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Officers

2012-2013
Past President       Chris Thompson, University of Kentucky Division of Regulatory Services
President           Susan Esser, Michigan Department of Agriculture
President Elect     Casey McCue, New York Department of Agriculture
Vice President      Dru Haderlie, Wyoming Department of Agriculture
Secretary           Gary Newton, Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
Executive Treasurer Eunice Schlappi, Kentucky Department of Agriculture

2013-2014
Past President       Susan Esser, Michigan Department of Agriculture
President           Casey McCue, New York Department of Agriculture
President Elect     Dru Haderlie, Wyoming Department of Agriculture
Vice President      Gary Newton, Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
Secretary           Gene Wiseman, Missouri State Milk Board
Executive Treasurer Eunice Schlappi, Kentucky Department of Agriculture
First of all I would like to thank Gary Newton for allowing me the privilege of acting as interim secretary for the 2013NADRO Conference due to his unforeseen absence; I do regret that he was not able to attend due to the oversight of an airline company forgetting to charter a plane for the flight he had previously booked. With that said, I was put into the NADRO Executive Board at the Orange Beach, Alabama meeting as vice president, skipping the necessary role as secretary of the association, however due to the unfortunate events beyond our control the assignment was placed upon me to follow through with this charge for the conference. The secretary has a huge responsibility at this conference as, minutes take, note organizer, compiler of state reports and presentations and other duties I may be forgetting because I lack the organizational and mental skills needed to be a good secretary, let alone a great one. This was a much needed experience for me personally to learn and understand the inner workings of the NADRO Executive Board.

I would like to thank Susan Esser for her great personality and leadership as President for this conference; I hope the best for her retirement. As for Casey McCue, Gary Newton, Gene Wiseman, and Eunice Schlappi, I look forward to working with you on the planning and presenting of the conferences yet to come. I must admit that being a part of this association has opened my eyes and understanding to the vastness of the dairy industry outside of Wyoming, I am impressed with the other state regulators I have gotten to know and participate in this conference with.

I would also like to thank, Chelle Schwope, Vicky Case, Linda Stratton, Wayne Cook, and Dean Finkenbinder for the help in organizing and making hotel and other such arrangements to make this meeting a success. It was very nice to host the meeting in my home state.

Once again I would like to thank all those members of the NADRO Executive Board that have helped me understand my role and responsibility as a board member, as well as be able to assume the roles and responsibilities of others in their absence, it allows all of use the privilege of serving each other along with those who attend these meetings. I look forward to my continued service as a board member and the privilege of organizing future meetings that promote the dairy industry, be informative to conference participants, and encourages industry, regulators and producers of the dairy business to come together and work for the common good and growth of the Industry.

Sincerely, Dru Haderlie
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Annual Meeting Agenda

Sunday, July 21, 2013

Noon to 5:00 pm        Early Arrival and Registration

Monday Morning, July 22, 2013

9:00 am- 1:00 pm        Registration
8:30 am- 11:00 am        Executive Board Meeting

Monday Afternoon, July 22, 2013: Moderator- Sue Esser, President

Noon                      Welcome- Sue Esser, President, NADRO
12:10 pm                   Welcome- Dru Haderlie, Vice President, NADRO
12:15 pm                   Welcome- Jason Fearnehough, Director, Wyoming Dept. of Agriculture
12:45 pm                   State Reports (A representative from each state will be given an opportunity to
Provide a brief (5 Minutes) dairy industry update regarding their home state)
2:00 pm                    Break
2:10 pm                    Business Session
                            Call to Order
                            Roll Call
                            President’s Report
                            NASDA Report
                            Submitting Questions for Artisan Cheese Roundtable Discussion
                            Committee Assignments
                            Resolution Assignments
4:00 pm                    Adjourn
6:00 pm                    Group Dinner

Tuesday Morning, July 23, 2013: Moderator- Casey McCue, President Elect

7:00 am                    Breakfast Provided
8:00 am                    NCIMS Update- Dr. Stephen Beam, Chair, NCIMS
8:30am                      NMPF Update- Jamie Jonker, NMPF
9:15 am                     IDFA Update- Cary Frye, IDFA
10:00 am                    Break
10:15 am                    Artisan Cheese Roundtable Discussion
11:00 am                    Milk Tank Truck Sampling and CIP- Bob Gilchrist, Agrimark
11:15 am                    Idaho’s Raw Milk Program- Mike Wiggs, Idaho Dept. of Agriculture
Noon                        Lunch on your own

Tuesday Afternoon, July 23, 2013: Moderator- Dru Haderlie, Vice President

1:00 pm                     Animal Health Issues- Dr. Jim Logan, State Veterinarian, Wyoming Livestock Board
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1:45 pm  PDA Update- 2013 NCIMS Update on conference actions/FSMA- Capt. Bob Hennes, Food & Drug Administration
2:45 pm  Break
3:00 pm  NADRO Committee Meetings
5:00 pm  Adjourn
6:00 pm  Reception
7:00 pm  Banquet / Awards

Wednesday Morning, July 24th, 2013: Moderator- Casey McCue, President Elect

7:00 am  Breakfast Provided
7:30 am  State Reports & Committee Reports
8:00 am  Dairy Practices Council (DPC) Update- Rebecca Piston, H.P. Hood LLC
8:30 am  State Reports & Committee Reports
10:00 am Business Session
  Roll Call
  Resolution Committee Report
  Financial Report
  Audit Report
  Old Business
  New Business
  Nominating Committee Report
  Election of Officers
  Host States for Next Two Annual Meetings
Noon     Adjourn

NCIMS Liaison Committee Meeting Immediately Following
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Delegate</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
<th>Dept. of Env Cons- Env Health</th>
<th>Dept. of Env Cons- Env Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Dr. Jay Fuller</td>
<td>Cherie Lowry</td>
<td>Dept. of Env Cons- Env Health</td>
<td>Dept. of Env Cons- Env Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Stephen Beam</td>
<td>Kristen Dahl</td>
<td>CA Dept of Food &amp; Agriculture</td>
<td>CA Dept of Food &amp; Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Bob Rogers</td>
<td>Natalie Adan</td>
<td>Georgia Dept of Agriculture</td>
<td>Georgia Dept of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Mike Wiggs</td>
<td>Marv Patten</td>
<td>ID Dept of Agriculture</td>
<td>ID Dept of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Douglas Metcalfe</td>
<td>Thomas Ford</td>
<td>Bd of AH Dairy Division</td>
<td>Bd of AH Dairy Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Eunice Schlappi</td>
<td>Bob Hickerson</td>
<td>KY Milk Safety Branch</td>
<td>University of KY-Reg Svc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Steven Giguere</td>
<td>Ronald Dyer</td>
<td>ME Dept of Ag, Cons &amp; Forestry</td>
<td>ME Dept of Ag, Cons &amp; Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Laurie Bucher</td>
<td>Connie Caffes</td>
<td>MD DHMH-Center for Milk Control</td>
<td>MD DHMH-Center for Milk Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Cathy Kaszowski</td>
<td></td>
<td>MA Dept of Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Susan Esser</td>
<td>Gordon Robinson</td>
<td>Michigan Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>Michigan Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Nicole Neener</td>
<td>Jason Gibbs</td>
<td>Minnesota Department of Ag</td>
<td>Minnesota Department of Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Gene Wiseman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missouri State Milk Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>George Hanssen</td>
<td>Randy Chloupek</td>
<td>Nebraska Dept of Agriculture</td>
<td>Nebraska Dept of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Anna Vickrey</td>
<td></td>
<td>NV Dairy Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Alf Reeb</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Mexico Dept of Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Casey McCue</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York Dept of Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Wayne Carlson</td>
<td>John Ringsrud</td>
<td>North Dakota Dept of Agriculture</td>
<td>North Dakota Dept of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Delegate</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
<th>Agency Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Delegate</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Ohio Dept of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roger Tedrick</td>
<td>Brian Wise</td>
<td>Ohio Dept of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Delegate</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Oregon Dept of Ag-Food Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Barcellos</td>
<td>Vance Bybee</td>
<td>Oregon Dept of Ag-Food Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Delegate</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>SD Dept of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Darwin Kurtenbach</td>
<td>Kevin Fridley</td>
<td>SD Dept of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Delegate</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Utah Dept of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Clark</td>
<td>R. Cody Huft</td>
<td>Utah Dept of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Delegate</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>VT Agency of Ag, Food &amp; Mkts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Scruton</td>
<td>Susan James</td>
<td>Vermont Dept of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Delegate</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Virginia Dept of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carolyn Peterson</td>
<td>Robert Trimmer</td>
<td>Virginia Dept of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Delegate</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>WV Env Health/PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Peggs</td>
<td>Mark Uraco</td>
<td>WV Env Health/PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Delegate</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>WA Dept of Agr-Food Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucy Severs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Delegate</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Wyoming Dept of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dru Haderlie</td>
<td>Linda Stratton</td>
<td>Wyoming Dept of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2013 Registrants & Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency/Department</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frank Barcellos</td>
<td>Oregon Dept of Ag</td>
<td>635 Capitol St. NE, Salem, Or 97301</td>
<td>503-986-4729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vance Bybee</td>
<td>Oregon Dept of Ag</td>
<td>635 Capitol St. NE, Salem, Or 97301</td>
<td>503-986-4729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Beam</td>
<td>CA Dept of Ag</td>
<td>1220 N St. GWO, Sacramento, Ca 95814</td>
<td>916-900-5068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Cook</td>
<td>WY Dept of Ag</td>
<td>PO Box 233, Cheyenne, WY 83114</td>
<td>307-249-3536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Esser</td>
<td>MI Dept of Ag</td>
<td>PO Box 30017, Lansing, Mi 48909</td>
<td>517-331-1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Finkenbinder</td>
<td>WY Dept of Ag</td>
<td>2219 Carey Ave, Cheyenne, WY 82002</td>
<td>307-777-6587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary Frye</td>
<td>IDFA</td>
<td>1250 H St. NW-Suite 900, Washington DC 20005</td>
<td>202-220-3543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Gates</td>
<td>NADRO Lifetime</td>
<td>139 Hunters Crossing Rd, Atiea, Ga 30006</td>
<td>706-549-2779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Gilchrist</td>
<td>Agri-Mark, Inc</td>
<td>PO Box 5800, Lawrence, Ma 01842</td>
<td>978-687-4923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dru Haderlie</td>
<td>WY Dept of Ag</td>
<td>PO Box 66, Cheyenne, Wy 83114</td>
<td>307-797-2376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Henne</td>
<td>USPHS/FDA</td>
<td>5100 Paint Branch Parkway College Park, MD 20740</td>
<td>240-402-2175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Hoel</td>
<td>Dean Foods Company</td>
<td>2711 N Haskell Ave, Dallas, Tx 75204</td>
<td>214-721-1101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cody Hutts</td>
<td>UT Dept of Ag</td>
<td>PO Box 146500, Salt Lake City, Ut 84114</td>
<td>801-538-7145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Jonker</td>
<td>NMFP</td>
<td>2101 Wilson Blvd, Suite 400, Arlington, Va 22201</td>
<td>703-243-6111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin Kurgenbach</td>
<td>SD Dept of Ag</td>
<td>523 E Capitol Ave-Foss Bldg, Pierre, SD 57501</td>
<td>408-656-3625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Lemmons</td>
<td>Borden Dairy</td>
<td>8750 N Central Expressway, St 400, Dallas, Tx 75231</td>
<td>214-721-1101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey McCue</td>
<td>NYS Dept of Ag &amp; Mkts</td>
<td>108 Aline Dr, Albany, NY 12225</td>
<td>518-457-1772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Metcalf</td>
<td>IN State Bd of AH</td>
<td>1202 E 38th St, Indianapolis, In 46205</td>
<td>317-544-2388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Metcalf</td>
<td>Guest-IN Bd of AH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Newton</td>
<td>FL Dept of Ag &amp; Consumer Svcs</td>
<td>Dairy Division-3125 Conner Blvd Room B28, Tallahassee Fl 32399</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gary.newton@freshfromflorida.com">gary.newton@freshfromflorida.com</a> 850-245-5145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas O’Carroll</td>
<td>United Dairymen Arizona</td>
<td>2601 S Hardy Dr, Tempe, Az 85282</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tocarroll@uda.coop">tocarroll@uda.coop</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Peterson</td>
<td>VA Dept of Ag &amp; Consumer Svcs</td>
<td>102 Governor St. Suite 349, Richmond, Va 23219</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carolyn.peterson@vdace.virginia.gov">carolyn.peterson@vdace.virginia.gov</a> 504-786-1452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Piston</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rebecca.piston@hphood.com">Rebecca.piston@hphood.com</a> 207-712-0312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Rogers</td>
<td>GA Dept of Ag</td>
<td>19 Martin Luther King, Jr Drive-Rm 316, Atlanta, Ga 30334</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hobb.rogers@agr.georgia.gov">hobb.rogers@agr.georgia.gov</a> 404-656-3625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsa Rogers</td>
<td>Guest-GA Dept of Ag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sanford</td>
<td>Dean Foods Company</td>
<td>PO Box 84, College Grove, Tn 37046</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john_sanford@deanfoods.com">john_sanford@deanfoods.com</a> 615-760-2242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunice Schleggie</td>
<td>KY Dept of Ag</td>
<td>100 Fair Oaks Lane-5th Fl, Frankfort, Ky 40601</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eunice.schleggie@ky.gov">eunice.schleggie@ky.gov</a> 502-564-4983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelle Schweppe</td>
<td>WY Dept of Ag</td>
<td>PO Box 644, Cowley, Wy 82420</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chelle.schweppe@wyo.gov">chelle.schweppe@wyo.gov</a> 307-548-2154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Scurton</td>
<td>VT Agency of Ag, Food &amp; Mkts</td>
<td>116 State St, Montpelier, Vt 05620</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dan_scurton@state.vt.us">dan_scurton@state.vt.us</a> 802-828-2433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Savers</td>
<td>WA Dept of Ag-Food Safety</td>
<td>PO Box 45260, Olympia, Wa 98504</td>
<td><a href="mailto:keyvers@agr.wa.gov">keyvers@agr.wa.gov</a> 360-725-5761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Stratton</td>
<td>WY Dept of Ag</td>
<td>2219 Carey Ave, Cheyenne, Wy 82002</td>
<td><a href="mailto:linda.stratton@wyo.gov">linda.stratton@wyo.gov</a> 307-777-6592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Vickrey</td>
<td>NV Dairy Commission</td>
<td>4600 Kietke Ln, Ste A107, Reno, Nv 89502</td>
<td><a href="mailto:avickrey@dairy-state.nv.us">avickrey@dairy-state.nv.us</a> 775-688-1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Wiggles</td>
<td>ID State Dept of Ag/Dairy Bureau</td>
<td>PO Box 790, Boise, Id 83701</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mike.wigges@agri.idaho.gov">mike.wigges@agri.idaho.gov</a> 208-332-8550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Wiggles</td>
<td>Guest-ID Dept of Ag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby Wiggles</td>
<td>WY Dept of Ag</td>
<td>67 Louis Lamoure Lane, Powell, Wy 82435</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vicky.wine@wyo.gov">vicky.wine@wyo.gov</a> 307-250-8603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky Wine</td>
<td>WY Dept of Ag</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:gene.wiseman@mda.mo.gov">gene.wiseman@mda.mo.gov</a> 573-522-3206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Wiseman</td>
<td>MO State Milk Board</td>
<td>1616 Missouri Blvd- PO 630, Jefferson City, Mo 65102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Wiseman</td>
<td>Guest-MO State Milk Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Wolff</td>
<td>USDA, AMS, Dairy Programs</td>
<td>1400 Independence Ave SW Rm 2746, Washington DC 20230</td>
<td><a href="mailto:phil.wolff@ams.usda.gov">phil.wolff@ams.usda.gov</a> 202-720-9832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials (NADRO)
55th Annual Meeting

Honorary Lifetime Members

Arizona
George H. Parker
4418 West Cherry Lane
Phoenix AZ 85031

Florida
Jay Boosinger
2053 Taylor Road
Tallahassee, FL 32308

William Brown
3034 White Ibis Way
Tallahassee, FL 32308

Dean Elliott
1440 Figueroa St
The Villages, FL 32164

Georgia
Jack Dodd
1315 Quincy Highway
Attapulgus, GA 91717

Peggy Gates
139 Hunter's Crossing Rd
Athens, GA 30606

Charles H. Murphy
204 Pebble Shore Dr
Georgetown, GA 39854

Cliff Ward
5600 Hog Mountain Rd
Bogart, GA 30622

Idaho
Randy Elsberry
19082 Ave 300
Exeter, CA 93221

Jay L. Nichols
8315 Valley View Dr
Boise, ID 83702

Iowa
Richard Dennler
6915 Sunset Terrace
Des Moines, IA 50311

Ray H. Ormand
6915 Sunset Terrace
Des Moines, IA 50311

Kansas
Melvin Brose
Martin Creek Place
4950 SW Huntoon #201
Topeka, KS 66604

Bruce Rowley
2221 West 31st Street Terrace
Topeka, KS 66611

Kentucky
Edward Troutman
3416 Belvoir Drive
Lexington, KY 40503

Maine
Dana Small
RR #
Bowdoinham, ME 04008

Massachusetts
J. Peter Griffin
10 Conry Crescent
Jamaica Plain, MA 0213

Arthur W. Hoyt
Birch Meadow Road
Merrimac, MA 01860

David L. Sheldon
RR 3, Box 107
Great Barrington, MA 02130
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Michigan

