

1 THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
2 Grain Inspection Advisory Committee
3 Meeting
4

5
6 Moderated by: Barbara Grove
7

8
9 DATE: Wednesday, May 16, 2024

10 TIME: 8:30 AM, CDT

11 LOCATION: AMS National Grain Center
12 10383 North Ambassador Drive
13 Kansas City, Missouri 64153
14

15
16 REPORTED BY: Devin L. Richmond, Notary Public, and
17 RON
18

19
20 JOB No.: 1012
21 Day Two
22
23
24
25

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 **Denise Ruggles**, Executive Program Analyst, USDA

6 **Charles Parr**, Director, Field Management

7 **Dr. Ed Jhee**, Director, Technology and Science
8 Division

9 **Dr. Charles Hurburgh**, Professor, Iowa State
10 University

11 **Charles Bird**, Senior Director Product Management,
12 Neogen Corporation

13 **Philip Garcia**, Grain Inspection Program Manager,
14 Washington State Department of Agriculture

15 **Christopher Frederking**, Vice Chair, General
16 Manager, Zen-Noh Grain Corporation

17 **John Morgan**, Vice President, JD Heiskell &
18 Company

19 **Kia Adams-Mikesh**, Secretary, North Dakota Grain
20 Inspection Service, Inc.

21 **Erin Casey-Campbell**, Program Manager, Missouri
22 Department of Agriculture

23 **Rashad Hart**, General Superintendent of Plant
24 Operations, Cargill, Inc.

25 **Mark Heil**, General Manager, Prairie Central

A P P E A R A N C E S (Cont'd)

Cooperative, Inc.

Tracy Logan, Director of Export Documentation,
United Grain Corporation

Erica Olson, Market Development & Research
Manager, North Dakota Wheat Commission

Dr. Kurt Rosentrater, Professor, Iowa State
University

Jacob Thein, Chief of Policy Procedures and
Analysis, FGIS

Nick Friant, Cargill, NGFA and NAEGA

Gregory Giese, Staff member, PPMAB

Kendra Kline, Chief of Staff, USDA, AMS and FGIS

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	PAGE
CALL TO ORDER.....	5
PUBLIC COMMENTS.....	5
DISCUSS RECOMMENDATIONS.....	8
FINIAL RECOMMENDATIONS.....	48
DISCUSS AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING.....	49
CLOSING REMARKS.....	61
MEETING ADJOURN.....	64

P R O C E E D I N G

1
2 **CHAIR GROVE:** All right, good morning,
3 everybody. Welcome back to day two. A lot of good
4 discussions that we had here yesterday, and I think --
5 uh, again a lot of very relevant discussion to the
6 world we live in today. Many things that affect a lot
7 of different areas in our industry, and some of our
8 talk has a very broad reach. Some of our topics cover
9 a lot of areas.

10 So, our discussions today will revolve around
11 saying what do we want to recommend to FGIS. So, I am
12 going to quickly start out to say, do we have any
13 public comments? I know at this time we had checked
14 there weren't any that were submitted online. So, as
15 in the chat for you people online, make sure to put
16 something in the chat. We have about -- I'm going to
17 give about ten minutes here if you have something that
18 you would like to come on to add to the conversation,
19 anybody in the public gallery, any final things that
20 the Committee want -- might want to comment on?

21 Like I said, I'm just going to wait just a couple
22 of minutes to see if we have anything pop up, but we
23 had verified there were no -- no public comments
24 submitted yesterday. Want to be sure we have the
25 opportunity to give everybody one last say. And while

1 we are waiting for that -- well, I have verified
2 Kendra, we do have a quorum today. So, we will be --
3 we will be fine to go ahead and vote on resolutions
4 today.

5 All right. And seeing nobody come forward, we
6 are going to get directly to the business today. Our
7 Vice Chair, Chris, is going to do editing for us
8 today.

9 Thank you, everybody. Thank you, Kurt, Phil, Kia
10 -- um -- for submitting last night for some reviews of
11 drafts to the Committee, and we're just going to take
12 a quick look. We have them up on the screen. And can
13 I verify, can the public, see?

14 **MS. KLINE:** Not yet. Hold on.

15 **CHAIR GROVE:** Okay. Okay. So, we'll go
16 ahead and read -- read the first one. The first
17 couple -- we kinda changed the order from yesterday.
18 We decided we wanted to take care of, in a sense, the
19 -- the Committee business pieces first, and those
20 entail Advisory Committee quorum. So, the Grain
21 Inspection Advisory Committee, the GIAC, under the
22 Membership Balance Plan .6 Quorum Requirements, the
23 Advisory Committee requires two-thirds of its members
24 to be present in order to hold a meeting. The GIAC
25 Committee would like to recommend a change in the

1 quorum requirements to a simple majority of the
2 membership.

3 The Committee believes that the ability to hold
4 business meetings more consistently each year gives
5 them a better ability to address industry issues in a
6 timelier manner. We also believe that the public
7 forum and comment period posted prior to the meeting
8 would allow each member, whether present or not, to
9 have a voice, and weigh in on the topic even if they
10 cannot be part of the vote.

11 And for me, that was a very important piece.
12 When you think of changing a quorum, then what you've
13 done is changed the voice of all the diversity in this
14 room. And that's a very important part of the
15 Committee. But, again, as we discussed yesterday,
16 everybody still would have that opportunity, because
17 our topics are published ahead of time, and they are
18 sent to the Committee ahead of time.

19 So, everybody has a chance to review those agenda
20 items, and still send in your comments, send in your
21 voice. That way we know, even if you don't have a
22 vote, we do know the information that you could bring
23 to the Committee.

24 So, are there any changes that anybody feels,
25 whether it's a little bit of wording -- and I may ask

1 Kendra or Arthur just from the -- um -- if you want to
2 say, just making sure official wording is correct. I
3 think that is under the Membership Balance Plan. That
4 is what we reviewed yesterday. Um -- just want to make
5 sure that we are in the right area and know where
6 we're supposed to edit. Any other changes anybody
7 sees? Everybody okay with this? I would like to ask
8 for a -- uh --

9 **MR. MORGAN:** -- a motion we --

10 **CHAIR GROVE:** -- a motion. That's what I
11 could - sorry, it's -- it's -- it's a morning.

12 **MR. MORGAN:** I motion we accept the Granting
13 Inspector Advisory Committee quorum recommendation as
14 presented.

15 **CHAIR GROVE:** Thank you.

16 **DR. HURBUGH:** Second.

17 **CHAIR GROVE:** All right. All in favor, say
18 "aye".

19 **MAJORITY MEMEBERS:** "Aye."

20 **CHAIR GROVE:** Any opposed? That motion
21 passes.

22 And we are going to go ahead and go on with
23 the second Committee business, the Grain Inspection
24 Advisory Committee Nominations, and Terms.

25 We discussed a few different things yesterday on

1 whether it would be the timing --um -- you know, as we
2 discussed, timing of a term depends on timing of
3 approval from the Secretary. And in weighing the pros
4 and cons that did not -- changing that term -- term
5 limit, the con would be somebody's time may be
6 shortened, and there's no guarantees of, again --
7 things are happening, we don't know.

8 So, the Grain Inspection Advisory Committee under
9 the U.S. Grain Standards Act, Section 87J. Advisory
10 Committees. A: Established -- establishment numbers
11 in terms of members. Members of the Advisory
12 Committee shall be appointed to three-year terms,
13 except that of the initial fifteen members of the
14 Advisory Committee, first appointed Committee for --
15 for appointed following the enactment of this section.
16 Five shall be appointed to a term of one year, and
17 five shall be appointed for terms of two years. No
18 member of the Advisory Committee shall serve for more
19 than two terms.

20 The Advisory Committee would like to recommend to
21 FGIS to support a change in the Statute or in -- in
22 the U.S. Grain Standards Act -- um -- to extend the
23 terms to four years. An extended term will allow for
24 a time frame where no member would be rolling off of
25 the Committee.

1 This would give the Committee a better
2 continuation in the experience of Committee members
3 and in the business operations and diversity of the
4 knowledge of the industry. And I think the only
5 question that I might have would be, four or five-year
6 term? We talked about both.

7 So, if there is -- right now, we are asking for a
8 four-year term. And as described yesterday -- um --
9 this again, would allow for not every single year
10 asking for nominations and a group rolling off. So,
11 we just have a better continuation of business and
12 just the experience and people understanding their
13 roles. Any differences people may ask in the four to
14 five-year term?

