

NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING

DOCKET NO.: 23-J-0067; AMS-DA-23-0031

Before the Honorable Channing D. Strother, Judge

---000---

Carmel, Indiana
August 31, 2023

---000---

Reported by:

MYRA A. PISH, C.S.R. Certificate No. 11613

| 1 | APPEARANCES: |
|----------|--|
| 2 | FOR THE USDA ORDER FORMULATION AND ENFORCEMENT DIVISION, USDA-AMS DAIRY PROGRAM: |
| 3 4 | Todd Wilson Erin Taylor Brian Hill |
| 5 6 | FOR THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION: |
| 7 | Roger Cryan |
| 8 | FOR THE INTERNATIONAL DAIRY FOODS ASSOCIATION: |
| 9 | Steve Rosenbaum |
| 10 11 | FOR THE MILK INNOVATION GROUP: |
| 12 | Charles "Chip" English |
| 13 | FOR THE NATIONAL ALL-JERSEY, INC.: |
| 14 | John Vetne |
| 15 16 | FOR THE NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION: Nicole Hancock |
| 17 | Brad Prowant |
| 18 19 | FOR SELECT MILK PRODUCERS, INC.: |
| 20 | Ryan Miltner |
| 21 | |
| 22 | 000 |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 28 | |
| 4 O | |





| 1 | MASTER INDEX | |
|----------|--|----------------|
| 2 | WITNESSES IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER | |
| 3 | WITNESSES: PA | .GE |
| 4 | Harry Kaiser: | |
| 5 | | 51 71 |
| 6 7 | Kevin Krentz: | |
| 8 | Cross-Examination by Dr. Cryan 15 | 75 80 |
| 9 | Cross-Examination by Mr. Miltner 15 | 83 85 88 |
| 10 | Dr. Peter Vitaliano: | |
| 11 | Direct Examination by Mr. Miltner 15 | 92 |
| 12 13 | Cross-Examination by Dr. Cryan 16 | 99 |
| 14 | Cross-Examination by Ms. Taylor 16 Darin Hanson: | 03 |
| 15 | | 11 |
| 16 | | 28 |
| 17 | Harry Kaiser: | |
| 18 | Cross-Examination by Mr. English 16 | 41 54 84 |
| 19 | Cross-Examination by Dr. Vitaliano 16 | 94 |
| 20 | Darin Hanson: | |
| 21 | Cross-Examination by Mr. English 17 | 21 |
| 22 | <u> </u> | 29 37 |
| 23 | Cross-Examination by Dr. Cryan 17 Cross-Examination by Ms. Taylor 17 | 38 |
| 24 | Cross-Examination by Mr. Wilson 17 | 51 |
| 25 | 000 | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |



| 1 | | MASTER : | INDEX | |
|--------|-----|-------------------------------------|--------|------|
| 2 | | INDEX OF EXI | HIBITS | |
| 3 | NO. | DESCRIPTION | I.D. | EVD. |
| 4 | 115 | Testimony of Dr. Harry Kaiser | 1555 | 1716 |
| 5 6 | 116 | Testimony of Kevin Krentz | 1574 | 1591 |
| 7 | 114 | Testimony of Dr. Peter Vitaliano | | 1610 |
| 8 9 | 117 | Testimony of Darin Hanson | 1614 | 1755 |
| 10 | 118 | Document | 1631 | 1758 |
| 11 | | | | |
| 12 | | 000 | | |
| 13 | | | | |
| 14 | | | | |
| 15 | | | | |
| 16 | | | | |
| 17 | | | | |
| 18 | | | | |
| 19 | | | | |
| 20 | | | | |
| 21 | | | | |
| 22 | | | | |
| 23 | | | | |
| 24 | | | | |
| 25 | | | | |
| 26 | | | | |
| 27 | | | | |
| 28 | | | | |
| | | | | |



THURSDAY, AUGUST 31, 2023 - - MORNING SESSION

THE COURT: Let's get started. On the record, Mr. Rosenbaum.

MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, I have a preliminary matter to raise.

THE COURT: Yes, counsel?

MR. ROSENBAUM: Steve Rosenbaum for the International Dairy Foods Association.

It has been our practice that at the end of a session, for the counsel to confer, sometimes with USDA participating, as to who the witnesses are for the following day. And we had this exchange yesterday. I was specifically asked, for example, who I would be calling. I said I would need to check, but I would let them know, which I did yesterday evening.

This morning, we received a list from National Milk as to who they are going to call today. Obviously, we prepare for whoever is going to be coming the next day, and even if a witness may have had his testimony posted some time ago, you prepare for whoever you are told is going to be the next day. There are so many people who are being called as witnesses.

I was told this morning that National Milk

Producers Federation intend to call Dr. Kaiser as a

witness today. He was not on the list of individuals who

were provided to me yesterday. I was provided several

other names, and that's what I spent my entire evening

preparing for. And I believe it's unfair.



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

Now, it's true Dr. Kaiser's testimony has been posted for some time, but that he is one of, I don't know, a dozen or more testimonies that have been posted by National Milk. And obviously, I have not prepared in advance for every single one of them. I think it is unfair for Dr. Kaiser to be permitted to testify today, and I object to his testifying today.

THE COURT: How would you feel, Mr. -- we got other people, we'll hear from them. I do appreciate your helping everybody to sort out the procedure. I know these are long hearing days, and as much as we can do off the record to streamline things and give people fair warning, I think it is a great use of time.

MR. ROSENBAUM: This -- I mean, that practice of letting the opposing counsel know is sort of -- it's a part of the courtesy, but frankly, it has become simply practice in every litigation in which I'm involved, not just USDA proceedings. It is just the way the world works. It's obviously reciprocity. You do it from both sides because both sides need to have that advance notice.

National Milk has offered to have Dr. Kaiser this afternoon. That's not sufficient. I am spending this morning here in the hearing, and I'm prepared to cross-examine the other witnesses, who I prepared for last night.

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. English.

MR. ENGLISH: If I may go before National Milk, so they can respond once rather than twice.



2.

2.0

2.1

So, yes, it is been posted. I will note that I did read it enough and -- to look at it. And it's about Class I elasticity. We have heard a little bit about that. But when you read it, it talks about increasing the Class I price differential. And so I inferred that it was going to come up during the Class I price differential.

And I understand posting, you know -- but we really did not prepare for it last night. It is extraordinarily difficult and dense testimony. I can assure you that if it goes today, we're going to come to a grinding halt because it is really hard stuff, and having not prepared means that it's going to take a whole lot longer to go through.

So as a matter of hearing efficiency -- now, I understand from National Milk, this is the one day he can testify. Well, again, I agree it is not a requirement, but we heard last night -- I would have spent my entire night differently had I known that he was testifying today.

And -- and so as a matter of hearing efficiency, even if he went tomorrow, it is going to be a whole lot more efficient. And I just worry that we're going to grind the hearing to a halt today.

THE COURT: Before I hear from National Milk, does

AMS have anything to say about this? You'd prefer

National Milk to talk?

MR. HILL: Yeah.

THE COURT: Very good.



2.

2.1

Ms. Hancock.

2.

2.1

MS. HANCOCK: Thank you, your Honor.

Your Honor, we did tell them that Harry Kaiser was going to testify a few days ago. I didn't have my computer open last night. In fact, I leaned over Ms. Taylor's list and said, "Who do you have for us down tomorrow?" And I went off of her list, and I didn't have it by memory that Mr. Kaiser was coming in today.

But it is true that I didn't tell them last night, but I had told them previously that he was coming in this week. And, in fact, your Honor, we have bent over backwards to give them our entire chronology of lists for the entire week to let them know who we have coming in.

And we're not required to tell them.

We have been -- we have been 100% cooperative with them when they have had their witnesses that they need to get in and on the stand and off the stand, even though it interrupts our presentation of evidence. We let their rebuttal witnesses go in the middle of our testimony. And you'll remember that we did Mike Brown, and we did two of their producers. We stopped our progression of witnesses so that we could accommodate their schedules, and we made sure that -- that we did that. We have offered every day to cooperate with them.

If this is any kind of formal or binding situation where we're not being flexible, then I would be much more formal about sitting down with them with my computer and my entire list. This is something where we just stand in



the back of the room and talk about where we're -- where we're going.

Mr. Kaiser's testimony -- or Dr. Kaiser's testimony has been on the website for a week, more than a week now. It was one of the first testimonies that we even submitted in this hearing. It's not new information. There was not the plethora of testimonies that we see on the website today when his testimony was posted, because his was one of the first ones that were posted.

I offered as a gesture of kindness and to cooperate with them that we would post it after -- or that we would put him on after lunch instead of after Dr. Vitaliano this morning, so that they could have that time to prepare for this.

But the reality is, every time we put on a witness, we're preparing somewhat on the fly. Right? We don't have any advanced testimony for anything other than the proponents of proposals.

This is the one day that Dr. Kaiser can testify. He flew in last night, he flies out at 4 o'clock in the morning, and so this is the day that he has available.

And, your Honor, we're not required to provide it to them. We have done it.

But, frankly, Mr. Rosenbaum has accused me of really awful things and that I'm trying to hide or conceal this witness, which I think is entirely inappropriate and inconsistent with what we have done in this hearing. This has not been adversarial at all, and, you know, that I



2.

2.0

2.1

didn't remember last night to say his name again, it was my omission, but it's certainly not to the level that they are representing to this -- to your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. English.

MR. ENGLISH: Very quick. I acknowledge the cooperation. I think we have all been trying to cooperate. That's just a little bit why we were caught by surprise. And I certainly did not intimate, and certainly on the record I did not hear Mr. Rosenbaum intimate, that it was done to mislead or to hide, that it is just a reality that -- you know, whether it's posted or not.

I guarantee you, none of us have had any downtime. I can't -- I can't expect National Milk has had any downtime. None of us has had downtime. We're working feverishly, you know, night and day, weekends, to get prepared. And literally, you look at the schedule, and you say, what can I prepare for tonight? And I can tell you, there's e-mails going back and forth at 2:00 a.m., at 5:00 a.m., and at 6:00 a.m.

And so, again, look, we appreciate the gesture of putting on after lunch. I think that's still not exactly what we need. I don't know if he can come at another time. The reality is that this is going to be really — this is really hard, really difficult stuff. I do not have my economist with me today to help me. And so it is going to be a little wandering in the wilderness.

THE COURT: What's AMS have to say about this? You guys all ready to go?



2.

2.0

2.1

MR. HILL: Yes. While we do understand that 1 2. people need time to prepare, we also do understand that there is no requirement for National Milk to provide 3 4 anything extra here. We do -- from AMS's point of view, we want to hear 5 as much testimony as we can. We understand that the 6 7 witness is only here today. So we understand that 8 everyone has a very difficult job here. But we really 9 take no position other than to hopefully get all that we 10 need on the record, and whatever that requires, we are in 11 favor of. But we take no position between the two sides 12 here, obviously. 13 THE COURT: But AMS feels like it's prepared for 14 this witness? 15 MR. HILL: Yes, we are prepared to move forward. 16 Yes. 17 THE COURT: Okay. 18 Yes, sir. 19 DR. CRYAN: Good morning. 2.0 THE COURT: Good morning. 2.1 DR. CRYAN: I'm Roger Cryan. I don't know if I 22 have to say that right now. 23 So we had a conversation yesterday at the end of 24 the -- among Ms. Hancock, Mr. English, and Mr. Rosenbaum, 25 We exchanged cards to -- to share information 26 about witnesses. I heard nothing from Mr. Rosenbaum, so



you.

27

28

what's good for the goose is good for the gander. Thank

THE COURT: I'm sorry, what was the last part?

DR. CRYAN: What's good for the goose is good for the gander.

THE COURT: And by that you mean -- I understand the meaning of that --

DR. CRYAN: I think it was a courtesy and -- and it didn't happen. You know, we -- we don't have to be attorneys to represent our folks at this -- at these proceedings. But I'm -- I'm just pointing out that if it is practiced, then it is not being consistently followed, so I don't see any reason not to let National Milk put its witnesses on.

THE COURT: Yeah, I'm not sure I follow. You are saying it hasn't become an established -- well, I mean, I have not gotten involved with establishing, you know, notice of witnesses and such. I don't know if anyone is asking me to do that. I would prefer not to do that. I appreciate the cooperation among the witnesses.

I have not heard why Dr. Kaiser is only available this one day.

Ms. Hancock, can you address that?

MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, he flew in last night to -- specifically to testify for today, and he has a flight out tomorrow. He doesn't live here. And this is something that he's doing as an -- as an expert witness. This isn't -- you know, he's not in the dairy industry where this is something that he can be present here.

THE COURT: I'm not sure it's easier on a dairy



2.

2.0

2.1

farmer person involved in the dairy industry to be here than an expert witness, frankly.

Well, I mean, we have Friday set aside for dairy farmers, and I guess it would be possible to pick up part of that day with a different witness?

I mean, I, frankly, have not known how we have done the witness scheduling. And I am concerned about what Mr. Rosenbaum and Mr. English are saying about not being prepared for this witness. And if -- well, I mean, it occurs to me, if we have to take this witness over because they can't complete their examination because they haven't had a chance to prepare thoroughly, it is an inefficient use of our time here.

And I don't think -- well, if that happens, we decide what to do then, in bringing back the witness or carrying, you know, in -- into the evening would be a possibility.

I'm not sure what to do here. I have not been involved in the scheduling of witnesses. I had not heard the conversations. It's a little hard for me to say -- and I don't think that our goal here is to establish blame. It's -- I mean, these are long hearing days.

We're all working very hard. I appreciate all that work. I appreciate people meeting after hours. And it's tough. And the goal is to get the -- get the hearing done, but I'm hearing that that is interfering to some extent with the ability to get it done because people have trouble preparing. I mean, I have been there in private practice,



2.

2.0

2.1

and I know we're under tight deadlines.

How about tomorrow?

MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, he has a flight out. He has to leave at 4 o'clock in the morning. He is a professor, and he teaches classes.

I will note, your Honor, that National Milk complied with all of the requirements. We have turned and submitted in all of our testimonies early. We haven't submitted them late. We have — they have been posted online. This is not new information. Everything that we're required to do, we have done. We provided — this testimony has been available for more than a week. We have done everything that we're required to do. We were going above and beyond in trying to cooperate with them.

But it wasn't anything that was required, and it wasn't anything that was even formal. It was something that -- that we were doing and -- and that we didn't say his name last night, but had said it earlier in the week. I mean, there's no reason why they couldn't have prepared for this. They are not -- they are not prejudiced in any way that they didn't prepare last night for it, I understand. But that's why we have said that we'll put him on after lunch. I mean, if we want to take a 90-minute lunch instead of a one-hour lunch, maybe that makes sense.

But we have done everything that we're required to do under all of the regulations. In fact, we have gone above and beyond. And now that it didn't work out the way



2.

2.0

2.1

that -- that we all -- that I would have liked to have it work out, it is not a basis for either delaying or excluding this witness or somehow penalizing National Milk because we have done everything that we're required to do.

THE COURT: Well, I don't see it as penalizing

National Milk, frankly. I mean, you are not -- the only

penalty would be if you get to foreclose your opponents

from having the time they assert that they need to

prepare. I mean, there's going to be slippage in whatever

procedures that we have here.

Mr. English, you mentioned not having your economist to help you prepare. Is he available over lunch and we can take a longer lunch?

I mean, we've got seven weeks of hearing here. I have some difficulty with the concept that this witness has got to come up tomorrow because he's here. I realize it is an expense to National Milk, expert witness, I'm sure. But, you know, all of our time is -- is -- Mr. English's time is expensive I'm sure, Mr. Rosenbaum. My time is not.

MR. ENGLISH: Your Honor, I'm not -- okay. It's a whole lot better to have him here. I can certainly try to consult, you know, remotely and do the best I can.

I -- I just assure you that when you start talking about estimated price elasticities using something in the neighborhood of 25 or 30 studies and analyzing, for instance, you know, averages, medians, standard deviations, concepts of what this data means, and how it



2.

2.0

2.1

is applied, it is probably the most dense material we are going to discuss at this hearing. And there's going to be other witnesses to talk about it, and we certainly will let National Milk know when those witnesses, you know, are going to appear.

THE COURT: Well, I think everyone's going to -MR. ENGLISH: And I want to emphasize, yes, I -- I
agree. And, listen, I am very grateful for everything
National Milk has done to prepare. It's just a reality
that -- as opposed to last night, Mr. Rosenbaum and I both
preparing for witnesses on Issue 2 having to do with the
price surveys, and at a minimum one of us would have gone
off entirely into this area. And I did not do that at
all.

So if we end up -- and, again, I appreciate

National Milk as a gesture of good faith saying, put him

after lunch. I'm just saying that I am at a disadvantage.

And, yes, it's a disadvantage based upon the nature of how
all this works, but it is the reality of what we did last
night.

And, again, it is not intended in any way,

Ms. Hancock, to reflect -- you know, we're moving as fast
as we can.

But the idea that sometime in the last ten days, when I have worked every single hour I can, I mean, I -- and I'm not unique. I'm not claiming I'm unique. I'm getting at best three or four hours sleep. And there is not another moment in the day to have said, okay, I'm



2.

2.1

going to look at this testimony when I don't think it's going on, is the problem.

You know, I -- I do think, you know, the question is, can he come another time? I realize he flew down. That's -- you know, I get it. Maybe there's something we can do about that. But, I mean, the reality is this hearing isn't going to be over until the end of September, and there may be another day. And I -- I can absolutely guarantee that if he's on another day, the examination by me will be at least half as long, if not -- you know, it's just a reality.

And not only that, but focused, the record, trying to understand all of this stuff. I -- I'd just try to, you know, consider. And I don't know whether we can go off the record and National Milk can consult with Mr. Kaiser, and we can talk about the expense of his flight or something like that. I don't have authority to offer that, but, I mean, I'm trying to think of something that's a compromise that works for everybody.

MR. HILL: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Rosenbaum.

MR. HILL: To the extent that --

THE COURT: I'm sorry, Mr. Hill. Let's not have the record reflect the wrong speaker. That would be Mr. Hill speaking right now.

MR. HILL: Yes. To the extent that the witness will be heard today --

THE COURT: Yes.



2.

2.0

2.1

MR. HILL: -- I'm not sure of the efficacy of waiting until after lunch because it seems to me at that point we're just eliminating part of the time that he would be able to be cross-examined. So if the witness were to be heard this morning, and then maybe again, there's a break at lunchtime at which people can gather their thoughts and recall the witness after some period of time, it seems to me that that would be a better solution than just waiting until the afternoon and eliminating two or three hours that a person -- that he could be crossed, so --

THE COURT: Well, I mean -- I mean, we're -- I take AMS's thoughts into account here. We're really doing this to inform the decisionmaker at USDA, which I guess you represent. And I do think that it seems to me everyone has been operating in good faith and doing their best under trying -- trying circumstances.

What would it take to bring Dr. Kaiser back, Ms. Hancock?

MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, I don't know. This is -- what I have been told is that this is the day that he has to testify.

I will note two things. One, the substantive testimony that he has is four pages long. Four pages. Yesterday, MIG's economist testified as to price inelasticity. If I just use Dr. Kaiser as a rebuttal witness or a surrebuttal witness to MIG's economist that testified yesterday, which, frankly, is going -- she said



2.

2.0

2.1

the exact same thing that Dr. Kaiser is going to say, in that fluid milk is inelastic -- or the price of fluid milk is inelastic. But if I'm using him to address what she said yesterday, I didn't have to even tell them last night, exactly what they have done to me every morning where I get a testimony in the morning, and they use it as a rebuttal testimony.

They have blown this up to be something far beyond what it is. This is a professor who is going to testify on price inelasticity. Their own economist testified about that yesterday. Mr. English just told you that he has other witnesses that are going to testify about this. This is not a new issue for them. This isn't a big surprise issue that they haven't had time to talk about with their economist or other witnesses. They have already talked about it because she testified about it yesterday, and they have other witnesses coming.

I do think that Mr. Hill's suggestion about putting his direct testimony on before lunch and giving them the lunch hour to prepare for a cross-examination, that's more time than I've had to prepare for their cross-examination of their rebuttal witnesses. We're going to continue to face this throughout the hearing. And I just think that this has been used as somewhat of a red herring for an issue that doesn't exist.

THE COURT: Okay.

Mr. English, rebuttal witness.

MR. ENGLISH: Not exactly, your Honor, because he



2.

2.0

2.1

was presented as being a substantive witness, as I mentioned. It appeared to be the Class I issue, which is Issue 5.

I do note that, you know, it may be that the statement in principle is four pages, but there's an appendix that is page 9 that is Econometric Output for Farm to Retail Price Transmissions. That page by itself, you know, variable coefficient, standard error, t-statistic, probability, C, LOG(T), I mean, R-squared, you know, that page is what's really going to be an issue here, so saying it's just a mere four pages.

I do not think it is the same thing as a rebuttal witness because it is their case in chief for Issue 5, and Issue 5 is the Class I differentials. If it had said components in it somewhere, I would have read it differently. Again, everybody -- I -- I don't want to -- you know, to undercut -- because I certainly don't want to change these off-the-record conversations about who is coming. I just think that this is a different scale, a different scope.

And, you know, again, sure, you could put him on before lunch and then he might get done today, but it is still not going to be the kind of clear record I think we really need. And I still think we have been, you know, put under an unfortunate -- and if unintended -- difficult situation that is just really hard for us -- it is just really big testimony on issues.

And as I say, you read it, it says -- critical



2.

2.1

sentence on page 3: "How would increasing the Class I price differential impact retail fluid milk demand?" I read that sentence. I said to myself, aha, they posted it early, but it is for Issue 5. I did not expect it to come up now.

THE COURT: Yes, Ms. Hancock.

MS. HANCOCK: And, your Honor, that's ridiculous. We have been talking this last week and a half, or however long it's been, everything that we have heard from Mr. Rosenbaum and Mr. English when they put their witnesses on, is how the components are increasing Class I prices. That's exactly what we're talking about in the component issue. Almost every one of the proposals that -- that National Milk is putting forth is going to increase Class I prices. We do want our expert witness to go on in front of all of that. That's what we're entitled to have.

There -- if -- if inelasticity of Class I prices didn't matter for components, then why did MIG's economist testify yesterday that it was inelastic? That he read one sentence in a -- in a -- in the expert's report and he thought it was going to go on later, we posted it the first week. It was one of the first testimonies that we put into the record.

THE COURT: I do think the topic of price elasticity has come up. The whole idea about what happens if you raise the allowance, what people can absorb, things like that. I don't know what's in this testimony exactly.



2.

2.1

It has come up in this first section of the thing.

I would ask you -- well, would -- AMS says it's ready to go. We could have AMS go before you all, if that helps. Does it help to have the witness testify in the morning so you could hear what he says and have -- and I'm willing to take two hours for lunch to give you a little more time.

Does -- what's better for you, Mr. English, and, you, Mr. Rosenbaum?

To have this witness come on in the morning?

Apparently he can't come on tomorrow.

I am struggling with the idea this witness can only -- there's only one day of seven weeks that this witness can testify for.

MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, I -- I try to be reasonable and compromise when I can. I'm not going to compromise on this one because the only compromise that makes sense is that he comes back another day.

I mean, Mr. English points out this witness is presenting a very complicated analysis, elasticity. It has, as Mr. English pointed out, tremendously complex computations, which are not the sort of thing that I have an independent background to be able, over lunch, to prepare to examine someone on.

I'm -- and I'm not suggesting that this was intentional on the part of National Milk --

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. ROSENBAUM: -- but I am suggesting that we had



2.

2.1

a specific exchange of information, and I didn't prepare.

And I don't -- I don't have with me the people I need to prepare.

THE COURT: So I have got to make some kind of decision here. Would you prefer this -- if we go ahead with this witness before lunch or after lunch, better for you, Mr. English and Mr. Rosenbaum?

And I think from now on, if people can remind me, at the end of the day we'll talk about which witnesses are coming up when. I -- I would prefer not to -- it's great that you all -- when you all can work out things amongst yourselves. It is hard for me to come in after the fact.

MR. ENGLISH: Well, your Honor, I'm going to -I'm going to answer your question two ways.

First, I'm going to agree with Mr. Rosenbaum that I don't think I can compromise and that I think that we are really prejudiced -- and, again, not intentionally -- but we are prejudiced in a permanent way for being able to prepare properly. The idea that we can do so over lunch means we can prepare a little bit, but we can't prepare completely.

My second answer to the question is, you know, obviously if the idea is that we need to get him on and off the stand today because he's only here today -- and we have yet to hear, it seems to me, on the record or off the record, why he can't be here sometime in September, which I think is a critical question that has not been addressed.



2.

2.1

I will say that if we're going to do it, sure, and it started in the morning, give us more time at lunch.

But I will not waive what I view to be an objection -that is our objection of permanent prejudice, because we
just don't have the resources, having prepared the way we
have, to cross-examine this witness properly at this time.

Again, it is absolutely not a claim in any way, shape, or form that National Milk or its counsel have done anything but operate in good faith. I accept absolutely the -- just the -- that's fine.

THE COURT: Well, it is not like you asked them, you know, when is Dr. Kaiser coming on, either, right?

MR. ENGLISH: No, because I made -- and I made an assumption. Is the assumption on me? That's -- yeah, that's my fault. But I think it was a reasonable assumption and --

THE COURT: Tell me again why that was a reasonable assumption. I just -- I mean, I just have not been involved --

MR. ENGLISH: We're going to be talking about elasticity a lot during this hearing, but in terms of actual experts who would know about it, to the extent that there is testimony coming about those, the most reasonable time for them to come, as is stated on page 3 of his testimony, is about the Class I differential, because that's the biggest increase, and that's what he said in his statement.

THE COURT: And you are saying that that's really



2.

2.1

a part of a later proposal?

2.

2.0

2.1

MR. ENGLISH: It is really part of Issue 5. And, yes, Issue 1 is about increasing. Issue 4 is about increasing. But Issue 5 is where the biggest price increase is. And it's where he said you can -- you know, increasing Class I differentials. He didn't say increasing Class I prices; he said increasing Class I differentials. So my reasonable inference as a lawyer who has been doing this for 38 years was that that's going to come up in Issue 5.

And so I do think the one thing that is missing in this record today is an explanation of why he can't come in September. Which, okay, not Friday the 1st, but the 5th, the 6th, the 7th, the 11th, the 12th, the 13th, the 14th, etcetera. And that's missing in this record.

THE COURT: Mr. Miltner.

MR. MILTNER: Your Honor, I realize that my clients are not primary proponents in this proceeding, but we do have three. And although I have had conversations with counsel for most of the participants in this room, and it's been cordial and collegial, I have overheard conversations about which witnesses are coming on each day. I have not been part of those as a regular basis, and perhaps going forward I should be.

My economist has not been able to be here the first two weeks of the hearing due to an issue -- an unexpected issue that's arisen. And so as Ms. Hancock noted, when -- especially when you have rebuttal



witnesses, that testimony comes out, and we deal with it that morning. And we deal with it as we are able to with the personnel that we have.

Both Mr. Rosenbaum and Mr. English do have economists, either on staff or associated with them, who can work with these statements as they are filed, and I understand that they are not here and available today.

I think the issue as to whether Dr. Kaiser is able to come in September is one that we should answer. However, if today is the only day on which he can be available, we have all been in this position before where we have to do examination or cross-examination under less than ideal circumstances.

And given that both IDFA and MIG have economists of their own, if they feel that there is a hole that they haven't been able to address on cross-examination, they certainly have the ability to put those expert economists on, who are very capable individuals, to point out the issues that they might not have been able to tease out on cross-examination. And I don't want that point to be left off the record. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Hancock, Dr. Kaiser can leave his teaching post and come back here at a later time. I realize that's an expense and an imposition on you all.

I'm trying to develop -- and I'm trying to develop the best record we can for the Department of Agriculture, or AMS, and I just want it to be as thorough and as well



2.

2.0

2.1

done as possible. Although I'm influenced by AMS not wanting to take a position here. I come back to them.

But go ahead, Ms. Hancock.

MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, I appreciate that. It has been repeatedly communicated to me and confirmed that he is not available to come back. So today is his day that he can testify, and if he can't testify today, then we're not able to bring him back here to testify. He is a professor, and he has classes. This is the start of the school year. And that's -- that's the information that we have been given.

Your Honor, I think it's important to note that Mr. Miltner's right, the conversations have only occurred between Mr. Rosenbaum and Mr. English and me, and to the extent that AMS is involved, them as well, where we have tried to do this. It's only been a courtesy that we have -- that we have offered. And we have really tried to be as professional and courteous as we can.

What we have not heard them address is the fact that a couple of days ago I told them that he was going on this week. It was only last night that I didn't reconfirm it. But I had already told them that he was going on this week.

This is not new information. This is information that they have had. When I had my computer earlier, I have a list right on my computer of the order of witnesses that we're going in. We have taken their witnesses, MIG's and IDFA's witnesses, out of order because they have said



2.

2.1

that those are the only days they could go on. The two producers, one from Hood and one from Shehadey, we put both of them on on Tuesday because that was the day that they had to go on and go off.

We put Mr. Brown on before them because they wanted to make sure that Mr. Brown testified before their two producers. So we paused the presentation of our case and our proposal, and we allowed them to do that, because that accommodated their schedule. I did not grill them on whether their witnesses could come at another time or ask them about what their personal schedules were, why they couldn't come back at another time.

We have been more than accommodating to their witnesses and their schedules. In fact, your Honor, we have now burned 45 minutes of this time they could have been getting ready. I mean, this is time that they could have been getting ready instead of going back and forth. We get zero time to prepare. There is not even as many hours left in the evening as what we're offering to give them. This 45 minutes that we have already burned, you have offered them two hours at lunch, and they are saying, I'm not willing to compromise.

Frankly, your Honor, it is not their decision to compromise or not. We didn't have to give them notice. We did it as a courtesy. I will continue to extend them the professional courtesy because that's the way that I practice law, and I think that that's the way it should be practiced. But they are literally biting the hand that



2.

2.0

2.1

just fed them that courtesy because I didn't have to extend it to them. But the one time that I misstepped, in one fraction of a moment, now they are just coming at me and -- and they have --

THE COURT: Well, Ms. Hancock, in fairness to you, they could have asked you, too, like, who is up next, right? I take it you are not saying they asked you, and you didn't tell them.

MS. HANCOCK: And I told them when we -- they already started the conversation yesterday when I talked. I wasn't even in the conversation initially. And then I joined in late, and I asked -- I didn't have my computer with me, which is where I keep my list. And I didn't have the list memorized. I leaned over Ms. Taylor's shoulder and said, who did you have us down for tomorrow? And it was all of our barrel witnesses, and I said, oh, yeah, that's right. And then I said, well, then we're going to need more witnesses. I didn't have my computer in front of me. I mean --

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. HANCOCK: -- I'm just not infallible. Your
Honor --

THE COURT: No. If this system counts on any of us, including your Honor here, being infallible, we are in deep, deep trouble, so --

MS. HANCOCK: I do agree that maybe perhaps at the end of each evening we could put on the witnesses that we're going to call officially --



2.

2.0

2.1

THE COURT: Well, I think we're going to have to do that, yeah.

MS. HANCOCK: And I --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Let me talk, just so we don't have two people at -- you don't have to sit down.

You can -- you can continue to talk to me. I don't -- I'm not telling you you have to stop.

But, I mean, the last thing I want to do is discourage cordial relations, you know -- cordial is not even the right word -- professional, cooperative interactions between counsel. I think we're really counting on that to get through this hearing. I don't -- definitely do not want to discourage that. And I don't want to have to be a part of every conversation among counsel as to witness scheduling, either. And there are going to be glitches here.

And I think -- I still don't understand why a -- seven weeks of witness testimony, he can't come back for one day?

MS. HANCOCK: Well, your Honor, he's not in the dairy industry -- this is not --

THE COURT: I understand.

MS. HANCOCK: He doesn't have a stake in this.

And so he's a professor. He has a full-time job. And so we have coordinated for him to be here today. I did notify the other parties of that earlier in the week. And it was only yesterday that I didn't reiterate it for them.

THE COURT: Yeah. But, I mean, I take it you are



2.

2.0

2.1

| 1 | paying him. He's an expert witness. He took on a |
|----|--|
| 2 | MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, I didn't ask any of the |
| 3 | other parties why Hood or Shehadey, who actually has a |
| 4 | vested interest in the outcome of this hearing and are |
| 5 | participating as actual participants in this hearing, why |
| 6 | they couldn't come at another time. |
| 7 | THE COURT: Yeah. But I take it you didn't feel |
| 8 | severely disadvantaged by putting those witnesses up at |
| 9 | that time either, whereas I'm hearing from Mr. English and |
| 10 | Mr. Rosenbaum that they are disadvantaged. |
| 11 | MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor oh, okay. Well, he |
| 12 | just wanted me to make clear he's not being paid for this, |
| 13 | so |
| 14 | DR. KAISER: I'm not being paid to testify. |
| 15 | THE COURT: You are not being paid, Dr. Kaiser. |
| 16 | DR. KAISER: I am not. I'm doing it pro bono. My |
| 17 | expenses are covered. That's it. |
| 18 | THE COURT: Well, I'm not sure that I'm not |
| 19 | sure what to make of that. |
| 20 | MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, we |
| 21 | THE COURT: I guess I it's very admirable of |
| 22 | you, Dr. Kaiser, to be willing to do this for free, I |
| 23 | think, and help inform the record. I sure think it's |
| 24 | appropriate that we get your views on the record. |
| 25 | All right. Tell you what AMS, do you have |
| 26 | anything really, this is for again, we're trying to |
| 27 | develop a record for HSDA here And I know people think |



28

I've got more decisional ability perhaps than I have and

all that. I'm just sort of calling balls and strikes to try to develop a record on which someone else can make a decision here. So I'll take any suggestions you have -- or I mean, I will hear any suggestions you have.

MR. HILL: Right. From our perspective we want as much information on the record as we can get. And if he's only available today, we need to have him on today to hear what he has to say.

And I -- we will point out that the rules that we have for testimony have changed a little bit for this hearing in terms of how quickly people get the information that's on the website and so forth. And in years past, and in hearings past, that wasn't even available. People came up with their testimony on the day of, and you had to do it -- whatever you had to do to tease out of that witness what you could at the time.

So from our perspective we need to get this witness on as soon as possible so that we can get the best record that we can possibly attain.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Okay. I mean, this is difficult. I think, again -- is it better -- if I'm going to say that this witness should appear today, which I am, is it better that we take this morning or put him on this afternoon, Mr. English and Mr. Rosenbaum? I realize you are under difficult circumstances, but would you rather have him in the morning and -- would AMS be willing to go first?



2.

2.0

2.1

MR. HILL: As I said before, your Honor, we would

like to take him early and then have cross this afternoon. 1 2. I mean, you know, we can take a long lunch for that, but it doesn't seem efficacious to us to have him wait until 3 4 the afternoon because that just -- it -- it actually cuts off an opportunity for cross-examination. So if we could 5 have a little bit of extra time maybe, as your Honor has 6 7 stated before, that would be perfectly fine with us. And 8 if we -- if you want us to go first, I suppose that USDA would do that as well. 9 10 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. English, Mr. Rosenbaum, 11 what do you think? I mean, we could take an hour off this 12 morning too. I mean, I hate to do that. 13 MR. ENGLISH: Your Honor, without waiving our 14 objection, and understanding what you are saying, and 15 appreciating that Dr. Kaiser has come on his own, 16 effectively -- you know, we're not trying to inconvenience 17 I want to be very clear about that but --18 THE COURT: That is sort of a telling point, isn't 19 it? 2.0 MR. ENGLISH: Well, I mean, a little -- it is. On 2.1 the other hand --22 THE COURT: I mean --23 MR. ENGLISH: On the other hand, it doesn't change 24 the prejudice to us. THE COURT: No. I understand. 25 26 MR. ENGLISH: So, you know, having said that and 27 without waiving our objection, you know, obviously -- you



28

know, I can't say that if he's going to be an all-day

anyway because I think at some point there's only so much I can do without the lack of preparation. But, you know, clearly, putting him on sooner, you know, and then giving us whatever opportunity we have at lunch -- and I'm not going to say that an hour and a half is actually going to make a difference and all of that. But, you know, obviously putting him on sooner is more likely to get him finished, because I think the one risk is if you put him after lunch, he doesn't get finished, and then we have the same problem we have anyway.