Laurence L. Clough  
Friendship Village, Apt 28  
Kalamazoo, MI 49007

Ken Feighner  
6620 East Scott Road  
Nashville, MI 49073

William McCarthy  
107 Rex Lane  
St. John, MI 48879

Kenneth Van Patten  
2365 Howell Road  
Williamston, MI 48895

Minnesota

Bill Coleman  
1122 Sixth Street, South  
Fargo, ND 58103

Orlowe M. Olsten  
1375 Fairmount Avenue  
St. Paul, MN 55105

Greg Pitman  
13390 420th Ave  
Waseca, MN 56093

Missouri

Carl Action  
304 West Spring  
Fayette, MO 65248

James Kennedy  
12408 RT C  
Russellville, MO 65074

Terry Long  
19170 Factory Creek Road  
Jamestown, MO 65046

Fred Neinershagen  
1103 Falcon Drive  
Columbia, MO 65201

Montana

Everett L. Tubbs, RS  
2014 Lockie Ave  
Helena, MT 59601

Nebraska

Dan Borer  
301 Centennial Mall S #4  
Lincoln, NE 68508

New York

Will Francis  
3269 Chrisland Dr  
Annapolis, MD 21403

Dwayne Liniski  
RR 2  
Johnsonville, NY 12093

Alfred Place  
10 Norge Road  
Delmar, NY 12054

North Carolina

Leonard F. Blanton  
RR 5 Box 332  
Lincolnton, NC 28093

Robert Gordon  
419 Oak Ridge Road  
Carey, NC 27511

Bruce Williams  
5204 Calvin Place  
Raleigh, NC 27609

North Dakota

Phil Park  
107 West Ave A  
Bismark, ND 58501
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Ohio

Lewis Jones
8995 East Broad Street
Reynoldsburg, OH 43068

Oklahoma

Clyde D. Lacey
PO Box 744
Atoka, OK 74525

George M. Parker
3216 South Rankin
Edmond, OK 73034

Dan Rackley
7801 W. Shawnee
Muskogee, OK 74401

James E. Smith
643 Ridgecrest
Edmond, OK 73034

Oregon

Ron McKay
5253 Aldercrest Court South
Salem, OR 97306

Eric Paulson
1138 Simpson St
Aumsville, OR 97306

Al Tesda
1515 7th Ave NE
Salem, OR 97303

Pennsylvania

James Dell
5269 Trout Run Ln
Spruce Creek, PA 16683

South Dakota

G. William Fouse
RR 1, Box 95
James Creek, PA 16657

Verne Brakke
624 North Jackson
Pierre, SD 57501

Roger Scheibe
1100 Telluride Ln
Brookings, SD 57006

Vermont

Donald F. George
14 Green Mountain View
Barre, VT 05641

Washington

Byron Moyer
155 Richardson Rd
Barre, VT 05641

Wisconsin

Donald Penders
8328 60th Ln SE
Lacey, WA 98513

Tom Leitzke
PO Box 8911
Madison, WI 53708
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Past Presidents

1958-1959 Dr. W. L. Bendix (VA)
1959-1960 C.H. Holcombe (MN)
1960-1961 Dr. Richarc Parry (CT)
1961-1962 Harry Tiborond (WY)
1962-1963 Dr. W.L. Bendix (VA)
1963-1965 Brace Rowley (KS)
1964-1965 Laurence Clough (NY)
1965-1966 Harry Staver (CO)
1966-1967 C. Harold Amick (SD)
1967-1968 Donald Spiegel
1968-1969 Peter Griffin (MA)
1969-1970 Dean Chrestensen (ID)
1970-1971 Howard Brosset (LA)
1971-1973 Herbert Kling (NY)
1973-1974 R.L. Van Buren (CA)
1974-1975 M.W. Jefferson (VA)
1975-1976 Kenneth Van Patten (MI)
1976-1977 Archie S. Hurst (UT)
1977-1978 Gene Dally (GA)
1978-1979 G. William Fouse (PA)
1979-1980 Orlowe M. Olsten (MN)
1980-1981 Jess D Strum (WY)
1981-1982 Jay Boosinger (FL)
1982-1983 Alfred R. Place (NY)
1983-1984 Kenneth D. Feighner (MI)
1984-1985 Fred G. Geik (NM)
1985-1986 Archie C. Folliday (VA)
1986-1987 Donald George (VT)
1987-1988 Ronald W. McKay (OR)
1988-1989 Daniel J. Borer (NE)
1989-1990 Charles H. Murphy (GA)
1990-1991 Dave Sheldon (MA)
1992-1993 Bruce Williams (NC)
1993-1994 William Coleman (MN)
1994-1995 Harold Rubnick (NY)
1995-1996 Kyle Stephens (UT)
1996-1997 Terry Long (MO)
1997-1998 Byron Moyer (VT)
1998-1999 Donald R. Penders (WA)
1999-2000 John A. Beers (VA)
2000-2001 Darwin Kutenbach (SD)
2001-2002 Claudia G. Coles (WA)
2002-2003 Jim Dell (PA)
2003-2004 John Miller (FL)
2004-2005 Lewis R. Jones (OH)
2005-2006 Mike Wiggs (ID)
2006-2007 Will Francis (NY)
2007-2008 Peggy Gates (GA)
2008-2009 Gregg Pittman (MN)
2009-2010 Linda Stratton (WY)
2010-2011 Cathy Kaszowski (MA)
2011-2013 Sue Esser (MI)
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Past Meeting Locations

1959 Nashville, Tennessee
1960 Memphis, Tennessee
1961 Jackson, Wyoming
1962 Buffalo, New York
1963 Dodge City, Kansas
1964 New Orleans, Louisiana
1965 Santa Fe, New Mexico
1966 Burlington, Vermont
1967 Madison, Wisconsin
1968 Morgantown, West Virginia
1969 Jackson, Wyoming
1970 Windsor, Connecticut
1971 Sandusky, Ohio
1972 Miami Beach, Florida
1973 ----------------
1974----------------
1975----------------
1976 Williamsburg, Virginia
1978 Saratoga Springs, New York
1979 Branson, Missouri
1980 Lexington, Kentucky
1981 Boise, Idaho
1982 Portland, Maine
1983 Traverse City, Michigan
1984 Winston-Salem, North Carolina
1985 Portland, Oregon
1986 Burlington, Vermont
1987 Rapid City, South Dakota
1988 Long Boat Key, Florida
1989 Spokane, Washington
1990 Boston, Massachusetts
1991 Lincoln, Nebraska
1992 Williamsburg, Virginia
1993 Park City, Utah
1994 Albany, New York
1995 Bloomington, Minnesota
1996 Nashville, Tennessee
1997 Sun Valley, Idaho
1998 Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
1999 Lake of the Ozarks, Missouri
2000 Traverse City, Michigan
2001 Jackson, Wyoming
2002 Colchester, Vermont
2003 Wisconsin Dells, Wisconsin
2004 Louisville, Kentucky
2005 Portland, Oregon
2006 Lake Placid, New York
2007 Columbus, Ohio
2008 Norfolk, Virginia
2009 Reno, Nevada
2010 Portland, Maine
2011 Rapid City, South Dakota
2012 Orange Beach, Alabama
2013 Cody, Wyoming
National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials (NADRO)  
55th Annual Meeting  
President’s Report  
July 22 – 24, 2013  
Cody, Wyoming

To the members of NADRO:  
It has been an honor and a privilege to serve as your president. We had a very successful meeting in Cody, Wyoming with 39 members and guests in attendance including 15 state voting delegates. I'd like to applaud Eunice Schlappi for doing a great job of getting the word out to interested dairy stakeholders about our annual meeting and the purpose of our NADRO organization which is to protect the health, welfare and interests of dairy product consumers and to promote unity and efficiency in the application of dairy regulatory procedures. Eunice has been very generous of her time while she has served as Executive Treasurer of this organization, providing continuity to that role. In addition, I'd like to thank everyone from Wyoming for their warm and generous hospitality.

The attendees at our 2013 meeting heard presentations from various speakers on topics of importance to the dairy industry. These topics included artisan cheese regulation, Idaho's raw milk program, animal health issues in Wyoming, as well as updates from the Food and Drug Administration, the National Conference on Interstate Milk Shipments (NCIMS) and dairy industry organizations.

Of particular interest this year was the federal Food Safety Modernization Act and its impact on the dairy industry and state regulatory agencies. Much discussion on this topic was generated during the 2013 National Conference on Interstate Milk Shipments and further discussion occurred at our NADRO meeting. This resulted in the adoption of a NADRO Action item that requests our parent organization, the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture to encourage FDA to recognize the PMO and NCIMS milk safety program as meeting the requirements of the preventive food safety control strategies, including the responsibility and accountability provisions, contained within the Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA) and to strongly urge FDA to exempt PMO-regulated facilities from FSMA’s Preventive Controls provisions.

I feel that this is one of the most important issues currently facing the dairy industry, state regulatory agencies and FDA because it fundamentally changes the way milk processing plants are regulated and, moreover, it changes the way milk safety laws are developed, shifting from the NCIMS process to the Federal Register process.

Please join me in welcoming your incoming NADRO president, Casey McCue from New York. It has been an honor to serve as your President and I look forward to seeing you in Missouri in July 2014.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Susan Esser, Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development
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Committee Assignments

**Audit**
Darwin Kurtenbach- Chair
Eunice Schlappi
Frank Barcellos

**Joint Committee on Animal Health and Manufacturing Dairy Regulations**
Dan Scruton- Chair
Casey McCue
Dru Haderlie
Wayne Cook
Doug Metcalf
Gene Wiseman
Jamie Jonker
Linda Stratton
Phil Wolff
Anna Vickrey
John Sanford
Bob Rogers
Vicky Wine
Bob Gilchrist
Tom O’Connell

**Awards**
Darwin Kurtenbach- Chair
Eunice Schlappi

**NCIMS/ Grade “A” Regulations**
Steve Beam- Chair
Bob Hennes
Peggy Gates
Rebecca Piston
Frank Barcellos
Kevin Lemmons
Chelle Schwope
Carolyn Peterson
Casey McCue
Cody Huft
Cary Frye
Roger Hooi
Dean Finkenbinder
Lucy Severs
Mike Wiggs

**Nominating**
Linda Stratton- Chair
Gene Wiseman
Darwin Kurtenbach

**Resolutions**
Vance Bybee
Mike Wiggs
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Business Meeting Minutes

July 22, 2013

President Susan Esser Called the NADRO business meeting to order at approximately 2:00pm

Vice President Dru Haderlie acting in place of Secretary Gary Newton called roll. The following state delegates or alternate delegates were in attendance.

CALIFORNIA, GEORGIA, IDAHO, INDIANA, KENTUCKY, MICHIGAN, MISSOURI, NEVADA, NEW YORK, OREGON, SOUTH DAKOTA, UTAH, VERMONT, VIRGINIA, WEST VIRGINIA, WASHINGTON, WYOMING

A quorum was present.

Officers present included:
- President, Susan Esser
- President Elect, Casey McCue
- Vice President, Dru Haderlie
- Executive Treasurer, Eunice Schlappi

President Report
President Susan Esser talked about affect FISMA could have on small cheese plants, Sue announced NCIMS Liaison meeting following NADRO Meeting.

Round Table Discussion Topics
Blank stock cards were passed out to attendees to allow them to write down questions they have regarding artisan cheese processors to be brought up on Tuesday July 23rd as a round table discussion item during meeting general session.

Committee Assignments
The committee assignments were passed out and explained to meeting attendees. (the assignments are included in the Annual Report)

Meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:00pm and announced to reconvene at 8:00am July 23rd
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Business Meeting Minutes July 24th, 2013

Casey McCue called the meeting to order at approximately 8:45am. Roll was taken by Vice President Dru Haderlie, a full quorum was present with 17 state delegates.

**Resolutions (resolutions are included in the report)**
Resolution 1: Passed, motion to accept; Dan Scruton, 2nd ed; Darwin Kutenbach
Resolution 2: Passed, motion to accept; Gene Wiseman, 2nd ed; Frank Barcellos
Resolution 3: Passed, motion to accept; Doug Metcalf, 2nd ed; Casey McCue
Resolution 4: Passed, motion to accept; Carolyn Peterson, 2nd ed; Gene Wiseman
Resolution 5: Passed, motion to accept; Dan Scruton, 2nd ed; Stephen Beam

**Committee Assignment Actions**

**Animal Health Committee, Dan Scruton, Chair, Presented Action items**

Action Item regarding drug residue testing for manufacturing grade dairy milk for interstate shipping was discussed, discussion was opened to floor; item failed with motion made by Doug Metcalf and 2nd ed by Darwin Kutenbach.

Action Item requesting the NADRO executive board to appoint a committee to work with NASDA on the dairy section of NASDA’s comments regarding FISMA’s affect on dairy regulations to FDA. Motion to accept, Doug Metcalf; 2nd ed Carolyn Peterson

Action Item: Manufactured frozen dairy desserts be related to Grade A products, by representation of NCIMS process with a similar document as the PMO. Motion was taken for no action.

**NCIMS/Grade “A” Committee, Stephen Beam, Presented Action Item**

Action Item, requesting NADRO executive board to appoint a committee to work with NASDA’s comments on FSMA to FDA. Motion to accept, Doug Metcalf; 2nd Carolyn Peterson

Stephen Beam from NCIMS/Grade “A” Committee presented action item 1, he read the action item, then opened to floor for further discussion and rewording of document, this document is enclosed in this report titled NADRO Action Item One. Motion to accept, Mike Wiggs; 2nd Casey McCue.

**Financial Report**

Eunice Schlappi, Executive Treasurer, presented the financial report. Motion to accept report, Gene Wiseman, 2nd Frank Barcellos.

**Audit Report**

Darwin Kutenbach, Chair of Audit Committee, presented the audit report. Motion to accept report, Casey McCue; 2nd Doug Metcalf.

**Old Business**

None
New Business

Delegates discussed state attendance, making adjustments to agenda so it is easier for state agencies to approve travel and attendance to meeting. Delegates also discussed structuring meeting so committees can meet earlier in conference allowing more time for committees to work on and discuss action items presented at NADRO meeting, the use of conference calls for this purpose was also mentioned.

Nominating Committee Report

Linda Stratton, Chair of Nominating Committee, addressed group with the proposed nomination of Gene Wiseman to be the NADRO secretary.
Sue Esser addressed group with the following nominations for NADRO Executive Board

President: Casey McCue
President Elect: Dru Haderlie
Vice President: Gary Newton
Secretary: Gene Wiseman

Motion to accept nominations, Motion to accept nominations, Carolyn Peterson; 2nd Dan Scruton.

Host States

President Sue Esser announced that the 2014 conference would be hosted by Missouri and that the 2015 would be in either New York or Vermont.
Meeting was adjourned at approximately 12pm.
The National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials (NADRO) continues to recognize the importance of the Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA) in protecting the safety of the food supply of the United States.

In keeping with historical agency practice, NADRO strongly urges the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to make full use of the unique and proven milk safety system of state regulatory oversight for Grade “A” milk and milk products provided through the National Conference on Interstate MilkShipments (NCIMS), and the food safety requirements of the Pasteurized Milk Ordinance (PMO).

The PMO is based on preventive control principles and is a proven component of a comprehensive integrated food safety system. This cooperative milk safety program between states, industry and FDA has been effective at protecting the public’s health for over 60 years.

All 50 states and Puerto Rico have adopted the PMO or regulations substantially equivalent to the PMO. States conduct enforcement activities based on the PMO requirements. Changing this regulatory system would have a substantial economic impact for both state regulatory agencies as well as the regulated community with no added value in terms of public health protection.

Grade "A" milk and milk products are subject to substantial oversight and regulation by the states, in close cooperation with FDA, pursuant to the NCIMS program, and are subject to quarterly state inspections including extensive pasteurization system testing to ensure compliance with the PMO. FDA has long recognized the validity of these inspections in ensuring the safety of milk and milk products, and should continue to do so.

NADRO believes FDA should continue to rely on inspections conducted by state regulatory officials of Grade "A" milk and milk product facilities pursuant to the procedures of the NCIMS, that ensure compliance with the milk safety requirements of the PMO.

The 1977 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between FDA and the NCIMS states: "FDA considers these standards, requirements, and procedures to be adequate for the protection of the health and safety of the consumer." This MOU is still in effect.

Because of the longstanding partnership between the states and the agency as a result of the NCIMS, including the MOU between FDA and the NCIMS, FDA should recognize these state inspections in order to satisfy the inspection frequency mandate under the Act.

**Action Request**

The National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials requests the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture to encourage FDA to recognize the PMO and NCIMS milk safety program as meeting the requirements of the preventive food safety control strategies, including the responsibility and accountability provisions, contained within the Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA) and to strongly urge FDA to exempt PMO-regulated facilities from FSMA’s Preventive Controls provisions.
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2013 Resolution

Resolution One

Whereas the 55th Annual Meeting of the National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials was held at the Holiday Inn, Cody, Wyoming, July 22-24, 2013, and

Whereas the staff and management of the Holiday Inn provided exceptional service and outstanding hospitality by way of meeting rooms, catering, and guest room accommodations, and

Whereas the conference delegates and their guests thoroughly enjoyed the conference facilities, proceedings, and activities;

Be it resolved that the attendees and guests associated with the 55th Annual Meeting of the National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials heartily thank the staff and management of the Holiday Inn for their extraordinary efforts to make the conference productive, comfortable, and enjoyable.

Adopted on July 24, 2013
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2013 Resolution

Resolution Two

Whereas the 55th Annual Meeting of the National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials was held in Cody, Wyoming, July 22-24, 2013, and

Whereas the speakers provided informative reports that contained valuable content for the meeting’s participants, adding substantially to the success of the annual conference, and

Whereas the conference participants found the conference agenda and the information delivered to be timely, and educational;

Be it resolved that the participants attending the 55th Annual Meeting of the National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials formally demonstrate their gratitude to the speakers for sharing their time and talents to make the 55th Annual Meeting a resounding success. Specifically, the National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials identifies the following speaker to whom a debt of gratitude is owed:

Jason Ferneyhough, Director, Wyoming Department of Agriculture;
Dr. Stephen Beam, Chair, NCIMS;
Jamie Jonker, NMPF;
Cary Frye, IDFA
Bob Gilchrist, Agrimark;
Mike Wiggs, Idaho Department of Agriculture;
Dr. Jim Logan, State Veterinarian, Wyoming Livestock Board;
Captain Bob Hennes, U.S. Food and Drug Administration;
Rebecca Piston, H.P. Hood, LLC;
And State Report Presenters from participating states.

