guidance or models
22 documents.

23 So when you think about, you know, this report
24 being finalized, what do you see as the short list of
25 recommendations to the Secretary? Josette.

1 MS. LEWIS: Well, I think one of the -- it's one
2 or it's two, I guess, depending on how you think of it --
3 but to really strongly encourage USDA to mainstream the
4 availability of these tools within a very diverse set of
5 programs that reach out to different constituencies for --
6 that USDA interacts with.

7 So I think we grappled a lot, at least I know in
8 our Venues working group, about whether there was money set
9 aside -- we talked a little bit about that yesterday -- that
10 could be tapped in to host these meetings. We talked about
11 the complexity of different factors that farmers are dealing
12 with and the fact that there's also some incentive programs
13 they can tap into that -- none of which are dedicated to
14 coexistence.

15 By the same token, it seems like it was a pretty
16 consistent theme that even if money isn't set aside for
17 coexistence and it isn't earmarked for coexistence, there
18 are a lot of very strong programs within the Department that
19 should be aware of these tools and encouraged to make them
20 available and applied where appropriate, because that's --
21 if we're going to emphasize the local level, that's, I
22 think, where USDA has the most effective opportunity, is at,
23 you know, FSA-run programs or NRCS-run programs or these
24 other things that can be tapped into as part of their
25 overall agenda and really mainstream it within those.

1 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Was that one recommendation or
2 two?

3 MS. LEWIS: I'd give it one.

4 MR. REDDING: Right. And with that, Josette,
5 specific to which, which documents, or you know, are we
6 talking about, you know, the guidance documents, the models,
7 right, or the --

8 MS. LEWIS: Both.

9 MR. REDDING: -- the two primary resources, right?

10 MS. LEWIS: Both.

11 MR. REDDING: Okay. All right. Yeah. Laura.

12 MS. BATCHA: Laura Batcha. So I think I have four
13 basic recommendations. I think one of them is aligned with
14 Josette's, primarily, in terms of dissemination, broad
15 dissemination of the tools, and I concur about those two
16 primary tools being the things that are disseminated.

17 I think I have a question about -- I like the
18 mainstreaming because then there's that wide dissemination,
19 but at the end of the day, I think I have a little bit more
20 confidence that actual individuals make things happen. And
21 I'm intrigued by a direction that we're discussing,
22 unrelated to this, for organic production and some needs
23 around facilitating transition of acres where FSA is moving
24 towards establishing a point person in each state on
25 organics so that that person has some interest, they've

1 self-selected themselves, and they take on the portfolio,
2 and it doesn't mean they're the convener or they're
3 anything, just they're an individual with an interest who's
4 making sure they're talking to people and people know about
5 it.

6 So in addition to sort of the mainstreaming, I
7 think it might be helpful to consider this idea of
8 establishing a point person that's self-selected within the
9 USDA network who just takes it on themselves to see if they
10 can help facilitate making a few things happen. That might
11 be helpful, and they would likely be individuals with a
12 natural interest in the subject if they were self-selected.

13 In addition to that, I think I'd like to see there
14 be an endorsement from the Secretary's office of the value
15 of doing this that goes with the dissemination. I think
16 that that's important with the leadership that USDA can
17 offer.

18 I think there should be some -- I'd like to see us
19 recommend some sort of collation of available funds that
20 might be used for the convening and this idea of building
21 these types of convening meetings into the RFPs of those
22 appropriate programs so that as conversations start to
23 happen, people know where they might be able to go to
24 organize.

25 And then I think my last recommendation for what

1 the Secretary and USDA might be able to do with our
2 recommendations, I, I liked the point that our member of the
3 public that joined us yesterday in his comments to us about
4 building in some kind of evaluation. So is there some way
5 we can recommend to the Secretary that there be some check
6 as to see whether or not this resulted in meetings being
7 convened?

8 And then my last piece on the recommendation is
9 I'd like us to think about some kind of recommendation to
10 the Secretary about how to build a direct bridge from USDA
11 to state departments of agriculture because there's some way
12 -- somehow we have to hop out of the federal system into the
13 state and local system, and I don't know what that looks
14 like, but I'd like to recommend some bridge. Exactly.

15 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Sorry.

16 MR. REDDING: Bridge, I, I --

17 MS. BATCHA: And that bridge could be -- and that
18 bridge could be named Russell, but you know.

19 MR. REDDING: Yeah. Yeah. Well, and just on that
20 point, I think Dr. Glenn, you know, did express NASDA's
21 interest in being a partner, I mean, with the letter and
22 sort of endorsement of both the coexistence theme and the
23 charge and support. So it's certainly not unreasonable, I
24 think, to really have an engagement with NASDA.

25 I think I had shared at the March meeting that for

1 -- there's actually policy, you know, within NASDA
2 organization on coexistence, and Dr. Schechtman and I
3 presented at the last NASDA midwinter policy meeting. So,
4 so this would be, you know, certainly an appropriate next
5 step, I think, in that State Department of Agriculture
6 engagement. So, yeah, thank you.

7 MS. RAKOLA: Secretary Redding, could I just
8 explain a little bit about the FSA --

9 MR. REDDING: Yeah. Yeah, please.

10 MS. RAKOLA: Just to provide a little bit more
11 context about what the Farm Service Agency is doing -- and
12 thank you, Laura, for bringing that up -- we are looking at
13 an existing model that USDA already has that is a voluntary
14 collateral duty. So we're not creating new positions, but
15 we are looking at whether people can dedicate a portion of
16 their time to the topic of organic. We're calling it the
17 Organic Champion Model, and this is built on the model of
18 something that already exists called the Special Emphasis
19 Program Managers.

20 In the past this has been used primarily to have
21 folks focus on civil rights for historically underserved
22 communities. So we have special emphasis program managers
23 for African-Americans, Asian-Americans, Latinos, women,
24 persons with disabilities, sort of more identity or
25 demographic groups, and we are looking at expanding that

1 model to use for more topical subjects.

2 So both the Natural Resources Conservation Service
3 and the Farm Service Agency are looking at establishing
4 these networks of organic champions throughout the nation.
5 They're doing it a little bit differently, trying to make
6 sure that we do have locally appropriate models.

7 So it may look a little bit different in each
8 state, depending on what the interest and the need is.
9 Obviously it's going to be very different if you are in
10 Alabama or if you are in California, but again, looking at,
11 I think to Laura's point, you know, looking at somebody who
12 is self-selecting, who is interested, and probably already
13 has some level of knowledge or interest in the topic and who
14 would really take the initiative to be a leader within their
15 own agency on the local level. So in some cases we'll have
16 one in each state; in some cases there may be multiples in
17 each state, but thinking about how that person can be a
18 resource for their colleagues.

19 MR. REDDING: Great. Thank you. Alan.

20 MR. KEMPER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think as we
21 look at coexistence -- and Laura hit a lot on the, on the,
22 working with the state departments of agriculture to help be
23 a role model through that -- but as we look at coexistence,
24 USDA has a lot of bridge-building to build back. The most
25 discriminated sector in the U.S. American agriculture is the

1 American white male. They have now eliminated those farmers
2 from farming anything under 10 acres and getting any type of
3 payments. You don't know how discouraging that is to a
4 35- or 40-year-old son who's trying to farm in the agrihoods
5 or neighborhoods with a lot of little farms and now saying
6 he can't get any type of payment from those tracts.

7 The rural countryside of Midwest has a lot of
8 disagreement and just, and just very discouraged with USDA
9 at this point over that issue because, even if you're a
10 2500-acre farmer or a 3,000-acre farmer or a 100-acre
11 farmer, you probably have some 10-acre tracts and, when you
12 go into an FSA office and saying they will, they will let
13 anybody else in the program but an American white male,
14 those farmers are really getting upset with USDA. Thank
15 you.

16 MR. REDDING: Alan, if you'd -- I mean, I'm not
17 familiar with that 10-acre rule. Is that, is that a --

18 MR. KEMPER: According to FSA --

19 MR. REDDING: Yeah.

20 MR. KEMPER: -- anything that's under 10 acres
21 cannot be farmed by an American white male and be still in
22 the program. You can be a Native American, you can be
23 African-American, you can be a woman, but American white
24 males are not allowed. As a matter of fact, they void the
25 contracts. They're voiding contracts in community offices

1 because of that.

2 So, I mean, you know, with the ARC and that, you
3 probably won't get payment anyway, but when a person walks
4 in like my son or anybody else and says, sorry, we will be
5 calling your landlord because you do not qualify, because
6 you're an American white male. Thank you.

7 MR. MCKALIP: Al, if we could follow up with you
8 to understand what is being communicated to you, because I
9 think there may be a gap between what the FSA policy is and
10 how it's being communicated out in the countryside. So
11 let's sit down. I'd like to make sure I understand --

12 MR. KEMPER: No problem with that. It's just --
13 it's a flat-out black-white issue in the county offices.
14 They just turn you around, send you out the door, and say
15 you do not qualify. Thank you.

16 MR. REDDING: Leon and then Chuck.

17 MR. CORZINE: Back to your question, Mr. Chairman,
18 about how we direct this to the Secretary as far as rolling
19 this on out, I think if you look to that Local Coexistence
20 Discussions and you get past your introduction and maybe
21 somehow in the language, as you, as you put language to the
22 outline, that you point out -- when you get to about page 6
23 on there and then page 7, you really get to the convening
24 discussions, and maybe somehow that should be highlighted or
25 pointed out, that these are things that are possibilities to

1 help convene those discussions, and I think that really is
2 the meat of the charge, to get the discussions, whether it's
3 farmer-to-farmer or community discussions or -- and then
4 also list the venues and possibilities there. So it looks
5 to me like that would be the meat of what we're really asked
6 to do and to highlight that in our report to the Secretary.

7 MR. REDDING: Good. Thank you. Angela and then
8 Chuck. So I'm not sure that we're out here, but go ahead.

9 MS. OLSEN: I really like the discussion about the
10 broad dissemination. Laura, I liked a lot of your thoughts.
11 I also had NASDA on my list as well, you know, really
12 building that bridge. It appears the bridge already exists
13 but to make sure that they, that they're involved in this as
14 well, because I think they could be tremendous champions for
15 this as well.

16 Just something I know, you know, probably obvious,
17 but as long as we're coming up with our list, obviously to
18 have these two tools on USDA's website. The U.S. -- the
19 AC21 report would be there but maybe also extracted out the
20 two tools so that they're very easy, easy to find as
21 stand-alone documents and, also, a reach-out from the
22 Secretary -- I mean, again, it could be just a brief
23 communication -- but to different trade associations and
24 grower groups and seed associations, you know, from ASTA to
25 Farm Bureau to Corn Growers to the local farm bureaus.

1 It seems that somebody may want to get together a
2 -- and I don't think we should do that around this table;
3 these are just some ideas -- but a list of, you know, who
4 really has their finger on the pulse of the grower, the seed
5 companies, et cetera, and what's the easiest way to
6 disseminate, again, through the trade associations, the
7 grower groups. That may be another, another way to
8 streamline and to, you know, for this broad dissemination
9 concept that we've been talking about.

10 MR. REDDING: Good. Thank you. Chuck.

11 MR. BENBROOK: Angela, you stole my thunder. So
12 in terms of the recommendations to this Secretary of
13 Agriculture, Secretary Vilsack -- and let me preface my
14 statement by saying that it is highly likely that whoever
15 the next Secretary of Agriculture is, they're not likely to
16 have a lot of time and, and bandwidth to focus on advancing
17 and implementing recommendations in this AC21's report,
18 certainly not well into 2017 and who knows what other
19 intervening events will, in the world of biotech, you know,
20 might command the attention.

21 So I think if anything is going to happen with
22 this AC21's report by virtue of some efforts by the
23 Secretary of Agriculture, it will have to come from what
24 Secretary Vilsack does between the date our report is
25 released and January 22nd or whenever the inaugural is. And

1 I think, I think definitely our recommendations to Secretary
2 Vilsack should include one about how the USDA should engage
3 with the state departments of agriculture, to use them as
4 one channel of this outreach and accessibility to the two
5 documents and whatever else the Secretary wishes to suggest
6 is important for the Secretary of Agriculture to be working
7 on during 2017 in an -- in a period when there's not likely
8 to be a lot of action at the federal level over this, but in
9 addition, there should be a recommendation to Secretary
10 Vilsack about engaging with commodity groups and grower
11 groups and NGOs and other private players in terms of how
12 they can use the resources and use their networks. And so
13 -- because I think, you know, really, all USDA is going to
14 do is they're going to put out a press release that the
15 report is done and they're going to post the two documents
16 on the website and that's pretty much going to be it, at
17 least for the foreseeable future.

18 So I would -- I think we need to recommend to
19 Secretary Vilsack some, some real systematic outreach to
20 groups like the corn growers and the soybean growers and
21 grain companies, organizations that represent the grain
22 industry, to encourage them to pick up the ball and try to
23 keep this process going and filtering down into the local
24 level. Thanks.

25 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Just one comment from that, if I

1 can. I think that's very interesting recommendations, but I
2 do want to just make one point about the life span of
3 reports, and that is that after our report is completed, you
4 know, under the overall FACA process, recommendations get
5 tracked and any department's efforts and success in
6 implementing those recommendations is reported to GAO and
7 then to Congress.

