

		Colorado	Illinois	Maryland	Nebraska	North Carolina	South Carolina
1	Does your jurisdiction inspect devices for accuracy in TW determination?	NTEP meters have not been inspected for TW but will begin testing this year.	Yes - One quart sample of SRWW stored at room temperature is used to check TW. If a meter is capable of TW and the word approximate is removed we test it.	Yes - we inspect/test devices for accuracy in TW determination if the feature is activated and they use TW as a dockage determination.	No - The PSC does not currently inspect devices for accuracy in TW determination.	Yes.	We test the accuracy of the test weight feature on meters that have that ability built in and the accuracy of separate pound per bushel scales to insure they are accurate.
	How is that working out?	-	Compared to last year, this year many of the Steinlite SL 95 meters failed TW.	So far it is working out fine.	We have been unable to collect samples that will test within the tolerances. In discussions, Gary Green had with KC personnel, he was told to use below standard TW grain and we have not been able to obtain any quantity of low TW grain.	Initial rejection rate for TW was 47.57%. We are now in our fourth year of testing and we are seeing a decline in rejected meters for TW indications. The 2006 inspection year yielded a rejection rate of 12.27%, while tests thus far in 2007 show a rejection rate of 2.83%.	
	Are the test procedures and tolerances appropriate?	?	The procedures and tolerances for HB 44 seem to be adequate for us.	The test procedures and tolerances are ok.	?	Yes, for field inspection. It would be helpful if there were procedures for the lab preparation of field test samples, however.	We have no problems with the procedures or tolerances.

		Colorado	Illinois	Maryland	Nebraska	North Carolina	South Carolina
2	Has your jurisdiction performed inspections of grain analyzers for protein content of grain?	Wheat and barley protein were checked during a survey test of 32 CO NIR grain analyzers in the late 1990s – failure rate of 29%, no testing has been conducted since.	We do not test for protein content.	No.	We have not, nor do we have any plans at this time to conduct inspections on the protein content of grain.	No.	We do not test grain analyzers for protein content.
	How has that worked out?	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	If you have not done these inspections, is there a reason why?	The CO measurement Standards Act provides for licensing GMMs but not NIR; limited resources, we have not yet contacted industry partners for input.	As far as I know, there are only two locations in the state that check protein but they are only doing it as a reference.	Our jurisdiction does not have any Grain Analyzers for protein content that we know of.	-	No commercial field meters performing protein tests.	To my knowledge, I do not know of any being used in this state.
	Are there still hurdles to clear in Handbook 44?	HB 44 states that constituent values be assigned by GIPSA– We suspect that purchasing enough samples from GIPSA to test all the commercial devices in CO would be cost prohibitive.	-	-	-	-	-

		Colorado	Illinois	Maryland	Nebraska	North Carolina	South Carolina
4	How are you getting along with the tolerances and test procedures for grain moisture?	<p>No problems with the tolerances and test procedures.</p> <p>Inspection failure rate over past 5 years has averaged 5%.</p>	<p>The procedures and tolerances of HB 44 seem to be adequate for us.</p> <p>2007 inspection failure rate was 5.89%.</p>	<p>We are seeing less and less problems with grain moisture. It seems that the NTEP devices are getting closer to the oven each year that we do the testing. There are still some concerns about High Corn but it is hard to determine if the problem is the meter or the sample. No problems with tolerance or test procedure.</p>	<p>The tolerances and test procedures for grain moisture are working quite well. We use the FGIS standard moisture meter as our standard meter in our side by side meter tests for moisture content. The only problem, we currently have are the calibrations currently in use for the Motomco 919, 919E, 919ES and the new Seedburo 1200A. We have rejected a large percentage of the Motomco meters and have been unable, on a consistent basis, to approve the new 1200A. There are currently only two 1200As in use in Nebraska and I am concerned about the retesting on those.</p>	<p>I think they are adequate at this time.</p>	<p>We have no problems with the current tolerances and test procedures for grain moisture meters.</p> <p>HOWEVER, in using the air oven method to determine the moisture content for corn samples, we still occasionally end up with a results that some meters read well and other makes do not. It might be good if a round robin was done with some grain samples to see if different labs get the same results with their air oven tests.</p>
*	<i>Other Information</i>	225 GMMs 55% are NTEP	1,460 GMMS 58.9% are NTEP				