

1 THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
2 Grain Inspection Advisory Committee Meeting

3  
4 Moderated by: Barbara Grove

5 DATE: October 30, 2024

6 TIME: 8:30AM CST

7  
8 LOCATION: AMS National Grain Center

9 10383 North Ambassador Drive

10 Kansas City, Missouri 64153

11  
12  
13 REPORTED BY: Devin L. Richmond, Notary Public, and RON

14  
15 JOB No.:1030

16  
17 DAY 2

## A P P E A R A N C E S

1  
2 **Barbara Grove**, Chairperson, Central Valley Ag

3 **Arthur Neal**, Deputy Administrator, Federal Grain  
4 Inspection Service

5 **Dr. Carlos Campabadal**, Kansas State University under  
6 the International Grains Program Institute

7 **Rashad Hart**, General Superintendent of Plant  
8 Operations, Cargill, Inc.,

9 **John Morgan**, Vice President, JD Heiskell &  
10 Company

11 **Charles Parr**, Acting Director, Field Management

12 **Dr. Ed Jhee**, Director, Technology and Science  
13 Division`

14 **Phillip Garcia**, Grain Inspection Program Manager,  
15 Washington State Department of Agriculture

16 **Jess McCluer**, National Grain Feed Association

17 **Jacob Thein**, Chief of Policy Procedures and  
18 Analysis, FGIS

19 **Kia Adams-Mikesh**, Vice President of NDGI and  
20 Official Grain Inspection

21 **Mark Heil**, Prairie Central Cooperative and General  
22 Manager of a Local Country Elevator Grain Company

23 **Shayleen Rambur**, JDH

24 **Tracy Logan**, United Grain Corporation, Director of  
25 Export Documentation

1 **Erin Casey-Campbell**, Missouri Department of  
2 Agriculture, Missouri Grain Inspection

3 **John Morgan**, Supreme Rice

4 **Chuck Bird**, Neogen Corporation

5 **Kendra Kline**, USDA

6 **Steve Goldsmith**: FBI (Online)

7 **Christopher Coon**, USDA (Telephonic and Online)

8 **Dr. Charles Hurburgh**, Professor, Iowa State University

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CONTENTS

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

ITEMS	PAGES
CALL TO ORDER.....	5
EQUIPMENT EQUIVLENCY.....	9
RECOMENDATIONS.....	7
NEXT MEETING AGENDA ITEMS.....	36
OFFICER ELECTIONS.....	42
CLOSING REMARKS.....	67
MEETING ADJOURN.....	69

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

P R O C E E D I N G

**CHAIR GROVE:** Good morning, everybody.

Thank you for those in the gallery for attending through -- you know, coming here through the rain today. Thank you, committee, again for your continuing attendance today.

I just want to start a quick reminder to everybody. That it is health, and safety is of the utmost importance. So, considering travel today, if - - if you need to be updating or checking your flights or saying, hey, I might need to leave early. We do understand that. Looks like some pretty severe weather. It looks like the Kansas City storm is pushing a little after five o'clock. So, make sure we're -- you're watching your flights. And don't -- maybe don't check out of the hotel quiet, quite yet. I think we have another half day, don't we? Okay. So, we're actually going to start today by asking the public if they have any comments.

Those virtually and those here in the room

1 do we want to double check if anybody has any thoughts  
2 or any additions to the discussions yesterday.

3 And our topics had been equipment equivalency, the  
4 container handbook, handbook reviews and industry  
5 engagement, the Fido issuance policy, lab scales, and  
6 then really more general conversations of technology  
7 and grain inspection and emerging export issues. But  
8 if we do feel there is something we need to go forward  
9 as a recommendation in technology, we do have the  
10 ability to make one today. But I think in general,  
11 yesterday we talked more about some updates of things  
12 FGIS was currently doing.

13 So, I will give just a moment again for any  
14 public comments and anybody virtually put something in  
15 the chat if you have something. And if you do want to  
16 speak, we can individually unmute somebody for this  
17 purpose. And then again, this committee -- very  
18 quickly -- we do have the recommendations that were  
19 worked on last night, and in place. If there's  
20 something that you're re-thinking and you want to  
21 resend something or you feel we need a discussion,  
22 revisit, then please go ahead and we can do that now.  
23 I don't think we're going to need 20 minutes for  
24 public comment.

25 So, hearing none and seeing nothing in the

1 chat, and I don't think you're seeing anything in the  
2 chat, we're going to go ahead and move on to  
3 discussing the recommendations that we have.

4 And if -- yep -- Kia is going ahead and  
5 going to plug in, and we'll put those up on the  
6 screen. Okay. Yep. And if you would make that a  
7 little bit bigger.

8 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Which one are we starting  
9 that at? Any larger?

10 **CHAIR GROVE:** I think yeah -- I think -- I  
11 think that's good. Okay. I'm going to go ahead and  
12 let Erin go ahead and just walk us quick here through  
13 your recommendation.

14 **MS. CASEY-CAMPBELL:** Hi. So, this was for  
15 the Container Handbook. So, the first chunk is a  
16 little bit of a summary of what we heard from Jake  
17 Thein yesterday. So, the need for a comprehensive yet  
18 streamlined resource regarding containers was  
19 established leading up to and including recent GIAC  
20 meetings. As a result, Jake Thein and his crew  
21 reported relevant work is already in progress with  
22 current plans to move instructions from critical  
23 directives such as this one mentioned into a handbook.  
24 And within that handbook incorporate other relevant  
25 resources such as our directives, bulletins, and

1 memos, including those by reference, including  
2 hyperlinks.

3 So that's just kind of a summary of what we  
4 heard from FGIS yesterday. Before we move on from  
5 that is there any inaccuracies, anything we needed to  
6 add to that portion?

7 **CHAIR GROVE:** And again, Jake we'll look to  
8 you for some expertise or suggestions if you seize  
9 them. So.

10 **MS. CASEY-CAMPBELL:** Okay. As this work is  
11 already progressing JIC recommends FGIS to continue  
12 their work in this area with the following emphasis -  
13 transparency. Including a publicly published timeline  
14 for comment and review, which I believe we all  
15 received a copy of this morning. That has not only  
16 this, some of this work, but others.

17 Enlisting stakeholder input throughout the  
18 development process including providing clear  
19 instructions for submitting comments and inviting  
20 industry associations to participate. Streamlining,  
21 including collecting, and collecting or referencing  
22 all relevant information into one resource, and the  
23 inclusion of instructions for USGSA and AMA  
24 Commodities.

25 **CHAIR GROVE:** Thank you. And again,



1 appreciate FGIS' timeliness. And the fact --  
2 listening to our discussion yesterday and having that  
3 in front of us this morning already, very much  
4 appreciated. As we read this, -- um -- you know,  
5 Jake, Arthur gives you a direction you feel it's  
6 meeting. Okay. Thank you. Very well written. Thank  
7 you very much. Good discussions that we had  
8 yesterday. Um -- if anybody sees no changes needed for  
9 this recommendation, I would entertain the motion to  
10 accept.

11 **MR. HURBURGH:** So, moved.

12 **UNIDENTIFIED SEPAKER:** Second.

13 **CHAIR GROVE:** All right. All in favor?

14 **ALL MEMBERS:** Aye. Aye. Aye.

15 **CHAIR GROVE:** all right. And do we have any  
16 noes, or we're not ready for this? All right. Thank  
17 you. So, again, our Container Handbook has moved.  
18 Okay. FGIS AFES MOU, if you would like to go ahead and  
19 talk through that with us, Tracy.

20 **MS. LOGAN:** Okay. For the recommendation  
21 for updating the FIGUS APHIS MOU, the background's  
22 more at the bottom on this one where we have  
23 situations where FGIS would waive, weighing inspection  
24 requirements. But today, the MOU agreement doesn't  
25 allow for the Fido certificate to be issued without

1 the 921-2, which isn't available, if the inspectors  
2 aren't there.

3 So, in case of natural disaster or other  
4 interruption of service, there isn't a protocol in  
5 place today that provides for the Phyto issuance,  
6 which is always required by importing countries. And  
7 APHIS will assess each situation on a case-by-case  
8 basis. And I think the change to the MOU will help  
9 facilitate the grain flow throughout the industry by  
10 allowing for continued grain shipments at export  
11 facilities when waivers are issued. So, my  
12 recommendation that I wrote here, the grain  
13 inspection advisory committee recommends that FGIS  
14 facilitate a conversation with APHIS to update the  
15 existing FGIS, APHIS, PPQ, MOU. In cases where FGIS  
16 has granted a waiver of official inspection and  
17 weighing requirements, the MOU will allow for third  
18 party insect inspection and witness of fumigation  
19 reporting to APHIS for phytosanitary certificate  
20 issuance. By implementing the change to the MOU  
21 agreement, export facilities can be assured of  
22 receiving a phyto-certificate in emergency situations  
23 when an FGIS waiver is issued.

24 **CHAIR GROVE:** So, through discussion  
25 yesterday, obviously, it was determined, no, this  
isn't this isn't a FGIS call, but FGIS conversation.

1 And that's what the recommendation that Tracy has put  
2 forward is about is that we would like you to have  
3 those conversations. And, again, as a reminder from  
4 yesterday, it isn't about trying to cut FGIS out of  
5 the picture and use third party services. It's about  
6 we need to be sure we're prepared in situations where  
7 you can't do the staffing or waivers involved. Do you  
8 feel this gives you the way forward that you need?  
9 You're so quiet today. We're good. Okay. I would  
10 then if nobody -- nobody has any questions or  
11 concerns, I would recommend or ask for the motion to  
12 accept this recommendation.

13 **DR. ROSENTRATER:** So, moved.

14 **CHAIR GROVE:** Thank you, Kurt. All in  
15 favor?

16 **MR. MORGAN:** Do you need a second?

17 **CHAIR GROVE:** Yes.

18 **MR. MORGAN:** I'll second it.

