UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

DIETARY GUIDELINES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FOURTH MEETING

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2009

The meeting came to order at 1:00 p.m. Dr. Linda Van Horn, Chairperson, presiding.

PRESENT:

LINDA V. VAN HORN, PHD, RD, LD, CHAIR

NAOMI K. FUKAGAWA, MD, PHD, VICE CHAIR

CHERYL ACHTERBERG, PHD, MEMBER

LAWRENCE J. APPEL, MD, MPH, MEMBER

ROGER A. CLEMENS, DRPH, MEMBER

MIRIAM E. NELSON, PHD, MEMBER

SHARON (SHELLY) M. NICKOLS-RICHARDSON, PHD, RD, MEMBER

THOMAS A. PEARSON, MD, PHD, MPH, MEMBER

RAFAEL PEREZ-ESCAMILLA, PHD, MEMBER

XAVIER F. PI-SUNYER, MD, MPH, MEMBER

ERIC B. RIMM, SCD, MEMBER

JOANNE L. SLAVIN, PHD, RD, MEMBER

CHRISTINE L. WILLIAMS, MD, MPH, MEMBER

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

ALSO PRESENT:

- CAROLE DAVIS, MS, RD, CO-EXECUTIVE SECRETARY AND DFO, CNPP, USDA
- KATHRYN McMURRY, MS, CO-EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, ODPHP, HHS
- SHANTHY BOWMAN, PHD, CO-EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, ARS, USDA
- HOLLY MCPEAK, MS, CO-EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, ODPHP, HHS
- RAJ ANAND, DVM, MPH, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CNPP, USDA
- RADM PENELOPE SLADE-SAWYER, PT, MSW, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH, DPHD, HHS
- CAPT SARAH LINDE-FEUCHT, MD, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, ODPHP, HHS

ROBERT POST, PHD, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, CNPP, USDA

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

AGENDA

Wednesday,	November 4, 2009	
1:00 p.m.	Opening Remarks	PAGE
	Raj Anand, Executive Director Center for Nutrition Policy an Promotion U.S. Department of Agriculture	nd 4
	Sarah Linde-Feucht, Deputy Dir Office of Disease Prevention a Health Promotion U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	
	Linda Van Horn, Chair, Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee	
SUBCOMMITT	EE TOPIC AREA DISCUSSIONS	
-	Nutrient Adequacy Chair: Shelly Nickols-Richardso	n 26
-	Carbohydrates and Protein Chair: Joanne Slavin	118
5:00 p.m.	Meeting Recess	218

NEAL R. GROSS

www.nealrgross.com

4 1 PROCEEDINGS 1:00 p.m. 2 DR. ANAND: Ladies and gentlemen, 3 good afternoon from Washington. Those of you 4 who have come from off site, luckily we have a 5 nice weather for you. So, if you get 6 а 7 chance, qo out. Raj Anand, the Executive Ι 8 am Director for USDA's Center of Nutritional 9 10 Policy and Promotion. Ι would also like to welcome 11 people who are on webinar for the fourth 12 13 meeting of the 2010 Dietary Guideline Advisory Committee. 14 I would really like to thank the 15 16 Committee for their contributions, and I want each member to know that their service is 17 highly-appreciated. 18 19 I would also like to acknowledge the cooperation between USDA and our partners 20 in the 2010 Dietary Guideline process, 21 the Department of Health and Human Services, the 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	ARS, the Agricultural Research Service, and
2	the original committee members at the table
3	here today.
4	We also have some members, and
5	I'll take the liberty of introducing them. On
6	my right is Dr. Robert Post, Deputy Director
7	of the USDA's Center for Nutrition Policy and
8	Promotion.
9	Next to him is Ms. Carole Davis,
10	Director of Nutrition Guidance and Analysis
11	Division of the CNPP. Carole is a Designated
12	Federal Officer and Co-Executive Secretary of
13	the DGAC and I call her the Queen of Dietary
14	Guidelines. She lives and breathes dietary
15	guidelines, believe me.
16	On the left also, Rear Admiral
17	Penny Slade-Sawyer, Director of Office of
18	Disease Prevention, Health Promotion, will be
19	joining us later.
20	But we do have Capt. Sara Linde-
21	Feucht, Deputy Director, Office of Disease
22	Prevention and Health Promotion. And we also
	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

have Ms. Kathryn McMurry, Senior Nutrition Advisor at the Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion at the HHS. She also Co-Executive Secretary of the DGAC, which is the Dietary Guideline Advisory Committee.

I would like to take the liberty 6 7 of reminding the Committee of their charge. Your charge is informing the Secretaries of 8 both departments of the changes to dietary 9 10 guidelines that are warranted, based on the preponderance of most current scientific and 11 medical evidence, placing their primary focus 12 13 on the review of scientific evidence published since the last Dietary Guideline Advisory 14 15 Committee deliberation, emphasizing the 16 development of food-based recommendations, not nutrient-based, preparing and submitting 17 а technical of recommendation with 18 report 19 rationales to the Secretaries of USDA and HHS. charge also states that 20 The the DGAC does have the responsibility of 21 not translating these recommendations into policy 22

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

www.nealrgross.com

1 or communication document.

2	This committee is governed by the
3	Federal Advisory Committee Act, or otherwise
4	called as FACA. FACA was established to
5	assure that advisory committees, one, provide
6	advice to provide advice that's relevant,
7	objective, open to public, they act promptly
8	to complete their work Remember, they act
9	promptly to complete their work in time
10	comply with reasonable cost controls and keep
11	recordkeeping requirements.
12	Therefore, each public meeting of
13	this committee has been and will continue to
14	be announced in the Federal Register through a
15	public notice.
16	As part of the open, transparent
17	process, the meeting the full committee are
18	open for observation by the public, and any
19	deliberation that occur between meetings, such
20	as those topic-specific subcommittees are
21	brought back to the full committee at a public
22	meeting, as you will hear today and tomorrow.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1	During the meeting, all public
2	participants will be in a listen-only mode.
3	The public has opportunities to participate in
4	the process by providing written comments to
5	the committee through our on-line public
6	comments database at <u>www.dietaryguidelines.</u>
7	gov. I repeat, www.dietaryguidelines.gov.
8	In the recent rules of FACA, I
9	would also like to introduce some rules of
10	engagement for the committee. The Dietary
11	Guideline Advisory Committee Members will
12	refer any individual who contacts them
13	personally to solicit information about their
14	work on the committee, the Dietary Guideline
15	Management Team.
16	The committee members are not able
17	to speak or give presentation to any
18	individual or outside group regarding the work
19	of the committee, as this would be
20	inconsistent with the Advisory Committee
21	operations, and would preclude the requirement
22	the committee works is transparent to public.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1	Now, I want to recognize Capt.
2	Sarah Linde-Feucht from HHS, who would make
3	some comments and that will be followed by our
4	Deputy Director, Rob Post. Sarah.
5	CAPT. LINDE-FEUCHT: Thank you so
6	much, Dr. Anand. Good afternoon, everybody.
7	As introduced, I am Dr. Sarah
8	Linde-Feucht, and I'm the Deputy Director of
9	the Office of Disease Prevention and Health
10	Promotion. And for those of you who are
11	interested in the shorter name, we call it
12	ODPHP, part of the Department of Health and
13	Human Services.
14	I'm giving the welcoming remarks
15	on behalf of Rear Admiral Slade-Sawyer, who
16	will be joining us later. She had an
17	engagement that precluded her attendance right
18	at this moment, but she will be joining us
19	just as soon as she can.
20	On behalf of her and the
21	Department of Health and Human Services, I
22	would like to join Dr. Anand in welcoming the
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Committee Members, and also the listening
 members of the public.

The Department of Health and Human 3 Services deeply appreciates all of the many 4 hours that you have provided in leading your 5 6 expertise for the very important job of ensuring the Dietary Guidelines for Americans 7 continue to reflect the preponderance 8 of scientific and medical evidence 9 current relating to nutrition and health. 10 fully appreciate all of your 11 We efforts, the efforts of the USDA staff, as 12 13 well as the HHS staff to improve the nutritional health of Americans. 14 So, Dr. Post, I will turn it over 15 16 to you. Thank you, Sarah, and 17 DR. POST: than you, Raj. 18 19 As one of the Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotions, policy officials, 20 Ι the committee certainly welcome and look 21 forward to another productive meeting. 22

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

NEAL R. GROSS

www.nealrgross.com

1 We are very excited to be broadcasting this meeting live via the Web. 2 The third meeting was held this past April, 3 and it was the first to be held via Webinar. 4 And evident from the WebEx 5 as survey feedback, from those participants, this 6 new medium enables us to reach a more varied 7 and larger audience of interested parties. It 8 also provides for recording of the meeting to 9 10 be archived at, once aqain, www.dietaryguidelines.gov, for 11 current and future reference by the public. 12 13 We have individuals or participants that are registered from across 14 15 the nation, as well as internationally. We are particularly happy knowing that. In fact, 16

16 are particularly happy knowing that. In fact, 17 we've got folks registered in Saudi Arabia, 18 Slovenia, Brazil, Iraq, Canada and Greece, to 19 name a few countries. 20 I would like to review a few

21 technical points for the public, and I guess 22 in a departure from the past, I'm not here to

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 tell you where the restrooms are. I can, 2 though, tell you that on your screen, for those who have registered, you will see some 3 relevant information. 4 Τf experience technical 5 you difficulties, you may contact WebEx technical 6 support, toll free at 1-866-229-3239. 7 This information also emailed all 8 was to as was a technical assistance 9 registrants, 10 number for our international participants. The event staff here in the room 11 at the committee's meeting will be monitoring 12 13 an email line, so to speak, where public participants can send notes of any technical 14 difficulties while the meeting proceeds. 15 16 as you see on the screen, Now, this email address is tech issue@yahoo.com. 17 Please note that the event staff will not 18 19 respond to these emails. It is simply one of monitoring 20 the several ways we are the streaming efficiency of the meeting to 21 the public. 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

value your feedback on this 1 We 2 Webinar meeting. After the meeting registrants will receive a follow-up survey 3 4 from WebEx. And, as in the past, a transcript and a written summary of this event will also 5 6 be posted to our website when available. 7 Because this meeting is being streamed live to the public, I would like to 8 ask that the committee members clearly state 9 10 their name before speaking. This is particularly important to facilitate clear 11 deliberations to the public who are following 12 the discussion. 13 And with that, I'd like to turn 14 back to Dr. Anand. 15 16 DR. ANAND: Thank you. I will speak a little more now. I would like to turn 17 the meeting to the Chair of the Dietary 18 19 Guideline Committee, Dr. Linda Van Horn. Linda, all yours. 20 CHAIR VAN HORN: Thank you, Dr. 21 afternoon 22 Anand. And qood to committee **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 members and the DGAC support staff, and good 2 afternoon to our public participants who are 3 watching via the Web today.

Since the third meeting of the DGAC in late April, the committee and our support staff have been working very hard to complete many milestones, and I think that's an understatement.

The committee has qiven much 9 10 thought to the various research questions that could be asked to help inform dietary guidance 11 for the United States. In so doing, we have 12 13 developed and extensive list of research questions to be answered. 14

15 The detail involved in the work 16 being completed is extraordinary, but necessary, enlightening 17 and also highly It will provide the information relevant. 18 19 needed to develop a thorough, yet concise advisory report. 20

The process we are using will strengthen our advisory report, and in turn,

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

4

5

6

7

8

enhance the value of the report to inform the Federal Government, as they develop the 2010 Dietary Guidelines for the American's policy.

1

2

3

committee 4 The has seven subcommittees, each with 5 it's topics own listed on the agenda. In addition to these 6 7 seven subcommittees, we have also the Science Review Subcommittee whose task is to provide 8 oversight and quidance related the 9 to 10 technical weighing of the evidence.

Among the subcommittees, a number 11 of families of research questions have been 12 13 developed that encompass roughly 180 subquestions that we'd like to address. 14 We 15 have begun drawing proposed conclusions on the 16 evidence but, due to the volume of work, we will not be presenting all of our conclusions 17 at this meeting. 18

19 Today and tomorrow hope we to propose conclusions supported by the evidence, 20 and have discussion for a large number of our 21 research questions. This means that at the 22

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

fifth meeting, which will occur in quarter of 2010, the first quarter, we will plan to propose our conclusions for all of the remaining research questions and come to general consensus on the science.

We originally had five meetings planned for our public deliberations, however, to accommodate the large volume of information that needs to be discussed, we will be holding a sixth and final public meeting in the spring of 2010, where we will present and vote on our advisory report.

13 To help meet our goals for this meeting, our committee members have agreed to 14 15 keep their presentation succinct. I would 16 like to remind the public that our evidence review will be summarized 17 in our report, however, the details of the evidence review 18 19 will also be available in an electronic database called the USDA Nutrition Evidence 20 Library or NEL, as you will hear referred to 21 throughout our deliberations. 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

1 The NEL is a web-based system set 2 of tools to help support our scientific review Having the nutrition evidence 3 process. details 4 library ensures that the of our scientific review well-documented, 5 are 6 transparent and reproducible. also 7 Our systematic process reduces reviewer bias and better standardizes 8 various the approach by the 9 used 10 subcommittees. Most questions we will discuss were answered using a NEL systematic review. 11 help with the time, I would 12 То 13 like to preface an upcoming presentations with general criteria and information that 14 some 15 applies broadly to all our work. 16 The first step of the evidence review 17 process was to generate research questions that led to the search and sort 18 19 plans to search the scientific literature. general, literature 20 In in our following review the inclusion 21 met and exclusion criteria. Inclusion criteria 22 **NEAL R. GROSS**

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

generally entailed studies with human subjects that are of English language as well as international. Sample sizes with a minimum of ten subjects per study arm and a preference for larger sizes if available.

Drop-out rates less than 20 percent with a preference for smaller drop-out rates and populations of healthy individuals and those with elevated chronic disease risk.

10 Most questions only considered at-risk populations, healthy or but 11 other included when it populations were 12 was 13 pertinent to the question.

criteria Exclusion 14 generally entailed studies of medical treatment 15 or 16 therapy, disease subjects with -- such as subjects already diagnosed with or a disease 17 related to the study's purpose, hospitalized 18 19 patients, malnourished or Third-World populations or disease incidences that are not 20 relative to the United States population, such 21 as malaria, animal studies, in vitro studies, 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1

and articles that are not peer reviewed.

Exceptions this list and 2 to additional criteria considered will be noted 3 subcommittee 4 by each during their In some cases the systematic 5 presentation. 6 review of the literature went back to cover 7 literature on infants since potential manifestation of disease in infancy can 8 continue on and across the lifespan. 9

The Dietary Guidelines themselves, however, provide recommendations for ages two and above. An evidence worksheet was developed to organize the information for each article included in our reviews.

These worksheets were developed by trained evidence abstractors from throughout the country. NEL staff then prepared draft portfolios of evidence worksheets, summaries of each article and overview tables for each research question that we used to review the evidence and draw our conclusions.

22

The committee is grading the body

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 19

of evidence supporting our conclusions using an approach the group has agreed to. You can see the criteria here which takes into account the quality of the studies, consistency of the findings, number of studies supporting the evidence, magnitude of the effect or outcome, and generalized ability.

Based on these criteria the
conclusion statement will be given a grade of
I, strong; II, moderate; III, limited; IV,
expert opinion; and V, grade not assignable.

addition to NEL reviews, In 12 we 13 also other sources of evidence when use Thus, it is important to note 14 appropriate. only conclusion statements for which 15 that there was a formal DGAC NEL review are graded. 16

After the release of our report, 17 all of the materials, including the 18 19 committee's evidence summaries, conclusion grades forth will 20 statements, and so be accessible online to the public in addition to 21 written advisory report 22 our to the

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

Secretaries. 1

2	For some questions it was decided
3	that a formal NEL review was not needed. For
4	example, when only a brief update is needed to
5	another substantial source of evidence such as
6	the 2005 Dietary Guideline Report, IOM reports
7	or other sources.
8	Examples of this approach that are
9	being presented today and tomorrow include
10	assessing, if there's a need for B12
11	fortification, and answering the question,
12	"What amount of fluid is recommended for
13	health?"
14	For some questions, we use food
15	pattern modeling. To understand the
16	implications of dietary guidance for
17	Americans, the total diet must be evaluated.
18	We do this by identifying amounts of different
19	foods that could be consumed to achieve
20	various nutrient intakes.
21	The modeling approach has been
22	developed by USDA's Center for Nutrition
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1 Policy and Promotion and provides an 2 "what-if" opportunity to answer our type questions. Modeling allows evaluation of the 3 amounts of nutrients that would be obtained 4 for consuming various combinations of food to 5 ensure adequate intake. 6 All modeling analyses are designed 7 to be isocaloric. That is, the changes are 8 made within fixed calorie levels and they also 9 10 evaluate how the proposed modifications impact moderation goals for the diet. 11 For example, one question that was 12

evaluated through modeling is: What is the impact on intake of folate and other nutrients if all recommended grain amounts are selected as whole grains, rather than half whole grains and half enriched grains.

The draft report for this question will be presented by the Nutrient Adequacy Subcommittee today.

In addition to modeling, we also have other types of data analyses such as

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

23

analyses of dietary intake data from the
 National Health and Nutrition Examination
 Surveys.

help These data us answer important questions such as what are the major food sources of sodium in the US diet. So, as you can see, there are many sources of evidence. Often they are used in combination to answer a question.

We have also received about 750 We have also received about 750 public comments throughout the process already, and each subcommittee is taking these into consideration in the development of their work.

15 The DGAC has the assistance of 16 staff that help to support this work. All of us are extremely grateful for their assistance 17 and ongoing input. Each subcommittee has a 18 19 team that includes a lead staff person from the Dietary Guidelines management team who 20 supports the Chair and the Members of their 21 subcommittee in overall project management. 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

4

5

6

7

8

9

1 There is a NEL project manager who 2 leads the NEL review for the subcommittee, and also performs quality control measures 3 to ensure the integrity of the evidence-based 4 systems that stay intact. 5 There is a NEL research librarian 6 7 who conducts the many literature searches and each team also has other staff support members 8 that contribute in a supportive role similar 9 10 to those I have just described. have reviewed Now that the 11 we overall systematic approach being used, we are 12 13 ready to begin hearing some results. Each will subcommittee present their 14 research 15 questions, propose conclusion statements and 16 then briefly describe the evidence supporting those conclusions. 17 The proposed conclusions will be 18 19 presented first, but I'd like to remind the public that the subcommittees began with open-20 questions ended and conducted extensive 21

surveys of the scientific literature and

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

22

www.nealrgross.com

graded the evidence before drafting these
 conclusions.

appropriate, the When 3 from 4 recommendations other national organizations will also be summarized. 5 When there are inadequate data to draw fully the 6 7 evidence-based conclusions, the DGAC has listed recommended research needed to address 8 these issues. 9

10 I'd also like to remind everyone 11 that on everything being presented today and 12 tomorrow, it's in a draft form.

13 Although, as a committee, we need to come to agreement on many conclusions, as 14 15 many as possible for some topics, especially 16 those for which there are still puzzle pieces missing collaborative work 17 or between subcommittees planned, additional discussion 18 19 will be needed after this committee meeting and before a consensus can be formally reached 20 at a later meeting. 21

22

(202) 234-4433

Lastly, each committee member

www.nealrgross.com

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	should please remember to announce themselves
2	when speaking to help the public follow along.
3	With that, I would like to begin
4	our first subcommittee, and we are ready to
5	proceed with the Nutrient Adequacy
6	Subcommittee, chaired by Shelly Nickols-
7	Richardson.
8	With that, I'll turn it over to
9	you, Shelly.
10	MEMBER NICKOLS-RICHARDSON: Thank
11	you, Linda. And Okay. I just want to
12	start off by recognizing the members of the
13	Nutrient Adequacy Subcommittee. They are
14	listed here on your slide, recognizing the
15	work of Naomi and Cheryl and Joanne and Mim in
16	this committee.
17	I also want to recognize Trish
18	Britten, our liaison at USDA, as well as
19	Rachel Hayes and Eve Essery at the DHHS. They
20	have been extremely instrumental in helping us
21	complete our work, particularly the modeling
22	analyses that we present today.
	NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1	So, our subcommittee today will
2	present information about nutrients of
3	concern, folic acid fortification, B12
4	fortification/supplementation and then move
5	into some food pattern modeling, including the
6	realignment of vegetable subgroups, adequacy
7	of USDA food patterns and then USDA patterns
8	with typical food choices.
9	And I'll ask that questions be
10	held to the end so that we can move through
11	our information and our proposed conclusions
12	prior to taking those questions.
13	So, the first question that the
14	subcommittee has been working with is looking
15	at nutrients of concern and when considering
16	nutrients of concern, two basic principles
17	were used to frame this question, and the
18	review of data, as well as guide the
19	decisionmaking process.
20	The first is that nutrients should
21	come primarily from foods and so population-
22	based dietary intake data were examined to
	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
	1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

identify gaps in nutrients, as contained in
 the usual intakes of individuals residing in
 the United States.

second premise is that The the Guidelines for Dietary Americans provide guidance regarding means to achieve the most recent Dietary Reference Intakes so that nutrient needs by age and sex groups are achieved.

10 So, our first question here is 11 "What nutrients are most likely to be consumed 12 by the general public in amounts low enough 13 and are of public health significance to be of 14 concern?"

The process by which nutrients of concern were evaluated included first, the short-fall nutrients were identified. Shortfall nutrients are those nutrients for which a group or groups has or have a high prevalence of inadequate dietary intake based on food consumption data.

22

4

5

6

7

8

9

Second, biochemical indices, when

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

available and/or disease prevalence data were evaluated for short-fall nutrients to consider the public health significance of all or any short-fall nutrients.

5 And third, the likelihood of a 6 short-fall nutrient being met by achieving 7 food intake guidelines was also considered.

identify So, to short-fall 8 usual nutrients, intake data from several 9 10 sources were examined. The 2005, What We Eat in America Report included 24 nutrients from 11 NHANES 2001 through 2002 data. 12

13 The 2008 Food and Nutrition Service the diet quality 14 reports on of 15 Americans by Food Stamp participation status, 16 the diet quality of American young children by WIC participation status, and the diet quality 17 of American school-aged children by school 18 19 lunch participation status included 18 nutrients from NHANES 1999 through 2004 data. 20 The 2009 What We Eat in America 21 Report for 25 nutrients from NHANES 2005/2006, 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

for one-day intakes, and then the 2009 What We Eat in America Report for usual intake of four nutrients, including vitamin D, calcium, phosphorus and magnesium from 2005/2006 data were also evaluated.

The 2008 Centers for Disease 6 7 Control and Prevention Report titled National Report on Biochemical Indicators of Diet and 8 Nutrition in the US Population, 1999 through 9 10 2002, was used to evaluate blood or urine of relevant biochemical concentrations 11 indicators of diet and nutrition. 12

were from 13 Specimens the NHANES 1999 through 2002 survey, and then additional 14 15 peer reviewed studies were used to supplement 16 this report for nutrients not included in the and disease prevalence data 17 report, were considered for nutrients without biochemical 18 19 indicators to reflect nutritional status.

20 The likelihood of achieving the 21 DRI for nutrient was also considered. Food 22 intake patterns using the 2005 USDA Dietary

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

Guidelines for Americans within set caloric 1 2 levels were modeled and the ability to consume nutrients in adequate amounts were examined 3 using nutrient-dense food choices from food 4 item clusters for food groups. 5 Α review of the dietary intake 6 evidence indicates that short-fall nutrients 7 for adults and children include vitamins A, C, 8 D and E, and calcium, magnesium, potassium and 9 10 dietary fiber. adults, short-fall nutrients 11 For also include vitamin K and choline and for 12 children, phosphorus is a short-fall nutrient 13 among adolescent females. 14 A review of biochemical evidence 15 16 indicates that less than five percent of the US population has low serum concentrations of 17 retinol and alpha tocopherol, and the CDC has 18 19 also reported from 2003 to 2004 NHANES data, a very low prevalence of poor serum vitamin C 20 concentration in the US. 21 And Booth and Al Rajabe in 2008, 22 **NEAL R. GROSS**

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

reported that vitamin K deficiency is very
 rare in the United States.

One report also indicated that more than 55 percent of individuals residing in lower latitudes in the United States had serum 25 hydroxy vitamin D concentration less than 25 nanograms per ml or 63.5 nanamoles per liter during the wintertime.

And I'll just note here that this 9 10 particular information is pointed out specifically for lower latitudes because these 11 individuals do have more year-round exposure 12 13 to sunlight compared to those living in the higher latitudes. 14

15 The IOM defines serum 25 OHD 16 concentration of less than 12 nanograms per ml approximately 30 nanamoles per ml for 17 or adults and less than 11 nanograms per ml, or 18 19 27.5 nanamoles per liter, excuse me, for infants and young children. 20

21 So, using the IOM cutoff values, 22 only about ten percent of non-Hispanic whites

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 over the age of 60 years have а 25 OHD concentration of less than 11 nanograms per 2 ml, with a proportion of older adults having 3 vitamin D deficiency increasing as the cutoff 4 values increase. 5 And so, minor changes in that 6 somewhat 7 cutoff point do increase significantly the number of individuals with 8 lower or inadequate vitamin D concentrations, 9 10 25 OHD concentration.

These cut points will be reviewed when we review vitamin D more thoroughly and potentially present that at the next meeting.

from Data NHANES 2005-2006 14 15 indicated that ten percent of women and two 16 percent of 50 vears had men over aqe osteoporosis of the femoral neck and many more 17 older women and men have osteopenia. 18

19 Nearly 100 million men and women 20 have prehypertension and hypertension, and 21 it's also known that increased potassium 22 consumption in foods can lower systolic and

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

diastolic blood pressure in individuals with normal and elevated blood pressure.

Dietary fiber is considered in light of risk reduction of coronary heart disease, which is the leading cause of death in the US.

7 And food pattern modeling indicates that DRI's for vitamins A, C, and K 8 easily achieved 9 can be by meeting 10 recommendations for fruit and vegetable intakes, although vitamin E is less readily 11 consumed in the typical diets of individuals 12 13 in the US, biochemical data and disease prevalence data do not suggest that vitamin E 14 nutriture is problematic for Americans. 15

16 Choline and phosphorus represent 17 nutrients that may be possible -- of possible 18 concern for some subgroups of individuals in 19 the US and these nutrients are addressed in a 20 separate question by the Nutrient Adequacy 21 Subcommittee looking at particular nutrients 22 of concern for subgroups of individuals.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

www.nealrgross.com

1	So, after evaluating dietary
2	intakes of Americans, biochemical data,
3	disease prevalence and potential ability to
4	meet nutrient recommendations by consumption
5	of a variety of foods, the nutrients of
6	concern for children and adults include
7	vitamin D and calcium, magnesium, potassium
8	and dietary fiber.
9	Evidence for magnesium is still
10	under review, and for certain subgroups,
11	vitamins B12, folate, choline, iron and
12	phosphorus require attention. Potassium will
13	be and is thoroughly addressed in the sodium,
14	potassium and water group. I believe that's
15	in future discussions, and not presented
16	today.
17	And then dietary fiber will be
18	addressed in upcoming meetings and discussions
19	in the carbohydrate and protein group.
20	Questions related to folate and
21	vitamin B12 will be presented today and to
22	start with folic acid fortification, I'll turn
	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

it over to Mim to discuss fortification and 1 2 questions related to folic acid. MEMBER NELSON: Hi. This is Mim 3 Are we going to -- we aren't going to 4 Nelson. do questions within each piece, as we go, or 5 are we going to wait till the very end? Okay. 6 7 Okay. That's fine. So, I am presenting on a series of 8 questions related to folic acid fortification. 9 10 So, what is the relationship between folic acid intake in the US post fortification era 11 related to serum, plasma and red blood cell 12 13 folate status, neural tube defects, CVD and stroke. 14 15 I should say CHD and stroke, colon 16 cancer and folic acid supplementation, risk of CHD and folic acid supplementation risk of 17 stroke. 18 19 You will recall that in mandatory compliance in the United States for folic acid 20 fortification began in January 1998, with 21 voluntary starting in '96, and in Canada, full 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

compliance was by 1998. All of this as a result of an FDA authorization -- or rather the United States Public Health Service recommendation that all women of childbearing age should be consuming 400 micrograms of folic acid daily to reduce the risk of neural tube defects.

had our basic inclusion So, 8 we criteria with the NEL was research published 9 10 between 1999 and February 2009. January 2004, and February of 2009, regarding colon cancer, 11 looking at healthy human subjects for the most 12 part and some that have elevated chronic 13 disease risk, peer-reviewed in the 14 English 15 language.

16 So, one of the first questions that we wanted to look at was "Has there been 17 an increase in folic acid in serum plasma and 18 19 red blood cells result of the as а fortification?" and our draft conclusion with 20 the Grade I evidence is that there's clear and 21 consistent evidence that serum plasma and red 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

blood cell folic concentrations increased in the United States and Canada following mandatory folate fortification.

from eleven different 4 This is cross-sectional studies, eight in the United 5 States, three in Canada, five, which were 6 7 nationally represented in the United States using NHANES data, and one with high-risk 8 Mexican-American population that was on the 9 10 border between Mexico and America.

And serum folate more than doubled 11 between pre and postfortification periods. 12 13 Red blood cell folate increased approximately 57 percent. There still is a very small group 14 15 of women of childbearing years that do have -still 16 at risk for low folate or are concentrations. 17

The second question, "What impact has mandatory folic acid fortification had on the incidence of neural tube defects?" The proposed conclusion with the Grade I evidence is that there is clear and consistent evidence

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

the incidence of children born 1 that with 2 neural tube defects has been reduced following mandatory folic acid grain fortification in 3 the United States and Canada. 4 This is from 13 different studies, 5 three cohort, one longitudinal, one CDC 6 7 report, one cross-sectional and seven trend Of the nationally-represented 8 studies. studies in the United States, it showed that 9 10 there was about a 23 to 54 percent reduction in spina bifida incidence and about 11 to 16 11 percent reduction in anencephaly incidents. 12 13 One Canadian national studv

13 One Canadian national study 14 reported a similar 53 percent reduction in 15 spina bifida and a 31 percent reduction in 16 anencephaly incidents.

So, moving along, "What impact has mandatory folic acid fortification had on the incidence of stroke?" The proposed conclusion with a Grade of III is that there is limited evidence.

This is mostly because there's not

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

much evidence, but there is some that stroke mortality has declined in the US and Canada following folic acid fortification policy.

1

2

3

4 There is one population-based cohort study that was conducted in the United 5 States and Canada, and with controls against 6 England and Wales, ongoing decline in stroke 7 mortality in the Canada US and between 8 comparing 1990 to 1997 to 1998 to 2002 showed 9 10 an increasing reduction going from minus 3.3 percent to minus 2.9 percent per year in the 11 US and going from one percent per year, minus 12 13 1 percent to minus 5.4 percent per year in Canada, whereas the stroke mortality 14 in 15 England and Wales did not change significantly 16 between 1990 and 2002. So, small but а significant difference. 17

impact So, "What has mandatory 18 19 folic acid fortification had on the incidence of colon cancer? We gave this a Grade of III, 20 that there's limited evidence that mandatory 21 folic acid fortification has resulted in a 22

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

transient increase in the incidence of colon
 cancer in the US and Canada.

This comes from two studies, one that was done in the United States and Canada, and one that was done in Chile. Absolute rates of colorectal cancer began to increase in 1996.

This is when voluntary 8 fortification began, or 1997 in Canada and 9 10 peaked in 1998 or 2000 in Canada, and it represents a signification transient deviation 11 from prior folate fortification in the US by 12 about four to six additional cases per hundred 13 thousand individuals. 14

15 There is some evidence that the 16 rate of incidence is back to where it was before, and that this is a -- the reason for 17 the transient is that there was a shift for 18 19 several years during the time, and if we need to, I can get into some of the biological 20 plausibility, but I'd rather not, because we 21 did that before in an earlier meeting. 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1	Rates an interesting study that
2	was done in Chile looked at the rates of
3	hospital discharge due to colorectal cancer in
4	Chile before their fortification, which was
5	looking between 1992 and '96, and after 2001
6	to 2004, after their mandatory folic acid
7	fortification, and they saw an increase by a
8	rate ratio of 2.6 in adults age 45 to 64, and
9	2.9 in adults age 65 to 70.
10	So, further evidence in another
11	country that went through folate fortification
12	of this bump up in colorectal cancer.
13	So next, we wanted to look at
14	to sort of complete the full question, looking
15	at folic acid supplementation, so, "What
16	effect does folic acid supplementation with or
17	without additional B vitamin supplementation
18	have on risk of stroke and those with or
19	without existing preexisting vascular
20	disease.
21	We give this a Grade III, that
22	there's inconsistent evidence that
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

supplementation with folic acid reduces risk of stroke in adults. This comes from two meta-analyses, one that 12 RCT's in the US, Canada in Europe and another that had eight RCT's from US, Canada, China, Australia, New Zealand and Europe.

In the first there was an overall
relative risk for patients treated with folic
acid supplementation compared to controls, was
nonsignificant. For cardiovascular diseases,
CHD, stroke and all-cause mortality -- and
I'll get to CHD further in the next question.

And in the other trial, folic acid 13 supplementation, in that meta-analysis did 14 significantly reduce risk of stroke by about 15 16 18 percent, but should be noted that the relative risk for those trials that were in 17 fortified regions with qrain 18 was 19 nonsignificant.

The final question was, "What effect does folic acid supplementation, again, with or without additional B vitamin

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

www.nealrgross.com

supplementation, have on the risk of CHD, in 1 2 those with or without preexisting vascular disease?" 3 And we give this a Grade I, that 4 folic acid supplementation does not appear to 5 reduce risk of CHD, particularly in countries 6 with folic acid fortification. 7 This from comes large 8 two randomized control trials, and 9 one meta-10 analysis that -- that also -- that contained 12 RCT's. 11 One of the randomized trials was 12 13 done in Norway. There was no effect of folic acid, B12 В6, total mortality 14 or or 15 cardiovascular events. This is in people with 16 preexisting disease. also looking 17 The other was at folic acid, B12 and B6, and also did not 18 19 reduce cardiovascular events. That trial also was in people with preexisting disease. 20 And then the meta-analysis, folic 21 acid supplementation did not reduce risk of 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

cardiovascular disease or all-cause mortality 1 2 in persons with prior history of disease. So, Eve, do you have -- is there -3 - I see you're wandering around in there. 4 MS. ESSERY: I am going to pass it 5 along. 6 7 MEMBER NELSON: Oh, okay. Okay. Sorry. 8 summary, the overarching 9 So, in question which we will summarize this into 10 really answer, but the overarching 11 one question really is, "What is the relationship 12 between folic acid intake in the US and Canada 13 postfortification era and health outcomes?" 14 15 And the overarching is that there 16 substantial reduction in neural tube is а There may be a very small decrease, 17 defects. but significant decrease in stroke. There may 18 19 also be -- and it may have been transient -we'll have to see with further data as we get 20 further along after these dietary guidelines 21 are out, but that there may be a transient 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 increase in colon cancer.

2	So, it's mixed, but I would say
3	the overall the overarching is that the
4	benefit of the neural tube defects is very
5	much there.
6	MEMBER FUKAGAWA: This is Naomi
7	Fukagawa who will now address the question
8	another overarching question, namely why am
9	I not going forward? Ah. Here we go
10	about special nutrient recommendations needed
11	for certain subgroups.
12	And this is somewhat of a
13	different nutrient, in that we did not conduct
14	a full NEL review of the literature for this
15	specific nutrient.
16	As many of you know, the 2005
17	Dietary Guidelines for Americans did address
18	the concern about groups at risk for
19	pernicious anemia or neurological deficits
20	related to vitamin B12 deficiency, and these
21	were largely pregnant women and those who are
22	over the age of 50.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	Instead of a full NEL review, we
2	chose to update the literature review since
2	
3	2005, since there weren't significant new
4	randomized control trials done on these
5	particular nutrients, and we also included a
6	review of the NHANES intake data for 2005 to
7	2006 in order to draft a conclusion.
8	So, my presentation this morning
9	is or this afternoon, will actually be a
10	little bit different from what Mim has just
11	done, in that I'll present the evidence before
12	proposed conclusion.
13	So, on this next slide, we can see
14	that, based on the NHANES 2005 to 2006 data,
15	the mean daily vitamin B12 intake from foods
16	was above the recommended dietary allowance,
17	which is approximately 2.4 micrograms per day,
18	for all ages and all gender groups.
19	And furthermore, vitamin B12
20	deficiency, which was found in was found in
21	less than three percent of the population
22	based on serum B12 concentrations, but this
	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

was also in combination with serum
 homocysteine concentrations greater than 10
 micromoles per liter.

did find in this particular 4 We supplement, 5 report that the the use of supplements or fortification for B12 did 6 7 reduce this prevalence to less than .5 percent in the older at-risk population. 8

So therefore, our 9 proposed 10 conclusion is that individuals over the age of 50 appear to be meeting their RDA for vitamin 11 B12 and should continue to do so by eating 12 foods naturally rich in vitamin B12 13 and consume fortified foods with -- foods that are 14 fortified with vitamin B12 or by taking the 15 16 crystalline form of vitamin B12. Thank you.

17 CHAIR VAN HORN: Before we move 18 into the food modeling discussion, I think 19 perhaps it would be valuable for the committee 20 to discuss a little bit of what was presented 21 so far in terms of the nutrient issues.

So, Shelly, if you want to maybe

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

22

www.nealrgross.com

1	kick off the discussion, that would be great.
2	MEMBER NICKOLS-RICHARDSON: Well,
3	I'll open it for questions or comments.
4	MEMBER CLEMENS: This is Rog.
5	Thank you very much, Naomi, for that insight
6	on vitamin B12 status, in particular. I can
7	remember a number of years ago we're looking
8	at the elderly population and I found that in
9	that particular case we see that a number of
10	those individuals have challenges with the
11	intrinsic factor.
12	Do we have any data that these
13	individuals are able to maintain an adequate
14	status other than what you indicate here in
15	terms of absorption, other than what you
16	indicated on serum status?
17	MEMBER FUKAGAWA: That's more of a
18	problem. This is Naomi Fukagawa. More of a
19	problem with the naturally-occurring vitamin
20	B12. But if one the absorption of the
21	crystalline vitamin B12 is really quite good
22	in the elderly individuals.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

And so therefore, if one looks at adequacy and intake, at least across the age groups, they certainly are receiving sufficient -- or it appears that they are receiving sufficient B12.

1

2

3

4

5

MEMBER RIMM: This is Eric Rimm. 6 7 Ι just wanted to add onto that comment, because I know I've seen some, I believe, 8 preliminary data, or if not published data, 9 10 probably published data by now, from the Premium Heart Study, suggesting that measuring 11 serum B12 and homocysteine doesn't actually 12 13 deficiency, that looking capture at methylmalonic acid, which really is a marker 14 of vitamin B12 activity, you capture much more 15 16 of the deficiency state, and there actually cognitive function associated 17 was with methylmalonic acid. 18

So, I wonder if there's -- maybe this data set doesn't have that, and I wonder if there's a way to try to incorporate that, because I do worry that this may be an

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

51

underestimate of the population that's getting sufficient amounts of B12 that's actively incorporated.

This is Naomi MEMBER FUKAGAWA: At least in the data and the studies aqain. that I've reviewed, there wasn't an association, even looking at methylmalonic acid concentrations with change -- functional such as cognitive decline and changes so forth, but that's a point well-taken, yes.

MEMBER APPEL: Larry Appel. Ι 11 have a question for Mim about the folic acid 12 13 supplementation. The -- it looks like for coronary heart disease you I. 14 gave Grade 15 There's no relationship, and yet for stroke, 16 it seems like you're -- you might be trying to leave the door open, and I was wondering 17 whether, you know, the conclusion should be no 18 19 apparent benefit as opposed to inconsistent evidence that it reduced. 20

21 It looks like one of the -- the 22 bigger of the two meta-analyses -- and granted

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

I don't have it in front of me, showed no relationship. So --

MEMBER NELSON: Yes. This is Mim 3 Inconsistent. I'm -- I'm a little 4 Nelson. nervous about sort of providing much strength 5 to either of those in terms of -- so you're 6 7 talking about with the stroke one in particular? 8

9 MEMBER APPEL: Well, actually, I 10 think we might be on the same wavelength here. 11 MEMBER NELSON: Yes.

12 MEMBER APPEL: Your conclusion, 13 proposed conclusion for CHD was -- does not 14 appear to reduce --

MEMBER NELSON: That's right.

MEMBER APPEL: -- say, risk Grade I, okay, so it's basically you don't see a relationship, good evidence, and yet for stroke you say inconsistent evidence of -- of a relationship --

MEMBER NELSON: Because --

22

21

15

MEMBER APPEL: -- with Grade III.

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1	MEMBER NELSON: Because one of the
2	meta-analyses did show an improvement and the
3	other didn't, but I think that the key with
4	that was that in the folate-fortified
5	countries, there was no reduction.
6	So, it's inconsistent. Do you
7	think it should be a different grade?
8	MEMBER APPEL: Well, it's two
9	points. I was wondering whether it should be
10	there is no apparent relationship, which is
11	probably
12	MEMBER NELSON: So, what do I do
13	with the other meta-analysis, then?
14	MEMBER APPEL: Well, I'm not is
15	the one with the 12 RCT's I know it has
16	more numbers, but is it a you know, meta-
17	analyses get updated, and so
18	MEMBER NELSON: Right.
19	MEMBER APPEL: the general is
20	you accumulate more evidence, you believe the
21	last one rather than using the first one to
22	keep a hypothesis alive that might not be
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

54 worthy of being alive. 1 2 MEMBER NELSON: Yes, I'm just looking. 3 MEMBER APPEL: Part of the reason 4 I say this is --5 6 MEMBER NELSON: Yes. 7 MEMBER APPEL: -- somebody's going look at this and say, yes, it's 8 to а reasonable hypothesis, we need to do another --9 10 MEMBER NELSON: Yes --MEMBER APPEL: -- study. 11 MEMBER NELSON: I don't think --12 13 one of my researcher -- I'm not sure that we need any more research here. 14 15 MEMBER APPEL: Yes. 16 MEMBER NELSON: I think I'd be --I don't know, Eric, you had just reviewed 17 this, you said also. So, can we go back, can 18 19 I just go back? MEMBER APPEL: This is the kind of 20 MEMBER NELSON: Yes. 21 MEMBER APPEL: -- maybe it's worth 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

55 either a committee coming back and --1 2 MEMBER NELSON: Yes, and taking a look. 3 4 MEMBER APPEL: Because you have two frames --5 6 MEMBER NELSON: So, it's with this 7 one it's this one, because there's _ _ inconsistent evidence. 8 MEMBER APPEL: And you said that a 9 10 Grade III, but your larger meta-analysis would, I think, support a Grade I, no 11 relationship. 12 13 MEMBER NELSON: That's right. MEMBER APPEL: You know, and I 14 15 don't know if --16 MEMBER NELSON: Or at least а Grade II, yes. 17 MEMBER APPEL: Or whatever, yes. 18 19 MEMBER NELSON: Yes, okay. MEMBER APPEL: And then the CHD 20 one is --21 22 MEMBER NELSON: Pretty strong. **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	56
1	MEMBER APPEL: It's stronger in
2	the Grade I. So, I'm just trying to look for
3	parallels here.
4	MEMBER NELSON: More, because
5	they're yes, okay. Yes. Let me go back
6	and look at this, but I'm inclined at least to
7	go with a Grade II on this instead of Grade
8	III, because I agree.
9	MEMBER APPEL: Yes.
10	MEMBER NELSON: The trickier part
11	is the one is actually with the folate
12	fortification, in seeing this small both in
13	Canada and the United States, and is there
14	anything else going on that may have caused
15	that I don't think so. I think it's the
16	folate.
17	Or, what do you think, because
18	this right here, this is this is, again,
19	it's just one it's one population-based
20	cohort study with stroke. And this is just
21	MEMBER APPEL: Yes.
22	MEMBER NELSON: similar to the
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
	1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1 neural tube defects. I mean, it's a similar 2 design. It's basically looking at the decline -- stroke mortality has been going down, so 3 it's looking at the percent reduction. 4 MEMBER APPEL: 5 Yes. MEMBER NELSON: It's very small. 6 7 MEMBER APPEL: Yes. I mean, Ι 8 think you, in order to make а strong statement, you need to know what's happening 9 10 with blood pressure levels and control rates--MEMBER NELSON: There's so many 11 other things going on. 12 13 MEMBER APPEL: -- such as Т mean, blood pressure is probably the strongest 14 15 determinative of stroke that we know. MEMBER NELSON: That's right. 16 So, if you're not 17 MEMBER APPEL: out --18 19 MEMBER NELSON: So that's why -- I mean, it's only -- we'll never have another 20 study because this is the data and it's only 21 one time only, but I give it -- do you think 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

	58
1	this is fair?
2	I mean, given this is the one, you
3	know, it was US and Canada versus England and
4	Wales.
5	MEMBER RIMM: Larry, what are you
6	saying? Are you saying we should I mean,
7	the conclusion is that there may be some
8	benefit for folate and stroke, and you want to
9	make that a stronger grade?
10	MEMBER APPEL: No, no. No.
11	MEMBER NELSON: No.
12	MEMBER APPEL: I mean, I was
13	MEMBER NELSON: I brought up this
14	
15	MEMBER APPEL: brought up the
16	issue, and I was explaining that it's hard to
17	
18	MEMBER NELSON: It is very hard.
19	MEMBER RIMM: I mean, the
20	challenge is that a lot of these studies are
21	among people this is Eric Rimm, sorry. A
22	lot of these studies are among people with
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1 preexisting disease, so the question really 2 is, for primary prevention, it's more challenging because most of the trials for 3 stroke also are among people with preexisting 4 disease. 5 MEMBER NELSON: No, but this is --6 7 no, this is not the trial. MEMBER APPEL: This just looks 8 like vital statistics --9 10 MEMBER RIMM: Oh, sorry. Yes, this aspect of it, yes. 11 MEMBER NELSON: This aspect. 12 13 MEMBER APPEL: So it can be very This is ecologic data, I believe. hard. 14 15 MEMBER RIMM: Yes. Okay. I mean, 16 I think there are a few prospective studies from a long time ago also that would suggest 17 that there's benefit of folate in stroke that 18 observational, that 19 are are not just ecological --20 MEMBER NELSON: But this is --21 22 MEMBER RIMM: that's ___ not **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1 fortification.

