U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

+ + + + +

GRAIN INSPECTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

THURSDAY
MAY 13, 2021

+ + + + +

The Committee Meeting met via Video/teleconference at 11:00 a.m. EDT, Matthew Kerrigan, GIAC Vice-Chair, presiding.

PRESENT:

DAVID AYERS, Champaign Danville Grain Inspection, Inc.

RANDALL BURNS, Arkansas Bureau of Standards JANICE COOPER, Wheat Marketing Center CURTIS ENGEL, The Scoular Company NICHOLAS FRIANT, Cargill Inc. MATTHEW KERRIGAN, EGT, LLC RYAN KUHL, Northern Plains Grain Inspection

Service

JOHN LINDGREN, United Grain Corporation

ROBERT SINNER, SB&B Foods, Inc.

ERROL BRENT TURNIPSEED, South Dakota State University Seed Testing Lab

MARK WATNE, Jamestown ND

ALSO PRESENT:

LEE CAPPER, FGIS Chief Innovation Officer
ANTHONY GOODEMAN, Director, FGIS Field Management
Division

EDWARD JHEE, Director, FGIS Technology and Science Division

KENDRA KLINE, FGIS Chief of Staff and the Advisory Committee Specialist

JESS MCCLUER, NGFA Vice President of Safety and Regulatory Affairs

ARTHUR NEAL, FGIS Deputy Administrator, DFO DENISE RUGGLES, FGIS Executive Program Analyst BRUCE SUMMERS, AMS Administrator PAT MCCLUSKEY, Branch Chief, FGIS Policy,

Procedures, and Marketing Analysis Branch BARRY GOMOLL, FGIS Grain Marketing Specialist

CONTENTS

Call to Order and Welcome 4
FGIS FDA MOU Discussion Anthony Goodeman 6
Public Comments
Discuss Recommendations
Lunch
Discuss Recommendations
Break
Officer Elections
Discuss Agenda Items for Next Meeting 103
Closing Remarks
Matthew Kerrigan
Arthur Neal

1 PROCEEDINGS

(11:02 a.m.)

MR. KERRIGAN: Good morning, everybody, again. I'm showing 8:02. Arthur, Kendra, how are we doing for a quorum this morning?

MS. KLINE: I can count ten for sure. So we have a quorum.

MR. KERRIGAN: Okay.

MS. KLINE: So we can at least continue.

MR. KERRIGAN: Perfect. That's all we're looking for, right? So just want to start off again by saying thank you to FGIS, all the staff time, the GIAC members -- I know we are all in no shortage of things to do, by any means -- and obviously, those of you that have a vested interest in this, who are silently and quietly behind your black screens, watching this meeting take place.

So with that, we have a quorum. I'll call this day-two meeting to order. I'm assuming that everybody still has the agenda. For the

1 most part, today is going to be the FGIS FDA MOU 2 discussion. So public comments and then recommendations before we get into next-meeting 3 4 elections, and, again, agenda topics. 5 Yes, always want to make sure that we If anybody has any pressing questions 6 7 regarding day one, that we'd like to get out in 8 the open? Okay. Arthur, do you have any opening 9 comments on day two, before we run into the MOU discussion? 10 11 MR. MCNEAL: Opening comments: I 12 thought yesterday we had some pretty good discussions, so I look forward to today's 13 14 continuation of what we started yesterday. I'm sure what Tony's going to bring to the table 15 16 will add to that. So looking forward to another 17 good day. 18 MR. GOODEMAN: Don't get your hopes 19 too high up here. MR. KERRIGAN: 20 Okay. With that, Tony, 21 the show is yours.

Oh, great.

MR. GOODEMAN:

22

I used up

all my energy yesterday talking about regulatory policies. It's going to be a tough act to follow, with FDA first in the morning here.

Okay. So good morning, everybody.

Can everybody hear me okay? Kind of sorry to hear that. Okay. Here we go. So it was a recommendation from the committee, to look at the MOU with the Food and Drug Administration. Just as background, I'll read a couple notes just for clarity about our MOU.

Administration was initially established in 1980.

It's been in place for a long time. The basic premise of this agreement, since all of FGIS and our official agencies are out in the field, seeing these products that FDA has some regulatory authority over, is that we will report certain things that we see, to FDA; we call these actionable lots. Those are defined by FDA regulations and they're outlined in our MOU with FDA.

Once FGIS reports an actionable lot to

the Food and Drug Administration, FDA takes over. FGIS can assist, we can witness grain transfers, we can seal bins, things of that nature, but we don't mandate nor approve any mitigation plans. Some examples of our really common actionable items include insect-damaged kernels in wheat. Like, if it goes over a threshold -- think it's 33 in 100 grams, 33 insect-damaged kernels in 100 grams of wheat -- that's actionable. Insects in milled rice, whether they're alive or dead, are actionable to FDA. Animal filth or animal excreta in grain is actionable. Anything that is called distinctly low quality.

Basically, anytime we have a really strange situation -- these are very rare. Like, we've had hydraulic fluid accidentally get spilled on grain, or somehow fuel gets spilled on grain. Potentially, flood-damaged grain. Really strange things. If we find an animal carcass or something in grain.

Kind of the wild card for FGIS, for our inspectors, is something that's totally

unusual and not really defined in the standards; we call that grain distinctly low quality, DLQ. Anything in that category is reported to FDA. That also includes deer droppings. We say, if we find deer droppings, we consider that to be a large-animal filth, and it's reportable to FDA. We've seen that in recent years.

The last two that I'll mention just as common actionable lots are commercially objectionable foreign odors. Anytime we find an odor, in grain, that's not common to grain, we report that. This could be some kind of a masking agent. This could be grain was contaminated in some way. And then aflatoxin: over 20 parts per billion is reportable.

So the committee asked us to look at our MOU and our directive because, in some of the discussion, some of the references were outdated. We agree with that assessment. In these past couple of years, we've worked very closely with FDA. We've also determined that it's not in our best interest to update the MOU. The MOU

framework is still valid. We are updating our directive. And so we've worked alongside FDA to make updates to our directive, and we anticipate -- you know, those changes are becoming ready for publication.

The biggest thing, though, that I think the committee was looking for when we talked with industry is more pre-approved mitigation plans, because sometimes as we notify FDA, there can be delays in how quickly FDA responds. Some of those are very meritus, because they need to evaluate, you know, the risks and the human health concerns. Others are just because they may not see violations very regularly and just need to get up to speed. just the availability; they may not have staff available on a weekend, for example, when something like this comes up at midnight, you know, Friday night, Saturday morning, and the elevator's got some kind of a carrier tied up, be it a shipping bin or railcar. They want to know what they can do with that. The industry seems

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

like they're very interested in these pre-approved plans.

And so what FDA informed us is that they typically work with industries to develop those plans and to receive those ideas. From the FGIS side, we're very willing to help carry that and help relay the significance to FDA and then do whatever we can, once they're approved, to help shepherd that process. So if FDA does have some kind of recognized pre-approved plan, we will then help carry out whatever that is, because it's in the interest of everyone to get that handled smoothly and not have anything bad in the food chain there.

So I think that's the primary update that I wanted to give. I'm sorry that I'm not going to drone on for 30 minutes on the FDA MOU. But I do want to get feedback from you; I think it's really important. Like, the biggest thing I think that this committee or the industry could provide is what are the incidences that are most critical that we should look at; and then, on top

of that, what would the pre-approved-plan proposals be -- it's a lot of Ps, pre-approved plan proposals -- that we'd like to send to FDA for consideration. So would that be -- and I mentioned a lot of things there. Would it be deer droppings? And if it is, what would be the proposed plan to mitigate that situation?

The same for insects and rice perhaps,

IDK in wheat, because a lot of times we hear from

companies that they end up -- there might be some

time for approval, but they end up approving

similar things in similar situations, whether

that be a reconditioning in some way, whether

that be, you know -- in the rare case, we have to

take it to a landfill or destroy the product. It

ends up being similar in these varied situations.

So I'm going to look to Arthur to make sure that I covered everything, and see if there's anything else we want to touch on. But we're really looking for feedback from you-all, as to where we can best direct these efforts and what would be those top situations and, you know,

reconditioning options we'd like to run with.

MR. NEAL Yes, thanks, Tony. I think you've covered everything. The purpose of bringing this back to the committee is we're really going to need the committee's thoughts and support in getting input from industry on what Tony just ended with, on reconditioning methods or strategies to help us try to speed up an approval process by FDA so that customers aren't waiting, you know, weeks at a time for a response.

With all of the things going on in the country, the more work we can take off of some of these agencies in trying to figure out, you know, what's appropriate, what's sufficient, what's good enough, I think it'll help us in the long run. Not only that; we're believing that if we can come to them with these -- I'm calling them pre-approved; we're seeking their pre-approval -- with these pre-approval options, that it'll also help the approval process, in terms of getting a document, where we can get blessed by FDA and we

can begin using out in the field.

FGIS will not be able to come up with those options, because FDA has conveyed to us they need to hear from the industry. They can hear from us, that's fine, but the weight comes from the industry, not from FGIS. And so that's why we're coming back to the Grain Inspection Advisory Committee, as you-all have connections to all of the stakeholders and represent the voice of the stakeholders. Doesn't mean that your recommendation alone should be the end-all, be-all, but we do believe that it will help as we try to stress the significance and importance of this issue and the need for attention.

MR. KERRIGAN: So if I can ask you to clarify maybe one comment with that, Arthur, that you had mentioned there regarding that the recommendations, you know, need to come from industry. What does that look like, I guess, from the GIAC? Or does that mean, you know, that we should work with our parent -- our individual companies that are dealing with this, the trade

groups? Or can there be, you know, some document that actually comes out of the GIAC, that you guys can use in -- or make sure that I understand kind of the process with the GIAC and what we are able to provide out there that's actually of use, I guess?

MR. NEAL Yes. Great question. No, it can look a lot of different ways. One, Matt, individual companies can send in information to us, FGIS. Individual companies can respond also to the GIAC or through members of the GIAC, with ideas that help serve as these remedial plans for these lots that have been identified.

The GIAC could present a document that summarizes some of those options to FGIS for consideration; that way, it could represent a collective body of work. The GIAC could also, amongst yourself, take up some of that work if they feel that there's enough members or, like, there's enough knowledge around the issues, and you can create a recommendation around that internally through subcommittees. Or

subcommittees could do some work and then present that body of work to the overall GIAC to consider, and then make that a recommendation.

You know, and there are probably other ways that it could look. But we're bringing it to you-all, you know, now because we're going to need help getting an organized body of solutions that we can present to FDA for consideration.

MR. FRIANT: So, Arthur, this is Nick.

Just for a point of clarification on that. Based
on what you said, a potential action that the
advisory committee could recommend is forming a
task force then, right? I think you used the
term --

MR. NEAL Subcommittee.

MR. FRIANT: -- subcommittee or task force could be an approach? Okay.

MR. NEAL Yes. Yes. It doesn't have to be a subcommittee. Task force is just as effective. And with respect to a task force,
Nick, in this context, it could be led by a GIAC member or a couple of members, and it could

include members of the industry that are outside of GIAC. And they can bring that information to the GIAC, for consideration by the whole.

MR. FRIANT: You must've read my mind.

That was my next question on membership.

MS. KLINE: Yes.

MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. Yes, I think that that provides an awful lot of clarity. And frankly, thank you very much to Tony for digging into this and getting some clarity, especially with the FDA, because, you know, definitely while quite a bit of time has gone by, not to any fault of anybody else, just because of COVID and such, because it does still feel like a long time ago -- but that's a great step, frankly, from my standpoint, that they are potentially open to it or have seen a process, you know, for that in the past; that I think that the industry definitely can provide something.

And then it's just kind of up to how we get that information. And really appreciate you guys being willing to liaise, you know, not

only on presenting this information to them, on what you guys can and can't kind of assist with, I guess, with those remediation plans and moderating it, but then on that moderation as well.

So just for the group, I want to kind of clarify here. Some of those typical items, Tony, is DLQ, IDK, deer droppings, floodwaters, aflatoxin above 20. Are there any other -- we will go out to the group to see kind of what else is out there, what they've seen. But is there anything of the heavy hitters -- those are definitely the ones that I know I've been a part of, from my experience in industry. Are there any others that you've seen or have heard about or -- whether it's Tony or anybody else on the GIAC or call, that we want to make sure that we get on that shortlist, to make sure, if we can come up with some form of standardized plan, that we address it?

MR. FRIANT: Matt, could I ask you to run through that list you just rattled off,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	again? I couldn't write quite quick enough.
2	MR. KERRIGAN: Yes. Sorry about that.
3	DLQ; that's the distinguished low quality or I
4	don't have the D right. Sorry.
5	MR. GOODEMAN: Distinctly low quality,
6	yes.
7	MR. KERRIGAN: Distinctly low quality.
8	IDK, insect-damaged kernels. Large-animal
9	droppings; typically I think it's been deer,
10	which has
11	MR. GOODEMAN: Deer droppings have
12	been yes.
13	MR. KERRIGAN: come up quite a bit.
14	Grain that has been touched by floodwaters.
15	Aflatoxin above 20 parts.
16	MR. GOODEMAN: And then I would say
17	this is not grain, but insects in milled rice has
18	been a common issue too. Again, that's
19	MR. SINNER: Well
20	MR. GOODEMAN: not grain, so but
21	I know that was an issue in the past.
22	MR. SINNER: Well, I think you also

_	tarked about contamination from different
2	liquids, whether it's hydraulic fluid, antifreeze
3	
4	MR. GOODEMAN: Yes, those Yes, we
5	do see that, and we also see the commercially
6	objectionable foreign odors. I would not put
7	those in the common category necessarily. And I
8	would say, just as insight, it seems like the
9	grain contaminated by those petroleum products
LO	it doesn't have a bright future. It does not end
L1	up getting reconditioned, usually or, you know
L2	but, like
L3	MR. KERRIGAN: But part of this,
L 4	though, much like with grain that's been touched
L5	by floodwaters, is for the most part, we know
L6	what's going to happen with it, right
L7	MR. GOODEMAN: Right. Right.
L8	MR. KERRIGAN: Is that, almost
L9	every single instance, it
20	MR. GOODEMAN: Right. Right.
21	MR. KERRIGAN: Needs to be
22	quarantined and then go to a landfill or some

other disposal mechanism. 1 2 MR. GOODEMAN: Right. But if that is MR. KERRIGAN: 3 4 designated of what needs to happen to it, it 5 allows us to at least move forward --Right. 6 MR. GOODEMAN: Right. Right. 7 MR. KERRIGAN: -- instead of it tying 8 up the bin space, the belt space, everything, 9 correct? 10 MR. GOODEMAN: It's a very good point. 11 Yes. Yes. 12 MR. SINNER: So, Tony, I mean, you say 13 large-animal droppings. I mean, are we including 14 rabbits, squirrels, other thing that can get onto 15 grain piles? I mean --It's a great question. 16 MR. GOODEMAN: 17 So generally speaking -- it's always funny 18 talking about this. But generally speaking, we 19 say that large-animal droppings -- cow, you know, 20 livestock -- is generally too large to enter a 21 sampling device. And so basically if we ever see 22 anything that's too large to enter a sampling

device -- concrete in the rare -- like, you see weird things. When you handle as much grain as you-all do, you just see weird things time to time; pieces of belt coming off, or metal. We say, okay, our sample's not representative, because this big piece of concrete is in the grain, we can't sample that, this is distinctly low quality, you know, this is not something that is represented in this sample here.

We include large-animal droppings in that. We draw the line at deer. Basically, deer and larger is -- anything smaller than that would not be. I hope that answers your question.

MR. SINNER: Yes.

MR. GOODEMAN: We would only count those if they ended up in our 1,000-gram portion, and we'd weigh it out. We have a tolerance, in most of the standards, for rodent droppings.

MR. SINNER: Okay.

MR. KERRIGAN: John, I think you had your hand up there for a second. Did you have a question or comment?

MR. LINDGREN: Yes. It just went up before Tony. He mentioned rice. Because I know rice was a concern at the last meeting that we had together. So once he mentioned rice on that, that pretty well took care of that.

MR. GOODEMAN: Okay.

MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. So it kind of sounds like here obviously, from a GIAC-membership industry standpoint, that we kind of have a path forward, but we have some work to do. I don't think that necessarily in the middle of this meeting its right to make the sausage, personally.

I think Nick was alluding to potentially creating a task force. Because of the outside entities from this committee, I think it'd be wise for us to reach out to other members; industry -- you know, there are a lot of different personnel that each of our companies and outside the company definitely tend to take the lead with FDA, that I think we should approach to start this process.

So I think it'd be my recommendation that we get a few volunteers, we set out a task force with an update at the next meeting, to hopefully try and provide some vetted solutions -- sorry, some vetted potential remediation plans that can be submitted as part of this. Please let me know if anybody feels differently with that. Okay. Arthur, Kendra, as far as creating a task force, I do not have my GIAC handbook handy and how we create a task force formally. Can you assist me with -- is that a voting item? I just need, you know, to garner some volunteers and then kind of set that aside? Or how does that work?

MR. FRIANT: Matt, this is Nick.

Based on the reading of that, I think my

preference would be we put a recommendation in

for this, so then we've got a -- and then, Arthur

maybe, or Kendra, they're -- that's not

necessarily based on it being in the procedures

manual. But I would say, when we get to that

point for talking about recommendations, we

should just have a recommendation round, forming a task force. We can work on the wordsmithing, but --

MR. NEAL Yes, I agree, Nick. I was talking on mute. Apologies. Yes, it'll need to be a recommendation and vote, because you also need to have those individuals who are going to be on the GIAC, who's leading the task force, identified. So that will be something you need to consider; any recommendation.

The process about how we populate that task force -- since we're talking about giving folks an opportunity to participate outside of the GIAC, we'll need to work that out here because we'll need to make sure there's transparency in that process and folks have an opportunity to express interest. So typically how we formed task force in the past, we've put out some type of notice, and people would respond to that notice, that they would want to be a part of the task force.

MR. KERRIGAN: And the difference

between a task force and a subcommittee to explore this topic could be individuals -- could a GIAC member individually solicit information but then bring it back to just the subcommittee members for discussion?

MR. NEAL Yes.

MR. KERRIGAN: Is that the big difference with that?

MR. NEAL It would be simpler to do a subcommittee. Why? Because a subcommittee would be formed of GIAC members, and you can solicit information from whoever you want, and bring that information back together. Forming a task force means we'll basically have to go out with a public notice, soliciting participation from the public, for individuals who are interested. And then there's a process to select those members. So it's going to take a little longer. May take a lot longer to establish that task force.

MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. Let's throw it back to Nick and some of the other GIAC members. What's your thoughts?

This is Nick. MR. FRIANT: Yes. I mean, I guess I can go first. I hadn't thought of that aspect, Arthur, and I'm glad that you I quess, just for me personally, I raised that. needed to chew on it a little bit more. I think we want to make sure that we've got inclusion, Matt, as you alluded to; some of our key trade associations that have a key interest in supporting and fostering this work. I think, right, a couple that we could probably all guess: NAEGA and NGFA would be really keen on being a part of it or aware of it.

But I think we also do need to act with a little bit of a sense of urgency since this has been out there for a couple of years, and it's questions that continue to arise, particularly for handlers, you know, when we get these actionable lots of grain. You know, I'm willing to roll with the flow of the committee on this one, but I'm not sure that going through that full process of, you know, the notice and comment period to form a task force -- if that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

just makes this drag on longer and longer. You know, I'm not the only voice in this one, for sure.

MR. KERRIGAN: Yes. It kind of feels to me, because of that time aspect, you know, given that several members of the GIAC have direct contacts to NAEGA, NGFA, and, frankly, our individual companies, that we may be able to, if nothing else, start with a subcommittee, bring that information back. If we feel that we don't have a good cross-section or, frankly, good feedback, then we can always go to a task force to expand it, you know, at the next meeting, which we'll get into. I'm assuming we're going to attempt to have a second meeting yet in '21.

So that could be a way to kind of see if we can garner enough good information, I guess, even if not for the full list but for some of the heavy hinders, assuming expediency is still the main name of the game, because once it comes down to GIAC, I'm assuming then it's going to take some time for FGIS to go back to FDA to

have some back-and-forth work, you know, before there's even any thought of some pre-approved plans.

MR. NEAL Yes, this is Arthur. Once we get the recommendation from GIAC, we would run it up the chain through leadership across the street, make sure secretary's fully aware of what the recommendations say. Then we'd engage FDA accordingly. We may have to partner, depending on what comes out of the recommendation.

I kind of sense that we'll need to do some of this negotiation work. And, Tony, you know, correct me if I'm wrong. We'll need to make sure that industry is poised to engage.

