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THE CHAIR: Good morning. The 2006 Conference for Food Protection Assembly of State Voting Delegates is hereby called to order. Before we begin this morning, I'd like to introduce the folks sharing the dais with me. To my right, Mr. Trevor Hayes, our executive director; to his right, John Krakowski, conference Parliamentarian; and then Allen Gelfius, also conference Parliamentarian.

To my left, Cory Hedman, Conference Vice Chair; to his left, Elizabeth Nutt, our Resolutions Chair; and she is followed by our Council Chairs, Frank Yiannas, Chair Council I; Vicki Everly, Chair Council II; and Larry Kohl, our Chair for Council III.

I'd like to take a moment again to thank all of the voting delegates, the Council chairs, vice chairs and Council members, our parliamentarians, the
committee chairs and committee members, you, the
county members, and, of course, our executive
board.

This has been a most exceptional and
enjoyable conference, marked by your determined
effort to set a positive example for others to point
to when the question is raised: How do organizations
work out the position differences among their
members? You have redefined collaboration so that it
is synonymous with Conference for Food Protection.
You have all done an outstanding job and give
yourselves a round of applause.

(Applause.)

And with that, at this time I'll turn it
over to our executive director, Mr. Trevor Hayes.

TREVOR HAYES: Good morning, everyone.
FROM THE FLOOR: Good morning.
TREVOR HAYES: I will begin with the roll
call of the states. There are a few changes to the
delegate roster that was distributed yesterday. If
you will please add Dave Reid, Minnesota ag to your
roster. And if you will flip the two names for the
Michigan delegation, your copy will then be up to
date.
Tom, you also wish to make a change.

Would you like to do that now?

TOM LEITZKE (WISCONSIN): Yes. Jackie Owens will serve as the delegate.

TREVOR HAYES: Okay. From Wisconsin Jackie Owens will serve as the delegate in place of Tom Leitzke.

As I read out the name of your state, I'd like you to respond by indicating the share of the vote you have. If you have a full vote, please so state. If you have less than a full vote, please indicate the share of the vote you have; for instance, one-half or one-third.

Alabama?

ALABAMA: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Thank you. Alaska?

ALASKA: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Arizona?

ARIZONA: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Arkansas?

ARKANSAS: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: California?

CALIFORNIA: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Colorado?
COLORADO: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Connecticut?

CONNECTICUT: Half vote.

CONNECTICUT: Half vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Thank you. Delaware?

DELAWARE: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Florida?

FLORIDA: One-third.

FLORIDA: One-third.

FLORIDA: One-third.

TREVOR HAYES: Georgia?

GEORGIA: One vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Hawaii?

HAWAII: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Idaho?

IDAHO: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Illinois?

ILLINOIS: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Indiana?

INDIANA: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Iowa?

IOWA: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Kansas?

KANSAS: One-half.
KANSAS: One-half.

TREVOR HAYES: Thank you. Kentucky?

KENTUCKY: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Louisiana will not be represented.

Maine?

MAINE: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Maryland?

MARYLAND: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Massachusetts?

MASSACHUSETTS: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Michigan?

MICHIGAN: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Minnesota?

MINNESOTA: Half vote.

MINNESOTA: Half vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Thank you. By the way, the roster should also reflect that for Michigan Kevin Besey is the voting delegate.

Mississippi?

MISSISSIPPI: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Missouri?

MISSOURI: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Montana?
MONTANA: Full vote.
TREVOR HAYES: Nebraska?
NEBRASKA: Full vote.
TREVOR HAYES: Nevada?
NEVADA: Full vote.
TREVOR HAYES: New Hampshire?
NEW HAMPSHIRE: Full vote.
TREVOR HAYES: New Jersey?
NEW JERSEY: Full vote.
TREVOR HAYES: New Mexico?
NEW MEXICO: Full vote.
TREVOR HAYES: New York?
NEW YORK: One-half.
NEW YORK: Half vote.
TREVOR HAYES: Thank you. North Carolina?
NORTH CAROLINA: Full vote.
TREVOR HAYES: North Dakota?
NORTH DAKOTA: Full vote.
TREVOR HAYES: Ohio?
OHIO: Half vote.
OHIO: Half.
TREVOR HAYES: And half vote too?
OHIO: Half vote, yeah.
TREVOR HAYES: Okay. I didn't hear you.
Sorry.

Oklahoma?

OKLAHOMA: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Oregon?

OREGON: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Pennsylvania?

PENNSYLVANIA: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Rhode Island?

RHODE ISLAND: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: South Carolina?

SOUTH CAROLINA: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: South Dakota, no representation.

Tennessee, Lori Lemaster?

TENNESSEE: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Thank you.

Texas?

TEXAS: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Utah?

UTAH: One-half.

UTAH: Half vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Thank you.

Vermont?

VERMONT: Full vote.
TREVOR HAYES: Virginia?

VIRGINIA: Half vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Thank you.

Washington?

WASHINGTON: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: West Virginia?

WEST VIRGINIA: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Wisconsin?

WISCONSIN: Half vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Wyoming?

WYOMING: Full vote.

TREVOR HAYES: District of Columbia?

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: A strong half vote.

TREVOR HAYES: Thank you.

And Puerto Rico?

PUERTO RICO: Half vote.

FROM THE FLOOR: There should be a change on the roster that Mr. Hoffner from Delaware is the delegate; it should be switched to Maida Graves.

TREVOR HAYES: The delegate from Delaware is Maida Graves in place of Robert Hoffner. Thank you.
While I present the rest of my report, our parliamentarians will ascertain what constitutes a majority and what constitutes two-thirds for the voting that will ensue.

My report to the assembly is as follows:

There are 435 registrants at this conference meeting. Our previous highest attendance figure was 353. We have a total of 59 delegates here today representing 48 states, the District of Columbia and one territory. Our year end final financial report ending December 31, 2005, reflects a balance in our treasury of $110,109.

Caucus elections to fill positions on the executive board this year resulted in the following members being named: In the state regulatory category, from the southwest for a term extending to 2012, Mary Glassburner from Kansas Health; state regulatory northeast 2012 term, Barbara Gerzonich, a returning board member, New York Health; local regulatory from the Midwest, also 2012, Jeff Luedemen, returning board member Bloomington, Minnesota; southeast 2012 new member Bill Hardester from Mecklenburg County Health in North Carolina.

In the industry caucus we have in food
service for a term until 2012 John Gurrisi from
Darden Restaurants, Orlando, Florida; also from
industry in the food store category, 2012, Cory
Hedman, returning board member from Hannaford
Brothers, Scarborough, Maine; and industry-at-large
filling the remaining two years of a six-year term is
Larry Kohl from Walt Disney World Lake Buena Vista,
Florida.

In addition, our executive board has
affirmed the appointment of the following members to
the position of Council Vice Chair; Council I, Pam
Williams from Young Brands, Incorporated; Council II,
Aggie Hale, Florida Agriculture; and Council III, Ken
Rosenwinkel, Jewel-Osco/Albertsons.

I would like to at this time also advise
you that our 2008 conference meeting will be held
April the 11th through the 16th, 2008, at the Omni in
San Antonio, Texas. Please mark these dates on your
calendar and plan to attend. They are also posted on
the conference website at Foodprotect.org. I
encourage you to develop a habit of checking the
website for news and information updates.

The meeting minutes of the 2004 meeting of
this assembly have been distributed. Madam Chair,
will you entertain a motion to waive the reading of
these minutes, please?

THE CHAIR: I ask for a motion now to
waive the reading of the minutes of the 2004
colference.

FROM THE FLOOR: So move.

THE CHAIR: Is there a second?

FROM THE FLOOR: Second.

THE CHAIR: Is there discussion? Then all
those in favor of waiving the reading of the minutes
of the 2004 conference, state so by saying aye.

FROM THE FLOOR: Aye. Those opposed?

Motion carried.

TREVOR HAYES: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I have something to read briefly here. A quorum must
be present. A quorum is defined as the presence of
registered voting delegates from at least two-thirds
of the states with designated official delegates in
attendance at this conference meeting. Each
territory in the District of Columbia shall count as
one-half a state in constituting a quorum. A
two-thirds majority is required to change a procedure
adopted at a previous conference or to make changes
in the constitution and bylaws. Other actions
require a simple majority; yes, no, and abstain are the votes. A Council recommendation cannot be changed. Votes are kept by voice or by a show of hands by the voting delegates. Roll call votes are taken only if requested by a delegate. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Trevor.

I need to give you some instructions now as to the conduct of the assembly. The first item that I'd like to bring to your attention is that it is absolutely necessary that you turn your pagers, your telephones or other electronic communication devices to either mute or vibe so as to not disrupt this voting delegate session.

Okay. The second item that I'd like to ask of you is that you please try not to leave the room during voting.