Adopted on July 24, 2013
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2013 Resolution

Resolution Three

Whereas the 55th Annual Meeting of the National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials was held in Cody, Wyoming, July 22-24, 2013, and

Whereas Wayne Cook, Dean Finkenbinder, Dru Haderlie, Chelly Schwope, Linda Stratton, and Vicky Wine of the Wyoming Department of Agriculture and Eunice Schlappi of the Kentucky Department of Agriculture planned, organized and facilitated a relevant, informative, educational, and enjoyable meeting, and

Whereas the participants of the 55th Annual Meeting find the supporting staff from the Wyoming Department of Agriculture to be particularly hospitable, the meeting to be relevant and well-organized, and the location to be uniquely beautiful;

Be it resolved that the attendees and guests of the 55th Annual Meeting of the National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials heartily congratulate and sincerely thank the Wyoming Department of Agriculture for its presentation of an outstanding meeting and for its welcoming hospitality

Adopted on July 24, 2013

2013 Resolution

Resolution Four

Whereas the 55th Annual Meeting of the National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials was held at the Holiday Inn, Cody, Wyoming, July 22-24, 2013, and

Whereas financial support was graciously provided by—

Gold-level Sponsors: International Dairy Foods Association and Agrinark
Silver-level Sponsors: H.P. Hood, LLC and United Dairymen of Arizona;

Be it resolved that the participants and guests of the 55th Annual Meeting of the National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials express their grateful appreciation to the 2013 Allied Sponsors.

Adopted on July 24, 2013
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2013 Resolutions

Resolution Five

Whereas the 55th Annual Meeting of the National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials was held at the Holiday Inn, Cody, Wyoming, July 22-24, 2013, and

Whereas Wilcoxson Dairy from the state of Montana provided delicious refreshments for the attendees and guests of the 55th Annual Meeting;

Be it resolved that the National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials express its sincerest gratitude to the Montana company that so graciously contributed to the enjoyment of the meeting.

Adopted on July 24, 2013
NADRO Action Item One
July 24, 2013

The National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials (NADRO) continues to recognize the importance of the Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA) in protecting the safety of the food supply of the United States.

In keeping with historical agency practice, NADRO strongly urges the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to make full use of the unique and proven milk safety system of state regulatory oversight for Grade "A" milk and milk products provided through the National Conference on Interstate Milk Shipments (NCIMS), and the food safety requirements of the Pasteurized Milk Ordinance (PMO).

The PMO is based on preventive control principles and is a proven component of a comprehensive integrated food safety system. This cooperative milk safety program between states, industry and FDA has been effective at protecting the public's health for over 60 years.

All 50 states and Puerto Rico have adopted the PMO or regulations substantially equivalent to the PMO. States conduct enforcement activities based on the PMO requirements. Changing this regulatory system would have a substantial economic impact for both state regulatory agencies as well as the regulated community with no added value in terms of public health protection.

Grade "A" milk and milk products are subject to substantial oversight and regulation by the states, in close cooperation with FDA, pursuant to the NCIMS program, and are subject to quarterly state inspections including extensive pasteurization system testing to ensure compliance with the PMO. FDA has long recognized the validity of these inspections in ensuring the safety of milk and milk products, and should continue to do so.

NADRO believes FDA should continue to rely on inspections conducted by state regulatory officials of Grade "A" milk and milk product facilities pursuant to the procedures of the NCIMS, that ensure compliance with the milk safety requirements of the PMO.

The 1977 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between FDA and the NCIMS states: "FDA considers these standards, requirements, and procedures to be adequate for the protection of the health and safety of the consumer." This MOU is still in effect.

Because of the longstanding partnership between the states and the agency as a result of the NCIMS, including the MOU between FDA and the NCIMS, FDA should recognize these state inspections in order to satisfy the inspection frequency mandate under the Act.

Action Request
The National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials requests the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture to encourage FDA to recognize the PMO and NCIMS milk safety program as meeting the requirements of the preventive food safety control strategies including the responsibility and accountability provisions, contained within the Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA) and to strongly urge FDA to exempt PMO-regulated facilities from FSMA's Preventive Controls provisions.
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2012 Financial Report  
Eunice Schlappi  
Presented July 22-24, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>net</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative fees</td>
<td>$3094.87</td>
<td>$750.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual meeting</td>
<td>$13,442.85</td>
<td>$13,743.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td>$1700.00</td>
<td>$1,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on checking</td>
<td>$9.98</td>
<td>$9.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$16,537.72</td>
<td>$21,203.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Gain

$4,665.95

Checking balance as of 12/31/2012

$11,161.46

Savings balance as of 12/31/2012

$10,024.16

Total assets

$21,190.82

Contact information for Executive Treasurer:

NADRO-Eunice Schlappi  
Office: 502-564-4983  
Ky Department of Agriculture  
Fax: 502-564-0854  
100 Fair Oaks Lane, 5th Floor  
Email: eunice.schlappi@ky.gov  
Frankfort, KY 40601
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Nominating Committee Report

President: Casey McCue
President Elect: Dru Haderlie
Vice President: Gary Newton
Secretary: Gene Wiseman

Respectively Submitted:

Linda Stratton
Gene Wiseman
Darwin Kurtinbach
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NADRO Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

July 22, 2013

Executive Committee Meeting called to order at approximately 9:00am on July 22, 2013 by Pres. Sue Esser. Vice President Dru Haderlie acted as Secretary due to Gary Newton being unable to attend meeting.

Meeting Minutes

Discussion of what NADRO officer and committee member’s responsibilities are, talked about roll call and having state delegates declare their name during the roll call

Eunice reported that 16 states were represented at 2013 meeting, 26 states had paid their dues.

We made changes to the agenda moderator’s since Gary Newton was not present to moderate, we also talked about going back to the longer format of meeting agenda for future conferences and having the agriculture tour at future meetings.

Eunice discussed with group the financial report

Committee assignments were reorganized, appointing new chair assignments and groups based on meeting attendees.

The awards ceremony was discussed along with the final banquet proceedings. The lifetime members list and awards was brought up, the following folks have achieved this award, Peggy Gates, Don McClellan, John Beers, John Miller.

The topic of host states was talked about with Missouri expressing interest in hosting the 2014 meeting and either New York or Vermont for 2015.

Meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:00am
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Constitution and Bylaws as Amended July 14, 2010
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF DAIRY REGULATORY OFFICIALS

CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I Name

The name of this association shall be the National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials. (Amended December 4, 2008)

ARTICLE II Objectives and Purposes

The objectives and purposes of this Association shall be to:
(1) Protect the health, welfare, and interests of the consumers of dairy products;
(2) Consider problems and effect programs designed to further the interests of our American dairy farmer and dairy industry;
(3) Promote unity and efficiency in the application of regulatory measures in the dairy fields;
(4) Formulate recommendations relating to the general use or application of designations, definitions, standards of composition, marketing, standard methods of analysis, and requirements for marketing and labeling milk and dairy products;
(5) Advise the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture on dairy issues. (Amended July 26, 2000; December 4, 2008)

ARTICLE III Membership

SECTION (1) The voting member of this Association shall consist of such persons charged with the enforcement of state or territory dairy laws or program evaluation as designated by the head of each State or Territory Department of Agriculture, State or Territory Department of Health, or other State or Territory Agency. All heads of State or Territory Departments of Agriculture, State or Territory Departments of Health, or other State or Territory Agency shall be ex-officio members of this Association. (Amended August 15, 2005; December 4, 2008)

SECTION (2) Associate members of this organization may consist of dairy industry representatives or other dairy related organizations. Associate members are non-voting. Associate members shall be recognized in the annual meeting proceedings. (Amended July 14, 2010)

ARTICLE IV Officers

The Association shall annually elect a President, President-Elect, Vice President, Secretary and Executive Treasurer. (Amended December 4, 2008)
ARTICLE V Executive Committee

SECTION (1) The Executive Committee of this Association shall be composed of the President; the President-Elect; the Vice-President; the Secretary, the Executive Treasurer and the immediate Past President. The President-Elect shall serve as Chair of the Executive Committee. If, for any reason, the President-Elect is ineligible to serve, then the Vice-President shall serve as Chair of the Executive Committee. (Amended July 26, 2000; December 4, 2008)

SECTION (2) The affairs of this Association between Association meetings shall be administered by the Executive Committee. (Amended December 4, 2008)

SECTION (3) If not otherwise provided by the Bylaws, the Executive Committee shall fill vacancies occurring in all offices.

ARTICLE VI Annual Meetings

An annual meeting shall be held at such time and place as the Association may direct. Special meetings shall only be called by the President and upon request of a majority of the members of the Executive Committee. (Amended December 4, 2008)

ARTICLE VII Voting

SECTION (1) All members of this Association who are present at a duly scheduled session of any annual or special Association meeting shall be recognized as a quorum authorized to transact any business of this Association, but not more than one vote from a member State or Territory shall be counted on any questions voted upon. (Amended December 4, 2008)

SECTION (2) The names of one voting delegate and one alternate delegate from a State or Territory shall be registered with the Secretary by the respective head of the State or Territory Department of Agriculture, State or Territory Department of Health, or other State or Territory Agency. Thereafter, the voting delegate shall cast all votes for the state or territory from which the delegate is registered. Provided, however, in the absence of a voting delegate, an alternate delegate may cast votes for the state or territory from which the alternate delegate is registered. (Amended July 26, 2000; Amended August 15, 2005)

ARTICLE VIII Proxies

No proxies shall be permitted at any meeting of the Executive Committee or of this Association. (Amended December 4, 2008)

ARTICLE IX Bylaws

Appropriate Bylaws to effectuate and carry out the provisions of this Constitution may be adopted by a majority of the members present and voting at any annual meeting.
ARTICLE X Amendments

No amendment shall be considered unless such amendment has been presented for consideration to the membership thirty (30) days prior to a duly scheduled meeting. (Amended August 15, 2005)

ARTICLE XII Miscellaneous

No member, or person, or groups of members or persons, shall represent or speak for or represent oneself or themselves as having the right to speak for or having the endorsement of this Association unless consent thereto has first been given by a majority of the members of the Association present and voting at a duly scheduled session of an annual or special Association meeting, or by three-fourths of the members of the Executive Committee between Association meetings. (Amended December 4, 2008)
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF DAIRY REGULATORY OFFICIALS

BYLAWS

ARTICLE I Officers

SECTION (1) All officers of the Association shall be elected annually at the annual Association meeting, and shall serve from the final adjournment of the annual Association meeting at which they have been elected until the final adjournment of the next annual Association meeting or until their successors have been duly chosen. (Amended December 5, 2008)

SECTION (2) Nominations for each office in the Association shall be made by a Nominations Committee appointed by the President. Additional nominations may be made by any member of the Association. (Amended December 5, 2008)

SECTION (3) The President shall perform the usual duties pertaining to that office and shall appoint all necessary committees. Committee members shall serve until their successors have been duly appointed or the committee discharged, unless otherwise indicated by members of the Association at any Association meeting. (Amended December 5, 2008)

SECTION (4) The President-Elect shall assume the duties and powers of the President in the absence of the President, and shall perform such other duties as the Executive Committee may direct. The President-elect shall automatically become President of the Association whenever a vacancy in the office occurs. The President-Elect, when assuming the duties of the President due to a vacancy in that office, shall not, as a result thereof, be ineligible for election to the office of President for the subsequent year. Members shall not be eligible to succeed themselves after having been elected to any office, except for the Executive Treasurer, who may succeed himself/herself. (Amended December 5, 2008)

SECTION (5) The Secretary shall keep the minutes of all Association meetings and meetings of the Executive Committee and conduct all official correspondence of the Association. (Amended December 5, 2008)

SECTION (6) The Executive Treasurer shall collect and disburse all monies of the Association. The records and accounts of the Association shall be audited annually by a committee appointed by the President. (Amended December 5, 2008)

ARTICLE II Executive Committee

A meeting of the Executive Committee shall be held immediately after each annual Association meeting. Other meetings may be called, on not less than fourteen days notice, by the President or by a majority of the members of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee, after notice to all of its members, may also act by written vote, filed with the Secretary. (Amended December 5, 2008)
ARTICLE III Dues

SECTION (1) Dues, if any, shall be set at a regular meeting of the Association, and shall be paid annually, by or on behalf of each State or Territory Department of Agriculture, State or Territory Department of Health, or other State or Territory Agency which has designated a person or persons for membership. Such dues shall be payable annually in January, and nonpayment of such dues by, or on behalf of any State or Territory shall operate to suspend such State or Territory from all rights and privileges of the Association, including voting privileges. (Amended July 26, 1962; July 26, 2000; July 13, 2005; December 5, 2008)

SECTION (2) Associate members dues, if any, shall be set at a regular meeting of the Association, and shall be paid annually, by or on behalf of each Associate supporting member. Such dues shall be payable annually in January, and nonpayment of such dues by, or on behalf of any Associate member shall operate to suspend the Associate membership. (Amended July 14, 2010)

SECTION (3) No dues shall be required of honorary lifetime members. (Amended July 26, 2000)

ARTICLE IV Procedure

The Proceedings and deliberations of the Association, including meetings of the Executive Committee, shall be governed by the Rules of Parliamentary Practices established by Robert's Rules of Order, revised. (Amended December 5, 2008)

ARTICLE V Honorary Lifetime Membership

SECTION (1) Honorary lifetime membership may be bestowed on any former member who has attended at least five annual meetings as a state or territory dairy regulatory official who is no longer active in enforcement of any state or territory dairy laws, by a majority of the Executive Committee. (Amended July 26, 2000; Amended July 14, 2010)

SECTION (2) Honorary lifetime members shall be entitled to all the privileges and information granted to a member, except voting rights. The honorary lifetime member shall be entitled to complimentary dues remission, but may be required to pay all or a portion of the normal registration fee for the meeting in which they are in attendance as determined by the Executive Committee. (Amended July 14, 1983; July 26, 2000)

ARTICLE VI Amendments

These Bylaws may be amended at any duly scheduled meeting attended by a majority of the members. (Amended December 5, 2008)
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Memorandum of Understanding  
MOU

- MOU between FDA and the NCIMS (1977)
- Collaboratively FDA and NCIMS will develop a cooperative federal-state program (IMS Program) to ensure the sanitary quality of milk shipped interstate
- Agreement between FDA and NCIMS to follow principles of the Procedures and execute the IMS program

Grade "A"  
Pasteurized Milk Ordinance

- IMS Program relies on the Pasteurized Milk Ordinance (PMO) and related technical documents to ensure safety and wholesomeness of milk
- FDA considers these standards and requirements adequate for the protection of public health
- Decades long record of extraordinary success regulating Grade-A milk products

NCIMS Conference

- The Conference had its first official meeting in 1950
- NCIMS meets biennially in odd-numbered years to consider changes, additions, deletions and modifications to the PMO and other IMS documents.
- 34th Conference, Indianapolis, IN (April 19-24, 2013)
- 35th Conference, Portland, OR (April 24-29, 2015)

NCIMS Conference

"We'd like to open the floor to the speaker to ask her questions."
2015 NCIMS Conference

- 311 attendees
- Regulatory representatives from all 50 states and Puerto Rico
- 63 Proposals submitted to revise the PMO or other NCIMS documents (91 in 2011)
- 35 Proposals passed by state delegates as submitted or as amended (57 in 2011)

Proposal Process - Post Conference

- Transcript to FDA - within 45 days after conference (June 5, 2013)
- FDA concurs/non-concur letter to Executive Board - within 90 days after receiving transcripts (September 3, 2013)
- Executive Board meeting (October 9 – 10, 2013, Chicago, IL)
- FDA concurs and mutually acceptable non-concur (published in October 2013 in an IMS-a)
- Implementation – One year after electronic publication of affected documents or notification to states by IMS-a (unless implementation date specified in proposal)
  (FDA updates published documents, PMO, Procedures, MSSR, EML, etc)
- Unresolved business sent to next Conference

NCIMS Committees

Standing Committees (12)
- Constitution & Bylaws - Allen Fitzgibbon
- Documents Review - Mike Wiggs
- HACCP Implementation - Jason Crafts
- Laboratory - Frank Barcellos
- Method of Making Satisties Ratings (MMSR) - Mike Wiggs
- NCIMS/FDA Liaison - Sue Estes
- Other Species Milk - Lynn Hackley
- Hauling Procedures - Gay Newton
- Scientific Advisory - Stephen Beam
- Single Service Container & Closure - Randy Chouteau
- Technical Engineering Review - David Luten

NCIMS Committees

New Standing Committee
- International Certification Program - Claudia Coles & Tony Ford
- Proposal 305 at 2013 Conference (Formerly Pilot 2005/2007)
- Currently two (2) IMS-Listed/Approved Third Party Certifiers
- Includes approved Third Party Certifiers under the meaning of “Regulatory Agency” or “Rating Agency” in PMO and Procedures
- No vote on delegate floor, but may serve as “regulatory” members of councils and committees, and as a non-voting member of the Executive Board.

NCIMS Committees

Ad Hoc Committees
- Program Committee - Cary Frye
  - Aseptic Program - Sia Economides / Mary Wodtke (2011)
  - Appendix N Modification Study - Roger Hool (2005)

Appendix N Modification Study Committee

National Milk Drug Residue Database
October 1, 2012 - September 30, 2012

3,196,413 samples 542 positive 0.017%
FY 2011 0.021%
FY 2003 0.053%
FY 1995 0.144%
2005 Proposal 243:
"...create a NCIMS Ad-hoc Study Committee to evaluate the potential to modify Appendix N of the PMO to require that raw milk be tested for drug residues on a statistically designed basis that will consider the volume of use of the drug(s), its toxicity, and other public health risk factors...."

NCIMS Appendix N Modification Study Committee
- Requested FDA conduct risk analysis of drug residues in milk
- FDA team from CFSAN and CVM
- Assessment will evaluate:
  - Which drugs are likely to be present on farms
  - Public health concerns of potential residues
  - Management practices or options to avoid residues

FDA Draft before 2015 Conference

FDA Public Health Question
Do practices that have led to drug residues in tissues of slaughtered dairy cows also cause drug residues in milk?

FDA December 2010
CVM
Last 5 Years
- 7.7% of cattle slaughtered are adult dairy cows
- Dairy cows account for 67% of tissue residue violations
- Majority of violations (~80%) are not beta-lactum antibiotics

THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST INLANDER April 19, 2011
Got Milk? What About Drugs?
“It could be in your latte or your child’s bowl of breakfast cereal. It could be in your refrigerator or freezer.”

Not factual. Not Science based.