2 MEMBER NELSON: This is about fortification. 3 MEMBER APPEL: Right. 4 NELSON: This 5 MEMBER is 6 prefortification and post. I mean, I -- I --7 so, Larry, you're saying -- and Tom, I'm looking at you, too, you're okay with this as 8 a Grade III, and it's limited evidence and we 9 10 leave it because we'll never know, is basically it? 11 No, we 12 MEMBER RIMM: may know. There's a lot of countries that have fortified 13 with folate. 14 15 MEMBER NELSON: Right. 16 MEMBER RIMM: There may be 30 or 40 studies that can be done like this. 17 MEMBER NELSON: Come up. 18 19 MEMBER RIMM: Yes, that come up where there's a -- you know, change in stroke 20 rates over time. 21 22 MEMBER NELSON: Okay. **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

MEMBER APPEL: Yes, the -- it just will have to have better data because, you know, also there are big pushes now to achieve better blood pressure control in a lot of different countries.

MEMBER NELSON: Right. There's so 6 7 many. And that's the same issue, I think, with these -- sorry, with the questions about 8 folate supplementation. It's the same issue. 9 10 These people with preexisting disease, most of them are on statins or blood 11 pressure medication. 12 There's so many other 13 things that qoinq that it's are on problematic. 14

But, Larry, we'll revisit this one on stroke and probably upgrade it to II.

Yes, Tom.

18 MEMBER PEARSON: This is Tom 19 Pearson. You know, I think the 1990 to 1997 20 actually was in somewhat of an odd sequence of 21 years ago, to stroke incidents, which it 22 actually had been going down, flattened off

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

17

1 for about seven years, and then proceeded to 2 go down again, so that the decline in stroke fortification looks like on 3 preprefortification levels. 4 And think it's just entirely 5 Ι ecologic, and probably the declines had to do 6 7 more with an awareness that the stroke rates weren't going down and blood pressure control 8 9 10 MEMBER NELSON: Yes. MEMBER PEARSON: -- had kicked in 11 at that point. I think the other thing is 12 13 that you have ecologic data that's influencing Grade III, and you have randomized 14 your 15 control trial data that usually, in the course 16 of things, you go with a high-risk group, you do your randomized trials and then put all the 17 evidence together, but it's the randomized 18 19 trial data that I think really is the most direct here. 20 MEMBER NELSON: It is. 21 MEMBER PEARSON: So, I think the --22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

I think the Grade III for this particular 1 2 conclusion is adequate, because it's ecologic data has other 3 many, many explanations. 4 MEMBER NELSON: Right. For this 5 one. For the fortification one, but we may, 6 7 for the actual supplementation one, upgrade this to a II, this one. There's two different 8 ones around the stroke. Does that make sense? 9 10 Okay. Okay. Thank you. MEMBER PEREZ-ESCAMILLA: Can I --11 MEMBER NELSON: Yes. Sorry. 12 13 MEMBER PEREZ-ESCAMILLA: I have a follow-up question folic acid 14 on 15 fortification, and -- this is Rafael. -- and 16 what you are calling a transient increase in a colon cancer, and my understanding, based on 17 the biological plausibility that you shared 18 19 with that committee before, that these may be related to people that 20 have precancerous lesions to begin with. 21 22 MEMBER NELSON: Yes. **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

MEMBER PEREZ-ESCAMILLA: But my question is why it would be transient and not continue.

MEMBER NELSON: Well, the folate hypothesis here with cancer is that it may be -- it may be actually protective, chemoprotective in terms of if somebody does not already have cancer, it may reduce their risk.

10 But, if they actually have precancerous polyps, then the replication of 11 the cancerous cells may be up-regulated with 12 13 the folate, and so that may speed up the full-blown cancer, colorectal incidents of 14 15 cancer.

16 So, it could be -- if you don't already have polyps, it's protective. 17 If you do have them, it may speed it up. So, there 18 19 is this sort of a hypothesis that, you know, maybe over time colon cancer rates may 20 qo down, but we popped up that group that -- no 21 pun intended, but already had polyps, so to 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

www.nealrgross.com

	65
1	speak.
2	So, I guess that's the best way I
3	can simply sort of describe this.
4	MEMBER PEARSON: I have a couple
5	of questions. This is Tom Pearson again on
6	for Mim on the folic acid fortification. One
7	of the charges was to look at cardiovascular
8	disease and fortification.
9	MEMBER NELSON: Oh, yes.
10	MEMBER PEARSON: I would like to
11	expand that to congenital coronary
12	congenital heart disease
13	MEMBER NELSON: Okay.
14	MEMBER PEARSON: because I know
15	that your search was focused on neural tube
16	defects, but I thought there was some evidence
17	that might influence on a quantitative basis
18	your recommendations coming from the
19	congenital heart disease data, I think in the
20	Canadian study, particularly about the
21	conotruncal abnormalities, ventricular septal
22	defects and a single ventricle disorder.
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1 MEMBER NELSON: Yes. 2 MEMBER PEARSON: So, I was I 3 was wondering if, because relative to where 4 the neural tube defect activity is going, it 5 should also affect the closure of the 6 structures of the heart on an embryologic 7 basis. 8 MEMBER NELSON: Yes. 9 MEMBER NELSON: So, I think 10 MEMBER NELSON: So, I think 11 12 MEMBER PEARSON: will influence 13 some of your decisions about the, say, the 14 quantity of the fortification, which is my 15 second question, is is it I would agree 16 with your conclusions that the fortification 17 has been a success. 18 The question is, there seems to be 19 a lingering discussion of should we go 20 further, so it becomes not a qualitative one, 21 whether or not this has been good, but a 22 quantitative one about should the		66
 was wondering if, because relative to where the neural tube defect activity is going, it should also affect the closure of the structures of the heart on an embryologic basis. MEMBER NELSON: Yes. MEMBER PEARSON: So, I think MEMBER NELSON: I think that will MEMBER PEARSON: will influence some of your decisions about the, say, the quantity of the fortification, which is my second question, is is it I would agree with your conclusions that the fortification has been a success. The question is, there seems to be a lingering discussion of should we go further, so it becomes not a qualitative one, whether or not this has been good, but a quantitative one about should the 	1	MEMBER NELSON: Yes.
 the neural tube defect activity is going, it should also affect the closure of the structures of the heart on an embryologic basis. MEMBER NELSON: Yes. MEMBER PEARSON: So, I think MEMBER NELSON: I think that will MEMBER PEARSON: will influence some of your decisions about the, say, the quantity of the fortification, which is my second question, is is it I would agree with your conclusions that the fortification has been a success. The question is, there seems to be a lingering discussion of should we go further, so it becomes not a qualitative one, whether or not this has been good, but a Quantitative one about should the 	2	MEMBER PEARSON: So, I was I
 the neural tube defect activity is going, it should also affect the closure of the structures of the heart on an embryologic basis. MEMBER NELSON: Yes. MEMBER PEARSON: So, I think MEMBER NELSON: I think that will MEMBER PEARSON: will influence some of your decisions about the, say, the quantity of the fortification, which is my second question, is is it I would agree with your conclusions that the fortification has been a success. The question is, there seems to be a lingering discussion of should we go further, so it becomes not a qualitative one, whether or not this has been good, but a Quantitative one about should the 	3	was wondering if, because relative to where
 should also affect the closure of the structures of the heart on an embryologic basis. MEMBER NELSON: Yes. MEMBER PEARSON: So, I think MEMBER NELSON: I think that will MEMBER PEARSON: will influence some of your decisions about the, say, the quantity of the fortification, which is my second question, is is it I would agree with your conclusions that the fortification has been a success. The question is, there seems to be a lingering discussion of should we go further, so it becomes not a qualitative one, whether or not this has been good, but a quantitative one about should the 	4	
 structures of the heart on an embryologic basis. MEMBER NELSON: Yes. MEMBER PEARSON: So, I think MEMBER NELSON: I think that will MEMBER PEARSON: will influence some of your decisions about the, say, the quantity of the fortification, which is my second question, is is it I would agree with your conclusions that the fortification has been a success. The question is, there seems to be a lingering discussion of should we go further, so it becomes not a qualitative one, whether or not this has been good, but a quantitative one about should the 	5	
7 basis. 8 MEMBER NELSON: Yes. 9 MEMBER PEARSON: So, I think 10 MEMBER NELSON: I think that will 11 12 MEMBER PEARSON: will influence 13 some of your decisions about the, say, the 14 quantity of the fortification, which is my 15 second question, is is it I would agree 16 with your conclusions that the fortification 17 has been a success. 18 The question is, there seems to be 19 a lingering discussion of should we go 20 further, so it becomes not a qualitative one, 21 whether or not this has been good, but a 22 Quantitative one about should the		
 MEMBER NELSON: Yes. MEMBER PEARSON: So, I think MEMBER NELSON: I think that will MEMBER PEARSON: will influence some of your decisions about the, say, the quantity of the fortification, which is my second question, is is it I would agree with your conclusions that the fortification has been a success. The question is, there seems to be a lingering discussion of should we go further, so it becomes not a qualitative one, whether or not this has been good, but a quantitative one about should the 		
 MEMBER PEARSON: So, I think MEMBER NELSON: I think that will MEMBER PEARSON: will influence some of your decisions about the, say, the quantity of the fortification, which is my second question, is is it I would agree with your conclusions that the fortification has been a success. The question is, there seems to be a lingering discussion of should we go further, so it becomes not a qualitative one, whether or not this has been good, but a quantitative one about should the 		
10 MEMBER NELSON: I think that will 11 12 MEMBER PEARSON: will influence 13 some of your decisions about the, say, the 14 quantity of the fortification, which is my 15 second question, is is it I would agree 16 with your conclusions that the fortification 17 has been a success. 18 The question is, there seems to be 19 a lingering discussion of should we go 20 further, so it becomes not a qualitative one, 21 whether or not this has been good, but a 22 quantitative one about should the		
 11 12 MEMBER PEARSON: will influence 13 some of your decisions about the, say, the 14 quantity of the fortification, which is my 15 second question, is is it I would agree 16 with your conclusions that the fortification 17 has been a success. 18 The question is, there seems to be 19 a lingering discussion of should we go 20 further, so it becomes not a qualitative one, 21 whether or not this has been good, but a 22 quantitative one about should the 		
12 MEMBER PEARSON: will influence 13 some of your decisions about the, say, the 14 quantity of the fortification, which is my 15 second question, is is it I would agree 16 with your conclusions that the fortification 17 has been a success. 18 The question is, there seems to be 19 a lingering discussion of should we go 20 further, so it becomes not a qualitative one, 21 whether or not this has been good, but a 22 quantitative one about should the		MEMBER NELSON: I think that will
 13 some of your decisions about the, say, the 14 quantity of the fortification, which is my 15 second question, is is it I would agree 16 with your conclusions that the fortification 17 has been a success. 18 The question is, there seems to be 19 a lingering discussion of should we go 20 further, so it becomes not a qualitative one, 21 whether or not this has been good, but a 22 quantitative one about should the 	11	
 quantity of the fortification, which is my second question, is is it I would agree with your conclusions that the fortification has been a success. The question is, there seems to be a lingering discussion of should we go further, so it becomes not a qualitative one, whether or not this has been good, but a quantitative one about should the 	12	MEMBER PEARSON: will influence
15 second question, is is it I would agree 16 with your conclusions that the fortification 17 has been a success. 18 The question is, there seems to be 19 a lingering discussion of should we go 20 further, so it becomes not a qualitative one, 21 whether or not this has been good, but a 22 quantitative one about should the NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS	13	some of your decisions about the, say, the
 with your conclusions that the fortification has been a success. The question is, there seems to be a lingering discussion of should we go further, so it becomes not a qualitative one, whether or not this has been good, but a quantitative one about should the 	14	quantity of the fortification, which is my
 17 has been a success. 18 The question is, there seems to be 19 a lingering discussion of should we go 20 further, so it becomes not a qualitative one, 21 whether or not this has been good, but a 22 quantitative one about should the NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS	15	second question, is is it I would agree
18The question is, there seems to be19a lingering discussion of should we go20further, so it becomes not a qualitative one,21whether or not this has been good, but a22quantitative one about should theNEAL R. GROSSCOURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS	16	with your conclusions that the fortification
19a lingering discussion of should we go20further, so it becomes not a qualitative one,21whether or not this has been good, but a22quantitative one about should theNEAL R. GROSSCOURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS	17	has been a success.
20 further, so it becomes not a qualitative one, 21 whether or not this has been good, but a 22 quantitative one about should the NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS	18	The question is, there seems to be
21 whether or not this has been good, but a 22 quantitative one about should the NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS	19	a lingering discussion of should we go
22 quantitative one about should the NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS	20	further, so it becomes not a qualitative one,
NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS	21	whether or not this has been good, but a
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS	22	quantitative one about should the
(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com		COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

fortification be even more. Would you comment
 on that.

MEMBER NELSON: Boy, I'm hesitant to really answer that question because I don't think that we, as a committee, might be the right committee to answer that.

7 One of the things that we know happened with the -- right at the mandatory 8 folate fortification time is that, in fact, it 9 10 was probably double to triple or somewhere -very high levels of fortification, it 11 was because the manufacturers were worried they 12 13 were going to not meet the targets.

And then, in fact, if you look at 14 15 serial blood, there are a couple of these --16 when looking at the blood levels, there are a couple of studies that actually looked at just 17 before, just during the first couple of years, 18 19 and then after, you see an increase and then you actually see a coming down. 20 So the highest levels were within those two years. 21

I'm hesitant to answer that

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

22

www.nealrgross.com

question, whether there should be more. 1 My 2 bias reading this would be at the moment, I'm always worried about the risk/benefit ratio, 3 and I would say probably not. 4 But one of the things I should 5 say, one question that we attempted to answer 6 7 was actually -- which I don't have here, was the impact of folate fortification on coronary 8 heart disease, and there were no -- there were 9 10 no data. So, we didn't answer it. But, I will take a look at what 11 you're talking about before. 12 13 MEMBER FUKAGAWA: Mim, I'd like to make a comment addressing Tom's concern about 14 15 congenital heart disease. 16 MEMBER NELSON: Yes. MEMBER FUKAGAWA: But one of the 17 other considerations we have to think about 18 19 are the epigenetic changes that might be induced by higher methyl group intake in the 20 form of folate. 21 think 22 And that's question Ι а **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1 that's not yet answered. It certainly has 2 been investigated in animal studies, and would be a consideration. 3 MEMBER NELSON: Yes. But, I don't 4 know, Tom, maybe I should ask you. Do you 5 6 think -- I mean, do you know anything I don't 7 know about whether we should actually be fortifying with more folate? 8 Well, around the MEMBER PEARSON: 9 10 time there had been, relative to some population-based folate levels, I believe, 11 some consideration of a further reduction from 12 13 the -- say 50 percent or so reduction in neural tube defects and anencephaly, 14 even 15 further. MEMBER NELSON: Right. 16 PEARSON: Because 17 MEMBER the randomized control trials, I think, of high-18 19 risk groups, you know, the folate story is absolutely textbook, a case of causal --20 MEMBER NELSON: Right. 21 22 MEMBER PEARSON: -- inference. **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

All the pieces are there.

1

2 MEMBER NELSON: Yes. MEMBER PEARSON: And even though 3 public health 4 there is а piece, the epidemiologic, ecologic piece 5 there, the question still remains whether you could get 6 down to the levels of folate that you get with 7 a supplementation strategy with women who are 8 planning childbirth --9 10 MEMBER NELSON: Right. MEMBER PEARSON: -- in which you 11 tube large reductions in neural 12 get very 13 defects, whether or not you're achieving that with a fortification policy. 14 MEMBER NELSON: Yes. 15 16 MEMBER PEARSON: And I think this is --17 MEMBER NELSON: Yes. 18 19 MEMBER PEARSON: -- so it's not a scientific --20 MEMBER NELSON: Right. 21 MEMBER PEARSON: -- question, it's 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

almost an implementation issue about should be supplementing more, as part of our charge looking at the American diet.

MEMBER NELSON: Yes. I think it's 4 worthy to continue doing research on 5 the 6 impact. There's different ways to look at 7 this, but to look at it before we change it, there's -- it wasn't -- it was -- the initial 8 -- the monitoring research projects were not 9 10 well-designed before the fortification went into play, and so -- which is unfortunate, 11 because this was something -- we're going into 12 13 a national experiment, and all of these should have been set up better, and I think we need 14 to -- you know, there's still more work that 15 16 needs to be done on the existing fortification. 17

Larry.

19 MEMBER APPEL: Yes. Hi. I'll 20 take you off the hot seat. I want to --21 Shelly, I have a question for you, and it has 22 nothing to do with nutrient adequacy, even

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

18

1	though that's the name of your phosphate
2	and phosphorous I mean phosphorous.
3	It seems that is there a public
4	health issue that is lurking that we haven't
5	really dealt with, which is that not
6	inadequate, but excessive intakes you know,
7	I think, you know, we'll come to this in
8	electrolyte, but sodium, you know, phosphate
9	is now being added to a lot of meats, and we
10	have a, you know, kidney disease epidemic, and
11	with a lot of people consuming large amounts
12	of, you know, phosphorous that they might not
13	be aware of.
14	I don't know, did that was
15	there a you listed it more as a possible
16	short-fall in children, but I'm thinking of it
17	more as a potential serious a potential but
18	unknown I'll put that "unknown" health
19	problem in the adult population.
20	MEMBER NICKOLS-RICHARDSON: This
21	is Shelly Nickols-Richardson. In response to
22	that from our dietary intake data, it is just
	NEAL R. GROSS
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1	that one adolescent female group that there
2	appears to be, you know, a short-fall nutrient
3	related to phosphorous.
4	So, I don't think it's a large
5	concern. I don't think that there's a public
6	health concern in relation to a positive
7	health outcome.
8	We will be looking at abundance
9	nutrients next. That's one of our next steps,
10	and I don't know that we had really thought
11	about phosphorous as maybe in light of
12	abundance-type nutrient in relation to health
13	outcomes, but I think we could add it to the
14	list of those that we consider and take a look
15	at it from that perspective.
16	MEMBER APPEL: I guess that if you
17	do that, too, you just my own experience is
18	that nutrient databases are pretty inadequate,
19	and you might get a misleading result that you
20	think it's not a problem because it all adds
21	up, and it seems to be relatively low, but
22	there are so many missing values when we try

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

to attempt to understand our diets and our feeding studies, that it might appear normal or low, but really actually be quite high when you take into account all sources.

NICKOLS-RICHARDSON: 5 MEMBER Shelly, again, and that's a great point. Ι 6 7 think when we consider, you know, much of the dietary intake data, that there are 8 some limitations to that, putting them 9 in the 10 context of what are the -- I'm not sure that they are biochemical data to support this, but 11 what are the other public health issues of 12 13 concern, and maybe doing an exploratory search that would lead making 14 us toward some 15 decisions about that, but it's certainly something we could take a look at. 16

Shelly -- this is 17 CHAIR VAN HORN: Linda Van Horn. I think the other topic that 18 19 came up during discussions within this subcommittee related to the whole issue of 20 supplement use, indiscriminate, I guess 21 Ι should say, supplement use, especially among 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

certain segments of the population, and in this case, particularly the elderly who, of course, are at higher risk for development of something like colon cancer.

think it was certainly a 5 And Ι telling moment to me, personally, but I would 6 7 imagine we all would want to continue to keep in mind that what perhaps we used to think of 8 as a kind of benign activity, i.e., taking 9 10 vitamin, mineral supplements individually or, you know, complex, may not necessarily be as 11 benign as we think in the context of food 12 13 fortification, and there may be reason to consider studying those kinds of questions to 14 15 make that we're not overnourishing sure 16 certain segments of the population, and then placing them at risk. 17

So, I think, as this group continues to go forward and as the studies move ahead, we should continue to keep that very important question in mind, and plan our studies to be specific about assessing not

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

only diet, but also supplement use so we can
 take a look at that.

MEMBER NELSON: Linda, if I could 3 This is Mim Nelson. 4 just comment on that. During our Webinars that we had in helping us 5 to inform our work on the folic acid 6 7 supplementation, fortification, et cetera, all of our experts, it seemed to me, and those 8 that were on the call can hopefully agree or 9 10 disagree with me, but that, in fact, multivitamin B supplement, supplementation for 11 older adults was not advised, specifically 12 13 because that's where the problems come in, not with the fortification, not with basic folate 14 15 that's in the foods, but the problem is much 16 more with actual B vitamin supplementation, and in the very high levels. 17 So, Ι think what 18

So, I think what you -- you reminded me about that, and I'll make note of that.

21 MEMBER NICKOLS-RICHARDSON: Okay. 22 And we will move on with the rest of the

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

nutrient adequacy information. Let's get to
 our appropriate slide here.

Okay. So now we're going to shift to questions that were investigated by food pattern modeling, because these questions were more appropriately addressed by modeling scenarios, rather than through literature searches.

And in the next three modeling 9 10 questions that we discussed, for each of these modeling analyses, there specific 11 was а methodology that was developed and approved by 12 the subcommittee. 13

14 So, as we go through these 15 different -- these three different modeling 16 analyses, you'll see that there were very 17 different approaches taken for them.

18Cheryl's going to begin with the19first question related to the vegetable20subgroups.

21 MEMBER ACHTERBERG: Thank you,
22 Shelly. Cheryl Achterberg here. This is a

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

very different kind of research question, where we're actually investigating whether or not the current food group patterning or categories is effective, and what would it look like if we made some adjustments.

So, the first food pattern 6 7 modeling question was designed to address the vegetable subgroups and current patterns of 8 intake, and more specifically the question is 9 10 "What revisions to the vegetable subgroups, including with such tomatoes 11 as orange vegetables and leafy lettuce with dark green 12 13 vegetables may help to highlight vegetables of importance and allow recommendations for 14 15 intake levels that are achievable -- that's by 16 the general public -- without compromising the nutrient adequacy of the patterns themselves. 17

This current concern -- I'm sorry. I went the wrong way there. This current concern is that the other vegetable subgroup contributes the greatest proportion to overall vegetable intake in the US diet, but the

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

www.nealrgross.com

recommendation for orange vegetables is much
 greater than consumption.

For example, the recommendations 3 are nine times greater for girls and 14 times 4 greater for boys than median intakes. 5 Orange 6 vegetables currently count for four percent of the, 7 vegetable consumption, while quote, "other vegetable" subgroup accounts for 55 8 And tomatoes, alone account for 22.3 9 percent. 10 percent of total vegetable consumption.

Giving more recognition to tomatoes will make vegetable consumption recommendations more realistic and highlight a good source of specific short-fall nutrients.

Therefore, the rationale for 16 examining potential changes in the vegetable 17 subgroups structure is four-fold: to decrease 18 19 the wide discrepancy between the largest vegetable subgroup, "other vegetables," 20 and the smallest vegetable subgroup, 21 orange vegetables; to provide more focus on tomatoes, 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

15

1	now part of the "other vegetable" group,
2	orange vegetable group, as a vegetable choice
3	in recognition of their nutrient
4	contributions.
5	Did I skip something?
6	MEMBER NICKOLS-RICHARDSON: Just
7	go back one.
8	MEMBER ACHTERBERG: Yes, I'm
9	sorry. To facilitate development we'll
10	call this number three for now to
11	facilitate development of food intake patterns
12	that meet nutritional recommendations, within
13	calorie needs and are realistic and similar to
14	proportions selected by consumers.
15	And the forth rationale, to
16	encourage increased vegetable consumption and
17	selection of a variety of vegetables to meet
18	nutrient needs through guidance that is both
19	understood and achievable by consumers.
20	To cut to the chase, the vegetable
21	subgroups were realigned. The results are
22	that the food item clusters changed somewhat.
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1	And, as you can see, orange shifted now to
2	red-orange vegetables, subgroup emerged.
3	Butterhead lettuce and bok choy
4	shifted to the dark green subgroup, and the
5	consumption of orange-red vegetables, when
6	tomatoes are included substantially increases.
7	So, red-orange vegetables, when
8	tomatoes are included, is a new subgroup we
9	have introduced and consumption is
10	substantially increased in that particular
11	group.
12	The overall vegetable
13	recommendation does not change. That is two
14	and a half cup equivalents per day. With the
15	realignment, the new recommendations are
16	within the 95th percentile of usual intake for
17	almost all age, sex categories, while still a
18	large increase above the median, the change
19	required may be more achievable than the
20	change required for meeting current targets.
21	In terms of nutrient adequacy, the
22	overall nutrient adequacy of the new patterns
	NEAL R. GROSSCOURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.(202) 234-4433WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701www.nealrgross.com

1	is essentially the same as the old patterns.
2	Shifting now to conclusions. The
3	proposed revision of the vegetable subgroups
4	results in expanding to the new red-orange
5	vegetable subgroup with only minor changes in
6	the dark-green, leafy and broccoli subgroup.
7	And these proposed new amounts are
8	more achievable than existing recommendations
9	while meeting nutrient adequacy and staying
10	within an individual's calorie needs.
11	MEMBER NICKOLS-RICHARDSON: Okay.
12	Thank you, Cheryl. This is Shelly Nickols-
12 13	Thank you, Cheryl. This is Shelly Nickols- Richardson again. Our second question related
13	Richardson again. Our second question related
13 14	Richardson again. Our second question related to modeling, dealt with "How well do USDA food
13 14 15	Richardson again. Our second question related to modeling, dealt with "How well do USDA food intake patterns using updated food intake and
13 14 15 16	Richardson again. Our second question related to modeling, dealt with "How well do USDA food intake patterns using updated food intake and nutrient data meet DRI's and potential 2010
13 14 15 16 17	Richardson again. Our second question related to modeling, dealt with "How well do USDA food intake patterns using updated food intake and nutrient data meet DRI's and potential 2010 Dietary Guideline nutrient recommendations.
13 14 15 16 17 18	Richardson again. Our second question related to modeling, dealt with "How well do USDA food intake patterns using updated food intake and nutrient data meet DRI's and potential 2010 Dietary Guideline nutrient recommendations. And part of the reason for
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Richardson again. Our second question related to modeling, dealt with "How well do USDA food intake patterns using updated food intake and nutrient data meet DRI's and potential 2010 Dietary Guideline nutrient recommendations. And part of the reason for conducting the vegetable subgroup modeling

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

vegetable subgroups, and then looking at how well do these patterns, based on the USDA Dietary Guidelines meet requirements.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

22

(202) 234-4433

This modeling analysis was actually conducted in 2005 as well for the Dietary Guidelines, and the approach to the modeling analysis was that appropriate energy levels for food intake patterns were identified based on the DRI formulas for estimated energy requirements.

11 Next step was that nutritional 12 goals for these patterns were set for nine 13 vitamins, eight minerals, six macronutrients, 14 and the acceptable macronutrient distribution 15 range for five macronutrients, and then based 16 on age, sex groups.

Food groups were established in amounts of nutrients obtained by consuming various combinations of foods were determined and nutrient levels in each pattern were evaluated against nutritional goals.

To update this modeling analysis

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

M

for the 2010 Dietary Guidelines, more recent 1 2 and detailed food consumption and nutrient content data were used. All foods reported 3 the 2003-2004 4 consumed from NHANES were assigned to appropriate food item clusters and 5 an ideal -- ideal being a nutrient-dense form 6 representative food was selected for each item 7 Nutrient profiles for each food 8 cluster. group or subgroup were then calculated. 9

10 The vegetable subgroup realignment analysis was used again, and calories and 11 nutrients provided by each pattern from the 12 13 nutrient profiles and recommended intake data calculated, finally, nutritional 14 were and 15 qoals that were or were not met were 16 identified.

For all food patterns, when using 17 calories the nutrients and from ideal 18 19 representative foods, again, those are foods that are in their nutrient-dense forms. 20 The sum of the calories from recommended amounts 21 each food group in oils, which 22 of are

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

considered essential calories, was less than
 the caloric goal for the pattern.

The remaining calories were assigned to the discretionary calorie allowance.

5 So, the 12 USDA food patterns meet 7 almost all of their nutritional goals for 8 adequacy. Many nutrients in the patterns are 9 well above the RDA or AI, such as protein, 10 selenium, riboflavin, copper and vitamin B12.

Some nutrients are within 90 to 12 110 percent of the RDA or AI, such as iron for 13 women age 19 to 50 years of age, or calcium 14 for adolescent girls.

Three nutrient adequacy goals are not met, including vitamin E and choline as well as potassium in patterns at the lower calorie levels. However, these patterns meet almost all nutrient goals for moderation.

20		As	an	example,	the	USDA	food
21	pattern	for	1400	calories	incl	udes	1,255
22	essential	са	lories	based	on	the	ideal

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

representative food pattern modeling analysis
 with 145 discretionary calories.

This example highlights that 3 consumption of nutrient-dense foods within the 4 guidance of the USDA food patterns can meet 5 6 the vast majority of nutrient requirements with some discretionary calories available so 7 that further nutrient-dense foods or other 8 food items can also contribute to nutrient 9 10 qoals.

So the proposed conclusion here is that nutrient needs can be met by consuming the USDA pattern of eating that includes a defined energy intake level for an individual.

15 Then, the food next pattern modeling question that is of interest is, 16 "What is the impact on caloric and nutrient 17 if intake, the USDA food patterns 18 are 19 followed, but typical, rather than the ideal representative choices are made?" 20

21 So, this question then looks at 22 what are Americans currently doing and how

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

11

12

13

14

www.nealrgross.com

1	does that compare to these ideal food choices.
2	As with the USDA food patterns,
3	modeling analysis, all foods reported consumed
4	from the 2003-2004 NHANES were assigned to
5	appropriate food item clusters, and the
6	typical food consumed, which was usually the
7	top contributor to intake from each item
8	cluster was selected as the typical
9	representative food.
10	Nutrient profiles for each food
11	group or subgroup or were calculated.
12	Calorie, sodium, cholesterol and saturated
13	fatty acid levels for nutrient profiles using
14	ideal and typical food choices were compared,
15	and excesses and deficiencies in the typical
16	choices pattern compared to ideal choices in
17	the standard were identified.
18	Calories, sodium and saturated
19	fatty acids in most food groups increased when
20	typical versus ideal food choices were
21	included in the model.
22	Typical food choices that
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

contributed to these higher levels included 1 2 foods from all food groups, so across all of food groups, these typical choices 3 our contributed to the higher levels. 4 of these higher levels 5 Must of calories, sodium and saturated fatty acids had 6 to do with selection of processed foods, 7 methods of preparation, such as frying of 8 foods or inclusion of added sugar and whole 9 10 fat foods. Calorie levels per cup or 11 ounce equivalent were up to 50 calories higher when 12 typical rather than ideal food choices were 13 So, if typical food choices 14 made. were 15 continually made, moderation qoals for 16 calories, total fat, saturated fat, cholesterol and sodium would not be met. 17 So, a proposed conclusion is that 18 19 typical food choices do not substantially affect nutrient adequacy goals, so nutrient 20 requirements are with typical foods, 21 met typical foods tend however higher, 22 to be

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2 sodium and cholesterol, compared to the ideal nutrient-dense food selected for the USDA food 3 pattern models. 4 example, the 2000 calorie 5 For pattern contains over 2400, or about 400 more 6 7 calories if all food choices are typical food rather than nutrient-dense choices food 8 choices as modeled in the USDA food intake 9 10 pattern. I'm going to go ahead and go on to 11 our next -- next step slide, knowing that 12 we'll come back for discussion on the modeling 13 question. for nutrient 14 So, next steps 15 adequacy subcommittee include now moving into 16 food groups of concern. We've looked at the nutrients and 17 we'll continue some work with the nutrients of 18 19 concern, but we want to move into those food We'll also be looking at abundance 20 groups. foods or nutrients of concern and can keep 21 some of the comments in mind from today. 22

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

NEAL R. GROSS

again, in calories, total fat, saturated fat,

(202) 234-4433

1

www.nealrgross.com

Vitamin D will be a specific question, and we're moving forward with that. Breakfast intake and meeting nutrient needs is part of a larger question that's being addressed by several subcommittees.

Looking at the question of 6 7 nutrient supplements was sort of our fundamental premise of foods 8 first, then taking a look at nutrient supplements only for 9 10 specific intake patterns and age, gender in groups and looking at this light 11 of nutrients for specific age groups. 12

We have some more modeling work to be done looking at substituting whole grains for enriched grains and Linda did mention we would present that today, but we're holding that until the next meeting to have some other pieces that go along with that from other subcommittees.

Then, also looking at vegan patterns, milk and milk products, nutrients from starchy vegetables compared to grains and

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

www.nealrgross.com

1 additional food patterns and nutrient 2 adequacy. So, some additional modeling that needs to be done. 3 So, I'll open the discussion up 4 for questions related to the modeling. 5 MEMBER PEREZ-ESCAMILLA: I have a 6 7 question for Cheryl or -- Cheryl, and thank you very much for a very nice presentation. 8 And this question is related to 9 10 the issue of adding tomatoes to the orange-red group because I think it is important to have 11 an understanding of the food products that are 12 13 contributing the most to tomato intake in different age groups in the US, because if we 14 15 allow for catsup and processed pasta sauces 16 and so on that are very high in sodium, do we count it? 17 I'm not sure if we did a benefit-18 19 risk analysis how that would come out. Thank you for 20 MEMBER ACHTERBERG: the question. I feel confident in staying 21 that catsup is not a huge contributor to this 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

food group, but we have been doing the modeling and looking specifically at the particular foods, and I think, in fact, in the typical diet modeling study, we have the specific info on what tomato products are consumed.

7 Marinara sauce is high in that respect. If you were wondering about a tomato 8 sauce, and we have separated plain tomato 9 10 sauce from the marinara sauce which also, incidentally, contains added fats, but be that 11 as it may, we have all of those data and we 12 13 can speak to those data.

the first modeling question 14 But difference would 15 what it make if was we 16 restructured the way that vegetables were categorized so that we could 17 speak more directly to the public about the consumption 18 19 of those vegetables.

20 MEMBER RIMM: This is Eric Rimm. 21 I mean, just to add to that comment, Rafael, I 22 think it is a really important point, but I

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

think it needs to be taken in the context ofall the guidelines.

If we have quidelines saying that 3 sodium should be reduced and the fat that's in 4 the food should be monosaturated tomato, then 5 you could make a tomato sauce that contributes 6 7 to the red vegetables, contributes to low sodium and contributes to monounsaturated 8 fats. So, in defense of tomato sauce. 9

10 CHAIR VAN HORN: I would just like to congratulate the group on the work done so 11 far, recognizing just how complex all these 12 questions are. But I also would like to just 13 sort of remind ourselves as we go forward with 14 15 this discussion today, tomorrow, that we'll 16 repeatedly remind ourselves of the obesity epidemic that we have currently underway. 17

And I think everything that Shelly 18 19 and her group has done in regard to recognizing that lower energy intake is lower 20 be necessary for the majority of 21 to the American public as we go ahead. 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1	The value of energy density
2	becomes even more apparent because making
3	proper selections within each of those food
4	groups really becomes essential in a reduced
5	calorie environment, and so the food modeling
6	that is going on, and all of the effort to try
7	to come up with recommendations at various
8	calorie levels will be just really invaluable,
9	I would think, for the public as they try to
10	work their way through these choices and still
11	meet all their nutrient goals.
12	So, you know, the point that Eric
13	just made about, you know, pasta sauce that
14	makes a lot of different contributions in one
15	felled swoop will become more and more
16	important because meeting those nutrient needs
17	within a limited calorie intake will become
18	something that everyone in this country should
19	be more conscious of.
20	MEMBER ACHTERBERG: This is
21	Cheryl, if I could add to that. And, thank
22	you, Linda.
	NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Ι think this may be the first 2 committee that's really taking in hand to what the realities of average intakes as they are 3 in trying to figure how to move them in the 4 direction that's desired. 5 And that was the impetus behind a 6 7 lot of this food modeling. Acknowledging what exists, where it is, and then trying to figure 8 out how do we shift it in the direction that 9 10 we think is desirable. Cheryl, this is a MEMBER PEARSON: 11 directed view of maybe the entire committee, 12 and we've had a number of issues from the 13 fatty acid group relative to the probability 14 15 that some of our models may not show adequacy 16 in choline, and it looks like you've had that kind of across the board in many instances. 17 it would certainly Ι quess be 18 19 helpful to us in our fatty acid committee to get an idea of really the significance of the 20 choline recommendation, how definite those 21 22 are.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1	I had been led to believe that
2	these were perhaps still a little bit sketchy
3	in terms of compared to the nutrient adequacy
4	data we have for many other things, and that
5	would be very helpful for us to know that so
6	that we don't basically have kind of the tail
7	wag the dog here in terms of the a
8	relatively minor issue, actually starting to
9	control something that such as saturated
10	fat or cholesterol content, which obviously
11	are big issues.
12	MEMBER ACHTERBERG: Yes, thanks
13	Tom, for the question. It looks like I am
14	going to punt to Shelly.
15	MEMBER NICKOLS-RICHARDSON: Well,
16	I am not sure that I am receiving that ball
17	yet but I will say this is Shelly that
18	when we look at choline, obviously, there's a
19	particular food source that is abundant in
20	choline. That presents a problem for
21	cholesterol.
22	That when we look at this as being
	NEAL R. GROSSCOURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.(202) 234-4433WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701www.nealrgross.com

a nutrient of concern for certain subgroups, 1 2 probably looking we're at women childbearing age, and then potentially 3 older population. 4 So, it will not likely fall across 5 the entire population of all age ranges. 6 And the evidence 7 MEMBER PEARSON: for those concerns are strong enough to --8 NICKOLS-RICHARDSON: 9 MEMBER 10 is Shelly again. The evidence for those concerns is not at the same level of -- I 11 don't think we have the ability to conduct a 12 13 NEL search at this point. We have done some soft searches, if you will, some exploratory 14 15 searches, and the evidence that is there is 16 not as robust as what we have been able to do for some of the other questions. 17 So, I -- we don't plan at this 18 19 point to have a NEL process to go along with that, but it's more a cautionary note for 20 certain subgroups. 21 This 22 MEMBER SLAVIN: is Joanne **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

97

of

an

This

1 here. Ι just wanted to mention, it's an adequate intake for choline, so it isn't --2 you know, it's not -- so I think we do want to 3 acknowledge that, so it's similar to fiber 4 where we have and adequate intake as far as 5 the DRI, so I think we need to make sure that 6 7 if we're not meeting it, that we address it. MEMBER APPEL: Yes, Larry Appel. 8 That was great. I -- in terms of just one 9 10 comment, could dark-green be just plain green vegetables, you know, because I think you're 11 now moving some other --12 13 MEMBER ACHTERBERG: Okay. The perennial problem. This is Cheryl. 14 The 15 perennial problem with green beans. Their nutrient profile doesn't align with the other 16 dark-green vegetables. 17 MEMBER APPEL: So what are you 18 19 going to put, like lettuce? Is that --MEMBER ACHTERBERG: It's not dark-20 green, either, although the dark-green leafy 21 lettuces are good. So, so the iceberg lettuce 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

has fewer nutrients of interest here. It's basically water, but some of the darker-green leafy lettuces grouped in the dark-green leafy vegetable group do have the nutrients of interest.

MEMBER APPEL: You know, it might 6 7 be helpful to see sort of side-by-side, you 8 know, old system, new system to understand, you know, how these sorted out, and I think 9 10 there is a -- I mean, I just -- I'm having a difficulty understanding it little bit of 11 myself, somebody who 12 doesn't reallv as understand --13

MEMBER ACHTERBERG: Sure.

15 MEMBER APPEL: -- where all the 16 greens --

MEMBER ACHTERBERG: actually 17 We have, in essence a white paper written, and I 18 19 think the suggestion is that these papers would be attached as appendices in the report. 20 MEMBER NELSON: Sorry, this is 21 Mim. I agree. I agree. I think it might be 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

14

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

helpful to very succinctly and clearly sort of describe the old and the new system and what things fit in, but which would -- I'm assuming would be done anyway.

So, beyond just a white paper, but 5 actually in the question -- yes, just to 6 7 clarify. But, as long as I have the speaker for a second, I just want to really commend 8 Trish. The typical diet modeling, I think, 9 you know, I echo some other voices around 10 here. 11

I think it was incredibly helpful 12 13 because what it really, really showed, and I think we've got to hammer it home, is that 14 15 when people are meeting their nutrient needs, 16 the typical American, the way that they're meeting them to get these food groups is 17 2000 calorie diet they're they're, for а 18 19 getting 2400 calories, which is significant, and I just -- it's really -- I think it's 20 really important that we highlight this. 21

MEMBER APPEL: Yes, to tell you --

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

22

1 this is Larry Appel again. Actually, this was the main question I was going to raise, is 2 that when I looked at the -- what at least the 3 summary here is the substitution between ideal 4 and typical was not meant to be isocaloric, 5 which I think is a key issue, you know. 6 7 And so, the question that I would have -- I mean, you're changing -- your doing 8 two things. One, you're letting the type of 9 10 food change, but also the total caloric intake. 11 You know, so then saturated fat, 12 13 sodium and cholesterol will go up, as well as actually the nutrients. A possibility. 14 So, I'm just wondering what -- you 15 know, this gets at the heart of what the type 16 of modeling should be. Should it. 17 be isocaloric, or should it be, you know, let it 18 19 float a little bit, you know, and I really --20 MEMBER NELSON: But my sense is -my sense is the ideal was we can design, or we 21 -- as in the modeling, the global "we" can --22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 this is Mim Nelson again -- that you can 2 design with ideal foods really nutrient-dense 3 wonderful diet.

So, it's -- and they were done at different caloric levels, and that's what Shelly presented. And I think that the -what we wanted to see was, okay, well, these are ideal and these are great and we actually can and we should be able to meet our nutrient needs with eating real foods.

But what are Americans actually 11 eating, and how does that -- if you put that 12 13 screen over it, what does it look like for these food groups to -- I think that that is 14 15 the right -- if you -- the other thing is, 16 without а doubt, if you then did it isocalorically, I'm assuming by just the math, 17 if you do it isocalorically, you're going to 18 19 be deficient in the food groups because you'd be eating a lot less of each of the things in 20 order to make that calorie. 21

22

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

MEMBER APPEL: But I guess I'm --

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

and I don't want to be a devil's -- I actually 1 2 don't think it's being a devil's advocate. Ι think that, in reality people are eating those 3 typical foods, but it's not -- I don't know 4 the extent of the calorie, how many more 5 6 calories, but the likelihood, you know, if 7 people are just, you know, for the obesity, given the obesity epidemic, that's probably 8 only like 50 to 100 calories, you know, on 9 average that's contributed. 10 MEMBER NELSON: No. 11 So, if that's the MEMBER APPEL: 12 13 case -- per day. So if that's the case, then do we, you know, how many calories more per 14 day --15 16 MEMBER NELSON: Over 400. MEMBER APPEL: Over 400. 17 That's impossible. It's impossible. So, I think --18 19 MEMBER NELSON: But Trish is shaking -- Trish is shaking her head. 20 Maybe 21 _ _ Could I MEMBER ACHTERBERG: 22 _ _ **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1	this is Cheryl. Could I speak, please.
2	Because I think it has not been widely
3	recognized that when the food guide pyramid
4	was put together, and the recommendations
5	made, they were made on the basis of a so-
6	called representative food items, which were
7	the most extreme, the most nutrient-dense
8	choices within each of those food groups.
9	So, comparing the most nutrient-
10	dense food item choices to the typical intake
11	is that gives us that 400-calorie spread on a
12	daily basis on a 2000 calorie diet.
13	So, the exercise to evaluate the
14	typical intake, I think was extremely
15	important to show us, in essence, what the gap
16	is, and to help us consider, as we are framing
17	or reframing advice what we need to be giving
18	our attention most to.
19	Does that make any more sense?
20	MEMBER APPEL: I understand but,
21	you know, neither is realistic. That's the
22	problem. And to have 400 calories more, I
	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1 just don't -- I mean, I think if you did 2 modeling where you somehow ratcheted the calorie -- because I just, for the life of me, 3 4 cannot believe that, you know, people are consuming 400 calories more in real life. 5 And that's what I think you're 6 7 trying to model, closer to real life. So, you might want to say, okay, well, it's not 8 isocaloric, but maybe it's a hundred calories 9 10 more on average when they make bad selections. MEMBER ACHTERBERG: It's 11 not intake data. 12 13 MEMBER APPEL: No, I realize that. MEMBER ACHTERBERG: Yes. 14 MEMBER APPEL: You're trying to 15 model what would likely be happening if people 16 were consuming, you know, the typical choices 17 18 19 MEMBER NICKOLS-RICHARDSON: The top typical choices all the time. So, it's 20 one extreme to the other extreme. 21 So, the reality is probably somewhere in that 400 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 calories.