15 **MR. NEAL:** I -- I do want to share this
16 conversation that I've been having with the White
17 House Liaison on our nominations, because I don't
18 think we've been interpreting the two terms the way
19 that they are now interpreting it. I think they will
20 begin to look back to see how many terms has a member
21 served historically -- which would -- which could
22 limit our pool of nominees in the future.

23 So, if a member has already served two terms,
24 whether they were consecutive or not, they may limit
25 that individual from being considered for appointment

1 on -- on the Committee. So, that restricts our pool.
2 I'm still -- we're still having conversations. That's
3 how they have interpreted things. I have not seen it
4 in writing, but they're applying that to boards and
5 committees that are being established under USDA. So,
6 that's just for -- for folks' information.

7 **DR. HURBUGH:** That could even impact service
8 now, because -- I'll just stick my neck out and talk
9 about me. I was on this two terms way back when, in
10 the -- in an earlier life. And so, I sometimes have
11 forgot about it. But the point is, how does that play
12 here?

13 **MR. NEAL:** It doesn't right now.

14 **DR. HURBUGH:** Okay.

15 **MR. NEAL:** I think it's on appointments that
16 are being made. And what I'm trying to -- I'm -- I'm
17 looking now -- it doesn't say consecutive. It just
18 says no more than two terms. That was the new
19 addition in the USGSA and so that's why I think
20 they're interpreting it that way.

21 **MR. BURBURGH:** I get what you're
22 say 'in, but --

23 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Would we consider
24 changing it to add non-consecutive? What if we added
25 that? And then that would apply to you.

1 **MR. BURBURGH:** (Inaudible)--

2 **CHAIR GROVE:** --It could -- it could still
3 limit it --

4 **THE REPORTER:** I didn't hear you. Could you
5 please turn your mic on?

6 **DR. HURBUGH:** Oh. And anyone else that has
7 been on the Committee in previous years, under
8 previous administrations, etcetera.

9 **CHAIR GROVE:** Right. So, I think if -- if
10 we add new Advisory Committee may serve more than two
11 consecutive terms --

12 **MR. NEAL:** --It used to be consecutive.

13 **MS. CASEY-CAMBELL:** The printout vision does
14 say, successively -- the one we got yesterday. It
15 says, "that no member of the Advisory Committee may
16 serve successively for more than two terms."

17 **MR. NEAL:** So that's my -- that's my --
18 that's what I'm trying to get them to understand. It
19 shouldn't be a historical ban. But I didn't see it up
20 there. That was my -- that's the difference between
21 us and them. So, if clarification is needed you may
22 want to consider that. So, that currently -- it's not
23 necessary clarification here.

24 I think that a recommendation to the Secretary to
25 help them understand how the Committee views the

1 language, how it should be interpreted. Because right
2 now, the White House Liaison is interpreting it; that
3 if a person has served two terms, just like you
4 basically how you've got it written, that they can't
5 be re-appointed. And so, the Secretary would need to
6 know how, does the Committee feel about members
7 serving more than two terms or being appointed more
8 than two terms.

9 So, this is a little bit different. This -- what
10 you got on the screen is related to the USGSA, and I
11 think what I'm sharing with you is regarding how it's
12 being interpreted internally by the White House
13 Liaison's Office.

14 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** So, do we want to put in
15 this recommendation, instead of saying successively,
16 being very clear that consecutively, or does it not
17 matter?

18 **MR. NEAL:** Clarification that it means
19 consecutively, and it does not mean holistically or
20 historically.

21 **MS. ADAM-MIKESH:** Okay.

22 **CHAIR GROVE:** So, if we change that Chris,
23 in the bottom, the Committee would like to recommend
24 some word change to extend to four years -- um -- and
25 then right after that -- and to change the word

1 successively to --

2 **MR. MORGAN:** -- consecutive --

3 **CHAIR GROVE:** -- consecutive. And that no
4 member of the Advisory Committee may serve
5 consecutively more than two terms. I'm sorry, yes,
6 terms. But I think we still do want to have the two
7 terms consecutively, right? Because if we just say
8 consecutive terms, that could just continue on, and
9 continue on. We do think that it is important to have
10 some rotation, but the ability for somebody to come
11 back at another time is still important. So, it's in
12 terms of four years, no member of the GISA may serve -
13 - Is it still important to say two consecutive terms?

14 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** I think we could just do
15 the exact same verbiage that it is and just swap
16 successively for consecutively. I recommend that.

17 **MR. MORGAN:** I'm not sure if consecutive or
18 successive -- the legal determinations, but from an
19 English language standpoint, they mean the same thing.

20 **Ms. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Arthur -- what -- why are
21 they interpreting it holistically versus consecutively
22 like we've always had it in the past? Do you know is
23 that the exact verbiage of why they're starting to
24 interpret it that way? Is it that sentence, or do you
25 know why?

1 **MR. NEAL:** No, that's it -- sorry. No, I've
2 not seen their interpretation in writing.

3 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Okay. Would it make
4 sense for us to -- to instead make it so specific --
5 state that we just in general promote or -- want it to
6 be that we recommend that it is not in a holistic or
7 historical approach, and it is consecutive. Then if
8 they aren't talking about that specific line right
9 there, if they're talking about something else, it
10 would still give you kind of that leverage.

11 **MR. NEAL:** I think that helps.

12 **CHAIR GROVE:** So actually, I feel we want to
13 address it as a separate sentence. So, if you want to
14 copy and paste what you just did and then cut.
15 Because I do think -- first of all, we are talking
16 about the extended term, and then on the end, we would
17 also like to address --

18 **MR. NEAL:** -- how it should be interpreted?

19 **CHAIR GROVE:** Yes. The interpretation that
20 a member of the Advisory -- Advisory Committee may
21 serve consecutively two terms but may return - may be
22 - may be considered --

23 **MR. NEAL:** -- considered --

24 **CHAIR GROVE:** -- after sitting out at least
25 one term. Not ten, Charlie. We're not going to wait

1 ten terms.

2 **DR. HURBUGH:** My point on is going to be --
3 be careful that you don't put so much specificity in,
4 that it simply will generate more debate over, well,
5 do I sit out one term? Do I sit out two? Especially
6 if the administration changes. Don't ask for a problem
7 is what, I guess, I'm getting at.

8 **CHAIR GROVE:** No, but we want to make --

9 **DR. HURBUGH:** -- It would be nice if we --

10 **CHAIR GROVE:** -- we want to make sure that
11 if somebody does serve two consecutive terms -- so, if
12 you have a suggestion for that -- that they can serve
13 two consecutive terms but then they're not limited,
14 they can't come back on again -- we want -- but may
15 return in the future. Does that sound better? May
16 serve consecutive terms. Don't put the number two in
17 there.

18 **DR. HURBUGH:** It would nice if this could be
19 just an understanding that --

20 **CHAIR GROVE:** -- it would be nice if it was
21 an understanding.

22 **DR. HURBUGH:** Because the moment you put
23 numbers in, then you ask for more numbers. I don't
24 know.

25 **MR. NEAL:** The thing about this

1 recommendation, only one part of it would be dealt
2 with at the USGSA level. The other part, where you're
3 talking about how it should be interpreted, is dealt
4 with internally of USDA. Um -- so, you have really a
5 two-part recommendation related to the same issue.

6 One: You're talking about proposing language to
7 amend the USGSA to extend the term to four years
8 versus two. That's specific.

9 The other one, and I don't know, you know kinda
10 how those flows. White House Liaison Officers, they
11 change. But how they are interpreting that -- I think
12 there needs to be some clarity for them to the
13 Secretary as to what the industry desires in terms of
14 its ability to staff this Committee with nominees.

15 That's my perspective. So, that at least he
16 knows, or she knows, whoever the next Secretary would
17 be, they have input from the industry.

18 **MR. MORGAN:** Without putting a number in
19 after but are considered -- I think we could say --
20 just proposing this -- um -- but are not limited to
21 additional terms in the future. There's no number in
22 there. It's just there's no limit other than
23 consecutive. So -- that's good.

24 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Do we want to make it
25 clear, in kind of a separate area, that we as the

1 Advisory Committee or the GIAC -- how -- would like
2 the -- don't use my words -- but would like the
3 interpretation to be x,y,z, and kinda talk about that
4 as -- so -- because -- that first -- that second
5 paragraph seems to be kind of more addressing. It
6 could maybe be taken as talking about that last
7 sentence in the first one, and just making it
8 extremely clear that we want it interpreted that way,
9 outside of the Act as well. I don't know if that --
10 Arthur, do you think this would be -- do you think
11 this would be enough?