8 So while I think it's undoubtedly true that a new
9 administration coming in will initially have higher
10 priorities than dealing with a report from the previous
11 administration, they don't vanish and there is a recurrent
12 question that comes to departments about what have you done
13 to, to implement the recommendations of committees that
14 you've spent money on and held public meetings with. So I
15 just wanted to, to put that out there.

16 MR. REDDING: Yeah, if I could add, I think the --
17 I mean, two points: one, whatever we produce, like the
18 previous AC21 reports, it's really to make sure that this
19 transcends administrations. I mean, I see this as, you
20 know, Secretary Vilsack sort of, again, advancing the
21 conversation on coexistence.

22 If you go back and read the very early reports, I
23 mean, some of the foundational work that was done around
24 biotechnology and the evolving issues, I mean, it really
25 helped inform our discussion in 2011, '12, to produce that

1 report. So I guess I'm looking at this as -- I get that
2 we're in a transition with the administration, but this is a
3 topic that transcends administrations. Right? It is
4 central to agriculture.

5 The final point would be, I think in our
6 background and context portion of the 2012 document, there
7 was a statement about all participants in agriculture have a
8 role in making coexistence work, right, and I don't want to
9 lose sight of that. I think we can easily say to the USDA
10 that there is a, you know, thank you for bringing it to the
11 table and helping us sort of get, you know, further -- to
12 form that, but the real benefit is to sort of push this out
13 as broadly as we can, from tech providers to managers to
14 markets, I mean, USDA, others, all actually.

15 So just keep that in mind as we look at the
16 recommendations to certainly the Secretary, that he would
17 have and the USDA would have a reach within that network of
18 stakeholders of USDA. But I think as we look at the group
19 that's here on the committee, that reach is equally as
20 important out to the farm community and technology, and each
21 of us sort of bring a piece of this, you know, to the table,
22 but carrying that back, I think, is really important.

23 So somewhere in our recommendations is noting that
24 sort of all participants have a role, and maybe we want to
25 speak very specifically about how we could, knowing there's

1 a transition, to help facilitate this sort of dissemination
2 of information and keep this awareness level pretty high. I
3 think the Oregon example was a great exhibit. Right? It is
4 not going away, and it is not getting easier.

5 So how do we really position agriculture, and
6 however you want to define that, to really address those
7 issues, those contemporary issues around the different forms
8 of production agriculture interfacing, right, and how do we
9 in the recommendations say it's, yes, it's to the USDA per
10 the charge but it's also -- that's who we are, right; that's
11 what we need to do to carry back and to carry out what we
12 would see as, you know, dissemination of the documents but
13 also really giving some serious thought within our own
14 organizations who would be an appropriate point person to
15 help, help the USDA but also help us, I think, just keep
16 this conversation out there about the need for coexistence.

17 So other, other thoughts, comments on
18 recommendations?

19 (No audible response.)

20 MR. REDDING: Okay. So we have a few other, I
21 guess, just making sure that, you know, when, you know, we
22 bundle these different, different pieces up, I mean, making
23 sure that if there's something else you want to convey to
24 the Secretary or make sure that you're looking at the short
25 list of recommendations, that we've captured that. Okay.

1 David.

2 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There's
3 one paragraph that are -- that's in these documents that I
4 read every day, and it's that opening paragraph of the quote
5 that the Secretary had about we have great diversity in
6 American agriculture. We all know that paragraph. Right?
7 And when I come to Washington, D.C., every three or four
8 months, one of the things I do on Sundays is I go to the
9 monuments. I go to the Lincoln and I go to the Jefferson
10 and I go to the FDR, and I read all these quotes on the
11 walls because they have impact on my life and they've
12 impacted everybody's lives.

13 So one of the recommendations I'd like to make to
14 the Secretary is that when people visit USDA, this quote
15 that is at the beginning of our documents is framed and put
16 up in the atrium for everybody to read, because I come back
17 to this meeting every time looking at that paragraph,
18 wanting to fight for this issue because of that paragraph.
19 I'm not sure if he wrote it, he had help writing it, but it
20 is one of the most amazing quotes I've ever read about
21 agriculture. And so in the recommendation I'd like to
22 somehow see that people who visit USDA or think about
23 American agriculture get to read that quote. I read it
24 every day before I come to this meeting, and that's all I'd
25 like to add.

1 MS. BATCHA: Here, here.

2 MR. REDDING: Good.

3 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Is that something for the next
4 Secretary of Agriculture to do, to frame his predecessor's
5 quotes?

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We forgive --

7 MR. REDDING: Yeah, forgive us, yeah, but yeah, I,
8 David, agree. In that, in that one paragraph or few
9 sentences, it sort of sums up sort of the charge and
10 expectation and what we see both in the opportunity and
11 challenges that were noted, yeah. That's good.

12 Other thoughts and recommendations, I mean, things
13 that you want to make sure that at least topically we raise
14 here and keep track of as we draft the document for the
15 Secretary?

16 (No audible response.)

17 MR. REDDING: Okay.

18 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Let me just --

19 MR. REDDING: Yeah, please.

20 MR. SCHECHTMAN: I just sort of want to ask folks
21 to think back because I'm not, I'm not sure that there might
22 not have been things that came up in the past as
23 recommendations that we've forgotten. So was there anything
24 that was recommended yesterday or in a previous meeting for
25 things that USDA should be doing with this report that

1 anyone remembers?

2 I mean, I will go back over the notes to see if
3 there were other recommendations from the past, but I just
4 want people to put on their thinking caps or their memory
5 caps or whatever they are to think if there were any other
6 things that came up in the past that were recommendations
7 for using this. I see Chuck may have --

8 MR. REDDING: Yeah, Chuck, please, and then Missy.

9 MR. BENBROOK: Well, sort of consistent with that
10 theme, Michael, I'm struck in reviewing our November 2012
11 report by the contrast between the substance of this
12 document and what I envision the substance of the document
13 that we've been discussing, and it definitely strikes me
14 that we -- I'd like to see some more discussion about how we
15 can incorporate the, the many -- much more specific and, I
16 think, important recommendations in this November 2012
17 report as part of our body of work and what we're, you know,
18 recommending to the Secretary that, that he continue
19 advancing.

20 I know that there's -- you know, Michael, you've
21 suggested a couple of ways that the initial report could be
22 referenced, and other people have said that the new report
23 is an extension of the old report, but, so -- but how do we
24 really do that? I mean, for people that never read the 2012
25 report, maybe don't even know it exists, how can we more

1 effectively highlight and reference what's to me a much, a
2 much more substantive set of recommendations in this 2012
3 report than what we're going forward with now?

4 MR. REDDING: That's a good question. I don't --
5 I mean, we've talked about, if you look at the outline, I
6 mean, some reference, but I mean, there is a base assumption
7 there that folks are actually aware of it, you know, have
8 read it, and do we need to do more -- yeah. So how to
9 connect the two, right? Is it a restatement of
10 recommendations, or is it, you know, somehow in the
11 presentation of this to make sure that folks know that this
12 is a companion piece to the earlier work? So we can talk
13 more about that. Missy.

14 MS. HUGHES: To Michael's question about are there
15 any other recommendations, I feel like we at a previous
16 meeting had a good conversation about how the USDA might
17 consider technology in the future, as far as social media,
18 webinars, things like that -- so, you know, to include that,
19 I think, in some form in the recommendation about the USDA
20 being open to using tools like that to help disseminate this
21 information.

22 The second piece that I'm struggling with a little
23 bit -- and I'm wondering if Doug and Michael can help, maybe
24 Betsy too -- if you're a USDA employee and you're presented
25 with this kind of -- you know, I see our two documents; I

1 think Angela used the term tear-offs -- you're presented
2 with, okay, this group of people came together and wrote
3 this document, go forth and do something with it, what's the
4 process that the USDA would take? I would imagine the
5 lawyers would look at it. I would imagine there'd be a
6 whole process, and if you can help me just briefly
7 understand that, it might help inform what other
8 recommendations we might have. Like, to understand how this
9 will go through the machine and come back out the other side
10 might help me to think about helping to direct that machine.

11 MR. MCKALIP: So just a few thoughts on that --
12 the policy discussions we have with our agencies over
13 program priorities, use of resources, direction for the
14 field staff all come about from results of documents like
15 this. A recent example is the biogas road map that USDA put
16 together has placed additional emphasis on funding anaerobic
17 digesters on dairies to -- for the purposes of greenhouse
18 gas sequestration.

19 Going way back in my career, maybe 20 years plus,
20 concerns over field prices helped drive how USDA marketed
21 conservation tillage at the local level. So it wasn't so
22 much that anything changed in the program priorities, but
23 the word clearly got out to our field staff that a good way
24 to communicate the use of conservation tillage to a farmer
25 is fewer passes across the field, thereby less usage of

1 diesel or traditional petrol.

2 What comes about as a result of this report can
3 help drive those conversations our Department has with our
4 subcabinet, with our agency chiefs and administrators, all
5 the way down to the field staff to discuss, here is what a
6 producer who is concerned about coexistence is thinking,
7 here is how USDA can help facilitate those discussions at
8 the local level to help come to better plans and
9 resolutions. It just simply helps frame the issue in a
10 different way for our county-based agencies and for our
11 research agencies and otherwise. Michael or Betsy.

12 MR. SCHECHTMAN: I'll just add one thing. I
13 think, based on what we heard from the committee, the two
14 stand-alone documents are things where we have been pretty
15 careful to have, at most, a very, very limited role for
16 USDA. So these documents are, are documents that, to the
17 extent that they go out further, you know, the, the major
18 roles for USDA are going to be effective at disseminating
19 this to the people who will then use them and to
20 demonstrating our support in the ways that you think is most
21 appropriate for doing that and maybe to be, to have a
22 clearer sense of what kinds of financial opportunities there
23 might be to help this process along and to see how, to see
24 how this all works but not to have the, based on what we
25 heard, not to have our folks have a leading role in these

1 processes.

2 So it's a, it's a little bit different. We have
3 to be, you know, figure out the way that we can clearly
4 support this process but not be out front on it. So, so I
5 don't know -- you know, it will help our agencies think
6 creatively about how this information can be brought to the
7 local communities, but obviously it's not going to be
8 something that we are -- that we, as USDA, are there, you
9 know, running the process, so for what, for what that's
10 worth.

11 And, you know, in terms of, you know, because we
12 don't have recommendations -- you don't have recommendations
13 in the report for USDA to take, you know, very significant
14 policy actions. It's not like our general counsel is going
15 to have to be looking, looking through this in the same way
16 as some of the other recommendations, I would think.

17 MS. HUGHES: So should our -- okay. So I heard
18 two very different things: one, Doug was describing kind of
19 this is a program policy priority and we're going to take it
20 through subcabinet, agency chiefs, field staff. Michael,
21 what you're saying is something different, and so I'm just
22 -- here's all I'm saying, is should the committee include
23 language that says we understand that the USDA won't have a
24 primary role in pushing this out; however, we encourage the
25 USDA to think creatively about just some, some recognition

1 of that, because I don't want somebody to pick up this
2 report and go, well, we can't do it, we don't have anything
3 to do with this. It seems like we're kind of shooting
4 ourselves in the foot if we don't acknowledge that and
5 somehow say, but yet the USDA does have a proactive role in
6 this.

7 MS. RAKOLA: No, if I could just jump in there. I
8 think -- that was a question that came to my mind as I was
9 reading through the committee's -- the subgroups' documents;
10 that, on the one hand, these are recommendations that are
11 going to USDA but a lot of the themes that I heard,
12 especially verbally at the last AC21 meeting, were that USDA
13 and the federal folks are not who we see as conveners, that
14 there seems to be, frankly, some negative perceptions of
15 federal folks getting involved in this conversation. There
16 was a real strong sentiment that that was not the
17 appropriate role.

18 At the same time, when I was reading through the
19 documents, it seemed like there was maybe a split between
20 USDA at the federal or headquarters level and then sort of
21 state or local offices, and I think that that is a little
22 confusing reading through the document, trying to figure
23 out, then, what is the role that's being asked of USDA; is
24 it really trying to get those state and local folks involved
25 but not necessarily the headquarters folks?

1 You know, as Doug was explaining, you know, we are
2 certainly a hierarchical organization where these sorts of
3 messages do get pushed down that way. I think, also, if the
4 folks at the field level are not hearing the need from the
5 people that they're seeing day in and day out, it can be
6 hard to make the case for them about why to dedicate their
7 time to these topics.

8 So I do think that, you know, in thinking about
9 what is the role that you want to ask of USDA, clarifying
10 that. You know, is it simply the concern about something
11 that's perceived as Washington telling people what to do,
12 you know, isn't that where we want to go; however, the state
13 and local structure of USDA would be an appropriate either
14 convener or partner? You know, trying to resolve that, that
15 tension or just clarify that a little bit, I think, would be
16 helpful in us understanding what it is that you'd like us to
17 do.

18 MR. MCKALIP: Yeah. Like the previous 15 policy
19 initiatives that we launched were all very much federal
20 resource-driven, whether it's review of the germplasm at ARS
21 or various program-level things. This effort underway this
22 year is much more focused on state and local efforts on
23 coexistence, but there -- and I think what Michael and I
24 were both trying to get at -- there are, there's a role for
25 USDA to help facilitate, trigger, provide resources for

1 those discussions.

2 And so the recommendations that you all have that
3 are driven in those manners will help us at USDA know, you
4 know, the best way to do that, which may include either
5 directives or work with our county-based agencies to help
6 either with some dollars or meeting space, or whatever it is
7 that you all identify will help those discussions take
8 place.

