

PDS/Policy Comments

NOP-NOSB Collaboration

1. **Terry Shistar of Beyond Pesticides** addresses recent USDA actions that usurp and deny the authority of the NOSB granted to it under the Organic Foods Production Act (OFPA). “We believe these actions endanger public trust in the organic label. We urge the NOSB to: not abdicate its responsibilities under OFPA; support motions to delist sunset materials in subcommittee; support a motion on every petition to add an annotation calling for an expiration date in 5 years; and disclose interests fully on every issue, and ask others to do so.... OFPA directs the Secretary to consult with the NOSB (§6503(c), §6506(c)(2)(ii)), and gives the NOSB the responsibility for advising the Secretary in all aspects of the implementation of the Act (7 U.S.C. § 6518(a)), as well as spelling out several specific areas of responsibility....These comments will address the final three issues, which are part of a more general issue, the fact that USDA is, contrary to the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, exerting undue influence on the recommendations of the NOSB. ...OFPA intends that the NOSB play a large role in setting priorities of the National Organic Program....Recommendations to the Secretary concerning actions that affect the production, sale, and use of genetically engineered seed fall within the purview of the NOSB....**Recent USDA/NOP announcements change organic policy making from one driven by the public process to one controlled by USDA, which can choose to dismiss critical issues.** For example, NOP has changed the decision-making procedure for sunset—a procedure set by a public process—reversing the standard for the decision; has limited “timely” input into the sunset process to a time when the public does not have access to subcommittee proposals; has arbitrarily removed an agenda item; has imposed a conflict of interest policy that does not require public disclosure of potential conflicts; has limited public participation in policy decisions that affect the way decisions are made about organic production; and has required that USDA/NOP priorities drive the public process. The NOSB was designed to maximize public input from a community with strong and often conflicting views about the meaning of “organic.” Through that input and a definition of “decisive vote” that enforces concurrence of most of the community on any exceptions from the general rules of OFPA, the public has come to have trust in the USDA organic seal. That trust may be abruptly destroyed as a result of the USDA’s recent actions. Comments from the fall include:
 - a. **USDA has taken control over the determination of eligibility to vote on NOSB motions.**
 - b. **USDA has prevented the NOSB from carrying out its duty to advise the Secretary by preventing the GMO Ad Hoc Subcommittee from recommending actions to the Secretary regarding seed purity.**
 - c. **The NOP has arbitrarily reversed the long-standing NOSB policy on sunset.**
 - d. **USDA has asserted the right to relist sunset materials in the absence of a recommendation by the NOSB and acted to relist in opposition to a recommendation by the NOSB, both of which are contrary to OFPA.**

- e. **USDA denied agreed- to NOSB participation in writing guidance for biodegradable biobased mulch film.**
 - f. **USDA pulled from the agenda of the fall 2013 NOSB meeting a definition of production aids proposal passed by the Materials Subcommittee, after having received public comment on a discussion document at the spring 2013 NOSB meeting.**
 - g. **USDA has shown little progress on the implementation of an inert ingredients policy adopted by the NOSB.**
2. **Center for Food Safety** says, “Undue influence of USDA officials was repeatedly identified as a critical issue of concern by representatives of the organic community during the development of OFPA. In fact, at one Congressional Subcommittee meeting in particular, every agricultural, industry, environmental, and consumer advocate present unanimously opposed giving the USDA Secretary the authority to unilaterally add synthetics to the National List. To prevent this from happening, Congress created the NOSB under OFPA and explicitly gave the Board recommendation authority over adding substances to the NL.... Nearly 24 years later, against the wishes of Congress, USDA has asserted control over the NL by usurping the NOSB’s authority in two critical ways. First, the policy overturns the long-standing presumption that each synthetic substance on the NL is slated to be removed after five years, at sunset, unless compelling information exists to retain it on the list.... Secondly, the NOSB’s authority has been further usurped by the reformulated Sunset Policy, which allows synthetic substances to be renewed without a full Board vote.... Center for Food Safety urges NOSB members to request that all Subcommittees bring forward substances destined for sunset before the NOSB for a public debate, analysis and full NOSB vote. We further urge the NOSB to use all avenues available to accomplish this, including: voting to de-list a substance in Subcommittee and using the petition process to add a five year expiration annotation to listed the material. In conclusion, we urge the NOSB to work with the USDA/NOP to reinstate the historical, former sunset policy that subjects substances slated for sunset to the same two-thirds majority vote that allowed them on the list in the first place.