Now, the next set of information I need to give to you I need you to pay careful attention to. If a delegate wishes to make a motion or speak to an issue, you must come to the microphone, or in the absence of coming to the microphone and standing where you are, you must speak loudly and clearly so as to be audible for our stenographer. You must, however, state your name and affiliation for the
record. The Chair, me, will then recognize you.

If someone in the audience who is not a voting delegate wishes to speak to an issue, a state delegate must come to the microphone, or stand, as it were, where you are and yield the floor to you. The non-delegate then must state your name and affiliation for the record, and again the Chair will recognize you.

Now, traditionally in past delegate sessions, to keep the meeting moving the length of time for debate has been limited. If it is the will of the delegates to do so during this session, I will now entertain a motion to that effect.

DEBORAH MARLOW (TEXAS): Deborah Marlow from Texas. I move to limit the total amount for debate to ten minutes with no more than two minutes per speaker.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Is there a second?

FROM THE FLOOR: Second.

THE CHAIR: Okay. So moved. Is there any discussion?

Okay. Well, then the limit for debate has been set to a total of ten minutes, presumably starting with the person who requested the extraction
speaking first for no more than two minutes, followed by subsequent speakers, each limited to two minutes, so forth and so on, debate or discussion ending at precisely 10 minutes on that issue.

Are there any questions on this set of instructions? Okay. With that, then I'll turn the podium over to our parliamentarians for some further instructions.

PARLIAMENTARIAN KRAKOWSKI: Good morning, Madam Chair, delegates and my fellow conference members. Congratulations on a great conference. I just wanted to go over some of the processes that we'll be using today for voting.

The Chair will begin to invite Council chairs to the podium and Council chairs will give their reports in order. They will then give their reports in two parts. The first part will be the issues that were accepted or accepted as amended; and then the second part will be the issues where no action is recommended by the Council. At that time, the Chair will ask if there are any issues from that Council report that they wish to extract.

If there's a delegate that wishes to extract an issue, he or she will come to the
microphone or audibly state their name and the issues that they would like to extract. And that will continue until all the issues from that Council's report are extracted.

At that time, the Conference Chair will entertain a motion to accept all of the issue recommendations from that Council's report, and there will be a vote. After that is done, each extracted issue will be considered by the assembly. And the time limits have, in fact, been identified.

What will happen is that when the extracted issues are considered, the Chair will announce, "I will entertain a motion to accept the Council recommendation for issue," and then state the extracted issue number. And so the person who extracted ideally would come to the microphone and make that motion, and then there is a requirement to have a second, and then there will be the discussion.

All of the issues related to bylaws and procedures are automatically extracted from the Council II report. And the Council Chair will entertain a motion to consider all of the bylaws changes in a single vote. The reason why the bylaws and procedures are automatically extracted, because
they require a two-thirds vote. All other issues that come before us today require -- regular votes are a simple majority which is 50 percent. The simple majority today will be 25 votes and the two-thirds vote will be 33.

And thank you very much. Have a great deliberation.

THE CHAIR: I need to correct one item as a point of order. I didn't actually take your vote on the time limit, so I'll go back and do that now.

All those in favor of limiting the debate to ten minutes with a total debate time of two minutes per speaker, state so by saying yes.

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Those opposed, please state so by saying no. Motion carried. We will limit the debate to two minutes -- to ten minutes with two minutes per speaker as recommended.

Okay. With that then, Frank, will you please give us the report for Council I.

FRANK YIANNAS: Good morning, Madam Chair.

It was a great honor for me to serve as Chair of Council I, and on behalf of my Vice Chair, Lee Cornman, and Council members, I would like to submit
Part 1 of the Council I report.

For Part 1 of the report, we have the 13 issues accepted as submitted; 15 issues accepted as amended; and we have one minor correction for the record. If I turn your attention to Issue 1-023, the last item in that issue, No. 2, needs to be stricken from the record. That same language appears on Issue 1-022, and that's the correct location.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Frank. Does anyone wish to extract an issue from Part 1 of Council I?

DAVE REID (MINNESOTA): My name is Dave Reid. I'm with the Minnesota Department of Agriculture, and I would like to extract Issue 1-18.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Does anyone wish to extract another issue?

Hearing none, then I will now entertain a motion to accept the Council I report --

ERNEST JULIAN (RHODE ISLAND): I would like to extract Issue 1 also. Ernest Julian with Rhode Island Department of Health.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Does anyone wish to extract another issue from Council I report from Part 1?

THE CHAIR: Does anyone wish to extract another issue?

Okay. Then hearing no others, I will now entertain a motion to accept the Council I report minus the extracted issues.

DAVID LUDWIG (ARIZONA): Madam Chair, David Ludwig, state of Arizona. I move that we approve the remaining issues for passing.

THE CHAIR: Is there a second?

PADRAIC JUAREZ (FLORIDA): Second.

THE CHAIR: So moved. Is there any discussion? Then all those in favor of accepting the report of Council I -- are there any abstentions?

Okay. All those in favor of accepting the report of Council I minus the extracted issues, please indicate so by saying yes.

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

THE CHAIR: All those opposed, please indicate so by saying no. The motion carries. Part 1 of the report is accepted then except for the extracted issues.
Okay. For no particular reason, I'm going to take the extracted issues in the order of their request, okay. Then I will now entertain a motion to accept the Council recommendation for Issue 1-18.

DAVE REID (MINNESOTA): My name is Dave Reid, again, with the Minnesota Department of Agriculture, and I would like to yield the floor to Lorna Girard.

THE CHAIR: I'm actually still waiting for the motion before we go into discussion.

DAVE REID (MINNESOTA): So move.

THE CHAIR: Is there a second?

ERNEST JULIAN (RHODE ISLAND): Second.

THE CHAIR: Now, is there any discussion now? Okay. With the reminder that the agreed upon time limit for discussion is ten minutes or two minutes procedure.

FROM THE FLOOR: I'd like to yield the floor to Lorna Girard.

THE CHAIR: The Chair then recognizes Lorna Girard.

LORNA GIRARD (MINNESOTA): My name is Lorna Girard, and I'm with the Minnesota Department of Agriculture, and I believe Issue 1-001 and 1-018
were combined with the language that prevails in 1-018. And I would like to recommend a no vote to the delegates.

This issue or a similar issue was discussed in 2004, and that was Issue 026, as far as eliminating floor drains in walk-in coolers. It passed. It ended up it did go into the 2005 food code as negotiated and they negotiated this with the planning committee. And that actually went to Section 5-402.11(B). So floor drains have been eliminated in walk-in coolers.

If this proposal to say equipment does not include refrigerated spaces that are constructed as an integral part of the building goes through, it also means that other equipment requirements will not apply. And that would be for such as 4-101.19, non-food contents construction; 4-301.11, cooling, heating, holding capacities; 4-501.11, good repair and proper adjustment. So with this exclusion of walk-in coolers as a piece of equipment, there are other provisions that will also be affected. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Does anyone else wish to speak to this issue?
Point of order, will someone yield the floor.

DEBORAH MARLOW (TEXAS): Deborah Marlow, Texas Department of Health, yielding to Larry Edwards --

THE CHAIR: Would you state your name for the record.

DEBORAH MARLOW (TEXAS): Deb Marlow from Texas.

LARRY EDWARDS: My name is Larry Edwards from the Food and Marketing Institute.

THE CHAIR: Chair recognizes Mr. Edwards then.

LARRY EDWARDS: Thank you very much.

This issue was put forth as a follow-up to the original recommendation to the conference; that being not only to change in the code the appropriate places, but also a change in the definition.

At the 2004 conference, the Council then went through the deliberation process, and it was decided that the appropriate placement in the food code and annexes would be changed, but the definition was not attended to. It was our intent in submitting this issue to clarify further that floor drains in
refrigerated places -- spaces should not be included as equipment, it should be addressed as part of the building, as floor drains and that back rooms or walls, floors and ceilings would be. So the intent was never to eliminate the refrigerated space from being addressed by other provisions of the code.

When it went through Council, the FDA presented their issues, and we all heard those, and but didn't feel that the intent of the issue was to eliminate all those other provisions, the code from addressing this issue.

Now, I know some people at the FDA -- I'm kidding -- but I was really hoping -- it went through Council, and it was passed, and I was hoping that the FDA could take that intent and then try and address that once they received the issue from the conference. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Does anyone else wish to speak to this issue?

DAVE REID (MINNESOTA): This is Dave Reid with the Minnesota Department of Agriculture.

THE CHAIR: The Chair recognizes Mr. Reid.

DAVE REID (MINNESOTA): I would like to yield the floor to a speaker from FDA.
SHIRLEY BOHM (FDA): This is Shirley Bohm from FDA.