Industry will have to be poised to engage. And that's another good reason why having a consolidated recommendation that takes into account of industry makes sense; that way, folks would be on the same page and not coming at it from different angles.

MR. GOODEMAN: I don't know if you're interested; we've got Pat McCluskey and Barry

Gomoll on the line; they work on our policy staff 1 2 and have been instrumental in working with FDA's Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition. 3 And I don't know if they've got insights as to 4 5 some of the comments they've made, Pat or Barry, but might be helpful to the conversation. 6 7 MR. MCCLUSKEY: One thought I had from 8 -- can you hear me okay? 9 Barely, but yes. MR. GOODEMAN: There 10 we go. 11 MR. MCCLUSKEY: One thought I had from 12 working with FDA over the years on this -- we work with the Center for Food Safety and Applied 13 14 Nutrition, CFSAN. And of course, their focus is a lot on -- is very much targeted at food safety. 15 16 They think a lot about microbiology. So I just 17 want to make sure you get a good understanding 18 for yourself, for your subcommittee, on what they 19 think about what's important to them; get very

And just by way of example, to continue Tony's story about deer droppings: When

acquainted with them.

20

21

we discussed deer droppings with them, I don't know, three, four years ago and tried to come up with a plan that was acceptable to them, they said, Well, you know, if there are deer droppings, there is potentially also deer urine in there, so we better start looking for some kind of microbiological presence of bacteria from deer urine.

And I said, well, that's probably not going to be a big deal to you. And then I went through and explained -- and this is in wheat.

So I explained to them about the process of cleaning wheat before it goes into a flour mill, and a lot of technical stuff, and kind of talked them off the ledge of going down that road.

But I say that to you by way of getting familiar with what they're looking for, as you come up with your remediation plans that you want to submit to them, because, you know, they have a lot of high-level scientists that sit on these committees, and you just want to make sure you understand kind of where their come-from

is.

MR. NEAL Well, this is another thing too, Matt: When the subcommittee is established, we'll make sure that we also have a resource person from FGIS that assists, so that the type of perspective that Pat just raised -- we're making sure that we're helping to think through this, along with the subcommittee; it's not that you're off on your own, you know, without any support, any guidance, any direction.

MR. KERRIGAN: These are great comments and a great piece of information to know regarding that subcommittee. You know, Pat, to your point, where I kind of see maybe, you know, some of this industry knowledge going is -- obviously, there's a number of members that have dealt with this -- I don't want to say on a regular basis, but obviously it's come up that maybe we start with, frankly, polling our internal industry on these specific items and, you know, what the end-up outcome was from it, and starting from there, because then we can kind

of get an idea of maybe what has been approved on that one-off basis, to see, you know, how common, you know, that is with it, and trying to evaluate those concerns that could be outliers; for instance, in your case, you know, should that be expanded, or what information that they definitely took into account to actually come to that.

MR. MCCLUSKEY: And another thing I think we've observed over the years -- and I think Nick can probably speak to this more than me. But I think we've seen over the years that they tend to have regional policies, where you-all want a national policy. And so as you put forth your recommendations, that might be something to gently work into your presentation as well. Nick, would you say that's kind of accurate?

MR. FRIANT: You must be a mind-reader, Pat, because that's exactly what I was just thinking. And especially, like, the example around the large-animal excreta. We see

differences regionally, and I think that's 1 2 important to call out. We got to take that into consideration and be thinking about that. 3 4 MR. MCCLUSKEY: That's my two cents' 5 worth. That's worth more than 6 MR. GOODEMAN: 7 two, Pat, for sure on that one. 8 I'll send you a bill. MR. MCCLUSKEY: 9 MR. ENGEL: Pat, this is Curt. Ι This has a little 10 thank you for the comments. 11 bit of a potential to be creating a solution that 12 goes looking for a problem. 13 Tony, does FDA have a targeted list? 14 I mean, there has to be some number of these type of contamination issues that are recurring, that 15 16 are vexing for the industry as well as FDA. 17 mean, is there a target focus here? 18 MR. GOODEMAN: Is there a target 19 You know, when we first presented on this focus? 20 topic, we counted up -- and we had a busy year 21 for actionable lots; I think this was in 2019.

So it was a particularly -- I think conditions

were present that made it tough, and had a lot of actionable lots; we had about 100 in a calendar year.

And I think the information, how that was broken down, roughly, we -- I think the industry would probably know more about the real pain points there. Aflatoxin, for example -- I meant to mention this earlier, but we have an existing policy of how you can recondition a hot aflatoxin sample: run it over the cleaners, test both portions, the whole grain and the broken pieces, and, if the whole grain is good and the broken pieces are still hot, you know, you're pretty free to release the whole grain. mention that because that would be an example of a common actionable lot, but I don't know if it's necessarily a pain point for the industry, given that there's already options.

MR. ENGEL: Thank you. You know, in my career, I've run across a number of these types of issues, and knowing what to do has generally been the largest part of the problem.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 It wasn't that anyone was unwilling to do it. Ιt 2 was just, okay --MR. GOODEMAN: Right. 3 MR. ENGEL: -- What do we do now? 4 And 5 there's been --6 MR. GOODEMAN: Right. 7 MR. ENGEL: -- no clear understanding 8 of the problem, and no clear path to a solution. 9 So --It seems like there's 10 MR. GOODEMAN: a lot of interest in trying to, you know, as 11 12 opposed to starting from scratch each time, say, okay, if you've got deer droppings, if you've got 13 14 bugs in milled rice, here's what ends up 15 happening in almost every situation; let's just 16 do that; that way, we don't have all these bins 17 tied up, all this -- or a railcar tied up, 18 whatever it is, while we try to figure out what 19 to do and then days or weeks or more go by. 20 MR. ENGEL: Precisely. 21 MR. GOMOLL: Tony, you mind if I cut 22 in here for a second?

MR. GOODEMAN: Barry, if that was you,
I can't hardly hear you.

MR. GOMOLL: Oh, I'm sorry. Can you hear me currently? My mic might not be picking up.

MR. GOODEMAN: Little bit. Give it a shot.

MR. GOMOLL: Okay. So the FDA
maintains compliance policy guides, or CPGs, for
different actionable criteria, and one of the
back-and-forths right now is talking with them
about what we report and what we include in our
directive, for factors that we report, whether
they line up with the compliance policy guides or
not.

And in some cases -- for instance,

COFO odors. They don't have any specific CPG to

cover COFO orders, but we have been reporting

them every time. And I'm trying to get a little

more clarification on when we need to report; if

we should only report factors that have a clear

CPG actionable limit, or if we should just

continue reporting things like that that might indicate some other underlying factor that could cause that grain to be -- actionable might not necessarily be the word, but unsanitary or unfit for consumption.

So that's one of the ongoing things right now as far as our directive goes. And I can't tell you anything right now, but there may be changes in what we report, based on whether we just want to go strictly along with those CPGs or continue to have a bit more of an overarching reporting. Thanks, Tony.

MR. GOMOLL: Thanks, Barry.

MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. I think that's some really good discussion. Anybody else?

Again, really, really appreciate all the work on the FGIS side to assist with this group in understanding maybe the process forward here, you know, for something that -- you know, I think we-all accept it as just the way it is, versus trying to find a proactive way to maybe make it easier for all of us.

If there's no other discussion on this, because we have the recommendations coming up a little bit later to give everybody an hour or so to think about some of this, I guess we're going to move on to public comments.

MS. KLINE: I have received no requests to do a public comment.

MR. KERRIGAN: Okay.

MR. FRIANT: Wait. Matt, this is --

MR. KERRIGAN: Yes.

MR. FRIANT: -- Nick Friant. Kendra,
I have a question on that. And, you know, I'm
not sure, Kendra, if it's for you or Arthur, all
the above. And it's more clarification from some
of the discussion we had yesterday, around how
the committee works and whatnot. So is there
opportunity for folks to raise items that were
not included on the agenda during the period for
public comments, whether that's, you know,
yesterday or today, or, if anyone wants to make
public comments, those have to be made in
response to the Federal Register Notice

announcing the meeting?

MR. NEAL So thanks, Nick. Was that one question or two questions?

MR. FRIANT: Yes.

MR. NEAL That's fine.

MR. FRIANT: I guess it's really one, right -- or two. I don't know.

MR. NEAL Let me answer it this way, the way I think I heard it: in terms of raising issues for the committee to take up, the committee cannot take up new work that has not been identified prior to the meeting.

MR. FRIANT: Okay.

MR. NEAL Why? Because there may be people who are interested in that topic, who did not have an opportunity to be made aware of it. And the committee will make a decision on that topic, without people being made aware of it, and they may want to have issued or participated in that discussion, through public comment or providing some documentation that would counter, that would support the committee's position. So

that's for agenda-item work.

They should let us know that they want to make public comment. The challenge that you have doing this virtually, I think -- this is our first time -- is that if no one signed up and we have, you know, a lot of people on virtually, that want to comment publicly but have not notified us that they want to comment, then we don't have any type of order to our process.

So for today, if someone wants to comment, they should notify us that they want to comment, so that we can have order in our process. So they still can comment, but they need to let us know that they want to comment during the public comment period.

MR. FRIANT: Okay. That helps. And then just to carry that a step further, then -- and I don't know of anybody that has any public comment, so this isn't a pre-loaded question; I'm just trying to learn the new process. If someone from the public does make some comments, if that

1	was not already on the agenda as an approved
2	agenda item, the committee could not take action,
3	then, on whatever you know, if we had a
4	test-kit manufacturer come talk about their new
5	latest ethyl methyl test kit, the advisory
6	committee could not take any action on that
7	unless that had been a pre-notified agenda item?
8	Is that a correct interpretation?
9	MR. NEAL Correct. The
10	MR. FRIANT: Okay.
11	MR. NEAL Committee could note that
12	comment and they could take that item up for the
13	agenda for the next meeting, if that's what they
14	chose to do or you chose to
15	MR. FRIANT: Okay.
16	MR. NEAL Yes.
17	MR. FRIANT: Clear. Thank you. I
18	appreciate that.
19	MR. NEAL Yes, sir. And FYI: This
20	change is not something that's random. We're
21	doing this based on the Federal Advisory
22	Committee Act rules. This is how Federal

Advisory Committee boards and committees should handle business under the act, for transparency and inclusion.

MR. KERRIGAN: I appreciate that information. We do have a significant amount of new members on the GIAC. Obviously, there's some that have participated in the past as well, you know, as well as obviously a renewed focus on the GIAC, from yourself, Arthur. And appreciate that, especially, experience from the organic side, and kind of how all of that works. So --

MR. NEAL No, we appreciate the partnership and the openness and the progress that's being made. And I'll share this -- one of the things we talked about -- well, I guess that was 2019, right? Man -- was wanting to make sure that the work of the committee was valued, was valuable, and that had the necessary impact that drew the type of attention and participation that the industry needs. And I believe that that's exactly where it's headed, based on the type of agenda items taken up, how we facilitate

participation from industry, in helping to resolve some of those issues. It will definitely elevate the impact and status of the committee.

MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. Well, we are well, well ahead of schedule here, everybody. With no public comments, what's going to come up next here is recommendations. What I'd like to do -- do you want to take a longer lunch or do you want to take a short break before we delve into that topic?

MR. NEAL Oh. We would --

MR. KERRIGAN: We're about --

MR. NEAL It's 11:48. Public comments at 12:00. Lunch is at 1:15. It's really up to you and the committee, in terms of whether or not you want to -- we need to keep lunch at 1:15. Why? Because on the agenda it says we'll take up those recommendations at 2:15. So what you choose to do between now and 1:15 -- you can have a discussion about that whether or not you talk -- you know, have pre-conversation whether or not you take a break. We'll not take up the formal

discussion on your recommendation, before time. 1 2 MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. So we can't discuss recommendations until the 12:30 time? 3 4 Because there's --5 I'm sorry, I said --MR. NEAL Yes. -- a section there for 6 MR. KERRIGAN: 7 lunch. 8 2:15. 12:30. I said MR. NEAL Yes. 9 the wrong time. 10 MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. So 12:30. 11 we've got about 40 minutes here before we can take that up. I want to take a few minutes here 12 and then we will take an extended break here. 13 14 When we start talking about recommendations --15 again, we just went through the process of 16 potential recommendations. Again, had to be 17 agenda items for us to take up a recommendation. 18 There's essentially four agenda items 19 that we've discussed; it was the corn borer, the 20 average inspection flexibilities, that falling 21 number, and then the FDA MOU. From my notes from

yesterday, the corn-borer issue is an item that

does not fall under the USGSA; thus, the GIAC cannot -- or it wouldn't be actionable, I guess, if GIAC decided to make a recommendation to FGIS, even, you know, engage APHIS or Department of Ag., because you wouldn't be able to do it, correct? So that is kind of a non-item for the group. Is that the way I understand that, Arthur? I believe that --

MR. NEAL As a committee recommendation and action item, because that issue does not fall under USGSA, it would not hold any weight for the secretary to have to respond to that, because it would fall outside the scope of the USGSA.

MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. So if it doesn't hold weight, it doesn't hold weight, right? So that is something for the committee to think about; not to lead the committee into anything. But the average inspection flexibilities -- kind of sound like, Tony, that there may be some work on both sides of the table, for some additional research on capabilities, as well as, there were

a lot of recommendations from the GIAC, regarding not only some trade organizations with U.S. wheat; NAEGA as well, who handles a lot of our contract terms; to garner some more information on there.

The falling-number item: There is an ongoing, I guess, evaluation, I guess I'll call it maybe, within FGIS, regarding how it falls underneath of AMA for the authority, and how that's applied officially and unofficially. And then we've had a lot of discussion regarding the FDA MOU and how the FDA could perceive some recommended pre-approved remediation plans for certain actionable items. However, there is a strong emphasis on industry involvement versus FGIS just as a liaison.

Those are very, very quick summaries, but I did want to follow back and touch on all those topics, for everybody to kind of be thinking about here, once we come back from break. If there's anything else, anything in that, I guess, Arthur, that I've misstated

regarding the technicality of those items, you 1 2 know, please. MR. NEAL No, I think you summarized 3 it well, even with the first item you mentioned 4 5 concerning the corn borer; it's still on the record, and --6 7 MR. KERRIGAN: Sure. 8 MR. NEAL -- we've got input, through 9 dialogue, on what options are. And so we've registered that loud and clear. 10 11 MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. Okay. Any 12 comments, questions, discussion, before we go into break? My intention is to take a break 13 14 until that 12:30 time, and then we'll come back 15 and circle back with the entire group, on each of 16 those items, if anybody wants to propose a 17 recommendation and go through that process. 18 anybody have any other comments before we go do 19 that? 20 MR. GOODEMAN: I'm sorry, what time 21 are we coming back? It'll be 12:30 Eastern, 22 MR. KERRIGAN:

1	9:30 Pacific.
2	MR. GOODEMAN: Thank you.
3	MR. TURNIPSEED: Matt, this is Brent.
4	MR. KERRIGAN: Yes. Yes.
5	MR. TURNIPSEED: Can I ask a question
6	about something that was discussed earlier
7	yesterday? Quick question.
8	MR. KERRIGAN: Yes.
9	MR. TURNIPSEED: It's more for Arthur.
10	Just because I'm questioning our FGIS our
11	GIAC board had been reapproved, and they had
12	approved recommendations. Did they approve the
13	recommendations to extend the committee members'
14	length of terms?
15	MR. NEAL The committee members'
16	length of terms well, let me let you know how
17	I heard that question, first.
18	MR. TURNIPSEED: Okay.
19	MR. NEAL There was a recommendation
20	made that existing members who were on the
21	committee at the time that recommendation was
22	made, have their terms extended before the

That did not happen. 1 re-auth. 2 MR. TURNIPSEED: Okay. However, the reauthorization 3 MR. NEAL of the USGSA did allow for committee members to 4 5 serve two consecutive terms should they be reappointed by the secretary. 6 7 MR. TURNIPSEED: Okay. 8 MR. NEAL So I think I may have gotten 9 to that aspect. 10 MS. KLINE: And also, Arthur, just to 11 add to that, you have to reapply. 12 MR. NEAL Right. 13 MS. KLINE: So when we go out for --14 so there's five members rolling off at the end of 15 next month. We're working on the nomination 16 announcement. And if you want to be selected to 17 continue or be part of the next five selected, 18 you have to go reapply. So you have to send in 19 the form like you've done previously. 20 MR. TURNIPSEED: I think I'm one of 21 those rolling off, so I was curious. I just 22 wanted to make sure I was interpreting that

1 correctly. 2 MR. NEAL No, I appreciate that, Brent. 3 4 MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. Any other 5 questions, comments, concerns? Okay. Let's take about 34 minutes here and we'll be back at 12:30 6 7 Eastern Time and we'll delve into 8 recommendations. Thank you. 9 MR. NEAL All right. Thank you. MR. GOODEMAN: 10 Thank you. 11 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter 12 went off the record at 11:56 a.m. and resumed at 13 12:31 p.m.) 14 MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. Welcome back, 15 everybody. I'm hoping that we have the group 16 here again. As discussed -- or I guess I'll open 17 Given Zoom, I know there's difficulties. 18 I know I keep asking, and I get a lot of silence, 19 but is there anything else, you know, comments 20 that anybody wants to make, before we jump into 21 recommendations? Okay. Well, we will get into

We'll take them in order. And, you know,

it.

again, as we rehashed right before our break, there's, I guess, three or four things that the committee can decide to do: We can make a formal recommendation. We can do absolutely nothing and move on. And, as Arthur noted, our discussion, you know, is documented and taken notice. You know, we have the ability to kind of punt and ask that it be put as an agenda item on the next meeting. And we can also create a subcommittee, which would have some subcommittee/task force to continue work on it until the next meeting.

So on the topic of the corn borer, is there anybody who would like, or thinks, that the GIAC should make a recommendation of some sort regarding the corn-borer topic?

MR. FRIANT: Matt, this is Nick. As sponsor or presenter of the topic, I guess I'm not sure how much I procedurally can or cannot say or should or should not say. But I guess, from my seat, I would say no action from the committee at this time, and not do anything further with it.

MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. I'm hearing no calls for a recommendation. Nick has suggested that, for the GIAC, no subcommittee, no task force, no recommendation, no need to keep it as an agenda item, moving forward. We don't really need a vote on this. I quess, kind of a last call for GIAC members if they feel otherwise before we move past it? Okay. I'm not hearing anything from any GIAC member, regarding the corn-borer agenda item, so we're going to move Average inspection flexibilities: This forward. is one that I was the champion sponsor of. there was a lot of discussion there. As champion of it, again, if any GIAC member feels otherwise, they'll let me -- as chairperson, you write it .

I kind of think that maybe there's some more background information that even I would like to gather, and some other working groups that I would like to discuss with. Given that Mr. Goodeman has already stated that there's some kind of, you know, potentially more information that they need to look into regarding

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

this, and after the dialogue and discussion, it would be my recommendation that we do not do a formal recommendation to the secretary.

I also don't think at this point in time that we're ready for a task force or subcommittee, but rather would like to see this added as a continuing agenda item at the next meeting, to possibly give some updates from both sides, both the GIAC membership as well as from FGIS, regarding just potential information, capabilities, and things of that nature, to move forward.

So with those comments, does anybody feel differently, that they would like to, I guess, recommend a recommendation to the secretary?

MR. FRIANT: Matt, this is Nick. I guess just beyond recommending, I agree with you that -- keep this as an agenda item for the next committee meeting and then allow advisory committee members to go back to their respective companies and/or trade associations to gather

some more info. So I think that is a good approach. And I would agree: probably no need, at this point, for a formal recommendation.

MR. KERRIGAN: Okay.

MS. COOPER: I concur with your recommendation as well, Matt. I think that's a good path forward. I think it's an important topic. There's a lot more information that I think we need to gather before moving to a more formal recommendation.

MR. KERRIGAN: Thank you, Janice.

MR. AYERS: David Ayers. Do we need a motion to put it on the agenda for the next meeting?

MR. KERRIGAN: I believe that it's kind of an informal at this point, that we will go out as a committee -- or, sorry, prior to the next meeting, there will be a request for topics before it gets issued to the Federal Register. I don't believe -- Kendra, you can correct me if I'm wrong -- if we need a motion on that or not.

MR. NEAL So this will be old

business. It's carrying over.

MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. Anything else?

Okay. Moving on to the falling-number item.

John Lindgren, as the champion of that, do you have any comments that you'd like to make after all the discussion in the last day, day-and-a-half?