Conflict of Interest

Summary

4 commenters including Beyond Pesticides, Consumers Union, and Cornucopia oppose the NOP conflict of interest policy.

4 commenters including Beyond Pesticides, Consumers Union, and Cornucopia believe the NOP COI policy is not transparent enough.

1 commenter (Consumers Union) does not believe that NOSB members are “representatives”.

1. **Susan Brown** believes that the board-based proposal provides clearer guidance to the COI process and left determinations less to the discretion of the NOP. We support a procedure that requires disclosure of interests to the full board and the public, rather than only the NOP, in the belief that decision making of a board of representatives requires input from all perspectives, but also the recognition by other Board members of the perspectives from which differing opinions come. She also believes that the COI proposal should be

evenhanded in recognizing that stakeholders may and often do have a special but not personal financial interest in a Board decision. In addition to not being adequately transparent, the NOP is requiring a COI policy that is not evenhanded because it holds board members employed by public interest nonprofit organizations to a higher COI standard than board members who are employed by for-profit companies. In this respect, employees in a company that would benefit economically from a Board decision are not asked to recuse themselves, while those who work for organizations supported by contributors with an economic interest in Board decisions are. Overall, the discretion afforded the NOP to make these decisions without clear uniform criteria will create public distrust and hurt the integrity of the organic label.

2. **Consumers Union** writes,

We are very concerned with the direction that the USDA appears to be moving in regarding the NOSB's conflict of interest policy. We submitted a comprehensive comment on this topic in October 2013, yet it appears that the USDA has not considered the concerns we raised and is moving ahead with a different approach from the one we proposed.

Given its importance to the integrity of the process, we urge the Board and the NOP to read our comment on COI in its entirety. Below are some highlights from our comment:

1 NOSB members are not representatives We are especially concerned with the USDA's assertion that NOSB members are "representatives." The first line of the National Organic Program Memo on Conflict of Interest from March 2013 states: "NOSB members (you) are classified as representatives under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA)."

It is unclear why the USDA considers NOSB members to be "representatives" based on FACA. *Neither OFPA nor the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) refers to NOSB members as "representatives" or suggests their primary interest is in representing a particular interest group. In fact, FACA never uses the term "representative" to refer to advisory committee members. Both OFPA and FACA clearly suggest that NOSB members are advisors.*

The rationale behind OFPA's creation of different NOSB member categories was not to create "representatives" but rather to bring stakeholders together, with various expertise from different sectors, into a deliberative process to assist and advise the Secretary with the implementation of OFPA.

It is unreasonable to expect Board members to speak and vote on behalf of entire groups, like "farmers" and "handlers." It is an oversimplification of the complexity that exists that we believe the Secretary must consider. Public comment often shows this complexity; and there have been plenty of votes where one group of farmers urged Board members to vote one way when other farmers urged the Board to vote another way.

If the NOP's COI policy becomes official, NOSB members will no longer be expected to vote objectively on materials petitions - determining objectively whether a material meets OFPA criteria - and therefore protect organic integrity, but will be expected to serve narrow interests regardless of whether OFPA criteria are met and organic integrity is preserved. The organic industry depends on consumer trust in the integrity of the label, and we cannot allow this USDA policy to become official.

Defining Conflict of Interest We are less concerned with *who* determines the conflict of interest than with *how* conflict of interest is defined and how recusals are determined. Who makes the decision is less important than that the declaration be made in a transparent manner and that the decision be based on clear, ethically sound standards that were openly and publicly discussed and developed.

A "conflict of interest" occurs when a primary interest is unduly influenced by a secondary interest. In order to determine what constitutes a "conflict," it is necessary to first define the primary interest - it must be clearly articulated and agreed upon.