9 MR. REDDING: Laura, then -- I'm sorry. Josette,
10 Laura, Missy.

11 MS. HUGHES: Oh, I'm done.

12 MS. LEWIS: Well, I think it's a good point you
13 raised, Missy. I guess I feel like there's a very nice
14 space in between any kind of command and control of, from
15 USDA hierarchy saying, this is a priority, you all need to
16 pay attention and do something; and, on the flip side,
17 saying that it's up to others at the local and private level
18 to really take these tools and make something of it.

19 So I do think we should be clear that we think
20 it's a priority for USDA within its own institution to make
21 sure that these resources are, are made available and
22 understood down to that local level and then leave it to the
23 discretion at the local level as to how they use these. I'm
24 not -- I'm happy to -- I also endorse Laura's point about
25 having some kind of, you know, evaluation checkpoint to just

1 see if these were useful, if they were helpful to making
2 progress. Presumably, it's a way to help frame whatever
3 future work the AC21 may do under a new Secretary.

4 So I think that's to me the -- I do think we
5 should be clear that we would like to see as a priority -- I
6 mean, it'd be wonderful if we've spent our time here
7 producing documents that everyone just thought were
8 spectacular and started using, but we're an advisory
9 committee to the Secretary of USDA. So if we can't get USDA
10 to take some action, then it seems to me that we're, we're,
11 we're not quite doing our job appropriately, but I think
12 there's a very happy medium between making sure USDA
13 understands it's a priority to make these tools available
14 and understood at the local level and then leave the
15 discretion at the local level.

16 I don't see that means USDA has to convene these
17 things. It may be just, you know, USDA talking to its
18 constituents and saying, these things are available and
19 there's some programmatic resources; if you guys want, we
20 could help you tap into those if these are priorities. But
21 if USDA doesn't do that, it seems to me that's kind of
22 falling short on our job of advising the Department.

23 MR. REDDING: Yeah, and Josette, I just would
24 note, I mean, if you go back and look at the recommendations
25 in the November 2012, Recommendation II and III, II

1 particularly says, you know: USDA should spearhead and fund
2 a broad-based, comprehensive education outreach initiative
3 to strengthen understanding of coexistence between diverse
4 agricultural production systems. USDA should design and
5 make available to the agricultural community voluntary and
6 outcome-based strategies for facilitating production.

7 So I, you know, for context, right, I take this
8 conversation and say, okay, I get it, that we made a
9 recommendation and now we come back and we inform that
10 recommendation. It's not simply -- right? So I think that
11 for me helps to say, in terms of next steps for the USDA,
12 this was our initial work; we said in broad strokes, I mean,
13 that was really important and we think that's an appropriate
14 role for the USDA. I think now we can say it is, and we
15 actually have a few documents, resource-wise, that are, that
16 really help facilitate that for the USDA.

17 Recommendation III then gets into, you know,
18 everything from cooperative extension of the land-grant
19 system to other USDA agencies. So I see sort of
20 Recommendation II and III being really central to how we
21 frame, and that may be part of even some of the outline that
22 we should talk about, is putting this in context, right,
23 because I think that's really helpful for public
24 consumption, is why did this committee spend, you know, this
25 time worrying about these resource documents, why is that

1 important -- well, because we talked about, you know, in our
2 original work, this was an issue of concern and we felt, as
3 an advisory role to the USDA, that we really would, hoped
4 the Secretary and the USDA would take a lead, a lead on.
5 Right? So just for thoughts. Laura.

6 MS. BATCHA: Thanks for reminding us of those
7 recommendations, Russell, and I think -- so between that
8 recommendation and our charge, the informing piece was that
9 USDA wouldn't be in the driver's seat with resources but
10 these needed to be things that were facilitated at the state
11 and local level with incentives there. So if we start with
12 that, then we need to, we need to put the hook in there,
13 which you got, got us where we are.

14 And I think for me it's interesting to hear,
15 Betsy, your read of the document being confusing that way
16 about roles, because I think I've understood the roles all
17 along to be as Josette described them and Doug just
18 described them. So let's be clearer, I think, just in the
19 document about sort of the, the leadership role, sort of the
20 megaphone role of USDA, the facilitation, the catalyzing
21 role, and then the convening, driving, organizing role
22 happening at the state and local level. And I think if
23 we're just clear about it, that will be helpful, but I
24 really, also, like a thread back to where our original
25 recommendation and --

1 MR. REDDING: Good. Thank you. Jerry and then
2 Alan.

3 MR. SLOCUM: Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate you
4 reminding us of our recommendations in the first report
5 because, I mean, what we're doing today is the meat of that
6 discussion. At the same time, it, it -- I truly believe
7 that the first users of this information won't use it at
8 meetings. It'll be, it'll be a farmer that decides that he
9 wants to get into organic production, or there'll be a
10 farmer that decides he wants to get into non-GE production
11 and he sits there and thinks about what do I need to know,
12 and he's going to go to the places that he finds what I need
13 to know. You know, 20 years ago that was the local
14 extension office, and since they, in large, don't exist, at
15 least they don't exist in my part of the world anymore, he's
16 going to go to the web. He's going to go to the Internet,
17 is where he's going to go, or he may wander down to the FSA
18 -- to the sole conservation office.

19 He may wander to those places, but I really think
20 the first users of these things are going to be individuals,
21 and how we position that, you know, how we position that, I
22 think, will be very important because, you know, agriculture
23 has, you know, we have early adopters and then we have those
24 guys that watch early adopters and then they come to the
25 game, and that's when I think you'll have meetings as such.

1 And it may be, it may be sponsored by the local grain
2 elevators because we'll see an opportunity for ourselves and
3 we'll see an opportunity for producers, and they may be the
4 first real conveners in this business, or it may be the seed
5 companies introducing a new trait, be it functional or be it
6 whatever. They may be the next level of conveners.

7 But I think that part of USDA's charge has got to
8 be able to communicate these pieces to the field staff, to
9 the guys that work in Senatobia, Mississippi, and the guys
10 that work in Cerro Gordo, that these things exist and, when
11 people wander in and ask about how we might do this, at
12 least you can point to those places and say, hey, this work
13 has been done, it's out there, lots of resources you can
14 tap, maybe even some moneys you can tap but certainly there
15 are resources you can tap, and I don't think we need to lose
16 sight of that. I don't think we're going to start this
17 thing with a bunch of meetings all over the country. I
18 think we're going to start it with some farmers that are
19 looking for better opportunities or at least different
20 opportunities.

21 MR. REDDING: That's a great point. Thank you.
22 Alan.

23 MR. KEMPER: Thanks. I would, Mr. Chair, I'd just
24 like to tag on a little bit to what Jerry said. I mean, he
25 sets up a great situation where a lot of farmers are

1 exploring changes for their operations, whether that's
2 getting out of GE and going organic or what, and they will
3 go to the web, the Internet, and friends, particularly the
4 millennials -- they'll definitely go there -- and then you
5 have the other scenario, if you're just trying to bring
6 about a meeting on coexistence for your community or your
7 local area.

8 Mr. Chair, I would suggest that if you do that,
9 though, you need to include the land-grant universities as
10 well as extension. I think it might be somewhat unfair for
11 FSA staffers to -- they can call the meeting and be there,
12 but for them to actually be the, if you call it, the
13 neutral, as you do on the document, it might put them in a
14 little more precarious situation, because they're actually
15 delivering a lot of the programs to those farmers, whereas
16 extension could be kind of, I hate to use the word referee,
17 but the more friendly guy in the middle, if you will. Thank
18 you, Mr. Chair.

19 MR. REDDING: Good point. Chuck. Oops, sorry.
20 Yeah, go ahead, Chuck, and then we'll pick up with --

21 MR. BENBROOK: Well, kind of following up on what
22 Alan said, to me one of the really interesting new topics
23 that got on the table during this meeting is the recognition
24 that a whole heck of a lot of the coexistence challenges are
25 going to actually arise within a farm operation as the

1 farmer looks at their economic opportunities and market
2 demand and chooses to go after some markets that they, they
3 haven't. And I think we should consider writing a special
4 section in -- adding a special section in the documents that
5 focus on the coexistence issues and challenges within an
6 operation and the tools and tactics and strategies that,
7 that farm managers ought to pursue and consider in arming
8 themselves optimally to get through whatever transition
9 they, they choose to pursue, because I think it's, it's a
10 really different cluster of issues than coexistence between
11 neighbors with different farming systems, which has been 99
12 percent the focus of our deliberations for the last six
13 years. So I think it's worth us trying to really
14 crystallize and focus on that in some way in our new report.

15 MR. REDDING: Good. Thank you. Lynn.

16 MR. CLARKSON: Lynn Clarkson. I think Jerry's
17 point that individuals will be the ones that pick up these
18 recommendations is the same way that I see this happening.
19 So while I spend most of my time running a grain company, I
20 am a farmer, and as a farmer, I regularly visit the Farm
21 Service Administration office in Piatt County, Illinois --
22 other farmers do too -- and about a year ago was the first
23 time I ever saw the word organic in an FSA office. There
24 was a tear sheet, and I'm one of the people who's quite
25 delighted to see that, but other farmers would come into my

1 office and say, wow, we noticed a flier in the FSA office
2 about organic and maybe I should look into this. So they
3 came to ask more questions.

4 And where I could see the stimulation of this
5 report going is to farmers who are looking for the benefits
6 of more diverse markets, and they're going to the FSA
7 office, and they're finding out what website they can go to
8 from the USDA there or vice versa, from the website to the
9 FSA office, and having a list of resources that they can
10 tap, which would be extension, the land-grant colleges,
11 their trade associations, and other places. But I can see a
12 role for tear sheets in the FSA offices, pointing out what
13 markets we see emerging and what some of the rules are and
14 what some of the difficulties are and a tear sheet about
15 coexistence issues, and I can see local farmers picking up
16 that issue and being the driving force of this.

17 MR. REDDING: Good. Leon.

18 MR. CORZINE: Thank you. I'd just like two things
19 -- one, to add on to the point about the FSA offices and the
20 importance as you think about that, because any IP
21 opportunity that is going to require a coexistence plan,
22 whether it's organic or whether it's some sort of specialty
23 grain, you're going to go to the FSA office anyway if you're
24 a farmer, because you have to check -- nearly all acres are
25 signed up in a government program of some sort; so you've

1 got to make sure whether it's going to affect where you are
2 in that farm program, right? If you have to have extra
3 buffers or if you -- whatever you have to do could affect
4 your eligibility, and everybody is aware of that that's in
5 the programs, and so that could be a center or a start of
6 the information.

7 So if the FSA office, whether, as Lynn Clarkson
8 said, whether it's a tear sheet or some sort of
9 acknowledgment, maybe it is a notice from USDA to their
10 field service people in the FSA office, just an awareness
11 that, hey, if somebody comes in, here is a document for
12 suggestions or some guidance about where you go from there,
13 I think that could be useful on dissemination.

14 I don't agree with, with what Chuck said. I think
15 whether you are dealing with another neighbor or whether
16 you're dealing within your own farm, you've got the same
17 issues, because you've got to segregate, you've got to
18 maintain purity. The only difference is, I guess you'd be
19 talking to yourself instead of talking to your neighbor,
20 right, or -- because in most cases you'd be talking to your
21 landlord either way. So I don't think we need anything
22 additional just because maybe I'm just doing it on a part of
23 my farm, because it'll affect part of my farm and, depending
24 on where that is, that particular plot of land, it may also
25 involve a neighbor.

1 So I don't -- I think we could just muddy the
2 waters by trying to do anything on a farmer talking to
3 himself, okay, but I do think the FSA office deal is an
4 important one to remember, that we will be in there talking
5 to them about eligibility and that's where you can get
6 information to further what you need. Thanks.

7 MR. REDDING: Leon, if I could just ask, I mean,
8 we focused on the FSA. I mean, I guess the NRCS office as
9 well? I mean, are we making a distinction here in terms of
10 the dissemination of this being to a program or office
11 focus? I mean, we want it to be fairly broad, right? So am
12 I interpreting that correctly? I just want to make sure
13 that I look at it thinking, how do I push this out, if
14 that's the objective.

15 MR. CORZINE: Yeah, I guess you wouldn't want to
16 forget that.

17 MR. REDDING: Okay.

18 MR. CORZINE: That's a good point, Russell. In my
19 part of the world, the majority of the acres would be FSA
20 and not NRCS, right, but there are parts the other way. So
21 maybe you just -- your local field offices, in both
22 instances, and maybe include soil and water conservation
23 offices as well, or you know, all of those type entities
24 that those programs can be impacted by some sort of IP
25 product or something different I'm going to do that I

1 haven't done before.

2 MR. REDDING: Good. Chuck and then Laura.

3 MR. BENBROOK: Well, perhaps it's a fool's
4 mission, but I'm going to try to change Leon's mind on, on
5 this. Now, you know, Betsy and Laura know the details far
6 more than I, but I know there are a number of new provisions
7 in the crop insurance program and other commodity
8 support-like programs that are either in place or soon will
9 be in place that recognize some of the different risk
10 scenarios and also payment rates and income rates under --
11 in organic production, and whether there are any involved
12 with non-GE production, I don't know. But who knows? There
13 may be.

