STATE OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

In the Matter of)
)
Dublic Hooming for Plant Contain)
Public Hearing for Blood Centers of California Petition)
OI CAIIIOINIA PELILION)

PUBLIC HEARING
FOR O'MELVENY & MEYERS LLP PET FOOD LABELING PETITION
TITLE 17, CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, SECTION 19005(M)

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH
1500 CAPITOL AVENUE
ROOM 167
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

MONDAY, APRIL 2, 2018

9:00 A.M.

Reported by: Peter Petty



APPEARANCES

CDHP PANEL:

Tammy Pahland, Senior Staff Counsel, California Department of Public Health

Linda Cortez, Office of Regulations, California Department of Public Health

Jane Reick, Chief, Food & Safety Inspection Unit, Food & Drug Branch

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Scott Whipple, Canidae Pet Food Company

Rebecca Peterson, Lockridge Grindal Nauen, LLP

Heather Walterman, The Honest Kitchen

Ab Badu, Pet Food Institute, PFI

Diane Loiselle, Hills Pet Nutrition

	INDEX	PAGE
1.	Opening Remarks	5
	Tammy Pahland, Senior Staff Counsel	
2.	Department's Exhibit A submitted	7
	Linda Cortez, Office of Regulations	
3.	Public Testimony	8
4.	CDPH Closing Statements	23
5.	Adjournment	23
Cert.	ificate of Reporter	24
Cert	ificate of Transcriber	25

EXHIBITS

EXHIBITS FOR THE DEPARTMENT:	ID	RCVD
Department Exhibit A Petition and Notice of Hearing	7	7

EXHIBITS FOR THE PUBLIC:

PROCEEDINGS

9:00 a.m.

MS. PAHLAND: Good morning ladies and gentlemen.

I am Tammy Pahland with the California Department of Public Health.

Under the provisions of the Administrative

Procedure Act, this is the time and place set for the

presentation of statements, arguments and consideration

orally and in writing, for or against the regulatory

petition submitted by the Petitioner in this matter.

Notice of this hearing was published on the Department of Public Health's website, sent by email, and sent by the United States Postal Service to interested groups and individuals.

The California Department of Public Health considers these proceedings to be quasi-legislative hearings in which it is carrying out a rulemaking function delegated to it by the Legislature. As such, witnesses presenting testimony at this hearing will not be sworn in. We will not engage in cross-examination of witnesses or otherwise debate or discuss the issues, which may be presented today at today's hearing.

We shall take, under consideration, all written and oral statements submitted or made during this hearing.

The entire proceeding will be recorded by a

certified court reporter.

In order to assist the court reporter to accurately record this hearing please remember the following: keep all answers verbal using words and not gestures when speaking, and allow each speaker to complete his or her sentence before responding, this avoids speaking over one another.

The transcript and all exhibits and evidence presented during this hearing will be included in the official record of these proceedings. Persons wishing to view the official record may contact the Department's Office of Regulations. The address and phone number are shown in the notice for this petition hearing.

Persons wishing to speak should have completed the Public Hearing Speaker Registration Form.

MS. CORTEZ: You guys got pink, but there's blue also.

MS. PAHLAND: If you wish to complete, but have not completed a registration form, raise your hand and you will receive one.

Persons in the audience will be given the opportunity to testify following these opening remarks. Everyone wishing to make a statement will be given the opportunity to do so.

To enable the audience to hear you, and to ensure

that your comments are entered into the record, we ask that you come to the front of the room and stand near the court reporter when you are called to speak. And there is a microphone right on that table. Either side's fine too.

12.

At the beginning of your remarks, please state your name and the organization you represent, if any. It would also be helpful to give the court reporter a business card with your name on it if you have one with you.

With me on the panel is Linda Cortez with the Department of Office Regulations and Jane Reick, Chief of the Food and Safety Inspection Unit of the Food and Drug Branch.

At this time, Ms. Cortez will present the Department's exhibits.

MS. CORTEZ: Thank you, Tammy.

The Department Exhibit A includes the Petition, which is on our website and that was mailed out and emailed with the Public Notice of this Petition Hearing.

(Department's Exhibit A was marked for identification and admitted.)

