

MINUTES
AAFCO FEED LABELING COMMITTEE
AAFCO 2009 MIDYEAR MEETING
Tucson, Arizona
Thursday, January 22, 2009 1:30 PM – 3:00 PM

1. Introductions – Meagan Davis (Chair), Kentucky Division of Regulatory Services

Chair Meagan Davis called the meeting to order at 1:30 PM. The following committee members and industry advisors were present.

Committee Members

Meagan Davis (KY), Chair
Ricky Schroeder (TX), Vice-Chair
Richard Ten Eyck (OR)
Ken Jackson (NB)
Tony Claxton (MO)
Paul Bachman (FDA)

Industry Advisors

Jan Campbell, NGFA
Ellen Slaymaker, NGFA (Alternate)
Sue Hays, WBFI
Kris Mantey, WBFI (Alternate)
Nancy Cook, PFI
Jim Barritt, PFI (Alternate)
Richard Sellers, AFIA
Randy Sample, AFIA
Dr. David Dzanis, ACVN & APPMA

2. Committee Membership & Liaison Update

AAFCO President Andy Gray (MT) introduced new committee officers:
Meagan Davis (KY) as chair of the Feed Labeling Committee
Ricky Schroeder (TX) as vice-chair of the Feed Labeling Committee

3. Review of Minutes from 2007 Annual Meeting in Grand Rapids, MI

Meagan Davis called for any changes to the minutes. There were no comments, corrections or additions.

4. Changes in the Agenda

The noted business order in the agenda changed prior to the meeting due to much interest in certain topics versus the allotted time scheduled for the meeting. Also, Richard Ten Eyck (OR) added the Carbohydrate Working Group to Old Business.

5. Separation of Goat and Sheep Label Requirements – Ricky Schroeder, TX

A sub-working group was formed during the AAFCO Mid-Year Meeting in Savannah, GA in 2007 to address the separation of label requirements for sheep and goats. This group consisted of Richard Sellers, Dave Dzanis, Richard Ten Eyck and Jan Campbell. Their charge was to collect information from sources on this topic and formulate a proposal for the committee.

During the Feed Labeling Committee meeting in Tucson, Ricky Schroeder presented a proposal to separate the label requirements based on nutritional guidelines in the future. Currently, both species require the same requirements except for copper and he would like to see this noted with an asterisk statement on the table of required guaranteed nutrients by feed type. Historically, it was believed that the two animal species had similar nutritional requirements, therefore the label requirements were combined but new

nutritional information has proved that the species require separate nutritional requirements.

Ricky Schroeder formally moved to separate the label requirements of sheep and goats. The motion was seconded by Richard Ten Eyck and was passed by the committee. A task force group was formed consisting of Richard Ten Eyck, Ricky Schroeder, Richard Sellers, Bruce Arentson, and Jan Campbell. This task force will begin to form a list of experts who will assist in this matter and present this information to the Board of Directors.

6. Sulfur Levels of Dried Distillers Grains – Tony Claxton, MO

There has been much concern that varying levels of sulfur being fed to cattle in a daily ration may induce decreased daily gain or produce symptoms of the neurological disease polioencephalomalacia (PEM). Research shows that the maximum tolerable level for sulfur in the daily diet is 0.4% based on a dry matter basis. There is much debate on the varying levels of sulfur in co-products of grain processing, especially dried distillers grains.

Tony Claxton provided the committee with a brief description of sulfur and cattle feeds. He also suggested statements that could be added to the labels 1.) “Do not feed as sole ration” and/or 2.) “For mixing with other ingredients.” There was much discussion from the committee as well as the audience. Matt Frederking of Poet Nutrition stated that the label requirements reflect that these feed ingredients are “for further manufacture of feed.” Richard Sellers noted that Mr. Frederking’s statement was correct, however, the consumer wasn’t in attendance at the meeting to state demands. Charlie Staff of the Distillers Grain Technology Council stated that there are multiple feed ingredients with varying sulfur levels and that these ingredients are not fed as the sole ration. Mr. Staff felt that additional statements would be unnecessary and redundant. Ricky Schroeder (TX) supported Mr. Staff’s concerns. Tony Claxton (MO) disagreed with both Mr. Staff and Mr. Schroeder and stated that there were beef cattle producers feeding dried distillers grains as the sole rations due to economic and environmental conditions.

Mr. Claxton feels that an educational outreach program is a necessity to inform the consumer that these products may contain varying and high levels of sulfur which may be detrimental to their beef production herd. Richard Ten Eyck agreed with Mr. Claxton that educational outreach is needed for all ingredients that contain varying and high sulfur levels.

The motion to place a statement on the label for dried distillers grains was rejected.

For the concerns of educating the consumer, Meagan Davis agreed to get in contact with different Cattleman’s Associations in order to determine what is needed.

7. Principal Display Panel Definition – Meagan Davis (KY), Ken Bowers (KS), and Dr. David Dzanis

It was previously noted that there is not a definition for principal display panel in the Model Bill and Regulations. A working group was charged with the task of developing this definition.

There is much concern that a definition will be difficult to develop due to the current regulations listed in Regulation 2 of the Model Regulations that are not currently being enforced as reflected by product type available to the consumer. Dr. Francisco Jaramillo Jr. asked if it was possible to compose a definition that matched that noted in PF1.

Richard Ten Eyck moved to return the issue back to the working group for further development. The motion was seconded by Ricky Schroeder and was passed by the committee.

8. Carbohydrate Working Group – Richard Ten Eyck (OR)

Richard Ten Eyck requested information on the original intentions of this working group. Richard Sellers stated that the intent of the group was brought upon by multiple claims on commercial feed products available for sale with statements such as “low-carb.” The working group will continue with this matter.

9. Revisions to the Non-Pet Food Labeling Guide – Meagan Davis (KY), Dr. David Dzanis

It was brought to the attention of Meagan Davis by Sue Carlson that there are multiple errors in the Non-Pet Food Labeling Guide. It was noted that the Guide needs to be edited and updated. Meagan Davis and Dr. Dzanis will complete these needed revisions.

10. Table: Guarantees by Feed Type Under Model Bill and Regulations – pg. 117 of the 2008 OP

Ricky Schroeder feels this guideline is confusing to those who attempt to utilize it. Tony Claxton (MO) and Randy Sample both believe that this table is a great “guide” for those who make labels.

Meagan Davis pointed out that in the 2009 Official Publication there was an error in the table underneath the heading “Veal/Herd Milk Replacer and the deletion of the required phosphorus guarantee. Nancy Cook requested that the table be reviewed, edited for more available binding space and possibly renamed to avoid confusion as its use as a “guide.”

Tony Claxton (MO) moved that this table be revised, edited and renamed. The motion was seconded by Richard Ten Eyck (OR) and was passed by the committee. Ricky Schroeder accepted this responsibility.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 PM once all committee business was completed.