19 **CHAIR GROVE:** All right. I'm going to go  
20 with, do we have any dissents? Okay. Thank you.  
21 This is passed. Group, you are very efficient this  
22 morning, and I'm going to say that goes to some good  
23 homework last night. Thank you very much. Equipment  
24 equivalency. Charlie, if you would just want to go  
25 ahead and read your proposal.

1           **DR. HURBURGH:** Yes. This is the same one  
2 that was originally posted on the website in response  
3 for the.

4           **CHAIR GROVE:** Microphone. Oh,

5           **DR. HURBURGH:** Oh, sorry. This is the same  
6 wording that -- I -- that was proposed originally, on  
7 the website before this meeting. I'll read it and  
8 I've got just a couple comments and -- and we can have  
9 discussion. Develop a proposed protocol for measuring  
10 equivalence that can be applied to potential  
11 alternative new technologies under consideration for  
12 official use. The general con -- criterion would be  
13 that the use of additional technologies for a given  
14 test would not create unacceptable systemic  
15 variability beyond what is present with the existing  
16 technology. And a couple of comments, we saw the  
17 example yesterday with the -- with the video grading  
18 of damage. There will be others. Once you --  
19 technology is nasty that way. Once you develop ones -  
20 - once somebody develops one, others develop one of  
21 something of consideration. When we get into the same  
22 situation that we were are with the NIRT. That --  
23 that instrument was effectively approved in what  
24 'eighty-nine', I believe, and it's stayed the official  
25 machine and there's now technologies that do the same

1 thing, produce the same result. So that's the point  
2 here, is to have a methodology, general methodology to  
3 be able to incorporate technologies that may work a  
4 little bit differently but measure the same factor in  
5 a smooth and -- and -- and timely way and would not  
6 create, glitches across locations any more than we  
7 have with what we what we do today. So, with that.

8 **CHAIR GROVE:** Go ahead. Yep.

9 **DR. JHEE:** Good morning. All right. Thank  
10 you, Charlie. Just -- just waiting for him --  
11 Good? Okay. Charlie, I think we address this issue  
12 of equivalence through the technology evaluation  
13 program. The -- the process for how we would evaluate  
14 equivalence, I think, is going to be dependent upon  
15 numerous factors, not just the factor itself that  
16 we're trying to measure. But the technologies may  
17 require us to also visit other policies, procedures,  
18 standards.

19 **DR. HURBURGH:** Yes.

20 **DR. JHEE:** Etcetera. So, I think it's  
21 difficult for us to pinpoint what, "would the  
22 documented procedure be". What would the process be?  
23 I think this is one of the types of discussions that  
24 we need to have should we get to the point of proof of  
25 concept with these instruments, and then have these

1 discussions about how do we incorporate a new  
2 technology that appears to be equivalent with an  
3 existing method. Appears to be. We have to probably  
4 make consider some alternative arrangements. We may  
5 have to make some adjustments to standards or  
6 procedures, but I think those are part of the  
7 discussions that will help us define equivalence.

8 **DR. HURBURGH:** My only comment is protocol  
9 doesn't specify the exact points. You're absolutely  
10 right. It will be different with technology, with --  
11 with the factor involved, and so forth. Just the  
12 general criterion that we don't want to introduce more  
13 variability in the inspection system. Equivalence is  
14 a statistical concept. You can measure, I mean, you  
15 can write down how to calculate it. It may not be  
16 easy to get the data, but right. So, protocols don't  
17 force the development of any specifics for a  
18 particular test. Just that this is an important  
19 point.

20 **MR. JHEE:** Gotcha. All right. Thank you,  
21 sir.

22 **CHAIR GROVE:** So, this is a little bit of a  
23 tough one. I mean, you're right. Yes and no. In --  
24 is this a way forward? Is this clear on what we're  
25 asking with Ed's input just now?

1           **MR. HURBURGH:** Well, I just proposed work  
2 for Ed. I mean - I -- I didn't I'm not telling him  
3 what to do.

4           (Room laughter.)

5           **CHAIR GROVE:** Yeah. You know, I -- I like  
6 your thought process, Charlie, on look at some of the  
7 technology we looked at. And there are many  
8 different pieces of equipment out there, and I know  
9 FGIS has been asked to look at many. So, with that,  
10 as Charlie talked about yesterday, where he used, was  
11 what is the baseline for it. If -- if any of these  
12 technologies don't have the baseline to build off of  
13 - um -- then are they going to have that chance for  
14 an equivalency across?

15           **DR. HURBURGH:** Well, you have to meet the  
16 base criteria -- the baseline before you do anything  
17 else.

18           **CHAIR GROVE:** Right. So -- does our process  
19 for submission give that type of information? If  
20 somebody's submitting for a piece of equipment to be  
21 reviewed, do they understand and the know, and where  
22 would they find what is what is the base calibration  
23 need for a piece of equipment?

24           **MR. JHEE:** We were we were very careful to not  
25 specify and box anybody in -- into any type of,

1 parameters on in which the evaluation process would be  
2 considered. What I mean by that is we don't exactly  
3 know what kind of technology is out there. We don't  
4 know exactly how it would be applied to our industry.  
5 We do know that this process does establish what we  
6 consider baseline criteria. I mean, starting from the  
7 fundamental question of, "does the industry need  
8 this?"

9 That's a big -- that's a pretty subjective  
10 question, but that is something that is basically a  
11 market question, I think, that we're asking. But when  
12 we get to accuracy, precision, some of the technical  
13 criteria, what we always strive to do is identify what  
14 the reference would be. What are we going to compare  
15 against? And then, oftentimes, we've got another  
16 instrument to compare against. Oftentimes, that  
17 master instrument goes to an additional wet chemistry  
18 type of method. So, it's identification of those  
19 references that we're comparing against that allows us  
20 to formulate whether or not something can be  
21 considered to be equivalent.

22 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Ed, would - and -- would  
23 something maybe make sense where instead of stating  
24 develop a proposed protocol that's a little more  
25 formal than it seems like we're wanting to get at --



1 at this point, we recommend that this maintains being  
2 a priority and that -- that is presented through --  
3 through the recommendations for different equipment.

4 **MR. NEAL:** So -- so -- I'm shaking my head  
5 because I think -- I think this address, what I hear  
6 Doctor Hurburgh saying, "hey, don't introduce  
7 variability into the system when you're approving  
8 equipment." And I think the process is set up such  
9 that we don't introduce variability into the system  
10 with any equipment, whether it is a current piece of  
11 equipment that's been modified or improved or a new  
12 piece of equipment that no one has ever utilized or  
13 seen before. Um -- and Sea Grian, case in point, never  
14 saw it before for what we were doing. And it was an  
15 iterative process for how we established equivalence  
16 in the bar. Humans are involved in establishing that  
17 equivalence. So, it -- it is going to depend on the  
18 piece of equipment, and it's going to be an iterative  
19 process. But at the end of the day, the core of our  
20 evaluation process is to ensure that there's no  
21 variability that's going to affect the official  
22 system.

23 So -- so, I mean, I think -- I think we're  
24 all on the same page. What it looks like, you won't  
25 be able to put us in a box on because part of that

1 process also in when we're evaluating equipment, part  
2 of our process is built in is bringing results back to  
3 this -- this committee and having conversations about  
4 it. So, it -- it's a iterative process, and this is  
5 not done in a vacuum.

6 **CHAIR GROVE:** So, you feel this is  
7 redundant, that it's already dressed in your policy?

8 **MR. NEAL:** I -- I -- I feel that it's okay  
9 to have the recommendation because it's a priority  
10 for, you know, the committee that puts a reminder to  
11 FGIS. Make sure you got a protocol in place to ensure  
12 equivalence. And so, we just have to make sure, you  
13 know, we want to make sure that we're also  
14 prioritizing that. How -- how that looks, you know,  
15 will it be a -- a formal document that says but what  
16 beyond what we've already said? Not sure, right. But  
17 I do know that there will be engagement in the process  
18 around that topic. Because even in a pilot, if we're  
19 piloting equipment before it's released, we're still  
20 having dialogue with the industry about results and  
21 potential impacts. So, if there are concerns about  
22 how something will - uh -- impact other parts of the  
23 country, we're all having those discussions.  
24 Baseline, you know, we talk about what samples are we  
25 going to use to -- to calibrate the machinery, what's

1 the baseline? All of these things are part of that  
2 process. It's not just one aspect, but all of these  
3 things are also addressed in our protocol.

4 **MR. HEIL:** I -- I think I've -- Mark with  
5 Prairie Central -- I think I've heard that it's maybe  
6 being -- being viewed as being done already. This is  
7 redundant. Could this limit vendors wanting to  
8 potentially bring new technologies in -- into the  
9 system here at all?

10 **MR. JHEE:** I don't know if that's a question  
11 I can answer - um -- especially with regards to a  
12 decision that a manufacturer may want to make. I do  
13 think that, to be fair, many of the manufacturers that  
14 are out there that we've had candid conversations with  
15 - uh -- they are asking themselves, should we make the  
16 investment in this industry? Because it's very niche.  
17 Right? So, I think we have to balance that as well.  
18 So, I think part of our effort was us somewhat being  
19 assertive in finding who's out there and -- and  
20 initiating those conversations. Right? And the door  
21 is open, and we do want to encourage additional  
22 innovation development and proposed solutions, but  
23 it's an -- it's an -- it's a two-way street. It --  
24 it's, you know, us being able to communicate and  
25 articulate that at the end of the day, we want to be

1 able to demonstrate equivalence, right, with a new  
2 technology being introduced. Obviously, I think,  
3 fundamentally, origin and destination readings must be  
4 equivalent. That's -- that's the bottom line. Right?  
5 I think that's the clearest way to -- to send that  
6 message. So, I think we're all on the same page here,  
7 and it is incorporated naturally throughout what we  
8 foresee over the last 24 hours, the evolution of what  
9 this process will become. Does that make sense? It's  
10 hard to put on paper.

