

Whey Review Committee
March 27, 2008

Whey Review Committee Meeting Notes

March 27, 2008
Sacramento, California

MEMBERS PRESENT

Andrew Branagh
Scott Hofferber
Scott Magneson
Tony Mendes
Joe Paris
Bill Schiek
Ray Souza
Sue Taylor
Sietse (Sean) Tollenaar
William C. Van Dam
Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel
Tom Wegner
John Jeter
Dr. Jim Morgan – Facilitator

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT

Mike McCully

DEPARTMENTAL STAFF PRESENT

George Gomes
Kelly Krug
John Lee
Dave Ikari
Jeff Cesca
Hyrum Eastman
Candace Gates
Annie Pelletier

PUBLIC GUESTS IN ATTENDANCE

Bill Hoekstra
Jim Gruebele
Frances Pacheco
Tiffany La Mendola
Ben Yale
George Simoes
Jacob Schuelke
Ana Dyrland
Dominic Carinalli

Opening Remarks / Introductions

Undersecretary George Gomes began the meeting at 9:30 a.m. by welcoming the Whey Review Committee (WRC) members. He looked forward that their recommendation to the Secretary has a long term perspective. He mentioned that the past three months has been an education to CDFA staff and would help with future decisions made by staff.

He asked that all persons in the room introduce themselves. George then introduced Dr. Jim Morgan.

Mr. Morgan reviewed the agenda for the day, as well as the charter of the group. He provided an explanation to the mathematical calculations for alternatives 10 and 12. He mentioned one person changed their vote to "yes" for alternative #4.

Alternative 4 Discussion

Alternative #4 will be submitted as a recommendation for further examination. The members discussed and presented additional information related to this alternative. Jim Morgan captured this information.

Evaluation Criteria of Alternatives (excluding #4)

Jim Morgan asked each member to identify what their top three evaluation criteria were when each member ranked the alternatives (excluding #4). Mr. Morgan then documented each member's top choice (evaluation criteria); other evaluation criteria were added as well.

Alternatives (additional pros/cons)

Additional pros/cons were provided by members to the various alternatives.

Review of Top 3 alternatives

Alternatives 1, 5, and 8 received the most positive response and votes by the members based upon the homework for today's meeting. A review of these alternatives took place.

Public Comment/Lunch

Two public comments were received and the Committee was released for lunch at 12:05 pm and asked to return in one-half hour.

Review of Top 3 alternatives (continued)

Discussion continued on the top 3 alternatives.

Mr. Morgan then asked for all WRC members to re-rank all of the alternatives (excluding #4), however part of the ranking process included whether alternative #4 should be submitted as a separate recommendation. A sheet was handed out to help with the ranking process.

Whey Review Committee
March 27, 2008

The top three alternatives were still 1, 5, and 8, and it was agreed by ten of the thirteen WRC members present that alternative #4 should be submitted as a separate recommendation.

Discussion ensued to see if some type of agreement, consensus and narrowing of the alternatives could be reached related to the top three alternatives. During the discussion, it was noted that alternatives 1, 5, and 8, could be changed via the hearing process; alternative #4 would require legislation. Various changes and modifications were made to some alternatives to see if agreement could be reached. Agreement and consensus could not be achieved.

Two public comments were received. It was determined another meeting would be in order.

Next Meeting Date

Thursday, July 17th was identified as the next meeting date. The location will be determined; time for the meeting will be 9:30 am – 2:30 pm.

The WRC was asked to absorb the top three alternatives over the next few months and to share them with each member's constituency. The goal for the July meeting will be to narrow down the alternatives and to decide which will be the recommendation to the Secretary.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm.

Submitted By:

Jeff Cesca, Special Assistant
CDFA – Marketing Services

Date