

ATCP 82 Subcommittee Meeting

October 24, 2023 - 12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Attendees:

Laura Traas, Max Huebner, Joanna Kahvedjian, John Umhoefer, Tony Lampman, Mick Homb, Andy Johnson, Adam Brock, Jordan Blunt, Brandon Johnson, Leigh Hamilton, Anthony Canavan, Helen Schmude, Kathy Cornell

Transcript:

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: [What we are going to do] today is start talking about ATCP 82 which is the hauling and sampling rule revision. As you see on the screen, we had an open meeting notice posted. This is an open meeting as required by law, it was posted so folks were aware of it and on the open meeting notice, we have our agenda.

So I'd like to start off by welcoming you all, thanking the committee members for people being willing to put forth some time to talk about these items and hopefully put forth a good product once we're done. I'm going to start by going through the list and asking each person to introduce themselves and indicate where they're from. I'll call first on Adam Brock.

Adam Brock: Here. Sorry my video will click on in a minute here. Adam Brock, Dairy Farmers of Wisconsin.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Andy Johnson. I know he was here. We'll see if he comes back, Mick Homb.

Mick Homb: Mick Homb, Director of Milk Marketing for Family Dairies, which is a division of Farm First Dairy Cooperative out of Madison, WI.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: John, Umhoefer.

John Umhoefer: Hello John Umhoefer, I run the Wisconsin Cheese Makers Association.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Helen Schmude, are you here with us yet? OK, Tony Lampman.

Tony Lampman: Tony Lampman, Milk Hauler for Organic Valley.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: And Alex O'Brien? I believe he turned it down. He was not available. I am Laura Traas. I am the Dairy Services Section Manager for the Department of Agriculture and the other person who will be with us on this journey is Max Huebner, Max if you want to introduce yourself.

Huebner, Max K – DATCP: Yes hello. I am Max Huebner. I am the Program and Policy Analyst with the dairy program. I'll be in charge of notes and setting up these meetings, so if anyone ever has any questions through the process, just feel free to reach out to me.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Let's see, we have Anthony Canavan I believe out there.

Anthony Canavan: Yes. Anthony Canavan here. I'm the CEO of Piper Systems. I am currently in Ireland.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Brandon Johnson.

Brandon Johnson: Hello. Brandon Johnson, CEO of Liquid Freight and Hagen Johnson Group in Janesville, WI.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Jordan blunt.

Jordan Blunt: Good afternoon. I'm Jordan Blunt with the Paul Mueller company. We manufacture refrigeration and storage vessels for dairy farm all over the world and we I may have already said this, but we're in Springfield, MO. So yeah, thanks for having us.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Leigh Hamilton.

Leigh Hamilton: Hi, Leigh Hamilton. I'm CEO of Piper Systems and based in Dublin, Ireland.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: And Joanna Kahvedjian. Did I get it close?

Kahvedjian, Joanna C – DATCP: That is great. Yes, Joanna Kahvedjian, I am here as a program and policy analyst at the Department of Agriculture at the main office here in Madison. I am just listening in today.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Did I miss anyone who is on the call? OK, hearing no one speak up. We are about to enter the next phase of the rule making process, the rule making process has several phases and each one of them takes some time. What we are going to talk about today is where we are and where we need to go.

We are in the process of drafting the proposed rule, the economic impact assessment and the regulatory flexibility analysis. Those packages all need to be drafted. As for this group, the only things you're going to get involved in is the actual proposed rule language and express some opinions about the economic impact if we do decide to change any rules.

Prior to this, what happened was there was a scope statement that was developed that had to go through our legal group and then had to be signed off by the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, had to go to the Governor's Office for Signature and had to be approved by the Department of Ag's Board. Once they did that, and once that was all finished, that started our clock and you will see here at the bottom, the final rule, if I have my clock correct, must be approved by July 26th of 2025.

So even though we look at, hey, great, we've got not quite two years to get this done, that's not so. There's a lot of steps after we get [the draft] done, which is the rule has to be posted to the website for at least 14 days or up to 16 days depending upon how much economic impact it has. The draft rule is sent for strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats analysis. It goes to the rules coordinator, our attorney and general counsel to review the package. Then the secretary's office reviews and, if they agree with the rule, they sign it. Then we get ready for public hearings, we have to prepare a notice of public hearing for the board, request approval to hold those public hearings, and then the package needs to be submitted to the Clearing House, Department of Administration, the Governor's Office, the Assemblies Chief Clerk, the Senate's Chief Clerk, and the Joint Council for Rules and Regulations.

The clearinghouse has 20 days to review the rule and submit a report to the department. Right around that same time, the package needs to go to the LRB for publication. Once it has been published, We can hold public hearings. They have to take place at least 10 days after the LRP publication and after the 20

day Clearing House review. So if we do the Clearing House review and the LRB publication at the same time, we need to wait for the 20 days of the clearinghouse review.

[We] make updates based upon the public hearing comments and then submit the final review for review and approval before it goes before the board again. Once it goes to the board, it has to go through the legislature again, and I hope I got that all right. It's been a while since I've done a rule.

Any questions on that rather complex process?

Leigh Hamilton: Once you submit the draft and it goes through the process, does the draft get changed as a result of the process or is it just a yes/no that that can result from the process?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Once we complete the draft and it goes through this whole process and it goes through the public hearings, after it's gone through all of these comments, we will make updates to the rule draft. At that time, we'll probably bring the committee back together to say, you know, OK, these were these were the things that were commented on at public hearing, these were the comments that legal recommended we make, and meet again with this committee to discuss what those changes look like and if they look acceptable.

Leigh Hamilton: Thank you.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: OK, I see we had a couple more folks join Helen, could you introduce yourself please?

Helen Schmude: Hi, I am Helen Schmude. I work at Belgioioso Cheese as quality assurance manager.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: And Kathy Cornell, I see you joined.

Cornell, Kathy A – DATCP: Hello, I'm Kathy Cornell. I'm a financial specialist with DATCP DFRS and I'm just here to learn. Thank you.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: OK, did anyone else join? OK, so now we need to talk about what we're allowed to do.

We are not allowed to just go in and wholesale change the rule. We have to stay within the requirements of what has been written in the scope statement. The scope statement, uh, there's a lot of other stuff here, but the big thing that we want to focus on is item 2 here: the detailed description of the objective for the proposed rules.

