



# BEYOND PESTICIDES

701 E Street, SE ■ Washington DC 20003  
202-543-5450 phone ■ 202-543-4791 fax  
info@beyondpesticides.org ■ www.beyondpesticides.org

March 18, 2024

Ms. Michelle Arsenault  
National Organic Standards Board  
USDA-AMS-NOP  
1400 Independence Ave. SW  
Room 2648-S, Mail Stop 0268  
Washington, DC 20250-0268

**Docket ID # AMS-NOP-23-0075**

## **Re. CS: Compost Discussion Document**

These comments to the National Organic Standards Board (NOSB) on its Spring 2024 agenda are submitted on behalf of Beyond Pesticides. Founded in 1981 as a national, grassroots, membership organization that represents community-based organizations and a range of people seeking to bridge the interests of consumers, farmers, and farmworkers, Beyond Pesticides advances improved protections from pesticides and alternative pest management strategies that eliminate a reliance on pesticides. Our membership and network span the 50 states and the world.

## **Summary of these comments**

Compost from plant and animal materials is of fundamental importance to organic practices. Composting is the way that organic growers meet the requirement in law to “foster soil fertility, primarily through the management of the organic content of the soil through proper tillage, crop rotation, and manuring.”<sup>1</sup> The integrity of organic production must be maintained by preserving the integrity of compost. Contaminants in broadly defined “compost feedstocks” cannot be predicted, but history suggests that more persistent toxic pollutants will be found. Only synthetic materials that are specifically added to the National List through the prescribed process should be allowed in compost destined to be an input into organic production. Therefore, the NOSB should reopen the workplan item on contaminated inputs that is currently on hold.

## **Overview**

This discussion document is wide-ranging, “seeking information in all areas of regulations surrounding compost making.” We congratulate the CS in compiling so much information in one place. However, in terms of moving forward with action proposals, we believe that it would be better to break it up.

---

<sup>1</sup> Organic Food Production Act (OFPA) 6513(b)(1).

The questions dealing with carbon-nitrogen (C/N) ratios, temperatures, and the length of time needed to ensure a nonpathogenic finished product are quite distinct from those concerning novel inputs to the composting process that could result in contamination. The former subject is well-defined, with a substantial body of research in support of conclusions. The latter is more open-ended, with less-defined uncertainties. We will leave the former subject, the topic of CS questions 1 (time and temperature) and 2 (C:N ratios), to others, and these comments will address the issues of defining compost feedstocks and allowable contamination. We support the comments of the National Organic Coalition on questions 1 and 2.

While we want to encourage composting in general, it is increasingly viewed as a dumping ground for the waste products of industrial society. Because of the potentially broad nature of the inputs, compost without parameters is incompatible with the principles of organic production. It is important to recognize that composting of “food waste” can result in widespread contamination with persistent toxic chemicals and heavy metals.<sup>2</sup> This can occur not only from the use of the compost in organic production, but also from its widespread use in other systems, encouraged by its acceptance in organic systems. Organic standards must maintain strict control over allowed organic inputs and seek ways to eliminate contaminated inputs.

### **Compost is of fundamental importance for organic production.**

The Organic Foods Production Act (OFPA) at §6513 requires producers to “foster soil fertility, primarily through the management of the organic content of the soil through proper tillage, crop rotation, and manuring.” Composting is the principal tool used by organic producers in implementing this management requirement. Most importantly, compost introduces and augments the soil organisms that build organic fertility and sequester carbon in the soil.

The NOSB, in advising the USDA on implementation of OFPA, approved “Principles of Organic Production and Handling”<sup>3</sup> that emphasize above all, that organic production systems “optimize soil biological activity.” Organic systems also, according to the NOSB, “[r]ecycle materials of plant and animal origin in order to return nutrients to the land, thus minimizing the use of non-renewable resources” and “[m]inimize pollution of soil, water, and air.”

These principles are also built into NOSB guidance on compatibility with a system of sustainable agriculture and consistency with organic farming and handling,<sup>4</sup> to be used in

---

<sup>2</sup> EPA, 2021. Emerging Issues in Food Waste Management: Persistent Chemical Contaminants. <https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2021-08/emerging-issues-in-food-waste-management-persistent-chemical-contaminants.pdf>. For heavy metals, see Zhujie Chu, Xiuhua Fan, Wenna Wang, Wei-chiao Huang, Quantitative evaluation of heavy metals’ pollution hazards and estimation of heavy metals’ environmental costs in leachate during food waste composting, 2019. Waste Management 84,: 119-128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2018.11.031>.