MR. LINDGREN: Well, through most of the discussions yesterday and what my original recommendations were, it appears to capture recommendation 1, which was to get people doing it the same way. Simply moving falling numbers from AMA to USGS would solve that first recommendation. And always looking for new ways to -- different ways, competitive ways, for other results. I leave that on.

The concern, I'm sure, through discussions yesterday, is: to move it over to USGSA would require all official agencies to use the 2:2 method. So I don't know if there's any leeway on that option, to allow some to run 1:2, you know, because it's going to turn into a

time-sensitive issue if official agencies are required to run 2:2 method, with it being under USGSA.

So I'm not sure -- you know, I mean, as a group, that's what we need to discuss. If we simply recommend to the secretary that it be moved from AMA to USGSA, which FGIS was looking at anyway, our recommendation, I would assume, would further that movement along. I'm just concerned for some of the official agencies out there that still want to run 1:2.

MR. KERRIGAN: Go ahead, Arthur.

MR. NEAL Just a question. Whatever you choose to do in making a recommendation or not making a recommendation, if you do make a recommendation, ask yourself, whatever you're recommending, is it helping to solve the problem, because what I hear the problem is: falling-number tests at origination -- different from the results at destination.

And also here, we need efficiency for railcars. And so if you're not ready to make the

recommendation, don't do so. Really take time to look at the issues and see if you can come up with a workable solution, because if you make a recommendation and we move forward with it, there's an industry response that's going to also have to be addressed. And so I just want to make sure; before you do what you do, feel comfortable with whatever choice you're going to.

MR. LINDGREN: So as a group, I'm assuming we would have to vote on whether or not to make the recommendation? That's --

MR. KERRIGAN: If we wanted to make --

MR. LINDGREN: -- True or --

MR. KERRIGAN: If we want to make a recommendation, we would need to finalize some language regarding what was in that recommendation, and then we would vote on that verbiage -- or settle verbiage for that specific recommendation, yes. So, informally, I guess, since we don't have verbiage in front of us, does the group feel -- or does any one person want to, or feel that we need to, make a recommendation in

this meeting, to start working on what that recommendation would look like?

To John's point, to Arthur's point, I think we understand that FGIS is already looking at potentially moving it from AMA to, you know, USGSA. There are definitely some positives.

That solves one. But I think we-all acknowledge -- or the discussion around it seems to acknowledge that it may create some pretty significant issues on the other side, right? So I think where we're at is: do we feel that the group is comfortable to start working on verbiage for a formal recommendation out of this meeting?

MR. LINDGREN: From this point -excuse me -- I don't know that we're ready to
work on that verbiage yet, because I think
there's too many unknowns on the impact on if it
would have to be the 2:2 method, which it
currently is. So, you know, and as a group, we
can certainly move it forward and continue to
discuss. But, you know, talking with other
individuals, just within the Grain Inspection

1	Advisory Committee as well as, you know, outside
2	the committee, one of the biggest concerns is the
3	timeliness of delivery of service, based on that.
4	And I assume Tony, you can correct me if I'm
5	wrong if FGIS chooses to try to move this to
6	USGSA, it'll go through the Federal Register, and
7	comments and all that stuff have to have happen
8	as well, correct?
9	MR. GOODEMAN: We're exploring that
10	piece but, in talking with Pat, we think that, at
11	a minimum, it'd be a Federal Register Notice
12	(Simultaneous speaking.)
13	MR. FRIANT: Yes, this is
14	MR. GOODEMAN: At a minimum.
15	MR. FRIANT: This is Nick. My
16	follow-up question on that was going to be: yes,
17	is it just a Federal Register Notice or is it
18	actually, during the next reauthorization of the
19	Grain Standards Act, that this one would be taken
20	up?
21	MR. GOODEMAN: No. I mean, not that
22	it couldn't be resolved legislatively, but

Okay. It could be 1 MR. FRIANT: 2 handled, though, through the --MR. GOODEMAN: Yes. 3 4 MR. FRIANT: -- notice and the comment 5 And everything we've 6 MR. GOODEMAN: 7 got so far --8 MR. FRIANT: Okay. 9 MR. GOODEMAN: -- Says that it can be 10 handled even just as a policy matter; just an 11 interpretation, something at a very low level. 12 But again, since it's such a big issue, we want 13 to be very transparent and upfront about -- I 14 don't think we have to change our regulations. 15 We may have to update our fee schedule, something like that, you know, from the AMA column over to 16 17 the USGSA side. Again, and our initial review 18 would probably be a notice in the Federal Register that this was taking place, if we did 19 20 that -- if we went this route. 21 MR. LINDGREN: So I believe, at this 22 point, then, that there shouldn't be a formal

recommendation and that we just continue on to -you know, it's under old business like the other,
until we get a better handle on what it is
everybody doesn't need. We'll have to see.

Tony, what's -- sorry. MR. KERRIGAN: I guess, can you give maybe a little rehash, a flavor of exactly where you're at with this kind of discussion review or what you think the next steps are with timing? Obviously, there's a lot of stuff going on, you know, with staffing, with COVID, and things like that. What's your expectation? And kind of maybe more thinking about between now until, let's just say, this fall, do you think that you guys will come back with much information or kind of thoughts on where you guys might be at? Do you think that you may be able to get to that point, or is that being a little bit presumptuous, with everything that's going on, to where this is just kind of an open item that's hanging out in the background, that you're just kind of mulling around?

I would say it's a

MR. GOODEMAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

priority for us. It's one of our internal Field
Management Division goals for this fiscal year,
which ends in September: to evaluate options.
And I think we're probably, you know, pretty far
along in that process. But I think one thing
that may help this committee is just what that
looks like in implementation. And that's
something that we can look at more closely is, if
we went this route, what steps would we have to
take, what would the time line be. I mean,
generally with big policy changes, we try to
allow as much time as possible.

You might remember, with the most recent round of falling-number changes back in the spring of 2019 -- I think we published those in the fall, for May implementation, I think is the time line. And so, you know, for something pretty big like this, I think we'd probably look for a similar, you know, notice. But again, we'd want to confirm, and that's something that we can do, that's a part of our, you know, project, is to evaluate exactly what that would look like if

we made this change, what steps we'd go through. 1 2 Arthur --MR. NEAL Tony, questions: In reality 3 4 now, the falling-number test can be performed by 5 official agencies and unofficial inspection companies, right? 6 7 MR. GOODEMAN: Right. 8 MR. NEAL So whatever we did, you 9 still have the possibility that you've got unofficial companies performing the test, right? 10 But what we'd be saying -- or is there a 11 12 potential that they would no longer be able to 13 perform the test? 14 Right. Yes, so no MR. GOODEMAN: matter what we do, unofficials -- and I hate to 15 16 name company names but, you know, just so people 17 know. 18 MR. NEAL Don't name them. 19 You know, any unofficial, MS. KLINE: 20 non-FGIS overseeing company can run anything they 21 want, unofficially, now, and can run anything

they want. Even if we move this to the USGSA,

they could run it unofficially in the future.

And one thing that we're trying to align is that anytime that you see, you know, Northern Plains, Champaign, Danville, state of Missouri, whatever it is -- anytime you see that name on a certificate, we want to make sure that there's clarity this was run according to official procedures, because right now with the test being run under the less restrictive Ag. Marketing Act, any of these official agencies, cooperators, they're allowed to run it just on their own letterhead. They don't have to follow the procedures. They don't have to use two They don't have to use licensed tubes. personnel. They don't have to go by a USGSA fee schedule -- or, I'm sorry, a AMA fee schedule. They operate in that manner, exactly like -- or could operate exactly like an unofficial company.

And so if we made this change,
according to the USGSA, because of the
restrictive language in the USGSA and the
regulations, they'd no longer be allowed to wear

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

two hats. They could only wear the official hat, only do it by the book.

MR. NEAL And so if I'm not mistaken, a lot of the catalog -- some of the examples that were brought to us of the differing results from the variation -- some of those tests were run by unofficial companies. And so --

MR. GOODEMAN: Right.

MR. NEAL -- though we could make a change on our end that affects our official agencies, we still have the problem that companies may be using unofficials, and the results they'd get at origination still don't pair up with the results they get at destination.

MR. GOODEMAN: Potentially, yes.

Private third parties, unofficials, and house graders, you know, company graders, yes, no obligation to do things officially, unless there's anything at the state level that would mandate something different. But no obligation to follow our rules; that's correct.

MR. NEAL So -- I'm just talking out

loud -- it appears that there may need to be a broader discussion to really figure out where can we get something in place, because, no matter what, it's almost as if -- there's a business decision almost, too. If you're trying to go for speed and efficiency and just get some idea of what a one-drop test will get you, you know, you can do that, but you run the risk, on the back end, not having or not have shipped which you thought you wanted to ship.

If we go 2:2 method, there's the feedback that it's going to slow things down when you're dealing with a unit train; not going to be move; at low-risk fast, make those decisions; may cost more; those type of decisions. But on the back end, you will have probably greater alignment in results, from origination to destination.

I don't know currently how many folks are using third parties versus official agencies in the process. I think that some information that will be helpful to the committee, in terms

1 of processing whatever we recommend, will this 2 actually help address the situation, because we could be changing something that has no impact or 3 very little impact. 4 5 MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. MR. KUHL: 6 So --7 MR. KERRIGAN: Some more --8 MR. KUHL: Oh. 9 Yes, go ahead, Ryan. MR. KERRIGAN: 10 MR. KUHL: Hey, Tony. You said that 11 there would be a notice in the Federal Registry. 12 Would that be just a notice or would that be available for comment? 13 14 MR. GOODEMAN: That's something we 15 have to look at. I suppose I'd say, at a 16 minimum, a notice. Like, I think we've got --17 Pat, could you help me out? We just did a notice 18 on some rating procedural changes, interpretation 19 changes, in edible beans, and I'm trying to think 20 if that was a notice and comment or just a 21 notice.

MR. MCCLUSKEY: Yeah, it's notice for

comment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. GOODEMAN: Yes. So that was a notice-and-comment period. It's reasonable for us to evaluate and consult with our internal processes, to see what a change like this would There are things that we do with a necessitate. notice. It's just a notice: here's what's happening and here's when it's happening. there are things that we do -- here's what we're looking to do, we'll accept comments. Or, you know, I think it's a notice-and-comment period: this is going to be effective; unless we receive adverse comments -- we have a lot options, I think.

MR. NEAL And there's also the possibility that we could do a notice for comment on this problem in general, and seek input from industry, on what type of options they think exist that could help resolve this, and provide that feedback. And we can say in the comment maybe that, you know, we'll be using this to provide information to the Grain Inspection

Advisory Committee, you know, to help come up with a proposed recommendation on how we should move forward and address it. That's another option.

Now, that's time too, because we have to write that notice up, get it through the clearance process, allow people to comment. We want to try to have all of that done before our next meeting, hopefully, in the fall, which is roughly, what, five to six months away, less than that. I don't know -- yes.

MR. KUHL: John, what is your thoughts on the time for this? We're getting closer to a idea.

MR. LINDGREN: Well, from my point of view -- if you said John, meaning me, Ryan -- MR. KUHL: Yes.

MR. LINDGREN: Yes. It really simply comes down to -- everything is about time, speed, and efficiency. And I don't want to strap down official agencies with what they're currently doing, because that may not even be what all the

exporters want.

exporter chooses to use third party, whether it's through the falling number or even just simply grading, you know, that's the risk that we-all take, if that third party is used, on whether or not they're doing it properly. You know, the fallback is always to go to official agency. If you're not using official agency, you can, to make sure that it's going to align with how we export grain.

And the official agency -- I certainly don't want to strap official agencies down to having to do something that may not make any difference to anybody anyway, because they may still use unofficial if that's what they choose to do. And then when they fall back to using that term -- I don't know what everybody does use. If they choose to use official agency, then they know what rules are going to be followed.

So from this standpoint, you know, through this discussion, I believe we're getting

closer, but I don't think it's anywhere near a formal recommendation, without further checking with everybody that is affected by it, because there's a heck of a lot more people than just those that are listening to this conversation right now. So I don't know --

MR. FRIANT: And this is Nick. Sorry,
John.

MR. LINDGREN: No. Go ahead, Nick.

MR. FRIANT: I agree with you; I don't think at this point we have enough information.

Like you said, there's some other pretty important stakeholders that I think would want to connect with advisory-committee members, for input. I think the question I would ask is: do we need, you know -- and this is for you, Tony and Arthur, I think -- you know, can you continue to provide updates on the work that FGIS is doing and/or, you know, different options on how we might address it, or make a recommendation between now and the next meeting.

So in other words, will the agency

keep advising the advisory committee on options in what you're exploring, or do we need to have a recommendation on that, because I do think it's important for us, as the advisory committee, to keep up to speed on the work that you guys are doing and the options that we could pursue. Is that part of the normal operations, where you'll continue to give the advisory committee updates, or do we need to make a recommendation that says, Hey, make sure you guys keep giving the committee updates?

MR. NEAL I think that's necessary.

I think we'll keep you --

MR. FRIANT: Okay.

MR. NEAL -- Updated on progress. One of the things I will try to research and find out, I guess, after our break, after lunch, is whether or not there's an opportunity for the committee to make a request for input on a problem or a challenge that does not have to go through the Federal Register.

I don't know, I've got to explore

this. Say, for instance, out of this meeting, you want to get input from industry on this particular issue, and there's a set of questions that you want people to respond to. Can we post that on our website, notify folks that it's there, and they provide responses through Regulations.gov so that you can have that input to factor in before our next meeting? I don't know if that's possible, but I'll try to figure that out and research it before when we get back after our break. And what that does, it potentially helps to facilitate a more timely response to the challenge and get you information quicker.

MR. GOODEMAN: I think that would be good info to have.

MS. COOPER: If I could make just a general comment about the falling-number test.

The cause for differences between the results from origin to destination can be caused by many things, not only the method of testing. And that's not always true; that's not true for all

the tests. But in this one in particular, it can be problematic. You can get different results from the same field if you use exactly the same testing method.

So I just wanted to note that there's a lot of reasons for results to be different, so I just wanted to remind us all of that so that we're not looking just for alignment in method as the solution for this particular problem. So just wanted to mention that.

MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. So I think, in summary, what I'm hearing is that there is not a need for, at this meeting anyhow, a formal recommendation to the secretary. Going to pause there and ask, if any GIAC member feels otherwise, to speak now. Okay.

MR. KUHL: Yes. Sorry. I'm not sure if this is possible, but can we recommend or talk about -- if FGIS decides to throw this over to GSA, can we recommend not to do it soon, so we have time to figure out the best way?

MR. KERRIGAN: Well, we probably

could, but I think, from what I heard from Arthur and Tony, and especially what we-all know -- no offense to how quickly the federal government moves -- is that I don't think it's going to happen quick; and even with just the public notice, that it's still, you know, five months out, even if they probably submit it today.

And so I guess my general thoughts on that is that, you know, we'll definitely be well into/past at least the 2021 wheat harvest, you know, before anything of that nature happens.

And the intention would be that we would have another meeting by that point in time, to likely be able to get an update.

I guess what I'm getting from Tony is

I don't think they're at a position and a place

here today to even start that process of moving

it over, is what I'm hearing.

MR. GOODEMAN: That's an accurate assessment. I mean, even if -- again, just from a policy standpoint, for a change like this, we'd try and do it at the, you know, beginning of the

marketing year. We wouldn't want to do it right before harvest, for example; that might be problematic.

Again, I'll hearken back to what we did two years ago with the procedural changes in falling number. We gave a significant amount of advancement -- it's not quite a year, but a lot of notice, and had made the change in May. You know, I'd hate for it to drag out too long if this is a genuine issue that we could help make progress on. You know, in every harvest that goes by, we could have other issues that come up and -- but you're right, it's not a real quick process. So I'd hate to delay it too much, but I definitely understand the need to evaluate it properly and provide appropriate notice.

MR. NEAL So if I'm going to --

MR. GOODEMAN: I think that that is important, like, how much notice you might need; that's important; or how urgent this issue is.

You know, even coming away with this, you know, without a resolution, saying this is a terrible

idea, stop now, I think is, you know, noteworthy, just to continue to look at it. I think it's all really good information.

MR. NEAL So just upon quick review; there may be a possibility for the committee to craft a request for public comments. You know, and there'll be a need to frame the issue, what it is, you know, that's challenging the industry, and how you want the public to comment, you know, what kind of information you're looking for. There may be a possibility for that to be done without us going through the Federal Register, for the committee. I'll confirm that.

But what I'm seeing, there could be a possibility that that exists. So after lunch, I'll have an answer for you on that and, that way, the committee can take up whether or not you want to develop a recommendation that requests public comment on this issue, and that can get you data to formulate potentially a more firm recommendation to us, on how you think it can be handled. And we'll still continue to do our part

on the back end, assessing options from our perspective.

MR. KERRIGAN: I'll ask the GIAC members: is there anybody who, on that initial, I guess -- what Arthur's going to check into, that that could be a benefit? Or would that add value to anybody on the GIAC, before Arthur spends this time over lunch, researching something?

MR. FRIANT: Yes, this is Nick. I think there's value in it. I got to kind of chew on it a little bit more. But I think there's potentially some value in that.

MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. Because, you know, the other option, I think as John alluded to, is with FGIS continuing to work, you know, with maybe some of the -- I don't want to call them revelations, but maybe clarity on official/unofficial, both inside of the, I guess, official agencies, but then also maybe the realization of all of the independent surveyors who are not, you know, held to this in general; that there's definitely -- that probably built

the data set of concern, that we could just leave it on as an agenda item, kind of carry it to the next meeting as well. And I think what Arthur is alluding to as a step further on, if there's a need for actual public comment leading up to the next meeting, to gather information, because there's kind of two levels of information gathered there.

Any other thoughts or comments on this falling-number item? Okay. If not, we'll stay that, I guess, until we -- if we think that there could be some value with what Arthur's going to look into, we kind of make kind of final decision on that, once we hear backup for some clarity on that. Okay?

The fourth and final topic for us to consider is the discussion around the FGIS FDA MOU, specifically regarding coming up with kind of a agreed-upon sample remediation for various actionable items that've been discussed. It doesn't sound like we are at a level of recommendation; however, I will pause to see if a

1	sorry, a recommendation to the secretary.
2	I'll pause there to make sure that we kind of get
3	that out of the way. It sounds like we're at the
4	level of likely a subcommittee. Nick, I believe
5	that you had expressed some consideration for
6	recommending the creation of a subcommittee. Is
7	that correct?
8	MR. FRIANT: Yes. I would be
9	interested in recommending a subcommittee to take
10	a look at it.
11	MR. KERRIGAN: Okay.
12	MR. FRIANT: So let me ask a question:
13	From a process perspective, what does that look
14	like? So that is
15	MR. KERRIGAN: We would need to draft
16	some language regarding the creation of the
17	subcommittee. Then I believe we would then take
18	a roll-call vote, yea/nay, on the creation of
19	that subcommittee, once we have the verbiage on
20	that creation and what its intent is, settled.
21	MR. FRIANT: Okay. And that's just
22	internal to the advisory committee; that's not

something that would be a recommendation that 1 2 goes up to the secretary, then? MR. KERRIGAN: Arthur, is that 3 4 correct? 5 Yes, I guess --MR. FRIANT: MR. NEAL Well, all of the 6 7 recommendations -- we're going to make sure the 8 secretary is aware of it. And so this is going 9 to be an output -- well, no. So in answering, I 10 guess no. We will inform the secretary, of the 11 body of work that resulted from this meeting. 12 But this is not an actual recommendation you're 13 asking USDA to take action on. 14 MR. FRIANT: Okay. 15 MR. KERRIGAN: Can you scroll up, 16 Kendra, to the main subcommittee, not the task 17 force. There we go. 18 So I believe the key here in 19 discussion regarding the subcommittee is: 20 responsible for conducting research and analyses 21 in drafting proposals for consideration by the 22 full GIAC. So, Nick, is this something that

1	sounds like you'd like to propose that we work on
2	the recommendation for, to create a subcommittee?
3	MR. FRIANT: Yes. Yes. You got it.
4	MR. KERRIGAN: Do you have a
5	MR. FRIANT: During the break, I
6	MR. KERRIGAN: Suggested language?
7	MR. FRIANT: I started on some
8	suggested language during the previous break. I
9	notice we're kind of getting up close to the
10	second break here. What's the easiest way?
11	Should I send this to you, Kendra, for the and
12	it's a draft, so I'm totally open to the
13	committee slicing and dicing and getting it the
14	exact way we want it. But I do have something we
15	can at least start with.
16	MS. KLINE: I would suggest sending it
17	to Brent, since he's the acting secretary for the
18	committee.
19	MR. FRIANT: Okay.
20	MR. TURNIPSEED: I've got a
21	MR. FRIANT: Okay. Will do that.
22	MR. TURNIPSEED: Word document kind

of going here, so I can put it on the screen or 1 2 something. MR. FRIANT: Okay. 3 4 MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. Well, if you'd 5 like to send that over to Brent. And we are 6 coming right up here on lunch. Maybe we take the 7 hour lunch and then, when we come back, we will 8 wordsmith that to be able to hopefully take the recommendation to a roll-call vote. Arthur will 9 have some clarity regarding gathering public 10 11 comment without the Federal Register; we can make 12 a decision on that and then continue on to finish 13 the meeting. 14 So with that, let's go ahead and take 15 just over an hour for lunch. We'll reconvene 16 back at 1:15 Eastern Time. Is that right? And we will start 17 I'm sorry, 2:15 Eastern Time. 18 right where we left off here with this 19 subcommittee. Thank you. 20 MR. GOODEMAN: Thank you. 21 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter 22 went off the record at 1:13 p.m. and resumed at

2:19 p.m.)