The objective of the proposed rules is to A. Consider aligning the definitions of milk between chapters 80, ATCP 65 and ATCP 82. 65 was more recently adopted and so it had a slightly different definition for several things, so we'll need to consider aligning those definitions.

B. Consider increasing the fees to keep pace with the increased cost of performing inspections. Fees associated with Reinspections have not been addressed since 2016. Fees are one of those things that, it used to be that when you wrote a rule, whatever the fees were, they stayed back for the next 10-12 years until you reviewed that rule. However, we now have a process where we can update the fees in between times. So, what we need to look at is how much, if any, do we need to increase the fees as they may have changed from 2016 to today.

C. Consider adding language to clarify that licensed butter makers and cheese makers must pass the field inspection of their sampling procedures to continue to be authorized to weigh and sample milk with their butter maker or cheese maker license. Butter makers and cheese makers would not need to have a bulk milk weigher and sampler license, but they still need to go through the same exam that a bulk milk weigher and sampler would go through in order to be licensed to pull those samples.

D. Consider updating the references to 3A sanitary standards for tankers to reflect the name change due to the 2016 modification of the standard. This is a step in the process, when we go through one of our legal reviews. One of the things we go through is looking at each document that we've referenced: 3A standards, if we reference standard methods for the examination of milk and milk products, any other written document like that. If we refer to it in the rule, then we need to make sure that those rules are up to date, that those references are up to date, and that all of the links, if we use any links to web pages, are active and accurate.

E. Consider adding references to align the rule with Chapter 812 requirements surrounding water well construction and well pump installation practices and procedures. There's a section of this rule that talks about that you need potable water at the farms for doing things like rinsing out the tanks. It is recommended that we make sure that our water rules reflect what the DNR rule is.

F. Consider adding or modifying language regarding the below items to bring ATCP 82 into further compliance with the Pasteurized Milk Ordinance: requirements for tanker cleaning facilities, requirements for identification of individuals who complete sampling procedures on weight tickets, requirements for industry plant samplers to be a bulk milk weigher and sampler to take universal samples, and requirements for two water samples to be taken annually. Those are all things that we'll need to address and I will be honest, when I sent the 82 document, I did not reference all of the different F items because I didn't find them all. So that's one thing we'll need to look at.

G. Consider editing or removing the current requirement to clean the external surfaces of bulk milk tankers whenever a tanker is cleaned and sanitized, which is unnecessary from a food safety perspective. This one I have already gotten public comments on, even before we have asked for them. There is a very definite divide out there in industry. There are some folks who say that they really want to keep the requirement to wash the external surface of a bulk milk tanker. There are other folks who say we do not want to keep that. That is one of the things we will need to discuss and do some discernment as a group.

H. Consider modifying language to clarify when a grade A permitted facility needs to be used to clean tankers, because if a tanker goes from a picking up milk at a Grade A facility and then it goes in and picks up Grade B milk and goes into a Grade B facility, if that if that facility is not approved as a bulk milk tank wash facility, then the next facility receiving the milk may have a problem receiving that milk because it doesn't meet the PMO standards again.

I: Consider adding language that milk and dairy pumps and hoses that remain unused for a period of more than four hours need to be cleaned and sanitized at a licensed facility to align ATCP 82 with ATCP 65. 65 states no milk or dairy products may be held at the dairy plant for more than four hours at a temperature that is between 45 degrees Fahrenheit and 140 degrees Fahrenheit due to bacterial growth.

J. Consider adding language to allow for inline sampling and meter systems on farms. This is this is going to be a major change to this rule because this rule still exclusively talks about dippers. So we're going to have to totally draft new language to include this.

H. Consider modifying or removing language to clarify when milk has been out of temperature controls for an unknown period of time. It should not be allowed to be picked up as it is a public health risk.

I. Consider adding or modifying language to clarify how to sample and measure milk on a farm or at a dairy plant. If the sampler is only completing a single farm pickup, we are going to need to do a lot of talking about direct ship loads, single farm pickups, and moving forward pickups out of silos. How do we sample these? How do we measure these? That's going to be a lot of our work.

J. Consider adding language to allow sampling and metering to be conducted from the grade A permitted truck. New technology out there has developed inline samplers that can sample and measure the milk as it is loaded on to the truck. So we need to figure out how to include that language.

K. Consider adding language to allow scaling of milk at the plant, including information on where the samples are taken and how the weight records get back to the farm. Because right now the weight records always have to be recorded at the farm. How do we get that information back to the farm in a timely manner?

L. Consider adding or modifying language to account for silos being used as bulk milk tanks

M. Consider modernizing references to 65.14(6) in ATCP 82.10(11)(am)1 as the referenced section has been modified or moved so that one will be easy. That's probably the only one on this list that will be easy.

N. Consider modifying language to require agitation time frames that follow manufacturers recommendations for the tanks.

So those are the things that are included in the scope statement. It pretty much covers the entire rule, but there are probably a couple of things that are not included. Questions about this?

Brandon Johnson: Laura, I was thinking that, also and maybe you said this and I apologize if you did, the ATCP 82 Section 4 cleaning documentation – are we also going to be talking about the digitization of records?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yes, yes, that will be included in that conversation because anytime we talk about something that is required, we also need to talk about how it's documented.

Brandon Johnson: OK, great. Thank you.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Other questions?

John Umhoefer: Laura, the concrete is set on this document, right? It is. It is done. It is passed right?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: The scope statement, yes.

John Umhoefer: Yeah. OK. We're not, we're not adding, we're not subtracting, OK.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: The only reason I have to present the scope statement is because the scope statement gives us the framework of what we are allowed to do. If it isn't in the scope statement, or something that you can reasonably say, well, that's part of that scope, if it isn't in there, then we cannot address that.

Helen Schmude: So the last one or it says consider language to modify or modify language to require agitation time frames, is that for bulk tanks and silos, or is that going to include direct ships as well?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: That's the direct ships can be included in that if the manufacturer of the tanker and the manufacturer of the agitator get together and give you manufacturer recommendations.

Helen Schmude: OK. Thank you.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: So what does this look like in the real world? One of the other things that I sent to you was a Word document of ATCP 82. Some changes and a lot of comments. What I did is I went through the scope statement and identified each scope statement item and where it applied.

I also took the liberty in this first case to update the definitions to match the definitions as found in 65. What I have done here is I've just changed any definition to match 65, it doesn't mean this is where we need to stop with definitions, what it means is that that that's just what is in 65. But if we look at what 65 says and say, you know, 65 was written 6-7 years ago and it's already out of date. We can update these definitions to better match what it is today, and then we will need to bring 65 into a line with 82.