<sup>3</sup> NOSB recommendation adopted October 17, 2001.

<sup>4</sup> NOSB recommendation adopted April 29, 2004.

National List decisions. That guidance lists as its first question, “Does the substance promote plant and animal health by enhancing the soil’s physical chemical, or biological properties?”

National Organic Program (NOP) regulations also recognize the importance of composting and building soil biology at §205.203, “Soil fertility and crop nutrient management practice standard” that describes practices, including composted plant and animal materials, that “maintain or improve the physical, chemical, and biological condition of soil and minimize soil erosion.”

### **Organic Agriculture and Organic “Waste”**

Although organic agriculture “emphasizes the use of management practices in preference to the use of off-farm inputs,”<sup>5</sup> organic farmers and gardeners are known for scavenging organic matter from surrounding farms and communities. When organic farmers can make use of manure, grass clippings, vegetable waste, and other organic materials that would otherwise cause problems for others, it appears to be a mutually beneficial arrangement.

However, there are often other parties involved, some of whom may be unknown to both the organic farmer and the supplier of the materials. Manure may come from animals that have been treated with antibiotics, other drugs prohibited in organic production, or pesticides. Grass clippings may be from lawns that were treated with pesticides (including insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides) and synthetic fertilizers. Straw may come from a crop that was treated with pesticides and synthetic fertilizers.

Many of these contaminants can be broken down to harmless constituents by composting and other practices used on organic farms, but some may not. In addition, use patterns can affect residues of pesticides—such as when herbicides are used as harvest aids.

### **Organic Methods in Environmental Cleanup**

Bioremediation is the use of biological agents, such as bacteria, fungi, or green plants, to remove or neutralize contaminants, as in polluted soil or water. In doing so, it uses methods long employed by organic farmers, such as composting and plants that accumulate specific substances.

The process of composting uses organisms including earthworms, bacteria, and fungi to break down organic matter to a form more readily available to soil life, which releases nutrients for plants. Since many pesticides and industrial pollutants are organic (carbon-based) chemicals, they may be broken down by the same process. Bioremediation of contaminated sites uses microorganisms and fungi selected or engineered for feeding on specific contaminants.

Organic farmers may also use plants that accumulate certain macro- and micronutrients. If these plants are composted, they make those nutrients more available to crops.

---

<sup>5</sup> NOSB Principles of Organic Production and Handling, adopted October 17, 2001.

Bioremediation may also make use of plants and fungi that hyperaccumulate heavy metals in phytoextraction. In this case, the harvested crop can be moved off the site and contaminants recovered through composting or incineration. This may even become an economically viable source of the metals.<sup>6</sup>

### **Industrial Byproducts as Organic Inputs**

The penchant of organic farmers for scavenging inputs has not gone unnoticed by industry. As a result, the National Organic Program has received petitions to allow several materials that are byproducts of industrial processes. These include ash from burning poultry manure, sulfuric acid, tall oil, corn steep liquor, and vinasse. The NOSB has sometimes—though not always—treated these materials as being incompatible with organic production. In part, the incompatibility arises from a reluctance to be reliant on industrial byproducts. In the case of ash from manure burning—a nonsynthetic material prohibited for use because of the dependence of organic production on the carbon and nitrogen that manure provides—the NOSB has stated, “Utilizing burning as a method to recycle millions of pounds of excess poultry manure inadvertently supports the business of CAFOs by creating an organic industry demand for ash. Utilizing ash from manure burning in order to assist CAFOs in their reduction of environmental and human health contamination is not a compelling argument for consideration for addition to the National List.”<sup>7</sup>

### **Contaminants are more pervasive, with negative impacts in smaller concentrations, than were previously known.**

We are daily confronted with examples two forms of this pervasive contamination—microplastics and poly- and per- fluoroalkyl substances (PFAS).

#### Plastic

Research continues to raise alarms about the hazards associated with the use of plastic, including the microplastic particles that are distributed in alarming amounts throughout the environment and taken up by organisms, including humans. A study published by researchers at Columbia and Rutgers universities in the January 2024 [Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences](#) reports that the average liter of three brands of bottled water in the U.S. contains almost a quarter of a million bits of microplastics, of which 90 percent are at the nanoscale.<sup>8</sup> The other ten percent are slightly larger, at microscale.