The Notice of the Hearing was duly noticed prior to today. Copies of this notice were sent by email and the United States Postal Service to all interested parties.

In addition, the Notice continues to be available on the Department's Internet website.

We will also accept exhibits from the public.

Any written comments, reports, studies or other information submitted for the record by any speaker will be given a public exhibit number. At this time exhibits are received, and they will be given an exhibit number such as Public Exhibit 1, Public Exhibit 2, along with the name of the person submitting the exhibit. Written comments from non-speakers can be submitted at the registration table, who will also take them up here.

MS. PAHLAND: In order to provide an equal opportunity for individuals to speak, we ask that you limit your comments to three-to-five minutes per speaker. We will call time as appropriate. You may submit, and we will accept, written materials for the record as previously instructed.

All oral testimony will be recorded in a transcript and therefore will be considered along with the written testimony that is received during the public comment period. The Department will consider comments and exhibits until 30 days after the hearing, before it decides upon a rulemaking. The deadline for any additional comments will be May 2nd, 2018 at 5:00 p.m.

Okay. I'll begin to call the speakers forward if you wouldn't mind stepping up to the front of the room?

Scott Whipple please, from Canidae Pet Food.

MR. WHIPPLE: Good morning.

MS. PAHLAND: Good morning.

MR. WHIPPLE: I'm Scott Whipple with Canidae Pet

Foods, I take it I'm first?

MS. PAHLAND: Yes, if that's okay?

MR. WHIPPLE: That's great, thank you.

All right, as I said my name is Scott Whipple and I am the Cofounder of Canidae Pet Foods, which is a small family-owned pet food company based in California. We have about 100 employees. We were the petitioners who launched this rulemaking process formally. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to be heard on this very important issue.

For 20 years, we have prided ourselves for following the rules. You, the California Department of Public Health, told me what the rules were. For years, you told me on your website that if I followed this rulebook I'd be in compliance with the law. And I was happy to do it.

AAFCO's official publication provides a complete and clear set of guidelines, which makes sense because it was created by a group of regulators just like you. This rulebook allowed me, a small pet food company, to compete nationally with the big guys.

Pet food is complicated. This rulebook that is used nationwide levels the playing field. So why am I

here? In the last year, a bunch of plaintiffs' lawyers have been filing lawsuits saying that your guidance means nothing. They are creating so much uncertainty. I'm here to urge you to bring that certainty back. I'm not here to say don't regulate. I'm begging you to regulate by saying formally, what you used to say on your website: that the official publication is the definitive reference for pet food labels and ingredients.

Happy to answer any questions you may have.

MS. PAHLAND: Any questions (indiscernible)?

MS. REICK: No, I don't. Thank you.

MS. PAHLAND: No. Thank you, Mr. Whipple.

MR. WHIPPLE: Thank you.

MS. PAHLAND: Rebecca Peterson from Lockridge, Grindal and -- I'm sorry, I can't quite.

(Off mic colloquy.)

Thank you.

MS. PETERSON: Good morning, Rebecca Peterson of Lockridge Grindal Nauen. I am an attorney represents the California consumers that were the litigation that spawned the request for this petition.

So I'm here today to advocate on behalf of a consumers of pet food, for those who make the decision to bring a pet such as a dog or a cat, into the family and into their home. They know that their pet is 100 percent

dependent on them for food, shelter and all other basic needs for the entirety of their life. Given the gravity of this responsibility, pet owners tend to be discerning consumers about the food that their pets ingest.

You know, pet owners feel strongly about taking good care of their pets. They're part of the family. That means they care about their health and what they eat is important. Decisions are made based on what they think will give them the best nutrition and keep them around as long as possible. Consumers rely on the words on the labels to mean what they claim to mean, and trust those words when the food is marketed in a specific way to emphasize a particular word, like the word "natural."

Like any other citizen however, pet owners are taxpayers who have jobs and families. As we all know, life is demanding and keeps us all busy whether as a parent or an employee. The average consumer doesn't have time to get acquainted with the complicated and technical AAFCO guidelines for pet food.

In fact, most do not even know what AAFCO is or that these guidelines exist. Consumers do not receive a copy of the AAFCO guidelines or this Department's statement in its licensing procedures given to manufacturers that refer to the AAFCO guidelines when they purchase pet food. And even if they did, many cannot afford the \$100 to buy

the AAFCO guidelines, so that they can read and get up to date. Nor should they have to. If it is the law, it should be provided when purchasing any pet food at no cost to consumers.