2	Let me have Trish speak now.
3	Trish is going to say a few comments.
4	MS. BRITTEN: Hi. I think the
5	confusion about the extra 400 calories is that
6	the way we approach the modeling from the
7	staff perspective was what if Americans
8	actually followed all the advice about how
9	much to eat from every food group so that they
10	are actually are eating two and a half cups of
11	vegetables a day, they actually are eating two
12	cups of fruit a day, the three cups of milk,
13	et cetera.
14	But, they didn't get the second
15	half of the message, which is they have to be
16	in nutrient-dense forms. So, we know right
17	now that Americans are not eating two and a
18	half cups of vegetables. They are eating more
19	like a cup to a cup and a half, and about a
20	cup of you know, less than two cups of
21	fruit by a long shot, and less than three cups
22	of milk by a long shot.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	So, that 400-calorie level is the
2	I'm sorry. I'm reminded to say that this
3	is Trish Britten from USDA.
4	So, that 400-calorie difference
5	isn't a difference that actually would happen
6	unless you had a person who said, okay, I'm
7	now I'm going to I haven't been
8	following this, I'm going to follow it, I'm
9	going to eat all of these food groups as
10	recommended, but they are still eating fried
11	chicken and they're still drinking whole milk
12	or two percent milk, and not listening to the
13	rest of the message.
14	So, that's where that difference
15	is. We just wanted to make sure that that
16	we identified the extent of the problem of not
17	getting the whole complete message about
18	following the food patterns.
19	MEMBER ACHTERBERG: So, in essence
20	it establishes both the floor and the ceiling.
21	MS. BRITTEN: Yes.
22	MEMBER ACHTERBERG: Through this
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
	1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

modeling. But what people actually do is
 going to be somewhere in between.

MEMBER APPEL: Yes. The problem 3 is that you're using the term "typical foods," 4 but it's not a typical total intake. 5 And if you made typical foods plus typical intake, 6 7 you probably would get a better idea of -- of what would be happening, you know, in the real 8 world if somebody was --9

MEMBER ACHTERBERG: Point taken.

MS. BRITTEN: Well, we have taken data. This is Trish again. We do have intake data from NHANES. We have -- we know what people are eating, and so that's one point of departure.

But this is another point of departure, looking at what if we're following these recommendations that would, in fact, be nutrient adequacy.

20 MEMBER FUKAGAWA: This is Naomi. 21 I have a question for either Trish or Cheryl. 22 With respect to making the change that you've

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

www.nealrgross.com

1 made with respect to going to red-orange, 2 certainly the other food groups changed, because you're within a finite. 3 impact does that 4 And what have with the movement around between vegetables, 5 6 starches, starchy vegetables, grains, et 7 cetera. The biggest change MS. BRITTEN: 8 it really kind of equalized the 9 was in ___ 10 amount of vegetables and the amount of consumption that came from each one of the 11 subgroups, because the other -- the, quote, 12 13 "other vegetable" subgroup in the old system half of all vegetables 14 represented over 15 consumed and it was kind of a mish-mash of 16 different vegetables. But pulling the tomatoes out, that 17 was the only really big change that was made. 18 19 All the others are minor. I would call them housekeeping. 20 What done is, 21 you've you've established a red-orange group that is about, 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Ι think it's 30 percent of vegetable 2 consumption, but I don't have the numbers in front of me, and a, quote, "other vegetable" 3 group that's about 30 percent. 4 So, things are spread out. 5 The starchy vegetables, the legumes, were not 6 7 changed at all in this modeling, and the darkgreen only changed by finding a couple of 8 dark-green leaves that are similar to 9 the 10 other dark-green leaves, which were the butterhead lettuce and bok choy, putting them 11 in where they belonged, along with the romaine 12

12 In where they belonged, along with the romaine
13 lettuce and the spinach and the collard greens
14 and those things.

15 that of So, was more а 16 housekeeping issue. But the big change was that -- that all of the intake of tomatoes 17 kind of got lost and we had this focus, if you 18 19 look at our vegetable subgroups of orange 20 vegetables, a real focus on essentially four vegetables which only one has any kind of 21 major consumption, and that's carrots. 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

111

1 MEMBER FUKAGAWA: But the actual 2 that they would be consuming did amounts change. 3 The total -- we kept 4 MS. BRITTEN: that constant, because the question really was 5 realigning the vegetable subgroups, 6 not 7 increasing total vegetable consumption above what's now currently recommended. We just 8 shifted the amounts around. 9 10 MEMBER ACHTERBERG: Cheryl Achterberg. So, these calculations were done 11 in cup equivalents. 12 13 MEMBER FUKAGAWA: If they were they did change from 2005 for other things, 14 15 such as peas, dried beans and peas would have 16 gone down. MEMBER ACHTERBERG: Actually, they 17 didn't, but we have all of the data in this 18 19 white paper. I have the numbers all in front of me. You probably don't want me to sit and 20 read them to you, but -- but what we kept 21 constant was the volume of vegetables, and all 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

we did was sort them differently.

1

2	MEMBER PEREZ-ESCAMILLA: Cheryl, I
3	have a question about are you going to be
4	able to model and this is Rafael for
5	families or individuals on a limited budget,
6	the types of food selections that they could
7	make to meet nutrient requirements and stay
8	within caloric requirements and budgetary
9	constraints?
10	MS. BRITTEN: This is Trish. We
11	actually, at USDA have a whole other other
12	set of food plans. They are designed
13	specifically to look at lower income. I think
14	there was a presentation in April or January
15	by by Andi Carlson of our office, and the
16	most famous of our food plans is the Thrifty
17	Food Plan, which is the basis for Food Stamp
18	allotments.
19	It actually used the same food
20	grouping system as as our the patterns
21	you're looking at that are the basis for
22	MyPyramid.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1 And she does a computerized 2 simulation to identify how to put -- meet all the constraints of the amounts 3 that are recommended from each food group and all the 4 nutrient constraints and what foods come up 5 with -- with meeting that at the lowest cost. 6 7 And so, that's what ends up being the Thrifty Food Plan. So, essentially, yes, 8 we do it, and that is updated on a regular 9 10 basis as well. presumably, after these 11 So, out, that will be quidelines are updated 12 13 again, and so people will be able to see foods that are at minimum cost that meet all of the 14 constraints of nutrient adequacy and food 15 16 group recommendations. MEMBER ACHTERBERG: 17 And perhaps just for the sake of clarification -- this is 18 19 Cheryl again -- I'll share a few numbers just to give you a picture of this. 20 dark-green vegetables, So, 5.38 21 percent, red-orange, rounding it now to 27 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 percent, legumes six percent, starchy, 30 2 percent, other, 32 percent. Whereas, the "other" used to be over 50 percent. 3 So, the shift is really out of the 4 "other" and into red-orange. And as Trish 5 described it, almost everything else is 6 7 margins, on the margins and housekeeping. CHAIR VAN HORN: Okav. Other 8 questions or comments in regard to this? 9 10 MEMBER ACHTERBERG: I just have I'm sorry. Go ahead, Xav. 11 one. MEMBER PI-SUNYER: I just wanted 12 13 to clarify, is this a done deal? ACHTERBERG: Cheryl. 14 MEMBER Everything we're presenting today, in the 15 spirit of everything else we're presenting 16 today, I guess are provisional, but it was the 17 basis from which all things flow in terms of 18 19 our other modeling. So, all of our other modeling 20 exercises did so with this regrouping. 21 MEMBER NELSON: So, -- this is Mim 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

little bit of 1 а the same follow-up 2 question. What if we, after, you know, April, that we say that actually it's not, you know, 3 three vegetables a day or whatever the number 4 is, that it should be five or six, does then -5 - do we sort of update the modeling process? 6 7 Is that sort of -- okay. Because, I think we ought to be a 8 little careful, because there may be evidence 9 10 why we want more fruits and vegetables. I don't think MEMBER ACHTERBERG: 11 this would get in the way at all. Rather, you 12 13 know, our preexisting organization, if you people fruits 14 wanted to eat more and 15 vegetables, it was very hard to steer them 16 into anything except other vegetables. But, the choices in that other 17 category essentially equate cucumbers 18 and 19 iceberg lettuce to tomatoes, but from а nutritional point of view, they are very, very 20 different in terms of contributions to the 21 diet. And that's what we were trying to take 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 into account.

2	MEMBER NICKOLS-RICHARDSON: And
3	this is Shelly. Just for the record, we were
4	nodding head. The answer to Mim's question is
5	yes.
6	MEMBER NELSON: Okay.
7	CHAIR VAN HORN: And maybe just to
8	kind of summarize the discussion that we just
9	had, I'm looking again at your slide, talking
10	about the nutrients of concern, and the short-
11	fall nutrients which in both adults and
12	children, you know, A, C, D, E, K, you know,
13	calcium, magnesium, potassium and dietary
14	fiber.
15	Well, obviously, very many of
16	those would be accommodated if there was a
17	greater intake of fruits and vegetables across
18	the entire population. So, as we continue to
19	go forward and as Trish continues to do her
20	modeling, I think, once again, in an obese
21	environment, we're looking at ways to enhance
22	nutrient density without increasing calories.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

And so, you know, making choices within this new configuration is more likely to result in nutrient adequacy where these nutrients are concerned.

addition, you 5 And in know, initiating that, I think is really where we 6 7 would like to see people go. There's no question that the kinds of things we'll be 8 recommending mean some differences, mean some 9 10 changes that we're advocating here that people, children, families, policies, 11 we'll 12 need to make, not only to meet those 13 nutrients, but also to address the obesity problem. 14

15 So, I believe that what we're 16 describing here is the essence of that, and as we continue, you know, we'll simply continue 17 add further to how that ideal eating 18 to 19 pattern should look, and hope that, you know, up with practical and cost-20 we can come effective ways to make that happen. 21

Other questions, comments on this

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

22

1

2

3

4

118 1 very important subcommittee? 2 (No response.) CHAIR VAN HORN: All right. With 3 that, I think I would like to adjourn for ten 4 minutes just a postponement, or a break for 5 6 everyone, and we'll resume promptly at three 7 o'clock eastern time. Thank you. (Whereupon, а short recess 8 was taken from 2:49 p.m. until 3:00 p.m.) 9 10 CHAIR VAN HORN: Welcome back. We ready to get started for the second 11 are presentation of the group 12 this afternoon, 13 which will be chaired by Joanne Slavin on carbohydrate and proteins, and we have a rich 14 15 discussion in store. Thank you. MEMBER SLAVIN: Thanks, Linda. 16 carbohydrate 17 Yes, we're the and protein subcommittee, and I'd like to acknowledge my 18 19 other members listed here, Dr. Cheryl Achterberg, Dr. Pi-Sunyer and Dr. Van Horn. 20 I would also like to acknowledge 21 the wonderful staff that works with us, Jan 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1 Adams, Eve Essery, all the NEL people, the 2 librarians. It's been a ton of literature searches we're going to go through today and 3 had a lot of help with that. 4 topics we're going through 5 The today are all NEL searches, and the way we 6 7 structured our work at the end we'll give you a list of all of the things that are also on 8 the committee's plate to do. 9 10 But everything that we're going to talk about today are NEL searches. And they 11 are listed in the next slide. Glycemic load 12 13 and glycemic index by Dr. Pi-Sunyer. I'll talk about dietary protein 14 15 patterns and then we will get into our food 16 groups discussions, fruit and vegetables. Cheryl will talk about and I will cover milk 17 and milk products, and then dried beans and 18 19 peas. So, I'm going to turn it over to 20 Dr. Pi-Sunyer. Thanks, Eve. 21 22 MEMBER Thank PI-SUNYER: you, **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Joanne. So this first presentation is а 2 review of glycemic index and glycemic load, and we asked the following questions: What is 3 the relationship between glycemic index and 4 glycemic load, and body weight, cancer, type 5 II diabetes and cardiovascular disease? 6 First of all, I want to go through 7 definitions. Glycemic index some is 8 а classification proposed qualify 9 to the 10 relevant blood glucose response to consuming carbohydrate-containing foods. 11 Operationally, it is the 12 area under the curve for the increase in blood 13 glucose after the ingestion of a set amount of 14 carbohydrate in a food, generally 50 grams 15 during the two-hour postprandial period 16 relative to the same amount of carbohydrate 17 from a reference food, white bread or glucose, 18 19 tested in the same individual under the same conditions, using the initial 20 and blood glucose concentration as a baseline. 21

Glycemic load is an indicator of

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

22

www.nealrgross.com

the glucose response or insulin demand that is induced by total carbohydrate intake. It is calculated by multiplying the weighted mean of the dietary glycemic index of the diet of an individual by the percentage of total energy from carbohydrate. And the glycemic response is the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 effects of carbohydrate-containing foods, the 8 effects that they have on blood glucose 9 10 concentration during the time course of digestion. 11

With regard to the search strategy that we used, we used -- we looked at any references that were available from June 2004 to March 2009 for body weight and cancer.

When we did that for cardiovascular disease and type II diabetes, we found very few references, so we went back and looked at the time range from January 20 2000.

21 We considered incident disease as 22 outcomes. Neoplasm was the search term used

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1 for cancer and all types of cancer were 2 We excluded all systematic reviews included. and meta-analysis and reviewed only original 3 research articles. 4 The first question, then, is what 5 is the relationship between glycemic index and 6 7 load and body weight. The proposed conclusion with a grade of strong, is that GI and GL are 8 not associated with weight and do not lead to 9 10 greater weight loss or better weight maintenance. 11 no difference between There 12 was 13 high versus low GI and GL diets of greater than eight-week durations in facilitating 14 weight loss. 15 The review of the evidence, 16 we found 22 articles relating to 17 this, 13 randomized clinical trials, two prospective 18 19 cohort studies and seven cross-sectional

21 The randomized control trials 22 overwhelmingly show no difference between high

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

studies.

20

www.nealrgross.com

and low GI diets in achieving weight loss or maintenance. Data on glycemic load were less numerous, but show the same results. And observational studies validate this finding from RCT's.

The second question is: What is 6 the relationship between glycemic index and 7 cancer? Aqain, 8 load and the proposed conclusion grade is strong. The evidence is 9 10 strong that the epidemiological evidence for between glycemic association index 11 an or glycemic load and cancer is overwhelmingly 12 13 negative.

The review of the evidence, we found 26 articles, 19 prospective longitudinal observational studies, one cross-sectional, observational study, five case control and one case cohort study.

19 Seventeen prospective studies 20 examined the association between GI and 21 cancer, one showed a very weak positive 22 association for total cancer, 15 found no

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

association, and you can see the different cancers that were involved, endometrial, pancreatic, breast, stomach and colorectal, and one found an inverse association for colorectal cancer.

With regard to glycemic load, 19 6 7 prospective studies examined the association between glycemic load and cancer. One, again, 8 showed a very weak positive association for 9 10 total cancer. Sixteen found no association with endometrial, pancreatic, breast, stomach 11 colorectal cancer, and one found and 12 an inverse association for colorectal cancer. 13

other No associations 14 were 15 observed except in the case control reports. In the case control reports, three found GI to 16 be significantly associated with cancer. 17 One for prostate and one for gastric and one for 18 19 thyroid, and similarly for glycemic load.

20 With regard to type II diabetes, 21 the question is: What is the relationship 22 between glycemic index and load and type II

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

1 diabetes?

2	For glycemic index, the proposed
3	conclusion with a Grade of II, or moderate, is
4	that there is mixed evidence as to whether
5	there is an association between a high GI and
6	type II diabetes.
7	With regard to glycemic load, the
8	proposed conclusion with a Grade I of strong,
9	is that there is little evidence to suggest
10	that a high glycemic load is associated with
11	type II diabetes.
12	The review of the evidence shows
13	ten longitudinal prospective observational
14	studies. With regard to the glycemic index,
15	five reports found a positive association, two
16	were from the same cohort, four found no
17	association, and one found an inverse
18	association.
19	With regard to glycemic load, one
20	report found a positive association, seven
21	found no relationship, and two found an
22	inverse association.
	NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	With regard to cardiovascular
2	disease, the proposed conclusion is Grade III,
3	very limited data, and the conclusion is the
4	evidence for an association between high GI or
5	high GL and cardiovascular disease is more
6	negative than positive, but the evidence
7	available is inadequate, really, to come to a
8	firm conclusion regarding this question.
9	The review of the evidence with
10	regard to cardiovascular disease, we found
11	eight articles. Seven were longitudinal
12	prospective observational studies, and one was
13	a case control study.
14	The relationships between GI and
15	GL and cardiovascular disease outcomes were
16	inconsistent. Three studies reported a
17	relationship between GI and GL and
18	cardiovascular outcome in women with a BMI
19	greater than 23 or 25, but not in those with
20	lower BMI.
21	So, overall, if we put the
22	questions together and say what is the
	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1	relationship between GI, GL and weight, type
2	II diabetes, cardiovascular disease and
3	cancer, I think the overall conclusion is
4	strong with a Grade of I.
5	Current evidence predominantly
6	shows no relationship of GI and weight or
7	cancer, and no relationship of GL and weight
8	type II diabetes and cancer.
9	The evidence for GI and type II
10	diabetes is mixed, but more strongly negative
11	than positive. The evidence for the
12	relationship of either GI or GL in
13	cardiovascular disease is inadequate to come
14	to any conclusion.
15	Thank you very much.
16	MEMBER SLAVIN: I think what we'd
17	like to do is, since our different questions
18	don't relate, if anyone has a question now on
19	glycemic index, glycemic load, please ask.
20	MEMBER APPEL: Yes. Xav, a
21	question. I notice that you didn't include
22	systematic reviews and meta-analyses, and I
	NEAL R. GROSS
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1	think that a lot of other groups are using
2	those, so I was just sort of curious what the
3	rationale was, because I think I was hoping
4	I wasn't quite sure.
5	MEMBER PI-SUNYER: Well, we
6	thought it was better to go to the original
7	literature rather than look at the reviews.
8	So, we went to the original publications.
9	MEMBER APPEL: But sometime I
10	mean, but then there's the I realize that,
11	that's useful going to the originals, but then
12	to synthesize I guess if it's a
13	consistently null, and you know, you aggregate
14	and you get point estimates that are null,
15	then that reinforces the overall conclusion.
16	But sometimes, you know, things
17	that tend you know, where there's
18	inadequate statistical power, of course, and
19	you aggregate, you might get a result.
20	MEMBER PI-SUNYER: Well, we could
21	go back and do that. We felt that we had
22	enough data I don't think that we could
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

resolve the cardiovascular one if we went back and looked at the review ones, and I think the other would probably stay pretty much the same.

5 But, we could certainly do that if 6 the committee wants us to go back.

7 The only advantage I could see to that would be that the reviews would probably 8 go back beyond 2005, and so would include some 9 studies that were not included here, because 10 our window has been between 2005 and 2009, 11 diabetes and cardiovascular 12 except for 13 disease, where we didn't have enough -- we didn't feel we had enough data from 2005 to 14 15 2009 to come to any conclusions.

MEMBER NELSON: This is Mim. Ι 16 had sort of a similar question, because 17 Ι think that -- that I sure would feel more 18 19 comfortable if there were systematic review or meta-analysis that sort of corroborated this 20 and went back, because I'm concerned about 21 some of our questions where there may have 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

been really good trials that were done before 1 2 our cutoff, were sort of -- not that we're in a vacuum, but we're not necessarily reviewing 3 those, and I think that that's where a meta-4 analysis or review can sort of corroborate and 5 we feel solid. 6 think 7 Т it miqht be really helpful, because if it doesn't say anything 8 different, it's more, you know, confirmatory 9 10 and it does go back further in history, which I think can be helpful. 11 MEMBER PI-SUNYER: Well, 12 we can certainly do that if the subcommittee wishes. 13 Tom. 14 15 MEMBER PEARSON: This is Tom 16 It seems in the lipid, in the fatty Pearson. acid group we were coming across a number of 17 times an end point that was not related to a 18 19 nutrient, except in the subgroup with diabetes, or metabolic syndrome, and I 20 was wondering if you got any signal since, you 21

22

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

know, seven or eight percent of Americans now

(202) 234-4433

are diabetic, and probably another 25 percent
 are pre-diabetic.

Did you get any possible subgroup signals of the glycemic load index, et cetera, that would suggest that as a subgroup that might have some -- a different conclusion than you're drawing?

MEMBER PI-SUNYER: I think it's 8 possible that a diabetic group would have a 9 10 different result with regard to this. Our --I think when we started our deliberations we -11 - we agreed that we wouldn't do diseases, that 12 13 we would do it essentially we're talking to healthy nonchronic disease Americans. 14

15 If we branch out and do diabetes 16 and cardiovascular disease and so forth, we 17 could do that, but then that would greatly 18 change the whole -- the whole inspection of 19 the evidence.

20 One of the problems with the 21 diabetes ones, I think, if you look at them as 22 most of them are very short-term, you know, we

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	generally said that we would only look at
2	those that went longer than eight weeks.
3	There are a lot of single-meal or
4	short very short-term studies with diabetic
5	patients. There aren't many long-term
6	studies. There are some, but not very many.
7	MEMBER PEARSON: No, I agree. We
8	did the same thing, but these came up in the
9	course of looking at other papers where the
10	authors looked at the subgroup and said that,
11	but it didn't look like the diabetics were
12	acting the same way as the healthy groups. I
13	just wondered if that was a signal you got.
14	MEMBER PEREZ-ESCAMILLA: Xavier,
15	this Rafael. My understanding is that there
16	is quite a large intra individual variability
17	in glycemic measures. And if that is the
18	case, could that explain why it is so
19	difficult to find association with any of the
20	outcomes or do you think it's just a poor
21	biomarker for predicting chronic disease?
22	MEMBER PI-SUNYER: Well, I think
	NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

it's probably both. I think it's certainly 1 2 true, there is an enormous variation from time to time. We know that even from a glucose 3 load for a two-hour glucose tolerance curve. 4 You know, one day a person could 5 be normal and the other day abnormal. It's 6 7 created a bit of havoc with diagnosis. So, we know there is this variation that's very 8 strong, but I think, you know, whether it's --9 10 that it's a biomarker effect, there could be some of that, too. 11 I am going to cut MEMBER SLAVIN: 12 13 in if that's okay, unless there's a pressing question, just to keep schedule. 14 on our 15 Appreciate that -- the glycemic index load was 16 an example of one that was reviewed in 2005, so then we took the NEL approach. 17 We're going 18 to move on to 19 something that is new to this committee, so we had nothing to start from, so we -- what is 20 the association between consumption of various 21 dietary patterns, plant-based, animal based 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 and vegan, and health outcomes.

2	And in trying to put this question
3	together, these are the ways we came up to
4	phrase them. "How did the health outcomes of
5	a plant-based diet compare to that of an
6	animal-based diet?"
7	"How did the health outcomes
8	differ between those who follow a vegan, non-
9	animal protein diet, and those who consume
10	animal products?"
11	Definitions were a problem, just
12	we came up with these, and this is the way we
13	searched, and this is and at the end you
14	will see that this is a limitation of this
15	field.
16	We define the animal-based diet as
17	a dietary pattern that includes regular
18	consumption of animal products, a plant-based
19	diet, as a dietary pattern that includes
20	occasional consumption of animal products with
21	most dietary intake coming from plant foods,
22	and a vegan diet as a dietary pattern that

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

does not include animal products.

1

-	aceb net merdae animar produces.
2	We went back, trying to figure out
3	how far to search. Our date range, January
4	2000 to June 2009. Children and adults, two
5	years and older, and specific health outcomes
6	were not identified in the search, so we
7	wanted to go fairly broad in this search.
8	First question: How do the health
9	outcomes of a plant-based diet compare to that
10	of an animal-based diet, and our conclusion is
11	a Grade III limited.
12	Using the current NEL process,
13	intake of a plant-based diet is associated
14	with lower BMI and blood pressure, no
15	protective properties of vegetarian diets
16	against cancers were found in the EPIC-Oxford
17	cohort, and a little bit of a disclaimer here
18	is that the differences in eating patterns
19	among countries are great and affect the
20	results of this question.
21	The studies that came in to the
22	NEL review: 18 observational studies, 15
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

longitudinal cohort, two-case controls, 11 cross-sectional studies. They represented data from nine different countries, and six articles were actually from the same EPIC-Oxford cohort in the UK.

1

2

3

4

5

They've made an attempt to include 6 7 vegetarian, so it was one of the few cohort studies that has enough vegetarians. Some of 8 the limitations of this, small sample sizes of 9 10 those consuming plant-based compared to animal-based diets in these cohorts, 11 and that's particularly true of vegans. 12

But even people that are more plant-based, there is a small number, and this all inconsistent classification of plant-based diets, that in most studies there's not a way that this gets sorted out, that people go into these categories.

So, I think the Oxford study that -- the reason that we have data from that is that they made an attempt to do that. Most other studies, the numbers in these groups are

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

very small, and they are not easily classified.

Question: How did the health 3 outcomes differ between those who follow a 4 vegan, non-animal protein diet, and those who 5 6 consume animal products? Our Grade III, 7 limited for a conclusion, there are very few studies that compare vegan diets to animal-8 based diets. 9

10 So, any types of study, perspective, interventions, there just aren't 11 studies out there that have been published in 12 13 this area to go from. There is some limited data that vegans have lower body mass index 14 15 than meat-eaters. There is some data that 16 vegans may have lower blood pressure than meat-eaters. 17

There's -- in looking at nutrient 18 19 data in these studies, vegans have significantly lower intakes of calcium than 20 meat-eaters. So there's some data that a 21 veqan eating pattern may improve certain 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1 biomarkers, but can also be associated with 2 lower intakes of nutrients, some and particularly calcium coming out here. 3 Dietary protein patterns, 4 review of the evidence, five observational studies, 5 two longitudinal cohorts, three 6 cross-7 sectional. Again, four were based on this EPIC-Oxford cohort, and the limitations of 8 small number of 9 verv vegans and semivegetarians in this cohort. 10 We have a big section on research 11 recommendations on this 12 just because this 13 area, even though there's a lot of interest, a lot of public comments, and we really wanted 14 to do a nice job of reviewing this and seeing 15 16 what's out there, but there are really a need for well-defined cohort studies of populations 17 where we have people consuming plant-based 18 19 diets compared to animal-based diets. Some of the potential limitations 20 of plant-based diets for key nutrients come 21 calcium, iron, B12, protein quality, 22 out: **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 especially in children and the elderly, and 2 some of these can be done with a modeling. We'll talk more about that as potential ways 3 4 to get at that. assessment tools 5 Better to classify vegetarian dietary patterns in 6 7 epidemiologic studies. Most of the studies, there's very few people in these categories, 8 anyway, and they're not well-classified. 9 10 Α need to identify and follow cohorts that include a significant number of 11 vegan subjects on US diets compared to matched 12 13 protein eaters. I mentioned most of the data is in other countries, or hardly any US data 14 15 at all. A lot of variation between the --16 among all these different countries and the results. 17 And then there are -- essentially, 18 19 I could find -- we could find really no intervention studies 20 where people were actually given vegan diets compared to other 21 non-vegan diets, and looked at biomarkers, 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

	140
1	weight loss, anything like that. There's just
2	no real studies out there that make those
3	comparisons.
4	All right. Any questions about
5	animal protein patterns?
6	MEMBER FUKAGAWA: I do. This is
7	Naomi Fukagawa.
8	MEMBER SLAVIN: Yes.
9	MEMBER FUKAGAWA: Presumably into
10	the category of protein quality, you are
11	implying that it's the amino acid distribution
12	within vegetable versus animal proteins?
13	Because there are definite differences that
14	will occur based on some of the essential
15	amino acids, and therefore, it could have an
16	impact on health outcomes.
17	MEMBER SLAVIN: Well, the way this
18	search was the questions were put together
19	was just animal versus plant, so we didn't
20	talk about all the differences that
21	potentially would be in those diets, whether -
22	- you know, because absolutely protein
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	quality, there would be big differences there.
2	MEMBER FUKAGAWA: So that's what
3	you mean by protein quality in that research
4	areas, or research recommendations?
5	MEMBER SLAVIN: Okay.
6	MEMBER FUKAGAWA: Looking at that,
7	that was the question.
8	MEMBER SLAVIN: Okay. Yes.
9	MEMBER FUKAGAWA: And a follow-up
10	question to that is, another important
11	consideration is whether it's total protein
12	intake or really the type of protein that
13	induces some of the, you know, negative
14	health, or whatever health outcomes you may be
15	concerned about, because there are some sort
16	of prospective sort of, you know, studies and
17	clinical research centers, et cetera, that
18	might suggest that it's the total protein
19	intake, not really the type of protein that
20	could be associated with physiologic changes
21	that lead to negative health outcomes.
22	MEMBER SLAVIN: Right. In some of
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

our other areas we're going to look at with the macronutrient distribution of carbohydrates, proteins and fats in weight loss and relation to biomarkers will get at that more than this question will.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

This question was really just set up of, if we look at protein source, plant versus animal, and ask that question straightout, what kind of differences do we see?

10 MEMBER PEREZ-ESCAMILLA: Joanne, this is Rafael. You know, the difference in 11 lifestyles between vegetarians 12 and non-13 vegetarians have been well-documented for a number of risk factors, others than diet, and 14 15 I'm assuming that, you know, these studies 16 probably control for a number of those, but still, you know, without a randomized trial, 17 this is an area where it's, I think, very 18 19 difficult to interpret the differences.

20 MEMBER SLAVIN: We looked at some 21 information on just number of vegetarians and 22 vegans in the US and I think it's like 2.3 and

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

	143
1	1.4, so it's a very small number.
2	So these large studies, typically
3	we don't get very many people and people do
4	go, you know, from category to category. They
5	become vegans and then they, you know, stop
6	being vegans.
7	So, I think we wanted to ask this
8	question because of all the public comments we
9	got to see what what information is out
10	there and to I think the research
11	recommendations would say there's a real need
12	to generate more research in this area to
13	answer a lot of the questions that we have.
14	Mim.
15	MEMBER NELSON: Well, I have a
16	question because this is Mim Nelson. I
17	also wonder, the reality, seeing that there's
18	less than, let's say, three percent of the
19	population that is vegan or even vegetarian,
20	isn't the more relevant question on the range
21	like high, abundant meat-eaters, versus,
22	you know, like along the spectrum so that I

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

mean, isn't there some data that, you know, people that eat meat, you know, three times a day, that they may not have as great health outcomes as people that eat, you know, meat, twice a week kind of thing. So, it's on the spectrum, not in

the categorical, but more as a continuous variable, I guess, is what I'm getting at.

9 MEMBER SLAVIN: We are asking a 10 question on animal protein later on, and I 11 think that would get at that as far as more of 12 a quantity.

I think there's this kind of perception, though, that there would be a huge difference in health outcomes if you separate it out, you know, vegetarians versus meateaters.

And with the data we have, that we can't -- that data doesn't exist. Now, whether, if you had -- I don't know, I think it would be good to study people and have more information.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

7

8

1 But even like, meat-eating -you know, Cheryl wants to chime in. Help me out 2 here. 3 think 4 MEMBER ACHTERBERG: Ι my perception of going through the literature is 5 that somewhere along the line we, 6 as а 7 nutrition community, stopped investigating vegetarian diets, vegans or plant-based foods. 8 There were a lot more studies done 9 10 about 20 years ago, but the diets that people consumed then about 20 years ago are quite 11 different, I think, than plant-based 12 the 13 vegetarian diets today. So, I think, in general, all we 14 15 can say is there was a big hole in the 16 literature that needs to be filled, and it's very hard for us to speculate beyond that. 17 MEMBER SLAVIN: Tom. 18 19 MEMBER PEARSON: Were the -- this Were the blood pressure 20 is Tom Pearson. changes explained by the BMI changes in the 21 vegans versus the meat-eater? 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1	MEMBER SLAVIN: I think they were,
2	because that's the same study that information
3	came from. So, yes.
4	MEMBER PEARSON: So all of that,
5	there's no other pathways to look like we're
6	acting
7	MEMBER SLAVIN: Not reported.
8	MEMBER APPEL: This is Larry
9	Appel. I have a little bit of perspective on
10	this because actually the rationale for the
11	DASH Diet was a vegetarian diets lower blood
12	pressure and if you go to the RFA that was
13	part of it.
14	So, the fact that the literature
15	search was clipped, what was it ten years,
16	is a problem because the two major study
17	there are clinical trials of vegetarian diets
18	and blood pressure, and they both showed about
19	a five millimeter reduction in blood pressure,
20	one and hypertensive and one in
21	nonhypertensive.
22	So and I grant you, there are
	NEAL R. GROSSCOURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.(202) 234-4433WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701www.nealrgross.com

147

not a lot of clinical trials in this, so it 1 2 won't be -- get a rating of I, but there are clinical trials out there, and it was just 3 4 before your point in time. So, that's one 5 thing. And then, just to get to Cheryl's 6 I actually wanted to do a clinical 7 point, trial. It didn't have the menus for DASH Diet 8 versus a vegetarian version of the DASH Diet, 9 10 could not get it funded, couldn't even get approval to submit the application. 11 So, the reality is that, you know, 12 13 that when you try to even do the studies and you have a good design and an infrastructure 14 to do these things, you might not be able to 15 get it done. 16 MEMBER NELSON: But -- this is Mim 17 I mean, I think we have to, with all Nelson. 18 19 these questions, be careful about clipping the data at a certain time point because a lot of 20 times -- we have to be cognizant of previous 21 research because otherwise, some of the best 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

research may have been done earlier. We just
 have to be very careful about it.

MEMBER APPEL: Yes. I don't know what the solution is, though. If you just say, you know, how do you deal with this if, you know, if you -- the last ten years when your best studies are done 30 years ago or 25 years ago and they were trials.

9 MEMBER SLAVIN: Well, I also think 10 just the diet has changed at that point, that 11 with soy and some of the -- yes, some of the 12 newer things that people are consuming, it 13 would be nice to have more current studies on 14 that.

CHAIR VAN HORN: The other thing 15 we were discussing earlier on this subject --16 this is Linda Van Horn -- is the fact that 17 what we do have are data that suggest that 18 19 people who eat more vegetable protein versus 20 animal protein _ _ in other words, not necessarily pure vegans or vegetarians, even, 21 but rather do consume a diet that is more 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

vegetable plant-based, those data exist in
 greater abundance.

And so, you know, sometimes it's a 3 matter of looking at the data through those 4 eyes and being able to tweak and filter out 5 those answers from data that not 6 were 7 necessarily collected to answer that question.

And I think this group has done a great job of trying to do that, and I believe we'll probably go forward a little bit more on that -- that level.

Despite what Joanne said about the 12 13 very small estimate of vegans, less than two percent in the population, I suspect, and I 14 15 think we already know that there are more 16 people who eat relatively less animal protein vegetable protein, 17 and more and that population is somewhat greater, which would 18 19 allow us to look at some of those relationships. 20

21 So, I think that's kind of the 22 direction we're more likely to head, rather

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

than an all-out randomized control trial,
looking at, you know, one versus the other.
MEMBER SLAVIN: I wanted to follow
up on Naomi's point, too, just about protein
quality because, as we talk about people
eating less, I think protein quality becomes a
more important variable.
MEMBER NELSON: Linda this Mim.
Shouldn't we make sure that some of the
studies that you're referring to are it
seems that they would be appropriate in this
search category that we that Joanne just
reviewed, that we should make sure that those
papers are in there because sometimes these
search terms can really cut out a whole
category of studies that should be considered.
CHAIR VAN HORN: Yes. To share
with those who are listening and may know
specifically. Hello. Linda Van Horn. To
specifically. Hello. Linda Van Horn. To

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

NEL, et cetera, it's only as good as the
 search terms that are applied.

And I'm not suggesting that they're not good. They're absolutely wonderful, and this is the closest we've ever come, I think, to doing a thorough evidencebased analysis.

But without a doubt, even in our 8 deliberations earlier today we recognized that 9 10 there were certain studies, certain papers, certain topic areas that, for whatever reason, 11 were simply not captured by that search that 12 we now need to go back and work with our 13 librarian staff and group to try to make sure 14 that we've done justice to the availability of 15 16 some of those data, even if it's a hand search to try to be sure we incorporate some of that. 17 18

So, you know, it's not a perfect world and some things will, you know, simply fall out, but I think the goal now is to look at whatever was provided on a standardized approach and make sure we're not missing

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

3

4

5

6

7

anything by going back over it with some of
 these other studies.

MEMBER SLAVIN: Ι wanted to 3 mention -- this is Joanne again, Linda, that 4 we are looking at animal protein products as 5 another one of our searches. So, this is not 6 7 -- we're not done with protein. So, there is -- yes, we're just starting. 8

9 So, any other protein questions 10 before we go to food groups?

Roger?

MEMBER CLEMENS: Yes. 12 Roq. Α 13 number of years ago there were a number of studies that looked at protein in excess. 14 Ιf you are to reexamine to Larry's comment, go 15 back another ten, 20 years, would your group 16 look at the potential issues associated with 17 excess protein intake. 18

I think the current USDA data indicate we're taking about two times the amount of animal protein than we do in terms of plant protein. I just throw that out, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

(202) 234-4433

11

1	it piggy-backs also on Naomi's comment.
2	MEMBER SLAVIN: Yes, and I think
3	if you look at DRI, it's anywhere from ten to
4	35 percent of our calories are from protein,
5	and there's no UL for protein, so I think for
6	DRI, as calories go down, percentage of
7	calories from protein have to go up.
8	MEMBER FUKAGAWA: This is Naomi.
9	I did want to make one more comment that, you
10	know, we've placed a lot of emphasis, perhaps,
11	on the EPIC-Oxford Study, and I just checked,
12	and their BMI's were largely from self-report.
13	They did obtain real weights in
14	only about 5,000 of the cohort, but we all
15	know the difficulties we have with self-report
16	of height and weight. So, we'd have to look,
17	interpret that data with some caution, I
18	think.
19	MEMBER SLAVIN: And I think that
20	that comes up because they did try to recruit
21	vegetarians, so they have and a lot of that
22	obviously is self-reported in there, too, just
	NEAL R. GROSSCOURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.(202) 234-4433WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701www.nealrgross.com

	154
1	the way the diets are described.
2	All right. Other questions before
3	we move to our food groups?
4	We're going to go through fruits
5	and vegetables, milk and dried beans and peas,
6	and Cheryl is going to take us through fruits
7	and vegetables.
8	MEMBER ACHTERBERG: Okay. I think
9	as I go through this, a lot of the same themes
10	will emerge once again, so you might want to
11	consider contextual factors here.
12	Our first question here is, the
13	general question: Was the relationship
14	between the intake of fruits and vegetables
15	and body weight. In one case cardiovascular
16	outcomes, in another, future presentations,
17	we'll be looking at diabetes type II, and
18	cancer.
19	Our search strategy, I want to
20	emphasize the date range here. June 2004 to
21	June 2009. As we began this, and we looked at
22	the charge to the committee it said to
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

155

emphasize the last five years. 2 We were trusting that we would be building on the work that had been done in the 3

1

9

former Dietary Guideline Advisory Committee 4 work. 5 The studies here were restricted 6 7 to adults 19 years and older, and that's because another subcommittee is looking at 8

10 The search included individual as well as systematic reviews studies 11 and meta-analyses, and we looked at the intake of 12 13 all fruits and vegetables, but did not consider juices. 14

what happens in a pediatric population.

the first question, 15 So, for а 16 relationship between the intake of fruits and The proposed vegetables and body weight. 17 conclusion here is Grade III, limited. 18

19 Usinq the current NEL search evidence for association 20 process, the an between increased fruit and vegetable intake 21 and lower body weight is modest, with a trend 22

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

towards decreased weight gain over five or
 more years in middle adulthood.

No conclusions can be drawn from the evidence on the efficacy of increased fruit and vegetable consumption in weight loss diets.

So, for the review of the
evidence, there were 11 studies, three RCT's,
three prospective cohort studies, one case
control and four cross-sectional studies.

In the RCT's, a small weight loss 11 that was usually one to two kilograms were 12 13 observed over short time periods of less than All prospective cohort studies six weeks. 14 15 showed a weak inverse relationship between fruit and vegetable consumption and weight 16 gain that was long term, from approximately 17 six to 12 years. 18

There was also an inverse relationship reported in the cross-sectional studies except for one study from China where we didn't see any significant effect, but

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

3

4

5

6

again, I think the baseline there had higher
 fruit and vegetable intakes.

Limitations, of the 3 most limitations described in 4 that were the previous section are here as well. It's also 5 6 very difficult to quantify the amount of 7 fruits and vegetables in any given study of the various differences because in 8 methodology. 9

10 Shifting to the second question: 11 What is the relationship between the intake of 12 fruits and vegetables and cardiovascular 13 disease?

The proposed conclusion in this 14 15 case is a Grade II, moderate. Using the 16 current NEL search process, there is moderate strong evidence supporting 17 to an inverse relationship between fruit and vegetable 18 19 consumption and cardiovascular coronary heart disease in the US, in US populations, with 20 larger effects noted above, five fruit and 21 22 vegetable servings per day.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1 Looking at the evidence, then, 2 there were ten studies, two meta-analyses, six prospective cohort studies and 3 two case control. 4 The meta-analyses showed increased 5 vegetable intake and increased fruit intakes 6 7 are independently associated with decreased of CVD mortality when risk the total 8 consumption was over five servings a day. 9 10 Four prospective cohort studies found positive relationships between fruit and 11 vegetable intake and a decrease in CVD 12 in 13 extreme quintiles -- that's the highest versus the lowest consumption there, and the case 14 control studies showed similar results. 15 Turning now to blood pressure. 16 What is the relationship between the intake of 17 fruits and vegetables and blood pressure? 18 19 this case we're proposing a In conclusion Grade III, limited. 20 There were very few data. So, using the current NEL 21 search process, there's limited evidence to 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

suggest any association between fruit and
 vegetable intake and blood pressure.

What did we look at? There were 3 four studies, one prospective cohort study and 4 cross-sectional studies. 5 three The prospective cohort study found no association 6 7 between the intake of fruits, vegetables, or combined vegetables fruits and and 8 hypertension. 9

10 Cross-sectional studies provided I think all of these mixed results. 11 are international. 12 One study reported no 13 relationship where that average intake was over five and a half servings per day. 14

15Onereportedaninverse16relationshipforfruitandvegetableintake17andbloodpressure.Onereportedapositive18associationbetweenfruitandvegetableintake19andlowerriskofhomemeasuredhypertension.20Continuingnow,bloodcholesterol.

21 What is the relationship between the intake 22 of fruits and vegetables and blood

NEAL R. GROSS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

(202) 234-4433

cholesterol? Once again, the proposed
 conclusion is a Grade III, limited.

Usinq the current NEL search 3 process, the evidence for relationship between 4 fruits and vegetable intake and blood lipids 5 is limited, but appears to show a trend 6 7 between increased consumption of fruits and vegetables, with lower total and LDL blood 8 cholesterol levels. 9

10 Review of the evidence. There 11 were only three studies, one trial and two 12 cross-sectional studies. The trial added 13 three servings of cherries per day for 28 14 days, and the impact on plasma lipids.

15 Cross-sectional studies found an 16 inverse association between fruit and 17 vegetable consumption and, as I said before, 18 with total and LDL cholesterol between extreme 19 quintiles.

20 Implications. I think this work 21 is still under review. There are a lot of 22 questions. I think we now want to look

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

(202) 234-4433

farther back in terms of what the research 1 2 literature has to offer us, take a longer long-range perspective on that. 3 4 So, what we've presented today represents what evidence has been collected 5 6 and reviewed for the last five years. 7 Any questions? MEMBER NICKOLS-RICHARDSON: This 8 is Shelly. Just a quick question just for 9 10 clarification. In these studies "servings" is related to --11 MEMBER 12 ACHTERBERG: Cup 13 equivalent. NICKOLS-RICHARDSON: 14 MEMBER Cup 15 equivalents. What are the servings? 16 MEMBER ACHTERBERG: You raise one of the major limitations. I really struggled 17 with this because different studies approach 18 19 it different ways. Europe tends to approach vegetable 20 intake according to weight measures by gram. 21 Here in this country we're using cup measures. 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

Some of the Asian studies -- it's something
 different again.

So, a serving does not equal a serving, does not equal a serving as you're trying to compare studies one to another. So, that's one of several limitations here.

7 Other limitations qo with the difference in diets altogether. For example, 8 one study from Serbia, the main vegetable 9 10 consumed were onions. In Asia, it's а of vegetables. different set In the US, 11 another set of vegetables. 12

13 So, Ι think one of the major questions and implications 14 research are 15 whether, as we consider higher intakes of fruit and vegetables whatever effects 16 are found, is that due to a replacement? 17

In other words, the question is: Are fruits and vegetables acting as an asset or out of a deficit model, that if there's more of something, there's less of something, and we see an effect that way.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

Or, are the fruits and vegetables,
in and of themselves, contributing something.
And I might add there, are they contributing
something independent of fiber, because
another confounding factor here, as we look at
the evidence, is oftentimes those two terms
are used interchangeably, and clearly fruits
and vegetables are more than fiber packages.
So, it ultimately gets down to
food matrix questions, or perhaps even diet
matrix question.
CHAIR VAN HORN: Eric.
MEMBER RIMM: I wonder this is
Eric Rimm. This is one of those cases where
you had to make tough decisions at the
beginning of this in terms of which questions
to ask.
You obviously did not ask fruits
and vegetables and cancer because there's a
recent report on it that you can probably
point to.
But I wonder if it's, at this
NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1 point, now that you've gone through some of 2 this is that you may want to trim your questions, is that the fruits and vegetables 3 and blood pressure, maybe there's not enough 4 new, and we need to just sort of fall back on 5 what was there and say what was there is --6 7 there's not -- you know, there's not enough new, and maybe the weight change is also 8 because it's so difficult to measure weight 9 10 change and the new data are not substantially greater than what's there, and maybe, instead 11 of making it seem a little bit more vague and 12 13 confusing, we should just fall back on the ones where the answers are the strongest. 14

15 MEMBER ACHTERBERG: Well, I think we still have to look at that literature 16 before we decide that for 17 sure, but the curious thing is these results don't 18 19 necessarily align with some of the older 20 results.