14 So the difference in an individual producer within
15 the land that they own and rent and manage, between two
16 farmers, two separate farmers, the differences are that the
17 individual farmer will capture or have to cover whatever
18 impacts from the marketplace occur, it's fully internalized,
19 but they also, as you said, Leon, need to understand what
20 opportunities or barriers or constraints might arise in a
21 suite of other USDA programs -- in particular, crop
22 insurance and EQIP -- that they might not have been aware
23 of, that they actually could, you know, perhaps get some
24 help or qualify for a higher market price in locking in
25 their -- what is it Laura, the total-farm income guarantee

1 program?

2 MS. BATCHA: Whole-Farm Revenue --

3 MR. BENBROOK: Yeah, all-farm revenue program.

4 So, you know, I do think there are some really big
5 differences between the checklist of facts and knowledge
6 that a farmer needs to know about and internalize in making
7 their decision and that that's a distinct challenge from
8 what we've focused on, which is fostering coexistence issues
9 between one farmer and another farmer, where the economic
10 consequences of all of the decisions are separate, and just,
11 I think that's really quite distinct.

12 MR. CORZINE: Well, you're correct, if I may
13 respond, you didn't change my mind, because everything that
14 you suggested -- I have those things that I have to go
15 through whether I am, you know, whether I'm doing it all
16 within my, part of my farm is going to remain conventional
17 and part of it is going to be something else or whether I'm
18 dealing with a neighbor, and all those things you mentioned,
19 the different insurance, different, all those different
20 things and opportunities are, those are -- it's of no
21 consequence whether it is all within my own farm or part of
22 my farm or next to a neighbor's farm because, as we
23 mentioned, coexistence is everybody's deal and, even if it's
24 within my own farm, I could very likely still be affecting a
25 neighbor; and, even if I'm not, I'm still going to be going

1 through that process, either way. I still don't see any
2 difference at all, actually. I've just internalized my own
3 coexistence plan, but that's not really any different than
4 whether I'm doing it with my neighbor across the road.

5 MR. BENBROOK: Okay.

6 MR. REDDING: Okay. Let's do this: I mean,
7 there's a couple other cards up. Why don't we take a quick
8 break, right, and just take 10 minutes here. Take a break,
9 and then we'll reconvene and resume this conversation, okay,
10 and we'll pick up with Latresia and Laura.

11 (Whereupon, at 10:29 a.m., a brief recess was
12 taken.)

13 MR. REDDING: Okay. Let's, let's reconvene. We
14 had a couple of folks who wanted to comment on sort of the
15 recommendations. I always give Latresia credit, but I think
16 it's actually Barry's --

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Card.

18 MR. REDDING: -- Barry's card. Is that right?

19 MR. BUSHUE: The card is up.

20 MR. REDDING: It just always looks like it's in
21 front of you, Latresia. So Barry and then --

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No control.

23 MR. REDDING: -- Laura, I think was the other.
24 Okay. Barry, go ahead.

25 MR. BUSHUE: I'll make mine very quick. I think

1 we're kind of beating dead horses here. We've, we've got
2 good documents. We've got good working documents. As far
3 as -- I would agree with Lynn with regard to the
4 specificities of what you do on your own property. I mean,
5 most of us -- and I don't think this was ever the intention
6 by anyone -- but, you know, we aren't stupid people. We
7 have the ability to sit down and gather this information. I
8 can gather as much information I need on this phone,
9 especially after this document is out, in terms of what I
10 want to do in terms of diversity on my own farm.

11 This isn't rocket science, folks. This is just
12 general information that people have access to, will have
13 access to, and the work we've put together here gives us one
14 more tool for that availability of access. I see no reason
15 to separate out an operator that's doing something on his
16 own farm from what he's doing with his neighbor.

17 And I think we should also keep in mind that -- I
18 like all the ideas about having it go out to NRCS and FSA
19 and all those other organizations, land grants -- if you
20 have one that actually cares about agriculture, God bless
21 you -- and those types of things. So with that regard, I
22 think we've done a lot and we need to move forward, and -- I
23 guess that's enough.

24 MR. REDDING: Okay. Thank you. Laura.

25 MS. BATCHA: So I think the discussions we're

1 having right now actually are important because -- I concur,
2 we've got a good start on the documents, on the work, but I
3 think we've got some work left to do. So I encourage folks
4 to try to stay engaged on that conversation so we can get to
5 a place where everybody's comfortable with the final
6 document.

7 On this question about the applicability of the
8 documents to choices that a farmer makes on their own farm
9 versus between neighbors versus between a farmer and a
10 landowner, I think -- I'm not going to speak for Chuck --
11 but I agree that I think the emphasis was somewhat of a
12 little aha moment for us, when we were working on our Models
13 subcommittee, about the applicability of it at that level
14 and how that might actually present everything as a way that
15 was just about choices and opportunities and not about
16 conflict.

17 So I think that was, that was where our intention
18 was when we started talking about this, and I think the
19 intention is not to sort of push any buttons about personal
20 property rights or any of that kind of stuff. So I think it
21 could be done in a way that is a simple enough reference
22 that just says something like, these tools are applicable
23 between neighbors, between a farmer making a farm plan and a
24 choice, and between a farmer and landowners, and then you go
25 through the materials.

1 It doesn't have to be a separate set of materials
2 geared towards this type of conversation or that or make any
3 judgment about, of course farmers do these plans all the
4 time and have access to the information, but it's just a way
5 to signal that these, these tools are available and this is
6 consistent with embracing coexistence and diversity in
7 agriculture and, if you find them helpful, here they are.
8 So --

9 MR. REDDING: Okay. Thank you. Any, any -- yeah,
10 Angela.

11 MS. OLSEN: Laura, I agree with you. I think it
12 can be dealt with in a very easy way and easy reference. My
13 comment or my question really is, is for Betsy and going
14 back to what are some of the things that USDA can do. I
15 agree, let's get back to the charge and let's continue these
16 really important discussions so that we can produce
17 something for the Secretary.

18 Going back to the what are some of the things that
19 USDA can do, Betsy was talking about the Special Emphasis
20 Program, and I wanted to hear if Betsy's willing to share a
21 little bit more about that program and whether that may be a
22 way to help promote coexistence as well. Is that something
23 that's just for the organic program? Could it be used for
24 other diversity in agriculture, and is that a tool that
25 maybe we can think about as a way that USDA may be able to

1 assist in enhancing and promoting coexistence?

2 MS. RAKOLA: Sure. I think this is a rapidly
3 emerging area as we're trying to look creatively at existing
4 tools that we have. You know, the special emphasis program
5 managers have previously existed within the Civil Rights and
6 the Equal Employment Opportunity charge that USDA has, but
7 we are thinking about -- sorry, it is on; I can try to yell
8 louder -- I think we're trying to think creatively about
9 whether that's a tool that we can use for more topical
10 areas, and so certainly I think it's something that's worth
11 exploring and worth a conversation with the leadership at
12 our field agencies.

13 MR. REDDING: Chuck and then Missy.

14 MR. BENBROOK: Another suggestion for a
15 recommendation to the Secretary -- all organic farmers have
16 to file an organic system plan every year. The purpose of
17 that plan is to describe the management strategies that the
18 farmer is going to use to deal with all the routine elements
19 and aspects and challenges of growing a profitable organic
20 crop. We should -- we could recommend to the Secretary that
21 he direct the NOP to develop a guidance document to organic
22 farmers about how to address coexistence issues within the
23 context of their organic system plan, which could, you know,
24 provide some, some guidance coming right out of our
25 documents about what -- you know, sort of a checklist of

1 things to consider, and these could apply both to land that
2 the farmer manages within their own operation and also to
3 coexistent issues across the fence to neighbors.

4 But I think this is relatively new, and since all
5 organic farmers will be required at some point to address
6 and deal with coexistence issues in the context of these
7 organic system plans, some guidance from the National
8 Organic Program could be useful in that regard.

9 MR. REDDING: Thank you. Missy, then Laura.

10 MS. HUGHES: So I have a couple thoughts. One is
11 that with regard to Angela's question about the Special
12 Emphasis Program and the folks being identified for organic
13 within FSA, I'm going to, I'm going to strongly discourage
14 putting more work on those people's plate. If they've been
15 -- if they've expressed an interest in helping organic
16 agriculture, let's not broaden that to helping all diversity
17 in agriculture, because organic is desperate for resources
18 to help the farmers be able to access programs within the
19 USDA and that's what I see that role as.

20 And so I'd strongly -- you know, I've heard lots
21 of conversations around the room about the lack of resources
22 at NRCS and don't put more burden on them. Well, I'm going
23 to ask, don't put more burden on those folks. If they're
24 willing to help organic, can we please just let them do that
25 and not make it broader.

1 The second piece, you know, goes a little bit to
2 what Chuck was just saying as far as the organic system
3 plan. I just get concerned that what is coming out of the
4 committee is, if you're an IP producer, here is what you
5 need to do, here's the burdens that we're going to put on
6 you. In my mind, a successful moving forward on coexistence
7 says this includes all farmers, not just IP producers, this
8 is a conversation between all producers. I think there's
9 agreement on that.

10 And, you know, going to the charge, the charge
11 says: Is there an approach -- is there an approach by which
12 farmers could be encouraged? So what we're trying to do is
13 we're trying to encourage these conversations. We're not --
14 it's not just that we have a great document that talks about
15 the practices that you might consider with, with
16 coexistence, to foster coexistence. It's you need to have
17 these conversations and we support you having these
18 conversations. It's creating an awareness that these
19 conversations are the most important thing.

20 So our recommendations need to be very much
21 spearheaded to how do we encourage those conversations, not
22 what those conversations are; not, you know, does it include
23 hedgerows, does it include wind barriers, whatever it is.
24 It's you should have these conversations in order to
25 encourage diversity in American agriculture.

1 MR. REDDING: Thank you. Laura.

2 MS. BATCHA: I'm just clarifying the comment that
3 Chuck made. The National Organic Standards Board did just
4 recently pass a recommendation for NOP to release a guidance
5 document on best practices for what -- because it's the
6 National Organic Standards Board, they call it, I think,
7 reducing contamination. So words aside for this group,
8 that's -- it's essentially a best practices document about
9 the system's plan and the role of the certifier, et cetera.
10 So that exists at USDA.

11 MR. REDDING: Alan.

12 MR. KEMPER: Just, just following up, Mr. Chair,
13 on what Missy's comments were, and I agree with it on how do
14 you encourage it, and a lot of us, and myself particularly,
15 I've been particularly blessed by hearing Secretary Vilsack
16 a lot of times in his speeches and meetings, and I think
17 that we -- I think, Mr. Chairman, we might use it as preface
18 or a start to this document of actually thanking all
19 American farmers for what they do.

20 I mean, whether that's organic, conventional or
21 whatever, livestock, whatever, they're out there providing
22 choices for American consumers and society, as well as the
23 world, and I think you get a lot more -- if you give them a
24 little bit of gratitude, they will listen a little bit
25 longer, and I always enjoy Secretary Vilsack when he speaks

1 about it, because he always recognizes that pretty much
2 right up front and maybe two or three times during a meeting
3 or a presentation. We might want to think about that.

4 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5 MR. REDDING: Okay. Thank you. So any, any final
6 comments for recommendations? Laura, question?

7 MS. BATCHA: This is -- we haven't talked about
8 this yet, but hearing Missy's comment about encouraging and
9 then also where we've landed, which is a strong emphasis on
10 the steps the IP producer can take to engage management
11 strategies that allows them to meet the market demand, and
12 thinking about venues, is -- you know, where's the place
13 that the farmer that makes the choice to grow a GE crop --
14 and my apologies in advance for not knowing this, not being
15 one of those farmers -- where's the place that you go that
16 you register, that you get that contract, and isn't that,
17 whatever that exchange is that happens, isn't that an avenue
18 also to be encouraged to engage in joint coexistence plans
19 if we're looking at places to encourage?

20 So we're trying to find ways for people to be
21 encouraged to engage in the development of the plan when
22 they're choosing diverse options around IP, et cetera, or in
23 the FSA office. Is there a way to have some encouragement
24 there, when you're making that choice, that says, you know,
25 we're, we're encouraging you to, to, you know, communicate

1 with your neighbors about your choice and there's some
2 resources available? I mean, it doesn't -- wouldn't need to
3 be more than that, but I'm not knowledgeable enough to know
4 where that interaction is.

5 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Isn't that also the FSA office?

6 MR. REDDING: Yeah. It could be any number of
7 points. I'm thinking, you know, the tech provider is part
8 of that. It's the Lynn Clarksons that are contracting. It
9 could be, you know, some of the extension or public offices
10 as well. Leon.

11 MR. CORZINE: To answer that question, Laura, any
12 biotech products you use -- now, and I assume you mean any
13 rather than just an IP situation -- but you sign an
14 agreement, a tech agreement with each company that you may
15 be growing their products, and there are sections in that
16 agreement on coexistence. So there's -- and it's rather
17 lengthy. I think some of them may be up to two, three
18 pages. So they really go into some detail of what to do in
19 regards to coexistence, so if that answers your question.

20 That's what we do in general, and then in anything
21 that is an identity-preserved product or an added-value
22 product that we need to segregate, you've heard me talk
23 about before, in the contracting there are -- in the seed
24 industry, there are specific requirements that you do, and
25 one of those requirements is you talk to whoever you border,

1 whether it's one of your own fields or your neighbor fields,
2 to see what they're going to grow and, if they're going to
3 grow -- for example, if I'm growing seed corn and they have
4 corn next to me, I go to a 660-foot buffer. If they're
5 growing beans next to me, maybe it's a 200-foot buffer. If
6 I'm growing seed beans, if it's a deregulated product, you
7 only have to have X number of feet. If it's a regulated
8 product, you have to have maybe 50 feet or something like
9 that.