Last December, researchers at Norway’s MicroLEACH project published a study that analyzes the components of 50 items in common use—plastic bags, disposable cups, dishwashing gloves, car tire granules, children’s toys and balloons.<sup>9</sup> The researchers found, as in

---

<sup>6</sup> Raskin, I., Smith, R. D., & Salt, D. E. (1997). Phytoremediation of metals: using plants to remove pollutants from the environment. *Current opinion in biotechnology*, 8(2), 221-226.

<sup>7</sup> Spring 2015 proposal on petition for annotation of ash from manure burning on §205.602 of the National List.

<sup>8</sup> Qian N, Gao X, Lang X, Deng H, Bratu TM, Chen Q, Stapleton P, Yan B, Min W. Rapid single-particle chemical imaging of nanoplastics by SRS microscopy. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*.

<sup>9</sup> Summary at <https://phys.org/news/2023-12-toxicity-standard-plastic-products.html>.

previous studies, that many hazardous chemicals are in the plastics as well as many that **could not be identified** because they were not listed in the major chemical substance databases. Only 30 percent of the chemical compounds identified in the study were present in two or more products. This suggests that most plastics contain many unidentified chemicals, far beyond the known impurities, metabolites and degradation products. Further, it suggests that in the environment plastics are chemically reactive and forming new compounds not anticipated and whose toxicity is unknown.

In the Columbia/Rutgers study, the researchers checked for seven types of plastic, but they were only able to identify about ten percent of the nanoparticles they found. Polyethylene terephthalate (PET) was a common ingredient, probably because many water bottles are made of it. However, they also found polyamide, polystyrene, polyvinyl chloride, and polymethyl methacrylate. (Tap water also contains microplastics in many places, although in much lower concentrations.) The team found that the number of individual chemical compounds varied wildly among products, ranging from 114 to 2,456, leading them to conclude that “assessing the toxicity of plastic chemicals present in a product based on testing individual target chemicals has limited value.” The Norwegian scientists also exposed cod eggs, embryos and larvae to water containing microplastics. The toxic effects they observed include spinal deformities reminiscent of scoliosis in humans.

In other new studies, out of a total of 257 patients who completed the study, polyethylene was detected in carotid artery plaque of 150 patients (58.4%), with a mean level of 2% of plaque; 31 patients (12.1%) also had measurable amounts of polyvinyl chloride, with a mean level of 0.5% of plaque.<sup>10</sup> Microplastic particles have even shown up in brain as well as placenta.<sup>11</sup>

## PFAS

With health risks<sup>12</sup> including developmental, metabolic, cardiovascular,<sup>13</sup> and reproductive harm, cancer, damage to the liver, kidneys, and respiratory system, as well as the potential to increase the chance of disease infection and severity,<sup>14</sup> per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) and their toxic trail of contamination in the environment is wreaking havoc with all life. Gestational (during pregnancy) and childhood exposure to PFAS increases cardiometabolic risk, or the risk of heart diseases and metabolic disorders, later in life,

---

<sup>10</sup> Marfella R, Prattichizzo F, Sardu C, Fulgenzi G, Graciotti L, Spadoni T, D'Onofrio N, Scisciola L, La Grotta R, Frigé C, Pellegrini V, Municinò M, Siniscalchi M, Spinetti F, Vigliotti G, Vecchione C, Carrizzo A, Accarino G, Squillante A, Spaziano G, Mirra D, Esposito R, Altieri S, Falco G, Fenti A, Galoppo S, Canzano S, Sasso FC, Maticchione G, Olivieri F, Ferraraccio F, Panarese I, Paolisso P, Barbato E, Lubritto C, Balestrieri ML, Mauro C, Caballero AE, Rajagopalan S, Ceriello A, D'Agostino B, Iovino P, Paolisso G. Microplastics and Nanoplastics in Atheromas and Cardiovascular Events. *N Engl J Med.* 2024 Mar 7;390(10):900-910. <https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa2309822>.

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.nytimes.com/2024/03/09/health/microplastics-sxsw-health-plastic-people.html>.

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/ToxProfiles/tp200-c2.pdf>.

<sup>13</sup> <https://beyondpesticides.org/dailynewsblog/2021/04/exposure-to-pfas-the-forever-chemical-during-pregnancy-results-an-increase-in-heart-and-metabolic-problems-among-adolescence/>.