21 MEMBER RIMM: Yes. This is Larry 22 Appel. Yes, this is one where the prior data

(202) 234-4433

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

are going to have an impact. I mean, most 1 2 people -- the DASH clinical trial again, there third that fruits was а arm was and 3 that significantly reduced 4 vegetables, and blood pressure, well-controlled study, 5 150 people, you know, versus control. 6

So, you know that -- and then there was another study, I believe, by John's -- the reason I know this is I was in your position five years ago. I reviewed the fruit and vegetable literature, so I'm glad --

So, I think that -- but, you know, 12 13 there are not a huge number of studies, so you're not going to push this up to -- I mean, 14 15 I think there is a reasonable argument, but it's also in the context of potassium, the 16 reality, because you have supplement trials, 17 then you have some food group trials, and 18 19 together the argument is reasonable, though.

But in terms of the other issue that I wanted to raise, I think you need to divide cardiovascular into stroke and CHD

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

because if I remember correctly when I did this, the evidence on stroke was actually pretty decent with almost all of the co -- not all, but most of the cohort studies showing a, you know, an inverse relationship.

You know, I just looked it up. It was like seven or eight out of ten cohort studies of higher fruits and vegetables associated with reduced stroke and again, it's consistent with this blood pressure-potassium hypothesis.

For CHD, it only comes out when you do the meta-analysis, you know, there might be one or two studies, but more then tend to be, you know, negative. So, I think you need to -- they are -- they're different, I think.

MEMBER ACHTERBERG: I wanted to follow up, too, Eric, because cancer and type II is still being done, so it's not like we're not -- yes, so they will be done.

And also, I wanted to just

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

22

1	mention, Larry, just this when we start
2	with this process, the NEL process, I think it
3	really, you know, deciding how far to go back
4	is a real problem.
5	You know, and because and the
6	other thing I worry about is sometimes in
7	these studies, unless somebody keyworded
8	fruits and vegetables, they won't come up
9	unless you know them. They are not going to
10	get onto this review because that's not how
11	they were keyworded.
12	So, that's a concern, that there
12 13	So, that's a concern, that there might be data out there that we don't pick up
13	might be data out there that we don't pick up
13 14	might be data out there that we don't pick up in this type of a search unless somebody, you
13 14 15	might be data out there that we don't pick up in this type of a search unless somebody, you know, knows about it and brings it forward.
13 14 15 16	might be data out there that we don't pick up in this type of a search unless somebody, you know, knows about it and brings it forward. MEMBER APPEL: The one thing that
13 14 15 16 17	might be data out there that we don't pick up in this type of a search unless somebody, you know, knows about it and brings it forward. MEMBER APPEL: The one thing that we might do, and I don't know if the NEL
13 14 15 16 17 18	might be data out there that we don't pick up in this type of a search unless somebody, you know, knows about it and brings it forward. MEMBER APPEL: The one thing that we might do, and I don't know if the NEL people do this, is that there are, you know,
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>might be data out there that we don't pick up in this type of a search unless somebody, you know, knows about it and brings it forward.</pre>

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 know, linked -- linked, you know, related 2 articles or something like that, you might be able to pull up some of the ones that you just 3 described that wouldn't, you know, be captured 4 in your search. 5 MEMBER NELSON: This is Mim. Ι 6 7 agree. I'm concerned, because the DASH study didn't make it into the search, and so --8 MEMBER ACHTERBERG: The date 9 ___ the date would not --10 MEMBER NELSON: Because of the 11 And so, again, it's a time issue, and date. 12 13 we've got to be careful that we're -- we can't come up with an implement -- you know, a 14 15 conclusion and grade based on just a certain number of years when there's been good data 16 beforehand that's not being considered. 17 And we -- just it's a -- we have 18 19 to be very careful. I think that would be 20 erroneous. MEMBER ACHTERBERG: I just want to 21 thrown in hindsight is 20/20. I think this 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

was a careful, systematic review following the 1 2 guidelines we as a committee all agreed on. In hindsight, because these 3 results didn't necessarily align with earlier 4 results, now questions are being raised. 5 Now it's being asked should we go back for a 6 7 longer-term review. But let's be clear about where we 8 are, why we're there, and the quality of the 9 10 work that got us here. MEMBER RIMM: I don't -- this is 11 Eric Rimm. don't think anybody would 12 Ι 13 question what you've done and that this is a thorough job. 14 15 I think the issue is that, for all 16 of our things, I think ultimately what we're doing, we're trying to summarize, 17 we're essentially bean-counting the number 18 of 19 studies -- excuse the pun but, I mean, the blood pressure is -- you have four studies, 20 one's prospective and three 21 are crosssectional. 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1	So, you have three cross-sectional
2	studies where people are diagnosed with high
3	blood pressure. They may change their diet,
4	so they compare that result with, you know,
5	the many, many studies that came before.
6	It's not it shouldn't be just a
7	matter of bean-counting. We have to look at
8	the quality and decide if it really should
9	impact our decision based on the new evidence.
10	New studies are not always the best.
11	MEMBER ACHTERBERG: Absolutely.
12	And we also need to ensure that we maintain a
13	systematic approach. That's what I'm trying
14	to say.
15	MEMBER PI-SUNYER: Yes, that's the
16	this is Xavier. That's the danger of your
17	suggestion, Larry, that if you go back and you
18	know two studies, that's not systematic.
19	MEMBER APPEL: No, no, no. That
20	wasn't what I was saying. I was saying you do
21	the systematic, but that gets you only part of
22	the package. I mean, most systematic reviews
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1 actually have, you know, you search multiple 2 databases, but then you also have seminal studies and you use those to either reference 3 check or use those as related articles 4 to identify ones that weren't captured. It's not 5 only -- it's more global. 6 Yes, and it helps 7 MEMBER NELSON: come up with different search terms that you 8 haven't thought about --9 10 MEMBER APPEL: Well, yes.

MEMBER NELSON: -- which is the 11 and then you're systematic. kev, I mean, 12 13 we've done that with some other questions. You know, we've come up with why didn't it 14 15 pick up these couple studies, and then you 16 realize because of a couple of search terms or a date. 17

There is another CHAIR VAN HORN: 18 19 issue that relates to the assessment 20 methodology, and we're all aware of the, you know, limitations of diet assessment, not only 21 in terms the method used, i.e., food 22 of

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1 frequency, questionnaires, they tend to group 2 things together which, of course, limits, you know, what you can do with those data. 3 But, also the fact earlier studies 4 were more nutrient-focused and it's only been 5 more recently that we started looking at food 6 7 groups or foods themselves and food patterns and things of that sort. 8 So I think, you know, we're trying 9 10 to, you know, synergies all of these different factors and maximize the benefit of current as 11 well as previous studies that allow us 12 to 13 perhaps look at some of these questions using new approaches, but not, you know, forget that 14 15 some of those were not created or developed in 16 that allows have perfect us to way а assessment ability and, you know, the method 17 used may not allow that. So, we just have to 18 19 be careful. Other fruit and 20 MEMBER SLAVIN: vegetable questions before we move to milk? 21

And I appreciate your comments, Linda, because

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

22

www.nealrgross.com

it's like when we did this, these searches, we 1 2 decided to go with the food groups pretty much early on because we thought they would create 3 some discussion. 4 the studies weren't really 5 And designed to do that. So, we're looking for 6 7 milk, milk products, fruits and vegetables, this is what comes up. 8 So, background on milk and milk 9 10 products. We know they are a source of many They vary from fat-free to full nutrients. 11 Calorie content is going to vary. 12 fat. You 13 know, fat-free -- or get rid of saturated fat, but you have protein, calcium. 14 15 The relationship between milk 16 intake and body weight is controversial. The role of calcium intake in obesity 17 and adiposity has also been debated, so there's a 18 19 lot of literature in this area. It does tend to fall out, is it 20 food, milk -- food-related, or is it nutrient-21 Calcium, we're going to talk about related. 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

bone health, the importance of milk and milk
 products as calcium-rich foods.

Cardiovascular disease and saturated fat, we kind of move over into that area just because most of the searches we did on just dairy -- milk and dairy products, milk products, so fat is typically not controlled in our searching here.

9 So, low-fat dairy products 10 included in the DASH Diet, here are some 11 examples of where different dairy products are 12 included in diets and I'm not sure we're going 13 to always pick those things up.

So, our question has to do with 14 15 what is the relationship between intake of 16 milk and milk products and these end points, body weight, bone health, cardiovascular 17 outcomes, metabolic syndrome, 18 type II 19 diabetes.

We did go back to 2004 and this was because in Section 6 of 2005 Dietary Guidelines there was a search on milk and milk

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

products. So, we did not go past. Just like the fruit and vegetable which was also in the 2005, we went back, started 2004 to July 2009.

For children two to 18, for all outcomes except body weight, and this is looked at in another subcommittee, so we're not going to include that, and then adults 19 and older for all other outcomes we're talking about.

10 In this case we -- this is what's hard in our literature that when you include 11 systematic review or meta-analysis, you don't 12 13 want to double count them. So, trying to figure out what's already been counted, 14 in 15 this we included individual studies as well as 16 systematic reviews and meta-analyses, and then if it was already counted in a meta-analysis, 17 we tried to exclude it. So, that was really 18 19 difficult to do.

And I can see like for Xav, the nice thing about excluding the meta-analysis and the systematic reviews is you can, you

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1 know, do all your own analysis and not be 2 worried about double counting.

First question: What's the 3 relationship between the intake of milk and 4 milk products and body weight? It's a Grade 5 little convincing I, strong. There is 6 7 evidence that milk and milk products have any unique role in regulation of body weight and 8 body adiposity. 9

10 So, we'll go through the review of the evidence. Eighteen studies, 11 one randomized control systematic review, one 12 13 trial, four prospective cohort studies, eight cross-sectional, three studies with energy 14 15 intake an outcome and as one study in pregnancy, and this conclusion is supported by 16 the systematic review and intervention study 17 and four prospective cohort trials. 18

19 questions on body weight? Any There's been a lot of interest in it, calcium, 20 milk as, you know, particularly linked to 21 lower body weights, but I think the literature 22

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

	177
1	is quite clear, there's nothing uniquely
2	calcium or dairy product, milk product that
3	has any difference there.
4	Bone health
5	MEMBER CLEMENS: This is Rog.
6	Just real quick.
7	MEMBER SLAVIN: Sure.
8	MEMBER CLEMENS: This is rather
9	intriguing, frankly, because there have been a
10	lot of studies on fractions of milk relative
11	to body weight and weight management, and
12	obviously in this type of research, if you
13	look at the full food to your comment, Linda,
14	that that relationship doesn't pop up in the
15	most recent information.
16	MEMBER SLAVIN: Yes. There are,
17	you know, a lot of components for sure. There
18	are studies that people have looked at that,
19	and it doesn't in this approach we're
20	looking at milk and milk products.
21	So, what is the relationship
22	between the intake of milk and milk products
	NEAL R. GROSS
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

and bone health? This is a -- we had a big 1 This is a very top area. 2 discussion on this. Proposed conclusion, intake of 3 milk and milk products is associated with 4 improvements in bone health in children, and 5 we've given it a moderate, Grade II. 6 7 Adults, the results in adult mixed 8 trials are more and there's inconsistency. There's inconsistent 9 an 10 support for the role of milk and milk products on bone health. 11 We've struggled with this grade 12 13 right now. It's -- we think it's a moderate, -- well, go through 14 because we can the 15 literature and we're going to have more 16 discussion about this. Review of the evidence, 17 nine articles, one systematic review to meta-18 19 analysis, three trials, one longitudinal, one case control, one cross-sectional study. 20 A study reported that children who 21 are milk avoiders have poorer markers of bone 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

health. There is a meta-analysis of this
 question in adult populations that's less
 clear.

There are some concerns about just measures of bone health, so we can go down that path and talk about that, but one review concluded that there is weak evidence of a protective capacity of milk and milk products on bone health.

10 Another meta-analysis concluded that a low intake of calcium, as judged by 11 intake of milk does not confer a substantial 12 13 increase in fracture risk, and the intervention studies are supportive of a role 14 for milk and milk products in bone health. 15 16 So, there are quite a few intervention studies that show a role. 17

I guess we want to -- we'll go 18 19 through all the milk, and then we'll take questions. Milk 20 and milk products, cardiovascular disease, 21 what's the relationship between intake of milk and milk 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

4

5

6

7

8

9

products and cardiovascular disease, and a
 Grade II, moderate.

Recent studies find that intake of 3 milk and milk products is protective against 4 cardiovascular disease. This is based 5 on three articles, one systematic review, one 6 7 systematic review with a meta-analysis, and 8 one case control study.

Some of the outcomes that 9 were 10 reported, stroke, myocardial infarction, ischemic heart disease, acute 11 coronary syndrome, inverse association 12 an was 13 consistently reported.

Metabolic syndrome, what's the relationship between intake of milk and milk products and metabolic syndrome, Grade III, limited milk and milk product consumption is not generally linked to metabolic syndrome and may even be protective in certain population groups.

21 Evidence, five articles, one 22 systematic review, one prospective cohort

(202) 234-4433

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 study and three cross-sectionals. The meta-2 analysis showed a reduction in risk associated with the highest level of milk consumption. 3 Dairy consumption was not 4 associated with any metabolic variables in an 5 elderly Dutch population. 6 In a French study, intake of dairy 7 products was associated with lower probability 8 of insulin resistance and NHANES data, looking 9 10 at that data set that they found that each serving of dairy products increased risk of 11 metabolic syndrome by eight percent among men, 12 13 significant associations between whole no milk, low-fat milk or skim milk and metabolic 14 15 syndrome were observed. Blood What's the 16 pressure. relationship between milk and milk products 17 and blood pressure? Grade III, limited. 18 19 Using the current NEL search process, there is limited evidence that supports a relationship 20 between intake of milk and milk products and 21

22 blood pressure.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 This 13 articles, one systematic review, one trial, six prospective cohort 2 studies, five cross-sectional. The systematic 3 review concluded 4 there is an inverse association between intake of dairy products 5 and hypertension. 6 results 7 The from the six prospective studies reviewed suggest a more 8 mixed result with four 9 not reporting а 10 relationship. And this area is complicated by types of milk products consumed, confounding 11 with calcium intake, relationship of blood 12 13 pressure to weight loss. Blood cholesterol. What's the 14 15 relationship between intake of milk and milk 16 products and blood cholesterol? Grade II, moderate. Intake of milk and milk products in 17 recent studies does not show increases in 18 19 total blood cholesterol, but may be linked to increased HDL cholesterol. 20 articles, one randomized 21 Three trial, one prospective, cross-sectional. 22 In **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

the dairy product feeding study intakes of milk product was associated with lower blood cholesterol, but that was also associated with weight loss in the study.

1

2

3

4

The Dutch elderly study, baseline 5 dairy consumption was not associated with 6 7 change in lipid levels over 6.4 years, and NHANES data set found that in women more 8 cheese consumption was 9 frequent associated 10 with higher HDL cholesterol, lower LDL, while in men more frequent cheese consumption was 11 associated with higher 12 BMI, waist circumference, HDL and LDL cholesterol. 13

Diabetes. What's the relationship 14 15 between intake of milk and milk products and 16 type II diabetes. Grade II, moderate. Recent with 17 systematic review а meta-analysis relative risk for type ΙI diabetes 18 was 19 estimated to be ten percent lower in people who had a high milk intake. 20

One systematic review with meta-21 included analysis meta-analysis four 22 ___

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

prospective cohort studies and this relative 1 2 risk was estimated to be ten percent lower in people with high milk intake. 3 Milk and milk product 4 All right. questions. Comments. 5 Eric. 6 This is Eric 7 MEMBER RIMM: Hi. I mean, again, I don't know the studies 8 Rimm. have led to this, but the fact that that 9 10 there's Grade II evidence that higher milk consumption is associated with potentially 11 increased HDL cholesterol worries me. 12 Is that -- I don't know if that's 13 driven by just the fact that this is only data 14 from the last five years, or that we've -- it 15 16 does not take into account different types of fat, but obviously, if you can compare it to 17 what's going on in the fat subcommittee where 18 19 we're looking at different types of fat and how they impact HDL or LDL cholesterol, 20 I guess this would be an opposite conclusion. 21 Well, I think you 22 MEMBER SLAVIN:

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1	have got to remember, too, we're asking the
2	food group question here. Milk and milk
3	products. So and it's a broad milk and
4	milk product question, so we don't get
5	MEMBER RIMM: So that well, can
6	I make okay. Well, maybe the question is,
7	is the Grade II based on is Grade II
8	that's a pretty strong statement. It's strong
9	enough to have a single trial and a single
10	prospective cohort study to make that
11	statement.
12	The prospective study was not
13	associated with I don't want to challenge
14	you. You guys obviously know this stuff much
15	more than I do. It just struck me as this
16	is very different from what we have been
17	talking about in the fat subcommittee.
18	I know, I realize it's fat, and
19	milk and milk products are different things.
20	The cross-sectional studies from NHANES, which
21	is based on a single 24-hour recall of milk.
22	MEMBER SLAVIN: Yes. Yes, I think
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

the NHANES -- right. 1

2	MEMBER RIMM: Which would trouble
3	me, if you're going to base a Grade II
4	conclusion on a single 24-hour recall where
5	you're equating it with a biomarker. I don't
6	know the trial, so I guess the issues is, if
7	the trial is a fantastic trial and it's proven
8	it's long-term and it's NIH-funded, then I
9	would be very happy with that conclusion.
10	But I would be worried about where
11	this could go. If this is such a strong
12	conclusion, this would lead to a Guideline
13	that to increase HDL cholesterol, the
14	strongest thing to do would be to increase
15	milk consumption and milk products.
16	MEMBER SLAVIN: Well, you know,
17	yes. Each you see, there's a lot of
18	questions on milk and milk products with
19	different end points. So, you know, in doing
20	the search, that's what came up, because
21	that's what we were looking for.
22	And so we're searching milk and
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	milk products, and then these different search
2	criteria that came in. So, I think that the
3	rating with this is difficult.
4	MEMBER RIMM: Yes. No, I agree.
5	MEMBER SLAVIN: You know, and
6	deciding what's a II or a III with the food
7	groups now. So, I think we could discuss that
8	for sure.
9	MEMBER PI-SUNYER: This is Xavier.
10	I wonder if this is you know, it's what
11	this is bring up is that five years aren't
12	enough, and we're running into trouble here
13	with a lot of them, you know, where you have
14	one RCT or no RCT and three cross-sectional,
15	and we're trying to come to conclusions on the
16	basis of very little evidence.
17	MEMBER ACHTERBERG: And it's a
18	changing food supply. And we need to be
19	careful about that. The milk and milk
20	products is another example. So, as you're
21	looking at the relationship between certain
22	lipids derived from milk and milk products,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

the profile of what people have been consuming 1 2 has changed pretty dramatically. And people have decreased, a total 3 decrease in milk and milk products, but people 4 who are using them, many, many more are using 5 low-fat, fluid milk, yogurts, nonfat, 6 and 7 other kinds of milk products. So, I think it is useful to have 8 the longer perspective but at the same time we 9 10 have to be very careful to balance that longer view against changes in the food supply. 11 MEMBER APPEL: Just a question --12 13 just to follow up on that, the -- we say milk There actually have been sort of a 14 products. several studies dealing with 15 sort of products that have peptides from dairy. 16 Was that what you mean by milk products or are you 17 thinking about yogurt? 18 19 MEMBER SLAVIN: No. We're just thinking about foods. So, we didn't get into 20 21 _ _ No, but those are 22 MEMBER APPEL: **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

189 actually -- I mean, I think some of 1 them 2 actually --(Off-mic comment.) 3 4 MEMBER SLAVIN: Yes. We like whey protein, milk peptides. We did not -- that 5 would not --6 7 MEMBER APPEL: So, that's not included, okay. 8 MEMBER SLAVIN: -- that would not 9 10 come up in the search. MEMBER PEREZ-ESCAMILLA: This is 11 Rafael. Have you looked at the dietary 12 13 patterns comparing high versus medium versus low dairy consumers? Because, I think, you 14 15 know, it's -- I understand why you are looking 16 at a food group, but the food group falls within a dietary pattern, and it's really 17 difficult, I think, for me at least, to make 18 19 sense of all of these massive work that you have done without understanding more what are 20 the characteristics in terms of the rest of 21 the diet of those. 22

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1	MEMBER SLAVIN: Linda, go ahead.
-	MEMBER SLAVIN. LINGA, 90 anead.
2	CHAIR VAN HORN: Right. I think
3	that the point you're raising, Rafael, is
4	something that we talked about earlier today
5	also as being one of those cross-cutting
6	issues that go back to the discussion we just
7	had about modeling.
8	For example, we know that in
9	individuals, both adults and children who
10	consume more dairy products, more milk
11	products, their intakes of not only calcium
12	but magnesium and vitamin D and a variety of
13	other nutrients that are concerns, are
14	enhanced because of the nature of the food
15	that they are consuming.
16	I suspect that, you know, as we
17	continue through this and again, this is
18	all preliminary, so just to remind our
19	listening audience as well as everybody here,
20	you know, we're raising this today to reveal
21	the level of discussion that we have going on,
22	but there are absolutely no confirmatory

190

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

NEAL R. GROSS

statements being made here yet.

1

2	I think the other thing to recall
3	is, even a study like DASH, for example, which
4	did involve low-fat dairy products and
5	including that as far as its relationship to
6	blood pressure being a risk factor for
7	cardiovascular disease, I think some of these
8	issues really need further deliberation in
9	terms of, you know, is it a cause and effect
10	or is it an association, is it a substitution
11	effect, what is it that we're actually looking
12	at here.
13	But, you know, without a doubt, we
14	won't have the answers to some of these
15	questions on the basis of hard evidence
16	because the studies were not designed that
17	way.
18	Again, we're trying to make
19	implications out of data that exists and try
20	to tease, you know, those kinds of issues
21	apart.
22	Mim.
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1 MEMBER NELSON: This is Mim. One 2 following up on that, I really think that we have to be careful as a committee with these 3 4 single food group and nutrient sort of outcomes because I think where we have moved 5 to, thanks to a lot of research over the last 6 7 five to ten years is more of the patterns. And I think that -- that we're 8

9 going to -- we may stumble on each other, with 10 our different committees, different questions, 11 because we're going to come up with one thing 12 when you look at it one way, but you're going 13 to look at it another, if you look at the 14 pattern.

And Ι think that there may 15 be reasons to tone down the single food group 16 piece and talk more, you know, beef up -- no 17 pun -- well, I shouldn't use "beef up," but 18 19 you know, strengthen the food pattern piece and the modeling piece because of the obvious 20 -- it's -- whether it's the deficit model or 21 the addition model, we don't know, because 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

diet is a funny thing. 1

2	And I just wouldn't I mean,
3	it's just sort of an overall I'm nervous
4	about the single food group piece. And to
5	that end, in terms of bone, having done a lot
6	of research in the area of milk and dairy
7	products and bone, I think one of the issues
8	that we have weaker evidence is just because
9	in the last all the best studies were done
10	in the Eighties and Nineties around this, and
11	all of the really new stuff on milk and milk
12	intake has been more in the, you know, the
13	lipids and, you know, it's like there's a lot
14	more work that's happening, so you have
15	stronger evidence just because of the nature
16	of the trials that have been done.
17	And, you know, they're classic
18	trials. And I, you know, just reading over
19	again, looking at the guidelines that were
20	before we should update I think, I really
21	feel like we should be updating the literature
22	searches here, not necessarily coming up with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

193

(202) 234-4433

1 different conclusions because -- anyway, Ι 2 just think we have to be careful, because the bone data, even though the diets change, it's 3 pretty strong on the RCT's, and I know there's 4 a bi-modal approach to bone 5 sort of and calcium, but anyway --6 MEMBER SLAVIN: Other dairy, milk 7 and milk product questions? 8 I completely agree with you, Mim. 9 10 You know, and I think last time these questions were done last, and we decided to do 11 them first because we wanted to do them with 12 13 the NEL process. I think they will have So, 14 to circle back and come back together and not be 15 16 in conflict. All right. 17 Our next group of questions are dried beans and peas. We know 18 19 they are important sources of protein, fiber, minerals and vitamins in the US diet. 20 I want to mention that these were 21 not done in 2005, so we were starting from no 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1

review in the Dietary Guidelines book.

2 Typically, when look you at consumers, they don't consume much beans and 3 peas in the daily diet in the US. 4 We have good data on fiber linking to lower 5 bodv 6 weight, so we might think that intake of beans 7 and peas might also be linked to lower body weight. 8 We also know that dried beans and 9 10 peas are concentrated sources of soluble fiber which is 11 known to lower lipids. serum Vegetable protein from legumes are stated that 12 13 it also lowers serum lipids. We have an existing health claim in the US for 14 soy protein and lowering serum lipids. 15

And a little bit on soluble fiber 16 slowing absorption of carbohydrates and lower 17 glycemic index of foods, and in the original 18 19 studies on glycemic index, intake of legumes associated with 20 was the lowest qlucose 21 response.

22

(202) 234-4433

So, it's possible that dried beans

www.nealrgross.com

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

and peas could show promise for use in blood
 glucose control.

that's the background. So, 3 So, 4 the questions we asked: What is the relationship between intake of dried beans and 5 peas and body weight, cardiovascular outcomes 6 7 and type II diabetes.

8 We, in this -- since this was not 9 searched in the 2005 Dietary Guidelines, we 10 went back to January of 2000 and, as we've 11 discussed today, that may not be back far 12 enough, but that's where we started.

13 Ages, children and adults, two years and older. What we did in this, we 14 15 looked at individual studies and then we also 16 looked at systematic reviews and meta-analyses were included in the review. And then if the 17 individual study was included in the meta-18 19 analysis, then we did not review it twice.

First question: What is the relationship between intake of dried beans and peas and body weight? Grade III, limited.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

There's very little data that intake of dried 1 beans and peas is related to body weight. 2 The evidence that reviewed, we 3 4 nine articles, one meta-analysis, two 5 systematic reviews, four trials, one prospective cohort study, one cross-sectional 6 7 study. the randomized trials diet In 8 treatments with beans and peas are generally 9 10 no more successful in weight loss than the controller, the comparison treatment. So, the 11 studies that were done, they didn't -- beans 12 13 and peas did not look to be uniquely better at weight loss. 14 The cross-sectional analyses 15 suggest that bean-consumers had better overall 16 nutrient intakes and lower body weights and 17 So, there is some data, waist circumference. 18 19 cross-sectional data that suggests that people that consume more beans, dried beans and peas, 20 body weights, but lower in general, 21 are there's hardly any intake of beans and peas in 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

	198
1	the US prospective cohort trials.
2	So, it's difficult to see if it's
3	linked to disease outcomes, because intake is
4	so minor.
5	Cardiovascular: What's the
6	relationship between intake of dried beans and
7	peas and cardiovascular. Also a Grade III,
8	limited.
9	Soluble fiber content of beans
10	contributes to lipid lowering benefits. There
11	is limited evidence that dried beans and peas
12	have any unique abilities to lower serum
13	lipids, so there's a theoretical, but there's
14	not much there.
15	Thirteen articles, one meta-
16	analysis, six trials, three prospective cohort
17	studies, one longitudinal, one case control
18	and one cross-sectional.
19	In intervention studies, dried
20	beans and peas lowered serum lipids, as
21	expected, based on their soluble fiber
22	content. So, in these studies they are
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

typically fed, and the predicted amount 1 of 2 lipid-lowering is seen based on their high content of soluble fiber. 3 Soy studies. Soy may lower lipids 4 in subjects -- hypercholesterolemic subjects, 5 but doesn't lower serum lipids in subjects 6 with normal serum cholesterol. 7 Then just this -- if you look at 8 the prospective cohort studies, the intake of 9 10 dried beans and peas is -- and soy all are really low. 11 And as we go through this I want 12 13 to mention that we did separate out soy in these studies, just because there's a lot of 14 15 research with soy that has been done since 16 2000. Dried beans and peas, type 17 II, what's the relationship between intake of 18 19 dried beans and peas and type II diabetes, limited. Their consumption of legumes may be 20 inversely associated with risk of type 21 ΙI diabetes. 22

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

NEAL R. GROSS

www.nealrgross.com

1 There's very little data, one 2 prospective study, total cohort lequme consumption and consumption of soybeans and 3 4 other legumes were each associated with decreased risk in type II diabetes. 5 So, any beans and peas questions 6 7 before we move to a list of other things that we are working on? 8 Yes, Tom. 9 10 MEMBER PEARSON: As a major source of protein for vegans, is this confounded by 11 group being overrepresented 12 this in the 13 consumer groups? MEMBER SLAVIN: Ask me that again. 14 15 I'm confused. MEMBER PEARSON: I would imagine 16 highest consumption of dried -- the 17 the highest consumers of dried peas and beans, I 18 19 would imagine, as a protein source, would be from vegetarians or vegans. 20 I'm just wondering if there was a 21 confounding of the relationship with some of 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

these with that group that had a lot of other
 things going on.

MEMBER SLAVIN: Yes, and I think 3 4 there is such low consumptions in the prospective studies 5 that you have hardly anybody. You know, if you look at protein 6 7 quality of beans and legumes, even though they have fairly high protein content, their net 8 protein utilization is actually pretty low. 9

10 It's one of the least digestible proteins, depending on how you cook it, but --11 think to include this 12 Ι we wanted iust 13 because, trying to be responsive of interest in more vegetarian eating patterns and to see 14 15 what kind of data is out there on health 16 benefits.

Cheryl.

MEMBER ACHTERBERG: But I'm glad you mentioned that we did this analysis separating the soy from the beans and peas because the earlier comments we had about dietary patterns, people who eat a lot of soy

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

(202) 234-4433

17

1 don't necessarily eat dried beans and peas, 2 and a lot of the folks who eat a lot of dried beans and peas don't eat soy. 3 4 And they may work quite differently. And certainly the way they are 5 6 used in the diet are -- you know, it's a 7 different pattern of usage. So, I think that distinction is 8 important, although it's still hard for us to 9 10 draw very many conclusions. CHAIR VAN HORN: Rafael. 11 MEMBER PEREZ-ESCAMILLA: This is 12 13 Rafael. In terms of the soybean studies, did you -- and lipid profiles, did you identify 14 15 randomized control trials? 16 MEMBER SLAVIN: Yes. PEREZ-ESCAMILLA: 17 MEMBER Okay. And did they actually use soybean foods or did 18 19 they use soy protein isolates? MEMBER SLAVIN: Yes. Most of them 20 used soy protein isolates. 21 22 MEMBER PEREZ-ESCAMILLA: And my **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

understanding is that when you translate that concentration into the actual food intake, into actual soy intake, that people would have -- would need to have, it's pretty large. Right?

6 MEMBER SLAVIN: Yes. It's like 25 7 grams of soy protein to significantly lower 8 cholesterol. So, to get a health claim, you 9 have to have 6.25 grams in your -- but, you 10 know, tofu, there's a lot of things, soy 11 flour, that can get there.

So, you know, there are foods out there but, you're right. Most of the studies that were done on concentrated soy proteins.

In hyperlipidemics, yes.

Larry.

MEMBER APPEL: Yes. These are more questions -- I mean, comments, questions that are generic rather than to your group, but I listened to you and I'm getting sleepless trying to figure out how you're going to get all this done plus update the thing.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

12

13

14

15

16

And then I also take that in the 1 context of -- I mean, there are 11 more, and 2 each of those is actually in multiple parts. 3 And then earlier on we had a discussion that 4 in February we're supposed to go through all 5 our conclusions and we said there are 180 6 7 questions. that if we have 16 That means 8 hours, we're going to finalize every hour 9 11 10 conclusions. And I just think that we have to really trim our sails and focus on the things 11 that are most likely to affect the Guidelines, 12 13 and I'm worried that -- and Т think Т mentioned this before, that I'm really worried 14 15 that we are -- some of these questions, Ι just not going to change 16 mean, are the Guidelines, because we, you know, we might be 17 relying on gut instinct, but we know that the 18 19 literature isn't there to support something 20 major, and so why are we, you know, wasting staff time, our time on this. So, 21 the narrowing it, I think is really important. 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1	The second thing has to do with, I
2	think, come out, and I don't I think that
3	you've done a great job. I don't think it's
4	sort of shooting the messenger to say this
5	issue about how to deal with truncating the
6	literature searches is huge, and affects all
7	the committees.
8	And I think we're not dealing with
9	it in a systematic way, and I think that
10	unless I think we can't leave this meeting
11	unless we, you know, have guidance for you,
12	for my for our group.
13	I think we dealt with it
14	differently, how to deal with, you know, the
15	pre you know, before this NEL process, and
16	because it could also, again, waste your time.
17	And I'm wondering how we do this
18	because, you know, I look at our schedule and
19	it's you know, it's dense with subcommittee
20	presentations, and yet we really need a very,
21	you know, procedure-oriented discussion about
22	how to deal with this evidence and grade it,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

and at least have tentative conclusions. 1 So, I'm just -- you know, maybe we 2 should -- some of us should just stay here and 3 just think about the options and come back 4 5 tomorrow, you know. Better use -- you know, better -- I don't know. I'm just throwing 6 7 that out. SLAVIN: think, MEMBER Ι took, 8 that we want everything to be documented, so 9 10 that's why we used the NEL process. If we bring in papers from before, if the 2005 11 Dietary Guidelines, if that's in there, we can 12 13 build on that, and then just say from this point on. 14 15 But if we're bringing in new 16 things, then we want to make sure that it's been presented and it's -- people can get it 17 from the library, so it's all, you know, 18 19 available for everybody to see where the data is and what we based our conclusions on. 20 So, I agree with you that we want 21 to make sure that that's done systematically 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 || so people --

2 MEMBER APPEL: And consistently. CHAIR VAN HORN: There's another 3 thing to keep in mind, I think, as we've 4 discussed in terms of some of our sub 5 ___ 6 scientific review committee calls, that one of the beauties of this approach is that each of 7 the subcommittees has a committed, dedicated 8 group deliberating 9 of experts on these 10 questions. And we, as a total team, rely on 11 the expertise of these individuals to make 12 13 some of those investigations and determine whether preexisting data are so solid and so 14 complete that the idea of going back over 15 16 them, just to say that we did, really, as you said, Larry, is not necessarily the best use 17 of our time because, you know, there are such 18 19 concrete, you know, data, suggesting that this is solid evidence, that we need to move ahead. 20 Whereas, in other cases, as we've 21 just discussed today, and especially things 22 **NEAL R. GROSS**

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1 that have come up since the 2005 Guidelines, again, 2 you know, there once are some subcommittees that are dealing with that. 3 So, even though I think we all 4 recognize the value of trying to standardize 5 our approaches to this, there will be 6 7 variability, subcommittee-to-subcommittee because of the data that exists, because of 8 technology that has changed since 9 then, 10 perhaps, where there are perhaps more objective data now to be able to look at that 11 didn't exist prior. 12 You know, it's all those kinds of 13 questions, but if we all deliberated on every 14 15 one of these collectively, we would be here 16 until 2020. So, I think we have to, you know, 17 while I agree totally that we should do as 18 19 much as we can to standardize, we also have to use some judgment here in making some of those 20

21 decisions within subcommittees, and then 22 prioritize those factors.

(202) 234-4433

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1	MEMBER APPEL: Yes. I think that
2	this is Larry again. I think the main
3	thing I'm finding, really concerned about, is
4	this grades of evidence where you do a five-
5	year search and you give a Grade III when the
6	best studies were done, you know, 15, 20 years
7	ago, and we know that, you know.
8	And that really worries me. And
9	we had, I think, some discussion in the
10	electrolytes committee that we would apply the
11	grades of evidence only to the ones where we
12	did a NEL search, plus there was some
13	systematic review.
14	And I it might be worthwhile to
15	say, okay, well, does everybody buy into this,
16	and if so, then to try to follow this to the
17	extent possible. And if you're not following
18	that NEL process, you never give a numeric
19	grade, I, II, III, you just give some
20	qualitative, but it's not it's not, you
21	know, an official
22	Now, there are probably other ways
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to do it, but I think we just need to make 2 sure we are all sort of --MEMBER SLAVIN: I want to mention 3 4 to Larry, if you look at our remaining 5 research topics, we started with our NEL searches. So most of those up there are not 6 7 going to be NEL searches, the things that are still, you know, in the process. 8 So, I agree with you that I don't 9 10 think we can -- we can't give them a grade, so they won't be graded. 11 Even though some of 12 MEMBER APPEL: 13 these might be your stronger relationships, or some of them. 14 15 MEMBER NELSON: This is Mim. But 16 also wonder, again, as procedural is, Ι thinking about in particular some of the ones 17 that you've presented and also, you know, 18 19 looking at the Dietary Guidelines book, if there is -- it's the trimming of the sails. 20 At some point I think we're not 21 going to be able to fully answer all 180 of 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

these questions, and I think that we need to do some pretty quick triaging within our subcommittees to say all we need to do is update a few references in the 2005 Dietary Guidelines. We did it pretty well, we did a

search, but things haven't really changed in terms of what we would recommend, because it's a whole process when we do this NEL search and the way we present it.

really think within And Ι 11 our subcommittees we should do some -- maybe in 12 our next individual subcommittee calls, do a 13 pretty quick triage on what we need to trim, 14 15 also based on what we hear over the next 16 couple of days, because 180 questions is -- I think it's actually ridiculous. 17

especially when And the focus 18 19 should be more the patterns, caloric on intake, obesity. I mean, I just sort of am 20 echoing what Linda has said, but I think we 21 need to do some really quick trimming. 22

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1 MEMBER ACHTERBERG: Ι have а 2 suggestion to offer. This is Cheryl. Ι think, as we've listened to the work we've 3 4 presented so far today, one of the major outcomes of all our effort here is to identify 5 what the research gaps are. 6

212

7 And, very quickly, as we were looking at whatever individual question we're 8 focused on, I think we can come 9 to some 10 conclusions whether there needs to be a lot more research, or whether there doesn't need 11 to be a lot more research, and that might help 12 13 us do this triage.

You know, to focus on those areas 14 15 where we know we need to look. Well, if we 16 know we can't answer the question and more research has to happen, let's say that, and 17 then move on and focus more of our attention, 18 19 our time in those areas where we think there's enough evidence that we can come to a more 20 precise answer. 21

22

(202) 234-4433

MEMBER PI-SUNYER: I do think --

www.nealrgross.com

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	this is Xavier that some of the
2	subcommittees will have an easier time than
3	others. I think this has been a particularly
4	difficult one, and it will continue to be.
5	I think things like ethanol and
6	fluids and electrolytes and food safety, I
7	think we can won't have this kind of
8	difficulty.
9	So, it's not across the board.
10	It's just some particular subcommittees have a
11	much more difficult job.
12	MEMBER ACHTERBERG: And might I
13	mention, this is a small subcommittee.
14	MEMBER PEREZ-ESCAMILLA: But it's
15	bigger than the food safety subcommittee.
16	MEMBER SLAVIN: I just wanted to
17	just the remaining research topics that we
18	have up there, and some of these obviously are
19	in progress, they're just not completed, so
20	we're not going to present them today, but the
21	food groups, whole grains and also animal
22	protein products where we're asking questions

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

about different animal protein and if there 1 2 are health relationships with that. Vegetable protein, animal versus 3 vegetable. Fiber, carbohydrate type, which is 4 a large -- and some of this is background 5 that's already in the Dietary Guidelines and 6 7 it will be expanded. There's not a lot of new 8 research. Liquids versus solids, 9 а very 10 large area. Noncaloric sweeteners, also a large area. Satiety and then some of 11 the modeling questions that are related to 12 our 13 subcommittee, we appreciate. Adjusting percent of animal 14 and 15 plant protein intake, if we do -- you know, since there isn't a ton of data on vegans 16 veqetarians animal 17 versus versus product protein-eaters, if we can just model that and 18 19 see if we do the modeling, what type of nutrient deficiencies, problems we run into, 20 if any. 21 And then macronutrient proportions 22 **NEAL R. GROSS**

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 and nutrient adequacy is also on our 2 committee's plate.

CHAIR VAN HORN: Okay. Other comments or questions, either related to this subcommittee or other topics that go along the line of what Larry was saying?

7 One thing I would also add, based 8 on just kind of following up to what Cheryl 9 said, there may be some lightbulbs that go on, 10 you know, as we continue with this over 11 tomorrow.

I mean, we've heard -- we've heard 12 13 some amazing, you know, and very comprehensive today. they 14 reports But are only the 15 beginning, and we have several more that are going to take place tomorrow. 16

And since I've had the opportunity sit in on several of the subcommittees, I would venture that the energy balance group and the discussion again -- you know, I sound like a broken record, but our focus is on obesity and the epidemic we're facing, or that

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

we have currently in our country and I think that in many ways if we had to pick one priority area, we're sort of charged with that one, because we've already, you know, recognized and identified that that is public enemy number one at this point.

So, I think that we will want to 7 keep that in mind as we go forward. I think 8 that we have spoken over and over again, and 9 10 we haven't even begun to talk about this yet, but we will tomorrow, about primary prevention 11 of obesity which, of course, will, without a 12 13 doubt, address children, and the need to look at children, growth, even gestational weight 14 gain that we discussed earlier today in some 15 of our smaller group sessions. 16

So, you know, I think that as we go forward, some of these questions, not all of them, I'm sure, but some of them may fall into place, and into rank order as far as what we should be addressing first and foremost in order to, you know, really stay true to our

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

1 goals that were identified up front. 2 Other topics along that line or other things that anybody in the group would 3 like to raise? 4 MEMBER FUKAGAWA: This is Naomi 5 Fukagawa. I agree with you, Linda, and I do 6 7 think that in some ways we're somewhat strapped by the fact that we've been grouped 8 into nutrient categories. 9 10 And really, what we want is an integrated view on the diet that will affect 11 the health and well-being of the population. 12 13 So perhaps we don't need, as Larry was saying, to continue to, you know, try to whittle away 14 at some of the more sort of specific types of 15 16 questions, but perhaps put our energies towards a more global, integrated view, or at 17 least that's my thought. 18 19 CHAIR VAN HORN: Other topics? NICKOLS-RICHARDSON: This 20 MEMBER is Shelly. I don't have a question, but just 21 a comment, that Joanne and your committee, I 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

217

very much appreciate this analysis that you
have done, because I think now when nutrient
adequacy goes to look at the food intake and
look at patterns, this will help support if we
find gaps in food intake, that there are
health outcomes, health consequences of that.
So, in terms of connecting pieces,

this is going to be very helpful for our committee in informing us on what those gaps mean.

11 CHAIR VAN HORN: All right. Well, 12 I think we have really covered the territory. 13 I think for those listening in, the group 14 here is still bright and eager, but clearly 15 has seen a busy day, and is ready, perhaps for 16 a little rest, and maybe you are, too.

We appreciate everybody's interest and attention, and we will adjourn for today and reconvene tomorrow morning at eight a.m., Eastern Time. Thank you all very much.

21 (Whereupon, at 4:38 p.m., the 22 meeting concluded for the day.)