MR. KERRIGAN: All right. I see everybody we need, on. Brent has a proposed verbiage regarding the establishment of a subcommittee for the GIAC to review FDA actionable items. I think we kind of focus in on the number two there, that, quote/unquote, final verbiage. If everybody'd like to take a couple of minutes to take a look at that, and we'll open the floor for any comments for revision.

MR. FRIANT: So this is Nick. Maybe while people are chewing on it, I'll call up a couple areas that I just struggled with writing, that I want to make sure folks are comfortable with. You know, the identification of the topics, I labeled them FDA actionable items. Does that resonate with folks? That was one area that I want to make sure folks are comfortable with how that was spelled out.

And then the second piece was in the second sentence; start talking about should also propose what actions/activities would be

required. Does that use of the words: actions 1 2 and activities be required under pre-approved reconditioning plan --3 MR. KERRIGAN: Do we need to put in 4 5 the --6 MR. FRIANT: -- Does that language 7 resonate? 8 Tony, I think one of MR. KERRIGAN: 9 the words that I heard you use quite a bit was the remediation. Is that the technical that the 10 11 FDA is looking for, or are we playing semantics? 12 MR. GOODEMAN: It might be semantics. 13 I think reconditioning -- I might've been using 14 the wrong word, actually. I think reconditioning is probably what they term it if you're going to 15 16 try and, you know, eliminate the problem or make the grain, you know, better and get rid of it; 17 18 whatever the issue was. Think the reconditioning 19 is probably the better term. 20 MR. TURNIPSEED: Would 21 slash-remediation be better? Because, some 22 situations, you're going to want disposing of it.

1	MR. GOODEMAN: Right. Sometimes you
2	have to.
3	MR. FRIANT: I think that's a good
4	suggestion.
5	MR. SINNER: So, Tony, just back to
6	when you presented this. These are actionable
7	items that were identified by FDA, correct, and
8	that's why it's stated this way?
9	MR. GOODEMAN: Technically, they'd be
10	identified or first-noticed by FGIS or one of our
11	official agencies, and then reported to FDA. We
12	call them actionable lots; I think it's how
13	they're termed in our directive and our FGIS
14	instructions. But they're actual because FDA
15	that's why they set up an MOU when they're
16	actionable, because of FDA regulations.
17	MR. KERRIGAN: So would we revise that
18	
19	MR. FRIANT: FDA
20	MR. KERRIGAN: So would we revise that
21	to say: to review FGIS actionable lots which were
22	reported to FDA?

1	MR. GOODEMAN: Probably semantics
2	there. I think that, you know, they're only
3	actionable because of our MOU with FDA.
4	MR. FRIANT: FDA defines
5	MR. KERRIGAN: A lot of us
6	MR. FRIANT: I was just going to say,
7	Tony, FDA defines what's actionable, right?
8	MR. GOODEMAN: Exactly. And a lot of
9	us, at least on the FGIS side, we refer to them
LO	as FDA-actionable so we kind of know what lane
L1	it's going down and what instructions will apply.
L2	MR. KERRIGAN: Okay.
L3	MR. FRIANT: How about FDA-actionable
L 4	conditions instead of items?
L5	MR. KERRIGAN: It kind of sounds like
L6	if Tony feels we're playing semantics with it,
L7	then, like I say you know, this is a
L8	subcommittee here. I mean, I think the intent is
L9	pretty clear, as long as, frankly, Arthur and
20	Tony probably more Arthur, I guess, is good
21	with that language.
22	MR. GOODEMAN: I don't want to

interiere, but I think I understand what you're
getting at there. Of course, I had been in the
weeds on this the whole time, so it'd almost be
better if an outsider, you know, wanted to check
it out. But I certainly understand what you're
trying to convey here: I mean, a subcommittee to
review the actionable items and for which a
pre-approved reconditioning plan can be
developed; propose what actions or activities
will be required under the pre-approved
reconditioning remediation plan; work in
conjunction with staff; propose findings for the
next meeting. I mean
MR. TURNIPSEED: That need to be
defined as FGIS staff?
MR. NEAL What was the question?
MR. TURNIPSEED: Do we need to define
that as FGIS staff there that we'd work with on
this?
MR. NEAL We understand. But for
clarity, that doesn't hurt.
MR. TURNIPSEED: Nick, is that

1 something you --2 MR. FRIANT: Yes, I agree with Arthur: for clarity. The example from last meeting, the 3 recommended subcommittee did not include FGIS. 4 5 But I think, for clarity, we should include that. Okay. 6 MR. KERRIGAN: Any other 7 comments, revisions, questions, concerns? Okay. 8 So I'm assuming, Nick, you would like to make a 9 motion regarding the, quote/unquote, final verbiage to create a subcommittee, as written. 10 11 Is that correct? 12 MR. FRIANT: So moved. Yes. 13 MR. KERRIGAN: Can I get a second? 14 MR. AYERS: Dave Ayers. I'll second. 15 MR. TURNIPSEED: David Ayers? 16 MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. And then I want 17 to go through one by one here. I need either a 18 yea or a nay. Yea will be to, obviously, approve 19 the establishment of the subcommittee, and nay 20 would be to not approve. 21 So David Ayers? Dave? How you doing?

Okay.

Yea.

MR. AYERS:

1	MR. KERRIGAN: Randy Burns? I believe
2	you're on the phone.
3	MR. BURNS: Yea.
4	MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. Janice Cooper?
5	MS. COOPER: Yea.
6	MR. KERRIGAN: Curt Engel?
7	MR. ENGEL: Yea.
8	MR. KERRIGAN: Nick?
9	MR. FRIANT: Yea.
10	MR. KERRIGAN: I will also be a yea.
11	Ryan Kuhl?
12	MR. KUHL: Yea.
13	MR. KERRIGAN: John Lindgren?
14	MR. LINDGREN: Aye.
15	MR. KERRIGAN: Bob Sinner?
16	MR. SINNER: Yea.
17	MR. KERRIGAN: Brent?
18	MR. TURNIPSEED: Yeah.
19	MR. KERRIGAN: And Mr. Watne?
20	MR. WATNE: Yeah.
21	MR. KERRIGAN: Did I miss any GIAC
22	members? Okay. We have 11 yeas to zero nay.

Arthur, I'll ask, did you find anything interesting regarding a request for comments?

MR. NEAL Did. So there's a blended approach. I was wrong in the fact that we cannot ask for comments outside of a Federal Register Notice. But because we do have an active Federal Register Notice for this meeting, we can create an active request for comments on the agenda item for this meeting. So that's positive.

So we got an active agenda item, which is the falling number. What we could do -- and we also have a document on the website, regarding this issue. What could happen is that the committee could take that document and figure out how it wants to craft a request for comment on that topic, and we could have the public comment on that topic. And the comments will be collected through Regulations.gov and be available for the public to review, as well as all committee members.

MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. So we have a lot of discussion regarding the falling number. I

guess I'll put that to the GIAC back again. It did not sound like there was a movement earlier to do a formal recommendation to the secretary; however, with this new information regarding comments potentially, to gather that from any interested party, is there anybody on the GIAC who would like to try and move forward with that? Otherwise, this would remain as an open item for the next meeting, as an update.

MR. NEAL Hey, Matt, I apologize for interrupting. There's one thing I forgot to also state. We have to also identify a closing date for the comment period.

MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. So let's start with the first question there: Do we feel that we have enough information to request specific comments regarding the falling-number item as presented? Not hearing anything, do we want to continue without requesting public comments, but continuing to keep this on our agenda item, to come back for the next meeting, to get a further update from FGIS, and potentially further

information from GIAC members? 1 2 MR. LINDGREN: I think the second one is a better plan of attack, just because I don't 3 4 know if we would capture everything we wanted for 5 comments, to put it in the register. 6 MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. MR. FRIANT: 7 This is Nick. That's a 8 little bit my concern too, is if we had to put 9 together, like, this afternoon what we would want for account requests in the Federal Register, I 10 don't know that -- I don't feel comfortable --11 12 that feels rushed to me, I guess is the way to 13 say it. 14 MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. Any other commentary from GIAC members? 15 16 MS. COOPER: This is Janice. I would 17 support just keeping it on our agenda as old 18 business and discussing it at the next meeting. 19 I would agree as well. MR. KUHL: 20 MR. BURNS: Agree. 21 MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. We do not need 22 a motion for that. I just want to make sure that

nobody feels otherwise for anything that we do 1 2 need recommendations for. So I'll kind of give a moment here for anybody else if they want to 3 4 counter that proposed move forward. 5 MR. TURNIPSEED: Want me to stop sharing my screen so you don't see my typing? 6 MR. KERRIGAN: Sure. 7 That's fine. 8 MR. TURNIPSEED: Okay. 9 MR. KERRIGAN: It kind of sounds like, 10 Brent, for the time being, that, hearing no other 11 items, we have one recommendation for a 12 subcommittee. The other items we'll move to old 13 business at the next meeting. Okay. Simple, 14 short session compared to the last one I was a 15 part of. 16 All right, Arthur, we're another 45 --17 almost an hour ahead of our agenda again. 18 move to officer elections or do we need to wait 19 until that time comes up? Because this doesn't involve 20 MR. NEAL 21 the items including the public debate, you can

continue to move forward.

MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. Nick --

MR. FRIANT: And --

MR. KERRIGAN: -- Did you have

something there?

MR. FRIANT: Yes. Sorry to interrupt.

Before we do that, just a point of procedure or process: For the subcommittee -- and I'm asking you, I guess, Arthur -- how does that work? Is that discussion amongst the committee now, on who wants to be part of it? Do we need to have a chair of that subcommittee? I didn't see anything about a chair in the procedures document. So maybe just a little bit of guidance on how we should proceed with that subcommittee.

MR. NEAL Yes, there should be a discussion here about who would chair that committee, so there's a point on it. And you can make those -- you know, to self-nominate, or someone could nominate someone else for it, and you-all decide as a committee if you agree, disagree. And we also need members of that committee, so you need volunteers to be on it, as

1	well.
2	MR. KERRIGAN: Thank you, Nick and
3	Arthur.
4	Would anybody want to nominate or
5	self-nominate to chair the FDA MOU subcommittee?
6	MR. FRIANT: This is Nick. I'd like
7	to
8	MR. ENGEL: This is Curt. I'd like to
9	nominate Nick, and I'll volunteer to be on it.
LO	MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. Do we need to
L1	vote if there's only one nomination for the
L 2	chair? No. Nick, looks like you are the chair
L3	of the subcommittee.
L 4	MR. FRIANT: I accept.
L5	MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. I
L6	MR. FRIANT: Who else besides Curt?
L7	MR. KERRIGAN: Yes, we got Curt. I
L8	would be happy to volunteer for the subcommittee.
L9	MR. FRIANT: Just my opinion: I think
20	it'd be good to have someone from the official
21	agencies as well.
22	MR. KERRIGAN: We'll have a staff

1	liaison anyhow, correct? Oh, I'm sorry, you're
2	talking about the other
3	MR. FRIANT: Yes.
4	MR. KERRIGAN: official agency.
5	MR. FRIANT: Yes, Dave or Ryan or
6	Jimmy or somebody.
7	MR. KUHL: I will be able if unless
8	you want it, Dave. I can.
9	MR. AYERS: I can do it. I have
10	plenty of time.
11	MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. I'm pretty sure
12	we can I know we had to have a minimum of
13	three. I think we can go over three if anybody
14	else would like to participate.
15	MR. FRIANT: Janice, is this something
16	that you would be interested in, from the Wheat
17	Marketing Center perspective?
18	MS. COOPER: Actually, with all
19	respect, no. It's not within my purview.
20	MR. FRIANT: Sure. I wanted to make
21	sure to ask.
22	MS. COOPER: Thank you. Appreciate

1 it.

MR. KERRIGAN: All right.

MR. KUHL: I can as well, if you're looking for more.

MR. KERRIGAN: We'll go ahead and keep you clued in, Ryan. We'll put you on that; that way, it'll be a little bit easier to make sure that we maintain our minimum for any discussions that we have.

Okay. Any further self-nominations, requests to be a part of it? Basically, I have Nick as the chair, we have Curt, Matt, David, and Ryan as members of the FDA MOU subcommittee.

Okay. And then, Nick, we'll just need to take a look, being back on the policies and procedures. We don't need to do any Federal Register Notice, but we do need to meet on a regular basis and make sure that, obviously, we're documenting our conversations to present to the full GIAC, then.

MR. FRIANT: Okay. Do we need to hear from FGIS on staff liaison or -- going to go out

on a limb and say it's either Tony or Pat.

MR. NEAL I think, from our perspective, you know, we're definitely going to have someone committed to it; it could vary, who it is. It could be more than one. It just depends on what issues -- but you definitely got us on the hook to be connected at the hip with you on the subcommittee.

MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. Well, we will make sure to let everybody know, I guess, on that first conversation. Will likely be a kickoff conversation. And we'll kind of play it by ear from there.

Okay. Anything else that I may have missed, I apologize about that, regarding the recommendations or anything else, I guess, moving forward here, before we go into officer elections and next-meeting and agenda items? Okay. All right. Now, the fun part. Let me see if I can't find -- Kendra, do you have a current list of the members who are not rolling off next month, that you could put up? Otherwise, I have an older

1	one. I believe, if I'm not mistaken, the five
2	members that are currently rolling off are Randy
3	Burns, John Lindgren, Rick Robinette, Brent
4	Turnipseed, and Mark Watne.
5	MS. KLINE: I believe so. This is the
6	only list I have.
7	MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. So basically,
8	everybody except for those five individuals will
9	be eligible for nomination/self-nomination for an
10	officer position. I believe we have a chair, a
11	vice chair, and a secretary position to fill.
12	Would anybody like to nominate or self-nominate
13	for either one of those positions?
14	MR. AYERS: Matt, David Ayers. I'd
15	like to nominate you as the chair, and Janice
16	Cooper as the vice chair.
17	MR. KERRIGAN: Okay.
18	MR. FRIANT: This is Nick. I will
19	second that nomination.
20	MR. TURNIPSEED: Who seconded that
21	motion?
22	MR. FRIANT: This is Nick Friant.

1	Sorry.
2	MR. TURNIPSEED: Okay. And who made
3	the motion? I didn't even
4	MR. KERRIGAN: David Ayers.
5	MR. TURNIPSEED: Okay. Okay. Thanks.
6	MR. KERRIGAN: Do we have a nomination
7	for secretary? Nick, would you have any interest
8	in doing it?
9	MR. FRIANT: I was just going to say
10	I could be secretary. Sure.
11	MR. KERRIGAN: Since I was nominated
12	by or seconded by you, I will be happy to
13	nominate you.
14	MR. SINNER: I'll second that. Bob
15	Sinner.
16	MR. KERRIGAN: And we can have
17	competing elections here. So if anybody else is
18	interested or would like to nominate or
19	self-nominate, by all means.
20	MR. WATNE: If we're not hearing any,
21	can we do a motion to cast unanimous ballot for
22	the candidate for president, secretary, and vice

1	president? Can we do that? Is that legal?
2	MR. KERRIGAN: I am staring at Kendra
3	right now; she is giving a thumbs-up, that that
4	is an option.
5	MR. WATNE: So I will so-move that.
6	MR. ENGEL: This is Curt. I'll second
7	it.
8	MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. One second here;
9	I'm also keeping notes. All right. So we've got
10	a motion to accept those as we've got a
11	second. I believe I will need to go through roll
12	for the 11 members.
13	Yea or nay, Mr. Ayers?
14	MR. AYERS: Yea.
15	MR. KERRIGAN: Randy Burns?
16	MR. BURNS: Yea.
17	MR. KERRIGAN: Janice Cooper?
18	MS. COOPER: Yea.
19	MR. KERRIGAN: Curtis Engel?
20	MR. ENGEL: Yea.
21	MR. KERRIGAN: Nick?
22	MR. FRIANT: Yea.

MR. KERRIGAN: I will be a yea. Ryan?
MR. KUHL: Yea.
MR. KERRIGAN: John?
MR. LINDGREN: Yea.
MR. KERRIGAN: Bob?
MR. SINNER: Yea.
MR. KERRIGAN: Brent? Brent
Turnipseed?
MR. TURNIPSEED: Yea. I'm sorry. My
computer must have muted me.
MR. KERRIGAN: Fine. And Mr. Watne?
MR. WATNE: Yea.
MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. Have I missed
anybody? We have 11 yeas for Matt Kerrigan as
chair, Janice Cooper as vice chair, and Nick
Friant as secretary, for the coming session. All
right. Moving along here. Just cruising. The
next item I have is: discuss agenda items for
next meeting. I believe we have far as old
business, think all of our items are remaining,
if I'm not mistaken.
We also have one new item that has

been requested, regarding the timeliness or time reporting of shuttle train arrivals, and its impact on the inspectors. That was presented by Mr. Jimmy Williams. I spoke with him last night; he is not able to be on the phone today to discuss that further. He will have a kind of one-page white paper to present it to the group, prior to the next meeting. But he did ask that we include that as an agenda item as well.

Little bit of a background on that is -- if any of you have worked with shuttle-train loadings, we get free advice usually four or five days before, and then the railroad will adjust that time. Obviously, with a shuttle train, you know, 110 to 115 cars typically takes at least eight hours to load. That can expand out to as much as 10, 12, you know, 15 hours, sometimes more.

And the problem lies -- you know, as you're getting closer and closer, that time will start to either move up or move back, which makes it very difficult for the scheduling of

1	inspectors, which then you start to run into
2	excessive fatigue, just scheduling challenges,
3	and which does impact not only overtime and pay
4	but also especially the retaining of employees,
5	because of the unknown schedule; nights,
6	weekends, and things of that nature.
7	So that is a summary on that. Let's
8	say Jimmy will have more information. Other than
9	kind of what's been discussed, are there any
10	other known agenda items that anybody would like
11	to request at this point in time, for the next
12	meeting?
13	MR. AYERS: Matt, David Ayers. I'd
14	like to have an update on the exception program.
15	MR. KERRIGAN: Okay.
16	MR. AYERS: If that would be a okay
17	topic, Arthur?
18	MR. NEAL Yes, sir.
19	MR. AYERS: Thank you.
20	MS. COOPER: Dr. Jhee mentioned
21	yesterday that they're working on a process for
22	approving new technology in the official system.

I'd be very interested in getting a whole reading on the status of that and maybe, you know, look at some recommendations, depending on how that's going.

MR. NEAL Feedback on that: In Dr.

Jhee's comments, what we plan on doing is having
a document for the community to review prior to
the meeting.

MS. COOPER: That'd be great.

DR. JHEE: We'll be sending the document as well as some focus questions on those areas that I mentioned yesterday we kind of hit some sticking points on and wanted to get some industry input.

MR. GOODEMAN: This is Tony. I have just a clarifying question, out of curiosity:
Will there be, like, a Federal Register Notice seeking topics as well, or some kind of outreach to the committee, to gather more topics in advance of the next meeting, or is this the opportunity?

