

**Farm, Ranch, and Rural Communities Committee (FRRCC) Conference Call to Approve
Land Use Advice Letter**

Meeting Minutes

May 19, 2009 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM EDT

**Designated Federal Officer (DFO) – Alicia Kaiser
Associate DFO – Chris Ashcraft
Jim Moseley – Chair of FRRCC**

ROLL CALL

Members:

Jim Andrew
Richard Bonanno
Garth Boyd
Chris Chinn
Otto Doering
Tom Franklin
Earl Garber
Ralph Grossi
Karri Hammerstrom
Tom McDonald
Jim Moseley
Dave Nelson
Dennis Treacy
Jay Vroom
Jeff Vonk
Doug Young

EPA Employees:

Chris Ashcraft
Pat Cimino
Khanna Johnston
Alicia Kaiser
Melissa Kramer
Jenny Noke

Members of the Public:

David Beaudreau
John Bonitz
Tom Hance
Don Parrish
Kent Splitman

At 1:00 PM EST Alicia Kaiser, DFO, started the conference call:

Alicia Kaiser: Hello everyone this is the call to approve the draft FRRCC Land Use White Paper. We are just waiting one more minute to get started while we are waiting for a few more members to join the call, thank you.

Hello everyone I'm Alicia Kaiser here at EPA, the DFO for the Farm, Ranch and Rural Communities and you are participating in the call to approve the draft land use white paper that the committee has been preparing over the course of the last few months. So with that I think I'll let Jim Moseley open the call if he's ready.

Jim Moseley: Yes good afternoon everyone. First thing we want to do - Alicia's already laid out that the - that we are working on the land use white paper that's been developed by the Emerging Issues Workgroup and that's my phone going off and I apologize I'll shut it off. Sorry.

The first thing we want to do is let's take a roll of the membership that's on the call. And I don't know how to do this other than just have people speak up. Again this is Jim Moseley and I'll turn it to the next person that speaks up.

Roll Call: The roll call occurred over the next fifteen minutes. The Committee was short one member of a majority (only 15 of 30) so Chris Ashcraft, Associate DFO FRRCC, called any members not on the line to see if they could participate. Chris was able to reach Richard Bonanno, making the total number of members 16. Alicia Kaiser then conducted a roll call of the people in the room, EPA employees, and members of the public. While Chris Ashcraft was calling members the Committee began to discuss the paper, but did not vote or conduct any official business since they did not have 16 members. Once they had Richard Bonanno on the line they were able to conduct official business.

Ralph Grossi: Jim this is Ralph, you know, might it be possible to go through and simply identify those areas where there will be issues raised, so we can sort of begin to catalog them?

Jim Moseley: As far as I'm concerned I think, you know, we can't conduct official business but we can certainly listen. I think that's the case, I'm not sure if Alicia's still on the line. But I think that's the case.

Alicia Kaiser: Jim this is Alicia. I just wanted to say real quick, our line was muted because I was conferring with somebody here on that, but we can - we can talk as much, I mean as long as we've got everyone on the phone we can go ahead and

discuss this as much as we want. We just need the numbers to be right to be able to actually approve the letter. So we can go ahead with our conversation, yes.

Jim Moseley: Let's do that and find out where we are and then we'll see what happens here. Ralph I'm going to just turn to you and let's - we've already taken up 12 minutes or so. Let's just go ahead and just get started on this.

Ralph Grossi: Okay thanks Jim. So just a brief review of the four-page paper. You all got a modified version from Alicia this morning with some additional fine-tuning of language and some proposed changes. Just a reminder this paper has been worked on by the Emerging Issues Workgroup since last year.

It was a first draft in the fall that was discussed by the workgroup and displayed before the full committee. Then a number of drafts between the fall and spring meeting was discussed again by the Emerging Issues Workgroup in February and the - then it was opened for full committee input anytime between - after February.

I have to say I didn't receive much in the way of comments from committee members. And then another draft was sent out a couple of weeks ago to the workgroup. The workgroup made some additional comments. Those have been incorporated.