We believe that NOSB members' primary interest is written in the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (OFPA): "to assist in the development of standards for substances to be used organic production and to advise the Secretary on any other aspects of the implementation of this chapter (Section 6518(a))" and OFPA's purpose includes "to assure consumers that organically produced products meet a consistent standard (Section 6501(2))."

2 Transparent Process We believe that a set of criteria for determining recusals due to a conflict of interest must be developed in a transparent manner, involving both the NOSB and the public. The development of clear criteria should go through the formal NOSB and NOP rulemaking process, including a public comment period for both the NOSB recommendation and the NOP proposed rule. We oppose the current process as it is unfolding, where the USDA appears to be adopting a new policy without public input or participation, and with their own interpretation of FACA.

The organic industry's continued growth and success depends on consumer trust in the integrity of the label. We would like to see a strong conflict of interest policy based on sound standards that will assure consumers of the integrity of the organic program and label.

Again, we urge the USDA and NOSB to read our full comment on Conflict of Interest in its entirety.

3. **Cornucopia Institute** says,

We believe that it is important to preserve transparency on the question of conflicts of interest. The following items are requirements to maintain transparency:

- The NOSB should determine policy at full Board meetings that are open to the public.

- Potential or perceived conflicts should be disclosed to fellow members of the Board before discussions or voting occurs.

Since the NOSB members are the people who are most affected, they should be the ones who write and implement the policy. We ask that the NOP abide by the opinions of the NOSB.

Nothing we are stating here should suggest that having a conflict of interest, in itself, is an ethical problem. It has been long established that certain stakeholders are expected to have conflicts from time to time on the NOSB. But not disclosing these conflicts, in a transparent manner, publicly, is a problem. And members voting on materials and issues that directly benefit them personally, or their employers, should not hesitate to remove themselves from the process if conflicts, or the impression of conflicts, exist.

4. **Beyond Pesticides** says that USDA has established a Conflict of Interest policy that improperly influences the independent deliberation and full participation of the Board –a policy that does not require public disclosure of potential conflicts.

Sunset

Summary

197 commenters wrote to oppose the new sunset policy, including Beyond Pesticides, Midwest Pesticide Action Center, PCC Natural Markets, Center for Food Safety, Food and Water Watch, Consumers Union, Cornucopia Institute, National Organic Coalition.

No one wrote to support the new sunset policy.

1. **Terry Shistar of Beyond Pesticides says**, “OFPA gives the NOSB responsibility for managing the National List. The NOP has usurped that authority. The NOSB should use every opportunity to assert its authority. This includes refusing to approve petitions because they may prove to be irrevocable and unmodifiable in the near future. ...We ask that the NOP place a moratorium on changes announced in the September 16, 2013 Federal Register until the changes are announced with an opportunity for public comment.” She also says, “Because new information relating to criteria under the Organic Foods Production Act (OFPA) on materials up for sunset review is likely to arise between now and the next sunset date, future new information concerning their relisting must be considered under the same terms as the original petitions. Since the new National Organic Program (NOP) policy requires a two-thirds majority to prevent a material from being relisted after five years –as opposed to the former policy of requiring a two-thirds majority to relist—the only way to apply the same threshold for allowance as is required by the petition process is through the Board adoption of a five-year expiration date as an annotation to the listing. Because the new NOP sunset policy does not permit the National Organic Standards Board (NOSB) to propose annotations at sunset, we are hereby informing the NOSB that Beyond Pesticides has submitted petitions for annotation of the listings of all materials on the NOSB’s agenda in the April 2014 for preliminary review –aqueous potassium silicate, sulfurous acid, sodium carbonate peroxyhydrate, sherry, marsala, gellan gum, and tragacanth gum—which we request be considered and acted upon simultaneously with the sunset review.”