FDA Milk Sampling Project
*CVM January 2012*
- Samples from 1800 dairy farms in U.S.
  - 900 with history of tissue residues
  - 900 without violations
- Producer milk samples collected by FDA from state approved commercial/industry milk testing laboratories.
- Samples BLINDED. Vial marked only with code for either violator or non-violator (random) group.
- Tested for 30 different drugs
Status?

- FDA informed NCIMS that sampling, testing, and quality assurance work is completed.
- Draft report pending.
- FDA-CVM has said report summarizing the results will be made public.
- FDA has said they will work with state regulatory agencies and industry stakeholders before releasing the report regarding interpretation and public messaging. (CVM Compliance program changes?)
- Results used in FDA antibiotic risk assessment for NCIAMS. (Draft for comment by 2015 Conference).

NCIMS will remain engaged with FDA.

Only FDA-approved drug screening tests may be used if they exist for a particular drug family.

Appendix N, Section V. of Pasteurized Milk Ordinance:
"One (1) year after tests have been evaluated by FDA and accepted by NCIMS for a particular drug or drug family, other unevaluated tests are not acceptable for screening milk."

April 2013 Indianapolis, IN

- Proposal 220 passed as submitted
  - Assigns a study committee to examine the issue of drug residue screening with unapproved tests for contractual or export obligations at levels different than the safe/tolerance level, when an FDA approved test does exist.
  - Assigned to Appendix N Committee — report to NCIMS in 2015.

FDA Regulatory Discretion?

States

Food Safety Modernization Act?

Other Species Committee
Lynn Hinekley, Chair

- Proposal 120 (2011)
  - Chair to assign an ad-hoc committee to develop program options for the control of tuberculosis and brucellosis for hooved mammals not covered by the USDA Bovine Tuberculosis and Brucellosis Eradication Programs.
  - Assigned to Other Species Committee by Executive Board.
  - States, Industry, FDA and USDA.

National Conference on Interstate Milk Shipments

Passed Resolution No. 10

- Requests the Liaison Committee to develop a comparative analysis of FSMA and the PMO, and provide it to the NCIMS Executive Board in order for the Board to submit comments to FDA demonstrating comparable levels of public health protection.

FSMA: Proposed Rule for Preventive Controls for Human Food (Comments until September 16, 2013) 

Liaison Committee: Draft Analysis prepared.
NCIMS Executive Board

- Elected Chair:
  Stephen Beam – California Dept. of Food and Agriculture
  Formerly John Miller, Florida Dept. of Agriculture and Consumer Services

- Re-elected Vice Chair:
  Don Breiner – Land O’Lakes, Pennsylvania

- Eastern States:
  State Enforcement – Casey McCue, New York
  State Rating – Gary Newton, Florida
  State Enf./Local Health – Laurie Bucher, Maryland
  FDA – John Sheehan, College Park, MD
  Industry – Don Breiner, Land O’Lakes, PA

- Western States:
  State Enforcement – Mike Wiggs, Idaho
  State Rating – George Blush, Kansas
  State Enf./Local Health – Stephen Beam, California
  USDA – Kenneth Vorgert, Lisle, IL
  Industry – Jodeen Meederink, Dean Foods, Utah

- Central States:
  State Enforcement – Steve DiVincenzo, Illinois
  State Rating – Gene Wiseman, Missouri
  State Enf./Local Health – Roger Tedrick, Ohio
  Academia – Patrick Gorden, Iowa State
  Industry – Dave Lattan, Prairie Farms Dairy, IL
  Laboratory – Roger Hooi, Dean Foods, TX
  Consumer Representative – Vacant

NCIMS Executive Board

NCIMS Hall of Fame?

April 2013 Indianapolis, IN
• Passed Resolution No. 11
  Requests the NCIMS Executive Board to establish criteria for eligibility and create an NCIMS “Hall of Fame” with the first nominees to be submitted to the NCIMS Executive Board for consideration prior to the 2015 Conference...
NCIMS Executive Board

- Non-voting Members:
  - Council I Chair — Gena Zeich, Washington
  - Council II Chair — Randall Chloupek, Nebraska
  - Council III Chair — Doug Cart, Dean Foods, IL
  - Program Chair — Cary Frye, IDFA, Washington, DC
  - Liaison Committee Chair — Susan Esser, Michigan
  - IDFA — Clay Hough, Washington, DC
  - NMPF — Jamie Jonker, Arlington, VA
  - Third Party Certifier — Vacant

Consumer Representative

Eligibility Requirements

- No direct financial interest in commercial production or marketing of milk and milk products, except as a consumer...
- Not a member of any trade association or industry organization directly related to the production, processing, transportation or marketing of milk or milk products...
- Not an employee of a local, state or federal government agency with regulatory authority over food, including milk or milk products.
- The applicant shall not be a spouse, parent or child of an individual that does not meet the requirements above

Consumer Representative

- Section 4, Article 4 of NCIMS Constitution
- "...one (1) non-voting member at large representing consumers, appointed by the Chair and confirmed by the Board."
- Vacant for many years
- Executive Board developed and approved a policy for recruitment, eligibility and selection of Consumer Representative (Approved 4/2013)
- Vacancy Announcement issued June 17, 2013

Consumer Representative

- Executive Board nominates the candidate(s) for the Chair's final consideration.
- Appointed by the Chair but a majority vote of the Executive Board required to confirm the appointment
- Term of Service: Serves on the Executive Board at the pleasure of the Chair. However, a consumer representative who fails to attend two (2) consecutive Board meetings and who fails to show cause why they were absent, may have their position declared vacant by the Chair.

Consumer Representative

- 30-day application period
- Posted on NCIMS web-site; sent to state delegates
- Sent to SAFE FOOD COALITION
  - American Public Health Association
  - Center for Foodborne Illness Research and Prevention
  - Center for Science in the Public Interest
  - Consumer Federation of America
  - Consumers Union
  - Food & Water Watch
  - Government Accountability Project
  - National Consumers League
  - The Pew Charitable Trusts
  - STOP Foodborne Illness
  - United Food and Commercial Workers Union
  - U.S. Public Interest Research Group
- Issued June 17, 2013. Will be re-announced for another 30-days

"To Assure the Safest Possible Milk Supply for All the People"

Stephen.Beam@cdfa.ca.gov
Thank you!
**Farm Bill – Senate**

- Passed 66-27 on June 10, 2013
- With NMPF endorsed Dairy Security Act
  - Includes both a margin protection program and a market stabilization program
  - Senate Dairy Title Remained intact throughout the process – no amendments offered in Committee or on the Floor

**NMPF Updates @ NADRO**

Jamie Jonker, Ph.D.
Vice President, Scientific & Regulatory Affairs
National Milk Producers Federation

---

**Farm Bill – House**

- Passed “Farm Bill” by 216-208 on July 11, 2013
  - Followed failure of the comprehensive Committee passed bill on June 20, 2013
  - Bill does not include the nutrition title
- No decision on whether a nutrition only bill will be taken up by the House or what it will look like
- Does NOT include the Dairy Security Act
  - Bill includes the Goodlatte-Scott dairy language
  - Dairy Security Act defeated on floor during the consideration of the comprehensive Committee bill

**What We’ll Cover**

- Farm Bill 2013?
- FARM Animal Care Program
- Residues
- Raw Milk
- Real Seal

---

**Farm Bill – Conference**

- Senate
  - Unanimous consent agreement to proceed to conference
  - Conferences (not yet named): 7 Democrats, 5 Republicans
- House
  - How will the House will proceed to conference?
  - How will nutrition title be resolved?
  - May not be resolved before the August recess
- Timing
  - Remains unclear for an “official conference”
  - Informal staff level negotiations between the House and Senate have begun
  - Current Farm Bill expires September 30, 2013

**Farm Bill Update**
PROGRAM Verification

- 2011 Program verification analysis completed 2012
- Results shared in 2012 Year in Review
- 2012 analysis on-going to be shared in 2013 Year in Review
- Information used to inform the revision process

Three-Year Continuous Improvement Cycle

CONTINUOUS Improvement

THREE YEARS
- Additional Third-Party Evaluations
- Animal Health
- Animal Welfare
- Improved Dairy Operations
- Third-Party Verification

Three Steps
- On-Farm Educational Improvements
- Action Plan Developed
- From National RBST Evaluation
- Second-Party Evaluation
- Farm of Last Known Healthy
- Certified by Second-Party Verifiers

Three-Step Approach

Education
> Animal Care Manual, Quick Reference User Guide, Animal Care DVD
> All materials available online in English and Spanish

On-Farm Evaluation
Third-Party Verification

Voluntary and available to all producers

ANIMAL Care Reference Manual Revisions

Developed by Technical Writing Group
- Overseen by NMPF Animal Health and Well-being Committee
- Industry-wide Review
  > Cooperatives, Producer Associations, Processors
  > AABP Animal Welfare Committee
  > AVMA Animal Welfare Committee
- Finalized June 2013, Implement Fall

PARTICIPATION

- Over 8,000 on-farm Second Party Evaluations completed
- Over 180 Third-Party On-farm Verifications completed
- 52 Cooperatives and Proprietary Processors
- 70% of nation’s milk supply participating in the program
KEY Revision – Body Condition

- Changed from 90 percent to 99 percent of all animals score 2 or more (1-5 scale, 1 is thin)
- Added – Action is taken to improve animals with BCS less than 2.

KEY Revision – Herd Health Plan & SOPs

- Must now be written – previously could be oral
- Herd Health Plan must be developed in conjunction with a licensed herd veterinarian

KEY Revision – Lameness

- 95% of lactating and dry cows score 2 or less (1-3 scale, 3 is severely lame)
- Changed from 90% of all animals
- Added – Producer taking action to improve animals with severe lameness.
- Added – A lameness prevention protocol is in place.

KEY Revision – Dehorning

- Added a guideline – Calves are disbudded at eight weeks of age or earlier and with appropriate use of analgesics and/or anesthetics.
- Best practices are provided as guidance
- Pain control protocols must be agreed upon by producer and herd veterinarian

KEY Revision – Hock & Knee Lesions

- 95% of lactating and dry cows score 2 or less (1-3 scale, 3 is swelling or open lesion)

KEY Revision – Tail Docking

- Incorporates the NMPF position adopted in June 2012
- Opposes the routine tail docking of dairy animals
- Practice is recommended to be phased out by 2022
Drug Residues in Milk and Cull Dairy Cows

**Percent of Bulk Milk Tankers Positive for Antibiotic Residues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T400</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T390</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T380</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T370</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T360</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T350</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T340</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T330</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T320</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T310</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T300</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from National Milk Drug Residue Data Base

**Tissue Residues in Dairy Cull Cows**
(FDA Data, 2007-2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penicillin</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>24.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flunixin</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>22.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfathiazole</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceftriaxone</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>7.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentamicin</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>5.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfamethazine</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>3.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxytetracycline</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neomycin</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetracycline</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampicillin</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetracycline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dihydrostreptomycin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenylbutazone</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Materials**

- All FARM program materials freely-available on website
- New See It? Stop It! Initiative
  - Empowers employees to notify owners of any abuse, neglect observed
  - www.SeefStopIt.org

**National Dairy FARM Program**
Farmers Assuring Responsible Management

---

*Image: National Dairy FARM Program logo and dairy cows.*
Consumer Communication Plan

Communication Goal

Maintain consumer confidence in milk safety and quality

Issues Management Approach

**RELEASE DAY**: Response-mode communication only
- Position industry as cooperative with regulators and committed to continuous improvement
- Reinforce milk safety and quality

**LONGER TERM**: Align industry around action steps that drive continuous improvement

Industry Outreach and Education

**2013 Milk and Dairy Beef Residue Avoidance Manual**

*Charm Sciences Inc*

*IDEXX Laboratories* 

Tissue Residues in Dairy Cull Cows (FDA Data, 2007-2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRUG</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tylosin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfadiazine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolythromycin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amikacin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furazolidone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincomycin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paromomycin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfadiazine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfathiazole</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 1017 (903 + 855 + 757 + 453 + 3985) 100.00%

*Prior to July 28, 2008, USDA was not quantify Cattle.
**Messengers Who Can Be Effective Spokespeople on Antibiotic Topic**

- **Dairy Farmer**
- **Veterinarians, Public Health Experts**
- **FDA**

**Stakeholders**

- Producers
- Co-ops and processors
- Bovine veterinarians and greater veterinary community
- Dairy producer trade orgs
- Health professional and marketing partners
- Consumers (via media and social media)

**Messaging**

- Top-of-Mind Mentions of Antibiotics are Tiny

**Communication Materials**

- Message track/Q&A
- Fact Sheet on antibiotics and milk production
- Fact Sheet on FDA Sampling Program
- Industry response statement
- Dairygood.org blog post
- Third party expert commentary
2013 Outbreaks

- 5 outbreaks
  - 1 from homemade queso fresco
  - 1 from 60-day aged hard cheese
- 69 illnesses
- Repeat Offenders
  - 2 outbreaks were from the same cowshare
  - 1 outbreak was from a facility that had an outbreak in 2012

Conclusion

- Bridge to protocols already in place to protect milk safety
- Producer audience => education on residue avoidance
- Consumer audience => education on modern dairy farming practices

Legislative Victories

- Legislation vetoed in Maine and Nevada

Raw Milk

2012 Outbreaks

- 6 outbreaks
  - 1 outbreak from a cow-share
  - 5 other outbreaks were in states where direct sale of raw milk to consumers is legal
- 220 illnesses
  - one outbreak was responsible for 148 illnesses
Facebook Ads

Wondering What's REAL?
Look for the REAL® Seal & make sure your
moring yogurt is made from real,
cultured dairy.

Taste the Difference
Have a soft, cold glass
of REAL® custard daily.

Dairy Makes a Difference
Enjoy real dairy! Use
it to think outside
the milk carton.

What's REAL® have
you to say off your
year with real,
whenever dairy.

The REAL® Seal

- Expanded REAL® Seal Options
- Updated website
- REAL® Seal Facebook page
- REAL® Seal Facebook ads
- Blogger Outreach brings consumers in
- Website consumer buyers guide
- Educating young consumers

Expanded REAL® Seal Options

American Made
REAL® Dairy Product
REAL© Cheese

Made With
REAL® Dairy Ingredients

Made With
REAL® Butter

Facebook Page

What's My Name Contest

Outreach to Drive Visibility

In addition to NMFP's traditional outreach, MXP has
started an outreach campaign to influential bloggers
around the country, driving original stories and
impressions about the importance of the REAL® Seal.
NMPF Update @ NADRO

Jamie Jonker, Ph.D.
jjonker@nmpf.org
**IDFA Regulatory Update**

**Casy Frye**
V.P. Regulatory & Scientific Affairs
International Dairy Foods Association
Padro
JULY 23, 2013

**Outline**
- Nutrition Issues
  - School meal changes impact dairy
  - Greek yogurt pilot in schools
  - Competitive foods standards next year
- Standards & Labeling
  - Non-nutritive sweetener petition
  - Pending Nutrition Facts Panel update
  - GMO/GE labeling legislation
- FSMA Preventative Controls Comments

**What’s at Stake for Dairy at School?**

- Fiscal Year 2010: The NSLP served 31.7 million children each day and the SMP program reached 11.3 million children each day.

**USDA Nutrition Standards for School Lunch & Breakfast**
SY 12/13
- Four Dietary Specifications
  - Standard to be met on average, over the week (5 days)
  - Calories
  - Sodium reduced - Interim steps with goal of 50% in 10 yrs.
  - Saturated Fat - < 10% of total calories, Total Fat - 25-32% of calories
  - Zero trans fat
- Milk: 8 ounces OFFERED at each meal
- Fat-free (unflavored and flavored)
- Low-fat (unflavored)
- No calorie or sugar restrictions
- Offer at least two choices
- Yogurt and Cheese count as meat alternatives

**Greek Yogurt Pilot in schools**
- Yogurt companies want USDA to count yogurt with a higher protein content than the current 1 cup = 1 meat/meat alternative for school meal reimbursement
- Four ounces (weight) or 1/2 cup (volume) of plain or flavored, unsweetened or sweetened yogurt equals 1 cup of the milk/meat alternate requirement
- Congress requested a pilot to study acceptability of Greek Yogurt in schools
- USDA developed a Commercial Item Description (CID) for Yogurts that include "high protein yogurt"
- 30% higher protein (based on the protein BV of 50 g = 10 additional grams per 8 oz)
- Either the "strained" or "not strained" manufacturing process
- Requests for bids for in New York, Arizona, Maine and Wisconsin

**Executive Summary: School Milk Declined 5.1%**

Loss of 23 MM gallons brings four year decline to 41 MM gallons.
White grew 5.7%, 8 MM gallons, but did not offset 31MM of flavored losses.
Chocolate declined 26 MM gallons, compared to being 2.5 MM per year in each of the prior three years. Strawberry lost 4.7 MM gallons, while "All Other" flavors lost nearly 1.6 MM gallons (-5%).
Executive Summary: Industry Size Projection

The school channel's $8.5 billion income (not growth) can be broken down as follows:

- By Type
- By Flavor
- By Package Type

School Channel Milk Volume Cause of Change

Milk volume in schools declined 3.3% or 23.3 million gallons in the 2012-13 school year, increases came from enrollment growth, breakfast participation and summer feeding (+3.3 million gallons).

Declining lunch participation and structural changes in the school feeding programs (meal standards, adding milk bars, etc) resulted in a loss of 23.3 million gallons (giving price reduction), an unprecedented loss for a single year.

School Milk Trend Highlights

1. Milk volume declined 3.3%, or 23.3 million gallons. The decline is of significant concern and the result of a series of factors that compounded together:
   - New meal standards generated controversy, a 10% decline in paid meals and a 25% drop overall.
   - New standards require a fruit or vegetable as part of every meal. Some processors report schools were pushed to "push F & V at the register" to compete with variety outside the meal.
   - Merchandising wine need to milk more often with the district being happy financially with their substituion for the milk.
   - Slow growth of breakfast participation (still growth in recent years).
   - Reduced programming in support of milk consumption in schools.
   - Continued, though reduced, efforts to curb milk's role.
   - Final conversion of flavored milk to fat free, further widening the taste gap between school and retail chocolate (flat free not widely available & retailers). Together, these factors caused a decline in milk volume across third-fourths of the Daily Census areas and a similar portion of processors.

Traditional White Milk Volume 2011-'13

Retail sales volume during the first six periods (June-July) was -2.7% vs. 2012 in the Multi-Outlet reporting firm.