THE CHAIR: Chair recognizes Shirley Bohm.

SHIRLEY BOHM (FDA): We recognize and appreciate the explanation from FMI that that was their intent, that we look at the intent, but the -- the issue and recommendation as written doesn't give us the latitude to kind of go along with the intent. It was very clearly asked to change the definition, and as was explained earlier, that would have a big impact on other -- it would have other impacts. So we -- we believe that this should not be incorporated into the food code as written.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Does anyone else wish to speak to the issue? No one else? Okay.

Then we will now vote on this issue. All those in favor of accepting the Council recommendation on Issue 18 which was combined with Issue 1, please indicate so by saying yes.

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

THE CHAIR: All those opposed, indicate by saying no.

FROM THE FLOOR: No.

THE CHAIR: With that, then the motion is
defeated.

Are there any abstentions for the record?

Okay. With that then I will entertain a motion to accept the Council recommendation for Issue 1-023. And if you'll state your name just for our stenographer as you're making the motion, that would be very helpful.


THE CHAIR: Is there a second?

DAVID LUDWIG (ARIZONA): Second.

THE CHAIR: Is there then any discussion to this issue?

PATRICK GUZZLE (IDAHO): Madam Chair, again, Patrick Guzzle, Idaho Department of Health and Welfare.

This issue calls for allowing either manual ware-washing in sinks to be installed in a new establishment or mechanical dishwashing, not both. I think we would hopefully recognize that the best practice would be to have both three-compartment sinks or manual ware-washing in addition to mechanical ware-washing.

If there is a situation whereby an
establishment simply cannot meet that requirement, various provisions already do exist in the code whereby an establishment operator can request a variance to change that.
The reason that the state of Idaho feels this is an important issue, we have several rural areas in our state whereby an operator, assuming worse case scenario, power failure or other system failure in that mechanical ware-washing system that might be the only thing installed in that facility is not operable, it may take several hours, possibly several days, before that establishment can contact a sanitary to have them come out and help them reestablish the operable -- operability of that mechanical ware-washing system. By presenting that possible time frame of several hours or possibly several days, it would require in the state of Idaho at least that that establishment close for that time when the mechanical ware-washing is not operable.
Rather than face the possibility of an adverse financial situation for the establishment, the state of Idaho recommends that the current language continue to exist and require both manual ware-washing as well as both mechanical ware-washing
in food establishments.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Does anyone else wish to speak to this issue?

DAVE GIFFORD (WASHINGTON): Dave Gifford, state of Washington.

THE CHAIR: Chair recognizes Mr. Gifford.

DAVE GIFFORD (WASHINGTON): This issue was submitted because the code language as stated currently in the 2005 version does not explicitly say you need both sinks and mechanical dishwasher. It states that for manual dishwashing you need to have a three compartment sink and states that if you use mechanical dishwashing you need to follow manufacturers' instructions. But it does not state currently that you need both. So the issue was submitted to clarify that issue.

We don't feel like redundancy in this issue is necessarily required. It's not required in other issues. If there is a power failure, the place will close probably anyway due to other reasons. But at the very least, if we do vote down this issue, then it will remain unclear in the code, and maybe we just need to ask the FDA to clarify their position in the code otherwise. But we just want to make it
clear that if this issue is voted down, the issue will remain unclear in the code and states will interpret it both ways. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Does anyone else wish to speak to the issue?

PADRAIC JUAREZ (FLORIDA): Madam Chair, delegates, I'm Patrick Juarez from the state of Florida.

THE CHAIR: Chair recognizes Mr. Juarez.

PADRAIC JUAREZ (FLORIDA): Thank you. Our point on this particular issue is that we don't require redundancy anywhere else in the code on much more important systems. We don't require that there be an ice block refrigerator in there in case refrigeration goes down. We don't require a wood stove in case the microwaves don't work anymore.

We -- I think we all know that that's for foodborne illnesses occurring not so much coming from dishwashing as this is redundancy, and I don't believe anywhere in the public health reasonings does it mention why you have to have redundancy in this particular thing. I would encourage you to accept this issue. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Does anyone else
wishes to speak to the issue? Does someone wish to
yield the floor--

DAVID LUDWIG (ARIZONA): I'd like to
yield--David Ludwig, state of Arizona. I'd like to
yield to this person.

KEVIN SMITH (FDA): Morning. Kevin Smith,
FDA.

THE CHAIR: Chair recognizes Mr. Smith.

KEVIN SMITH (FDA): The agency is happy to
consider ways that 4.302-12 can be clarified. We
believe that the recommended solution doesn't clarify
the intent; rather, it changes the intent. We think
that it is necessary for the food code to require an
establishment be equipped to manually ware-wash its
utensils that become soiled. The code currently does
not require it done in systems. You don't have to
have both manual ware-washing and mechanical, but you
do need to be able to be capable of manually
ware-washing the equipment that becomes soiled.

So while we will consider changes to make
that more clear, we don't believe that the
recommended solution where it establishes a rule of
one or the other is the way to go. We do recognize
that there are situations where an exception to that
rule is appropriate where you may be able to get by with just only a mechanical ware-washer, but that tends to be in situations where there's either very limited menus or very limited amount of utensils that become soiled. And in that situation we think a variance or a waiver to that requirement is appropriate. But, again, that should be the exception, not the rule. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Does anyone else wish to speak to this issue?

Okay. Hearing no one else, we will now vote on this issue. All those in favor of accepting the Council recommendation on Issue 1-023, please indicate so by saying yes.

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

THE CHAIR: All those opposed indicate so by saying no.

FROM THE FLOOR: No.

THE CHAIR: It sounds as though the no's have it, but for the record, are there abstentions that need to be documented?

BOB PANICO (OHIO): Bob Panico, Ohio Department of Agriculture. I would like to have a roll call.
PARLIAMENTARIAN GELFIUS: Mr. Ludwig, for clarification, were you in abstention?

DAVID LUDWIG (ARIZONA): No.

THE CHAIR: Mr. Gifford abstained.

PARLIAMENTARIAN GELFIUS: Sorry, Mr. Gifford abstained. Wrong Dave. I can't keep them apart.

FROM THE FLOOR: I was going to do what he did.

PARLIAMENTARIAN GELFIUS: For the record, were there any abstentions on the vote? Okay.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. We'll do a roll call vote now, and speak up so that we hear that you're definitely saying yes or no, and your state.

TREVOR HAYES: Okay. For the roll call, Alabama?

ALABAMA: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Alaska?

ALASKA: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Arizona?

ARIZONA: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Arkansas?

ARKANSAS: No.

TREVOR HAYES: California?
CALIFORNIA: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Colorado?
COLORADO: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Connecticut?
CONNECTICUT: No.
CONNECTICUT: No. Two half no's.
TREVOR HAYES: Thank you. Delaware?
DELAWARE: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Florida?
FLORIDA: Three-thirds yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Georgia?
GEORGIA: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Hawaii?
HAWAII: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Idaho?
IDAHO: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Illinois?
ILLINOIS: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Indiana?
INDIANA: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Iowa?
IOWA: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Kansas?
KANSAS: One-half yes.
KANSAS: One-half yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Kentucky?
KENTUCKY: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Louisiana, not here.
Maine?
MAINE: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Maryland?
MARYLAND: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Massachusetts?
MASSACHUSETTS: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Michigan?
MICHIGAN: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Minnesota?
MINNESOTA: Half no.
MINNESOTA: One-half no.
TREVOR HAYES: Mississippi?
MISSISSIPPI: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Missouri?
MISSOURI: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Montana?
MONTANA: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Nebraska?
NEBRASKA: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Nevada?
NEVADA: No.

TREVOR HAYES: New Hampshire?

NEW HAMPSHIRE: No.

TREVOR HAYES: New Jersey?

NEW JERSEY: No.

TREVOR HAYES: New Mexico?

NEW MEXICO: No.

TREVOR HAYES: New York?

NEW YORK: One-half no.

NEW YORK: One-half no.

TREVOR HAYES: North Carolina?

NORTH CAROLINA: No.

TREVOR HAYES: North Dakota?

NORTH DAKOTA: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Ohio?

OHIO: One-half yes.

OHIO: One-half yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Oklahoma?

OKLAHOMA: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Oregon?

OREGON: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Pennsylvania?

PENNSYLVANIA: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Rhode Island?
RHODE ISLAND: No.

TREVOR HAYES: South Carolina?

SOUTH CAROLINA: No.

TREVOR HAYES: South Dakota not here.

Tennessee?

TENNESSEE: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Texas?

TEXAS: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Utah?

UTAH: One vote no.

TREVOR HAYES: Vermont?

VERMONT: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Virginia?

VIRGINIA: One-half no.

VIRGINIA: One-half no.

TREVOR HAYES: Washington state?