Anything in 82 that is highlighted in yellow are our fees that are charged and so, as part of scope B, consider increasing the fees. Anything that's highlighted in yellow is something we'll need to look at and determine if it needs to be increased, decreased, eliminated, whatever we think it is appropriate as a group.

There's one other thing that I did which was here in 82(4) we have Wisconsin Act 152, which said that our bulk milk weigher and samplers, if they are inspected and licensed by another state that we will accept their license. I incorporated that language even though it wasn't in the scope statement since it is an existing act that was passed by the legislature that we're allowed to bring in also.

So I think that should be all of the things I need to discuss. Everything else here is identified with a letter from the scope statement. So at this point, any questions on the rule, or as to what sent to you?

Andrew Johnson: Can we just go down through it and just see if there is any comment on any of these? I know I have read through it. I mean, are we at the point where we discuss what we want to change for fees or suggestions on dollar amounts for that part? Are we at that point or are we somewhere else in the process?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: We could be at the point of discussing fees, but the fees might be impacted by how we change parts of the world. So I'll ask the committee what is your pleasure? Do you want to discuss fees at this point or do you want to start going through each section of the rule and talk about what else needs to be updated in this role?

Andrew Johnson: Do you think we could just go down through this and say is there any comment on this part of it? I mean, I guess you could start at the fee point, I think I think I think everybody might be in agreement that the definition part is pretty self-explanatory. I do not think there will be any question on

changing that. I guess I could start out by saying I think I think the fee is fine. I do not think it probably caught, I mean, it probably is not going to make or break the department on what the fee is.

I guess my comment would only be if there is a reinspection fee, maybe I would make that higher and maybe then guys would work harder to not be reinspected. You know the motivation would be there, but I mean, I don't know what that dollar amount should be and I don't know if we're at that point to suggest dollar amounts, but I guess that's my feeling on it.

Is this something that legislation would determine? I mean, maybe we're not the people to be suggesting that actual dollar amount.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: OK, to answer that question: What we'll do is Max will do his magic with our computer databases that we have to help us determine just how much each one of these services costs us, and then we'll bring that number back to this committee to discuss. So that's, that's how we'll do that. Leigh, you have your hand up?

Leigh Hamilton: Yeah, I have just a quick question on that. Is it worth leaving yourselves the flexibility in your draft so that every time you want to revise the fee, you don't have to come back and revise the entire piece of legislation, so you could say, for example, you could put in a fee for the time being to be reviewed every 18 months or whatever.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yeah. And we somehow do that now. We do somewhat have that flexibility. In the scope statement I read something about that the fees were increased in 2016, which was midway through the life of this rule, so we now have the ability to go back in and examine all of our fees to determine if we need to change them at all.

Leigh Hamilton: Great.

John Umhoefer: What's the process there, Laura? To change your fee.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: We do an analysis of our costs for providing the service. We also do [an analysis of] the change in the consumer price index and there's a couple of other things we look at, including the date of when the fee was last changed to the current date. Then, taking all of those things into consideration, we'll make a proposal for a specific rule change to change the fees that goes through a public hearing and then goes through the board. I believe it also has to be approved by the legislature, but it's just that one item.

John Umhoefer: Did you do that discovery process for this now? Could you look at your costs and recommend something to this committee?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yep, that's what I said. Max as our program and policy analyst will. He has just gotten, for the most part, all of our databases to where they are automated, where he can pull that kind of information out of them. So yes, we will be able to provide some of that information.

John Umhoefer: OK.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: OK, ready to move on from that one?

What this section is are things like grade a permit display - that probably will not change much.

Certified industry inspection of bulk milk tankers - I am not sure that was not included in the scope statement. I am not sure how much we will do any changing with that section.

82.04 is where we have really start looking at changing things.

John Umhoefer: Hey, Laura. If we are actually doing what you are doing now and not talking about fees anymore, I did have some minor changes and questions in the definitions. So if we are going through line by line now, we might as well start at the top, right, OK.

Some of this is my ignorance, but I was wondering about the last line of number 1. Is there any factor there for, or is there an expectation in the last line that the producer's milk and his dairy plant are nearby? What I mean is that what if there are 200 miles apart? Is that is that going to be always the case?

Andrew Johnson: So is that last line basically a definition of saying what is not a bulk milk tanker, right? So if that's, I mean obviously they shouldn't be using a container to transport milk to their bulk tank or something other than if it's canned milk or something like that, which is not Grade A by definition, correct?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Right. And the other thing that this addresses is If the milk producer owns his own truck, his own bulk milk tanker, to transport the milk to the dairy plant operated by himself, there is no limitation on the distance between his farm and his plant.

John Umhoefer: OK, that was my question. It's still not a bulk milk tanker if they're 50 miles apart.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Right.

John Umhoefer: OK, so for #4 I wondered if you wanted to sneak into Part D after the first line where it says the milk contractor in 65, it adds a phrasing as defined in statutes 12640.8 stats, so that's just a pick up that would make it more like 65 and defines milk contractor within this Part D without having to perhaps define milk contractor separately. Because the term kind of pops up out of nowhere, undefined, but you could pick up what they did in 65 and just say as defined in 12640.8 stats.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Actually, what would probably do is insert a comment saying as defined in ATCP 65.01(40). So usually, we will refer back to 65.

John Umhoefer: No, You could do that too. That is great. #5 does not have the word normal before lacteal secretion, which it does in 65, so I do not know if you want to say milk means the normal lacteal secretion, which would make them identical.

Got a couple of typos in 9M.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Does not surprise me.

John Umhoefer: Cooled and owned, so that is minor, but I was wondering if you needed to say in the first line one time. I do not know if that, I think that may add confusion. One time almost implies you can do this once, but I do not think that is what you mean, but I think it could be confusing. If you know what I mean.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yeah, like let us fix this fix that. Interesting. OK so. OK, you said cooled was-

John Umhoefer: That looks better now, unless you fix it in the meantime and then.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Oh, there it is. OK, I wasn't finding the owned.

John Umhoefer: Yeah, there. That one.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: OK.

John Umhoefer: And then I mean, if we want to get picky, single farm pickup should have a closed quote on it. And then and then there's that question of one time and you know right on that same line, the "one time transfer properly cooled milk" that seems to, just as someone reading this for the first time, you might interpret that to mean you can do this once. I think, I do not know. I think you mean something different there, so it might just be a language change.