12 **MR. MORGAN:** Or would you move this sentence
13 that starts with also to the end?

14 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Yeah.

15 **MS. MORGAN:** Is that what you're
16 recommending, Kia?

17 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Yeah.

18 **CHAIR GROVE:** We'll make -- make it a
19 separate topic --

20 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Yeah.

21 **CHAIR GROVE:** -- in a sense. Its own
22 separate - its own separate paragraph.

23 Unless there are any last thoughts, I would
24 entertain a motion to accept.

25 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** I'll motion.

1 **DR. HURBUGH:** Second.

2 **CHAIR GROVE:** All right. All "ayes"?

3 **ALL MEMEBERS:** "Aye."

4 **CHAIR GROVE:** Any against? All right.

5 Thank you. This passes.

6 And, we do not have a recommendation up for
7 Committee Handbook. It was determined by the
8 Committee yesterday that we do not need to make
9 recommendations -- all that. This will be handled for
10 more of an orientation versus an official need. And
11 also, Technology Subcommittee, it was determined
12 yesterday this is not something needed at this time,
13 so will we not be making a recommendation on that
14 agenda item.

15 This is cybersecurity. So, we will now move to
16 cybersecurity. And, Kurt, if you would want to go
17 ahead and read your own, I would appreciate that
18 today.

19 I apologize to the group. I'm going to need to
20 stand up and walk around the room.

21 **MR. ROSENTRATER:** No problem. And also, the
22 first paragraph is just background information. And
23 if you all think we should cut that out, that is fine
24 with me. So, it was just providing context.

25 To keep pace with the growing population, global

1 agriculture is witnessing rapid implementation of new
2 digital based technologies to increase agriculture and
3 food production. Deemed Agriculture 4.0, the
4 expansion of new technologies such as robotics, aerial
5 imaging, digital mapping of seeds, and GPS are just a
6 few examples of the expansion of technologies in
7 agriculture.

8 Consistent with an increased use of digital
9 tools, there is a need to maintain and update
10 protections for food and agricultural supply chains
11 from farm to table, not just physical protections, but
12 also digital protections via cybersecurity. New
13 digital technologies enable opportunities for more
14 advanced agriculture efficiencies, but also provide
15 multiple platforms for cyberattacks.

16 What role should USDA, AMS, FGIS play in helping
17 defend critical infrastructure and ensure viable
18 supply chains in the U.S. Grain Industry? Key actions
19 to consider, but are not limited to, invite FBI's
20 Cybersecurity Task Force to the next FGIS Advisory
21 Board Meeting to discuss anti-terrorism activities the
22 FBI is engaging in to protect U.S. agricultural
23 systems. Invite NGFA staff to next FGIS Advisory Board
24 meeting to discuss their ongoing activities and
25 potential partnering opportunities with FGIS to

1 provide cybersecurity resources to U.S. Grain
2 Industry. Evaluate current FGIS digital security
3 measures. Develop a digital security road map to be
4 used in conjunction with contemporaneous development
5 of instrumentation technologies.

6 **CHAIR GROVE:** Thank you, Kurt. Appreciate
7 that. So, in looking at that, that's a mouthful. I
8 know everybody got to read it last night. Any
9 thoughts? Anything in particular that somebody sees
10 to add or change? I think Kurt hit all the points
11 that we discussed yesterday.

12 Definitely, I like the piece of inviting industry
13 in, inviting other avenues, because I don't think
14 anybody here at this time -- um -- promotes themselves
15 to be a cybersecurity expert. And so, I think that's
16 very important for us.

17 There was one thing that I think we did talk about
18 yesterday, and that was how can we help partner to
19 help those that don't have the finances? Is that --
20 is that addressed? We would see if we also could help
21 and find those resources for those who need. Is that
22 something that we feel FGIS can help do, or is that
23 better served in looking towards other industry, if we
24 add that as a point? Um --

25 **MR. NEAL:** Are -- are you asking, would we have

1 the capacity to invite other -- other entities?

2 **CHAIR GROVE:** Not to invite to the meeting because
3 we do address that. We'd like to invite -- invite
4 them to help. But one comment yesterday was that, you
5 know, there were probably finances out there that
6 might be available that, you know, maybe a non-
7 government person wouldn't know would be available
8 that -- that we can help facilitate partnering for
9 those businesses, companies in the Ag Industry that
10 wouldn't have the finances to enact their own
11 cybersecurity.

12 There are, you know, small Ag companies we talked
13 about yesterday. One small piece of the supply chain
14 goes down, it could affect everybody down and
15 upstream. Is that something we feel that we can
16 address here? Again, it was just something that we
17 discussed yesterday that we add that point. What are
18 thoughts on that? Is that something we feel we can
19 address later through -- um -- inviting or we
20 encourage -- um -- encourage FGIS, USDA to look at
21 funds available to help those underserved in the Ag
22 Industry?

23 **MR. NEAL:** From my perspective, I think what
24 you've got proposed is recommending that FGIS builds
25 into our engagement, you know, some conversation and -

1 - and interaction around cybersecurity with those who
2 have the expertise in it to help educate, build
3 capacity for our industry. That, you know, and that
4 would probably, you know, expand beyond FBI -- FBI.
5 And there are organizations who may engage with this
6 Committee and industry who may have access to
7 information around funding opportunities, sources of
8 money, things of that nature. I think it -- it can
9 happen without having to specifically address it. I
10 think we know what we need.

11 **CHAIR GROVE:** Okay. Thank you. So, with
12 that, if there are no further comments or questions on
13 this, I would entertain a motion to accept as is.

14 **MR. ROSENTRATER:** So, moved.

15 **DR. HURBUGH:** Second.

16 **CHAIR GROVE:** All in approval say, "aye."

17 **ALL MEMEBERS:** "Aye."

18 **CHAIR GROVE:** All right. Any "no's"? All
19 right. Thank you. This resolution passes a
20 recommendation.

21 We are going to move on to the Standardizing
22 Protein Moisture Basis. And Phil, if you could go
23 ahead and read that for us.

24 **MR. GARCIA:** Sure. The grain -- excuse me.
25 The Grain Inspection Advisory Committee recommends

1 that the Federal Grain Inspection Service require the
2 inclusion of actual moisture content within the
3 Certificate Results Statement for soybeans, protein,
4 and oil. Specifically, the certificate should state
5 the protein content as protein, comma, moisture basis
6 comma As-Is. This change aims to ensure transparency
7 with the industry and provide accurate information to
8 grain buyers.

9 Currently, if reporting on an As-Is basis on a
10 separate certificate, the actual moisture is not
11 reported. By specifically -- or -- by specifying the
12 actual moisture level used for certification, the
13 calculations become more transparent. By implementing
14 this cert -- I can't really, it's so far -- by
15 implementing this certification change, buyers can
16 make information decisions or inform -- just thank you
17 -- inform decisions based on accurate information
18 leading to fair trade practices. I forgot my read 'in
19 glasses. Did that make sense?

20 **CHAIR GROVE:** Yes, it did.

21 **MR. GARCIA:** Good. Good.

22 **CHAIR GROVE:** So, I'm going to say,
23 definitely rely on those of you in official and
24 designated agencies, as you would be the ones putting
25 this on. So, any changes in wording or questions?

1 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Yes, I realized Phil,
2 that we forgot probably just one little part. After
3 the, "require the inclusion of actual moisture content
4 within the" cert -- cert -- oh my gosh -- I can't talk
5 either -- "within the certificate results statement
6 for soybean, protein and oil on an As-Is basis".
7 Because otherwise, that could potentially be
8 misconstrued as talking about any of the Moisture
9 Basis, but we're specifically talking about As-Is.
10 Can we ask FGIS if they feel that this --

11 **CHAIR GROVE:** -- definitely, definitely - we
12 need -

13 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** -- gives proper
14 clarification to what we need specifically -- Ron
15 Bundy?

16 **MR. BUNDY:** Hello. All right. Ron Bundy,
17 B-U-N-D-Y. Uh -- yeah -- I think this is good because
18 -- uh -- it will -- there's going to be a customer
19 base that's still looking for that term "As-Is", and
20 this specifies the moisture basis and also includes
21 that verbiage "As-Is" that some customers are looking
22 for. So, that's all I got.