The last comments that were incorporated I highlighted in yellow since even the workgroup has not had a chance to comment again since those changes and additions were made. There are only two very substantial additions.

One was in the first paragraph, some language in the first paragraph and the other was on Page 4 in the biofuel section language suggested by Jim Andrews. I hope by now you've all had a chance to review this many times.

The first section is kind of a general section then a section on urbanization and EPA's role, market forces, emerging farmers and generation (unintelligible) issues, biofuels and regulations. And some proposed EPA role. I think you'll see that in most cases we are asking for EPA to collaborate with other agencies.

And that's just a quick overview of the four-page paper. It would of course be sent with a cover letter to the administrator if approved by the full committee.

Jim Moseley: Okay Ralph, thank you. Let's have discussion in kind of two groups here. If there's any committee member at this moment that wants to put thoughts forward hopefully you've all had the chance here over the last - I know I've gotten several emails over the last couple of weeks on this - to review this and get your thoughts in.

But if there's some views right now that need to come forward let's have the committee members make those comments and then we'll go to members of the public.

Otto Doering: Jim, its Otto Doering.

Jim Moseley: Hi Otto.

Otto Doering: First I want you to know that my corn is planted.

Jim Moseley: Wonderful.

Otto Doering: Secondly...

Jim Moseley: Keeping our priorities straight here.

Otto Doering: I think in this document at times we ask EPA to do some things that they have never traditionally done. Where we talk about planning grants and getting involve in land use planning that's an example.

And maybe the way to handle is that Ralph if in the cover letter you indicate to the administrator that we understand that we're asking EPA to take some expanded roles here in areas they have not operated. But we feel these roles are very important and no one else is willing to step up to the plate and take them.

Ralph Grossi: Okay. Good suggestion.

Jay Vroom: Jim this is Jay Vroom, I have a couple of specific suggestions that I think are pretty straight forward that might help with some additional clarification along perhaps along some of the same line that Otto was referring. So the first place I would make a suggestion is in - on Page 1 the EPAs role section there, which is currently one sentence.

I'd suggest that we add an additional sentence ahead of the one that's there that would read something to the effect that while land use planning is a state and local matter in the United States actions by the Federal Government do impact those other levels of government in their work.

So in essence what I'm trying to do is to suggest that we have a preamble statement to this EPA role paragraph that explicitly acknowledges that land use planning in our country is a state and local matter to kind of set that up. And then in the sentence itself it's there working with other Federal agencies.

I would suggest that it be other Federal agencies and the states. EPA should develop a policy - I would strike the word policy and replace that with the

word framework approach. I fear that policy may be a stronger word than really was intended there.

Just some thoughts as a way to perhaps make that particular EPA role kind of recommendation statement a little clearer and then on Page 2 in the middle...

Ralph Grossi: Could we - Jim as a matter of procedure here should we deal with each one and say suggestion as they come along or...

Jim Moseley: That was my inclination actually...

Jay Vroom: I didn't know if we could do that without having a quorum, I'm sorry.

Ralph Grossi: And I would just say that I think those are - those are just very good suggestions on Jay's part. I certainly wouldn't have any concern at all at putting them in.

Jim Moseley: And I guess that's my conclusion, but I would - any other committee members - let's put it this way. Any other committee members have an objection to that kind of inclusion of language.

Alicia Kaiser: You know what, this is Alicia Kaiser here. I am trying to - this is a really odd situation to try to be doing business without a quorum or trying not to even since we don't have a quorum.

So I'm kind of - I'm conversing with the authority here on these matter, Khanna Johnston, and I might want to break in here and have Khanna kind of explain what we're - what we're exactly allowed to do and not do right now.

Jim Moseley: That's good because we were prepared to beg for forgiveness, but if we have legal counsel that can help us while we'll avoid that.

Khanna Johnston: And you know, technically we should probably not be having substantive discussions. So as long as comments are put forward and each individual just states their opinion. And the committee as a whole does not vote on each individual comment or say we accept this comment maybe for right now just go ahead and receive individual comment on the document and not make the group come to any form of consensus.

