



AAPFCO Mid-Year 2009
February 21-25, 2009
Reno, NV

**Schedule, Meeting Rooms &
Committee Agenda
Effective 2-16-09
First Edition**

See you there!!!

AAPFCO Midyear Meeting
February 19-26, 2009
Reno, Nevada

(revised 12/4/08)

For Meeting and Hotel Details click here:

www.aapfco.org

Day Date	Time	Committee	Room
<u>Thurs. 2/19</u>	1:30-5:00 PM	RISE	Donner
<u>Fri. 2/20</u>	8:00 – 11:30 AM	RISE	Donner
<u>Sat. 2/21</u>	11:00 - 2:30 PM	Registration	2 nd Floor Foyer
	11:00 - Noon	<u>Long Range Planning</u>	So. Pacific B/C/D
	1:00-5:00 PM	<u>Soil Amendment Sub Committee</u>	So. Pacific B/C/D
<u>Sun. 2/22</u>	10:00 - 2:30 PM	Registration	2 nd Floor Foyer
	10:00 AM - Noon	<u>Uniform Bills</u>	Bonanza C
	1:00 - 5:00 PM	<u>Terms/Labeling</u>	Ponderosa B
<u>Mon. 2/23</u>			
	7:30 AM	COFFEE SERVICE	2 nd Floor Foyer
	7:30 – 2:00 PM	Registration	2 nd Floor Foyer
	9:00 - 11:00 AM	<u>Environ. Affairs</u>	Bonanza A
	10:00 - Noon	<u>Magruder</u>	Bonanza C
	1:00 – 3:00 PM	<u>Uniform Reports</u>	Bonanza B
	1:00 – 4:00 PM	<u>Slow Release</u>	Ponderosa A
	3:00 - 4:00 PM	<u>Seminars</u>	Tahoe
	4:00 - 5:00 PM	<u>Ed & Info</u>	Bonanza C
	6:00 - 7:30 PM	<u>TFI/RISE Reception</u>	Poolside Terrace
<u>Tuesday 2/24</u>	7:30 AM	COFFEE SERVICE	2 nd Floor Foyer
	8:00 – 1:30 PM	REGISTRATION	Same
	8:00 – Noon	<u>Lab Services</u> <u>AOACI Community</u>	Ponderosa A
	11:00 - Noon	<u>Ind/Reg Council</u>	Bonanza C
	1:00 – 5:00 PM	<u>AAPFCO Board</u>	Genoa
	1:00 – 5:00 PM	<u>TFI Product Quality</u>	Bonanza A
<u>Wednesday 2/25</u>	8:00 – 10:00 AM	<u>Laboratory Services</u>	Ponderosa A
	8:00 – 9:00 AM	<u>BMP</u>	Bonanza A
	9:00 – 10:00 AM	<u>Plant Security</u>	Bonanza A
<u>Wednesday 2/25</u>	10:15 - Noon	<u>Joint Meeting</u> <u>TFI/AAPFCO</u>	Bonanza A

Day Date	Time	Committee	Room
	1:00 - 8:00 PM	<u>Methods Forum</u>	Bonanza A
	5:00-6:00 PM	<u>(3) Breakouts</u>	Carson, Donner & Washoe
	6:30-9:00 PM	<u>Dinner</u>	Poolside Terrace
<u>Thursday</u> <u>2/26</u>	8:00 AM – 5:00 PM	<u>Methods Forum</u>	Bonanza A
	9:30-12:00 PM	<u>(3) Breakouts</u>	Carson, Donner & Washoe
	1:00-5:00 PM	<u>Methods Forum</u>	Bonanza A

Long Range Planning Committee Meeting Agenda
Reno, Nevada
February 21, 2009

Approval of minutes from the annual meeting

Old Business

1. Tonnage Report Processing Update – Joe Slater
 - a. Data collection & reporting
 - b. Contracts
2. Strategic Plan – Pat Johnson
3. Update on Lab Services Project/ Lab Manual – Weldon Collier
4. New chairperson or vice chair for Long Range Planning – Pat Johnson

New Business

MINUTES
Long Range Planning Committee
Nashville, Tennessee
August 7, 2008

The Long Range Planning Committee met on Thursday, August 7, 2008. The meeting was called to order at 7:40 AM. Committee members present were Weldon Collier, Brett Groves, David Howle, Pat Johnson, Ben Jones, Chris Mason, Kenny Naylor, Joe Slater, and Garry Wagner. Also in attendance were Dan Danielson, Amrith Gunasekara, and Roger Hoestenbach.

Tonnage Report Processing Update

Louisiana, Hawaii and Wyoming estimate their tonnage. Hawaii may do a survey. TFI has done a call for the data and Joe is trying to get it finalized. California and Florida will be entering their data.

Strategic Plan Development

Pat did not get the present Strategic Plan out to the administrator's for review prior to the annual meeting. She will get it out before the midyear.

Update on Lab Services Project/Lab Manual

Weldon Collier wants to continue with the Lab Services validation of an AAPFCO laboratory manual. The Lab Services committee will be looking for single lab validation and peer to peer validation. Bill Hall is still working with AOAC on improving the process that we have with them. There will be a list serve established for the members of the Lab Services committee.

On the issue of keeping the secretary and treasurer's information updated, Jamey still need to transfer his information to Chris Mason for back up. Jamey has had issues with his old computer and now he is trying to get the new system and the back log completed.

Weldon made a comment about promoting AAPFCO because a lot of people do not know that we exist. It is in the strategic plan and the education committee has been tasked with that job.

The committee discussed upcoming annual meetings. Canada was discussed for 2010. Puerto is till on the agenda for an upcoming meeting. 2011 will be Salt Lake City. Nothing established for 2012. The group likes California, preferably San Diego.

Pat Johnson brought up the issue of finding a replacement for her as Chair of Long Range Planning since she is now on the Board of Directors. Also, Asif Mann has resigned his position as vice chair of Long Range Planning.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45.

Other Business

AGENDA SOIL AMENDMENT SUBCOMMITTEE AAPFCO 2009 MidYear Meeting

Reno, Nevada

Saturday, February 21, 2009 1:00 PM – 5:00 PM

1. Welcome and Introductions

Membership:

Control Officials

Kenny Naylor, Chair (OK)
Ann Brueck (ID)
Bill Cox (FL)
Teresa Crenshaw (DE)
Amrith Gunasekara (CA)
Matt Haynes (OR)
Julie Hester (GA)
Pat Johnson (CO)
Ewa Madey (Canada)
Paul McNelly (MN)
Anthony Parker (Canada)
Joe Slater (MO)
Garry W. Wagner (ND)
Tom Waller (IL)

Industry Liaisons

Ron Alexander, US Composting Council
David DeCou, OMRI
Bill Gillum, Terracycle, Inc.
Pam Guffain, TFI
Blaize Holden, Sustane Natural Fertilizer
Irene Karas, Aquatrols
Ada Lavin, Leaca, LLC
Sherri McElroy, The Scotts Miracle Gro Co.
Sandy Simon, Spectrum Brands
Jim Skillen, RISE
Vince Snyder, The Espoma Company
Shane Wolf, Advanced Microbial Solutions

2. Review of Minutes from Nashville, TN at 2008 AAPFCO Annual Meeting

3. Uniform Soil Amendment Bill & New Rules

The subcommittee will continue the review of proposed revisions to the AAPFCO Uniform Soil Amendment Bill and new Rules.

4. Status of 2007 Soil Amendment Survey

MINUTES SOIL AMENDMENT SUBCOMMITTEE AAPFCO 2008 Annual Meeting

Nashville, Tennessee

Tuesday, August 5, 2008 1:30 PM – 3:00 PM

1. Welcome and Introductions

Membership:

Control Officials

Kenny Naylor, Chair (OK)
Ann Brueck (ID)
Bill Cox (FL)
Teresa Crenshaw (DE)
Amrith Gunasekara (CA)
Matt Haynes (OR)

Industry Liaisons

Ron Alexander, US Composting Council
David DeCou, OMRI
Brian Gilbertson
Bill Gillum, Terracycle, Inc.
Pam Guffain, TFI
Blaize Holden, Sustane Natural Fertilizer

Julie Hester (GA)	Irene Karas, Aquatrols
Pat Johnson (CO)	Ada Lavin, Leaca, LLC
Ewa Madey (Canada)	Sherri McElroy, The Scotts Miracle Gro Co.
Anthony Parker (Canada)	Sandy Simon, Spectrum Brands
Joe Slater (MO)	Jim Skillen, RISE
Garry W. Wagner (ND)	Vince Snyder, The Espoma Company
Tom Waller (IL)	Shane Wolf, Advanced Microbial Solutions

Chair Kenny Naylor opened the meeting at 1:39 pm and welcomed the members, liaisons and guests. There were a total of 19 control officials, 21 industry representatives and 2 industry association representatives who signed the committee roster.

The minutes from the 2008 MidYear Meeting in Tampa, FL were approved with no changes. (Motion to accept minutes by Garry Wagner; motion seconded by Ann Brueck.)

2. Uniform Soil Amendment Bill & Proposed Rules

Review of revisions to the AAPFCO Uniform Soil Amendment bill and proposed Rules.

Ann Brueck asked about the definition of “microbe” and noted that larger organisms such as earthworms could be included under this definition. “Organism” was changed to “microbiological organism”. Ewa Madey asked why were we dealing only with changes to the soil and not including products that interact with the plant root. Chair Kenny Naylor noted that the Uniform Soil Amendment Bill only deals with changes to the soil. He referred to page 97 of the 2008 Official Publication in Note #4 that provided an option for *plant* amendments. If microbes utilizing some other action were to be regulated, there would have to be a *Soil and Plant* Amendment Bill. Ewa Madey asked why would we not want the model bill to include plant amendments. Don Delorme warned that some of these products could possibly cross over as pesticides. Ewa Madey said that some microorganisms are used for soil remediation but should not be included under this bill; however, they could be included under the definition of microbe as it is currently written.

Ann Brueck asked about the definition of “ingredient statement” that requires ingredients to be listed according to predominance “by volume”. She asked if this definition should also include “by weight. Harry Ballard noted that the law allows both volume and weight. The definition of ingredient statement was changed to allow “by volume or weight as appropriate”.

Amrith Gunasekara asked about listing ingredients in non-quantitative terms. Chair Kenny Naylor noted that this format for an ingredient statement was needed for the exemption from the guaranteed analysis. Sandy Simon explained that there should be no numbers or percentages in the ingredient statement so that the company did not have to reveal their proprietary formulation.

Ann Brueck asked about the definition of “landscape soil” and if the intended use as a growing medium was sufficient. She explained that landscape soil could also be intended to be mixed with native soils. Sherri McElroy noted that the language “not in containers” would suffice.