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

8

9

10

www.nealrgross.com

	1		1	1
A	107:19,22 108:10	192:22	106:8	align 98:16 164:19
abilities 198:12	111:10,11,17	additional 19:3	advised 76:12	169:4
ability 20:7 31:2	113:17 114:10,14	25:18 30:14 41:13	Advisor 6:2	alive 53:22 54:1
35:3 97:12 172:17	115:11 118:20	42:17 43:22 91:1	advisory 1:4 3:10	allotments 112:18
able 8:16 49:13	145:4 154:8	91:2	4:13 6:5,14 7:3,5	allow 78:14 91:15
82:20 97:16 102:9	161:12,16 164:15	address 12:17	8:11,20 14:20,22	149:19 172:12,18
112:4 113:13	166:18 168:9,21	15:14 25:8 46:7	16:12 20:22 155:4	allowance 47:16
147:15 149:5	170:11 187:17	46:17 78:7 98:7	advocate 103:2	85:5
168:3 208:11	201:18 212:1	117:13 216:13	advocating 117:10	allows 22:3 172:16
210:22	213:12	addressed 34:19	affect 66:5 88:20	all-cause 43:11
abnormal 133:6	acid 27:3 35:22	35:13,18 77:6	135:19 204:12	45:1
abnormalities	36:2,9,11,16,17	90:5	217:11	all-out 150:1
65:21	36:20 37:6,18	addressing 68:14	afternoon 4:4 9:6	alpha 31:18
Absolute 41:5	38:19 39:3,18	216:21	13:22 14:2 47:9	altogether 162:8
absolutely 69:20	40:3,19,22 42:6	adds 73:20	118:12	amazing 215:13
140:22 151:4	42:15,16 43:1,9	adequacy 3:12	age 28:8 33:1,16	America 1:1 29:11
170:11 190:22	43:13,21 44:5,7	22:19 26:5,13	37:5 42:8,9 46:22	29:21 30:2 38:10
absorption 49:15	44:14,18,22 45:13	27:6 34:20 50:2	48:10 50:2 81:17	American 29:16,18
49:20 195:17	50:14,18 51:8,12	71:22 77:1 78:17	83:16 85:13,13	71:3 93:22 100:16
abstractors 19:16	63:14 65:6 76:6	81:21,22 82:9	90:10,12 91:14	Americans 10:7,14
abundance 73:8	87:13 95:14,19	85:8,15 88:20	97:3,6	21:17 28:5 29:15
89:20 149:2	130:17 140:11	89:15 91:2 95:15	agenda 3:1 15:6	31:1 34:15 35:2
abundance-type	acids 87:19 88:6	96:3 108:19	ages 19:11 47:18	46:17 86:22
73:12	140:15	113:15 117:3	196:13	102:11 106:7,17
abundant 96:19	acknowledge 4:19	215:1 218:3	aggregate 128:13	130:22 131:14
143:21	98:4 118:18,21	adequate 22:6 31:3	128:19	American's 15:3
acceptable 83:14	Acknowledging	49:13 63:2 98:2,5	ago 49:7 59:17	amino 140:11,15
accessible 20:21	95:7	adiposity 173:18	61:21 145:10,11	amount 21:12
accommodate 16:8	act 7:3,7,8	176:9	148:7,8 152:13	109:10,10 120:14
accommodated	acting 132:12	adjourn 118:4	165:10 209:7	120:17 152:21
116:16	146:6 162:19	218:18	agree 56:8 66:15	157:6 199:1
account 20:3 74:4	actively 51:2	Adjusting 214:14	76:9 99:22,22	amounts 21:18
79:9 116:1 184:16	activity 50:15 66:4	adjustments 78:5	132:7 168:7 187:4	22:4,15 28:12
accounts 79:8	75:9	Admiral 5:16 9:15	194:9 206:21	31:3 51:2 72:11
accumulate 53:20	actual 63:7 76:16	adolescent 31:14	208:18 210:9	82:7 83:18 84:21
achievable 78:15	111:1 203:2,3	73:1 85:14	217:6	111:2,9 113:3
80:19 81:19 82:8	acute 180:11	adult 72:19 178:7	agreed 16:14 20:2	analyses 22:7,22
achieve 21:19 28:6	Adams 119:1	179:2	131:12 169:2	23:1 26:22 53:17
61:3	add 50:7 73:13	adulthood 156:2	agreement 25:14	77:11,16 197:15
achieved 28:9 34:9	92:21 94:21	adults 31:8,11	Agricultural 5:1	analysis 5:10 44:10
achieving 29:6	117:18 163:3	32:18 33:3 35:6	Agriculture 1:2 3:5	83:4,7,22 84:11
30:20 70:13 123:1	215:7	42:8,9 43:2 76:12	Ah 46:9	86:1 87:3 91:19
Achterberg 1:12	added 72:9 88:9	116:11 135:4	ahead 75:20 89:11	130:5 151:7 176:1
77:21,22 80:8	92:11 160:12	155:7 175:7 178:7	93:22 114:11	178:19 181:2
91:20 94:20 96:12	adding 91:10	190:9 196:13	190:1 207:20	183:22 196:19
98:13,20 99:14,17	addition 15:6 20:12 20:21 22:21 117:5	advantage 129:7	AI 85:9,12	198:16 201:19
103:22 105:11,14	20:21 22:21 117:5	advice 7:6,6 104:17	Al 31:22	218:1

Anand 2:8 3:4 4:3	54:22 55:4,9,14	archived 11:10	183:9,12 184:11	back 7:21 13:15
4:8 9:6,22 13:15	55:18,20 56:1,9	area 3:11 120:12	185:13 195:20	19:6 41:16 54:18
13:16,22	56:21 57:5,7,13	137:13 138:13	199:21 200:4	54:19 55:1 56:5
Andi 112:15	57:17 58:10,12,15	142:18 143:12	association 51:7	80:7 89:13 118:10
and/or 29:1	59:8,13 60:4 61:1	167:20 173:19	123:11,20,22	121:18 128:21
anemia 46:19	71:19 73:16 98:8	174:5 178:2	123.11,20,22	129:1,6,9,21
anencephaly 39:12	98:8,18 99:6,15	182:10 193:6	124.1,4,7,9,10,13	130:10 135:2
39:16 69:14	100:22 101:1	214:10,11 216:3	125:22 126:4	151:13 152:1,16
animal 18:22 69:2	100.22 101.1	areas 141:4 142:1	123.22 120.4	,
	,			161:1 164:5,13
133:22 134:9,10	104:20 105:13,15	151:11 212:14,19	155:20 159:1,6,18	167:3 169:6
134:18,20 135:1	108:3 127:20	argument 165:15	160:16 180:12	170:17 174:20
137:6,8 140:5,12	128:9 146:8,9	165:19	182:5 191:10	175:3 190:6
140:19 142:8	148:3 164:22	arm 18:4 165:3	associations 124:14	194:15,15 196:10
144:10 148:20	167:16 170:19	ARS 2:5 5:1	181:13	196:11 206:4
149:16 152:5,21	171:10 188:12,22	article 19:14,19	assuming 100:3	207:15
213:21 214:1,3,14	189:7 203:17	articles 19:1 122:4	102:17 142:15	background 173:9
214:17	207:2 209:1	122:17 123:15	assure 7:5	196:3 214:5
animal-based	210:12	126:11 136:4	attached 99:20	bad 105:10
134:6,16 135:10	appendices 99:20	168:2 171:4	attempt 74:1 136:6	balance 188:10
136:11 138:19	application 147:11	178:18 180:6,21	136:21	215:19
announce 26:1	applied 151:2	182:1,21 197:4	attempted 68:6	ball 96:16
announced 7:14	applies 17:15	198:15	attendance 9:17	base 186:3
answer 22:2 23:4,9	apply 209:10	Asia 162:10	attention 35:12	based 6:10 20:8
45:11 67:4,6,22	appreciate 10:11	Asian 162:1	104:18 212:18	27:22 28:20 47:14
68:6,10 116:4	133:15 172:22	asked 14:11 120:3	218:18	47:22 63:17 83:2
143:13 149:7	214:13 218:1,17	169:6 196:4	at-risk 18:11 48:8	83:9,15 85:22
210:22 212:16,21	appreciates 10:4	asking 144:9 185:1	audience 11:8	133:22 137:9
answered 14:14	approach 17:9 20:2	213:22	190:19	138:7 140:14
17:11 69:1	21:8,21 24:12	aspect 59:11,12	Australia 43:5	151:7 168:15
answering 21:11	83:6 106:6 133:17	assessing 21:10	authorization 37:2	170:9 180:5 185:
answers 149:6	151:22 161:18,20	75:22	authors 132:10	185:21 198:21
164:14 191:14	170:13 177:19	assessment 139:5	availability 151:15	199:2 206:20
anybody 169:12	194:5 207:7	171:19,21 172:17	available 13:6	211:15 215:7
201:6 217:3	approaches 77:17	asset 162:19	16:19 18:5 29:1	baseline 120:21
anyway 100:4	172:14 208:6	assignable 20:11	86:7 121:14 126:7	157:1 183:5
139:9 194:1,6	appropriate 20:14	assigned 84:5 85:4	206:19	basic 27:16 37:8
apart 191:21	25:3 77:2 83:7	87:4	average 95:3	76:14
apparent 51:19	84:5 87:5 150:11	assistance 12:9	103:10 105:10	basically 52:17
53:10 94:2	appropriately 77:6	23:15,17	159:13	57:2 60:11 96:6
appear 44:5 48:11	approval 147:11	ASSISTANT 2:10	avoiders 178:22	99:2
52:14 74:2	approved 77:12	associated 50:17	aware 72:13 171:20	basis 65:17 66:7
appears 50:4 73:2	approximately	122:9 124:17	awareness 62:7	104:5,12 112:17
160:6	32:17 38:13 47:17	125:10 135:13	a.m 218:19	112:21 113:10
	156:17	138:1 141:20	<u> </u>	114:18 187:16
Appel 1:13 51:11				
Appel 1:13 51:11 51:11 51:11 52:9,12,16	April 11:3 14:5	152:17 158:7		191:15
Appel 1:13 51:11		152:17 158:7 166:9 178:4 181:2 181:5,8 183:2,3,6	B B 1:20 42:17 43:22 76:11,16	191:15 beans 98:15 111:15 119:18 154:5

				1
194:18 195:3,6,9	138:11 141:1	176:5,8,9,19,22	butterhead 81:3	89:1,7 100:19
195:22 196:5,21	145:15 178:1	177:11 195:5,7	110:11	103:6,9,14 104:22
197:2,9,12,20,20	bigger 51:22	196:6,22 197:2,17	buy 209:15	105:5,9 106:1,5
197:22 198:6,9,11	213:15	197:21	B12 21:10 27:3	116:22 153:4,6,7
198:20 199:10,17	biggest 109:8	bok 81:3 110:11	35:11,21 44:14,18	Canada 11:18
199:19 200:6,18	biochemical 28:22	bone 174:1,17	46:20 47:15,19,22	36:22 38:2,6 39:4
201:7,20 202:1,3	30:8,11,18 31:15	177:4 178:1,5,11	48:6,12,13,15,16	40:2,6,8,14 41:2,4
bean-consumers	34:13 35:2 74:11	178:22 179:5,9,15	49:6,20,21 50:5	41:9,10 43:4,5
197:16	biological 41:20	193:5,7 194:3,5	50:12,15 51:2	45:13 56:13 58:3
bean-counting	63:18	book 195:1 210:19	85:10 138:22	Canadian 39:13
169:18 170:7	biomarker 132:21	Booth 31:22	B6 44:14,18	65:20
beauties 207:7	133:10 186:5	border 38:10	·	cancer 36:16 37:11
beef 192:17,18	biomarkers 138:1	born 39:1	C	40:20 41:2,6 42:3
began 24:20 36:21	139:22 142:4	BOWMAN 2:5	C 4:1 31:8,20 34:8	42:12 46:1 63:17
41:6,9 154:21	bit 47:10 48:20	Boy 67:3	116:12	64:5,8,14,15,20
beginning 163:16	96:2 99:11 101:19	boys 79:5	calcium 30:3 31:9	75:4 120:5 121:15
215:15	115:1 133:7	branch 131:15	35:7 85:13 116:13	122:1,1 123:8,12
begun 15:15	135:17 146:9	Brazil 11:18	137:20 138:3,22	123:21,22 124:5,8
216:10	149:10 164:12	bread 120:18	173:14,17,22	124:10,12,13,17
behalf 9:15,20	195:16	break 118:5	176:20 177:2	127:3,7,8 154:18
believe 5:15 35:14	bi-modal 194:5	Breakfast 90:3	179:11 182:12	163:19 166:19
50:8 53:20 59:14	blood 30:10 34:1,2	breast 124:3,11	190:11 194:6	cancerous 64:12
69:11 96:1 105:4	36:12 37:19 38:1	breathes 5:14	calcium-rich 174:2	cancers 124:2
117:15 149:9	38:13 57:10,14	brief 21:4	calculated 84:9,14	135:16
165:8	61:4,11 62:8	briefly 24:16	87:11 121:3	capacity 179:8
belonged 110:12	67:15,16 120:10	bright 218:14	calculations 111:11	Capt 2:11 5:20 9:1
benefit 46:4 51:19	120:13,20 121:9	bring 187:11	call 5:13 9:11 76:9	9:5
58:8 59:18 91:18	135:14 137:16	206:11	80:10 109:19	capture 50:13,15
172:11	145:20 146:11,18	bringing 206:15	called 7:4 16:20	captured 151:12
benefits 198:10	146:19 158:16,18	brings 167:15	104:6	168:4 171:5
201:16	159:2,17,20,22	Britten 26:18 106:4	calling 63:16	carbohydrate
benign 75:9,12	160:5,8 164:4	107:3,21 108:11	calls 207:6 211:13	35:19 118:14,17
best 65:2 147:22	165:5 166:10	109:8 111:4	caloric 31:1 85:2	120:15,17 121:2,6
148:7 170:10	169:20 170:3	112:10	86:17 101:10	214:4
193:9 207:17	181:16,18,22	broad 135:7 185:3	102:5 112:8	carbohydrates
209:6	182:12,14,16,19	broadcasting 11:2	211:19	3:13 142:3 195:17
better 17:8 61:2,4	183:2 191:6 196:1	broadly 17:15	calorie 22:9 80:13	carbohydrate-co
71:14 108:7	BMI 126:18,20	broccoli 82:6	82:10 85:4,18	120:11 121:8
122:10 128:6	135:14 145:21	broken 215:21	87:12 88:11 89:5	cardiovascular
139:5 197:13,16	183:12	brought 7:21 58:13	94:5,8,17 100:18	43:10 44:15,19
206:5,6	BMI's 153:12	58:15	102:21 103:5	45:1 65:7 120:6
beyond 100:5	board 95:17 213:9	budget 112:5	104:12 105:3 173:12	121:17 126:1,5,10
129:9 145:17	body 19:22 120:5	budgetary 112:8	calories 84:11,18	126:15,18 127:2
bias 17:8 68:2	121:15 122:7	build 206:13	84:21 85:1,3,21	127:13 129:1,12
bifida 39:11,15	137:14 154:15	building 155:3	85:22 86:2,7	131:16 154:15
big 61:3 96:11	155:17,22 173:16	bump 42:12	87:18 88:6,12,16	157:12,19 165:22
109:18 110:16	174:17 175:5	busy 218:15	07.10 00.0,12,10	174:3,17 179:21
	l		l	

٦

100 1 5 101 7	160 15 100 10	1	00 12 14 10 00 7	1 147 10
180:1,5 191:7	168:15 180:19	characteristics	88:13,14,19 89:7	clipping 147:19
196:6 198:5,7	187:21	189:21	89:8,9 94:10	closer 105:7
careful 115:9	certainly 10:21	charge 6:7,8,20	104:8,10 105:17	closest 151:5
147:19 148:2	50:3 69:1 74:15	71:2 154:22	105:20 115:17	closure 66:5
168:13,19 169:1	75:5 95:18 109:2	charged 216:3	117:1	cluster 84:8 87:8
172:19 187:19	129:5 130:13	charges 65:7	cholesterol 87:12	clusters 31:5 80:22
188:10 192:3	133:1 202:5	chase 80:20	88:17 89:2 96:10	84:5 87:5
194:2	cetera 76:7 106:13	CHD 36:15,17	96:21 101:13	CNPP 2:2,8,13
Carlson 112:15	109:7 131:4	43:11,12 44:1,6	159:20 160:1,9,18	5:11
Carole 2:2 5:9,11	141:17 151:1	52:13 55:20	182:14,16,19,20	cognitive 50:17
carrots 110:22	Chair 1:10,11 3:9	165:22 166:12	183:3,10,13	51:9
case 49:9 69:20	3:12,14 13:18,21	check 171:4	184:12,20 186:13	cognizant 147:21
75:2 103:13,13	23:21 48:17 74:17	checked 153:11	199:7 203:8	cohort 39:6 40:5
123:17,18 124:15	93:10 114:8 116:7	cheese 183:9,11	choline 31:12 34:16	56:20 122:19
124:16 126:13	118:3,10 148:15	chemoprotective	35:11 85:16 95:16	123:18 125:16
132:18 154:15	150:17 163:12	64:7	95:21 96:18,20	135:17 136:1,5,7
156:9 157:15	171:18 190:2	cherries 160:13	98:2	138:8,10,17
158:3,14,19	202:11 207:3	Cheryl 1:12 26:15	chose 47:2	153:14 156:9,14
175:10 178:20	215:3 217:19	77:22 82:12 91:7	choy 81:3 110:11	158:3,10 159:4,6
180:8 198:17	218:11	91:7 94:21 95:11	CHRISTINE 1:22	166:4,7 176:13,18
cases 19:5 41:13	chaired 26:6	98:14 104:1	chronic 18:9 37:13	180:22 182:2
163:14 207:21	118:13	108:21 111:10	132:21	184:1 185:10
categorical 144:7	Chairperson 1:7	112:2 113:19	circle 194:15	197:6 198:1,16
categories 78:4	challenge 58:20	114:14 118:19	circumference	199:9 200:2
81:17 136:18	185:13	119:17 145:2	183:13 197:18	cohorts 136:11
139:8 217:9	challenges 49:10	154:6 201:17	claim 195:14 203:8	138:6 139:11
categorized 92:17	challenging 59:3	212:2 215:8	clarification	collaborative 25:17
category 115:18	chance 4:7	Cheryl's 77:18	113:18 161:10	collard 110:13
140:10 143:4,4	change 40:15 51:8	147:6	clarify 100:7	collected 149:7
150:12,16	60:20 71:7 81:13	chicken 107:11	114:13	161:5
catsup 91:15,22	81:18,20 101:10	childbearing 37:4	classic 193:17	collectively 208:15
causal 69:20	108:22 109:8,18	38:15 97:3	classification 120:9	colon 36:15 37:11
cause 34:5 191:9	110:16 111:3,14	childbirth 70:9	136:15	40:20 41:1 46:1
caused 56:14	131:18 164:8,10	children 29:16,18	classified 137:2	63:17 64:20 75:4
caution 153:17	170:3 183:7 194:3	31:8,13 32:20	classify 139:6	colorectal 41:6
cautionary 97:20	204:16	35:6 39:1 72:16	clear 13:11 37:21	42:3,12 64:14
CDC 31:18 39:6	changed 80:22	116:12 117:11	38:22 169:8 177:1	124:3,5,12,13
ceiling 107:20	109:2 110:7,8	135:4 139:1 175:4	179:3	combination 23:8
cell 36:12 38:1,13	148:10 188:2	178:5,21 190:9	clearly 13:9 100:1	48:1
cells 37:19 64:12	208:9 211:7	196:13 216:13,14	163:7 218:14	combinations 22:5
Center 3:4 4:9 5:7	changes 6:9 22:8	Chile 41:5 42:2,4	CLEMENS 1:14	83:19
10:19 21:22	33:6 51:9 68:19	chime 145:2	49:4 152:12 177:5	combined 159:8
centers 30:6 141:17	79:17 82:5 117:10	China 43:5 156:21	177:8	come 4:5 16:4
certain 35:10 46:11	141:20 145:21,21	choice 80:2	clinical 122:18	25:14 27:21 60:18
75:1,16 97:1,21	188:11	choices 27:8 31:4	141:17 146:17	60:19 72:7 76:13
137:22 147:20	changing 101:8	86:20 87:1,14,16	147:1,3,7 165:2	89:13 91:19 94:7
151:10,10,11	187:18	87:16,20,22 88:3	clipped 146:15	113:5 117:20
	l			

	1	1	1	
126:7 127:13	committees 7:5	38:1,17 47:22	conducting 82:19	113:3,5,15
129:15 138:21	192:10 205:7	48:2 51:8	conducts 24:7	consume 31:2
151:6 167:8	committee's 12:12	concern 27:3,15,16	confer 179:12	48:14 134:9 137:6
168:14 171:8,14	20:19 119:9 215:2	28:14,16 34:18,22	confident 91:21	148:22 190:10
187:15 189:10	communication 7:1	35:6 46:18 68:14	configuration	195:3 197:20
192:11 194:15	community 145:7	73:5,6 74:13	117:2	consumed 21:19
205:2 206:4 208:1	compare 87:1	78:18,20 89:16,19	confirmatory	28:11 34:12 84:4
212:9,20	134:5 135:9 137:8	89:21 97:1 116:10	130:9 190:22	87:3,6 92:6
comes 41:3 43:2	162:5 170:4	167:12	conflict 194:16	109:15 145:11
44:8 153:20	184:17	concerned 117:4	confounded 200:11	162:10 182:11
166:12 173:8	compared 32:13	129:21 141:15	confounding 163:5	consumer 200:13
comfortable	43:9 87:14,16	168:7 209:3	182:11 200:22	consumers 80:14
129:19	89:2 90:22 96:3	concerns 97:8,11	confused 200:15	80:19 189:14
coming 55:1 65:18	136:10 138:19	179:4 190:13	confusing 164:13	195:3 200:18
67:20 130:17	139:12,21	concise 14:19	confusion 106:5	consuming 22:5
134:21 138:3	comparing 40:9	concluded 179:7,10	congenital 65:11	37:5 72:11 83:18
193:22	104:9 189:13	182:4 218:22	65:12,19 68:15	86:12 105:5,17
commend 100:8	comparison 197:11	conclusion 20:9,15	congratulate 93:11	111:2 120:10
comment 50:7 67:1	comparisons 140:3	20:19 24:15 37:20	connecting 218:7	136:10 138:18
68:14 76:4 92:21	complete 7:8,9 14:7	38:21 39:19 47:7	conotruncal 65:21	148:12 188:1
98:10 152:15	26:21 42:14	47:12 48:10 51:18	conscious 94:19	190:15
153:1,9 177:13	107:17 207:15	52:12,13 58:7	consensus 16:5	consumption 28:21
189:3 217:22	completed 14:16	63:2 86:11 88:18	25:20	33:22 35:4 79:2,7
comments 8:4,6 9:3	213:19	122:7 123:9 125:3	consequences	79:10,12 80:16
23:11 49:3 89:22	completely 194:9	125:8 126:2,3,8	218:6	81:5,9 84:2 86:4
106:3 114:9	complex 75:11	127:3,14 128:15	consider 29:2	92:18 109:11
117:22 138:14	93:12	131:6 135:10	73:14 74:7 75:14	110:2,22 111:7
143:8 172:22	compliance 36:20	137:7 155:18	104:16 154:11	133:21 134:18,20
184:5 201:21	37:1	157:14 158:20	155:14 162:15	156:5,16 157:19
203:18 215:4	complicated	160:2 168:15	consideration	158:9,14 160:7,17
committed 207:8	182:10	176:16 178:3	23:13 69:3,12	180:17 181:3,4
committee 1:4 3:10	comply 7:10	184:21 186:4,9,12	141:11	183:6,9,11 184:11
4:14,16 5:2 6:5,7	components 177:17	conclusions 15:15	considerations	186:15 199:20
6:15 7:2,3,13,17	comprehensive	15:17,20 16:3	68:18	200:3,3,17
7:21 8:5,10,11,14	215:13	19:21 20:1 24:17	considered 18:10	consumptions
8:16,19,20,22	compromising	24:18 25:2,7,14	19:3 29:7 30:18	201:4
10:1,21 13:9,19	78:16	27:11 66:16 82:2	30:21 34:3 85:1	contact 12:6
13:22 14:5,9 15:4	computerized	129:15 156:3	121:21 150:16	contacts 8:12
16:14 19:22 25:13	113:1	187:15 194:1	168:17	contained 28:1
25:19,22 26:16	concentrated	202:10 204:6,10	considering 27:15	44:10
48:19 55:1 63:19	195:10 203:14	206:1,20 212:10	consistency 20:4	contains 89:6 92:11
67:5,6 95:2,12,19	concentration	concrete 207:19	consistent 37:22	content 84:3 96:10
129:6 133:19	31:21 32:6,16	conditions 120:20	38:22 166:10	173:12 198:9,22
154:22 155:4	33:2,10 120:21	conduct 46:13	consistently 128:13	199:3 201:8
169:2 192:3 207:6	121:10 203:2	97:12	180:13 207:2	context 74:10
209:10 217:22	concentrations	conducted 24:21	constant 111:5,22	75:12 93:1 165:16
218:9	30:11 31:17 33:9	40:5 83:5	constraints 112:9	204:2

contextual 154:11	51:14 65:11 68:8	198:18	dark 78:12 81:4	date 135:3 154:20
continually 88:15	157:19 180:11	cross-sectionals	98:20 110:7	168:9,10,12
continue 7:13 10:8	correctly 166:1	181:1	darker-green 99:2	171:17
19:9 48:12 64:3	corroborate 130:5	crystalline 48:16	dark-green 82:6	Davis 2:2 5:9
71:5 75:7,20	corroborated	49:21	98:10,17,21 99:3	day 47:17 81:14
89:18 116:18	129:20	cucumbers 115:18	110:9,10 113:21	103:13,15 106:11
117:17,17 190:17	cost 7:10 113:6,14	cup 81:14 88:11	DASH 146:11	106:12 115:4
213:4 215:10	117:20	106:19,19,20	147:8,9 165:2	133:5,6 144:3
217:14	count 79:6 91:17	111:12 161:12,14	168:7 174:10	157:22 158:9
continues 75:19	175:13	161:22	191:3	159:14 160:13
116:19	counted 175:14,17	cups 106:10,12,12	data 22:22 23:1,4	218:15,22
Continuing 159:20	counting 176:2	106:18,20,21	25:6 27:18,22	days 160:14 211:16
continuous 144:7	countries 11:19	curious 128:2	28:21 29:1,9,12	deal 114:13 148:5
contribute 24:9	44:6 53:5 60:13	164:18	29:20 30:4,17	205:5,14,22
86:9	61:5 135:19 136:3	current 6:11 10:9	31:19 33:14 34:13	dealing 188:15
contributed 88:1,4	139:14,16	11:11 78:3,8,18	34:14 35:2 38:8	205:8 208:3
103:10	country 19:17	78:19 81:20 127:5	45:20 47:6,14	dealt 72:5 82:14
contributes 78:21	42:11 94:18	135:12 148:13	49:12 50:9,9,10	205:13
93:6,7,8 198:10	161:22 216:1	152:19 155:19	50:20 51:5 57:21	death 34:5
contributing 91:13	couple 65:4 67:15	157:16 158:21	59:14 61:2 62:13	debated 173:18
163:2,3	67:17,18 110:8	160:3 172:11	62:15,19 63:3	decent 166:3
contributions 4:16	171:15,16 211:16	181:19	65:19 68:10 72:22	decide 164:17
80:4 94:14 115:21	course 62:15 75:3	currently 79:6	74:8,11 82:16	170:8
contributor 87:7	121:10 128:18	86:22 93:17 111:8	84:3,13 92:12,13	decided 21:2 173:2
91:22	132:9 172:2	216:1	96:4 105:12	194:11
control 24:3 30:7	216:12	curve 120:13 133:4	108:12,13 111:18	deciding 167:3
44:9 47:4 57:10	cover 19:6 119:17	cut 33:11 80:20	123:2 126:3	187:6
61:4 62:8,15	covered 218:12	133:12 150:15	128:22 129:14	decision 170:9
69:18 96:9 122:21	Co-Executive 2:2,3	cutoff 32:21 33:4,7	136:3,20 137:14	decisionmaking
123:17 124:15,16	2:5,6 5:12	130:2	137:15,19,21	27:19
126:13 142:16	create 173:3	CVD 36:13 158:8	139:13,14 144:1	decisions 66:13
150:1 156:10	created 133:7	158:12	144:18,19 147:20	74:15 163:15
158:4,15 165:6	172:15		148:18 149:1,4,6	208:21
176:12 178:20	criteria 17:14,22	D	151:16 152:19	decline 40:7 51:9
180:8 196:2	17:22 18:14 19:3	D 4:1 30:3 31:9	153:17 158:21	57:2 62:2
198:17 202:15	20:3,8 37:9 187:2	32:6 33:4,9,12	164:10,22 167:13	declined 40:2
controlled 174:7	cross 138:6 169:21	35:7 90:1 116:12	168:16 172:3	declines 62:6
controller 197:11	cross-cutting 190:5	190:12	181:9,10 183:8	decrease 45:17,18
controls 7:10 40:6	cross-sectional	daily 37:6 47:15	184:14 191:19	79:18 158:12
43:9 136:1	38:5 39:7 122:19	104:12 195:4	194:3 195:5 197:1	188:4
controversial	123:16 136:2	dairy 174:6,6,9,11	197:18,19 200:1	decreased 156:1
173:16	156:10,20 159:5	177:2 181:4,7,11	201:15 206:19	158:7 188:3 200:5
convincing 176:6	159:10 160:12,15	182:5 183:1,6	207:14,19 208:8	dedicated 207:8
cook 201:11	170:1 176:14	188:16 189:14	208:11 214:16	deeply 10:4
cooperation 4:20	178:20 182:3,22	190:10 191:4	database 8:6 16:20	defect 66:4
copper 85:10	185:20 187:14	193:6 194:7	databases 73:18	defects 36:13 37:7
coronary 34:4	197:6,15,19	danger 170:16	171:2	38:20 39:2 45:17
	1	1	1	

102:2 147:14 23:6 29:14,16,17 **differ** 134:8 137:4 46:4 57:1 65:16 5:17,21 9:4,8 65:22 69:14 70:13 30:8.12 71:3 76:1 **Designated** 5:11 **difference** 40:17 disagree 76:10 **defense** 93:9 designed 22:7 78:7 78:22 92:4 100:9 92:15 107:4,5,14 discharge 42:3 112:12 173:6 deficiencies 87:15 100:18 102:3 122:12.22 142:11 disclaimer 135:17 discrepancy 79:19 214:20 191:16 104:12 115:22 144:15 162:8 deficiency 32:1 desirable 95:10 121:4 134:5,6,9 177:3 discretionary 85:4 differences 117:9 33:4 46:20 47:20 desired 95:5 86:2.7 134:16,19,22 135:9,10,13 137:5 discuss 17:10 36:1 50:13,16 **Despite** 149:12 135:18 140:13,20 deficient 102:19 detail 14:15 142:14 146:11 141:1 142:9,19 48:20 187:7 **deficit** 162:20 detailed 84:2 147:8,9 148:10.22 157:8 discussed 16:9 192:21 **details** 16:18 17:4 163:10 170:3 different 21:18 77:10 196:11 determinative **deficits** 46:19 171:21 174:10 38:4 39:5 46:13 207:5.22 216:15 **define** 134:16 57:15 189:22 193:1 47:10 53:7 61:5 discussing 148:16 **determine** 207:13 discussion 13:13 **defined** 86:14 194:20 195:4 63:871:677:15 **defines** 32:15 determined 83:19 197:8 202:6 77:15,17 78:1 15:21 25:18 48:18 **definite** 95:21 **develop** 14:19 15:2 91:14 94:14 102:5 49:1 66:19 89:13 217:11 dietary 1:4 3:9 4:13 140:13 developed 14:13 109:16 115:21 91:4 93:15 116:8 definitions 120:8 15:13 19:13,15 4:21 5:13,14 6:5,9 124:1 127:17 118:15 173:4 134:11 21:22 77:12 6:14 8:10,14 10:7 130:9 131:6,10 178:2,16 190:6,21 **deliberated** 208:14 172:15 13:18 14:11 15:3 136:3 139:16 204:4 205:21 **deliberating** 207:9 development 6:16 145:12 161:18,19 209:9 215:20 19:10 21:6,16 **deliberation** 6:15 23:13 75:3 80:9 162:2.11 166:16 discussions 3:11 23:1,20 27:22 7:19 191:8 80:11 28:5,7,20 30:22 171:8 172:10 35:15,18 74:19 **deliberations** 13:12 deviation 41:11 31:6,10 34:3 35:1 174:11 184:16,19 119:16 16:7,22 131:11 **devil's** 103:1,2 **disease** 3:7 5:18,21 35:8,17 45:21 185:16,19 186:19 151:9 **DFO** 2:2 46:17 47:16 72:22 187:1 192:10,10 6:2 9:9 18:9,16,17 **DGAC** 5:13 6:4,21 demand 121:1 74:8 82:17 83:3,6 194:1 202:7 214:1 18:20 19:8 29:1 **dense** 104:10 14:1,5 20:16 84:1 116:13 differently 112:1 30:6,17 34:5,13 205:19 23:15 25:7 119:14 121:4 202:5 205:14 35:3 37:14 42:20 density 94:1 116:22 **DHHS** 26:19 133:22 134:17,19 **difficult** 132:19 44:3,16,20 45:1,2 diabetes 120:6 134:21.22 138:4 **Department** 1:2,3 142:19 157:6 51:14 59:1,5 3:5,8 4:22 9:12,21 121:17 124:20 139:6 155:4 164:9 175:19 61:11 65:8,12,19 10:3125:1,6,11 127:2 174:21 189:12,17 187:3 189:18 68:9,15 72:10 departments 6:9 127:8,10 129:12 195:1 196:9 198:2 213:4,11 120:6 121:17,21 **departure** 11:22 130:20 131:15.21 201:22 206:12 difficulties 12:6,15 126:2,5,10,15 210:19 211:4 153:15 127:2,13 129:13 108:15,17 154:17 174:19 depending 201:11 214:6 difficulty 99:11 183:14,16,18 131:14,16 132:21 196:7 199:19,22 **Deputy** 2:9,11,13 diets 34:12 74:1 213:8 157:13,20 174:3 3:6 5:6,21 9:4,8 digestible 201:10 179:21 180:1,5,11 200:5 122:13 123:1 **derived** 187:22 digestion 121:11 191:7 198:3 **diabetic** 131:1,9 135:15 136:11,16 **describe** 24:16 65:3 132:4 137:8,9 138:19,19 **direct** 62:20 diseases 43:10 100:2 diabetics 132:11 138:21 139:12,21 directed 95:12 131:12 described 24:10 diagnosed 18:17 139:22 140:21 direction 95:5,9 disorder 65:22 114:6 154:1 157:4 170:2 145:8,10,13 149:22 distinction 202:8 168:4 diagnosis 133:7 146:11,17 154:1 directly 92:18 distribution 83:14

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

156:6 162:8

174:12 194:3

Director 2:8,11,13

3:4,6 4:9 5:6,10

140:11 142:2

divide 165:22

describing 117:16

design 57:2 101:21

diastolic 34:1

diet 21:17 22:11

Division 5:11	Dutch 181:6 183:5	effort 94:6 212:5	angagamant 8.10	184:6,7
document 7:1	DVM 2:8	efforts 10:12,12	engagement 8:10 9:17	erroneous 168:20
documented 206:9	D v W 2.0	eight 38:5 43:4	England 40:7,15	especially 25:15
dog 96:7	E	83:13 126:11	58:3	74:22 139:1
doing 14:12 71:5	E 1:15 4:1,1 31:9	130:22 132:2	English 18:2 37:14	207:22 211:18
74:13 86:22 92:1	34:11,14 85:16	166:7 176:13	enhance 15:1	essence 99:18
101:8 150:22	116:12	181:12 218:19	116:21	104:15 107:19
151:6 169:17	eager 218:14	Eighteen 176:11	enhanced 190:14	117:16
186:19	earlier 41:22 148:1	Eighties 193:10	enlightening 14:17	essential 85:1,22
door 51:17	148:16 151:9	eight-week 122:14	enormous 133:2	94:4 140:14
double 67:10	169:4 172:4 190:4	either 52:6 55:1	enriched 22:17	essentially 82:1
175:13 176:2	201:21 204:4	98:21 108:21	90:15	110:20 113:8
doubled 38:11	216:15	127:12 171:3	ensure 22:6 24:4	115:18 131:13
doubled 38.11 doubt 102:16 151:8	early 173:3	215:4	170:12	139:18 169:18
191:13 216:13	easier 213:2	elderly 49:8,22	ensures 17:4	Essery 26:19 45:5
DPHD 2:10	easily 34:9 137:1	75:2 139:1 181:6	ensuring 10:7	119:1
Dr 1:7 4:3 5:6 9:6,7	eastern 118:7	183:5	entailed 18:1,15	established 7:4
9:22 10:15,17	218:20	electrolyte 72:8	entire 95:12 97:6	83:17 109:22
13:15,16,19,21	eat 29:10,21 30:2	electrolytes 209:10	116:18	establishes 107:20
118:19,20,20	106:9 107:9	213:6	entirely 62:5	estimate 149:13
119:13,21	115:14 144:2,4	electronic 16:19	environment 94:5	estimated 83:10
draft 19:17 22:18	148:19 149:16	elevated 18:9 34:2	116:21	183:19 184:2
25:12 37:20 47:7	201:22 202:1,2,3	37:13	EPIC 136:4	estimates 128:14
drafting 25:1	eaters 139:13	eleven 38:4	EPIC-Oxford	et 76:7 106:13
dramatically 188:2	144:17	email 12:13,17	135:16 138:8	109:6 131:4
draw 19:21 25:6	eating 48:12 86:13	emailed 12:8	153:10	141:17 151:1
202:10	102:10,12,20	emails 12:19	epidemic 72:10	ethanol 213:5
drawing 15:15	103:3 106:10,11	embryologic 66:6	93:17 103:8	Europe 43:4,6
131:7	106:17,18 107:10	emerge 154:10	215:22	161:20
drawn 156:3	108:14 117:18	emerged 81:2	epidemiologic 70:5	evaluate 22:10
DRI 30:21 83:9	135:18 137:22	emphasis 153:10	139:7	30:10 104:13
98:6 153:3,6	150:6 201:14	emphasize 154:20	epidemiological	evaluated 21:17
dried 111:15	echo 100:10	155:1	123:10	22:13 28:16 29:2
119:18 154:5	echoing 211:21	emphasizing 6:15	epigenetic 68:19	30:5 83:21
194:18 195:9,22	ecologic 59:14 62:6	enables 11:7	equal 162:3,4	evaluating 35:1
196:5,21 197:1,20	62:13 63:3 70:5	encompass 15:13	equalized 109:9	evaluation 22:3
198:6,11,19	ecological 59:20	encourage 80:16	equate 115:18	Eve 26:19 45:3
199:10,17,19	effect 20:6 42:16	ended 24:21	equating 186:5	119:1,21
200:17,18 202:1,2	43:21 44:13	endometrial 124:2	equivalent 88:12	event 12:11,18 13:5
drinking 107:11	133:10 156:22	124:11	161:13	events 44:15,19
driven 184:14	162:22 191:9,11	ends 113:7	equivalents 81:14	everybody 9:6
DRI's 34:8 82:16	effective 78:4	enemy 216:6	111:12 161:15	190:19 206:19
drop-out 18:6,7	117:21	energies 217:16	era 36:11 45:14	209:15
DRPH 1:14	effects 121:8,9	energy 83:7,10	Eric 1:20 50:6	everybody's 218:17
due 15:16 42:3	157:21 162:16	86:14 93:20 94:1	54:17 58:21 92:20	evidence 6:12,13
162:17	efficacy 156:4	121:5 176:14	94:12 163:12,14	10:9 15:10,16,20
durations 122:14	efficiency 12:21	215:19	166:19 169:12	16:16,18,20 17:3
	•	•		•

17:16 19:12,16,18	excessive 72:6	extremely 23:17	fat-free 173:11,13	67:18 77:19 78:6
19:21 20:1,6,13	excited 11:1	26:20 104:14	FDA 37:2	82:20 90:8 92:14
20:19 21:5 23:8	exclude 175:18	eyes 149:5	February 37:10,11	95:1 120:1,7
24:16 25:1 31:7	excluded 122:2	F	204:5	122:5 135:8
31:15 35:9 37:21	excluding 175:21		fed 199:1	154:12 155:15
37:22 38:21,22	exclusion 17:22	F 1:19	Federal 5:12 7:3,14	176:3 194:12
39:21 40:1,21	18:14	FACA 7:4,4 8:8	15:2	196:20 216:21
41:15 42:10,22	excuse 32:19	facilitate 13:11	feedback 11:6 13:1	fit 100:3
47:11 51:20 52:18	169:19	80:9,11	feeding 74:2 183:1	five 16:6 31:16 38:6
52:19 53:20 55:8	Executive 2:8 3:4	facilitating 122:14	feel 91:21 129:14	83:15 115:5
60:9 62:18 65:16	4:8 6:4	facing 215:22 fact 11:16 67:9,14	129:18 130:6	123:17 125:15
97:7,10,15 115:9	exercise 104:13	76:10 92:3 108:18	193:21	138:5 146:19
122:16 123:9,10	exercises 114:21	146:14 148:17	felled 94:15	155:1 156:1
123:14 125:4,9,12	exist 144:19 149:1	172:4 184:9,14	felt 128:21	157:21 158:9
126:4,6,9 127:5,9	208:12	217:8	female 73:1	159:14 161:6
127:11 131:19	existing 42:19	factor 49:11 163:5	females 31:14	165:10 180:21
138:5 151:6	71:16 82:8 195:14	191:6	femoral 33:17	182:3 184:15
155:20 156:4,8	exists 95:8 191:19	factors 142:14	Feucht 5:21	187:11 192:7
157:17 158:1,22	208:8	154:11 172:11	fewer 99:1 fiber 31:10 34:3	209:4
160:4,10 161:5 163:6 166:2 170:9	expand 65:11 expanded 214:7	208:22	35:8,17 98:4	fixed 22:9 flattened 61:22
176:7,11 178:17	expanding 82:4	fair 58:1	116:14 163:4,8	float 101:19
179:7 180:21	expected 198:21	fairly 135:7 201:8	194:19 195:5,10	floor 107:20
181:20 184:10	experience 12:5	fall 28:18 97:5	194.19 195.5,10	flour 203:11
187:16 191:15	73:17	116:11 151:20	199:3 214:4	flow 114:18
193:8,15 197:3	experiment 71:13	164:5,13 173:20	field 134:15	fluid 21:12 188:6
193:11 205:22	expert 20:11	216:19	fifth 16:1	fluids 213:6
207:20 209:4,11	expertise 10:6	falls 189:16	figure 95:4,8 135:2	focus 6:12 79:22
212:20	207:12	families 15:12	175:14 203:21	110:18,20 204:11
evidence-based	experts 76:8 207:9	112:5 117:11	filled 145:16	211:18 212:14,18
24:4 25:7	explain 132:18	famous 112:16	filter 149:5	215:21
evident 11:5	explained 145:21	fantastic 186:7	final 16:10 43:20	focused 65:15
Examination 23:2	explaining 58:16	far 48:21 93:12	finalize 204:9	212:9
examined 27:22	explanations 63:4	98:5 135:3 144:11	finally 84:14	folate 22:14 35:11
29:10 31:3 123:20	exploratory 74:13	167:3 191:5	find 48:4 132:19	35:20 36:13 38:3
124:7	97:14	196:11 212:4	139:19,19 180:3	38:11,13,16 41:12
examining 79:17	exposure 32:12	216:20	218:5	42:11 56:11,16
example 21:4 22:12	extensive 14:13	farther 161:1	finding 110:8 123:4	58:8 59:18 60:14
79:3 85:20 86:3	24:21	fat 88:10,16,16	209:3	61:9 64:4,13 67:9
89:5 133:16 162:8	extent 103:5	89:1,1 93:4 96:10	findings 20:5	68:8,21 69:8,11
187:20 190:8	107:16 209:17	101:12 173:12,13	fine 36:7	69:19 70:7 76:14
191:3	extra 106:5	174:4,7 184:17,18	finite 109:3	folate-fortified
examples 21:8	extraordinary	184:19 185:17,18	firm 126:8	53:4
174:11	14:16	fats 92:11 93:9	first 11:4 16:2	folic 27:3 35:22
Exceptions 19:2	extreme 104:7	142:3	17:16 24:19 26:4	36:2,9,10,16,17
excess 152:14,18	105:21,21 158:13	fatty 87:13,19 88:6	27:13,20 28:10,16	36:20 37:6,18
excesses 87:15	160:18	95:14,19 130:16	37:16 43:7 53:21	38:1,19 39:3,18
L				

٦

40:3,19,22 42:6	165:18 171:22	71:10,17 75:13	158:11 159:1,16	gaps 28:1 212:6
42:15,16 43:1,8	172:6,7 173:2,21	76:7,14	159:18 160:16	218:5,9
43:13,21 44:5,7	177:13 185:2	fortification/sup	162:16 165:10	gastric 124:18
44:13,18,21 45:13	187:6,18 188:11	27:4	167:20 172:20	gender 47:18 90:10
51:12 63:14 65:6	189:16,16 190:14	fortified 43:18	175:2	general 16:5 17:14
76:6	192:4,16,19 193:4	48:14,15 60:13	fruits 115:10,14	17:20 28:12 53:19
folks 11:17 202:2	203:2 213:6,15,21	fortifying 69:8	116:17 154:4,6,14	78:16 145:14
follow 26:2 107:8	218:3,5	forward 10:22 46:9	155:13,16 157:7	154:13 197:21
134:8 137:4	foods 21:19 27:21	75:19 90:2 93:14	157:12 158:18	generalized 20:7
139:10 150:3	33:22 35:5 47:15	116:19 149:10	159:7,8,22 160:5	generally 18:1,14
166:19 188:13	48:13,14,14 76:15	167:15 216:8,18	160:7 162:19	120:15 132:1
209:16	83:19 84:3,19,19	found 47:20,20	163:1,7,18 164:3	180:18 197:9
followed 9:3 86:19	86:4,8 87:3 88:2,7	49:8 121:18	165:3 166:8 167:8	generate 17:17
106:8	88:9,10,21,22	122:17 123:15,22	173:7	143:12
following 13:12	89:21 90:8 92:3	124:4,10,12,16	frying 88:8	generic 203:19
17:21 38:2 39:2	102:2,10 103:4	125:15,16,17,20	Fukagawa 1:11	gentlemen 4:3
40:3 107:8,18	108:4,6 113:5,13	125:21,21 126:10	46:6,7 49:17,18	gestational 216:14
108:17 120:3	120:11 121:8	135:16 158:11	51:4 68:13,17	getting 51:1 100:19
169:1 192:2	134:21 145:8	159:6 160:15	108:20 111:1,13	107:17 144:8
209:17 215:8	172:7 174:2	162:17 181:10	140:6,7,9 141:2,6	203:20
follow-up 13:3	188:20 195:18	183:8	141:9 153:8 217:5	GI 122:8,13 123:1
63:14 115:1 141:9	202:18 203:12	four 30:2 41:13	217:6	123:20 124:16
food 21:14 22:5	food-based 6:16	79:6 110:20	full 7:17,21 36:22	125:5 126:4,14,17
23:6 27:5,7,8	food-related	125:16 138:7	42:14 46:14 47:1	127:1,6,9,12
28:20 29:7,13,15	173:21	156:10 158:10	173:11 177:13	girls 79:4 85:14
30:21 31:4,4,5	foremost 216:21	159:4 169:20	fully 10:11 25:6	give 8:17 42:21
34:7 48:18 75:12	forget 172:14	176:13,18 182:9	210:22	44:4 57:22 113:20
77:4 78:3,6 80:11	form 25:12 48:16	183:22 197:5	full-blown 64:14	119:7 209:5,18,19
80:22 82:14,15	68:21 84:6	fourth 1:5 4:12	function 50:17	210:10
83:8,17 84:2,5,7,8	formal 20:16 21:3	four-fold 79:18	functional 51:8	given 14:9 20:9
84:17,22 85:6,20	formally 25:20	fractions 177:10	fundamental 90:8	58:2 103:8 139:21
86:1,5,9,15,18	former 155:4	fracture 179:13	funded 147:10	157:7 178:6
87:1,2,5,6,9,10,14	forms 84:20 106:16	frame 27:17	funny 193:1	gives 104:11
87:19,20,22 88:2	formulas 83:9	frames 55:5	further 42:10	giving 9:14 79:11
88:3,13,14,19	forth 20:20 51:10	framing 104:16	43:12 45:20,21	104:17
89:3,3,7,7,8,9,16	80:15 131:16	frankly 177:9	66:20 69:12,15	GL 122:8,13 126:5
89:19 91:1,12	fortification 21:11	free 12:7	86:8 117:18	126:15,17 127:1,7
92:1 93:5 94:3,5	27:3 35:22 36:1,9	French 181:7	130:10 191:8	127:12
95:7 96:19 100:17	36:11,21 37:20	frequency 172:1	furthermore 47:19	glad 165:11 201:18
101:10 102:14,19	38:3,19 39:3,18	frequent 183:9,11	future 11:12 35:15	global 101:22
104:3,6,8,10	40:3,19,22 41:9	fried 107:10	154:16	171:6 217:17
106:9 107:9,18	41:12 42:4,7,11	front 52:1 110:3		glucose 120:10,14
109:2 112:6,12,16	44:7 48:6 56:12	111:19 217:1	G	120:18,21 121:1,9
112:17,17,19	60:1,3 62:3 63:6	fruit 34:10 106:12	G 4:1	133:3,4 195:20
113:4,8,15 119:15	63:15 65:6,8	106:21 119:16	gain 156:1,17	196:2
120:15,18 152:10	66:14,16 67:1,9	155:21 156:5,16	216:15	glycemic 119:12,13
154:3 163:10	67:11 68:8 70:14	157:2,18,21 158:6	gap 104:15	120:2,2,4,5,8,22