I think that allows you to use this time fruitfully and keep moving forward. But unfortunately you'll have to come back together as a committee or hopefully Chris is outside making telephone calls trying to get one more person to join. And then you'll be able to vote as a committee and make the decisions that you need to make.

But until then just - I think I would suggest just accept each individual comment for what it's worth and maybe Jim just get Alicia to document it and then keep moving forward.

Jim Moseley: Okay if that's the case then Ralph I think we need to just let Jay go ahead and make his point.

Ralph Grossi: Are you saying that we can't even ask for any comments on the suggestions?

Khanna Johnston: Unfortunately yes because it invokes what our legal counsel would advise us as substantive discussions.

Alicia Kaiser: Sorry guys.

Khanna Johnston: Sorry, I mean I'm sorry it seems like such a waste of time to set up a conference call but, you know ..

Alicia Kaiser: Chris is still making calls.

Jim Moseley: All right.

Alicia Kaiser: He's giving us a nod I think we have one more person coming on. Yes I hear him reading the phone number to a person so we got one. Maybe - do we just want to put this on hold for a second until they join?

Jim Moseley: Yes let's just do that. Tell them that we're waiting on them, how's that. And then while you're doing that while we'll decide whether we're going to crucify this person or applaud this person.

Chris Chinn: Exactly. Jim and Ralph before we do that I want to let you guys know I'm going to have to sign off in about ten minutes to leave for another meeting. So before you go to too much trouble I just wanted to make you aware that I'm not going to be able to be on here for the full time.

Jim Moseley: Well you'd better get two more then Chris. I mean Alicia. Better get two more. Just stay on Chris.

Chris Chinn: I'll stay on as long as I can, but I had a prior commitment and I didn't realize this was going to be an hour-long call. I'm sorry I apologize.

Ralph Grossi: We'll accept your proxy vote.

Otto Doering: This is Otto I'm in a somewhat similar situation I've just gotten on an airplane and I'll stay until they close the door.

Alicia Kaiser: I think I just heard the beep of Rich Bonanno joining, did I, was I right?

Richard Bonanno: Yes I'm here.

Alicia Kaiser: Hi Rich thank you so much for joining.

Alicia Kaiser: We've got 10 minutes to do whatever we can. So...

Jim Moseley: Okay so let's go move forward. Ralph you want to take it here and (Jay) in fact (Jay) put your other thought on the table as quick as possible.

Jay Vroom: Okay. On Page 2 under Market Forces, the first full paragraph ends with the words, "Let the long-term impacts of these changes are less certain." I would propose that we strike those words and end that sentence after the words environmental impacts. That's it.

Jim Moseley: I'll second that.

Ralph Grossi: Okay. That's all you have, Jay?

Jay Vroom: Yes.

Ralph Grossi: Okay. We have others Jim?

Jim Moseley: That's what I'm - you take the lead and let's go ahead.

Ralph Grossi: Are there any other comments on the paper, anywhere in the paper?

Dave Nelson: Ralph and I've got two quick ones.

Ralph Grossi: Okay.

Dave Nelson: They have fiber in their food, fuel, fiber and feed supply. Fiber is pretty important too, to the use of our farmlands.

Ralph Grossi: Yes.

Jim Moseley: No objections.

Dave Nelson: Then in the second paragraph, I would strike the last sentence “productions keeps on in agriculture”. I don’t think it’s to remain topic and kind of raises a red flag to...

Ralph Grossi: Where are you again?

Dave Nelson: The third paragraph, first page.

Ralph Grossi: Okay.

Dave Nelson: The last sentence I would propose to delete that.

Ralph Grossi: The one that starts with, “wild bio fuels?”

Dave Nelson: Because they’re already addressing it in a whole section.

Ralph Grossi: Is there any concern about that? Anyone else? Okay.

Jim Moseley: I wouldn’t fall on my sword over it, but I don’t think that it’s particularly a problematic sentence, so I’m curious David as to the rationale behind extracting it. In fact, I see it as being somewhat useful.