Ewa Madey asked why the definition of microbe included a “mixture of microorganisms” since we were defining a “microbe”. Chair Kenny Naylor noted that microbes are usually added as more than one species or may include bacteria and fungi. Ewa Madey noted that that the term “microorganism” is included in the definition of “microbe”. Could the definition be changed from “means” to “includes”? Dave DeCou noted that it no longer was a definition if the term were changed to “includes”. Chair Kenny Naylor asked if the redundancy was acceptable. All agreed that the redundancy did not hinder the definition.

Chair Kenny Naylor moved on to the exemptions. Since compost is listed as an exempted ingredient, Ewa Madey confirmed that a guarantee would not be required for “organic matter” when claimed for a compost. Ann Brueck noted that the table in Rule 2(a) was not complete but other ingredients could be added as per Rule 2(c).

Ron Alexander asked for confirmation that a generic statement claiming the presence of microbes would no longer be acceptable under Rule 2(d) unless accompanied by a guarantee. Chair Kenny Naylor confirmed that a guarantee would be required. Ann Brueck asked if a product contained several microbes within the same species, would a general guarantee be acceptable. Ewa Madey said that this would not be a good idea. She said that some companies may have a product that contained several microorganisms but may only guarantee one or two. She thought all the microbes should be guaranteed at the genus and species level. Amrith Gunasekara confirmed that California required both the genus and species. Vince Snyder wanted to make sure that anything we developed here did not conflict with existing state laws. Amrith Gunasekara confirmed this would not be a conflict in California.

Sandy Simon noted that the claim allowed for composts in proposed Rule 4g referring to the presence of microorganisms would

require a guarantee, but this same statement would be allowed under the Bulk Compost Rules for compost registered as a fertilizer. He said that there should be a link between the two rules. Ann Brueck said that she did not require guarantees for “naturally-occurring” microorganisms; but Chair Kenny Naylor noted that many products contain microorganisms that are naturally-occurring such as compost tea. Ewa Madey said that Canada did regulate products that contain naturally occurring microbes, but they were more concerned about products that were “artificially” inoculated. She continued that consortia (naturally-occurring) products are required to be guaranteed at the genus and species level, and this committee may want to differentiate the two. Ron Alexander said that the industry supported the use of generic statements, and he could supply the committee with supportive data. Ewa Madey noted that not all naturally-occurring microorganisms are safe.

Ewa Madey said that she still had concerns about the definition of microbes. Dave DeCou noted that there were many microbes in the soil for which we did not know the genus and species. They could not be identified. Ewa Madey noted that there were now many analytical methods available to determine them as long as the microorganism could be cultured. Chair Kenny Naylor noted that a company was not required to guarantee “all” of the naturally occurring microorganisms, but only one or two guarantees would be acceptable. Sandy Simon asked if we were requiring guarantees for “added” microorganisms, and Chair Kenny Naylor responded that guarantees would be required for both naturally occurring and added microbes.

Ewa Madey asked if the control official ever asked for the processing methods for growing the microbes. She noted that a slight change in the method could produce a totally different product. Harry Ballard responded that we would check for whatever was guaranteed on the label. Chair Kenny Naylor asked how consumers would know what they were buying with only a generic statement about the presence of microbes with no guarantees. Ann Brueck said that she was also concerned about the accuracy of the guarantees. Chair Kenny Naylor said that as long as minimum guarantees were met, that would be sufficient.

Ewa Madey noted that Canada did require genus and species for all microorganisms but she realized that the regulations were not intended for consortia products. She noted that Canada would be looking at them. Amrith Gunasekara asked how she would propose to handle these consortia products. Ewa Madey said that they would require the strain as long as there were no pathogens. Amrith Gunasekara asked how one would know that there were no pathogens without specifying a species. Ewa Madey responded that there were methods available that would be able to determine species. She urged the committee to consider this since the interaction of consortia microorganisms could be producing the desired effect claimed for the product.

Joe Slater noted that the Uniform Soil Amendment Bill has “adulteration” and “misbranded” sections to handle products that may contain harmful microorganisms.

Ewa Madey proposed a guarantee for total microbial mass for naturally-occurring microbes. She noted that this was not what was required in Canada, but she preferred this language. Amrith Gunasekara noted that he would like to specify microbes at the species level. He supported total microbial mass guarantees, but according to his state’s requirements, he would need to know the species.

Vince Snyder noted that the general consumer does not understand CFU’s but would understand the statement that there were “naturally occurring microbes” in the product.

Chair Kenny Naylor asked if the committee would like to move this document forward to the Uniform Bills Committee or continue to work on it. Vince Snyder asked if the committee meant to no longer allow generic claims for microorganisms. Ewa Madey confirmed that if the label claimed the microbes were there, the microbes should be guaranteed.

The discussion indicated that the subcommittee should continue to work on the document at the 2009 midyear meeting.

3. Status of Soil Amendment Survey

A copy of the survey results was distributed. Teresa Crenshaw noted that no responses were received from Alabama, Wisconsin, and Puerto Rico but that we would continue to contact them to complete the survey. Teresa Crenshaw noted that any listings in red print were questionable and would need to be verified. Danny Turner noted that the information for North Carolina should show “no” regulations. Bill Cox also noted that fees have increased in Florida as of July 1, and he would update his response.

Joe Slater motioned to adjourn; Garry Wagner seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 pm.

AGENDA
AAPFCO Uniform Bills Committee
2009 MidYear Meeting
Reno, Nevada
Sunday, February 22, 2009 10:00 AM – 12:00 Noon

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
2. **Review of Minutes from 2008 Annual Meeting in Nashville, TN**
3. **Policy Statement for Local Fertilizer Legislation – Currently in Tentative Status**

The committee must vote to recommend to the Board that the policy should become “official” or that it should remain in tentative status. The policy statement is:

POLICY STATEMENTS OF AAPFCO

Local Fertilizer Regulation

The Association of American Plant Food Control Officials (AAPFCO) is vitally interested in the protection of the environment; and believes that appropriate fertilizer use can improve the quality of the environment. AAPFCO recognizes that the regulation of fertilizers must be based on sound scientific principles and that local ordinances regulating the registration, labeling, packaging, sale, storage, distribution, use and application of fertilizer can significantly disrupt the uniform movement of these products in commerce and could harm the environment. Municipalities and other forms of local government may lack the proper scientific expertise to properly and adequately regulate fertilizers; therefore, the Association of American Plant Food Control Officials does not support the development of local regulation of fertilizers by political subdivisions below the level of the State. Furthermore, the Association recommends that all states move quickly to develop legislation that prohibits the regulation of fertilizers below the level of the State in order to insure that these materials are regulated based on sound scientific principles needed to protect the environment.

4. **Obsolete/Discontinued Products & Registration Issues – Vince Snyder, The Espoma Company**

This discussion will include a review of the policy of the Association of American Pesticide Control Official (AAPCO) for discontinued products. Can this policy for pesticides be adapted to fertilizers?

The AAPCO policy is:

“Resolved that products which are discontinued by a manufacturer be reregistered for a period of two years. Said two year limit covers the year in which the item is declared to be discontinued by the registrant and one additional year to permit time for distributors to dispose of shelf stocks.
(Revised, Tentative 1970) (Adopted 1971). ”

5. **Soil Amendment Update – Kenny Naylor, OK Dept. of Agriculture**
6. **Federal Regulation of Ammonium Nitrate – TFI Update**
7. **New Business?**

Includes Revisions approved at the AAPFCO 2008 Annual Meeting, Nashville, TN.
Note: Proposed language is presented in red print in brackets []; deleted language in red-strikeout.
Language approved in Nashville is presented in blue print.

DRAFT

Revisions to AAPFCO Uniform Soil Amendment Bill And New Rules & Regulations

Section 3. Definitions of Terms used in this Act

- (a) “Soil Amendment” means any substance [or a mixture of substances] which is intended to improve the physical[, chemical, biochemical, biological or other] characteristics of the soil except ~~commercial~~ fertilizers, agricultural liming materials, unmanipulated animal manures, unmanipulated vegetable manures, pesticides and other materials exempted by regulation[.]
- (b) “Soil [Amending] Ingredient Form” means the chemical compound such as salt, chelate, oxide, acid, etc., of an ingredient, or the physical form of an ingredient.
- (p) “Soil Amending Ingredient” means a substance which will improve the physical[, chemical, biochemical, biological or other] characteristics of the soil.

Section 4. Labeling

- (a) Soil Amendment Labels – [Except for materials exempted by regulation,] ~~¶~~ [t]he following information shall appear...

[RULES AND REGULATIONS – SOIL AMENDMENTS]

1. Definitions

- (a) “Compost” means a biologically stable material derived from the composting process.
- (b) “Ingredient Statement” means a collective and contiguous listing of the ingredients of which the soil amendment is composed. Such ingredients shall be listed in descending order by their predominance by volume or weight as appropriate in non-quantitative terms.
- (c) **“Landscape soil” or “garden soil” means any substance or mixture of substances promoted as or intended to function as a growing medium for plants or crops not in containers.**
- (d) “Microbe(s)” means any microbiological organism or mixture of microbiological organisms intended to produce any physical, chemical, biochemical, biological, ~~physical~~ or other change in the soil.
- (e) ~~“Microbial product” means any biological substance or mixture of biological substances to be applied to the soil; intended to produce any physical, chemical, biochemical, biological, physical or other change in the soil.~~
- (e) “Mulch” means any organic or inorganic soil surface cover used to help retain moisture longer in the soil by retarding evaporation, to discourage weed growth, to help maintain a constant temperature by insulating the soil, to discourage runoff and soil erosion by shielding the soil surface from water abrasion[.] ~~or to promote water absorption and retention[or some other similar purpose].~~
- (f) “Peat” means partly decayed vegetable matter of natural occurrence and shall be described in accordance with ASTM standards as to whether it is sphagnum, hypnum, reed-sedge, humus, or other peat.
- (g) “Perlite” means a lightweight granular material made of a volcanic mineral expanded by heat treatment for use in growing media.
- (h) “Planting mix” means a material suitable for holding and growing plants and is usually made from natural materials.
- (i) “Potting soil” means a material suitable for holding and growing potted plants and is usually made from natural materials.
- (j) “Vermiculite” means a lightweight mica product expanded by heat treatment for use in growing media.

2. Exemptions

- (a) The following single ingredient soil amendment[s products when clearly and conspicuously identified as such on the label] are exempt from the guaranteed analysis ~~and ingredient statement~~ as required in Section 4(a)(3) of the Act:

Compost

Mulch
Peat
Perlite
Vermiculite
Gypsum
Vermicompost

- (b) In lieu of a guaranteed analysis as required in Section 4(a)(3) of the Act, the label of the following soil amendments [when clearly and conspicuously identified as such on the label] shall include an ingredient statement:

Garden Soil
Landscaping Soil
Planting Mix
Potting Mix

- (c) In addition to those soil amendments listed in Rule 2(a) and (b), other products may be exempted from Section 4(a)(3) of the Act with permission from the _____.