WASHINGTON: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: West Virginia?

WEST VIRGINIA: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Wisconsin?

WISCONSIN: One-half yes.

WISCONSIN: One-half yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Wyoming?

WYOMING: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: DC?

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Puerto Rico?

PUERTO RICO: No.

PARLIAMENTARIAN KRAKOWSKI: The vote was

33 no and 16 yes. So...

THE CHAIR: All right. Then with that,

the motion to accept the Council recommendation for

Issue 1-023 is defeated.

Okay. Then will you please give us the

report for Part 2 of Council I?

FRANK YIANNAS: Yes, Madam Chair. For

Part 2 of our report, there were 14 issues and

Council II recommended no action.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Does anyone wish to

extract an issue from Part 2 of Council I? Okay.

DAVE GIFFORD (WASHINGTON): Madam Chair?

THE CHAIR: Mr. Gifford.

DAVE GIFFORD (WASHINGTON): Clarification.

Did we defeat both 118 and 11 in the same action?

THE CHAIR: Because they were combined,

yes.

DAVE GIFFORD (WASHINGTON): Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Hearing then no requests for
extractions from Part 2 of the report for Council I,
I will now entertain a motion to accept Council I
report for Part 2.

FROM THE FLOOR: So move.

THE CHAIR: Is there a second?

FROM THE FLOOR: Second.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Is there discussion?

Then all those in favor of accepting the report of
Council I, Part 2, please state so by saying yes.

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Those opposed state so by
saying no.

Any abstentions? Okay. Then Part 2 of
the report for Council I is accepted. Thank you,
Frank.

Okay. Then, Vicki, if you would please
give us the report for Council II.

VICKI EVERLY: Thank you, Madam Chair. It
has been an honor and a privilege to have served as
Council II Chair during the past two years. I'd like
to extend a public note of thanks to your Council
Vice Chair, John Gurrisi, our Parliamentarians,
scribes, and of course our Council members. All did
their part in making our deliberations within
Council II a very positive experience.

In total, Council II deliberated 45 issues; 15 of those were accepted as submitted, 25 were accepted as amended. The issues submitted by the CFP constitution and bylaws committee are automatically extracted as they require a two-thirds vote, and as the Parliamentarian stated, he requested that I request a motion to consider Issues 2-001 through Issues 2-010 as a single motion.

SCOTT GILLIAM (INDIANA): Madam Chair --

THE CHAIR: Yes.

SCOTT GILLIAM (INDIANA): Scott Gilliam from Indiana. I request a motion to consider all the motions 1 through 10 as a group.

THE CHAIR: Is there a second?

LINDA WHALEY (WEST VIRGINIA): Second.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Any abstentions?

With that then when we come to the extractions we'll consider 2-01 through 2-010 collectively. Thank you.

Pardon me. Too much coffee this morning.

All those in favor of considering -- is there any discussion again? Then all those in favor of considering Issues 2-01 through 2-010 collectively when extracted state so by saying aye -- I'm sorry,
FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Those opposed indicate so by saying no. Any abstentions? Then when we come to the extractions we'll consider them for later. Thank you, Vicki.

All right. Then with that then I will now entertain a motion to accept the Council II report.

Are there any requests for extractions from Council II other than the 10 automatically extracted items?

RONALD KLEIN (ALASKA): Yes. 2-039.

PARLIAMENTARIAN GELFIUS: Mr. Klein, would you identify yourself, please.

RONALD KLEIN (ALASKA): Yes, Ron Klein, state of Alaska, request extraction of 2-039.

THE CHAIR: Are there other requests for extractions? Okay.

Point of order, I need to dispense with the 1 through 10 first, if that's okay with you.

Okay. Then I will now entertain a motion to accept the Council recommendation for Issues 2-01 through 2-010 collectively.

FROM THE FLOOR: So move.
THE CHAIR: Is there a second?

FROM THE FLOOR: Second.

THE CHAIR: Any discussion? All those then in favor of accepting the Council recommendation on Issues 01-010, please state so by saying yes.

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Those opposed indicate so by saying no. Any abstentions? Then the Council recommendation for Issues 010 through 010 -- 01 through 010 carries.

Okay. Yes, sir?

RONALD KLEIN (ALASKA): Ron Klein, state of Alaska --

PARLIAMENTARIAN KRAKOWSKI: Excuse me, Madam Chair. I think that what we need to do is we need to request a motion to bring it to the table.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Just one point of order, sir, then -- I will now entertain a motion to accept the Council recommendation on Issue 2-039.

PATRICK GUZZLE (IDAHO): So move.

THE CHAIR: Is there a second?

RONALD KLEIN (ALASKA): Second.

THE CHAIR: Is there any -- now, is there any discussion?
RONALD KLEIN (ALASKA): Thank you. Ron Klein, state of Alaska. Regulatory Program Standard No. 2 is a training standard. Issue 2-039 is a hiring standard. Hiring is a prerogative of state, local and federal authorities. The issue unequivocally states that a bachelor's degree shall be a prerequisite to starting a training and certification process which is embodied in the program Standard No. 2.

This interferes with the training process. For example, a jurisdiction that hires college interns would not be compliant with the standard if it elected to begin the training process prior to an individual receiving their degree.

Finally, unless a person is on a public state registry, it is questionable whether a state compliance with a proposed hiring standard could even be audited. State privacy laws require information used in the hiring process such as CRNTRP (phonetic) be held confidential. It very well may be illegal to release them to a third-party auditor to assess whether a person has the requisite semester quarter hours in science.

THE CHAIR: Is there further discussion?
PAUL PANICO (OHIO): Paul Panico, Ohio Department of Agriculture.

THE CHAIR: Chair recognizes Mr. Panico.

PAUL PANICO (OHIO): I recognize the importance of education, but I also need to incorporate the experience factor as well. I oppose this issue.

In Ohio in order to be a registered sanitarian you must have a degree. However, we do have grandfather registered sanitarians within the state of Ohio who do not have degrees. My concern with this issue is that it will limit our ability as managers to hire or utilize qualified and experienced staff who are registered sanitarians. Experienced sanitarians will not be able to switch a position within either an agency or between agencies without jeopardizing meeting the FDA standards.

An example which is an analogy to something we are currently experiencing within our state in our contract inspection program that we have with FDA, FDA has indicated to us that we must -- our staff doing contract inspections must meet their educational requirements.

I have 16 staff in the field, all of which
have done FDA inspections in the past. Not all of
them meet the FDA educational requirements; however,
they are registered sanitarians.

FDA has allowed me to utilize the staff
who are currently doing the FDA inspections; however,
those staff who used to do the inspections a couple
of years ago will not be permitted to do those
inspections because even though they are an RS within
Ohio, they don't have the educational background.
It's a limitation of my ability to utilize staff that
I currently have on board.

It will also jeopardize local Health
Department sanitarians who are grandfathered RS's to
move within their agency. If they are a generalist
in one agency and wish to go to another agency as a
food person, moving to that agency may jeopardize
that other agency's standards with FDA. So I
recommend that we oppose this issue. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

BECKY VIGUE (MAINE): Good morning, Madam
Chair. This is Becky Vigue from the state of Maine.

THE CHAIR: Chair recognizes Ms. Vigue.

BECKY VIGUE (MAINE): Thank you. Maine is
striving to build a quality food safety program
worthy of achieving compliance with the FDA voluntary national retail food regulatory program standards. After much consideration, I remain unconvinced that the four-year baccalaureate science degree at issue here must be the sole prerequisite to becoming a trained and certified inspection officer in a quality food safety program. The state of Maine's hiring practices recognize that other professional qualifications, including medical, military, legal and computer backgrounds, as well as comparable inspection investigative experience, can afford excellent professional foundational equivalence to the bachelor's of science degree. If a bachelor's of science becomes the sole prerequisite training standard, Maine will not only not achieve this standard, it will be less motivated to do so. Educational degrees are worthy goals, but should not be the sole prerequisite of competency training standards that excludes already competent professionals. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.


THE CHAIR: Chair recognizes the delegate
from Ohio.

PATRICK GUZZLE (IDAHO): Idaho.

THE CHAIR: Idaho.

PATRICK GUZZLE (IDAHO): Common mistake.

State Delegates, I have struggled with this issue for the past several hours. On one hand, I also recognize the value and significant importance that education and training play. On the other hand, I represent a state which was the first state to have all of its health jurisdictions enrolled in the program standards. We've been enrolled now for several years.

We are making significant strides in meeting those standards. In spite of the advancement we are making on the standards, there has been and continues to be somewhat of an opposition with some of our local health districts in relationship to how exactly a standard is to be met; however, with that opposition, or at least concerns that have been voiced, we are still making strides.