- Table Volume

Economic & External Factors

- Tailwinds (in favor)
- Headwinds (challenging)
- Economic & employment uncertainty,
- Weak budget pressure (PRAs)
- Dairy in home preparation
- Changing demographics
- New milk choices
- Declining lactose
- Increase in "nondairy"
- School food & reg. changes
- Gen. economic
- Less innovation in competition
- Compounding brand growth & spending levels
Competitive Foods in Schools

- Smart Snacks in schools: nutrition standards for competitive foods
- Interim Final Rule released by USDA in July 27, 2013
- A la carte, snack bars, vending
- During school hours on campus
- States and local schools may enact stricter standards

Competitive Foods in Schools

- Nutrition Standards of Foods
  - Whole grain rich or first ingredient a fruit, vegetable, protein food or dairy product
  - Or provide a 10% DV nutrient of concern
  - Limits on total fat (35% /cal.), saturated fat (10%/cal.), trans fat (0g) per portion, sodium (200 mg), calories (200/portion)
  - Allow exemptions for reduced fat cheese and part skim cheese from fat requirement
  - 35% sugar content by weight of food Sugar by weight will allow higher sugar content dairy foods, including low fat ice cream, frozen desserts, juice bar and sweetened yogurts

Competitive Foods in Schools

- Beverage Standards
  - All Schools may sell water, milk, juice with or without carbonation, but no added sweeteners
  - Milk: plain low fat or fat free milk, flavored milk must be fat free
    - 8 oz. in elementary, 12 oz. in middle and high school
  - High schools
    - Low and no calorie drinks up to 20 oz. if not more than 5 calories/oz and up to 20 oz. if 10 calories or less
  - No restrictions on caffeine and non-nutritive sweeteners
  - Can be served during school meal times

A La Carte Beverage Offerings

Beverage category offerings only changed modestly; all alternatives lost a standards portion of their distribution.
MEDIA & ACTIVIST ATTENTION

"Quiet Diet
Are dairy producers
trying to sneak artificial
sweeteners into our milk?"
State Magazine - May 4

MILK STANDARD PETITION

PETITIONERS ACTIONS

Withdraw petition

Using joint comments delayed in allow for
analysis of amendments

No action

Nutrition Labeling Changes

FDA’s Top Priority - Changes to Nutrition Facts panel
- ANPR released in late 2007
  - Change serving sizes
  - Change Daily Values
    - Would also affect nutrient content claims
  - Add/delete nutrients
  - Added sugars
  - Calories from saturated fat
  - Format changes
    - Increased size of calorie declaration
  - IDFA submitted comments to ANPR
    - Met with FDA leaders

Nutrition Labeling Changes

- FDA considering consumer research on declaring added sugars on Nutrition Facts panel
- Trans fat declarations may change
- Focus on added sugars
- Front-of-pack icons may not be part of new regulations?
- Proposed rule from FDA anticipated in 2013
- Final regulation and implementation could take 3-5 years or more

GMO/GE Food Labeling
GMO/GE Food Labeling

- Ground swell of activist who want foods and food ingredients derived from genetic engineering labeled
- US FDA policy mandates labeling based on nutrition and safety
  - Draft Guidance 2001- Allows truthful voluntary labeling if that is truthful and not misleading
    - "Genetically engineered"
    - "This product contains ingredients that were produced using biotechnology"
- State legislation enacted in 18 states
  - Enacted in ME, NJ, VT, CT*
    - Some legislation prohibits the use of "natural" labeling
      - Would only go into effect if at least 5 other states (with geographic and population requirements) enact similar mandatory GMO labeling laws.

Labeling Resources - IDFA Manuals

IDFA's labeling manual for milk and milk products, cheese, and ice cream and frozen desserts have been fully revised and updated with new information on nutrient content claims, qualified health claims and structure/function claims. The new content covers all aspects of labeling, including standards of identity and product name, net contents statement, ingredient listing and allergen information.

*Cost: $395 for members, $595 for nonmembers; $100 for Government Agencies (Order on line at: www.idfa.org/products/publications)

FSMA Preventative Controls Comments

- IDFA filing comments to support compliance with the PMO should also be compliance FSMA
  - FSMA and the PMO are both based on prevention
  - Congress cited the PMO in FSMA as a model of food safety
  - The PMO is specific to dairy products
  - The states inspect dairy processors more frequently than is required by FSMA
  - The FDA still exerts considerable control and can assure standards are kept
  - The PMO has a long track record of food safety
- FDA should exempt facilities that are subject to the PMO or otherwise determine that dairy facilities that are compliant with the PMO to also be in compliance with FSMA's preventative controls provision

THANK YOU!
We invite you to come to the International Dairy Show
www.dairyshow.com enter IDS13FREE for a complimentary registration

International Dairy Show
November 6-8, 2013
 McCormick Place

7/7/2014
Raw Milk in Idaho

- Temperature—40 degrees within 2 hours after milking and maintain below 45 degrees
- Bacteria Limits—not to exceed 15,000 per ml
- Coliform—not to exceed 15 per ml
- Drugs—Negative by test method approved by Department
- Somatic Cell—500,000 per microw, 50,000 per ml goat
- Brucellosis—Annual negative test by a licensed vet
- TB—Annual negative test by a licensed vet

Raw Milk in Idaho

- Mike Wiggs
  - Idaho Department of Agriculture
  - Dairy Program Manager
  - 208-756-9077
  - mike.wiggs@agd.idaho.gov
  - www.agd.idaho.gov

Raw Milk in Idaho

- Raw Milk Permit
  - Meet the facility requirements of the current PMO
  - Meet the TB and brucellosis Standards
  - Meet the applicable drug testing requirements as determined by the Department
  - All raw milk and raw milk products must be produced and processed on the same facility
  - No limit as to herd size

Raw Milk in Idaho

- 3 levels of raw milk permits
  - IDAPA 02.04.15
  - Rules Governing Raw Milk
  - 1. Raw Milk Permit
  - 2. Small Herd Raw Milk Permit
  - 3. Herd Share Programs

- Small Herd Raw Milk Permit
  - Meet the raw milk and raw milk products quality standards
  - Meet the TB and brucellosis Standards
  - Meet the applicable drug testing requirements as determined by the Department
  - All raw milk and raw milk products must be produced and processed on the same facility
**Raw Milk in Idaho**

- Small Herd Raw Milk Permit
  - No facility requirements
  - Quality test results must be made available to consumers upon request
  - Size requirement
    - 3 lactating cows
    - 7 lactating goats
    - 7 lactating sheep

- Herd Share Program
  - Meet the raw milk and raw milk products quality standards
  - Meet the TB and brucellosis Standards
  - Product sampled monthly by the Idaho Dept. of Agriculture
  - A copy of the test results must be provided to each owner and proof that the information was provided to the Department.
  - Meet the 2 of 4, 3 of 5 requirements
  - May NOT be sold in stores, farmers markets for human consumption
  - May only be received from the dairy by the owners of the herd share or by an owner on behalf of another owner

**Raw Milk in Idaho**

- Product sampled monthly by the Idaho Dept. of Agriculture
- Meet the 2 of 4, 3 of 5 requirements
- May be sold in stores, farmers markets for human consumption
- May not be sold to restaurants or food establishments
- Labels must be approved by the Department
- Must have the words “non-pasteurized” or “unpasteurized” in addition to “Raw” on the label

**Raw Milk in Idaho**

- Facility must be registered with the Department
- Name of farmer, address of farmer, statement of raw milk and raw milk products being produced
- Proof of ownership
  - Bill of sale, stock certificate or other written evidence
  - A boarding and care plan for the livestock
  - A conspicuous notice the milk or milk products will be raw
  - Proof of written information regarding the herd health and production standards used by the dairy or farm have been provided to each herd share owner

**Raw Milk in Idaho**

- Herd Share Program
  - No facility requirements
  - Must be produced and processed on the same facility
  - Size requirement
    - 7 lactating cows
    - 15 lactating goats
    - 15 lactating sheep

**Questions?**
Animal Health Issues and Zoonotic Diseases of Importance to the Dairy Industry

By Dr. Jim Logan
Wyoming State Veterinarian

Zoonotic Diseases

- Of the 96 diseases and conditions on the Wyoming Department of Health reportable disease list, 60 could potentially be transmitted from an animal to a human.
- Dairy cattle, sheep and goats can all play a transmission role in many zoonotic diseases.

Zoonotic Diseases cont.

- Many WILS Reportable Diseases are zoonotic, including:
  - Brucellosis
  - Tuberculosis (Tb)
  - Campylobacter jejuni
  - Q Fever
  - Salmonella
  - Johne’s
    - Possible relation to human Crohn’s disease

Brucellosis...What is it?

- A disease that causes abortion in cattle, elk and bison
- Caused by the bacteria *Brucella abortus*
- Bacteria is shed from infected animal at birthing event.

- Bacteria ingested by susceptible animal
- Incubation period 2 weeks to 2 months and in some cases considerably longer
- Infected animals should be considered life-long carriers
- Susceptibility related to age, pregnancy status.
- Direct relationship between dose exposed to and likelihood of infection.
Prevention

- Temporal and spatial separation of cattle from wildlife
- Management
- Surveillance
- Vaccination
  - Calves
  - Adults

What is Tuberculosis?

- Serious chronic bacterial disease
- Three main types:
  - Human (Mycobacterium tuberculosis)
  - Avian (M. avium)
  - Bovine (M. bovis)
- Zoonotic: animal to human transmission possible
- Slow onset/long incubation
- Primarily a respiratory disease, but can involve bone and other organs
- No vaccine for animals

Transmission of Bovine TB

- Primarily animal to animal spread
- Mainly through air - sneezing or coughing
- Contaminated feed, water, milk possible
- Requires close contact with an infected individual or contaminated area
- Enhanced by crowding and stress
- Wildlife reservoirs: White-tailed deer in Michigan and Minnesota

Bovine TB Pathology

Tuberculosis in Cattle

- Onset correlated with exposure dose
- Primarily affects respiratory tract & associated lymph nodes
- Disseminated infection rare - occurs late in disease progression
- Disease course is chronic - progresses over several years
- Latent infections possible - may become active infections if the immune system is impaired
Bovine T3 Diagnosis

- Skin testing – Tuberculin injection
  - positive-exposure
  - Caudal fold - initial screening
  - Comparative cervical - confirmatory
  - New confirmatory blood test – Gamma Interferon
  - Good as herd tests
  - May miss infection (anergy)
- Histology (microscopic examination)
  - lymph nodes - acid-fast organisms
- PCR Polymerase chain reaction
- Culture - Slow (8 weeks)

Primary Risk Factors

- Mexican Cattle
- Recreation Cattle
  - Roping steers
  - Rodeo cattle
- Dairy Cattle

Signs of Tb

- There are often no signs of Tb
  - Disease can spread unnoticed though a herd
- Signs possible in advanced disease
  - Progressive emaciation
  - Lethargy
  - Weakness
  - Anorexia
  - Fluctuating low-grade fever
  - Brechopneumonia
  - Possible lymph node enlargement
  - Death

States where Tb has been found recently

- California
- Colorado
- Idaho
- Michigan
- Minnesota
- Nebraska
- New Mexico
- South Dakota
- Texas

- Prevalence of bovine Tb has increased because of:
  - Access to infected wildlife
  - Contact with infected:
    - Rodeo cattle
    - Feeder cattle
- Also detected in many U.S. dairies in recent years

Campylobacteriosis

- Infectious disease caused by bacteria of the genus Campylobacter
- Wyoming Human Campylobacter cases (2010)
  - Animal Source – 28% (16% were cattle)
  - Unpasteurized Dairy Products – 2.7%
- Most human cases caused by Campylobacter jejuni
- One of the most common bacterial causes of diarrheal illness in the United States
  - Sporadic or outbreaks

Symptoms of Infection
Animal and/or Human

- Diarrhea, often bloody
- Abdominal cramps
- Fever
- Can cause serious life-threatening infections in persons with immune system compromise
Salmonella Species

- *S. typhimurium, newport, dublin*
- *S. dublin* – most common serotype reported (USAHA 2011) in cattle
- Wyoming Salmonella cases in 2010 were:
  - 28% animal source
  - 6.3% raw milk source

Significance of *Salmonella dublin*

- Multi-drug resistant
- Difficult to successfully treat
- Zoonotic
- Asymptomatic carriers – quietly maintains disease in a herd
- High contagious – environmental persistence

*Salmonella dublin* Signs in Cattle

- Most frequently affects calves 30-90 days old
- Generally mild enteric disease (differs from other salmonella strains)
- Septicemia; respiratory; fever
- Peri-partum shedding from affected adults (may be asymptomatic)
- Agalactia - decreased milk production
- Abortion
- Fatalities

*Salmonella dublin* Control

- Good sanitation key to prevention/control
- Biosecurity at farm
- Management
  - Prevent herd stress
  - Avoid over crowding

Johne’s Disease

- *Mycobacterium paratuberculosis*
- Possible link to human Cohn’s Disease
- 68.2% - Percentage of US dairy operations infected with *Mycobacterium paratuberculosis* (2007 NAHMS Dairy Study)
- At least 25% of dairy operations may have a relatively high number of Johne’s infected cows in their herds.
- Can affect cattle, sheep, goats
- Financial impacts are significant
- Tests are not highly accurate
- Disease is slow, progressive, contagious, untreatable
- Progression – young calves are most susceptible

Signs/Symptoms in Livestock

- Signs are not typically seen until 3 or more years of age
- Chronic diarrhea
- Weight loss/cachexia
- Shedding of causative bacteria
Controlling Johne’s

- Sanitation/Management
- Biosecurity

Crohn's Disease

- Human disease with similarities to Johne's Disease
- Organism has been found in tissues of Crohn's patients
- No absolute proof of link

Wyoming has had cases of Johne's Disease in beef and dairy cattle, sheep and goats, over past several years.

Q-Fever

*Coxiella burnetti* (rickettsia)

- Cattle, sheep and goats are main carriers
- World wide distribution
- Wyoming had 8 human cases from 2009-13
- Wyoming has had cases in sheep, goats, cattle & humans in past years
- Signs in livestock
  - Abortion, metritis
- Signs in humans
  - Flu-like symptoms

Q-Fever continued

- Organism is shed in milk and reproductive discharges
- Although rare, ingestion of infected milk is a possible route of transmission
- Two primary routes of transmission
  - Aerosols of contaminated soil or reproductive tissues/ fluids
  - Tick vectors
What is the DPC today?

The DPC is a nonprofit organization of education, industry and regulatory personnel concerned with milk quality, sanitation and regulatory uniformity.

Objectives of DPC

- Develop & distribute practical, easy-to-understand educational guidelines
- Guidelines are designed to improve sanitation & production practices in the production of milk & dairy products
- DPC cooperates with other organizations that have similar educational goals
  Examples: NMC, ACS, ADGA, 3A, IDFA, IMHA, NMPF

DPC Annual Conference

- 3 day conference takes place each Fall. Usually starts the day after election day in November
- Task Forces meet concurrently and provide a forum where topics of common interest can be shared with members & other attendees & where guidelines are developed and revised
- General Sessions feature topics of current interest to the Dairy Industry
- Recognized by NYS Ag & Mkt for CMI and PPS certification

Membership Dues

- Individual Members: $75/yr.
- Educational & Regulatory: $150/yr.
- Sustaining Memberships:
  - Bronze Level: $200/yr.
  - Silver Level: $325/yr.
  - Gold Level: $600/yr.
  - Platinum Level: $1000/yr.
Sustaining Members

- Advanced Instruments
- Alco
- Agricultural Engineering Services
- AgriMark, Inc.
- American Cheese Society
- American Dairy Goat Assoc.
- Bins Bros Process Equipment
- Byrne Dairy
- Cabot Creamery
- Capital Plastics
- Chem Sciences
- ChesterBrand LLC
- Choice Milk Daily
- Conrail Milk Quality Improvement Program
- Country Dairy
- Dairy一眼
- Dairy Farmers of America
- Dairy Marketing Service, LLC
- Dairyumann USA
- Dairymen Specialty Co., Inc.
- Dairytec
- DeLaval, LLC
- Dairyland Dairy
- DairyOne
- Eastern Crown
- Ecolab
- Empire Cheese
- Empire State Milk Quality Council
- Farmland Dairies
- Farmtek Group
- Farmers Markets
- Friends of Holstein
- Friendship Dairy
- Gallop Dairy Co.
- GEA Farm Technologies USA
- Grace Murray Insurance Co.
- Guida-Soldati Dairy
- Harold Winters Associates
- Honeywell Farms/EHT Milling
- HP Hood LLC
- IBA, Inc.
- Iowa Laboratories
- International Dairy Foods Association
- International Milk Freight Association
- Jackson-Mitchell Goat Dairy
- Kampeska
- Kansas City Dairy (KDC)
- Kentucky Dairy (KDC)
- Lancaster Dairy
- Lexco-Pennland Dairy
- Land O Lakes
- Lehigh Valley Dairy
- Lilly USA
- Mill & Ve Mfg. Prod.
- McCabe Family Farms
- Michigan Fresh Milk Council
- Michigan Milk Producers
- Mohican Valley, Inc.
- Neogen Corp.
- National Milk Council (NMC)
- Northeast Dairy Foods Assoc., Inc.
- Olin Thomas & Sons Dairy
- Pantrytours Int'l
- Pagniano Consultants Intern'l
- Page-Pederson International Ltd.
- Quality Management Inc. (QMI)
- Quality Milk Production Services
- Ranchland Associates
- Rawdawn Farms
- Rubber Dairy, Inc.
- Safeway, Inc.
- Sanitary Design Industries
- St. Marks Coop Creamery
- Stouff Foods, Inc.
- Sunline Family Farms
- Suprasis Chemical Co., Inc.
- Swiss Dairy Products
- Thermo Fisher Scientific
- The Schuster Company
- Turkey Hill Dairy, Inc.
- UMD Dairy, Inc.
- United Milk Co-op
- Vermont Dairy & Cheese
- Vermont Technical College
- Walker Transport
- Walker Scientific, Inc.
- Wisconsin Dairy/Outsiders

International DPC

Argentina
Australia
Brazil
Canada
Chile
Czech Rep.
Denmark
Finland
France
Germany
Great Britain
Greece
Israel
Ireland
Italy
Japan
Kuwait
Mexico
New Zealand
Pakistan
Portugal
Spain
Sweden
Thailand
Turkey
Venezuela

DPC Executive Board

Officers

- Executive VP: Jeff Bloom, Daily Practices Council
- President: Rebecca Piston, Hood, LLC
- Vice President: Bebe Zabinski

Pics
DPC Executive Board
Board Members Representing Regulatory
- Steve DiVincenzo, Illinois Department of Public Health
  Springfield, IL
- Dennis Gaalswyk, FDA
  College Park, MD
- Glenn Goldschmid, Wisconsin Dept of Agriculture
  Madison, WI
- Pat Healy, USDA Market Administrator
  Lenexa, KS

DPC Executive Board
Board Members Representing Industry
- Meikel Brewster, Charm Sciences, Inc.
  Lawrence, MA
- Ron Gelser, Dairy Marketing Services
  Orono, MN
- Greg Leach, Lurande Foods
  Harvey, NY

DPC Executive Board
Board Members Representing Education
- Joseph Zulovich, University of Missouri
  Columbia, MO
- John Partridge, Michigan State University
  East Lansing, MI
- Vacant

Task Force I
Farm Buildings & Equipment
Director: John Tyson
Penn State University
University Park, PA
- Activities & guidelines of this Task Force involve buildings & equipment for dairy operations including designs for handling cows, feed, milk, ventilation & manure.