Ralph Grossi: Okay, any other comments?

Jim Moseley: Isn't that pretty much the reason - I mean that was the stimulus for the letter.

Dave Nelson: But it's highlighted all in another - in its own section.

Ralph Grossi: Yes.

Dave Nelson: So it doesn't sound like your main opening section.

Ralph Grossi: Okay, other suggestions from anyone?

Jeff Vonk: This is Jeff Vonk. Ralph, I guess I have a concern over the additional paragraph at the top of Page 4. It seems like what we're doing in that paragraph predominantly is commenting on a proposed rule as opposed to identifying an emerging issue.

If this committee is going to comment on a rule, we ought to do it as a committee or else we ought not to do that as a committee and let individuals comment on proposed rules and I guess I would have an objection to including that paragraph.

Ralph Grossi: On process as much as substance?

Jeff Vonk: Correct.

Ralph Grossi: In terms of commenting on proposed rules?

Jeff Vonk: Yes.

Ralph Grossi: Okay, I'll turn to Jim Andrews since this was Jim's suggestion and he worked with counsel on this to put this wording together.

Jim Andrews: Yes, I first all commend the work group on the outstanding job they did putting all this paper together. I did feel there was a need to put this specific information in.

It's a Renewable Fuel Standard that has more or less hit the ground here in the last two weeks and has caused a great deal of information out here in farm country.

I'm staring at the - when people out in the Midwest hear land use, the first thing that comes to their mind, I think, is indirect land use as a part of the Renewable Fuel Standard 2 and so there's a great deal of concern that we're going to lose the battle before we've even had a chance to state the case.

And that's why I inserted this paragraph and also wanted to make it clear that this is not our final comment, that the Bio Fuels and Climate Change working group have been tasked with reviewing RFS2 and coming up with more specific comments and recommendations to make to the FRRCC to possibly be submitted to the administrator.

Karri Hammerstrom: This is Karri Hammerstrom. I would add a comment to that as well. In the earlier version, the comment was that we were not asked to provide comment on the proposed rule so as an emerging issue, that probably should have been something that we should have been able to comment on.

But I think the comments as proposed in there, I think, are very germane to emerging issues.

Jim Andrew: I agree.

Ralph Grossi: Others?

Man: This is (unintelligible), I agree as well.

Ralph Grossi: Agree with?

Man: Agree with leaving it in.

Ralph Grossi: Leaving it in.

Garth Boyd: I agree.

Ralph Grossi: Are there other comments about that paragraph, the substance of it, the way it's written? Who's there? Jim, my suggestion would be that once we get all the comments in, that we just come back and vote these issues up or down unless there's obvious consensus.

Jim Moseley: Yes, I agree. I hope you're keeping - let's do that, I hope you're keeping...

Ralph Grossi: I'm trying to keep track here. Other comments about the paper? If there aren't, Jim, I'll turn it back to you and we can start to go through the specifics.

Jim Moseley: Okay, the - I feel it's a time constraint here. Otto are you still on or off?

Ralph Grossi: Otto's off.

Jim Moseley: Otto's off.

Otto Doering: I am on for about two more minutes.

Jim Moseley: All right, here's the deal. Real quick, public comment, does anyone feel a compelling need to make, from the public, to make a comment on this discussion at this point in time?

Don Parrish: This is Don Parrish with American Farm Bureau Federation.

Jim Moseley: Yes, Don.

Don Parrish: Again, Chris has been really, really busy this time of year on the farm and we have not, as an organization, really had an opportunity to review this and I know from the standpoint of this being you guys and it's your committee, I think that's good.

But I think before you guys pass something along, you probably ought to reach out broader to the agricultural community as it relates to land use and seek broader input from some of the Ag organizations.

I know a lot of them are doing things to, you know, to confront this issue of urbanization or from the standpoint of, you know, emerging farmers in generational transitions.

There's a lot of good things that are going on out there that you ought to at least hear about from some of the farm organizations before you put a final, you know, dot on this because until just recently, I had not seen this.