Transparency and honesty from manufacturers are the only ways a consumer can truly understand what kind of food they are buying and feeding their pet. The consumer protection laws in this state have a common theme: for corporations to promote honesty and transparency as they market their product to consumers. That premise should apply here. There is no need to change the regulations. And in fact, the requested change would only hurt pet owners.

If the Department however, does consider changing the regulations it should be done correctly and not as a kneejerk reaction. The Department should take the time and expend the resources to accurately measure how labeling affects consumer behavior and whether this change would promote honesty and transparency to pet owners and actually protect consumers.

And the only way to do this is to determine consumer understanding and preference as to the usage of the term "natural" by a professionally designed and wideranging statistical significant study that measures and captures consumer's reaction to labels, packaging and

advertising. That emphasizes that the pet food is natural, not only by the terms used on the label, but also the images. And here, due to what is exactly at issue, the study should also include a comparison to consumers' understanding to the phrase "natural dog food with added vitamins and minerals" to natural dog food with added synthetic vitamins and minerals. It's clear that the current regulation language that provides no exception to the term "natural" allows for the better protection of consumers and pets.

Maintaining the regulation as it empowers consumers, and allows them to fully understand how they are spending their money on their pets' nutrition and health, is what we ask the Department to do. Thank you.

MS. PAHLAND: Thank you. Any questions for her? Heather Walterman from The Honest Kitchen?

MS. WALTERMAN: Hi.

MS. PAHLAND: Good morning.

MS. WALTERMAN: I'm Heather Walterman. I'm from The Honest Kitchen. I'm our Director of Regulatory Affairs. Our company was founded approximately 16 years ago by Lucy Postins. We are a human-grade dehydrated pet food company.

Our corporate office is actually located in San Diego, California. We currently do not produce in the

State of California, but we would like to. 'We applied for a pet food license and the opportunity to say "human grade" on our packaging. We say it in every other state and we've never had an issue. Well, we had one issue, but we were able to take care of that. When we applied for our license, we were told that we could get a pet food license, but we would not be allowed to say "human grade" on our packaging. And so we reviewed the AAFCO OP and California regulations and California regulations clearly state that they take into account all AAFCO ingredient definitions. And human grade is a definition. It's in the 2000 OP, page 343.

We provide all of the information requested to every state every year. We include more than most companies. We include more than most companies. We include supplier information. We include manufacturing information. Everything that's requested to prove that we are human grade. We would love to produce in the State of California, so in order to do that we do need to be able to say "human grade" on our packaging.

We have received letters of no objection of from the FDA. We have worked with USDA. We came up with language that is clearly showing the intent of our product. It is made in a human food facility, but it is made for your dog or cat to eat, not you. We've made that very

clear. FDA understands, USDA understands and every other state has understood. Every state, again has worked with us, so that we can say this on our packaging.

One of the other issues that was brought up was that USDA does not recognize this. Apparently, on one of the AAFCO human-grade working group committees we are working to try to fix any gaps between USDA and FDA, but again it is still allowed by every other state.

We are very transparent. We completely agree that companies do need to be transparent with the consumer. I feel like the AAFCO OP is a great way to do that. It creates a level playing field. That is the very definition of AAFCO. AAFCO wants to create a level playing field for all companies, so that a small company like us, Kitchen, or Canidae, can have the same opportunities as a company such as Purina. And in order to do that, trying to follow the AAFCO OP as much as possible will afford us that.

Any questions?

much.

MS. PAHLAND: Delegates? No, thank you very

MS. WALTERMAN: Thank you.

MS. PAHLAND: I apologize ahead of time, Abizhad Badu. (phonetic) Did I pronounce that correctly?

MR. BADU: Good morning.

MS. PAHLAND: Did I pronounce your name

correctly?

MR. BADU: Absolutely.

MS. PAHLAND: Okay. Good.

MR. BADU: Good morning and thank you for this opportunity and you can call me "Ab" if you have questions.

MS. PAHLAND: Thanks.