- (d) In lieu of a guarantee expressed as a percentage as required in Section 4(a)(3) of the Act, a product that claims the presence of a specific microorganisms [microbe(s)] shall [guarantee the microbe(s)] be guaranteed as the following [as follows]:

- (1.) Minimum number of each claimed viable organism at the genus and species level in colony forming units (CFU), spores or propagules per gram or milliliter (cm³); and
 (2.) Expiration date; and
 (3.) Storage & handling instructions

Note: For products containing naturally-derived microbial consortia, a guarantee of total microbial mass in CFU's per gram or milliliter is acceptable.

3. Directions for Application

Minimum directions for application shall include:

- (a.) **Recommended application rate or rates in units of weight or volume per unit of area coverage; and**
 (b.) **Application timing and minimum intervals; and**
 (c.) **The statement “Apply Only as Directed” or a statement of similar designation.**

4. Product Claims

Compost shall be exempt from providing proof of claims or proof of usefulness as required in Section 4(c) of the Act if the label and labeling bear a statement that the product is intended solely to be used for one or more of the following purposes:

- (a) Improves soil structure and porosity – creating a better plant root environment;
 (b) Increases moisture infiltration and permeability, and reduces bulk density of heavy soils – improving moisture infiltration rates and reducing erosion and runoff;
 (c) Improves the moisture holding capacity of light soils – reducing water loss and nutrient leaching, and improving moisture retention;
 (d) Improves the cation exchange capacity (CEC) of soils;
 (e) Supplies organic matter;
 (f) Aids the proliferation of soil microorganisms;
 (g) ~~Supplies beneficial microorganisms to soils and growing media;~~
 (h) Allows plants to more effectively utilize nutrients, while reducing nutrient loss by leaching;
 (i) Enables soils to retain nutrients longer;
 (j) Contains humus – assisting in soil aggregation and making nutrients more available for plant uptake;
 (k) Buffers soil pH.]

AGENDA
AAPFCO Uniform Bills Committee
2008 Annual Meeting
Nashville, Tennessee
Wednesday, August 6, 2008 8:00 AM - 10:00 AM

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Teresa Crenshaw opened the meeting at 8:04 A.M. Committee members and industry liaisons introduced themselves. There were 28 control officials, 12 industry representatives and 2 industry association representatives who signed the attendance roster. Teresa thanked Pat Johnson for agreeing to record the minutes for this meeting.

2. Review of Minutes from 2008 MidYear Meeting in Tampa, FL

Minutes from the previous meeting were reviewed, and no changes were recommended. Mike Hancock motioned to accept the minutes as presented, and Robert Waltz seconded the motion. The committee approved the motion.

3. Local Fertilizer Regulation

At a previous meeting, the committee approved the pre-emption resolution as a policy statement of AAPFCO. Teresa noted that the new policy statement would be voted on by the AAPFCO membership at the Business Session held later that day. If approved as an AAPFCO policy, the committee would no longer vote on the resolution each year for it to be included in the AAPFCO Official Publication. The policy statement for pre-emption is:

POLICY STATEMENTS OF AAPFCO

Local Fertilizer Regulation

The Association of American Plant Food Control Officials (AAPFCO) is vitally interested in the protection of the environment; and believes that appropriate fertilizer use can improve the quality of the environment. AAPFCO recognizes that the regulation of fertilizers must be based on sound scientific principles and that local ordinances regulating the registration, labeling, packaging, sale, storage, distribution, use and application of fertilizer can significantly disrupt the uniform movement of these products in commerce and could harm the environment. Municipalities and other forms of local government may lack the proper scientific expertise to properly and adequately regulate fertilizers; therefore, the Association of American Plant Food Control Officials does not support the development of local regulation of fertilizers by political subdivisions below the level of the State. Furthermore, the Association recommends that all states move quickly to develop legislation that prohibits the regulation of fertilizers below the level of the State in order to insure that these materials are regulated based on sound scientific principles needed to protect the environment.

4. Obsolete/Discontinued Products & Registration Issues – Pat Johnson, CO Dept. of Agriculture and Vince Snyder, The Espoma Company

Pat Johnson gave a presentation of control officials' responses to Vince Snyder's proposed Statement of Uniform Interpretation and Policy (SUIP) for obsolete/ discontinued products. None who responded to the survey agreed with the SUIP. Some of the concerns were:

- A. States would have to be notified that a registration is being cancelled.
- B. How would products be handled that remain in the marketplace once the registration is cancelled?
- C. Interstate shipment.
- D. Who would be responsible for adulterated products after the registration had been cancelled?

Vince Snyder asked the state program administrators to look at the language of the Model Bill and not at their own laws for this discussion. He reviewed the Model Bill and said we may not be interpreting the requirements correctly. Joe Slater noted that the law does not require dual registration on products unless the company changes the product name. He suggested that a company pick up the product once it is no longer registered. Sandy Simon said some companies keep old product even though it has been discontinued. He continued that some companies would maintain registration of a product for 5 years but could no longer track the distribution once the product is discontinued. He said he did not think a company should be responsible for a product after it had been discontinued. He asked for a discontinuance period for old products.

Vince asked who would be responsible for distributing a discontinued product. He said the retailer should not be punished. Pat Johnson said that if the product is discontinued, it should be pulled off of the shelf. The retailer should not be held responsible.

Vince asked the committee to look at the AAPCO policy for discontinued product. David Howle found the pesticide policy and read it to the committee as follows:

Resolved that products which are discontinued by a manufacturer be reregistered for a period of two years. Said two-year limit covers the year in which the item is declared to be discontinued by the registrant and one additional year to permit time for distributors to dispose of shelf stocks. (Revised, Tentative 1970) (Adopted 1971)

David said that he would send a copy of the policy to Teresa and let Vince decide if that is the way he wants to proceed.

5. Soil Amendment Update – Kenny Naylor, OK Dept. of Agriculture

Kenny Naylor said that he hoped to have the new language for the Uniform Soil Amendment Bill ready to go for this meeting, but the subcommittee still has more work to do. The group is working on new rules including guarantees for microorganisms, directions for use, and label claims. Teresa added that a soil amendment survey had been sent out in 2007, and the information about registration and tonnage reporting had been compiled and distributed. Responses for the other questions would be compiled later.

6. Federal Regulation of Ammonium Nitrate – TFI Update

Teresa reminded the committee that the Uniform Bills Committee had been charged by the AAPFCO Board of Directors to include model language for the regulation of ammonium nitrate. Bob Tadsden with The Fertilizer Institute gave an update on the status of federal legislation. He said it was on hold until the new President and administration take office. This topic will be discussed further at the next meeting.

7. New Business?

No new business was presented to the committee. Mike Hancock motioned to adjourn the meeting. Kenny Naylor seconded the motion. The committee approved the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 A.M.

AGENDA
LABELING AND DEFINITIONS COMMITTEE
AAPFCO 2009 MIDYEAR MEETING
February 22, 2009

CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Committee Members-Control Officials

Pat Johnson, Chair, Ricky Schroeder, VC (Definitions), Lynn Sheridan, VC (Labeling), Gary Boutz, Weldon Collier, William Cox, Teresa Crenshaw, Amrith Gunasekara, Robert Hougaard, Steve McMurry, Paul McNelly, Kenny Naylor, Rod Noel, Mike Norman, Anthony Parker, Kyle Stephens, William Thom, Tom Waller.

Industry Liaisons

Ron Alexander, David Anderson, Michael Archer, Brian Birrenkott, Alan Blaylock, Gregg Brown, Sherri Bukovec, Fred Carney, Esper Chandler, Kerry Cooner, Dave DeCou, Bill Easterwood, J. Harold Falls, William Gillum, Pam Guffain, Gregory Haberkost, William Hall, Michael Hojjatie, John Jernigan, Dawn Kominski, Madhu Mandava, Jack Peters, John Peterson, David Rose, Rudy Schneider, Sanford Simon, Jim Skillen, Vincent Snyder, Anne Turnbough, Dawn Walters, Chris Wible.

2. REVIEW OF THE NASHVILLE, TN MINUTES

3. ITEMS CURRENTLY IN TENTATIVE STATUS

The committee must vote to recommend these terms to remain in Tentative Status or be moved to Official Status.

A. New Terms Approved as Tentative:

- (1) T-__ **Urban Turf or Lawns** means non-agricultural land planted in closely mowed, managed grasses except golf courses, parks and athletic fields.
- (2) T-__ **Sports Turf** means non-agricultural land planted exclusively for golf courses, parks and athletic fields.
- (3) T-__ **No Phosphate Fertilizer** means fertilizer products with phosphate levels below 0.5% intended for established urban turf or lawns.
- (4) T-__ **Low Phosphate Fertilizer** means fertilizer products intended for new or established urban turf or lawns, with available phosphate levels above 0.5% P₂O₅ and an application rate not to exceed 0.25 lb P₂O₅/1000 sq ft/application and 0.5 lb P₂O₅ a/1000 sq ft/year.
- (5) T-__ **Starter Fertilizer** means a fertilizer formulated for a one-time application at planting or near that time to encourage root growth and enhance the initial establishment.

- (6) T-__ **Established Urban Turf** means urban turf older than 12 months.
- (7) T-__ **New Urban Turf** means urban turf established less than 12 months.

B. Terms Currently in Tentative Status:

The committee must vote to recommend these terms to remain in Tentative Status, be moved to Official Status, or be deleted.

- (1) **BSC-1 Available Silicon (Si)** is the soluble portion of the total silicon in a fertilizer known as monosilicic acid $[\text{Si}(\text{OH})_4]$.
- (2) **BSC-2 Calcium Silicate** is derived from naturally occurring minerals such as Wollastonite or synthetically derived, having the principal formula of CaSiO_3 .
- (3) **BSC-3 Potassium Silicate** is derived from a readily soluble solid or aqueous Solution having the principal formula of $\text{K}_2\text{O} \times \text{SiO}_2$, where $x = 1$ to 3 on a weight basis.
- (4) **BSC-4 Sodium Silicate** is derived from a readily soluble solid or aqueous solution having the principal formula of $\text{Na}_2\text{O} \times \text{SiO}_2$, where $x = 1$ to 3.5 on a weight basis.

The committee must vote to recommend this term to remain in Tentative Status or be moved to Official Status.

- (5) **T-70 Enhanced Efficiency** is a term describing fertilizer products with characteristics that allow increased plant uptake and reduce the potential of nutrient losses to the environment such as gaseous losses, leaching or runoff, as compared to an appropriate reference product.

C. New Definitions Approved as Tentative

The committee must vote to recommend these definitions to remain in Tentative Status or be moved to Official Status.