11 **MR. BIRD:** Quick question for you, Ed. If  
12 whatever the instrument, whatever the -- the factor,  
13 how close is close enough? And I'm curious because is  
14 there any guidance for industry that you -- you  
15 provide that answers that question. For this specific  
16 test, how good is good enough? And if you don't have  
17 it, maybe this will help facilitate -- what -- what do  
18 you define as equivalence?

19 **MR. JHEE:** Equal to or better than the  
20 current rep -- the current standard. So, meaning, we  
21 are results focused. Right? We're -- we're trying to  
22 look at the outcome. Can you achieve the same  
23 outcome? But instead of taking the windy path, can  
24 you get there like an arrow? Right? I think that's  
25 if we if we stay focused on what the objective is,

1 that's the clearest way to articulate the point. I  
2 don't know. You know, it's - that -- let me think  
3 about that.

4 **DR CAMPABADAL:** Just a quick -- quick comment  
5 on that. Just to just to kind of get wrap up things  
6 in terms of equivalency. Would a good example be,  
7 let's say, using NIR technology, we use files? Just  
8 using, let's say, Hooker Optics, and I don't sell any  
9 equipment, but just an example, but using the same  
10 calibration current, which I know that depends on the  
11 company that will talk and some that actually use on -  
12 - on the feed side the same ones. But would that be a  
13 good example of the -- the results that you have to be  
14 equivalent using that?

15 That that would that be a good example of so  
16 people can maybe wrap up their minds for what we're  
17 talking about?

18 **DR JHEE:** Yeah. That's a good example. And  
19 I think, Kurt, getting back to the question of it's  
20 really a tolerance, I think. You know? And another  
21 example was the data that I showed you guys yesterday  
22 about the UGMA test weight and comparing that against  
23 the court kettle. So -- so being able to present the  
24 data that if we use the SIMS tolerance for the quart  
25 kettle, and that warning limit is £0.6 per bushel, but

1 the instruments are performing as 0.8 or £0.85 per  
2 bushel. I presented the data to you, but I cannot  
3 actually make a determination of what the impact would  
4 be. And, I think that's where it creates dialogue  
5 amongst us because that's a concerning number as far  
6 as I can -- I can tell.

7 **DR. CAMPABADAL:** Right? Well, and in that  
8 particular case, in test rate, you know, of course,  
9 compaction factors for inventories will have an  
10 effect, especially for insurance and warehousing --

11 **DR. JHEE:** -- right --

12 **DR. CAMPABADAL:** -- so that one, I will tell  
13 you that definitely will have a specific impact. But  
14 I don't know, like, I don't know, trying to think  
15 about it. The NIRs, I mean that that opens the market  
16 for -- for other equipment if you use the same  
17 calibration. I mean, we did this study with protein  
18 and wheat because that's one that has an economic  
19 connotation right off. And -- and so the question  
20 was, if you got -- to what level did we have to get to  
21 for standard error across instrument makes and models  
22 to not to be considered okay for industry? And the  
23 test for that will be different for every -- you we  
24 can't use the example we use for NIR. That's probably  
25 not going to work for particle size or visual damage

1 or, you know, whatever the - the -- be an individual  
2 individually designed. But -- but we need to have some  
3 general policy if nothing else. Maybe you want to  
4 change the word to policy or -- or procedure - uh --  
5 for saying, introduce this piece of equipment into the  
6 system, it will probably add or not x to the  
7 variability across locations, whatever x is.

8 **MR. NEAL:** I think what Ed is also saying,  
9 so, if we got tolerances established -- um --  
10 equipment has to perform in a manner such that it's  
11 equal to or better than existing. So, if the  
12 tolerance is 0.6, the equipment is 0.1. That's better  
13 than in terms of performance. So that -- that  
14 introduces greater accuracy, consistency, we -- we  
15 still have to have a conversation around because how  
16 does industry want to deal with that? You know?  
17 There -- there's no simple answer because this is the  
18 industry's market. And when we are introducing things  
19 that are going to perform better than, or outside of,  
20 we don't -- we -- we -- we bring back the information.  
21 We share, hey, these -- these are results.

22 We're going to have to socialize this. You  
23 know? Do you want to -- to accept x - y - z? Because  
24 it may have these impacts. But for us, we know that  
25 it can perform. We know that it's accurate. We know

1 that it's within tolerance or better than tolerance.  
2 Now the decision on how we move forward in terms of  
3 impact is different ballgame.

4 MR. JHEE: Now, I -- I think you described  
5 the intent fully right there. So, I don't know. I'm  
6 -- I'm struggling with how we wanted to define this  
7 recommendation, because I think it's -- it's  
8 ingrained.

9 CHAIR GROVE: Yeah. Yeah.

10 MS. ADAMS-MIKESH: What if we do something  
11 like prioritize policies for measuring equivalent so  
12 it doesn't put you in a box of saying that you have to  
13 develop something new, but it's getting across that we  
14 want to make sure that this is a priority -- priority.

15 DR. HURBURGH: I know it's less formal than  
16 with the word, "protocol" too. So yeah. And  
17 development --

18 CHAIR GROVE: As you're talking, you know,  
19 policy is we say we do this. Protocol and procedure  
20 is the steps in doing it.

21 DR. JHEE: Right. Right.

22 MR. NEAL: Is the how to do that?

23 CHAIR GROVE: Yeah. All right. The other,  
24 group feedback, good discussion. Whoa, Charlie.  
25 Testing us this morning. Making sure making sure our



1 coffee has kicked in this morning. Um -- I do like  
2 this again that asking for a priority, and not putting  
3 saying, in a sense, the word developed means we expect  
4 almost a physical action, and that's not what we're  
5 doing. So, I -- I -- yeah. I like this. How about a  
6 recommendation or sorry. A motion. She's hiding for  
7 a coffee. Move to accept. Motion to accept.

8 **MR GARCIA:** Move to accept as amended or as  
9 edited -

10 **DR HURBURGH:** -- Second --

11 **CHAIR GROVE:** -- Second? -- All right. And  
12 I will just ask for any dissent.

13 **MR. HEIL:** I'm going to dissent against this  
14 one.

15 **CHAIR GROVE:** Okay. That is noted. Thank  
16 you. By majority, this does pass. We are going to  
17 move on to now handbook review. And, John, we were  
18 working on this, doing a little, just reorganizing the  
19 paragraphs for you. So here we go. You would like to  
20 do it. Reorganizing. So, it - it - so - so --

21 **MR. MORGAN:** You liked it, but just not the  
22 way it was worded? Okay. Gotcha.

23 **CHAIR GROVE:** So, if you can make this just  
24 a little bit larger --

25 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** -- Yes. Sorry --

1           **CHAIR GROVE:** -- And then uh --

2           **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** -- That was bad --

3           **CHAIR GROVE:** -- And - uh -- we'll let --  
4 we'll let John go through his proposal.

5           **MR. MORGAN:** I'll show them to be simple and  
6 elegant, I guess. I failed. The recommendation is to  
7 enhance the transparency and accessibility of the  
8 review process for the FGS inspection handler, we  
9 recommend the following actions. Provide clear  
10 contact information. Ensure that detailed contact  
11 information including name roles, contact methods,  
12 email, phone, etcetera. For relevant FGIS personnel,  
13 it is readily available to outline submission  
14 guidelines, develop and provide clear and concise  
15 guidelines for submitting recommendations, specifying  
16 any required formats or documentation. Three,  
17 schedule regular updates.

18           Continue with a public schedule for regular  
19 updates and reviews of the handbooks with  
20 opportunities for stakeholders to provide input at  
21 each stage. These steps will all make the review  
22 process more inclusive and transparent, ensuring that  
23 all stakeholders have a voice in the development and  
24 improvement of the FGIS inspection handbooks. And --  
25 and I realized from Jake's presentation yesterday,

1 what he's provided, they're already in a process. I  
2 think what we're asking for is just enhancements. And  
3 thank you all for making it so much better.

4 **CHAIR GROVE:** Pretty. Pretty. So again,  
5 I'm just going to, again, show appreciation for the --  
6 the quick turnaround, and this ties -- ties right into  
7 Erin's, again, in talking about the handbooks that you  
8 -- you did supply information that we are talking  
9 about right here. So, thank you for that. Any other  
10 discussion on this? And feel again, Jake, understand  
11 what -- what we're asking. Okay. Thank you. So, if  
12 there's -

13 **MR. GARCIA:** Move to accept?

14 **CHAIR GROVE:** Yes. Second?

15 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Second.

16 **CHAIR GROVE:** All right. Any dissent on  
17 this?

18 **MS. CASEY-CAMPBELL:** I just wanted to add a  
19 comment real quick. Something that I mentioned to --  
20 to John via email late last night, so may not have  
21 gotten to you guys. It's just clarifying with this  
22 that we are talking about handbooks and directions in  
23 general, not just the FDIS inspection handbook number  
24 two. So just making sure that that intent is -- is  
25 relayed through this, not to keep it narrow to that

1 specific handbook.

2 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Jake, to clarify, when  
3 you are addressing all of them, you generally use the  
4 word instructions, don't you?

5 **CHAIR GROVE:** Sure. I'm just going to say  
6 any -- any dissent with the updated wording. Just  
7 changing for clarification. Thank you, Erin. All  
8 right. Thank you. That passes. All right. So, this  
9 one, thank you, FGIS, did cause a lot of discussion  
10 last night. We're going to move into the lab scales.  
11 And everybody on the committee, we did ask yesterday,  
12 you know, if we felt we need to table this, we were  
13 asking for more information. And you did supply that,  
14 or Kendra sent that to us last night in the form of  
15 information on the commodities affected and how, and  
16 everybody had a chance to review those. Although, I  
17 was like, we -- we had to ask for clarification from  
18 our academics and not understanding some of the -- the  
19 research equations in there. But that was helpful in  
20 seeing that.