10 So there are very specific things, actually more
11 specific than I think we can get that you just may not be
12 aware of. So in each of those areas, we do, we do go
13 through what it takes to segregate, what it takes to coexist
14 with whatever we're going to produce.

15 MS. HUGHES: So, Leon, is that if you're the IP
16 producer, you sign a contract? I'm --

17 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Missy, microphone, please.

18 MS. HUGHES: Sorry. I didn't know I was going to
19 be that long. I'm just trying to understand if that -- I
20 think what Laura is saying is you're the non-IP -- I'm the
21 non-IP producer and I'm just engaging in my normal Roundup
22 Ready farming.

23 MR. CORZINE: Okay.

24 MS. HUGHES: At the moment of contracting, when I
25 say I'm going to grow 10 acres -- maybe there is no forward

1 contracting, so maybe it doesn't happen -- but is there an
2 opportunity at that moment for the non-IP producer to be
3 touched, to say, hey, you should talk to your --

4 MS. BATCHA: Resources are available.

5 MS. HUGHES: Yeah.

6 MR. CORZINE: If you are a non-IP producer and
7 growing anything that's biotech or GE, you have a technology
8 agreement, and that coexistence -- a coexistence discussion
9 happens within that contract. Okay? Does that answer that?
10 And then that's --

11 MS. HUGHES: Well --

12 MR. KEMPER: Mr. Chair, Mr. Chair, let me try to
13 help address that, if you'd allow me.

14 MR. REDDING: Yeah, jump in.

15 MR. KEMPER: Thank you. First of all, I went to
16 Purdue. We keep it more simple than U of I grads.
17 Anyway --

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Ouch.

19 MR. KEMPER: -- a lot of farmers on their farms
20 grow IP and conventional on various methods. I'm not going
21 to go down the licensing route; that's a given, but as we do
22 our contracts -- and a lot of us do contract our crops.
23 Like, right now we probably have a third of our crop
24 already, our new crop, already contracted to the ADMs, the
25 Cargills in the area.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

2 MR. KEMPER: So to Laura's point is, those are
3 being used, also, that needs to have maybe a tear sheet on
4 their bulletin board about coexistence, and I think that's
5 maybe what you were driving at. And now a lot of times,
6 just at the elevator, during the fall, up to 80 percent of
7 the grain may be coming in unpriced. Well, those are still
8 farmers on Rural Route 2 that either are IP for Plenish
9 beans or conventional or GE just for like a Cargill or
10 something for ethanol or sweetener. Those can also have
11 tear sheets for it. So I think that's what we're trying to
12 address. There are numerous things for that to reach out to
13 producers. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14 MS. BATCHA: Yeah, I think, I think Alan's got
15 what I'm trying to get at, and it might be a combination of
16 both of those things. It might be in our recommendations
17 that USDA do outreach to the tech providers and to the
18 commercial entities that interact with the farmers growing
19 the GE crops and encourage the reference to the tools that
20 we've produced, as well, as a, you know -- you know, getting
21 people where they are is, is one of the biggest challenges
22 of this, and in some ways that's easier, that's more
23 contemporary in the way you transfer data, is to get to
24 where the interaction is happening rather than establish a
25 new location and try to draw participation. So that's,

1 that's what I'm trying to get at.

2 MR. KEMPER: That's a good point.

3 MR. REDDING: Yeah, fair point. Thank you. Okay.

4 Any other recommendations we want to make?

5 (No audible response.)

6 MR. SCHECHTMAN: This is good.

7 MR. REDDING: This has been really helpful, very
8 helpful. So let's shift now to the revised outline. I
9 think that's one other piece that we've got to talk about
10 just as we begin to frame up discussions this morning,
11 actually, and form this well. So as you look at this
12 revised outline, thoughts?

13 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Secretary, maybe just bearing in
14 mind that we still have to go back and talk about the
15 Complex Issues piece, just sort of seg, yeah.

16 MR. REDDING: Yeah. So as noted on this outline,
17 there is a reference here to the Complex Issues. We touched
18 on that this morning. There were a couple of thoughts on
19 that. We've got to go back and talk about that a little
20 more, but in terms of the general outline that we're writing
21 to and expectations of content, thoughts on this outline,
22 please. Angela.

23 MS. OLSEN: I think the overall framework looks
24 good. I would ask, though, that we, you know, for Item 4,
25 The Evolving Complexity of Coexistence, and then 8,

1 Challenges, Opportunities Now and Into the Future, I would
2 think that would be something that we would address when we
3 talk about the Complex Issues document that you were talking
4 about, Russell and Michael, to determine does, does that go
5 into our report, is it, is that answering the Secretary's
6 charge, does more information need to be added to the two
7 work products that we've all gotten around, that we've
8 talked about -- the guidance document and the models for
9 local discussions -- because to me those, as I stated
10 earlier today, those are really the crux of our report.
11 It's that and then what can USDA to help -- do to help
12 encourage those discussions.

13 So it's the -- I think the framing is important up
14 front and then the what will the report do -- so, again,
15 that's part of the framing -- the guidance document, the
16 models for local discussions, then what are the
17 recommendations for USDA, what do we think USDA can do to
18 assist this, this process, and then 4 and 8 I just, I don't
19 know if they're a part of our report. So I'm going to
20 reserve that until we've had the discussion on the, the
21 Complex Issues, because when I look at the Complex Issues,
22 too, if we're going to highlight Functional Traits -- and,
23 again, it doesn't mean we don't mention it; it's important;
24 seed is important -- not to say these things aren't
25 important, but why aren't we then talking about

1 cross-pollination and have a robust section on that? Why
2 aren't we talking about how to clean out your planters and a
3 robust section on that? And I'm not encouraging us to do
4 that.

5 So, again, I, I reserve 4 and 8. I don't know
6 that they belong exactly where they are in the report or
7 perhaps in that format. Maybe it's that we beef up one of
8 the other arguments to include the concise information that
9 we think is important to answer the charge.

10 MR. REDDING: Thank you. Leon and then Laura.

11 MR. CORZINE: As I looked at this -- and I went
12 back through several times the report on Complex Issues --
13 each one of these points is brought out at least once and, I
14 think, actually, two or three times within the other parts
15 of the document that we're developing.

16 So, you know, we can have a robust discussion and
17 maybe even see if we need to go to those other points,
18 whether it's in the guidance document, I think, maybe more
19 than the other one, and see if anything needs to be added to
20 those, but other than that, I, I don't really see the need
21 for this part. I think it just adds another component that,
22 if you take a look at our charge, I don't think it's -- my
23 opinion is we don't need it within our document.

24 MR. REDDING: Okay. Laura.

25 MS. BATCHA: I'm going to continue to say that I

1 don't agree with that. I think from my perspective what I
2 don't understand is this, is the strong resistance to it.
3 There may be needs for revision in the language or a step
4 back to see whether or not we've cast the net wide enough to
5 capture the range of things that fit inside the net.

6 For me, I think as a volunteer, who has a lot of
7 stuff going on every day, to take my time for years to sit
8 in these meetings and then there to just be resistance to
9 including things that others in the group feel are
10 important, is disappointing. So I will continue to say,
11 while they may need work and they may need rework after
12 work, at this point I'm really not ready to agree to
13 eliminating them from the outline.

14 MR. REDDING: Barry.

15 MR. BUSHUE: I am.

16 MR. REDDING: Josette and then Alan.

17 MS. LEWIS: I can agree to mentioning
18 controversial and complex issues in the report, and I do
19 feel like there's two places where we can find appropriate
20 references to those, in Section 4, The Evolving Complexity,
21 and Section 8, Challenges for the Future, because the
22 reality is, I don't think we have agreement on what the
23 steps are to address those complexities right now. And
24 maybe it's because I wasn't in the Models working group that
25 -- from which those seemed to come out of, if I'm correct,

1 but I, I was perplexed in why seed is flagged in so many
2 places when, in our first round of discussions in AC21 that
3 led to our previous report, we talked about the whole range
4 of potential sources of unintended presence and the need for
5 measures and research and tools to address those.

6 So I agree they should be mentioned. I'm not
7 interested in sweeping them under the rug or pretending
8 they're not there. I just, the, the degree of emphasis of
9 those two issues at the, at the lack of balance with other
10 ones that are equally important -- and I think you even said
11 something, Michael, yesterday about flagging whether things
12 like gene flow had almost disappeared off of the report,
13 which for me feels like it has, and that actually is a big
14 issue around seed, too, I mean, in addition to around
15 commodity production -- so I guess I'm very comfortable that
16 they be referenced in the report. I just, the proportion of
17 emphasis on them didn't feel right to me. So I don't know
18 if there's a balance to go forward in that regard.

19 MR. SCHECHTMAN: So, so again, let me just reflect
20 on, on why they became a separate piece, and again, I think
21 it came out of the discussions at the last meeting where
22 there had been considerable comments by several members
23 about these things needing to be talked about in a longer
24 way -- be talked about at some length and corresponding
25 comments from others that a more detailed discussion of

1 these things did not belong in the stand-alone documents.
2 So that's how they got to the place where they are.

3 Are they too much? Is it not clear why these
4 topics are talked about and not others? You know, those
5 are, those are things, those are things to be, to be
6 discussed, but I just wanted to give folks an idea of why
7 this document, which might seem to be coming a little bit
8 unrelated from the other pieces, is there. I just wanted to
9 reflect on that.

10 MR. REDDING: Alan and then Missy.

11 MR. KEMPER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Are we
12 blinking? Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate it.
13 I'm somewhere -- and with all respect to staff, I appreciate
14 that, that you did take notes and that people did talk about
15 it in the various committees -- however, I'm between Barry
16 and Josette because I'm at, no, it does not go in;
17 otherwise, we're going to go through 240 other commodities
18 and we're going to tell you why or why not they should be in
19 that document.

20 But I think there is -- and I think we've
21 addressed it in two of the documents that we're putting
22 forward for the final in that. We just don't need the
23 step-by-step process, but I would definitely agree with
24 Barry, they do not, this whole parking lot or, as I would
25 call it in Australian, talk-about notes, does not need to be

1 in there. Thank you.

2 MR. REDDING: Okay. Missy and then Angela.

3 MS. HUGHES: You know, as I look at these
4 sections, I think that they represent part of the work that
5 the Secretary asked us to do, which is to come together as
6 members of different pieces of American agriculture and
7 figure out how to talk about these things and how to work
8 through these issues in a way that's not confrontational, in
9 a way that moves agriculture forward.

10 And, you know, if you look at the Functional
11 Traits conversation, to me, you know, over the years that
12 we've talked about this, it represents this concept that
13 it's not organic versus GMO; it's, it's not anybody versus
14 anybody. It's these different types of agriculture out
15 there, and Functional Traits, I think, tries to bridge that
16 concept to say, you know, that there are -- this is coming
17 at us from many different directions. And so I think it
18 serves the purpose that way.

19 You know, with the seed conversation, we can, we
20 can never talk about that too much. Producers want seed --
21 there are producers out there who want seed with no GMO
22 material in it, and the choice that they want with that
23 needs to be again and again discussed because, once you lose
24 sight of it, you lose track of it, and so to bring that
25 there.

1 I'm happy to have a sentence in here that says we
2 talked about so many different issues at AC21 that we can't
3 put them all in here, but here's two that demonstrate what I
4 just talked about, this bridge and then an overwhelming
5 importance on this concept of seed, and that we, we just
6 don't want to lose sight of it.

7 MR. REDDING: Thank you. Angela and then
8 Latresia.

9 MS. OLSEN: So I'm, yeah, I'm in no way suggesting
10 that we keep Seed out of the report or that we keep
11 Functional Traits out of the report. I agree with Josette.
12 Where I think it's disproportional, there's so many things
13 that we could write about and then, you know, is it going to
14 misinterpreted why we've identified these two or three,
15 three issues?

16 What I'm suggesting is, does it make sense -- and
17 we're trying to strike a balance with these, the two
18 stand-alone documents. We all agree they should be short,
19 they should be straightforward, but clearly, whether we
20 could, you know, pull out a few bullets that go into I don't
21 know which of the documents at this point to, to address our
22 conversation. I don't know that they need to be those
23 stand-alone sections because, again, I think it's
24 disproportionate. Why aren't we talking about, as Josette
25 said, pollen flow? Why aren't we talking about how people

1 clean out their combines? There's so many topics that we
2 could include, and just to sort of, you know, target two or
3 three, which are important ones, I'm not saying they're not,
4 there's many other topics that are important as well.

5 So is there a balance where we just maybe add some
6 additional language to the stand-alone documents, but I'm in
7 no way suggesting that that stays out of the report, the
8 concepts. That's not what I'm suggesting, but we do address
9 them already, and if we need to address them and, you know,
10 with a few additional points, you know, maybe that's
11 something that we should talk about.

12 But, again, I go back to the charge of the
13 Secretary, how do we pull people together, and this is, you
14 know, again, one topic that, or one or two or three topics
15 that could go into in a more -- in maybe some additional
16 detail in those stand-alone documents, but I don't think it
17 belongs as a stand-alone section, but interested in what
18 others think as well. I see Latresia has been up for a
19 while.