- (1) N-__ **Distillers Dried Grains** is the dried yeast fermentation product of a grain mixture.
- (2) N-__ **L-Lysine Amino Acid** is a free amino acid containing product derived from bacterial fermentation.
- (3) C-__ **Calcium Phosphite** is a product obtained when phosphorous acid is neutralized with calcium oxide and consists primarily of calcium phosphite (CaHPO_3) in a stable aqueous suspension or as a wettable powder. The phosphorus atom is in the oxidation state of III. It does not contain any significant amount of available phosphate.

D. New Rule 2(f) Approved as Tentative:

The committee must vote to recommend New Rule 2(f) to remain in Tentative Status or be moved to Official Status.

- (2)(f) Beneficial substances or compounds guarantees shall appear under the heading "Contains Beneficial Substances" or "Contains Beneficial Compounds".

Contains Beneficial Substances
 Beneficial Substance.% Or acceptable units
 Purpose Statement:

Or

Contains Beneficial Compounds
Beneficial Compound.....% or acceptable units
Purpose Statement:

Please note: Current 2(f) and (g) will be renumbered to 2(g) and (h).

4. **PROPOSED REVISION TO TERM "READILY AVAILABLE NITROGEN"**

**Presenter: Jim Skillen
Director of Science & Regulatory Affairs
RISE
Washington, DC**

Current Term:

T- **Readily Available Nitrogen** - Nitrogen in a water-soluble form that does not have slow or controlled release properties.

Proposed Terms:

T- **Readily Available Nitrogen** – Nitrogen in either ammoniacal or nitrate form that does not have slow or control release properties.

T- **Readily Available Nitrogen** - Nitrogen in a water-soluble form that does not have slow, controlled release, stabilized nitrogen or enhanced efficiency properties.

5. **PROPOSED NEW SUIP FOR CLAIMS FOR ORGANIC FERTILIZERS**

**Presenter: Vince Snyder, Consultant
Columbus, Ohio**

Mr. Snyder is proposing a new SUIP to permit the use of claims for organic fertilizers that would not require a dual registration as both a fertilizer and a soil amendment. This proposed SUIP would be consistent with the Uniform Agricultural Liming Materials Bill and new Bulk Compost Rules.

Proposed SUIP

SUIP #__ Organic fertilizers shall be exempt from registering as a soil amendment if the product is registered as a fertilizer and bears directions for use consistent with nutrient applications. These products may contain statements regarding the presence of organic matter and claims consistent with established agronomic benefits that organic matter imparts on soils.

6. **COMPOST EXTRACT**

No committee action required. Information only. This term was approved as tentative by the committee at the 2008 Annual Meeting.

T- Compost Extract is the water extract of compost and may contain suspended material.

7. GYPSUM VERSUS LANDPLASTER, C-15

Presenter: Vince Snyder, Consultant
Columbus, Ohio

The labeling of gypsum. Some states are requiring that gypsum be labeled according to the AAPFCO definition : i.e. as **CaS04-H20**. The problem is that many states still regulate gypsum under their old landplaster laws which require that gypsum be labeled as **gypsum "(CaS04)"**. There should not be a requirement in AAPFCO that results in a conflict with existing laws. The AAPFCO definition for gypsum needs to be re-written to accept both methods of labeling gypsum.: i.e. with or without the water of hydration.

8. PROPOSED NEW DEFINITION FOR MANGANESE THIOSULFATE

Presenter: Michael Hojjatie
Tessengerlo Kerley Inc

Michael Hojjatie is requesting a definition for Manganese Thiosulfate.

Manganese Thiosulfate (Mn Thio, Fertilizer Grade) is a product composed principally of $Mn_2S_2O_3$. It is most commonly available in aqueous solution. The guaranteed percentage of Manganese and sulfur shall be stated as part of the brand name."

9. TIME FRAME FOR COMMITTEE ISSUES

The time frame for submitting information to the committee is:

- A. Issues to be discussed at the Midyear Meetings must be presented to the chair at least 60 days in advance of the scheduled meeting.
- B. Issues to be discussed at the Annual Meetings must be presented to the chair at least 60 days in advance of the scheduled meeting.

This policy will be strictly adhered to and may be changed only at the discretion of the Chair.

Note: The minutes for this meeting have been inserted within the agenda in blue print.

Action items are presented in red print.

**MINUTES
AAPFCO LABELING AND DEFINITIONS COMMITTEE
Hilton Downtown Nashville
Nashville, Tennessee
August 6, 2008**

CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Committee Members-Control Officials

Pat Johnson, Chair, Ricky Schroeder, VC (Definitions), Lynn Sheridan, VC (Labeling), Gary Boutz, Weldon Collier, William Cox, Teresa Crenshaw, Amrith Gunasekara, Robert Hougaard, Kenny Naylor, Rod Noel, Mike Norman, Anthony Parker, Kyle Stephens, William Thom.

Industry Liaisons

Ron Alexander, David Anderson, Michael Archer, Brian Birrenkott, Alan Blaylock, **Gregg Brown**, Fred Carney, Esper Chandler, Kerry Cooner, Dave DeCou, Bill Easterwood, J. Harold Falls, William Gillum, Pam Guffain, Gregory Haberkost, William Hall, Michael Hojjatie, John Jernigan, Dawn Kominski, Madhu

Mandava, Sherri McElroy, Jack Peters, John Peterson, David Rose, Rudy Schneider, Sanford Simon, Jim Skillen, Vincent Snyder, Anne Turnbough, Dawn Walters, Chris Wible.

Chair Pat Johnson opened the meeting at 10:23 am. The committee members and industry liaisons introduced themselves. There were a total of 15 control officials and 21 industry representatives and industry association representatives who signed the committee roster.

2. REVIEW OF THE TAMPA, FLORIDA MINUTES

Chair Pat Johnson asked for corrections to the minutes from the 2008 AAPFCO MidYear Meeting in Tampa. There were no changes. Rod Noel moved to accept the minutes. Bill Thom seconded the motion. The committee approved the motion, and the minutes were accepted as presented.

3. **ITEMS RECOMMENDED TO TENTATIVE STATUS**

Chair Pat Johnson reviewed the following items approved as tentative by the committee at a previous meeting. She noted that these items would be voted on at the business session held later that day.

Information Only. These items were approved by the committee, submitted to the BOD and will be voted on at the Business Session.

A. New Terms Approved as Tentative:

- (1) T-__ **Urban Turf or Lawns** means non-agricultural land planted in closely mowed, managed grasses except golf courses, parks and athletic fields.
- (2) T-__ **Sports Turf** means non-agricultural land planted exclusively for golf courses, parks and athletic fields.
- (3) T-__ **No Phosphate Fertilizer** means fertilizer products with phosphate levels below 0.5% intended for established urban turf or lawns.
- (4) T-__ **Low Phosphate Fertilizer** means fertilizer products intended for new or established urban turf or lawns, with available phosphate levels above 0.5% P₂O₅ and an application rate not to exceed 0.25 lb P₂O₅/1000 sq ft/application and 0.5 lb P₂O₅ a/1000 sq ft/year.
- (5) T-__ **Starter Fertilizer** means a fertilizer formulated for a one-time application at planting or near that time to encourage root growth and enhance the initial establishment.
- (6) T-__ **Established Urban Turf** means urban turf older than 12 months.
- (7) T-__ **New Urban Turf** means urban turf established less than 12 months.

B. Terms Recommended to Remain in Tentative Status:

- (1) **BSC-1 Available Silicon (Si)** is the soluble portion of the total silicon in a fertilizer known as monosilicic acid [Si (OH)₄].
- (2) **BSC-2 Calcium Silicate** is derived from naturally occurring minerals such as Wollastonite or synthetically derived, having the principal formula of CaSiO₃.
- (3) **BSC-3 Potassium Silicate** is derived from a readily soluble solid or aqueous Solution having the principal formula of K₂O x SiO₂, where x = 1 to 3 on a weight basis.
- (4) **BSC-4 Sodium Silicate** is derived from a readily soluble solid or aqueous solution having the principal formula of Na₂O x SiO₂, where x = 1 to 3.5 on a weight basis.
- (5) **T-70 Enhanced Efficiency** is a term describing fertilizer products with characteristics that **minimize** allow increased plant uptake and reduce the potential of nutrient losses to the environment such as gaseous losses, leaching or runoff, as compared to an appropriate reference product.

C. New Definitions Approved as Tentative

- (1) N-__ **Distillers Dried Grains** is the dried yeast fermentation product of a grain mixture.
- (2) N-__ **L-Lysine Amino Acid** is a free amino acid containing product derived from bacterial fermentation.
- (3) C-__ **Calcium Phosphite** is a product obtained when phosphorous acid is neutralized with calcium oxide and consists primarily of calcium phosphite (CaHPO₃) in a stable aqueous suspension or as a wettable powder. The phosphorus atom is in the oxidation state of III. It does not contain any significant amount of available phosphate.

D. New Rule 2(f) Approved as Tentative:

- (2)(f) Beneficial substances or compounds guarantees shall appear under the heading “Contains Beneficial Substances” or “Contains Beneficial Compounds”.

Contains Beneficial Substances
Beneficial Substance.% Or acceptable units
Purpose Statement:

Or

Contains Beneficial Compounds
Beneficial Compound.....% or acceptable units
Purpose Statement:

Please note: Current 2(f) and (g) will be renumbered to 2(g) and (h).

4. TENTATIVE TERMS RECOMMENDED TO BE DELETED

Chair Pat Johnson reviewed the following two items to be deleted that were approved by the committee at a previous meeting. She noted that these items would be voted on at the business session held later that day.

Information Only. These terms were approved by the committee to be deleted, were submitted to the BOD and will be voted on at the Business Session.

- A. **T-71 Slow Release** are fertilizer products that release (convert to a plant-available form) their plant nutrients at a slower rate relative to a “reference soluble” product. Examples of slow-release products are coated or occluded, which control the release of soluble nutrients through coating or occlusion of the soluble nutrient compounds, water insoluble, or slowly available water-soluble.
- B. **T-72 Stabilized** Products that have been amended with an additive that reduces the rate of transformation of fertilizer compounds, resulting in extended time of availability in the soil. Examples of stabilizing amendments are nitrification inhibitors, nitrogen stabilizers, or urease inhibitors.

5. SUIP 28 RECOMMENDED TO OFFICIAL STATUS

Chair Pat Johnson reviewed the following item approved as official by the committee at a previous meeting. She noted that this item would be voted on at the business session held later that day.

Information Only. SUIP 28 was approved by the committee, submitted to the BOD and will be voted on at the Business Session.

28. Labeling of Organic Input Products. Products intended for use as organic inputs may make statements on the products label that affirm that the product is in accord with the National Organics Program (NOP) (e.g. "suitable for organic farming", "acceptable for use in organic production", "meets National Organic Program requirements for organic production", and may use the logos issued by recognized agencies such as OMR (Organic Materials Review Institute), certifying agencies, state programs, or other recognized organic input listing services. Such statements are exempt from requirements pertaining to organic labeling under the fertilizer law.