21 So, again, there was a lot of discussion last  
22 night. I -- I didn't think that was -- was going to  
23 be our controversial one, but it was. Because as you  
24 put in the proposals, as the information was given to  
25 us, there is -- there was a large financial impact or

1 could be. So, through some discussions, there were  
2 some different things talked about, and we'll let Kia  
3 go through those and -- and "why." Again, there still  
4 may be a little descent today, so -- so we're going to  
5 work through this one.

6 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** I'm expecting there to be  
7 some just a little bit more discussion around it.  
8 We're - um -- a little bit of background of before we  
9 go into it is, we wanted to look at making sure that  
10 we weren't -- we weren't going into something that  
11 limits us in the future from changing the instructions  
12 related to scales. And so, um -- but we also didn't  
13 feel that we could definitively say that we don't  
14 recommend going to those scales for in the future. Um  
15 -- with the tighter tolerances or to the 100th. And  
16 so, what we are throwing out here right now, and  
17 again, available for discussion, is stating that the  
18 Grain Inspection Advisory Committee recommends that  
19 the Federal Grain Inspection Service adopt the ASTM  
20 class six weights. So, what I would like to call,  
21 "option four."

22 And as the minimum lab scale standard, this  
23 change will provide a procedure for testing laboratory  
24 scales for precision across the FGIS range of use,  
25 justify the use of expanded resolution, remove scales

1 that are not precise to 100ths of a gram from official  
2 use, and provide flexibility for future changes in  
3 laboratory scale procedures. Now if our understanding  
4 is correct, which it might not be, the reason for ASTM  
5 class four, which was part of option one, or why we  
6 would like class x versus the class four, is then if  
7 we decide in future meetings that we would -- we do  
8 think that there is a statistical impact that we then  
9 would have that ability and official agencies and FGIS  
10 wouldn't have to repurchase all of the weights again.  
11 Is - that -- would -- that make sense?

12 **MS. LOGAN:** I have a question. How is this  
13 -- is not option two? This is different.

14 **CHAIR GROVE:** This is a separate option.  
15 And oh, sorry --

16 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** It's a separate option.  
17 So, option one was doing class four weights, which  
18 were the \$500, and then not doing anything with the  
19 scales, essentially. And then there were ones stating  
20 that we would go to the different scales, which is  
21 where the large financial impact would be. But from  
22 what I gathered is if you were to do those scales, you  
23 need the ASTM class six weights. Is that correct,  
24 Jake?

25 **MR. THEIN:** Hi. This is Jacob Tine, T - H -

1 E - I - N, with FGIS. So, I had a chance to talk to  
2 Ryan a little bit about this yesterday afternoon.  
3 And, one of the reasons for the recommendation of the  
4 ASTM class four weights is based on some of the data  
5 that we had - um -- we felt that the ASTM class six  
6 weights, the actual accuracy of the weight itself was  
7 not accurate enough to test scales to the 100th of a  
8 gram. So - so -- so one of the tables, and I don't  
9 know if Kendra had --

10 **MS. KLINE:** -- Ryan's on the call --

11 **MR. THEIN:** -- Okay. So, Ryan, did you want  
12 to, are you able to chime in on this one, Ryan?

13 **MR. SEAPY:** Yes. Can you hear me?

14 **MR. THEIN:** Thank you.

15 **MR. SEAPY:** Okay. Yes. So, the ASTM sick --  
16 class six weights are effectively the same as ASTM  
17 class four weight or sorry -- as -- as NIST class F  
18 weights. ASTM class six doesn't have the precision  
19 required to be able to certify to the 100th of a gram.  
20 Did you potentially mean - um -- ASTM class two?

21 **CHAIR GROVE:** Well, um -- the  
22 recommendations is listed yesterday that were put in  
23 front of us. Option one was to use the ASTM four and  
24 just change the weights. Option three said the ASTM  
25 six weights and change all the scales.

1           **MR. SEAPY:** -- let me --

2           **CHAIR GROVE:** -- that was option three, I  
3 thought --

4           **MR. NEAL:** -- That was option --

5           **MR. SEAPY:** -- Sorry. That should be class  
6 two ways to change all the scales --

7           **MR. NEAL:** -- Three of class two ways --

8           **CHAIR GROVE:** -- Of class two?

9           **MR. SEAPY:** Okay.

10           **CHAIR GROVE:** Yeah. Okay. There. We didn't  
11 have it in front. Yeah. That that I -- think was a  
12 clarification. Okay. Thank you.

13           **MR. SEAPY:** So, yes. Okay. In that case,  
14 yes. It makes sense with class two weights instead of  
15 class six. That's what you said makes sense.

16           **MS. ADAMS- MIKESH:** And the -- the purpose  
17 from this, and again, we can have whatever discussion  
18 is needed, is that we wanted to be able to have it so  
19 that in the future, if this committee or any other  
20 body decides that we do need to go to those precision  
21 scales or have different options, that then all of our  
22 agencies in FGIS didn't just buy and do new weights  
23 and then maybe in our next committee meeting, we  
24 decide that there is too much variability. So that  
25 was the purpose for it. They are more expensive, I



1 believe - um -- from the options. Let's say it's 500  
2 versus 2,000. And so, we can have discussion too on  
3 the financial impact of that.

4 **MS. CASEY-CAMPBELL:** Maybe a question here  
5 for Ryan. So, we've established that the class six  
6 cannot certify scales to the 100th of a gram, and  
7 we're talking about just going ahead and getting to  
8 class two. But have we declared that class four is  
9 not an option, the cheaper scales? I mean, as -- as  
10 far as the certifying to the 100th of a gram.

11 **MR. SEAPY:** Sorry. Was that a question for  
12 me? I'm -- I'm not quite sure I -- I'm not sure I  
13 followed the question. If you - sorry. Ask that one  
14 more time.

15 **MS. CASEY-CAMPBELL:** Yeah. So, for class  
16 four, weight option for option one, it's --

17 **MR. SEAPY:** -- Yes --

18 **MS. CASEY-CAMPBELL:** -- so the class four  
19 have that same capability to certify the scales to the  
20 100th of a gram?

21 **MR. SEAPY:** They do, but not across the  
22 entire range of -- of not across the entire scale  
23 capacity. So, if the scale can go up to a 1000 grams,  
24 a class four weight will not certify a 1000 cap --  
25 gram capacity scale to the 100th. However, it will

1 certify up to 100 grams to -- to the 100th or to the  
2 200ths, which is what we measure. And so, the reason  
3 for class four was for FGIS's use case, where we read  
4 to the 100th up to 100 grams, we read to the 10th up  
5 to 500 grams, and we read to the nearest gram above  
6 500 grams, ASTM four is sufficient for that level of  
7 precision. If the scales are being used to the 100th  
8 of a gram at their full capacity, be it 500, 1000,  
9 4000 grams, ASTM four would not be sufficient for  
10 that. And for that, you would need ASTM two.

11 But that's beyond the FGIS use case. However, it  
12 is true that per NIST recommendation, if you're going  
13 to use that scale, you should certify it with those  
14 weights because they're -- they're assuming use across  
15 the entire range. Does that answer the question?

16 **MS. CASEY-CAMPBELL:** I think so. If -- if  
17 I'm following it correctly. I mean, from the FGIS and  
18 from how we use it in an inspection standpoint, we're  
19 not using it out to the 100TH at, you know, the  
20 500,000-gram level. So, is that really relevant to  
21 us? Are -- or -- are we aligning with missed best  
22 practices for a -- a case that wouldn't apply to our  
23 everyday work?

24 **DR. CAMPABADAL:** Can I jump in? I -- I Ryan,  
25 this is Carlos from Kansas State University. Correct

1 me if I'm wrong. I think that the overall goal is to  
2 be able -- just to say, okay. Our calibration to  
3 certify the weights to the - um -- to the that all of  
4 them across the board can go to a 100th, for those  
5 scales that go beyond. So, we are point 01% certified  
6 across the board even if you don't use that, just to  
7 be sure that everything is standardized. Correct?

8 **MR. SEAPY:** Yeah. That would be option three  
9 where everything is to the 100th of a gram across the  
10 board. No worries. You know, option one was, well,  
11 we don't need to worry about the upper end since we're  
12 not using it there. So, if we're or if we're trying  
13 to cut back, that would be a way to do it.

14 **DR. CAMPABADAL:** So - so -- so it's not that  
15 the usage is for everyday certifying, calibrating that  
16 -- that is precise. I mean, I think that's -- that's  
17 the overall goal into it. Correct, Ryan?

18 **MR. SEAPY:** Yeah. Yeah.

19 **DR. CAMPABADAL:** And then I know that makes  
20 it clear, probably.

21 **MS. CASEY-CAMPBELL:** No. It -- it does  
22 help. I just want to make sure we're not spending  
23 \$2,000 per weight --

24 **MR. SEAPY:** -- I -- I get that --

25 **MS. CASEY-CAMPBELL:** -- Just for the sake of

1 precision. Not that I don't want us to be precise.

2 But --

3 **DR. CAMPABADAL:** Just So not -- not in every  
4 measurement of the different tests you need that.

5 **MS. CASEY-CAMPBELL:** Right.

6 **DR. CAMPABADAL:** But you just want to be sure  
7 that we're all calibrated in the same way.

8 **MS. CASEY-CAMPBELL:** Sure. Yep.

9 **DR. CAMPABADAL:** Which I agree with you on  
10 the on the cost. But --

11 **CHAIR GROVE:** You know -- yesterday's  
12 discussion, we had said we didn't truly feel we had  
13 enough information on why -- on why the need. We did  
14 get some information last night - um -- some slides.  
15 If we still yet today are not sure what direction we  
16 want to take, this can still be tabled. We can table  
17 this and put it in for our next meeting. We can ask  
18 for more information. And in your own - um -- in your  
19 own business, you can assess which is the best avenue  
20 to go. We did get a little bit of information last  
21 night in in again the brains and when and why they're  
22 impacted. I kind of feel looking around the room that  
23 we may not be ready for this yet.