20 MR. REDDING: Yeah. Latresia.

21 MS. WILSON: Well, thank you. I'm finally awake,
22 I guess. I've sat back and I've listened to everything this
23 morning, and, and I do see whereby my training as an
24 engineer and as a technical writer, whereby I can see where
25 there's a need for 4 and 8, just from a technical standpoint

1 in terms of writing. It gives you balance in terms of, when
2 you're working up into the document, what you're trying to
3 say, and then 8 comes in and saying, okay, this is where we
4 look at down the future. And so I do believe that 4 and 8
5 should be there.

6 Now, Angela talked about balance in terms of
7 whether we need to have just solely those two, Seed Purity
8 and Functional Traits. I agree, there should be more.
9 There are less. We need to find balance with the other
10 technical issues that also are making coexistence complex.

11 So I would say that 4 and 8 should stay; however,
12 I believe that we need to balance out Seed Purity,
13 Functional Traits and add some of the other issues that are
14 more -- maybe a couple of others so that we do get a balance
15 of those two things. And in terms of the white males that
16 are, seem discriminated, I say, welcome to my world.

17 MR. REDDING: Okay. Leon, then Laura and then
18 Jerry.

19 MR. CORZINE: Well, my intent with my comments is
20 not to sweep anything under the rug. Mine is trying to keep
21 it concise and keep it where it's a useable document, and my
22 impression is we have hit all these points in, in the
23 previous report we did or also in these other areas that I
24 mentioned, and if we need to tag on to those a little bit, I
25 guess maybe I could see that.

1 But, for example, in this, contentious or whatever
2 it is, the whole part about Challenges for Coexistence Now
3 and Into the Future and it talks about farmer challenges,
4 and you know, I think, leading to what Alan has talked
5 about, we look at those as opportunities. And kudos to the
6 writers and what your attempt was, but you know, there are a
7 lot of those things that are there today that really have
8 been there a little while and we look at every year, and I
9 think all farmers do, and they look at what their business
10 plan is going to be, and as I read through that, for
11 example, that section is just, it gets down to added
12 wordiness.

13 I don't, I don't see what that adds to what we're
14 trying to do here, because we do address in the introduction
15 and some of those other things about what farmer
16 opportunities are, what challenges are, but we go into all
17 of this extra language that is there that I really, if you
18 step back and look at it, nice discussion but it doesn't add
19 to the report, and I think it just adds bulk that will be a
20 detriment to our report as a whole.

21 And I think you can say the same thing about the
22 Seed Issues. I mean, we addressed those pretty thoroughly
23 in the previous reports as well. And I think in Functional
24 Traits, I mean, we've, we've got a section -- maybe it could
25 be expanded a little bit -- on functional traits in, I think

1 it's in the, not the guidance, maybe the models document on
2 -- and I would just like to see it stay as concise as we can
3 rather than put some of these things in. We're trying to do
4 feel-good things that really are going to be a detriment to
5 the final document as far as its usefulness. That's all.

6 MR. REDDING: Laura and then Jerry.

7 MS. BATCHA: So I think, you know, if the concern
8 is about being concise and feel good is used, then I would
9 bring us back to, I think, our first meeting we had together
10 when there was, I think, in my recollection, a good deal of
11 flexibility sort of granted or agreed to by the group when
12 Commissioner Goehring was insistent on bringing in other
13 issues related to agricultural production to these sessions,
14 other than just gene flow. And if you look at that models
15 document, it includes pages of stuff that is not central to
16 the original charge in an attempt to be flexible, hear each
17 other, trust that each other knows what the constituents
18 they represent need to see to buy in, and so I just want to
19 remind us of that.

20 So if what we're going to do is just go concise
21 and eliminate anything feel good, then we're going to do
22 that review for the entire work product, in my opinion.

23 MR. REDDING: Okay. Jerry.

24 MR. SLOCUM: Well, being sensitive to what Laura
25 has now mentioned what, four times this morning, that there

1 are certain things that people need to see in this report so
2 we can get consensus, and we all believe that the strength
3 of our previous work has been the fact that we've come to
4 consensus, maybe with a few additional remarks or a few
5 dissenting remarks, but for the most part, we've come to
6 consensus and that's what's made our work products worthy.

7 So I'm in a place here that I don't know exactly
8 how to address the Functional piece, but I think we can
9 address the Seed piece within, within the document, within
10 the -- which document is it -- within the guidance document,
11 because we mention seed there is a critical component and
12 maybe it's the most, although I wouldn't insist on that, but
13 it's certainly one of the first critical components.

14 We had a great, a great piece out of first work
15 that's in the Complex Issues document where we quote
16 ourselves: Seed purity is a crucial issue. All AC21
17 members recognize the important role, yada yada yada. It
18 seems to me that we could simply insert that paragraph from
19 our previous work into Seed Being a Critical Component
20 without, without a lengthy discussion or a lengthy
21 regurgitation of earlier discussions.

22 And I agree entirely that it's first the seed.
23 That's what ASTA says. Michael Funk, when he was on the
24 committee, said that was simply the most critical and
25 important part of it in his business, was the seed, and I

1 think we all concur. I think we all agree. I think most
2 growers wish there were more information on the seed tag. I
3 certainly do. I'm pretty damn certain that the soybean seed
4 are not 80 percent germ, although that's what the label
5 says. They're somewhere between 75 and 100, but they're not
6 80. If they are, it's an accident. And I wish it'd be more
7 precise than that, but it's not going to be, and I can live
8 with that.

9 But I think that -- and I do understand that for
10 the non-GE community, which is the fastest growing part of
11 agriculture, I assume, and which probably has the most
12 opportunity in it for additional profits in the short run, I
13 understand that seed is a -- is the most critical issue, and
14 I don't think we can ignore that. Okay? At the same time,
15 I don't think we need to reinvent the wheel there and have a
16 discussion once again that we've had in any number of our
17 publications.

18 So if we can strengthen the part of Seed Being a
19 Critical Component within, within the stand-alone guidance
20 document, maybe that would suffice. Okay?

21 As to Functional Traits, I'm not exactly sure how
22 we, how we deal with that other than they're just, they're
23 just traits, and while they may have a more punitive impact
24 on the crops that are growing around them that they may
25 escape into, nonetheless, they're just -- it's just part of

1 a coexistence plan. And maybe, maybe there's a way to
2 highlight the fact that there are some crops that we have an
3 opportunity to grow that will require a better, a better
4 coexistence agreement or a better separation agreement. I
5 don't know how we address that without -- I don't think we
6 want to draw huge attention to these things to the point of
7 discouraging producers from attempting these, these new
8 opportunities, and when we use words like complex, you know,
9 it -- we don't want to scare people away. I don't think we
10 do.

11 There's a -- I'm impressed with, when I look at my
12 customer base and when I talk to my younger customers, guys
13 in their, in their late 20s or in their 30s that are the
14 sons of old-time customers or the grandsons of old-time
15 customers, I'm impressed with their willingness to embrace
16 the new, the untried. I really am impressed by it, and we
17 don't want to discourage those folks. We want to arm them
18 to take on these new opportunities or slash challenges,
19 because they're all the same, but we don't want to -- we
20 don't want to discourage them to the point that they say,
21 well, it is granddaddy's old farm, we just got to keep doing
22 the same old, same old, because that's not going to be the
23 future of American agriculture. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

24 MR. REDDING: Yeah. Jerry, I think the, just on
25 the point of encouraging, I mean, we, we want to make sure

1 in the framing of the document, front side, is that we
2 really are, you know, positive and we're encouraging.
3 Right?

4 MR. SLOCUM: Right.

5 MR. REDDING: But we also want to say that there
6 are things that are evolving, that are inherently complex in
7 the business that we've chosen, right, and some of those are
8 under our control; many of them are not. So how do you sort
9 of frame that and capture that? And there are things where
10 -- there are technology, there are BNPs, there's climate,
11 there are all kinds of issues. I think there's a way for us
12 in the document, without sort of, you know, putting a label
13 on those evolving complex, by a section here.

14 MR. SLOCUM: Right.

15 MR. REDDING: If you fold some of these things in
16 other places around challenges or, you know, the
17 opportunities or if we can modify or amplify something
18 that's already there, we should try to do that but have a
19 document at the end of the day we can point to and say we
20 started over here with a larger charge, we assessed that
21 landscape, we were given a new charge, there are things in
22 there that are certainly more tangible in terms of what we
23 can present, and then there's some things that we know we're
24 just going to bump into in the course of the conversation.

25 If that's our charge, is to, you know, facilitate

1 this conversation, you're going to bump into these things.
2 I would hope that the document at least would point to them
3 and say, you know, that committee, which is the thought
4 leaders around biotechnology and the coexistence, they
5 recognized that there were issues but they're not
6 conclusive, right, but they at least acknowledged they were
7 out there.

8 You know, I think we can do that. It gives us a
9 way in the document to sort of present it. We're not
10 singling them out. We're not saying that they are Nos. 1,
11 2, and 3 but they are just on that landscape as we look at
12 it. It's complex. It's going to get more complex. How we
13 manage that conversation, as we noted this morning,
14 farmer-to-farmer, farm level, will be critical. And we also
15 have to know that in that -- in presenting that, we also
16 need to raise the awareness of those who are engaged in this
17 that may not be as informed as we are, right, in this first
18 circle of understanding of what some of these evolving
19 issues are.

20 So if we can present that in a way in the report,
21 I think we have done a service to and lived true to the
22 charge the Secretary gave us without calling them out, you
23 know, here in a separate section that somehow these are two
24 or three that are more important. They're among others of
25 unresolved issues, but I think we, I think we can manage

1 that within, within this framework, okay, because there were
2 two sort of themes, being don't call them out but
3 acknowledge them or don't acknowledge them that they even
4 exist. I would hope that we would be more on you don't have
5 to single them out but they're out there. Right? I mean, I
6 hear that. So folding them in would be acceptable here,
7 just not in a separate section, but --

8 MS. BATCHA: I have a clarifying question about
9 that, Russell, if you don't mind.

10 MR. REDDING: Okay. Yeah.

11 MS. BATCHA: So my recollection of our discussions
12 on this, that the reason they ended up in a separate section
13 -- and I think we had some discussion yesterday about maybe
14 the questions around international trade would get rolled
15 into that -- is because there was not comfort with those
16 more complex issues going into the core documents that we
17 were producing as products that then would be serving as
18 guides for these coexistence conversations at the state and
19 local level, and so because of some folks flagging those as
20 being inappropriate for those documents, we ended up putting
21 -- pulling them out and putting them someplace else.

22 So I'm just reminding that that's at least my
23 recollection how we got there, was because some of these
24 more open-ended complex questions people were not
25 comfortable with having in the core documents. So --

1 MR. REDDING: Right, but I guess, Laura, just for,
2 for clarification, so noted that they were identified, not
3 in the core documents, but could we fold them into the
4 Challenges and Opportunities section? Right? I'm assuming
5 that there would still be a section there --

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh.

7 MR. REDDING: -- called Opportunities and
8 Challenges. Right?

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

10 MS. HUGHES: Not in Angela's.

11 MR. REDDING: Pardon me?

12 MS. HUGHES: I think Angela advocated for not
13 having that in there.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

15 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Use the microphone, please.

16 MR. REDDING: Yeah, sorry. Yeah. So, I guess,
17 just I don't want to lose the point that they were
18 identified --

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

20 MR. REDDING: -- we didn't want to lose sight of
21 them; they were flagged by members of the work group. So
22 what --

23 MS. BATCHA: And they were -- they were requested
24 to not be in the two core documents, Russell.

25 MR. REDDING: Okay. So, okay, so not there, then

1 somewhere, right? So the question is, in the placement of
2 this outline, do you still try to get them in the document
3 but not in the core documents? Right? Angela.

4 MS. OLSEN: Yeah. I mean, that was my initial
5 suggestion, but I could certainly live with them being
6 somewhere in the document if they're not singled out as
7 these are No., you know, Nos. 1 and 2 and they're
8 disproportionate to some of the other topics that we've
9 talked about, and also, it would depend on how they're
10 drafted. There's -- you know, the way that the Complex
11 Issues document currently is drafted, there are things that
12 -- language I would not prefer, that I don't think is, you
13 know -- so we'd have to talk about what language goes in.

14 But certainly, if there was a section, you know,
15 Opportunities, I don't love the word Challenges, we may want
16 to think about another word there, or maybe that is the
17 word, but if it's folded into another section and, again,
18 it's listed out among other things, then, you know -- the
19 words matter; I would have to see what the words are -- but
20 I think that that, you know, that, that would be a
21 compromise I could agree to. But, again, you know, what is
22 it going to look like having these large sections that just
23 call out, you know, functional traits and seeds and have
24 these robust sections when we don't have anything on
25 cross-pollination or, you know, some of the other issues

1 that we've identified in the guidance document? It doesn't
2 seem balanced to me.

3 So I could certainly agree to folding it into
4 another section as long as it's more balanced, it's
5 positive, it's in an, sort of an incentivized way. So I
6 would consider that.

7 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Let me, let me just make a point.
8 So in drafting these sections, I had -- we had been focusing
9 on trying to capture all of the things that we had heard
10 from committee members who had raised these as, as important
11 topics, as well as information that I know Lynn, for
12 example, had put in the draft, an earlier draft of the
13 guidance -- his first suggestion on the guidance document,
14 talking about functional traits.