23 **CHAIR GROVE:** Thank you for your input.

24 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Jake, from a policies
25 standpoint, is there anything else that you would need

1 to -- in order to make this easier for inputting it --
2 putting it into the Handbook?

3 **MR. THEIN:** Jacob Thein, T-H-E-I-N, PPMAB.
4 I believe this option would give us the transparency
5 that we are looking for. I think we'd be able to
6 clarify this in the Handbook really well. I -- I
7 think that's -- this is pretty much what we're kinda
8 looking for. So, thank you.

9 **CHAIR GROVE:** All right. Thank you.

10 **DR. HURBUGH:** Does the moisture that is
11 listed there -- moisture is 14 XX, and then the actual
12 moisture is listed. Does that actual moisture need to
13 be an official moisture, or not? And if so, it should
14 say so.

15 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Yes. It would need to be
16 -- so that would be the interpretation.

17 **DR. HURBUGH:** I think it's right. It would
18 have to be an official moisture.

19 **MR. GARCIA:** Well, everything we do is
20 official. So, the assumption that the moisture is an
21 official --

22 **DR. HURBUGH:** -- you're right. It's
23 official.

24 **MR. GARCIA:** Yeah.

25 **MR. NEAL:** Don't make the assumption.

1 **MR. GARCIA:** Well, it's not making an
2 assumption. It's an actual, because we don't do
3 anything unofficial.

4 **DR. HURBUGH:** But the NIR will report
5 moisture that won't be an official moisture.

6 **MR. NEAL:** All I'm saying is just make it
7 clear.

8 **DR. HURBUGH:** Okay. Yeah, that's what I was
9 saying too.

10 **CHAIR GROVE:** Okay -- If -- first of all,
11 Charlie or Kia, where should Chris add that? Tell him
12 in the sentence, and then we do have a public comment.

13 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** I think after the
14 quotations or -- what was that?

15 **DR. HURBUGH:** Right where the cursor is --

16 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** -- yeah --

17 **DR. HURBUGH:** -- right now --

18 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** -- official moisture --

19 **DR. HURBUGH:** -- Actual Official Moisture
20 Content.

21 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Yeah. That's perfect.

22 **CHAIR GROVE:** Okay, and -- uh --.

23 **MR. HUEBENER:** Chad Huebner, H-U-E-B-N-E-R.
24 Would you also want to notate -- uh -- oil on there
25 too? You have protein moisture basis. You probably

1 want to put oil moisture basis also because 99% of the
2 requests are for protein and oil.

3 **DR. HURBUGH:** Would this apply to corn, too?
4 It's almost like constituent measurement, rather than
5 just protein, or just oil.

6 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** We'd have to be careful
7 because we don't want this -- It can't go for wheat.
8 So, it would have to be -- I wasn't sure from the
9 presentation yesterday if we were specifically asking
10 for just soybean or if we wanted to, include -- it
11 would be nice to have corn, barley, etcetera, the same
12 but --

13 **CHAIR GROVE:** And my recollection of the
14 presentation, one of the options was, change
15 everything to same as wheat, was option one. Two was
16 another option, and then three is in a sense, this is
17 kind of that-- where we opted, right? Because number
18 one did say, just do everything the same as wheat, and
19 I think we're trying to stay away from that one,
20 correct?

21 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Yeah. We are trying to
22 stay away from number one -- um -- to not limit
23 markets, but then also, number three, we can't do
24 because that would require -- that was where we would
25 actually have the moisture result in the results area,

1 and we would have that on the Grade Certificate
2 already.

3 And there are other instructions within FGIS that
4 we can't have it -- have an official moisture in two
5 different ways on two different certificates. So, we
6 couldn't do number three.

7 But the number two had it as the actual moisture
8 basis. And what we did -- it was add also -- is keep
9 -- well, keeping the verbiage of "As-Is". So, you're
10 getting a little bit of the best of both worlds. Of
11 people are used to the verbiage of "As-Is", so you're
12 just adding on what the actual moisture basis is. So,
13 that's kind of the rationale of where we came up with
14 this hybrid option, if you will.

15 **CHAIR GROVE:** Okay. Jacob?

16 **MR. THEIN:** All right. So, Jacob Thein, T-
17 H-E-I-N. So, the purpose of our proposal was to
18 actually have this encompass to -- to all the grains
19 except -- except for wheat, if that was the -- if that
20 was the decision that was made. So --

21 **CHAIR GROVE:** So, we --

22 **DR. HURBUGH:** -- barley also --

23 **THE CHAIR:** -- we do have the word,
24 "soybean".

25 **MR. THEIN:** Yes.

1 **DR. HURBUGH:** So, this would apply to
2 barley. Okay, because that's another one that just
3 has protein.

4 **CHAIR GROVE:** So, would taking the word
5 soybean out in that third sentence, or we -- we need
6 to leave that there and make a statement of all
7 commodities except wheat. Do we want to be that
8 specific?

9 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** I think we could say all
10 commodities except for wheat, or we could specify
11 soybean, corn, barley. And then where it talks about,
12 like, protein content, could say protein, oil starch
13 and also put that -- also put that within the
14 statement of protein, or oil or starch, how they have
15 it in the Handbook.

16 **MS. CASEY-CAMPBELL:** Could we just clean it
17 up by getting rid of the mention of the protein
18 specifically and just explain this is how we are -- um
19 -- certifying any of those things, but just talk about
20 how we're describing the moisture specifically. And
21 that way, we don't have to mention the protein, oil,
22 or starch.

23 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** We will -- I believe we
24 will need to have it specifically how we want it
25 certified -- um -- but we can -- I think that's

1 something that they would need from FGIS?

2 **CHAIR GROVE:** So, I think too, you know, if
3 Ron or Jacob again weigh in as -- as for the -- the
4 Handbook side. Arthur?

5 **MR. NEAL:** What is it that you need from
6 FGIS?

7 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Would -- where Chris's
8 cursor is, if we were to change that to protein, oil,
9 starch, and then saying content as, for example and
10 giving that, would that give enough clarification of
11 how we would want things certified?

12 **MR. THEIN:** Jacob Thein. T-H-E-I-N. So,
13 yes, I believe -- I think that there would be the
14 understanding that for each different type of grain,
15 we would separate it with the statements -- um -- for
16 the -- for that specific grain. So, like Charlie
17 mentioned, barley just has protein. The -- the
18 statement would just be related to protein. In
19 soybeans, there's protein and oil. So, it would be
20 applicable to protein and oil and soybeans. And then
21 with your corn, you have protein, oil, and starch.
22 And so, then we would develop that -- that statement
23 for each of those that would be applicable to the
24 specific grain.

25 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** So, I believe Chris, you

1 can put -- state the protein, comma, oil, comma, or
2 starch, and or starch content.

3 **CHAIR GROVE:** And then, comma, as an ex --
4 as an example --

5 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** -- yeah.

6 **CHAIR GROVE:** Oh, I think the content needs
7 to stay beside -- and starch, yeah. Kia, Phil, and
8 again, Ron and Jacob, even want to just a thumbs up.
9 You feel if -- if you feel there's a word we've missed
10 or a statement we've missed, come up to the
11 microphone. Otherwise, I'd take a thumbs up as you're
12 -- you feel it covers what we're needing.

13 **MR. BUNDY:** It might be a little nitpicky,
14 but up on the top, the bold title, should we change
15 that Certification for Soybeans to Certification for
16 Soybeans, Corn, Barley?

17 **MR. ROSENTRATER:** To follow on with that,
18 do we want to modify the word protein in the title and
19 add on?

20 **CHAIR GROVE:** It's just taking the word
21 protein out or do we need to specify now that we've
22 added oil and starch, have them also in the title?
23 Are we really watering it down?

24 **MR. NEAL:** If you don't mind repeating that
25 question for me?

1 **CHAIR GROVE:** So, you know, the original
2 presentation yesterday was Standardizing Protein
3 Moisture Basis. And now we -- we have also added oil
4 and starch. So, do those have to be listed or just
5 Standardizing Moisture Basis, is -- is that clear
6 enough, or do we need to say Standardizing Protein,
7 Oil, and Starch Moisture Basis? And let's let -- Ron
8 was going to comment, let's see where he goes with
9 this.