24 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Can I provide one  
25 comment? I -- and FGIS, please correct me if I'm

1 wrong here, but our class f weights, we can't get them  
2 anymore. Is that correct? They've discontinued them.  
3 And so, if we need to get additional weights to  
4 certify our scales, to check our scales, we don't have  
5 a means of purchasing them anymore under the current  
6 instructions. Is that correct?

7 **DR. HUURBURGH:** Inaudible.

8 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Ryan, could you please  
9 confirm that?

10 **MR. SEAPY:** Yes. So NIST class f weights are  
11 no longer allowed to be manufactured per, FGIS  
12 handbooks and regulations. There is not another  
13 option at the moment.

14 **DR. CAMPABADAL:** And -- and that -- that this  
15 is Carlos again. That's why you triggered those --  
16 those recommendations at the end of the day. So,  
17 maybe that -- that will help the audience.

18 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** From a person -- oh, go  
19 ahead --

20 **CHAIR GROVE:** -- I -- just say with that  
21 thought in mind, if everybody has, I'm assuming, the  
22 class f weights right now. It would be if for  
23 whatever reason you would need to replace them, now we  
24 don't have a provision.

25 **DR. CAMPABADAL:** Yes, ma'am.

1           **CHAIR GROVE:** And we certainly don't want  
2 that. Or, as you know, Charlie was showing us  
3 yesterday in -- in Texas some changes in grain  
4 inspection. If there's a new office coming into play  
5 get weights. Now they can't get weights. So, it  
6 isn't this -- this can't be a long this has to be  
7 something fairly soon.

8           **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Are we allowed to state  
9 that an agency could have either or?

10           **MS. CASEY-CAMPBELL:** That's essentially my  
11 question as well. Can these two things, the existing  
12 check testing procedures with the existing weights and  
13 perhaps a class two streamlined, scale check testing,  
14 can those two things exist at the same time? Are they  
15 equivalent?

16           **DR. CAMPABADAL:** Like, for a transition  
17 period, I mean, the yeah. Yeah. I -- I want to see  
18 why not, but I don't know how the policy or procedures  
19 will be.

20           **MS. SEAPY:** Speaking about bulk weighing  
21 systems, this is a similar problem because NIST class  
22 f also can't be manufactured for bulk weighing  
23 systems. The -- the plan and, Jake, feel free to, you  
24 know, speak up here. For the -- the weighing handbook  
25 would be to allow for NIST class f or ASTM class six,

1 which is essentially equivalent when you're talking  
2 about any weight above 2,000 grams, to be allowed for  
3 bulk scale or, sorry, a bulk scale, check testing.  
4 So, in that context, yes, ASTM six could be used in  
5 addition to NIST class f. Some weight check test  
6 companies are going to stop check testing for NIST  
7 class f because if the weights are no longer being  
8 manufactured, they -- they might stop using that as a  
9 standard altogether. At which point, people would  
10 need to move to ASTM six, but most NIST class f  
11 weights will -- will pass a check test at the ASTM  
12 sorry. NIST class f will pass a check test at the  
13 ASTM six level.

14 **MR. NEAL:** Hey, Ryan. This is Arthur. If  
15 there was a recommendation to allow agencies to use  
16 either class four or class two, will we have to have  
17 more than one check test procedure?

18 **MR. SEAPY:** If we were going to use ASTM four  
19 two - four -- no. They -- they would have the same  
20 check test procedure for lab scales.

21 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Really, the reason why I  
22 would be asking that is I have some concern as an  
23 agency that if, again, if the committee decides later  
24 after evaluating the data more that were in the  
25 slides, that if we decide that we do actually need to

1 go to the other scales, the option that has that  
2 higher financial impact, then we may have to  
3 repurchase all new weights again. That -- that's  
4 where my personal concern is if we do decide that  
5 because there was a lot of discussion about that last  
6 night if we were understanding the data correctly.

7 **MR. SEAPY:** I think this was asked earlier  
8 about whether there could be multiple options. If  
9 you, we were to -- there would also -- we wouldn't  
10 change the language in the handbook to allow an or  
11 better. So, if ASTM four is the standard, it would be  
12 ASTM four or better. So, ASTM two would be completely  
13 acceptable in a four or better scenario.

14 **CHAIR GROVE:** If we're saying class four or  
15 better, do we still need minimum? I guess it doesn't  
16 matter. It doesn't it -- doesn't hurt it. Does this  
17 -- this satisfy again in -- in looking at the options?  
18 As Kia said, if in the future, it was determined that  
19 changing the weights and changing the scales was  
20 needed, people rebuying new weights, again, would be  
21 another money outlay. So, I think this gives  
22 availability. And, as long as the procedure allows  
23 for this, then I don't think we're rewriting a new  
24 policy each time a determination is made.

25 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** And then it can be



1 essentially a business decision for the -- for the  
2 agencies on if they want to take that risk of versus  
3 four or two.

4 **MS. LOGAN:** Okay. But then option three  
5 should be removed. Right? Item three. Because the  
6 because the class four wouldn't give you the 100th.  
7 Isn't that what he said?

8 **CHAIR GROVE:** I think yeah --

9 **MR. CAMPABADAL:** -- It would give you the 100  
10 saying --

11 **CHAIR GROVE:** -- Take off to a 100<sup>TH</sup> -- three  
12 because we have step four would be coming up three  
13 because what we are asking is to provide flexibility  
14 for future needs. Yeah. Good call. Is there any  
15 further discussion? Sir Kurt, I would entertain a  
16 motion.

17 **DR. ROSENTRATER:** So, moved as amended. MS.

18 **ADAMS- MIKESH:** Second.

19 **CHAIR GROVE:** I would ask for -- I guess --  
20 dissent. All right. Hearing none, this  
21 recommendation passes. And the other -- the other two  
22 items that were under our discussion topics yesterday  
23 being technology and grain inspection and emerging  
24 export issues, again, there -- there were broad  
25 discussion. Technology was on there for the purpose

1 of continued discussions, the ability for continued,  
2 you know, review of products that we did yesterday,  
3 and for us to have the ability if somebody, found an  
4 area we really felt FGIS needed to move, you know, a  
5 different priority that we have the availability --  
6 availability to make that recommendation.

7 **MR. NEAL:** So.

8 **CHAIR GROVE:** We didn't hear anything in  
9 discussion yesterday of a need to move priorities.  
10 So, no recommendations at this time for technology and  
11 grain inspection. And, again, emerging export issues  
12 was a broad discussion, so we can all make sure we  
13 were on the -- the same page and talk about what we  
14 felt were some problems.

15 So, with that, we have our final recommendations.  
16 Next on the agenda is officer elections. I'm going to  
17 ask us to take just a quick ten-minute break right  
18 now, and then we can kind of regroup as we're moving  
19 into a different section. Yeah. You got it.

20  
21 (WHEREUPON AT 9:30AM 10 MINUTE BREAK.)

22 (BACK ON RECORD AT 9:40AM.)

23  
24 **CHAIR GROVE:** All right. Welcome back,  
25 everybody. I know that was a -- a little bit longer than

1 the -- the 15 minutes. We're just trying to get  
2 ourselves organized a little bit here. The next order  
3 of business is the officer elections for the committee.  
4 I'm going to ask prior to that, Kendra or Arthur, is  
5 there an ability to give us a little bit of an update  
6 on you know, we talked a little bit yesterday where the  
7 current -- um -- package for approval of committee  
8 members is at and also some things about where some  
9 charter changes are, or is that not appropriate at this  
10 time? Yeah. If you want to -- to give us just help us  
11 a little bit with the discussion we're having here.

12 **MS. KLINE:** Okay. So, the nomination  
13 package is with the department. So, that's all I know  
14 is with the department.

15 **CHAIR GROVE:** And - and -- and - so -- so  
16 for general reference, what does that mean now?

17 **MS. KLINE:** So, we, every application we  
18 get, goes through, initially, a background check  
19 through vetting with the department. And everyone in  
20 past, like, no one was removed. And then that goes --  
21 everybody's application goes into a package and we  
22 kind of summarize everybody onto one sheet that the  
23 applications are sent with. And it gets submitted  
24 through the agency and then it goes to the department  
25 and works through the department to the secretary's

1 office for selection.

2 So, there will be six new members to be  
3 selected. And the goal is to have their term start  
4 when the current people roll off. So, it'll be kind  
5 of a hopefully, start being consistent with having new  
6 members starting March, April every --every year.  
7 Kind' a get it to that, hopefully, is the goal. But,  
8 yeah, it's been with the department for a while.

9 **CHAIR GROVE:** Okay. And -- and then one  
10 other piece of recommendation from the last committee  
11 meeting had been about changing, changing the quorum  
12 from two thirds to just that simple majority.

13 **MS. KLINE:** Yes. So current quorum is ten.  
14 Two thirds is ten of -- of the fifteen. Simple  
15 majority is usually half plus one. I googled it.  
16 That's how it seems everyone defines it. So, we  
17 picked that as eight. So, our initial -- so we have  
18 to do it. There's a few different pieces. So, the  
19 charter expires in July, but we're just going ahead  
20 and getting everything submitted. So, we have plenty  
21 of time for things to get cleared and reviewed. The  
22 first piece of the Charter clearance is a civil rights  
23 impact analysis, and we just got that cleared, I  
24 think, yesterday.

25 So now it's getting -- sending all the

1 package, like, the membership quorum will have the  
2 change in it, and they kind' a just -- the charter the  
3 actual charter language, none of that's changing, and  
4 that gets submitted to the agency for review. The  
5 administrator signs off on that, and then it goes  
6 through. There's an extensive department review, and  
7 then that's where it'll go next. So, hopefully, we'll  
8 have the charter, the whole package, to the agency by  
9 the end of this week, next week, ideally. So, then it  
10 can keep moving as best as it can.