And I'm -- you know, I'm not going to say I know how long the cross-exam is going to go because I haven't had a chance to prepare. I have been pretty good at trying to prepare for cross-examination, and as a result, making it pretty efficient.

THE COURT: You have argued that the more time you had to prepare, the shorter the cross would be. I understand that, too.

MR. ENGLISH: Yeah, and that is not going to happen today, so I just cannot predict.

So, by definition, again, without waiving our objection about prejudice -- and I understand AMS's position about information in the record. I think there is a caveat to that. Information in the record that is efficiently presented and understood is better than just information in the record without that parenthetical attached to it.

I'm going to stop, you know, arguing about all of



2.

2.1

| 1 | this is. I think you I do want to point out that |
|----|--|
| 2 | whatever we've done with the 45 minutes, the point is that |
| 3 | when we're in the hearing room, we're paying attention, |
| 4 | very close attention to the witness, and preparing |
| 5 | cross-examination for that witness. So when other |
| 6 | witnesses are on the stand, we don't have an opportunity |
| 7 | to prepare. So that does go to the point of probably |
| 8 | putting him on sooner. |
| 9 | THE COURT: Should we postpone I forget where |
| 10 | we are on this witness. Where are we on this witness? |
| 11 | MS. TAYLOR: Cross. |
| 12 | THE COURT: Cross. Do we want to interrupt this |
| 13 | witness and put Dr. Kaiser on? |
| 14 | MS. TAYLOR: That's fine. |
| 15 | MS. HANCOCK: That's fine, your Honor. We're fine |
| 16 | with that. |
| 17 | THE COURT: What do people think? All right. |
| 18 | That gives us some more time. |
| 19 | Mr. Rosenbaum. |
| 20 | MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, I, in candor, don't |
| 21 | think this choice is meaningful. |
| 22 | THE COURT: Uh-huh. |
| 23 | MR. ROSENBAUM: And to the concerns that I you |
| 24 | know, that I identified. And I'm not relying upon when |
| 25 | I predicted Dr. Kaiser was going to testify, based upon |
| 26 | what issue he was covering, and although I agree with |



27

28

Class I -- and we have a section that's devoted to Class I

Mr. English, I would have predicted he would come on

differentials. His testimony explicitly is addressing raising Class I differentials. So my expectation was certainly the same as Mr. English's. But what I was relying upon was a specific discussion yesterday as to who was going to be called.

And AMS is right, that they have established certain additional procedures here. But I have been doing this a long time, and it has been the practice of revealing who your witnesses are going to be for the next day. That goes back well before the procedures that AMS published here.

And I just -- you know, I continue to be of the view that we're prejudiced --

THE COURT: No, your objection is preserved, and I understand.

I think we have to do the best we can here, and we'll be more careful -- all of us will be more careful going forward so everyone knows better what witnesses are coming up. But I think we got the witness here. We better use it -- use the time we have, do the best we can with it. So that's where we are.

So I think we will -- I hate to interrupt this witness --

DR. VITALIANO: Not a problem, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

So, Dr. Kaiser, ready to go then?

Do I have his testimony? Let's go quickly as we can to get as much in as possible.



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27



Ο.

- A. No, I'm not. My expenses, just my business -- travel expenses.
- Q. Okay. Could you provide for us some of your professional background, starting with your education after high school?
- A. Yes. I went to the University of Wisconsin at Eau Claire as an undergraduate from 1975 to 1979, where I majored in economics and history. And then I did my Master's and my Ph.D. at the University of Minnesota Twin Cities from 1979 to 1985.
 - Q. What was your specialty?
 - A. Agricultural and applied economics.
- Q. And can you talk about your professional career after you graduated with your Ph.D.?
 - A. Yes. My entire professional career spans
 38 years, I started in 1985, all at Cornell University. I
 took a sabbatical leave from Cornell in 1994, '95, where I
 was at the University of Minnesota for a year and half
 time at Land O'Lakes Dairy Cooperative.
 - Q. And what was your role in the private sector?
 - A. My role was, basically, to act as kind of a -- one of their applied researchers, and I was given a couple of different projects to research, including the futures market which was brand new to dairy at the time, and how we -- and how Land O'Lakes could go about hedging using the futures markets.
 - Q. And have you published any articles or been involved in any other programs related to the dairy



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

industry?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

28

- A. Can you -- related to the dairy industry, did you say, or not related?
 - Q. Related to the dairy industry.
- A. Yes. I have published -- I have published 150 journal articles that -- those are peer reviewed, since 1985, and I would guesstimate that about a third of those, maybe -- yeah, a third of those are all related to the dairy industry, specifically dairy policy and dairy marketing issues.
- Q. Okay. And did you participate in the dairy promotion program?
- A. Yes, I did. From -- for -- for a period of 11 or 12 years, I performed the independent economic evaluation for the Dairy and the Fluid Milk Acts, which is the dairy farmer and the fluid milk processor checkoff programs.

 That is -- that analysis is required every year under -- under the Farm Bill. And I -- and I did that for, I think it was like 12 years.

Prior to that, by the way, I worked with officials from AMS as well as ERS USDA on developing a model that they adopted, and then they finally just said, why don't you -- why don't you do it for us, and they hired me to do that.

- O. And what was --
- A. And that -- oh, go ahead.
- 27 | O. No, go ahead and finish.
 - A. And I think it was a -- relatively speaking, it



was probably like 12 years that I did that.

- Q. Okay. What was the timeframe for that?
- A. I think I stopped doing it about ten years ago.
- So I -- the 12 years prior to whatever -- 2013, 2014.
 - Q. What type of modeling was it?
- A. It was an econometric model and the -- basically the -- the bottom line, the key thing that they wanted was a return on investment for both dairy farmers and fluid milk processors.
- Q. Okay. Specific to the dairy industry?
- 11 A. Specific to the dairy industry. More specific to 12 the -- to their promotion effort and -- and the way they 13 are spending their money.
 - Q. And I think you said it was for both the dairy farmers and for the processors?
 - A. Yes, that is correct. Originally it was just for the dairy farmers, and then the last five years, they added my evaluation to include the Fluid Act, which I think is the name of the fluid processor program.
 - Q. Okay?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

- MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, I would offer Dr. Kaiser as an expert in agricultural economics and consumer demand analysis.
- THE COURT: Yes, I find that he's qualified to testify as an expert on those matters.
- MS. HANCOCK: Thank you, your Honor.
- 27 BY MS. HANCOCK:
 - Q. Dr. Kaiser, did you prepare testimony in support



1 of National Milk's five proposals? 2. Α. Yes, I did. And has that been identified as Exhibit NMPF-48? 3 Ο. Yes, it is. 4 Α. MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, for identification 5 purposes, can we mark this as Exhibit 115, please? 6 7 THE COURT: So marked. 8 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 115 was marked for identification.) 9 10 MS. HANCOCK: Thank you. BY MS. HANCOCK: 11 12 Ο. Dr. Kaiser, would you mind providing us with your 13 testimony? 14 Α. Sure. 15 Ο. Thank you. 16 I think I'll skip the first paragraph since I Α. 17 think we just talked about my credentials. 18 So the focus of my testimony is on the expected 19 impacts of milk product demand accompanying regulated 2.0 price changes. The price elasticity of demand for milk is 2.1 inelastic, which means that consumers are not very 22 sensitive to adjusting their purchases in response to 23 price changes. 24 A price elasticity basically measures the 25 percentage change in demand given a 1% change in price. 26 Technically, any elasticity that is lower in absolute



27

28

value than 1.0 indicates that the demand is relatively

price inelastic since changing the price by 1% is less

than -- will result in less than a 1% change in quantity demanded. When firms have control over price setting, they will strive to raise the price when the current price is in the inelastic range of a demand since doing so will result in a higher percentage increase in the price than the corresponding percentage decrease in quantity and, therefore, revenue will increase.

The overwhelming majority of empirical studies that have measured the price elasticity of demand for milk have found it to be inelastic. For instance, I constructed a table based on 38-peer-reviewed studies that have measured the price elasticity of demand for milk at the retail level, and the average estimated elasticity indicates that a 1% increase in the retail price of milk would cause, on average, a 0.35% decrease in per capita quantity demanded, when you hold all other demand drivers constant.

More on that later because what I'm going to argue in my testimony is that these other demand drivers are much more important than the retail price.

The median elasticity from these 38 studies is even smaller than that. Specifically a 1% increase in price reduces per capita quantity demanded by 0.2%. In other words, half of the 38 studies finds that the price elasticity is less than 0.2, and the other half of them find that the elasticity is bigger higher than 0.2 in absolute value.

It's also important to note that these studies



2.

2.1

span 60 years and have consistently shown the same result, the price inelastic nature of milk.

In my Table 1 in my testimony, this does not list all researched studies of milk demand price elasticity, but they do represent the overwhelming bulk of published peer-reviewed studies. The finding that milk demand is inelastic is consistent with the use of classified pricing that charges the highest regulated price for milk utilized in Class I products while charging lower prices for milk used for more price elastic manufactured dairy products.

Of the 38 studies cited in my testimony, only one study, the study by Davis, et al., in 2012, estimated milk to be price elastic. The researchers reported in that study a 1% increase in the retail price would cause milk quantity demanded to decrease by 1.66 -- 1.63%, in other words, that's -- that's a finding of an inelastic price elasticity.

However, the 37 remaining studies all found milk to have a price inelastic demand ranging as low as practically zero, minus .003 by a study that my research associate and I did in 2008, to a high of minus .873, a study by Aviola and Capps in 2010.

I think a natural question is, why is demand for milk inelastic? Milk is considered a staple good in that milk -- milk buyers regularly consume it, usually in the same amount regardless of the price level. For regular milk consumers, milk is considered more of a necessity than a luxury, which explains why consumers are not very



2.

2.1

sensitive to price changes. They regularly buy milk and do not significantly alter their purchases when the price changes.

For non-milk consumers, which are also part of the market, such as vegans, people who are lactose-intolerant, or people who simply do not drink milk, the price of milk has no impact on their decisions on whether or not to consume it. For example, for people who practice a vegan diet, the price of milk could be zero and they still would not consume it.

The net result is that for people ranging from those who consume a lot of milk to those consuming little or no milk, price is not much of a deciding factor in their purchase decision.

In addition, other economic demand drivers, such as the price of substitutes and the price of complementary products to milk have been found to not have a large impact on milk demand. You may have heard of this as the cross-price elasticity of demand. That's what economists technically refer that to.

And as an example, that same study that my research associate and I did in 2008, we estimated that the most important substitute product for milk at that time is bottled -- was bottled water and that a 1% increase in the price of bottled water would cause a .32% increase in the demand for milk, holding other demand drivers constant. In other words, bottled water was the most important substitute at that time for fluid milk.



2.

2.0

2.1

Most empirical studies on milk demand have also shown that the own and the cross-price elasticities of milk demand are inelastic. In other words, changing the price of beverage options up or down does not proportionately impact milk consumption up or down.

Another way to demonstrate how unimportant price changes are in terms of driving milk demand, consider the fact that the real price of milk relative to all goods and services in the United States economy has fallen by 7% since 2013. So the price of milk -- the real price of milk relative to the -- to all goods and services in the economy has fallen since -- by 7% since 2013.

That means that milk has become less expensive to purchase relative to other goods and services in the economy since 2013. Yet during that same time period, per capita milk consumption actually decreased by 18.3%. That is even though the price of milk has decreased relative to other products, per capita demand has decreased since 2013.

Of course, there are other demand drivers that help explain this decline, but if the price of milk was actually elastic, one would expect the 7% decrease in the real milk price to have resulted in an increase in milk demand over that time period, not an 18.3% decrease. This is just illustrative of the unimportance of the retail price when it comes to driving demand for milk.

Well, what -- a natural question then is, what has caused the steady decline in per capita milk demand over



2.

2.1

time? There are at least three reasons that I can think of for this, and they do not include the retail price of milk.

First, the beverage market has become increasingly competitive with many new products introduced over time. In the distant past -- in fact, I remember when I started at Cornell in 1985, milk lost significant market share to soda. More recently, bottled water, sports drinks, and, of course, more recently, plant-based milk products have taken tremendous market share away from milk. The steady downward trend in per capita milk sales, in large part, has been due to milk drinkers switching to these alternative beverages.

Second, another cause of declining per capita milk consumption has been the increasing trend in food consumed away from home. Food consumed away from home would include restaurants, convenience stores, buying beverages anywhere outside the home. As people consume more food away from home, fluid milk consumption may be diminished by the lack of availability of many varieties of fluid milk products at restaurants as well as other establishments, as well as the expanding availability of other products that compete with milk.

Many eating establishments carry only one type, if any, of fluid milk, which causes some people who would normally drink fluid milk to consume a different beverage if the preferred fluid milk product is not available away from home.



2.

2.1

Between 2013 -- between 2013 and 2019, prior to COVID, the trend in food consumed away from home as measured in food expenditures away from home increased by 34%. These expenditures decreased significantly during COVID, but were still 15.4% higher in 2021 -- the most recent year of data that I found -- than in 2013. So clearly, consumers are spending more and more money over time on food and beverages that are consumed away from home. Thus, the increase in food consumed away from home appears to be responsible for some of this decrease in fluid milk consumption -- in per capita fluid milk consumption.

Finally, an important demographic change causing a decrease in milk demand is the proportion of young children in the population, which is lower than it was in 2013. Since young children are one of the largest fluid milk-consuming cohorts, any decline in that cohort negatively impacts average per capita fluid milk consumption for the United States.

Between 2010 and 2021, the proportion of the population under 19 years of age in the U.S. fell from 26.9% to 24.8%, which represents almost an 8% decline in the youngest cohort of our population. Therefore, there is a positive relationship between per capita fluid milk consumption and the age cohort; both have declined.

How would increasing the Class I price differential or the Class I price impact the retail fluid milk demand? National Milk Producers Federation's



2.

2.1

proposal recommends a nationwide increase in the Class I price differential by an average of almost \$1.50 per hundredweight. At current Class I prices -- and current -- I mean, when I was writing this testimony a month ago -- this represented approximately an 8.6% increase in the Class I price.

To translate the Class I price increase to the retail level, we need an estimate of a price transmission from the farm price to the retail price. So if you increase the farm price, what does that do to the retail price?

Based on monthly Class I and retail price data, from 2013 through May of 2023, I estimated -- and that's the last page that was referred to in my testimony -- that a 1% change in the Class I price would cause a .55% change in the same direction in the retail price for milk products.

By the way, this has -- this has been found by other people that, roughly, the farm value of the -- of the -- of milk -- the milk price is roughly around 50%. So this is -- this is much in line with what -- what the empirical evidence shows.

Based on this estimate, an 8.6% increase in the Class I price, then, would result in a 4.7% increase in the retail price for milk products. Okay? So if -- if the Class I price is increased by 8.7%, the retail price would -- would increase over time by about 4.7%.

Based on the average retail price elasticity of



2.

2.0

2.1

the 38 studies that I computed, that is .35, a 4.7% increase in the retail price would cause per capita fluid milk demand to decrease by 1.6%.

Alternatively, using the smaller median retail price elasticity of demand, which is .2 -- not .37, but .2 -- a 4.7% increase in the retail milk price would cause per capita fluid milk demand to decrease by just under 1%, .9%. Using either estimate, the decrease in demand would be substantially lower than the percentage increase in the Class I price and, therefore, would increase gross revenues to dairy farmers.

In summary, practically all studies that have measured the price elasticity of demand for milk has found it to be inelastic. Likewise, many of these studies have found the cross-price elasticities of demand for milk substitutes to be inelastic.

These results -- these results suggest that increasing the Class I price by increasing Class I differentials will increase gross revenues to dairy farmers while not having a significantly negative impact on milk sales volume.

These insights are essential to validating the ongoing justification or rationale for establishing higher minimum Class -- minimum prices for Class I milk. The underlying economic rationale hinges on two factors: One is the higher cost of serving Class I processors; the second relates to the economic argument that setting a higher price for the most inelastic use of milk will



2.

2.0

2.1

result in higher gross revenue to dairy farmers, even if there is consequent lower prices for other uses of milk as markets find new supply and demand equilibria.

It is important to understand clearly that the facts that the consumer -- the fact that the consumer demand for Class I products is price inelastic in no way conflicts with the obvious fact that per capita and total sales of these products have been trending downward over a decade, over the last 20 years, over the last 50 years.

What the research indicates is that those sales trends are one cause by other factors than the price of milk, and two, would exist -- would exist even if minimum Class I prices were lowered. This is not to say that changes in minimum Class I prices would have no impact on sales, but rather that those impacts would be minor in comparison to the other demand drivers for milk.

That concludes my written testimony.

Q. Thank you, Dr. Kaiser.

I just have a couple follow up questions. I think it was yesterday -- what is today, Thursday -- Tuesday we heard testimony from a producer who processes milk or sells milk -- or processes milk in California, and they have a higher protein requirement for their Class I milk in California.

Are you familiar with that requirement?

- A. Yes. And -- and the average retail prices are -- are higher in California because of that.
 - Q. Okay. And he gave an example that if for some --



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

A. Well, that -- that makes obvious sense because there's lower price milk in that market. So if the availability of -- of a big supply of that milk is lower priced, it doesn't -- you know, price arbitrage would mean that they would have to lower their price.

That doesn't mean, though, that the price of -that the demand for milk is inelastic. It just says if
you somehow shock that market with higher priced milk,
that -- that they are going to have to price the milk like
the rest of the market.

- Q. Okay. So would then it make sense if -- if all of the producers had the same requirement for pricing, that that would neutralize that effect?
- A. Exactly. So if you are talking about a national market, for example, that -- that would totally neutralize that.
 - Q. Okay. Thank you.

And you gave three reasons why -- I guess three reasons why you believe Class I milk consumption has declined over the years.

I want to just ask about the third one. You talk about the age demographics of 19 or under. Is that also -- is there any correlation to the consumption of



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

cereal?

2.

2.0

2.1

A. That's a good question. I do not know for a fact that that is true, but I would -- I think that that's a pretty good thing to speculate. I mean, there's -- there's -- there's certainly more of a correlation with young people and milk consumption, drinking milk. But I would also guess that children probably consume -- are bigger consumers of cereal. But I -- I -- that's a little bit of a speculation on my part. But it is certainly true with milk. Certainly true with milk.

And, in fact, if I could just elaborate on that. What I have found over time, over 38 years studying milk demand, is that it used to be 19 years of age, where it was kind of the -- where people really stopped or really significantly reduced their milk consumption. That threshold has come down, and now what we're seeing is the younger cohort being -- stopping, you know, at ten years of age and switching to plant-based milk or -- or substitutes.

So I have -- when I estimate a milk demand function, which I have done a lot over my career, that is always the biggest -- that is the largest demand driver that I have found for milk, and it is the only elastic.

So, for example, we -- we typically see that a 1% increase in the young cohort, be it under 19 or be it under nine years of age, results in an increase in -- in milk demand, per capita milk demand, by over 1%. It is like 1.4% or something like that.



And if you read, for example, the reports to Congress on the dairy evaluation, they estimate fluid milk demand in that study, they include that as a variable -- I started to do that, and my predecessors that took over doing that, from Texas A&M, continue to put that, as well as the trend in away from home, because those are the two most important factors affecting demand over time, and it's basically empirically shown in those studies.

O. Thank you.

2.

2.1

On page 3 of your testimony, in the third full paragraph, the last sentence, you state, "Using either estimate, the decrease in demand would be substantially lower than the increase in the Class I price and would, therefore, increase gross revenues to dairy farmers."

I'm wondering if you can elaborate on that a little bit. As I understand that statement, are you saying that, you know, because if demand decreases at or the same amount or -- it would take away the benefit of the corresponding price increase to dairy farmers because they would not have as much volume to sell?

A. Right. So it -- it's -- it's always -- economics is always a little bit abstract, but it is actually a pretty easy thing to describe. When you have an inelastic -- in this case, a highly inelastic price elasticity, what that literally means is if you increase the price by, say, 10%, you are going to get a much, much smaller percentage decrease in quantity demanded. And since revenues, gross revenues, are price times quantity,



revenues will go up.

2.

2.1

And so -- in fact, I just taught this yesterday to my price analysis class. We like to say, if a firm can set price, and they are -- and they know they are operating at a price that is on -- that's on the inelastic portion of their demand curve, it is optimal for them to raise the price because the revenues will go up by doing so. And so it's as simple as that.

Q. Okay. Thank you.

MS. HANCOCK: I think that's all I have for now. Your Honor, I don't know if there's anybody that has cross-examination questions, but we would submit him for that if anybody wants to examine now, or as we talked about previously, we're happy to bring him back after lunch so that people have an opportunity to spend some time preparing.

THE COURT: I think AMS said they were ready to go.

MR. HILL: Your Honor, I know this is highly irregular, but we have a farmer here who can only be here apparently for the morning. It should be quick, we believe. And so we will do our cross a little bit later. I think -- I think we want to do it after lunch, but we will go first at that point. But we do have a farmer here we would like to get on.

THE COURT: Any objections other than the objections already lodged and preserved?

MR. ENGLISH: We're perfectly clear, dairy farmers



1 go first. So, no, absolutely no objection. 2. MR. ROSENBAUM: This is Steve Rosenbaum for the International Dairy Foods Association. We have a very 3 4 longstanding practice that dairy farmers can come as they are available, and I have never heard an objection to a 5 dairy farmer testifying when they are available. I don't 6 7 view the current witness as falling within that category. That is as to the person that just got through testifying. 8 But the long and short of it is we certainly have no 9 10 objection to the dairy farmer testifying at this time. THE COURT: So ruled. Dairy farmers come first. 11 12 We all think that's important. 13 MS. HANCOCK: Perhaps we could just clarify --14 perhaps if we could just clarify. Are we bringing him 15 back after the dairy farmer, or are we going to bring him 16 back after lunch? 17 MR. HILL: I think after lunch would be our 18 preference. 19 MS. HANCOCK: Okay. Sounds fair. 20 THE COURT: Then we're going to put another 2.1 witness on after the dairy farmer. This is an irregular 22 morning. 23 MS. HANCOCK: Finish Dr. Vitaliano's cross? Okay. 24 THE COURT: We're going to work -- thank you, 25 Doctor. Thank you, Professor. 26 Mr. Miltner. 27 MR. MILTNER: I have one quick ask, and that is



28

that after we complete the dairy farmer, I will have

cross-examination for Dr. Kaiser. There's one or two questions that might take 15 minutes for Dr. Kaiser to go through. And I think if we can have him do that, I hope those questions would help everybody prepare the rest of their cross for this afternoon. So if that -- if we could do that, I really think it would be helpful.

If we can do it now before we put on the farmer, I have no problem doing that.

THE COURT: Well, what do we want to do? I kind of like the idea of something that would -- and you are representing that it would -- that it would clarify cross, I guess no one will know unless they hear it. And it doesn't -- and one or two questions sounds good. I'm inclined to let you do that. I mean, you are representing in good faith that --

What do you think Ms. Hancock? It is your witness.

MS. HANCOCK: If Mr. Miltner is ready to ask these questions, we might as well knock them out now, and we'll still have time for the dairy farmer before lunch.

THE COURT: Does that work for you, AMS?

MR. HILL: As long as the dairy farmer can get on before lunch.

THE COURT: Absolutely.

MR. HILL: He has to leave before lunch.

THE COURT: Dr. Kaiser has resumed the stand.

Mr. Miltner has a couple of questions in service of the record.



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

| | NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING |
|----|---|
| 1 | MR. MILTNER: Thank you. |
| 2 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 3 | BY MR. MILTNER: |
| 4 | Q. For the transcript, my name is Ryan Miltner. I |
| 5 | represent Select Milk Producers. |
| 6 | Dr. Kaiser, my questions are not about the text of |
| 7 | your statement but about the references that appear on |
| 8 | page 5. |
| 9 | A. Okay. |
| 10 | Q. All of the articles and research you cite there, I |
| 11 | have not gone through and matched them up against Table 1, |
| 12 | but do those just correspond with the studies that are |
| 13 | listed in Table 1? |
| 14 | A. That's correct. |
| 15 | Q. Is there anything in the references that's that |
| 16 | is not part of what's referenced in Table 1? |
| 17 | A. No, there is not. |
| 18 | Q. On page 9, and this is where we might take a |
| 19 | little bit of time but your appendix, for those of us |
| 20 | that are not statisticians, can you walk us through what |
| 21 | this shows. |
| 22 | A. Sure. Sure. |
| 23 | So this represents what is technically called a |
| 24 | price transmission. And what a price transmission |
| 25 | measures is how do prices at the farm level get |
| 26 | transmitted to the wholesale, to the retail level. And |
| 27 | this is a farm-to-retail price transmission. |



28

And so it's just a statistical model that tries to

explain the retail price per fluid milk per gallon times 8.6, which is roughly a hundredweight, a hundred pound, as a function of the farm Class I price.

And because this is monthly, a change in the Class I price in one month will have a -- probably have an impact on the retail price, but it takes time. So if you change -- if you increase the Class I price today by say 10%, it might increase the current retail price, but it would take time.

And so I basically looked at this -- and the bottom part of that graph is four months of lags. And so the sum of the lags where it says .54929, that basically means that over a four-month period, a 1% increase in the Class I price would result in a little over a half a percent increase in the retail price. That's the price transmission.

Alternatively, one could just look at and -- look at the average Class I price and the average retail price adjusted on a quantity basis, and you roughly will get something that's in this neighborhood of half a percent.

Q. All of your -- I'm looking at the middle of this appendix here where you have R-squared, adjusted R-squared.

Is that standard error of regression?

A. Yes. Yes. These are all statistical diagnostic measures. The R-squared, quite simply, is 7 -- .74, for example, that means that 74% of the variation in the Class I price and its four lags explains 74% of the



2.

2.1

changes in the retail price for milk. That's what -- it is sometimes referred to as a goodness-of-fit measure.

And that's a very reasonable R-squared.

- Q. And the rest of the measures in there are similar measures of fit?
- A. Yes. They -- they are measures of statistical -- they are statistical diagnostic measures, basically.

But, quite frankly, the reason I did this -- I didn't do this in the first draft. I just took a number like 50 -- and knowing that, for example, in New York State, the retail price for milk cannot be 50% more than the Class I price. I originally just used the number .5 because I needed to translate the proposed Class I price increase into a retail price increase, and that's why I did that. And then later on I found this data, so I just simply ran this regression. So this is really just a way to translate the price -- the -- the \$1.50 increase in the Class I differential to what that would mean in terms of a percentage increase in the retail price.

- Q. Would it be correct then that the information in the appendix, because it relates to the effects on the retail price from a wholesale price increase, it's not -- the data in this appendix does not relate to the elasticity of demand for milk, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Okay.
 - MR. MILTNER: Thank you. That's all I had.

 THE COURT: So we're going to let Dr. Kaiser step



2.1

| 1 | down from the stand, and we're going to bring up dairy |
|----|--|
| 2 | farmer Kevin Krentz. |
| 3 | I'll swear you in. Welcome, Mr. Krentz. Thanks |
| 4 | for coming in. Please raise your right hand. |
| 5 | KEVIN KRENTZ, |
| 6 | Being first duly sworn, was examined and |
| 7 | testified as follows: |
| 8 | THE COURT: Do we have someone filling the role of |
| 9 | direct examiner? |
| 10 | DR. CRYAN: No. Well, not really. I'm just |
| 11 | here I have President Krentz Kevin Krentz is the |
| 12 | president of the Wisconsin Farm Bureau and a dairy farmer. |
| 13 | He's here as a farmer and as the president of the |
| 14 | Wisconsin Farm Bureau. I'm here to facilitate however I |
| 15 | can on behalf of one of our member states. But I I'm |
| 16 | only here to help. |
| 17 | So I think at this point I'll just say, go ahead, |
| 18 | President |
| 19 | THE COURT: Well, let's mark his |
| 20 | DR. CRYAN: Oh, yes. |
| 21 | THE COURT: Go ahead, sir. Let's mark it as an |
| 22 | exhibit for identification. |
| 23 | DR. CRYAN: President Krentz has written |
| 24 | testimony, and we would ask that it be marked for as an |
| 25 | exhibit. I don't know what the next number is. |
| 26 | MR. HILL: 116. |
| 27 | THE COURT: So marked, Exhibit 116. |
| 28 | (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 116 was marked |



for identification.) 1 2. DR. CRYAN: Thank you very much. THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Krentz, you may give your 3 4 statement. Am I pronouncing your name correctly? 5 THE WITNESS: Correct. Yes. 6 You are. 7 THE COURT: Proceed. THE WITNESS: Again, my name is Kevin Krentz. 8 Ι 9 am the president of Wisconsin Farm Bureau, and along with 10 my wife Holly, we milk 600 cows and run 1400 acres in 11 Berlin, Wisconsin. I purchased my father's cows, 60 cows, 12 in 1994 and have been dairy farming since. 13 First, I want to thank USDA for agreeing to 14 hearing these proposals on Federal Milk Marketing Order 15 reform. These changes are long overdue. Midwest farmers 16 are in need of urgent reform, and the proposals supported 17 by the American Farm Bureau will go a long way to 18 restoring balance to a system that has moved away from sustainably supporting producers. 19 2.0 Wisconsin is America's dairyland and, as such, 2.1 have seen some of the greatest market fluctuations in the 22 country. While we can talk about Wisconsin's agriculture 23 diversity, the economy in Wisconsin, the agriculture 24 economy, is driven by the dairy sector. 25 Let's look at the dairy industry in Wisconsin. Tn 26 2018 the last time the Farm Bill was being debated and the



27

28

average-of was adopted, Wisconsin had roughly 8800 dairy

farms. At the beginning of 2023, there was about 6,000

left. That's a loss of about 30%.

2.

2.0

2.1

Milk margins have the lowest level since 2019, and the catastrophic \$4 level on dairy margin cover was also breached for the first time. Changes as a result of the 2018 Farm Bill have cost farmers nationally almost \$1 billion since May of 2020, not to mention inputs remain high and feed costs continue to be increased.

But let's bring that to a community level. A number of years ago, I did analysis on my expenses on my farm, and I found that 62% of my expenses on my farm are spent within a 15-mile radius of my farm. Multiply that by the 6,000 dairy farms in Wisconsin, and that's heavily affected small communities across the state where those dollars are spent over and over.

While the news of farmers dumping milk during the pandemic, and most recently earlier this summer in Western and Southeast Wisconsin, is disheartening, Wisconsin Farm Bureau and American Farm Bureau are supporting several changes that could positively impact dairy farmers.

Wisconsin Farm Bureau is proud to support the following provisions for reform for Federal Order:

Number one, the reform for the dairy pricing formula moving back to the higher of as opposed to the average of Class I mover. This change was made in the 2018 Farm Bill at the request of the stakeholders. The Class I mover was -- on the average of Class III or Class IV has been a terrible impact for dairy farmers and dairy markets. Changes in the market could lead to



similar price misalignments between the Class III and Class IV in the near future, as cheese -- cheese-making capacity grows. This -- these changes are also supported by the American Farm Bureau.

Number two, reducing economic incentives for depooling. Depooling has several negative impacts for farmers. In some cases the manufacturers don't pay into the pool, taking money out of the pockets of dairy farmers. Even when manufacturers do pay the full class price value to their depooled farmers, that creates winners and losers. Some farmers get more, some farmers get less for the same product, which defeats the purpose of Federal Milk Marketing Orders to assure farmers in the market get roughly the same price regardless of what the use is. And this ultimately pits farmer against farmer. It pits neighbor against neighbor.

There's a higher chance of negative PPD producer price differentials. Negative PPDs and depooling create huge risk for farmers who try to hedge on farmer contracts; that is, the relationship between future settlement prices and actual market blend prices is so volatile that it can increase in farmer's risk rather than manage it. This is penalizing farmers for trying to do the right thing to manage their risk.

Many farmers across the state use Dairy Revenue

Protection. And even if they -- even if the Dairy Revenue

Protection product is at class price during that month, a

large negative PPD will drastically throw that -- throw



2.

2.1

that income off for that producer. And I have heard negative PPDs in Wisconsin of negative 7 to \$9 across the state, moving through 2020.

The 2018 Farm Bill switched from the higher-of to the average-of plus \$0.74, further exasperating the disruption and made milk checks more confusing. Leading to another discussion that we need to have is milk check standardization or transparency.

In 2020 alone, over 700 million was lost in the revenue pool, partly due to the formula switch decreasing the payments many farmers are receiving as well as manufacturers' depooling behavior. At first this imbalance was linked to COVID forces; however, the losses in pool value have continued into 2023 as Class IV prices have become a significant driver in the dairy market.

Cumulative pool losses have reached nearly 920 million since the formula went into effect in May of '19.

The third, eliminating advanced prices of Class I milk and Class II skim milk. Under the current Class I and Class II pricing formulas, weighted averages dairy product prices from the first two weeks of one month are calculated -- advanced prices used to price Class I and Class II products for the following month. This arrangement creates a long lag between when the advanced prices and the current prices are announced for the same month and means that advanced prices can be based on weekly data that is 25 to 40 days older, on average, than



2.

2.1

the basis of the current prices.

2.

2.0

2.1

This means when the market prices rally, current prices can be much higher than advanced prices, leading to low and negative PPDs. This creates the opportunity to depool milk from the order to benefit from a non-pooled volume of the recent elevated prices without sharing the value with the pool and further depress the PPD.

By removing advanced pricing, all commodity prices would be announced during the same month using the same data, removing any lag time within the pricing system.

Combining this adjustment with the switch back to the higher-of Class I mover would further reduce price spreads that contribute to higher probability of handlers depooling from the marketplace.

Elimination of advanced pricing would not be expected to have a substantial impact on average Class I or overall producer prices, but it would increase average uniform prices in the Federal Milk Marketing Orders because periodic high manufacturing milk values would not be removed through pooling.

During 2020, avoiding depooling would have retained billions of dollars in the Federal Milk Marketing Order pool, helping better maintain uniform price amongst producers rather than large differences between pooled and depooled milk values. And with my farm alone, it was roughly \$200,000 from negative PPDs affecting my farm.

I believe in fairness in pricing and transparency in dairy pricing. Processors and producers both must



2.

2.0

2.1

2.4

| have both must be profitable. But we have to ask |
|---|
| ourselves, how many new farms have been created the last |
| couple of years? How many new dairy farms the last couple |
| of decades? We need a pricing system that works for dairy |
| farmers and pays them for the commodity they produce. |
| Without these reforms, we'll continue to see small farms |
| leave and greater consolidation in the industry. These |
| priorities are not only in keeping with America's or |
| Wisconsin's dairyland heritage, but will benefit farms |
| across the order. |

In conclusion, these changes won't stop dairy farms from going out of business, but in combination with the proposals along with the possible Farm Bill changes, give dairy farmers the best opportunity to minimize their risk. Wisconsin dairy farmers aren't looking to put processors out of business. In fact, we need -- we need producers and processors. These changes make it at least possible where we could find some symmetry between the two moving forward.

And I also look forward to working with USDA on milk check transparency down the road and building standardization in that as well, as we build trust within the system between processors and producers moving forward.

Thank you.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

27 BY DR. CRYAN:

Q. I'm Roger Cryan with the American Farm Bureau



Federation. Thank you, President Krentz, for your testimony.

Do you support all of AFBF's proposals and our positions in support of other proposals, including four of the five National Milk positions?