MR. NEAL So the committee can meet

ahead of the next meeting -- I'll probably have 1 2 multiple meetings ahead of the next meeting -- to discuss further agenda items. 3 4 MR. GOODEMAN: Okay. Thank you. 5 MR. KERRIGAN: Anything else at this 6 point in time that anybody would like to request? As Arthur said, this is not the last opportunity 7 8 leading up to the next meeting, but if there's 9 anything known that we want to get on the docket, to make sure that we have time to prepare and, 10 frankly, don't miss it? 11 12 MR. KUHL: I possibly would like to 13 ask some more official agencies their thought. 14 But possibly one to review would be the OCIS. 15 Just an update? Or you MR. KERRIGAN: 16 think that there's going to be something specific 17 when you talk to some of the other agencies 18 regarding it? 19 I would like to ask what MR. KUHL: 20 their thoughts would be if falling numbers were 21 to take that path, to see -- on how that would 22 I know that there's going to be quite a work.

few OCIS agreements, possibly in the hundreds, 1 2 for each agency that runs falling numbers. like to review the OCIS myself as well as talk to 3 4 other to OAs, to see if it should be discussed in 5 this committee. So can I potentially add that as the agenda? 6 7 MR. KERRIGAN: Sure. 8 MR. KUHL: Okay. 9 MR. KERRIGAN: Yes, we can mark that 10 down. Like I say, we do have plenty of 11 opportunity to revise the agenda items before 12 that goes to the Federal Register Notice, prior 13 to the next meeting. MR. NEAL And also for consideration 14 on that topic, Ryan: if it's connected to that 15 16 falling-number issue, you can think about 17 handling a lot of that, too, through the 18 subcommittee. 19 MR. TURNIPSEED: I think I captured 20 that, but my lights have quit working in my 21 office.

MR. GOODEMAN: Was there a

1	subcommittee on the falling number?
2	MR. KUHL: Not to my knowledge.
3	MR. KERRIGAN: No.
4	MR. TURNIPSEED: Oh.
5	MR. KERRIGAN: There's only a
6	subcommittee on the FDA MOU. We were going to
7	MR. GOODEMAN: Okay.
8	MR. KERRIGAN: Basically use it as
9	
10	MR. GOODEMAN: Yes, business item.
11	Yes, yes.
12	MR. KERRIGAN: An old-business
13	item, to kind of have everyone, like, collect
14	some information, bring it back to the next
15	meeting.
16	MR. NEAL Yes, thanks for I got the
17	issues mixed up, Tony. Thanks.
18	MR. KERRIGAN: Arthur's getting ahead
19	of himself on what we're going to do at the next
20	meeting.
21	No, Brent, if you could turn yourself
22	into a cat as well, while you're kind of fading

in and out there, it would bring a nice end to this meeting.

MR. TURNIPSEED: Technology beyond me.

MR. KERRIGAN: Anything else for agenda items? Okay. I'll just end with closing remarks for myself. I do want to really thank everybody for their time over the past two days. I want to thank all the staff members at FGIS, for the updates as well as all the cooperation. I really think that we're all getting a lot better at this technology thing and remote meetings. While it may not be preferred, I actually think this is one of the smoother group meetings that have had, what, upwards of 50 people on, most of the time. So thank you very much for making this go very, very well.

Thank you for all the cooperation.

Been a very, very good discussion on these
topics. I know that some are little surprised
because of past meetings and the sheer number of
topics, but I feel that the quality of these
items and the impact, you know, on the industry,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

at various levels, with the impact that FGIS can have and vice versa, has been great. So on behalf of me, thank you very, very much to the GIAC, FGIS, as well as all the other participating members, and come back.

I'm going to turn it over to Arthur.

There is a little bit of a question. If you can:

not only end the closing remarks; kind of talk

about maybe the plan for -- you know, what your

thoughts are for next meeting, rough time line,

and things of that nature.

MR. NEAL Excuse me. Well, first of all, I want to say thank you. Thank you for flowing with us. When I say flowing, this is different. But everybody was very flexible in this process, coming up to this meeting date; very participative. And I just really wanted to say thank you for being great partners and, you know, servants to the industry, in this way, on this committee.

I want to say thank you for those members rolling off: Rick, Randy, John, Brent,

Mark. You know, we didn't get a chance to spend a full three years together, but the time that we did have to connect has really been a pleasure.

And I hope we have an opportunity to do it more, whether it's through GIAC or some other venue.

For those that are going to be staying for the ride: This is a evolutionary process as we improve how we interact with each other and with our stakeholders, and how we provide more prepared, more structured, thoughtful recommendations that could impact the industry.

I'm really grateful to be a part of FGIS. This is an organization that stands for excellent service. You know, and as I, you know, meet with employees, it just iterates the spirit of excellence that flows throughout the industry, in terms of providing quality product and us providing quality service to help market the products that are being produced, shipped worldwide.

So I think this has been a great meeting. I look forward to the next meeting. In

terms of time, that's going to really be -- I guess it's a shared responsibility. We're anticipating better, more free movement in the fall; that's an anticipation. I didn't get a chance to read it thoroughly; I did see the date that the CDC came out with guidance that said people who were fully vaccinated no longer had to wear masks outdoors or indoors. What does that mean for us in terms of travel? I don't know. But I'm hopeful that we'll get the green light that we can start traveling again.

I've already put the request, you know, to Bruce, our administrator, that we have a desire to want to meet in person for our next meeting. We have to wait before -- you know, wait for the White House to give us the okay to start traveling and gathering together on behalf of the federal government. But that's our goal.

We were looking at a time line of November to get us past any potential COVID issues. I think if we target any date sooner than that, we may not have clarity. And it's

going to take a lot of planning on our end to make it happen. As we don't want to facilitate that meeting in the National Grain Center, we'll probably target a hotel. And so that means getting a contract in place and the like, making sure we got audio-visual in place. You know, we got to get your flights arranged, and things of that nature. So it'll take a little bit more coordination and so we need to make sure we've given ourselves enough time to plan for that, and adjust for any unexpected circumstances that we hope not to occur.

so that's my thoughts on a future meeting. It gives the committee and subcommittees plenty of time to work on issues, reach out to stakeholders, have conversations, bring information back. It gives us the time that we need to continue working on items as well, in partnership with you.

I think our next meeting's going to be a even greater meeting than this one. And I feel like this has been fairly productive, considering

the topics that we had on the table. And some of these topics that we had for this meeting were rollovers from when we were planning in March, I think, of 2000.

So, lot's happened since then. I'm sure there's more that may pop up between now and our meetings, to plan for the next GIAC meeting.

So that's my perspective. Any questions or additional thoughts on that?

MS. COOPER: Arthur, you said you weren't planning on using the National Grain Center. Does that mean that you might have the meeting somewhere else besides Kansas City?

MR. NEAL No, we're still looking at Kansas City.

MS. COOPER: Okay. Perfect.

MR. NEAL Kansas City right now -- you know, when we have these meetings, -- this is my thought process. I could be wrong. And it's not all up to me. If there are locations that you-all think we should look at, feel free to recommend those to us. Cost is always going to

be a factor. So we're looking at Kansas City, one, because of cost. We were planning to have our in-person meeting in Kansas City at a hotel, if we were to have met in 2020. We had a good deal with the hotel.

Kansas City is pretty central to a lot of our stakeholders, so people can get to it fairly easily, whether by driving or flying in.

We'd like to be able to move our meetings across the country, to other parts of, you know, grain country, but those locations need to be such that it's easy for us to access our stakeholders.

So that's kind of our thought process, is that when we meet in public, we want people to be able to participate and us not be too far out of reach from them. Any additional thoughts, comments? Before we meet next time, we should have an undersecretary in place here for our Marketing and Regulatory Program. If there are any other changes administratively through appointments, we'll do our very best to make sure we keep you-all apprised. And if there's an

1	opportunity for us to get those individuals in
2	front of you, we'll do our very best to do that
3	so that you have an opportunity to meet them and
4	know who they are. And that's about all I have,
5	you-all.
6	MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. Anything else
7	from anybody? Hearing none
8	MR. NEAL Let me ask a quick question
9	to make sure I
10	Dave Ayers Dave, you're on with us
11	for another year, right?
12	MR. AYERS: Yes.
13	MR. NEAL Yes. Okay. Just wanted to
14	make sure I didn't forget you. I didn't think
15	you were off. Okay.
16	MR. AYERS: You're not getting rid of
17	me that easy.
18	MR. NEAL Right. I haven't been able
19	to do it yet, so
20	MR. KERRIGAN: Okay. Well, I will
21	entertain a motion to adjourn.
22	MR. AYERS: So moved.

1	MR. KERRIGAN: And a second?
2	MR. FRIANT: Second.
3	MR. KERRIGAN: Okay.
4	MR. TURNIPSEED: Who made the motion?
5	MR. KERRIGAN: Meeting's adjourned.
6	MR. MCCLUSKEY: David Ayers, Nick
7	Friant.
8	MR. FRIANT: Yes.
9	MR. NEAL Thank you-all. You-all
10	continue to be safe.
11	MR. KERRIGAN: Thank you-all.
12	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
13	went off the record at 3:02 p.m.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

a.m 1:8 4:2 50:12 ability 51:7 able 13:2 14:5 27:8 45:5 61:17 63:12 75:14 83:8 97:7 104:5 116:9 116:15 117:18 above-entitled 50:11 83:21 118:12 absolutely 51:4 accept 37:20 68:10 96:14 102:10 acceptable 30:3 access 116:12 accidentally 7:16 account 28:18 32:7 93:10 accurate 32:18 75:19 acknowledge 58:7,9 acquainted 29:20 act 6:2 26:13 41:22 42:2 59:19 64:10 acting 82:17 action 15:11 41:2,6 45:10 51:20 81:13 actionable 6:19,22 7:5 7:9,11,12 8:9 26:18 33:21 34:2,16 36:10 36:22 37:3 45:2 46:14 79:20 84:6,16 86:6,12 86:16,21 87:3,7 88:7 actions 85:1 88:9 actions/activities 84:22 active 91:6,8,10 activities 85:2 88:9 actual 79:5 81:12 86:14 add 5:16 49:11 78:6 108:5 added 53:7 additional 45:21 115:9 116:16 address 17:20 67:2 69:3 71:20 addressed 57:6 adjourn 117:21 adjourned 118:5 adjust 104:13 114:11 Administration 6:8,12 7:1 administratively 116:20 administrator 2:6,7 113:13 advance 106:20 advancement 76:7 **adverse** 68:13 advice 104:12

advisory 1:3 2:5 13:8	;
15:12 41:5,21 42:1	
53:20 59:1 69:1 72:1	1
72:4,8 80:22	1
advisory-committee	1
71:14	1
Affairs 2:6	i
aflatoxin 8:14 17:9	i
18:15 34:7,10	4
afternoon 93:9	i
Ag 45:5 64:9	i
agencies 6:15 12:14	i
55:19 56:1,10 63:5	i
64:10 65:11 66:20	i
69:21 70:13 78:19	
86:11 96:21 107:13	
107:17	
agency 70:8,9,12,19	
71:22 97:4 108:2	
agenda 3:17 4:22 5:4	
38:18 41:1,2,7,13	
42:22 43:17 44:17,18	i
51:8 52:5,10 53:7,19	
54:13 79:2 91:8,10	i
92:20 93:17 94:17	1
99:18 103:18 104:9	1
105:10 107:3 108:6	i
108:11 110:5	i
agenda-item 40:1	1
agent 8:13	1
ago 16:14 30:2 76:5	6
agree 8:19 24:4 53:18	1
54:2 71:10 89:2 93:19	
93:20 95:20	
agreed-upon 79:19	6
agreement 6:14	6
agreements 108:1	
AGRICULTURE 1:1	6
ahead 43:5 56:12 67:9	١.
71:9 83:14 94:17 98:5	1
107:1,2 109:18	•
align 64:3 70:10 alignment 66:17 74:8	١.
alive 7:10	•
allow 49:4 53:20 55:21	
62:12 69:7	•
allowed 64:11,22	
allows 20:5	1
alluded 26:7 78:14	•
alluding 22:14 79:4	
alongside 9:2	1
AMA 46:9 55:13 56:7	'
58:5 60:16 64:16	'
amount 42:5 76:6	
AMS 2:7	
analyses 81:20	
Analysis 2:0	

and/or 53:22 71:19 angles 28:20 animal 7:11,11,19 announcement 49:16 announcing 39:1 answer 39:8 77:16 answering 81:9 **answers** 21:13 **Anthony** 2:2 3:3 anticipate 9:3 anticipating 113:3 anticipation 113:4 antifreeze 19:2 anybody 5:6 16:13 17:16 23:7 37:15 40:19 47:16,18 50:20 51:13 53:13 70:15 78:4,7 92:6 94:3 96:4 97:13 100:12 101:17 103:14 105:10 107:6 117:7 anytime 7:14 8:10 64:3 64:5 anyway 56:8 70:15 **APHIS** 45:4 Apologies 24:5 apologize 92:10 99:15 appears 55:10 66:1 applied 29:3,13 46:10 apply 87:11 appointments 116:21 appreciate 16:21 37:16 41:18 42:4,9,12 50:2 97:22 **apprised** 116:22 approach 15:17 22:22 54:2 91:4 appropriate 12:15 76:16 approval 11:11 12:9,21 **approve** 7:4 48:12 89:18,20 approved 10:8 32:1 41:1 48:12 approving 11:11 105:22 area 84:17 areas 84:13 106:12 Arkansas 1:12 arranged 114:7 arrivals 104:2 Arthur 2:6 3:21 4:4 5:8 11:17 13:16 15:9 23:8 23:18 26:3 28:4 38:13 42:9 45:8 46:22 48:9 49:10 51:5 56:12 63:2 71:17 75:1 78:7 79:3 81:3 83:9 87:19,20

89:2 91:1 94:16 95:8 96:3 105:17 107:7 111:6 115:10 **Arthur's** 58:3 70:2 78:5 79:12 109:18 aside 23:13 **asked** 8:16 asking 50:18 81:13 95:7 aspect 26:3 27:5 49:9 assessing 78:1 assessment 8:19 75:20 assist 7:2 17:2 23:11 37:17 **assists** 31:5 associations 26:8 53:22 assume 56:8 59:4 assuming 4:21 27:14 27:19,21 57:10 89:8 attack 93:3 attempt 27:15 attention 13:14 42:19 audio-visual 114:6 authority 6:17 46:9 availability 9:16 **available** 9:17 67:13 91:19 average 44:20 45:19 52:11 aware 26:12 28:7 39:16 39:18 81:8 **awful** 16:8 **Ave** 90:14 **Ayers** 1:11 54:12,12 89:14,14,15,21,22 97:9 100:14,14 101:4 102:13,14 105:13,13 105:16,19 117:10,12 117:16,22 118:6

В back 12:4 13:7 25:4,13 25:21 27:10,22 46:18 46:20 47:14,15,21 50:6,14 53:21 61:14 62:14 66:8,16 70:17 73:10 76:4 78:1 83:7 83:16 86:5 92:1,21 98:15 104:21 109:14 111:5 114:17 back-and-forth 28:1 back-and-forths 36:11 **background** 6:9 52:17 61:20 104:10 **backup** 79:14 bacteria 30:7 **bad** 10:13

Analysis 2:8

Analyst 2:7

advising 72:1

ballot 101:21 82:17 83:5 84:3 90:17 97:17 114:3 115:12 closer 69:13 71:1 94:10 100:3 103:7,7 central 116:6 104:20,20 **Barely** 29:9 closing 3:19 92:12 cents' 33:4 Barry 2:9 28:22 29:5 109:21 111:22 110:5 111:8 36:1 37:13 **bright** 19:10 certain 6:18 46:14 based 15:10 23:16,20 **bring** 5:15 16:2 25:4,12 certainly 58:20 70:12 **clued** 98:6 COFO 36:17.18 37:9 41:21 42:21 59:3 27:9 109:14 110:1 88:5 certificate 64:6 **collect** 109:13 **basic** 6:13 114:17 **bringing** 12:4 15:5 **CFSAN** 29:14 collected 91:18 basically 7:14 20:21 broader 66:2 chain 10:14 28:6 collective 14:17 21:11 25:14 98:11 chair 95:11,12,16 96:5 100:7 109:8 **broken** 34:5,11,13 **column** 60:16 basis 31:18 32:2 98:18 96:12,12 98:12 come 12:18 13:2,18 brought 65:5 17:19 18:13 30:2,18 **Bruce** 2:7 113:13 100:10,11,15,16 **be-all** 13:12 **beans** 67:19 **bugs** 35:14 103:15,15 31:18 32:7 41:4 43:6 **built** 78:22 chairperson 52:15 46:20 47:14 57:2 becoming 9:4 Bureau 1:12 **challenge** 40:4 72:20 61:14 69:1 76:12 83:7 beginning 75:22 Burns 1:12 90:1,3 73:13 92:21 111:5 **behalf** 111:3 113:17 challenges 105:2 come-from 30:22 **believe** 13:12 42:20 93:20 100:3 102:15 102:16 challenging 77:8 **comes** 9:18 13:5 14:2 45:8 54:15,20 60:21 70:22 80:4,17 81:18 business 42:2 55:1 **Champaign** 1:11 64:4 27:21 28:10 69:19 61:2 66:4 93:18 94:13 **champion** 52:12,13 94:19 90:1 100:1,5,10 55:4 **comfortable** 57:7 58:12 102:11 103:19 103:20 109:10 believing 12:17 **busy** 33:20 **chance** 112:1 113:5 84:14,18 93:11 **belt** 20:8 21:4 **change** 41:20 60:14 coming 13:7 21:4 28:19 C benefit 78:6 63:1 64:19 65:10 68:5 38:2 47:21 76:21 79:18 83:6 103:16 best 8:22 11:21 74:21 C 4:1 75:21 76:8 111:16 116:21 117:2 calendar 34:2 changes 9:4 37:9 62:11 comment 13:16 21:22 better 30:6 61:3 85:17 call 3:2 4:21 6:18 8:2 62:14 67:18,19 76:5 26:22 38:7 39:20 40:2 85:19,21 88:4 93:3 17:17 33:2 46:7 52:7 116:20 changing 67:3 40:4,8,9,12,13,14,15 110:11 113:3 78:16 84:12 86:12 40:16,20 41:12 60:4 beyond 53:18 110:3 called 7:13 **check** 78:5 88:4 **big** 21:6 25:7 30:10 calling 12:18 checking 71:2 67:13,20 68:1,16,20 chew 26:5 78:10 69:7 73:18 77:9.19 60:12 62:11,18 calls 52:2 chewing 84:12 79:5 83:11 91:15,16 biggest 9:6 10:19 59:2 candidate 101:22 92:13 **Chief** 2:2,4,8 **bill** 33:8 capabilities 45:22 commentary 93:15 billion 8:15 53:11 **choice** 57:8 bin 9:21 20:8 choose 43:19 56:14 comments 3:5 5:2,9,11 CAPPER 2:2 70:16,19 29:5 31:12 33:10 38:5 **bins** 7:3 35:16 capture 55:10 93:4 **chooses** 59:5 70:3 38:19,21 40:22 43:6 **bit** 16:12 18:13 26:5,14 captured 108:19 33:11 36:6 37:11 38:3 carcass 7:19 **chose** 41:14,14 43:13 47:12,18 50:5 61:18 78:11 85:9 93:8 card 7:21 **circle** 47:15 50:19 53:13 55:5 59:7 circumstances 114:11 68:10.13 77:6 79:9 95:13 98:7 104:10 care 22:5 111:7 114:8 career 34:20 City 115:13,15,17 116:1 84:10 89:7 91:2,5,8 **black** 4:18 116:3,6 91:17 92:5,17,19 93:5 Cargill 1:13 blended 91:3 carrier 9:20 clarification 15:10 106:6 116:17 36:20 38:14 commercially 8:9 19:5 **blessed** 12:22 carry 10:6,11 40:18 clarify 13:16 17:7 committed 99:4 **board** 48:11 79:2 clarifying 106:16 committee 1:3,7 2:5 6:7 boards 42:1 carrying 55:1 8:16 9:7 10:20 12:4 **Bob** 90:15 101:14 103:5 cars 104:15 **clarity** 6:10 16:8,10 case 11:14 32:5 64:7 78:17 79:14 13:8 15:12 22:16 **body** 14:17 15:2,7 26:19 38:16 39:10,11 81:11 cases 36:16 83:10 88:21 89:3,5 39:17 41:2,6,11,22 book 65:2 cast 101:21 113:22 42:1,17 43:3,15 45:9 **borer** 44:19 47:5 51:12 cleaners 34:10 cat 109:22 45:17,18 48:13,15,21 **Branch** 2:8,8 catalog 65:4 cleaning 30:13 clear 35:7,8 36:21 49:4 51:3,21 53:20,21 break 3:13 43:9,22 category 8:3 19:7 44:13 46:21 47:13,13 cause 37:3 73:19 41:17 47:10 87:19 54:17 59:1,2 62:6 clearance 69:7 66:22 69:1 72:1,4,8 51:1 72:17 73:11 82:5 **caused** 73:20 72:10,19 77:5,13,17 82:8,10 **CDC** 113:6 **close** 82:9 Brent 1:16 48:3 50:3 Center 1:12 29:3,13 closely 8:20 62:8 80:22 82:13,18 91:14