<sup>14</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2022/mar/10/pfas-covid-infection-forever-chemicals-studies>.

according to a Brown University study published in *Environment International*.<sup>15</sup> The use of PFAS in industrial and commercial applications has led to widespread contamination of water and biosolids used for fertilizer, poisoning tens of millions of acres of land and posing a significant threat to the biosphere, public health, gardens, parks, and agricultural systems. Farmers and rural communities, in particular, bear the brunt of this contamination, as it affects their drinking water, soil quality, and livestock health.

There are more than 9,000 synthetic (human-made) chemical compounds in the PFAS family, which includes the most well-known subcategories, PFOS (perfluorooctane sulfonate) and PFOA (perfluorooctanoic acid). These PFAS compounds have been dubbed “forever chemicals” for their persistence in the environment (largely because they comprise chains of bonded fluorine–carbon atoms, those bonds being among the strongest ever created). PFAS contamination of drinking water, surface and groundwater, waterways, soils, and the food supply, among other sources, is a ubiquitous and concerning contaminant across the globe.

The widespread exposure to these compounds arises from multiple sources, both past and present. PFAS is used as an active ingredient in as many as 1,000 products, which can contaminate compost. Although some of the uses have been or are being phased out, many persist, including several related to food processing and packaging.<sup>16</sup> The flooding of the materials stream with thousands of persistent synthetic PFAS compounds since their first uses in the 1950s allows them to remain widespread in the environment and in human bodies.

PFAS compounds have been found to contaminate water and irrigation sources, and soils themselves—often through the use of fertilizers made from so-called “biosludge” (biosolids) from local waste treatment plants. Thankfully, the drafters of OFPA rules had the foresight to prohibit the use of sewage sludge, or biosolids. Sewage plants may discharge millions of gallons of wastewater into waterways, contaminating them; current waste and water treatment generally does not eliminate PFAS compounds from the treated effluent. Biosolids and wastewater have long been sources of exposure concerns related to pesticides, industrial chemicals, pharmaceuticals, personal care products, and household chemicals; PFAS contamination is now rising as a specific and concerning addition to that nasty list.

These forever (and perhaps “everywhere”) compounds may be contaminating nearly 20 million acres of productive agricultural land in the U.S. A significant portion of farmers, perhaps

---

<sup>15</sup> Nan Li, Yun Liu, George D. Papandonatos, Antonia M. Calafat, Charles B. Eaton, Karl T. Kelsey, Kim M. Cecil, Heidi J. Kalkwarf, Kimberly Yolton, Bruce P. Lanphear, Aimin Chen, Joseph M. Braun, Gestational and childhood exposure to per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances and cardiometabolic risk at age 12 years, *Environment International*, Volume 147, 2021, 106344, ISSN 0160-4120, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.106344>.

<sup>16</sup> <https://www.fda.gov/food/process-contaminants-food/authorized-uses-pfas-food-contact-applications#:~:text=Paper%2Fpaperboard%20food%20packaging%3A%20PFAS,from%20leaking%20through%20the%20packaging.>

5%, is using biosludge from local treatment plants as fertilizer on their acreage.<sup>17</sup> The use of biosludge was thought by many, a decade ago, to be a sensible use of the waste products from treatment; it was even encouraged by many state agricultural department programs, but now it is recognized that these products present threats when spread on fields that produce food—or anywhere that presents the possibility of human, organism, or environmental exposures to potentially toxic PFAS compounds. Notably, there are currently no federal requirements to test such sludge “fertilizers” for the presence of PFAS.<sup>18</sup>

Meanwhile, we must not lose sight of the fact that PFAS chemicals are not the only legacy contaminants. Others include wood preservatives, DDT, dioxins, and the termiticide chlordane. Unfortunately, some of these continue to be added to the environment, sometimes inadvertently, but also intentionally, particularly through pesticide use.

Furthermore, PFAS and microplastics—both contaminants little known a few years ago—act synergistically to threaten fish and wildlife, as well as humans.<sup>19</sup>

### **Need for a contaminated inputs strategy**

What is avoidable contamination? As has been pointed out by the CS, “It is widely acknowledged that some level of pesticides, heavy metals, PFAS, glass, plastic, etc. enters the composting process.”