121:4,7 122:6	107:7,8,9 108:2	209:11	217:3 218:13	guys 185:14
123:2,7,11,12	109:1 112:3 119:3	grading 19:22	grouped 99:3 217:8	
124:6,8,19,22	119:5,10,20	grain 22:15 39:3	grouping 112:20	<u> </u>
125:2,7,10,14,19	128:11 133:12,18	43:18	groups 28:8,19	half 22:16,17 81:14
127:19,19 131:4	142:1 145:5 152:1	grains 22:16,16,17	31:5 46:18 47:18	106:10,15,18,19
132:17 133:15	154:4,6 165:1,14	90:14,15,22 109:6	50:3 69:19 83:16	109:14 159:14
195:18,19	167:9 173:12,22	213:21	83:17 87:19 88:2	hammer 100:14
go 4:7 36:5 46:9	174:12 175:7	gram 161:21	88:3 89:16,20	hand 95:2 151:16
54:18,19 56:5,7	178:15 184:18	grams 120:15	90:11,12 91:14	happen 107:5
62:2,16 64:20	186:3 190:21	203:7,9	94:4 100:17	117:21 212:17
66:19 75:19 77:14	192:9,11,12 201:2	grant 146:22	102:14,19 104:8	happened 67:8
80:7 89:11,11	203:21 204:9,16	granted 51:22	107:9 109:2	happening 57:9
90:18 93:14,22	207:15 210:7,22	grateful 23:17	119:16 128:1	105:16 108:8
97:19 101:13	213:20 215:16	great 49:1 74:6	132:12 136:22	193:14
114:11 116:19	218:8	98:9 102:8 135:19	152:10 154:3	happens 155:9
117:7 119:3 120:7	good 4:4 9:6 13:22	144:3 149:9 205:3	172:7 173:2	happy 11:16 186:9
128:6,21 129:6,9	14:1 49:21 52:18	greater 48:2 79:2,4	180:20 187:7	hard 14:6 58:16,18
130:10 135:7	66:21 79:14 98:22	79:5 116:17	200:13 213:21	59:14 115:15
136:17 137:13	130:1 144:21	122:10,13 126:19	growth 216:14	145:17 175:11
143:4 146:12	147:14 151:1,4	149:2,18 164:11	guess 11:21 65:2	191:15 202:9
149:10 151:13	168:16 195:5	greatest 78:21	73:16 74:21 95:18	havoc 133:7
152:10,15 153:6,7	gov 8:7	greatly 131:17	102:22 114:17	Hayes 26:19
154:4,9 162:7	governed 7:2	Greece 11:18	128:12 144:8	HDL 182:20
167:3 169:6	Government 15:2	green 78:12 81:4	179:18 184:21	183:10,13 184:12
170:17 173:2	grade 20:9,11	98:10,15,21 110:8	186:6	184:20 186:13
174:20 175:1	37:21 38:21 39:20	greens 99:16	guidance 5:10	head 103:20 116:4
176:10 178:14	40:20 42:21 44:4	110:13	14:11 15:9 21:16	149:22
179:5,18 186:11	51:14 52:16,22	group 8:18 20:2	28:6 80:18 86:5	health 1:3 2:10 3:7
190:1,6 199:12	53:7 55:10,11,17	28:19 35:14,19	205:11	3:8 4:22 5:18,22
204:5 215:5,9	56:2,7,7 58:9 60:9	38:14 62:16 64:21	guide 27:18 104:3	6:3 9:9,12,21 10:3
216:8,18	62:14 63:1 122:8	68:20 73:1 75:18	Guideline 4:13,21	10:10,14 21:13
goal 85:2 151:20	123:9 125:3,8	78:3 80:1,2 81:11	6:5,14 8:11,14	23:2 28:13 29:3
goals 16:13 22:11	126:2 127:4	84:9,22 87:11	13:19 21:6 82:17	37:3 45:14 70:4
83:12,21 84:15	135:11 137:6	91:11 92:1 93:11	155:4 186:12	72:4,18 73:6,7,12
85:7,15,19 86:10	155:18 157:15	93:19 95:14 99:4	guidelines 1:4 3:10	74:12 134:1,4,7
88:15,20 94:11	158:20 160:2	106:9 109:22	5:14,15 6:10 10:7	135:5,8 137:3
217:1	168:15 176:5	110:4 113:4,16	15:3 19:10 23:20	140:16 141:14,14
goes 218:3	178:6,12 180:2,16	118:12 130:17	28:5 29:7 31:1	141:21 144:3,15
going 36:4,4,6	181:18 182:16	131:9 149:8	45:21 46:17 83:3	174:1,17 177:4
40:10,12 45:5	183:16 184:10	151:14 152:16	83:6 84:1 93:2,3	178:1,5,11 179:1
46:9 54:7 56:14	185:7,7 186:3	165:18 172:1	113:12 169:2	179:5,9,15 195:14
57:3,12 61:13,22	196:22 198:7	185:2 189:16,16	174:22 193:19	201:15 203:8
62:8 66:4 67:13	205:22 209:5,19	192:4,16 193:4	195:1 196:9	214:2 217:12
71:12 77:3,18	210:10	194:17 200:12	204:12,17 206:12	218:6,6
89:11 94:6 96:14	graded 20:16 25:1	201:1 203:19	208:1 210:19	healthy 18:8,11
98:19 101:2	210:11	205:12 207:9	211:5 214:6	37:12 131:14
102:18 106:3	grades 20:20 209:4	215:19 216:16	gut 204:18	132:12

				Page 250
hear 7:22 16:21	highly-appreciated	hypertension 33:20	181:18 187:6	61:21 64:14
211:15	4:18	159:9,19 182:6	196:22 198:7	inclined 56:6
heard 215:12,12	high-risk 38:8	hypertensive	209:5,19	include 21:9 31:8
hearing 24:13	62:16	146:20	imagine 75:7	31:12 35:6 89:15
heart 34:4 50:11	hindsight 168:22	hypothesis 53:22	200:16,19	127:21 129:9
51:14 65:12,19	169:3	54:9 64:5,19	impact 22:10,14	135:1 136:6
66:6 68:9,15	history 45:2 130:10	166:11	38:18 39:17 40:18	139:11 175:7,11
101:16 157:19	holding 16:9 90:16	100.11	68:8 71:6 86:17	201:12
180:11	hole 145:15	I		included 18:12
height 153:16	HOLLY 2:6	iceberg 98:22	109:4 140:16 160:14 165:1	19:14 28:16 29:11
0		115:19		
held 11:3,4 27:10	home 100:14	idea 95:20 108:7	170:9 184:20	29:19 30:16 47:5
Hello 150:19	159:19	207:15	impetus 95:6	81:6,8 87:21 88:1
help 14:11 16:13	homocysteine 48:2	ideal 84:6,6,18	implement 168:14	122:2 129:10
17:2,12 23:4,16	50:12	85:22 86:19 87:1	implementation	155:10 174:10,12
26:2 78:13 104:16	hope 15:19 117:19	87:14,16,20 88:13	71:1	175:15 183:22
119:4 145:2	hopefully 76:9	89:2 101:4,21	implications 21:16	189:8 196:17,18
212:12 218:4	hoping 128:3	102:2,8 117:18	160:20 162:14	includes 23:19
helpful 95:19 96:5	Horn 1:7,10 3:9	identified 28:17	191:19	85:21 86:13
99:7 100:1,12	13:19,21 48:17		implying 140:11	134:17,19
130:8,11 218:8	74:17,18 93:10	83:9 84:16 87:17 107:16 135:6	importance 78:14	including 20:18
helping 26:20 76:5	114:8 116:7 118:3		174:1	27:5 30:3 78:11
helps 171:7	118:10,20 148:15	216:5 217:1	important 10:6	85:16 191:5
hesitant 67:3,22	148:17 150:17,19	identify 28:1 29:8	13:11 20:14 23:5	inclusion 17:21,22
HHS 2:4,7,10,12	163:12 171:18	113:2 139:10	75:21 91:11 92:22	37:8 88:9
6:3,19 9:2 10:13	190:2 202:11	171:5 202:14	94:16 100:21	income 112:13
Hi 36:3 71:19 106:4	207:3 215:3	212:5	104:15 118:1	inconsistency
184:7	217:19 218:11	identifying 21:18	141:10 150:7	178:9
high 28:19 67:11	hospital 42:3	II 20:10 55:17 56:7	194:19 202:9	inconsistent 8:20
69:18 74:3 76:17	hospitalized 18:18	61:16 63:8 120:6	204:22	42:22 51:19 52:4
91:16 92:7 122:13	hot 71:20	121:17 124:20,22	impossible 103:18	52:19 53:6 55:8
122:22 125:5,10	hour 204:9	125:3,6,11 127:2	103:18	126:16 136:15
126:4,5 143:21	hours 10:5 204:9	127:8,9 154:17	improve 10:13	178:9
170:2 183:20	housekeeping	157:15 166:20	137:22	incorporate 50:21
184:3 189:13	109:20 110:16	174:18 178:6	improvement 53:2	151:17
199:2 201:8	114:7	180:2 182:16	improvements	incorporated 51:3
higher 32:14 68:20	huge 91:22 144:14	183:16,16,18	178:5	increase 33:5,7
75:3 88:1,4,5,12	165:13 205:6	184:10 185:7,7	inadequate 25:6	37:18 41:1,6 42:7
88:22 157:1	human 1:3 3:8 4:22	186:3 187:6 196:7	28:20 33:9 72:6	46:1 63:16 67:19
162:15 166:8	9:13,21 10:3 18:1	199:17,19,21	73:18 126:7	81:18 120:13
183:10,12 184:10	37:12	200:5 209:19	127:13 128:18	179:13 186:13,14
highest 67:21	hundred 41:13	III 20:10 39:20	incidence 38:20	increased 33:21
158:13 181:3	105:9	40:20 42:21 52:22	39:1,11,19 40:19	38:1,13 80:16
200:17,18	hydroxy 32:6	55:10 56:8 60:9	41:1,16	81:10 87:19
highlight 78:13	hypercholesterol	62:14 63:1 126:2	incidences 18:20	155:21 156:4
79:13 100:21	199:5	135:11 137:6	incident 121:21	158:5,6 160:7
highlights 86:3	hyperlipidemics	155:18 158:20	incidentally 92:11	181:11 182:20
highly 14:17	203:15	160:2 180:16	incidents 39:12,16	184:12
, - ····				
L	1	1	1	1

increases 81:6	infarction 180:10	141.12 10 152.19	interventions	item 31:5 80:22
182:18	inference 69:22	141:12,19 152:18 154:14 155:12,16	137:11	
	influence 65:17	154:14 155:12,10	intra 132:16	84:5,7 87:5,7 104:10
increasing 33:4 40:10 111:7	66:12			items 86:9 104:6
116:22	influencing 62:13	158:6,12,17 159:2	intriguing 177:9 intrinsic 49:11	IV 20:10
	info 92:5	159:7,13,16,18,21	introduce 8:9	
incredibly 100:12	inform 14:11 15:1	160:5 161:21		i.e 75:9 171:22
independent 163:4	76:6	173:16,17 174:15	introduced 9:7 81:9	J
independently 158:7	information 8:13	176:4,15 177:22 178:3 179:11,12		$\overline{\mathbf{J}}$ 1:13
index 119:13 120:2	12:4,8 14:18 16:8	178.3 179.11,12	introducing 5:5 invaluable 94:8	Jan 118:22
120:4,8 121:4	17:14 19:13 27:2	181:7,21 182:5,12	inverse 124:4,13	January 36:21
120:4,8 121:4 122:6 123:7,11	27:11 32:10 77:1	181.7,21 182.3,12	125:17,22 156:15	37:10 112:14
122.0125.7,11	142:21 143:9	182.13,17 183.13	123.17,22 130.13	121:19 135:3
124.22 123.2,14	142.21 145.9	193:12 195:6,19	159:15 160:16	196:10
127.19 131.4	177:15	195.12 195.0,19	166:5 180:12	Joanne 1:21 3:14
195:18,19	informing 6:8	190.3,21 197.1,22	182:4	26:15 97:22
indicate 49:14	218:9	203:2,3 211:20	inversely 199:21	118:13 120:1
152:20	infrastructure	214:15 218:3,5	v	142:10 149:12
indicated 32:3	147:14	intakes 21:20 28:2	investigated 69:2 77:4	150:12 152:4
33:15 49:16	ingestion 120:14	28:7 30:1 34:11	investigating 78:2	217:22
indicates 31:7,16	initial 71:8 120:20	35:2 72:6 79:5	145:7	job 10:6 138:15
34:8	initiating 117:6	95:3 137:20 138:2	investigations	149:9 169:14
indicator 120:22	input 23:18	157:2 158:6	207:13	205:3 213:11
indicators 30:8,12	insight 49:5	162:15 183:1	involve 191:4	John's 165:8
30:19	inspection 131:18	190:11 197:17	involved 14:15	join 9:22
indices 28:22	instances 95:17	integrated 217:11	124:2	joining 5:19 9:16
indiscriminate	instances 55.17 instinct 204:18	217:17	IOM 21:6 32:15,21	9:18
74:21	instrumental 26:20	integrity 24:4	Iraq 11:18	judged 179:11
individual 8:12,18	insulin 121:1 181:9	intended 64:22	iron 35:11 85:12	judgment 208:20
86:14 120:19	intact 24:5	interchangeably	138:22	juices 155:14
121:5 132:16	intake 22:6,14 23:1	163:7	ischemic 180:11	July 175:3
155:10 175:15	27:22 28:20 29:7	interest 86:16 99:1	isocaloric 22:8	June 121:14 135:4
196:15,18 211:13	29:9 30:2,22 31:6	99:5 138:13	101:5,18 105:9	154:20,21
212:8	36:11 45:13 47:6	176:20 201:13	isocalorically	justice 151:15
individually 75:10	47:15 50:2 68:20	218:17	102:17,18	
individuals 11:13	72:22 74:8 78:9	interested 9:11	isolates 202:19,21	K
18:8 28:2 32:4,12	78:15,22 80:11	11:8	issue 58:16 61:7,9	K 1:11 31:12 32:1
33:8 34:1,12,18	81:16 82:15,15	interesting 42:1	71:1 72:4 74:20	34:8 116:12
34:22 41:14 48:10	83:8 84:13 86:14	international 12:10	91:10 96:8 101:6	Kathryn 2:3 6:1
49:10,13,22 112:5	86:18 87:7 89:9	18:3 159:12	110:16 165:20	keep 7:10 16:15
190:9 207:12	90:3,10 91:13	internationally	168:12 169:15	53:22 75:7,20
individual's 82:10	93:20 94:17 98:2	11:15	171:19 205:5	89:21 133:14
induced 68:20	98:5 101:11	interpret 142:19	issues 25:9 48:21	207:4 216:8
121:2	104:10,14 105:12	153:17	74:12 95:13 96:11	kept 111:4,21
induces 141:13	108:5,6,12 110:17	intervention	152:17 186:6	key 53:3 101:6
infancy 19:8	116:17 121:2	139:20 176:17	190:6 191:8,20	138:21 171:12
infants 19:7 32:20	134:21 135:13	179:14,16 198:19	193:7	keyworded 167:7
				167:11
L			•	•

				1 (0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 7,	155 10 100 1
kidney 72:10167:3,5,9,15,17larger 11:8 18:5107:1 149:11Linde 5:20kilograms 156:12167:18,19,20,21 $55:10 00:4 157:21$ 181:3 190:21Linde-Feucht 2:11kind 54:20 75:9168:1,1,4,14larges 79:19levels 22:9 31:23:6 0::2,5,878:195:17 96:6170:4,18 171:1,14Larry 51:11 58:557:10 62:4 67:11ine 12:13 145:6100:9,15 10:18171:21 172:3,9,1060:7 61:5 71:1867:16,21 69:11215:6 217:2110:21 116:8172:14,17 173:1098:8 101:1 146:870:7 76:17 78:15lingering 66:19142:91 14:50:21177:17 184:8,13170:17 203:1687:13 88:1,45,5,11176:21 180:18174:4 201:15185:14,18 186:6207:17 209:294:8 102:5 160:9182:19 195:7188:7 191:20190:8,16,20 191:9Larry's 152:15liberty 5:5 6:6lipid 130:16 183:7208:13191:13,20 192:17Lasty 25:22librarians 119:2187:22 193:1335:16 54:17 45:14193:13,17.18lattudes 32:5,11librarians 119:2187:22 193:1335:16 54:17 55:14194:4,10,18 195:932:14library 16:21 17:4198:10 20:1458:3 60:10.12,20203:10,12 204:17LD 1:10life styles 142:12Liquids 21:4965:14 67:7 69:5.6205:14,15,18,19183:10,13 184:20lifestyles 142:12Liquids 21:4965:14 67:7 69:5.6205:14,15,18,19183:10,13 184:20lifestyles 142:12Liquids 21:4965:14 67:7 69:5.6205:14,15,18129:33lifetloi02 21:59lifetloi02 21:59lifetloi02 21:59 <td>kick 49:1</td> <td>165:6,7,9,12</td> <td>largely 46:21</td> <td>169:8 212:17</td> <td>177:13 190:1</td>	kick 49:1	165:6,7,9,12	largely 46:21	169:8 212:17	177:13 190:1
kitograms 156:12 is 167:18, 19.20, 21 is 157:21 is 18:1 90:21 is 1.1 ide-Feucht 2:11 is 168:1 90:17 90:6 is 170:4, 18 171:1, 14 is 149:21 is 158:5 is 57:10 6:24 67:11 is 168: 171:21 172:3, 9, 10 is 0:7 6:17 78:15 is 160:9 11 is 12:13 145:6 is 0:7 0:7 6:17 78:15 is 169:9 12:13 145:6 is 0:7 0:7 6:17 78:15 is 169:9 12:13 145:6 is 0:7 71:17 178:15 is 170:17 203:16 is 0:7 0:7 6:17 78:15 is 169:9 182:19 195:7 113:7 215:8 is 186:16, 19 187:5 210:4 21:56 is 183:7 is 0:83:7 is 0:18:14:18 is 0:20:17 209:2 94:8 102:51 60:9 is 182:19 195:7 113:7 10:13 189:15 217:3 is 160:9 is 0:20:14 is 170:13 189:15 217:13 is 160:16 is 0:7 6:16 77:16:17 56:16 is 0:18:19 195:7 is 110:18 197:55 is 0:19 19:37 209:2 is 0:10:10:20:14 is 0:16 133:7 is 0:18:7 is 0:13:10:13 19:15 217:13 is 0:10:14:15 is 0:16:18:17 55:16 is 0:18:19 195:7 is 0:13:10:12 0:19:13 20:19:12 is 0:14:15 is 0:15:16 is 0:14 is 0:0:5.14 is 0:0:14 is 0:0:2.5 is 0:0:0.12 is 0:0:14 is 0:0:15 is 0:0:14 is 0:0:14 is 0:0:14 is 0:0:14 is 0:0:15 is 0:15 is 0:16 is 0:15 is 0:16 is 0:15 is 0:16 is 0:17 is 0:0:13 is 0:10 is 0:11 11 0:11 is 0:11 0:11 0:11 0:11 0:11 0:11 0:11 0:1					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $, , ,	0		, ,
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			•		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,			,	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,	· · · · ·		,	,
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		· · · · · ·			
		,			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		-			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,			8
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			v	•	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,	e e		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,			<i>′</i>
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $, ,	· · · · ·		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				e e	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,				, , , ,
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,	,	-	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			-	•	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	·			0	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	·	· · · · ·		0	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			0		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		· · · · · ·			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,	-		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		-		,	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	-			·	,
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	106:16,20 108:8	knowing 11:16	leaves 110:9,10	162:6,7 171:21	190:19 218:13
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	108:13 115:2,3,13		led 17:18 96:1	limited 20:10 39:20	Ũ
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	116:12,12 117:1,5		184:9	40:21 60:9 94:17	liter 32:8,19 48:3
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	128:16,17 130:9	knows 167:15		135:11 137:7,13	19:6,7 24:7,22
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		T	0	,	
140:121 (11:15,17) 142:11,15,17Ladies 4:3 language 18:2 37:15201:7 lesions 63:21 letting 101:9161:10;12 (14:16) 198:8,11 199:20144:2,4,16,20 145:2 147:1237:15 large 15:21 16:8 44:8 70:12 72:11 73:4 81:18 132:16201:7 lettuce 78:12 81:3 98:19,22 110:11 110:13 115:19161:2 164:16 165:11 173:19149:15 150:2,18 150:21 151:18,19143:2 203:4 214:5201:7 lettuce 98:22 99:313110;20 175:11 176:22			,	,	
142:11,10,17 1anguage 18:2 1anguage 18:2 165:11 173:19 143:4,5,22 144:1 1anguage 18:2 37:15 1eting 101:9 1imits 172:2 165:11 173:19 144:2,4,16,20 147:12 1arge 15:21 16:8 1eting 101:9 13:19,20 26:11 175:11 176:22 148:3,5,6 149:3 144:8 70:12 72:11 98:19,22 110:11 74:18 76:3 90:15 204:19 205:6 149:15 150:2,18 73:4 81:18 132:16 110:13 115:19 94:22 118:16 1ittle 13:17 47:10 150:21 151:18,19 143:2 203:4 214:5 1ettuces 98:22 99:3 148:17 150:8,19 48:20 52:4 96:2			199:20 200:4	,	145:16 146:14
144:2,4,16,2037:15letting 101:9Linda 1:7,10 3:9175:11 176:22145:2 147:12large 15:21 16:8lettuce 78:12 81:313:19,20 26:11178:15 193:21148:3,5,6 149:344:8 70:12 72:1198:19,22 110:1174:18 76:3 90:15204:19 205:6149:15 150:2,1873:4 81:18 132:16110:13 115:1994:22 118:16little 13:17 47:10150:21 151:18,19143:2 203:4 214:5lettuces 98:22 99:3148:17 150:8,1948:20 52:4 96:2	, ,			·	
141.2, 1, 10, 20large 15:21 16:8lettuce 78:12 81:313:19,20 26:11178:15 193:21148:3,5,6 149:344:8 70:12 72:1198:19,22 110:1174:18 76:3 90:15204:19 205:6149:15 150:2,1873:4 81:18 132:16110:13 115:1994:22 118:16little 13:17 47:10150:21 151:18,19143:2 203:4 214:5lettuces 98:22 99:3148:17 150:8,1948:20 52:4 96:2	, ,	0 0			
148:3,5,6 149:344:8 70:12 72:1198:19,22 110:1174:18 76:3 90:15204:19 205:6149:15 150:2,1873:4 81:18 132:16110:13 115:1994:22 118:16 little 13:17 47:10150:21 151:18,19143:2 203:4 214:5 lettuces 98:22 99:3148:17 150:8,1948:20 52:4 96:2			8	,	175:11 176:22
149:15150:2,1873:481:18132:16110:13115:1994:22118:16little13:1747:10150:21151:18,19143:2203:4214:5lettuces98:2299:3148:17150:8,1948:2052:496:2		0		,	
150:21 151:18,19 143:2 203:4 214:5 lettuces 98:22 99:3 148:17 150:8,19 48:20 52:4 96:2	148:3,5,6 149:3		98:19,22 110:11	74:18 76:3 90:15	204:19 205:6
	149:15 150:2,18		110:13 115:19	94:22 118:16	little 13:17 47:10
153:10,15 164:7 214:10,11 let's 77:1 143:18 152:4 172:22 99:11 101:19	150:21 151:18,19		lettuces 98:22 99:3	148:17 150:8,19	48:20 52:4 96:2
	153:10,15 164:7	214:10,11	let's 77:1 143:18	152:4 172:22	99:11 101:19

115:1,9 125:9	197:13 199:8	147:1,20 153:10	magnesium 30:4	McPEAK 2:6
135:17 146:9	201:6 205:18	153:21 154:9	31:9 35:7,9	MD 1:11,13,17,19
149:10 164:12	208:11 210:4	160:21 173:19	116:13 190:12	1:22 2:11
176:6 187:16	212:15 216:13	176:20 177:10,17	magnitude 20:6	mean 47:15 57:1,7
195:16 197:1	218:3,4	186:17 187:13	main 101:2 162:9	57:14,20 58:2,6
200:1 218:16	looked 42:2 67:17	192:6 193:5,13	209:2	58:12,19 59:15
live 11:2 13:8	89:17 101:3	199:14 201:1,22	maintain 49:13	60:6 69:6 72:2
lives 5:14	121:13,19 129:2	202:2,2 203:10	170:12	92:21 99:10 101:8
living 32:13	132:10 139:22	212:10,12 214:7	maintenance	105:1 117:9,9
load 119:12 120:2,5	142:20 152:14	low 28:12 31:17,20	122:11 123:2	121:3 128:10
120:22 122:7	154:21 155:12	38:16 73:21 74:3	major 23:5 110:22	141:3 144:1
123:2,8,12 124:6	166:6 175:6	93:7 122:13 123:1	146:16 161:17	147:18 165:1,14
124:8,19,22 125:7	177:18 189:12	179:11 189:14	162:13 200:10	169:19 170:22
125:10,19 127:19	196:15,16	199:11 201:4,9	204:20 212:4	171:12 184:8
131:4 133:4,15	looking 27:14	lower 32:5,11 33:9	majority 86:6	188:17 189:1
logical 82:22	34:21 37:12 42:5	33:22 85:17 93:20	93:21	193:2 203:18
long 59:17 100:7	42:14 44:17 49:7	93:20 112:13	making 74:14 94:2	204:2,16 211:20
106:21,22 156:17	50:13 51:7 54:3	126:20 135:14	108:22 117:1	215:12 218:10
longer 132:2 161:2	57:2,4 60:8 67:16	137:14,16,20	164:12 208:20	means 15:22 28:6
188:9,10	71:3 73:8 83:1	138:2 146:11	malaria 18:22	204:8
longer-term 169:7	89:20 90:6,11,14	155:22 159:19	malnourished	meant 101:5
longitudinal 39:6	90:20 92:2 97:2	160:8 176:22	18:19	measure 164:9
123:15 125:13	108:17 112:21	181:8 183:2,10,19	management 8:15	measured 159:19
126:11 136:1	116:9,21 132:9	184:2 195:5,7,11	23:20,22 177:11	measures 24:3
138:6 178:19	137:18 141:6	195:17 197:17,21	manager 24:1	132:17 161:21,22
198:17	149:4 150:2 152:5	198:12 199:4,6	mandatory 36:19	179:5
long-range 161:3	154:17 155:8	203:7	38:3,19 39:3,18	measuring 50:11
long-term 132:5	158:1 172:6 173:6	lowered 198:20	40:18,21 42:6	meat 144:2,4,16
186:8	177:20 181:9	lowering 195:15	67:8	meats 72:9
look 10:21 37:17	184:19 186:21	198:10	manifestation 19:8	meat-eater 145:22
42:13 54:8 55:3	187:21 189:15	lowers 195:13	manufacturers	meat-eaters 137:15
56:2,6 65:7 67:14	191:11 193:19	lowest 113:6	67:12	137:17,21 143:21
68:11 71:6,7	210:19 212:8	158:14 195:20	March 121:15	meat-eating 145:1
73:14 74:16 76:2	looks 50:1 51:13,21	low-fat 174:9	margins 114:7,7	median 79:5 81:18
78:5 90:9 96:18	59:8 62:3 86:21	181:14 188:6	marinara 92:7,10	medical 6:12 10:9
96:22 102:13	95:16 96:13	191:4	marker 50:14	18:15
110:19 112:13	loss 122:10,15	luckily 4:5	markers 178:22	medication 61:12
117:19 128:7	123:1 140:1 142:4	lunch 29:19	mass 137:14	medium 11:7
131:21 132:1,11	156:5,11 182:13	lurking 72:4	massive 189:19	189:13
142:1,7 146:5	183:4 197:10,14		matched 139:12	meet 16:13 35:4
149:19 151:20	lost 110:18	M	materials 20:18	67:13 80:12,17
152:17 153:3,16	lot 58:20,22 60:13	M 1:16	math 102:17	82:16 83:3 85:6
159:3 160:22	61:4 72:9,11	macronutrient	matrix 163:10,11	85:18 86:5 94:11
163:5 164:16	94:14 95:7 102:20	83:14 142:2	matter 149:4 170:7	102:9 112:7 113:2
170:7 172:13	119:4 128:1 132:3	214:22	maximize 172:11	113:14 117:12
177:13 192:12,13	138:13,14 139:15	macronutrients	McMURRY 2:3	meeting 1:5,7 3:15
192:13 195:2	143:13 145:9	83:13,15	6:1	4:13 7:12,17,22
L	-	•	•	

				2
8:1 10:22 11:2,3,9	80:8 82:11 91:6	202:16,17,20,22	methodology 77:12	99:22 102:1
12:12,15,21 13:2	91:20 92:20 94:20	203:6,17 206:8	157:9 171:20	114:22 129:16
13:2,7,18 14:4	95:11 96:12,15	207:2 209:1 210:3	methods 88:8	143:14,16 147:17
15:18 16:1,10,14	97:7,9,22 98:8,13	210:12,15 212:1	methyl 68:20	150:8 168:6
25:19,21 33:13	98:18,20 99:6,14	212:22 213:12,14	methylmalonic	191:22 192:1
34:9 41:22 48:11	99:15,17,21	213:16 217:5,20	50:14,18 51:7	194:9 210:15
81:20 82:9 90:3	100:22 101:20	members 5:2,4	Mexican-Americ	Mim's 116:4
90:17 94:16 98:7	102:22 103:11,12	8:11,16 10:1,2	38:9	mind 75:8,21 89:22
100:15,17 113:6	103:16,17,19,22	13:9 14:1 16:14	Mexico 38:10	207:4 216:8
205:10 218:22	104:20 105:11,13	23:21 24:8 26:12	micrograms 37:5	mineral 75:10
meetings 7:19 16:6	105:14,15,19	118:19	47:17	minerals 83:13
35:18	107:19,22 108:3	men 33:16,18,19	micromoles 48:3	194:20
member 1:12,13,14	108:10,20 111:1	181:12 183:11	middle 156:2	minimum 18:3
1:15,16,17,18,19	111:10,13,17	mention 90:15 98:1	milestones 14:7	113:14
1:20,21,22 4:17	112:2 113:17	152:4 167:1	milk 90:21,21	minor 33:6 82:5
25:22 26:10 36:3	114:10,12,14,22	194:21 199:13	106:12,22 107:11	96:8 109:19 198:4
45:7 46:6 49:2,4	115:11 116:2,6	210:3 213:13	107:12 119:17,18	minus 40:10,11,12
49:17 50:6 51:4	118:16 119:22	mentioned 139:13	154:5 172:21	40:13
51:11 52:3,9,11	127:16,20 128:5,9	201:19 204:14	173:7,7,9,9,15,21	minutes 118:5
52:12,15,16,21,22	128:20 129:16	menus 147:8	174:1,1,6,6,16,16	MIRIAM 1:15
53:1,8,12,14,18	130:12,15 131:8	message 106:15	174:22,22 176:4,5	mish-mash 109:15
53:19 54:2,4,6,7	132:7,14,22	107:13,17	176:7,7,21 177:2	misleading 73:19
54:10,11,12,15,16	133:12 140:6,8,9	messenger 205:4	177:10,20,20,22	missing 25:17
54:20,21,22 55:2	140:17 141:2,5,6	met 17:21 29:6	177:22 178:4,4,10	73:22 151:22
55:4,6,9,13,14,16	141:8,9,22 142:10	84:15 85:16 86:12	178:10,22 179:8,8	mixed 46:2 125:4
55:18,19,20,22	142:20 143:15	88:17,21	179:12,15,15,19	127:10 159:11
56:1,4,9,10,21,22	144:9 145:4,18,19	meta 44:9 53:16	179:20,20,22,22	178:8 182:9
57:5,6,7,11,13,16	146:1,4,7,8	130:4 178:18	180:4,4,15,15,17	ml 32:7,16,17,18
57:17,19 58:5,10	147:17 148:3,9	181:1 183:21	180:17 181:3,14	33:3
58:11,12,13,15,18	150:3,8 152:3,12	196:18 198:15	181:14,14,17,17	mode 8:2
58:19 59:6,8,10	153:2,8,19 154:8	metabolic 130:20	181:21,21 182:11	model 87:21 105:7
59:12,13,15,21,22	161:8,12,14,16	174:18 180:14,16	182:15,15,17,17	105:16 112:4
60:2,4,5,12,15,16	163:13 164:15,21	180:18 181:5,12	183:2,15,15,20	162:20 192:21,22
60:18,19,22 61:1	166:18 167:16	181:14	184:3,4,4,10	214:18
61:6,18 62:10,11	168:6,9,11,21	meta-analyses 43:3	185:2,2,3,4,19,19	modeled 31:2 89:9
62:21,22 63:5,11	169:11 170:11,15	51:22 53:2 127:22	185:21 186:15,15	modeling 21:15,21
63:12,13,22 64:1	170:19 171:7,10	155:12 158:2,5	186:18,18,22	22:3,7,13,21
64:4 65:4,9,10,13	171:11 172:20	175:16 196:16	187:1,19,19,22,22	26:21 27:5 34:7
65:14 66:1,2,8,9	177:5,7,8,16	meta-analysis	188:4,4,6,7,13,17	48:18 77:5,6,9,11
66:10,12 67:3	184:7,22 185:5,22	43:14 44:21 53:13	189:5 190:10	77:15 78:7 82:14
68:13,16,17 69:4	186:2,16 187:4,5	55:10 122:3	193:6,11,11 194:7	82:19 83:4,7,22
69:9,16,17,21,22	187:9,17 188:12	129:20 166:13	194:8	86:1,16 87:3
70:2,3,10,11,15	188:19,22 189:4,7	175:12,17,21	millimeter 146:19	89:13 90:13 91:2
70:16,18,19,21,22	189:9,11 190:1	179:1,10 180:7	million 33:19	91:5 92:2,4,14
71:4,19 72:20	192:1 194:7	183:17,22 197:4	Mim 26:15 36:1,3	94:5 95:7 100:9
73:16 74:5 76:3	200:10,14,16	method 171:22	47:10 51:12 52:3	101:17,22 105:2
76:21 77:21 80:6	201:3,18 202:12	172:17	65:6 68:13 76:4	106:6 108:1 110:7

114 10 00 115 6		010 11 15 01 (10	114 00 116 6	104.0 140.10
114:19,20 115:6	N	212:11,15 216:13	114:22 116:6	non 134:8 142:12
116:20 139:2	N 4:1	217:13	129:16 143:15,16	Noncaloric 214:10
190:7 192:20	name 9:11 11:19	needed 14:19 21:3	147:17,18 150:8	nonchronic 131:14
214:12,19	13:10 72:1	21:4 25:8,19	168:6,11 171:7,11	nonfat 188:6
models 89:4 95:15	nanamoles 32:7,17	46:10	192:1 210:15	nonhypertensive
moderate 20:10	32:19	needs 16:9 28:8	Neoplasm 121:22	146:21
125:3 157:15,16	nanograms 32:7,16	71:16 80:13,18	nervous 52:5 193:3	nonsignificant
178:6,13 180:2	32:18 33:2	82:10 86:12 90:3	net 201:8	43:10,19
182:17 183:16	Naomi 1:11 26:15	91:3 93:1 94:16	neural 36:13 37:6	non-animal 137:5
moderation 22:11	46:6 49:5,18 51:4	100:15 102:10	38:20 39:2 45:16	non-Hispanic
85:19 88:15	108:20 140:7	145:16 212:10	46:4 57:1 65:15	32:22
modest 155:22	153:8 217:5	negative 123:13	66:4 69:14 70:12	non-vegan 139:22
modifications	Naomi's 150:4	126:6 127:10	neurological 46:19	normal 34:2 74:2
22:10	153:1	141:13,21 166:15	never 57:20 60:10	133:6 199:7
moment 9:18 68:2	narrowing 204:22	neither 104:21	209:18	Norway 44:13
75:6	nation 11:15	NEL 16:21 17:1,11	new 11:7 43:5 47:3	note 12:18 20:14
monitoring 12:12	national 23:2 25:4	19:17 20:12,16	81:8,15,22 82:4,7	32:9 76:19 97:20
12:20 71:9	30:7 39:13 71:13	21:3 24:1,2,6 37:9	99:8 100:2 117:2	noted 19:3 43:16
monosaturated	nationally 38:7	46:14 47:1 97:13	133:19 164:5,8,10	157:21
93:5	nationally-repres	97:19 119:1,6,11	170:9,10 172:14	notes 12:14
monounsaturated	39:8	133:17 135:12,22	193:11 206:15	notice 7:15 127:21
93:8	naturally 48:13	151:1 155:19	214:7	November 1:6 3:2
morning 47:8	naturally-occurr	157:16 158:21	newer 148:12	null 128:13,14
218:19	49:19	160:3 167:2,17	NHANES 29:12,20	number 12:10
mortality 40:2,8,14	nature 190:14	181:19 194:13	29:22 30:13 31:19	15:11,21 20:5
43:11 44:14 45:1	193:15	205:15 206:10	33:14 38:8 47:6	33:8 49:7,9 80:10
57:3 158:8	Nearly 33:19	209:12,18 210:5,7	47:14 84:4 87:4	95:13 115:4
move 27:4,10 48:17	necessarily 75:11	211:9	108:13 181:9	130:17 136:14
75:20 76:22 89:19	130:3 148:21	Nelson 1:15 36:3,4	183:8 185:20	138:9 139:11
95:4 133:18 154:3	149:7 164:19	45:7 52:3,4,11,15	186:1	142:14,16,21
172:21 174:4	169:4 193:22	52:21 53:1,12,18	nice 4:6 91:8	143:1 152:13,13
200:7 207:20	202:1 207:17	54:2,6,10,12,16	138:15 148:13	165:13 168:16
212:18	necessary 14:17	54:21 55:2,6,13	175:21	169:18 216:6
moved 192:5	93:21	55:16,19,22 56:4	Nickols 26:6 82:12	numbers 53:16
movement 109:5	neck 33:17	56:10,22 57:6,11	Nickols-Richard	110:2 111:19
moving 39:17	need 21:10 25:13	57:16,19 58:11,13	1:16 3:12 26:10	113:19 136:22
89:15 90:2 98:12	41:19 54:9,14	58:18 59:6,12,21	49:2 72:20,21	numeric 209:18
MPH 1:13,17,19,22	57:9 71:14 98:6	60:2,5,15,18,22	74:5 76:21 80:6	numerous 123:3
2:8	104:17 117:12	61:6 62:10,21	82:11 96:15 97:9	nutrient 3:12 21:20
MSW 2:9	138:16 139:10	63:5,12,22 64:4	105:19 116:2	22:19 26:5,13
multiple 171:1	143:11 151:13	65:9,13 66:1,8,10	161:8,14 217:20	28:8 29:6 30:21
204:3	164:5 165:21	67:3 68:16 69:4	NIH-funded 186:8	31:13 34:20 35:4
multiplying 121:3	166:16 170:12	69:16,21 70:2,10	nine 79:4 83:12	46:10,13,15 48:21
multivitamin 76:11	187:18 191:8	70:15,18,21 71:4	136:3 178:17	71:22 73:2,12,18
myocardial 180:10	203:4 205:20	76:3,4 99:21	197:4 Ninetics 102:10	77:1 78:17 80:3
MyPyramid	207:20 210:1	101:20 102:1	Nineties 193:10	80:18 81:21,22
112:22	211:1,3,14,22	103:11,16,19	nodding 116:4	82:9,16,17 83:20
			Į	ļ