Andrew Johnson: Yeah, John, could it be something like a, you know "that will not be commingled" or I do not know the exact words. Solely, you know, "solely his milk on that truck" - something in that term. I agree with you on that.

John Umhoefer: So I I'd be open to your change, but just to point it out today. And then my last thought on that one is in line. "Stored in a bulk tilt bulk milk tank or silo" You say on line 2. You define bulk tank above, so you could use the definition and you could just say store it in a bulk tank because here you are sort of expanding the definition again for no particular reason, I think. You know what I mean? Now that you got a definition, you can start using it. So you can say stored in a bulk tank or above, which includes silo.

My final thought is pure ignorance. Umm, this [section] is implying that milk always goes from the cow into a bulk tanker or milk tanker. It never flows from the milking system right into a milk tanker?

Andrew Johnson: I think it does, John. Correct me if I'm wrong. Laura, are you trying to define the transfer of milk onto a tank that makes it a single farm pickup after, you know it's not a direct load, pick up, it's a single farm pickup that has gone through a cooling vessel before loaded onto the tank?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Correct. Yes, yes, there is a difference between a single farm pickup. Single farm pickup is that the milk is stored somehow on the farm and then the truck rolls in, unloads that silo or tank and drives away, which is different from what I just added above here, which is a direct ship load which goes through a heat exchanger, gets cold and goes right onto the truck.

John Umhoefer: OK.

Andrew Johnson: Right. So that way this single pickup definition helps us later on determine if we can take that milk to plant and weigh it, sample it there at the same as you would have direct load farm, correct.

Brandon Johnson: Could you could you say that again?

Andrew Johnson: So we're defining a single farm pickup for the, say direct load farm, so that way later on we can determine if we, you know we can treat that single farm, pick up the same as a direct load farm and sample it and weigh it at the plant for pay purposes and official samples.

Brandon Johnson: OK. Yeah, correct. Thanks.

Jordan Blunt: So and then the single farm pickup multiple loads can be taken out of the bulk tank? Does it read that way?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: It does further down because if you have a single farm pickup that does not take all of the milk out of the silo or bulk tank on the farm, then we go to the partial pickup rules. We will refer back to single farm pickups [and say] they can fall under those partial pickup rules.

John Umhoefer: If we're good there, I just one final comment and it was on #10. Would you care to say, instead of bulk transport container, bulk milk tanker which you've defined? Suddenly the word transport container appears out of nowhere, so I'm not sure why that's the new words when you've already defined a bulk milk tanker, which probably is a transport container.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: What I am looking for is does the bulk milk tanker definition include provisions? I will need to look into does it address some of those smaller operations that want to use pallet sized cubit containers to transport milk?

John Umhoefer: You might you almost have to define a bulk transport container then?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yep.

Andrew Johnson: So they are using these totes to transfer raw milk or finished product?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Nobody is doing it yet, but we have had a couple of inquiries about using them.

Brandon Johnson: I think I like leaving it to transport container. That is just my personal opinion, especially if there are other ways that it is possible that you could transport it, but that is just my opinion.

Andrew Johnson: If we do that, then I think we need to define transport container somewhere in the definitions.

Brandon Johnson: Correct, correct.

John Umhoefer: Agree. Yeah, I agree. It should probably have its own definition. In the Venn diagram, a transport container is a bigger circle and envelopes bulk milk tanker then I guess.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yeah. So yeah, we will need to look at that. And Leigh, I see you have your hand up.

Leigh Hamilton: Yeah, I do not know if people are still putting their hands up. But just in relation to the defining a single form pickup versus a direct load or those separate definitions, there is actually also a system which allows you to pick up as a single form pick up on some occasions and as a direct load on other occasions on the same farm. So I think when we're getting around to defining that, I think I just want to flag it now that we'll be looking probably to include something that allows you to do either or both at the same venue.

John Umhoefer: Does this mean that direct firm pick up needs a definition?

Leigh Hamilton: Yes, I would say so, Laura.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yeah. And I, yeah, I already had it in there.

John Umhoefer: OK.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yeah, because I believe the PMO has a very specific definition for direct ship where the truck has to back up to the building, there has to be a bumper that seals around the building and it is piped directly to the truck.

Andrew Johnson: Correct me if I am wrong, but does the PMO have that definition but allows more than one cooling device like you can use a bulk tank to cool the milk and then direct load it onto a direct load.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: That is correct, yes, you can use a bulk tank to cool the milk and then load it onto the truck. Anything else with the definitions? And do not worry, we will get to come back and look at this stuff again. OK, so as he said, 82.02 is the grade A permit requirements. That is all pretty straightforward. Name, address, phone number, make, model, serial number. [Grade B] there. Display of permits. Inspection of bulk milk tankers.

So 82.04. Bulk Milk sampler license grade a permit. As I said, this just adds the language that says that a bulk milk weigher and sampler needs to be licensed in Wisconsin or have a license issued by an equal equivalent Regulatory agency in another state.

Then C said cheesemakers and butter makers must pass the evaluation, so I threw some language in here. Butter maker/cheesemaker subsection 1 that says that they have to have a license to pick up milk to weigh milk and collect the sample. You must have a bulk milk weigher and sampler license unless you have a butter maker or cheese maker license and have passed a field inspection administered by the Department or another regulatory agency that grants bulk milk, weigher and sampler licenses within the previous 24-month period.

So all we're saying there is that your butter makers and cheese makers at the plant, if they're going to do any weighing or sampling of milk, need to have gone through an inspection, but they don't need the bulk milk weigher and sampler license.

John Umhoefer: Do you anticipate any workflow problems with that? I do not know how many people the entails.

Traas, Laura – DATCP: It is not a lot. Most of the larger plants have dedicated intake people and now when we go in and do the intake inspection, we will go, you know, "do you have any folks that need to be inspected". It is the smaller plants where you have all three people running the plant and one of them is the intake operator, then the cheesemaker, and the other one is the pasteurizer operator in between those two so the one can leap frog. That is where we run into problems, but there is not a lot of them.

John Umhoefer: OK. And this could be done in in the quick time frame, say during an inspection?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yeah. The hardest part about this is the timing of having load there because they need to demonstrate their ability to measure and sample, and if we come in and it's a smaller operation that only receives one load every other day? Yeah, we have to call ahead and make sure what time is your truck supposed to be in and pray it is not snowing or raining or something like that to slow it down.