And, you know, again I think it is a paper that could have some very profound implications, you know, along the lines of what I've heard already spoken here.

I mean just the idea of, you know, an EPA role in local and state decisions regarding land use is quite a shift. And I would encourage you guys to think very carefully as you move forward just how you want to insert yourself into that issue.

I know that it's an important issue. I know that, you know, looking ahead, we've got to be productive so that, you know, we're able to produce food and fiber for not only 6 billion people but 9 billion people soon.

But I would encourage you to deal with this issue very carefully because within our organization, we have members that span the spectrum. We have members that care very deeply about their land that you would - almost as emotionally as they would a family member.

We also have members in our organization that view land as a capital asset, no different from cash or bonds or stocks. And then in a lot of cases, are a lot more sound and, you know, that is the capital they use to invest in technology and productive capacity.

So just as a word of caution or as an ask, as you guys think about this and you develop this, I would encourage you to open this discussion up broader to the ag community and maybe have a listening session beyond this as to what the impact of this could be on the broader ag community. And with that, I'll be quiet. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Jim Moseley: Okay, I'm going to turn it back to Ralph but I will make the comment that I think that the goal here of the work group in the sense of Ralph and this group has been to do precisely that.

So to present those issues and to make EPA and the administrator aware of what the views are out there from the broader agriculture and forestry group. So I don't know that there's anything here that's countered to what has been suggested.

Now I'll turn it back to Ralph. I suspect we've lost an opportunity here to conduct and finalize our business, but Ralph, now I'm going to go back to you and you comment.

Ralph Grossi: Okay, all right, there are two things that I'd at least like to accomplish, one is to make sure we get these concerns and edits made and that we have either consensus or an up and down vote on what those changes should be.

Even if we can't get to a vote on the full paper today because as you can guess, this is a pretty frustrating process and Don, you know, let me speak directly to your comments.

I think what everyone has to recognize here is that this is a 30-member committee. This is not all of agriculture but its pretty well represented on the committee and the committee members who represent different areas of agriculture, need to take their role seriously.

This paper has been properly noticed, distributed, discussed over more than six months, so a little disappointing when I hear we haven't had a chance to see it.

So on process, I don't know what we do because we can always have somebody come up and say, gee, I just got this yesterday, but we do have people on the committee whose job it is to raise issues. That's a process issue. On the question of land use and EPA, I think my reaction to that is we're not starting with a clean slate.

EPA is deeply involved in influencing land use in various ways in this country and I think the paper is intended to put out some brackets around that, provide some suggestions for framework and pretty heavily suggest that voluntary

approaches and working with USDA and other agencies is the proper way to go.

I mean we already have EPA involved in Smart Growth Initiatives and working with local governments on air quality so there's a number of places where EPA is already involved. We're trying to offer some guidance here where the work group is.

So those are - I'll open it up again for any additional comments and after that, Jim, what I'm going to suggest is I go down the list of things that I believe are accepted by consensus on the call and so we can get to the one or two things that might require a vote if we still have enough people to vote.

Jim Moseley: Okay, that's fine. So any other - let's take Ralph's lead on that - any other comments now from the public?

Tom Hans: Yes, I will take this opportunity. This is Tom Hans with American Soybean Association. As a follow up to the discussion on the international indirect land use, you know, it seems to me that, you know, a document within EPA on land use at a time when there are multiple congressional hearings going on, on international indirect land use as legislation has been introduced, it's a front burner issue to say the least, with numerous studies being conducted.

It seems to me that this committee, who is tasked with providing advice to the administrator on issues of impact to farmers and rural communities, the fact that they did not have the opportunity to have input into the EPAs international indirect land use assumptions and determinations phases were finalized in the proposed rule.

It's certainly a concern and to me, brings into the question the relevance and credibility of the committee of EPAs framework here. So I just put that there

for the record and understand that the other committee is going to be now undertaking a review of that proposed rule and possibly having developed there.