10 **MR. BUNDY:** Ron Bundy, B-U-N-D-Y. Chad
11 actually had a good point. We just -- what if we just
12 put NIRT up there instead of defining protein, oil,
13 and starch? And then my only comment was to give the
14 thumbs up, I was -- I was going to give you a thumbs
15 up, but I think the whole premise is just to move away
16 from the verbiage As-Is, to the value, and I think
17 that's what this is doing. So --

18 **CHAIR GROVE:** Okay. All right. Thank you.
19 So, we have a thumbs up from FGIS. So, if there are
20 no --

21 **MR HEIL:** -- was there an online - was there
22 an online comment, or did we catch that?

23 **CHAIR GROVE:** But thank you for keeping an
24 eye on that. I'm away from my computer. All right.
25 I would entertain a motion to accept, unless somebody

1 sees another edit they would like.

2 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** I'll motion to accept.

3 **CHAIR GROVE:** All right. A second.

4 **MR. HEIL:** Second.

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

6 **ALL MEMBERS:** "Aye."

7 **CHAIR GROVE:** All right. All opposed? All
8 right. Thank you. Thank you for that one.

9 You know, I guess when we're -- when we're
10 looking at -- uh -- here's a rule, here's a Handbook,
11 and we're trying to encompass multiple factors and
12 multiple grains, it -- it takes a little thinking to -
13 - to make it read right. So, we're going to move on
14 to technology. Kia, if you would go ahead and read
15 this for us.

16 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** The Grain Inspection
17 Advisory Committee, GIAC, strongly recommends placing
18 technology and innovation at the forefront of Federal
19 Grain Inspection Services priorities. Specifically,
20 we emphasize the need to enhance export inspection
21 efficiencies through technological advancements
22 and procedural changes.

23 Rationale Budget Constraints: We
24 acknowledge the current budget limitations faced by
25 FGIS. However, we urge you to recognize that

1 technology is a strategic necessity.

2 Export Volume: Export inspection is a
3 critical function within our industry. With the
4 decline in export volumes and unknown domestic use,
5 the ability to operate within the changing market is
6 imperative.

7 Recommendations: Investing in -- investment
8 in technology, allocate resources, or partner with
9 other agencies to research, develop, and implement
10 technology driven solutions for inspection processes.

11 Approach the Feasibility: Approach the
12 feasibility and implementation of current solutions to
13 streamline sample functions at a minimum. Looking
14 into the current solution of the MCI Auto Kicker with
15 approved inspection equipment combined into,

16 1. Apparatus to increase efficiencies at
17 the export locations.

18 2. Brainstorm potential solutions for
19 decreasing time taken between sampling and sample
20 breakdown of samples.

21 Analysis of Test Weight: Using
22 instrumentation versus current Manual Kettle Method,
23 specifically looking into current approved moisture
24 meter feasibility, and analyzing test weight alongside
25 the moisture.

1 4. Continue vetting potential
2 instrumentation regarding visual inspection.
3 The committee wants to keep technological efficiencies
4 within grain inspection as a continual topic at the
5 GIAC Meetings. By the next Meeting, the Committee
6 would like to hear updates on the above priorities.

7 **CHAIR GROVE:** Thank you. It was very nice.
8 Again, great discussions yesterday. Technology
9 involves so many areas. And we do -- also in the
10 updates yesterday, as -- as Arthur talked to us, we
11 have some past recommendations that do involve data.
12 So, all of those are tying in very nicely, that --
13 that the data, the cybersecurity, now use of
14 technology, we're wanting to keep moving forward.
15 Charlie, I think, do you have a comment?

16 **DR. HURBUGH:** Just remember that changing
17 the technology -- I'll look at the MCI Kicker as an
18 example, the definitions of the great standards were
19 built in the 1900's around the Carter Dockage Tester.
20 And, therefore, changes like that really say we need
21 to look at the standards. It's more than just
22 adjusting a piece of equipment or testing a piece of
23 equipment. I don't know how we reflect that in here,
24 but I think we should reflect that we understand that
25 these kinds of changes will make changes in the basic

1 standards, because they were defined around pieces of
2 equipment.

3 **CHAIR GROVE:** So, it is very quickly and
4 minutely messaged, and it's right at the top of the
5 screen. If, Chris, you could go down just a smidge --
6 Solutions for Inspection Processes.

7 So, I do like where you're going, that we want to
8 definitely define it is also looking at the standard,
9 not just the technology. So, I think we want to be
10 very specific.

11 **DR. HURBUGH:** Now, this has been the hang-
12 up in the future. I'm drawing on my ten years ago or
13 whatever. This has been the hang-up that has brought
14 a lot of these discussions to a halt, because changing
15 the standards means changing the definition of the
16 number that you put on the certificate. And that's
17 where things just went to a halt in previous cases,
18 because it had to go to Federal Register, and it
19 couldn't -- didn't get traction -- It couldn't.

20 **CHAIR GROVE:** So, is it changing each
21 individual grain standard or changing the Handbook --
22 the process?

23 **DR. HURBUGH:** Yeah. This is not just a
24 process.

25 **CHAIR GROVE:** And, you know, we do on a

1 regular basis -- all grains do come up for review of
2 their standard. I think Jacob initiated some of those
3 yesterday that are in play right now. Since that is
4 already a process of the audit, is there a need to
5 change that they're already doing that? And maybe if
6 we change something, obviously, a -- a grain has to
7 come up, or do we want to redirect it to be more
8 frequent if we change the technology, and so on?
9 Does -- Arthur, are you going to speak? Otherwise,
10 I'll go to Ed.

11 **MR. NEAL:** Oh, I'll -- I'll go.

12 **CHAIR GROVE:** Okay. Go ahead.

13 **MR. NEAL:** So, just what you said, Dr.
14 Hurburgh, I think this may have been looked at in the
15 early 2000's. And when you use technology like, you
16 know, the MCI Auto Kicker, there's a potential that
17 the dockets may be higher.

18 **DR. HURBUGH:** Different.

19 **MR. NEAL:** Yeah. Different. I think when
20 we introduce any technology -- any technology, the
21 results may be more accurate or more precise.
22 Something may change, but this is a part of the
23 evaluation process. You know, it's -- it's just if
24 we're going to move in this direction, there's some
25 grade that may get removed that may currently exist

1 in, you know, our process, but this is the direction
2 we have to move in.

3 **DR. JHEE:** My comment is actually for number
4 one, in the wording.

5 **CHAIR GROVE:** Could you --

6 **DR. EDWARD JHEE:** Oh, this is Ed Jhee last
7 name is J-H-E-E, Director of TSD. For the first point
8 there, I would like to caution us on specifying the
9 MCI Auto Kicker. One: You are specifying a private
10 entity. Two: We need the organization also to meet
11 with us, be willing to meet with us. So, I think,
12 it's just something for us to consider.

13 **CHAIR GROVE:** Would changing it to be as an
14 example, or do you still -- still think better to be
15 cautious and not have the name of a piece of equipment
16 in it? If we said, as an example, instead of at a
17 minimum or you would rather -- and I understand where
18 you're coming from because then we're promoting a
19 piece of equipment versus giving the chance for --
20 does somebody have something similar that could go
21 through the process of -- of testing?

22 **MR. NEAL:** Something like that.

23 **CHAIR GROVE:** Okay.

24 **DR. HURBUGH:** A totally different technology
25 like image recognition, for example.

1 **CHAIR GROVE:** Mh-mm.

2 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** So, I think what we were
3 trying to get at here is that -- um -- these are more
4 of the short-term priorities that have been discussed
5 in a lot of the task force -- forces. And there is a
6 current solution out there. And so that's why that
7 became a short-term priority.

8 If we were going to start looking into a lot of
9 other types of solutions for it -- it might not have
10 made it to the short-term priority list. There's an
11 extremely urgent need at export facilities to be able
12 to do this type of thing, but I know what you're
13 saying, and we went back and forth on it, of how do we
14 -- how do we state this?

15 So, we kind of expected that this was going to
16 come up. Would it be something that we say instead of
17 at a minimum, saying, as an example, looking into the
18 current solution of an Auto Kicker?

19 **CHAIR GROVE:** An automated dockage machine?

20 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** And -- yeah.

21 **DR. HURBUGH:** Automated form material
22 automated dockage.

23 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** An automated dockage.
24 So, when we're taking the name out, but we're still
25 alluding to and even -- and as we were discussing

1 this, looking into this, and even if a company says we
2 will not meet with you, that's still you looking into
3 it.