- A. We do, and I do. We have a robust grassroots policy process within the Farm Bureau, and many of our dairy farmers within Wisconsin have been part of that process over the last number of years, building a robust policy that we can support everything that we have proposed from AFBF.
- Q. And dairy farmers like you are very active in the membership and leadership of Wisconsin Farm Bureau; is that right?
 - A. Absolutely.
- Q. You attended the -- our forum, the Farm Bureau Federal Milk Marketing Order forum last fall, and spoke, in fact.
 - A. In Kansas City, yes.
- Q. And was it your understanding there was a pretty high consensus among farmers in support of a number of things, including the higher-of Class I formula and addressing negative PPDs?
- A. Yes. Yeah. That forum helped build consensus amongst processors and producers.
- Q. You talked in your testimony about the variation in prices among producers within -- within our -- even within the neighborhood. You even said it pitted neighbor



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

versus neighbor in terms of price variation.

Could you talk about that a little bit, from your experience?

- A. Absolutely. When we have producers within the same town, within the -- within the same neighborhood, that are potentially selling to two different plants, and they are -- they're producing the exact same commodity, but yet their prices could be vastly different because one plant decided to depool and move out of the market and one plant stayed as a pooled product, so --
- Q. And that also -- as you also talked about, impacts that has on risk management?
- A. Absolutely. That -- that is -- we have built a system that dairy farmers can protect themselves with the Dairy Revenue Protection, and it has become a significant tool. But it takes fluctuations in the market to create opportunity with that product. But the negative PPDs drastically drop that at the final price for the milk check, for the -- for the profitability of that farm.
- Q. Well, are there any other impacts of depooling and negative PPDs you want to share with us?
- A. Well, again, I shared almost 200,000 from my farm alone, and it -- it is not only farms across Wisconsin, across the orders, it is communities that this drastically affects, because those dollars are -- are spent over and over within those communities.
 - Q. Of course.

Is there anything else you would like to say?



2.

2.0

2.1

1 A. I don't believe so.
2 Q. Okay. Well, thank you very much, sir.

DR. CRYAN:

THE COURT: Do we have questions for this witness?

Thank you.

Mr. Rosenbaum.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

28

Q. Good morning, Mr. Krentz. My name is Steve Rosenbaum. I represent the International Dairy Foods Association. Thank you for coming today to testify.

I'm done.

You in your testimony referenced the 2018 Farm

Bill that changed the -- what a lot of people call the

Class I mover. You know what I mean when I refer to that?

- A. Yep.
- Q. And changed it from the higher-of Class III or Class IV to instead the average-of Class III and IV plus \$0.74, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Is it your understanding that that change was jointly proposed by both the dairy farmer side and the dairy processor side to Congress?
 - A. As far from a dairy producer, I don't -- I don't remember having any say in that. As for -- from a Wisconsin Farm Bureau standpoint, I do not recall having participate in that discussion.
 - Q. Okay. Do you know whether other dairy farmer associations, for example, some of the other organizations here today, whether they were actively supporting that,



along with the processor side?

- A. I want to be careful on speaking on behalf of someone else.
- Q. Okay. You are just not sure one way or another; is that fair?
 - A. Correct.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Okay. And are you familiar with the proposal that my client, the International Dairy Foods Association, has submitted for this hearing to change the Class I mover?
 - A. Not in -- not in depth, but some of it, yes.
- 11 Q. Okay. Do you -- do you know whether that -- let 12 me strike that.
 - Your -- your concern is that there was a period in 2020 when had the Class I mover been the old formula, it would have returned a higher price than the formula that, in fact, came into effect in 2019, correct?
 - A. 2020 showed the significant portion of that, but those negative PPDs continue even into 2023.
 - Q. Are you aware that International Dairy Foods
 Association proposal is designed to ensure that dairy
 farmers will never be paid less than they would have been
 paid had the higher-of been in place?
 - A. I guess I -- I'm not following your exact question.
 - Q. You wanted -- you want to be -- you feel like you were underpaid because the formula was no longer the higher-of, correct?
 - A. Correct.



| 1 | Q. And I take it you haven't examined whether the |
|----|---|
| 2 | IDFA proposal would itself achieve the result of paying |
| 3 | dairy farmers as much as they would get under the |
| 4 | higher-of? |
| 5 | A. I no. Not fully. I have not dove into that. |
| 6 | MR. ROSENBAUM: That's all I have. Thank you. |
| 7 | THE COURT: Further questions? |
| 8 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 9 | BY MR. MILTNER: |
| 10 | Q. Good morning, Mr. Krentz. |
| 11 | A. Good morning. |
| 12 | Q. Ryan Miltner for Select Milk Producers. |
| 13 | I think during the conference in Kansas City we |
| 14 | spent some time talking, if I recall. |
| 15 | A. Okay. |
| 16 | Q. I want to ask about that that meeting that you |
| 17 | referenced. |
| 18 | I believe it was over three days that producers |
| 19 | met from around the country to talk about these issues, |
| 20 | correct? |
| 21 | A. Correct. |
| 22 | Q. I wonder if you could share for USDA, if you can, |
| 23 | the consensus that was built around returning to the |
| 24 | higher-of? |
| 25 | A. Specifically with that, there was a the |
| 26 | majority of the room moved in that direction. That was |
| 27 | one of the major items that we came to consensus pretty |



28

quickly.

- Q. And of all the issues talked about, would you say that that was one of the most important, if not the most important, discussion that was had?
- A. That is one of the major items that have essentially left dollars outside the farm gate, if you will. And, again, that's a major concern of dairy farmers across the nation. And -- and, like you said, that was one of the major items that we came to consensus in that forum in Kansas City.
- Q. By the end of that meeting, do you recall if there was any real opposition in the room to returning to the higher-of?
- A. Again, I can't speak for -- for any opposition.

 But, again, the goal of that was to come to a consensus.

 Now, that's not necessarily unanimous, right.
 - Q. Sure. Yeah. Consensus is not unanimous.
- 17 | A. Uh-huh.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

16

19

2.0

2.1

25

26

27

- 18 Q. Thank you.
 - Have you had a chance to review or are you familiar with the three proposals in this hearing from Select Milk Producers?
- A. I have not dug deep into that.

 (Court Reporter clarification.)
- 24 BY MR. MILTNER:
 - Q. When the change was made to move away from using the-higher of to the average-of III and IV plus \$0.74, I understand you were -- as you had said to Mr. Rosenbaum, you weren't involved in those discussions.



Do you recall, though, when that change was made that the expectation among the dairy producer community was that there would be no material economic change to your check from that?

- A. I -- I guess in 2018 I don't recall hearing that specific discussion at that point, so --
- Q. Okay. Whether through your role as Farm Bureau president or just as a dairy farmer, do you pretty carefully track the class -- the individual class prices month to month?
- A. I do. And I generally, especially with products like Dairy Revenue Protection or buying -- using puts and calls on the CME, I am generally looking forward nine to 12 months, trying to protect myself, trying to protect my business, and locking -- trying to lock in a margin along the way. Again, if -- if those -- if I'm locking in a margin and -- and doing what I can to protect myself and my business and something happens, like negative PPDs, large negative PPDs, it drastically changes that measure in a short amount of time when that milk production month comes along.
- Q. You also spoke about how during 2020 the change to the new Class I mover had serious financial consequences to farmers, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Have you -- have you looked at what that relationship between Class III and Class IV is in the last few months?



2.

2.0

2.1

- A. PPDs, I -- are positive, at least at my farm.

 They have been slightly positive, 30 -- I believe last

 month was \$0.36.

 Q. Have you looked to see whether the Class I mover

 would have been higher or lower than it is now for the

 first day of August?
 - A. I have not. I'm going to let the economist do that.
 - Q. Very good. Thanks for answering my questions.
- 10 A. Thank you.

8

9

19

2.0

2.1

- THE COURT: Any further questions, other than AMS?

 Seeing none, Ms. Taylor.
- 13 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 14 BY MS. TAYLOR:
- 15 Q. Good morning.
- 16 A. Good morning.
- 17 | O. Thank you for coming today to testify.
- 18 A. Thanks.
 - Q. The Small Business Administration defines for a dairy farm a small business as one that receives

 7-point -- excuse me -- \$3.75 million or less in gross revenue a year, and that's on a whole farm basis.
- Would your farm meet that definition?
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And you answered some questions to Mr. Miltner about your risk management use.
- Did I catch it correctly that you -- when you are looking to lock in a margin, you go out about nine to 12



months when you are doing that?

2.

2.0

2.1

- A. I try to stay out that far, looking to protect myself. Now, margin fluctuations, price of that product, may dictate when -- when I pull the trigger if you will on -- on buying that product.
- Q. Okay. And I don't think you mentioned this. Are you a cooperative member or are you an independent shipper?
- A. I used to be a cooperative, but that was purchased by a private.
- Q. Okay. I think you answered some of my questions already in other people's questions.

On the second page of your statement when you are talking about the impact of negative PPDs, number four says, "At first, this imbalance was linked to COVID-19 forces, however the losses in pool value have contributed (sic) through 2023 as Class IV prices have become the driver of the dairy market."

I was wondering if you could expand what you mean by that statement.

A. Again, in Wisconsin, we -- we produce -- 90% of our milk in -- 90-plus percent of our milk in Wisconsin goes into the cheese market, so we're heavily reliant on Class III and Class IV. And moving from the higher-of to the average-of has -- has drastically changed those calculations or that -- that -- that price coming to the farm. And as the Class IV is a higher driver in that is the -- has been more of a differential in that.



| Q. Okay. And then towards the bottom of the page |
|---|
| when you are discussing eliminating advanced pricing, you |
| say, "It would not be expected to have a substantial |
| impact on average Class I or overall producer prices, but |
| it would increase the average uniform prices because |
| periodic high manufacturing milk values would not be |
| removed through pooling." |

I just would like you to, for the record -- I think I know what you mean there but, for the record, kind of explain what that statement means.

A. Again, keeping -- keeping the product in the pool, so there's a -- a fair price across the board. And, again, I'm speaking from the producer standpoint and the dollars that essentially come to the farm gate. And that's where I believe that the -- keeping the pool, keeping the standardization, disincentivizing depooling, if you will, is extremely important.

Not all areas of the country, not all orders can support a very stringent process of depooling, basically, lengthening out the days required when you are going through the depooling process. And so the -- disincentivizing the depooling process is extremely important, so that way we can incentivize producers to stay within the pool, bringing a standardization of dollars to that farm gate.

Q. Okay. And so expanding on that a little bit, would it be fair to say that if you eliminate advanced pricing and Class I was announced at the end of the month,



2.

2.0

2.1

1 just like manufacturing classes, then you would lessen the 2. chance of price inversions? That's what I believe, yes. 3 Ο. 4 Yeah. You mentioned that your farm has lost \$200,000 5 6 from negative PPDs. 7 Do you know what time period that was from? The majority of that is in 2020. 8 Α. 9 Ο. Okay. 10 MS. TAYLOR: I think that's it for AMS. Thank you 11 so much. THE COURT: Redirect? 12 No? 13 Let's offer the statement into evidence. 14 objection to the admission of Exhibit 116 into the record? 15 Seeing none, the exhibit is admitted. 16 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 116 17 was received into evidence.) 18 THE COURT: With that, thank you for coming. 19 THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor. 2.0 THE COURT: You are excused. 2.1 It is 10:00 a.m. We have been going for two 22 I'm sure everyone's ready for a break. Do we need 23 more than ten minutes? The reporter requests 15. 2.4 return at 10:15. 25 (Whereupon, a break was taken.) 26 THE COURT: Okay. Back on the record. 27 Witness Vitaliano has resumed the stand.



28

Mind you, you are still under oath.

| 1 | THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. |
|----|--|
| 2 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 3 | BY MR. MILTNER: |
| 4 | Q. Good morning, Dr. Vitaliano. |
| 5 | A. Good morning, Mr. Miltner. |
| 6 | Q. We're starting a couple hours later than planned, |
| 7 | but we are starting, right? |
| 8 | A. We are starting. |
| 9 | Q. All right. I'm looking at your written statement, |
| 10 | Exhibit 114, if I wrote that down correctly, and I'm |
| 11 | looking at page 5. |
| 12 | Do you have it in front of you? |
| 13 | A. Yes, I do. |
| 14 | Q. With the fourth line down after your graph, you |
| 15 | write, "Approximately 90% of natural cheese produced in |
| 16 | the U.S. is sold using the CME 40-pound block price as a |
| 17 | pricing index." |
| 18 | Can you expand on the record for that and how the |
| 19 | block price is used as an index to price cheese? |
| 20 | A. Yes. As you know, the block and barrel cheese |
| 21 | forms, cheddar the only the only types of cheese |
| 22 | that have spot markets, and typically in the industry |
| 23 | and we have other witnesses that are very actively |
| 24 | involved in those markets, can explain further usually |
| 25 | dairy products are often priced with reference to an |
| 26 | actual spot market for a similar product and trade at a |
| 27 | premium or a discount to the market price that's |



established in the spot market.

- Q. If you were a manufacturer of, say, mozzarella cheese, am I correct that the way you would index your mozzarella price off of cheddar would be to say, I'm going to sell you my mozzarella cheese, and the price will be the 40-pound block price plus or minus some -- some factor?
- A. That's my understanding. But I would recommend that you also direct that question to the next witness, Mr. Darin Hanson. He represents a company that's one of the largest manufacturers of mozzarella cheese and can give you a very definitive answer to that.
 - O. Thank you.

Do you know, or will one of National Milk's witnesses know, to the extent which product cheese or cheese products are priced off of barrels?

- A. Yes, I believe.
- Q. Is that something I should ask you about or one of the other witnesses?
- A. Well, you can, but I asked them the same question and went through basically the varieties of cheese, you know, which one -- you know, which of the two prices -- mozzarella, which price is Swiss, things of that sort. So I'd say probably you will get a more definitive answer by



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

either directing it to Mr. Hanson or Mr. Bower.

Q. Thank you.

2.

2.1

At the bottom of page 5, you discuss the volatility of the block and barrel price spread. And I believe it was yesterday, Sally Keefe testified about volatility of Class I costs and how it impacted fluid processors.

Do you recall her testimony on that?

- A. Somewhat, yes.
- Q. Do you believe that the adoption of Proposal -- is this Proposal 3, yes -- the adoption of Proposal 3 would reduce the volatility in Class I prices as well?
- A. It could. But don't forget, both -- both block and barrel prices are volatile. And so if Proposal 3 was adopted, that would not necessarily -- I could not say a priori that it would reduce the volatility of that price series.

The point I was making in the volatility between barrels and blocks is because they are both treated as -- as if it was a single product, that -- that -- you know, whose prices were closely aligned, that this volatility, you know, creates difficulties in establishing the Class III price. That does not mean that the Class III price itself would become less volatile but that it would become less volatile with respect to the correlation between the value of cheese and the value of the Class III price to producers.

Q. Were you here at the hearing when Lynne McBride



testified about Proposal 6? About mozzarella, adding mozzarella to the survey?

- A. I have been here for this hearing, but I don't recall her particular testimony on that.
- Q. Have you heard from any National Milk members or anyone else any concerns about thinness of the market for 40-pound blocks and whether that price alone is sufficient to price Class III?
- A. We looked -- we had a discussion, for example, about the -- if you want to call it thinness of the market, for the price of butter, which basically the reported volumes of butter compared to the total manufactured butter is about 10%. We looked at ways, including a proposal here, to add unsalted butter to that.

Our conclusion as a task force was that the importance of securing greater volumes is not insignificant, but adding -- adding an inappropriate product, a product that is not truly the -- you know, the residual commodity product, to the formulas for the pure sake of increasing the volume is not necessarily a good trade-off.

And so we are proposing that while, yes, indeed, eliminating barrel cheese would eliminate some volume, it would not create a thin market situation when you look particularly compared to butter, when including barrels, as we -- as I testified yesterday, would clearly overstate the importance of barrel cheese in establishing the proper -- the proper value of Class III products -- of



2.

2.0

2.1

Class III milk.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. Are any of National Milk's witnesses particularly well suited to discuss that issue about whether the 40-pound block CME market is sufficient?
- A. I think all of our witnesses on Proposal 3 are prepared to discuss that in their testimony, yes.
- Q. Are you familiar with the types of whey that come from the manufacturing of 40-pound blocks and 500-pound barrels?
- A. In a general sense. I'm not a -- an expert in dairy processing.
- Q. Are you aware that the whey stream or the whey that comes off of those products is different in a material respect?
- A. Yes. I'm aware that the whey stream coming from barrel cheese production is uncolored, if you call it by virgin whey I think is the term, and that I have heard that that has a premium value in the growing market for nutritional products, particularly for protein, enhanced whey, whey protein concentrate and the like.

But those are marketed to audiences that do not like to see something on the label called, say, unbleached -- or bleached whey, which is my -- my understanding is the use of whey from block cheese production, particularly in, you know, maybe the Upper Midwest where there's coloring in the whey, to make it suitable for use in some of those products that color has to be taken out. But -- but I can't -- I can't give you



- Q. Have you -- do you know if any of the National Milk task force or any of its members have -- have discussed whether that white whey or virgin whey is actually a target product for a manufacturer and that the 500-pound barrel is a byproduct of producing white whey?
- A. I have heard that, and I have heard that with the growing importance of whey, which used to be a byproduct, there are some cheese operations where the whey product is considered the chief value added product, including -- I have heard that for barrels, and the cheese becomes the commodity -- I wouldn't call it co-product, I would call it -- but I -- I do not have information on the actual, you know, price premium that that uncolored whey could deliver for barrel manufacturers, for example.
- Q. As an economist, would you agree that if a byproduct were produced in sufficient -- in a quantity greater than the market demands, and then placed for sale, it would depress the value of the sales price of that commodity as received on the market?
- A. In general, when there's an oversupply of any product, compared to the demand for that, the market will adjust for the lower price until the market clears.
- Q. And if 500-pound barrels were, in fact, in oversupply, and the market for 40-pound cheddar and 500-pound cheddar were not substitutes, would that help to explain the growing divergence between those two prices on the market?



2.

2.1

2.

2.0

2.1

| A. It could. If they were not perfect substitutes |
|--|
| for each other, the supply and demand situation in those |
| two different markets and the resultant prices would |
| not the technical term is arbitrage where one product |
| could move into the other market as a substitute. |

I would -- I would look at the growing volatility of the spread between block and barrel price and say there must be some of that in there, as well as perhaps the difference in virgin -- in the whey -- quality of the whey streams, the value of the whey streams, which has resulted in a recent average of \$0.12 per pound difference in the moisture-adjusted prices of barrels and blocks compared to the \$0.03 historical one.

Q. Thank you. I have one more question, or maybe a couple of questions on the same topic.

Have you looked at or do you track the volume of processed cheese sales in the U.S.?

- A. No, I have not -- I have not -- I have tracked that in the past, particularly at a time when I think USDA used to report more data on that. But my understanding is that processed cheese sales are not increasing as much as natural cheese sales.
- Q. And is it -- and I forget if it is in your testimony, and I don't want to waste our time looking for it. But are 500-pound barrels the primary source of the cheese used to manufacture processed cheese?
- A. I believe so. But, again, we have other witnesses to follow who would very definitively be able to answer



that question.
Q. I'll save the rest of my questions for those
witnesses then.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Further questions? Other than AMS?

Mr. Rosenbaum.

MR. MILTNER:

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

2.2

23

2.4

25

26

27

- Q. Dr. Vitaliano, I want to follow up on some questions asked about your statement on page 5 of your testimony here in Exhibit 114 that approximately 90% of natural cheese product produced in the United States is sold use the CME 40-block price as a pricing index. Okay?
- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. So I take it what you are describing here are the private contracts between the cheddar cheese manufacturer and its customer; is that correct?
 - A. Presumably it would be private contracts, but it could be open spot transactions as well.
 - Q. Do you actually have access to the terms of those private contracts?
 - A. No, I do not.
 - Q. And are all cheddar cheese manufacturers members of co-ops that are part of National Milk Producers Federation?
 - A. We have -- National Milk Producers Federation membership I believe processes -- produces a significant proportion of the cheddar cheese, but I'm sure they -- you



- Q. I take it this 90% number is an estimate, not actually based upon --
 - A. Oh, yes.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

28

Q. Let me finish -- let me start the question again just so the reporter can get it down.

The 90% is an estimate, not something that's calculated based upon actual underlying data?

- A. It is an estimate based upon USDA National Agriculture Statistic Service data on the production of cheese in the United States by -- natural cheese by variety.
- Q. But in terms of what -- I'm focusing simply on the question as to whether the CME 40-block price is used as the pricing index for the sale of that. You don't have any access to any underlying data that would result in that 90% --
 - A. I did not do a survey of actual contracts.
- Q. Okay. I take it you have read the testimony of Mr. Hanson?
 - A. Yes.
- MR. ROSENBAUM: If I could approach the witness, your Honor.
- 26 THE COURT: Yes.
- 27 BY MR. ROSENBAUM:
 - Q. This is National Milk Producer Federation



doubtlessly be given a Hearing Exhibit number later.

And if you look at page 8, he says, "In my ex-" -well, "In my experience at Foremost and other companies,
at least 75% of natural commodity cheese sold in the U.S.
uses the CME 40-pound block cheddar cheese price as a
pricing index."

Do you see that?

A. Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

2.0

23

2.4

25

26

27

Q. Now, I read that sentence to be describing the exact same thing you are describing in your testimony on page 5, except that his number is 75% -- or I should be clear -- at least 75%, and your number is 90%.

Am I right that you are both describing the same thing?

- 19 A. Roughly, yes.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. His characterization is at least 75%; mine is approximately 90%.
 - Q. And of the two of you, which of you is more involved in the actual market?
 - A. Mr. Hanson is. You will need to question him on his estimate.
 - Q. Okay.

MR. ROSENBAUM: That's all I have, your Honor.



| 1 | | THE COURT: I don't see any need to mark that |
|----|----------------------|---|
| 2 | exhibit | just used with that witness for identification |
| 3 | now. I | think the designation of the exhibit as NMPF-7 at |
| 4 | the top | right-hand corner is good enough for now. |
| 5 | | Thank you, Mr. Rosenbaum. |
| 6 | | MR. ROSENBAUM: Thank you, your Honor. |
| 7 | | THE COURT: Any further examination of this |
| 8 | witness | other than AMS? |
| 9 | | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 10 | BY DR. | CRYAN: |
| 11 | Q. | Roger Cryan for American Farm Bureau Federation. |
| 12 | | Hello, Peter. |
| 13 | А. | Good morning, Roger. |
| 14 | Q. | It's great to see you, as always. |
| 15 | А. | Likewise. |
| 16 | Q. | So you you emphasize that 500-pound barrels |
| 17 | are | are not a substitute for 40-pound blocks. |
| 18 | А. | Increasingly, yes. That's |
| 19 | Q. | Are 640-pound blocks economic substitutes, or use |
| 20 | substit [.] | utes, for 40-pound blocks? |
| 21 | А. | I'm not that familiar with 640-pound blocks. I |
| 22 | would r | ecommend that you direct that question to our |
| 23 | Q. | Okay. |
| 24 | А. | following witnesses that are actively involved |
| 25 | in the | cheese business. |
| 26 | Q. | Okay. I will. |
| 27 | | DR. CRYAN: Thank you. |
| 28 | | THE COURT: Anyone else other than AMS? |



Your witness, Ms. Taylor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. TAYLOR:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. Good morning.
- A. Good morning.
- Q. I wanted to start just going through a couple of the statements that you made in your testimony. I'm going to start on page 5 towards the bottom.

In the middle of that paragraph you have a sentence that reads, "Since 2017, however, the significantly wider and increasingly volatile block-barrel price spread has caused instability in the cheese market."

I wonder if you could elaborate on what you mean there.

- A. I was primarily referring to it created volatility in the transmission of basically information from the cheese market translated through the Federal Order product price formulas, to an appropriate value for the Class III price. That's -- that was my primarily reference.
- Q. Okay. My other -- I'll get into some other questions, but I just wanted to go through just some statements in your testimony.

On the next page, towards the bottom, you talk about how eliminating barrels would still provide an adequate volume for price discovery purposes for cheese.

I was wondering if you could expand on that and define, you know, what is -- what would you consider adequate.



A. Well, I -- to a great extent, I use the benchmark of the butter price, which we discussed extensively, and we had advocates on our task force for seeking ways to expand the volume of butter in the survey, particularly looking at adding unsalted butter.

And those of us -- those of our task force who were very involved in butter production and marketing indicated that that was not appropriate, we will testify later to that extent. And they did not express as active users of, you know, butter markets, spot markets futures, and active followers of the NDPSR, and its role in establishing the butterfat price, they basically concluded that even, you know, the 9% was not a -- an issue in terms of its -- the appropriateness of that volume of butter to establish the important value of butterfat in the Federal Order pricing formulas.

So to that extent we looked at -- effectively considered, you know, 10% or so adequate volume as long as it was properly constructed. And the numbers we looked at indicated that block cheese by itself would represent about 16% of the natural cheddar cheese production, and therefore, we could -- that there would still be adequate volume with blocks only in the formula.

Yes, we would lose some volume. We do -- National Milk does not dispute that more volume is better than less volume in the survey. But -- but there is a trade-off.

If you by -- if you seek to achieve more volume in the survey by including inappropriate products, that trade-off



2.

2.1

is a negative one.

2.

2.0

2.1

The point we're making in that connection is that at the time of Federal Order Reform, the behavior of barrels and block prices made it appropriate to include both in the weighted average form as in the formula.

But going back to our overarching premise for everything we -- behind our proposals of this hearing, the structure of the dairy industry has changed. What may have been very appropriate at the time of Federal Order Reform, and for years after that, in many cases has become inappropriate because the industry has changed and the formulas have not. And the inclusion of barrel cheese, which we would concede would have been appropriate, because it was not disruptive up until through 2016, is now inappropriate because the industry has changed and barrels and blocks have become two different markets.

Q. Okay. And that kind of leads me to my next question then. You talk about how including barrels currently has led to disorderly marketing conditions.

And other than the price volatility that you have discussed, you know, what are the other disorderly market conditions that you are speaking of?

A. Primarily the volatility, but that on average, not only -- if you go back to Figure 1, not only have block and barrel prices become very volatile in terms of the spread between the two of them, but the -- the establishment of an average \$0.12 difference in recent years compared to the assumed \$0.03 difference has created



Q. Okay. So I think you touched on this yesterday, but I don't quite remember the whole answer then.

On that line of how the survey doesn't properly represent how their milk is used in cheese, and you estimate that 90% is used in blocks or priced off blocks, and 10% then would be barrels; is that correct?

A. Yes.

the first place.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

28

- Q. So how come we wouldn't just look to weight differently with the prices in the survey rather than just eliminate a product to begin with?
- A. The task force, the National Milk task force considered that as an option but chose to -- if the number was 10% or something -- you know, something -- you know, a significant majority, given the importance, if you looked at the other formulas of having a single product, why not just eliminate the barrels altogether. That was the choice.
- Q. Okay. So you did discuss about how during reform USDA made the assumption that blocks and barrels were similar; hence, they both were included with the \$0.03 on barrels, and they are different now.

And so what makes them different?

A. I would defer that -- I would reserve that



Q. Okay. And then -- and maybe these questions will be better served for another witness, but I'll just ask you and you can let me know.

So, you know, the purpose of our end product pricing program now, and as stated in our reform decision, that the products we survey are the bulk commodity wholesale products.

How would you define a bulk commodity wholesale product?

A. A bulk commodity wholesale product -- and this is not a professional definition -- would be -- a commodity product would be sort of the product of last -- what product would you produce, say -- it's a little simpler with butter. What type of -- what product would you produce if you had extra cream that really couldn't go anywhere else? What would be the last market short of dumping where you could put excess cream when nobody else would -- what's the last one that would take your product? It would be producing standard 80% salted butter because there's adequate -- always adequate capacity for that.

Similar, with cheese, where would you send your cheese milk, what would you produce, if you had extra cheese milk and you couldn't find a home for it anywhere else? It would be an undifferentiated non-value-added product, which are usually produced by contractual agreements. It would be sort of the undifferentiated, the



2.

2.0

2.1

most basic product that, again, would be -- I would use the term residual product, where -- where would you -- where is the last resort where you could put your extra milk or dairy component?

And bulk would mean it's not specially packaged. It would be in the standard packaging, which in the case of cheese is 40-pound blocks or -- yeah, basically -- you know, 40-pound blocks is kind of -- would be the basic commodity product in cheese.

- Q. So then it's National Milk's position that barrel cheese doesn't represent a bulk commodity wholesale product anymore, it is not a place of last resort?
- A. I would defer that question to our witnesses that are more -- very far more experienced in the cheese markets than I am.
- Q. Okay. I think I have more questions for your further witnesses, but I will ask one.

The last question is, I know we're getting into makes and yields eventually. But if National -- if USDA does decide to adopt your proposal and eliminate barrels, then would the follow-on to that be making sure that the makes and yields in the formulas also only reflect blocks and not barrels production?

- A. Yes, that would be appropriate.
- O. I think that's it.

MS. TAYLOR: Thank you.

THE COURT: Redirect?

Or do we have re-cross? Re-cross.



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

DR. CRYAN: Yes. This is in response to

2 | Ms. Taylor's questions.

THE COURT: Okay.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY DR. CRYAN:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Q. Ms. Taylor asked you about why the markets are separate, and at one time they weren't. And let me offer you a hypothetical and let me -- and tell me if you think that makes economic sense.

It's -- if in 2000 there was substantial slack capacity to produce both blocks and barrels, then there -- and there was an opportunity to move milk from one production line to another to meet demands, would that tend to allow the prices to -- to be closer together and make the markets look similar?

- A. This is just an economic answer.
- O. Yes.
- A. If there's adequate arbitrage capacity or capabilities, then you would expect there would be some price equivalent -- equilibrating, that they would be closer together.
- Q. And if -- and if you had a situation, say, again, hypothetically, 20 years later where block and barrel plants were running at full capacity without slack to move milk from one to the other, would that tend to lead to separate market prices?
- A. If they were -- if they were different capacity situations in different markets, yes, that could explain



1 price differences. 2. Ο. Very good. Thank you. DR. CRYAN: Thank you very much. 3 THE COURT: Redirect? 4 Thank you, your Honor. We have no 5 MS. HANCOCK: further questions. We'd move to admit Exhibit 114. 6 7 THE COURT: Seeing no objections, Exhibit 114's admitted into the record. 8 9 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 114 was received 10 into evidence.) THE COURT: Thank you. 11 12 MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, our next witness is 13 Darin Hanson. It is almost 11:00. I'm not sure what you 14 were thinking for the -- if we're still going to do an extended lunch hour, when you would like to start it, but 15 16 we and probably get the direct in. 17 THE COURT: Okay. But -- I'm sorry, Ms. Taylor? 18 MS. TAYLOR: Whatever you all decide. 19 THE COURT: Yeah. Okay. I did -- I forget what I ruled before. What did we decide? We're going to go with 2.0 2.1 this witness and bring up Dr. Kaiser after lunch; is 22 that -- okay. I don't trust my own memory here. 23 All right. Yes. Let's -- and as far as an extended lunch, does that help you all, Mr. English, 24 25 Mr. Rosenbaum? Your previous objections are noted and --26 MR. ENGLISH: Without waiving the previous 27 objection, I thought the conversation -- and having



28

consulted with our team -- a two-hour lunch really is

| 1 | important. But I do think we can get this direct done. I |
|----|--|
| 2 | don't think we need lunch now. And, in fact, I don't |
| 3 | think I'm ready to do that. So I think I think it |
| 4 | makes sense to do the direct. |
| 5 | THE COURT: Mr. Hill, did you want to say |
| 6 | something? |
| 7 | MR. HILL: Yeah. If it's fine with Mr. English |
| 8 | and Mr. Rosenbaum, we're fine with it too. |
| 9 | THE COURT: If it's fine with you all, then it's |
| 10 | fine with me. Yes, by consensus, with the previous |
| 11 | objections noted and continuing forth in the future, we'll |
| 12 | take this witness, whose name I have already forgotten. |
| 13 | I'm sorry. |
| 14 | Please raise your right hand. |
| 15 | DARIN HANSON, |
| 16 | Being first duly sworn, was examined and |
| 17 | testified as follows: |
| 18 | THE COURT: Ms. Hancock, it's your witness. |
| 19 | DIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 20 | BY MS. HANCOCK: |
| 21 | Q. Good morning, Mr. Hanson. Can you state and spell |
| 22 | your name for the record, please? |
| 23 | A. Darin Hanson, D-A-R-I-N, H-A-N-S-O-N. |
| 24 | Q. Thank you. |
| 25 | Would you provide your mailing address, please? |
| 26 | A. Yes. 8401 Greenway Boulevard, Suite 600, |
| 27 | Middleton, Wisconsin, 53562. |
| 28 | Q. Thank you. |



And where were you employed?

A. At Foremost Farms USA.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. What's your role there?
- A. I am senior vice president of supply chain and risk management.
- Q. What falls within the scope of your responsibilities at Foremost?
- A. Everything related to procurement and logistics and warehousing of all direct materials, including all milk materials, balancing milk, all the risk management, and working with our commercial team on risk management and pricing programs.
- Q. How long have you been at -- in this position at Foremost?
- A. This position has grown over the past five years since I have been at Foremost and -- but I have always been in that risk management and milk procurement member relations role.
 - Q. How long have you worked in the industry?
 - A. 20 years.
- Q. And what are the various roles that you have held in the industry?
 - A. I started at Pillsbury as a commodity analyst where we looked at risk management strategies, procurement strategies. And then at General Mills, I was procurement manager for dairy products, including cheese and powders. Then at Land O'Lakes, I was a procurement manager, and then director for dairy products, including cheese and



powders, and working very closely with the business teams on risk management and pricing programs. And then moved to Foremost Farms in similar types of roles as we discussed.

- Q. And what about your educational background?
- A. I have a Bachelor's degree from Drake University in economics, a Master's degree from the University of Minnesota, and an applied economics and an MBA from the University of Chicago.
 - Q. Your first Master's degree, what was that in?
- 11 A. Applied economics.
 - Q. Okay. Applied economics. Thank you.
- MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, I would offer Mr. Hanson
 as an expert in procurement, risk management, and
 agricultural economics.
- 16 THE COURT: I so find.
- 17 MS. HANCOCK: Thank you.
- 18 BY MS. HANCOCK:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- 19 Q. Mr. Hanson, did you prepare testimony on behalf 20 the National Milk's barrel elimination proposal?
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. And is that what we have identified as Exhibit
 NMPF-7?
- 24 A. Yes.
- MS. HANCOCK: Okay. Your Honor, I believe we're
 on Exhibit 117. Is it okay if we mark NMPF-7 for
 identification purposes as Exhibit 117?
- 28 THE COURT: So marked.



| 1 | (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 117 was marked |
|----|--|
| 2 | for identification.) |
| 3 | MS. HANCOCK: Thank you. |
| 4 | BY MS. HANCOCK: |
| 5 | Q. Mr. Hanson, would you go ahead and offer your |
| 6 | testimony? |
| 7 | A. Yes, thank you. And thank you for the opportunity |
| 8 | to testify today. I will skip through my bio and go right |
| 9 | down to the Foremost profile since we have gone through my |
| 10 | bio. |
| 11 | Q. And I just |
| 12 | A. Uh-huh. |
| 13 | Q maybe, proactively, I'd ask you to read slowly |
| 14 | as well. |
| 15 | A. Sure. |
| 16 | Foremost is a large dairy cooperative |
| 17 | headquartered in Middleton, Wisconsin. Our 850 members |
| 18 | produce 6.2 billion pounds of milk annually and are |
| 19 | located in Wisconsin, Michigan, Iowa, Minnesota, Indiana, |
| 20 | Ohio, and Illinois. |
| 21 | The cooperative has all sizes of dairy farming |
| 22 | operations, ranging from less than 50 cows to more than |
| 23 | 10,000. Foremost is a large manufacturer of cheese, |
| 24 | producing 500 million pounds annually. Of that volume, |
| 25 | 350 million pounds is soft Italian style cheeses, making |
| 26 | Foremost one of the top manufacturers of Italian cheeses |
| | |



28

in the US.