Andrew Johnson: Can I make one comment on that, Laura, I think this is probably a good thing for the minority of plants that maybe don't have, like you said, a field rep or designated person that has a weigher or sampler. It allows this butter maker/cheese maker to have a been inspected for a federal survey or something like that where we don't require today at the state but the PMO would require that he should have been inspected. So, I think this helps that minority and in my opinion - I mean the easiest thing would be to just eliminate the exemption and make them get a weigher or sampler license then they would meet the requirements - but I think that you know, with this exemption in there it helps those people and that's just my comment on that.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Okay, then we move on to the initial application. They have to submit their application, they have to pass a written test. That's the only time they have to pass the written test is the first time they get their bulk milk weigher and sampler license and then after that it's just pass the field inspection administered by the Department.

Then this identifies what the department shall do. The Department shall act on any applications we receive within 40 days. The licenses expire on the 2nd September 30th following the date on which the Department issued or renewed the license. That is just saying that every two years the licenses expires.

This gives that grace period, that if an application comes in after August 15th of a year (this is an initial application) we will grant that license from August 15th of say 2023 through September of 2025, so that it's good for a full two years plus 45 days and that's pretty standard for us is to add a 45 day grace period.

Leigh Hamilton: Laura. Can I ask, Leigh again, do you have the flexibility or the ability to off - I mean, I'm not saying you do now, but between now and when this legislation is reexamined in 10 years or whatever it might be - it might make sense to include that you have the ability to offer that test digitally, for example, instead of in writing just to give yourselves the scope to allow you to modernize when those facilities become available to you.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yeah, I think that may, I believe by state law written examination includes digital, but I will include it as a comment because I know we switched one of our other groups from a paper test to a digital test.

Leigh Hamilton: Yeah, great. Thanks.

Mick Homb: Laura, this is Mick. Could I ask a question? In in Section 2, where I think it was Andy was talking about the few amount of people in. The easiest thing would be to have them all have a milk weigher and samplers license. What is the downfall if it is only a few people of requiring them to have a bulk milk weigher and samplers license? Is there any or is the exception just for convenience?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: The exception is more so in recognition of small businesses, and anytime we do a rule like this, we have to do small business impact. So if we have that smaller business that has three employees and we make that person pay the \$60.00 a year for their butter maker's license or their cheesemakers license and another \$60.00 a year for their bulk milk weigher license yeah, it's \$60.00, but on a small business that's viewed as a potentially too big a small business impact.

Mick Homb: OK, just a question.

John Umhoefer: You also have to open another rule.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yep. OK, so here is the license fees and yeah, it is \$60.00 every two years. Reinspection fee if there is a reinspection required, its \$60.00 for that reinspection.

Brandon Johnson: Laura, when were those last changed? Just curious, do you know?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: 2016.

Brandon Johnson: Ok. And what did they go from? Was it 50 before?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: I believe it was 50, yes. And if there's a reinspection required, the department required the bulk milk weigher and sampler to pass a written exam. We will see about that language from above and there is no fee for that.

Brandon Johnson: Laura, is that something, and I guess I am just poking in here again, is that something that - to go back on what Leigh had said before - could be possibly a digital exam? Just because I was over in Michigan and they do that and it is really pretty neat as far as time saving.

Traas, Laura M - DATCP: Well, we do it we do it currently in Wisconsin with our drug residue testing industry supervisors. The first time they take the test, they have to do it in person and after that they can renew their industry supervisor approval by watching the videos online and taking the written test online.

Brandon Johnson: That is great.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Adam asked, does the reinspection fee need to be the same as the license fee? No it doesn't. The reason it is the same is because, the thought was we have to do an inspection on these folks every two years. The \$60.00 was the cost for our staff to go out and do an inspection and so if that's what it costs us to do an inspection, that's what it should cost us to do a reinspection. I'll have to check with legal because it's been recommended here on one other thing that maybe we should make reinspections more expensive as a disincentive to failure. It is something we can examine.

OK. License renewal. Two years, they will get a renewal letter saying you need to renew. I believe the bulk milk weigher and samplers are one of those groups that can now renew online, but they must also pass a field inspection administered by our Department or another regulatory agency in the previous 24 months. Now if they have that reinspection done by our agency, it is automatically uploaded into the system. But if they have that reinspection done, say in Iowa, then they need to send us a copy of that inspection report so that their license can be renewed. They cannot renew without that inspection report and that is to meet PMO requirements. Then the department has 40 days once we receive the completed application, so that is application and documentation of their inspection, we have 40 days to send them the license.

Now this I find interesting and I've got to look into it because it talks about, under sub two, no person may do either of the following, so that tells me you've got to go all the way back up here - the reference seems wrong... OK, so it is not wrong - so it refers back to this and it is like, why are we restating what is in 1? So let us go back down to 9 and I'll ask the group, can you see a reason that we need to restate what's in 1?

Andrew Johnson: This is Andy. I guess I see exactly what you are saying. It seems like we are saying it twice so, you know, whether that is just a housekeeping rule or - I do not know why it would have been put in there. I mean it pretty much references the same ATCP 65 that .38 and so.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Can I see your comment, Brandon? Brandon says I do not see a reason to restate it again, so we will need to look at if there was some legal reason we needed to restate this.

John Umhoefer: Well, that's Grade A. That is the different language.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: And that, well, that is the different language, but since I don't see any differences between how we treat grade a bulk milk weigher and samplers and any other bulk milk weigher and samplers, why do we need the distinction between grade A and grade B in this instance?

Leigh Hamilton: Are you just about to enter into a number of clauses in a row that just lay down rules for grade A? Laura.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yes.

Leigh Hamilton: OK, so that is why they are doing it. But the question is, is it necessary to do it?

John Umhoefer: Yeah, it is probably 1.

Andrew Johnson: Yeah, because in the number 1 there when you it says weigh and measure milk and then 9 it says weigh or measure grade A milk.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yeah. But if we require everyone to have a license and that license is your permit because I don't - and Andy you may be able to speak to this better than anyone here, because I believe you have your bulk milk weigher and sampler license - is there any difference between your license if you do grade A versus grade B?

Andrew Johnson: That is what I was just struggling right here in my brain was. No, there really isn't. I mean you, there's a grade B requires a an official sample taken on certain instances, whether it's immediate response or an antibiotic clearing sample just the same as a grade A does, so I don't know what would be different with the grade B, you know versus grade A.

John Umhoefer: So the question on the table may be the elimination of 10 and 11 as well, right?