15 So there was an attempt to include all of those --
16 you know, basically, all of the things that we had heard
17 around these issues and the things that had been brought up
18 by members around the table. That did result in a fairly
19 long document on these issues, and it may be that -- again,
20 because there was a specific desire to capture all of that,
21 it may be that these pieces could be combined with -- to
22 address these issues but with a lighter touch, you know,
23 having heard what committee members have, have said about
24 this, but still could be included in a Challenges and
25 Opportunities section in a bit, in a bit more abbreviated

1 fashion but hitting some of these points. So that is a
2 possibility if, if members can go along with that.

3 I am seeing more separation where there had been a
4 lot of consensus on this issue than on most of the other
5 discussions we've had in the last couple of meetings. So I
6 just want to throw that out as a possibility if folks can,
7 can deal with that.

8 MS. BATCHA: I think that would depend on where
9 the final models document then landed with the other
10 additional things that were brought in there.

11 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Use the microphone, please,
12 Laura, sorry.

13 MS. BATCHA: That would then depend on where the
14 models document landed and how we treated all that
15 additional information that was brought in there without a
16 direct bridge to gene flow. So we'd have to go back and
17 look at that possibility.

18 MR. REDDING: Okay. Yeah. Alan.

19 MR. KEMPER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
20 It's nice you guys have two-way conversations. Michael,
21 we're exactly back where we were an hour and seven minutes
22 ago on your discussion of where the parking lot was and all
23 the details. We noted that you took notes on it. We noted
24 that there were thoughts and processes for it.

25 Mr. Chairman, you had a very good movement towards

1 a consensus on all your thoughts about eight minutes ago
2 that we were going to do that into the document, maybe one
3 or two paragraphs into Existing Challenges slash
4 Opportunities. And I think we need to go forward on that
5 because I think you'll find much more leaning towards a
6 consensus on that thought than to put several, eight to 10
7 paragraphs in. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8 MR. REDDING: Okay. Yeah. Thank you. Barry and
9 then Josette.

10 MR. BUSHUE: I would tend to agree with Alan. I
11 did want to make one specific point. There was, in that --
12 regardless of what happens to the, what are we calling it,
13 The Evolving Complexity Issues, there was a comment in there
14 or a reference in there to the canola issues in the
15 northwest. I hope and pray that does not become part of
16 this document. That was perhaps the most contentious,
17 divisive decision ever made with regard to coexistence. It
18 is not coexistence. It was not collaborative. It was
19 something that in the end the legislature weighed in on, and
20 I don't think anybody in this room wants legislature
21 determining what you can and can't grow on your farm.

22 If we're talking about coexistence and
23 collaboration and farmers working together, that is the
24 worst example that anyone could cite in terms of where,
25 where I think this group is trying to head. So I would hope

1 that there's a great big black line through all of that.

2 MR. REDDING: Okay. Josette and then Latresia.

3 MS. LEWIS: What I was going to suggest as maybe a
4 way forward is that as a first priority for the next step of
5 work would be to draft the sections 4 and 8 so that we can
6 see those in writing and have more time to discuss those
7 prior to our next meeting, because it seems like we're
8 moving towards an idea there has to be reference to these
9 issues, and the question is, all the devil is in the detail
10 as to how that much reference.

11 But I think, picking up on Laura's point, because
12 yesterday I raised -- I actually had an equal concern about
13 the other issues in agriculture that I had a puzzling -- I
14 couldn't understand how these were all being listed and they
15 didn't directly relate to coexistence. So for me that's
16 still a problematic question.

17 It really is in the framing, and I would guess,
18 maybe -- so maybe as a concrete response to Laura's point, I
19 would suggest that, that if we're going -- if we were to
20 take on requesting a draft of Sections 4 and 8, it would
21 also include a redraft of the models, to take some of that
22 detail or that context and make sure it is also moved to The
23 Evolving Complexity or Challenges and Opportunities, because
24 to me that's what these are all about.

25 These are the fact that there's a lot of factors

1 that growers have to take into consideration, seems to be
2 what I'm understanding Doug Goehring was suggesting, and
3 also, we haven't resolved how do deal with all those
4 complexities yet because there are these issues for the
5 organic growers around seed purity and the availability of
6 sufficient seed.

7 So I guess specifically what I'm suggesting is,
8 I'm not -- I think a lot of us feel the need we need to see
9 the text in order to be able to understand where we're
10 getting that right balance of recognizing the issues that
11 people are passionate about but in a balanced way. So that
12 seems to me like some text that we need to react to to move
13 forward and that, sort of going along with that, suggesting
14 that one -- an additional piece of that drafting is to
15 relook at the models and see if there's balance that needs
16 to be achieved there, because it is part of the overall
17 equation on these.

18 MR. REDDING: Okay. Thank you. Latresia.

19 MS. WILSON: In terms of The Evolving
20 Complexities, basically, what I see there is that it gives
21 credence to what we've done. It tells us that there are
22 some complex issues that we have addressed, and we're
23 putting them in that section and saying, these are things
24 that we can address directly but they're evolving, they may
25 be getting better, they may be getting worse; however, it

1 gives us credence in terms of this report was well thought
2 out, it was -- those issues were considered by all; there
3 may not be consensus on some of those issues; however, these
4 are complexities that we need to have there.

5 So I still put forth the idea that we do have No.
6 4 there, and then No. 8, again, we've come through the
7 storm; now we're getting over. There's some, still some
8 opportunities and challenges we can now face and go on.
9 Again, I think 8 should be in there.

10 MR. REDDING: Okay. Thank you. Alan, did you
11 have another comment?

12 MR. KEMPER: Oh, I'm sorry. No.

13 MR. REDDING: Jerry.

14 MR. SLOCUM: Yeah, I would, I would --

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Got to use your mic.

16 MR. SLOCUM: Oh, sorry. I would think 4 could
17 become 8. I think we could combine those two issues, and
18 before we talk about The Complexity, or The Evolving
19 Complexity of Coexistence and Challenges and Opportunities,
20 we can talk about this report. We can talk about this
21 report. We can talk about what this report does to arm or
22 to prepare the farmers that want to, that want to
23 participate and have a market through identity preservation.
24 We can, we can point to our two documents that would help
25 them go down that road, and then we can talk about what the

1 future may hold, that coexistence and farming, just not
2 necessarily coexistence, but farming, will become -- there
3 will be more opportunities as well as more challenges; and,
4 you know, not, not put it in the front of the report, or in
5 the front of the document, but put it in the, in the back as
6 we look to the future.

7 And we've talked about some of these issues.
8 Functional characteristics will become more important on the
9 landscape as those products are developed, and they will
10 present new challenges as well as new opportunities, but our
11 core work, our guidance document and our models document,
12 you know, will address those issues.

13 I mean, it -- you know, the conversation is going
14 to have to be had among farmers or amongst participants in
15 the same farming operation. Whether it's me having that
16 conversation with myself or whether it's me having that
17 conversation with my neighbors, our core documents, those
18 two stand-alone pieces, will provide the avenue to have
19 those discussions. It may be a discussion at a greater
20 depth. It may be a discussion that requires more, more
21 scientific understanding than the existing world does, but
22 nonetheless, I think, I think the work we're doing is work
23 that will allow producers to address those things.

24 So I wouldn't put them in No. 4. I'd kind of, if
25 we were going to talk about those things, I'd move it toward

1 the end of the document, if you would.

2 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Could I --

3 MR. REDDING: Yeah.

4 MR. SCHECHTMAN: -- could I make a point? Just,
5 just one point, before that section became The Evolving
6 Complexity of Coexistence and had the pieces of Seeds and
7 Functional Traits added into it, it was a perhaps more
8 positively focused thing that said Coexistence Is an Ongoing
9 Process but Is Not New and that is something that could go
10 before the, and this is the, and this is the bulk of our
11 recommendations. And then conceivably, dealing with these
12 other issues again after the bulk of the document and in a
13 more concise way might, might be a way forward, if we move
14 them back, back to the end, but certainly open to hear what
15 others think about that.

16 MR. REDDING: Angela and then David.

17 MS. OLSEN: Yeah, Michael, thank you. I think
18 that is something that could work, the concept of
19 Coexistence Is Not New. I recall it being a positive
20 statement, however you had phrased it. I do think that the
21 topics that we are discussing within 4 could be folded into
22 8. So I like your suggestion, Michael. I think that could
23 work.

24 That still puts the topics in the report. It
25 still talks about opportunities and challenges. We may want

1 a different word for challenges, but maybe not. You know,
2 so it acknowledges that but, again, in a more concise way.
3 The language will matter. I think we need to, you know, it
4 needs to be much shorter than what's here now, and I
5 understand now, Michael, what you were trying to do with the
6 documents. You were trying to sort of capture all the
7 thoughts, but I don't think that's the text that goes into
8 that section.

9 I also wanted to respond to Josette's point about
10 the models document. What we had heard at the table -- and
11 I don't have strong feelings on this, but I, just to reflect
12 what was discussed at the last meeting -- Doug and some of
13 the growers around the table had said in order to
14 incentivize us, this has to be a meeting to pull us
15 together; it has to be more than just we're going to talk
16 about coexistence; it's an important topic but to talk about
17 -- bring people together to talk about topics that are
18 important for all of agriculture and practical local issues
19 that folks are dealing with on their farms. I think that
20 was the conversation. So I think that's why those other
21 topics were in there.

22 It's not that I feel strongly about it, but if
23 it's going to be something that's going to incentivize
24 growers to come and one of those topics is coexistence, I
25 think that's a positive, that's a positive thing, but

1 interested in others' thought as well. Again, I don't feel
2 strongly about it, but if it's something that's going to
3 bring people to the table, I'm in, I'm in favor of it.

4 MR. REDDING: David and then Barry.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted
6 to focus my comments to Seed Purity, Seed Production, and,
7 and I think on behalf of other people that have raised these
8 issues before, whether that's Isaura or Michael Funk or
9 myself or others, I think that those sections are in both
10 the guidance and there's even a section in the models
11 document called Including Seed Production.

12 Jerry spoke to the fact that he thought some of
13 the people that would read these documents and benefit from
14 them both initially would be farmers, that they would be
15 reading them, and I think there's another group -- and
16 they're already using our, our first document that we put
17 out in 2012 -- and that's seed production companies, people
18 that are actually trying to produce seed that's used then to
19 grow commodities. It's the seed that's used to plant the
20 seed, right? And they're using these documents, and they're
21 trying to become innovative in how to get pure seed, I mean,
22 and we've even heard Lynn talk about seed companies that
23 are, that are actually trying to put stuff on tags now.

24 And so I think those are, those are, those --
25 that's at least one subject that we should include in both

1 of those documents because it, it starts a conversation
2 that's actually started many years ago but it continues that
3 conversation and it continues those people working towards
4 whatever they can do to provide choice in the marketplace.

5 And I know there's a lot of people around the
6 table that have been asking what can we do to improve purity
7 in seed at various levels, and I'm not talking about
8 necessarily commodity that's produced and taken to the
9 elevator, but the seed that's used to plant all of those
10 deals, what can we use to do that. So there's a big
11 undercurrent that's underway in seed companies. I worked at
12 one for 20 years. We spent hours talking about how were we
13 going to get pure seed, where are we going to grow it, what
14 are we going to do for buffers. I mean, it changed our
15 whole culture in how we thought about seed production in a
16 crop like cross-pollinated alfalfa.

17 So I would encourage everybody to just kind of
18 think about some of the things that we put in various parts
19 of the document and how they're having a bigger impact on
20 conversations all around the country that we're not even
21 maybe recognizing. Thank you.

22 MR. REDDING: Jerry.

23 MR. SLOCUM: I'm sorry.

24 MR. REDDING: No? Okay. Okay. So we have --
25 good discussion, good feedback. I think, you know, we can

1 look at, you know, how to, how to produce this, sort of a
2 hybrid between 4 and 8, right, informed by sort of content
3 that probably folks need to look at and see what's there,
4 but as noted, I mean, a placement of that will be important
5 as well. So if it ends up being, you know, sort of in the,
6 what is now the Challenges and Opportunities -- and we can
7 find another way to say that. I think what we're trying to
8 forecast in the document, that there's a lot of opportunity
9 there. We state that, I think, in the very intro of our
10 report, but there's a way to also say, as we look to the
11 future, these are things we see, right, and trying to --
12 again, don't know what the right words are -- but trying to
13 capture that in that section is what we'll, we'll attempt to
14 do and then come back in a draft. Okay?

15 But getting, I think, some acknowledgment that
16 there are issues there, they're not resolved, how we place
17 them and what we term them will be important but don't leave
18 them out, right, that we're not doing a service to either
19 the Secretary's charge or to American agriculture to simply
20 ignore them; put them in, but put them in context, fair?

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's right.

22 MR. REDDING: Okay. So when you look at the, the
23 outline, the revised outline, are there other sections,
24 other things that you, that you want to have identified?
25 Missy.

1 MS. HUGHES: I'm going to, I'm going to try and
2 add --

3 MR. REDDING: Okay.

4 MS. HUGHES: -- to what you just said.

5 MR. REDDING: Okay.

6 MS. HUGHES: Before talking about, you know,
7 anything else, I just -- it occurs to me, you know, this
8 whole conversation about challenges versus not, I wonder if
9 there's a way to say that we believe following on these
10 recommendations, taking these recommendations up may help
11 alleviate some of the things we see coming in the future; in
12 other words, good conversations among farmers about
13 coexistence might help provide more transparency to consumer
14 expectations, whatever, you know -- so trying to say, what
15 we're trying to do now is trying to help what we see coming
16 in the future.