But it seems it would have been more prudent to have that into the process when that was under consideration by EPA before they published the proposed rule and in my opinion, the committee should push the administrator and EPA to consult them these decisions before they are made.

Jim Moseley: Point very well made and point very well taken. I don't think there's anything else that needs to be said. That stake is driven in the ground. Thank you.
Okay, any other comments? All right.

Ralph Grossi: If not, Jim, if you'd like, I'll go through and read off a few of the items that I think are probably going to be adopted by consensus.

Jim Moseley: Okay.

Ralph Grossi: Are we okay on doing that? You know, we're working against a horrible constraint here, not enough members, which is very disturbing to me. But back to Alicia, where are we at here?

Alicia Kaiser: We should have still enough numbers as long as Otto is still on the phone. Has Otto had to leave yet?

Otto During: Otto is on until the sword hits me over the head.

Alicia Kaiser: Okay.

Jim Moseley: So move.

Alicia Kaiser: Keep going, let's go.

Ralph Grossi: Okay, very quickly then. We had some of the things I think we can just accept is Otto's comments about the cover letter and mention of the new roles of EPA.

Jay had a suggestion to change policy to framework approach, which seemed fine to me, but I'll defer to others if there's an objection and also to add a sentence that was a preamble to that role regarding land use planning as a traditional role of state and local governments. And we'll get the exact wording on that and circulate it around.

Nelson comments about adding fiber with food, fuel and feed and deleting the third sentence of the third - or the last sentence of the third paragraph.

Jim Moseley: Ralph, let's take these. While we're here, let's just take them. In fact, back up one or two there. Otto's comments, any objection? Okay. Jay's comments?

Ralph Grossi: That would be about framework approach or the lead sentence on EPA's role.

Jim Moseley: I hear none. That's consensus right?

Ralph Grossi: Yes.

Jim Moseley: Okay, now (Dave)'s comments on adding fiber? And then now we're caught up. Dave's second comment was...

Ralph Grossi: To delete the final sentence in the third paragraph, the one that starts with, "while bio fuels feed production." - "feed stock production keeps land and agriculture." Any objection?

Jim Moseley: I didn't hear whoever spoke there.

Ralph Grossi: None.

Alicia Kaiser: Yes, just keep on moving.

Jim Moseley: Okay. There was a comment, I want to make sure on this one because there was a comment someone said, I thought that's the reason why we kind of did this part of the paper anyway. So Dave is suggesting that we scratch that sentence. I'm going to scratch it with consensus. If anyone wants to object to that, do so now.

Otto During: Okay, scratch it with consensus. I have to turn off the cell phone, this is Otto.

Jim Moseley: Okay, all right.

Alicia Kaiser: Thanks Otto.

Jim Moseley: Move ahead.

Ralph Grossi: We are left with several questions about the first paragraph on the fourth page. This was the paragraph added this past week.

Jim Moseley: Yes.

Ralph Grossi: Can we have a discussion about it?

Jim Moseley: Okay, yes. I don't think we can do anything. Am I right on that Alicia? But we can have a discussion as long as it is not subsidy?

Alicia Kaiser: That's correct, thank you.

Jim Moseley: I don't know what a non-subsidy discussion is but...

Jim Moseley: Okay, while we're on the phone, let's have a discussion about that. There are two different viewpoints here, let's get them out there.

Jay Vroom: Jim, this is Jay Vroom, I would just say that I agree with the comments about the fact that the indirect land use issue associated with bio fuels evaluation is the number one land use issue of the day and it seems appropriate to include it in this document at this time.

Jim Moseley: Okay. Any other comments because we can't do any action now, but any comments? So Ralph, you have some framework now you have to - and for us to come back.

I assume what we're going to have to do here to complete this process is go through and find a time that we can get the group back together on a phone call again. Am I correct on that Alicia?

Chris Ashcraft: That's correct and the other option is we'll have another teleconference call in July, but we'll have to wait and see on that, but we can easily do another federal register notice that does follow a later date.