Andrew Johnson: I mean, how was it given to the person that takes it? If you take away your sampler, can you actually get a just the way your sampler permit and then a grade A license for it, just like a dairy farm. No, you get a grade a bulk milk weigher and samplers permit, right? So it's not that there's anybody out there with the weigher sampler that's not got a grade A attachment to it, correct?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Right, that is correct. Yeah, there is nowhere on the license, nowhere on the inspection form that it says yeah, this person picks up grade A.

Leigh Hamilton: And from the administrative side, when you're looking at it as an administrator, are there different obligations or requirements on you guys for issuing those or the timelines or the renewal times or is it the same across the board?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: The FDA timelines only apply to grade A, but the way we've written this rule and the way we've treated this rule is if you pick up milk, this is the requirement. We do not distinguish

between grade A and grade B. There is a couple of places that we do not distinguish grade A, grade B, drug residue testing is one of those. This is another one in order to pick up milk, you need a bulk milk weigher and samplers license and it does not distinguish.

Andrew Johnson: Maybe it is just another something for legal to see why it was originally in there and then we can tackle whether we want to take it out or not or change it.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yep, that's why I'm not taking anything out just yet. Just making comments on the side so that we can, you know, ask those questions before we erase something and then I need to go back and put that back in.

Andrew Johnson: I think that is a good exercise that we are doing here now is just to go through it and make those comments between everybody in the meeting.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yep. So, that ends ATCP 82.04.

82.06 is the construction and maintenance of bulk milk tankers. I believe the only thing - this is a very short section - and the only thing we need to change is the 3A reference and that that information I have already entered.

82.08 cleaning and sanitizing of bulk milk tankers. First thing I identified was item C talks about that milk and dairy product, pumps and hoses shall be cleaned and sanitized whenever those pumps and hoses remain unused for more than four hours, and my thought is does this meet what the scope statement said? Because that that was "consider adding language that milk and dairy pumps and hoses need to be cleaned and sanitized" and it's like it's seems to me it's already here.

No person may operate a bulk milk tanker unless the tanker bears A tag under sub four, showing that it has been cleaned and sanitized according to this section. I can think of one thing that needs to be worked on right there, which is we are seeing the digital age and the thought of a paper tag attached to the pump on the back of a bulk milk pickup truck maybe going by the wayside. So, I think we need to look at this language and discuss how else we could identify that.

Leigh Hamilton: And Laura, sorry, just to track back briefly on B&C there, I'm wondering about the language as written and should your lawyers maybe take a look at that, because I think what it's saying, my reading of it is I think, the opposite of what's intended, if you like. So it's saying, except as provided in paragraph C, which says they have to be sanitized every four hours, it's required to be sanitized every 24 hours. But really, I think it should be the opposite, that it's required to be sanitized every 24 hours except where it has to be done when it's unused for every four hours. So maybe your lawyers could just tweak or at least consider a tweak on that it should read almost the opposite, that it's in the alternative. They need to be done every four hours, but in general they need to be done every 24 hours.

Andrew Johnson: I think, I'm sorry Laura, I think with the milk and the dairy pump and hoses every four hours refers to that those are going warm up and cause [problems]. I mean, we hope that a lot of this is scientifically backed, right? I mean, we have talked about that and our meetings a lot. So the hoses and pumps are not going to stay cool in four hours, so that's why I see talks about the milk and dairy product pumps and hoses should be cleaned and sanitized or sanitized if it goes more than four hours. The reference in B is the tanker itself should be washed in a 24 hour period.

Leigh Hamilton: And I totally I absolutely agree with that. I just think that the language is a little confusing in it.

Andrew Johnson: It talks about milk and dairy product pumps and hoses and in B it talks about a bulk milk tanker so that is OK.

Leigh Hamilton: So I suppose what I'm saying is, so if say for example your entire system gets CIPed, is it good for 24 hours, unless it picks up milk again in between, in which case that 4 hour limit comes into play? Is that what's being said?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yes.

Andrew Johnson: Correct. And when they talk about the dairy pumps, it's after they've been used, then you have 4 hours to pick up milk or you have to wash and sanitize it.

Leigh Hamilton: Yeah, and all I'm saying is I think that the lawyers could clean up that language a tiny bit to make that a little bit more clear.

John Umhoefer: You are right, and that "except provided" language appears 2,000,000 times in state regulation which is always confusing. Yeah.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Jordan, you have a question.

Jordan Blunt: Yes, thank you. Is there a time limit for the clean tanker to be utilized again?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: If the clean tanker, it's empty for more than 96 hours, it needs to be reset and sanitized, but there's nothing says it has to be re-cleaned.

Now the other thing that most folks forget is once there's milk on the tanker, as long as the tanker keeps the milk at proper temperature, there is no time limit for how long that milk can be on that tanker. And that's one thing that that blows a lot of people's minds is that as soon as milk hits that tanker, as long as that milk stays at proper temperature, it can be there for four or five days.

Andrew Johnson: Is there not a 72 hour limit on getting that milk off that truck or no?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: There is a 72 hour limit on silos, but I believe farm bulk tanks can be up to four days, which is 96 hours and once it's on the truck, no, there's no time limit at all. Which is kind of scary to me here in Wisconsin, but when you start talking about trucking milk across Texas, that's where some of that comes from.

Andrew Johnson: I know this is state Statute, so I'll change my question. Is there anything in the PMO that requires that it has to be dumped or emptied in 72 hours?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: No, just the silos. And that's the other thing, I believe this would also apply to a silo at a farm. If the milk is in that silo, it cannot be in that silo for more than 72 hours, but there's nothing that says you can't move it from 1 silo to another in the plant. It's just that the silo has to be washed every 72 hours.

John Umhoefer: But there's still a temperature requirement?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: There's still a temperature requirement, Yep.

Jordan Blunt: So the 72 hours doesn't start when the first load is taken out? It's just in general, 72 hours on a silo?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: On a silo in a plant? Yes. And I'm not sure, I've got to go back and look at the how the PMO handles silos on farms.

Jordan Blunt: Thank you.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Okay, are we pretty much OK with A through C? I added the one here and then this one is scope H clarify that that grade permit is required for the cleaning facility when they're cleaning a tanker that is going to go pick up grade A milk.

Brandon Johnson: Laura, I just added to the chat just an idea. Obviously, I think things would have to be expanded upon. But are you looking for something like that? "No person may operate a bulk milk tank, or unless there is digital or physical proof showing it has been cleaned and sanitized."

