Suggestion Number	Suggestion	Response	Suggestion commenter
1	We should not exclude the AgWG voting members from voting roles on the AMT. This is due to a desire to get the right people with relevant background information involved.	We will allow anyone to be on the AMT regardless of commitments to other groups provided they have no conflicts of interest	WVA, DE, MD, NY, PA
2	We should soften the language to allow a larger pool of at large members.	Language has been softened to allow at large bids to be anyone with the in-depth knowledge necessary to provide input. This includes bringing in non-voting technical experts for specific topics.	US Poultry Industry Rep, NY, WVA
3	Explicitly state non-voting member roles in the charge.	We previously had several of these listed but have expanded language to list additional non-voting roles more comprehensively.	CBPO
4	We should ensure that is clear that people with historically relevant knowledge be included in the AMT.	We have added wording that state non-voting expertise will exist.	NY
5	States should be able to nominate signatory and alternate members.	This was written in before, but more explicit language was added to clarify this process.	NY, MD, PA, DE, WVA