We recognize the program standards to be a measuring stick by which to account or by which to have a program of accountability for our own retail food program in Idaho. We are pleased with the
results we are seeing. We believe that we have a very high quality program. However, I do not believe that the standards should be the instrument to dictate to us as regulatory health professionals what our educational background must be.

And the way that it's worded, the food safety inspection officer shall have a bachelor's degree with 30 semester or 45 quarter hours, I think the intent is good, but the word "shall" presents a problem. I think that this will create opposition for other jurisdictions in trying to enroll in the standards. Having gone through several of the standards myself, I would hate to see that happen because the standards are an excellent tool to use to evaluate our programs. Because of that, state of Idaho recommends opposition on this issue.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

PRESCILLA NEVES (MASSACHUSETTS): Prescilla Neves, Massachusetts Department of Public Health.

THE CHAIR: Chair recognizes Ms. Neves.

PRESCILLA NEVES (MASSACHUSETTS): Thank you, Madam Chair. First and foremost, I'd like to my fellow delegates to say I consider this an honor to work with each and every one of you regardless of our
differences, and I respectfully request that you consider accepting Council II's wisdom, insight and decision to support a basic college level education requirement for food safety inspection officers. The Health inspector, the sanitarian, the food inspector, whatever you want to call us, is the person who is directly working in the field with industry every day. That is the face of our profession. And they are the ones who are ultimately going to determine the success of each inspection or investigation. They are going to determine the success of the jurisdiction's retail food inspection program and the ability of that program to respond to food emergencies, including outbreaks; and they are also going to determine the level of consumer confidence in our country's retail food industry.

The regulatory retail food safety inspection in the country right now is broken. The lack of knowledge and professionalism in retail food inspectors is one of our biggest complaints and jeopardizes the integrity of our system. It's painful to me when people in the profession are defined by the media and perceived by the public and some of our own colleagues in food safety as being
the equivalent to Larry the cable man health inspector. It is broken when we care more about the program and the process than we do for the individuals. It's unfair to let people assume that they can be true potters in food safety without a basic college level education that's going to provide them with a solid foundation to build their knowledge, their skills, their abilities relating to conducting food safety assessments and evaluating the complex food systems that are required to investigate foodborne illness, to communicate with industry, the consumers, the media, the public, the healthcare providers, and encouraging active managerial control and participating in the development of appropriate policy and regulations. This is an opportunity for us to take a leadership role, to challenge the process and send a message to the consumer, to our public health officials, to our politicians --

PARLIAMENTARIAN GELFIUS: Ms. Neves, it's with great pain that I must tell you you're out of time.

PRESCILLA NEVES (MASSACHUSETTS): Okay.
Then vote yes. Thank you.

(Applause.)

THE CHAIR: Do we still have time in the ten minutes remaining?

PARLIAMENTARIAN GELFIUS: Yes, we do.

THE CHAIR: Is there anyone else?

CHRIS GORDON (DC): Yes, Madam Chairperson. Chris Gordon with the District of Columbia would like to yield to the National Restaurant Association.

DONNA GARREN (NRA): Thank you. Donna Garren with National Restaurant Association. And I'm not sure I can really duplicate Prescilla's passionate plea to support this issue.

I do know that this has been an issue, an ongoing issue, for the conference for close to 12 years now. And as an association and those that are inspected by your professionals, we do support any effort by the regulatory community to improve and enhance their education level and professionalism. So thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

SANDRA CRAIG (SOUTH CAROLINA): Sandra Craig, South Carolina Department of Health and
Environmental Control. I will be brief.

I would just like to ask us to slow this process down. I am for education. I am for going for this goal. But we just got these wonderful Standard 2 training standards to work with. Can't we at least give it a couple of years to go? Let's run the pilot program that John was talking about yesterday. Let's let us use this training tool for a year or two. Then if we want to come back in 2008 and put this high bar up there, do it then. But South Carolina has not signed up for the standards yet, and this would discourage us from signing up for Standard 2.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

PARLIAMENTARIAN GELFIUS: Madam Chair, the time for this discussion has expired.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Our ten minutes has lapsed.

DAVE GIFFORD (WASHINGTON): Can we recommend an extension?

PARLIAMENTARIAN GELFIUS: You can make a motion for an extension.

DAVE GIFFORD (WASHINGTON): I make a motion for an extension.
FROM THE FLOOR: Second.

THE CHAIR: Is there any discussion on that motion? We will take a vote. All those in favor of extending the period of debate for another --

PARLIAMENTARIAN GELFIUS: Another ten minutes.

THE CHAIR: -- for another ten minutes, state so by saying yes.

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Those opposed say no.

FROM THE FLOOR: No.

THE CHAIR: Whoa.

PARLIAMENTARIAN GELFIUS: The yes's have it, I believe.

THE CHAIR: Okay. We'll extend the period of debate for another ten minutes beginning now, with the gentleman on my left.

DAVE REID (MINNESOTA): My name is David Reid with the Minnesota Department of Agriculture, and I would like to yield the floor to Larry Edwards.

THE CHAIR: Chair recognizes Mr. Edwards.

LARRY EDWARDS: Thank you very much, Madam Chair, and thank you to both the first and second.
I won't take long. But at FMI we recognize the hard work of the FDA and the accomplished food protection on this issue, and on these standards that have been placed. These are voluntary standards. We recognize that. We understand that a jurisdiction may or may not elect to enroll in the standards or may or may not elect to take on the standard until they are ready. But they are voluntary standards, and we believe that these are gold standards.

It reads in the resolution that this is for new food safety inspection officers, and so I think that's -- again, this is the gold standard. It is out there for all of us to reach to. And we in the retail food industry would like those people walking in the door to have that education. We can talk on the same level about the risk factors and many other things as previously stated.

These standards are not to be accomplished overnight, but much over time, and I think they are a very positive stroke coming out of this conference, and we support the education and the training and we support this issue. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.
JAMES BLOOM (ILLINOIS): Jim Bloom with the state of Illinois. I'll make it quick, I promise.

For several years Illinois has had a requirement for both registration and a requirement for a bachelor's degree. This year the legislators have allowed the registration act to be sunsetted so it will be eliminated. Now that they removed the registration, then they will eliminate the bachelor's degree requirement.

If we have the national standards as a requirement for a bachelor's degree, this will help provide the support that we need, and this will help sell this to the legislators as something that, again, I feel has been going on for quite a few years, and I know for the last two sessions with the conference this has come up. So I basically am just asking for people to vote yes on this.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. For the line on the left, I'd like to acknowledge the persons who have not spoken to the issue first before those who have already spoken to the issue.

COLLEEN PAULUS (MINNESOTA): Colleen Paulus, Department of Health in Minnesota. I would
like to correct the previous speakers' perception
that the issue does not grandfather in existing
employees. The issue does recognize existing
employees and does not have requirement for
bachelor's degree. So I just wanted to make sure
that people understood that there is a grandfathering
clause in the issue.

In addition, since we've been here
debating this issue at the conference, the news media
in Ohio recognizes the importance of having college
degrees, and they made this a noteworthy item during
their news telecast during this week saying that
there's been an increase in college graduates in the
state of Ohio. And I'm asking the delegates to also
recognize and support this issue saying that we also
want to recognize that we have a science-based code
that requires a science-based education; and to move
us forward into having educated employees --
providing the regulations throughout the states. And
I would ask that you do support these -- the
Council's decision. Thank you.

RONALD KLEIN (ALASKA): Ron Klein, state
of Alaska.

THE CHAIR: Chair recognize Mr. Klein.
RONALD KLEIN (ALASKA): Thank you. Just two additional points, new information. First, the proposed standard is flawed in that it does not recognize that an individual may have a bachelor's without the requisite science, and may have a master's degree with the requisite science, that this would not recognize the state's ability to hire that individual and still maintain the direction towards achieving the program standard.

Second, I think that that presents a problem for me as a regulatory manager given the succession management issues that I'm faced with with the impending retirement. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

PARLIAMENTARIAN GELFIUS: Ladies and gentlemen, including the delegates, when a speaker is at the microphone, I must insist that you please give them your attention.

PRESCILLA NEVES (MASSACHUSETTS):
Prescilla Neves, Massachusetts Department of Public Health.

THE CHAIR: Chair recognizes Ms. Neves again.

PRESCILLA NEVES (MASSACHUSETTS): Thank
you, Madam Chair. I'll try to be brief.

Maybe someday there will be a national professional credential that truly reflects the complexity of the service that we provide, but until then, incorporating an educational requirement into the voluntary standards, which is supposed to set that gold bar, is the right thing to do. I applaud Minnesota and the other states who are already doing this.

While I know that it may take some time before many others of us, including Massachusetts, my state, before we can do this, before we'll be able to meet the standards, there is -- I know that there are a number of you, there's a growing number of people in our profession who believe that, again, that this is the right thing to do, and to support if you care about the role of the local, state, county folks in food safety.