6. PROPOSED NEW SUIP

**Presenter: Vince Snyder, Consultant
Columbus, Ohio**

Mr. Snyder is proposing a new SUIP to permit the use of claims for organic fertilizers that would not require a dual registration as both a fertilizer and a soil amendment. This proposed SUIP would be consistent with the Uniform Agricultural Liming Materials Bill and new Bulk Compost Rules.

Proposed SUIP

SUIP #__ Organic fertilizers shall be exempt from registering as a soil amendment if the product is registered as a fertilizer and bears directions for use consistent with nutrient applications. These products may contain statements regarding the presence of organic matter and claims consistent with established agronomic benefits that organic matter imparts on soils.

Vince Snyder provided a PowerPoint presentation and a handout to the committee (attached.) He stated that the model Bulk Compost Rules exempts composts from the Uniform State Soil Amendment Bill if the compost is registered as a fertilizer. Some states require fertilizers to be dual registered as a fertilizer and as a soil amendment if certain claims are made. Vince Snyder read his proposed SUIP. He noted that the second part of the SUIP is meant to deal with claims about organic matter that could result in registration as a soil amendment. Vince Snyder showed examples of info sheets about soil organic matter and reviewed the claims that were considered to be agronomic axioms – something proven over and over again that should not have to be further substantiated. He thought such claims should be able to be made without having to also register the fertilizer as a soil amendment. Vince Snyder noted that these claims were similar to those accepted for bulk compost.

Vince Snyder referred to the AAPFCO Official Publication about exemptions for products that have dual uses. He referred to liming products that are exempt from the fertilizer bill even though liming materials have nutrient content. He also referred to bulk composts that are exempt from the soil amendment bill. Vince Snyder said that it is his opinion that AAPFCO has never sanctioned dual registration. These products are fertilizers that claim the benefits of organic matter. He asked for any questions. Bill Cox asked how many states require dual registration of composts. Ron Alexander responded that there were a few states that do. Weldon Collier noted that the Uniform State Fertilizer Bill is a model, and since only a few states require dual registration, this issue is already addressed. Vince Snyder replied that the model should promote uniformity.

Ewa Madey asked why not register the product as a soil amendment and then exempt it from the fertilizer law. Vince Snyder replied that all claims have to be substantiated under the fertilizer bill. A company should not have to register under both laws, but some states feel that was the way it should be. He noted that in the fertilizer bill, fertilizers are exempt as soil amendments. And, the product is registered as a fertilizer because it is a fertilizer. Organic matter is consistent with AAPFCO's definition of "organic". Bill Thom questioned the claims about heavy soils. He said these claims should be looked into. He also noted frequent confusion about claims for heavy soils.

Ron Alexander said that he agrees with Vince Snyder about dual registration. He has some clients who have the same problem. He continued that when we talk about the benefits of organic matter, shouldn't we have to relate back to the application rates? He thinks low application rates cannot support the claim, and he has concerns about efficacy. If the claims referred to application rates for which the product is accumulated into the soil over time, he would be okay with the claims. Vince Snyder said that some of the information sheets require very little of the product to be applied in order to meet the claims. Vince Snyder said that any claim must be truthful as required by the fertilizer bill.

Chair Pat Johnson noted that she is not comfortable moving this SUIP forward without it first going to a working group. **She will send this issue to the Specialty Products Working Group.** The committee members confirmed that no motion was needed, and Pat could handle this issue at her discretion.

7. PROPOSED NEW TERM FOR DIGESTATE

Presenter: Ron Alexander
US Composting Council

Ron Alexander is proposing a new term for Digestate as follows:

T- ___ Digestate - The liquid or solid material derived from the digestion process.

Ron Alexander presented a PowerPoint presentation (attached). He noted that he made a brief presentation to the By-Products & Recycled Materials Subcommittee about new products derived from anaerobic digestion. Several technologies are being used, and there are many digesters for wastewater. Now the technology is being used for composts. Several potential uses for these products are now coming to market. Ron said that he is seeing liquid products being used for fertilization, and some are being concentrated. These products are already being sold, with many being sold to farmers due to the high price of fertilizer. These products are probably not registered. Companies need a definition in order to sell these products. Some may say it is not necessary to register them since the product is "manure". There are sludge products, food waste products, etc., but the term "digestate" is being used within the industry. Ron said in developing this new definition for "digestate", he used similar language from the AAPFCO terms "composting" and "compost". He wants to bring this definition for companies selling the material that may not know a registration is needed.

Bill Easterwood said he liked the definition but asked if there should be a differentiation between "anaerobic" and "aerobic" since this may be something customers would like to know. Ewa Madey asked if some digestates were a combination of both anaerobic and aerobic digestion. Ron Alexander replied that if a solid were composted, it would be called compost (or composted manure.) Would the term "composted digestate" be acceptable? There is also an issue of liquid product coming into the market. Mel Bryant thinks "anaerobic" needs to be removed from the definition, and that we should just define "digestate". Ron Alexander said the definition for the AAPFCO term "compost" included the terms "anaerobic" and "aerobic" digestion. Mel Bryant says the term to be defined should be "anaerobic digestion". Brian Birrenkott says then we need to define "digestion". Ron Alexander noted that processes should not be defined, only the product itself. Bill Thom asked if we would be faced with approving a product already regulated by another agency, such as EPA or Departments of Health, in order for it to be applied to land. He cited "septage" as an example. Ron Alexander said if it is to be applied to land, it is a fertilizer.

Amrith Gunasekara said he has seen these products in California, but he does not know of a solid material that is a product of anaerobic digestion. He suggested removing "solid" and leaving liquid in the definition. Ron Alexander noted that the digestate may have suspended materials and may be dewatered. He said that he was defining a product that is already being used and understood in the market. Amrith Gunasekara noted that suspended solids are not digested. Fred Carney asked about pathogens that may remain in the product. Ron Alexander explained that you are not going to create new pathogens and will usually see a reduction of pathogen content. The digestate will probably be heated again to deal with pathogens if that is an issue. Fred Carney said that it was stated that the digestate may be applied directly to soil and therefore may not be subsequently treated. Ron Alexander said that with manure, there would usually be a pathogen reduction.

Ewa Madey asked about other contaminants. Ron Alexander replied that this was not a concern because most contaminants would upset the process. The process would be innately clean if coming from food wastes, and usually, the process is self-regulating. The material would be regulated according to the type of feedstock, and that may determine the need for heavy metal testing. Vince Snyder said the EPA 503's would take care of biosolids. This was nothing more than manipulating a product that is already out there – manure. Ron Alexander noted that California is dealing with food product wastes, and he has offered the term for a product that may be coming across the desk of other state officials. He said he was just trying to follow the format of a similar definition and would work with anyone if they thought it was worthwhile. Bill Gillum noted that there is large potential for food materials to create methane gas.

Chair Pat Johnson said she would like to see Ron Alexander work on a better definition based on comments from the group. He agreed.

8. OBSTACLES OF ORGANIC REGISTRATION

No presentation was made.

Presenter: Len Conley
The Sanctuary Organic Fertilizers
Winter Park, Colorado

A. Confusion regarding registration requirements of OMRI approved Sulfate of Potash

When registering products for retail applications with no implication for organic crop production, there is an issue regarding natural mined sulfate of potash when used in these formulations. Some states qualify this ingredient as a natural input whereby it counts towards the volume requirement for natural or organic based products. Where by some states will not permit this ingredient to qualify as part of an organic formulation. However, there are some states will qualify this same ingredient for organic crop production pending the product list on the label "suitable for organic crop production". The problem is that The Sanctuary is manufacturing products for the aesthetics market, which is price sensitive and requires lower spread rates. This mandates The Sanctuary to manufacture either natural-based or organic-based products to meet these market requirements. We would like to have AAPFCO clear up this confusion regarding sulfate of potash.

B. Organic fertilizers vs. soil amendments.

Organic fertilizers provide nutrition for microbial stimulation, which some states qualify as a soil amendment property. The Sanctuary uses high protein ingredients and carbohydrates as their main ingredient. These ingredients contain the plant nutrients plus energy for microbial stimulation. Due to this energy value, these ingredients build and stimulate the natural soil microbes, which through biological activity release these plant nutrients. By definition, organic fertilizers use a biological process to release plant nutrients. Therefore, some states are now requiring a soil amendment registration requirement due to the natural organic process of the soil. These products should only have to qualify for registration as organic fertilizer. Why are some states requiring these products to be dual registered as soil amendments? A potential solution is to add the term metabolizable energy.

9. COMPOST EXTRACT

Presenter: Bill Gillum
Terracycle

Note: Bill Gillum is proposing a definition for Compost Extract.

T - ___ Compost Extract – the water extract of a biologically stable material derived from the composting process and may contain suspended material.

Bill Gillum presented a PowerPoint presentation (attached.) He is trying to follow the format of an official term already approved. He continued that there is no companion term "compost extract" to go along with T-35 Compost as there is T-68 Vermicompost Extract with T-67 Vermicompost. Bill Gillum noted that compost extract is not allowed in Florida since there is no approved term for the derived from statement. Otherwise, it would need to be registered as a soil amendment.

John Peterson asked if there is a need to specify the nutrient source rather than list it as a source of nutrients. Ron Alexander noted that most is sold as soil amendments. Ewa Madey said an extract usually involves an active process. These products refer mostly to passive diffusion. She said the definition does not include any reference to an active process. Bill Gillum noted that agitation could be used, and aeration and heating could be part of the process. Should the definition include more about the process? Ewa Madey said she was just making a comment and that the committee may want to further discuss the process. Ron Alexander said we just need to develop a definition to compliment the existing definitions.

Chair Pat Johnson noted that there is already the term T-68 for Vermicompost Extract. Ron Alexander said these are two distinctly different products based on the feedstock. Vince Snyder said the proposed definition is almost identical to the definition for T-68 and should be adopted.

Rudy Schneider asked for the difference between digestate and compost extract. The only difference is solid versus liquid. Ron Alexander explained that they are not the same thing because compost extract is not a true digestion. Bill

Cox asked what was the known beneficial plant growth response/agronomic value. Ron Alexander said there has been a lot of research done at Ohio State University, both nutritional and microbiological. Bill Gillum said a guarantee would be required. Bill Cox asked if it could be a beneficial substance. Ron Alexander replied that he did not know examples of how that would fit. Bill Cox said some states have minimum nutrient guarantees, and these products would never meet those minimums. Ron Alexander said it would be sold as a soil amendment. Bill Thom asked if the definition could be shortened. He would be in favor of it if the definition were made simpler.