Task Force II
Plant Equipment & Procedures
Director: Allen Sayler
Creston Safety & Regulatory Solutions
Visalia, CA
- To develop meaningful guidelines for procedures and equipment involved in dairy plant operations and promote uniformity between the states.

Task Force III
Laboratory & QC Procedures
Director: Pat Healy
USDA Market Administrator
Lenexa, KS
- To cover topics related to laboratory, quality control, product evaluation, trouble shooting procedures and methods of assuring quality through good production and manufacturing procedures.
Task Force IV
Regulatory Issues and HACCP

Director: Phillip Wolff
USDA AMS
Washington, D.C.

- To foster communications & uniformity between the states.
- This Task Force has been assigned guidelines concerning inspections as well as those relating to HACCP.

Task Force V
Milking Systems & Procedures

Director: Steve Lehman
Michigan Milk Producers Assoc.
Novi, MI

- To address guidelines relating to milking system design, equipment and facility function and cleaning.

Task Force VI
Small Ruminants

Director: Chris Hylden
NY State Department of Ag. & Markets
Albany, NY

- To develop guidelines pertaining to all aspects of production and processing for dairy goat, sheep and other small ruminant operations.

Guideline Development

- Developed in Task Forces by people who have an interest in the guideline topic.
- There are almost 100 Guidelines & more in the development process.
- Guidelines are periodically updated & revised, depending on changes in technology or procedures.

Guideline Development Peer Review

- Each Guideline goes through several levels of peer review, including state regulatory & FDA.
- Peer Review insures that Guidelines represent the state of knowledge at the time they are written.

Almost 100 Guidelines in print and on CD

- A complete set of Guidelines currently fits on one CD
- CD sets are available: The Complete set of DPC Guidelines and The DPC Small Ruminant Set
- All GLs are available to be purchased as pdf downloads from the DPC website: www.dairypc.org
Guideline Distribution
The DPC distributes approximately 1,000 Guidelines to our membership at each mailing
There are usually 2 mailings per year
Each mailing may contains 2 – 5 new or updated Guidelines

Would you like to help write GLs?
• Guidelines can be any topic that you feel would be beneficial to the Dairy Industry
• Guideline contributors are recognized on the Guideline’s front cover
• Lead Authors are presented with a plaque at the Annual Conference

Some of the Guidelines available on CD & PDF Downloads

New for DPC
• Custom Guideline CD’s
• Workshops at Annual Meetings
  – Madison 2012 – Joint workshop with National Mastitis Council
  – Harrisburg 2013 – Workshop for Artisan Cheese Makers / On Farm Processors with sponsorship by Mid Atlantic Dairy Association

New for DPC
• Tours at Annual Meetings
  – Charm Sciences – Lawrence, MA
  – Babcock Dairy Plant – Madison, WI
  – TBD – Harrisburg, PA

• Relationships with American Cheese Society and American Dairy Goat Association – guideline sharing with members

DPC Annual Conference
• Our 44th Annual Conference will be held November 6 – 8, 2013 in Harrisburg, PA

• Future Annual Conferences:
  2014: Kansas City, MO
  2015: Burlington, VT
November 6 - 8, 2013
Holiday Inn East, Harrisburg, PA.

- Conference topics include:
  - The latest on the Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA)
  - Animal Welfare technical standards
  - Safe Quality Foods (SQF): risk assessment & equipment calibration
  - Farm odor control
  - A behind the scenes look at the Dominos Pizza dairy promotion
  - WATER savings, sustainability, CIP design, & how much water is needed for production & processing
  - Allergen & how to detect & ass for it
  - Sensory evaluation of dairy products
  - FDA update & the results of the tissue residue testing program

Thank You!
For further information, visit our website: www.dairypc.org

E-mail: dairypc@dairypc.org
jeffbloom@dairypc.org
Tel /Fax: 215-355-5133
Twitter: dairypc
National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials (NADRO)
55th Annual Meeting

State Reports
CALIFORNIA REPORT

National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials
55th Annual Meeting, Cody WY
July 22 – 24, 2013

The Milk and Dairy Food Safety Branch (the Branch) of the California Department of Food and Agriculture is charged with ensuring that California’s milk and milk products are safe, wholesome, and properly labeled, and is the only regulatory program in the state with comprehensive expertise in milk production, handling, processing and distribution from farm to table.

To accomplish its food safety mission, the Branch inspects dairy farms, bulk milk tanker trucks, tanker wash facilities and milk processing plants, conducts testing of pasteurization systems, administers technical license examinations for dairy industry personnel, samples and tests milk and milk products, responds to consumer complaints, investigates illegal importation or unlicensed manufacturing of dairy products, and assists allied agencies with food-borne illness investigations. The Branch also conducts ratings of dairy farms, milk processing plants and manufacturers of single-service dairy containers, as well as evaluations of milk testing laboratories for compliance with the Pasteurized Milk Ordinance and the National Conference on Interstate Milk Shipments. In addition, the Branch is responsible for regulating industry or commercial testing of milk used as a basis of payment to producers in order to safeguard against inaccurate test results used to determine the quality and value of milk sold by California dairy farms.

Current Regulatory Workload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade A Dairy Farms</td>
<td>1,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing Grade Dairy Farms</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Products Plants (IMS listed)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Products Plants (Not IMS listed)</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasteurizer Units Tested Quarterly</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft-serve (Semi-frozen) Dessert Establishments</td>
<td>7,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk Milk Tanker Trucks</td>
<td>1,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk Milk Haulers and Samplers</td>
<td>1,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk Milk Tanker Wash Stations (Free-standing)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Plant Samplers (PMC, Appendix N)</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Service Container Manufacturing Plants</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMS Listed/Laboratories</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Drug Residue (Appendix N) Screening Labs</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Drug Residue (Appendix N) Confirming Labs</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Industry Basis of Payment Testing Labs</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

California is the leading milk producing state, with 41.8 billion pounds of production in 2012, providing about 21% of the nation’s total milk supply and approximately 40% of all U.S. exports of dairy products into international markets. The dairy industry is therefore an important economic engine for California, generating over $6.9 billion in farm-gate sales in 2012 and, according to the latest available data, an estimated $63 billion in annual economic activity. Although the number of dairy
farms in the state has continued to decline about 5 - 6% per year, the total number of dairy cows has remained close to 1.8 million since 2008. The average dairy herd size in California has therefore continued to rise and reached 1,164 cows per farm in 2012. The average Grade-A goat dairy herd is approximately 800 goats per farm. Over 99% of the milk produced on California dairy farms is Grade-A. Of the 41.8 billion pounds of total cow's milk produced in the state last year, 43.4% was used for the manufacture of dry milk powders and butter, 35.2% for cheese, 13.1% for fluid milk products, 5.0% for soft Grade-A products such as yogurt, sour cream and cottage cheese, and 3.3% for frozen dairy products.

Although the size of the industry continues to stretch the Branch's regulatory resources, the diversity of manufacturing processes is also increasingly challenging. In addition to some of the largest milk products plants in the nation that utilize the most advanced milk processing technologies, California has an expanding artisan farmstead cheese-making sector, growing interest in raw milk herd share operations, and simultaneous interest in the development of both local and international markets. This diversity of approaches to producing, manufacturing and distributing dairy products places greater pressure on the Milk and Dairy Food Safety Branch to maintain an appropriate breadth of expertise within our inspection staff, and to uniformly enforce laws and regulations governing the safe production and processing of milk, while also supporting the innovation and growth of the dairy industry overall in California.

After significant General Fund reductions last fiscal year, the inspection activities of the Milk and Dairy Food Safety Branch are now funded 100% by fees and assessments paid by the dairy industry. Fees were increased in all sectors of the industry, including both producers and processors, to offset reductions in General Fund support as a result of the overall California State Budget deficit. The increase in fees to cover program costs was the result of a cooperative effort between the California Department of Food and Agriculture and dairy industry stakeholders, and reflected the shared objectives of both government and the agricultural industry to ensure necessary food safety regulatory activity is maintained in the state.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Dr. Stephen Beam, Chief
Milk and Dairy Food Safety Branch
Animal Health and Food Safety Services
National Association Of Dairy Regulatory Officials
Annual Report
Cody, Wyoming
July 22-24

Georgia dairy farm numbers have declined over the past year yet cows numbers in the state are about the same. Several of our larger dairies have built new milking centers and increase their herd size. We have some new 60 and 80 cow rotary parlors. Direct load is getting popular with our larger dairies. We are increasing in the numbers of New Zealand style grazing dairies in the southern half of the state due to our mild winters and abundant water supply.

We hosted a FDA plant inspection course in March and will be hosting a cheese course in October. Two of our inspectors attend the FDA Farm course in New York State in June.

I would like to thank Wyoming Department of Agriculture for the great hospitality they have provided for this meeting.

Respectfully submit,

Bob Rogers
Dairy cows have decreased by 0.7% (from 82,812 January 2012 to 82,217 January 2013).

Milk per cow increased to 61 lb/cow/day during January 2013 (up from 57 in January 2012).

Average cows per dairy increased 0.6% from 322 in January 2012 to 324 in January 2013.

Farms have decreased 4.2% from 259 (January 2012) to 248 (January 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As of Dec. 31</th>
<th># Farms (comp. to 2012)</th>
<th>PRODUCTION (comp. to 2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1.525 bil. lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>273 (down 9.5%)</td>
<td>1.385 bil. lbs. (up 10.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>369 (down 33.1%)</td>
<td>1.460 bil. lbs. (up 4.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>599 (down 58.8%)</td>
<td>1.513 bil. lbs. (up 0.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of July 1, 2013 we have 241 cow dairies, 3 goat dairies, 1 sheep dairy.

5. Production increased during 2012 from 2011 by 5.8% (from 1.441 bil. in 2011 to 1.525 bil. in 2012).


7. Raw milk export totals decreased by 13.9% from 955.5 million in 2011 to 822.6 million in 2012.

8. In 2012 55% of the raw milk produced in Georgia was exported (66% in 2011).

85.4% to Florida 10.6% to Alabama 1.2% to North Carolina 0.1% to Tennessee

9. Imports of raw milk decreased by 28.1% from 849.9 million in 2011 to 611.5 million in 2012.

10.66% of imported milk came from states other than the southeast.


11. Antibiotic violations decreased on farms from 5 in 2011 to 4 in 2012.

12. Pounds of milk dumped for antibiotics decreased from 249,062 lbs. in 2011 to 149,766 lbs. in 2012.

4 positive tankers - down 20% from 5 in 2011 (value of the 4 tankers were $31,348; value in 2011 was $59,158)

13. 7 suspensions (other than antibiotics) were made at the farm level in 2012 (19 in 2011):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>barn violations</th>
<th>somatic cell</th>
<th>bacteria</th>
<th>added water</th>
<th>well water</th>
<th>agitation</th>
<th>Aflatoxin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2011)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2012)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. 73 warning letters were generated in 2012 (88 in 2011):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barn violations</th>
<th>somatic cell</th>
<th>bacteria</th>
<th>added water</th>
<th>well water systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2011)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2012)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Georgia has:

- 12 Grade A Processing Plants (down 1 from 2011)
- 41 Manufacturing Plants (up 8 from 2011)
- 14 Single Service Plants (up 1 from 2011)

As of July 1, 2013 we still have

- 12 Grade A plants
- 41 Manufacturing plants
- 14 Single Service plants

Top 8 ranking dairy counties, according to number of Grade A farms (as of Jan. 2013):

3. with 1 dairy, 15 with 2, 7 with 3, 5 with 4, 0 with 5.

Top 6 ranking dairy counties, according to number of cows (as of Jan. 2013):

* Brooks has 8 dairies  * Burke has 10 dairies  * Mitchell has 3 dairies

(COW STATS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># FARMS</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARMS WITH &lt;200 COWS</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARMS WITH &gt;200 &lt;1,000 COWS</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARMS WITH &gt;1,000 COWS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are for January 2013

Compiled by Ga. Dept. of Agriculture/Dairy Section
Idaho Report to Dairy Division of NASDA  
July 22-24, 2013  
Cody, Wyoming

As in the past few years, milk production is still increasing in the state. Currently there are 639 farms in the state active. This includes the traditional grade A farms as well as those that fall under the small herd exemption for the sale of raw milk. The herd average per grade A facility is 1031 mature animals. Existing processor capacities continue to expand to try to keep up with the existing and anticipated increases in milk production. Chobani Idaho opened for production on November 2012. The first phase of the project is projecting about 4 million pounds per day. Future expansion of the facility is in the planning stages already. This plant was in operation for the ground breaking in an amazing 326 days. High Desert Milk expanded there processing capabilities by adding a butter operation to the facility. Sorrento Lactalis has built a new fresh Mozzarella plant as an addition to their facility. Glanbia Foods is completing a new cheese innovation center for the research of cheese processing. There has also been a substantial growth in the small operations and farm stead type operations over the past few years and should continue.

Some of the key issues continuing to face the dairy industry at this time are the availability of water, feed supplies and animal welfare and of course the economy and financial issues. The dairy industries ability to handle environmental issues, water availability and social issues has been and will be the primary factors for the continued growth.

The big change in the program has been the introduction of the raw milk operations in the state. In 2011 rules were finalized and set in place to allow the small herd exemptions and herd share programs to sell raw milk in the state. These facilities are allowed to do this by being permitted with the Department, and no facility requirements. The work load has been increased by the staff to conduct the required monthly sampling of the raw milk and raw milk products at the facility.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mike Wiggs  
Dairy Program Manager

STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade A Farms</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>Mfg. Grade Farms</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Plants</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Raw Milk Plants</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw Small Heard Exempt</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Goat/Sheep Farms</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Service Mfg. Plant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transfer Stations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Milk Production 13.55 billion lbs.
July 10, 2013

TO: Board of Animal Health

FROM: Douglas H. Metcalf
       Director

SUBJECT: Dairy Division - Quarterly Report

Mr. Tom Ford, my deputy, will be covering the Board meeting in my stead this quarter. I will be on vacation and attending the National Assembly of Dairy Regulatory Officials in Cody Wyoming July 22–24.

In April we hosted the National Conference of Interstate Milk Shippers, NCIMS. This biennial meeting of State and Federal Regulatory Officials and the Dairy Industry uses a parliamentary process to determine changes to the rules under which Grade A raw milk and Grade A Dairy Products move in interstate commerce. (Ice Cream, cheese and butter are not covered under NCIMS.) As a Conference member, Indiana has one vote. Voting members include just the 50 states, DC, Puerto Rico, US VI, and Guam. BOAH agrees to abide by the following conference documents which the Board incorporates by rule in accordance with IC 15-18 Dairy Products:

- 2011 Pasteurized Milk Ordinance
- 2011 Methods of Making Milk Sanitation Ratings
- 2011 Evaluation of Milk Laboratories
- 2011 NCIMS Procedures (includes the NCIMS Constitution and Bylaws)

Perhaps the most controversial proposal involved lowering the Somatic Cell Count standard from 750,000 to 400,000. This proposal was defeated twice. The Dairy Division’s Debbie Hall, is a member of the NCIMS Laboratory Committee. Her committee dealt with many proposals updating laboratory procedures and forms. Tom Ford is co chair of the International Certification Pilot Program Committee. Their proposal passed making it possible for international processors to label their milk products as Grade A and ship to the U.S. It is no longer a pilot program. Mary Wodtke is co chair of the Aseptic Processing Committee. Her committee’s proposal adding retort (canning) processing standards to the PMO passed. Debra’s, Tom’s and Mary’s efforts are commendable and reflect well on the talent we have in the dairy division. Tina Zaring, the divisions Administrative Assistant, led our team hosting the conference and making sure our scribes were prepared to perform their duties in support of the Councils and Conference.

We started the quarter with 183 high risk farms that are now being inspected quarterly. These farms are identified as high risk as they have a history of failing inspections. Six of those farms have chosen to go out of business. Reports from the field indicate that the majority of these farms have made significant

Safeguarding Indiana’s animals, food supply and citizens for over 100 years.
An equal opportunity employer and provider.
improvements in sanitation. Some have made capital investments to improve their overall milking operation.

Quarterly metric – our performance metric is to achieve a passing score on 95% of Survey Enforcement Ratings to get a ‘green’ rating and 91% for a ‘yellow’ rating. In the first quarter we passed 19 of 20 for a 95% rating. For the second quarter we passed 19 of 19 for a 100% rating.

Just as some farms have challenges in meeting the strict requirements of the Pasteurized Milk Ordinance, some plants do as well. In those instances we ask the plants to meet with us to discuss our mutual concerns. During the meeting the plant outlines a plan of action to improve areas of concern and a methodology is agreed to for additional oversight in those areas of concern. Plants are already inspected quarterly so the methodology often entails spot checks by our inspectors and/or additional specified reporting of particular items of mutual concern.