Foremost has eight plants in its dairy

manufacturing network. These include three Italian cheese manufacturing plants, two cheddar type manufacturing plants, and one butter manufacturing plant, all located in Wisconsin. In addition, there are two milk separation facilities in Michigan and Wisconsin.

Foremost processes two-thirds of its member milk into its own products and markets one-third of the remaining milk. Foremost sells cheese in various sizes to converters, foodservice, and retail customers who incorporate our cheese into their finished products.

In all cases, Foremost's cheese is priced using a cheese market price index, which transfers market price risk from Foremost to its customers. Some customers have chosen to engage in risk management activities, such as cheese and milk hedge pricing to help offset their price risk.

In recent years, dairy producers in the Federal Milk Marketing Orders have been adversely impacted by fundamental pricing changes in the cheddar cheese market. Commodity cheese prices in the US are primarily indexed on two prices series, the 40-pound block cheddar price and the 500-pound barrel cheddar price.

Prior to 2017, these markets were highly correlated with an annual average spread of about a penny per pound. This is NDPSR block higher than NDPSR barrel. As a result of this strong correlation, both price series were incorporated into the protein price formula used in the Class III milk price calculation through weekly



2.

2.0

2.1

surveys of both sellers and buyers.

Federal Order pricing is designed to provide dairy producers with a fair price for their milk based on the value of dairy products manufactured by processors.

However, since 2017, the spread between the NDPSR 40-pound block price and the NDPSR 500-pound barrel price has expanded significantly with the block price exceeding the barrel price by as much as \$0.27 per pound on an annual basis.

As a result, the Class III milk price has been undervalued because the proportion of barrel cheese used in the protein calculation is significantly overstated relative to the total volume of commodity cheese priced using the barrel cheese market as an index.

Most commodity cheese in the US, whether that be Italian or cheddar, is priced using the block market as an index. The CME 40-pound block cheddar cheese price is the driver of the NDPSR block cheddar cheese price. Barrel cheese has been selling at a significant discount as compared to block cheese over the past five years, and the resulting impact on the Class III price calculation has cost dairy producers around \$2 billion since 2017.

Table 1 shows the spread impact to dairy producer revenue on reported Class III and Class I volume. This actually understates the revenue impact to dairy producers because a significant amount of depooling of Class III volume occurred in 2020 and 2021 which is not included in the impact calculation. If this volume was included, the



2.1

impact would be significantly higher.

Federal Order pricing has historically also ensured consistent and predictable earnings for processors of dairy products, which includes dairy cooperatives. Ideally, the cost of milk incurred by a processor is based on the revenue generated from the sale of milk products minus the cost to manufacture the products. The cost credited back to processors is referred to as the Make Allowance.

When a single price series is used to calculate a component price, the cost of milk will be highly correlated with the prices of the finished product. However, because the Class III protein price is based on reported prices received from the sale of both block and barrel prices, processor profitability will fluctuate if the spread between block and barrel prices is highly variable.

Since 2017, the price spread between blocks and barrels has been extremely variable, resulting in earnings volatility for processors. Barrel cheese manufacturers have been paying high milk costs relative to the prices received for barrel cheese. Block cheese manufacturers have faced financial uncertainty when the price spread shifts dramatically over time.

The Class III milk price in the Federal Orders is derived from calculations of protein, butterfat, and other solid component prices. The protein component price uses two cheddar cheese survey price series submitted by



2.

2.1

manufacturers through the Dairy Product Mandatory
Reporting System and reported in the weekly National Dairy
Products Sales Report.

The price series used are the 40-pound number 2 yellow cheddar block price and the 500-pound barrel cheddar cheese price. The total cheese price used in the protein calculation is the volume-weighted average of the NDPSR block and barrel prices, adding \$0.03 per pound to the moisture-adjusted barrel price.

Survey reported volume of cheddar prices was 34% of total cheddar cheese produced in the U.S. in 2022. Block prices represented 16% of total cheddar production and barrels represented 18%. Removing the barrel price series from the Class III calculation would result in 40-pound block representing all U.S. cheddar cheese production at that 16% level. While seemingly a small percentage, it would still be higher than the butter counterpart. The NDPSR butter represents just 9% of total U.S. butter production.

During Federal Order Reform, USDA proposed and later adopted the inclusion of the 500-pound barrel cheddar cheese price in the Class III protein price formula because block cheddar cheese prices and barrel cheddar cheese prices were highly correlated. Including barrel cheese also boosted overall cheddar cheese volume in the survey for pricing calculation purposes. This increased the sample size by 150%, according to the original 1999 USDA justification for Federal Order Reform.



2.

2.0

2.1

The barrel cheddar cheese prices were then adjusted by \$0.03 per pound and adjusted for moisture to arrive at a synthetic 40-pound block-equivalent price.

With the price spread between blocks and barrels becoming less predictable with a larger difference in swing, barrel cheese can no longer be used to represent a synthetic 40-pound block equivalent price. Its inclusion in the Class III protein price calculation is not appropriate. The benefit of having a larger sample size is outweighed by the distortion caused by a volatile block-barrel price spread.

Block and cheddar prices reported -- reported volumes captured in the NDPSR have remained fairly consistent over the past ten years with barrel volumes being slightly higher than blocks over the past three years.

If you look at Table 3, in 2022 blocks represented 48% of reported prices -- reported volume, and barrels represented 52%.

From 2000 to 2016, the price spread between NDPSR 40-pound block cheddar cheese and 500-pound barrel cheddar cheese annually averaged a plus \$0.01 per pound with a range of minus \$0.01 per pound to a positive \$0.03 per pound. The high correlation and tight spread between block and barrel cheese prices diminished significantly from 2017 through 2022. The annual average price spread of NDPSR block cheese prices over NDPSR barrel cheese prices during the five period (sic) was plus \$0.11 per



2.

2.1

pound, with an annual average range of plus \$0.01 per pound to a high of \$0.27 per pound. The highest monthly spread during this period was plus \$0.61 per pound, but the lowest was minus \$0.20 per pound.

Total U.S. cheese production in 2021 was
13.8 billion pounds, with cheddar cheese representing
3.9 billion pounds, or 29% of total cheese production.
Total barrel cheese production capacity in the U.S. is
estimated to be 1.2 billion pounds annually, which is only
9% of total commodity cheese production. Breaking out
barrel production capacity from all cheddar cheese
production leaves 2.7 billion pounds of block cheddar in
the form of 40-pound block and 640-pound blocks.

The CME 40-pound cheddar block price is used as a pricing index for most of the cheese sold in the U.S., whether it's selling 40-pound block cheddar, 640-pound block cheddar, mozzarella, other American cheese, such as Colby and Jack, or other styles such as parmesan and Hispanic cheeses. The 40-pound block cheddar market is typically used as an index for the cheese selling price.

In my experience at Foremost and other companies, at least 75% of natural cheese sold in the U.S. uses the CME 40-pound block cheddar cheese price as its pricing index.

From Table 5, barrel cheddar prices only represents -- barrel cheddar cheese represents only 9% of natural cheese manufactured in the U.S. The CME 500-pound barrel cheese price is used as an index to price most



2.

2.1

barrel cheese, and processed cheese products, but is not often used to price other forms of natural cheese. In my experience, the CME barrel cheese price is used to price only around 9% of total U.S. natural cheese and the other cheese categories use the block market as a pricing index.

In conclusion, the increasingly volatile relationship between the 40-pound block cheddar cheese price and the 500-pound barrel cheese price over the past five years has negatively impact both dairy producers and cheese processors.

Historically, using both block cheese and barrel cheese prices in the Class III pricing formula was feasible and widely accepted because the relationship was consistent over time and barrel prices did not have an adverse and disproportionate effect on the Class III milk price calculation.

However, since 2017, the price spread has widened and become less predictable, more volatile, and more disparate from month to month. The two forms of cheddar cheese are not interchangeable products and have developed into different and distinct markets.

Including barrel cheese prices in the Class III formula reduces revenue for dairy producers because barrels overrepresent the volume of total U.S. cheese production that uses the barrel price series as a price index.

Eliminating the barrel price series from the Class III price calculation will reduce financial



2.

2.1

uncertainty for processors, including cooperatives, where cheese prices are not reflective of actual market conditions and could result in shifts to where both blocks and barrel processors use a block market as a pricing index.

Price risk management opportunities for processors will be enhanced because there are no barrel market futures or options available today, and existing risk management tools, such as Class III, cheese block and barrel futures, will be more efficient to price customers and manage input cost risk.

National Milk strongly recommends eliminating the barrel cheddar cheese price from the Class III price calculation.

Foremost thanks the USDA for the opportunity to testify on this critical Federal Order Reform topic.

Q. Thank you, Mr. Hanson. I just have a few questions I just want to expand on in your testimony.

In your testimony, on page 2, you talk about how the market has -- for barrels has changed, or at least the price spread for barrels, and the 40-pound block of cheddar has changed since 2017. And we have heard some questions yesterday where barrel elimination had been talked about in order reform in 2000 -- or in the late 1990s, and then again in 2008 there was another opportunity for talking about removing barrels from the pricing.

I'm wondering if you could expand a little bit



2.

2.0

2.1

- A. I think during that time you saw a lot of -- you saw an increase in barrel production capacity around that 2017 time period, and so I think there was some overcapacity in the industry at that time that started causing barrel prices to drop versus block. But then you've seen some contraction in barrel capacity, and then you've seen barrel prices jump up versus block. But overall, you just -- you saw an imbalance between block capacity and barrel capacity that was driving a lot of that volatility.
- Q. And I think we heard a little bit when we were talking with Dr. Vitaliano about the market-clearing nature of the barrel -- of barrels.

Can you talk about that?

A. Yeah. I think every -- every manufacturer has its own plant network where they have to balance and have balancing levers to make sure that they are making product out of milk. I mean, for Foremost, for example, we make 40-pound blocks, we make 640-pound blocks, and we make mozzarella.

If we have too much milk because milk production is up, or if we have lower demand, we may have to balance 40-pound blocks in the spot market. Or if we have -- don't have orders for 640s, we may have to balance 640-pound blocks. Or we -- it might be the same with mozzarella too where we have to make mozzarella cheese and



2.

2.0

2.1

put that on the spot market.

2.

2.0

2.1

So it's not just like barrels are the balancing lever in the industry and -- and the place of last resort. I think, every -- every manufacturing company has to balance within their own network.

- Q. So would you consider barrels today to be a market demand product than a residual or market-clearing product?
- A. I'd consider them a demand product. I mean, there's a demand for barrel cheese going into processed cheese.
- Q. And then I think you might have said this, but just to make sure that the record is clear on this. Is it a product of last resort?
- A. I mean, it's -- it's going to really depend on where the market prices are and where those specific manufacturers have open capacity. I mean, for us it's -- for Foremost Farms, it is not a market of last resort. We don't make barrels. If companies are making both blocks and barrels, it may be their product of last resort. But if barrel prices are higher than blocks, then they are going to make -- they are going to make barrels versus -- versus blocks.
- Q. Just to respond to the natural demand of the marketplace?
 - A. Right.
- Q. Okay. Can you -- can you help us understand what the difference is between the cheddar market and the barrels?



- A. The markets and, like, where the products get used?
- Q. How the products get used, what the differences are between the two, cheddar block and barrels, yeah.
- A. Yeah. The block products, you get a lot of use in cut-and-wrap type applications. They put it in shred-type products. They can be cubed. So they get put into a lot of retail foodservice types of products that use natural cheese. Either barrel prices -- or barrel products -- barrel -- barrels go into processed cheese products, where they get combined with other types of ingredients to give the processed cheese sort of functionality. And that can be used for a quite a few different products, from sauces to, you know, cheese slices and things like that.
- Q. And would you consider them to be interchangeable products?
- A. They can be on the fringe, but if prices get really, really wide, let's say barrels are much lower than blocks, you are going to see blocks go into processed cheese applications, just because there is an economic incentive to do so. But then you get into labor challenges and things like that.
- Q. Can you tell me about what those -- what you mean by labor challenges?
- A. Well, I mean a lot of cut-and-wrap and processed -- block processors are very automated, and, you know, if -- if you are using blocks in a processing cheese application, you are going to have to physically pick up



2.

2.1

Q. Can you take a look at page 7 of your testimony? I want to look at Table 4.

And you put this table together?

A. Correct.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Q. And it looks like you -- so at the bottom there, you have an average of the NDPSR block minus barrel spread for -- you averaged it for 2000 to 2016.

And -- and that was 0.01; is that right?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And then you took the average where you said that the market started changing at 2017, and took it for all the -- up to date, for at least the reported data and -- and reached an average of 0.11?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And we can see that in 2022, it looks like it was back to -- just for that one year, it was back to 0.01.

Do you know why it dipped back down then? What was happening in the market at that point in time?

A. Yes. Starting in May of 2022, you -- the spread inverted between block and barrel, so you had barrel prices higher than block for about a six-month period up until November of that year. Just -- again, it's just supply and demand conditions. At that point in time, the demand for barrels was higher than what the demand was for block.



- A. Yeah, it -- it came back. It -- blocks were higher than barrel, so a positive spread from about December until April. And then it inverted again where barrels were above block from May until July. In late July, blocks are above barrel, and so for the past six weeks we have had a positive block-barrel spread. A lot -- a lot of volatility.
- Q. That was going to be my next question. More indicative of the volatility that you have been talking about, you have seen continue even after 2022?
 - A. Right.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Q. And then if we look at page 8 of your testimony, Mr. Rosenbaum foreshadowed where he'll be going with you in comparison to Dr. Vitaliano's estimates.

When you say, "In my experience at Foremost and other companies, at least 75% of natural commodity cheese sold in the U.S. uses the CME 40-pound block cheddar cheese price as a pricing index."

And he had that compared to Dr. Vitaliano's testimony in which Dr. Vitaliano said approximately 90%.

- A. Right.
- Q. Would you help provide some clarity as to -- are you guys saying different numbers or explain what you -- what you understand to be that difference?
- A. Well, I think it is just -- it's my risk manager nature. Right? So I'm being more conservative with some of the numbers I put out there. I do agree that the



- Q. Okay. So would you agree that at least 75% is the -- consistent with somebody saying approximately 90%?
 - A. Yes.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

23

2.4

25

26

27

28

- Q. And are there significant types of natural cheese besides barrel cheddar that are priced off barrels?
- A. As far as I'm aware, only -- from a natural cheese perspective, only barrels are going to be priced off the barrel price index. Again, processed cheese, a lot of processed cheese is priced off the barrel market, but that's not part of the natural cheese category.
 - O. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Hanson.

MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, we would submit him for cross-examination at this time.

THE COURT: Mr. Rosenbaum.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

22 BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

Q. Steve Rosenbaum for the International Dairy Foods Association.

I mean, is it fair to say from your testimony that both barrels and blocks can be product of last resort based upon particular circumstances at a point in time?

A. Yes.



- Q. Okay. Now, Foremost, I take it, does not make barrels; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

- Q. Is it correct to say that most companies that make barrels do also make blocks?
 - A. Some do, some don't, yes.
- Q. I'm just -- specifically on the companies that make -- I'm not asking whether companies that make blocks also make barrels. I'm asking the opposite, just so we're clear on my question. Do companies that do make barrels typically also make blocks?
- A. Again, there's some barrel companies that only make barrels; there's some that make barrels and blocks.
 - Q. Okay. And according to -- as I read your testimony, in 2022, roughly, 1.2 billion pounds of barrel cheese was sold in 2022?
 - A. Produced, yes.
 - Q. Okay. And roughly half of the cheese that is surveyed for purposes of setting minimum class prices is block cheese, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And the other half, 40-pound -- 40-pound -- sorry, it's roughly half 40-pound -- start the question again.
- The survey is roughly 40% 500-pound barrels and half 40-pound blocks, correct?
- A. Well, the survey volumes, it would be 52% barrel and 48% block.
 - Q. Okay. And the total survey is 34% of cheddar



1 | cheese, correct?

A. Yes.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. That's a very robust survey, you would agree, for setting minimum milk prices?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And eliminating 500-pound blocks would basically cut in half the market price information utilized, correct?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. So -- okay. I'm correct that both 40-pound blocks and 500-pound barrels are traded on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, correct?
- 13 A. Correct.
- Q. And does that tend to indicate that both of them are commodity products?
- 16 A. Yes.
 - Q. And we are going to be having discussions about which products should be used to price Class III or Class IV milk. I just want to counter distinguish, if you will, those proposals.
 - There's one proposal to include 640-pound blocks in the survey. That is not a CME traded commodity, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. And similarly, there's a proposal to include unsalted butter in the butter survey for purposes of setting minimum milk prices. That is not a CME traded product, correct?



- 1 Α. Correct. And then, finally, there is a proposal to add 2. mozzarella to the cheese survey. And that is not a CME 3 4 traded product, correct? Α. Correct. 5 So let's talk a little bit, if we could, about the 6 Ο. 7 requirements established for inclusion in the survey. MR. ROSENBAUM: And I would like to have this 8 9 document marked as the next exhibit number, your Honor, 10 whatever it is --11 THE COURT: Yes. Exhibit 118. 12 MR. ROSENBAUM: -- if I could. THE COURT: It's so marked for identification. 13 14 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 118 was marked 15 for identification.) 16 BY MR. ROSENBAUM: 17 So showing you Exhibit 118. Are you familiar with 18 the fact that there is a regulation establishing the 19 specifications that cheddar cheese has to satisfy to be 2.0 included in the survey? 2.1 Α. Yes. 22 And it's set forth in 7 CFR, Section 170.8; is that correct? 23 24 Α. Sure. 25 And -- and do you see here where the -- these are Ο. 26
 - the specifications, correct?
 - Α. Yes.
 - And so just to look at, if you will, the Ο.



similarities between the products, or dissimilarities, obviously, you can either be a 40-pound block or a 500-pound barrel, correct?

A. Correct.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

24

- Q. And in terms of moisture content, for 400-pound blocks moisture content is not reported, and it -- one would exclude cheese that will be aged, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And then for 500-pound blocks you do report the weighted average moisture content but adjust it to a standard of -- a particular standard, correct?
- A. Correct.
- Q. And the cheese moisture can't exceed a specified level, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And then when it comes to age, the -- correct me
 if I'm wrong, but the age requirements are the same,
 namely, that in both cases the cheese cannot be less than
 four days, no more than 30 days old on date of sale,
 correct?
- 21 A. Correct.
- Q. And that applies to both the blocks and the barrels, right?
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And for grade, the 40-pound blocks have to meet the Wisconsin State brand or be USDA Grade A or better, correct?
 - A. I assume that's correct.



Q. Okay. And 500 pounds can also meet the Wisconsin State brand or USDA extra grade or better standards.

Do you see that?

A. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. The color requirements are slightly different, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And then, of course, in terms of packaging, there's a requirement for the cheese being -- if it's a 40-pound block, the cheese being wrapped in an airtight package, in corrugated or solid fiberboard, and any other packaging costs are excluded, correct?
 - A. Yeah. If that's what it says, yeah.
- Q. And the 500-pound barrels, you exclude the packaging cost, correct?
 - A. If that's what it says, yes.
- Q. And then there's a series of things excluded thereafter in number eight. I will not go through them one by one except to indicate, if you will agree with me, that these are exclusions that apply equally to the blocks and to the barrels; is that correct?
 - A. If that's what it says, then, yes.
 - Q. Okay. And in terms of any -- strike that.

I assume it's cheaper to package some -- one 500-pound something than it is to package separately a bunch of 40-pound somethings, correct?

A. Right. On a per-pound basis, I would agree with that, yes.



- Q. Sorry, I couldn't quite --
- A. On a per-pound basis, I agree with that.
- Q. I appreciate that correction.

And you are aware that the federal formula, pricing formula, provides a \$0.03 adjustment to reflect that difference in packaging cost, correct?

A. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. Okay. So, I mean, the -- the uses of these products are both reflective of substantial demands for cheddar cheese in this country, correct?
- A. Correct.
 - Q. So that I'll just read what the CME says:

 "Although blocks and barrels are both cheddar cheese

 products, their end uses are diverse. Typically

 manufacturers use block cheddar cheese for chunks, loaves,

 shreds, and snack-sized natural cheese, while barrels are

 often consumed in the processed cheese category," end

 quote.

Is that -- that's con- -- is that your view as well?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And so I take it that if you are going to be looking to produce chunks, loaves, shreds, or snack-sized natural cheeses, you are going to be, as a buyer, buying 40-pound blocks, maybe a larger block too, but in any event a block, correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And if you are buying -- strike that.



to typically be buying a barrel; is that right?

A. Correct.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Okay. So, I mean, you have to include both of them, don't you, really, to reflect the actual supply and demand for cheddar cheese in this country?
- A. Well, National Milk -- we're taking the stance that you need to have one price series to represent the key dairy commodities used in pricing. So one series for cheese, one series for butter, one for whey, and one for nonfat, to make sure that you don't have price distortion from milk going to the finished product.
- Q. But you are -- you -- I mean, cheddar cheese is the commodity that we use to set minimum prices in this country for all -- for all cheese, correct?
- A. And it worked well prior to 2016 because there was a high correlation. So to create the synthetic block from barrel by adding the \$0.03 adjusting moisture worked because there was a very tight price correlation. So since 2017, the wide block-barrel spread has been very disruptive, both to processors, and it has really shortchanged dairy producers on the value they get on the Class III price.
- Q. Well, but I take it that the -- at some points in time, the inclusion of the barrel has lowered the minimum regulated price; is that right?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. And -- and that reflects that at that point



in time -- at those points in time, the demand for barrel cheese was such that it simply didn't support as high a price; is that correct?

A. I agree with that.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

27

- Q. That's reflective of the supply and demand for milk going to cheddar cheese, right?
- A. Right. But I think an order of magnitude it impacted dairy producers. I mean, because barrel cheese is only 9% of total commodity cheese, but it represents 52% of the price calculation of Class III milk. So that's a 5X of magnitude that dairy producers are getting impacted by the block-barrel spread.
- Q. But you have admitted -- you admitted, I think to my first question, that from time to time it's barrels that are the product of last resort, and sometimes it's blocks, right? Goes from --
 - A. Uh-huh.
 - Q. -- one to the other, correct?
- 19 A. Correct.
- Q. And so, I mean, if to the extent that USDA
 believes that it's important that minimum milk prices are
 reflective of the value of milk going to the product of
 last resort, sometimes that's barrels.
- A. For the past five years, it's been barrels most of the time. And that's been really disruptive to the pay price to dairy producers --
 - O. Well --
 - A. -- because it's overrepresented in the overall --



where --

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- O. Well --
- A. -- wherever Class III milk goes, barrels are overrepresenting that larger pool of commodity cheese production.
- Q. At those points in time the product -- the market -- strike that.

At the times when the barrel is lower, that's going to be the product of last resort, correct?

- A. Yes. When it's lower.
- 11 Q. Okay. And are you familiar with the term
 12 market-clearing price?
- 13 | A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. I mean, and at those times it's barrels that are providing the market-clearing price, correct?
 - A. Yeah, you can argue that's the market-clearing price as -- out that's the market-clearing price for 9% of the commodity cheese that Class III milk goes into, not 52%. But the impact on the Class III price is over 50%. It should only be closer to 9%. So taking barrels out really removes that disruption and gives dairy producers more value.
 - Q. Well, you would end up with a price that's above the market-clearing price for barrels, surely. That's -- that's what you would be achieving?
 - A. Yeah. But you would be -- it would better represent reality than what we're seeing today.
 - Q. Well, my question was a little different. In the



circumstances you are describing, you are setting a minimum milk price that is in excess of the market-clearing price for barrels, correct?

- A. I disagree that it's -- it -- you -- you're -- you're -- you would be making it closer to reality because barrels are overrepresenting the market-clearing impact in the marketplace today.
- Q. Let just -- but for those 1.2 billion pounds of barrel cheese --
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. -- you are going to be setting a price that's in excess of the market-clearing price?
 - A. Just for that 9% of commodity product.
- 14 Q. Okay.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- MR. ROSENBAUM: That's all I have.
- 16 THE COURT: Mr. English, your witness.
 - MR. ENGLISH: I can go, but I am conscious -- you know, I -- of Dr. Kaiser's schedule and the fact that we really shouldn't go too late because we all have other things for tomorrow. And so I'm wondering whether now would be a good time to take a two-hour break -- I mean, I could go now, but I'm just worried that we push it at the end -- and I hope Dr. Kaiser knows, pointblank, none of what happened this morning was about him personally, it was about the timing of the hearing. So now having your making the decision you have made, I want to help work with his schedule, and I'm going to be clear about that.



THE COURT: I'm here to serve the parties.

MR. ENGLISH: I think it makes most sense -- and I would also do a procedural thing -- I think it makes most sense if we take our two-hour lunch break now. And I appreciate the offer from USDA, but I think given that we would normally do it, I actually prefer regular order, which is to say that we come back, Mr. Rosenbaum and I do the examination, because I don't think it's going to change our preparation ability. So unless USDA objects, I think we would come back with Dr. Kaiser, obviously maybe other cross-exam other than Mr. Rosenbaum and I, but I think that I worry a little bit that we don't get him done otherwise.

THE COURT: I'm worried, yeah.

MR. HILL: I was going to suggest the same thing, your Honor, that we take the break now before further cross-examination.

I do have one question or one note on what was marked as Exhibit 118. At the top it does say 170.8, and just for the record, I want it to be known that this is 7 CFR 1170.8, and only the A portion. I think there's a B, C, and a D that are not included on the document. So I just wanted to make that clear.

MR. ROSENBAUM: I must say, as I was reading it out, I was thinking that number doesn't sound right to me. But that's what it said on the piece of paper, so I read it. I appreciate the correction.

THE COURT: I had the same thought. Thank you, Mr. Hill.



2.

2.0

2.1

Okay. So we're going to take a two-hour lunch. Again, I'm making the ruling here, but I'm trying to do this by consensus. And nothing personal to anybody here, much less Dr. Kaiser, for sure. So let's -- let's suspend the cross-examination of this witness, take a two-hour lunch, and come back with Dr. Kaiser back on the stand. Thank you, everybody. Let's come back at 1:36 p.m. (Whereupon, a luncheon break was taken.) ---000---2.1



| 1 | THURSDAY, AUGUST 31, 2023 AFTERNOON SESSION |
|----|--|
| 2 | THE COURT: On the record. Dr. Kaiser has resumed |
| 3 | the stand. |
| 4 | I remind you, you are still under oath. |
| 5 | Do we have further direct? Is that where we are? |
| 6 | MS. HANCOCK: No, your Honor. He's available for |
| 7 | cross. |
| 8 | THE COURT: Okay. |
| 9 | And we wanted as I understand it, we were going |
| 10 | to do the usual order. |
| 11 | Mr. Rosenbaum bravely steps forward first into the |
| 12 | breach. |
| 13 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 14 | BY MR. ROSENBAUM: |
| 15 | Q. Dr. Kaiser, Steve Rosenbaum for the International |
| 16 | Dairy Foods Association. If you could turn to Exhibit |
| 17 | Hearing Exhibit 115, which is your testimony, your written |
| 18 | testimony. |
| 19 | A. Okay. |
| 20 | Q. On page 4, going onto page 5, you have a series of |
| 21 | estimates of price elasticity demand for fluid milk. |
| 22 | Do you see that? |
| 23 | A. Yes. |
| 24 | Q. Now, not having had the opportunity to actually |
| 25 | read any of them, I will nonetheless ask some questions. |
| 26 | It looks to me like the most recent estimate |
| 27 | strike that. Let me start that again. |
| 28 | It looks to me like the most recent study in which |



1 | you were personally involved was in 2012, the

- 2 Dong/Schmit/Kaiser study, the fourth one listed.
 - A. That is, I believe, correct.
 - Q. Okay. So that is the last time you published?
 - A. It is the last time I had a refereed publication on milk elasticity, yes.
 - Q. Okay. And is it the protocol that when the authors of a refereed work are listed, you list the authors in order of relative contribution?
- 10 A. That's -- that is correct.
- Q. So in that particular one, there were two individuals who had a greater contribution to the article than yourself, correct?
- 14 A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- 15 | Q. Okay. And --
- 16 A. But could I just add something there?
- So most of these articles are with research
 associates that I hired, and I always put their names
 before mine. So I wouldn't say that it's an extreme lack
 of my involvement as an author in these articles. I'm
 just trying to help out people that are younger in their
 career than I am.
 - Q. But it's been 11 years since you participated in a study to which --
 - A. In a refereed --
- 26 Q. In a referred --
- 27 A. -- study.
- 28 | Q. -- study?



23

24

- A. I have -- I have estimated milk for the report to Congress more recently than that.
 - Q. Okay. The most recent refereed work in which you are listed as the first author was in 1998, the Kaiser and Liu study?
- A. That is correct. Wait, no. I'm sorry. Yes.
- 7 Yes. I'm sorry, yes, the Kaiser and Liu study, correct.
 - Q. And I thought your last report to Congress was in 2011. Is that not correct?
 - A. I would have to look. If you have something in writing, I would believe it. I don't have a great recall on when I stopped doing that. But I thought it was a little bit more recent than that.
- Q. And this was a report to Congress on the efficacy of, what, one of the fluid milk promotion programs?
 - A. On the dairy and fluid milk promotion programs, checkoff programs, yeah.
 - Q. So that would have been roughly 11 years ago as well, correct?
 - A. Yes.

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

2.0

- Q. And I do note that the two studies that you -that -- that I believe are the two most recent studies on
 your list that have your name associated with them are the
 fourth one, which I referred to before, the
- 25 Dong/Schmit/Kaiser 2012 study, correct?
- 26 A. Correct.
- Q. And then the Dong and Kaiser study in 2008, correct?



- A. I will take it as -- I would have to look to verify that, but I believe it's probably true.
 - Q. Okay. And those studies came up with a price elasticity of negative 0.710 and negative 0.735, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And the bigger the negative number, the more elastic --
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. -- the response to a price increase, correct?
- 10 A. Correct.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

- Q. Okay. Meaning that the more your sales decline based upon a given price increase, correct?
- 13 A. Correct.
 - Q. If one were to focus on your own personal work in those two studies, you would have an elasticity response more than double the 4.7% -- I'm sorry -- more than double the 0.35 --
- 18 A. Correct.
 - O. -- elasticity that you included?
- 20 A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. So have you -- I mean, the -- the
 calculation that you actually put forth in your paper
 suggested that an increase of the magnitude being
 contemplated here would result in a 1.6% decline in fluid
 milk sales in the United States?
- 26 A. Correct.
- 27 | O. And --
- 28 A. Based on the average elasticity from the 38



1 studies, based on the median elasticity, it was .9%.

- Q. But if we were to focus on your own personal work, that would double to 3.2%, roughly? And these are rough numbers but --
 - A. For these -- just these -- I don't know how many publications I have on this, but you are just using two of them.
 - Q. Well, I'm using two of the recent -- I mean, I think they're the two most recent.
- 10 A. Yeah.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

- 11 Q. Yeah.
- 12 A. Okay.
 - Q. And by the way, just since we're talking about these results and what they mean, I mean, have you calculated what a -- what a 1.6% decline in milk consumption would mean in terms of loss of dollar sales?
- A. No, I haven't. But it would result in an increase in dollar -- in total value to dairy farmers because the price --
- Q. No, I'm worried about the processors in this question.
- MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, if we could let the witness finish --
- MR. ROSENBAUM: Okay. All right.
- MS. HANCOCK: -- his answers before we cut him off.
- THE WITNESS: It would also likely result in an increase in revenue to processors because the price



- Q. But you are assuming -- but you are assuming they are just passing through their additional costs, right?
- A. No, I'm not assuming anything. I'm -- I'm basically saying that's the definition of an inelastic elasticity. If it's below one in absolute value, the increase in the price will outweigh the decrease in the quantity demanded, and revenue will increase as a result.
- Q. Well, but your chart on page -- in the appendix, page 9, that's based upon -- that's your effort to determine what -- what would happen to the price -- price of milk based upon -- at the -- at the retail level?
- A. What the appendix on page 9 shows is if the Class I price basically increases by 10% --
 - O. Right.
- A. -- that would translate to a 5 -- roughly a 5% increase in the retail price. That has nothing to do with the revenue. The revenue is that when you have a demand elasticity that's inelastic, the processor revenue would go up if -- if you raise the price.
- Q. Well, yes. But based upon a cost -- based upon their bearing an extra cost, right? Isn't that --
 - A. What would the extra cost be?
- Q. The higher price we have to pay our farmers for the milk.
 - A. That would be passed along to the consumer.



2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

That's what I'm saying. If you are a retailer --

Q. You -- go ahead.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- A. If you are a retailer and you are selling in an inelastic market, if you raise the price, you are going to get a demand effect, a negative demand effect, but that will be less in percentage terms than the increase in the price. Revenue is equal to price times quantity, so revenue will go up for the processors as well.
- Q. But that -- you are reflecting in that calculation -- correct me if I'm wrong -- but you are reflecting, for example, that there are additional costs along the way. So it's just milk, isn't it, when it comes to the retail price of milk?
- A. Well, yes. I'm talking about revenue. I'm not talking about net revenue. Yes. No. Now I know what you are saying. Yeah, their costs would go up as well, but it's an empirical issue whether they're -- I'm -- I'm basically saying gross revenue for -- for processors and gross revenue for farmers will go up by raising the -- raising the Class I price.
 - Q. And costs as well for the processors?
 - A. Correct. Yes, that is true.
- Q. Now, also on -- going back to page 5 of 9, you calculate an average elasticity of -- of -- of negative 3-point -- of negative 0.354, correct?
- A. Correct.
- Q. And that's the number you used in the calculation that we have been discussing so far, correct?



- A. Correct.
- Q. I notice that you also have a standard deviation shown.
- A. Uh-huh.

2.

3

4

5

7

9

16

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. You need to say yes or no, just for the reporter.
- 6 A. Oh, I'm sorry. Yes.
 - Q. And -- which is the same number as the average?
- 8 A. Yes.

statistics?

- Q. And is that just a coincidence?
- 10 A. It is just a coincidence.
- Q. All right. And -- okay. My understanding of standard deviations, correct me if I'm wrong, is that to -- generally to be at a 95% confidence level that you are right, you would apply two standard deviations to whatever number you are assessing? Is that just standard
- 17 A. I don't really know the answer to that. It's been a while since I have taken probability.
 - Q. Okay. You don't know whether two standard deviations in a normal bell curve represents a 95% ---
 - A. Oh, I'm sorry. That sounds about right. There are -- there are other ways to go about doing that than talking about standard deviations. You and talk about standard normal, for example, and --
 - Q. I mean, I'm trying to use the phrase you used, standard deviation.
 - A. Okay.
 - Q. That's the way -- I'm using it in the way you used



1 | it in your paper.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

28

- A. This is -- this is the way -- can I answer -- the way I would interpret the standard deviation here is that, basically, a one standard deviation movement would be plus or minus. You would add that number to the mean to get -- to get -- I don't know if it's two. I'm not sure if it is two. But I think we're talking about a little bit different --
 - O. Well --
- A. -- thing. I mean, if you are talking about confidence interval, I think -- it wouldn't apply the way I calculated the standard deviation.
- Q. Okay. So this isn't a question of determining the likelihood that your number is correct?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Oh.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, Mr. Rosenbaum, I am just too tempted. Is it stepping on your cross if I ask why he includes a standard deviation number if it is not intended to be a test of the confidence level? If you don't want to ask that question, I will let -- again, I don't want to interrupt your cross, but I'm just too curious.

MR. ROSENBAUM: Sure.

BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

- Q. Why -- what were you calculating the number for if not to determine the likelihood that your number is accurate?
 - A. I will answer that as the following: Each one of



these estimates, elasticity estimates, are statistically diff- -- significantly different than zero. The standard deviation, you can't just add these numbers up and say that this is going to be a measure of -- I mean, you can, but -- but the individual observations that went -- went about in each one of these estimates was statistically significant. So I'm not sure what you are trying to point out by the standard deviation.

- Q. Well, my understanding of statistics is exactly as follows, that when you have a series of disparate results, you can calculate a standard deviation that tells -- that you can then apply to determine the likelihood that your conclusion, in this case your conclusion average of 0.354, is correct and that that standard deviation will grow as there's no disparity in the numbers --
- A. It certainly is correct. It's a simple average that I took. So what do you mean by it not being correct?
- Q. I mean, well -- well, but that's what statistics is all about. I mean, it is a question of when you have a series of disparate numbers that are, in this case, purportedly measuring the same thing and they are disparate numbers, then you can apply statistical probability that will let you know what's your confidence level that your average is right.
 - A. Isn't.
 - Q. Isn't that how you use it?
- 27 A. No.
- 28 Q. No?



2.

2.1

- A. I don't agree with your interpretation of statistics in that regard.
- Q. You are not -- you are not familiar with the notion that when -- you know what a bell curve is? Let me start with that. Do you know what a bell curve is?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And a bell -- isn't a -- and when you have a bell curve, you have a certain distribution of -- distribution of results?
- 10 A. Yep.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Correct?
- 12 A. Yep.
- 13 | O. And --
- 14 A. On a random variable.
 - Q. Right. And when they form a bell curve, isn't it correct that you can calculate standard deviation and -- let me finish -- and then you would -- and then if it's a normally distributed bell curve, then whatever is within two standard deviations, that's when you have a 95% confidence your number is right. That's not your understanding?
 - A. No. What you can do when you have a bell curve is you can take the area underneath it and calculate the probability that the random variable falls within that -- that area under the -- under the bell curve of 99%, 95, 90% confidence level.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. I'm not familiar with two standard deviations,



1 | what you are talking about there. That's foreign to me.

- Q. Are you -- and you are not confident with the notion that standard deviations will -- will provide you a confidence band?
- A. It will -- it will factor in -- a standard deviation will factor into a confidence band, but it's not the only thing that determines it. You need to multiply it by something. I -- I would have to go back to my elementary statistics books to talk about a confidence interval.
- Q. Okay. So since we're talking about how price would affect demand, I take it that the emergence of plant-based, what they at least would call milk products -- although we wouldn't consider them milk -- is a relatively recent phenomenon, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And a new competitive front for the dairy industry; is that fair to say?
- A. Yes.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. And is -- is that -- I mean, is that something that has occurred more recent than any of the studies that you personally participated in that are shown on this?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And do you -- what's the most popular plant-based milk product in the United States today, do you know?
- A. I don't know. I would assume soy milk, but I don't know.



- Q. Would it surprise you to know that that's wrong, soy milk is number three?
 - A. Nope. I said I don't know. I'm just guessing on that.
 - Q. Since I told you soy milk is number three, can you make another guess what's number one?
 - A. I don't see the point of guessing.
 - Q. Well, I'm trying to see whether your analysis actually reflects the current realities that face my client in the marketplace. I --
 - A. I submitted that it wasn't in my study. Oh, wait, soy milk -- actually soy milk was in the USDA study, but that's not on this list.
 - Q. Okay. Anyway, my question was whether you -- since soy is not it, do you have any idea what number one is?
- 17 | A. No.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

2.0

2.1

24

25

26

27

- Q. Okay. You are presupposing that the increase in minimum Class I prices would result in a decline in the sale of fluid milk in the United States?
 - A. I wouldn't use the term presupposing.
- Q. That was a loose word for me. You have calculated that --
 - A. Yes, I have calculated.
 - Q. -- that -- let me just finish -- you have calculated that an increase in the minimum price for Class I milk would result in a decline in fluid milk consumption in the United States, correct?



- A. That's correct.
- Q. Have you made any effort to address that social cost?
 - A. No, I have not.
- Q. I mean, if -- if you -- if one thinks that the Federal Order system was in some respects designed to make sure -- to encourage the availability and consumption of fluid milk because it's a healthy product, you have not assessed what -- what negative price, if any, we ought to assess -- to allocate to that decline?
- A. No.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- MR. ROSENBAUM: That's all I have at this time, your Honor.
- 14 THE COURT: Mr. English.
- 15 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 16 BY MR. ENGLISH:
 - Q. Good afternoon, Doctor. My name is Chip English.
- 18 A. Good afternoon.
 - Q. I represent the Milk Innovation Group, a group of ten entities operating a number of fluid milk plants across the United States.

And I don't want to repeat what Mr. Rosenbaum did, but I do want to set the stage, so I want to confirm in my first question what you were just discussing with him, which is that even though in your opinion milk prices are inelastic, an increase in the cost of fluid milk products at retail will still result in a decrease in purchases, correct?



A. Correct.

1

5

6

7

8

9

2.0

2.1

2.2

23

2.4

25

26

- Q. And on page 3, you say that NMPF's proposals would increase the Class I price by an avenue of \$1.49 per hundredweight, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. And using your first assumption, at the current Class I prices that would result in an 8.6% increase in Class I prices to my clients, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- 10 Q. And that in turn results in a 4.7% increase in 11 retail price, correct?
- 12 A. Yes. Correct, based on my estimated price 13 transmission.
- Q. And that estimated price transmission was 0.55%, correct?
- 16 A. Correct.
- Q. And that will result in a decrease in consumption by 1.6%, correct?
- 19 A. Based on the average elasticity, yes.
 - Q. Okay. Did you do any analysis of what that 1.6% milk demand drop means by pounds?
 - A. No, I did not. I would -- that would be easy to do. I just have to -- my numbers are based on basically all milk sales, so whatever the estimate would be.
 - Q. So assume with me for a moment that for annual 2022 that would be 54.6 million pounds. Okay. Just assume for a moment.
- 28 A. Uh-huh.



- 1 Q. "Yes"? Please. You agree you will do that?
- 2 A. Sure.

- Q. I just -- uh-huh doesn't help the court reporter, nor does my going fast.
 - A. Sorry about that. Yes.
- Q. So if there is decreased milk consumption in fluid milk at 54.6 million pounds, where does that milk go on the farm?
- 9 A. Where does that milk go? There's a good question.
 10 I don't -- I don't know that I have the expertise but -11 to answer that. But what I would guess is it would go
 12 probably to the export market.
 - Q. Which is Class IV, correct?
- 14 A. Which is Class IV, right.
- 15 Q. Which is the lowest class price, correct?
- 16 A. That's correct.
- Q. So when you did your analysis of the benefit to
 dairy farmers in your document here, did you consider the
 impact on dairy farmers of 54.6 million pounds less in
 Class I that would be in Class IV?
- 21 A. No, I did not.
- 22 Q. And Class IV is below Class I, right?
- 23 A. Correct.
- 24 Q. Okay.
- THE COURT: You say "below." You mean price?
- 26 BY MR. ENGLISH:
- Q. Sorry, the price. The price -- the classified price is lower, correct?



A. Correct.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

16

17

18

19

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

- Q. So you, in fact, don't know whether there will be a positive price impact for producers, do you?
 - A. I guess -- I guess it would depend upon what the price difference would be. I simply have not made that calculation. So I -- I feel like I can't answer that, definitively.
 - Q. So you don't know, for instance, what would that do to the Federal Order uniform prices, correct?
- 10 A. Correct.
- 11 Q. And you don't know what that would do to dairy
 12 farmer mailbox prices, correct?
- 13 A. Correct.
- Q. But we do know that consumer prices would go up, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. So in your analysis, you agree that purchases of milk these days are not just grocery stores but, for instance, restaurants, correct?
- 20 A. Correct.
 - Q. Did you include restaurants in your studies?
 - A. Some of them I did; others I did not. It depends upon the study. I would have to go through each of the studies. So some of them I used all milk sales. Some of them I used A.C. Nielsen data, which would just be store sales of milk. Would not include at home -- away-from-home, for example, milk. And that's true with all these studies -- all 38 studies. Some of them use



- Q. But I think you stated that consumption has been shifting to restaurants over grocery stores?
 - A. It has.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. And you agree that restaurants are price sensitive?
- A. Oh, wait. I'm sorry, can you -- can you say the first thing over again? That I what.
- Q. I thought you said at one point in your testimony that consumption has been shifting towards restaurants in terms of the percentage of the market versus grocery stores.
- A. What I said was away-from-home food and beverage consumption as an -- as an aggregate -- expenditures has been growing over time.
 - O. So if there's a shift --
- A. I didn't say that milk was being -- more milk was being consumed away from home. I said the amount of money that people spend over time on away-from-home versus at-home food and beverages has been growing over time. That's what I said.
- Q. Okay. And milk is a food or beverage that they would consume away from home, correct?
- A. Yes. But I'm not saying that -- that people's expenditures on milk away from home are growing. I have no idea about that.
 - Q. Would you agree that -- that restaurants are very



price sensitive?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

- A. Price sensitive to what?
- Q. To the cost. If they have a cost increase, they're price sensitive as a result, because restaurants have low profit margins?
 - A. Oh. Cost sensitive to food ingredient costs --
- 7 O. Yes.
 - A. -- and things like that you mean?I assume so. I'm not an expert on restaurants.
 - Q. Let's think about coffee shops for a moment. As the price of fluid milk goes up, do you agree that demand for fluid milk at coffee shops will go down?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Mr. Rosenbaum asked you a question. I'm going to ask a slightly different question. Do you happen to know when Starbucks rolled out oat milk as a product, as an alternative to our fluid milk that I drink?
 - A. I have no idea. I don't -- I don't shop at Starbucks.
 - Q. If it were March 2021, would that affect some of the studies that were conducted prior to March 2021?
 - A. Not sure. I'm not sure.
 - Q. You testified that milk consumption among youth, or young people, have fallen.
 - Do you know that that milk consumption has fallen by 50% per capita in teens?
- A. Can I argue with what the -- I didn't say that.

 What -- what -- the first part of what you said is not



1 | what I said.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

25

26

27

- Q. All right. Well, then, please, you -- you can correct me.
 - A. Okay. What did you say again.
 - Q. What is your testimony with respect to the milk consumption among young people?
 - A. What I said is the age -- that age cohort has been declining over time. It's lower -- it's lower -- fairly significantly lower than it was in 2013. And that is the largest milk-consuming cohort, and -- and that is explaining part of the reason why milk -- average milk consumption per capita for the whole population has declined.
 - Q. But -- but per capita, if there's fewer youth, that wouldn't explain -- isn't it also the case that the actual consumption by that reduced cohort is less than it used to be?
 - A. I think that's correct. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. I don't know about you, but I grew up drinking milk every day, both for breakfast and for dinner. But that's not true anymore, is it?
 - A. That's correct.
 - O. And it is increasingly true, correct?
- 24 A. Correct.
 - Q. And -- and with that changing population, that means there's a change in preference that we have to confront as a dairy industry, correct?
 - A. That is correct.



- Q. So why are young people, leaving aside that there are fewer of them, drinking less milk as opposed to products that may use the name milk but aren't milk?
- A. That is a very good question, and I don't know if I have the answer to it. And that's a question that the milk industry, I think, considers a really -- the million-dollar question.

One answer would be that -- that they -- there is -- there are so many more beverage -- competing beverages out there than when you and I were children. The parental structure is very different from when you and I were children and were given, you know, a mother at home. All the mothers worked at home -- or were at home at the time and gave us milk, and -- and we don't have that anymore. So those would be two speculative reasons on my part. But I don't claim to know the answer to that.

- Q. Well, the analysis of the proposal that at 1.49 -- \$1.49 per hundredweight, which results in a 1.6% consumption drop, will apply to young people, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And so how will higher prices help bring more of those teens back to fluid dairy?
 - A. It won't.
- Q. Do you agree with the following proposition: That when the dairy industry loses consumers in the early years, it is increasingly difficult to bring them back as fluid milk consumers as adults?
- 28 A. Yes.



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

- 1 Ο. So aren't we just by rising prices increasing the 2. problem in the long-term? 3 THE COURT: What problem? 4 MR. ENGLISH: The problem of fluid milk consumption. 5 THE COURT: Reduced fluid milk consumption. 6 7 MR. ENGLISH: Reduced milk consumption. 8 THE WITNESS: I think that's consistent with my 9 testimony, what I said. I'm just saying that it's one of 10 the least important problems confronting declining milk 11 consumption. 12 BY MR. ENGLISH: 13 But you agree it is a problem? I mean, it is not 14 that it is zero. 15 Yeah. Α. 16 It is going to contribute to it, correct? Ο. 17 Α. Yes. 18 Why would we make all those other problems worse 0. 19 by raising minimum regulated prices? 2.0 To help dairy farmers. Α. 2.1 Do you know the program under which we're Ο. 22 operating for the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act? 23 And you have testified before Congress about milk issues, 2.4 correct?
- 25 A. What -- what are you talking about in particular?
 - Q. I mean, so we're --
 - A. Are you talking about the dairy -- Federal Milk Marketing Order system?



27

- Q. Yes, the Federal Order system --
- 2 A. Federal Milk Marketing --

THE COURT: One at a time.

MR. ENGLISH: Sorry.

THE COURT: And we're going just -- you have been very -- you have both been very good, but just a little slower, because I'm having trouble hearing it, and I don't have to write it down.

BY MR. ENGLISH:

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

27

- Q. All right. Let me start over. We're here today, we've been here already for over a week, and we're likely to be here for at least another four weeks, at a proceeding initiated by the Secretary of Agriculture and AMS to consider amendments to Federal Milk Marketing Order system, correct?
- 16 A. Correct.
 - Q. Do you know the statutory basis under which the Secretary must operate, which is called the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act?
 - A. I'm -- I'm aware of it. I wouldn't be quizzed -- wouldn't want to be quizzed on all the provisions of it.
 - Q. So is the sole purpose of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act as applied for milk orders to increase prices to dairy farmers?
 - A. The sole purpose?
- 26 Q. Yes.
 - A. No.
 - Q. But that's all your testimony is about, correct,



1 raising prices to producers? 2. Α. Correct. And yet you don't know for a fact whether they 3 4 will actually go up because of lost consumption, the conversation we heard earlier? You didn't do an 5 6 analysis --7 THE COURT: Wait a minute. Didn't that just get -- I hate to interrupt, but didn't that just confuse 8 9 prices and revenues -- no questions the price will go 10 up --11 MR. ENGLISH: Right. But I --THE COURT: -- based on his testimony. 12 13 MR. ENGLISH: -- I asked a series of questions, 14 your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Yes. 16 MR. ENGLISH: And I thought his answer was he 17 stopped at the analysis of what the impact would be on 18 producers of the extra \$1.49 for Class I. BY MR. ENGLISH: 19 And I don't believe you considered what the impact 20 Ο. 2.1 would be of lost consumption as to where that milk would 22 go and how that would work out in uniform prices, correct? 23 Α. Correct. 24 Ο. Okay. 25 But can I just say one other thing? Because I 26 kind of misspoke, I think. That wasn't the sole purpose 27 of -- that -- that you -- that -- the way you summarized



28

it. I also -- my -- the main purpose of my study is to

affirm that the demand elasticity for fluid milk is inelastic. That's the main purpose.

Q. I -- I understand that, and I'm going to get to that. You know, Mr. Rosenbaum may have gone first, but somehow I drew the short straw for some of this, so we're going to get to that.

But that's -- do you understand that that's an analysis of why USDA decided many decades ago that it could price discriminate between fluid milk and other products?

- 11 A. I don't understand your question. Could you 12 rephrase it?
 - Q. The issue of alleged inelasticity is relevant to the question of whether USDA can and does differentiate between prices for fluid milk versus ice cream versus cheese versus butter, correct?
 - A. That is correct.
 - Q. Okay. But as you said a moment ago, it is not the sole purpose of the statute, right?
 - A. No.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

- Q. You know that the statute, when it says setting milk prices, is also says, "to be in the public interest"?
 - A. Yes, I'm aware of that.
- Q. And the public interest is understood to include consumers, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. So I want to understand, going back to page 3, your expert opinion on how the increased cost of \$1.49



will be passed through the system.

Is it your expert opinion today that fluid milk processors can absorb the entirety of the price increase -- can absorb the entirety of the increase in the price of milk by passing it on to retailers?

A. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 0. 100%?
- A. I don't know if it will be 100%, but it will be predominantly -- it will be very close to that, in my opinion.
 - Q. And on what basis do you have that opinion?
- A. The extreme inelasticity of demand basically would root that out, that it -- the cost -- the cost to -- of processors to raising their price is primarily -- in response to a cost -- a Class I increase, would be primarily the opportunity cost that they would lose. They would lose some quantity demanded. But that, as I repeatedly have said, will be a much smaller percentage decline than the respective percentage increase in the price that they receive.
- Q. But your study is an inelasticity of demand at the retail level, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. Do you have any evidence that that inelasticity of demand applies equally when a fluid milk processor goes to a grocery store and says, congratulations, your price just went up?
 - A. What was the question there?



- Q. Given that your study is the inelasticity of demand at retail --
 - A. Okay.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. -- do you have any study about what actually happens when my clients go to their clients, a grocery store, and say, congratulations, I have for you an increase of \$1.49 per hundredweight translated as gallons?
- A. Well, it wouldn't be a \$1.49, but I -- I'd have to do the arithmetic. But if everybody would be treated the same under this, I -- I think they -- they could do it. I think they could pass it along to the retailers, and the retailers would pass it along to the consumers. Because this would apply to every processor -- that the increase in cost would apply to every processor in the country.
- Q. But isn't it the case that as consumers' taste change and the dairy case that we understood growing up that included just milk, that we call milk, now the retailer has a choice of how much space they are going to give milk versus oat products versus almond milk versus soy milk, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And if retailers are going to lose sales on fluid milk, aren't they more -- aren't they likely to give up more of that shelf space to those competing products?
- A. Well, probably a little bit, but that would be -that would be consumer driven. If there's consumers out
 there that want to buy fluid milk, what retailer is not
 going to sell it to them?



- Q. But 1.6% down, so now the retailer has to fill their shelf with that 1.6 volume in order to drive their sales, correct?
 - A. I don't understand the question. Can you say that again?
 - Q. All right. By your analysis, fluid milk consumption would go down 1.6% --
 - A. Uh-huh.
 - Q. -- correct?
- 10 A. That was one of the bounds. The other one is .9%.
- 11 Q. Okay. I'm just using one of the bounds.
- 12 A. Okay.

5

6

7

8

9

16

17

18

- Q. That means that retailers have the same size shelves to fill, correct?
- 15 A. Yes.
 - Q. And so when their sales of fluid milk go down, that means they are going to fill them with more water or more plant-based beverages, correct?
- 19 A. Correct.
- Q. Do you agree, based upon the studies that you have seen, that these price increases will be most felt not in the specialty milk products but on traditional fluid milk sales?
- A. Can you repeat the question? The price increases,

 I don't --
 - Q. So -- so your inelasticity studies --
- 27 A. Yes.
- 28 Q. -- or those that you have seen, do you agree that



there is a difference between how the consumers react between specialty milk products and traditional fluid milk sales?

A. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. And where will the -- where will the impact be felt more by the consumer?
- A. I would believe that the highest valued milk products would have more of an elasticity than the lower -- the bulk milk, for example, the lower priced per unit bulk milk. That would be more inelastic.
- Q. So -- and that's the successful growing segment, correct, of the fluid milk category, is the specialty milk products?
 - A. Yes. Yes.
 - Q. So the impact on them is greater. And so doesn't that mean the very segment that is growing is going to be hurt the most?
 - A. I don't understand what you mean by the impact on them is greater. Are you meaning that they have a higher elasticity of demand for -- for those products? Is that what you are saying?
 - O. Yes.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And because of that higher elasticity of demand, the very segment that is not completely dying will be impacted negatively in the sense that consumers are going to buy less of it because the price elasticity is higher, correct?



- A. Let me -- let me propose an alternative to that. The -- what do you think about the data that the real price of milk has declined by just the exact opposite of what you are saying, by 8.3%? And what happened to milk sales over that period? They dropped by 18%. So does it follow from your logic then that if you cut the price, that -- that it's going to be the savior of the fluid milk industry? I wouldn't agree with that.
 - Q. Well, let me -- let me skip ahead, and I'll have



23

24

25

26

27

to come back.

2.

2.1

If -- if demand was dropping, as you said in your testimony, at 18.3%, when the price was declining 7%, how can the fluid milk industry handle a price increase if it's going down even when their price is going down?

- A. What that -- what that fact tells me is that price is very unimportant.
- Q. You don't think in the face of the declines we have already had, that a 1.6% decline simply because of that one proposal in Class I prices, you don't think that's significant?
- A. I think that it -- it's important, but in the grand scheme of things, it is relatively unimportant relative to the main drivers that are driving that trend downward. I mean that's pretty clear in my testimony. I didn't say there's no impact. I'm just saying that it is a very, very small impact, and in the grand scheme, not that important relative to other demand drivers for fluid milk.
- Q. Even accepting your premise, the price increase that you are talking about that you say is not going to have a huge impact, it does have an additive impact? It is like, you know, piling the insults on to the fluid milk industry, right?
- A. Yes, I have answered that question several times. I said it does have an impact.
- Q. So what are the main demand drivers in your opinion, if it's not price?



| A. The three that I mention in my testimony I think |
|--|
| are the main ones, at least those are the ones that I have |
| actually quantified in the past. And that is the the |
| growing competitive competing products to milk. There's |
| been an explosion over the last 25 years in that regard. |
| Now the consumers basically has at their at their |
| disposal, many, many more products, beverage substitutes |
| to milk than they used to have. I think that's a big one. |

I think that the decline in the percentage of the population, that is one of the biggest, if not the biggest. Milk-drinking cohort has hurt -- that has driven down average per capita consumption.

And then the trend in -- the trend in people dining out, away from home, has also hurt. Most milk consumption is done at home, not away from home, including restaurants, convenience stores, gas stations, etcetera.

- Q. And doesn't the growth of competing products make demand more elastic for milk, for fluid milk?
- A. Make it more elastic? I don't think the empirical evidence bears that out.
- Q. So let's go back to consumers. In your expert opinion, are consumers hurt by higher Class I prices, fluid milk prices?
 - A. Yes.

Oh, can I rephrase that? Fluid milk producers -there have been many studies on this, on the impacts of
Federal Milk Marketing Orders on consumers. Fluid milk
consumers are hurt by classified pricing, but other dairy



2.

2.0

2.1

2.4

consumers are helped because their prices are lower.

Those prices go down.

- Q. But as you yourself said, there's growing demand for competing products?
 - A. Correct.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. Let us all in this room, I hope, agree, that milk has higher and better nutrition than bottled water, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. That milk has higher and better nutrition than all those milk -- those claimed products like oat milk or soy milk, correct?
- A. I can't answer that. I'm not a nutritionist.

 I -- I do know that not everybody would agree with that,
 that drinking whole milk is healthy for you. But I'm not
 a nutritionist, and I'm not -- and I don't play one on TV,
 so I'm not going to try to answer that.
 - Q. I know -- well, and I -- I -- THE COURT: Well, we are on TV.

BY MR. ENGLISH:

Q. I'm not an economist, and I am on TV, but anyway.

But -- so I know it's been a few years, you have
been away from the milk promotion programs. Isn't it the
case that -- that the milk promotion programs are now
touting the fact that real milk, what we call real milk,
has protein that comes from the actual milk that can -that is actually absorbed by the human body much more
efficiently than these other products that add protein,



1 correct? 2. I -- I have heard that, correct. And would you agree that's true? 3 0. I don't know. I'm not a nutritionist, so I really 4 don't know. I mean, I believe -- if -- if a 5 scientist tells me that, I'll believe it. 6 7 THE COURT: Mr. English, does it help if you ask the witness to assume for purposes of this examination, 8 9 that that's true? 10 MR. ENGLISH: Thank you, your Honor. BY MR. ENGLISH: 11 12 Would you assume for the purpose of this 13 examination that it is true --14 Α. Sure. -- that fluid milk produced from cows has higher 15 16 nutrition that is more efficiently absorbed by consumers 17 than the competing products who put the word "milk" on --18 Α. Sure. -- their labels? 19 0. 2.0 Α. Yes. 2.1 THE COURT: He just answered yes, that you -- yes, 22 you would assume that. 23 THE WITNESS: Yes, I will assume that. 24 THE COURT: And that means you will take that as a 25 truth -- because I was thinking assume it for purpose of a 26 further question. 27 MR. ENGLISH: Thank you, your Honor. It's been a



28

long day already, and so thank you.

THE COURT: You are doing fine.

BY MR. ENGLISH:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

- Q. So at one time, I think, again, you worked with the milk promotion programs, both the one that is the producer-funded program and what's called MilkPEP, the dairy processor program, correct?
- A. Correct. I started off working for the dairy farmer program, and then -- and I believe that the MilkPEP program may have had their own study done, and then it got brought into one through -- through the USDA AMS, and I did those studies.
- Q. But as part of that you got to know -- I mean, you had to sort of get to know the processor industry a little bill, didn't you?
 - A. Yes, that is correct.
- Q. So if the proposal is adopted, and the increase of \$1.49 per hundredweight translates in one bound of your testimony to a 1.6% drop, that means that fluid milk processors will have less volume of milk to run through their plants, correct?
- A. Correct.
- Q. And to the extent their plants are expensive fixed assets, that means that their relative costs are going up per gallon, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. Doesn't that mean that the margins for fluid milk processors will likely go down?
 - A. It's possible. I -- I would -- I haven't looked



- Q. But are you aware -- so first let me draw a distinction that I don't think has been in the record yet.

 There are branded dairy products, correct?
 - A. Correct.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

26

- Q. And what does the term "branded" mean to you?
- A. Branded means it's -- it's an effort, a marketing effort by a firm to try to differentiate their product from competitors, and it is designed to increase their sales and perhaps capture more market share from the competitors.
 - Q. And what does the term "private label" mean?
- A. Private label, which I believe is synonymous with generic -- oh, private label is usually like Wegman's, a grocery store will adopt the label that -- that a whole -- a processor will make for them. And it's not branded, it is -- basically, it's a -- it's a similar -- very similar product, but it's not branded.
- Q. Oftentimes it's not just a similar product, except for the label, it's identical product, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. You know, it might have been the same plant code, same day --
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. -- all of that, correct?
- 28 A. Correct.



- Q. And typically, a branded product, will command a premium in the marketplace, correct?
 - A. Correct.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Over the private label, I meant?
- A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. Are you aware in your studies that when prices go up, that consumers typically switch from branded products to private label products?
- A. I -- that -- that sounds very reasonable to me.

 I'm not an expert on that, on that switching that goes on.

 But, yes, that's seems reasonable.
- Q. Now, that switch, in looking at your study, wouldn't reflect a reduced demand in fluid milk, correct?
- 14 A. Oh, if -- if --
 - MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, I'll object. He's already said he doesn't have that. That's not part of his study. We're kind of just going around --
 - MR. ENGLISH: No, this is --
 - MS. HANCOCK: -- what he just said.
- 20 MR. ENGLISH: This is different, your Honor.
 - THE COURT: Yeah, I think that's a -- I don't think that requires a study. He's asking whether it's being sold somewhere else, will that -- demand hasn't gone down, it is being solid a different way. I think that's what you're asking.
 - MS. HANCOCK: I think his answer was that he didn't know. Then he followed up with a question as if he did know.



1 THE COURT: Well --

MS. HANCOCK: That's my objection.

MR. ENGLISH: That's not my recollection.

THE COURT: Overruled for now.

BY MR. ENGLISH:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. But I think I said, is it reasonable to conclude that consumers, when prices go up, would switch from a branded product that's a premium price to a private label, correct?
- A. Yes, that sounds -- I said -- I said I -- I did say I don't know, but it sounds reasonable.
- Q. Okay. And if a consumer, instead of buying a gallon of branded product bought a gallon of private label, that would not be reflected as a lost gallon in any of these studies, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. But to the extent those products commanded a higher margin, that means the fluid milk processor who lost that branded sale, lost that higher margin, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Do you know if that's what contributed to the Dean Foods bankruptcy in 2020?
 - A. I'm not familiar with it.
 - Q. So I jumped ahead at one point because you answered a question about something I was going to ask later, so let me come back to this issue about demand dropping even when prices went down. Okay? Do you understand that's -- you have already talked about that



with me, correct?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

2.4

- A. Correct.
- Q. But that was three or four pages ahead, so now I'm going to come back. I have some questions I wanted to ask, but I wanted to set the stage.
 - A. Sure.
- Q. Would it surprise you to hear that we had testimony earlier this week from processors that they cannot always pass along fluid milk cost increases to their retailers?
 - A. No, it wouldn't surprise me.
- Q. And wouldn't agree, you know, based upon some of your studies, what you know, that if processors cannot pass all along these cost increases to retailers, that that will squeeze their margins further?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. So we talked briefly about the public interest.

 Do you understand that the purpose of Federal

 Order is to prevent disorderly market and to ensure a sufficient supply of milk for fluid use?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Is it your expert testimony that there is an insufficient supply of milk for fluid use?
 - A. That there's an insufficient?
- 25 O. Yes.
- 26 A. No.
- Q. You agree that there's more than a sufficient supply of milk for fluid uses, correct?



A. Yes.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. And the raising of the price to Class I processors with a resulting decrease, however small in your view, of consumption, will not result in Class I processors purchasing more milk, will it?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. So I'm going to turn back to -- and try very hard not to duplicate -- to pages 4 and 5 already discussed with Mr. Rosenbaum.

Are there any other studies of which you are aware that you have not included?

- A. There are no other peer-reviewed studies that I'm aware of. And I am aware of some other non-peer-reviewed studies. But this -- these are all the peer-reviewed studies that I found.
- Q. So you view that we can only consider peer-reviewed studies?
- A. I think that is more of the gold standard is a study that has been reviewed by experts that basically deem it worthy. I'm not saying that non-peer-reviewed articles are -- are inferior necessarily. I'm just saying that this is a -- kind of a quality control. That's why I use peer reviewed.
- Q. Given our conversation and your conversation with Mr. Rosenbaum about changes in the market, whether it's changes in the youth cohort, whether it's changes in -- in home demand, whether it's changes with the growing competition from all those products that are in the dairy



case today that are not milk, at what point in time, in your expert opinion, does the data reflected in studies reflect the current market situation?

- A. At what point in time? Well, I mean --
- Q. Let me ask it a different way. The first study as I see it is a study by Bartlett in 1964.
 - A. Right.
- Q. That study wouldn't reflect any of these three changes, correct?
- 10 A. Correct.

4

5

6

7

8

9

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Okay. And so asking that question now and coming forward, when are those three categories --
- 13 | A. I think --
- 14 Q. -- together?
 - A. Well, as I mentioned in my testimony, these studies span 60 years going back to the study that you just mentioned and going up to a study by Yang and Dharmasena in 2021. And I think if you went back ten years ago and asked that same question, you would probably -- we could probably agree that the market is different ten years ago than it was 15 years ago. So I don't know why -- I don't know why -- what good it would be for me to say how far back can you go to completely explain the current market environment. Maybe it was six months ago. I don't know. I -- I have no idea.
 - Q. Maybe it was six months ago.
 - A. Yeah.
 - Q. So you assert a number of reasons, and we just



chatted a little bit, for the decline of fluid consumption that you claim does not include the price of fluid milk.

The Slutsky equation -- S-L-U-T-S-K-Y -- says price elasticity of demand is composed of two parts, correct?

- A. Correct.
- Q. Income is one, correct?
- A. Correct.
 - Q. And the other is substitution, correct?
- 10 A. Correct.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

- 11 Q. And so there's an income effect and a substitution 12 effect, correct?
- 13 A. Correct.
 - Q. The income effect is not relevant to the price elasticity of demand for fluid milk? Would you agree?
 - A. I don't quite understand your question. Can you rephrase that again?
 - Q. Is the income effect relevant to the price elasticity of demand study for fluid milk?
 - A. It can be. It depends upon how -- what sort of demand equation was estimated for. There are ways to estimate what is called an income-compensated demand curve, and there are ways to estimate an uncompensated income -- uncompensated demand curve. I -- of these 38 studies I can't tell you which -- which ones did which, but I would imagine, to guess, that there's a mixture of both in here.
 - Q. But you don't know?



- A. I don't -- I mean, I'd have to look at the articles.
 - Q. What about any of yours, the recent ones of yours?
- A. For some of them, that's true. Where we use demand systems, we have that. And some of them, it's not true, where we just estimated what's called an individual single equation for milk. So some of them have it in there; some of them don't.
 - Q. So in those cases where it's not involved, substitution has to be the factor, correct?
- 11 A. Uh-huh. Yes.
 - Q. And so products that have more substitutes will have more elastic demand, correct?
 - A. Correct.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

19

2.0

2.1

2.4

25

26

- Q. And you admit that the beverage market has become increasingly competitive with all these competitive products, correct?
- 18 A. Correct.
 - Q. And so doesn't that increasingly competitive beverage market mean that prices matter more than others?
 - A. Not --
- 22 | 0. More than ever before?
- 23 A. Not necessarily.
 - Q. You wouldn't think, with the substitution effect, that the beverage market becoming more increasingly competitive would mean that milk demand is becoming more elastic?
- 28 A. No, I don't. I don't believe that. And the



| 1 | reason I don't believe it is that the cross-price |
|----|--|
| 2 | elasticity as a demand with respect to milk is very, very |
| 3 | inelastic. People that are milk drinkers tend tend to |
| 4 | drink milk, and they are going to drink milk almost |
| 5 | regardless of what the prices of other competing beverages |
| 6 | are. And then there's the exact opposite, there are |
| 7 | people that don't drink milk, and the price of beverages, |
| 8 | the price of milk has no impact at all on their demand. |
| 9 | Hence, we would say that the substitutes are weak |
| 10 | substitutes for milk. |
| 11 | O And that is by way of saying we sould never get |

- 11 And that is by way of saying, we could never get 12 them back, correct?
 - Α. Yes.

14

15

16

18

24

- And so the few that we have got that aren't among them are going to go down that 1.6% under your assumption, correct?
- 17 Α. Correct.
- MR. ENGLISH: I have no further questions, your 19 Honor.
- 2.0 THE COURT: Very good.
- 2.1 Any other questions on cross?
- 22 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 23 BY MR. MILTNER:
 - Ryan Miltner representing Select Milk Producers. Ο. Good afternoon, Dr. Kaiser.
- 26 Good afternoon, Ryan. Α.
- 27 Ο. I wanted to start with a few questions about your 28 statement that we didn't go over earlier.



- A. No. But I would say that I think one of the reasons the -- in general, the elasticities in Table 1 that tend to be the most elastic, tend to be ones that used scanner data from grocery stores, so they are a subset of all milk actually. And the substitution, basically -- they were done at a very disaggregated level. So, for example, they would include maybe -- I'm just going to make this up -- but maybe eight or nine, ten products, milk products, rather than fewer, in which case that tends to add just implicitly to the elasticity estimates because of that, using that dataset and the fact that it's not all milk that's consumed in society.
- Q. So if I could summarize that, the limited dataset affects the elasticity that's calculated; is that correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. Would you extend that to suggest that because of the limited dataset, the usefulness of that study is not as -- well, it is not as useful as a study that had a more encompassing dataset?
- A. That's my personal opinion, yes, because especially when you want to talk about Class I, you should really be talking about all Class I products, not just those that are sold in a grocery store.
 - Q. At the bottom of page 2 -- and this was something



2.

2.1

study?

where what you said when you read the statement was slightly different than what you wrote.

The second sentence, it's written as, "There are at least three reasons for this." When you -- when you read it, you said, "There are at least three reasons I can think of."

Are there any other reasons other than the three listed that -- that you wanted to add to that? I understand when you read things, you -- we fill in words, but I wanted to ask you about that.