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yeah, that language looks like it might work.

John Umhoefer: Or just proof.

Brandon Johnson: Well, that's what I was wondering is if we can, I mean if we can just take both out of there and then as a part of the proof, it has to show it either way. I actually like that better, John.

Leigh Hamilton: Can you and rather than using the word proof, could you use the word evidence and then define that in your in your definition section say that it refers to both written or digital documentation.

John Umhoefer: Definitions are better when they're used multiple times, but maybe it is.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yeah, I like that also because evidence has the legal connotation of needing to be able to be presented because that's the one thing that I'm going to be looking for here is that it is readily accessible to the inspectors.

Andrew Johnson: So as a real life scenario, I mean we talk about digitally and all that and how that is the future. I am thinking that grassland dairy products have a tanker today came in and decided that they were going to give us a digital wash tag. I don't know how we would, I mean, so now we're going to wait, I mean, is he going to show us on the phone, on his phone. I mean, when you have a physical wash tag on a truck, it's right there. We attach it to the manifest. We can scan it, we can do whatever, but in order, I mean, and this goes back to like inline samplings, which will have conversation here, you know eventually, but you know, where is our comfort level that this is going to meet the requirements and how do we produce this on an audit?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yeah.

Andrew Johnson: There are certain things that I mean we can make in house decisions and require all our tankers, but when we start buying outside milk or outside cream and it comes in with a digital wash tag you know it's going to slow things down. I mean, you know, I don't know that that's just what is entering through my mind so.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: That's one of the things that we're probably going to end up doing with this rule is we're probably going to end up changing the way a rule is written in the state of Wisconsin, at

least from the dairy section, to move away from very prescriptive things like “you shall have a dipper” to more of what's called a governance model for a rulemaking which says these are the outcomes you need to be able to provide and so in this case you need to be able to provide evidence that this tanker was washed, that evidence needs to be readily available to the receiving station that's receiving that milk and needs to be readily available to the inspector who will be inspecting that that stuff.

And so you set up that these are the ends, these are the are the outcomes we expect, and then you set up a second set of limitations that say that however you maintain your records, they cannot be overwritten, they cannot be changed by any outside of source, they must be readily available you know? So it's going to be a real tough writing of a rule because we've been so used to writing rules for so long that say you have a seven day recording chart and this is what your seven day recording chart needs to look like to this is the evidence you need, and these are the rules you can't break in producing that evidence.

John Umhoefer: Like part 8 is going to be really long.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Well, there's going to be a few things that are going to get a lot longer because we're going to have to address inline samplers at the farm, in line samplers on the truck, weighing and measuring equipment on the truck - how do how do we address all of that? There is just so much new technology out there that we are going to have to figure out how to address in a way that the department is comfortable that food safety is being protected and, as Andy points out, that industry is comfortable that they have access to the information they need to operate their business.

Brandon Johnson: I feel like you said that all beautifully, Laura. That's a lot, but I think like just from the probably coming from a similar place of where Leigh is, I just think our industry we have to have these ways to improve it with the technology that's available today. And so I'm really happy and excited that that we're talking about this stuff, even though it's not perfect and we're going to figure it out. Have to at least have it available to us as an opportunity. Otherwise, we're already running out of people to haul milk and to to do things, so we have to create efficiencies for our people. So thank you.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Now the other interesting thing will be to see if the legislature accepts a rule written in a new way that hopefully not just deals with the technology of today, but sets a framework for technology moving forward. We identified these are the outcomes we need, you need to be able to produce these outcomes. These are the rules you can't break and if you come up with a new technology that meets both of these requirements, we're good.

John Umhoefer: Maybe Laura, you will be able to define physical and digital evidence in section one and keep returning to that phrase throughout the document for the inline samplers for the back of the truck here so that you can put that bulk language in the definitions and then it's implied within the sections moving forward.

Leigh Hamilton: Yeah. And sorry, Laura, just one thing on the - I didn't really catch who asked the initial question - but to give some comfort around that. You know, they don't have to be in the alternative - physical or digital evidence – you can keep a requirement for both for the time being and you know none of these developments need to take away from the security that you have right now around the milk and the quality of the milk that you're receiving.

Helen Schmude: So one question, when looking at this, if you're going to be washing a pump in a hose, right, and it should be in a permit permitted facility, right? Is permitted facility called out anywhere. Looking at like 2 bulk milk tanker cleaning facilities, should it say permitted facility?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yeah, and that's this comment over here, which is highly cryptic which talks about that we need to make sure that that the permitted bulk milk tanker cleaning facility incorporates all of these sections out of the PMO. 65, 2, 4, 1, 2, possibly parts of 3, parts of 4, 5, 6, 8. So there's a lot of stuff that's going to need to be incorporated into the bulk milk tank cleaning facility to address those things.

And then this is also this. This sections definitely going to expand because “shall be equipped with adequate hot and cold water under pressure” - this is where we are going to be asked to add language to define the standards for water. And then this last line I just, I'm not sure what the intention was for that line.

Brandon Johnson: I wonder, Laura, if that is something that's old. The I am just. I am just wondering that, I mean, obviously there are there are plants being built today where they are like pull through plants where you technically might not be in the same room. However, a room is defined, you are unloading it, and then you are pulling into the head to get washed. And if that's not so, I'm just curious and wondering if that was an old thing to make it easy to describe the physical details of that room. That is my wondering. I wonder if it is applicable anymore. I don't know is that necessary?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: It might be necessary just because I believe there's somewhere, and I think it's in 65 that talks about separate rooms, and so I think that this might be needed to specify that this is one of the places that separate rooms does not apply.

Andrew Johnson: I think on the reverse side of that, that if you're going to unload milk in this room, then that room must meet those requirements of having a wash VAT, pressurized water, all of that stuff too, you know.

Brandon Johnson: Yeah, I'm just thinking are there plants that great a plants that just unload milk but you can't get washed there? Or do all plants that are grade A receiving stations have to, shall provide a grade A tank wash?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: I am not aware of any facilities that don't provide wash services after unloading, but I'm not aware of anywhere in the rule where it says that must be the case.

Brandon Johnson: Because I'm just thinking in other sectors of business, I mean it's rare in the milk world its very common in food grade for example, there's virtually no place you unload where they also wash - you have to go to a commercial wash.