2. **Susan Brown** says, “Anything you do pass must have a 5-year expiration date to sunset materials.” She urges the NOSB to reject (i) additions to the National List that raise potential health, safety, or essentiality concerns until there is a clear collaborative process in place and the sunset process is reinstated to require materials review to effect a material’s relisting, and (ii) the adoption of NOP-required policies in its policies and procedures that do not meet with NOSB member approval.
3. **Ruth Kerzee of the Midwest Pesticide Action Center** takes the position that the sunset process for listing materials used for organic food production needs to return to its original structure - requiring a two-thirds majority to relist materials allowed - or otherwise instate an "expiration date" for those materials that are on the list. Doing so will better uphold the integrity and accuracy of the list of materials that are acceptable. We support the most stringent review process of listed materials possible in order to uphold the integrity of the organic label. ... While the new sunset policy is intended to provide for a more organized system of evaluation, in reality it weakens our ability to respond to new and emerging science about the products used in the production of our nation's food supply.
4. **Anita E Anderson** says, “If you allow the current organic standards to be replaced by your standards of adding ingredients and not taking any away, allowing synthetics then organic foods will be like any other. You just killed a 18% growing industry. An industry the people are obviously choosing for a reason. WE ARE SICK OF BIG AGRA/CHEM POISONING US!”
5. **Jeanne Dixon** is a doctor who is concerned about the diets of her patients. She says, “The long-term viability of the USDA organic label is dependant on a separate organic board's ability to review petitions for additives to food. If the changes proposed to weaken this oversight and allow synthetics to be added, there will be public distrust of the organic label and distrust of the USDA,” and then cites the Beyond Pesticides website. “Please reinstate the sunset process.”
6. **Eli Penberthy of PCC Natural Markets** says,
On behalf of PCC Natural Markets’ 50,000 member households, we strongly oppose the National Organic Program’s (NOP) Notification of Sunset Process, published in the Federal Register on September 16, 2013 (78 FR 56811).

NOP’s announcement — without warning and without stakeholder input — of a new policy encouraging the indefinite use of synthetic and non-organic materials in organics is not acceptable. Until now, NOP policy has allowed only the temporary use of such substances for a specified period of time, with the intent of forcing users to search for organic alternatives.

The existing sunset provision has allowed the National Organic Standards Board (NOSB) to extend use of synthetic and non-organic materials with a two-thirds majority vote, provided the users of the substances made a convincing case. This system of vetting exceptional substances every five years allowed the organic industry flexibility while maintaining the integrity of the organic label. It has been successful in keeping the large majority of synthetics and non-organic substances

out of organic products. It has worked to make organic standards strong and is aligned with consumer expectations.

The new policy, however, diminishes the incentive to develop organic, nonsynthetic alternatives. Under the new rules just issued by NOP, a two-thirds majority vote by NOSB members would be needed to remove a substance from the approved National List, effectively a sharp reversal in the policy of limiting synthetics and non-organic substances.

Since the inception of the Organic Foods Production Act (OFPA) in 2005, the responsibility for making the case for the extended use of a given material was shouldered by those wanting to continue its use beyond the period of five years. Now, the NOP has set the default to leaving materials on the National List, unless a concerted effort is made to amass evidence of the need for removal. Clearly, this sharp reversal in NOP policy will allow many more exempted substances to be allowed in organics indefinitely, not the intent of OFPA.

The NOP claim that this rule change "increases transparency" is blatantly misleading. It removes decision-making from the full 15-member board and puts it in the hands of a much smaller subcommittee. Until now, all decisions have been made in a public meeting, and all transcripts were posted for public view. The new NOP policy changes that. Now, decisions can be made in private, in the subcommittee meeting, with the public unaware of the discussion. This is not transparent. NOP's decision is disappointing because it reduces transparency but even more so because of NOP's false claim that it increases transparency.

Organic consumers believe the integrity of organics depends on prohibiting and phasing out the large majority of synthetics and non-organics. This new policy will erode trust in the organic program and diminish the value of the seal.

What is most troubling about this recent action by NOP is it is rule-making from the "top-down" — rather than the fully democratic process provided by OFPA.