Г

88:2,8,13 85:19 nutriture 34:15 60:8,22 63:10,10 91:10 P4:1 package 170:22 86:17 71:10,13 0 65:13 76:21 77:3 102:21 216:20,22 102:81 102:21 216:20,22 102:81 102:21 216:20,22 102:81 102:21 216:20,22 102:81 102:21 216:20,22 102:81 102:21 216:20,22 128:13 102:21 216:22 212:16:12 202:17 208:11 103:81 173:17 154:81 67:21 organizations 25:5 111:19 paper 99:19 122:12 124:11 paper 99:19 122:12 111:19 paper 99:19 122:12 124:11 paper 99:19 122:12 111:19 126:18 111:19 126:18 111:19 126:18 111:19 126:18 111:19 126:18 111:19 126:18 111:19 126:18 1		1	1	1	1
88:19 86:6,6,9,12 65:13 76:11 77:19 package 170:22 package 170:22 88:02.028 04:1 0bese 116:20 0bese 116:20 0cs8 107:6114:8 0rganization package 163:8 90:37,9 91:1 0bese 116:20 0bese 116:20 0rganization package 170:22 package 163:8 94:11,16 96:3 0bese 116:20 0bese 116:20 organization paper 99:18 125:13 102:9 104:9 173:17 211:20 125:22 216:12 202:17 209:15 128:6.8 195:18 organization 25:5 111:19 137:18 173:1 0beervation 7:18 0de 23:3,18 48:8 organization 25:5 111:19 paper 99:19 132:9 137:18 173:1 0stervation 7:18 0de 33:3,18 48:8 osteoprosis 33:17 outcome 20:6 73:7 90:4 146:13 127:29 128:2 125:13 126:12 155:13 18:115 154:10 160:1 126:18 176:15 177:28 90:4 146:13 28:14 15,17,18 165:13 18:115 154:10 160:1 126:15 132:20 116:14 12:10,14 29:24,9,11 obtain 153:13 once 11:10 116:20 126:15 132:20 14:14:15 154:16 </td <td>84:2,8,13 85:15</td> <td>nutriture 34:15</td> <td>60:8,22 63:10,10</td> <td>91:10</td> <td>P 4:1</td>	84:2,8,13 85:15	nutriture 34:15	60:8,22 63:10,10	91:10	P 4:1
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				order 1:7 47:7 57:8	package 170:22
88:20.20 89:14 0 4:1 105:8 107:6 114:8 organization PAGE 3:3 90:37,9 91:1 obese 116:20 115:7 116:6 115:13 organizations 25:5 gramizations 25:5 organizations 25:5 organizations 25:5 113:13 141:5,8 organizations 25:5 organizations 25:5 111:19 paper 99:18 100:5 113:13 141:5,8 organizations 25:5 111:19 paper 99:18 100:5 113:13 141:5,8 organizations 25:5 0rganizations 25:5 <td></td> <td>0</td> <td>82:11 98:13 102:7</td> <td>102:21 216:20,22</td> <td></td>		0	82:11 98:13 102:7	102:21 216:20,22	
90:3,7,9 91:1 obese 116:20 115:7 116:6 115:13 pancreatic 124:3 94:11,16 96:3 obesity 93:16 103:7 133:13 141:5,8 organizations 25:5 rganizations 25:5 124:11 97:1 98:16 100:15 103:8 117:13 145:8 167:21 organizations 25:5 124:11 102:9 104:9 215:22 216:12 202:17 209:15 128:6.8 195:18 organizal 128:12 128:1 117:3 130:19 208:11 observation 7:18 old 82:1 99:8 100:2 orginals 128:11 206:11 137:17 12 125:22 125:13 126:12 155:7 164:19 outce 88:11 outce 88:11 71:2 80:1 82:18 214:20 215:1 25:13 126:12 155:7 164:19 outcomes 20:6 73:7 outcle 83:11 70:21 28:18 29:2,4,9,11 obtain 153:13 208:2 73:13 121:22 17:6 13:22 participants 8:2 29:20,22 30:3,16 obtain 422:4 ones 63:9 129:2 126:15 132:20 participate 8:3 34:17,19,21 35:5 obviously 96:10,18 corginal 3:2 12:2 17:4:14:21 14:4 14:2 31:8 41:2,18 116:15 153:22 ones 63:9 129:2 126:15 132:2	88:20,20 89:14	O 4:1	105:8 107:6 114:8		
94:11,16 96:3 obesity 93:16 103:7 133:13 141:5,8 organizations 25:5 124:11 97:198:16 100:15 103:8 117:13 154:8 167:21 organize 19:13 paper 99:18 100:5 102:9 104:9 173:17 211:20 215:22 216:12 202:17 209:15 128:6,8 195:18 paper 99:19 132:9 113:5,15 116:22 objective 7:7 215:3 originals 128:11 206:11 137:18 173:21 observation 7:18 observational osteoporosis 33:17 more 88:11 206:11 137:12 12:12 125:13 126:12 175:8 196:14 outcome 88:11 37:12 54:4 56:10 217:9 218:2 135:22 138:5 once 11:10 116:20 126:18 176:15 170:21 28:11,11,51,71,18 156:13 181:15 154:10 160:1 126:18 176:15 170:21 28:18 29:2,49,11 obtain 153:13 208:2 73:13 12:12 64:14 134:1,4,7 135:59 participats 8:2 20:12 30:2,16 obtains 12:21 64:14 134:1,4,7 135:59 participats 8:2 11:6:14 134:1,4,7 135:59 participats 8:2 21:17,19 s3:18 13:21 164:14 134:1,4,7 135:59 particip	90:3,7,9 91:1	obese 116:20	115:7 116:6	0	pancreatic 124:3
97:1 98:16 100:15 102:9 104:9 103:8 117:13 173:17 211:20 154:8 167:21 185:6 189:8 organize 19:13 original 5:2 122:3 paper 99:18 100:5 108:19 112:7 113:5,15 116:22 151:22 216:12 202:17 209:15 202:17 209:15 218:6,8 195:18 paper 99:19 132:9 113:5,15 116:22 objective 7:7 208:11 208:11 old 82:1 99:8 100:2 original 5:2 182:11 206:11 137:18 173:21 observation 7:18 observational old 82:1 99:8 100:2 original 5:2 182:11 206:11 214:20 215:1 59:19 123:4,16,17 76:12 97:4 135:5 outcome 20:6 73:7 90:4 146:13 217:9 218:2 135:21 1326:12 155:7 164:19 outcome 20:6 73:7 90:4 146:13 28:12 92:2,4,9,11 obtain 153:13 208:2 73:13 121:22 11:6,14 12:10,14 29:20,22 30:3,16 obtained 22:4 one 63:9 129:2 126:15 132:20 11:6,14 12:10,14 29:21,22 30:3,16 obtious 192:20 168:3 171:5 137:1 144:12 144:2 30:18 31:3,7,11 83:18 116:15 153:22 one's 169:21 144:15 154:16 participato 29:15 30:18 117,19 166:13 177:12 one's 169:21 144:15 154:16 participato 29:15 92:14 01:16 <td>94:11,16 96:3</td> <td>obesity 93:16 103:7</td> <td>133:13 141:5,8</td> <td>organizations 25:5</td> <td>-</td>	94:11,16 96:3	obesity 93:16 103:7	133:13 141:5,8	organizations 25:5	-
108:19 112:7 215:22 216:12 100:100:100:100:100:100:100:100:100:100	97:1 98:16 100:15		154:8 167:21	organize 19:13	paper 99:18 100:5
113:5,15 116:22 117:3 130:19objective 7:7 208:11 observation 71:18 observational 59:19 123:4,16,17 217:9 218:2215:3 208:11 observational 59:19 123:4,16,17 127:9 218:2observation 71:18 observational 59:19 123:4,16,17 125:13 126:12observation 71:18 observational observational 76:12 97:4 135:5 0oservation 116:20originally 16:6 originals 128:11 osteopenosis 33:17 outcome 20:6 73:7 004 116:13150:14 151:10 	102:9 104:9	173:17 211:20	185:6 189:8	original 5:2 122:3	111:19
117:3208:11old 82:19:8100:2originals28:11206:11137:18173:21observation 7:18109:13osteoporia33:18osteoporia33:18192:4197:17observationalobservationalr61:2109:13osteoporia33:18124:20215:159:19123:4,16,1776:1297:4135:5part 7:1691:15:8217:9218:2125:13126:12155:7164:19outcome 20:673:790:4146:1327:2,15,16,20observed 124:15once 11:10116:20outcome 20:673:790:4146:1328:1,11,15,17,18156:13181:15154:10160:1outcome 20:673:790:4146:1328:1829:2,49,11obtain 153:13208:273:13121:2211:6,14121:10,1429:2,02230:3,16obtained 22:4ones 63:9129:2126:15132:2014:230:1831:3163:18171:5137:4140:16participate 8:334:17,19,2135:5obviousl 92:20168:3171:5137:4140:16participatio 29:1545:190:16:15153:22one's 169:21144:15154:16garticipatio 29:1545:19163:18177:12ongoing 23:1840:7180:9192:518:1092:3 96:1999:1,4101:11174:13140:14open 7:7,16,1843:74:6378:2113:12:62:14:46117:13138:2140:14 </td <td>108:19 112:7</td> <td></td> <td>202:17 209:15</td> <td>128:6,8 195:18</td> <td>papers 99:19 132:9</td>	108:19 112:7		202:17 209:15	128:6,8 195:18	papers 99:19 132:9
11:1:1:1:1:1:1:1:1:1:1:1:1:1:1:1:1:1:1	113:5,15 116:22	0	215:3	originally 16:6	150:14 151:10
19:2:4 197:17 19:2:4 197:17observational 59:19 123:4,16,17older 33:3,18 48:8 76:12 97:4 135:5osteoporosis 33:17 ought 115:8part 7:16 9:12 37:13 54:4 56:10217:9 218:2 217:9 218:2125:13 126:12 135:22 138:5155:7 164:19 175:8 196:14outcomes 88:11 outcomes 20:6 73:7 0:e 11:10 116:2071:2 80:1 82:18 175:8 196:14mutrients 22:4,14 29:20,22 30:3,16observed 124:15 156:13 181:15ince 11:10 116:20 156:13 181:15ince 11:10 116:20 120:12ince 88:11 outcomes 45:1471:2 80:1 82:18 participants 8:228:18 29:2,4,9,11 29:20,22 30:3,16obtained 22:4 obtained 22:4one 61:10 16:20 133:18ince 11:10 16:20 133:12 164:14ince 11:10 16:12 133:12 164:14ince 11:10 16:12 133:14,7 135:5.930:18 31:3,7,11 34:17,19,21 35:5obviousl 92:20 obviousl 99:61:0,18 44:75 73:9 79:14obtained 22:4 obviousl 99:61:0,18 209:11 210:17inde:14 134:14,7 135:5.9inde:14 participate 8:3 participate 8:3 participate 8:333:18 44:12,18 116:15 153:22 09:1,4 101:14 116:15 153:22inde:16:21 one's 169:21 one's 169:21inde:14 144:15 154:16 180:9 192:5 196:6inde:12 29:15 34:21 47:5 48:4 49:6,9 52:8 63:1 99:1,4 101:1499:1,4 101:14 171:13 138:2,21inde:14 046 f1:20 046 f1:20online 20:21 online 20:21 011:12 10:17inde:14 13:12 02:14 44:4 118:16 23:12:5 218:6116:10,11 117:4 171:13 138:2,211 016:10occar 71:9 16:1 016:14online 8:5 046 f1:20operational 34:0 046 f1:20014:7 106:16 046 f1:20offer 61:2 212:2 04fred 12:212operational 3:	117:3 130:19		old 82:1 99:8 100:2	originals 128:11	206:11
214:20 215:1 59:19 123:4,16,17 76:12 97:4 135:5 ought 115:8 37:13 54:4 56:10 217:9 218:2 125:13 126:12 155:7 164:19 ouce 88:11 71:2 80:1 82:18 27:2,15,16,20 observed 124:15 observed 124:15 outcome 45:14 90:4 146:13 28:1,11,15,17,18 156:13 181:15 ots in 153:13 208:2 73:13 121:22 11:6,14 12:10,14 29:20,22 30:3,16 obtained 22:4 ones 63:9 129:2 126:15 132:20 14:2 participants 8:2 34:17,19,21 35:5 obvious 192:20 obvious 192:20 obvious 192:20 oes 63:9 129:2 126:15 132:20 14:2 35:18 84:12,18 116:15 153:22 one's 169:21 144:15 154:16 participate 8:3 35:21 90:12,21 obvious 192:20 oes's 169:21 144:15 154:16 participate 3:1 99:1,4 101:14 16:15 153:22 one's 169:21 144:15 154:16 34:21 47:5 48:4 89:21 90:12,21 odd 11:20 one's 169:21 144:15 154:16 34:21 47:5 48:4 99:1,4 101:14 213:18 one 11:0 0.16 174:18 175:5,8 31:10 2:21 44:6 116:10,11 117:4 138:12,221 one 18:5 oper 77,16,18 <td>137:18 173:21</td> <td></td> <td>109:13</td> <td>osteopenia 33:18</td> <td>parallels 56:3</td>	137:18 173:21		109:13	osteopenia 33:18	parallels 56:3
217:9 218:2 125:13 126:12 135:7 164:19 ounce 88:11 71:2 80:1 82:18 nutrients 22:4,14 135:22 138:5 observed 124:15 ince 11:10 116:20 outcome 20:6 73:7 90:4 146:13 27:2,15,16,20 observed 124:15 ince 11:10 116:20 ince 88:11 outcome 20:6 73:7 90:4 146:13 28:18 29:2,4,9,11 obtain 153:13 come 63:9 129:2 ince 63:9 129:2 ince 63:9 129:2 ince is 63:9 129:2 ince	192:4 197:17		older 33:3,18 48:8	osteoporosis 33:17	part 7:16 9:12
nutrients 22:4,14 135:22 138:5 intrients 22:4,14 intrients 22:4,15 intrients 22:4,14 intrientients 22:4,14,15 intrients 22:4,14,15 <	214:20 215:1		76:12 97:4 135:5	ought 115:8	37:13 54:4 56:10
arriveling 27:2,15,16,20 28:1,11,15,17,18 28:18 29:2,4,9,11observed 124:15 156:13 181:15once 11:10 116:20 156:13 181:15126:18 176:15 157:12170:21 participants 8:228:18 29:2,4,9,11 29:2,22 30:3,16 30:18 31:3,7,11 34:17,19,21 35:5 47:5 73:9 79:14obtain 153:13 obtious 192:20 obviously 96:10,18 16:15 153:22ones 63:9 129:2 168:3 171:5126:18 176:15 outcomes 45:14 131:12 164:14126:18 176:15 participants 8:234:17,19,21 35:5 47:5 73:9 79:14 83:18 84:12,18 85:8,11 89:17,18obviously 96:10,18 163:18 177:12 213:18136:15 153:22 one's 169:21126:15 132:20 144:15 154:16 one-day 30:1 oneis 169:21144:15 154:16 participation 29:1599:1,4 101:14 99:1,4 101:14 117:13 138:2,21166:15 153:22 cocur 7:19 16:1 140:14one-day 30:1 onios 162:10 online 20:21174:18 175:5,8 outside 8:18 210:17 213:1000111 17:4 011:14 17:13 138:2,21120:17 cocur 7:19 16:1 140:14198:3 212:5 218:6 overal 23:22 24:12 on-line 8:5 oper 7:7,16,1813:11 26:21 44:6 d43:7 46:3 78:210117:13 138:2,21 0117:13 138:22offer 161:2 212:2 office 3:7 5:17,21 014:12 20:21Openg 3:3 operationally193:3 197:16 213:31012:12 04:7 106:16 04:17:106:166:2 9:9 112:15 officials 10:20Operationally operations 8:21 opinion 20:11 operations 8:21 opinion 20:11 opinion 20:11 opinion 20:11 opinion 20:11 opinion 20:11 opinion 20:1213:3 opaties 11:5 94:13 path 179:6 oversight 15:9 pathways 146:5	217:9 218:2		155:7 164:19	ounce 88:11	71:2 80:1 82:18
28:1,11,15,17,18156:13 181:15156:10 160:1cutcomes 16:14176:1628:1,11,15,17,18156:13 181:15obtain 153:13comes 63:9 129:2126:15 132:2014:230:18 31:3,7,1133:18a3:18131:21 164:14134:1,4,7 135:5,9participants 8:234:17,19,21 35:5obvious 192:20168:3 171:5137:4 140:16participate 8:347:57 73:9 79:14obvious 192:20168:3 171:5137:4 140:16participate 8:383:18 & 116.15 153:22one's 169:21144:15 154:16participate 32:1085:8,11 89:17,18163:18 177:12one-day 30:1174:18 175:5,834:21 47:5 48:489:21 90:12,21184:17 185:14ongoing 23:18 40:7180:9 192:5 196:649:6,9 52:8 63:199:1,4 101:14213:18onc-day 30:1174:18 175:5,834:21 47:5 48:499:1,4 101:14213:18online 20:21outside 8:18210:17 213:10117:13 138:2,21occasional 134:20online 20:21outside 8:18210:17 213:10117:13 138:2,21120:12open 7:7,16,1843:7 46:3 78:2113:11 26:21 44:66:17ODPHP 2:4,7,1291:4127:3 128:15138:3 176:21104:7 106:166:2 9:9 112:15Opening 3:3193:3 197:16213:3046 61:2004ficials 10:20operations 8:21operations 8:21operations 8:21104:7 106:166:2 9:9 112:15operations 8:21operations 8:21operations 8:21172:5officials 10:20officials 10:200perations 8:21overrepresented<	nutrients 22:4,14		175:8 196:14	outcome 20:6 73:7	90:4 146:13
28:18 29:2,4,9,11 obtain 153:13 0btain 22:4 01:10:10:11 01:10:10:11 11:6,114 12:10,14 39:12,22 30:18 31:3,7,11 33:18 0bviousl 92:20 01:11:5 12:11:6,14 12:10:17 14:14,21 14:2 participate 8:3 47:5 73:9 79:14 0bviousl 96:10,18 116:15 153:22 01:11:5 137:4140:16 29:17,19 participate 8:3 83:18 84:12,18 116:15 153:22 0ne's 169:21 144:15 154:16 141:14,21 144:4 29:17,19 85:8,11 89:17,18 163:18 177:12 one's 169:21 144:15 154:16 13:21 0:17 144:15 154:16 140:14 29:17,19 99:1,4 101:14 213:18 occasional 134:20 one's 169:21 0utside 8:18 210:17 213:10 99:1,4 101:14 213:18 occasional 134:20 open 7:7,16,18 43:7 46:3 78:21 13:11 26:21 44:6 117:13 138:2,21 0df 61:20 0PHP 2:4,7,12 91:4 127:3 128:15 138:3 176:21 9:12 0perationally operationally overaching 45:9 pattes 11:8 pattes 11:8 104:7 106:16 6:2 9:9 112:15 official 209:21 official 209:21	27:2,15,16,20		once 11:10 116:20	126:18 176:15	170:21
29:20,22 30:3,16 30:18 31:3,7,11obtained 22:4 83:18loss 63:9 129:2 131:21 164:14126:15 132:20 134:1,4,7 135:5,9 137:4 140:16144:1 9 9articipate 8:3 participate 8:	28:1,11,15,17,18		154:10 160:1	outcomes 45:14	participants 8:2
10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:1	28:18 29:2,4,9,11		208:2	73:13 121:22	11:6,14 12:10,14
34:17,19,2135:5 (bvious 192:20)168:317:17 (168:3137:410:16.17 (17:12)participation 29:15 (14:14,2134:17,19,2135:5 (16:15)0bvious 192:20 (16:15)168:3171:15 (20:11137:410:16 (16:12)137:410:16 (16:12)29:17,19 (20:1183:1884:12,18 (16:15)116:15153:22 (16:3:18116:15153:22 (20:11141:14,21144:14 (20:1129:17,19 (20:1129:17,19 (20:1185:8,1189:17,18 (16:12,21)163:18177:12 (16:14)one-day 30:1 (16:12,21)144:15154:16 (16:12,21)144:15154:16 (16:12,21)34:2147:548:4 (40:6,20,23,22,24:12)99:1,4101:14 (16:14)213:18 (16:14,11,14)000 (16:14,11,14)000 (16:12,21,22,12)000 (16:14,11,14)13:1126:21 (16:22,12,12,12)000 (16:14,11,14,11,12)000 (16:14,11,14,11,12)000 (16:14,114,12)000 (16:14,114,12)13:1126:21 (16:12,21,12,12)000 (16:14,114,12) <t< td=""><td>29:20,22 30:3,16</td><td></td><td>ones 63:9 129:2</td><td>126:15 132:20</td><td>14:2</td></t<>	29:20,22 30:3,16		ones 63:9 129:2	126:15 132:20	14:2
47:5 73:9 79:14 47:5 73:9 79:14obviously 96:10,18 116:15 153:22 as:8,11 89:17,18116:15 153:22 163:18 177:12 163:18 177:12 163:18 177:12120:17 141:14,21 144:4 144:15 154:16 one-day 30:1 174:18 175:5,8120:17 141:14,21 144:4 144:15 154:16 144:15 154:16 34:21 47:5 48:489:21 90:12,21 99:14, 101:14184:17 185:14 213:18 occasional 134:20 occur 7:19 16:1 173:11 190:13163:18 177:12 140:14one-day 30:1 one-day 30:1 onions 162:10174:18 175:5,8 180:9 192:5 196:634:21 47:5 48:4 49:6,9 52:8 63:1 91:2 5218:6117:13 138:2,21 173:11 190:13occasional 134:20 occur 7:19 16:1 140:14online 20:21 open 7:7,16,18outside 8:18 43:7 46:3 78:21210:17 213:10 particularly 11:16 13:11 26:21 44:6nutrient-based 6:17 104:7 106:16odd 61:20 91:224:20 49:3 51:17 91:481:12,22 126:21 127:3 128:1565:20 75:2 136:12 138:3 176:21nutrient-focused 172:5offer 161:2 212:2 91:12:15Opening 3:3 0perationally193:3 197:16 91:4213:3 193:3 197:16nutrient-focused 172:5Office 5:12 official 209:21 official 209:21 official 209:21operations 8:21 opportunities 8:3 opportunity 22:2 215:17 opposed 51:19oversight 15:9 overview 19:19path 179:6 patients 18:19 43:8	30:18 31:3,7,11		131:21 164:14	134:1,4,7 135:5,9	participate 8:3
83:18 84:12,18 116:15 153:22 one's 169:21 144:15 154:16 particular 32:10 85:8,11 89:17,18 163:18 177:12 one's 169:21 144:15 154:16 particular 32:10 89:21 90:12,21 184:17 185:14 ongoing 23:18 40:7 180:9 192:5 196:6 49:6,9 52:8 63:1 99:1,4 101:14 213:18 oncins 162:10 198:3 212:5 218:6 81:10 92:3 96:19 116:10,11 117:4 cccasional 134:20 online 20:21 outside 8:18 210:17 213:10 117:13 138:2,21 140:14 open 7:7,16,18 43:7 46:3 78:21 13:11 26:21 44:6 6:17 0DPHP 2:4,7,12 91:4 127:3 128:15 138:3 176:21 13:11 26:21 44:6 6:17 0DPHP 2:4,7,12 91:4 127:3 128:15 138:3 176:21 13:11 26:21 44:6 6:17 0Jfice 3:7 5:17,21 91:4 127:3 128:15 138:3 176:21 13:11 26:21 44:6 104:7 106:16 offer 161:2 21:2:0 Operationally overarching 45:9 parties 11:8 172:5 official 209:21 opinion 20:11 75:15 pass 45:5 pass 45:5 172:5 officials 10:20 0ff-mic 189:3 opportunities 8:3 overrepresented	34:17,19,21 35:5		168:3 171:5	137:4 140:16	participation 29:15
85:8,11 89:17,18 89:21 90:12,21163:18 177:12 184:17 185:14 213:18163:18 177:12 184:17 185:14 213:18Internet one of a y 30:1 one-day 30:1174:18 175:5,8 180:9 192:5 196:6 198:3 212:5 218:634:21 47:5 48:4 49:6,9 52:8 63:199:1,4 101:14 99:1,4 101:14213:18 213:18 occur 7:19 16:1 140:14occasional 134:20 occur 7:19 16:1one-day 30:1 198:3 212:5 218:6174:18 175:5,8 49:6,9 52:8 63:134:21 47:5 48:4 49:6,9 52:8 63:1117:13 138:2,21 177:13 138:2,21occasional 134:20 occur 7:19 16:1online 20:21 online 20:21outside 8:18 016:12 23:22 24:1291:10 92:3 96:19 210:17 213:10117:15 15 177:15140:14 odd 61:20open 7:7,16,18 9:1243:7 46:3 78:21 138:3 176:2113:11 26:21 44:66:17 104:7 106:16 104:7 106:16offer 161:2 21:2 9:12offer 161:2 21:2 0fficer 3:7 5:17,21 0fficer 5:12 official 209:21 official 209:21 officials 10:20open 7:1 9:14127:3 128:15 193:3 197:16138:3 176:21 213:3111:15 46:3,8 opportunities 8:3 opportunity 22:2overnourishing 200:12partners 4:20 pass 45:5111:15 94:13 patients 11:29opportunities 8:3 200:12overrepresented 200:12111:15 94:13 patients 18:9 43:8	47:5 73:9 79:14	•	209:11 210:17	141:14,21 144:4	29:17,19
89:21 90:12,21184:17 185:14ongoing 23:18 40:7180:9 192:5 196:649:6,9 52:8 63:199:1,4 101:14213:18occasional 134:20ongoing 23:18 40:7180:9 192:5 196:649:6,9 52:8 63:1116:10,11 117:410:14occasional 134:20online 20:21outside 8:18210:17 213:10117:13 138:2,21occur 7:19 16:1140:14open 7:7,16,1843:7 46:3 78:2131:11 26:21 44:60dd 61:200DPHP 2:4,7,1291:424:20 49:3 51:1781:12,22 126:2165:20 75:2 136:120DPHP 2:4,7,1291:4127:3 128:15138:3 176:219:12offer 161:2 212:20perationally193:3 197:16213:3010:17 106:16office 3:7 5:17,210perations 8:21operations 8:21operations 8:2104:7 106:16official 209:21official 209:21official 209:21oportunities 8:3oportunity 22:2172:5official 209:21official 8:0:200fficial 10:200ff-mic 189:3oportunity 22:20fficial 10:200ff-mic 189:3oportunity 22:220:12oversight 15:9path 179:60fficials 10:200ff-mic 189:3opportunity 22:220:12oversight 15:9path 179:60fficials 10:200ff-mic 189:3opportunity 22:220:12oversight 15:9path 179:60fficials 10:200ff-mic 189:3opportunity 22:20versight 15:9path 179:60fficials 10:200ff-mic 189:3offentimes 163:6opportunity 22:2oversight 15:9path 179:60fficials 10:200ff-mic 189:3	83:18 84:12,18		one's 169:21	144:15 154:16	particular 32:10
99:1,4 101:14 116:10,11 117:4 117:13 138:2,21 173:11 190:13213:18 occasional 134:20 occur 7:19 16:1 140:14onions 162:10 online 20:21 online 8:5 open 7:7,16,18 24:20 49:3 51:17198:3 212:5 218:6 198:3 212:5 218:681:10 92:3 96:19 210:17 213:10nutrient-based 6:17odd 61:20 9:12odd 61:20 9:12odd 61:20 9:12on-line 8:5 open 7:7,16,18 91:4overall 23:22 24:12 43:7 46:3 78:21particularly 11:16 13:11 26:21 44:6nutrient-dense 6:179:12 9:12offer 161:2 212:2 9:12open 7:7,16,18 91:443:7 46:3 78:21 127:3 128:1513:11 26:21 44:6 13:11 26:21 44:66:17 91:2ODPHP 2:4,7,12 9:1291:4127:3 128:15 193:3 197:1613:8:3 176:21 213:331:4 84:6,20 86:4 86:8 89:3,8 102:2offer 161:2 212:2 0ffice 3:7 5:17,21 6:2 9:9 112:15Operationally 120:12overarching 45:9 120:12parties 11:8 parties 11:8 parts 204:3nutrient-focused 172:5Officer 5:12 official 209:21 officials 10:20 Off-mic 189:3opportunities 8:3 opportunity 22:2 215:17 opposed 51:19oversight 15:9 overview 19:19path 179:6 patients 18:19 43:8	85:8,11 89:17,18		one-day 30:1	174:18 175:5,8	34:21 47:5 48:4
116:10,11 117:4 occasional 134:20 online 20:21 outside 8:18 210:17 213:10 117:13 138:2,21 140:14 open 7:7,16,18 overall 23:22 24:12 particularly 11:16 140:14 odd 61:20 24:20 49:3 51:17 81:12,22 126:21 65:20 75:2 136:12 6:17 0DPHP 2:4,7,12 91:4 127:3 128:15 138:3 176:21 9:12 offer 161:2 212:2 operationally 193:3 197:16 213:3 9:12 offer 161:2 212:2 operationally 193:3 197:16 213:3 104:7 106:16 6:2 9:9 112:15 operations 8:21 operations 8:21 operations 8:21 operations 8:21 0fficer 5:12 official 209:21 opportunities 8:3 operations 8:21 operations 8:21 operations 8:21 0fficel 10:20 0fficel 10:20 0fficel 10:20 0portunities 8:3 operations 8:21 operations 8:21 operations 8:21 operations 8:31 path 179:6 16:20 17:3 21:22 offernic 189:3 015:00:11 010:12 path 179:6 path 179:6 16:20 17:3 21:22 oftentimes 163:6 opposed 51:19 overview 19:19 patients 18:19 43:8	89:21 90:12,21		ongoing 23:18 40:7	180:9 192:5 196:6	49:6,9 52:8 63:1
110:10,111111occur 7:19 16:1online 20:21outside 0:10210:11 213:10117:13 138:2,21occur 7:19 16:1140:14on-line 8:5overall 23:22 24:12particularly 11:16117:13 138:2,21140:14odd 61:20013:11 26:21 44:665:20 75:2 136:12117:13 138:2,21odd 61:200DPHP 2:4,7,1291:4127:3 128:15138:3 176:21117:14 84:6,20 86:4offer 161:2 212:20ffer 161:2 212:20pening 3:30perationally138:3 176:21104:7 106:16office 3:7 5:17,216:2 9:9 112:150perations 8:21operations 8:21operations 8:21104:7 106:16official 209:21officials 10:20operations 8:31opportunities 8:3opportunities 8:3operations 8:211172:5officials 10:20off-mic 189:3opportunity 22:2200:12path 179:616:20 17:3 21:22oftentimes 163:6opposed 51:19overview 19:19patients 18:19 43:8	99:1,4 101:14		onions 162:10	198:3 212:5 218:6	81:10 92:3 96:19
11711913012,21140:14odd 61:20open 7:7,16,1843:7 46:3 78:2113:11 26:21 44:6odd 61:20open 7:7,16,1843:7 46:3 78:2113:11 26:21 44:66:17odd 61:20open 7:7,16,1843:7 46:3 78:2113:11 26:21 44:66:17open 10:2 21:2:open 10:2 11:5open 10:2 11:513:13 26:21 44:6011111office 3:7 5:17,21open 10:2 21:2:open 10:2 11:5operationally13:11 26:21 44:601111office 3:7 5:17,21open 10:2 21:2:operationallyoverarching 45:9parties 11:8104:7 106:16officer 5:12operations 8:21operations 8:21operations 8:21operations 8:21operations 9:11pass 45:501111:10:10,19official 209:21official 209:21opportunities 8:3overrepresentedpasta 91:15 94:1316:20 17:3 21:22offent 189:3opposed 51:19overview 19:19patients 18:19 43:8	116:10,11 117:4			outside 8:18	210:17 213:10
nutrient-based odd 61:20 24:20 49:3 51:17 81:12,22 126:21 65:20 75:2 136:12 nutrient-dense 9:12 9:12 0pening 3:3 193:3 197:16 213:3 attrient-focused office 3:7 5:17,21 0perationally 0perations 8:21 0perations 9:15 0path 179:6 172:5 official 209:21 officials 10:20 0ff-mic 189:3 0portunity 22:2 200:12 path 179:6 path 179:6 16:20 17:3 21:22 oftentimes 163:6 opposed 51:19 overview 19:19 patients 18:19 43:8			on-line 8:5	overall 23:22 24:12	
6:17ODPHP 2:4,7,1291:4127:3 128:15138:3 176:21nutrient-dense9:120ffer 161:2 212:20ffer 161:2 212:20pening 3:30overarching 45:9parties 11:831:4 84:6,20 86:4offer 161:2 212:2office 3:7 5:17,210perationally120:12138:3 176:21104:7 106:16office 3:7 5:17,216:2 9:9 112:150perations 8:21overarching 45:9partners 4:20104:7 106:16officer 5:12operations 8:21operations 8:21overnourishingparts 204:3172:5official 209:21officials 10:20opportunities 8:3opportunity 22:2200:12past 45:50fficials 10:20Off-mic 189:3offentines 163:6opposed 51:19overview 19:19patients 18:19 43:8			open 7:7,16,18		13:11 26:21 44:6
nutrient-dense9:12Opening 3:3193:3 197:16213:331:4 84:6,20 86:4offer 161:2 212:2offer 161:2 212:2offer 161:2 212:2offer 161:2 212:2104:7 106:16office 3:7 5:17,216:2 9:9 112:150perationally120:12overarching 45:9104:7 106:166:2 9:9 112:15operations 8:21operations 8:21overnourishing172:5official 209:21officials 10:20opportunities 8:3opportunity 22:210:10,19offer 189:3offer 189:3opposed 51:19overview 19:19	nutrient-based		24:20 49:3 51:17	81:12,22 126:21	65:20 75:2 136:12
31:4 84:6,20 86:4 offer 161:2 212:2 Operationally overarching 45:9 parties 11:8 86:8 89:3,8 102:2 office 3:7 5:17,21 02:12 overarching 45:9 parties 11:8 104:7 106:16 6:2 9:9 112:15 operations 8:21 overnourishing parts 204:3 nutrient-focused 0fficial 209:21 opportunities 8:3 opportunities 8:3 overrepresented 172:5 officials 10:20 0ff-mic 189:3 215:17 oversight 15:9 path 179:6 6:1 10:10,19 offentines 163:6 opposed 51:19 overview 19:19 patients 18:19 43:8	6:17		91:4	127:3 128:15	
86:8 89:3,8 102:2 office 3:7 5:17,21 120:12 45:11,15 46:3,8 partners 4:20 104:7 106:16 6:2 9:9 112:15 operations 8:21 overnourishing 75:15 parts 204:3 172:5 official 209:21 officials 10:20 opportunities 8:3 opportunity 22:2 200:12 pasta 91:15 94:13 6:1 10:10,19 offentices 163:6 opposed 51:19 overview 19:19 patients 18:19 43:8	nutrient-dense		Opening 3:3	193:3 197:16	213:3
104:7 106:16 6:2 9:9 112:15 operations 8:21 overnourishing parts 204:3 nutrient-focused official 209:21 opportunities 8:3 opportunities 8:3 overrepresented pasta 91:15 94:13 nutrition 3:4 5:7,10 officials 10:20 officials 10:20 opposed 51:19 oversight 15:9 path ways 146:5 16:20 17:3 21:22 oftentimes 163:6 opposed 51:19 overview 19:19 patients 18:19 43:8	31:4 84:6,20 86:4			6	parties 11:8
nutrient-focused Officer 5:12 opinion 20:11 opinion 20:11 opinion 20:11 pass 45:5 172:5 official 209:21 officials 10:20 opportunities 8:3 opportunity 22:2 200:12 path 20:10 6:1 10:10,19 offentines 163:6 opposed 51:19 overview 19:19 path 20:10	-			, , ,	-
172:5 official 209:21 opportunities 8:3 opportunities 8:3 overrepresented pasta 91:15 94:13 nutrition 3:4 5:7,10 officials 10:20 officials 10:20 opportunity 22:2 215:17 oversight 15:9 path 179:6 6:1 10:10,19 offentimes 163:6 opposed 51:19 overview 19:19 patients 18:19 43:8			-	6	-
nutrition 3:4 5:7,10 officials 10:20 opportunities 0:5 overrepresented path 91:16 91:16 6:1 10:10,19 0ff-mic 189:3 opposed 51:19 overright 15:9 path 179:6 16:20 17:3 21:22 offentimes 163:6 opposed 51:19 overright 15:9 pathentials 18:19 43:8					-
6:1 10:10,19 Off-mic 189:3 215:17 oversight 15:9 pathways 146:5 16:20 17:3 21:22 oftentimes 163:6 opposed 51:19 overview 19:19 patients 18:19 43:8					-
16:20 17:3 21:22 oftentimes 163:6 opposed 51:19 overview 19:19 patients 18:19 43:8	-				-
	-			0	
					-
	23:2 29:13 30:9	Oh 45:7 59:10 65:9	opposite 184:21	overwhelmingly	132:5
30:12 145:7 OHD 32:15 33:1,10 options 206:4 122:22 123:12 pattern 21:15 27:5			-		-
nutritional 4:9 oils 84:22 orange 78:11 79:1 Oxford 136:5,19 34:7 77:5 78:6 10 14 20 10 00 12 abox 26:11 26:6 7 abox 26:11 26:6 7 abox 26:11 26:6 7 abox 26:11 26:6 7			0	,	
10:14 30:19 80:12 okay 26:11 36:6,7 79:5,21 80:2 81:1 o'clock 118:7 83:20 84:12 85:2		•	· ·	o'clock 118:7	
83:11,21 84:14 45:7,7 52:17 110:19 85:21 86:1,13,15 85:7 115:20 55:19 56:5 59:15 orange red 81:5 P 87:16 89:4 6 10				P	
85:7 115:20 55:19 56:5 59:15 orange-red 81:5 P 87:16 89:4,6,10	85:7 115:20	33.19 30:3 39:13	orange-red 81:5		87:16 89:4,6,10
			l		

	1		1	1
117:19 134:17,19	72:11 100:15	performs 24:3	113:8	population 18:21
134:22 137:22	103:3,7 105:4,16	period 120:16	planned 16:7 25:18	27:21 30:9 31:17
189:17 192:14,19	108:1,14 113:13	periods 38:12	planning 70:9	38:9 47:21 48:8
202:7	115:14 117:7,11	156:13	plans 17:19 112:12	49:8 51:1 72:19
patterning 78:3	119:1 136:13,17	pernicious 46:19	112:16	75:1,16 97:4,6
patterns 27:7,7	138:18 139:8,20	person 23:19 107:6	plant 134:21	116:18 143:19
30:22 78:8,17	143:3,3 144:2,4	133:5	140:19 142:7	149:14,18 155:9
80:11 81:22 82:1	144:21 145:10	personally 8:13	152:22 214:15	180:19 181:6
82:15,20 83:2,8	148:12,19 149:16	75:6	plant-based 133:22	217:12
83:12 84:17 85:6	150:5 165:2,6	persons 45:2	134:5,18 135:9,13	populations 18:8
85:8,17,18 86:5	167:18,21 170:2	perspective 73:15	136:10,14,15	18:11,12,20
86:18 87:2 90:10	177:18 183:19	106:7 137:11	138:18,21 145:8	138:17 157:20
90:21 91:1 107:18	184:3 188:1,3,4	146:9 161:3 188:9	145:12 149:1	179:2
112:20 119:15	197:19 201:22	pertinent 18:13	plasma 36:12 37:18	population-based
133:22 135:18	203:3 206:17	PHD 1:10,11,12,15	37:22 160:14	40:4 56:19 69:11
138:4 139:6 140:5	207:1	1:16,17,18,21 2:5	plate 119:9 215:2	portfolios 19:18
172:7 189:13	peptides 188:16	2:13	plausibility 41:21	position 165:10
192:7 201:14,22	189:5	phosphate 72:1,8	63:18	positive 73:6
211:19 218:4	percent 18:7 31:16	phosphorous 72:2	play 71:11	123:21 124:9
peaked 41:10	32:4,22 33:15,16	72:2,12 73:3,11	please 12:18 26:1	125:15,20 126:6
Pearson 1:17 61:18	38:14 39:10,12,14	phosphorus 30:4	104:1 127:19	127:11 158:11
61:19 62:11,22	39:15 40:11,11,12	31:13 34:16 35:12	plus 108:6 203:22	159:17
65:4,5,10,14 66:2	40:13,13 43:16	phrase 134:4	209:12	possibility 101:14
66:9,12 69:9,17	47:21 48:7 57:4	physiologic 141:20	point 33:7 51:10	possible 25:15
69:22 70:3,11,16	69:13 79:6,9,10	pick 167:13 171:15	62:12 74:6 92:22	34:17,17 72:15
70:19,22 95:11	85:12 107:12	174:13 216:2	94:12 97:13,19	131:3,9 195:22
97:7 130:15,16	110:1,4 113:22	picture 113:20	108:10,14,16	209:17
132:7 145:19,20	114:1,1,2,2,3	piece 36:5 70:4,5	115:20 128:14	post 2:13 5:6 9:4
146:4 200:10,16	130:22 131:1	192:17,19,20	130:18 147:4,7,20	10:15,17 36:11
peas 111:15,15	143:18 149:14	193:4	148:10 150:4	60:6
119:19 154:5	153:4 181:12	pieces 25:16 70:1	163:21 164:1	posted 13:6
194:18 195:4,7,10	183:19 184:2	90:18 218:7	190:3 206:14	postfortification
196:1,6,22 197:2	214:14	piggy-backs 153:1	210:21 216:6	38:12 45:14
197:9,13,20,22	percentage 121:5	Pi-Sunyer 1:19	pointed 32:10	postponement
198:7,11,20	153:6	114:12 118:20	points 11:21 33:11	118:5
199:10,17,19	percentile 81:16	119:13,21,22	53:9 174:16	postprandial
200:6,18 201:20	perception 144:14	128:5,20 130:12	186:19	120:16
202:1,3	145:5	131:8 132:22	policies 117:11	potassium 31:9
pediatric 155:9	perennial 98:14,15	170:15 187:9	policy 3:4 4:10 5:7	33:21 35:7,12,14
peer 19:1 30:15	PEREZ-ESCAM	212:22	6:22 10:20,20	85:17 116:13
peer-reviewed	1:18 63:11,13	place 215:16	15:3 22:1 40:3	165:16
37:14	64:1 91:6 112:2	216:20	70:14	potential 19:7 35:3
PENELOPE 2:9	132:14 142:10	placed 153:10	polyps 64:11,17,22	72:17,17 79:17
Penny 5:17	189:11 202:12,17	placing 6:12 75:17	poor 31:20 132:20	82:16 138:20
people 4:12 44:15	202:22 213:14	plain 92:9 98:10	poorer 178:22	139:3 152:17
44:20 58:21,22	perfect 151:18	plan 16:2 75:21	pop 177:14	potentially 33:13
59:4 61:10 63:20	172:16	97:18 112:17	popped 64:21	97:3 140:21
	l			l

184:11	presented 21:9	prioritize 208:22	productive 10:22	155:17 157:14
power 128:18	22:19 24:19 25:11	priority 216:3	products 90:21	160:1 178:3
-	35:15,21 48:20		91:12 92:5 119:18	
practical 117:20 pre 38:12 62:3	102:6 161:4	probability 95:14 181:8		proposing 158:19
205:15	206:17 210:18	probably 50:10	134:10,18,20	prospective 59:16
		L V	135:1 137:6 152:5	122:18 123:15,19
precancerous	212:4	53:11 57:14 61:16	173:7,10 174:2,6	124:7 125:13
63:20 64:11	presenting 15:17	62:6 67:10 68:4	174:7,9,11,16	126:12 141:16
precise 212:21	36:8 114:15,16	97:2 103:8 105:22	175:1 176:5,7	156:9,14 158:3,10
preclude 8:21	presents 96:20	108:7 111:20	177:20,22 178:4	159:4,6 169:21
precluded 9:17	presiding 1:8	129:3,8 131:1	178:10 179:8,15	176:13,18 180:22
predicted 199:1	pressing 133:13	133:1 142:16	179:20 180:1,4,16	182:2,8,22 184:1
predicting 132:21	pressure 34:1,2	149:10 163:20	181:8,11,17,21	185:10,12 197:6
predominantly	57:10,14 61:4,12	209:22	182:5,11,16,17	198:1,16 199:9
127:5	62:8 135:14	problem 49:18,19	183:15 185:3,19	200:2 201:5
preexisting 42:19	137:16 145:20	72:19 73:20 76:15	186:15,18 187:1	prostate 124:18
44:2,16,20 59:1,4	146:12,18,19	96:20 98:14,15	187:20,22 188:4,7	protective 64:6,17
61:10 115:13	158:16,18 159:2	104:22 107:16	188:14,16,17	135:15 179:8
207:14	159:17 164:4	108:3 117:14	190:10,11 191:4	180:4,19
preface 17:13	165:5 169:20	134:11 146:16	193:7 213:22	protein 3:13 35:19
preference 18:4,7	170:3 181:16,18	167:4	profile 98:16 188:1	85:9 118:17
prefortification	181:22 182:13	problematic 34:15	profiles 84:8,13	119:14 134:9
60:6 62:4	191:6	61:14	87:10,13 202:14	137:5 138:4,22
pregnancy 176:16	pressure-potassi	problems 76:13	progress 213:19	139:13 140:5,10
pregnant 46:21	166:10	131:20 214:20	project 23:22 24:1	140:22 141:3,11
prehypertension	presumably 113:11	procedural 210:16	projects 71:9	141:12,18,19
33:20	140:9	procedure-orient	promise 196:1	142:7 144:10
preliminary 50:9	pretty 55:22 73:18	205:21	Promotion 3:5,7	148:19,20 149:16
190:18	129:3 166:3 173:2	proceed 26:5	4:10 5:8,18,22 6:3	149:17 150:4,6
premise 28:4 90:8	185:8 188:2 194:4	proceeded 62:1	9:10 22:1	152:5,7,9,14,18
Premium 50:11	201:9 203:4 211:2	proceeds 12:15	Promotions 10:20	152:21,22 153:4,5
preparation 88:8	211:6,14	process 4:21 7:17	promptly 7:7,9	153:7 173:14
prepared 19:17	prevalence 28:19	8:4 14:21 17:3,7	118:6	189:5 194:19
preparing 6:17	29:1 30:17 31:20	17:17 23:11 27:19	proper 94:3	195:12,15 200:11
preponderance	34:14 35:3 48:7	28:15 97:19 115:6	properties 135:15	200:19 201:6,8,9
6:11 10:8	prevention 3:7	135:12 155:20	proportion 33:3	202:19,21 203:7
present 1:9 2:1	5:18,22 6:2 9:9	157:16 158:22	78:21	213:22 214:1,3,15
16:11 24:14 26:22	30:7 59:2 216:11	160:4 167:2,2	proportions 80:14	proteins 118:14
27:2 33:13 47:11	previous 147:21	181:19 194:13	214:22	140:12 142:3
90:16 211:10	157:5 172:12	205:15 206:10	propose 15:20 16:3	201:11 203:14
213:20	pre-diabetic 131:2	209:18 210:8	24:15	protein-eaters
presentation 8:17	primarily 27:21	211:9	proposed 15:15	214:18
16:15 19:5 47:8	primary 6:12 59:2	processed 88:7	22:10 24:18 27:11	proven 186:7
91:8 112:14	216:11	91:15	38:21 39:19 47:12	provide 7:5,6 14:18
118:12 120:1	principles 27:16	product 177:2,2	48:9 52:13 82:3,7	15:8 19:11 28:5
presentations	prior 27:12 41:12	180:17 183:1,2	86:11 88:18 120:9	79:22
17:13 154:16	45:2 164:22	184:4 185:4 194:8	122:7 123:8 125:2	provided 10:5
205:20	208:12	214:17	125:8 126:2	84:12 151:21
L				

