

----- Original Message -----

From: robin4million@aol.com

To: OTA_PCTF@topica.com

Sent: Wednesday, June 11, 2003 3:12 PM

Subject: OTA PCTF List My two cents

Hi all,

I actually typed and sent this email two days ago but accidentally posted it only to Kim Burton. So my comments were before David Bronner's emails dated 6/10 and 6/11 (i.e., I am not using his words).

Perhaps, I should wait until I receive a copy of the Austin minutes to respond (if they have been publicly released to all voting members, I have not yet received them). I am assuming they have not.

However, there are a few things I want to express. I came to the group hoping to have a voice in industry standards being set. The PCTF is made up of many of my competitors but I see this as a positive thing because we are all working towards a NEGOTIATED position on setting standards for the use of the word "organic" in our industry.

I was not able to attend the meeting in Austin recently but I was in Anaheim this spring. I have sort of taken the position of being part of the "jury" so to speak, taking in all the information that both sides have to offer on all issues including contentious ones.

At Anaheim, my recollection was that various people were there to provide the voting members of the PCTF with their points of view based upon their areas of expertise. Kim Burton was one of those persons. My recollection was that she was introduced by Phil as a member of the NOSB to provide guidance in what was going to "fly" or not. I clearly have no recollection of her being anything other than that. She was forceful in her points of view but I assumed that was the position she was representing as part of the NOSB and I gave her recommendations more weight based upon that assumption.

I was disappointed to learn in very recent emails that she also has been paid by Bayliss Ranch as a consultant (and probably was during the Anaheim meeting). Had I known that up front, I would have filtered her information differently, knowing that there is an inherent bias in her opinions (how can there not be?). I appreciated her opinions but nevertheless, I would have greatly appreciated knowing up front (i.e., upon introductions) that she was being paid by one of the members on the task force relating to the issue of hydrosols. "Working with" does not mean the same to me as being a paid consultant. I assumed that Bayliss Ranch had been in contact with Kim regarding regulatory issues but nothing more than that based upon comments made at the Anaheim meeting.

I do appreciate Kim's input and even though she is not a voting member, what she says DOES influence those of us who are "being members of the jury" trying to sort out facts to arrive at a half-way intelligent conclusion before we vote on issues.

I, for one, would like to know up front when people are providing voting members information at these meetings if they are representing (i.e., being paid by) anybody on the task force so that I have all the information I need to "filter" out potential bias's of the info being presented.

I welcome Kim's input as I do anybody's but I feel it was not appropriate and not fair to me, as a voting team member, to NOT be informed of her position as a paid consultant by Bayliss Ranch before she presented her points of view.

Thank you for your ear.

Robin Block
Wyndmere Naturals