7. **Frances Dunham** says, "My family relies on the OFPA and its original provisions for sunseting synthetic materials unless individually evaluated and approved by NOSB for provisional 5 year terms. New data and conclusions from credible sources must be weighed in these evaluations. We were distressed to learn that NOP has issued rules making it harder for NOSB to delist substances. This only damages the integrity and reputation of the "USDA Organic" label. For the sake of all organic consumers and producers, I also ask that no synthetic materials be approved until those rules are rescinded."
8. **Debbie Murphy** says, "Please keep all standards in place!"
9. **Tim Taylor** says, "It is important that the National Organic Standards and Program reflect my expectation of what the organic seal means: Not produced using processes or

synthetic materials. I am completely opposed to the rule changes of the Sunset Process and urge the NOSB to return to the previous Sunset Process.”

10. **Allan Peterson** says, “I feel that the NOP sunset policy is a necessary step in reassuring families like mine that we can provide safe foods. The USDA’s National Organic Program’s (NOP) arbitrarily changed the rules for approval of synthetic and non-organic materials used in organics, disregarding the Board’s policies and the Organic Act. I object to such a move and want the super majority reinstated.
11. **Center for Food Safety (CFS)** says, “[T]he Agency overturned commitment to limit synthetics in organic, without Congressional knowledge or consent and without public notice and opportunity to comment.... USDA has asserted control over the NL by usurping the NOSB’s authority in two critical ways. First, the policy overturns the long-standing presumption that each synthetic substance on the NL is slated to be removed after five years, at sunset, unless compelling information exists to retain it on the list.... Secondly, the NOSB’s authority has been further usurped by the reformulated Sunset Policy, which allows synthetic substances to be renewed without a full Board vote.... Center for Food Safety urges NOSB members to request that all Subcommittees bring forward substances destined for sunset before the NOSB for a public debate, analysis and full NOSB vote. We further urge the NOSB to use all avenues available to accomplish this, including: voting to de-list a substance in Subcommittee and using the petition process to add a five year expiration annotation to listed the material. In conclusion, we urge the NOSB to work with the USDA/NOP to reinstate the historical, former sunset policy that subjects substances slated for sunset to the same two-thirds majority vote that allowed them on the list in the first place.
12. **Food and Water Watch** says, “Because the new NOP sunset policy does not subject all materials to thorough review and public debate before allowing a material to be relisted, we are concerned that it does not meet the process created by OFPA. We therefore ask NOSB members to oppose petitions for materials for which addition, removal or change of an annotation might be needed in the future, or where the original petition included redacted confidential business information. This would compel full review by the entire NOSB for this listing and ensure that new information related to health, environmental, and essentiality issues is taken into account.”
13. **Consumers Union** says,
[W]e wish to comment again on the September 2013 decision by the USDA to change the process for relisting materials on the National List (Sunset). No public comment period was provided for the changes to this policy, which had been in place since 2005. We object to both the process and the substance of the policy change. We remain seriously concerned about this.

Under OFPA and prior to the NOP’s September 16, 2013 announcement, there was a controlled process for listing materials on the National List. Otherwise prohibited materials received exemptions for a five-year period, in order to encourage the development of natural (or organic) alternatives. The exemptions were required by law to expire, known as “sunset,” unless they were reinstated by a two-thirds “decisive”

majority vote of the National Organic Standards Board (NOSB) and include a public review. This is no longer the case.

In light of this recent policy change, we urge extra caution by NOSB members during materials review. Any material approved for listing on the National List is much more likely to remain on the National List in perpetuity, since the new policy requires a two-third vote to remove, rather than a two-thirds vote to relist, and only after the Subcommittee votes to propose a removal.

We are especially concerned that the NOP's new policy charges subcommittees with the task of proposing to remove a material from the National List. If a subcommittee decides not to propose a material's removal, the full NOSB does not have the opportunity to vote during the sunset process. Had oxytetracycline been a sunset vote (rather than a petition to extend an expiration date), this means that the full Board would not have voted on its removal, since the Crops Subcommittee voted by a one-vote margin against the immediate phase-out of oxytetracycline. Any time a Subcommittee determines that the material should be relisted, there will be no proposal to remove and therefore no opportunity for the full Board to review and vote.