11 **CHAIR GROVE:** Okay. And then also another  
12 piece was changing term limits. The request to  
13 possibly change term limits from three to four because  
14 we felt that would give a little more continuity and  
15 also not having to submit a nominations package every  
16 year, but there would be a kind of a year break. That  
17 had been a discussion on that - um -- where what are  
18 your thoughts on that? So that would.

19 **MS. KLINE:** Okay.

20 **CHAIR GROVE:** Again, does that go through  
21 the Charter --

22 **MS. KLINE:** --No. It has nothing to do with  
23 the Charter or us. It has to do with the US Grain  
24 Standards Act, and it has to -- that it's where it has  
25 to be changed. We do create, after the meeting, all

1 your recommendations go into a document, and it goes  
2 up to the Secretary's office just so they know what  
3 recommendations you passed. We included in the last  
4 meeting, that was included and, like, that we  
5 supported that change. So, the Secretary is aware of  
6 you all recommending that.

7 **CHAIR GROVE:** Okay. And -- and that  
8 actually the US Grain Standards Act, that's for 2025  
9 review.

10 **MS. KLINE:** Yep. September 30, 2025. There  
11 are certain amendments that sunset. So that opens up.  
12 They usually review it, and changes are made and  
13 renewed, etcetera.

14 **CHAIR GROVE:** So, in -- in what we would be  
15 looking at possibility, if having both those changes,  
16 again, the purpose was to be sure that the group  
17 didn't fall under -- um -- not having a quorum, which  
18 has happened in the past, again, due to the fact that  
19 how we operate all has different time frames. We  
20 operate on a calendar year, funded on a fiscal year,  
21 obviously, and then term limits are upon approval  
22 date. So, there isn't a set time and with having had  
23 late approvals or delayed approvals in the past, that  
24 has caused the group to not have a quorum, not be able  
25 to do business. And so, all of these things were to

1 try to help ensure that we can gather, we can meet,  
2 and we can work on industry issues and -- and -- and  
3 help continue to make an impact for betterment.

4 So, I guess, you know, we -- we hope and  
5 look for something good in -- prior to the March --  
6 prior to March. And then, again, those -- those key  
7 dates for us are July next year for Charter and then  
8 September 2025. It all takes time, but I think just  
9 continued updates. And then I know you do send us  
10 emails on -- on where some of those things are at.  
11 So, I appreciate that.

12 Again, as we're moving into officer  
13 elections - um -- you know, and we were having  
14 discussions, reaching out and talking about who -- who  
15 -- who is willing to serve, who enjoys serving, and --  
16 and how can we work with that going forward. So those  
17 -- those pieces of information help us. We do look  
18 for three Officers, a Chair, a Vice Chair, and a  
19 Secretary. And we were trying to help clarify a few  
20 of the things, you know, take out a little bit of fear  
21 last night and the fact that we have, court reporting.  
22 We have transcription.

23 It isn't the secretary sitting here keeping  
24 -- keeping notes on everything and is -- is reporting  
25 that, but we are, approving, what the transcription of

1 -- of the records are. But it has helped doing things  
2 like we're doing today, in the meeting. That  
3 secretary is very volatile in -- in helping as we're  
4 working on the meeting to -- to continue doing those  
5 updates -- updates for us. I'm going to turn this  
6 over to Chuck - um -- as you were kind' a implementing  
7 some things or -- or working through some problems  
8 with us last night.

9 **MR. BIRD:** Sure. Thanks, Barb. Chuck Byrd,  
10 Neogen Corporation. Yeah. Part of it is our -- our  
11 just trying to get an understanding of the -- of the  
12 overall process for, GIAC. And -- and what I mean by  
13 that is, you know, Barb brought up continuity. You  
14 know, all of us serve on a lot of different  
15 committees. I haven't really taken a pulse, but I  
16 guess if I'm going to take a pulse, I'm going to say  
17 this committee functions really well. I think we get  
18 a lot of things accomplished. I think we work really  
19 well together. Each of us kind of has a role.

20 We tend to come together around that. I  
21 mean, I watched it last night. Everyone's on their  
22 computer typing up these recommendations. I mean, it  
23 wasn't like, oh, I'll do that in the morning or all.  
24 You know, no. It's there's a committed group here.  
25 So, what, you know, there's -- there's I -- I looked



1 at it. I brought it up last night. I said, I think  
2 there's two options potentially. One would be just go  
3 ahead and elect new officers, the from the eligible  
4 candidates. But our question was, what if we wanted  
5 to -- to keep Barb as our president or -- or keep the  
6 existing -- uh -- uh -- structure because some of us  
7 are moving off, if you will. There's an unknown  
8 there. We weren't sure how that would work. And I  
9 guess we were looking for some clarification, Arthur  
10 or Kendra on how if -- if that's even an option to --  
11 to -- to pursue or not.

12 **MR NEAL:** Give -- given the slate of  
13 candidates or our members that are rolling off and not  
14 knowing what the appointments will be, not knowing  
15 when the next meeting will be. I think what could be  
16 done is that you can make a provisional vote to elect  
17 new officers. Those officers would go into effect  
18 after terms end for those rolling off the committee.  
19 The -- the provision would be that if, appointments  
20 are made prior to term limits ending. Those who you  
21 also desire to continue in their position could do so  
22 if they're appointed prior to their terms ending. If  
23 they get reappointed after their term ends, they'll  
24 have to be, you know - uh -- new vote. People would  
25 have to step down from the positions they've been

1 elected into. That's the way I can see that  
2 happening.

3 **MR. BIRD:** Okay.

4 **MR NEAL:** And -- and - and -- I -- I don't  
5 know if I said this. If we have another meter meeting  
6 prior to, terms expiring, you know, the current slate  
7 of officers will remain in place - uh -- for -- for  
8 the next meeting.

9 **MR. BIRD:** For the next meeting. Having a  
10 meeting in February, it would still be this group?

11 **MR NEAL:** Right. That that that that seems  
12 like it would make sense.

13 **CHAIR GROVE:** I -- I do want to ask Kendra.  
14 I, asked you yesterday, do you know what is the -- the  
15 date of that term end? You know, I don't remember it.  
16 You know? So I go, is it the end of March? Is it the  
17 middle of March? You know, if as we're talking in our  
18 next, you know, our next set of discussions here, if  
19 we're trying to set meetings, what is that change over  
20 in term limit for the six people rolling off?

21 **MS. KLINE:** I'm trying to pull up the exact  
22 date.

23 **CHAIR GROVE:** And that is just more out of  
24 curiosity. I think we can continue going on. That's  
25 just -- just kind of for the next topic as we discuss

1 agenda items and try to set meetings. I think that  
2 will be very relevant.

3 **MR. NEAL:** I don't know the exact date.

4 **CHAIR GROVE:** Yeah. It -- it just said March.  
5 I didn't know if it's at the (inaudible) March one,  
6 15th, you know, 30th. How does that affect scheduling  
7 in the next section? So, Chuck, I am going to turn it  
8 back over to you.

9 **MR. BIRD:** All right. So, what -- what I  
10 guess to summarize -- what I'm hear 'in is we could do  
11 a provision so we could -- we could say, here's the --  
12 the what we'd like to do provisionally, keep, let's  
13 say we keep Bob as -- as president or chair of the  
14 committee, excuse me, and the officers that are  
15 currently. So, they would go in provisionally. Do we  
16 have to have the backup? So, we've talked about last  
17 night if - if -- if Barb wasn't reappointed or there  
18 was another situation --uh -- we have people that have  
19 are willing to step up into those roles. Do we need  
20 to identify those people now also along with the  
21 provisional of keeping the current set of officers  
22 from a procedure standpoint?

23 **MR NEAL:** Yeah. I think for planning  
24 purposes, I would select the new officers provided  
25 that reappointments are -- aren't made for sitting

1 members. If reappointments if nominate if -- if  
2 committee members are seated by the secretary prior to  
3 terms ending and there are reappointments on this  
4 committee, then they could retain their -- their  
5 officer's role should that be the desire of the  
6 committee.

7 **MR. BIRD:** Okay.

8 **MR. NEAL:** Yeah. That -- that way, there's  
9 no break in service, and we don't have enough members,  
10 and you -- you have a -- we're down six, you know.  
11 So, you got a smaller committee deciding on who's  
12 going to who's going to lead at that point.

13 **MR. BIRD:** M-hmm. M-hmm. Okay. All right.  
14 So, I -- I believe then, would be on the table would  
15 be to, elect -um -- Kia as our Chair, Rashad as Vice  
16 Chair, and Mark as Secretary, as our as our group.  
17 And then it sounds like we would have the opportunity  
18 then if Barb was reappointed, then as a committee, we  
19 would then decide if we wanted to -- to change that,  
20 that structure.

21 **CHAIR GROVE:** Are you thinking about  
22 backwards to what you recommended?

23 **MR NEAL:** I think as a committee sitting  
24 now, you can decide if that's what you want. So, say  
25 for instance, if the desire is that if Barb is

1 reappointed that she serves as a Chair, you can still  
2 put that in the vote. In the recommendation? That  
3 will be contingent upon that. So, everything is based  
4 on, term dates expiring or expiration dates. So, in  
5 the case that terms expire, none of the sitting  
6 members rolling off are reappointed, this is your new  
7 leadership. If appointments are made by the Secretary  
8 prior to terms expiring, this is what you want your  
9 leadership to be.

10 **MR. BIRD:** Okay. Makes sense. But we -- we  
11 didn't -- we didn't finalize what that would  
12 potentially look like. So, I guess back to the  
13 committee then, are we proposing the new structure  
14 which we just proposed and then proposing that if  
15 Barb's reelected onto the committee that would we have  
16 to decide is the structure going to stay the same as  
17 it is today? Or do we still want to make changes in  
18 Vice Chair? Well, let's back up. Madam Chair, are  
19 are -- are you interested in being in, you know,  
20 public saying, are you interested in being the Chair  
21 for -- for three more years if you're -- if you're  
22 reelected?