While the strict standards of Indiana law and rules and the NCIMS documents set a regulatory bar for entry into and staying in the commercial interstate dairy industry, industry often sets a higher standard on itself. To that end we are noticing some rearrangement of farm affiliations as associations and others who market raw Grade A milk attempt to improve the economics and quality components of the milk they sell to processors and also meet the European Union standard of a Somatic Cell Count of 400,000 or lower. The bottom line appears to be that if an individual producer does not have the volume and/or the quality it takes to make money then they are likely to be dropped by some associations and milk marketers.

As the temperatures warm up, we are seeing our Grade B can producers once again struggle with milk quality. The standard for them is Somatic Cell count of 750,000 or less per milliliter and a bacteria count of 500,000 or less per milliliter. (Grade A is 750,000 and 100,000 respectively.) These producers also tend not to treat their dairy cows for mastitis with antibiotics and they tend to keep their cows on the milk string much longer than Grade A producers. And obviously since they do not get their milk cooled quickly and keep it cooled the opportunity for bacteria growth increases substantially. This milk goes to Ohio for processing into cheese.

In June we hosted two Executives from Dean Foods, John Sanford, Director of Regulatory Affairs, and Roger Hool, Director of Quality Assurance. After briefing them on the Indiana Dairy Industry and our Dairy Division, we toured first the Indiana Department of Health Laboratory and then the Kelsay Farm, a Dean Direct supplier. They were impressed with each tour. Following the tours we returned to BOAH to discuss drug residue issues.

FDA has not released the results of its 2012 study of dairy drug residues in raw milk. As soon as the results are released BOAH will analyze them and work with our industry and regulatory partners to address regulatory and industry needs if any.

Industry census – see attached
Dairy Farm Census as of 7/10/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Farms</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>% of Grade</th>
<th>% of milks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade B</td>
<td>322</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade A</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Based</td>
<td>10,650,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 largest</td>
<td>2,549,000</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 largest</td>
<td>7,315,000</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milks</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organic Dairy Census - 5/30/13

- 132 Dairies identified as organic (11%)
- Produce 230,000 #’s of milk (2%)
- Largest 10% produce 36% of #’s
- Largest 25% produce 53% of #’s
- 15% are on risk based inspection frequency

Other dairy census items

- 106 farms with 2 or more tanks/silos
- 7 farms are on direct load
- 5 farms have robotic milking equipment (+1 in proposal)
- 2 farms process fluid Grade A milk on the farm
- Permitted haulers – 493
- Bulk Tank Units - 74
- Bulk routes – 331
- Can routes - 6
KENTUCKY 2013 State Fact Sheet

- KENTUCKY ranked 27th in milk production, 26th in number of milk cows, 43rd in milk output per cow, and 12th in the number of licensed dairy operations during 2012 in the United States.

- KENTUCKY had SEVEN commercial milk processing plants operating during 2012 that were located in Glasgow, Springfield, Louisiville, London, Murray, Somerset, Fulton, Madisonville, and Winchester.

- KENTUCKY also had THREE commercial cheese manufacturing plants and a specialty ice cream plant. In addition, the state had two on-farm milk bottling plants and six on-farm cheese makers.

- Total amount of milk produced in the state during 2012 amounted to 130.2 MILLION GALLONS (or 1.12 billion pounds of milk).

- In KENTUCKY, cash receipts for the sale of milk by dairy farmers amounted to $214.6 MILLION during 2012.

- There were an estimated 74,000 MILK COWS on dairy farms in the state during 2012.

- Each dairy cow in KENTUCKY produced an average of 1,760 GALLONS of milk in 2012.

- In KENTUCKY, almost all of the milk produced in 2012 was used and consumed in the form of fluid milk.

- In 2012, KENTUCKY dairy cows produced an average of 5.8 GALLONS of milk per day, or enough to make 5 pounds of cheese, or 2.4 pounds of butter. To produce this much milk, an average cow consumes 40 gallons of water, 25 pounds of grain and feed concentrates, and 60 pounds of corn silage.

- The average value of a day's milk was about $9.51 PER COW during 2012.

- In 2012, a dairy cow in KENTUCKY cost about $1,470 PER HEAD.

- A typical KENTUCKY dairy farm has a herd of about 88 MILKING COWS.

- Dairy farming contributed about $767 MILLION to Kentucky's economy during 2012.
National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials
Cody, Wyoming
July 22 - 24, 2013

MICHIGAN REPORT

Introduction

The Dairy Section of the Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development's Food and Dairy Division is responsible for the inspection of all Grade "A" and manufacturing dairy farms, processing plants, bulk milk hauler/samplers, and milk tank trucks. The Dairy Section also conducts the NCIMS rating program as well as the Laboratory Evaluation program. In addition, Dairy Section staff carries out USDA surveys and grading through a USDA cooperative program.

Michigan has 1,824 Grade "A" dairy farms and 288 manufacturing milk farms for a total of 2,112. Dairy has a $14.7 billion impact on Michigan's economy and creates almost 40,000 direct and indirect jobs. In 2012, milk production in Michigan increased by 4.8% over 2011 levels. Michigan ranked 8th in the U.S. in milk production, producing 8.9 billion pounds of milk. Michigan ranked 5th in milk per cow with an average of 23,704 pounds. Michigan continues to add milk processing capacity with new plants being built and existing plants expanding.

Dairy Section Workload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade A Dairy Farms</td>
<td>1,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing Milk Farms</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Plants</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer/Tank Truck Cleaning Stations</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade A Milk Distributors</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Service Manufacturers</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk Milk Hauler Samplers</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Tank Trucks &amp; Can Milk Trucks</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Transportation Companies</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Industry Fieldpersons</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Industry Laboratories</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Drug Rescue Screening Sites</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certified Industry Field Representative Dairy Farm Inspection Program

In 2010, the Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (MDARD) began to implement the Certified Industry Field Representative Dairy Farm Inspection Program. The program was implemented because of the loss of six MDARD Dairy Section staff due to retirement, a budget reduction accompanying these retirements, and a subsequent proposal for a further budget reduction.
Consequently, in December 2010, the industry began to conduct official regulatory dairy farm inspections. The program was expanded to the point that the industry became responsible for inspecting 90% of Michigan's dairy farms. MDARD staff has oversight and conducts audits and Grade "A" ratings of the inspections being carried out by the industry.

Michigan has had Certified Industry Field Representative Dairy Farm Inspectors for many years who are employed by farm cooperative organizations and provide services to members. These industry farm inspectors are licensed by MDARD and comply with the requirements of Section 5 of the Grade "A" Pasteurized Milk Ordinance. MDARD staff continues to inspect Michigan's milk processing plants, milk pasteurization systems, milk haulers and tank trucks as well as other dairy businesses. MDARD continues to conduct milk sanitation and enforcement ratings, license dairy establishments, evaluate milk testing laboratories and screening sites, as well as conduct other milk safety-related activities.

The proposed funding reduction was restored to the Dairy Inspection Program in the budget beginning October 1, 2011. This enabled MDARD to hire 3 inspectors and resume conducting inspections on 78% of Michigan's dairy farms in February 2012. The FY13 budget brought additional funding to the program allowing MDARD to replace the remaining staff who retired in 2010. As of March 1, 2013 MDARD resumed inspection responsibility for all Michigan's dairy farms, dairy processing plants and other licensees.

New Value-Added Milk Processing Facilities and Robotic Milking Facilities

MDARD's milk safety inspection staff continues to receive inquiries from dairy farmers and others who are interested in starting up local, value-added milk processing facilities. These facilities include manufacturers of goat, sheep and water buffalo cheese as well as on-farm milk bottling facilities. The milk safety inspection staff works with these entrepreneurs from the initial planning stage all the way through construction and start-up. A continuing inspection program of these new facilities helps assure a smooth transition from planning to the production of safe, wholesome dairy products. Dairy processing facilities continue to increase in number from 79 in FY10 to 84 in FY11, to 91 in FY12.

Michigan continues to see a great deal of interest in robotic milking with new systems being installed on a regular basis.

Cow Share and Fresh Unprocessed Whole Milk Meetings

Brought together by Michigan Food and Farming Systems, this group of stakeholders including cow share farmers, considered various aspects of raw milk consumption and herd sharing to address the question: "Where do we want to be in three to five years on access to fresh unprocessed whole milk?" The workgroup concluded its deliberations and developed a report including recommendations in December 2012. A key point is that herd share operations will not be licensed or inspected by MDARD. In addition, products such as butter, cheese, and yogurt are not considered by MDARD to be part of a herd share operation and are therefore subject to applicable MDARD laws and regulations.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan K. Esser, Deputy Director
Food and Dairy Division
Missouri State Milk Board was created in 1972 to function as the administrator for milk inspection, relating to Grade “A” milk and milk supplies, to assure uniformity of procedures and interpretation of milk inspection regulations. The Board consists of 12 members, ten of whom are nominated by the Director of Department of Agriculture, appointed by the governor, and confirmed by the Senate. The two remaining members are the directors of the Department of Health and the Department of Agriculture or their designated representatives. Four members must be dairy producers, four active members of local health departments, one dairy processor representative and one a consumer-at-large.

In 1974 the State Milk Board was transferred to the Department of Agriculture under a Type III transfer where the Director of Agriculture does not maintain supervision over substantive matters relating to policies and regulatory functions.

On August 13, 1982, pursuant to Executive Order 82-9, the Missouri Manufacturing Milk and Dairy Marketing Testing Law was transferred from Department of Agriculture Animal Health Division to State Milk Board for administration.

Enforcement of regulations concerning fluid milk and fluid milk products is accomplished by contractual agreements with St. Louis County and Springfield-Greene County Health Departments. All Grade “A” activities are supported solely by revenue from inspection fees and services.

Manufacturing Grade dairy program has traditionally been supported by general revenue. Funding challenges have reduced our E&E budget to $792 for FY2014. Fees are generating some additional revenue however not enough to operate the manufacturing grade program without GR.
Litigation

SMB vs Morningland Dairy of the Ozarks

Nearly 2.5 years after initial notification Missouri Milk Board destroyed cheese found with *Listeria monocytogenes* and *Staphylococcus aureus*. Defendants became members of the Weston A. Price Foundation and received legal counsel from Farmer to Consumer Legal Defense Fund attorney.

August 25, 2010

- Dr. Beam, Chief, California Dept of Food & Agriculture Milk and Dairy Food Safety Branch reports two raw milk cheeses found *with Listeria monocytogenes and Staphylococcus aureus* from 29-428.

January 11-12, 2011

- Bench trial scheduled in Howell County Missouri Circuit Court.

February 23, 2011

- Final Order of Permanent Injunction. Judge orders cheese destroyed & requires Morningland to implement several sanitation practices when making cheese again, including the use of sanitizer and latex gloves. Morningland complains order is too costly and requests amended judgment.

May 23, 2011

- Amended Judgment and Order issued. Judge reaffirms earlier order and clarifies that the court found all of the cheese to be contaminated based on a representative sample and that the court found the cheese making facility was unsanitary.

June 29, 2011

- Judgment in Contempt. Judge ordered Morningland to cease selling contaminated cheese.

September 27, 2012

- Appeal from Circuit Court Affirmed by Missouri Court of Appeals Southern District.

December 29, 2012

- Supreme Court of Missouri *en banc* denied application to transfer case from Missouri Court of Appeals.

January 10, 2013

- Morningland asks if the State Milk Board will agree to destroy cheese on January 25, 2013, pursuant to the court order. State Milk Board agrees.

January 25, 2013

- Five State Milk Board employees arrive on site at 8:00 a.m. and are met by 30-40 protestors, some of whom are armed. Staff called Howell County sheriff and State Highway Patrol to assist in managing the crowd. At approximately 10:00 a.m., the highway patrolmen persuade the protestors to let SMB staff onto the Morningland farm. Cheese was removed and destroyed as per court order by 5:00 p.m.

State Milk Board Inspected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Mfg Grade</th>
<th>SCC</th>
<th>Powder</th>
<th>Truck Wash</th>
<th>Aseptic Stations</th>
<th>Distributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plants</td>
<td>19*</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>369</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes 3 Grade A Retail Raw Milk 2 CSR 80-3
Overview of New York State’s Dairy Industry

The dairy industry is New York’s leading agricultural sector, accounting for over one-half of the state’s total agricultural receipts. In 2012, approximately 5,150 dairy farms produced 13.2 billion pounds of milk with a gross farm-gate value of $2.6 billion. In terms of milk received at New York plants, about 35% sold as packaged fluid milk and cream products and 35% is used in manufacturing.

As of July 2013, the Department licensed approximately 360 dairy processing establishments, this number is up from around 200 in 2008. The breakdown is 40 Raw Milk Permits, approximately 140 Wholesale Frozen Desserts and around 180 Manufacturing Facilities. This extreme growth appears to be continuing and is attributed to the local food movement and smaller scale processing, but is not limited to just small scale processors, many of our long established facilities have undergone expansions and renovations often leading to further efficiencies. In addition, we have had a huge investment in our large dairy processing infrastructure with the addition of Muller Quaker Dairy, Alpina, Chobani and Fage. Byrne Dairy has announced it will be building a yogurt facility and Cayuga Milk Ingredients specializing in dairy proteins and powders has broken ground and has plans to be processing around the first of the year.

Economic Multipliers

Dairy contributes significantly to the State’s economy by providing some of the highest economic multipliers in the State. According to Cornell University, an additional $0.81 is circulated in the local economy for every dollar generated through farm gate milk sales. When multiplied out, that creates $1.782 million in revenue. The dairy processing sector has an economic multiplier of 2.26 for each dollar in processing, which represents an additional $4.972 billion for the State’s economy. Dairy farming and processing combined presents a total economic impact of $8.9 billion to New York State.
Job Creation

Using the same study from Cornell University, one on-farm job is created for every 40-50 cows added to the State’s herd. For every new job created on a dairy farm, an additional 1.24 jobs are created in the local community. Additionally for every job created in the dairy processing industry, 5.72 jobs are created upstream.

In 2011, New York’s dairy manufacturers employed an estimated 8,070 people with total wages of $414 million, a 14 percent increase from 2005.

Key Stats

Milk Production: New York is the fourth largest milk producing state in the country, producing 13.2 billion pounds of milk in 2012, up 2.8% from 2011. This accounts for 6.6 percent of total U.S. production of 200.3 billion pounds. New York’s milk production is up nearly 1.0 billion pounds since 2007. On an annual basis, Idaho is the third largest producing state, exceeding New York by just 368 million pounds (2.8%) in 2012. The first and second largest milk producing states are California and Wisconsin, respectively, producing 41.8 billion pounds and 27.2 billion pounds of milk in 2012.

In 2012, the average size dairy farm in New York State had 118 cows, producing 2.55 million pounds of milk per year. The annual average number of milk cows was 610,000 head, unchanged from the prior year. Average production per cow was 21,633 pounds, up an impressive 21.5% since 2003.

In 2007, NY dairy operations with 200 or more cows accounted for 10% of NY dairy farms while producing 60% of the state’s total milk production.

Cheese Production: New York is a major cheese producer, ranking fourth in the nation in total cheese production. New York ranks first in cream cheese and cottage cheese production. While milk used for yogurt production has increased dramatically, cheese production still uses the largest amount of milk received at New York plants. In 2011, the amount of milk/cream/skim used to make cheese was 4.8 billion pounds. Mozzarella accounted for the largest share, using 1.7 billion pounds of milk, followed by American cheese using 1.0 billion pounds of milk.

In 2011, New York produced 732 million pounds of cheese (excluding cottage), 205 million pounds of cream cheese and 194 million pounds of cottage cheese. Of the 732 million pounds of cheese, mozzarella accounted for 192.1 million pounds, followed by cheddar, 101.7 million pounds and ricotta, at 126.7 million pounds.

Cheddar production has been trending higher reflecting some recent plant expansions, lead by Great Lakes Cheese, which doubled the size of its plant in 2010.

Our miscellaneous cheese category has also been growing, reflecting the increasing number of plants and production of artisan type cheeses. In 2011, the total amount produced was 57.4 million pounds, up from 32.5 million pounds in 2008. The varieties in this category include Brick, Brie, Camembert, Columbian, Farmstead, Farmers, Feta.
Yogurt: Since 2000, the number of yogurt processing plants in New York has increased from 14 to 27 with another major plant, Muller Quaker Dairy in Batavia, NY which is just coming on line. This facility is a joint venture between PepsiCo and the German Theo Muller firm. The Muller Quaker facility sits directly across the road from the Alpina Foods facility, based in Columbia, South America, which opened in October 2012 and is also making yogurt.

For 2012, New York’s yogurt production is estimated at 692 million pounds, up 25% from 2011. Compared to 2007, at 234 million pounds, production has nearly tripled. The majority of the increase is due to the strong growth in the production of Greek strained yogurt, which requires three times more milk than traditional yogurt. As a result, the amount of milk used to make yogurt has increased dramatically, from 166 million pounds in 2007 to approximately 1.7 billion pounds in 2012. This represents nearly 13% of New York’s total milk production.

Division Statistics: The Division of Milk Control is currently made up of a director, (vacancies in the Assistant Director and Program Manager positions), 6 Regional Supervisors, a Compliance and Enforcement Supervisor, the lone Dairy Equipment Specialist/Chief Rating Officer, and 25 Dairy Products Specialist I’s. We are currently in the process of hiring four more DPS I’s and are creating a new region in the southern portion of the Hudson Valley due to the escalation of processors regionally and its close proximity of New York City.

During calendar year 2012, our Dairy Products Specialist I’s drove 447,130 miles down from 538,028 miles in 2008 or about 16,000 per person. Total hours spent driving were 11,307, down from 12,661.3 in 2008, for an average speed of 39 miles per hour. In NYC one of our inspectors averaged 15 miles per hour. The average specialist spends about 22 percent of their time behind the wheel driving based on the annual available work hours of 1750. Windshield time for our top driver accounted for 45 percent of available work hours. Overall we have between 6 or 7 FTE’s spent driving.

The “cost” of our annual cell phone service is about $21,000. This has enabled us to be much more effective and efficient in getting work done behind the wheel and in the field. The division continues to utilize Smartphones to collect and transmit data to our food laboratory. Our division submits over 1,200 dairy samples per month.