We believe that the USDA's decision minimizes all incentives for creating organic, natural alternative ingredients and lowers the standard for what consumers can expect behind the organic label. Allowing the USDA to automatically relist materials without the recommendation of the NOSB erodes the Board's legal authority over materials decisions, a key to consumer trust in the organic label. The fact that the agency made this decision without any public input only adds to the violation felt by watchdog groups and consumers alike. Potentially allowing an indefinite listing of non-natural ingredients and requiring a supermajority vote to retire a substance after five years undermines the spirit of the law for how materials head into "sunset" or retirement. It is unfair to producers trying to produce a truly organic product and it is unfair to consumers trying to make meaningful purchasing decisions. Simply put, this lowers the bar for much of the organic market. We believe the USDA must reverse course and we intend to mount a fierce campaign to hold the agency accountable to the millions of Americans who expect more from the government—and the organic label.

Cornucopia says, "The National Organic Program (NOP) sunset policy published in the Federal Register violates OFPA, because it does not subject National List materials to the required reassessment. The policy was a reversal of long-standing accepted procedures. This change in policy was undertaken without public comment and without the participation of the NOSB.... Cornucopia urges the Policy Subcommittee to **retain** the sunset process as it stands in the Policy and Procedures Manual (PPM). The Board is not required to support a sunset policy that violates the intent of Congress (OFPA). Indeed, it is the Board's responsibility to act in accordance with OFPA.... The purpose of the NOSB according to the Organic Foods Production Act:

Sec. 2119. [7 U.S.C. 6518] National Organic Standards Board:

(a) In General.-The Secretary shall establish a National Organic Standards Board ...to assist in the development of standards for substances to be used in organic production and to advise the Secretary on any other aspects of the implementation of this title.

(k)(1) The Board shall provide recommendations to the Secretary regarding implementation of this title.

This indicates that it is the responsibility of the NOSB, not the NOP, to determine sunset review procedures. OFPA does not give authority to the NOP to advise the NOSB.

This responsibility is restated in the [PPM's section on NOSB-NOP collaboration. **Policy established in 2005 should be retained.**" The comments also quote extensively from the minutes of the PDS of July 9, 2013.

14. **"NOC** believes that the new USDA/NOP sunset policy violates OFPA, because it does not subject all materials to the required review, careful analysis, and public debate as a prerequisite for allowing a material to be relisted through the sunset process. The sunset process is intended to hold the materials under sunset review and relisting to the same standards that are used to allow them on the National List through the petition process. That ensures that upon sunset, synthetic chemicals are not only reviewed prior to relisting, but they are recommended with the same two-thirds vote of the Board that allowed them on the list in the first place. The two-thirds vote is critical to public trust in the label because it ensures that most key sectors of the organic community are in alignment with the recommendation and that it meets the standards of OFPA. It is that high standard and level of consensus that gives the organic standard setting process and ultimately the label the integrity that consumers trust and will increasingly come to trust in the long-term. Application of the new (September 2013) USDA/NOP sunset policy would impede the full review and relisting required by the law (OFPA), which is relied on by the organic community (during sunset review every 5 years) to take into account all new information concerning health, environmental, and essentiality issues. **We therefore ask members of the NOSB to compel full review by the entire Board: analysis, public debate, and vote by the entire Board for all materials at sunset.** Means available to you to accomplish this include voting to de-list in subcommittee and using the petition process to attach a 5-year expiration annotation to a listed material. **NOC asks the NOSB to work vigorously with the USDA/NOP to reinstate the historical sunset policy** that subjects materials to the same two-thirds vote of the Board that allowed them on the National List initially."
15. **Karen Burroughs** says, "[P]ut a moratorium on changes announced in the September 16, 2013 Federal Register (78 FR 56811, National Organic Program-Sunset Process) and in the USDA Organic Insider on March 6, 2014, and allow the public the opportunity to comment. We deserve the right to tell you what we think here too."
16. **Anonymous Anonymous** says, "the public oversight serves to keep undue influences from watering down the laws and standards set to ensure biodiversity, lesser environmental impacts and the sunseting of synthetics. it should not be undermined by the NOP, USDA or special interests and in particular GE agribusinesses."
17. **Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey** says, "Trial and questionable materials should SUNSET without requiring a vote."