4 So, it -- that's good faith effort of trying to
5 see if it works. And I know that we've had a lot of
6 discussions as industry, both on AAGIWA and NGFA, of
7 how we can attempt to bring that current technology to
8 the table or where we can look at, can we put these
9 current approved machines and somehow get the same --
10 the same idea of it with a Carter Day? But the
11 purpose behind it is that there was already current
12 technology out there, and it was hopefully something
13 that could be done very quickly, in a quick manner.

14 **MR. GARCIA:** So, could you add -- a -- uh -
15 Sampler/Dockage Machine so that we're not limited to
16 just the dockage machine, please?

17 **CHAIR GROVE:** Well, and again, the -- the
18 premise of the Auto Kicker isn't just dockage, but
19 being auto, that piece of its name has protein
20 machine, moisture machine, all built in or added to,
21 and they're already approved machines. So, that - so,
22 there are a lot of other words that we could have.

23 **MR. GARCIA:** Well, the intention is to
24 automate the sampling process at the export facility,
25 not to automate the dockage process at an export

1 facility. So, I think putting the Sampler/Dockage
2 would be a little more in line with what the intent of
3 what we're trying to do.

4 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** And then the piece where
5 the Auto Kicker, where combining those approved
6 equipment, that's where we put in with -- with
7 approved inspection equipment combined into one
8 apparatus, where we are trying to make those terms --
9 or make it a little more open.

10 **MR. HEIL:** And then, is the language of this
11 very focused on the export side of it, or does it
12 include all the umbrellas of all the different
13 services provided by different agencies?

14 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** It -- it's something
15 that would -- if something -- and correct me if I'm
16 wrong -- but if something is approved for export as
17 long as it works with our instructions domestically --
18 um-- we'd be able to use it as well. But then the
19 intent is that the priority is placed on export
20 locations right now. And with this -- if -- as it
21 sits -- say, the Auto Kicker piece were to work -- the
22 -- besides the dockage piece, the rest of it is
23 approved inspection equipment already. So,
24 ultimately, it would only be introducing one extra
25 piece of approved equipment, and then official

1 agencies would be able to determine how they use that
2 in domestic practices as well.

3 **CHAIR GROVE:** Very good question, Mark,
4 because I, again myself, represent an inland or
5 domestic market. And having been in some of these
6 other task force meetings, we do discuss that, and a
7 comment had been, at one point, we know this doesn't
8 affect you.

9 I said, but it does, because I want to sell
10 to an exporter. So, if you want to say it's the
11 trickle-up is what it is. So, -- if -- if we're
12 asking FGIS, we're asking official inspection to look
13 at these things, those official inspection agencies
14 are -- are at the ports, or those official inspectors.
15 Then the designated are inland, so it would start on
16 the official side.

17 So, in the export, I think of technologies
18 such as UGMA's. I think the predominance of domestic
19 or country elevators didn't change over immediately,
20 and some may still have old ones in there, because the
21 thought is until the person I'm selling to really
22 starts noticing or discounting me or seeing a
23 difference, I'm not going to change. I'm not going to
24 do the money outlay. So, I think that usually is the
25 thought process. So, let's see what happens and how

1 it affects me, and then I'll change over. So, I think
2 this still benefits us all in general. Where maybe
3 the specific purpose is, right now, there needs to be
4 some efficiency at the ports and the export also.

5 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** One other comment. What
6 we were trying to get from this is -- One: There
7 obviously -- we heard yesterday there are a lot of
8 budget constraints within FGIS, and it -- through many
9 discussions, I believe we all are on the same page,
10 that we feel that the way out of a lot of those budget
11 constraints in the future would be around technology,
12 but there's a very short-term concern that you're
13 needing to cut in a lot of different areas. And what
14 we're wanting to do here is to publicly give you
15 something stating that us, as the Advisory Committee,
16 want you to have this to say we can't cut back on our
17 technology initiative, or it is going to hurt us in
18 the future. It's going to hurt us now, but also in
19 the future. And then when the one through four, we
20 wanted to make them very specific on purpose to help
21 give the guidance so that you guys -- you guys could
22 use that to make sure you could put your studies
23 together, and just use this as leverage or however you
24 want to say that.

25 **CHAIR GROVE:** And -- and, again, I think as

1 you were putting them, there definitely had to be some
2 short-term, mid-term, long-term priorities. We have
3 an overall objective, but you have to start somewhere.
4 And things, such as the possible use of test weight
5 instrumentation, could that happen more quickly than
6 some of the other pieces that are going to take a
7 little more time to prove? Ed, thoughts?

8 **DR. JHEE:** Well actually, this is Ed Jhee
9 again, TSD. Not answering that question. I'm sorry.
10 But going back to a point that Charlie brought up
11 earlier with regards to standards and policies and the
12 Handbook type of information.

13 I think as we move forward with evaluating or
14 exploring different approaches to implement
15 technology, we're going to be faced with those
16 decision points of addressing such things as basis of
17 determination, those specific factors that determine a
18 grade, what's relevant, what's important, what matters
19 most, what's the most costly. All of these things are
20 going to be under consideration.

21 **CHAIR GROVE:** So, again, we -- we haven't --
22 we've talked about it, but we haven't addressed it in
23 writing. In adding point five, or as a paragraph
24 underneath with technology initiatives, directive to
25 continually review the standards as they may be

1 changed by technology additions in the process.

2 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Up in the -- I think
3 it's the first paragraph, I talk about technical --
4 technological advancements and procedural changes. We
5 could say -- and technological advancements,
6 standards, and procedural changes or something like
7 that -

8 **CHAIR GROVE:** -- Okay --

9 **MS ADAM-MIKESH:** -- to just acknowledge that
10 we -- that we acknowledge that it could result in
11 that.

12 **CHAIR GROVE:** Yeah. Technological
13 advancements, standards, and procedural changes.
14 Yeah. Then at least we all are very clear. And then
15 if it comes up in the future, we -- we have something
16 to look back at and say, we understand that. We know
17 this has to happen. All right. Thank you.

18 Any other thoughts? And again, do you think - um
19 - Arthur, to say that we want this as a continued item
20 in discussion, is that -- or Kendra -- is this valid
21 enough to say this is just going to be an agenda item
22 and that that's -- this will be an agenda item every
23 time is what we're getting at here, that we just want
24 this to be a -- a continued agenda item. But with an
25 open -- open resolution to you, you know, this is

1 going to stay open actually for quite some time with
2 so many pieces. So, those are always something we can
3 discuss when they are already open, correct? Or an
4 approved -- an approved recommendation.

5 Well, we can just make sure we say every time we
6 want technology on the agenda. So, okay? Any other
7 thoughts from anybody on this? Thank you, again for
8 everybody's input.

9 It's important that we make sure understanding is
10 clear. I was just -- I was just working with a
11 Processing End User on food grade grains, and making
12 terms clear is very important. My term in saying
13 something is conventional grain, in my head, is that
14 standard number two yellow corn. But somebody on the
15 processing and food side says, oh, conventional is
16 just not organic or non-GMO, but it's still -- So,
17 terminology is important. Clarity is very important.
18 So, we know going forward -- and, again, there's
19 members of this committee in March that are rolling
20 off. We want those people coming back on to know what
21 our intent was. We want, hey, if there's changes --
22 changes to staffing, we want everybody -- clear where
23 we're at. All right. So, I'm going to ask for a
24 motion to accept.

25 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** A motion.

1 **CHAIR GROVE:** All right.

2 **MR. ROSENTRATER:** Second.

3 **CHAIR GROVE:** All right. Everybody in
4 favor?

5 **ALL MEMEBERS:** "Aye."

6 **CHAIR GROVE:** All right. Any opposed? All
7 right. Thank you. That passes. Thank you for the
8 work on that. I'm going to go grab my agenda and come
9 back to the mic.

10 So, we're rolling along very quickly this
11 morning. I'm going to give a quick option as we have
12 finalized the recommendations and had our discussions.
13 You can either go on a break or we can just go strict
14 -- straight into just a little, quick brainstorming on
15 if there's topics you know right now you want for
16 agenda items in the next meeting.

17 What time is it? Just about ten? So, 9:40.
18 So, I think let's just go ahead. Let's -- let's have
19 a quick discussion on if anybody has any agenda items
20 already for the next meeting. With the thought in
21 mind and discussion yesterday, if we would like to try
22 to have something by early September, we would need to
23 post for public comment and -- or actually, the
24 process would be turned in for approval of the
25 meeting, and we would have to have that agenda. So,

1 we would want that by the end of July, mid-July.