MR. BADU: I'm here on behalf of the Pet Food
Institute, PFI. And these are oral statement in support of
our already submitted written statement from March 7th.
And our members comprise of about 98 percent of all U.S.
pet food and treat products across the U.S. And we too,
are very committed to helping dogs and cats live long and
healthy lives.

As a voice of the U.S. pet food makers for 60 years we provide factual information about pet food and treat safety, nutrition and health to pet lovers, and advocate for a transparent science-based regulatory environment for our members.

Some key companies of -- some member companies of PFI want to reiterate our written comments submitted last month, but we also want to focus on some key points for you to consider. Pet foods and treats are regulated at the state level by entities such as California Department of Public Health and your compatriots across the country, and at the federal level by the U.S. Food & Drug

Administration.

Although AAFCO itself is not a regulatory authority, it serves as a collaborative forum for state and federal regulators to safeguard human and animal health. And to provide a level playing field for the animal feed and pet food industries by developing just an equitable standards, definitions and policies to be followed in enforcing such laws and to promote uniformity in such laws, regulations and policies. And I'm quoting the AAFCO's bylaws in the official publication, the OP.

California Department of Public Health has long acknowledged the official publication of AAFCO. For example, CDPH's regulations governing processed pet food specify that the common names and definitions of other ingredients used in the processing of pet food shall be recognized in the official publication of the Association of American Feed Control Officials, incorporated and/or the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and I cite California Code Regulation Title 17, Section 19005.

"Natural" is among the terms defined in the AAFCO OP and as such the definition of "natural" as applied to pet food ingredients already has a force of law in California. CDPH has historically recognized through guidance the AAFCO guidelines on natural claims to describe the product as a whole.

Rulemaking by CDPH to further reinforce AAFCO's OP's definition of natural and guidelines for natural label claims as applied to pet food ingredients, and to codify its historic recognition of the AAFCO guidelines on natural claims, to describe the product as a whole will avoid any regulatory uncertainty, we strongly believe. And it will strengthen consumer confidence in California law.

PFI agrees that rulemaking is important to prevent unnecessary litigation in which plaintiffs exploit a perceived regulatory ambiguity. We believe there is no ambiguity.

Furthermore, we also believe that formally adopting the AAFCO OP, which is published annually by AAFCO and includes updated AAFCO recommendations, into regulation would benefit California consumers and their pets by clarifying current regulatory standards.

In our written comments to CDPH we outline in detail suggested new subsections that define the term "natural" and clarify the conditions under which processed pet foods as a whole may be labeled with natural claims.

Our proposed regulatory text is drawn from the AAFCO definition of natural and guidelines for natural claims.

PFI and our member companies believe the proposed changes outlined in our comments would provide the necessary clarity in the immediate term. But we have also

1 welcomed the opportunity to work with the Department in 2 response to any questions regarding our proposals or 3 alternative proposals to codify relevant AAFCO quidelines and standards. Those are my comments. 4 5 MS. PAHLAND: Thank you, questions? 6 MR. BADU: Thank you. 7 MS. PAHLAND: I had a question --8 MR. BADU: Yes? 9 MS. PAHLAND: -- Mr. Badu, the labeling guide 10 that's published by AAFCO, do you know how often that's 11 modified? 12 I understand it's periodically. MR. BADU: 13 don't believe that there's a certain period of time as to when it's modified. I do know that AAFCO as an entity, 14 with all the states, get together at least twice a year to 15 16 review the AAFCO OP. And so there's a lot of opportunity 17 for input and for discussion between the co-regulators 18 across the country. 19 So I'm looking at, and I'm just MS. PAHLAND: 20 asking just because I haven't -- I have a current copy, 21 it's revised May 2016. Do you know what the date was from 22 the prior modified labeling guide? 23 MR. BADU: Prior to 2016? 24 MS. PAHLAND: Right.

I don't, but I can get back to you

MR. BADU:

25

with that answer.

. 11

MS. PAHLAND: Okay, Okay, thank you so much.

MR. BADU: Thank you.

MS. PAHLAND: Diane Loiselle from Hills Pet Nutrition.

MS. LOISELLE: Good morning. My name is Diane Loiselle and I am here today on behalf of Hills Pet Nutrition. I've worked at Hills for ten years and currently serve as the Vice President of Product Safety, Regulatory and Quality.