Robert Hougaard said to just take the definition of vermicompost extract and replace it with compost and be done. His proposed definition was:

T-__ Compost Extract is the water extract of compost and may contain suspended material.

Robert Hougaard made a motion to approve this term as tentative; Rod Noel seconded the motion. Jim Skillen asked if the product needed some level of being beneficial. He asked if there should be some microbial activity. He said he bought some over the Internet, but there were no microbials and no nutrients. Bill Gillum noted that some microbials were available for up to 5 years and would need a guarantee. Jim Skillen said it depended upon the claims as to whether it was a soil amendment or a fertilizer. He asked if there was a minimum microbial content. Ron Alexander agreed that if sold, the extract must be efficacious, and the claims must be true. Robert Hougaard said this was similar to claims for vermicompost. Dave DeCou said whatever the claims were, they would be taken care of by the control official. **The committee voted to approve the motion.**

Chair Pat Johnson noted that the definition for Readily Available Nitrogen (RAN) was sent to a working group at a previous meeting, and that is where it will go now. And, since Len Connolly did not show up, she would allow Vince Snyder to present an issue, landplaster, which was not listed on the agenda.

Vince Snyder Gypsum versus Landplaster, C-15.

Vince Snyder provided a PowerPoint presentation (attached.) Some states have a landplaster law, and he would like to have one label for gypsum that meets the landplaster law. Landplaster laws do not accept CaSO_4 . He said 68% CaSO_4 is not acceptable under landplaster laws so he has proposed an amended definition for C-15.

Harold Falls said the gypsum formula is not correct. He said there are two hydrates. John Peterson agreed. Vince Snyder noted that the existing definition, not what he is proposing, is incorrect. Chair Pat Johnson asked if the present definition was wrong. She was told that the formula was wrong and should be $\text{CaSO}_4 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$ (see Page 80, AAPFCO 2008 Official Publication.) **She wanted this item to go to the Specialty Products Working Group.** Vince Snyder noted that while it is a specialty product, the agricultural product industry also is affected and should be part of the review. It needs input from the Ag Products Working Group, too, and include input from the phosphate industry. **Alan Blaylock agreed that the Ag Products Working Group should work on this, too. It was agreed that this would be sent to both committees.**

10. TIME FRAME FOR COMMITTEE ISSUES

The time frame for submitting information to the committee is:

- A. Issues to be discussed at the Midyear Meetings must be presented to the chair at least 60 days in advance of the scheduled meeting.
- B. Issues to be discussed at the Annual Meetings must be presented to the chair at least 60 days in advance of the scheduled meeting.

This policy will be strictly adhered to and may be changed only at the discretion of the Chair.

Chair Pat Johnson explained that she would first send new items to the appropriate working group(s) if the item were not familiar to the entire committee. Even though the items may be moved to a working group, she still needed them submitted to her within the timeframes noted above. She said she needed volunteers for the working groups. **(Note the additional names added to each working group below in red print.)**

11. COMMITTEE WORKING GROUPS REVISED

TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE

Dr. Mike Norman, Chair (WA)
Weldon Collier (FL)
Anthony Parker (Canada)
Dr. David Terry (KY)
Amrith Gunasekara
Pat Johnson

Ewa Madey suggested renaming the Technical Working Group to more fully describe its function.

BENEFICIAL SUBSTANCES WORKING GROUP

William R. Cox (FL)
Dr. Mike Norman, Co-Chair (WA)
Teresa Crenshaw (DE)
Ewa Madey (Canada)

Industry Liaisons:

Esper Chandler
John Peterson
Jim Skillen
Shane Wolf
Gregg Brown

AGRICULTURE PRODUCTS WORKING GROUP

Dr. Rodney Noel (IN), Chair
Ricky Schroeder (TX), Vice-Chair
Gary Boutz (KS)

Industry Liaisons:

Alan Blaylock
Debbie Allen
Bill Easterwood
Harold Falls
Ada Lavin
Rudy Schneider

Alan Blaylock said he thought the number of industry members on the Ag Products Working Group was good, but more control officials were needed. Rudy Schneider wanted to see geographical representation. He wanted to see representatives on the working group from the western region because different items relate to different areas of the country. Amrith Gunasekara suggested merging some of the groups. He thought the Ag Products and Specialty Products Working Groups were good, but he thought the Beneficial Substances Working Group could be combined with another group. Bill Cox said he thought the groups were fine, but they just needed more members. He suggested that we should check with control officials who were not at the meeting. Alan Blaylock explained that Maryam Khosravifard formed these groups because there was so much time spent discussing the issues at the committee meeting. Sending an issue to a working group would allow a preliminary review of the documentation to ensure that all was complete. The smaller groups could look at the issue as a pre-screening. The working group would not make a decision but review the issue to make sure everything was there for the committee to review. He said this would help to facilitate a more productive meeting.

Kenny Naylor said that he had in mind a group that would review information for soil amendments. He hoped that the results of the efficacy data review could then be recommended and acceptable to other states. It would be a review of proprietary data so the group could not include industry members. John Peterson explained that this was why the Technical Working Group was formed. Weldon Collier said he had proposed this process to Maryam, and it was the same process used in Florida. This was desperately needed, and it should be one that both control officials and industry could understand. He said you could not continue to have four-hour marathons in the committee meeting. Such a process would take some of the pressure off of Florida and redirect it to AAPFCO. Ann Brueck said she is on the Soil Amendment Subcommittee, and she is willing to be on a Soil Amendment Working Group. She said she is already dealing with some of these products. She said she would ask the subcommittee members if any would like to be on this working group.

Vince Snyder noted that industry should be able to make their comments to the full committee. Weldon Collier confirmed that industry would have the opportunity to comment. Chair Pat Johnson noted that the working groups would not make the final decision but rather look at the issue and comment. Vince Snyder noted that it will streamline the process, but industry should be able to comment.

Ewa Madey asked to confirm that the Technical Working Group would be reviewing efficacy data. Weldon Collier confirmed that only control officials would be reviewing this kind of data. Ewa Madey asked if the intent was for the states and Canada to accept substances based upon a review of efficacy data by the working group. She said she looked at a lot of efficacy data. Amrith Gunasekara asked if it would be a good idea to move beneficial substances to the Technical Working Group. Ewa Madey said she understood that only the Technical Working Group would be reviewing efficacy data, and there are industry members on the Beneficial Substances Working Group who should not be on the Technical Working Group. Amrith Gunasekara said he was just trying to streamline the duties of the members.

Alan Blaylock said the working groups were not asking submitters to provide confidential data but were just trying to get a lot of the work done beforehand. That would be a big help. He said the working groups would not make the final decision – that would be done by the committee. He hopes to avoid wasting time that could have been done ahead of time. Bill Easterwood said he liked the way the groups were set up. The Technical Working Group would review new ingredients. He said he was worried about getting too many people on the working group so that it would become inactive. Weldon Collier clarified that the Technical Working Group would review technical data. Other groups would review terms and definitions, but only the Technical Working Group would review data. Vince Snyder said control officials should be careful to not allow industry to review data.

SPECIALTY PRODUCTS WORKING GROUP

Lynn Sheridan (WA), Chair
Vacant, Vice-Chair

Bill Cox (FL)

Amrith Gunasekara will suggest someone from California

Industry Liaisons:

Sandy Simon
Fred Carney
Michael Hojjatie
Vince Snyder

Ron Alexander

Brian Birrenkott

It was questioned whether to create a Soil Amendment Working Group or modify an existing group. Sandy Simon said the thought the issue should be sent to an appropriate working group that already existed.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Kenny Naylor moved to adjourn the meeting. Weldon Collier seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 pm.

AGENDA

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

David Howle, Chairman

AAPFCO MIDYEAR MEETING

RENO, NV

Monday, February 23, 2009

9:00 - Noon

Call to Order

Approval of Agenda

NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

Michael Norman, Vice Chair

Dr. Bill Hall: The Mosaic Company

What does fertilizer regulation have to do with nutrient management?

Tonnage reports

Use data

Product quality – claims, guarantees, testing

New legislation discussion – what is happening & where?

Does Nutrient Management include Air?

Dr. Harold F. Reetz, Jr.: International Plant Nutrition Institute

Fertilizer interactions, efficiency, and relation to agronomic responses and hypoxia.

Use of AAPFCO fertilizer data.

BY-PRODUCTS & RECYCLED MATERIALS SUBCOMMITTEE

April Hunt, Vice Chair

Review of Organic Matter Benefits Claims

Vince Snyder, Regulation & Registration Resources, LLC

Review of Vermicomposting Benefit Claims

Specified Risk Materials (SRMs) Cautionary Statement

Kenny Naylor, Oklahoma Department of Agriculture

Melamine and Fertilizer

Bill Herz, The Fertilizer Institute

Cadmium in Fertilizer/Feed Products from China

Bill Herz, The Fertilizer Institute

AGENDA

Magruder Committee Meeting
Monday, February 23, 2009
John Ascuaga's Nugget, Sparks, NV
10:00 a.m. - Noon
Bonanza C Room

1. Introduction
2. Minutes of Nashville Meeting - Kerry Cooner
3. Secretary Report - Kerry Cooner
4. Additions to Agenda
5. Treasurer's Report - Jamey Johnson
6. Check Sample Participation - Jamey Johnson & Committee
7. Completion of 2009-2010 samples - all
8. Investigational Allowances - Harold Falls
9. Review of Sulfur Data - Mel Bryant
10. Publicity - Bill Hall
11. Committee Membership review
12. Electronic Reporting - Where are we? - Rod Noel
13. Magruder contribute to Method Validation Fund? - Bill Hall

Uniform Reports Committee Meeting
Monday, February 23, 2009; 1 – 3 pm
Location: Bonanza B

Agenda

Introductions

Call For Additional Items

Old Business

Delaware Zip Code reporting Project Update.

UFTRS modifications

Uniform Registration Form

New Business

Florida Registration Program – Weldon Collier*

Use of Reported Data by International Plant Nutrition Institute (IPNI) - Dr. Harold F. Reetz, Jr

Future Directions & Committee Mission

Open Discussion

*Schedule subject to change as Weldon is involved with another committee meeting at this time

MEMORANDUM

TO: Slow Release Fertilizer Committee

FROM: Melton F. Bryant, Chair

SUBJECT: Information and Agenda for 2009 AAPFCO Midyear Committee Meeting

The Slow Release Fertilizer Committee is scheduled to meet on Monday, February 23, 2009, 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. in Reno, NV.