18. **Connie Kline** says, "I support the required two-thirds vote of the Board every five years to relist synthetics. This provides confirmation and confidence that the hazards of these synthetics have been thoroughly reviewed and that these substances are essential to production."
19. **Matthew Swyers** says, "The new sunset policy, a reversal of long-standing accepted procedures, does not subject synthetic and non-organic materials to the congressionally-mandated reassessment. The new policy allows a subcommittee of the Board to renew materials, thereby reducing public input and transparency. This change in policy was undertaken without public comment and without the participation of the NOSB. I do not support this change."
20. **Beatrice Elsamahy** says, "The new sunset policy reverses long-standing accepted procedures, and does not subject synthetic and non-organic materials to the congressionally-mandated reassessment. The new policy allows a subcommittee of the Board to renew materials, thereby reducing public input and transparency. This change in policy was undertaken without public comment and without the participation of the NOSB. This is unacceptable."
21. **Duane Stanton** says, "I believe that public input is invaluable to providing access to a variety of viewpoints on the process of determining which substances are continued and which are discontinued for use in organic agriculture. I oppose the possible use of a subcommittee to make these decisions without providing ample opportunity for the general public, particularly those with ecological and agricultural experience, to convey their views."
22. **Elizabeth Agostinho** says, "On September 16, 2013, the National Organic Program (NOP) published a notice in the Federal Register describing a significant change to the sunset process that requires materials to be reevaluated or removed from the National List after 5 years. The new sunset policy, a reversal of longstanding accepted procedures, does not subject synthetic and non-organic materials to the congressionally-mandated reassessment. The new policy allows a subcommittee of the Board to renew materials, thereby reducing public input and transparency. This change in policy was undertaken without public comment and without the participation of the NOSB."
23. **Mark Skinner** says, "I strongly support reversing or rescinding the new policies described in the Sep 16, 2013 Federal Register Notice significantly altering when and how approved materials are to be reevaluated every five years by the full NOSB. The new policy is not consistent with Congressional mandates nor with the best interest of growers, consumers and the spirit of good government."
24. **Anonymous Anonymous** says, "The new policy allows a subcommittee of the Board to renew materials, thereby reducing public input and transparency. This change in policy was undertaken without public comment and without the participation of the NOSB. This does not sound like responsible regulation of Organic products to me."
25. **Sandra Woodall** says, "Please tell the USDA to put a moratorium on changes announced in the September 16, 2013 Federal Register (78 FR 56811, National Organic Program-Sunset Process) and in the USDA Organic Insider on March 6, 2014, and allow the public the opportunity to comment."

26. **Christopher Martin** says, "I am completely opposed to and am Completely Offended by the Unscientific, Economy-based rule changes of the Sunset Process and not only urge but threaten you if you, the NOSB, do not to return to the previous Sunset Process, with my withdrawal of not only my GDP, but knowledge and political acumen; to another country."

27. **Janet Nesselbush** says, "I am completely opposed to, alarmed by, and disappointed in the irrational rule changes to the Sunset Process and strongly urge the NOSB to return to the previous Sunset Process."

28. **Rodney Ginter** is an organic consumer who opposes changes in the sunset process. The following 169 people stated that they are completely opposed to the rule changes of the Sunset Process and urge the NOSB to return to the previous Sunset Process:

29. **Luan Le**

30. **Ed Fischer**

31. **Kimberly Kelley**

32. **Cynthia Treadwell**

33. **Anonymous Anonymous USA CITIZEN**

34. **Karen Giles**

35. **Georgia Salmon**

36. **Karen Lawson**

37. **Kent Fadness**

38. **Cheryl Bowman**

39. **Ava Coleman**

40. **Anonymous Anonymous**

41. **Barbara Poulsen**

42. **Karen Graham**

43. **Bradley Hubbard**

44. **Tom Cheek**

45. **Trista Gaucher**

46. **Diane Vigne**

47. **Kat Malstead**

48. **Anononymous Anononymous**

49. **Michael Mittenberg**

50. **EMRYS HALBERTSMA**

51. **Merritt Stephens**

52. **Marilyn Olbricht**

53. **Pamela Morrow**

54. **Michael Meliher**

55. **Katherine Jones**

56. **christine salica**

57. **Kim Hill**

58. **Farrah Storli**

59. **Ann Bartholomew**

60. **Jeffrey White**

61. **Ken Busse**

62. Selma Al-Abbas
63. Susan DeSisto
64. Kenneth Rogers
65. Kerri Bishop
66. Wendy Hinckley
67. Maureen Hewett
68. Kevin Wisnosky
69. Laura Kays
70. Kathryn Chow
71. maura Elliott
72. Cassie Jongejan
73. Jean Palmer
74. Brian Alexander
75. Candace Hillard
76. Alvin Otero
77. Susan Berger
78. Ross Tapp
79. Jennifer Gillooly
80. Diana Herman
81. Joe Clark
82. Catherine Weber
83. Shelley Cole
84. Trina Anonymous
85. Davis, Barbara
86. Jesse Roth
87. shawna barata
88. Cindy Wexler
89. Brandy Sievers
90. Cheryl Brown
91. Elizabeth vonTauffkirchen
92. Alicia Haller
93. Jamie Beckett
94. Gregory Illes
95. Kristi Kazmierski
96. Brian Friesen
97. Anonymous Anonymous
98. Sherry Soroczak
99. James Nichols
100. Renee Johnson
101. ariel clark
102. Donna Maupin
103. cathy cioffi
104. Paul Anonymous
105. Bev Butterfield

106. Ruthe SchoderEhri
107. Sandra Griffin
108. Janet Kuykendall
109. Jessica Theetge
110. Ruta PeBenito
111. Diane Hain
112. natalie upson
113. Susan Anonymous
114. Candace Quibell
115. DARRELL THOMPSON
116. Cathy Lehman
117. Lucy Crook
118. Holly Wells
119. Roger Pack
120. lucille turuseta
121. Mychael Seubert
122. Kyle Epperson
123. KaCee Kemper
124. Cheri Langlois
125. C Valero
126. Ashley Campbell
127. Amy Meade
128. kristin parris
129. Deena Van Allen
130. LeAndra B
131. Jeanette Lewis
132. Eric Tillman
133. Ginger Betz
134. Russell1 Smith
135. Jessyca Berkley
136. Judy Miller
137. Jami Bowles
138. Janet Simpson
139. Linda Stewart
140. Justin Cook
141. Jennifer Ketchum
142. Renee Coughlan
143. Judy Soule
144. Theresa Teichman
145. Margaux Bangs
146. Melissa Turbeville
147. theresa typer
148. Inger Brown
149. antonio vargas

150. Frederica Huxley
151. Kevin Totels
152. Jennifer Lee-Therault
153. Lesley Harris
154. Marcie Brewster
155. Anonymous Frankly
156. Chrys Dean
157. Khanada Taylor
158. Cathy Robertson Mathia
159. Angie Conrow
160. Cheryl Anonymous
161. Kathy Tunney
162. Annette Taylor
163. Anonymous Anonymous
164. Trish Barner
165. Tina Tyler
166. Elizabeth Harvey
167. Jamie Morris
168. Nikki B.
169. Per Bluhm
170. Sharon Rogenmoser
171. Elizabeth Ammenwerth
172. Richard Bahr
173. marina baklashev
174. David Johnson
175. Colin Hutchins
176. anonymous anonymous
177. Jacqueline Trump
178. Scott Streisel
179. Jeff Bielski
180. Rachel Lytle
181. Jacob Sutherland
182. Annette Agee
183. Linda McGowen
184. Evan Cato
185. Nancy Wyrick
186. Anonymous Anonymous
187. Roxanne Marra
188. Alysia Tessling
189. Luz Engelbrecht
190. Jackie Greco
191. Frances Burge
192. Pamela Jaques
193. Anonymous Anonymous

- 194. **Renee Switkes**
- 195. **greg lunger**
- 196. **Jennifer Basaraba Sprague**
- 197. **Kevin Anderson**