Jim Moseley: Okay and I hear the phone beeping. I'm assuming we're losing people now.

Ralph Grossi: I mean clearly this will give Don and others a chance to circulate this paper more widely among their constituents as well. I'm taking from the conversation, this non-substance of conversation we're having, that generally it makes some sense to deal with the indirect land use in this paper.

Jeff Vonk): This is Jeff again. Before I hang up, I would say if you feel - if the paper is going to deal with it, it needs to deal with it as an emerging issue, not a comment on a proposed rule to get my vote on the whole paper.

Jim Moseley: Can I ask, Jeff, if you have some suggested language, we can try to work it in. You're saying as more generically as an issue than in the context of the Renewable Fuel Standard?

Jeff Vonk: Yes.

Jim Moseley: Yes.

Tom McDonald: This is Tom McDonald. I think one of Jay's comments also was under market forces on Page 2. Did we - as we were adopting Jay's comments, did you get that one?

Ralph Grossi: Yes, I'm sorry I passed over it but it was to drop that parenthetical statement at the end of the paragraph.

Jim Moseley: Yes.

Tom McDonald: I just wanted to make sure that one didn't get lost.

Jim Moseley: Thanks, Tom. All right, I hear a lot of clicks so we may be winding down to you and I having a conversation here Ralph and Jay and Tom. I think we've probably come as far as we can go.

If anyone has a point now, raise it but my apologies to you, Ralph, that this happened the way it did. I know you'd like to get this to completion. I appreciate you saying, the good news is that maybe this will get wider distribution and more people will take a look at it.

I do believe your intent was honorable and what you are accomplish, was on behalf of agricultural. So there's no question about what you are trying to do here, we just ran into a process problem.

So unless there's another comment here or Ralph you have a question that you would like to put on the table for those few that may be remaining the call, I think what we need to do is move towards an adjournment.

And I do believe that my sense is, unless you have a different view, that we ought to come back to a more immediate addressing of this issue than waiting until July.

In other words, set a notice of a timeframe. I will write a note about discipline if you're going to say you're going to be on a call because of the rule. If it wasn't for the rule, then it wouldn't be an issue, but because of the rule, we have to have people on the call.

And we'll survey the group, we'll get the federal register notice out as necessary and we'll get another call and get this completed for you, Ralph.

Ralph Grossi: No, I'm sincere in saying I hope, you know, anyone who feels they just need additional comments on their institutions that this is the chance to do it but I would hope we could continue to move this forward, get it wrapped up in the next couple months.

Jim Moseley: Yes, I agree.

Richard Bonanno: This is Rich.

Jim Moseley: Go ahead.

Richard Bonanno: I just wanted to make one comment. I understand that some people - that there are some people on this committee that are perhaps bound by the wishes of their employer in what they say and do on this committee.

But as we've been reminded so many times, if you're not on this committee representing groups of people, we're on this committee as individuals that were selected because of diverse background.

So while I may pass things by people, I don't feel any need to generate consensus among all the groups that I belong to, whether it's the vegetable growers or farm bureau or anybody else before I make a decision by someone who votes on this committee. I listen to what everybody has to say but I don't feel the need to get consensus from anybody on what I vote or how I vote.

Jim Moseley: Point very well made, Rich, I appreciate that.

Karri Hammerstrom: And this is Karri Hammerstrom and I just have a question for Ralph although and I do agree with Rich's comments. So as I understand the comment, we had enough on our committee to go through and approve all the comments up until that last paragraph and then the paper as a whole, is that correct?

Alicia Kaiser: I believe that's correct. Is that also your understanding, Ralph and Jim?

Jim Moseley: Yes where I came from, unless somebody can show me differently with some enthusiastic debate.

Karri Hammerstrom: Very good, thank you.

Jim Moseley: Thank you, Karry.

Unknown man: Can we get the revisions out pretty soon so folks will have an opportunity to do...

Alicia Kaiser: Definitely - this is Alicia, I will work on revising the paper according to all, you know, getting all the revisions that were approved into the paper. And then we'll send that back out and we'll do a poll for dates again just immediately to try to get a new call set up for approval.