Beginning with a discussion document in Fall 2014, the NOSB began to grapple with the problem of contamination of inputs that have been traditionally used in organic production.<sup>20</sup> OFPA addresses residues in agricultural products. §6506(a)(6) of OFPA requires certifying agents to test for “any pesticide or other nonorganic residue or natural toxicants.” §6511 requires that “If the Secretary, the applicable governing State official, or the certifying agent determines that an agricultural product sold or labeled as organically produced under this chapter contains any detectable pesticide or other non-organic residue or prohibited natural substance the Secretary, the applicable governing State official, or the certifying agent shall conduct an investigation to determine if the organic certification program has been violated, and may require the producer or handler of such product to prove that any prohibited substance was not applied to such product.” It also provides for the removal of organic certification if the substance is found to be intentionally added or present at excessive levels. §6518(k) makes it a responsibility of the NOSB to “advise the Secretary concerning the testing of organically produced agricultural products for residues caused by unavoidable residual environmental contamination.”

---

<sup>17</sup> <https://www.ewg.org/news-insights/news/2022/04/ewg-forever-chemicals-may-taint-nearly-20-million-cropland-acres>.

<sup>18</sup> <https://www.epa.gov/biosolids/regulatory-determinations-pollutants-biosolids> and <https://www.epa.gov/cwa-methods/frequent-questions-about-pfas-methods-ndes-permits>.

<sup>19</sup> [https://www.bayjournal.com/opinion/forum/how-pfas-microplastics-join-forces-as-a-synergistic-threat/article\\_634b24b6-d25e-11ee-adc1-d7d52920fb27.html](https://www.bayjournal.com/opinion/forum/how-pfas-microplastics-join-forces-as-a-synergistic-threat/article_634b24b6-d25e-11ee-adc1-d7d52920fb27.html).

<sup>20</sup> Unfortunately, this workplan item is currently on hold.

§205.203(c) of NOP regulations requires that “The producer must manage plant and animal materials to maintain or improve soil organic matter content in a manner that does not contribute to contamination of crops, soil, or water by plant nutrients, pathogenic organisms, heavy metals, or residues of prohibited substances.” §205.671 states, “When residue testing detects prohibited substances at levels that are greater than 5 percent of the Environmental Protection Agency's tolerance for the specific residue detected or unavoidable residual environmental contamination, the agricultural product must not be sold, labeled, or represented as organically produced.” Other sections of the regulations relate to the testing for residues.

In the 2014 discussion document, the NOSB cited these examples of topics that have become issues in the last few years:

- Heavy metal contamination of manure, compost, mined minerals and fish products;
- Neonicotinoid residues that could harm pollinators when taken up by plants;
- Insecticide residues such as bifenthrin that can be detected in compost
- Excessive foreign materials in compost and green waste;
- Antibiotic residues in manures that can affect soil organisms and result in tetracycline-resistant bacteria; and
- Genetically engineered plant material that may or may not break down in compost and soil.

Since then, the use of “produced water” from oil production and wastewater from hydraulic fracturing extraction of oil and gas (“fracking”) for irrigation has arisen as another issue. PFAS contamination is recognized as serious. And now we have a petition from BPI to greatly expand the universe of materials allowed to be composted for use in organic production.

In the spring 2015 NOSB meeting, the Crops Subcommittee reported that it is continuing to address the contamination issue by looking at pathways by which contaminants reach organic farms and the extent to which the contamination can be mitigated by composting and other practices.

## **BPI petition**

On August 30, 2023, the Biodegradable Products Institute (BPI) submitted a petition for rulemaking to USDA, asking NOP to engage in rulemaking to update the compost regulations. Specifically, BPI advocated adding a definition for “compost feedstocks” to the organic regulations and replacing the references to “plant and animal materials” with “compost feedstocks”—to be defined to include materials meeting ASTM International’s compostability standards.

By submitting this to USDA as a petition for rulemaking, BPI attempts an end run around the NOSB, whose responsibility it is to determine which synthetic substances may be used in organic production. BPI should instead petition for



inclusion on the National List those specific synthetics that may be contained in “compost feedstocks.”

Currently, the USDA organic regulations allow only newspaper, and other recycled paper through their inclusion on the National List, in addition to composting of plant and animal materials.

## **The devastation caused by biosolids should be a lesson about unknown risks.**

The use of biosolids (sewage sludge) has never been allowed in organic production. However, in 2022, 56% of biosolids were applied to land—31% to agricultural land—and nonorganic producers who thought it was a good deal<sup>21</sup> are now learning otherwise. Farmers are being ordered to shut down their operations because their land and products are contaminated with poly- and perfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS).<sup>22</sup> It is also affecting organic farmers who bought contaminated land unknowingly.<sup>23</sup> The lesson from biosolids is not that certain contaminants are hazardous, but that we cannot predict the hazards coming from uncontrolled sources.