A. That's a good question. I am -- I am sure there's some -- some other factors out there that the dairy industry would love to -- you know, to answer so maybe they could -- they could approach a solution to it perhaps.

I would say there might be some racial demographics that could be important over time. And by that, I -- I am going to quote this from memory, which may not be precise, but I know that if there's any racial changes in the population, it has an impact on milk consumption. For example, Caucasians consume more milk than African Americans consume but less milk than the generalization of Hispanics do. And therefore, over time, if those demographics are changing, for example, if there's more African Americans in the population, that will have an impact on milk demand. So -- so that would be one possibility.

I'd want to explore it and investigate that in



2.

2.0

2.1

more detail empirically, but that would be a hypothesis that I would be interested in testing. So that would be one factor that would be worth looking at.

And -- and I do have limited empirical -- a long, long time ago I did a lot of demand work on milk demand in New York City, and that was a market where I looked at over 25 years of monthly data. And that was a long time period, and there was these major changes in racial demographics that had a profound impact on driving milk demand in that market -- average milk demand in that market. So that would be one that I left off here that might be a candidate.

O. Thank you.

2.

2.1

In addition to your research on elasticities for fluid milk, have you done any broader surveys or research on the reasons why consumers may move away from consuming fluid milk products?

- A. No, I have always wanted to do that, but I have not done that. In fact, I put in a proposal for -- for doing just that, and the proposal wasn't funded, unfortunately, back when I was doing a lot of work on the dairy side and I had a team of researchers. We thought that was a very important and interesting question, but we weren't successful in getting that funded.
- Q. Toward the bottom of page 3 you talk about the average and the median elasticities from your study.

Do you have an opinion as to which of those measures would be most appropriate to rely upon, the



average or the median?

2.

2.1

A. In general, on any statistical measure, I prefer the median -- like if I want to -- if I give an exam to my class, I'll calculate the average and the median, and I always think the median is a little bit more informative. But I really -- I won't go on record as saying that .2 is a more accurate estimate than .35. It is just a different -- a different way of looking at it.

But what I particularly like about a median is it is really easy to understand. It basically says half the studies had an estimate that was .2 -- under .2 and half had an estimate that was over .2, and so it kind of gives you a nice little break.

And -- oh, and one other thing. And when you have an average, really, really extreme numbers can bias it up -- upwards, so it is not as good of a measure, in my opinion, of central tendency as a median is for that reason.

So let me just give you an example. Suppose you had five numbers: 1, .5, 1.5, 1.75, and 1,000. The average to that is going to be, you know, 500 maybe, and that's not very reflective of those first numbers. That's an average. The median of that would be something like 1.5, which is more accurate. So when you have an extreme outlier, averages are not very good.

- Q. I was going to say, in statistical terms, that would be excluding the outliers?
 - A. Yeah. Yeah. And that's one of the reasons why



Q. Right.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- A. And that can help solve the problem. I didn't do that. The average here is just the average of all the studies.
- Q. A question about Table 1 on page 4. I think this is just a stray character, but I want to make sure it doesn't mean anything. There is a question mark after --
 - A. I -- I have corrected that. I apologize. Yes.
- 0. Oh.
 - A. That -- that should be erased. There's no question to it. I don't know where that question mark came from.
 - Q. I'm sure as we present the testimony my clients have prepared, we'll find a nit or two as well, so no need to apologize.
 - A. But thank you for bringing it to the attention.
- Q. Obviously you authored or co-authored a number of these studies.
 - Can I ask, have you read all of the studies that are in this -- this table?
 - A. I have skimmed them. I have not read them super carefully. I was looking -- so the way I came up with these, by the way, was I did a Google Scholar search for milk elasticity and then a couple other things, and that's how I found these. And they needed to be in peer reviewed



articles.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

These are all journal articles with one exception, the Capps article is -- it's not an article, it is the report to Congress, which I used to do. But that is peer reviewed. It's very much peer reviewed, so I included that as the only non-journal article there. So -- but I -- but that -- but I basically tried to get as exhaustive of a peer reviewed list as possible, and that is how I came up with the 38 articles.

Q. I appreciate that.

Have you -- with respect to the Capps report to Congress, have you reviewed that --

- A. Yes.
- O. -- that particular report?
- 15 A. Yes.
 - Q. Is it correct that report I think by statute has to be presented to Congress annually?
 - A. That is -- that's technically correct. It isn't always finished annually, unfortunately, because it takes a long time, sometimes, to clear -- to get -- to get USDA clearance. And I understand that that was a little bit of an issue when the Texas A&M people were doing the studies. I'm not criticizing them. It is just -- it -- that -- the most recent study that was released I believe is 2019 and -- because it took a while to get through clearance. And that, I believe, is the most recent. I don't know when the next one will be coming out.
 - Q. When -- you have a date of 2022 on that.



A. Yes.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. Is that the 2019 report?
- A. Yes. The 2019 report came out in 2022.
- Q. Okay. Thank you.

Are the methodologies used in that report now similar or even identical to the methodologies that you used when you did that report?

- A. They were initially identical, and now they're very similar. The fluid -- the fluid one is almost identical. But when I did the last couple of them, I only did a fluid demand equation and then I did an all dairy, which included fluid demand equation, did both on a milk fat and a milk solids basis. I understand that the 2019 report has butter and a couple of other things that they evaluated, so they have extended it a little bit. But the fluid side is -- looks really similar to what -- what I did, and the results are very similar too.
- Q. And because the methodologies are so similar, I assume it would have been improper for you to include a number of those Congressional reports in your study here?
- A. That's -- that's exactly why I didn't include any of mine. I could have put like 15 of my studies in there, and each -- each year we just add four data points, so of course, the numbers are going to be very similar. So that's why I only included Judd Capps' report to Congress. Which, by the way, does have very similar findings.
- It's even more inelastic, by the way, than my study. It is one of the most inelastic results of all the



study is minus zero-point -- minus 0.071, I believe.

O. You -- that's correct.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- A. Highly, highly inelastic. That says a 10% increase in price would lead to a .7% decrease in quantity demanded.
- Q. And so although there's -- I mean, if you look at the dates of the studies in here, there's perhaps a bit of a gap between the early aughts or late aughts and 2022.

The studies have been performed. You could have listed them all in here, but it would have skewed the accuracy of your averages and median?

- A. Exactly. And I really wanted to -- I didn't want to do that. I didn't want to -- some of these studies where they are really elastic actually are overweighting this because I took the elastic -- some of them estimated for like skim milk, one estimate whole milk, another estimate, and so forth. Other studies, like the report, just had all milk. So I tried to make sure that no study was more heavily weighted in this table than -- than others.
- Q. There were questions asked of you about whether these studies took into account the demand and the sales of plant-based milk alternatives.

Do you recall those questions?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Do you know if the Capps report to Congress took into account those alternative products?



| 1 | A. Yes, I believe it did. The last three years that |
|----|---|
| 2 | I did the study, I had the the I had both the price |
| 3 | of soy milk soy milk, in quote and soy milk |
| 4 | advertising in as a as a factor that did impact milk |
| 5 | demand. |
| 6 | I believe, by the way, I called it soy beverage, |
| 7 | just to be politically correct. |
| 8 | Q. I'm sure everyone in the room here appreciates |
| 9 | that. |
| 10 | If you wanted let me just rephrase that, if I |
| 11 | could. |
| 12 | Would you find that the Capps report to Congress |
| 13 | represents an adequate and appropriate standalone measure |
| 14 | of the elasticity for fluid milk? |
| 15 | A. Yes. In fact, of all the studies on this of |
| 16 | that I have done, I would stand by that one the most. It |
| 17 | was subject to the most scrutiny by USDA experts, went |
| 18 | under went underwent some more than four or five |
| 19 | revisions, so it was very, very rigorous. And I'm sure |
| 20 | they did the same thing AMS did the same thing when the |
| 21 | Texas A&M people, the Capps people did the study. So, |
| 22 | yes. And and and us agricultural economists in the |
| 23 | profession have a lot of respect for Judd Capps. He's |
| 24 | a he's a fantastic economist. |
| 25 | Q. Thanks. I don't think I have anything else to |
| 26 | ask. I appreciate your answers. |



28

THE COURT: Let's keep going.

NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY DR. VITALIANO:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

28

Q. Peter Vitaliano with National Milk Producers Federation.

Good afternoon, Dr. Kaiser.

- A. Dr. Vitaliano.
- Q. I have a few questions that are primarily for the purpose of clarifying some of the previous questions and discussions.

On page 1, the last full paragraph states, The overwhelming majority of empirical studies that have measured the price elasticity of demand for milk have found it to be inelastic. The studies spanning many years have consistently shown the same result, the price inelastic nature of milk.

I'd like to focus on what I would characterize your article as a survey article and the significance for that for economic research.

Would you agree that we -- that economics is a social science that studies human behavior, and therefore it's often considered to be a bit of a soft science?

That -- to the extent that, you know, one individual study is not necessarily -- no matter how well done it is, no matter how well peer reviewed it is, is not necessarily accepted as definitive. Often other studies come up with different results. And that this -- this contrasts with some of our fellow scientists in the hard sciences.



NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING 1 Like let me cite two examples. Particle physics 2. that have received a lot of media -- attention in the popular media. A few years ago they did -- a team of 3 4 researchers I believe discovered the Higgs boson particle, and it was widely accepted to confirm a hypothesis that 5 had been longstanding, and the entire science breathed a 6 7 collective sigh of relief. And more recently there was a team researching 8 9 for -- searching for a very subtle wobble in the --THE COURT: Let him finish. 10 BY DR. VITALIANO: 11 12 -- particle and that it is expected that if that

Q. -- particle and that it is expected that if that is confirmed, it will upend the entire foundation of that science.

We don't have that luxury. If we do a study of the elasticity of demand for fluid milk, even if it's a stunningly brilliant study, we should not hold our breaths awaiting a telephone call from the Nobel committee in Stockholm informing us we have won the economics prize for the year. Okay.

THE COURT: Is there a question mark there someplace?

DR. VITALIANO: Yes. Is --

THE COURT: Before -- before you answer,

Dr. Kaiser, I would like to hear from Mr. English.

THE WITNESS: I not only agree with that --

THE COURT: Well, wait a minute. No, no, no. I said before you answer, I want to hear from Mr. English.



13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

2.

2.0

2.1

MR. ENGLISH: Your Honor, I object. There were I thought 12, 13 different thoughts in that. So if the witness is now to agree, I don't know which one he is agreeing with. It is not a question, and I think it should be stricken.

THE COURT: I'm not going to strike the intro, but I will -- I would like to hear a more specific question.

BY DR. VITALIANO:

- Q. Yeah. I would just -- would you agree that individual pieces of research in our field are not often considered to be very powerful indicators by themselves as a single article?
- A. Not only do I agree with that, I try to practice that. I'm a big, big believer in repeating studies, the -- and using different data to kind of stress test. And the more that you -- the more you see similar or even identical results from different techniques, different data sets, different studies, the more robust our conclusions are and the more confidence we can have.
- Q. So that means that a survey article like you have done, that surveys many pieces of research on the same subject, that come to roughly the same conclusion, collectively can be considered much more powerful support for their findings than a single study?
- A. That is true. And -- and this is sometimes referred to as a meta analysis.
 - Q. Yes.
 - A. So meta analysis has been used by, for example,



Q. And that characterization of meta studies is not necessarily weakened by the fact that those individual studies may come up with different specific numbers. Like in this case we're looking -- the studies are looking at a single number, the own price elasticity of fluid milk. And if you have a spread of numbers, that if 37 of them, say, in your study show less than one --

THE COURT: Yeah. Mr. English stands up. It is too much of an introduction here.

Also, I realize we allow friendly cross here, but if -- we really have a situation here of, you know, you're testifying, and then asking the witness to say, hey, ain't that right?

DR. VITALIANO: Sorry --

THE COURT: Now, that's the witness, you know, I think you are asking, are survey studies generally more -- thought to be more probative than individual studies, and I think the witness has answered yes and that that's why he did a survey study here.

How about that, Mr. English?

MR. ENGLISH: Your Honor, yes. The rules here are what they are, and, you know, people get to prepare



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

written statements, so -- but at some level, if this doctor standing next to me, as opposed to the doctor in the witness stand, needs to get back on the stand for rebuttal, it seems to me that's more appropriate than what we're hearing right now because -- and I -- I want to repeat our objection from earlier and say we did our part over the break to as efficiently as possible create an examination, and now it looks like we're going to have to go back because of some of these things. And we were trying to help this witness get off the stand at some point.

I just worry that we're going to end up with our having to get back up because I think there's issues being raised here. But that's up -- that's up to them. But I do think that the nature of the kinds of non-examination that's been going on is not helpful for the record.

THE COURT: Yeah, I agree, and I'm not sure what to do about it. I mean, we do allow friendly cross -- yes, Ms. Hancock, you may talk.

MS. HANCOCK: Yes, your Honor. I appreciate the Court's guidance here, your Honor's guidance for this.

And -- and, you know, if -- if Mr. -- if Dr. Vitaliano is not an attorney and didn't ask as precise of a question, I think that that's fine to maybe, you know, help get the record clear where we need it.

But in all fairness, Mr. English and Mr. Rosenbaum have asked what is traditionally very objectionable evidentiary questions, and we in the -- in the efficiency



2.

2.0

2.1

of this proceeding have not been objecting. And so to attack just one witness -- or one examiner here, I think is unfair.

So I think that Dr. Vitaliano has heard the message. He should be given an opportunity to conclude. But we don't delineate between who is allowed to ask questions. And I think that if we're going to create more of a rules of civil procedure evidentiary standard, it is going to apply to everyone.

THE COURT: Now, I mean, the criticism, there's certainly nothing personal about it.

Doctor, I just think -- and we have allowed friendly cross and leading questions on -- what's really friendly cross really should be a direct examination. I don't know what to do with this. But I will try to apply the rules fairly.

But I do think -- is there something different in your question? Do you -- that you want the question -- you asked the witness whether survey studies were better than individual studies, right?

BY DR. VITALIANO:

- Q. And the last question I asked was: That conclusion is not weakened by the fact that the individual numbers might be different, that's typical in economics; do you -- would you agree with that?
 - A. Yes, I agree.
 - Q. Okay.

THE COURT: Thank you. And, again, I don't mean



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

to criticize you at all. You are -- perfectly appropriate for you to be a representative of your client asking these questions.

But I will, however, because you are not a lawyer, give you more leeway in your questions.

DR. VITALIANO: I will try not to abuse that leeway, your Honor.

BY DR. VITALIANO:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

28

- Q. On page 2, the last full paragraph in the bottom. It says, Another way to demonstrate how unimportant price changes are in terms of driving milk demand, consider the fact that the real price of milk relative to all goods and services has fallen, and that means that milk has become less expensive to purchase relative to other products.
- A. Yes.
- DR. VITALIANO: Your Honor, may I approach the witness?
 - THE COURT: You may.
- 19 The witness has been handed a document.

20 BY DR. VITALIANO:

- Q. I have just handed the witness a document labeled Exhibit 62. That was my testimony from the first day of this procedure. Referring to the general economic impact section on page 8. I showed a figure that charted for the last 15 years the consumer price indices for all items, food and beverages, dairy products, and fluid milk.
 - Dr. Kaiser, have you seen this before?
 - A. Not this specific graph, but I -- I calculated a



- 2 But this has got additional products included.
- 3 | Importantly, it includes all food and beverages and dairy
- 4 products and fluid milk and all other items. So it has
- 5 got more than what mine had.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

- Q. So would you agree that this figure, which is now in the hearing record, is consistent with the point you were making in that paragraph I just stated?
- A. Yes. In fact, it is even more consistent in the sense that I compared what's happening to the fluid milk price to all goods and services in the economy, and in your graph here you have all food and beverages, which is more -- more -- closer related to fluid milk than all goods and services. And that is going up -- I'm sorry -- all food and beverages prices are going up even faster and more over time than fluid milk prices.
 - O. Thank you.
- On that same page 2, the second full paragraph from the bottom, you make the case that the cross-price elasticities of demand for milk are inelastic.
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Which means that consumption of milk is not very sensitive to price relationships with substitute products; is that correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And then later on you say one of the -- one of the major causes for the steady decline in per capita fluid milk consumption is the growth of substitute and



alternative beverages.

A. Correct.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. There could appear to be a bit of a contradiction to that, so I would like -- could you clarify the relationship for the finding that the cross-price elasticity of milk is low, but it's still losing share to other products. Does that mean that it's not price of milk compared to these others that's critical, but other factors?
- A. Yes, that's exactly right. It's -- price is not driving -- driving -- the prices of other commodities or substitutes that are -- that are mainly driving it. They are driving some of it, but not driving, you know, a lot of it. It's just the explosion of new products that are available. It has nothing to do with price. New products, it might be their advertising campaigns are real successful. I remember when bottled water first hit the scene, I mean, it was going up double digits, 20% a year when it first -- per capita consumption when it was first introduced. Had nothing to do with price, it was just newly available and became a preference change, basically.
- Q. There was some previous discussion in the questions I think from Mr. English about the concept of income effects on consumption.

Could you briefly explain that there is a separate elasticity that is specifically called income elasticity?

A. Yes. I'm glad you reminded me. Probably all or nearly all of the studies in Table 1 included income as



well as other demand shifters to estimate the price elasticity.

So, for example, typical -- for me, a typical demand equation for milk would include such variables as, of course, the price of milk, the retail price for -- of milk, the price of substitute products, maybe orange juice, coffee, cola, whatever, income, and then, population demographics, percent of food consumed away from home, etcetera.

And so income is explicitly in probably all, if not nearly all of these studies, and a separate elasticity can be found. All of these elasticities for income tend to be positive but very inelastic. So in other words, a 1% increase in -- in real income in the economy, for example, leads to a small increase -- a positive increase but a small increase in the demand for milk. So milk is sometimes referred to as what economists call a normal good, which simply means as income goes up, demand goes up.

Q. Thank you. I was going to ask you to define income elasticity as you just did.

You also listed a second cause of declining demand, the increasing trend in food consumed away from home. Can you clarify that that was not meant to be just -- refer to food service restaurant eating, that it could be it was a broader concept of literally all food consumed away from home, like in automobiles or in --

A. Yes.



2.

2.1

- Q. -- workplaces?
- A. Literally, if you don't -- if you consume food and beverages away from home, that's what I'm talking about there.
- Q. And I'm -- I have observed personally that shopping carts in grocery stores now have cup holders?
 - A. Yep.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. That would be another example of that?
- A. Yep.
- Q. You also talked about demographic change, and I -- I detected a little bit of confusion in some questions you got on that.

In -- in terms of -- I interpret your paragraph -- the second full paragraph on page 3 of your statement, that an important demographic change causing a decrease in milk demand is the proportion of young people in the population, which has been declining. And you give numbers.

I sensed in some of the discussion on that there was a bit of confusion between the rate of decline in consumption for these individual population cohorts versus the decline in their proportions. So if, for example, let's assume that each population cohort was constant in their consumption, a decline in the proportion of, say, the youthful cohort would still result in an overall decline in fluid milk consumption, even though no one person or no one cohort was decreasing themselves.

A. That's exactly right. That's perfectly said.



Another question would be what's happening to milk consumption in that cohort, but it is really the fact that the cohort itself, regardless of their consumption level changing, is decreasing, and that's what's causing -- so per capita is simply total milk sales divided by pop- -- all the population. So that is going down because that big consuming age cohort is going down.

- Q. So that would have relevance, then, for, say, promotion activities that would make it appropriate for them to look at causative factors of fluid decline for individual population segments --
 - A. That's --

2.

2.0

2.1

- O. -- which could be very different?
- A. That's exactly correct. Yes.
- Q. You gave this analysis of price transmission, and you used as an example the price -- Class I price differential impact, which you worked through the transmission and came up with an estimate of 1.6% decline.

Let's accept that just for the moment. I -- as I understood it, I interpreted Mr. English to say, wouldn't this result in increasing the problem long-term on top of -- you know, a change of that sort on top of a steady decline. Let me clarify whether or not this is a long-term thing.

My understanding is that an increase in the Class I differentials would be a one-time increase and that it might -- by your numbers, it would reduce consumption by 1.6%. But that would be -- wouldn't that



| 1 | be a single one-time impact |
|----|---|
| 2 | A. Yes |
| 3 | Q even though it might be |
| 4 | A it would be compounding every year |
| 5 | (Court Reporter clarification.) |
| 6 | BY DR. VITALIANO: |
| 7 | Q. So even though that adjustment might lag over a |
| 8 | couple of years, it is a one-time impact, and then there |
| 9 | would be no further reaction in consumption strictly from |
| 10 | the price increase once that played out? |
| 11 | A. Correct. |
| 12 | Q. It would the next year there would be a |
| 13 | relatively speaking, a 0% increase in the price, and it |
| 14 | would result in a zero impact on consumption, that's how |
| 15 | elasticities are applied? |
| 16 | A. Correct. |
| 17 | DR. VITALIANO: I think that completes my |
| 18 | questions. |
| 19 | THE COURT: Very well. |
| 20 | Further cross? |
| 21 | Yeah, Let's take a break. I was hoping we would |
| 22 | have a real short, but that's not a good assumption, I |
| 23 | don't think. |
| 24 | All right. It is 3:19. Let's come back at 3:30. |
| 25 | (Whereupon, a break was taken.) |
| 26 | THE COURT: Let's go back on the record. We're |
| 27 | back in session. |
| 28 | Who's up? AMS's turn? No one everyone we |



1 finished everyone's cross. I'm not saying we finished 2. re-cross. I hope we are. But, Ms. Taylor --3 MS. TAYLOR: I'm sure Dr. Kaiser does too. 4 THE COURT: Ms. Taylor, the floor is yours. 5 CROSS-EXAMINATION 6 7 BY MS. TAYLOR: Good afternoon. 8 Ο. 9 Good afternoon. Α. 10 Thank you for coming today to testify. Ο. Α. You're welcome. 11 12 I have a few questions that I don't think have 13 been covered in -- in -- from previous cross-examination. 14 So I had -- I wanted to talk on the top of your 15 testimony on page 2, you talk about how there are other 16 manufactured products that are more price elastic than 17 fluid milk. And so I wanted to know, if you could, for the record, talk about if there's a distinction between 18 19 being more price elastic and being price elastic. Yes, there is. One would -- for one, you would 2.0 Α. 2.1 use the term relative. When I talk about price 22 discrimination to my class, that's a really important 23 aspect of that, and that is this: To successfully price 2.4 discriminate doesn't mean that you have to have an 25 inelastic or an elastic product. You basically want to 26 price higher the product that is relatively more inelastic



27

28

than the other. And it may not be, in fact, inelastic,

but it is more inelastic than the other. So that's a

distinction.

2.

2.1

So, generally speaking, we call demand inelastic if its elasticity and absolute value is below one, and we call it elastic if it's -- if it is above one. And I take your question to -- to imply that you can also compare. Cheese, for example, is more price elastic than fluid milk. So that's a relative kind of comparison.

- Q. But it is not to say that cheese is inelastic?
- A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. So your testimony generally talks about price -- why milk is price inelastic, and you gave three main reasons for those. If I can summarize for the record, the first is increased competition in the beverage market, so there's new products, there is alternative products, etcetera. And your comment on that was people may switch to those products, but they are not doing it because of the price of milk, there's other reasons.
 - A. Correct.
- Q. The second was there's increased food consumption away from home and a lower proportion of young -- and a lower proportion of young kids in the population.

And I'm wondering, while milk is, according to, you know, your testimony and the surveys that you have put in here, milk price inelastic, do you think at some point there is a price ceiling for consumers that at some point the price will matter?

A. Yes, of course. The hard part of that question would be to predict what that would be. But, generally



speaking, as price goes up, people get more sensitive to price changes.

So a perfect example of that is the demand for salt. Salt is really an inexpensive part of our budget, and it tends to be highly inelastic, our demand for that. We just buy it when we need it. We probably don't even look at the price because we know that it's so cheap.

On the other extreme, the price of a new house, people when they go looking at, you know, a \$350,000 house are going to be very price sensitive when they make their purchase decisions.

And right now milk is not priced at -- at a price point that would make it inelastic, but if you raised it to \$100 a gallon, it most certainly would become elastic.

- Q. On page 3 you state that the average Class I differential change as proposed by National Milk would be \$1.49. Is that a simple average or how did you come up with that estimate?
- A. I didn't actually come up with that estimate.

 That was given to me by a colleague at the University of Wisconsin, Chuck Nicholson, who I believe will be testifying at this hearing in a week or two or something like that.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. And so I just took that as -- as an another expert's estimate. And he's well more -- he's way more well versed on -- on this provision of the hearing than I am, so I just took it as a given.



2.

2.1

- Q. Okay. And then is it your assumption in the later part of your testimony -- I want to -- I think maybe

 Mr. English touched on this a little bit -- but that eventually that full price change does get passed on to the consumer? I want to talk a little bit about, you know, the farm-to-retail transmission --
 - A. Yes.

2.

2.1

- Q. -- part of that.
- A. Yes. That is -- that is my assumption. I have not modeled that -- I have not modeled that. But when you have a very, very inelastic demand, like milk, my expert opinion is that almost the full cost, if not all of it, would be passed along to the retailer and then to the consumer.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. And by the way, I assumed that, and that's how I got the decrease in quantity demanded. I assumed it --
 - Q. You did assume that --
- 19 A. Yep.
 - Q. So in your answers, I think, this morning to Mr. Miltner's questions about retail price variable -- about the retail price variable you used in your analysis, you mention that the price is multiplied by 8.6 to convert a dollar per gallon retail price to a dollar per hundredweight equivalent. However, on page 3, you describe the price variable as a retail CPI for all milk products.
 - Can you clarify whether it's a retail price used



or a price index?

2.

2.0

2.1

- A. I apologize for that typo. I originally used the CPI, and then I went back in the -- in a more recent draft and changed it to an actual retail price per gallon, and I missed that. So it should not be the CPI. I used -- I used the retail price.
 - O. Okay. Thank you.

And then I wanted to turn to your table on page 9. It's the regression analysis that you did.

I wonder if you could, at first, under the variable column, you list four variables, if you could discuss each -- what each of those are.

A. Yes. So don't worry about C. C is a constant, and -- and it is not a variable.

And then what I did was -- so I -- I regressed the retail price on a -- on the Class I price -- on the current Class I price, the Class I price lag in the previous month, in the previous two months, in the previous three months, and the previous four months. I tried previous five months, and it wasn't significant, so I so I stopped there.

So I basically wanted to see how collectively both a current as well as -- I wanted to see over time dynamically how an increase in the Class I price would ultimately manifest itself in a permanent increase in the -- in the retail price for milk.

I also included a trend. That LOG(T), that's just a trend variable, as a way to proxy marketing costs, which



- 1 | I didn't have. We don't -- I don't have data on that.
- 2 | That's obviously confidential data from processors. So I
- 3 | included a trend term basically to be a proxy for omitted
- 4 | variables, and the main omitted variable would be
- 5 marketing costs.

- O. Okay. And the PDL01 and 02?
- 7 A. That stands for polynomial distributed laq. It's
- 8 | just an estimation technique that follows an imposed upon
- 9 | structure of how the impact manifests -- how much of the
- 10 | impact is felt currently versus over the last four months.
- 11 | And -- and it's really the sum of the lags that gives you
- 12 | the total impact over time. It's kind of like a long run
- 13 | thing because, as I mentioned this morning in my
- 14 | testimony, if the Class I price has increased this month,
- 15 | it will impact the current retail price, but it will also
- 16 | impact retail prices tomorrow, next month, and so forth.
- 17 | And that's the way I kind of captured it with this PDL
- 18 | specification.
- 19 | O. Okay. And on the line of the prices that you
- 20 | used, since we have advanced pricing in the system, is
- 21 | that factored in anywhere here where --
- 22 A. No. That's another reason I put the lags in
- 23 | here --
- 24 O. Okay.
- 25 A. -- because of that. So I'm capturing -- I'm
- 26 | basically saying it takes four months to be -- to be fully
- 27 | felt in terms of the retail price.
- 28 Q. Okay. So under this --



- A. It would be captured -- it would be captured here by that.
 - Q. Okay. And so to restate this in -- you make me very glad I have a Ph.D. economist sitting behind here on my side of the table to help me later.

But if I could restate it for those non-Ph.D. scientists. So what you are saying is, in your assumption, that \$1.49 that you talked about earlier, it would take four months for that to fully be shown at the retail price level?

11 A. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

18

19

26

- Q. Assuming that it all goes to the -- the assumption that it would all go there?
- A. Precisely. And furthermore, it wouldn't -- it appears empirically that it won't go longer than that.

 Four -- four months is the end of the impact, basically.
- 17 O. Okay.
 - A. So five months it wouldn't be felt. Six months it wouldn't be felt.
- 20 Q. Okay.
- A. So what's kind of nice about this is it tells you that the process, the full process, the full dynamic process for it to transmit.
- Q. So basically it would take four months for the shift to be fully felt --
 - A. Correct.
 - 0. -- of a curve?
- 28 A. Right.



Q. Yeah. Okay.

2.

2.1

- A. And part of that was, by the way, because I had monthly data. If I wanted to do this on a quarterly or an annual basis, I wouldn't need to lag it because it would be long enough periods of time that we're looking at.
- Q. Okay. And I had a question. I think Mr. Miltner asked the same question, so I apologize if I'm being duplicative, but I might have been trying to come up with other questions during that time.

So on the one study you talked about on page 2, that's the outlier, did I hear correct it is because that study looked at like a subset of milk products in the grocery store, not just milk generally?

A. I was spec- -- I mean, I can't give a definitive answer, but my -- my guess is it's due to the fact that, number one, yeah, they used a sub sample of -- of fluid milk products, that being only grocery store sales. And I believe it might not even include Walmart in there because for a while the A.C. Nielsen data did not get Walmart sales, so it was a smaller sub sample of all milk purchases.

And the other reason I believe it's more elastic in their price elasticity is they had a much higher disaggregation of fluid milk products than some of these studies that just had milk as milk rather than organic, 1%, 2%, you know. And so I can't remember exactly how many products they had, but it was much more disaggregated. When you have more products available,



| 1 | that adds that adds those estimates of elasticity |
|----|--|
| 2 | tend to be higher than if you just have one product. |
| 3 | Q. Okay. Thank you. |
| 4 | MS. TAYLOR: I think that's it from AMS. Thank |
| 5 | you so much. |
| 6 | THE WITNESS: Thank you. |
| 7 | THE COURT: Anyone that's all of AMS? |
| 8 | Cross? |
| 9 | Very well. Your witness. |
| 10 | MS. HANCOCK: Thank you, your Honor. We would |
| 11 | move to admit Exhibit 115. |
| 12 | THE COURT: Any objection? |
| 13 | Hearing none oh, Mr. Rosenbaum rises. |
| 14 | MR. ROSENBAUM: Out of an abundance of need to be |
| 15 | explicit, I'm not objecting to the contents of the exhibit |
| 16 | itself, but since I objected to the manner in which it was |
| 17 | presented |
| 18 | (Court Reporter clarification.) |
| 19 | MR. ROSENBAUM: Since we have objected to the |
| 20 | manner in which it was presented and the time period that |
| 21 | we had to prepare for it, I just want to make that clear |
| 22 | so that we don't our silence in objecting to the actual |
| 23 | receipt of the exhibit would not be interpreted to be |
| 24 | THE COURT: Yeah. |
| 25 | MR. ROSENBAUM: acquiescence. |
| 26 | THE COURT: That's fair. |
| 27 | Mr. English. |
| 28 | MR. ENGLISH: I join in that. That's all. |



1 THE COURT: Yep. That's fair. 2. With that -- with those noted objections, Exhibit 115 is admitted into the record. 3 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 115 was received 4 into evidence.) 5 THE COURT: Mr. Miltner, I'm sorry. 6 7 MR. MILTNER: That's okay. I have no problem with 8 admitting the statement or anything. I do have a related 9 request, though. THE COURT: Very well. But that exhibit is in the 10 11 record for the keeper of the exhibits. 12 MS. HANCOCK: Just to -- I'm so sorry. I'm going 13 to jump in front of Mr. Miltner because he's going to 14 change the subject. 15 Just in responding to the last two comments from 16 Mr. English and Mr. Rosenbaum, I do want the record to 17 reflect that we did take extensive argument on this 18 earlier this morning. The Court had already ruled. And 19 as a result, they both had an extended lunch hour. We put 2.0 the witness on before lunch, took some questions before 2.1 lunch, took a two-hour lunch hour to allow them time to 22 work on it. Both of them came back early from lunch in 23 the room and had full opportunity to conduct their 24 examination. I just want to make sure that our record 25 reflects all of that. 26 THE COURT: Okay. I think it will. 27 MS. HANCOCK: And it's 3:45 in the afternoon



28

today, with an hour and 15 minutes or more left of the

hearing.

2.

2.0

2.1

MR. ROSENBAUM: Well, I don't know what this notion is of what time I got back early. I mean, did I get here five minutes before we started? I suppose I did.

MS. HANCOCK: 30.

MR. ROSENBAUM: No, I wasn't here 30 minutes before we started, I assure you. I certainly wasn't here 30 minutes before the scheduled time for start, and I wasn't here 30 minutes before anything else, I don't believe. I don't want to reargue this, but I'm not going to let someone characterize the evidence in ways I don't -- of what happened today in ways that I don't believe are accurate.

THE COURT: Well, I think the record will -- I'm not sure what time you got back to the room is pertinent. If the decision writer wants to take that into account somehow, I suppose they can, but I'm not going to -- but thank you, Ms. Hancock.

And I do appreciate everyone's good faith efforts in trying to get this witness on and off today. I realize not everyone's happy with it. I don't expect everyone to be happy with what I allow and hear, but I think you all, despite some strong views, pulled together to do the best we could with this.

Yes, Mr. Miltner.

MR. MILTNER: Thank you, your Honor. I would like to ask that official notice be taken of the report of Professor Capps cited in the witness's statement. And the



reason for doing so is that although Professor Capps is the author, it is published by the United States

Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, and is a public document. It is an official report of a government agency. It is submitted to Congress, and it is reasonably available to the public. And pursuant to 7 CFR 15.121, it is appropriate to take official notice of that document, and I request that we do so.

THE COURT: All right. What do we think?

MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, we have no objection to that, and it was my understanding that anything in the public record that was a record of the USDA was already capable of being cited. And so we understood that that was already the case.

THE COURT: What's AMS think about this? Again, I -- I -- I'm looking -- I'm doing the best I can here, but I do consider AMS to be in a special position to try to preserve the record as a quality record.

Are you asking -- Mr. Miltner, you are asking that the Capps report referred to, among other places, at the bottom of Exhibit 115, page 4, somehow come into the record for the truth of what's written in that document?

MR. MILTNER: Yes. It is a government -- I'm sorry, Brian.

As a government report, official notice allows it to be admitted essentially as part of the administrative record and then referred to by participants in their post-hearing briefs as if it was presented in full.



2.

2.1

1 THE COURT: Is that your understanding? 2. MR. HILL: Yeah, we don't -- we don't mind that. What year is this? 3 MR. MILTNER: So it's -- it's on the AMS's 4 website. It was -- it reports -- it is the 2019 report to 5 Congress, submitted in 2022. And if it is helpful, I can 6 7 get the URL, and we can put that in the record, if 8 necessary. 9 MR. HILL: Okay. That would be fine. 10 MR. MILTNER: Thank you. 11 THE COURT: I'm not hearing any objection to it. 12 And I think it would be useful to have the URL just to --13 for all I know, there could be more than one Capps report. 14 Let's make sure we agree to that one. But as you say, I'm 15 not sure I even have to rule on this if CFR 15.121 says 16 what you say it says, and you have been pretty accurate so 17 far, I think. 18 MR. MILTNER: I try to be. So thank you. And 19 we'll get that URL. THE COURT: Again, thanks for everyone's 2.0 2.1 cooperation on these things. 22 And I will say the witness did -- in his testimony 23 did provide some testimony in support of those There's some testimony in this record, 24 conclusions. 25 actually which may be beyond what's required in that Federal Register section. It supports the validity of 26 27 contents of that study.