AGENDA

Slow Release Fertilizer Committee

Opening Comments and Introductions

Old Business

Review the objectives and goals of the committee – Melton Bryant

New Business

Understanding and using the term Enhanced Efficiency – Bill Hall

Methodology update – Bill Hall

Update on Slow Release Fertilizer technologies – Fred Carney / Melton Bryant

AOACI Update – Committee

Florida Update – Weldon Collier

Review of claims being made - how they are monitored, regulated and enforced – Melton Bryant

Other Business

Adjourn

MFB

Slow Release Fertilizer Committee

Melton Bryant, Chair

Annual Report

The Slow Release Fertilizer Committee was called to order by Melton Bryant, Chairman, at 8:00 a.m. August 6th, 2008 at the AAPFCO annual meeting in Nashville. There were 32 participants in attendance (9 regulatory and 23 industry).

After opening comments and introductions, the agenda was reviewed. Additional agenda items were added for discussing a plan to review the technology at the next meeting and to discuss the need to respond to the request for information from Martin Trenkel. Fred Carney may have a list to use. Ewa Madey asked for nanotechnology technology to be included.

Old Business:

1) The minutes from the midyear meeting in Tampa were reviewed and approved as provided (Weldon – Motion to approve, 2nd Rod Noel, motion carried).

New Business:

1) Bill Hall provided an update on the method development by Carolina Medina. Ruggedness testing is underway for the analytical method and the soil method. Expect results at the midyear meeting. Concerns were expressed about testing coatings at the 60 degree C level, but no problems have been noted with the products under examination. Instrument capabilities include the Antek system. Bill emphasized the work is primarily an extraction. The Antek instrument functionality was discussed. Jim Skillen requested data be made available in advance of the next committee meeting. Data should be available for the Roundtable meeting in Charleston.

2) Dr. Terry provided a review of the beginning of the slow release fertilizer task force and committee. Whitney Yelverton, TFI, expressed concern with AAPFCO's regulations dealing with slow release fertilizers at the February 16, 1994 joint meeting of the AAPFCO Board of Directors and the TFI Product Quality and Technology Committee (AAPFCO Official Publication, 1995). The task force members were selected in March of 1994 by Whitney Yelverton, TFI, and Dr. David Terry, AAPFCO, and appointed by Dr. David Terry, as President of AAPFCO (AAPFCO Official Publication, 1996). There were four members each from industry and regulatory

along with 5 ex-officio and advisors. Dr. Wilbur Frye was chair of the task force with William Hall vice-chair. Gary Braun, Dale Dubberly and Joel Padmore for regulatory and John Detrick, Richard Harrell, and Allen Sutton for industry were members. Edward Huber, Dr. David Terry, Whitney Yelverton, Norman Hummel and Jerry Sartain were also active on the task force. The purpose was to summarize labeling requirements, summarize materials, and evaluate analytical methodology. Five subcommittees were formed. An AAPFCO Policy Statement on Slow Release and Stabilized Fertilizers was developed and adopted in 1995.

On-going efforts dealt with labeling, materials, soil incubation method, laboratory analysis and definitions. The soil incubation research and lab method development proceeded. The importance of enhanced efficiency was considered, inhibitors and stabilizers. Funding was obtained for the soil incubation research.

Bill Hall, Co-chair of the task force, provided a summary presentation on the activities of the task force at the 2003 AAPFCO annual meeting and helped prepare a report by the Methodology Development Workgroup in 2004 that included soil and lab data with the correlation. The slow release fertilizer task force was dissolved and became the slow release fertilizer committee in 2005. The new committee comprised of 8 regulatory and 9 industry members with 2 advisors. Bill Hall presented "Enhanced Efficiency Fertilizers: Labeling, Regulations and Monitoring" at the 2005 annual meeting. The committee has worked on definitions for enhanced efficiency, slow release and stabilized fertilizer products. Bill Hall and Dr. David Terry were the only two present in this meeting that were part of the original task force.

Discussion

Alan Blalock stated the committee has accomplished several tasks and asked what tasks are being addressed at this time. The committee will address this at the midyear meeting. Mel Bryant reviewed the committee purpose statement: "Appointed in 1994 because of an industry concern with the existing state of AAPFCO regulations dealing with slow release fertilizers. It became apparent that a new policy statement needed to be developed to address concerns. Over the subsequent years the policy statement has been written and adopted as Official in 1999, laboratory methods have been developed, and labeling issues addressed."

Bill Hall related that there was no intent to require changes in labeling. Alan Blalock asked if control officials would start regulating with the lab method under development. Weldon Collier related that Florida would have to explore the option. Alan Blalock inquired if the method is a prediction of field performance. Bill Hall responded it would not. A question was raised about optimizing the method for different parts of the U. S.

Bill Hall responded that the method could be adapted or optimized. Jim Skillen asked if Florida requests data for 240 day products. Bill Hall responded that the method could be adapted or optimized. Jim Skillen asked if Florida requests data for 240 day products. Florida has statutory authority to request data, but is not currently reviewing this but Kentucky does request data.

3) Mel Bryant gave a presentation, "Examples of Slow Release Fertilizers", to discuss the sample size and variety of sample types with slow release claims. A discussion followed with a review of the lab method. In the slow release method the individual components are weighed and blended at this time. This issue was deferred until a later meeting.

4) Melton Bryant reviewed the committee membership and asked if additional regulatory members were needed. The consensus was "yes". Joe Slater had recommended Rhonda Boles from Missouri. Motion was made by Rod Noel and second by Weldon Collier to add Rhonda Boles to the committee, discussion, and motion carried. Membership was reviewed to determine if all members are correct. TFI needs to clarify if Bill Herz or Pam Guffain will represent TFI. For advisors, Don Waddington has limited travel funding but requests to remain involved. Alan Blalock will provide names for an additional advisor.

5) The interest in have the slow release method become an AOACI method was discussed. The funding of these

efforts was discussed at the Lab Services Committee meeting later in the day. The slow release method is a priority method on the fertilizer community list. The method may be ready to purpose to AOAC in 2009 depending on the funding (has partial funding only).

6) The enhance efficiency definition status was discussed. USDA is using this term. The Farm Bill is working around the term without an official definition. No other comments.

7) Florida Ordinance Update by Weldon Collier

2008 Fertilizer Ordinances in Florida

Current Status

- 10 Municipal Ordinances – Adopted or Proposed
- Scope of Ordinances
 - Limits P by
 - Referencing 5E-1.003 >0.25 P₂O₅
 - Formulations limited to no more than 2% P₂O₅
 - Mandates Controlled Release N
 - No “Fast Release Fertilizer”
 - Must contain 50% CRN/SRN
 - Training and Certification of Lawn Maintenance Professionals
 - Enforcement language, including fines for violations

Urban Turf Task Force

- The Task Force was created by the Florida Legislature in 2007 to review and provide recommendations on the state’s policies and programs addressing consumer fertilizers. It was composed of 13 individuals representing a range of stakeholder interests
- Legislative Findings
 - There is a need for better training and education regarding the proper use of consumer fertilizers.
 - There should exist a mechanism to help local governments promote and encourage the proper use of fertilizers, thereby eliminating or minimizing the potential for environmental impacts.
 - Local government regulation of fertilizer uses for nonagricultural applications should be based on sound science, including water quality, agronomics, and horticulture.
 - While the constituents in fertilizer are naturally occurring in the environment, the improper use of fertilizer can be one of many contributors to non point source pollution.
 - The state’s local governments are potentially subject to regulatory enforcement action by state or federal entities as a result of non point source pollution caused by storm water runoff.
- Task Force Recommendations
 - Support for the current DACS labeling requirements for urban turf fertilizers, Rule 5E-1.003(2).
 - Expansion of the Limited Commercial Landscape Maintenance (LCLM) certification established in Chapter 482, F.S.
 - Support of public education regarding fertilizer use based on six best practices for lawn care elements developed by the Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (IFAS).
 - Continued support of ongoing research projects on consumer fertilizer management.
 - A dedicated source of funding be provided for education and training initiatives that address the appropriate application of consumer fertilizers.
 - Funding through increased fertilizer tonnage fees

Ongoing Initiatives

- Research
- DEP revision of Green Industry BMP

8) The plans to discuss and review the slow release technologies at the next meeting is of interest. Fred Carney has a list of slow release technologies and Michael Hojjatie will provide input on the liquid aspect of this project. Nanotechnology and other new technologies will be included as appropriate.

9) Dr. Martin Trenkel asked for information for updating his publication about a year ago. Melton Bryant has provided some information. Bill Hall reviewed Dr. Trenkel's questions. Bill Hall, Alan Blaylock and Melton Bryant will work to provide the requested information.

Rod Noel made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Weldon Collier at 9:50 a.m.

**SEMINARS COMMITTEE
AAPFCO MID-YEAR MEETING
Monday February 23, 2009
3:00 pm – 4:00 pm
John Ascuaga's Nugget Hotel
Reno, Nevada**

1. Opening Remarks

2. Old Business

3. New Business

a. Inspector Training – Brett Groves

b. Fertilizer Administrators Seminar 2008 – Kenny Naylor

c. AAPFCO Inspection Manual

d. Open Discussion

4. Adjourn

Seminars Committee

February 18, 2008 Bayshore East
Sheraton River Walk Tampa, FL

The seminars committee was called to order by Steve McMurry (KY) at 3:02 pm on February 18, 2008 with 7 committee members, 12 control officials, and 7 industry representatives in attendance. Brett Groves (IN) moved to accept the reading of the Annual seminars committee meeting minutes from Grand Rapids, MI, motion seconded by Kenney Naylor (OK), motion passed.

Robert Hougaard, (UT), presented material on the Basic Inspector Training Seminar held in Salt Lake City, Utah in connection with AAFCO and AASCO. The training was held on September 11-13, 2007. The AAPFCO Inspection Manual was included in the registration fee and a copy was given to all attendees. Finalization of the budget is going to be completed and any excess distributed to the appropriate organizations.

Roger Hoestenbach (TX) discussed the Fertilizer Administrators Seminar held on November 8-10, 2007 in Nashville, TN. Nineteen individuals attended the seminar.

Kenny Naylor discussed the upcoming Fertilizer Administrators Seminar to be held in Nevada the week of October

20-24 or November 3-7, 2008. Dates and location will be firmed up by Annual meeting in August. Suggestions for topics should be forwarded to Kenny Naylor for incorporation into the seminar. Roger Hoestenbach moved that the committee ask the Board of Directors for \$2500 funding for scholarships for the 2008 Fertilizer Administrators Seminar, seconded by Mike Hancock (IN), motion passed.

A discussion was held about the involvement of the Seminar's Committee in helping with a lab training seminar. The consensus thought this should move to the Board of Directors for their input.

Roger Hoestenbach moved to adjourn the meeting, motion seconded by Gary Wagner (ND), motion passed.