Jim Moseley: You know, we kind of went...

Unknown women: Excuse me?

Jim Moseley: ...go ahead.

Woman: Can we piggy back onto the other committee call that we're doing the survey for right now?

Alicia Kaiser: I'm not sure. They are probably going to be reviewing four advice letters on that call, which is a lot already to tackle in that call so I'm not real optimistic that we can tack on more to that call at this point. I think the safest bet is to go ahead and poll for a separate call.

We also kind of need to take up the issue of the NANO Technology Paper so we can try to wrap those two issues into one call and not have it just be in vein that we're having a second one here before August.

Jim Moseley: Okay. We kind of came to the same point - I don't know if Jim is still on the call, Jim Andrews, but we kind of came to the same point with Jim, we may, as a matter of process, want to have a (false final) from this point forward

because that final seems to get people stimulated at the last minute and then do the actual work, vote and so forth about two weeks after that.

I know that's a politically incorrect comment, but I just had to throw that out there for people's generation. I hear some laughing. Okay, okay, anything else that we can do at this point in time?

Alicia Kaiser: I don't think so Jim but thanks everybody for your effort.

Jim Moseley: Yes, Ralph, thank you. Thank you committee. We'll do everything we can to bring this back. Let's have a conversation and see if we can also use the time more efficiently and if there's other issues that we can bring forward here, I'll leave that up to you, Alicia and your folks to get that organized. But I thank all of you and we'll try to get this done as quickly as we possibly can.

Ralph Grossi: Thank you, Jim.

Alicia Kaiser: Thank you.

Man: Bye.

Ralph Grossi: Bye, Jim.

Alicia Kaiser: Bye, bye.

Jim Moseley: Bye, bye.

Operator: The leader has disconnected. The conference will now end.

END 2:00 PM EDT

Meeting Participants

Members:

James R. Moseley (Chair of FRRCC)

Owner

Jim Moseley Farms, Inc.

James O. Andrew

Owner

Andrew Farms, Inc.

Richard Bonanno

Owner

Pleasant Valley Gardens

Garth W. Boyd, Ph.D.

Senior Vice President

Camco Global

Christine Chinn

Manager

Chinn Hog Farm

Otto Doering

Professor, Dept. of Agricultural Economics

Purdue University

Thomas M. Franklin

Senior Vice President

Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership

Earl J. Garber

President

Louisiana Association of Conservation Districts

Ralph Grossi

President

American Farmland Trust

Karri M. Hammerstrom

Co-Owner

Hammertime Ranch

Tom McDonald

Vice President for Environmental Affairs

Five Rivers Ranch Cattle Feeding

Dave Nelson

Chairman of the Board

Global Ethanol

Jeffrey R. Vonk

Secretary

South Dakota Department of Game, Fish,
and Parks

Jay Vroom

President

CropLife America

Douglas Young

General Partner

Spruce Haven Farm

Designated Federal Officer:

Alicia Kaiser

Special Assistant for Agricultural Policy

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Christopher Ashcraft

Junior Designated Federal Officer FRRCC

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

EPA Participants:

Khanna Johnston

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Pat Cimino

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Melissa Krammer

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Jenny Noke

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Members of the Public:

David Beaudreau

John Bonitz

Tom Hance

Don Parrish

Kent Splitman

These minutes are an accurate depiction of the matters discussed during this meeting.

*

James R. Moseley
Chair
Farm, Ranch, and Rural Communities Committee

The Farm, Ranch, and Rural Communities Committee is a federal advisory committee chartered by Congress, operating under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA; 5 U.S.C., App.2). The Committee provides advice to the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on a broad range of environmental issues. The findings and recommendations of the Committee do not represent the views of the Agency, and this document does not represent information approved or disseminated by EPA.

*

I, James R. Moseley, approve that the afore transcribed meeting minutes for the May 19, 2009 FRRCC Conference Call are an accurate description of the matters discussed during this meeting. Signed June 27, 2009.