I ask you to support the fine work of Council II and their committees. I ask you to support the voluntary standards. I argue that I will go back if this goes forward and make sure that as many jurisdictions in Massachusetts sign up if you support this. Because, again, it is about education,
and I feel that again for those individuals we're
supporting the individuals who have a vital role and
responsibility in our country's food safety system.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Does anyone else
wish to speak to this issue? Then if there is no
objection from the body on this particular issue, I'm
going to ask for a roll call vote on the front end of
this issue. Thank you.

TREVOR HAYES: As I read the name of your
state, please indicate yes or no.

Alabama?

ALABAMA: Yes.

PARLIAMENTARIAN GELFIUS: I'm sorry.

Could he we repeat Alabama's vote?

TREVOR HAYES: Yes.

Alaska?

ALASKA: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Arizona?

ARIZONA: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Arkansas?

ARKANSAS: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: California?

CALIFORNIA: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Colorado?
COLORADO: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Connecticut?
CONNECTICUT: Point of information. We're voting on withdrawing the recommendation of Council II?
PARLIAMENTARIAN KRAKOWSKI: No, you are voting on accepting the recommendation of Council II. That's the vote before you.
CONNECTICUT: One-half yes.
CONNECTICUT: One-half yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Delaware?
DELAWARE: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Florida?
FLORIDA: Florida Ag, one-third no.
FLORIDA: Florida Health, one-third yes.
FLORIDA: Florida Professional Regulation, one-third no.
TREVOR HAYES: Georgia?
GEORGIA: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Hawaii?
HAWAII: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Idaho?
IDAHO: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Illinois?

ILLINOIS: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Indiana?

INDIANA: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Iowa?

IOWA: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Kansas?

KANSAS: One-half yes.

KANSAS: One-half yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Kentucky?

KENTUCKY: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Maine?

MAINE: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Maryland?

MARYLAND: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Massachusetts?

MASSACHUSETTS: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Really? Michigan?

MICHIGAN: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Minnesota?

MINNESOTA: Half yes.

MINNESOTA: Half yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Mississippi?

MISSISSIPPI: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Missouri?
MISSOURI: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Montana?
MONTANA: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Nebraska?
NEBRASKA: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Nevada?
NEVADA: No.
TREVOR HAYES: New Hampshire?
NEW HAMPSHIRE: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: New Jersey?
NEW JERSEY: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: New Mexico?
NEW MEXICO: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: New York?
NEW YORK: One-half yes.
TREVOR HAYES: North Carolina?
NORTH CAROLINA: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: North Dakota?
NORTH DAKOTA: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Ohio?
OHIO: One-half no.
TREVOR HAYES: Oklahoma?

OKLAHOMA: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Oregon?

OREGON: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Pennsylvania?

PENNSYLVANIA: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Rhode Island?

RHODE ISLAND: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: South Carolina?

SOUTH CAROLINA: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Tennessee?

TENNESSEE: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Texas?

TEXAS: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Utah?

UTAH: One full vote yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Vermont?

VERMONT: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Virginia?

VIRGINIA: One-half yes.

VIRGINIA: One-half yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Washington state?

WASHINGTON: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: West Virginia?
WEST VIRGINIA: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Wisconsin?

WISCONSIN: One-half no.

WISCONSIN: One-half yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Wyoming?

WYOMING: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: DC?

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Puerto Rico?

PUERTO RICO: Yes.

THE CHAIR: The motion to accept the Council recommendation on Issue 2-039 carries.

(Applause.)

However, in my haste to dispense with that business, I neglected to get your official inclination on the remaining issues in the report of Part 1 from Council II. Therefore, I will go back and document your official vote on that. I'll now entertain a motion to accept the Council II report minus that single extracted issue.

DAVID LUDWIG (ARIZONA): So move.

THE CHAIR: Is there a second?

MARY GLASSBURNER (KANSAS): Second.

THE CHAIR: Is there any discussion? Then
all those in favor of accepting the report of Part 1
of Council II's report minus the extracted issue,
please indicate so by saying yes.

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Those opposed indicate so by
saying no.

Any abstentions? Then the motion carries
and the report Part 1 from Council II is accepted.

Vicki, can you please give us your report
for Part 2?

VICKI EVERLY: Yes. Part 2, Council II
recommended no action on all five issues. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Does anyone wish to extract an
issue from Part 2 of Council II? Okay. Hearing
none, I now entertain a motion to accept the Council
report for Part 2.

DAVID LUDWIG (ARIZONA): Madam Chair, I so
move.

THE CHAIR: Is there a second?

JAMES BLOOM (ILLINOIS): Second.

THE CHAIR: Is there discussion? Then all
those in favor of accepting the report of Council II
for Part 2, please indicate so by saying yes.

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.
THE CHAIR: All those opposed, please indicate by saying no.

Any abstentions? Thank you, Vicki.

Okay. Larry, can you please give us your report.

LARRY KOHL: Thank you, Madam Chair.

First I'd like to begin with a thank-you for the opportunity to serve the Council for Food Protection as the Council III Chair. On behalf of Dave Ludwig and our regulatory industry academia and consumer members, we are pleased to offer our Council III report.

Part 1, we have 14 issues that were accepted as submitted or accepted as amended in the report. And the report is contained in the yellow issues recommendations.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Larry.

Does anyone wish to extract an issue from Part 1 of the report?

TED EVANS (OKLAHOMA): Ted Evans from Oklahoma.

THE CHAIR: Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

TED EVANS (OKLAHOMA): I'd like to extract
3-019.

THE CHAIR: Does anyone wish to extract another issue?

Okay. Hearing none, I will now entertain a motion to accept the Council report minus the extracted issue.

DAVID LUDWIG (ARIZONA): Madam Chair, I so move. David Ludwig, state of Arizona.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Ludwig. Is there a second?

PAUL PANICO (OHIO): Second.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Any discussion?

Then all those in favor of accepting the report of Council III, Part 1, minus the one extracted issue, please indicate so by saying yes.

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Those opposed, please indicate so by saying no. Any abstentions? Then the motion carries to accept the report minus the one extracted issues.

I will now then entertain a motion to accept the Council recommendation for Issue 3-019.

PARLIAMENTARIAN KRAKOWSKI: Someone needs to make that motion.
ADAM INMAN (KANSAS): So move, Kansas Department of Agriculture.

THE CHAIR: Is there a second?

PAUL PANICO (OHIO): Second, Ohio Department of Agriculture.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Now, is there any discussion?

TED EVANS (OKLAHOMA): Ted Evans from Oklahoma. I'd like to recognize or yield the floor to FDA to speak on this issue.

DAVID ATCHISON (FDA): David Atchison (phonetic), FDA.

THE CHAIR: Chair recognizes Mr. Atchison.

DAVID ATCHISON (FDA): Thank you very much.

The FDA appreciated this issue being brought to the fore, and what we heard were a couple of important points. The first was related to improved interpretation of certain aspects of the food code regarding hand washing. This spoke to both a need for better interpretation and better implementation with regard to hand washing specifically.

The second point that we heard which we
thought was of value was an increased focus on the 
need for changing human behavior in relation to hand 
washing. Our concern about the proposal as -- the 
solution as we have it is that neither of those two 
goals would be met, and that the results of the 
deliberations of this committee will be somewhat 
unfocused. I'm further concerned that they may delve 
into the science behind hand washing, per se, rather 
than focusing on the two primary issues that we think 
are important; interpretation of the code and 
changing behavior. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Does anyone else 
wish to speak to this issue?

Hearing none, we will now vote on the 
issue. All those in favor of accepting the Council 
recommendation on Issue 3-019, please indicate so by 
saying yes.

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

THE CHAIR: All of those opposed, indicate 
so by saying no.

FROM THE FLOOR: No.

THE CHAIR: Okay. I think that calls for 
another roll call.

FROM THE FLOOR: I make a motion we do a
TREVOR HAYES: We can do that?

PARLIAMENTARIAN KRAKOWSKI: Well, we could -- we can certainly do that if that is the will of the body. The only challenge, my friends from Florida, and the like minded families that have split votes, so if the -- if there can be an agreement, we can do a hand vote if there's an agreement that people who have split votes will wait -- will vote in a separate section. We'll do full votes first, then we'll do half votes, and we'll do third votes, if necessary.

PARLIAMENTARIAN GELFIUS: Just do roll call.

FROM THE FLOOR: Roll call.

FROM THE FLOOR: Never mind.

THE CHAIR: Trevor, you have the floor.

TREVOR HAYES: Okay. Roll call vote.

Alabama?

ALABAMA: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Alaska?

ALASKA: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Arizona?

ARIZONA: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Arkansas?

ARKANSAS: No.