Agenda
AAPFCO Midyear Meeting, Reno, NV
Education & Information Committee

Monday, February 23, 2009
4:00 – 5:00 pm, Bonanza C

1. Call to Order
2. Welcome & Introduction of attendees
3. Agenda additions
4. Review of 2008 Annual Meeting Minutes
5. Update on brochures:
 - a. The report on the assignment to check with Extension on fertilizer information
 - b. Generic tonnage reporting form
 - c. Slow Release Fertilizers and Enhanced Efficiency
 - d. An explanation of the National Organic Program and how “certified organic” relates to fertilizers
6. Label Review Manual
 - a. Outline
7. AAPFCO website links
8. New Committee Chair Informational Packet
9. New / Other business
10. Adjourn

Minutes
AAPFCO Annual Meeting, Nashville, TX
Education & Information Committee

Wednesday, August 6, 2008
1:30 – 3:00 pm McKissack 2

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Liz Higgins, Chair, at 1:38 pm

2. Welcome & Introduction of attendees:

There were 5 control officials, 2 industry advisors and 11 guests present.

Control Officials	Industry Liasion
Liz Higgins (NM)	Debe Allen (Potash Corp)
Jim Larkin (IL)	Jan Jennings (SunGro)
Chris Mason (NE)	Bill Hall (Mosaic)
Kyle Stephens (SC)	
Theresa Wybrant (MO)	

3. Agenda additions:

Harold Falls (CF Industries) asked to speak about Nutrients for Life.

4. Review of 2008 Midyear Meeting Minutes

Liz Higgins called for any corrections to the midyear minutes.

Chris Mason moved the minutes be accepted Seconded by Jim Larkin. Motion passed.

5. Update on brochures:

- a. The report on the assignment to check with Extension on fertilizer information was tabled as Gary Boutz (KS) was not in attendance.
- b. Generic tonnage reporting form
Liz Higgins will check with Chris Ray regarding the status of this form before midyear.
- c. Slow Release Fertilizers and Enhanced Efficiency

Bill Hall reported that he has not worked on this. He stated that Dr. Dave Terry gave an assessment of slow release fertilizers in the slow release committee and would provide the committee with that information. Bill is going to develop a Powerpoint presentation to be presented at the 2009 midyear meeting in Reno. The committee should be able to utilize the information in the powerpoint to develop the brochure. Dale Dubberly (FL) was going to assist in the development of this brochure..Bill Hall will work on identifying people to help on the brochure.. Mel Bryant agreed to help on this at 2007 midyear.

- d. An explanation of the National Organic Program and how “certified organic” relates to fertilizers.
Gary Boutz was also working on this project. This will become a portion of the label review manual.

6. Label Review Manual

Kenny Naylor (OK) wrote a preliminary draft of the label review manual. The draft was handed out to committee members for review. Rick Killebrew suggested that when the manual is completed that the committee consider sponsoring a Fertilizer Label Review Workshop similar to what PFI and AAFCO did with the Pet Food Label Review Workshop held prior to the AAFCO annual meeting. A discussion was held on the need for a working group to develop the labeling guide. It was decided that the committee would work on the outline for the manual and came up with a preliminary draft. An email with this draft outline will be sent out to committee members, who will be asked to volunteer to write sections of the manual.

Outline of Fertilizer Label Review Manual

- Purpose of document
- Scope
- Brand
- Grade
- Guaranteed Analysis
 - a. Proper format of guarantees (N P K, minors and micros, slow release)
 - b. Derivation Statement
- Directions for use (format in Model Bill)
- Net Weight
- Name and Address of Registrant or Licensee
- Other Label Requirements:
 - Beneficial substances
 - Soil Amendments

AAPFCO Website Links

The committee members have been asked to periodically check the AAPFCO website links to ensure that all links are working. Brett said that he looked for the form on hosting a meeting but could not find the form on the AAPFCO website. Chris Mason stated that this form

was not available for fertilizer.

New Committee Chair Informational Packet

During the 2007 midyear board meeting, Chris Mason, AAPFCO President, asked the committee to develop an informational packet for new committee chairs. Liz Higgins wrote a draft and presented it and the sample packet to the committee. The packet contained the AAPFCO operating manual, Committee 101 powerpoint on CD, travel request form, travel expense voucher, and Roberts rule of order. Chris suggested web enabling the CD. There is an official Roberts Rule of Order Online. Liz highlighted how proposals will work from this point. Committee's technical working groups will get information prior to the committee having to vote. Chris Mason will chair the working group, Lynn Sheridan, Jan & Theresa will help with the packet.

New / Other Business

Harold Falls with CF Industries talked about the Nutrients for Life information that he can get for us at not charge. It will be pricey otherwise. It is designed for teaching about fertilizers and information about soils to students and other that are not informed. The books are designed for middle school and high school age students. The books have teaching plans and objectives for teachers. There is also a website.

Adjourn:

It was moved by Chris Mason and seconded by Kyle Stephens that the meeting be adjourned. Motion passed. The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 pm.

Laboratory Services Committee

Tuesday February 24, 2009

8:00 a.m. – Noon

Ponderosa A

Agenda

Introductions – 8:00 – 8:10 a.m.

Old Business -

1. Approval of annual meeting minutes (Nashville, TN) 8:10 - 8:20 a.m.
2. Silicon Method – Sanford Siegel, CF Industries 8:20 - 8:30 a.m.
3. Available Phosphate IA's - Harold Falls, CF Industries 8:30 - 9:00 a.m.
4. AOACI Fertilizer Community – Bill Halls, Mosaic 9:00 - 10:00 a.m.

Break 10:00 – 10:15 a.m.

5. AAPFCO Method Validation Process 10:15 - Noon
(we will cover as many items as time permits – discussions will be continued on Wednesday 8:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m., Ponderosa A)
 - a. System and Process Design

- i. New (or Revised) formal method submission process
- ii. Study Champion selection and assignments
- iii. Content and format requirements for written method proposal
- iv. Review Panel composition and responsibilities
- v. In-House (i.e. Single) Laboratory Validation requirements
test samples, ruggedness, accuracy, bias, fortified blank testing, negative control, statistical analysis, repeatability ($HorRat_{(r)}$), secondary response/interferences, SOP format and requirements, etc.
- vi. Recommended method acceptance/rejection criteria
- vii. Full Collaborative Study process
- viii. Peer Review Validation process

New Business –

1. AAPFCO/TFI Sponsored Regional Chemist's Workshops – Weldon Collier/Sanford Siegel
Wednesday – 8:00 - 8:20 a.m.
2. Continuation of Validation Process Discussion 8:20- 10:00 a.m.

Agenda
February 24, 2009
Ind/Reg Council
11:00 –Noon
Room: Bonanza C

Call to Order

Introduction of Attendees

Plan great meeting for Annual

Adjourn

Agenda
February 25, 2009
Best Manufacturing Practices Committee
8:00 AM - 9:00 AM
Room: Bonanza B

- Call to Order

- Introduction of Attendees

- Kyle Stephens-new vice chair

- Review of Annual Meeting

- Bulk Blend Manual
-updated edition
-volunteers to review

- Bulk Blend Workshop(S)
Conducted in 2008

- General Discussion/New Business

BEST MANUFACTURING PRACTICES COMMITTEE

Annual Report

Mike Hancock, Chair

August 6, 2008

The Best Manufacturing Practices Committee met from 10:30 AM – 11:40 AM in McKissack I Room. There were 12 in attendance, 7 Regulatory & 5 Industry.

Minutes from the Midyear meeting in Tampa, FL were reviewed and approved

Ben Jones circulated revised copies of a draft facility audit checklist for use by inspectors. He and his subcommittee have expanded the form from addressing only bulk blend issues to encompassing the total operation and also inserted a section dealing with Ammonium Nitrate. Recommendations received at the meeting in Tampa, FL were incorporated into the checklist. The committee and all attendees reviewed the audit checklist and provided three (3) recommendations for addition to the document but also directed the checklist be moved forward to the Seminars Committee for inclusion in the AAPFCO Inspection Manual, with the noted amendments.

There were three (3) workshops conducted in 2008: **January- Lake of the Ozarks, MO, March- Mount Pleasant, MI and June-Salado, TX**. The total workshops conducted, to date, is 66. Recognition was given to Sanford Siegel, CF Industries Inc., Kerry Cooner, Agrium, Dick Harrell, Consultant and Billy Marlowe, formerly with Royster Clark, for their assistance at the noted workshops. Additional cadre is needed, especially for the environmental regulation section. Anyone interested in assisting as cadre for the workshop, should speak with Bob Tadsen or me. Discussion also occurred about including fluid fertilizer as part of the presentation and review of the total program would need to occur so as not to have it go too far beyond the present time frame.

The revision of the Bulk Blend Manual, three years in the process, is due to have a draft for review sometime the week of August 11th, with a final draft completed sometime late in September and a revised manual possibly in print by the February midyear meeting. As all participants are receiving, or expecting to receive, a manual, the information should be updated and maintained current.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 AM

Previous Bulk Blend Workshops

Number	Location	Date	Number of Workshops
1	Mississippi	November 1990	1
2	Florida	November 1990	2
3	Iowa	August 1991	1
4	Kentucky	August 1991	3
5	North Carolina	November 1991	3
6	Louisiana	November 1991	1
7	New York	February 1992	2
8	Kansas	January 1993	2
9	Florida	February 1993	1
10	New York	February 1993	1
11	Florida	November 1994	1

Number	Location	Date	Number of Workshops
12	Kentucky	August 1995	2
13	Mississippi	November 1995	1
14	Michigan	December 1995	2
15	North Carolina	December 1995	3
16	Oklahoma	July 1996	3
17	Arkansas	September 1996	1
18	Mississippi	November 1996	1
19	Missouri	November 1996	1
20	Michigan	January 1997	2
21	Maryland	July 1997	1
22	Manitoba, Canada	July 1997	1
23	Pennsylvania	November 1997	1
24	Indiana	January 1998	1
25	Saskatoon, Canada	March 1998	1
26	North Dakota	March 1998	1
27	Alabama	September 1998	1
28	Ohio	November 1998	1
29	Pennsylvania	February 1999	1
30	Mississippi	February 1999	1
31	Kentucky	September 1999	2
32	Oklahoma	April 2000	1
33	Wisconsin	February 2001	1
34	LESCO, Martins Ferry, OH	March 2001	1
35	Kansas	July 2002	1
36	Georgia	August 2002	1
37	Arkansas	September 2002	1
38	Mississippi	March 2003	1
39	Michigan	January 2004	1
40	South Carolina	January 2004	1
41	Montana	October 2004	1
42	North Carolina	August 2005	1
43	Kentucky	August 2005	2
44	Pennsylvania	September 2005	1
45	South Carolina	January 2006	1
46	Tennessee	January 2006	1
47	Texas	June 2007	1
48	Missouri	January 2008	1
49	Michigan	March 2008	1
50	Texas	June 2008	1
Total Number of Workshops:			66

MOVE TO SECURITY COMMITTEE

Joint Meeting
TFI/AAPFCO
February 25, 2009
Bonanza A 10:15 – 12:00