91:20 95:9,17,20,22 106:19,22 108:5 111:20 114:14 committee's 12:5 39:22 committees 30:21 42:1 common 7:5 8:9,11 18:18 19:7 32:2 34:16 community 106:7 companies 11:10 13:22 14:9,10 22:19 27:8 53:22 63:6,10 65:7,12 company 1:13 22:20 63:16,20 64:18 65:17 compared 94:14 competing 101:17 competitive 55:15 compliance 36:9,14 computer 103:10 concern 22:3 55:17 79:1 93:8 concerned 56:10 concerning 47:5 concerns 9:13 32:4 50:5 59:2 89:7 concrete 21:1.6 concur 54:5 conditions 33:22 87:14 conducting 81:20 **confirm** 62:20 77:13 conjunction 88:12 connect 71:14 112:3 connected 99:7 108:15 connections 13:8 consecutive 49:5 consider 8:5 15:3 24:10 79:17 consideration 11:4 14:16 15:8 16:3 33:3 80:5 81:21 108:14 considering 114:22 consolidated 28:17 consult 68:4 consumption 37:5 contacts 27:7 contaminated 8:14 19:9 contamination 19:1 33:15 **CONTENTS** 3:1 context 15:21 continuation 5:14 **continue** 4:10 26:16 29:22 37:1,11 49:17 51:11 58:20 61:1 71:17 72:8 77:2,22 83:12 92:19 94:22 114:18 118:10 **continuing** 53:7 78:15

92:20 contract 46:4 114:5 conversation 29:6 71:5 99:11.12 conversations 98:19 114:16 convey 88:6 conveyed 13:3 Cooper 1:12 54:5 73:17 90:4,5 93:16 97:18,22 100:16 102:17,18 103:15 105:20 106:9 115:10,16 cooperation 110:9,17 cooperators 64:11 coordination 114:9 corn 44:19 47:5 51:12 corn-borer 44:22 51:15 52:10 Corporation 1:15 correct 20:9 28:13 41:8 41:9 45:6 54:20 59:4 59:8 65:21 80:7 81:4 86:7 89:11 97:1 correctly 50:1 cost 66:15 115:22 116:2 count 4:6 21:15 counted 33:20 counter 39:21 94:4 country 12:13 116:10 116:11 couple 6:9 8:20 15:22 26:10,15 84:8,13 **course** 29:14 88:2 cover 36:18 covered 11:18 12:3 **COVID** 16:13 61:11 113:20 cow 20:19 **CPG** 36:17,22 CPGs 36:9 37:10 craft 77:6 91:15 create 14:21 23:10 51:9 58:9 82:2 89:10 91:7 creating 22:15 23:8 33:11 creation 80:6,16,18,20 criteria 36:10 critical 10:22 cross-section 27:11 **cruising** 103:17 curiosity 106:16 **curious** 49:21 current 99:20 currently 36:4 58:19 66:19 69:21 100:2

Curt 33:9 90:6 96:8,16

96:17 98:12 102:6 Curtis 1:13 102:19 customers 12:9 cut 35:21

D 4:1 18:4 Dakota 1:16 **Danville** 1:11 64:4 data 77:20 79:1 date 92:12 111:16 113:5,21 **Dave** 89:14,21 97:5,8 117:10.10 David 1:11 54:12 89:15 89:21 98:12 100:14 101:4 105:13 118:6 day 5:7,9,17 55:6 day-and-a-half 55:7 day-two 4:21 days 35:19 104:13 110:7 dead 7:10 deal 30:10 116:5 dealing 13:22 66:13 dealt 31:17 debate 94:21 **decide** 51:3 95:20 decided 45:3 **decides** 74:19 decision 39:17 66:5 79:13 83:12 **decisions** 66:14,15 deer 8:4,5 11:6 17:8 18:9,11 21:11,11 29:22 30:1,4,5,8 35:13 **define** 88:17 defined 6:19 8:1 88:15 **defines** 87:4,7 **definitely** 16:11,18 17:13 22:20 32:7 43:2 58:6 75:9 76:15 78:22 99:3,6 delay 76:14 **delays** 9:10 delivery 59:3 **delve** 43:9 50:7 **DENISE 2:7 Department** 1:1 45:4 depending 28:9 106:3 depends 99:6 Deputy 2:6 designated 20:4 **desire** 113:14

destination 56:20 65:14

66:18 73:20

destroy 11:15

determined 8:21 develop 10:4 77:18 developed 88:9 device 20:21 21:1 **DFO** 2:6 dialogue 47:9 53:1 dicing 82:13 difference 24:22 25:8 70:15 differences 33:1 73:19 different 14:8 19:1 22:19 28:20 36:10 55:15 56:19 65:20 71:19 74:2,6 111:15 differently 23:7 53:14 differing 65:5 difficult 104:22 difficulties 50:17 digging 16:9 direct 11:21 27:7 direction 31:10 directive 8:17 9:2,3 36:13 37:7 86:13 Director 2:2,3 disagree 95:21 discuss 3:7,11,17 44:3 52:19 56:5 58:21 103:18 104:6 107:3 discussed 30:1 44:19 48:6 50:16 79:20 105:9 108:4 discussina 93:18 **discussion** 3:3 5:2.10 8:18 25:5 37:15 38:1 38:15 39:20 43:20 44:1 46:11 47:12 51:5 52:13 53:1 55:6 58:8 61:8 66:2 70:22 79:17 81:19 91:22 95:9,16 110:18 discussions 5:13 55:9 55:18 98:8 disposal 20:1 disposing 85:22 distinctly 7:13 8:2 18:5 18:7 21:7 distinguished 18:3 **Division** 2:3,4 62:2 **DLQ** 8:2 17:8 18:3 docket 107:9 document 12:22 14:1 14:14 82:22 91:12,14 95:13 106:7,11 documentation 39:21 documented 51:6 documenting 98:19

doing 4:5 40:5 41:21

55:11 69:22 70:7

71:18 72:6 89:21 101:8 106:6 Dr 105:20 106:5,10 draft 80:15 82:12 drafting 81:21 drag 27:1 76:9 draw 21:11 drew 42:19 driving 116:8 drone 10:17 droppings 8:4,5 11:6 17:8 18:9,11 20:13,19 21:10,18 29:22 30:1,5 35:13 Drug 6:8,11 7:1

Е

E 4:1.1 ear 99:12 earlier 34:8 48:6 92:2 easier 37:22 98:7 easiest 82:10 **easily** 116:8 Eastern 47:22 50:7 83:16,17 easy 116:12 117:17 **edible** 67:19 **EDT** 1:8 EDWARD 2:3 effective 15:20 68:12 efficiency 56:21 66:6 69:20 efforts 11:21 **EGT** 1:14 eiaht 104:16 either 89:17 99:1 100:13 104:21 **elections** 3:15 5:4 94:18 99:17 101:17 elevate 43:3 elevator's 9:20 eligible 100:9 eliminate 85:16 emphasis 46:15 employees 105:4 112:15 end-all 13:11 end-up 31:21 ended 12:7 21:16 ends 11:16 35:14 62:3 energy 6:1 engage 28:8,14,15 45:4 **Engel** 1:13 33:9 34:19 35:4,7,20 90:6,7 96:8 102:6,19,20 enter 20:20,22 entertain 117:21 **entire** 47:15

entities 22:16 **ERROL** 1:16 especially 16:10 32:21 42:10 75:2 105:4 essentially 44:18 establish 25:19 established 6:12 31:3 establishment 84:4 89:19 ethyl 41:5 evaluate 9:12 32:3 62:3 62:22 68:4 76:15 evaluation 46:7 everybody 4:3,22 6:4,5 38:3 43:5 46:19 50:15 61:4 70:18 71:3 84:3 99:10 100:8 110:7 111:15 everybody'd 84:8 evolutionary 112:7 exact 82:14 exactly 32:20 42:21 61:7 62:22 64:17,18 74:3 87:8 **example** 9:17 29:21 32:22 34:7,15 76:2 89:3 **examples** 7:5 65:4 excellence 112:16 excellent 112:14 exception 105:14 excessive 105:2 excreta 7:12 32:22 excuse 58:15 111:12 Executive 2:7 exist 68:19 **existing** 34:9 48:20 **exists** 77:15 **expand** 27:13 104:16 expanded 32:6 expectation 61:12 expediency 27:19 **experience** 17:14 42:10 **explained** 30:11,12 **explore** 25:2 72:22 **exploring** 59:9 72:2 **export** 70:11 exporter 70:3 exporters 70:1 express 24:17 expressed 80:5 **extend** 48:13 extended 44:13 48:22

F facilitate 42:22 73:12 114:2 fact 91:4 factor 37:2 73:8 116:1 factors 36:13.21 fading 109:22 fairly 114:22 116:8 fall 45:1,11,13 61:14 62:16 69:9 70:17 113:4 fallback 70:8 falling 44:20 55:12 70:4 76:6 91:11,22 107:20 108:2 109:1 falling-number 46:6 55:3 56:19 62:14 63:4 73:18 79:10 92:17 108:16 falls 46:8 familiar 30:17 far 23:8 37:7 60:7 62:4 103:19 116:15 fast 66:14 fatigue 105:2 fault 16:12 **FDA** 3:3 5:1 6:3,16,18 6:19,21 7:1,11 8:3,6 8:21 9:2,10,10 10:3,7 10:9,17 11:3 12:9,22 13:3 15:8 16:11 22:21 27:22 28:8 29:12 33:13,16 36:8 44:21 46:12,12 79:17 84:5 84:16 85:11 86:7,11 86:14,16,19,22 87:3.4 87:7 96:5 98:13 109:6 FDA's 29:2 FDA-actionable 87:10 federal 38:22 41:21,22 54:19 59:6,11,17 60:18 67:11 72:21 75:3 77:12 83:11 91:5 91:6 93:10 98:16 106:17 108:12 113:18 fee 60:15 64:15,16 feedback 10:18 11:20 27:12 66:12 68:20 106:5 feel 14:19 16:14 27:10 52:7 53:14 57:7,21,22 58:11 92:15 93:11 110:21 114:21 115:21 feels 23:7 27:4 52:14 74:15 87:16 93:12 94:1 **FGIS** 2:2,2,3,4,6,7,8,9 3:3 4:13 5:1 6:14,22

48:10 53:10 56:7 58:4 59:5 71:18 74:19 78:15 79:17 86:10,13 86:21 87:9 88:15,18 89:4 92:22 98:22 110:8 111:1.4 112:13 field 2:2 6:15 13:1 62:1 74:3 figure 12:14 35:18 66:2 73:9 74:21 91:14 fill 100:11 filth 7:11 8:6 final 79:13,16 84:7 89:9 finalize 57:15 find 7:19 8:5,10 37:21 72:16 91:1 99:20 findings 88:12 fine 13:5 39:5 94:7 103:11 finish 83:12 firm 77:20 first 6:3 26:2 33:19 40:6 47:4 48:17 55:13 92:15 99:11 111:12 first-noticed 86:10 **fiscal** 62:2 five 49:14,17 69:10 75:6 100:1,8 104:12 flavor 61:7 flexibilities 44:20 45:19 52:11 **flexible** 111:15 flights 114:7 flood-damaged 7:18 **floodwaters** 17:8 18:14 19:15 floor 84:10 flour 30:13 flow 26:19 flowing 111:14,14 flows 112:16 **fluid** 7:16 19:2 **flying** 116:8 **focus** 29:14 33:17,19 42:8 84:6 106:11 folks 24:13,16 28:18 38:17 66:19 73:5 84:14,17,18 **follow** 6:3 46:18 64:12 65:21 **follow-up** 59:16 followed 70:20 food 6:8,11 7:1 10:14 29:3,13,15 Foods 1:16 force 15:13,17,19,20 22:15 23:3,9,10 24:2 24:8,12,18,21 25:1,13

7:2,21 10:6 13:2,6

37:17 45:3 46:8,16

14:10,15 27:22 31:5

107:3 52:20 59:9.14.21 60:3 59:7 75:5 91:13 114:2 25:19 26:22 27:12 60:6.9 61:22 63:7.14 happened 115:5 51:10 52:4 53:5 81:17 **future** 19:10 64:1 65:8,15 67:14 68:2 happening 35:15 68:8,8 foreign 8:10 19:6 114:13 forget 117:14 **FYI** 41:19 73:15 75:19 76:18 **happens** 75:11 forgot 92:11 83:20 85:12 86:1,9 happy 96:18 101:12 G harvest 75:10 76:2,11 form 17:19 26:22 49:19 87:1,8,22 106:15 **G** 4:1 107:4 108:22 109:7 formal 43:22 51:3 53:3 hat 65:1 hate 63:15 76:9,14 54:3,10 58:13 60:22 game 27:20 109:10 garner 23:12 27:17 46:4 gotten 49:8 hats 65:1 71:2 74:13 92:3 gather 52:18 53:22 54:9 government 75:3 headed 42:21 formally 23:10 health 9:13 formed 24:18 25:11 113:18 79:6 92:5 106:19 hear 6:5,5 11:9 13:4,5 graders 65:17,17 forming 15:12 24:1 gathered 79:8 gathering 83:10 113:17 grading 70:5 29:8 36:2,4 56:18 25:13 grain 1:3,11,14,15 2:9 79:14 98:21 formulate 77:20 general 68:17 73:18 forth 32:15 7:2,12,17,18,18,20 heard 17:15 39:9 48:17 75:8 78:21 8:2,11,11,13 13:7 75:1 85:9 forward 5:13,16 20:5 generally 20:17,18,20 18:14,17,20 19:9,14 hearing 52:1,8 74:12 22:10 37:18 52:5,11 34:22 62:11 53:12 54:7 57:4 58:20 20:15 21:2,7 26:18 75:18 92:18 94:10 **gently** 32:16 **genuine** 76:10 34:11,12,14 37:3 101:20 117:7 69:3 92:7 94:4,22 58:22 59:19 68:22 hearken 76:4 99:17 112:22 getting 12:6,21 15:7 70:11 85:17 114:3 heavy 17:12 27:19 fostering 26:9 16:10 19:11 30:17 four 30:2 44:18 51:2 69:13 70:22 75:15 115:11 116:10 heck 71:4 104:12 82:9,13 88:2 104:20 **grams** 7:8,9 held 78:21 106:1 109:18 110:10 help 10:6,7,9,11 12:8 fourth 79:16 grateful 112:12 frame 77:7 114:5 117:16 greater 66:16 114:21 12:16,21 13:12 14:12 15:7 62:6 67:2,17 framework 9:1 **GIAC** 1:8 4:14 13:20 green 113:10 frankly 16:9,15 27:7,11 14:2,4,11,11,14,17 group 17:6,10 37:17 68:19 69:1 76:10 31:19 87:19 107:11 112:18 15:2,21 16:2,3 17:17 45:7 47:15 50:15 56:5 57:9,21 58:12,19 helpful 29:6 66:22 free 34:14 104:12 113:3 23:9 24:8,14 25:3,11 104:7 110:13 helping 31:7 43:1 56:17 115:21 25:21 27:6,21 28:5 Friant 1:13 15:9.16 16:4 42:6.9 45:1.3 46:1 **groups** 14:1 52:19 helps 40:17 73:12 Hey 67:10 72:10 92:10 17:21 23:15 26:1 48:11 51:14 52:3.7.9 **GSA** 74:20 guess 13:19 14:6 17:3 hiah 5:19 32:19 38:9,11,11 39:4 52:14 53:9 74:15 78:3 high-level 30:20 26:2,4,10 27:18 38:4 39:6,13 40:17 41:10 78:7 81:22 84:5 90:21 **hinders** 27:19 41:15,17 51:16 53:17 92:1,6 93:1,15 98:20 39:6 42:15 45:2 46:7 46:7.22 50:16 51:2.17 hip 99:7 59:13,15 60:1,4,8 111:4 112:5 115:7 hit 106:12 51:19 52:6 53:15,18 71:7,10 72:14 78:9 GIAC-membership **hitters** 17:12 57:19 61:6 72:17 75:8 80:8,12,21 81:5,14 22:9 hold 45:12,16,16 82:3,5,7,19,21 83:3 give 10:16 36:6 38:3 75:15 78:5,18 79:11 84:11 85:6 86:3,19 53:8 61:6 72:8 94:2 81:5,10 87:20 92:1 hook 99:7 93:12 95:8 99:10,16 hope 21:13 112:4 87:4,6,13 89:2,12 113:16 90:9 93:7 95:2,5 96:6 given 27:6 34:17 50:17 113:2 114:12 96:14,16,19 97:3,5,15 **guidance** 31:10 95:13 **hopeful** 113:10 52:19 114:10 97:20 98:21 100:18 gives 114:14,17 113:6 hopefully 23:4 69:9 guides 36:9,14 83:8 100:22,22 101:9 giving 24:12 72:10 102:3 **hopes** 5:18 102:22 103:16 118:2 **hoping** 50:15 glad 26:3 118:7,8 hand 21:21 hot 34:9,13 **Friday** 9:19 goal 113:18 front 57:20 117:2 handbook 23:9 hotel 114:4 116:3,5 **goals** 62:2 hour 38:3 83:7,15 94:17 fuel 7:17 Gomoll 2:9 29:1 35:21 handle 21:2 42:2 61:3 full 26:21 27:18 81:22 handled 10:13 60:2,10 hours 104:16,17 36:3,8 37:13 77:22 house 65:16 113:16 Goodeman 2:2 3:3 5:18 98:20 112:2 handlers 26:17 **human** 9:13 fully 28:7 113:7 5:22 18:5,11,16,20 handles 46:3 hundreds 108:1 fun 99:19 19:4,17,20 20:2,6,10 handling 108:17 hurt 88:21 funny 20:17 20:16 21:15 22:6 hydraulic 7:16 19:2 further 40:18 51:22 28:21 29:9 33:6,18 **handy** 23:9 56:9 71:2 79:4 92:21 35:3,6,10 36:1,6 hanging 61:20 47:20 48:2 50:10 92:22 98:10 104:6 happen 19:16 20:4 49:1