28

Okay. Is that it? Can I let Dr. Kaiser --

Professor Kaiser step down and make his airplane back to Syracuse and/or Ithaca, whichever it is.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.

MS. HANCOCK: Thank you for your time, Dr. Kaiser.

Your Honor, I think we would pick back up with the cross-examination of Mr. Hanson.

THE COURT: Yes, let's do that.

Welcome back to the stand, Mr. Hanson, you are still under oath.

MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, as a procedural matter, International Dairy Foods Association. In my examination of this witness earlier I had had marked Hearing Exhibit 118, and the government -- which is simply an excerpt from the Code of Federal Regulations -- the government counsel correctly pointed out that the heading was wrong in terms of the section.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ROSENBAUM: It should have been 7 CFR 1170.8. In addition, he pointed out that this document only replicates part A of that regulation. It's the one that relates to cheddar cheese. That's why it is even really relevant to the discussion.

So I have prepared an updated version of that exhibit that both corrects the heading and then also has ellipses at the end to indicate that I have removed everything that comes after section A.

So I would ask that this document, which I'll now provide copies to everyone, call -- which I have called



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

updated Hearing Exhibit 118 -- that this be substituted for the previous document.

THE COURT: Yes, I think so. No objections to substituting that exhibit, and by which we're going to give this copy to the keeper of the official exhibits, and Mr. Rosenbaum is going to hand it out. And I'm going to write on mine, superseded. I suggest everyone else do the same.

MR. ROSENBAUM: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very good, sir. I admire the diligence and precision.

Welcome back to the lectern, Mr. English.

MR. ENGLISH: Tradition has it USDA gets the front row on one side, and dairy farmers get the front row on the other side. So I'm as close as I think I'm allowed to get, your Honor.

THE COURT: Your witness.

MR. ENGLISH: Thank you.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

20 BY MR. ENGLISH:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. Mr. Hanson, my name is Chip English. I'm attorney for the Milk Innovation Group. Good afternoon.
 - A. Good afternoon, sir.
- Q. I'm going to try to recall where we were, which is to say where you were when Mr. Rosenbaum was finished with you some hours ago. So -- and I am trying not to duplicate.

But let me start with your testimony marked as



Exhibit 117, and I want to look at page 2 in your overview.

A. Okay.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

28

- Q. You refer to "as a result of the strong correlation, both price series" -- meaning block and barrels, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. -- "were incorporated into the protein price formula used in the Class III milk price through weekly surveys of sellers and buyers."

Wouldn't it be more correct to say that because both blocks and barrels were at that time, at least, considered to be market clearing, that they were both included, and the strong price correlation allowed USDA to conclude that you would use one and subtract \$0.03?

- A. I guess you could call it market clearing, but the important thing is they were moving closer together, and that spread was fairly consistent.
- Q. But the critical thing in USDA's decision was that they were market clearing, right?
 - A. I think the critical piece in my -(Court Reporter clarification.)

THE WITNESS: I think the important aspect there is those two series move together. And you -- the spread was fairly consistent. It was predictable. I mean, I don't remember looking at the spread back ten years ago, but now, today, I have to report the spread every day to my boss, who is the CEO, because it has that much of an



1 | impact on the business.

BY MR. ENGLISH:

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Okay. So your view is that it was the strong correlation that was more important than the fact that they were both market clearing?
 - A. Yes, in my opinion.
- Q. So in the next sentence you say, "FMMO pricing is designed to provide dairy farmers with a fair price for their milk" --
- A. Yes.
- Q. -- "based on the value of dairy products manufactured by processors."
 - Where does the words "fair price" come from in AMS policy as with the Federal Milk Order program?
 - A. I'm not sure if it's actually in there, but it's -- my interpretation of that is dairy producers should be getting the value that's in the marketplace for cheese products. That should be translated back into the milk price.
 - Q. And what makes that price fair or unfair?
 - A. Well, a fair price is if -- what manufacturers are getting for their products, whether it is based on the block or barrel market. And in this case, blocks represent the majority of the commodity cheese that's manufactured in the country. The dairy producers should be getting a price based on block that represents what's happening in the marketplace.
 - Q. Again, it's not that -- blocks themselves, it's



all the products you say that are priced off of blocks, correct?

A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Okay. Because the survey doesn't price all those products, it prices blocks, correct?
 - A. Right.
- Q. Okay. And you know, of course, that the Federal Milk Marketing Order system is not designed to be a price support program, correct?
- 10 A. Correct.
- 11 Q. Okay.
- 12 A. But I don't think dairy producers should be 13 supporting the block manufacturers either.
 - Q. I'm sorry. What did you just say?
- 15 A. I don't think dairy producers should be supporting 16 the block manufacturers either.
 - Q. How are dairy farmers supporting the block manufacturers?
 - A. Because what -- their price on the Class III is going to be 52 -- based on 52% barrel, 48% block. And over the past five years, barrel prices have been significantly less than the block price, even though barrels only represent 9% of the commodity cheese produced in the country, which translates into a lower milk price for dairy producers.
 - Q. Well, isn't that imbalance between block and barrel capacity due to less flexibility today in the plants?



- Q. So you agree that today there's less flexibility for plants to flex between blocks and barrels?
 - A. Yes.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Okay. And then isn't that the true issue then, that there -- that insufficient capacity to flex is a result of an unhealthy processing sector because of outdated Make Allowances?
 - A. Well, I'm not getting into Make Allowances here.
- Q. Well, but isn't your solution trying to deal symptom -- deal with the symptom rather than the problem?
- A. No. The solution here is to make -- is to ensure that dairy farmers are getting their fair share of the revenue generated from cheese sales and to take disruption out of milk pricing for both processors and dairy producers.
- Q. And you don't think those outdated Make Allowances are contributing to that lack of flexibility?
 - A. Like I said, that is a topic for a different day.
- Q. Well, you don't think the topics here are interrelated?



A. No.

1

- Q. So on page 5 of Exhibit 117, you have some charts.
- 3 And I guess, as I see this, this is a carryover from
- 4 page 4 where you say that butter represents just 9% of
- 5 | total U.S. butter production, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- 7 Q. Okay. So nonetheless, if your proposal were
- 8 | adopted, right now you would basically exclude on Table 2
- 9 | for NDPSR reporting the last line, which is barrels,
- 10 | correct?
- 11 A. Correct.
- 12 Q. And so block, which represents only 16% of the
- NDPSR, whatever's happening in the CME is not that, right?
- 14 A. Uh-huh.
- 15 | O. Correct?
- 16 A. It would represent 16%, yes.
- 17 | Q. And so going next to the next -- the bottom part
- 18 of the table, even though cheddar, you know, is -- in
- 19 | terms of volume is 3.9 billion pounds, if you -- if you
- 20 | take this, you're reducing the reported volumes
- 21 | percentage, which is that 644,226,963, plus the
- 22 702,431,327, that's in the first part of the table, you
- 23 | are reducing that down so that the percentage that is
- 24 | reported for cheddar will drop almost in half, correct --
- 25 | or drop more than half, correct?
- 26 A. Correct. Correct. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And -- and yet, whey powder, the reported
- 28 | volume is 26.6%, correct?



- A. Right. Yeah. 27% on the table.
- Q. And the nonfat dry milk is 52%, correct?
- 3 A. Correct.

2.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- Q. So -- so for a product that is more than those two combined, you want to have a representative sample that's only 16%?
- A. It would be 16%, yes. And still, I'd argue, it is more representative of what the commodity cheese production is in the country by removing a price series that does not represent what's actually being produced in the marketplace.
- 12 Q. Barrels not actually produced in the marketplace?
- 13 A. Only 9% of total commodity cheese.
- Q. But you say 9% of the commodity cheese. You are now calling mozzarella a commodity product?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Let's turn to page 7 and your Table 4.

 Let's look at your highest monthly spread during this

 period was a \$0.61 per pound. That was in 2020, correct?
- 20 A. Yes. \$0.27 on the table, yes.
- 21 Q. Well, the \$0.61 in the --
- 22 A. Oh.
- Q. -- ahead of that, that high, that was also 2020, correct?
- 25 A. Yes.
- Q. That was largely -- a part of what contributed to this you know, \$0.27 in 2020, correct?
- 28 A. Yeah. It was probably like July or November, one



of the two.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

28

- Q. So I want to suggest to you that 2020 data is not the most -- most -- it's not the data I would rely on very hard for what happened. Would you agree 2020 was an extraordinarily unusual year?
- A. It was an extraordinary year. And it was an opportunity for dairy producers to capitalize, and they weren't allowed to as much as they should have.
- Q. Wasn't part of that capitalization that USDA engaged at industry's request in the Food Box Program?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And didn't the Food Box Program contribute to that difference?
- A. Yes. Yes.
- Q. Okay. So I would suggest to you that we might want to consider excluding 2020 on the basis that industry asked for something, industry got it, and it contributed to that spread.
- A. Yes. But it was more than one year. I mean, it was five years of having the back and forth with the block-barrel spread.
 - Q. But then in 2022, it's back to 0.01?
 - A. That's right.
 - Q. And you want to sort of discount that one?
- A. No, I don't want to discount that one at all.
- MR. ENGLISH: I have no further questions.
- THE COURT: Next cross-examiner, other than AMS?



///

NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING 1 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2. BY MR. MILTNER:

- Good afternoon, Mr. Hanson. Ο.
- Good afternoon. 4 Α.
 - Still Ryan Miltner, and I'm still representing Select Milk Producers.
 - Α. Okay.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

2.0

24

25

27

- The milk that goes into Foremost's plants, is it all milk from your own membership?
- Most of it, it's a very high percentage, call it Α. 90-some percent, is our own milk. We have trades in place where we swap milk with others for logistical savings, and a few purchases here and there.
- 14 So when you say "a few purchases here and there," 15 would you call those spot purchases?
 - Α. Some contractual. But, yeah, there's some swap -or, no -- or just some spot purchases, yes.
 - And the milk that goes into plants from your own 0. membership, do you account for that or pay those producers at the class price?
- 2.1 Pay them based off class components, yes. Α.
- 22 From a global perspective for Foremost, if you 23 take barrels out of the survey --
 - Α. Uh-huh.
 - -- the Class III price goes up as expected. Ο.
- 26 Potentially, yes. Α.
 - Ο. Would that not actually increase the total cost of operations for Foremost's cheese plants?



- Q. So despite that particular financial impact, this issue is important enough to Foremost that they think that it ought to be addressed?
 - A. Yes, absolutely.
- Q. Have you done any, we'll call it research or investigation or even discussions with others in the industry about what is driving this increasing or -- or what has caused the gap between blocks and barrels to deviate from its historical three or three-and-a-half-cent relationship?
- A. Well, I think historically prior to 2017 you had more of a stable production capacity in the marketplace between blocks and barrels. In 2017, there was some additional barrel capacity added, and you had some barrel capacity being taken out later. But for those reasons, I think you saw patterns of we had excess barrel production weighing down in the marketplace.
 - Q. And you --
 - A. And, you know, it's fair, you had -- with the Food



2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 2. But in general, over the past five years, you
- have just seen more demand for blocks relative to barrels. 3

Box Program, that added a lot more support to blocks and

- 4 That's what drove the higher block-barrel spread.
- you have had a lot of occasions too where barrels got 5
- tight, and then barrel price shot up over block for a few 6
- months at a time. And then that trend reversed, and you 7
- 8 saw a positive block-barrel spread again. Again, you have
- 9 a lot of variability, and it is just -- it's disruptive to
- 10 a lot of -- for financial forecasting I'll say.
- 11 Ο. There's been some questions around this topic, and
- 12 I want to see if I can put a fine point on it. Do you
- 13 have an opinion as to whether 40-pound blocks and
- 14 500-pound barrels are fungible commodities?
- 15 Define fungible for me. Α.
 - Are they substitutes for each other? Ο.
- 17 Α. Not to a great extent. On the margin, they can
- 18 be. And you are going to see some arbitrage happen, and
- 19 you mentioned it before, when if you see a very -- if
- 2.0 blocks are \$0.30, let's say, above barrels, processed
- 2.1 cheese manufacturers are going to try to use more
- 22 blocks -- or excuse me -- if you had barrels above blocks
- 23 by \$0.30, you are going to see processed cheese
- manufacturers try to use more blocks in their -- in their 24
- 25 operations.

1

- 26 Are you at all familiar with the difference Q.
- 27 between the types of whey that are produced by block
- 28 manufacturers versus barrel manufacturers?



A. Somewhat.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. Is it part of your responsibility to monitor those prices or demands for the various types of whey in the market?
 - A. Yes. Myself and the commercial team at Foremost.
- Q. Do you have an opinion about whether the demand for the whey produced from a barrel manufacturer is different than the whey produced by a block manufacturer?
- A. It depends on where that whey is going to go. mean, if you are looking at -- like a WPC80 operation, white whey from a block manufacturer -- or barrel manufacturer is probably more valuable. If you are looking at a WPI manufacturer, it is probably more indifferent to whether it is coming from a block or a barrel manufacturer.
 - Q. So is WPC80 considered a value-added whey product?
 - A. I would say yes.
- Q. And that's not included in the survey of whey products that go into the Class III formula, is it?
- A. No. Dairy producers don't get the benefit of that.
- Q. Do you have an opinion or an observation as to whether any cheese manufacturers, including Foremost I suppose, view the whey product coming out of their plant as the primary product with the cheese almost as a byproduct?
 - A. No, not for Foremost.
 - Q. Anybody else in the industry that you -- you have



Ι

an opinion as to what they view as their primary product?

- A. I -- I would have to say, unless I'm incorrect, cheese is always going to be the primary product.
- Q. Are there situations where the whey coming out of a barrel manufacturer could provide real substantial income to that manufacturer?
 - A. Yes. But it would be secondary to the cheese.
- Q. Are you familiar with the manufacturing of 640-pound blocks?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Does Foremost manufacture any 640-pound blocks?
- 12 A. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. I'm a little bit ignorant on that topic, but is it as simple as cutting a 640-pound block into 16 40-pound blocks? Are those -- do you now have equivalent -- if I -- for instance, if I went to a 40-pound block manufacturer and bought 16 blocks, and I bought a 640-pound block and cut it up, do I have the same thing?
- A. Yes and no. I mean, you can do that. In our operations, we -- we press a 640-pound block into one block. It's not cut up and put together. It's one block. But it -- I have heard of people taking 40-pound blocks and collating them and putting them into a 640. But that's -- I have heard of it, so -- but that's not how Foremost manufactures 640s.
- Q. I guess as far as the uses of those two different blocks, would they be used for the same purposes?
 - A. A lot of it goes to cut-and-wrap operations for



- Q. Is the moisture content of a 40-pound block and a 640-pound block similar?
 - A. Similar, yes.
- Q. Could a 640-pound block be moisture-adjusted on price similar to the way we now moisture-adjust 500-pound barrels?
 - A. I suppose if you wanted to you could.
- Q. You could determine a price equivalency by adjusting the moisture?
 - A. Sure.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Q. On page 7 of your -- your statement, at Table 4, I understand you were looking at yearly averages, and so you stopped at the end of 2022.

Do you know what the spread between blocks and barrels is for 2023 thus far?

- A. Yes. Through June, it was -- it was pretty wide. It was blocks over barrels 20-some cents, I believe. And then July it dropped way down. And I'm not sure where August landed. Because you had a wide block-barrel spread first half the year, then it inverted in about that June, July time period on the CME.
- Q. And would that suggest to you that this -- this spread that, on an annual basis, I guess, peaked in 2020, that that's not really a peak, is it, it's -- it just



2.

2.0

2.1

NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING

happens to correlate with COVID and the Food Box Program?

- A. Yeah, it would -- it -- I mean, 2020 was an exceptional year, for sure.
- Q. But now that we're through the pandemic and there's no Food Box Program, that certainly doesn't mean that the end of this broad spread has arrived, does it?
- A. It's become much more variable. You get periods of time, six months, where you have a wide block-barrel spread, blocks above barrel, and that can flip around, and then you can have extended periods of time or shorter periods of time when barrels are above blocks.
- Q. If this is something you'd prefer not to answer as opposed to can't answer, I'm perfectly fine with that.

 But is the cost to manufacture 640-pound blocks similar to that for 40-pound blocks in Foremost's case?
- A. There's some dissimilarities. You have differences in packaging, you have differences in pack size. So there are differences between manufacturing of 640s versus 40s.
- Q. I don't think this was asked before. If it was, I apologize.

I'm looking at page 9 of your statement at the very top, and you -- you testified barrel cheddar cheese represents 9% of natural cheese manufactured in the U.S. And then at the end of that same paragraph: "The CME barrel cheese price is used to price only around 9% of total U.S. natural cheese."

Is the 9% that you reference second, is that in



- A. They go hand in hand. I mean, barrel -- barrel volume is only 9% of total commodity volume, and barrels only -- you only use a barrel index to price barrels. So it means that 9% of cheese production uses the barrel price index.
- Q. In other words, where a mozzarella manufacturer might say, the price of my cheese is the 40-pound cheddar price plus or minus something, you're not aware of -- of companies saying, my cheese is priced off the cheddar barrel price plus or minus something?
- A. I have not heard of any mozzarella being priced off the barrel market. I mean, there's some -- there is some differences in the price series, but in general, mozzarella is -- in my experience, is priced off the CME 40-pound block market.
- Q. In your experience can you think of any -- any cheese other than -- any natural cheese other than 500-pound barrels who are -- whose price is indexed off of the actual barrel price?
 - A. No. I can't.
- Q. I want to return to this idea -- this topic of the whey that comes from a 500-pound barrel.
- Have you -- in your discussions with others within Foremost or within the industry, has there been any suggestion that the value of clean white whey has been the



2.

2.1

driver for increases in manufacturing of barrels?

- A. In recent history, no.
- Q. Okay. When you say "recent history," how far back would that go?
 - A. Let's say ten years.
 - Q. Ten years. Okay. Thank you.
- 7 A. Uh-huh.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Mr. Rosenbaum?

CROSS-EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

- Q. Steve Rosenbaum for the International Dairy Foods Association. A few follow-up questions to the ones you just received.
- Am I correct that in the commercial world, there is no moisture adjustment for 640-pound blocks in terms of adjusting the price?
- A. As far as I know, no. Because 640s have a typical moisture profile as 40-pound blocks, and there really isn't a need to adjust for moisture.
 - Q. Excuse me, there is not a need, did you say?
 - A. Right. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. And then in terms of -- of the use of barrels to price other cheeses, does -- does your company export mozzarella?
 - A. Not on a -- just on a spot basis.
- Q. Okay. Do you know whether, in fact, other
 companies do price the mozzarella they are exporting based
 upon the barrel price?



- A. My experience is any time you export, it is a flat price, to be competitive in the world market.
 - Q. Okay.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- A. My experience.
- Q. And does that -- okay. And does that result in a pricing off of the barrel price?
- A. The -- it's -- a lot of times I believe it's priced off where the futures market is or it is priced off of where the -- where the fair price is in the global marketplace.
- Q. And could that be -- and is that the barrel price sometimes?
- 13 A. Not in my experience. Not -- that's not what I
 14 have seen.
- MR. ROSENBAUM: All right. Thank you.
- 16 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 17 BY DR. CRYAN:
- Q. Roger Cryan with the American Farm Bureau

 19 Federation.
- 20 A. Good afternoon.
- 21 Q. Hello. How are you?
- 22 A. Good.
- Q. I guess you made it clear, but let me ask. You
 cannot convert 500-pound barrels into 40-pound blocks; is
 that correct?
- 26 A. I have never heard of that before.
- Q. And you can't convert 40-pound blocks into 500-pound barrels?



- A. Never heard of that before either.
- Q. All right. But you can convert 640-pound blocks into 40-pound blocks?
 - A. Yes.

2.

2.1

- Q. Okay. And is it correct, are the specifications, the grading specifications for cheddar cheese in 640-pound blocks the same as the specifications for -- grading specifications for cheddar cheese in 40-pound blocks?
- A. I -- in -- in my -- I believe so, but I'm not exactly sure on that.
- Q. Is it -- is it your experience that -- that cheese plants generally run full, that they -- cheese plant operators strive to keep the plant full?
- A. I think you put enough time in for maintenance, preventative maintenance, and then you subtract that time off, and then you try to maximize then, yes, that remaining time.
- Q. And when you talk about some of these products being used for balancing, you are kind of talking about -- you know, when you talk about selling it to the spot market to balance, you are talking about finding value for the additional product that you are generating because you are trying to keep the plant full, right?
- A. Yeah. As a co-op, we're trying to do that because you get better plant efficiency if you are running full.

 But in most cases, we have member milk that we need to process --
- Q. Right.



- A. -- and so we have to find a home -- we have to find market access for that milk.
- Q. Those are related, keeping the plant full and using the -- all the members' milk?
 - A. Yes.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- Q. Okay. Was it more common 25 years ago for cheese plants to -- to be idle at times? If you don't --
- A. No, I think that's true. I mean, it's -- it's definitely you had more open capacity, that you could seasonally bring in milk when milk was flush and then better use the capacity.
- 12 Q. Okay.
- 13 A. That's less and less than it used to be.
- 14 Q. Sure. That's consistent with what we have seen in 15 the --
- 16 A. Right.
- Q. -- block and barrel, you know, the tightness of both.
- 19 A. Right.
- Q. In your experience is there any separation between the 40-pound block price and the 640-pound block price per pound of product?
- A. You -- you have some differences in packaging, but they are generally -- they are close, in my experience.
 - Q. Do -- when you sell -- when you sell blocks, do you typically -- do you typically quote the same price to customers for 40s and 640s?
 - A. I'm not comfortable answering that question.



25

26

27

| 1 | Q. All right. All right. That's fair. |
|----|--|
| 2 | And would you say that 640-pound blocks are |
| 3 | growing as a share of the market for cheddar cheese? |
| 4 | A. They have definitely grown over the past ten, 15 |
| 5 | years. What it's done the past few years, we've seen a |
| 6 | lot more block capacity coming online. I'm not sure if |
| 7 | we're seeing more 40s or more 640s with that new capacity, |
| 8 | but definitely over the past 15 years there's been more |
| 9 | 640 capacity. |
| 10 | Q. Wonderful. |
| 11 | DR. CRYAN: Thank you very much. |
| 12 | THE WITNESS: Thank you. |
| 13 | THE COURT: Any additional cross-examination by |
| 14 | parties other than AMS? |
| 15 | Seeing none, AMS. |
| 16 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 17 | BY MS. TAYLOR: |
| 18 | Q. Good afternoon. |
| 19 | A. Good afternoon. |
| 20 | Q. I'll try to make it through my questions. |
| 21 | Mr. Miltner stole a few, so I will try to keep this a |
| 22 | little more organized. |
| 23 | I just want to summarize kind of as I read your |
| 24 | testimony this morning and you talked, I always like to |
| 25 | try to summarize what I think is the main message that was |
| 26 | trying to come across. |
| 27 | And what I gather from your testimony is the |
| 28 | reasons that National Milk doesn't want or is seeking |



to drop barrels is, one, you do not see the two products as interchangable anymore?

A. Correct.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 0. Is that correct?
- A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. The second is that the NDPSR price no longer reflects how milk is actually used -- producer milk is used in the cheese market?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. A third one you had in your testimony, but hasn't been discussed about too much, was be able to enhance risk management tools available to --
 - A. Correct. It makes risk management more efficient.
- Q. Okay. So those are basically the three main reasons?
 - A. Yes. And another one that's in there, too, is that, you know, in the past -- over the past five years dairy producers have not realized the benefits of the higher block price to the extent that they should have in the Class III milk price.
 - Q. When you say "to the extent that they should have," and that's because, in your view, blocks are more widely used -- or the pricing off blocks is not as representative -- or let me rephrase this?

More of the cheese market is priced off blocks, so that the NDPSR price is not recognizing that?

- A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. I would like to spend a little time on the



chart you have on page 3 because I don't think that was kind of walked through in testimony. If you could walk through what you're trying to show there and what some of these columns mean.

- A. What we were trying to do here was estimate the value that was lost to dairy producers from 2017 through -- through first half of 2023 based on the block-barrel spread, NDPSR block to block -- the block-barrel spread in the NDPSR, and just said, okay, if we did not have barrels in the index, what would have been the financial impact to dairy producers. So we just -- we just said, here's -- in the left column you have the Class III annual milk pounds.
 - Q. That's pooled on the Federal Order?
 - A. That the pooled on the Federal Order.
 - Q. Uh-huh.
- A. Yep. And the second column is Class I annual milk pounds, because Class III impacts Class I but not 100%. So the third one takes a look at Class I pounds that were driven by Class III. So prior to May of 2019, it was the higher of Class III or IV. So the months where the Class III price was above Class IV, that volume was included. After May of 2019, then it was just half of the Class I volume because the Class I pricing -- the mover was based on the average of Class III and IV.

We just take the total of that volume, convert it to hundredweights, took the actual spread during those -- that time period and just subtracted \$0.03 off. I mean,



2.

2.1

that may not have been necessary but trying to be conservative here, because there's some assumptions that there's a \$0.03 spread between block and barrels, so just trying to make the estimate conservative. And then took that spread and converted it to a hundredweight impact.

And so we ran the spread per pound through the Class III model, and every penny in spread translates to 4.8 cents per hundredweight in the milk price. And then took that per hundredweight impact times the hundredweight volume, and that got to the dollar impact to dairy producers.

- Q. So to read this table then, it's showing that from 2017 to 2023, the impact of using blocks and barrels in the prices --
 - A. Uh-huh.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. -- reduced revenue to dairy producers by \$2 million and change?
- A. At least, yes. Because, to your point, it doesn't -- it's only pooled pounds, and if you look at 2020, the volume drops off dramatically because some of the Class III pounds were depooled in 2020.
 - O. Uh-huh.

In the footnote, then, can you explain the sentence: "Calculations based on total Class III milk volume" -- okay, I think I under- -- "plus Class I volume impacted by the Class III price." I think that explains those two columns there. I think I understand that more.

A. Yeah.



- Q. I do think that perhaps the footnote got cut off at the end. It says, "Based on Class III pricing formulas," comma, "every," and then the sentence ends.
- A. That should be "every penny in spread translates to a 4.82 per hundredweight impact."
- Q. Okay. So every penny in spread translates to a 4.82 cents per hundredweight impact?
 - A. Right.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Okay. So I got that correct.
- Okay. On page 4 you talk about how barrel cheese manufacturers have been paying higher milk costs relative to the prices that they receive for the barrel cheese?
- 13 A. Sorry, I was trying to get to that. Could you 14 repeat that again?
 - Q. Sure. On page 4, you talk about -- there's a sentence: "Barrel cheese manufacturers have been paying high milk costs relative to the prices received for barrel cheese," towards the top of the page?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. So if we only include blocks in the survey, what would be the impact to barrel makers whose milk is pooled on the Federal Order system if their price is no longer reflected in the protein price?
 - A. Yeah. In that case when you have a high block-barrel spread, initially, that's going to negatively impact barrel manufacturers. You know, our thought is that kind of puts them on the same playing field as other types of cheese that aren't 40-pound block, like



mozzarella 640-pound blocks, and there would be an evolution to where the -- you would have -- they would be priced more off the block market.

It is definitely not a perfect solution, but it gets you closer to what the reality of the marketplace is, which is commodity cheese in the country is, at least, in my opinion, 75% priced off the block market, and the milk price should reflect that better than it does today.

Q. You mention 75% of the cheese market -- commodity cheese market is priced off of blocks.

I asked a similar question to Dr. Vitaliano. What would be your definition of a commodity cheese product then?

- A. A commodity product would be anything that really is priced off a market index, which a lot of that cheese, that 13.8 billion pounds, is done. It is priced off of a block index. Not all of it, but the vast majority of it is.
- Q. So not necessarily a product that has to be the product of last resort?
- A. Right. Right. In all those -- a lot of those categories, they do have some balancing, and a lot of times it is going to be the product of last resort and -- and -- when you are trying to balance your network.
- Q. Okay. And I think -- so does that go to the point you were talking earlier, that in a company who has a diversified cheese production, you try to balance in the company?



2.

2.0

2.1

A. Uh-huh.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. So you balance with whatever production capacity you have, not necessarily barrels or blocks?
- A. Yeah. We may have times where we don't have the demand for mozzarella, but we have the demand for cheddar. So the cheddar lines are running and it is getting sold, but then we have to -- we may not have 100% sales for the mozzarella, and so we still have to make the product, and then sell that on the spot market. But that can change. That can -- we can be full on mozzarella, which is a lot of times the case, and we have to balance on the -- with 40-pound blocks, and then 40-pound blocks become the balancing outlet.
- Q. Okay. I did have a question. You know, we were looking on page 6 where you have the NDPSR volumes of the survey and, you know, the past three years barrels have been actually a higher percentage of what's surveyed than blocks.
- A. Yes.
- Q. And there's been -- I guess a question is, would it -- would it be correct to suggest that perhaps we're not capturing much of the 40-pound blocks in the survey -- in the NDPSR survey, and would there be reasons for that that you can think of?
 - A. It does --
- Q. There are very stringent requirements for what gets surveyed.
 - A. It does surprise me a little bit that there's not



- a higher percentage of blocks. We have added some block capacity in the past couple of years. We do expect that there's going to be more block capacity coming online where that -- I would think that the block would become a higher percentage, where those two might flip to 52 block, 48 barrel. That would be my thought.
- But, yeah, I'm a little surprised that we have got a higher percentage of barrel than block.
- Q. And so you said that there's additional block capacity coming online?
- A. Yeah, based on what I have been hearing, that there's more capacity coming online in the next few years.
- Q. Okay. And could that result in an oversupply of blocks at some point and then block prices decrease?
- A. It's -- it's possible. I'm not going to speculate on what the market prices are going to do.
 - Q. If we could all only do that correctly.
- A. Yeah.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Okay. Do you -- back on the 40s that might be excluded in the survey, you guys make 40s?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. And are they cut-and-wrapped in your facility?
 - A. No. We sell them as a bulk product to most -- to companies that would further process them.
 - Q. Okay. On page 7 -- well, I think my question was answered, but -- in my own head, so I'll answer it for the record.
 - The last sentence there says, "The highest monthly



spread during this period was \$0.61 per pound, but the lowest was \$0.20 per pound."

But the data you showed here is just annual data, but that's in the monthly data?

- A. Right. Right. Yeah, there's no table for the monthly. We just pulled out a couple data points.
- Q. On the top of 8, you talk about "Total U.S. cheese production was 13.8 billion pounds," etcetera. And down in the -- in that paragraph you talk about the 9% again, which is total commodity cheese production.

And I'm wondering if there's a distinction between just cheese production and commodity cheese production or you use those terms interchangeably?

- A. Yeah. I mean, we are referring to the cheese products that are manufactured in Table 5. That's reported by the USDA.
 - Q. Okay. And I did have a question on Table 5.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. So to my next question. And you source -- have a source there of that table from NASS. But NASS doesn't report blocks and barrels, NASS reports cheddar. So I'm curious if you can explain how you came up with those numbers.
- A. I mean, the source may need to be adjusted, but that's the data that gets reported by USDA for those specific product types.
- Q. Okay. Yeah. We would be curious about the source of that because --



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

A. Okay.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. -- I don't think NASS reports blocks and barrels separately.
 - A. Okay.
 - Q. This 9% of barrel cheese production being barrels has been discussed at length.

Can you expand on how you came up with that estimate? I guess that just goes -- excuse me -- to the NASS -- this number you are talking about in Table 5.

- A. Right. Right. So 1.2 billion pounds of cheddar -- or barrel cheese production out of 13.8 total cheese production.
- Q. I wanted to talk a little bit about mozzarella since you all produce mozzarella.
 - A. Uh-huh.
 - Q. Were you here for Ms. McBride's testimony on Monday?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. At that time she talked about -- we asked her questions about what would be considered a commodity size for mozzarella.
 - Do you have an opinion on what would be considered a commodity mozzarella product?
 - A. Yeah. The difficulty with mozzarella is you have all kinds of different packaging sizes. A lot of -- like with cheddar, you have 40-pound blocks, 500-pound barrels, that's pretty dominant.
 - Within mozzarella, there's really not a standard



- size. You have -- you have 20-pound blocks. You have six-pound blocks. You just have a lot of different sizes.

 I mean, 20-pound blocks is probably a bulk type size.
 - Q. And what do those get used for?
 - A. Mostly for further processing. For -- for slicing and things like that.
 - Q. And in our NDPSR survey we have standards for products and for cheese. Cheddar has to meet the FDA standard of identity. There's been discussion about mozzarella. A lot of it is not actual mozzarella according to the FDA standard of identify.
 - A. Right.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

- Q. Do you have any knowledge on maybe how much production meets that standard out there?
 - A. I don't have that knowledge.
 - Q. But -- but a lot of it probably wouldn't be -- we would call it pizza cheese; is that correct?
 - A. Well, I think there's a lot of that manufactured out there. Yeah, I just don't have a lot of information on the breakdown.
 - Q. Okay.
- MS. TAYLOR: I think Mr. Wilson has some questions for you.
- 24 THE WITNESS: Okay.
- 25 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 26 BY MR. WILSON:
 - O. Good afternoon, Mr. Hanson.
- 28 A. Good afternoon.



- Q. Thank you for coming. I have got a couple questions related to Table 4 on your summarization of the block-barrel spread history.
- Just for clarification and the record, it's labeled as NDPSR (NASS) Block and Barrel Spread History.
 - A. Yes.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

19

2.0

24

27

- Q. Beginning in May of 2012, AMS took that over. So I just wanted to clarify that.
 - A. Okay.
- 10 Q. I would like to know on the computations of 11 this -- this is a yearly number.
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. Is it an average -- is it just a simple average of each week's NDPSR price for each of those two things?
- 15 A. I believe it's the average -- it's the month -- it
 16 is the -- you take the monthly averages that are reported,
 17 and it's just the average of -- the annual average of the
 18 monthly averages.
 - Q. Okay. So it is not the weekly NDPSR average. It is -- it is an average of the announced --
- 21 A. Right.
- Q. -- monthly. It could be a four-week period, it could be a five-week period that that report --
 - A. I believe so. I believe so.
- Q. Okay. Do you know if that is -- if the barrel has been adjusted by moisture at that point?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And do you know if the \$0.03 has been added?



- 1 A. No, there -- the \$0.03 would not be added.
- Q. Okay. And it would be the weighted price?
- 3 A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. Based on the monthly data.
- 6 | Q. Yes.

7 MR. WILSON: That's all for AMS. Thank you, your

8 | Honor.

4

5

19

26

28

9 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

10 THE COURT: Redirect.

11 | MR. ENGLISH: Your Honor?

12 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. ENGLISH: Chip English. A question or two

14 | that follows up on two questions that Ms. Taylor asked in 15 | different ways.

16 THE COURT: Very well.

17 RECROSS-EXAMINATION

18 BY MR. ENGLISH:

- O. Again, Chip English for Milk Innovation Group.
- 20 A. Uh-huh.
- 21 Q. So if -- going to two of the questions that

22 Ms. Taylor asked about what happens here with blocks and

23 | barrels. If barrels were taken out of the class -- out of

24 | the NDPSR, therefore out of the Class III price setting,

25 | isn't there a risk that more manufacturers, in order to

clear the market, would dump excess cheese on the CME

27 | block market?

A. There's a -- there's a possibility you could see



1 | more product being put on the block market, I suppose.

- Q. Well, the market has to clear, right?
- A. Uh-huh.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

17

- Q. That's a "yes," right? Sorry. The court reporter can't take down --
 - A. Yes, the market has to clear.
- Q. And so if you take barrels out, and the market has to clear, doesn't that suggest that manufacturers who need to get that price to match with their barrels will need to dump excess block cheese on the CME block market to help clear the market?
- 12 A. I suppose that could be a scenario.
- Q. Okay. And once that happens, won't that just encourage others to do the same?
 - A. It's possible.
- 16 Q. Thank you.
 - MR. ENGLISH: I have no further questions.
- 18 | THE COURT: All right. Further re-cross? Cross?
- 19 Dr. Cryan.