TREVOR HAYES: California?

CALIFORNIA: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Colorado?

COLORADO: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Connecticut?

CONNECTICUT: Half yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Delaware?

DELAWARE: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Florida?

FLORIDA: Three-thirds yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Georgia?

GEORGIA: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Hawaii?

HAWAII: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Idaho?

IDAHO: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Illinois?

ILLINOIS: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Indiana?

INDIANA: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Iowa?
IOWA: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Kansas?

KANSAS: One-half no.

KANSAS: One-half no.

TREVOR HAYES: Kentucky?

KENTUCKY: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Louisiana?

FROM THE FLOOR: Not here.

TREVOR HAYES: Not here. Sorry.

Maine?

MAINE: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Maryland?

MARYLAND: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Massachusetts?

MASSACHUSETTS: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Michigan?

MICHIGAN: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Minnesota?

MINNESOTA: Half no.

MINNESOTA: Half no.

TREVOR HAYES: Mississippi?

MISSISSIPPI: Yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Missouri?

MISSOURI: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Montana?
MONTANA: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Nebraska?
NEBRASKA: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Nevada?
NEVADA: No.
TREVOR HAYES: New Hampshire?
NEW HAMPSHIRE: No.
TREVOR HAYES: New Jersey?
NEW JERSEY: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: New Mexico?
NEW MEXICO: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: New York?
NEW YORK: One-half yes.
NEW YORK: One-half yes.
TREVOR HAYES: North Carolina?
NORTH CAROLINA: No.
TREVOR HAYES: North Dakota?
NORTH DAKOTA: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Ohio?
OHIO: One-half yes.
OHIO: One-half yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Oklahoma?
OKLAHOMA: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Oregon?
OREGON: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Pennsylvania?
Pennsylvania: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: Rhode Island?
Rhode Island: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: South Carolina?
South Carolina: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Tennessee?
Tennessee: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Texas?
Texas: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Utah?
Utah: One vote no.
TREVOR HAYES: Vermont?
Vermont: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Virginia?
Virginia: One-half no.
Virginia: One-half no.
TREVOR HAYES: Washington state?
Washington: Yes.
TREVOR HAYES: West Virginia?
West Virginia: No.
TREVOR HAYES: Wisconsin?
WISCONSIN: One-half yes.

WISCONSIN: One-half yes.

TREVOR HAYES: Wyoming?

WYOMING: No.

TREVOR HAYES: DC?

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: No.

TREVOR HAYES: Puerto Rico?

PUERTO RICO: No.

THE CHAIR: Then the motion to accept the Council recommendation on Issue 2-019 (sic) is defeated. 3-019 is defeated. Sorry.

Larry, give us the report on Part 2.

LARRY KOHL: Thank you. Part 2, we had ten issues that were categorized as a no action by the Council.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Does anyone wish to extract any issues from Part 2 of Council III's report?

SHERI DOVE (PENNSYLVANIA): Sheri Dove with the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture. I'd like to extract 3-14.

THE CHAIR: Does anyone wish to extract another issue?

Then hearing none, I will entertain a
motion to accept Part 2 of Council III's report minus the one extracted issue.


THE CHAIR: Is there a second.

SCOTT GILLIAM (INDIANA): Second.

THE CHAIR: Is there any discussion? Then all those in favor of accepting Part 2 of Council III's report, minus the one extracted issue, please indicate so by saying yes.

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Those opposed, indicate so by saying no. Any abstentions? Then Part 2 of Council III's report is accepted minus the extracted issue.

I will now entertain a motion to accept the Council recommendation for Issue 3-014.

SANDRA CRAIG (SOUTH CAROLINA): Sandra Craig, South Carolina, so move.

THE CHAIR: Is there a second?

JAMES BLOOM (ILLINOIS): Second.

THE CHAIR: Is there any discussion?

SHERI DOVE (PENNSYLVANIA): Sheri Dove, Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture.
THE CHAIR: Chair recognizes you.

SHERI DOVE (PENNSYLVANIA): This issue was basically brought before the Council because there is a disconnect in the food code as it relates to reduced oxygen packaged fish. That section of the code requires that fish be kept frozen before, during and after packaging. That does not allow within the food code for an appropriate thawing method.

Council's reason was that there is a thawing method in the code, but part of the problem is you cannot -- if you reduce oxygen packaged fish and it must be kept frozen, you cannot thaw it under refrigeration currently.

The whole issue just at this point needs addressed by FDA, and at this point I'd like to recognize FDA if they would like to speak to the issue.

SHIRLEY BOHM (FDA): Shirley Bohm, FDA.

THE CHAIR: Chair recognizes Ms. Bohm.

SHIRLEY BOHM (FDA): Thank you. I think there may have been some misunderstanding of the issue itself during the discussion. There -- I agree -- we agree that there is perhaps a gap in the -- in the food code, because it -- while it does
address thawing, proper thawing of foods, it does not address thawing of reduced oxygen packaged foods or, for example, frozen fish.

Whether it's done at the commercial level or whether it's done at the retail level, there is a concern of a long period of thawing at refrigerated temperatures of 41, because non-proteolytic C bot, which is a common contaminant of seafood, does germinate and could potentially produce toxin at appropriate refrigerated temperatures in an anaerobic package; for example, the vacuum packaged fish.

So we agree that there is a need to address thawing of vacuum packaged products, whether they are done at the commercial level or at the retail level, and that should be -- should be fixed. So we would ask that you -- let's see. How does this go now? That you vote no on no action; is that correct?

FROM THE FLOOR: Correct.

SHIRLEY BOHM (FDA): So that it would be referred to the board and that we could address that.

LINDA WHALEY (WEST VIRGINIA): Madam Chair, Linda Whaley, West Virginia.

THE CHAIR: Chair recognizes the delegate
from West Virginia.

LINDA WHALEY (WEST VIRGINIA): Madam, I would like to relinquish my time at the podium to Mr. Gale Prince from the Food Marketing Institute.

GALE PRINCE (FMI): Gale Prince with the Kroger Company, also a member of the Food Marketing Institute.

THE CHAIR: Chair recognizes Mr. Prince.

GALE PRINCE (FMI): Madam Chairman and Delegates, there was considerable discussion. I should also mention that I'm a member of Council III, and I went through the long discussion on this particular issue. And we believe that the science on the thawing of this particular product does not require that the package actually be broken as was indicated in the issue that was submitted. And on top of that, we were concerned in breaking that particular seal if we would add further contamination to the particular product that was maybe greater than what we started out with.

In the thawing in the package, the spoilage organisms that are present would cause an odor so that the spoilage would certainly be evident long before the toxin was produced in the product.
from that standpoint. Therefore, I would suggest
that you think about the science and consider the way
that it was handled in Council III as a no action
item.

THE CHAIR: Does anyone else wish to speak
to this issue? Then hearing no one else, we will now
vote on the issue. All those in favor of accepting
the Council recommendation on Issue 3-014, please
indicate so by saying yes.

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Those opposed indicate so by
saying no.

FROM THE FLOOR: No.

THE CHAIR: Then the motion to accept the
Council recommendation on Issue 3-014 is defeated.

Okay. I think that's it. I'd like to
thank you again for all of your hard work. Give
yourselves a big hand. This was a laborious task.

(Applause.)

And I'd like to personally commend you
with the efficiency that you managed the delegation
or deliberation of all the issues in this conference.

With that I will now turn the podium over
to Ms. Elizabeth Nutt, chair of the resolutions
committee, to come forward and give us her report.

ELIZABETH NUTT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Yes, my name is Elizabeth Nutt, and for those of you who are old enough to remember the Almond Joy/Mounds commercials, yes, I always feel like one.

I would first like to recognize my committee, Cory Hedman, Sandra Landcaster and Lorna Girard. They were very easy to work with. They pretty much did everything I asked them to do.

I'll make these brief because I know people have plane reservations, et cetera, that they are trying to make. So the first resolution of appreciation that the conference would like to present is recognition of the Hyatt on Capitol Square. This has been one of the nicest hotels I have stayed at. I enjoyed the lighting feature in your room where the lights just gradually got bright. I thought that was very nice. And I thought that the nice lady in the elevator had a very nice, pleasant voice.

I did have one complaint, however, or concern. I guess it's probably just me. I'm a little bit directionally challenged. And I never
could get my bearings on where the conference rooms were; if it was on the second floor, legislative, executive -- I was in Council II, I never could find my Council room. And finally Ben Gale referenced the room; he said, "Don't you remember, that's the room that the Saturday reception the bar was in." And after that, I could find my way.

So the conference would like to recognize and thank staff of the Hyatt hotel, Mr. Dirk Bengel, Troy Hammond, Suzanne Render, Chef David Wolf, Anthie Constantinidis. It's hard for an Okie. And Matthew Auferderheide.