## **Questions from the CS**

We will not address questions #1 and 2 but refer the NOSB to responses by the National Organic Coalition. We will not address #9, which we will leave to others.

### **#3 Known contaminated inputs vs. UREC**

The CS asks, “How should the Subcommittee weigh the distinction between UREC and ‘Contamination’, as described in the NOP Preamble and testing requirements, against the current realities of contamination inherent in the rapidly growing organic compost industry?” The CS has highlighted an important part of the Preamble, “*Unavoidable residual environmental contamination levels will be based on the unavoidability of the chemical substances and **do not represent permissible levels of contamination where it is avoidable.***”

### **#4 Contamination, compost inputs, and the National List**

The CS asks, “When and how should organic draw the line on contamination?” No avoidable contamination should be allowed. All synthetic substances used in organic production must be on the National List by specific use or application. Therefore, no known contaminants should be allowed in materials used for compost in organic production.

### **#5 “Compost feedstocks”**

All synthetic substances used in organic production must be on the National List by specific use or application. Specific synthetic chemicals must be petitioned for inclusion on the

---

<sup>21</sup> <https://kentuckylantern.com/2024/03/07/legislature-should-reject-sludge-regulations-that-could-harm-farmers-damage-farmland/>.

<sup>22</sup> <https://www.kcur.org/news/2024-03-11/pfas-contaminated-biosolids-state-testing>.

<sup>23</sup> <https://www.thenewlede.org/2024/03/farmers-facing-pfas-pollution-struggle-for-solutions/>.

National List. The NOSB must pay attention to the lesson of biosolids. Unknown contaminants can ruin farms and lives.

## **#6 “De minimus” contamination**

There is no level of contamination that can be considered “de minimus.” Adverse health effects are being discovered at lower and lower concentrations. Endocrine disrupting chemicals, which mimic or interfere with the action of hormones, are active at extremely low concentrations.<sup>24</sup> These chemicals, which have not been fully regulated by EPA, cause harm at critical windows of vulnerability during developmental phases of life, defying classical toxicological thinking that dose makes the poison. To return to the PFAS example, EPA in 2022 set lifetime health advisory levels of 0.004 parts per trillion for just one of the many PFAS chemicals—PFOA.<sup>25</sup> In general, there is no level of exposure to a carcinogen that is without risk.<sup>26</sup> Organic production follows practice standards, not standards based on allowable levels of prohibited substances. In this case, the practice standard is that no synthetic chemical is allowed unless it is on the National List.

## **#7 Classes of allowable substances?**

The section of OFPA dealing with the National List at §6517(b) requires that, “The list established under subsection (a) shall contain an itemization, by specific use or application, of each synthetic substance permitted under subsection (c)(1) or each natural substance prohibited under subsection (c)(2).” OFPA also lists criteria for allowing synthetics. The NOSB cannot comply with the law unless it requires individual synthetic substances to be petitioned.

## **#8 Testing/Research**

Given the possibility of contamination with substances that can threaten farms and lives, compost operations producing “organic” compost for sale should be inspected. As mentioned above, the NOSB needs to develop a strategy for keeping contaminated inputs out of organic production.<sup>27</sup> The CS had begun such a strategy, but it has been dropped from the work agenda.

## **Conclusion**

Compost from plant and animal materials is of fundamental importance to organic practices. Composting is the way that organic growers meet the requirement in law to “foster soil fertility, primarily through the management of the organic content of the soil through proper tillage, crop rotation, and manuring.” The integrity of organic production must be maintained by preserving the integrity of compost. Contaminants in broadly defined “compost feedstocks” cannot be predicted, but history suggests that more persistent toxic pollutants will be found. Only synthetic materials that are specifically added to the National List through the prescribed process should be allowed in compost destined to be an input into organic

---

<sup>24</sup> [https://endocrinedisruption.org/assets/media/documents/2007-04-30\\_does\\_the\\_dose\\_make\\_the\\_poison.pdf](https://endocrinedisruption.org/assets/media/documents/2007-04-30_does_the_dose_make_the_poison.pdf).

<sup>25</sup> <https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2022-06/technical-factsheet-four-PFAS.pdf>.

<sup>26</sup> <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/cancer/policy.html>.

<sup>27</sup> See [meeting materials for Spring 2015 meeting](#), pp. 137ff.

production. The NOSB should reopen the workplan item on contaminated inputs that is currently on hold.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Terry Shistar". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal flourish at the end.

Terry Shistar, Ph.D.  
Board of Directors