Andrew Johnson: I do believe, though, that in Wisconsin there are facilities that do wash, but they are not considered a grade a wash. Am I wrong on that, Laura?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: No, you are not wrong on that. There are some facilities that wash that have not sought a grade A bulk milk tank wash approval.

And then this is item B is where we talk about that if you are going to wash grade a bulk milk tankers then you need either a grade a license for your receiving station or plant or approval as a grade A bulk milk tank wash facility attached to a grade beef plant.

Cleaning and sanitizing procedure. Clean the dairy product contact surfaces, sanitize the dairy product contact surfaces and then item C is the one that's up for contention because as I said, I've gotten both sides. I've gotten some people who have said you need to keep it in there and I've gotten some folks that say it needs to go.

Andrew Johnson: I guess there's an industry representative, I guess, I mean, we all want these trucks to look nice when they're picking up milk. I mean, we're all looking at sustainability and everything else and water usage.

You know, I don't know if it's, you know, again, you go back to science, which are advisory committee has said over and over you know, a clean truck does not necessarily going to create food safety hazards, but you know, I'm sure it was put in there just to help represent our industry and show our consumers that were, you know, have clean trucks when we're out picking up this milk and stuff like that. But to make it a requirement, I'm you know that could just be a an industry standard that each individual, I mean in, in my history, I've had trucks go to plants that don't want them to clean the outside of their trucks. And then, of course, the haulers saying, well, it's a requirement and then and then there's the big argument of, you know, well, you know, we have to be able to, well, they can go down the road and wash them if they need to or whatever but we're not using the water to do that or heating the water to do that.

And I guess I'm torn either way. I mean, I'd like to see nice trucks. We allow our haulers to wash the outside of their trucks, they're not allowed, of course, on the catwalks to get the parts of the truck that they can't reach because of safety issues and stuff like that. But I don't know if it needs to be requirement. I guess it is the opinion of myself and grassland in particular if you ask some of our management, they're on both sides of the fence too. Yeah, we want to be able to have nice trucks that have our sticker on the side of them but is it a definite requirement for food safety? I don't know if it really is or not.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: And Adam, Adam put in the chat. That perception is important, Brandon.

Brandon Johnson: I was just going say I agree with what you said. I don't know if it's good to have it in the rule. I know at our transfer station when we had one, obviously like in the winter, you've got a snowstorm going on, if you were checking your weights, say it's bulk milk sampled and you don't have an inline system like Leigh has and you're verifying that with the scale of the physical scale outside and you're unloading your milk. If you wash off that snow or ice or whatever, you vastly changed the weight of that truck. I do like clean trucks, I just don't know if it's a rule that should be on here. That's my thought.

John Umhoefer: I agree that it's good for perception, but it it's should not be a mandate from the state. I think, every company if they want clean trucks, they'll have the guys clean the trucks. It shouldn't be a mandate because a lot of companies 1st place they're looking for a sustainability metric is reduced water use and this is low hanging fruit. Less water use, less water going to waste water not to be

processed and it has nothing to do with food safety so if you want a clean truck then clean the truck but don't have the state mandate it.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: OK. We are at 1:46 on and we've still got part of this quite a bit of this section to go yet, but I would like to make sure that we get a chance to set another meeting date before we reach the end of the meeting so. We are here at Tuesday, October 24th. What days of the week work best for folks? And I'll start with the committee. What are your folk's thoughts?

Andrew Johnson: I am very open to whatever fits the other schedule.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: OK. Andy you're breaking up and I'm not sure if it's you or I think, Mick, we're getting some feedback from, I think your phone.

Mick Homb: OK, I muted myself.

Andrew Johnson: I am open to any times, but I think we need to meet more often because this conversation is good and sure we have to do it in an open meeting forum so.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yes. Helen. Tony. Adam, John. Thoughts.

Adam Brock: For me, I mean, I can make it work. I would want to avoid the 9th if possible. That would be my only request.

John Umhoefer: Forgive me. Are you suggesting a particular date? Is that what you're looking for?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yep, looking for a date and time. Brandon says Tuesdays in this time work for him. Tony says he's open.

Helen Schmude: I would agree. Tuesdays in this time work for me as well.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: OK.

John Umhoefer: Not the 7th.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: So not the 7th.

John Umhoefer: Correct.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yeah, I am not available the 14 nor is Max. We have our dairy section face to face meeting.

Helen Schmude: Is November 7th an option?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: We have one person who says they can't, one committee member who says they can't make it. What about the rest of the committee?

Helen Schmude: Would Wednesday, November 8th at the same time work for everyone?

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: I could make that work.

John Umhoefer: I cannot. In the Medical committee meeting later in the day, I could meet on the 7th after two around the 8th after three.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: I can't do the 8th after three, but I could do the 7th later in the day.

Leigh Hamilton: It's starting to get a little bit late for me and I'm at 8:00 PM now, so ideally anything earlier would be would be better if possible.

John Umhoefer: Or we have a meeting in Ireland.

Leigh Hamilton: You'd be most welcome. I'd love that.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: OK, I've got a I've got Brandon also. Yeah, I wrote that one already that the IT doesn't work for him.

Helen Schmude: Earlier on November 7th, work for everyone like 9:00 O'clock.

John Umhoefer: Yes.

Brandon Johnson: Yes.

Andrew Johnson: Yes.

Leigh Hamilton: Yeah.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: 9:00 o'clock on the 7th, Mick.

Mick Homb: Mick says yes.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: OK, I will put a placeholder so I remember that and I'm sure Max has it in the minutes. 9:00 AM on Tuesday the 7th. 2 hours a good length of time.

John Umhoefer: Yes.

Helen Schmude: Yes.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: OK, so back to here. So we've discussed upcoming meeting dates. Any final discussion we've got about 6 minutes before we had two o'clock.

Andrew Johnson: I think we should just take off where we left off and try to power through it and go from there.

John Umhoefer: Laura based on discussion do you think you might try some more inputs that you would show us? Because some of yours seem to be looking forward into the documents in your thoughts.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Yeah, I have a another document off to the side where I have some other thoughts stored, but I felt with this first meeting we needed to stick to the scope statement. So what I'll do is I will get the document umm saved and get it to Max so Max can forward it to all of you. I'll add some of the comments that I have in the other document I have and we can certainly discuss things via email prior to the meeting also. Anything else we need to discuss?

Brandon Johnson: Thank you, Laura. This is really good.

Traas, Laura M – DATCP: Thank you all very much and thank you for your willingness to push on this and do another meeting in two weeks. I really appreciate that. Have a good day all.