**NY DAIRY STATISTICS**

- 98 Certified Milk Inspectors
- 49 Grade A Processing Facilities
- 80 BTU’s
- 5120 Grade A Dairy Farms
- 136 Wholesale Frozen Dessert Mfgs.
- 4000 Milk Receivers/Samplers
- 178 Manufacturing Plants
- 40 Raw Milk Permits
Industry Numbers

270 Grade A producers (includes 3 sheep and 20 goat dairies)
17 BTUs
16 IMS listed plants
41 non-IMS listed plants

3 single-service facilities
160 milk tankers
120 permitted milk haulers

Dairy Program Staff

The Food Safety and Animal Health Program has 37 field staff
- 3 perform pasteurizer equipment checks (22 tests / month)
- 16 conduct dairy sampling (140 / month)
- 13 conduct farm inspections (47 / month)
- 5 inspect dairy plants (20 / month)

★ Dairy sampling and inspection assignments are in addition to the inspectors’ other regular assigned duties, such as manufacturing and retail food inspections, FDA inspections, licensing consultations, and plan reviews.

Training

We currently have 6 younger staff members training in pasteurization equipment testing, plant and farm inspections and future rating officers. We will be hosting the Pacific/Southwest Regional Milk Seminar in 2014.

Funding

The dairy program is funded with 28% General Fund dollars and 72% Other Funds (fees). (Dairy industry license fees do not generate sufficient funds to support the Dairy Program; for that reason, the retail industry has agreed to subsidize the dairy program with a portion of its license fees.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013 Dairy License Fee Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most License Types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - 5K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&gt;5K - 50K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&gt;50K - 500K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&gt;500K - 1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&gt;1M - 5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&gt;5M - 10M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&gt;10M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$135</th>
<th>$135</th>
<th>$189</th>
<th>$325</th>
<th>$487</th>
<th>$649</th>
<th>$912</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frm Dessert Manuf</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Industry update in 2013

Major industry expansion is the lactose drying plant under construction in Boardman, OR at the site of Columbia River Processing, which is owned by Tillamook Cheese. Production is scheduled to begin December 2013.

Raw Milk

Permitted: 3 cows/2 lactating or 9 sheep or goats; on-farm sales only; no advertising Loophole: "Condo Cows"

Early Reminder: Oregon will host the 2015 NCIMS Conference in Portland. We look forward to welcoming you to the Rose City.
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This past year has been very difficult for the Dairy Farmers in South Dakota. The extreme drought in the State last year caused all the commodity prices to increase substantially. Dairy quality alfalfa hay sold close to $400 per ton and corn was selling for over $7 per bushel left little profit for the dairy producer. Currently this year we have been getting some timely rains that has kept most of the State with favorable growing conditions. If crop production gets back to normal, the Dairy farmer should be able to see some profits again in the Dairy business.

As mentioned, last year Bell Brands has completed the first year of construction on their new Cheese Plant in Brookings, South Dakota. The 170,000 square-foot plant is on schedule to be completed in July of 2014. The first phase will be processing 1 million pounds of milk daily. Also the Agro-Pur Cheese plant in Iowa is expanding its processing capabilities from processing 3 million pounds of milk per day to 6.9 million pounds of milk per day. This plant is located about 20 miles from the South Dakota state line. With the completion of these two projects we should see more dairy expansion in the State within the next two years.

The Dairy Staff is in the process of Promulgating Rules for the sale of Raw Milk. The State will require the farms to be licensed and inspected. Monthly testing will be completed on the Raw milk supply as well as monthly pathogen testing on the milk in the bottle being offered to the consumer. As you all know, the Raw milk issue can be very controversial. If you would like to see our Proposed Rule, I have a copy with me or I can send you a copy of the Proposed Rules that will be heard on July 26th.
Last year 42 South Dakota Dairy farms left the industry as compared to 29 farms in 2012. The extreme drought that affected South Dakota and other States led to a higher number of farms exiting the Dairy business. The State's total milk production continues to increase even as we continue to lose farms.

This spring Walt Bones who had been the Secretary of Agriculture resigned and went back to the farm. Lucas Lentsch is the new Secretary of Agriculture for the State of South Dakota. Lucas is a Dairy Science graduate from South Dakota State University.

It has been a pleasure working with NADRO and the rest of the State's again this year. If the SDDA Dairy Staff can be of any assistance to you, please feel free to contact our office at (605) 773-4294.

Respectfully submitted

Darwin W. Kurtenbach
July 10, 2013

SOUTH DAKOTA

FY 2013 STATISTICS

Total Farms:
Grade “A” 238
Manufacturing 40

Inspections:
Plant/Rec/Transfer Station 66
Grade “A” Farms 698
Manufacturing Grade 58
Pasteurization Equipment 53
HTST Resealing 30
Bulk Milk Haulers/Trucks 93/154
Milk Products Tested 1572

Plants
Grade “A” Fluid 2
Grade “A” Drying 1
Manufacturing Grade Cheese 7
Manufacturing Grade Drying 6
Receiving/Transfer Stations 6
Single Service Fabricating 1
Cheese Cutting and wrapping 4
Ice Cream Plants 1
IMS Surveys/Resurveys 19/3
Check Ratings 2
Powder Blending 1

Licensed Sanitarians: (Fieldman) 22

Interstate Milk Shippers Listings: 30
The number of Utah dairy farms has dropped by 18 over the past year, while cow numbers continue to grow. The larger operations continue to absorb the majority of the cows being sold. The 18 farms were small producers and were adversely affected primarily by soaring feed costs. The larger producers have been forced to improve the efficiency of their feeding operations to stay ahead of the feed costs. Hydroponics appears to be coming to Utah Dairy Farms as one of the methods to improve nutritional programs and cut back on feed costs.

Raw for Retail operations have grown by only one dairy over the past year. One additional Raw for Retail goat dairy has joined the program. Judging from the decreased number of foodborne illness outbreaks from raw milk, the Raw for Retail producers in the state are improving their sanitation and production practices. The state had just one reported case of Campylobacter over the past year, allegedly from drinking raw milk. Credit should also be given to the tight controls the State Department of Agriculture and Food has maintained over the Raw for Retail Program.

### 2012 Inspection Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Inspections/Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade A Cow Dairies</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade A Goat Dairies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmstead Cheese Dairies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Processors</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw to Retail Dairies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Haulers/Samplers</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Trucks</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasteurizers</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>1381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total dairy farms in Utah</td>
<td>224 dairies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total milk cows in Utah</td>
<td>90,000 cows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average herd size</td>
<td>391 cows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total milk production</td>
<td>1,951 billion pounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average milk production per cow</td>
<td>21,678 pounds per cow per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2012 Plant Statistics

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Plants</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw for Retail Dairies</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Bays</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robotic Milkers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Service Fabricating Plants</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yogurt Plants</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmstead Cheese Dairies</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goat Dairies</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep Dairies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grade A Fluid Milk Plant: 15
Ice Cream Plants: 8
Manufacturing Grade Cheese: 19
Grade A Drying Plant: 1

History

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of Dairy Farms</th>
<th>Percent Reduction from Previous Year</th>
<th>Total Milk Production x 1,000,000</th>
<th>Average Cow Numbers x 1,000</th>
<th>Yearly Milk Production per Cow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1,661 x 1,000,000</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>18,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1,747 x 1,000,000</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>20,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1,732 x 1,000,000</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1,776 x 1,000,000</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1,767 x 1,000,000</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>21,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1,819 x 1,000,000</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>21,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1,854 x 1,000,000</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>21,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1,951 x 1,000,000</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>21,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,819 x 1,000,000</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>21,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,854 x 1,000,000</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>21,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1,951 x 1,000,000</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>21,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,819 x 1,000,000</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>21,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,854 x 1,000,000</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>21,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1,951 x 1,000,000</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>21,678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vermont Report to NADRO for 2013

By Dan Scruton, Dairy Section Programs Chief

Vermont’s dairy industry remains strong in spite of the economic challenges facing our farming community. The dairy staff consists of 4 farm inspectors, 3 plant inspectors, 1 milk quality specialist, an administrative assistant and myself.

The total number of dairy farms in July of 2012 was 1013 and in July of 2013 we are at 970. Of the 970 dairy farms; 934 are farms milking cattle, 31 are milking goats and 5 are milking sheep. We have done 2,318 farm inspections in the last year.

The processing side of the equation has been exciting with the economic drivers combined with an aggressive buy local marketing movement encouraging the development of a large number of new processing facilities. We did 315 plant inspections on 93 processing facilities. 14 new processors have come on line since July 1 of last year and there are numerous potential plants showing significant interest. 55 of our processors are on-farm processors. We have a large number of small processors with 51 of our processing facilities less than 500 pounds of milk per day processing capacity.

Data record keeping issues continue to dominate our logistical concerns as the server we have our old database on has been temperamental and on some days has not worked at all. Over the last year plans have changed and we are currently looking at the CAI product called USA Food Safety.

There is a bright future for the dairy industry for those that adapt to the changing markets while maintaining modern practices. The dairy industry has a tradition of adapting to market needs and I am confident they will continue to do so.
As of June 30, 2013, there were 649 Grade "A" dairy farms operating in Virginia as compared to 665 last year at this time. The total number of manufacturing milk farms on June 30, 2013 increased to twelve compared to nine one year ago. All of our manufacturing grade dairy farms are associated with farmstead cheese production.

Dairy Services continues to be part of the Office of Dairy and Foods in the Division of Animal and Food Industry Services. The Dairy Services Program consists of one Program Supervisor, one Program Support Technician, one Assistant Supervisor, and 10 Dairy Inspectors. The Dairy Services program continues to perform all grade "A" farm inspections at a frequency of two times per year and collection of all required milk samples. The Dairy Services Program budget is 100% general funded.

Governor Bob McDonnell included in his 2012 budget a new dairy inspector position and the funding to support this position. The FDA State Program Evaluation was instrumental in justifying this new position, and the position was filled in January 2012. The addition of this new inspector position helped the program to achieve a 94% inspection rate on milk transports and tankers and a 97% evaluation rate on milk hauler/samplers as of June 30, 2013. This more than meets the minimum performance standard of 80% evaluation frequency within two years for milk haulers and 80% each year for tank trucks. Virginia’s database was modified to track inspection and evaluation information and create management reports to hold inspectors accountable for completing the inspections.

Our small-scale farmstead cheese industry is continuing to grow. Virginia now has thirty-three small scale cheese makers. Ten of these cheese makers are using cow’s milk; fourteen are using goat’s milk, and one is using sheep’s milk. We had one commercial cheese plant go out of business this past year, but still have four commercial cheese plants in Virginia that manufacture cheese, cheese spreads,
smoked cheeses, smoked curd, unsalted butter, and cheese truffles.

We also inspect 16 small ice cream and frozen desserts plants operating in Virginia.

Statistical Information (July 1 – June 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of:</th>
<th>FY 06/07</th>
<th>FY 07/08</th>
<th>FY 08/09</th>
<th>FY 09/10</th>
<th>FY 10/11</th>
<th>FY 11/12</th>
<th>FY 12/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Positions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade A Dairy Farms</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade A Farm Inspections</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mfg. Milk Plants</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frozen Desserts Plant Permits</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Dip Shop Inspections</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade A Milk Samples</td>
<td>9173</td>
<td>8257</td>
<td>8441</td>
<td>8528</td>
<td>7793</td>
<td>8232</td>
<td>7986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport/Tank Truck Permits</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Water Supply Samples</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectively Submitted,

Carolyn K. Peterson
Program Supervisor
Office of Dairy and Foods
WSDA Food Safety Program

47 FTE's – 35 FSO's – 3 Regions
Dairy, Food Processing, Custom Meat, Eggs, Warehouse, Cottage Food and Feed

Lucy Severs - Food Safety Program Manager

**Program Dairy Statistics**

- Grade A Dairy Farms (22 BTU's): 491
- Grade A Dairy Plants: 22
  - 16 IMS (1 HACCP)
  - 6 non-IMS
- Cheese Manufacturing: 22
- Ice Cream Manufacturing: 30
- Grade A Raw Retail: 34
- Single Service: 14
- Tankers: 498
- Wash Stations: 7
- Technicians: 595

**Program Updates**

FDA Funding
- Rapid Response Team
- Manufactured Food Standards
- Recall Coordinator Position
- Sample Coordinator Position
- Food & Feed Contracts

Compliance
- Adoption of the 2011 PMO
- DMSCC lowered to 400,000

Events
- Raw Milk Events
- Other Food Events
- Aflatoxin testing on Milk & Feed Components
State of Wyoming Dairy Report

The state of Wyoming is a pretty small drop in the milk bucket when it comes to dairies and that drop is getting smaller. Since the state is the shape of your paper please flip it over and I will visually illustrate the physical logistics of the dairies located in the state. Most state reports will not be able to list the dairies in the state on a single piece of paper. So here they are.

South East Area
- Burnett Dairy- Milking 3000 cows (largest dairy in state)
- Olsen Dairy- Milking 100 cows
- Bartel Dairy- Milking 40 cows

North Central Area
- Denney’s Dairy- Milking 150-200 cows
- George Farms- Milking 550-600 cows

South West Area
- Crook Dairy- Milking 50 cows
- Terry Crook Dairy- Milking 100 cows
- Robert Jenkins- Milking 75 cows
- Gene Warren- Milking 75 cows
- Crook Farms- Milking 300 cows
- Jed Heap- Milking 75 Cows

Total milking cows: Approximately 4,515

Wyoming does not have any processing plants of any kind. All milk is shipped either to Idaho or Colorado, the North West area was shipping to Montana, however, that plant is under a DFA plant closure for the time being so their milk is going to Colorado. All Dairies are grade A in the state. Raw milk is still banned for retail sales in the state of Wyoming; however, herd sharing is legal in the state for private consumption of raw milk.
**National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials (NADRO)**

**55th Annual Meeting**

**2013 Sponsors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDFA</td>
<td>Cary Frye</td>
<td>1250 H. St. NW Suite 900</td>
<td>202-220-3543</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cfrye@idfa.org">cfrye@idfa.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC 20005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agri-Mark</td>
<td>Bob Gilchrist</td>
<td>Po Box 5800</td>
<td>978-687-4923</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rgilchrist@agrimark.net">rgilchrist@agrimark.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lawrence, MA 01842</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP Hood LLC</td>
<td>Rebecca Piston</td>
<td>Six Kimball Lane</td>
<td>617-887-3000</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hood.com">www.hood.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lynnfield, MA 01940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Dairymen of Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td>2008 South Hardy Dr.</td>
<td>480-966-7211</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uda.coop/">www.uda.coop/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tempe, AZ 85282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Name, Same Mission: Protecting public health and promoting regulatory uniformity and efficiency in the dairy industry.

For 50 years, the Dairy Division of the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture has worked diligently to address concerns of the dairy industry and to make recommendations to relevant federal agencies and national organization. However, our organization recognized that each state’s dairy regulatory structure can be unique. Many states have dairy regulatory units administered within departments of agriculture, others in departments of health. Furthermore, in other states, dairy regulators reside in specialized units or may be housed in multiple state agencies, sharing responsibilities within the state. Due to these diverse arrangements, we embarked on establishing a new name for our organization to more clearly identify our members and our goals. In December 2008, we became officially known as the National Association of Dairy Regulatory Officials.

The questions and answers below provide more information about our organization and our name change.

Q: Why did DDNASDA pursue a name change?
A: The driving force behind the name change was the desire to have a name to more clearly identify our organization’s goals and to be more inclusive of the diverse dairy regulatory agencies across the US. While DDNASDA meetings have regularly been attended by representatives from departments of agriculture, health and other agencies; the name seemed to convey exclusiveness to only departments of agriculture. Our new name is intended to be inviting to the breadth of dairy regulatory agencies across the US.

Q: How did the organization reach a decision on the name change?
A: A committee was formed in 2007 to consider possible names. The committee made a recommendation at our July 2008 meeting. Per our Constitution and By Laws, the appropriate changes were communicated to our membership and the document revisions were unanimously approved during special December 5, 2008 conference call meeting.

Q: What are the rights and privileges of NADRO member states?
A: Each member state is provided one vote on questions brought before the members at our annual or special meetings. Members may also bring up items of business for discussion at meetings. This is particularly important when a member state desires to make recommendations to federal agencies or national organizations.

Q: What if a state has multiple agencies involved in dairy regulatory matters? Who is assigned to vote at NADRO meetings?
A: Each member state has one vote. Per the Constitution, a delegate designation form is submitted to NADRO prior to the annual meeting. The form provides for specification of one delegate and an alternate. Each state should determine these representatives prior to submitting these forms.

Q: What is the relationship between NADRO and the NCIMS?

A: Many NADRO members are also delegates and participants in the NCIMS, however, these organizations should not be confused. The NCIMS convenes biannually in odd years to discuss items relevant to the Pasteurized Milk Ordinance (PMO) and supporting documents. While the PMO is regularly discussed at NADRO meetings, our meetings tend to have a broader context. NADRO meetings also tend to be smaller and conducted in a less formal manner.

Q: Who attends NADRO meetings?

A: NADRO meetings are attended by a wide range of professionals involved with the dairy industry. As stated above, each member state is provided with one vote, however, a number of state agencies regularly send multiple representatives to the annual meeting. Federal agency and industry representatives for producers, processors and allied industries are also regular participants at the annual meeting.

A: What is the normal composition of the NADRO meeting program?

NADRO meetings are conducted in a relaxed manner and provide many networking opportunities for representative to become better acquainted with colleagues from across the US. A member of each state in attendance is provided the opportunity to brief the audience on news regarding their home state’s dairy industry. The formal program regularly includes speakers from FDA, USDA, National Milk Producers Federation, International Dairy Foods Association and groups such as the American Dairy Products Association. Additionally, the host state typically arranges for speakers to address topics relevant to their state’s or region’s dairy industry. These speakers are often industry and university leaders from the area.

Also, each meeting typically includes a brief tour of a unique aspect of the host state’s agriculture. A banquet is scheduled on the last evening of the meeting. Each attendee brings a gift to the banquet representative of their home state or organization. At the conclusion of banquet, gifts are exchanged among attendees. The banquet provides a nice opportunity for fun and camaraderie.

Q: How can I find out more about NADRO?

A: Please feel free to contact any of our current officers about NADRO. Their contact information can be found in the registrant section of this report.