PARLIAMENTARIAN GELFIUS: Leave it alone.

ELIZABETH NUTT: Yeah, really. If you want the spelling of these, I can give those to you.

They went beyond the call of duty. The Hyatt was superbly located and provided a stately environment which was extremely conducive to our workings. I think we can all recognize that. A copy of this resolution will be given to these individuals and also be posted in the proceedings of the biennial conference.

Our second resolution is in recognition of our wonderful sponsors who made this conference very,
very successful. As you may recall, we did add a 
third, an additional level to the sponsorship. At 
the first level, the titanium level, we had 
contributors from Ahold USA, Albertsons, Bob Evans 
Farms, Chemstar, CK and E Restaurants, Ecolab, Food 
Marketing Institute, Johnson Diversey, the Kroger 
Company, National Registry of Food Safety 
Professionals, the National Restaurant Association, 
the Ohio Department of Health, Wendy's International, 
and Yum! Brands, Incorporated. And if there's 
individuals from these groups, would you please stand 
up and be recognized.

(Applause.)

The gold level contributors were Darden 
Restaurants, Inc., Publix Supermarkets and 
Underwriters Laboratories, Inc. If there are 
individuals from these organizations, please stand 
and be recognized.

(Applause.)

At the silver level we had the Coca-Cola 
Company and Wegman's. Are there any members?

(Applause.)

At the bronze level we had Burger King 
Corporation. I know there's somebody. Yes.
At the copper level we had contributors from Big Y Foods, Inc., Food Lion, LLC, Food Products Association, Hannaford Brothers Company, Jack In The Box, Inc., and the National Automatic Merchandising Association. Are any individuals here?

With these contributions and support, this allowed the conference to carry out their mission from food -- to bring together food representatives in the food industry; regulatory, academia and government, so we appreciate their contributions, and this resolution will also be published in the proceedings.

The next resolution is in acknowledgment to the National Alliance for Food Safety and Security. This organization, with the help of Mr. Richard Linton, gave a generous contribution to our workshop. This workshop was the most highly attended workshop in our history with 55 percent of our attendees attending. It was excellently coordinated by Mr. Linton and Mr. Eils. And it allowed for the conference to bring in some very talented speakers which provided excellent expertise
in the area of controlling and educating on Listeria monocytogenes. So we would like to thank them as well for their excellent contributing to further our mission of food safety.

(Applause.)

The conference would also like to acknowledge the following individuals of whom I'm sure you will recognize, and I believe many of them have become our friends. These people you will recognize immediately. And these are the members of the -- I'll probably get all emotional. They have been so good. The local arrangements committee: Mr. Bob Kramer, Gina Nicholson of the Columbus Health Department, Ms. Barbara Hunt of Wendy's International and Jim Ward of the Kroger Company. I have lots of words on this paper describing their excellent creativity, their enthusiasm, their spiritedness, but I think you all can show them better than I

(Applause.)

Just maybe a slight correction. I hope I did not skip over in the sponsors resolution Underwriters Laboratory, Inc., at the gold level.

And also the hotel staff is now here, if we would please let them see our sincere appreciation for
their...

(Applause.)

Our next acknowledgment is for an individual who you may not recognize his name, but his contribution to the conference will change our workings forever. This gentleman is Mr. Kevin Hamstra. Mr. Hamstra is a computer specialist with the Purdue University. And through his extensive personal time and outstanding service, he coordinated, programmed the electronic inspection issue submission process on our website. And for that we are very grateful.

Mr. Hamstra was very easy to work with, very patient, and it has enhanced the proceedings tremendously in our issue submission process, so we would like to recognize Mr. Hamstra.

(Applause.)

And you've heard the saying that behind every man there is a good woman. This next individual was also very instrumental in promoting the electronic submission process, and that is Ms. Marsha Robbins. Many of you recognize Ms. Marsha.

(Applause.)
Marsha has shown an extreme dedication in contribution to this conference. She has been involved at least with the issues committee since 1992. She has presided over the food code workshop in '96 and the HACCP workshop in 1998. She has shown much, much dedication and much, much patience to our issue submitters, and we would like to thank her for her outstanding time and effort. Thank you, Marsha.

(Applause.)

I did look up in the dictionary for this next individual, I looked up the definition of the word "gentleman." And it said things like man of respectable character, distinguished and mannerly. But what it should have said was Charles Otto.

(Applause.)

Mr. Otto, we recognized Charles at the beginning of the conference, but we would like to make it more formal with our resolution thanking him for his personal initiative, his professionalism, his organizational skills and hard work. He is enhancing our website and again bringing the conference into the 21st century. And thank you so much, Charles.

(Applause.)

This next resolution is a resolution
acknowledging the tremendous work for our illustrious Vice Chair, Mr. Cory Hedman. Cory has given us a lot of insight, hard work for the past two years as vice chair, keeping Janice in line.

THE CHAIR: Always a task.

ELIZABETH NUTT: We would like to thank him again for all of his hard work and distinguished service as Vice Chair. Thank you, Cory.

(Applause.)

And, of course, last, but not least, we would like to recognize Ms. Janice Buchanon for her distinguished service as our Vice Chair -- excuse me, as our Conference Chair. Bumping you.

THE CHAIR: At this point I'm so tired...

ELIZABETH NUTT: I have enjoyed every minute of working with, Ms. Janet. She is very professional. She has such grace and eloquence. I think that the conference again has -- has advanced tremendously under her leadership and guidance.

And we also have a plaque for you, Ms. Janice. If you'd stand up. I'll read this to you. It's very pretty. There's no battery in it.

Chair, for her valuable contribution of time and her
skillful, balanced and gracious leadership in
promoting, collaborating and advancing the conference
mission."

Thank you so much, Janice.

(Applause.)

THE CHAIR: I'll try to get through the
rest of this without crying.

Thank you, Elizabeth. Thank you for those
kind words especially.

I'd like to ask all those in favor of
approving the resolutions, now that I can have you
say aye again, please indicate so by saying aye.

FROM THE FLOOR: Aye.

THE CHAIR: Any opposed? Then thank you,
Elizabeth.

Then at this point I need a formal motion
from someone to authorize our executive director and
the executive board to make any editorial changes
that might be needed to the issues or resolutions
prior to their publication.

WAYNE DERSTINE (FLORIDA): So move.

THE CHAIR: Is there a second?

MARY GLASSBURNER (KANSAS): Second.
THE CHAIR: Then all those in favor of this authorization, please indicate so by saying aye.

FROM THE FLOOR: Aye.

THE CHAIR: Any opposed? Motion carries.

Thank you.

Before I adjourn, I would like to announce that a new conference chair and vice chair have been selected, thankfully. Elizabeth Nutt from Tulsa City, Oklahoma, is our new Conference Chair; and Larry Kohl with Walt Disney World Company is our Vice Chair. Would both of you please stand.

(Applause.)

Congratulations to both of you, and thank you for assuming this responsibility.

And I've been asked to make an announcement to the body before we completely adjourn, that if you'd like to participate in the pilot project included in Issue 2-036 which was accepted, please give your business card to Mr. John Marcello. John, are you in the room someplace?

Okay. Would you please find John before you leave the hotel or this room and give him your business card if you're interested in participating in the pilot project.
I have to say that I really need to thank everyone for making this one of the most rewarding experiences of my lifetime. I have ranked this experience in the top five best experiences of my professional career, and actually for me personally as an individual. It has really been a privilege and an honor to serve you as your Chair for the last two years. But I have to tell you, without a doubt, the person sitting over here to my right has really been the individual that has held up my wings constantly. And I need to thank you, Trevor, one more time publicly for being so efficient -- I don't know which of us is going to cry more now -- for being so efficient, so thorough and always on top of things; and making this a true joy for me to do this. Thank you, Trevor.

(Applause.)

Because Elizabeth has already told you, behind every good man there's a woman somewhere, Linda, can you please stand up.

(Applause.)

That likewise, Linda is one of the most detailed individuals I have ever met anywhere, professionally, personally, otherwise, in my entire
life. You have no comprehension of the degree of insight and detail she puts in a daily basis into ensuring that we have a comfortable and successful conference every two years. Linda, thank you again. (Applause.)

Okay. Unless there is further business, I will entertain a motion to adjourn this meeting.

WAYNE DERSTINE (FLORIDA): So move.

PADRAIC JUAREZ (FLORIDA): Seconded.

THE CHAIR: Is there any discussion? Then all those in favor of adjourning the 2006 Conference for Food Protection session of the voting delegates, please indicate so by saying aye.

FROM THE FLOOR: Aye.

THE CHAIR: Any opposed? We stand adjourned. Thank you again.

---

And, thereupon, the Conference was adjourned at 10:17 a.m.

---
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