



State of Connecticut
Department of Agriculture
Milk Regulation Board

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held October 16, 2013

1. Commissioner Reviczky called the meeting of the Milk Regulation Board to order at 10:09am. Members present: Mae Schmidle, Michael Young, Gregory Peracchio, Peter Orr, Lucy Nolan, Commissioner Steven K. Reviczky, Joann Houser Others present: James Jacquier, Robert Jacquier, Gary Wheelock, Amanda Allred, Heidi Harkopf, Dr. Bruce Sherman, Jason Bowsza.
2. Correspondence: Commissioner Reviczky shared a letter from the Environment Committee of the Connecticut General Assembly regarding a “Results Based Accountability” assessment of the Connecticut Milk Regulation Board. This is something that comes up periodically, as a number of boards and commissions are set to sunset over time, but this is the furthest that Commissioner Reviczky is aware of this process going in regards to this particular board. Several years ago, during consolidation, elimination of the Milk Regulation Board was discussed but the commissioner was able to convince the legislature that the role played by the Milk Regulation Board was still significant, relevant and timely. The commissioner stated that the Milk Regulation Board once served a true regulatory function, but those duties have since been absorbed by the department. Dr. Sherman gave a brief historical background. Ms. Schmidle thinks that the MRB does still provide an important function. Ms. Nolan highlighted the potential use of the board during an emergency situation. Dr. Sherman also believes that the MRB plays a role, particularly in regards to the sale of raw milk. The Commissioner asked for feedback about any potential statutory changes that would be necessary. He agreed with Ms. Schmidle and Dr. Sherman and suggested that, if the role of the Milk Regulation Board has evolved from its statutorily established mission, it would be appropriate to update that role in statute. The board will review the correspondence from the Connecticut General Assembly and plans to discuss via conference call in the next 4-5 weeks.
3. Approval of Minutes: A motion was made by Mr. Orr, seconded by Ms. Schmidle to approve the minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously.
4. Reports:
 - a. Commissioner Reviczky noted that conferees had been appointed in the US House and Senate to discuss moving forward a federal Farm Bill. The conference committee consists of seventeen Republicans and eleven Democrats. The commissioner made a special note that Rep. Goodlatt had not been named as a conferee. Mr. Orr commented that the entire bill was up in the air and that no one had any clear insight as to what may be the final product.
 - b. Commissioner Reviczky brought up the two suggested Food Safety Modernization Act rules changes. He noted that recognition by the Food and Drug Administration of the Pasteurized Milk Ordinance was a hot topic with deep support at the recent National Association of State Departments of Agriculture meeting. The commissioner further noted that an action item had been taken up at that conference calling for the formal

recognition of the PMO. There remains some space between NASDA members and the FDA in terms of agreement about the best way to move FSMA forward.

- c. Commissioner Reviczky noted that the University of Connecticut will continue to do cost analyses that inform Ag Sustainability grant amounts. This revolving account is paid out quarterly, which helps isolate it against potential budgetary sweeps. The commissioner noted that our Ag Sustainability remains a model for other states. Mr. Orr asked if the shutdown of the federal government would have an impact on the quarterly analyses and payments. Commissioner Reviczky indicated that he will ask Wayne Kasacek to contact UConn and determine if a delay was likely.
- d. Mr. Young asked the current status of the truck weight limit increase issue. Commissioner Reviczky explained that the legislative effort in Connecticut to increase the weight restriction was successful, and now requires federal action to become a reality. Other states in a similar situation (New Jersey and Pennsylvania were noted). In Connecticut, we have competing interests that were concerned about the impacts of such an increase in weight limit.

5. Public Comment:

Paul Miller asked if the Milk Regulation Board may be combined with any other boards that may do similar work. Commissioner Reviczky cautioned that that notion had as much risk as it did reward, as membership of boards are generally comprised of people with an expertise in a given area.

6. Adjournment: 10:45am