2 So, early July, we would need that so we can get
3 approval, and then we would have to post it for public
4 comment by the beginning of August. So again, we
5 don't need recommendations today. Just realize that
6 timeline.

7 **DR. HURBUGH:** I'd like to see us explore the
8 equivalence issue more. The example I gave before was
9 -- was a study of NIRT machines and whether we could
10 use more than one, but the same issue will apply to
11 dockage testers. If the two dockage testers don't
12 come -- aren't giving the same answer -- Well, I can
13 tell a story -- I won't tell it but -- about the issue
14 of foreign material in soybeans and the battle that
15 created. If the change in dockage testers raises or
16 lowers foreign material readings, you are changing the
17 standard. So, I think we ought to look at that
18 equivalence issue and - and -- try to think about a
19 test, a formal procedure, when you have alternate
20 methods of measure for the same characteristic, how
21 can we prove or maybe disprove? Maybe we just agree
22 to disprove but deal with that equivalence procedure -
23 - or equivalence question.

24 **MR. NEAL:** So, just -- I understand where
25 you're coming from, and it's built into our processes.

1 I'm just trying to figure out -- I mean, maybe you
2 just want to go on record to say it needs to be
3 equivalent. But if you -- if you've had an
4 opportunity to read the evaluation process for
5 equipment that we put out two years ago, I think it's
6 stated in there that the equivalency component is
7 expressed in there. It has to -- it has to meet kind
8 of current standard. It's part of the -- it's just
9 part of our acceptance testing.

10 **DR. HURBURGH:** But that means the current
11 standard can't change and some of these technologies
12 are going to call into question the current standard.

13 **MR. NEAL:** But that will be part and so --
14 as a part of our evaluative process, there's also a
15 feedback loop to this Committee. When we bring back
16 the results to share, hey, this is what we're seeing,
17 it -- it advises, kinda, how we want to move forward.
18 We try to -- and that's how we try to build that
19 process so that industry is providing input and we're
20 not, you know, they're not in the dark because if
21 something does change, we all need to be aware of
22 that. We all have to, kinda, be in agreement with
23 that, but the main thing is that equivalence is
24 established.

25 **DR. HURBURGH:** Yes.

1 **MR. NEAL:** Could that -- there could be
2 something that, like we said earlier, that may be more
3 accurate. And as an example, with the Sea Grain
4 Machine, that machine in detecting rice brokens was
5 more accurate than some of our graders. You know, but
6 online with the bar, spot on. And so that -- that
7 just shows what the instrumentation can do. And Ed, I
8 know you're at the mic, you can comment on this.

9 **DR. JHEE:** Sure. Well, I -- I think another
10 point -- I think if you look at equivalency, another
11 way of approaching the same subject -- well, let's go
12 back to equivalency. There're various ways we're
13 going to have to achieve equivalency. It's comparing
14 against the reference. That's what Arthur was
15 describing and it's what's describing our tech
16 evaluation process.

17 But then when it comes to implementation, I think
18 another concern that we've been raising since
19 yesterday was doing our best to mitigate any potential
20 variation in the official system. All right, so,
21 that's also going to come down to reproduce --
22 reproducibility and repeatability, which is a
23 component of this whole equivalence concept, right.
24 And so, putting that out there on record, just to make
25 sure that we're all aware that this is something that

1 we will be addressing at some point.

2 **MR. NEAL:** And just to add to what Ed said,
3 as we mentioned yesterday, that's why the pilots are
4 going to be so necessary. So, before any piece of
5 instrumentation is introduced, we've got to test it
6 out in the field to make sure we're not rushing and we
7 want to move fast, but we can't move so fast that we
8 create marketing challenges.

9 **CHAIR GROVE:** All right. Good discussion.
10 Thank you, Ed.

11 I still have it down though, Charlie. Any
12 other thoughts at this time?

13 And we do welcome from our gallery -- people are
14 very interested and have been very invested in our
15 conversations these last two days. So again, we do
16 welcome agenda items if you feel that is something, as
17 industry issues, that people feel should be addressed.

18 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** I would like to have a
19 discussion around getting a Container Handbook. We
20 currently have instructions kind of all over the
21 place. There are frequently asked questions. There
22 are directives. There are program notices -- policy
23 bulletins. It is very difficult to show -- there are
24 emails -- it's very difficult to show customers what -
25 - what our requirements are when they're not written

1 out clearly, and it is also extremely difficult for us
2 to train our employees consistently, when the
3 instructions aren't clear on what to do. And we're
4 talking about exports, and I feel like there should be
5 more clarification around that, more clarity.

6 **CHAIR GROVE:** Okay.

7 **MR. MORGAN:** Just -- just so I understand,
8 these are bulk containers?

9 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** Yes.

10 **MR. MORGAN:** Okay. We -- we stuff containers
11 with bags, so sometimes, a lot of the times.

12 **MS. ADAMS-MIKESH:** We do have ones, as well,
13 that we that we do with fakes. But I would say, I
14 guess where we run into our issues are -- because
15 we'll do AMA products, and that's just more of a --
16 it's a different entity. The ones that I -- I guess
17 for myself -- what we have our concerns around are the
18 processed commodity, bulk containers like DDG's,
19 soybean meal, and then also around bulk and bagged
20 USGSA commodities.

21 **CHAIR GROVES:** Okay. Thank you.

22 **MS. CASEY-CAMPBELL:** I would support that as
23 a -- as a topic, for sure.

24 **CHAIR GROVE:** Thanks, Erin.

25 All right, and again, we have -- we have

1 about a month and a half for you to brainstorm and,
2 hey, pay attention to what's going out in the industry
3 right now. If it's a topic that we haven't covered
4 and isn't open, as when the notes come out and when
5 the slides come out to the Committee -- I know, Dr.
6 Hurburgh and Dr. Rosentrater kinda missed the updates
7 yesterday, but you'll see some of those in case you're
8 looking for what are some of the opened
9 recommendations that we have. But again, there may be
10 open recommendations that something you're thinking of
11 has been talked about in the past and is ongoing, such
12 as the FDA MOU.

13 So, again, we have about a month and a half to
14 think about and pay attention to some things that
15 really have been, you know, maybe stuck in your craw
16 about something that's affecting your -- your
17 operation. Rashad?

18 **MR. HART:** Yeah Barbara, Tracy and I was
19 talking about it in a smaller group this morning. You
20 know, the emergency -- the emergency -- emerging
21 concerns within the industry. Maybe a catchall.

22 I know we're looking for specifics, but it could
23 be a good catchall to continue conversation that we've
24 had around, techno -- technology advancements, you
25 know what Arthur was speaking towards, cybersecurity,

1 you know, and how it impacts the industry. I really
2 like the approach that he articulated around educating
3 and seeing what capacity we have, because I think
4 that's going to be an ongoing continuous conversation
5 as we move forward for future meetings. So, not sure
6 if that emerging industry concerns could be a catchall
7 bucket for a lot of things.

8 **CHAIR GROVE:** And, you know, it worked well
9 yesterday as some of our conversations. We didn't
10 necessarily put any resolutions to it, but we had some
11 good conversations that helped lead into things when
12 you had suggested emerging export issues. So, it is
13 certainly something good for conversation.

14 **MR. NEAL:** I actually think that may be
15 helpful for you all as members. That as you engage
16 day-to-day, that you're able to capture those emerging
17 issues from stakeholders and the like. And you can
18 put those, you know, you can prepare those issues
19 prior to the next meeting for discussion. Because we
20 know that outside of technology, that's like the
21 number one issue of concern, is what's happening.

22 And because we all have different levels of
23 visibility into what's going on, like, we've got
24 federal visibility, some things we see where we
25 provide direct service, some things that we hear

1 through official agencies, but it's all -- everybody's
2 got different perspectives. It's good for that issue,
3 to be fueled by what you know can be addressed through
4 this setting by bringing it in advance. So, makes
5 sense to me.

6 **CHAIR GROVE:** And I do want to make sure to
7 clarify with both yourself and Kendra. If we have a
8 broad topic such as that, would it be tough to
9 actually pair it into, if we felt there's a
10 recommendation coming out of it. So, we would have to
11 have a -- a specific topic to make -- to make
12 recommendations because that would have to be
13 something turned in prior -- a 30-day public notice,
14 but it is still a -- a great a -- a great spot to keep
15 on the agenda because we had some good conversations
16 around it yesterday.