17 MR. REDDING: Good point. Okay. All right. So
18 anything, when you look at the outline, you want to see, we
19 need to highlight, avoid, just so we have clear guidance
20 when we get to this, to this outline that's going to be our
21 blueprint to draft? You're okay with what's here given the
22 conversation and the changes around No. 4 and 8 and however
23 that sort of presents itself in the final document, but the
24 content pieces would be there? Okay? All right.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

1 MR. REDDING: So we have an outline. We have the
2 recommendations. We have the guidance and the model. What
3 else do we need? What else do we need to go forward here?

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: Lunch.

5 MR. REDDING: Lunch. Okay. Alan.

6 MR. KEMPER: No, that's fine if you want to break
7 for lunch, Mr. Chair. That's fine, but I think you're
8 pretty wrapping the day up. I mean --

9 MR. REDDING: Yeah. I guess I'm just --

10 MR. KEMPER: -- you've given us that. So I don't
11 know --

12 MR. REDDING: Yeah.

13 MR. KEMPER: -- do we stay an extra 15 minutes
14 here and then release us so we can catch flights, or do you
15 want to drag us back and we sit another hour? Thank you.

16 MR. REDDING: Yeah. So let's, let's just take a
17 moment. On the agenda, what else -- I guess that was my
18 open-ended question -- sort of what else, beyond sort of
19 what we've noted this morning, do we need to sort of take
20 time to address prior to adjournment? It's not the agenda.
21 It's not the recommendations. It's not the two core
22 documents. Correct? So what is it? Right? What is it
23 we're going to focus on when we come back to the table? Is
24 there something that, that we need to finish here? I just
25 want to make sure that we're on the same page in terms of

1 where we're expending time and expectations here for the
2 afternoon. Angela.

3 MS. OLSEN: Mine is an easy one. It's just
4 process, and that is that we came up with our calendar
5 yesterday of when Michael, Michael, when he would have
6 certain drafts to us, and of course, now we're talking about
7 sort of a rewrite or a new section. You know, we all will
8 want to see, you know, Coexistence-Why It's Important; there
9 are different sections. And so my question is simply
10 process: Do we need to rejigger any of these dates so that
11 we get the work product? And, Michael, we want to respect
12 your schedule as well, you know, if we want to -- you know,
13 if it needs to be on, kind of on a rolling basis, because
14 this section is one that I think we're all going to be very
15 interested in seeing.

16 MR. SCHECHTMAN: So, so based on what I heard,
17 there's going to be considerably greater amount of work that
18 will need to be done on what up until this meeting was
19 called Complex Issues but will be a new section going later
20 into the report and will be a little shorter.

21 So what I will say is that this schedule, I think,
22 is still basically right. I can imagine that that document
23 could be a few days late, but you know, it's not going to be
24 much off from this July 1st date to have the other pieces,
25 you know, if it -- and if you'll just give me a couple of

1 days past the Fourth of July, in case I need it, to get that
2 piece out to everyone. But the schedule should be basically
3 as we talked about, and we'll still get, try to get you the
4 draft full report by around the 10th of August.

5 MR. REDDING: I mentioned yesterday, you know,
6 it'd be important, I think, in this document somewhere to
7 have the inventory of actions that the USDA has taken from,
8 from the point of our initial recommendations to the point
9 of reconvening with the new charge. So there's not one
10 spot, but I think that helps to address both the issues that
11 were raised by way of recommendation but also important to
12 note that that's not simply, you know, it's not just
13 list-making. Right? There really were substantive changes,
14 whether it be on the risk management products or the, the
15 National Genetic Resources work that they've done,
16 et cetera; so having someplace that points to, you know,
17 what we said initially were concerns and priorities but the
18 intervening actions, because this will be sort of a final
19 report of this AC21 and who knows what, you know, the new,
20 you know, what that future looks like in terms of transition
21 and use of product, but it would help, I think, answer some
22 of the questions, again, to put this in context.

23 You know, a lot of things were identified, a lot
24 of actions taken, you know, a limited charge on a couple of
25 points that we're delivering on, and then being able to sort

1 of -- particularly for whatever the, as we look at the
2 future section looks like, being able to reach back by way
3 of reference to actions already taken and work underway,
4 right, because it's continuing as well.

5 So somewhere in here I would hope that we could
6 agree to put those types of things. They're not -- I'm not
7 sure what the right presentation is or even how to get it,
8 but being able to fold that in, I think, will help tell the
9 larger story of the work of this AC21 over the course of six
10 years. Comment?

11 MR. SCHECHTMAN: I guess, I guess I would just
12 raise the question whether the report wants to list the
13 things that USDA has done or simply to acknowledge that a
14 lot of things have been done or to provide an appendix of
15 things that we've done, just as a few potential choices.

16 MR. KISLING: I would say just acknowledge.

17 MR. REDDING: Okay. All right. But having some
18 point to it, saying work done, right?

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

20 MR. REDDING: Okay. All right. Anything else
21 then on -- sorry. I get the wave that I'm not speaking to
22 the microphone. So, okay, so we'll consider, you know, this
23 revised outline as our rough outline with some modification
24 of the sections noted. We have agreement on the proposed
25 time line and feel like that's still realistic, and we have

1 agreement on, on the sections around guidance and models and
2 recommendations. Correct? And the recommendations, we'll
3 work on, you know, putting the thoughts this morning into
4 recommendation form and the course that'll come back to you.

5 Anything else that we need, that we set out on the
6 agenda for you in a formal way and/or you walked in here
7 expecting some further discussion about that -- you know,
8 next time you'll see some product, but when we come back to
9 the table, it's going to be in pretty final form, right,
10 with some discussion around it, but it's going to be in
11 pretty final form. So any thoughts of what needs to be in
12 the agenda and/or you're looking for content on tell us,
13 tell us now. Okay?

14 (No audible response.)

15 MR. REDDING: I don't -- hearing none, I think
16 there's some consensus around sort of what, what we have.
17 Keith, are you going to make the motion?

18 MR. KISLING: How about we adjourn? Keith
19 Kisling.

20 MR. MCKALIP: I wanted, I wanted to just say --

21 MR. REDDING: No, no. Yeah. I don't want to rush
22 past. I just want to make sure, content-wise, that we're
23 okay, yeah, and then we'll have a few, a few comments here.

24 MR. MCKALIP: Thanks, Secretary Redding. Thanks
25 for all of your work guiding us through this very difficult

1 process, incredibly important. Thank you, all, for your
2 very hard work. The Secretary is very aware of how hard
3 you're working on this task. I was out on the phone with
4 him just a few minutes ago, and he's very appreciative of
5 the work of this committee.

6 I did want to follow up, before we adjourn, just
7 on one item that was brought up earlier in the day. We had
8 an assertion that there was a USDA policy or rule that
9 prohibited white-male farmers, less than 10 acres, from
10 farming or that USDA had a rule that denied them benefits.
11 We take every assertion of discrimination incredibly
12 seriously, and rest assured, we follow up on it.

13 I just want to report back on follow-up that I had
14 gotten from FSA on this issue today, and that is that there
15 is not a USDA policy or rule. However, the 2014 Farm Bill
16 included language from Congress for two of the new programs
17 that were created in the 2014 Farm Bill -- the Ag Risk
18 Coverage, which is the Countercyclical program, and Price
19 Loss Coverage -- included language that stated that the sum
20 of base acres on entire farm must exceed 10 acres in order
21 to qualify for those two programs.

22 I asked our FSA staff why, why on earth would
23 Congress put that into the farm bill, and the response I got
24 back from our FSA staff was that apparently the Hill was
25 concerned with administrative costs of the program and felt

1 that for a farm of less than 10 acres, that the
2 administrative cost could end up outweighing the program --
3 benefits in the program.

4 So I wanted to report back to you that those -- it
5 does affect two FSA programs. Just whether you agree with
6 the policy or don't agree with the policy, it does not
7 affect the loan programs at FSA, it doesn't affect NRCS
8 programs, doesn't affect rural development but, for those
9 two FSA Countercyclical and Price Loss programs, that there
10 is a prohibition on less than 10-acre farms participating in
11 those programs. I did also learn that Congress did include
12 language for limited-resource producers, can get
13 Countercyclical program or Price Loss Coverage at any size
14 farm.

15 So, again, these -- it is important to USDA
16 whenever any farmer brings up an issue of discrimination. I
17 wanted to make sure that this wasn't something that was a
18 USDA policy, that it was not a USDA thing that we had put
19 into place, but I did want to report out on the facts, which
20 is that there is two programs in the farm bill that do have
21 a size prohibition.

22 So, again, just, you know, wanted to make sure we
23 did that before we closed out this discussion. I really
24 appreciate all of your hard work, as does the Secretary and
25 the whole USDA team. So thank you.

1 MR. SCHECHTMAN: A couple of last words.

2 MR. REDDING: Yeah.

3 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Okay. So maybe just switching
4 back to the subject of the, of the report, I want to thank
5 everyone for the hard work. We've had some difficult
6 discussions today, and I think the discussions really point
7 out that the report that we get is the report that no one
8 member would have written and that it brings people to a
9 place that nobody finds ideal, and that's in large measure
10 part of the charge from the Secretary. And we will do our
11 best to try again to, to find that point based on the
12 guidance that you've all given us, and if we have to make
13 some more adjustments based on what we hear on the pieces
14 that you will be receiving, we will do that. We will keep
15 trying to find that spot.

16 And now I have -- sort of before, before we
17 adjourn, I have just one other small message to give to
18 people, and that is, if -- since we are adjourning early, if
19 any of you are going to be trying to change your flights to
20 go back earlier, I am instructed to tell you that you should
21 do that not through the travel agency but through the
22 airline. That's correct, Diane, right? Yes. And so, so
23 that's the -- that was the one other housekeeping piece of
24 information for you, and now I'll turn it back to our chair.

25 MR. REDDING: Michael, thank you. Just a couple

1 of final comments here, just to -- want to say thanks again
2 for the engagement and time. You know, it really -- it's a
3 challenge for all of us to sort of carve out a couple of
4 days and travel, and I know what it is just sort of being
5 local, how difficult it is, and for those who are doing
6 extraordinary scheduling and stepping away from running
7 businesses and managing policy and family and life, thank
8 you very much.

9 Also, each time I'm at the table I'm very grateful
10 to have the committee that was selected by Secretary Vilsack
11 and just sort of the reengagement of AC21. I know we get
12 into these conversations and sometimes wonder why am I, you
13 know, hearing this for the 10th time, but I also like to
14 believe that this conversation that we're having really is
15 what outside we're expecting to have, right, and to model
16 that discussion and behavior and engagement. If it can't
17 happen here among this group, it's very difficult to expect
18 that to happen external, right?

19 So I think the engagement here is instructive in
20 terms of the difficulty, the sensitivities, the biases that
21 are built into sort of our life experiences; at the end of
22 that, trying to make sure that we also have a product, that
23 we have guidance that is going to work as well in the San
24 Joaquin Valley as it does in the Susquehanna Valley, right,
25 and that's a 3,000-mile -- and there's a lot of territory in

1 between that's got to be managed.

2 So I look at what we do as really critical to that
3 conversation and that there certainly are challenges and
4 opportunities, but I think all of us can appreciate that
5 what we do in this business is find an equilibrium between
6 them. Right? It's sort of the motivation for, for us to be
7 in this business of ag.

8 So there are many issues that we'll have to sort
9 of tackle going forward, but just want to say, working with
10 this committee, I appreciate the engagement. We're almost
11 there and then we can sort of have another conversation in
12 September when we're back together and consider that sort of
13 our final product.

14 So just would ask you to think, you know, about
15 the conversation the last two days, reflect on the
16 conversation, the opinions; really, you know, as you travel,
17 look at this outline again and the thoughts, just make sure,
18 you know, that what we have presented here as our sort of
19 blueprint is what you're expecting to see in the final
20 product and, at the same time, is, is it going to advance
21 that conversation of coexistence. Okay?

22 So with that, just thank you, good to see you,
23 safe travel in between, and we'll see you in September.
24 Okay? Thank you. And we have the motion to adjourn. All
25 the best. Thank you.

1 One final, I mean, I forgot Diane, sorry. I mean,
2 I looked over there and want to say this would not happen
3 without Diane, sorry, appreciate the good work, and Betsy as
4 well, thank you for all the good work. Thank you.

5 MR. KISLING: And you, also, Mr. Chairman and
6 Michael. We appreciate you and accolades to you guys. At
7 home they call me Mr. Plywood because of all the, all the
8 boards that I'm on, and I use this for a model, the way you
9 guys keep us from crawling over our tables from one side to
10 the other and keep it organized, and we appreciate that.
11 Thank you, guys.

12 MR. REDDING: That'll do it. Dr. Schechtman
13 deserves the credit. Thank you.

14 (Whereupon, at 12:11 p.m., the meeting was
15 adjourned.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Digitally signed by Wendy Campos

2

3 ELECTRONIC CERTIFICATE

4

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

9

10

11 ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON BIOTECHNOLOGY
12 AND 21ST CENTURY AGRICULTURE

13

14

15

16 By:

17

18



19

20

Wendy Campos, Transcriber

21

22

23

24

25