23 **CHAIR GROVE:** Well, to clarify, it -- it's  
24 it would be yearly versus --

25 **MR. BIRD:** -- True --

1           **CHAIR GROVE:** -- a full term --

2           **MR. BIRD:** -- Yeah. Got. --

3           **CHAIR GROVE:** -- So -- so for that clarity.

4 I certainly, it -- it is something that I do enjoy  
5 doing and I find value in it. And I find value in  
6 this committee, so I certainly would accept that.

7           **MR. BIRD:** And then, Kia, do you want to  
8 stay in if Barb's re-elected, do you want to stay in  
9 your role as is? Or do you want Vice Chair or what I  
10 mean?

11           **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** I wouldn't be happy --  
12 what -- whatever the committee would like.

13           **MR. BIRD:** Okay.

14           **CHAIR GROVE:** And -- and that is something  
15 we -- we did - felt -- I -- I did try to reach out to  
16 Chris. You know, Chris is not here. We don't know  
17 his intent. And, again, Chris is also somebody who's  
18 who's term and I know - he -- he has - he - he -- he  
19 did reapply. We don't know what that outcome for that  
20 is either. So, for fairness to Chris, we haven't  
21 asked him.

22           **MR NEAL:** Correct.

23           **CHAIR GROVE:** But I, you know, in -- in the  
24 last election, he -- he was willing. I'm just trying  
25 to see if he --

1           **MR. BIRD:** All right. So, kind 'a what I'm  
2 hearing is current structure, if -- if reappointments  
3 occur, then -- then we'll keep the current structure.  
4 If reappointments do not occur, we will move to the  
5 new structure of -- of Kia, Rashad and -- and Mark.  
6 Everybody, I guess, we have to vote on that anyway.  
7 So, we'll find out if everybody agrees.

8           **CHAIR GROVE:** So, what we would need to do,  
9 if -- if we feel what Chuck stated is clear, we're  
10 able to capture that correctly, then we would ask for,  
11 again -- uh - uh -- a move on that a motion on that,  
12 Kurt, of course. And then, again, a second. And --  
13 and -- and that we will take I will take, an -- an  
14 acceptance vote on that.

15           **MR. ROSENTRATER:** I move that we accept the  
16 proposal that you have placed in front of us in terms  
17 of new officers.

18           **MR. GARCIA:** Yeah. I agree with that. The  
19 first proposal where Kia would be Chair, Rashad would  
20 be Vice Chair, and I forget who he said it was  
21 Secretary.

22           **MR. BIRD:** Mark.

23           **MR. GARCIA:** Yeah. That's what I -- I agree  
24 for diversity and perspective. Even though you did a  
25 wonderful job.

1           **CHAIR GROVE:** I think what you just did was  
2 a -- a change in the motion, so then we do need to  
3 discuss this. And -- and that's okay.

4           **MR GARCIA:** Yeah. Well, I second his motion.

5           **CHAIR GROVE:** What were you doing? Were you  
6 seconding his motion?

7           **MR GARCIA:** Yeah. And I'm not sure -- I'm  
8 going to be off, so I'm not sure I can even do that.

9           **CHAIR GROVE:** But Rest please re-state your  
10 motion, Kirt.

11           **MR. ROSENTRATER:** I'll do my best. Correct  
12 me if I mis-speak. The motion is to list as the slate  
13 of Officers, Barb as Chair, Chris as Vice Chair, Kia  
14 as Secretary, assuming that you are all reappointed to  
15 the committee. If that does not occur, then the new  
16 structure, the new Officers will be Kia as Chair,  
17 Rashad as Vice Chair, and Mark as Secretary.

18           **MR. GARCIA:** And I -- I don't second that  
19 one.

20           **CHAIR GROVE:** You. Okay. And that's what I  
21 thought. That's why -- that's why I wanted to --

22           **MR GARCIA:** -- Yeah. No. I would -- I  
23 disagree with that one. Yeah. I thought he - I -- my  
24 understanding was we would go with Kia as Chair,  
25 Rashad as Vice Chair, and Mark as Secretary.



1           **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Not trying to make things  
2 more complicated, but we do run into something if Barb  
3 gets re-appointed and Chris doesn't or vice versa.

4           **MR GARCIA:** Yeah. And then it's also just  
5 some diversity so we have some more perspective and  
6 give opportunity to other folks.

7           **CHAIR GROVE:** And I do want to talk about,  
8 again, whether it's myself or Chris, something that we  
9 did talk about last night that the Chair and the Vice  
10 Chair should probably be in different term groups.  
11 Because if you have a situation where they may be both  
12 moving off or you have some type of situation that  
13 doesn't allow business, you still have a -- a  
14 continuity of someone that is on a different term.

15           **MS ADAMS-MIKESH:** But if we do, the first  
16 one is arbiter chair, and then the other two positions  
17 be people that are not being that are not ending their  
18 term. So, then it goes if you're re-appointed, then  
19 there's not as much complexity to it?

20           **CHAIR GROVE:** Would you re-state your  
21 intent, and -- and we can look at -- at that move.

22           **MS ADAMS-MIKESH:** Yeah. Of having what Kurt  
23 mentioned with the state not being the same, but  
24 having Barb and then whoever and as Vice Chair and  
25 whoever is Secretary with those two positions not

1 having their terms ending so that we don't have added  
2 complexity of both you and Chris and not having to go  
3 back and forth between if one of you gets it and one  
4 of you doesn't, then it goes straight to then if you  
5 aren't, then it goes to the second option.

6 **MR. MORGAN:** What if we just have elections  
7 and we choose the vice chair? If -- if Barb is the  
8 Chair and the Vice Chair is not in the same right is  
9 what you're getting at, then the Vice Chair becomes  
10 the Chair, Barb is not reappointed. Correct? Okay.

11 **MR GARCIA:** Or we can just go with the  
12 actual and what we do know with Keah being the Chair,  
13 Rashad being Vice Chair, and Mark being Secretary  
14 because we know they're going to be back next meeting.

15 **MR. BIRD:** But are they on the same terms?

16 **MR GARCIA:** But they're going to be there for  
17 another year, so that's quite okay because they're  
18 going to do another election. And but there's no  
19 assumptions. It's actual.

20 **DR. ROSENTRATER:** It might be wise for me to  
21 withdraw my motion based on discussions.

22 **CHAIR GROVE:** So, we need a new motion?

23 **MR GARCIA:** So, I'd like to motion Kia as  
24 Chair, Rashad as Vice Chair, and Mark as Secretary.

25 **DR. ROSENTRATER:** Second.

1           **CHAIR GROVE:** Okay. All in favor? All in  
2 favor, please signify.

3           **ALL MEMBERS:** "Aye".

4           **CHAIR GROVE:** Any dissent? Okay. Thank you.  
5 (Inaudible) have to pass it.

6           **MR GARCIA:** For the record, Barb, you did an  
7 excellent job in the last two years, and I really  
8 appreciate your service.

9                                 (CLAPING)

10           **CHAIR GROVE:** All right. Thank you.  
11 Sometimes, you know, many discussions after a glass of  
12 wine can -- can -- change -- change our perspective on  
13 things. We may make things more difficult than we  
14 think. I think the next set of both agenda items  
15 again, what we talk about in agenda items today is not  
16 a set in stone. We have time for that, but I think  
17 it's important to talk about - um -- something that  
18 was first started in the last meeting about some  
19 meeting times to, it was it was, mentioned. What  
20 about some consistency in in trying to set our  
21 meetings? And I know there's other things we're  
22 working about.

23                 We are working around, you know, Arthur's  
24 schedule. We are working around other industry  
25 events, that, you know, a lot of us are part of other

1 things. But what we also want to do is to be able to  
2 allow time between meetings. If we make  
3 recommendations, we can't have a quick turnaround of  
4 another meeting right on its heels because that  
5 doesn't allow FGIS to take the recommendations and put  
6 things into play. Doesn't give time for any work, any  
7 data.

8 So, one thing we have talked about as a  
9 possibility for next year that we'd like you to look  
10 into is there is an industry meeting roughly the 22nd  
11 through 25th February here in Kansas City. Can we  
12 schedule the next meeting either on the front side?  
13 Well, front side wouldn't be back if we're going to  
14 continue because that starts on a Saturday. So, it's  
15 not a probably a good look for a Friday. But on the  
16 backside of it, whether it's a Wednesday, Thursday  
17 type of meeting after that, that a lot of people may  
18 be here, just again. And if we look at kind of  
19 February or a early March time frame that could allow  
20 for flexibility of an August meeting when, you know,  
21 we look at some scheduling, and we appreciate very  
22 much -- um -- I'll say the academics on the committee.  
23 Because they're you are people who have done research,  
24 have knowledge behind some of the things that we're  
25 trying to do, and if we are waiting until September

1 started, class schedules have started. Also, we're  
2 looking at September, October, and we also are pushing  
3 into busy times with majority of our -- of our  
4 businesses in harvest. So, if we could do a type of  
5 time frame like a February, March, then it's possibly  
6 in August or July, but still allow some time frame in  
7 between, a six month possibly in between. So, again,  
8 we have to rely on the availability of what you can  
9 see and then keep that in mind for all of us for  
10 recommendations. You know, if I'm not mistaken again,  
11 Kendra, first of all, if we recommend a date and  
12 agenda items, it's almost six weeks prior or a little  
13 more than that that you have to turn that in to get  
14 approval first. So, is that almost a -- a two month  
15 prior?

16 **MS. KLINE:** That would be ideal because we  
17 have to go through a clearance process within the  
18 department. So, and we have to go through general  
19 counsel has to look at it, like, and we have to post  
20 it within like, ideally, we want to publish 30 days  
21 prior to the meeting, but I think, statute is 15 days.  
22 So, we have a little wiggle room there.