17 You know, and some of it is more, again, like you
18 said, education and awareness. We can all learn
19 something from each other, and that may tip us off
20 too. You know what? I don't think we're totally clear
21 on how that flow is going between our types of
22 entities. So, that's a topic, definite need for a
23 topic, for the next time. Okay. Thank you.

24 All right. And unless there are any others at
25 this time, again, we have about a month and a half

1 before we need to really be putting those things
2 together. Those that have been, again, active with us
3 in the public, you know you have connections. You
4 have relationships that you can convey those. And as
5 always, every meeting, we always have an FGIS update
6 section, and so those are things that may be emerging
7 from your side that we become aware of. So that's a
8 great, great time. So, unless there are any other
9 topics -- Kurt.

10 **MR. ROSENTRATER:** To follow-up on a
11 discussion we started yesterday, I'm not sure if this
12 -- there's any action items for the next meeting or
13 even a white paper, but in terms of potential topics,
14 we suggested, perhaps, engaging with other industry
15 groups, and I don't know how that would look in terms
16 of -- of, you know, what trade groups, what
17 organizations could be good partners for us in many
18 respects. So, I'm not sure how that would fit in the
19 agenda, but I think we should have a discussion
20 because we all have different organizations and groups
21 that we engage with frequently. And we mentioned
22 GEAPS as one potential. We also talked about U.S.
23 Grains Council as one potential. So, however we could
24 maybe have a discussion next time, I think that would
25 be really beneficial, especially as we're thinking

1 future work and impact of FGIS.

2 **CHAIR GROVE:** Thank you. That's a good
3 reminder, and I know we did have -- in two of the
4 specific recommendations today, we did talk about, you
5 know, in -- inviting some very specific entities to be
6 part, to give us more information. So that's a good
7 start. And so, this is a good conversation. Arthur,
8 to you.

9 **MR. NEAL:** A great point. I think not
10 necessary -- not necessarily for later, but for now.
11 I think the -- the reality is, as the industry
12 evolves, the market evolves. The conversation we
13 talked about yesterday was what future needs does
14 industry have of FGIS.

15 Everybody knows who we touch, how it could impact
16 the official system. Let that guide our conversations
17 to -- to frame our future work as well as invite
18 people to participate in the conversation. I'm not
19 suggesting that we change the model. However, I don't
20 know if the model has to change due to whatever the
21 industry is experiencing.

22 And so those people who utilize or leverage the
23 services being offered through official agencies,
24 through FGIS directly, those are conversations we need
25 to have people a part of so that we can be informed.

1 USGSA, you know, expires next year. If anything needs
2 to be discussed to inform that conversation, it should
3 happen -- it should start happening next meeting, in
4 my opinion. So that those who would be involved in
5 that process can get the input from a wide spectrum,
6 not just a, you know, narrow group. And because I --
7 I feel like if we don't move, when I say we, if -- if
8 there's not some level of consistency and agreement in
9 terms of how we move in this season, it could be
10 problematic.

11 **CHAIR GROVE:** So, our discussion when you
12 brought that up yesterday was definitely, you know,
13 the need, as Kurt said, to invite some people to
14 partner. But also, a job of each of us already on the
15 Committee. What is our role as being -- um -- part of
16 this Committee -- is that we represent many different
17 areas. So, we do have those contacts, and we do have
18 those relationships, and we should start that now.
19 And I do agree, Arthur, next meeting we definitely
20 need to discuss, again, you know, one of our
21 recommendations as it came to our terms is in the U.S.
22 Grain Standards Act. So, this is the time for those
23 type of things for us to -- to see where -- where are
24 changes needed. Thank you, Kurt, for reminding us of
25 that.

1 So, with no other suggestions at this time, and
2 again, you can -- you can -- add to those or send
3 those feelers out here in the next six weeks, I want
4 to thank everybody for the -- the time you've put in.
5 Again, your role is very important to make sure your -
6 in a sense, that your sector has somebody with that
7 experience, your avenue of agriculture is here to
8 represent and to help make a difference. That's very
9 important. So, thank you for everybody's time. Thank
10 you for the homework last night. Sometimes homework
11 can also be -- can also be a little bit fun. It's not
12 necessarily a negative thing. So, we had a lot of
13 great discussions to help in -- people writing those.
14 And, Arthur, I'm going to turn it over to you to
15 close.

16 **MR. NEAL:** I remain encouraged. I remain
17 encouraged by each of you, particularly how we've
18 engaged during these meetings and outside of these
19 meetings. I remain encouraged at the posture that I -
20 - you know, I sensed that in 2019 when I first came
21 into FGIS has changed. I believe our relationships --
22 have improved. I believe that we can agree on goals
23 that move us forward. I remain encouraged that even
24 in the midst of our challenges, we will overcome, and
25 we will continue to provide the type of service that

1 this industry needs to be successful.

2 The conversations that we've had over this week
3 are all meaningful and impactful. In the last topic
4 that we just got through discussing will be critical
5 for us in terms of how we navigate our days ahead, and
6 that is together. How do we pull people together?
7 And there are a lot of issues, you know, we're just
8 talking about official grain inspection. You know,
9 you've got CRP issues. You have entitlement issues
10 facing the industry. You have market changes that are
11 impacting the industry. There's tons of things
12 affecting the industry, so, people's attentions are --
13 are divided.

14 And so, however we engage our stakeholders, we
15 want to be concise. We want to be very particular so
16 that we leverage people's time well. And that the
17 input we seek from them, we can get from them and make
18 them feel that the time that they spend with us and on
19 our issues is worth their -- their involvement.

20 And, I just want to say thank you. Thank you to
21 the new members that have joined because we need you.
22 We need your perspective. We need your time, your
23 dedication. For those who have been serving for a
24 while, I want to say thank you because you've helped
25 us turn a corner. I feel like this Committee has more

1 purpose today than from what I understood in the past.

2 I believe that it's more focused. I believe that
3 it's more impactful. That it's richer. You know, the
4 issues are more substantive. I don't sense the
5 hesitation that I've heard from the past in terms of
6 the topics like the -- the hesitation of dealing with
7 technology of the past seems like it used to be an
8 issue between FGIS And industry. And I don't sense
9 that anymore.

10 We are committed to moving forward in this space.
11 You know, I want to commend Dr. G and his team at TSD,
12 because ever since he got here, we've been making
13 progress on issues that have been kind of sitting with
14 respect to technology.

15 I commend the new leadership and -- and the
16 Fuel Management Division for making some tough
17 decisions -- respect, you know, how we manage our
18 costs and -- and modifying our operations so that we
19 can protect our people yet protect the service. It's
20 not easy. And, like I said yesterday, not desirable,
21 but it's something that has to be done.

22 And so, I thank you all for your understanding as
23 well. Because some of the things that we've talked
24 about, I don't think folk, you know -- people like,
25 but I think you understand. And so, I say thank you

1 for -- for your understanding. And, Barb, I want to
2 thank you for your leadership of this committee
3 because it's been masterful. Thank you.

4 **CHAIR GROVE:** Thank you.

5 All right. Just a quick note. Thank you
6 again. You know, you've talked about your staff.
7 Kendra, you keep us on task. Thank you very much. I
8 know that sometimes we don't always respond in a
9 timely fashion and thank you for keeping us on track
10 and keeping us running. As well as, you know, we
11 have, I always say AV -- AV or IT people, those are
12 the people that you suck up to in your business
13 because they keep you going smooth. So, thank you.
14 Thank you very much for making this smooth and giving
15 us the ability to have our online people. That's very
16 important in this day and age. A lot of people here
17 that make this all look great and wonderful. So, with
18 that, I am going to entertain a motion to adjourn.

19 **MR. MORGAN:** So, moved.

20 **CHAIR GROVE:** Oh, I thought, man, nobody
21 wanted to leave. All right. Thank you. Meeting
22 adjourned. Thank you, and we will be working on our
23 next meeting schedule soon.

24
25 (Whereupon, at 10:02AM, the proceeding was 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

This is to certify that the forgoing transcript in the matter of the Grain Inspection Advisory Committee, before the USDA on May 16, 2024, in Kansas City, Missouri was duly recorded and accurately transcribed as true and accurate to my best knowledge and ability; and is a true and accurate record of this proceeding.

Devin L. Richmond
Notary Public and RON