				Page 239
159:10	quality 20:4 24:3	questions 14:10,14	132:15 142:11	118:11 218:15
provides 11:9 22:1	29:14,16,17	15:12,22 16:4	189:12 190:3	real 102:10 105:5,7
providing 8:4 52:5	138:22 140:10	17:10,18 18:10	202:11,13	108:8 110:20
provisional 114:17	141:1,3 150:5,6	21:2,14 22:3 23:5	raise 101:2 161:16	140:2 143:11
PT 2:9	169:9 170:8 201:7	24:15,21 27:9,12	165:21 217:4	153:13 167:4
public 7:7,12,15,18	quantify 157:6	35:20 36:2,5,9	raised 169:5	177:6
7:21 8:1,3,5,22	quantitative 65:17	37:16 49:3 61:8	raising 190:3,20	realigned 80:21
10:2 11:12,21	66:22	65:5 75:14 77:4,5	Raj 2:8 3:4 4:8	realigning 82:22
12:13,22 13:8,12	quantity 66:14	77:10 91:5 93:13	10:18	111:6
14:2 16:7,10,16	144:12	97:17 114:9	Rajabe 31:22	realignment 27:6
20:21 23:11 24:20	quarter 16:1,2	117:22 120:3	randomized 44:9	81:15 84:10
26:2 28:12,13	Queen 5:13	126:22 127:17	44:12 47:4 62:14	realistic 79:13
29:3 37:3 70:4	question 18:13	129:22 140:4,18	62:17,18 69:18	80:13 104:21
72:3 73:5 74:12	19:20 21:11 22:12	143:13 147:19	122:18,21 142:17	realities 95:3
78:16 92:18 93:22	22:18 23:9 27:13	152:9 154:2	150:1 176:12	reality 103:3
94:9 138:14 143:8	27:17 28:10 34:20	160:22 161:7	182:21 197:8	105:22 143:17
216:5	38:18 42:14 43:12	162:14 163:10,16	202:15	147:12 165:17
publications 128:8	43:20 45:10,12	164:3 169:5	range 83:15 121:19	realize 105:13
published 6:13	46:7,8 51:12 59:1	171:13 172:13,21	135:3 143:20	128:10 171:16
37:9 50:9,10	63:14 64:2 66:15	176:19 179:20	153:3 143:20	185:18
137:12	66:18 67:4 68:1,6	184:5 186:18	ranges 97:6	really 4:15 45:11
pull 168:3	68:22 70:6,22	191:15 192:10	rank 216:20	45:12 49:21 50:14
pulling 109:17	71:21 75:21 77:19	194:8,11,18 196:4	rare 32:2	59:1 62:19 67:4
puning 109.17 pun 64:22 169:19	78:1,7,9 82:13,22	200:6 203:18,18	ratcheted 105:2	72:5 73:10 74:3
192:18	86:16,21 89:14	204:7,15 207:10	rate 41:16 42:8	92:22 94:4,8 95:2
punt 96:14	90:2,4,6 91:7,9,21	208:14 211:1,16	rates 18:6,8 41:6	95:20 99:12 100:8
pure 148:21	92:14 96:13 100:6	213:22 214:12	42:1,2 57:10	100:13,13,20,21
purpose 18:18	101:2,7 108:21	215:4 216:18	60:21 62:7 64:20	101:19 102:2
push 165:14	111:5 112:3 115:2	217:16	rating 147:2 187:3	109:9,18 111:5
pushes 61:3	116:4 117:8 122:5	quick 161:9 177:6	ratio 42:8 68:3	114:4 117:6 126:7
pusites 01.5 put 62:17 72:18	123:6 124:21	211:2,14,22	rationale 79:16	130:1,7 138:14,16
98:19 102:12	126:8 127:18.21	quickly 212:7	80:15 128:3	139:19 141:12,19
104:4 113:2	129:17 133:14	quintiles 158:13	146:10	142:6 150:15
126:21 134:2	134:2 135:8,20	160:19	rationales 6:19	161:17 167:3,21
140:18 217:16	137:3 141:7,10	quite 49:21 74:3	RCT 187:14,14	170:8 173:5
putting 74:9	142:5,6,8 143:8	128:4 132:16	RCT's 43:3,5 44:11	175:18 189:17
110:11	143:16,20 144:10	145:11 177:1	53:15 123:5 156:8	191:8 192:2
puzzle 25:16	149:7 154:12,13	179:16 202:4	156:11 194:4	191.8 192.2
pyramid 104:3	155:15 157:10	quote 79:7 109:12	RD 1:10,16,21 2:2	204:11,14,22
p.m 1:7 3:3,12,13	161:9 162:18	110:3	RDA 48:11 85:9,12	204.11,14,22 205:20 207:16
3:15 4:2 118:9,9	163:11 169:13		reach 11:7	209:3,8 211:7,11
218:21	174:14 176:3	R	reached 25:20	211:22 216:22
	179:2 185:2,4,6	R 4:1	read 111:21	217:10 218:12
Q	188:12 196:20	Rachel 26:19	readily 34:11	Rear 5:16 9:15
qualify 120:9	212:8,16 217:21	RADM 2:9	reading 68:2	reason 41:17 54:4
qualitative 66:20	questionnaires	Rafael 1:18 63:15	193:18	75:13 82:18
209:20	172:1	92:21 112:4	ready 24:13 26:4	136:20 151:11
	1/2.1		1 cauj 27.13 20.7	150.20 151.11
	I	I	I	1

165.0	29.12 02.7	46:20 63:20 73:3	noly 207.11	noguined 81.10 20
165:9	38:13 93:7 reduce 37:6 43:15	46:20 63:20 73:3	rely 207:11	required 81:19,20
reasonable 7:10			relying 204:18	requirement 8:21
54:9 165:15,19	44:6,19,22 48:7	91:5,9 130:18	remaining 16:4	requirements 7:11
reasons 192:16	52:14 64:8	161:11 168:1	85:3 210:4 213:17	83:3,10 86:6
recall 36:19 185:21	reduced 39:2 51:20	171:4 173:22	remains 70:6	88:21 112:7,8
186:4 191:2	93:4 94:4 165:4	197:2 214:12	remarks 3:3 9:14	research 5:1 14:10
receive 13:3	166:9	215:4	remember 7:8 26:1	14:13 15:12,22
received 23:10	reduces 17:8 43:1	relates 171:19	49:7 166:1 185:1	16:4 17:17 19:20
receiving 50:3,5	reduction 34:4	relating 10:10	remind 16:16	24:6,14 25:8 37:9
96:16	39:10,12,14,15	122:17	24:19 25:10 93:14	54:14 71:5,9 78:1
recess 3:15 118:8	40:10 45:16 53:5	relation 73:6,12	93:16 190:18	122:4 138:11
recognition 79:11	57:4 69:12,13	142:4	reminded 76:19	141:3,4,17 143:10
80:3	146:19 181:2	relationship 36:10	107:2	143:12 147:22
recognize 9:1 26:17	reductions 70:12	45:12 51:15 52:2	reminding 6:7	148:1 161:1
208:5	red-orange 81:2,7	52:18,20 53:10	repeat 8:7	162:14 177:12
recognized 104:3	82:4 109:1,22	55:12 120:4 122:6	repeatedly 93:16	192:6 193:6
151:9 216:5	113:22 114:5	123:7 124:21	replacement	199:15 210:5
recognizing 26:12	reexamine 152:15	125:21 126:17	162:17	212:6,11,12,17
26:14 93:12,20	refer 8:12	127:1,6,7,12	replication 64:11	213:17 214:8
recommend 211:8	reference 11:12	154:13 155:16	report 6:18 14:20	researcher 54:13
recommendation	28:7 120:18 171:3	156:15,20 157:11	14:22 15:1 16:12	residing 28:2 32:4
6:18 37:4 79:1	references 121:14	157:18 158:17	16:17 20:17,22	resistance 181:9
81:13 95:21	121:18 211:4	159:13,16,21	21:6 22:18 29:11	resolve 129:1
recommendations	referred 16:21	160:4 166:5	29:22 30:2,7,8,16	respect 92:8 108:22
6:16,22 19:11	referring 150:10	173:15 174:15	30:17 32:3 39:7	109:1
25:4 34:10 35:4	reflect 10:8 30:19	176:4 177:14,21	48:5 99:20 125:20	respond 12:19
46:10 65:18 78:14	reframing 104:17	179:22 180:15	163:20	response 72:21
79:3,13 80:12	regard 93:19 114:9	181:17,20 182:10	reported 31:19	118:2 120:10
81:15 82:8,17	121:12 124:6,20	182:12,15 183:14	32:1 39:14 84:3	121:1,7 195:21
94:7 104:4 108:18	125:7,14,19 126:1	187:21 191:5	87:3 126:16 146:7	responsibility 6:21
113:16 138:12	126:10 131:10	196:5,21 198:6	156:20 159:12,15	responsive 201:13
141:4 143:11	regarding 8:18	199:18 200:22	159:17 178:21	rest 76:22 107:13
recommended	28:6 37:11 126:8	relationships	180:10,13	189:21 218:16
21:12 22:15 25:8	regions 43:18	126:14 149:20	reporting 182:9	restricted 155:6
47:16 84:13,21	Register 7:14	158:11 210:13	reports 21:6 29:14	restrooms 12:1
107:10 111:8	registered 11:14,17	214:2	124:15,16 125:15	restructured 92:16
113:4	12:3	relative 18:21 43:8	215:14	result 37:2,19
recommending	registrants 12:9	43:17 66:3 69:10	represent 34:16	73:19 117:3
117:9	13:3	95:14 120:17	representative 84:7	128:19 131:10
reconvene 218:19	regrouping 114:21	177:10 183:18	84:19 86:1,20	170:4 182:9
record 116:3	regular 113:9	184:1	87:9 104:6	resulted 40:22
215:21	134:17	relatively 73:21	represented 38:7	results 24:13 80:21
recording 11:9	regulation 176:8	96:8 149:16	109:14 136:2	82:4 123:3 135:20
recordkeeping	reinforces 128:15	release 20:17	represents 41:11	139:17 158:15
7:11	relate 127:18	relevant 7:6 12:4	161:5	159:11 164:18,20
recruit 153:20	related 15:9 18:18	14:18 30:11	reproducible 17:6	169:4,5 178:7
red 36:12 37:19,22	35:20 36:2,9,12	120:10 143:20	require 35:12	182:7
L				

resume 118:6	ridiculous 211:17	run 214:20	171:1,8,16 174:22	80:14 84:7 87:8
retinol 31:18	right 5:6 9:17	running 187:12	181:19 186:20	89:3
reveal 190:20	52:15 53:18 55:13	<u> </u>	187:1 189:10	selection 80:17
review 6:13 11:20	56:18 57:16 60:4	$\frac{\mathbf{S}}{\mathbf{C} + 1}$	209:5,12 211:7,9	88:7
15:8 16:17,18	60:15 61:6 63:5	S 4:1	searched 134:13	selections 94:3
17:2,5,11,17,21	67:6,8 69:16,21	safety 213:6,15	196:9	105:10 112:6
19:6,20 20:16	70:10,21 102:15	sails 204:11 210:20	searches 24:7 77:8	selenium 85:10
21:3 24:2 27:18	106:16 118:3	sake 113:18	97:14,15 119:3,6	self-report 153:12
31:6,15 33:12	140:4 141:22	sample 18:3 136:9	119:11 152:6	153:15
35:10 46:14 47:1	154:2 178:13	Sara 5:20	173:1 174:5	self-reported
47:2,6 120:2	184:4 186:1 190:2	Sarah 2:11 3:6 9:2	193:22 205:6	153:22
122:16 123:14	194:17 203:5,13	9:4,7 10:17	210:6,7	semi 138:9
125:12 126:9	218:11	Satiety 214:11	searching 174:8	seminal 167:19
129:2,19 130:5	Rimm 1:20 50:6,6	saturated 87:12,18	186:22	171:2
135:22 138:4	58:5,19,21 59:10	88:6,16 89:1 96:9	seat 71:20	send 12:14
156:7 160:10,21	59:15,22 60:12,16	101:12 173:13 174:4	second 28:4,22	Senior 6:1
167:10 169:1,7	60:19 92:20,20	sauce 92:7,9,10,10	38:18 66:15 82:13	sense 63:9 101:20
175:12 176:10,12	163:13,14 164:21	93:6,9 94:13	100:8 106:14	101:21 104:19
176:17 178:17,18	169:11,12 184:7,8	sauces 91:15	118:11 123:6	189:19
179:6 180:6,7,22	185:5 186:2 187:4	Sauces 91.15 Saudi 11:17	157:10 205:1	separate 34:20
182:2,4 183:17,21	risk 18:9 34:4	saw 42:7	Secretaries 6:8,19	144:15 199:13
195:1 196:17,19	36:16,17 37:6,14	saw 42.7 saying 58:6,6 60:7	21:1 Secretary 2:2.2.5.6	separated 92:9
207:6 209:13 reviewed 19:1	38:16 42:18 43:1	93:3 170:20,20	Secretary 2:2,3,5,6 2:10 5:12 6:4	separating 201:20
24:11 30:15 33:11	43:8,15,17 44:1,6 44:22 46:18 52:16	215:6 217:13	section 138:11	septal 65:21
51:6 54:17 122:3	64:9 69:19 75:3	SCD 1:20	157:5 174:21	sequence 61:20 Serbia 162:9
133:16 150:13	75:17 91:19	scenarios 77:7	sectional 138:7	serial 67:15
161:6 165:10	142:14 158:8	schedule 133:14	169:22	series 36:8
182:8 197:3	159:19 179:13	205:18	see 12:3,16 20:3	serious 72:17
reviewer 17:8	181:2,11 183:18	school 29:18	23:7 45:4,20	serum 31:17,20
reviewing 130:3	184:2 191:6	school-aged 29:18	47:13 49:9 52:17	32:6,15 36:12
138:15	199:21 200:5	science 15:7 16:5	67:19,20 77:16	37:18,22 38:11
reviews 19:14	risk/benefit 68:3	scientific 6:11,13	81:1 99:7 102:7	47:22 48:1 49:16
20:12 122:2	Rob 9:4	10:9 17:2,5,19	113:13 117:7	50:12 195:11,13
127:22 128:7	Robert 2:13 5:6	24:22 70:20 207:6	124:1 129:7	195:15 198:12,20
129:8 155:11	robust 97:16	screen 12:2,16	134:14 142:9	199:6,7
170:22 175:16,22	Rog 49:4 152:12	102:13	143:9 156:22	service 4:17 5:1
196:16 197:5	177:5	search 17:18,19	162:22 175:20	29:14 37:3
revision 82:3	Roger 1:14 152:11	65:15 74:13 97:13	186:17 198:2	Services 1:3 3:8
revisions 78:10	role 24:9 173:17	121:12,22 135:3,6	201:14 206:19	4:22 9:13,21 10:4
revisit 61:15	176:8 178:10	135:7 140:18	214:19	serving 162:3,4,4
RFA 146:12	179:14,17	146:15 150:12,15	seeing 56:12	181:11
riboflavin 85:10	romaine 110:12	150:22 151:2,12	138:15 143:17	servings 157:22
rich 48:13 118:14	room 12:11	151:16 154:19	seen 50:8 199:2	158:9 159:14
Richardson 26:7	roughly 15:13	155:10,19 157:16	218:15	160:13 161:10,15
82:13	rounding 113:22	158:22 160:3	segments 75:1,16	sessions 216:16
rid 173:13	rules 8:8,9	167:14 168:5,8	selected 22:15	set 17:1 31:1 50:20
	I	I		

71:14 83:12	showed 39:9 40:9	5:17 9:15	99:12 108:9 167:7	90:1,10,12 92:5
112:12 120:14	52:1 100:13	Slavin 1:21 3:14	167:14	135:5 217:15
142:6 162:11,12	123:21 124:9	97:22 118:13,16	somebody's 54:7	specifically 32:11
181:10 183:8	146:18 156:15	127:16 133:12	somewhat 33:7	76:12 78:9 92:2
seven 15:4,7 39:7	158:5,15 181:2	140:8,17 141:5,8	46:12 61:20 80:22	112:13 150:19,21
62:1 122:19	showing 166:4	141:22 142:20	149:18 217:7	Specimens 30:13
125:20 126:11	shows 125:12 127:6	144:9 145:18	soon 9:19	spectrum 143:22
130:22 166:7	side-by-side 99:7	146:1,7 148:9	sorry 45:8 58:21	144:6
Seventeen 123:19	signal 130:21	150:3 152:3 153:2	59:10 61:8 63:12	speculate 145:17
sex 28:8 81:17	132:13	153:19 172:20	78:18 80:9 99:21	speed 64:13,18
83:16	signals 131:4	177:7,16 184:22	107:2 114:11	spina 39:11,15
shaking 103:20,20	significance 28:13	185:22 186:16	sort 17:18 42:14	spinach 110:13
SHANTHY 2:5	29:3 95:20	187:5 188:19	52:5 64:19 65:3	spirit 114:16
share 113:19	significant 40:17	189:4,9 190:1	90:7 93:14 99:7	spoken 216:9
150:17,20	45:18 47:3 100:19	194:7 200:14	100:1 112:1 115:6	spread 104:11
shared 63:18	139:11 156:22	201:3 202:16,20	115:7 128:2	110:5
SHARON 1:16	181:13	203:6 206:8 210:3	129:17,20 130:2,5	spring 16:10
Shelly 1:16 3:12	significantly 33:8	213:16	141:15,16 164:5	staff 10:12,13
26:6,9 48:22	40:15 43:15	sleepless 203:20	172:8 188:14,15	12:11,18 14:1,6
71:21 72:21 74:6	124:17 137:20	slide 26:14 47:13	192:4 193:3 194:5	19:17 23:16,19
74:17 77:22 82:12	165:4 203:7	77:2 89:12 116:9	205:4 210:2	24:8 106:7 118:22
93:18 96:14,17	signification 41:11	119:12	211:20 216:3	151:14 204:21
97:10 102:6 116:3	similar 24:9 39:14	Slovenia 11:18	217:15	Stamp 29:15
161:9 217:21	56:22 57:1 80:13	slowing 195:17	sorted 99:9 136:17	112:17
shift 41:18 77:3	98:4 110:9 129:17	small 38:14 40:16	sound 215:20	standard 87:17
95:9 114:4	158:15	45:17 56:12 57:6	source 21:5 79:14	standardize 208:5
shifted 81:1,4	similarly 124:19	136:9,14 137:1	96:19 142:7	208:19
111:9	simply 12:19 65:3	138:9 143:1	173:10 200:10,19	standardized
Shifting 82:2	117:17 151:12,19	149:13 156:11	sources 20:13 21:7	151:21
157:10	simulation 113:2	213:13	23:6,7 29:10 74:4	standardizes 17:8
shooting 205:4	single 65:22 185:9	smaller 18:7	194:19 195:10	starches 109:6
short 28:17 116:10	185:9,21 186:4	216:16	soy 148:11 195:14	starchy 90:22
118:8 132:4	192:4,16 193:4	smallest 79:21	199:4,4,10,13,15	109:6 110:6 114:1
156:13	single-meal 132:3	sodium 23:6 35:13	201:20,22 202:3	start 26:12 35:22
shorter 9:11	sit 111:20 215:18	72:8 87:12,18	202:19,21 203:3,7	133:20 167:1
short-fall 28:17	site 4:5	88:6,17 89:2	203:10,14	started 118:11
29:2,4,6,8 31:7,11	six 41:13 83:13	91:16 93:4,8	soybean 202:13,18	131:11 172:6
31:13 72:16 73:2	114:1 115:5 136:3	101:13	soybeans 200:3	175:3 196:12
79:14	156:14,18 158:2	soft 97:14	speak 8:17 12:13	210:5
short-term 131:22	182:2,7 198:16	solicit 8:13	13:17 65:1 92:13	starting 36:22 96:8
132:4	Sixteen 124:10	solid 130:6 207:14	92:17 104:1 106:2	152:8 194:22
shot 106:21,22	sixth 16:10	207:20	speaker 100:7	state 13:9 50:16
show 53:2 95:15	sizes 18:3,5 136:9	solids 214:9	speaking 13:10	stated 195:12
104:15 122:22	sketchy 96:2	soluble 195:10,16	26:2	statement 20:9
123:3 160:6	skim 181:14	198:9,21 199:3	special 46:10	57:9 185:8,11
179:17 182:18	skip 80:5	solution 148:4	specific 46:15	statements 20:15
196:1	Slade-Sawyer 2:9	somebody 64:7	75:22 77:11 79:14	20:20 24:15 191:1
6				

			1	1
states 1:1 6:20	157:17 176:6	177:10,18 179:14	90:5,19 207:8	suggestion 99:19
14:12 18:21 28:3	185:8,8 186:11	179:16 180:3	208:3,21 211:3,12	170:17 212:2
32:2,5 36:20 37:3	194:4	182:3,8,18 184:1	213:2,10 215:18	suggests 197:19
38:2,6,7 39:4,9	stronger 56:1 58:9	184:8 185:20	subcommittee-to	sum 84:21
40:6 41:4 56:13	193:15 210:13	188:15 191:16	208:7	summaries 19:18
statins 61:11	strongest 57:14	193:9 195:19	subgroup 78:20	20:19
statistical 128:18	164:14 186:14	196:15 197:12	79:8,20,21 81:2,4	summarize 45:10
statistics 59:9	strongly 127:10	198:17,19,22	81:8 82:5,6,19	116:8 169:17
status 29:15,17,19	struck 185:15	199:4,9,14 201:5	84:9,10 87:11	summarized 16:17
30:19 36:13 49:6	structure 79:18	202:13 203:13	109:13 130:19	25:5
49:14,16	structured 119:7	209:6	131:3,5 132:10	summary 13:5 45:9
stay 24:5 112:7	structures 66:6	study 18:4 39:13	subgroups 27:6	101:4
129:3 206:3	struggled 161:17	40:5 42:1 50:11	34:18,22 35:10	sunlight 32:13
216:22	178:12	54:11 56:20 57:21	46:11 77:20 78:8	supplement 30:15
staying 82:9 91:21	studies 18:1,15,22	65:20 92:4 123:17	78:10 79:18 80:21	48:5 74:21,22
steer 115:15	18:22 20:4,5	123:18 126:13	82:3 83:1 97:1,21	76:1,11 165:17
step 17:16 82:21	30:15 38:5 39:5,8	136:19 137:10	109:12 110:19	supplementation
83:11 89:12	39:9 41:3 51:5	144:21 146:2,16	111:6	36:16,17 42:15,16
steps 73:9 89:14	58:20,22 59:16	153:11 156:21	subject 148:16	42:17 43:1,9,14
stomach 124:3,11	60:17 67:17 69:2	157:7 159:4,6,12	subjects 18:1,4,16	43:21 44:1,5,22
stop 143:5	74:2 75:19,22	162:9 165:5,8	18:17 37:12	51:13 61:9 63:7
stopped 145:7	122:19,20 123:4	168:7 176:15,17	139:12 199:5,5,6	70:8 76:7,11,16
store 118:15	123:16,19 124:7	178:20,21 180:8	submit 147:11	supplementing
story 69:19	125:14 126:12,16	181:1,7 183:1,4,5	submitting 6:17	71:2
straight 142:8	129:10 132:4,6	185:10,12 191:3	subquestions 15:14	supplements 48:6
strapped 217:8	135:21,22 136:2,8	196:18 197:6,7	substantial 21:5	75:10 90:7,9
strategy 70:8	136:16,22 137:8	200:2	45:16 179:12	supply 187:18
121:12 154:19	137:12,19 138:5	studying 75:14	substantially 81:6	188:11
streamed 13:8	138:17 139:7,7,20	study's 18:18	81:10 88:19	support 12:7 14:1,6
streaming 12:21	140:2 141:16	stuff 185:14 193:11	164:10	17:2 23:16 24:8
strength 52:5	142:15 143:2	stumble 192:9	substituting 90:14	55:11 74:11
strengthen 14:22	145:9 147:13	sub 207:5	substitution 101:4	178:10 204:19
192:19	148:7,13 150:10	subcommittee 3:11	191:10	218:4
stroke 36:14,15,18	150:16 151:10	15:8 19:4 22:20	success 66:17	supported 15:20
39:19 40:1,7,14	152:2,14 155:6,11	23:12,18,22 24:2	successful 197:10	176:16
42:18 43:2,11,15	156:8,9,10,14,21	24:14 26:4,6,13	succinct 16:15	supporting 20:1,5
45:18 51:15 52:7	158:2,3,10,15	27:1,14 34:21	succinctly 100:1	24:16 157:17
52:19 56:20 57:3	159:4,5,10 160:11	74:20 77:13 89:15	sufficient 50:4,5	supportive 24:9
57:15 58:8 59:4	160:12,15 161:10	118:1,18 130:13	51:2	179:14
59:18 60:20 61:16	161:18 162:1,5	155:8 175:6	sugar 88:9	supports 23:21
61:21 62:2,7 63:9	165:13 166:4,8,14	184:18 185:17	suggest 34:14	181:20
165:22 166:2,9	167:7,19,22	205:19 211:13	59:17 125:9 131:5	supposed 204:5
180:10 strong 20:10 55:22	169:19,20 170:2,5	213:13,15 214:13	141:18 148:18	sure 54:13 74:10
strong 20:10 55:22 57:8 97:8 122:8	170:10,18 171:3	215:5 subcommittees	159:1 182:8 197:16	75:15 91:18 96:16
123:9,10 125:8	171:15 172:4,12 173:5 175:15	7:20 15:5,7,11	suggesting 50:11	98:6 99:14 107:15 128:4 129:18
123:9,10 125:8	175:5175:15	17:10 24:20 25:18	151:3 207:19	128:4 129:18 150:9,13 151:14
121.4 133.9	1/0.11,13,14	17.10 24.20 25:18	131.3 207.19	130.7,13 131.14
	l	l	l	1

151:17,22 164:17	108:10,11 118:9	193:5 202:13	62:22 63:1 65:19	205:2,2,3,8,9,10
174:12 177:7,17	takes 20:3	207:5 211:8 218:7	66:9,10 67:5	205:13 206:4,8
187:8 206:16,22	talk 119:11,14,17	territory 218:12	68:18,22 69:6,18	207:4 208:4,17
210:2 216:19	139:3 140:20	tested 120:19	70:16 71:4,14	209:1,2,9 210:1
survey 11:6 13:3	150:5 173:22	textbook 69:20	72:7 73:4,5,13,20	210:10,21 211:1
30:14	179:6 192:17	thank 4:15 9:5	74:7,18 75:5,8,12	211:11,17,21
surveys 23:3 24:22	216:10	10:17 13:16,21	75:18 76:18 91:11	212:3,9,19,22
suspect 149:14	talked 190:4	26:10 48:16 49:5	92:3,22 93:1,18	213:3,5,7 216:1,7
190:16	talking 52:7 68:12	63:10 77:21 82:12	94:9 95:1,10	216:8,17 217:7
sweeteners 214:10	116:9 131:13	91:7,20 94:21	97:12 98:3,6,11	218:2,12,13
swoop 94:15	175:8 185:17	118:7,15 119:22	99:9,19,22 100:9	thinking 72:16
syndrome 130:20	targets 67:13 81:20	127:15 218:20	100:12,14,20	188:18,20 210:17
174:18 180:12,14	task 15:8	thanks 96:12	101:6 102:6,14	third 11:3 14:4
180:16,18 181:12	team 8:15 23:19,20	118:16 119:21	103:2,3,18 104:2	29:5 165:3
181:15	24:8 207:11	192:6	104:14 105:1,6	Third-World 18:19
synergies 172:10	tease 191:20	themes 154:9	106:4 110:1	Thirteen 198:15
synthesize 128:12	technical 6:18	theoretical 198:13	112:13 115:8,11	THOMAS 1:17
system 17:1 99:8,8	11:21 12:5,6,9,14	therapy 18:16	116:20 117:6	thorough 14:19
100:2 109:13	15:10	thing 62:12 102:15	118:4 127:3,16	151:6 169:14
112:20	technology 208:9	132:8 144:5 147:5	128:1,3,22 129:2	thoroughly 33:12
systematic 17:7,11	tech_issue@yaho	148:15 164:18	129:18 130:4,7,11	35:13
19:5 24:12 122:2	12:17	167:6,16 175:21	131:8,11,21	thought 14:10
127:22 129:19	tell 12:1,2 100:22	186:14 191:2	132:20,22 133:1,9	65:16 73:10 128:6
155:11 169:1	telling 75:6	192:11 193:1	136:19 142:18,22	171:9 173:3
170:13,18,21,22	ten 18:4 32:22	203:22 205:1	143:7,10 144:11	217:18
171:12 175:12,16	33:15 118:4	207:4 209:3 215:7	144:13,20 145:4	thousand 41:14
175:22 176:12,17	125:13 146:15	things 57:12 61:13	145:12,14 146:1	three 38:6 39:6
178:18 180:6,7,22	148:6 152:16	62:16 67:7 68:5	147:18 148:9	47:21 77:9,15
182:1,3 183:17,21	153:3 158:2 166:7	96:4 100:3 101:9	149:8,15,21 150:6	80:10 85:15
196:16 197:5	183:19 184:2	102:20 110:5,14	151:6,20 152:19	106:12,21 115:4
205:9 209:13	192:7	111:14 114:18	153:2,5,18,19	118:6 124:16
systematically	tend 88:22 128:17	117:8 119:8	154:8 157:1	126:16 138:6
206:22	166:15 172:1	128:16 147:15	159:11 160:20,22	143:18 144:2
systems 24:5	173:20	148:12 151:19	162:13 164:15	156:8,9 159:5
systolic 33:22	tends 161:20	169:16 172:2,8	165:12,15,21	160:11,13 169:21
T	tentative 206:1	174:13 185:19	166:15,17 167:2	170:1 176:14
	term 108:4 121:22	200:7 201:2	168:19,22 169:12	178:19 180:6
table 5:2	156:17	203:10 204:11	169:15,16 172:9	181:1 182:21
tables 19:19	terms 48:21 49:15	206:16 207:22	176:22 178:13	187:14 198:16
tail 96:6	52:6 64:7 81:21	210:7 211:7 213:5	184:22 185:22	Thrifty 112:16
take 5:5 6:6 68:11	96:3,7 98:9	217:3	187:2,7 188:8	113:8
71:20 73:14 74:4	114:18 115:21	think 14:7 48:18	189:1,14,18 190:2	throw 152:22
74:16 76:2 115:22	150:15 151:2	52:10 53:3,7	191:2,7 192:2,5,8	throwing 206:6
154:6 161:2	152:21 161:1	54:12,16 55:11	192:15 193:7,20	thrown 168:22
179:19 184:16	163:6,16 165:20	56:15,15,17 57:8	194:2,10,14 195:6	thyroid 124:19
204:1 215:16	171:8,16,22	57:22 59:16 61:7	201:3,12 202:8	till 36:6
taken 77:17 93:1	189:21 191:9	61:19 62:5,12,19	204:10,13,22	time 7:9 17:12

41 10 55 00 50 15	100.16		25 22 110 20	
41:19 57:22 59:17	tone 192:16	trials 43:17 44:9,12	35:22 119:20	U
60:21 64:20 67:9	tools 17:2 139:5	47:4 59:3 62:17	Turning 158:16	UK 136:5
69:10 105:20	top 87:7 105:20	69:18 122:18,21	tweak 149:5	UL 153:5
118:7 121:10,19	178:2	130:1 146:17	twice 144:5 196:19	ultimately 163:9
133:2,3 147:4,20	topic 3:11 74:18	147:1,3 148:8	two 19:11 27:16	169:16
156:13 168:12	151:11	165:17,18 176:18	33:15 41:3 43:2	underestimate 51:1
188:9 194:10	topics 15:5 25:15	178:8,19 193:16	44:8 51:22 53:8	understand 21:15
204:21,21 205:16	119:5 210:5	193:18 197:5,8	55:5 63:8 67:21	74:1 99:8,13
207:18 212:19	213:17 215:5	198:1,16 202:15	81:13 101:9	104:20 189:15
213:2 218:20	217:2,19	trickier 56:10	106:10,11,17,20	understanding
times 79:4,4 130:18	topic-specific 7:20	tried 175:18	107:12 122:18	63:17 91:12 99:11
144:2 147:21	total 21:17 44:14	trim 164:2 204:11	125:15,21 135:4	132:15 189:20
152:20	79:10 88:16 89:1	211:14	138:6 146:16	203:1
titled 30:7	101:10 108:5	trimming 210:20	149:13 152:20	understatement
tocopherol 31:18	111:4,7 121:2,5	211:22	156:12 158:2,3	14:8
today 5:3 7:22 14:3	123:22 124:10	triple 67:10	160:11 163:6	understood 80:19
15:19 21:9 22:20	141:11,18 158:8	Trish 26:17 100:9	166:14 167:22	underway 93:17
25:11 26:22 27:1	160:8,18 182:19	103:19,20 106:2,3	170:18 175:4	unfortunate 71:11
35:16,21 89:22	188:3 200:2	107:3 108:12,21	196:13 197:4	unique 176:8
90:16 93:15	207:11	112:10 114:5	two-case 136:1	198:12
114:15,17 119:3,6	totally 208:18	116:19	two-hour 120:16	uniquely 177:1
119:11 145:13	tough 163:15	trouble 186:2	133:4	197:13
151:9 161:4 190:4	trained 19:16	187:12	type 22:2 101:9,16	United 1:1 14:12
190:20 196:11	transcript 13:4	true 133:2 136:12	120:5 121:17	18:21 28:3 32:2,5
207:22 212:4	transient 41:1,11	216:22	124:20,22 125:6	36:20 37:3 38:2,5
213:20 215:14	41:18 45:19,22	truncating 205:5	125:11 127:1,8,9	38:7 39:4,9 40:5
216:15 218:18	63:16 64:2	trusting 155:2	141:12,19 154:17	41:4 56:13
tofu 203:10	translate 203:1	try 50:21 73:22	166:19 167:14	unknown 72:18,18
tolerance 133:4	translating 6:22	94:6,9 147:13	174:18 177:12	upcoming 17:13
toll 12:7	transparent 7:16	151:14,17 153:20	183:16,18 196:7	35:18
Tom 60:7 61:17,18	8:22 17:6	191:19 209:16	199:17,19,21	update 21:4 47:2
65:5 69:5 96:13	treated 43:8	217:14	200:5 214:4,19	83:22 115:6
130:14,15 145:18	treatment 18:15	trying 51:16 56:2	types 22:22 112:6	193:20 203:22
145:20 200:9	197:11	95:4,8 105:7,15	122:1 137:10	211:4
tomato 91:13 92:5	treatments 197:9	115:22 134:2	182:11 184:16,19	updated 53:17
92:8,9 93:5,6,9	trend 39:7 155:22	135:2 149:9 162:5	217:15	82:15 113:9,12
tomatoes 78:11	160:6	169:17 170:13	typical 27:8 34:12	updating 193:21
79:9,12,22 81:6,8	triage 211:14	172:9 175:13	86:19 87:6,8,14	upgrade 61:16 63:7
91:10 109:17	212:13	187:15 191:18	87:15,20,22 88:3	up-regulated 64:12
110:17 115:19	triaging 211:2	201:13 203:21	88:13,14,19,21,22	urine 30:10
tomorrow 7:22	trial 43:13 44:19	208:5	89:7 92:4 100:9	usage 202:7
15:19 21:9 25:12	59:7 62:15,19	tube 36:13 37:7	100:16 101:5	USDA 2:2,5,8,13
93:15 206:5	142:17 147:8	38:20 39:2 45:16	103:4 104:10,14	4:20 6:19 10:12
215:11,16 216:11	150:1 160:11,12	46:4 57:1 65:15	105:17,20 108:4,5	16:20 26:18 27:7
218:19	165:2 176:13	66:4 69:14 70:12	108:6,6	27:7 30:22 82:14
Tom's 68:14	182:2,22 185:9	turn 10:15 13:14	typically 143:2	83:2 85:6,20 86:5
ton 119:2 214:16	186:6,7,7	13:17 14:22 26:8	174:7 195:2 199:1	86:13,18 87:2

89:3,9 107:3	variety 35:5 80:17	113:21 115:4,10	35:11 83:13	watching 14:3
112:11 152:19	190:12	115:15,16 116:17	194:20	water 35:14 99:2
USDA's 5:7 21:22	various 14:10 17:9	119:16 154:5,7,14	vitro 18:22	wavelength 52:10
USDA's 4:9	21:20 22:5 83:19	155:13,17 157:7	voices 100:10	way 50:21 65:2
use 20:13 21:14	94:7 133:21 157:8	157:12 158:18	volume 15:16 16:8	78:19 92:16 94:10
48:5 74:21,22	vary 173:11,12	159:7,8,22 160:8	111:22	100:16 106:6
76:1 82:20 150:22	vascular 42:19	162:11,12,16,19	voluntary 36:22	115:12 119:6
171:3,4 192:18	44:2	163:1,8,19 164:3	41:8	132:12 134:12
196:1 202:18,19	vast 86:6	165:4 166:8 167:8	vote 16:11	136:16 140:17
206:5 207:17	vegan 90:20 134:1	173:7		154:1 162:22
208:20	134:8,22 137:5,8	vegetarian 135:15	W	172:16 191:17
useful 128:11 188:8	137:22 139:12,21	136:7 139:6	wag 96:7	192:12 202:5
usual 28:2 29:9	143:19	143:19 145:8,13	waist 183:12	205:9 211:10
30:2 81:16	vegans 136:12	146:11,17 147:9	197:18	ways 12:20 71:6
usually 62:15 87:6	137:14,16,19	201:14	wait 36:6	116:21 117:21
156:12	138:9 142:22	vegetarians 136:8	Wales 40:7,15 58:4	134:3 139:3
utilization 201:9	143:5,6 145:8,22	138:10 142:12,13	wandering 45:4	161:19 209:22
U.S 3:5,8	148:21 149:13	142:21 144:16	want 4:16 9:1	216:2 217:7
	200:11,20 214:16	148:21 153:21	26:11,17 48:22	weak 123:21 124:9
	vegetable 27:6	200:20 214:17	58:8 71:20 75:7	156:15 179:7
V 1:10 20:11	34:10 77:19 78:8	ventricle 65:22	89:19 98:3 100:8	weaker 193:8
vacuum 130:3	78:10,20,22 79:7	ventricular 65:21	103:1 105:8	weather 4:6
vague 164:12	79:8,10,12,17,20	venture 215:19	111:20 115:10	Web 11:2 14:3
validate 123:4	79:21 80:1,2,2,16	version 147:9	120:7 153:9	WebEx 11:5 12:6
valuable 48:19	80:20 81:12 82:3	versus 58:3 87:20	154:10,19 160:22	13:4
value 13:1 15:1	82:5,19 83:1	122:13 140:12,19	164:2 168:21	webinar 4:12 11:4
94:1 208:5	84:10 99:4 109:13	142:8 143:21	175:13 179:18	13:2
values 32:21 33:5	110:1,3,19 111:6	144:16 145:22	185:13 194:21	Webinars 76:5
73:22	111:7 140:12	147:9 148:19	199:12 206:9,16	website 13:6
Van 1:7,10 3:9	148:19 149:1,17	150:2 158:13	206:21 210:3	web-based 17:1
13:19,21 48:17	155:21 156:5,16	165:6 189:13,13	216:7 217:10	Wednesday 1:6 3:2
74:17,18 93:10	157:2,18,22 158:6	214:3,9,17,17	wanted 37:17 42:13	week 144:5
114:8 116:7 118:3	158:12 159:2,16	VICE 1:11	50:7 98:1 102:7	weeks 132:2 156:14
118:10,20 148:15	159:18 160:5,17	view 95:12 115:20	107:15 114:12	weighing 15:10
148:17 150:17,19	161:20 162:9	188:11 217:11,17	115:14 135:7	weight 120:5
163:12 171:18	165:11 167:20	vital 59:9	138:14 143:7	121:15 122:7,9,10
190:2 202:11	172:21 175:2	vitamin 30:3 31:12	147:7 150:3 152:3	122:10,15 123:1
207:3 215:3	195:12 214:3,4	31:20 32:1,6 33:4	165:21 166:18,22	127:1,6,7 140:1
217:19 218:11	vegetables 78:12	33:9,12 34:11,14	194:12 201:12	142:3 153:16
variability 132:16	78:13,13 79:1,6	35:7,21 42:17	213:16	154:15 155:17,22
208:7	79:20,22 80:17	43:22 46:20 47:15	wants 129:6 145:2	156:1,5,11,16
variable 144:8	81:2,5,7 90:22	47:19 48:11,13,15	warranted 6:10	161:21 164:8,9
150:7	92:16,19 93:7	48:16 49:6,19,21	Washington 4:4	173:16 174:17
variables 181:5	98:11,17 106:11	50:15 75:10 76:16	wasn't 51:6 71:8	175:5 176:5,8,19
variation 133:2,8	106:18 109:5,6,10	85:10,16 90:1	128:4 170:20	177:11,11 182:13
139:15	109:14,16 110:6	190:12	waste 205:16	183:4 195:6,8
varied 11:7	110:20,21 111:22	vitamins 31:8 34:8	wasting 204:20	196:6,22 197:2,10

		1		1
197:14 216:14	169:9,16,17,17	101:15 130:21	year 40:11,12,13	16 39:11 204:8
weighted 121:3	171:20 172:9	200:21 205:17	209:5	18 29:19 43:16
weights 153:13	173:6,22 174:12	words 148:20	years 33:1,16 38:15	135:22 175:4
176:22 197:17,21	175:6,8 177:19	162:18	41:19 49:7 61:21	180 15:13 204:6
welcome 4:11	178:15 184:19	work 7:8,9 8:14,18	62:1 67:18,21	210:22 211:16
10:21 118:10	185:1 186:22	14:15 15:16 17:15	85:13 135:5	19 85:13 123:15
welcoming 9:14,22	187:12,15 188:19	23:14,16 25:17	145:10,11 146:15	124:6 155:7 175:7
well-being 217:12	190:20 191:11,18	26:15,21 71:15	148:6,7,8 152:13	1990 40:9,16 61:19
well-classified	192:8,11 204:5,9	76:6 89:18 90:13	152:16 155:1,7	1992 42:5
139:9	205:8 206:15	93:11 94:10 119:7	156:2,18 161:6	1996 41:7
well-controlled	210:21 212:8	151:13 155:3,5	165:10 168:16	1997 40:9 41:9
165:5	213:20,22 215:22	160:20 169:10	183:7 184:15	61:19
well-defined	216:3 217:7	189:19 193:14	187:11 192:7	1998 36:21 37:1
138:17	we've 11:17 89:17	202:4 212:3	196:14 209:6	40:9 41:10
well-designed	95:13 100:14	working 14:6 27:14	year-round 32:12	1999 29:20 30:9,14
71:10	151:5,15 153:10	200:8	yogurt 188:18	37:10
well-documented	161:4 168:13	works 8:22 118:22	yogurts 188:6	
17:5 142:13	171:13,14 178:6	worksheet 19:12	young 29:16 32:20	2
well-taken 51:10	178:12 184:15	worksheets 19:15	you've 205:3	2.3 142:22
went 19:6 42:11	196:10 207:4,21	19:18		2.4 47:17
71:10 78:19	212:3,3 215:12,12	world 108:9 151:19	Z	2.6 42:8
121:18 128:8	216:4 217:8	worried 67:12 68:3	Zealand 43:6	2.9 40:11 42:9
129:1,21 132:2	what-if 22:2	176:2 186:10		2:49 118:9
135:2 175:3	whey 189:4	204:13,14	1	20 18:6 145:10,11
196:10	white 99:18 100:5	worries 184:12	1 40:13	152:16 209:6
weren't 47:3 62:8	111:19 120:18	209:8	1,255 85:21	20/20 168:22
171:5 173:5	whites 32:22	worry 50:22 167:6	1-866-229-3239	2000 41:10 89:5
we'll 45:20 57:20	whittle 217:14	worth 54:22	12:7	100:18 104:12
60:10 61:15 72:7	WIC 29:17	worthwhile 209:14	1.4 143:1	121:20 135:4
80:9 89:13,18,20	wide 79:19	worthy 54:1 71:5	1:00 1:7 3:3 4:2	196:10 199:16
93:15 117:8,11,17	widely 104:2	wouldn't 131:12	1:30 3:12	2001 29:12 42:5
118:6 119:7 139:3	WILLIAMS 1:22	168:4 193:2	10 48:2	2002 29:12 30:10
149:10 154:17	window 129:11	written 8:4 13:5	100 33:19 103:9	30:14 40:9,16
176:10 179:18,19	wintertime 32:8	20:22 99:18	11 32:18 33:2 39:11	2003 31:19
we're 49:7 71:12	wishes 130:13	wrong 78:19	136:1 156:8 204:2	2003-2004 84:4
75:15 77:3 78:2	women 33:15,18,19	www.dietaryguid	204:9	87:4
90:2,16 97:2 98:7	37:4 38:15 46:21	8:6	110 85:12	2004 29:20 31:19
108:17 114:15,16	70:8 85:13 97:2	www.dietaryguid	118 3:14	37:10 42:6 121:14
116:21 117:10,15	126:18 183:8	8:7 11:11	12 32:16 43:3 44:11	154:20 174:20
118:17 119:3,5,10	wonder 50:19,20	0./ 11.11	53:15 85:6 156:18	175:3
130:2,3 131:13	143:17 163:13,22	X	13 3:10 39:5 122:17	2005 21:6 29:10
130.2,5 151.15	145.17 105.15,22 187:10 210:16	Xav 114:11 127:20	182:1	30:22 46:16 47:3
146:5 149:22	wondered 132:13	175:20	14 79:4	47:6,14 83:5
140:3 149:22 150:22 151:22	wonderful 102:3	Xavier 1:19 132:14	1400 85:21	111:14 129:9,11
	118:22 151:5	170:16 187:9	145 86:2	129:14 133:16
152:7,8,20 154:4		213:1	15 123:22 135:22	174:21 175:3
158:19 161:22	wondering 51:17	213.1	209:6	194:22 196:9
166:20 168:13	53:9 66:3 92:8	Y	150 165:5	1)7.22 1)0.)
	l			l

1			5
006 11 000 1	100 16 17 10 100		
206:11 208:1	103:16,17 104:22		
211:4	105:5,22 106:5		
2005-2006 33:14	400-calorie 104:11		
2005/2006 29:22	107:1,4		
30:4	45 42:8		
2006 47:7,14	5		
2008 29:13 30:6			
31:22	5 48:7		
2009 1:6 3:2 29:21	5,000 153:14		
30:1 37:10,11	5.38 113:21		
121:15 129:11,15	5.4 40:13		
135:4 154:21	5:00 3:15		
175:3	50 33:16 46:22		
2010 4:13,21 15:2	48:11 69:13 85:13		
16:2,11 82:16	88:12 103:9 114:3		
84:1	120:15 52 20:14		
2020 208:16	53 39:14		
218 3:15	54 39:10		
22 122:17	55 32:4 79:8		
22.3 79:9	57 38:14		
23 39:10 126:19	6		
24 29:11	6 174:21		
24-hour 185:21	6.25 203:9		
186:4			
2400 89:6 100:19	6.4 183:7		
25 29:22 32:6,7,15	60 33:1 63.5 32:7		
33:1,10 126:19			
131:1 148:7 203:6	64 42:8		
26 3:12 123:15	65 42:9		
27 113:22	7		
27.5 32:19	70 42:9		
28 160:13	750 23:10		
3	750 25.10		
	9		
3.3 40:10	93:8		
3:00 3:13 118:9	90 85:11		
30 32:17 60:16	95th 81:16		
110:1,4 114:1	96 36:22 42:5		
148:7			
31 39:15			
32 114:2 35 152:4			
35 153:4			
4			
4 1:6 3:2,5			
4:38 218:21			
40 60:17			
400 37:5 89:6			
L	1	l l	I