Hills thanks the Department for the opportunity to be heard on this important issue. Hills fully supports the petition. Hills urges the Department to initiate rulemaking to formally adopt its earlier published guidance for pet food manufacturers like Hills.

Specifically, the Department should adopt the AAFCO official publication guidance on how to refer to natural pet food, as a whole. Doing so will confirm that every pet food manufacturer distributing products in California apply consistent standards and play by the same rulebook.

Hills has been dedicated to pet nutrition for over 70 years. Backed by the most extensive evidence-based clinical nutrition, we strive to deliver the highest quality pet food products that meet the diverse spectrum of

unique needs. We firmly believe the right pet nutrition is vital to pets living their long, healthy lives.

However, pet food is very complicated. Each bag and can must deliver complete nutrition for your dog or cat. For humans, people might eat eggs for breakfast, a salad for lunch, pasta for dinner. And probably by the end of the day, they end up with all the nutrients, vitamins and minerals that they need.

By contrast, pet foods must deliver everything that the pet needs in a single recipe. For our natural pet food line, Ideal Balance for example, the Hills team of pet nutritionists use natural ingredients to create dog and cat food recipes with optimum levels of over 50 nutrients. For these foods to be nutritionally complete they require the addition of tiny amounts of critical, essential vitamins and minerals that are synthetic.

We think these foods are natural even if these necessary vitamins and minerals are in there at very small levels. AAFCO says you have to call them out specifically, and we are certainly comfortable doing so.

AAFCO's guidance on how to accurately inform consumers that a product is blended from entirely natural ingredients except for these vitamins and minerals, is critical. It sets a uniform standard that everyone can follow, including manufacturers, consumers and regulatory

officials who came up with the labeling guidance in the first place.

AAFCO's mission is to provide honesty and transparency to consumers and this natural disclaimer actually does that.

On a national level, AAFCO's guidance has a profound competitive effect. Most states follow AAFCO's guidance in whole, or in part. Because everyone follows AAFCO there's no need for state-specific labels. We only need to print one set of labels, because everyone is following one set of rules.

Failure to formally adopt these standards would create chaos and confusion and increase the burden on manufacturers trying to compete here in California, and across the country.

I thank you for this opportunity to share our perspective on this important issue. And also I can also answer questions that you may have on the AAFCO process with respect to updating and I think you had some questions. I'd be happy to provide some feedback as well, so I thank you.

MS. PAHLAND: Great. So I'll repeat the question and hopefully, excuse me, I have the May 2016 revised labeling guidelines. Do you know when that was last published before the May of 2016?

```
1
              MS. LOISELLE:
                             About five years, five-to-seven
 2
   years earlier than that. And I think you're referring to
 3
   the actual book, a separate book on this case, not the
   AAFCO OP. A separate stand-alone document, yes?
 4
 5
              MS. PAHLAND: Correct, the labeling guidelines.
 6
   Right.
 7
              MS. LOISELLE:
                             Yes, correct.
                                             Correct.
 8
              MS. PAHLAND:
                            And you said it was five-to-seven
 9
   years ago.
10
              MS. LOISELLE:
                             Uh-huh.
11
              MS. PAHLAND: Okay. Great.
                                           Thank you.
12
              MS. LOISELLE: Great.
                                     Thank you.
13
              MS. PAHLAND: Is there anyone else who wishes to
14
   speak to the petition today?
15
              (No audible response.)
16
                     The California Department of Public
17
   Health's Office of Regulations will continue to receive
18
   written comments until 5:00 p.m., May 2nd, 2018 at 1415 L
19
   Street, Suite 500, Sacramento, California 95814. Also
20
   received by fax at (916) 440-5747 or via email to
21
   regulations@cdph.ca.gov.
22
              Hearing no additional requests to speak, I hereby
23
   close the hearing. Thank you very much, everybody.
24
     (Whereupon, the Public Hearing was adjourned at 9:28 a.m.)
25
                               --000-
```

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and

place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this $7^{\rm th}$ day of June, 2018.

PETER PETTY
CER**D-493
Notary Public

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 7^{th} day of June, 2018.



Myra Severtson Certified Transcriber AAERT No. CET**D-852