idea 32:1 66:6 69:14 105:8 109:14 114:17 88:3 96:20 109:2 known 105:10 107:9 informed 10:3 it'll 12:16,20 24:5 47:22 77:1 **Kuhl** 1:14 67:6,8,10 59:6 98:7 114:8 ideas 10:5 14:12 initial 60:17 78:4 initially 6:12 item 23:11 41:2,7,12 69:12,17 74:17 90:11 identification 84:15 identified 14:13 24:9 Innovation 2:2 44:22 45:10 46:6 47:4 90:12 93:19 97:7 98:3 103:2 107:12.19 39:12 86:7,10 input 12:6 47:8 68:17 51:8 52:5,10 53:7,19 108:8 109:2 identify 92:12 71:15 72:19 73:2,7 55:3 61:20 79:2,10 91:8,10 92:8,17,20 **IDK** 11:9 17:8 18:8 106:14 L insect-damaged 7:6,8 103:18,22 104:9 **impact** 42:18 43:3 58:17 67:3,4 104:3 18:8 109:10.13 Lab 1:17 items 3:17 7:6 17:7 labeled 84:16 105:3 110:22 111:1 insects 7:9 11:8 18:17 **inside** 78:18 landfill 11:15 19:22 31:20 38:17 42:22 112:11 implementation 62:7 insight 19:8 44:17,18 46:14 47:1 lane 87:10 insights 29:4 47:16 79:20 84:6,16 language 57:16 64:21 62:16 inspection 1:3,11,14 86:7 87:14 88:7 94:11 80:16 82:6,8 85:6 importance 13:13 13:7 44:20 45:19 94:12,21 99:18 87:21 **important** 10:19 29:19 103:18,20 105:10 large 20:20,22 33:2 54:7 71:13 72:4 52:11 58:22 63:5 68:22 107:3 108:11 110:5 large-animal 8:6 18:8 76:19.20 **improve** 112:8 **inspectors** 7:22 104:3 110:22 114:18 20:13,19 21:10 32:22 105:1 **iterates** 112:15 larger 21:12 **in-person** 116:3 instance 19:19 32:5 largest 34:22 incidences 10:21 include 7:6 16:1 21:10 36:16 73:1 **latest** 41:5 36:12 89:4,5 104:9 instructions 86:14 Jamestown 1:17 lead 22:21 45:18 included 38:18 87:11 Janice 1:12 54:11 90:4 leadership 28:6 leading 24:8 79:5 107:8 instrumental 29:2 93:16 97:15 100:15 includes 8:4 including 20:13 94:21 intent 80:20 87:18 102:17 103:15 learn 40:21 inclusion 26:6 42:3 intention 47:13 75:12 **JESS** 2:5 leave 55:16 79:1 Jhee 2:3 105:20 106:10 independent 78:20 interact 112:8 led 15:21 ledge 30:15 indicate 37:2 interest 4:17 8:22 10:12 **Jhee's** 106:6 individual 13:21 14:9 24:17 26:8 35:11 **Jimmy** 97:6 104:4 **LEE** 2:2 14:10 27:8 101:7 105:8 **leeway** 55:21 John 1:15 21:20 55:4 interested 10:1 25:16 individually 25:3 **left** 83:18 28:22 39:15 80:9 92:6 69:12,16 71:8 78:14 legal 102:1 **individuals** 24:7 25:2 97:16 101:18 106:1 legislatively 59:22 25:16 58:22 100:8 90:13 100:3 103:3 117:1 interesting 91:2 111:22 length 48:14,16 interfere 88:1 John's 58:3 let's 25:20 35:15 50:5 **indoors** 113:8 61:13 83:14 92:14 internal 31:20 62:1 68:4 jump 50:20 industries 10:4 80:22 105:7 industry 9:8,22 10:20 Κ 12:6 13:4,6,19 16:1 internally 14:22 letterhead 64:12 16:18 17:14 22:9.18 interpretation 41:8 **Kansas** 115:13,15,17 level 60:11 65:19 79:21 80:4 28:14,15,18 31:15,20 60:11 67:18 116:1,3,6 33:16 34:6,17 42:20 interpreting 49:22 keen 26:11 levels 79:7 111:1 43:1 46:15 57:5 68:18 interrupt 95:5 keep 43:16 50:18 52:4 **liaise** 16:22 73:2 77:8 106:14 interrupting 92:11 53:19 72:1,5,10,13 liaison 46:16 97:1 into/past 75:10 98:22 110:22 111:19 112:11 92:20 98:5 116:22 **involve** 94:20 licensed 64:14 112:16 keeping 93:17 102:9 info 54:1 73:16 **lies** 104:19 involvement 46:15 Kendra 2:4 4:4 23:8,19 light 113:10 **inform** 81:10 **issue** 13:14 18:18,21 38:11,13 54:20 81:16 44:22 45:11 56:1 **lights** 108:20 informal 54:16 82:11 99:20 102:2 informally 57:19 limb 99:1 60:12 73:3 76:10,20 kernels 7:6,8 18:8 77:7,19 85:18 91:13 limit 36:22 key 26:7,8 81:18 **information** 14:9 16:2 108:16 kickoff 99:11 Lindgren 1:15 22:1 16:21 17:1 25:3,12,13 27:10,17 31:12 32:6 issued 39:19 54:19 kit 41:5 55:4,8 57:9,13 58:14 KLINE 2:4 4:6,9 16:6 60:21 69:15,18 71:9 34:4 42:5 46:4 52:17 issues 14:20 33:15 34:21 39:10 43:2 57:2 38:6 49:10,13 63:19 90:13,14 93:2 100:3 52:22 53:10 54:8 58:10 76:12 99:6 103:4 61:15 66:21 68:22 82:16 100:5 line 21:11 29:1 36:14 71:11 73:13 77:3,10 109:17 113:21 114:15 **knowing** 34:21 it'd 22:17 23:1 59:11 knowledge 14:20 31:15 62:10,17 111:10 79:6,7 92:4,16 93:1

11			123
440:40	maintain 00:0	100:15 20 110:2	madaration 17.4
113:19	maintain 98:8	109:15,20 110:2	moderation 17:4
liquids 19:2	maintains 36:9	111:10,16 112:22,22	moment 94:3
list 17:22 27:18 33:13	making 31:7 56:14,15	113:15 114:3,14,21	month 49:15 99:21
99:20 100:6	110:16 114:5	115:2,7,13 116:3	months 69:10 75:6
listening 71:5	Man 42:16	meeting's 114:20 118:5	morning 4:3,5 6:3,4
little 25:18 26:5,14	Management 2:2 62:2	meetings 107:2 110:12	9:19
33:10 36:6,19 38:3	mandate 7:4 65:20	110:14,20 115:7,18	motion 54:13,21 89:9
61:6,18 67:4 78:11	manner 64:17	116:9	93:22 100:21 101:3
93:8 95:13 98:7	manual 23:21	member 15:22 25:3	101:21 102:10 117:21
104:10 110:19 111:7	manufacturer 41:4	52:9,14 74:15	118:4
114:8	March 115:3	members 4:14 14:11,19	MOU 3:3 5:1,9 6:8,10
livestock 20:20	mark 1:17 100:4 108:9	15:22 16:1 22:18 25:5	6:11,20 8:17,22,22
LLC 1:14	112:1	25:11,17,21 27:6	10:17 44:21 46:12
load 104:16	market 112:18	31:16 42:6 48:20 49:4	79:18 86:15 87:3 96:5
loadings 104:12	marketing 1:12 2:8,9	49:14 52:7 53:21	98:13 109:6
locations 115:20	64:10 76:1 97:17	71:14 78:4 90:22	move 20:5 38:5 51:5
116:11	116:19	91:20 93:1,15 95:21	52:8,10 53:11 55:18
long 6:13 12:16 16:14	masking 8:13	98:13 99:21 100:2	57:4 58:20 59:5 63:22
76:9 87:19	masks 113:8	102:12 110:8 111:5	66:14 69:3 92:7 94:4
longer 25:18,19 27:1,1	Matt 14:8 17:21 23:15	111:22	94:12,18,22 104:21
43:8 63:12 64:22	26:7 31:3 38:9 48:3	members' 48:13,15	104:21 116:9
113:7	51:16 53:17 54:6	membership 16:5 53:9	moved 56:7 89:12
look 5:13 6:7 8:16	92:10 98:12 100:14	mention 8:8 34:8,15	117:22
10:22 11:17 13:19	103:14 105:13	74:10	movement 56:9 92:2
14:8 15:5 52:22 57:2	matter 50:11 60:10	mentioned 11:5 13:17	113:3
58:2 62:8,18,22 67:15	63:15 66:3 83:21	22:2,4 47:4 105:20	moves 75:4
77:2 79:13 80:10,13	118:12	106:12	moving 52:5 54:9 55:3
84:9 98:15 106:2	Matthew 1:8,14 3:20	meritus 9:11	55:12 58:5 75:17
112:22 115:21	MCCLUER 2:5	met 1:7 116:4	99:16 103:17
looking 4:12 5:16 9:7	McCluskey 2:8 28:22	metal 21:4	mulling 61:21
11:20 30:6,17 33:12	29:7,11 32:9 33:4,8	method 55:20 56:2	multiple 107:2
55:14 56:7 58:4 68:10	67:22 118:6	58:18 66:11 73:21	must've 16:4
74:8 77:10 85:11 98:4	MCNEAL 5:11	74:4,8	mute 24:5
113:19 115:14 116:1	mean 13:10,20 20:12	methods 12:7	muted 103:10
looks 62:7 96:12	20:13,15 26:2 33:14	methyl 41:5	N
lot 6:22 11:2,5,9 14:8	33:17 56:4 59:21	mic 36:4	
16:8 22:18 25:19	62:10 75:20 87:18	microbiological 30:7	N 4:1
29:15,16 30:14,20	88:6,13 113:9 115:12	microbiology 29:16	NAEGA 26:11 27:7 46:3
34:1,16 35:11 40:7	meaning 69:16	middle 22:11	name 27:20 63:16,18
46:1,3,11 50:18 52:13	means 4:15 25:14	midnight 9:18	64:6
54:8 61:9 65:4 68:13	101:19 114:4	might've 85:13	names 63:16
71:4 74:6 76:7 87:5,8	meant 34:8	mill 30:13	national 32:14 114:3
91:21 108:17 110:10	mechanism 20:1	milled 7:10 18:17 35:14	115:11 nature 7:3 53:11 75:11
114:1 116:6	meet 98:17 106:22	mind 16:4 35:21 mind-reader 32:20	105:6 111:11 114:8
lot's 115:5	112:15 113:14 116:14		
lots 6:19 8:9 14:13	116:17 117:3	minimum 59:11,14 67:16 97:12 98:8	nay 89:18,19 90:22 102:13
26:18 33:21 34:2	meeting 1:3,7 3:17 4:18 4:21 22:3,12 23:3		ND 1:17
86:12,21	27:13,15 39:1,12	minutes 10:17 44:11,12 50:6 84:9	Neal 2:6 3:21 12:2 14:7
loud 47:10 66:1 low 7:13 8:2 18:3,5,7	41:13 51:9,11 53:8,20	missed 99:15 103:13	15:15,18 24:4 25:6,9
	54:14,18 58:1,13 69:9	Missouri 64:5	28:4 31:2 39:2,5,8,14
21:8 60:11		misstated 46:22	41:9,11,16,19 42:12
low-risk 66:14	71:21 73:1,8 74:13 75:13 79:3,6 81:11	mistaken 65:3 100:1	43:11,13 44:5,8 45:9
lunch 3:9 43:8,14,16 44:7 72:17 77:15 78:8	83:13 88:13 89:3 91:7	103:21	47:3,8 48:15,19 49:3
	91:9 92:9,21 93:18	mitigate 11:7	49:8,12 50:2,9 54:22
83:6,7,15	94:13 103:19 104:8	mitigation 7:4 9:9	56:13 63:3,8,18 65:3
	105:12 106:8,20	mixed 109:17	65:9,22 68:15 72:12
main 27:20 81:16	105.12 106.8,20	moderating 17:4	72:15 76:17 77:4 81:6
	107.1,2,0 100.13	inoderating 17.4	12.13 10.11 11.4 01.0
II	1	I	I

normal 72:7 79:14 80:19 paper 104:7 88:16.20 91:3 92:10 Northern 1:14 64:4 one-drop 66:7 parent 13:21 94:20 95:15 99:2 **one-off** 32:2 part 5:1 17:13 19:13,15 105:18 106:5,22 **note** 41:11 74:5 108:14 109:16 111:12 **noted** 51:5 **one-page** 104:7 23:6 24:20 26:12 115:14,17 117:8,13 **notes** 6:9 44:21 102:9 ones 17:13 34:22 49:17 62:21 117:18 118:9 noteworthy 77:1 72:7 77:22 94:15 ongoing 37:6 46:7 95:10 98:11 99:19 near 71:1 **notice** 24:19,20 25:15 open 5:8 16:16 50:16 26:21 38:22 51:6 61:20 82:12 84:9 92:8 112:12 **necessarily** 19:7 22:11 23:20 34:17 37:4 59:11,17 60:4,18 opening 5:8,11 participate 24:13 97:14 openness 42:13 necessary 42:18 72:12 62:19 67:11,12,16,17 116:15 operate 64:17,18 participated 39:19 42:7 necessitate 68:6 67:20,21,22 68:7,7,16 participating 111:5 69:6 75:6 76:8,16,19 operations 72:7 need 9:12,15 12:5 13:4 participation 25:15 13:14,18 15:7 23:12 82:9 91:6,7 98:17 **opinion** 96:19 106:17 108:12 opportunity 24:13,17 42:19 43:1 24:5,7,9,14,15 26:13 28:11,13 36:20 40:15 notice-and-comment 38:17 39:16 72:18 participative 111:17 68:3,11 106:21 107:7 108:11 particular 73:3 74:1,9 43:16 52:4,6,22 54:2 notified 40:9 112:4 117:1,3 particularly 26:17 54:9,12,21 56:5,21 **notify** 9:9 40:12 73:5 **opposed** 35:12 33:22 57:15,22 61:4 66:1 71:16 72:2,9 74:13 **November** 113:20 option 55:21 69:4 78:14 parties 65:16 66:20 number 31:16 33:14 102:4 partner 28:9 76:15,19 77:7 79:5 34:20 44:21 70:4 76:6 **options** 12:1,20 13:3 **partners** 111:18 80:15 84:3 85:4 88:14 88:17 89:17 93:21 84:7 91:11,22 109:1 14:15 34:18 47:9 62:3 partnership 42:13 94:2,18 95:10,21,22 110:20 68:13,18 71:19 72:1,6 114:19 parts 8:15 18:15 116:10 96:10 98:14,16,17,21 numbers 55:12 107:20 78:1 order 3:2 4:21 40:10,13 102:11 114:9.18 108:2 party 70:3,6 92:6 Pat 2:8 28:22 29:5 31:6 116:11 **Nutrition** 29:3,14 50:22 needed 26:5 orders 36:18 31:13 32:20 33:7,9 0 59:10 67:17 99:1 needs 19:21 20:4 42:20 organic 42:10 O 4:1 organization 112:13 path 22:10 35:8 54:7 negotiation 28:12 107:21 **new** 39:11 40:21 41:4 **OAs** 108:4 organizations 46:2 pause 74:14 79:22 80:2 42:6 55:14 92:4 objectionable 8:10 19:6 organized 15:7 origin 73:20 pay 105:3 103:22 105:22 obligation 65:18,20 original 55:9 **people** 24:19 39:15,18 **next-meeting** 5:3 99:18 observed 32:10 40:7 55:11 63:16 69:7 **NGFA** 2:5 26:11 27:7 **obviously** 4:16 22:8 origination 56:19 65:13 71:4 73:4 84:12 66:17 nice 110:1 31:16,18 42:6,8 61:9 NICHOLAS 1:13 outcome 31:21 110:15 113:7 116:7 89:18 98:18 104:14 Nick 15:9,21 22:14 outdated 8:18 116:14 occur 114:12 perceive 46:12 OCIS 107:14 108:1,3 outdoors 113:8 23:15 24:4 25:21 26:1 **Perfect** 4:11 115:16 32:11,17 38:11 39:2 odor 8:11 outliers 32:4 51:16 52:2 53:17 odors 8:10 19:6 36:17 outlined 6:20 **perform** 63:13 performed 63:4 59:15 71:7,9 78:9 offense 75:3 **output** 81:9 80:4 81:22 84:11 office 108:21 outreach 106:18 performing 63:10 88:22 89:8 90:8 93:7 officer 2:2 3:15 94:18 outside 16:1 22:16,20 period 26:22 38:18 24:13 45:13 59:1 91:5 95:1 96:2,6,9,12 99:17 100:10 40:16 68:3,11 92:13 outsider 88:4 person 31:5 57:21 98:12,14 100:18,22 official 6:15 55:19 56:1 56:10 63:5 64:8,10 101:7 102:21 103:15 overall 15:2 113:14 overarching 37:11 personally 22:13 26:4 65:1,10 66:20 69:21 118:6 personnel 22:19 64:15 night 9:19 104:4 70:8,9,12,13,19 78:19 overseeing 63:20 86:11 96:20 97:4 overtime 105:3 **perspective** 31:6 78:2 **nights** 105:5 80:13 97:17 99:3 nominate 95:19 96:4,9 105:22 107:13 Р 100:12,15 101:13,18 115:8 official/unofficial 78:18 P 4:1 petroleum 19:9 nominated 101:11 officially 46:10 65:18 phone 90:2 104:5 nomination 49:15 old 54:22 61:2 93:17 **p.m** 50:13 83:22 84:1 picking 36:4 96:11 100:19 101:6 94:12 103:19 118:13 nomination/self-nom... old-business 109:12 Pacific 48:1 piece 21:6 31:12 59:10 84:20 100:9 older 99:22 **page** 28:19 **pieces** 21:4 34:12,13 non-FGIS 63:20 once 6:22 10:8 22:4 pain 34:7,17 **piles** 20:15 non-item 45:6 27:20 28:4 46:20 pair 65:14

place 4:19 6:13 60:19 66:3 75:16 114:5,6 116:18 **Plains** 1:14 64:4 plan 10:10 11:3,7 17:19 30:3 85:3 88:8,11 93:3 106:6 111:9 114:10 115:7 planning 114:1 115:3 115:11 116:2 plans 7:4 9:9 10:2,5 14:12 17:3 23:5 28:3 30:18 46:13 play 99:12 playing 85:11 87:16 please 23:6 47:2 pleasure 112:3 plenty 97:10 108:10 114:15 point 15:10 20:10 23:22 31:14 34:17 53:4 54:3 54:16 58:3,3,14 60:22 61:17 69:15 70:2 71:11 75:13 95:6,17 105:11 107:6 **points** 34:7 106:13 poised 28:14,15 policies 6:2 32:13 98:15 policy 2:8 29:1 32:14 34:9 36:9.14 60:10 62:11 75:21 **polling** 31:19 pop 115:6 populate 24:11 portion 21:16 portions 34:11 position 39:22 75:16 100:10,11 **positions** 100:13 positive 91:9 positives 58:6 possibility 63:9 68:16 77:5,11,15 **possible** 62:12 73:9 74:18 **possibly** 53:8 107:12 107:14 108:1 post 73:4 potential 15:11 23:5 33:11 44:16 53:10 63:12 113:20 potentially 7:18 16:16 22:15 30:5 52:21 58:5 65:15 73:12 77:20 78:12 92:5,22 108:5 **pre-approval** 12:19,20 pre-approved 9:8 10:2

10:10 11:2 12:19 28:2 46:13 85:2 88:8,10 pre-approved-plan pre-conversation 43:21 pre-loaded 40:20 pre-notified 41:7 Precisely 35:20 preference 23:17 preferred 110:12 premise 6:14 **prepare** 107:10 prepared 112:10 presence 30:7 present 1:10 2:1 14:14 15:1,8 34:1 98:19 104:7 presentation 32:16 presented 33:19 86:6 92:18 104:3 presenter 51:17 presenting 17:1 president 2:5 101:22 102:1 presiding 1:8 pressing 5:6 presumptuous 61:18 pretty 5:12 22:5 34:14 58:9 62:4,18 71:12 87:19 97:11 116:6 previous 82:8 previously 49:19 **primary** 10:15 prior 39:12 54:17 104:8 106:7 108:12 priority 62:1 **Private** 65:16 proactive 37:21 **probably** 15:4 26:10 30:9 32:11 34:6 54:2 60:18 62:4,18 66:16 74:22 75:7 78:22 85:15,19 87:1,20 107:1 114:4 problem 33:12 34:22 35:8 56:17,18 65:11 68:17 72:20 74:9 85:16 104:19 problematic 74:2 76:3 procedural 67:18 76:5 procedurally 51:18 procedure 95:6 procedures 2:8 23:20 64:8,13 95:12 98:16 **proceed** 95:14 process 10:9 12:9,21 14:4 16:17 22:22

30:12 37:18 40:10.14 40:21 44:15 47:17 62:5 66:21 69:7 75:17 76:14 80:13 95:7 105:21 111:16 112:7 115:19 116:13 processes 68:5 processing 67:1 **produced** 112:19 product 11:15 112:17 productive 114:22 products 6:16 19:9 112:19 program 2:7 105:14 116:19 progress 42:13 72:15 76:11 project 62:21 properly 70:7 76:16 proposals 11:2,3 81:21 propose 47:16 82:1 84:22 88:9,12 proposed 11:7 69:2 84:3 94:4 provide 10:21 14:5 16:19 23:4 68:19,22 71:18 73:6 76:16 112:9 provides 16:8 providing 39:21 112:17 112:18 **Ps** 11:2 **public** 3:5 5:2 25:15,16 38:5,7,19,21 39:20 40:2,4,16,19,22 43:6 43:13 75:5 77:6.9.19 79:5 83:10 91:16,19 92:19 94:21 116:14 publication 9:5 publicly 40:8 published 62:15 **punt** 51:7 purpose 12:3 **pursue** 72:6 **purview** 97:19 put 19:6 23:17 24:18 32:15 51:8 54:13 83:1 85:4 92:1 93:5,8 98:6 99:22 113:12

Q

20:16 21:13,22 38:12 39:3 40:20 48:5,7,17

quality 7:13 8:2 18:3,5

18:7 21:8 110:21 112:17,18

quarantined 19:22

question 14:7 16:5

56:13 59:16 71:15 80:12 88:16 92:15 106:16 111:7 117:8 questioning 48:10 **questions** 5:6 26:16 39:3 47:12 50:5 63:3 73:3 89:7 106:11 115:8 quick 18:1 46:17 48:7 75:5 76:13 77:4 117:8 quicker 73:14 quickly 9:10 75:3 quietly 4:17 quit 108:20 quite 16:12 18:1,13 76:7 85:9 107:22 quorum 4:5,7,20 quote/unquote 84:7 89:9 R R 4:1 rabbits 20:14

railcar 9:21 35:17 railcars 56:22 railroad 104:13 raise 38:17 raised 26:4 31:6 raising 39:9 RANDALL 1:12 random 41:20 Randy 90:1 100:2 102:15 111:22 rare 7:15 11:14 21:1 rating 67:18 rattled 17:22 re-auth 49:1 reach 22:17 114:16 116:16 read 6:9 16:4 113:5 reading 23:16 106:1 ready 9:4 53:5 56:22 58:15 real 34:6 76:13 reality 63:3 realization 78:20 reapply 49:11,18 reappointed 49:6 reapproved 48:11 reason 28:16 reasonable 68:3 reasons 74:6 reauthorization 49:3 59:18 recap 5:6 receive 10:5 68:12