23 **CHAIR GROVE:** And in publishing in the 30  
24 days, it's at that time frame where if you have a  
25 recommended topic that you would need the background

1 paper and why so the public can see it. And if there  
2 is a want for them to attend it to be able to comment  
3 to that, that gives them time to do a little homework  
4 and look at those. So, the agenda items and a date  
5 being turned in roughly two months in advance doesn't  
6 mean your papers are due then, but that's when we want  
7 to kind of finalize this is what we want to talk  
8 about. So, with that in mind, in the hope of a end of  
9 February, beginning of March meeting, we would need  
10 the beginning of January is when we would want to have  
11 nailed down our agenda items. So, today's discussion  
12 isn't saying these are set in stone, but what are some  
13 ideas for us to kick around so we can make some  
14 priorities. And if nobody has anything today that  
15 comes to mind, that's just fine. Again, we have some  
16 time here this winter to discuss those. And, Arthur,  
17 if you had okay. I know. In addition. Okay. So,  
18 again, with in mind that we would like things turned  
19 in by, you know, right after the right after the first  
20 of the year. Anything that comes to mind now.

21 **MS ADAMS-MIKESH:** I would like to have a  
22 place in the next meeting that would be discussing the  
23 instructions that are being updated and if there is  
24 anything that you guys would like FGIS would like us  
25 to discuss during that meeting.

1           **CHAIR GROVE:** I -- I'm going to just say  
2 let's, put back on their, technology and grain  
3 inspection. I can keep that as a topic. That way, if  
4 there's a priority we have, we have the ability to  
5 make recommendations.

6           **MS ADAMS-MIKESH:** Another thing that I don't  
7 feel we were quite ready for this time, but in a  
8 previous committee meeting, we had discussed regarding  
9 scales that there also could be an option where it was  
10 discussed that existing skills are grandfathered in,  
11 but as things break and are removed, then it would be  
12 expected that the grading skills should be replaced  
13 with the ones that had been mentioned.

14           **CHAIR GROVE:** Smart topic of equipment  
15 replacement, just in general in case there's other  
16 pieces that you're thinking about or just specifically  
17 scales? Specifically, the scales.

18           **MS. CASEY-CAMPBELL:** Going further off of -  
19 uh -- Barb's suggestion to keep our continuing  
20 technology, based on, Ed's update of maybe when we  
21 might get a proof of concept. We may be close to that  
22 time if we are aiming for this late February. So just  
23 asking for -- formally asking for an update at that  
24 time of where what progress we have made.

25           **CHAIR GROVE:** Okay. Again, we have some

1 time, but it's nice to -- to get a few things few  
2 things out there. We can start that brainstorming and  
3 thought process. And, again, we do -- we do, value  
4 and encourage from the industry any of those, online  
5 and those here in the gallery. You know, be sure to  
6 reach out if you have things in mind because, again,  
7 what we are looking at, you know, the topic is just  
8 discussing industry issues. And while those of us on  
9 the committee have a wide range of what our experience  
10 and where we are in the industry, what we represent.  
11 We aren't the end all to it. So, again, always  
12 encourage industry feedback on arising topics.

13 **MS ADAMS-MIKESH:** Arthur, is there anything  
14 from FGIS' perspective that you would like us to  
15 consider for the next meeting?

16 **MR NEAL:** Not that I can think of. I'm sure  
17 that something's going to pop up between now and then,  
18 though.

19 **CHAIR GROVE:** I I'm going to put that out  
20 there. And, again, we have a little -- a little bit  
21 of time, and I think we want to even give a little  
22 more lead time, for industry topics. But we -- we had  
23 a -- a very good presentation on cybersecurity. Were  
24 there areas that we wanted to pursue or ask if FGIS  
25 could bring in, if you want to say whether it's the



1 industry expert or something, think about that here in  
2 maybe just this next 30 days. That would give FJS  
3 time to -- to consider and look for somebody that  
4 would be interested in coming to talk. So, again, if  
5 there's a presentation, that would be great. And I  
6 think that was helpful and, again, something to think  
7 about.

8 **DR. ROSENTRATER:** I'm curious. Would there  
9 be any interest with the committee to have someone  
10 come and give an update in terms of big trends coming  
11 down the pipeline that are impacting the industry.  
12 Whether it's the soy crush facilities that are coming  
13 online or whatever the hot topic of the year is.  
14 Would there be any interest in -- in those types of  
15 presentations?

16 **CHAIR GROVE:** So, I'm going to say just a  
17 blank yes. We look at the meeting, the technology  
18 meeting that was held at Texas Tech last year to look  
19 at what other areas of the USDA, what was cotton using  
20 for technology in their process, what was beef using?  
21 What was poultry and egg using? And, you know, it was  
22 very, you know, it was a little bit eye opening. It's  
23 like, hey. You know, I want that in grain grading.  
24 So upcoming trends and what somebody else is doing, I  
25 think is helpful because it opens up. Could we be

1 doing something different or adding something  
2 different? Or the technology is there. We just  
3 didn't know about it. You know how that looks, we  
4 might have to define that a little bit more. But,  
5 again, a good place to start. Yeah. What's out  
6 there? What should we be aware of? And are you  
7 looking at not just technology, but anything else? Is  
8 it -- is -- it sustainability? Is it, you know, how  
9 can we all affect that? There's a lot of different  
10 topics that could -- could fall under what's that  
11 what's that big thing out there. Thank you, Kurt.

12 **MR. HEIL:** Mark at Prairie Central. Just a  
13 background, just information on exports and volumes  
14 even looking back and saying this is where we've been,  
15 this is where we're at, this could be where we're  
16 going, and the changes that have that have gone on in  
17 in all aspects of that could be helpful for this group  
18 just understanding why things have changed and aren't  
19 changing, in in in that process.

20 **MR GARCIA:** Makes me wonder maybe someone  
21 from US Greens counsel would be really good to give an  
22 update.

23 **CHAIR GROVE:** And, again, it's a -- a very  
24 good suggestion because that was why the topic was  
25 originally brought up. And, you know, outside of our

1 committee meeting, many of us go to other stakeholder  
2 meetings. It was bringing a stakeholder into our  
3 meeting. So, thank you. That's a very good  
4 suggestion. So not to prolong this, again, as -- as  
5 we have, well, obviously, we've seen a few weather  
6 issues today. Everybody can get going and do a little  
7 travel planning so that we're moving safe. Yeah,  
8 watching the news this morning, they were talking  
9 about a few of those aspects and some important things  
10 for us to remember. You know, there's possibilities  
11 of tornadoes. Those of you hanging or that are still  
12 in town here and at the airport, make sure you're  
13 really keeping an eye on that because yeah. Well,  
14 we're so excited to see rain because we haven't seen  
15 it for such a long time. It's bringing a whole slew  
16 of other things with it that, you know of course, it  
17 wasn't on the menu that we were asking for. But okay.  
18 Well, thank you, everybody. I'm going to turn it over  
19 to Arthur here for just a moment to close us out.

20 **MR NEAL:** I'll be quick, but I want to say  
21 thank you to each one of you. I know that you're  
22 busy. Those in the in the gallery that have come to  
23 support us, thank you. Those who have left, that were  
24 here yesterday, we appreciate them as well. This is  
25 an important time in life, I think, of the official

1 grain inspection system because we are kind of at a  
2 pivotal point, and we make some critical decisions on  
3 how do we move forward. A way that sustains us,  
4 hedges to get some of the volatility that we see on  
5 the staffing side, on the demand side, and you're  
6 digging your heels in with open hearts, open minds,  
7 and you've been very objective about it. I just want  
8 to say I appreciate it because I've been in the  
9 environment and served on committees where there's a  
10 lot of bias coming through the members. And so, it's  
11 hard to decipher what is, you know, good for the  
12 whole. And I sense that you all are focusing on  
13 what's good for the whole. And I -- I commend you on  
14 that and appreciate you for that. It's all part, it's  
15 also part of a cultural change. And we're changing  
16 the culture here, and changing culture is not easy to  
17 do, and you're a part of that. You're part of  
18 history. And so, thank you for your service on behalf  
19 of the Secretary, on behalf of Bruce Summers, our  
20 administrator, all of the staff at FIS, we appreciate  
21 you. Safe travels home, and I look forward to seeing  
22 you again before terms roll off. You know? Thank  
23 you.

24 **CHAIR GROVE:** Again, I just want to echo  
25 Arthur. Thank you for everybody. What I have loved

1 about this committee from day one is, again, the  
2 diversity of knowledge, the experience that everybody  
3 has because that is helping to be well rounded in our  
4 decision making. I myself have learned a lot learned  
5 a lot of what somebody else is doing in their avenue  
6 of agriculture. And, you know, things like supper  
7 together last night. It wasn't about a business  
8 meeting, but it was, again, understanding better and  
9 developing those contacts for strong colleagues, and -  
10 - and people that you can reach out to for  
11 information. And, you know, for me, then getting to  
12 know the people in FGIS, knowing where we can turn for  
13 the help and the questions, and changing the culture  
14 of FGIS is off limits that your government, I'm not.  
15 That is a change and that's very important, because I  
16 feel what we're seeing is a shift of it's being  
17 collaborative and not being regulatory. There's a big  
18 difference in that and appreciate that. So, with  
19 that, thank you all for your engagement that we have  
20 had in this meeting. A lot of good things and I look  
21 forward to seeing you again, hopefully, end of  
22 February March. Thank you.

23  
24 (Whereupon, at 10:40AM, the proceeding was  
25 concluded.)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I, DEVIN RICHMOND AND DANA WALKER, do hereby certify that this transcript was prepared from the digital audio recording of the foregoing proceeding, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings to the best of my knowledge, skills, and ability; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this was taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

DEVIN L. RICHMOND & DANA L. WALKER