24:11,16 25:17 26:21

received 38:6

recognized 10:10

64:22 86:16 responsible 81:20 saving 4:13 63:11 recommend 15:12 76:22 Regulations.gov 73:7 restrictive 64:9.21 53:15 56:6 67:1 74:18 says 43:17 60:9 72:9 resulted 81:11 74:20 115:22 91:18 recommendation 6:7 regulatory 2:6 6:1,17 results 55:16 56:20 **SB&B** 1:16 13:11 14:21 15:3 23:1 116:19 65:5,13,14 66:17 **schedule** 43:5 60:15 64:16,16 105:5 23:17 24:1,6,10 28:5 **rehash** 61:6 73:19 74:2,6 resumed 50:12 83:22 scheduling 104:22 28:10,17 44:1,17 45:3 rehashed 51:1 retaining 105:4 105:2 45:10 47:17 48:19,21 **relay** 10:7 Science 2:4 release 34:14 revelations 78:17 51:4,14 52:2,4 53:2,3 53:15 54:3,6,10 55:11 remain 92:8 review 60:17 61:8 77:4 scientists 30:20 84:5 86:21 88:7 91:19 **scope** 45:14 55:14 56:8,14,15,16 remaining 103:20 remarks 3:19 110:6 106:7 107:14 108:3 Scoular 1:13 57:1,4,11,15,17,19,22 scratch 35:12 58:2,13 61:1 69:2 111:8 revise 86:17,20 108:11 remedial 14:12 revision 84:10 screen 83:1 94:6 71:2,20 72:3,9 74:14 77:18,21 79:22 80:1 remediation 17:3 23:5 revisions 89:7 screens 4:18 30:18 46:13 79:19 rice 7:10 11:8 18:17 **scroll** 81:15 81:1,12 82:2 83:9 85:10 88:11 22:2,3,4 35:14 **seal** 7:3 92:3 94:11 seat 51:20 recommendations 3:7 remember 62:13 **Rick** 100:3 111:22 3:11 5:3 13:18 23:22 remind 74:7 rid 85:17 117:16 second 21:21 27:15 remote 110:11 ride 112:7 35:22 82:10 84:20,21 28:8 32:15 38:2 43:7 renewed 42:8 risk 66:8 70:5 89:13,14 93:2 100:19 43:18 44:3,14,16 46:1 48:12,13 50:8,21 report 6:17 8:12 36:12 **risks** 9:13 101:14 102:6,8,11 55:10 81:7 94:2 99:16 36:13,20,21 37:9 road 30:15 118:1,2 reportable 8:6,15 seconded 100:20 106:3 112:11 **ROBERT** 1:16 Robinette 100:3 recommended 46:13 reported 8:3 86:11,22 101:12 **secretary** 45:12 49:6 89:4 reporting 36:18 37:1,12 rodent 21:18 recommending 53:18 104:2 roll 26:19 102:11 53:3,16 56:6 74:14 roll-call 80:18 83:9 80:1 81:2,8,10 82:17 56:17 80:6,9 reports 6:22 rolling 49:14,21 99:21 92:3 100:11 101:7,10 recondition 34:9 represent 13:9 14:16 100:2 111:22 101:22 103:16 reconditioned 19:11 representative 21:5 secretary's 28:7 reconditioning 11:13 represented 21:9 rollovers 115:3 section 44:6 12:1,7 85:3,13,14,18 request 54:18 72:19 **rough** 111:10 77:6 91:2,8,15 92:16 roughly 34:5 69:10 Seed 1:17 88:8,11 seeing 6:16 77:14 reconvene 83:15 round 24:1 62:14 105:11 107:6 113:12 record 47:6 50:12 83:22 route 60:20 62:9 seek 68:17 requested 104:1 seeking 12:19 106:18 requesting 92:19 RUGGLES 2:7 118:13 rules 41:22 65:21 70:20 seen 8:7 16:17 17:11,15 requests 38:7 77:18 recurring 33:15 93:10 98:11 run 5:9 12:1,17 17:22 32:12 refer 87:9 select 25:17 references 8:18 require 55:19 28:5 34:10,20 55:21 **selected** 49:16.17 **regarding** 5:7 13:17 required 56:2 85:1,2 56:2,11 63:20,21 64:1 64:7,9,11 65:6 66:8 self-nominate 95:18 31:13 46:1,8,11 47:1 88:10 research 45:22 72:16 96:5 100:12 101:19 51:15 52:9,22 53:10 105:1 self-nominations 98:10 73:10 81:20 runs 108:2 57:16 79:18 80:16 81:19 83:10 84:4 89:9 researching 78:8 rushed 93:12 **semantics** 85:11,12 resolution 76:22 Ryan 1:14 67:9 69:16 87:1,16 91:2,12,22 92:4,17 resolve 43:2 68:19 90:11 97:5 98:6,13 send 11:3 14:9 33:8 99:15 104:1 107:18 103:1 108:15 49:18 82:11 83:5 regional 32:13 resolved 59:22 sending 82:16 106:10 regionally 33:1 resonate 84:17 85:7 S resource 31:4 sense 26:14 28:11,18 register 38:22 54:19 sentence 84:21 59:6,11,17 60:19 respect 15:20 97:19 S 4:1 safe 118:10 September 62:3 72:21 77:12 83:11 respective 53:21 **servants** 111:19 91:5,7 93:5,10 98:17 respond 14:10 24:19 safety 2:5 29:3,13,15 serve 14:12 49:5 106:17 108:12 45:13 73:4 **sample** 21:7,9 34:10 service 1:15 59:3 registered 47:10 responds 9:11 79:19 response 12:11 38:22 **sample's** 21:5 112:14.18 Registry 67:11 57:5 73:13 **sampling** 20:21,22 session 94:14 103:16 regular 31:18 98:18 **set** 23:2,13 73:3 79:1 regularly 9:15 responses 73:6 Saturday 9:19 responsibility 113:2 sausage 22:12 86:15 regulations 6:20 60:14

	İ	Ì	1
settle 57:18	solutions 15:7 23:4	92:12	107:17 108:3 111:8
settled 80:20	solve 55:13 56:17	stated 52:20 86:8	talked 9:8 19:1 30:14
share 42:14	solves 58:7	status 43:3 106:2	42:15
shared 113:2	somebody 97:6	stay 79:10	talking 6:1 20:18 23:22
sharing 94:6	soon 74:20	staying 112:6	24:5,12 36:11 44:14
sheer 110:20	sooner 113:21	step 16:15 40:18 79:4	58:21 59:10 65:22
shepherd 10:9	sorry 6:5 10:16 18:2,4	steps 61:9 62:9 63:1	84:21 97:2
ship 66:10	23:5 36:3 44:5 47:20	sticking 106:13	target 33:17,18 113:21
shipped 66:9 112:19	54:17 61:5 64:16 71:7	stop 77:1 94:5	114:4
shipping 9:21	74:17 80:1 83:17 95:5	story 29:22	targeted 29:15 33:13
short 43:9 94:14	97:1 101:1 103:9	strange 7:15,19	task 15:13,16,19,20
shortage 4:15	sort 51:14	strap 69:20 70:13	22:15 23:2,9,10 24:2
shortlist 17:18	sound 45:20 79:21 92:2	strategies 12:8	24:8,12,18,21 25:1,13
shot 36:7	sounds 22:8 80:3 82:1	street 28:7	25:19 26:22 27:12
show 5:21	87:15 94:9	stress 13:13	52:3 53:5 81:16
showing 4:4	South 1:16	strictly 37:10	technical 30:14 85:10
shuttle 104:2,14	space 20:8,8	strong 46:15	technicality 47:1
shuttle-train 104:11	speak 32:11 74:16	structured 112:10	Technically 86:9
side 10:6 37:17 42:11	speaking 20:17,18	struggled 84:13	technology 2:3 105:22 110:3,11
58:10 60:17 87:9	59:12	stuff 30:14 59:7 61:10	tell 37:8
sides 45:21 53:9	Specialist 2:5,9 specific 31:20 36:17	subcommittee 15:15	ten 4:6
signed 40:6 significance 10:7 13:13	57:18 92:16 107:16	15:16,19 25:1,4,10,10 27:9 29:18 31:3,8,13	tend 22:20 32:13
significant 42:5 58:10	specifically 79:18	51:9 52:3 53:6 80:4,6	term 15:14 70:18 85:15
76:6	speed 9:15 12:8 66:6	80:9,17,19 81:16,19	85:19
silence 50:18	69:19 72:5	82:2 83:19 84:5 87:18	termed 86:13
silently 4:17	spelled 84:19	88:6 89:4,10,19 94:12	terms 12:21 39:9 43:15
similar 11:12,12,16	spend 112:1	95:7,11,14 96:5,13,18	46:4 48:14,16,22 49:5
62:19	spends 78:7	98:13 99:8 108:18	66:22 112:17 113:1,9
Simple 94:13	spilled 7:17,17	109:1,6	terrible 76:22
simpler 25:9	spirit 112:15	subcommittee/task	test 34:10 41:5 63:4,10
simply 55:12 56:6	spoke 104:4	51:10	63:13 64:9 66:7 73:18
69:18 70:4	sponsor 51:17 52:12	subcommittees 14:22	test-kit 41:4
Simultaneous 59:12	spring 62:15	15:1 114:15	testing 1:17 73:21 74:4
single 19:19	squirrels 20:14	submit 30:19 75:7	tests 56:19 65:6 74:1
Sinner 1:16 18:19,22	staff 2:4 4:14 9:16 29:1	submitted 23:6	thank 4:13 16:9 33:10
20:12 21:14,19 86:5	88:12,15,18 96:22	sufficient 12:15	34:19 41:17 48:2 50:8
90:15,16 101:14,15	98:22 110:8	suggest 82:16	50:9,10 54:11 83:19
103:6	staffing 61:10	suggested 52:2 82:6,8	83:20 96:2 97:22
sir 41:19 105:18	stakeholders 13:9,10	suggestion 86:4	105:19 107:4 110:6,8
sit 30:20	71:13 112:9 114:16	summaries 46:17	110:15,17 111:3,13
situation 7:15 11:7	116:7,12	summarized 47:3	111:13,18,21 118:9
35:15 67:2	standardized 17:19	summarizes 14:15	118:11
situations 11:12,16,22	standards 1:12 8:1	summary 74:12 105:7	thanks 12:2 37:12,13
85:22	21:18 59:19	SUMMERS 2:7	39:2 101:5 109:16,17
six 69:10	standpoint 16:16 22:9	support 12:6 31:10	That'd 106:9
slash-remediation	70:21 75:21	39:22 93:17 supporting 26:9	that've 79:20 they'd 64:22 65:13 86:9
85:21 slicing 82:13	stands 112:13 staring 102:2	supporting 26.9 suppose 67:15	things 4:15 6:18 7:3,19
slow 66:12	start 4:12 22:22 27:9	surprised 110:19	11:5,12 12:12 21:2,3
smaller 21:12	30:6 31:19 44:14 58:1	surveyors 78:20	37:1,6 42:15 51:2
smoother 110:13	58:12 75:17 82:15	system 105:22	53:11 61:11 65:18
smoothly 10:13	83:17 84:21 92:14	5,5tom 100.22	66:12 68:6,9 72:16
so-move 102:5	104:21 105:1 113:11	T	73:21 105:6 111:11
solicit 25:3,11	113:17	table 5:15 45:21 115:1	114:7
soliciting 25:15	started 5:14 82:7	taken 42:22 51:6 59:19	thinks 51:13
solution 33:11 35:8	starting 31:22 35:12	takes 7:1 28:17 104:15	third 65:16 66:20 70:3,6
57:3 74:9	state 1:16 64:4 65:19	talk 41:4 43:20 74:18	thoroughly 113:5

35:18 59:5 62:11 69:8 **Updated** 72:15 113:16 thought 5:12 26:2 28:2 72:16 73:9 75:22 **updates** 9:3 53:8 71:18 waiting 12:10 29:7,11 66:10 107:13 72:8,11 110:9 wanted 10:16 49:22 115:19 116:13 85:16 92:7 trying 12:14 32:3 35:11 updating 9:1 57:12 66:10 74:5,7,10 thoughtful 112:10 thoughts 12:5 25:22 36:19 37:21 40:21 upfront 60:13 88:4 93:4 97:20 61:15 69:12 75:8 79:9 64:2 66:5 67:19 88:6 **upwards** 110:14 106:13 111:17 117:13 **wanting** 42:16 107:20 111:10 114:13 tubes 64:14 urgency 26:14 turn 55:22 109:21 111:6 wants 38:20 40:11 115:9 116:16 urgent 76:20 three 30:2 51:2 97:13 **Turnipseed** 1:16 48:3,5 urine 30:5,8 47:16 50:20 91:15 97:13 112:2 48:9,18 49:2,7,20 **USDA** 81:13 95:10 use 14:3,5 55:19 64:13 wasn't 35:1 threshold 7:7 82:20,22 85:20 88:14 watching 4:18 88:17,22 89:15 90:18 64:14 70:3,16,19,19 throw 25:20 74:19 Watne 1:17 90:19,20 **thumbs-up** 102:3 94:5,8 100:4,20 101:2 74:3 85:1,9 109:8 **USGS** 55:13 100:4 101:20 102:5 THURSDAY 1:5 101:5 103:8,9 108:19 tied 9:20 35:17,17 109:4 110:3 118:4 **USGSA** 45:1,11,14 49:4 103:11.12 **two** 5:9 8:8 33:4,7 39:3 55:19 56:3,7 58:6 way 8:14 11:13 14:16 time-sensitive 56:1 59:6 60:17 63:22 27:16 28:18 29:21 timeliness 59:3 104:1 39:7 49:5 64:13 65:1 76:5 79:7 84:7 110:7 64:15,20,21 30:16 35:16 37:20,21 timely 73:12 times 11:9 usually 19:11 104:12 39:8,9 45:7 55:12 tying 20:7 type 24:19 31:5 33:14 74:21 77:17 80:3 **timing** 61:9 40:10 42:19,21 66:15 82:10,14 86:8 93:12 today 5:1 38:20 40:11 75:7,17 104:5 68:18 vaccinated 113:7 98:7 111:19 today's 5:13 types 34:21 valid 9:1 ways 14:8 15:5 55:14 tolerance 21:17 typical 17:7 valuable 42:18 55:15,15 we-all 37:20 58:7 70:5 **Tony** 5:20 12:2,7 16:9 typically 10:4 18:9 value 78:6,10,12 79:12 17:8.16 20:12 22:2 24:17 104:15 valued 42:17 75:2 28:12 33:13 35:21 wear 64:22 65:1 113:8 typing 94:6 variation 65:6 website 73:5 91:12 37:12 45:20 59:4 61:5 **varied** 11:16 U weeds 88:3 63:3 67:10 71:16 75:2 various 79:19 111:1 weekend 9:17 75:15 85:8 86:5 87:7 **U.S** 1:1 46:2 **vary** 99:4 weekends 105:6 87:16.20 99:1 106:15 unanimous 101:21 venue 112:5 weeks 12:10 35:19 109:17 underlying 37:2 **verbiage** 57:18,18,20 58:12,16 80:19 84:4,8 weigh 21:17 **Tony's** 5:15 29:22 underneath 46:9 weight 13:5 45:12,16 top 10:22 11:22 undersecretary 116:18 89:10 45:16 topic 25:2 33:20 39:15 understand 14:3 30:22 versa 111:2 versus 37:20 46:15 weird 21:2,3 39:18 43:10 51:12,15 45:7 58:4 76:15 88:1 Welcome 3:2 50:14 66:20 51:17 54:8 79:16 88:5,20 **vested** 4:16 went 22:1 30:10 44:15 91:16,17 105:17 understanding 29:17 50:12 60:20 62:9 108:15 35:7 37:18 **vetted** 23:4,5 topics 5:4 46:19 54:18 unexpected 114:11 **vexing** 33:16 83:22 118:13 84:16 106:18,19 weren't 115:11 unfit 37:4 vice 2:5 100:11,16 unit 66:13 101:22 103:15 111:2 **whatnot** 38:16 110:19,21 115:1,2 wheat 1:12 7:6,9 11:9 **United 1:15** Vice-Chair 1:8 totally 7:22 82:12 touch 11:19 46:18 University 1:17 Video/teleconference 30:11,13 46:3 75:10 97:16 touched 18:14 19:14 **unknown** 105:5 1:8 unknowns 58:17 view 69:16 white 104:7 113:16 tough 6:2 34:1 violations 9:14 wild 7:21 trade 13:22 26:7 46:2 unofficial 63:5,10,19 Williams 104:4 53:22 64:18 65:7 70:16 virtually 40:5,7 willing 10:6 16:22 26:19 voice 13:10 27:2 train 66:13 104:2,14 unofficially 46:10 63:21 wise 22:17 64:1 **volunteer** 96:9,18 transfers 7:2 witness 7:2 unofficials 63:15 65:12 volunteers 23:2,12 transparency 24:16 word 37:4 82:22 85:14 95:22 42:2 65:16 words 71:22 85:1,9 transparent 60:13 unsanitary 37:4 vote 24:6 52:6 57:10,17 wordsmith 83:8 travel 113:9 unusual 8:1 80:18 83:9 96:11 unwilling 35:1 voting 23:11 wordsmithing 24:2 traveling 113:11,17 work 10:4 12:13 13:21 tried 30:2 **update** 8:22 10:15 23:3 14:17,18 15:1,2 22:10 true 57:13 73:22,22 60:15 75:14 92:9,22 23:14 24:2,14 26:9 try 12:8 13:13 23:4 105:14 107:15 wait 38:9 94:18 113:15

			131
28:1,12 29:1,13 32:16 37:16 39:11 40:1 42:17 45:20 51:11 58:16 71:18 72:5	10 104:17 100 7:8,8 34:2 103 3:17 11 90:22 102:12 103:14	94 3:15	
78:15 81:11 82:1 88:11,18 95:8 107:22	11:00 1:8 11:02 4:2		
114:15	11:48 43:13		
workable 57:3	11:56 50:12		
worked 8:20 9:2 104:11	110 3:20 104:15		
working 29:2,12 49:15 52:18 58:1,12 105:21	115 3:21 104:15 12 104:17		
108:20 114:18	12:00 43:14		
works 38:16 42:11	12:30 44:3,8,10 47:14		
worldwide 112:20	47:22 50:6		
worth 33:5,6	12:31 50:13		
wouldn't 45:2,5 76:1	13 1:5		
write 18:1 52:15 69:6 writing 84:13	15 104:17 1980 6:12		
written 89:10	1900 0.12		
wrong 28:13 44:9 54:21	2		
59:5 85:14 91:4	2:15 43:18 44:8 83:17		
115:19	2:19 84:1		
	2:2 55:20 56:2 58:18		
X	66:11		
Υ	20 8:15 17:9 18:15 2000 115:4		
yea 89:18,18,22 90:3,5	2019 33:21 42:16 62:15		
90:7,9,10,12,16	2020 116:4		
102:13,14,16,18,20	2021 1:5 75:10		
102:22 103:1,2,4,6,9	21 27:15		
103:12	3		
yea/nay 80:18			
year 33:20 34:3 62:2 76:1,7 117:11	3:02 118:13 30 10:17		
years 8:7,20 26:15	33 7:8,8		
29:12 30:2 32:10,12	34 50:6		
76:5 112:2	38 3:5		
yeas 90:22 103:14	39 3:7		
yesterday 5:12,14 6:1	4		
38:15,20 44:22 48:7 55:9,18 105:21	4 3:2		
106:12	40 44:11		
you-all 11:20 13:8 15:6	45 94:16		
21:3 32:14 95:20			
115:21 116:22 117:5	5		
118:9,9,11	50 3:9,11 110:14		
Z	6		
zero 90:22	6 3:3		
Zoom 50:17	7		
0			
	8		
1	8:02 4:4		
1,000-gram 21:16 1:13 83:22	83 3:13		
1:15 43:14,16,19 83:16	9		
1:2 55:21 56:11	9:30 48:1		
l	1	1	I

${\color{red} \underline{C} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{E} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{R} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{T} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{I} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{F} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{I} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{C} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{A} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{T} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{E}}$

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Grain Inspection Advisory Committee

Before: USDA

Date: 05-13-21

Place: teleconference

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

Mac Nous &