20 RECROSS-EXAMINATION

- 21 BY DR. CRYAN:
- Q. Dr. Cryan for American Farm Bureau following up on Mr. English's question.
- 24 A. Uh-huh.
- Q. To the best of your knowledge, would dumping product onto the CME for the purposes of depressing the price be legal?
- 28 A. I'm not sure. I'm not a lawyer.



| 1 | DR. CRYAN: All right. Thank you. |
|----|--|
| 2 | THE COURT: Anyone else? |
| 3 | Redirect. |
| 4 | MS. HANCOCK: Thank you, your Honor. |
| 5 | REDIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 6 | BY MS. HANCOCK: |
| 7 | Q. Mr. Hanson, is more cheese on the CME, more |
| 8 | liquidity that would offer a better price discovery? |
| 9 | A. If you had more volume on the CME, yes, you would |
| 10 | have more price discovery. |
| 11 | MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, we would offer |
| 12 | Exhibit 117 into evidence. |
| 13 | THE COURT: Any objections? |
| 14 | Hearing none, Exhibit 117 is entered into the |
| 15 | record of this proceeding. |
| 16 | (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 117 was received |
| 17 | into evidence.) |
| 18 | THE COURT: Mr. Rosenbaum rises. |
| 19 | MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, I would ask that |
| 20 | Hearing Exhibit 118 be entered into the record. |
| 21 | THE COURT: Any objections? |
| 22 | MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, I don't believe that |
| 23 | I mean, it's a regulation. I don't think we need to have |
| 24 | it admitted into evidence. And I don't think that this |
| 25 | witness can lay the foundation for that. |
| 26 | THE COURT: We have things like motions what I |
| 27 | consider motions in here. I think it is appropriate. It |
| 28 | was referred to, I think, by that number. We can put it |



in this record. I mean, it's -- I think we can take official notice of that too.

MS. HANCOCK: I think you can take official notice of it. I guess I don't know what gatekeeping we're doing if we just let everything in that's been referenced.

THE COURT: Well, I'm going to let it into the record because it's -- you know, you didn't object to it when it was marked, so --

MS. HANCOCK: I thought we would deal with that at the end after all the testimony comes in.

THE COURT: Well, I think we have had -- I think we have had cross-examination on it. It was referred to as an exhibit number. I don't want somebody wondering what this was. I guess they can look it up and see what was identified. I don't think it has to come into the record. But I don't think it costs us very much to put in there, and I don't think anyone's disadvantaged by it.

Do you have something you want to say, Mr. Rosenbaum?

MR. ROSENBAUM: The witness was questioned regarding it, and there are many references to it as the Hearing Exhibit 118. I think it should go into the record.

THE COURT: Yes, I really think it is a convenience, not a matter of whether there's a question over the truth of what's asserted therein or anything.

But that's -- it is a fair point that it could be referred to because it's a part of the federal -- federal



2.

2.0

2.1

regulations.

2.

2.0

2.1

MS. HANCOCK: I mean, your Honor, it is not about the substance of this one. I don't care if this one is in. My only point is I'm not entirely sure what the gatekeeping function is if we don't have that -- if we don't have a gatekeeping function.

THE COURT: Sure, we have a gatekeeping function, and I'm part of that. And no one else -- does AMS have an objection to this exhibit coming in?

MR. HILL: I don't necessarily have an objection, but I do take Ms. Hancock's point on that, so -- but I don't have an objection. It's been referred to at this point. It's one page. We won't object at this time. We'll give it whatever weight it deserves.

THE COURT: Yes.

Are you satisfied, Mr. Rosenbaum?

MR. ROSENBAUM: Well, I think your Honor has admitted it, so -- has already admitted it, so --

THE COURT: Well -- okay. I mean, I could -- I could reconsider my decision but -- and if this comes up again, we can -- I'd have to think about it a little bit. I mean, we don't -- you asked the witness questions about it. You could show him a copy of the Code of Federal Regulations, I suppose. This seems like a convenience to me, and I am going to admit it.

Depends -- I don't think I would admit a whole volume of the Code of Federal Regulations or anything like that. In this case, it's a one-page document, or two,



| 1 | whatever. So I'm going to let it in this time, and I |
|----|---|
| 2 | intend to perform a gatekeeping function. |
| 3 | (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 118 was received |
| 4 | into evidence.) |
| 5 | MR. ROSENBAUM: Thank you, your Honor. |
| 6 | THE COURT: Thank you. |
| 7 | All right. Mr. Kaiser, you may you are |
| 8 | excused. |
| 9 | Ms. Hancock. |
| 10 | MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, I just note that we only |
| 11 | have ten minutes left. I don't believe that our next |
| 12 | witness can put on his direct testimony in that amount of |
| 13 | time. And given our earlier discussion, I think it might |
| 14 | be worthwhile to use this last ten minutes to set the |
| 15 | expectation for tomorrow. |
| 16 | THE COURT: Yes. You and I think alike. I was |
| 17 | about to raise the same thing. |
| 18 | Do we want to do that on the record or do we want |
| 19 | to have some discussion off the record and then put it on |
| 20 | the record? I don't know that we need to burden the |
| 21 | record with I don't know how controversial anything is. |
| 22 | MR. HILL: I would suggest going off the record |
| 23 | for that, your Honor. |
| 24 | THE COURT: Any objection? |
| 25 | Off the record. |
| 26 | (Off-the-record.) |
| 27 | THE COURT: Let's go back on the record. |
| 28 | Ms. Taylor I mean, I can try, but I think you |



1 would probably do a better job of it, and just quickly lay 2. out on the record what the plan is for tomorrow. MS. TAYLOR: Certainly. Tomorrow we'll start at 3 8:00 a.m. We'll start with Mr. Paul Bower. And the list 4 5 of witnesses who we may or may not get to tomorrow will be Christian Edmiston, Emma Downing, Roger Cryan, Mike Brown. 6 7 And we will have six dairy farmer witnesses testifying 8 virtually starting at noon Eastern Time. And after they 9 are finished, Ms. Cashman from USDA will testify on a few 10 additional data requests we have received. And we will 11 finish up by 3:00 p.m. tomorrow. 12 THE COURT: Very well. I think that's everything. 13 With that, we're adjourned for the day. 14 (Whereupon, the proceedings concluded.) 15 16 ---000---17 18 19 2.0 2.1 22 23 24 25 26 27



| 1 | STATE OF CALIFORNIA) |
|----------|--|
| 2 | COUNTY OF FRESNO) |
| 3 | |
| 4 | I, MYRA A. PISH, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do |
| 5 | hereby certify that the foregoing pages comprise a full, |
| 6 | true and correct transcript of my shorthand notes, and a |
| 7 | full, true and correct statement of the proceedings held |
| 8 | at the time and place heretofore stated. |
| 9 | |
| 10 | DATED: September 18, 2023 |
| 11 | FRESNO, CALIFORNIA |
| 12 | |
| 13 | 1 Musa Rad |
| 14 15 | China Contraction of the Contrac |
| 16 | MYRA A. PISH, RPR CSR |
| L7 | Certificate No. 11613 |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |



\$

\$0.01 1619:22,23 1620:1

\$0.03 1598:13 1605:28 1606:25 1618:8 1619:2,23 1634:5 1635:18 1722:15 1743:28 1744:3 1752:28 1753:1

\$0.11 1619:28

\$0.12 1598:11 1605:27

\$0.20 1620:4 1749:2

\$0.27 1616:8 1620:2 1727:20,27

\$0.30 1731:20,23

\$0.36 1588:3

\$0.61 1620:3 1727:19,21 1749:1

\$0.74 1578:5 1583:17 1586:26

\$1 1576:6

\$1.49 1655:3 1661:18 1664:18 1665:28 1667:7,8 1675:17 1709:17 1713:8

\$1.50 1562:2 1573:17

\$100 1709:14

\$2 1616:22 1744:17

\$200.000 1579:26 1591:5

\$3.75 1588:21

\$350,000 1709:9

\$4 1576:3

\$9 1578:2

---**00**0--- 1640:10 1759:16

--I 1521:17

0

0% 1706:13

0.01 1626:11,19 1728:22

0.071 1692:2

0.11 1626:16

0.2 1556:25,26

0.2% 1556:23

0.35 1644:17

0.35% 1556:15

0.354 1647:25 1650:13

0.55% 1655:14

0.710 1644:4

0.735 1644:4

003 1557:20

02 1712:6

1

1 1539:3 1557:3 1571:11,13, 16 1605:24 1616:23 1685:6 1688:20 1689:8 1694:10 1702:28

1% 1555:25,28 1556:1,14,22 1557:14 1558:24 1562:15 1563:7 1566:24,27 1572:13 1703:14 1714:26

1,000 1688:20

1.0 1555:27

1.2 1620:9 1629:15 1638:8 1750:10

1.4% 1566:28

1.49 1661:17

1.5 1688:20,24

1.6 1668:2

1.6% 1563:3 1644:24 1645:15 1655:18,20 1661:18 1668:1,7 1671:9 1675:18 1684:15 1705:18,28

1.63% 1557:15

1.66 1557:15

1.75 1688:20

10% 1567:26 1572:8 1595:13 1604:18 1606:11,18 1646:16 1670:3 1692:4

10.000 1614:23

100% 1522:15 1666:7,8 1743:18 1747:7

10:00 1591:21

10:15 1591:24

11 1553:13 1642:23 1643:18

114 1592:10 1599:11 1610:6, 9

114's 1610:7

115 1555:6,8 1641:17 1715:11 1716:3,4 1718:21

116 1574:26,27,28 1591:14, 16

117 1613:26,27 1614:1 1722:1 1726:2 1755:12,14,

1170.8 1639:20 1720:18

118 1631:11,14,17 1639:18 1720:13 1721:1 1755:20 1756:22 1758:3

11:00 1610:13

11th 1539:14

12 1553:14,19 1554:1,4 1587:14 1588:28 1696:2

12th 1539:14

13 1696:2

13.8 1620:6 1746:16 1749:8 1750:11

13th 1539:14

1400 1575:10

14853 1551:20

14th 1539:15

15 1570:2 1591:23 1681:21 1691:22 1700:25 1716:28 1741:4.8

15-mile 1576:11

15.121 1718:7 1719:15

15.4% 1561:5

150 1553:5

150% 1618:27

16 1733:14.17

16% 1604:21 1618:12,16 1726:12,16 1727:6,7

170.8 1631:22 1639:18

18% 1618:13 1670:24

18.3% 1559:16,24 1671:3

19 1561:21 1565:27 1566:13, 25 1578:18

1964 1681:6

1975 1552:7

1979 1552:7.10

1985 1552:10,16 1553:7

1990s 1622:25

1994 1552:17 1575:12

1998 1643:4

1999 1618:28

1:36 1640:8

1st 1539:13

2

2 1530:11 1563:5,6 1618:4 1622:19 1685:1,28 1688:6, 11,12 1700:9 1701:18 1707:15 1714:10 1722:1 1726:8

2% 1714:26

2.7 1620:12

20 1564:9 1609:23 1612:20

20% 1702:18

20-pound 1751:1,3

20-some 1734:21

200,000 1582:22

2000 1609:10 1619:20 1622:24 1623:2 1626:10

2008 1557:21 1558:22 1622:25 1623:2 1643:27

2010 1557:22 1561:20

2011 1643:9 1670:7

2012 1557:12 1642:1 1643:25 1670:8 1685:1 1752:7

2013 1554:4 1559:10,12,15, 19 1561:1,6,16 1562:13 1660:9

2014 1554:4

2016 1605:14 1619:20 1626:10 1635:16

2017 1603:10 1615:23 1616:5,22 1617:18 1619:26 1621:17 1622:22 1623:1,5 1626:14 1635:20 1730:20,22 1743:6 1744:13

2018 1575:26 1576:5,25 1578:4 1583:11 1587:5

2019 1561:1 1576:2 1584:16 1690:24 1691:2,3,13 1719:5 1743:20.23

201H 1551:19

2020 1576:6 1578:3,9 1579:21 1584:14,17 1587:22 1591:8 1616:27 1678:22 1727:19,23,27 1728:2,4,16 1734:27 1735:2 1744:20,21

2021 1561:5,20 1616:27 1620:5 1659:20,21 1681:18

Index: \$0.01..2021



2022 1618:11 1619:17,26 1626:18,22 1627:1,11 1629:15,16 1655:26 1690:28 1691:3 1692:9 1719:6 1728:22 1734:17

2023 1519:1 1562:13 1575:28 1578:14 1584:18 1589:17 1641:1 1734:19 1743:7 1744:13

24.8% 1561:22

25 1529:26 1578:28 1672:5 1687:7 1740:6

26.6% 1726:28

26.9% 1561:22

27% 1727:1

29% 1620:7

2:00 1524:18

3

3 1535:1 1538:24 1567:10 1594:11,14 1596:5 1619:17 1655:2 1665:27 1687:25 1704:14 1709:15 1710:25 1743:1

3-point 1647:25

3.2% 1645:3

3.9 1620:7 1726:19

30 1529:26 1588:2 1632:19 1717:5,6,8,9

30% 1576:1

31 1519:1 1641:1

32% 1558:25

34% 1561:4 1618:10 1629:28

35 1563:1 1688:7

350 1614:25

37 1557:18 1563:5 1697:12

38 1539:9 1552:16 1556:21, 24 1557:11 1563:1 1566:12 1644:28 1657:28 1682:24 1690:9

38-peer-reviewed 1556:11

3:00 1759:11

3:19 1706:24

3:30 1706:24

3:45 1716:27

4

4 1523:20 1528:4 1539:3 1626:5 1641:20 1680:8 1689:8 1718:21 1726:4 1727:17 1734:15 1745:10,15 1752:2

4.7% 1562:24,27 1563:1,6 1644:16 1655:10

4.8 1744:8

4.82 1745:5.7

40 1578:28

40% 1629:24

40-block 1599:13 1600:16

40-pound 1592:16 1593:10 1595:7 1596:4,8 1597:25 1601:9 1602:17,20 1608:7,8 1615:21 1616:5,17 1618:4, 15 1619:3,7,21 1620:13,14, 16,19,23 1621:7 1622:21 1623:21,25 1627:18 1628:6 1629:22,23,25 1630:10 1632:2,25 1633:10,26 1634:25 1731:13 1733:14, 16,22 1734:5 1735:15 1736:10,18 1737:18 1738:24,27 1739:3,8 1740:21 1745:28 1747:12,22 1750:26

400-pound 1632:5

40s 1734:4 1735:19 1740:27 1741:7 1748:19,20

45 1542:15,20 1549:2

48 1748:6

48% 1619:18 1629:27 1724:20

5

5 1534:3,13,14 1535:4 1539:2,4,10 1571:8 1573:12 1592:11 1594:3 1599:10 1601:15 1603:8 1620:25 1641:20 1646:18 1647:23 1680:8 1688:20 1726:2 1749:15,17 1750:9

5% 1646:18

50 1564:9 1573:10 1614:22

50% 1562:20 1573:11 1637:19 1659:26

500 1614:24 1633:1 1688:21

500-pound 1596:8 1597:6, 24,26 1598:25 1602:16

1615:22 1616:6 1618:5,21 1619:21 1620:27 1621:8 1629:24 1630:6,11 1632:3,9 1633:14,25 1731:14 1734:9 1736:21,25 1738:24,28 1750:26

52 1724:20 1748:5

52% 1619:19 1629:26 1636:10 1637:19 1724:20 1727:2

53562 1611:27

54.6 1655:26 1656:7.19

54929 1572:12

55% 1562:15

5:00 1524:19

5th 1539:14

5X 1636:11

6

6 1595:1 1747:15

6,000 1575:28 1576:12

6.2 1614:18

60 1557:1 1575:11 1681:16

600 1575:10 1611:26

62 1700:22

62% 1576:10

640 1733:23 1741:9

640-pound 1602:19,21 1620:13,16 1623:21,27 1630:21 1733:9,11,14,18,20 1734:6,8 1735:14 1737:15 1739:2,6 1740:21 1741:2 1746:1

640s 1623:26 1733:25 1734:3 1735:19 1737:17 1740:27 1741:7

644,226,963 1726:21

6:00 1524:19

6th 1539:14

7

7 1572:26 1578:2 1601:1,4 1626:4 1631:22 1639:20 1718:6 1720:18 1727:17 1734:15 1748:25

7% 1559:9,12,22 1671:3 1692:5

7-point 1588:21

700 1578:9

702,431,327 1726:22

74 1572:26

74% 1572:27,28

75% 1601:8,15,16,21 1620:22 1627:17 1628:1,3,7 1746:7,9

7th 1539:14

8

8 1601:3,6 1627:13 1700:24 1749:7

8% 1561:22

8.3% 1670:23

8.6 1572:2 1710:23

8.6% 1562:5,23 1655:7

8.7% 1562:26

80% 1607:21

8401 1611:26

850 1614:17

873 1557:21

8800 1575:27

8:00 1759:4

9

9 1534:6 1571:18 1646:12,15 1647:23 1711:8 1735:22

9% 1563:8 1604:13 1618:18 1620:10,26 1621:4 1636:9 1637:17,20 1638:13 1645:1 1668:10 1724:23 1726:4 1727:13,14 1735:24,26,28 1736:1,5,7 1749:9 1750:5

90% 1589:21 1592:15 1599:11 1600:4,9,19 1601:16,22 1606:10 1627:21 1628:8 1651:26

90-minute 1528:24

90-plus 1589:22

90-some 1729:11

920 1578:17

95 1552:17 1651:25

95% 1648:13,20 1651:20

Index: 2022..99%

99% 1651:25



Α

A&m 1567:5 1690:22 1693:21

A.C. 1657:25 1658:1 1714:19

a.m. 1524:18,19 1591:21 1759:4

ability 1527:27 1540:17 1545:28 1639:8

absolute 1555:26 1556:27 1646:8 1708:3

absolutely 1531:8 1538:7,9 1569:1 1570:24 1581:15 1582:4.13 1730:13

absorb 1535:27 1666:3,4

absorbed 1673:27 1674:16

abstract 1567:22

abundance 1715:14

abuse 1700:6

accept 1538:9 1705:19

accepted 1621:13 1694:25 1695:5

accepting 1671:20

access 1599:20 1600:18 1740:2

accommodate 1522:22

accommodated 1542:9

accommodating 1542:13

accompanying 1555:19

account 1532:13 1692:23,28 1717:16 1729:19

accuracy 1692:12

accurate 1649:27 1688:7,24 1717:13 1719:16

accused 1523:24

achieve 1585:2 1604:27

achieving 1637:25

acknowledge 1524:5

acquiescence 1715:25

acres 1575:10

act 1552:21 1554:18 1662:22 1663:19,23

active 1581:12 1604:9,11

actively 1583:28 1592:23 1602:24 1607:1

activities 1615:14 1705:9

Acts 1553:15

actual 1538:22 1545:5 1577:21 1592:26 1597:13 1600:10,20 1601:24 1622:2 1635:5 1660:16 1673:26 1711:4 1715:22 1736:22 1743:27 1751:10

add 1595:14 1631:2 1642:16 1649:5 1650:3 1673:28 1685:14 1686:8 1691:23

added 1554:18 1597:10 1730:23 1731:1 1748:1 1752:28 1753:1

adding 1595:1,17 1604:5 1618:8 1635:18

addition 1558:15 1615:4 1687:14 1720:19 1736:1

additional 1550:7 1646:5 1647:11 1701:2 1730:23 1739:22 1741:13 1748:9 1759:10

additive 1671:22

address 1526:21 1533:3 1540:16 1541:19 1551:18 1611:25 1654:2

addressed 1537:28 1730:12

addressing 1550:1 1581:23

adds 1715:1

adequate 1603:25,28 1604:18,22 1607:22 1609:18 1693:13

adjourned 1759:13

adjust 1597:23 1632:10 1737:19

adjusted 1572:19,22 1619:1, 2 1749:24 1752:26

adjusting 1555:22 1635:18 1734:13 1737:16

adjustment 1579:11 1634:5 1706:7 1737:15

Administration 1588:19

administrative 1718:26

admirable 1545:21

admire 1721:10

admission 1591:14

admit 1610:6 1683:15 1715:11 1757:25,26

admitted 1591:15 1610:8 1636:13 1716:3 1718:26

1755:24 1757:18

admitting 1716:8

adopt 1608:20 1676:17

adopted 1553:22 1575:27 1594:15 1618:21 1675:16 1726:8

adoption 1594:10,11

adults 1661:27

advance 1520:5,20

advanced 1523:17 1578:19, 23,25,27 1579:3,8,15 1590:2,27 1712:20

adversarial 1523:28

adverse 1621:15

adversely 1615:18

advertising 1693:4 1702:16

advocates 1604:3

AFBF 1581:11

AFBF's 1581:3

affect 1652:12 1659:20

affected 1576:13

affecting 1567:7 1579:26

affects 1582:25 1685:18

affirm 1665:1

African 1686:22,25

afternoon 1520:22 1532:9 1546:24 1547:1,4 1570:5 1641:1 1654:17,18 1684:25, 26 1694:5 1707:8,9 1716:27 1721:22,23 1729:3,4 1738:20 1741:18,19 1751:27,28

age 1561:21,25 1565:27 1566:13,18,26 1632:16,17 1660:7 1705:7

aged 1632:7

agency 1718:5

aggregate 1658:15

agree 1521:16 1530:8 1537:15 1543:26 1549:26 1597:16 1627:28 1628:5,7 1630:3 1633:19,27 1634:2 1636:4 1651:1 1656:1 1657:17 1658:6,28 1659:11 1661:24 1662:13 1668:20,28 1670:27 1673:6,14 1674:3 1679:12,27 1681:20 1682:15 1694:19 1695:26 1696:3,9, 13 1698:17 1699:25,26 1701:6 1719:14 1725:1,9 1728:4

agreeing 1575:13 1696:4

Agreement 1662:22 1663:19,23

agreements 1607:28

agricultural 1552:12 1554:22 1613:15 1662:22 1663:18,22 1693:22 1718:3

agriculture 1540:27 1575:22,23 1600:12 1663:13 1718:3

aha 1535:3

ahead 1537:5 1541:3 1553:26,27 1574:17,21 1614:5 1647:2 1670:28 1678:24 1679:3 1727:23

airplane 1720:1

airtight 1633:10

aligned 1594:21

alike 1758:16

all-day 1547:28

alleged 1665:13

allocate 1654:10

allowance 1535:27 1617:9

Allowances 1725:15,16,24

allowed 1542:8 1699:6,12 1721:15 1722:14 1728:8

almond 1667:19

alter 1558:2

alternative 1560:13 1659:17 1670:20 1692:28 1702:1 1708:14

Alternatively 1563:4 1572:17

alternatives 1692:24

altogether 1606:21

AMA 1697:1

amendments 1663:14

America's 1575:20 1580:8

American 1575:17 1576:18 1577:4 1580:28 1602:11 1620:17 1738:18 1754:22

Americans 1686:22.25

amount 1557:26 1567:18 1587:20 1616:26 1658:19 1758:12

Index: A&m..amount



AMS 1521:25 1524:27 1525:13 1536:2,3 1540:28 1541:1,15 1545:25 1546:27 1550:6,10 1553:21 1568:17 1570:21 1588:11 1591:10 1599:5 1602:8,28 1663:14 1675:10 1693:20 1715:4,7 1718:15,17 1723:13 1728:27 1741:14,15 1752:7 1753:7

AMS's 1525:5 1532:13 1548:22 1706:28 1719:4

analysis 1536:20 1553:17 1554:23 1568:3 1576:9 1653:8 1655:20 1656:17 1657:17 1661:17 1664:6,17 1665:8 1668:6 1696:26,28 1705:15 1710:22 1711:9

analyst 1612:23

analyzing 1529:26

and/or 1720:2

announced 1578:26 1579:9 1590:28 1752:20

annual 1615:24 1616:8 1619:26 1620:1 1655:25 1714:4 1734:27 1743:13,17 1749:3 1752:17

annually 1614:18,24 1619:22 1620:9 1690:17,19

answering 1588:9 1740:28

answers 1645:25 1693:26 1710:20

anymore 1608:12 1660:21 1661:15 1742:2

anyone's 1756:17

apologize 1689:11,18 1711:2 1714:7 1735:21

apparently 1536:11 1568:21

appeared 1534:2

appears 1561:10 1601:3 1713:15

appendix 1534:6 1571:19 1572:22 1573:21,23 1646:11,15

application 1625:28

applications 1625:6,20

applied 1530:1 1551:15 1552:12,22 1613:8,11,12 1663:23 1706:15

applies 1632:22 1666:25

apply 1633:20 1648:14 1649:11 1650:12,22 1661:19

1667:13,14 1699:9,15

appreciates 1693:8

appreciating 1547:15

approach 1600:24 1686:14 1700:16

appropriateness 1604:14

approximately 1562:5 1592:15 1599:11 1601:22 1627:21 1628:8

April 1627:4

arbitrage 1565:9 1598:4 1609:18 1731:18

area 1530:13 1651:23,25

areas 1590:18

argue 1556:18 1637:16 1659:27 1727:7

argued 1548:16

arguing 1548:28

argument 1563:27 1716:17

arisen 1539:27

arithmetic 1667:9

arrangement 1578:25

arrive 1619:2

arrived 1735:6

article 1642:12 1690:3,6 1694:17 1696:12,20

articles 1552:27 1553:6 1571:10 1642:17,20 1680:21 1683:2 1690:1,2,9

aspect 1707:23 1722:23

assert 1529:8 1681:28

asserted 1756:26

assess 1654:10

assessed 1654:9

assessing 1648:15

assets 1675:23

assist 1670:14

associate 1557:21 1558:22

associates 1642:18

Association 1519:8 1569:3 1583:10 1584:8,20 1628:24 1641:16 1720:11 1737:12

associations 1583:27

assume 1632:28 1633:24 1652:27 1655:25,27 1659:9

1674:8,12,22,23,25 1691:19 1704:23 1710:18

assumed 1605:28 1710:16,

assuming 1646:4,6 1713:12

assumption 1538:14,16,18 1606:24 1655:6 1684:15 1706:22 1710:1,9 1713:8,12

assumptions 1606:3 1744:2

assure 1521:9 1529:24 1577:13 1717:7

at-home 1658:21

attached 1548:27

attack 1699:2

attain 1546:19

attended 1581:16

attention 1549:3,4 1689:19 1695:2

attorney 1698:23 1721:21

attorneys 1526:8

audiences 1596:21

aughts 1692:9

August 1519:1 1588:6 1641:1 1734:23

author 1642:20 1643:4 1718:2

authored 1689:20

authority 1531:17

authors 1642:8,9

automated 1625:26 1626:3

automobiles 1703:27

availability 1560:20,22 1565:8 1654:7

avenue 1655:3

average 1556:13,15 1561:18 1562:2,28 1564:26 1572:18 1576:24,26 1578:28 1579:16,17 1590:4,5 1598:11 1605:5,23,27 1615:24 1618:7 1619:26 1620:1 1626:9,13,16 1632:10 1644:28 1647:24 1648:7 1650:13,16,24 1655:19 1660:11 1672:12 1687:10,26 1688:1,4,15,21, 23 1689:6 1709:15,17 1743:25 1752:13,15,17,19, 20

average-of 1575:27 1578:5

1583:16 1586:26 1589:25

averaged 1619:22 1626:10

averages 1529:27 1578:21 1688:25 1689:2 1692:12 1734:16 1752:16,18

Aviola 1557:22

avoiding 1579:21

awaiting 1695:18

aware 1584:19 1596:12,15 1628:12 1634:4 1663:20 1665:23 1676:4 1677:6 1680:10,13 1736:11

away-from-home 1657:27

1658:14,20

awful 1523:25

В

Bachelor's 1613:6

back 1523:1 1524:18 1527:15 1532:18 1536:18 1540:23 1541:2,6,8 1542:12, 17 1544:18 1550:10 1568:14 1569:15,16 1576:23 1579:11 1591:26 1605:6,24 1617:8 1626:19,20 1627:2 1639:6,9 1640:6,7,8 1647:23 1652:8 1661:22,26 1665:27 1670:6 1671:1 1672:21 1678:26 1679:4 1680:7 1681:16,18, 23 1684:12 1687:21 1698:3, 9,13 1706:24,26,27 1711:3 1716:22 1717:3,15 1720:1,5, 8 1721:12 1722:26 1723:18 1728:20,22 1737:3 1748:19 1758:27

background 1536:23 1552:4 1613:5

backwards 1522:12

balance 1575:18 1623:18, 24,26 1624:5 1739:21 1746:24,27 1747:2,11

balancing 1612:10 1623:19 1624:2 1725:5 1739:19 1746:22 1747:13

balls 1546:1

band 1652:4,6

bankruptcy 1678:22

barrel 1543:16 1592:20 1594:4,14 1595:23,27 1596:16 1597:6,15 1598:7 1605:12,25 1606:4 1608:10 1609:23 1613:20 1615:22,25 1616:6,8,11,14,18 1617:15,

Index: AMS..barrel



16,20,22 1618:5,8,9,13,21, 23,25 1619:1,6,14,21,25,27 1620:8,11,25,26,28 1621:1, 3,8,11,14,22,25,27 1622:4,7, 10,13,23 1623:4,7,8,9,11,15 1624:9,20 1625:9,10 1626:9, 23 1627:3,6 1628:11,14,15 1629:12,15,26 1632:3 1635:2,18,25 1636:1,8 1637:8 1638:9 1723:23 1724:20,21,27 1730:2,23,25 1731:6,28 1732:7,11,15 1733:5 1735:9,23,26 1736:2, 4,6,7,13,15,22,25 1737:28 1738:6,11 1740:17 1745:10, 12,16,17,21,26 1748:6,8 1750:5,11 1752:5,25

barrels 1593:2,20 1594:19 1595:25 1596:9 1597:11.24 1598:12,25 1602:16 1603:24 1605:4,16,18 1606:11,21,24, 26 1608:20,23 1609:11 1617:19 1618:13 1619:4,18 1621:24 1622:20,21,26 1623:15 1624:2,6,18,19,21, 28 1625:4,10,18 1626:2,27 1627:5 1628:11,13,26 1629:2,5,9,10,13,24 1630:11 1632:23 1633:14.21 1634:13,16 1636:14,23,24 1637:3,14,20,24 1638:3,6 1722:6,12 1724:23 1725:6, 10 1726:9 1727:12 1729:23 1730:17,22 1731:2,3,5,14, 20,22 1734:10,19,21 1735:11 1736:1,2,3,5,6,21 1737:1,23 1738:24,28 1742:1 1743:10 1744:3,13 1747:3,16 1749:21 1750:2,5, 26 1753:23 1754:7,9

Bartlett 1681:6

based 1530:18 1549:25 1556:11 1562:12,23,28 1578:27 1600:5,10,11 1616:3 1617:5,13 1628:1,27 1644:12,28 1645:1 1646:12, 14,23 1655:12,19,23 1664:12 1668:20 1679:12 1723:11,22,26 1724:20 1729:21 1737:27 1743:7,25 1744:24 1745:2 1748:11

basic 1608:1,8

basically 1552:21 1554:6 1555:24 1567:8 1572:10,12 1573:7 1590:19 1593:25 1595:11 1603:16 1604:12 1608:7 1630:6 1646:7,16 1647:18 1649:4 1655:23 1666:12 1672:6 1676:19 1680:19 1685:10 1688:10 1690:7 1702:21 1707:25 1711:22 1712:3,26 1713:16, 24 1726:8 1742:14

basis 1529:2 1539:23 1572:19 1579:1 1588:22 1616:9 1633:27 1634:2 1663:17 1666:11 1691:13 1714:4 1728:16 1734:27 1737:25

bear 1565:2

bearing 1646:24

bears 1672:20

begin 1606:15

beginning 1575:28 1752:7

behalf 1551:25 1574:15 1584:2 1613:19

behavior 1578:12 1605:3 1694:20

believer 1696:14

believes 1636:21

bell 1648:20 1651:4,5,7,15, 18,22,25

benchmark 1604:1

benefit 1567:18 1579:5 1580:9 1619:9 1656:17 1732:20

benefits 1742:18

bent 1522:11

Berlin 1575:11

beverage 1559:4 1560:4,26 1658:14,23 1661:9 1672:7 1683:15,20,25 1693:6 1708:13

beverages 1560:13,17 1561:8 1658:21 1661:10 1668:18 1684:5,7 1700:26 1701:3,12,15 1702:1 1704:3

bias 1688:15

big 1533:13 1534:27 1565:8 1672:8 1696:14 1705:7

bigger 1556:26 1566:8 1644:6

biggest 1538:26 1539:4 1566:22 1672:10,11

bill 1553:18 1575:26 1576:5, 25 1578:4 1580:13 1583:12 1675:14

billion 1576:6 1614:18 1616:22 1620:6,7,9,12 1629:15 1638:8 1726:19 1746:16 1749:8 1750:10 billions 1579:22

binding 1522:25

bio 1614:8,10

bit 1521:3 1524:7 1537:20 1546:10 1547:6 1566:9 1567:16,22 1568:22 1571:19 1582:2 1590:26 1622:28 1623:13 1631:6 1639:11 1643:13 1649:7 1667:25 1682:1 1688:5 1690:21 1691:15 1692:8 1694:21 1702:3 1704:11,20 1710:3,5 1733:13 1747:28 1750:13

biting 1542:28

blame 1527:22

bleached 1596:23

blend 1577:21

block 1592:16.19.20 1593:10 1594:4,13 1596:4, 24 1598:7 1601:9 1604:20 1605:4,24 1609:23 1615:21, 25 1616:6,7,16,17,18,20 1617:14,16,22 1618:5,8,12, 15,23 1619:7,12,21,25,27 1620:12,13,14,16,17,19,23 1621:5,7,11 1622:4,9,21 1623:7,9,10 1625:4,5,26 1626:9,23,24,28 1627:5,18 1628:6 1629:20,27 1632:2 1633:10 1634:15,25,26 1635:17 1722:5 1723:23,26 1724:13,16,17,20,22,26 1726:12 1730:1 1731:6,27 1732:8,11,14 1733:14,16,18, 20,21 1734:5,6,8 1736:18 1740:17,21 1741:6 1742:19 1743:8 1744:3 1745:28 1746:3,7,17 1748:1,3,4,5,8, 9,14 1752:5 1753:27 1754:1, 10

block-barrel 1603:11 1619:11 1627:7 1635:20 1636:12 1728:21 1731:4,8 1734:23 1735:8 1743:8,9 1745:25 1752:3

block-equivalent 1619:3

blocks 1593:2 1594:19 1595:7 1596:8 1598:12 1602:17,19,20,21 1604:23 1605:16 1606:10,24 1608:7, 8,22 1609:11 1617:18 1619:4,15,17 1620:13 1622:3 1623:21,25,27 1624:18,20,22 1625:19,27 1626:1 1627:2,6 1628:26 1629:5,8,11,13,25 1630:6, 10,21 1632:6,9,22,25 1633:20 1634:13,25 1636:16 1722:12 1723:23,28 1724:1, 5 1725:10 1730:17,22 1731:1,3,13,20,22,24 1733:9,11,15,17,22,27 1734:18,21 1735:9,11,14,15 1737:15,18 1738:24,27 1739:2,3,7,8 1740:25 1741:2 1742:22,23,25 1744:13 1745:20 1746:1,10 1747:3, 12,18,22 1748:1,14 1749:21 1750:2,26 1751:1,2,3 1753:22

blown 1533:8

board 1590:12

body 1673:27

bono 1545:16

books 1652:9

boosted 1618:25

boson 1695:4

boss 1722:28

bottled 1558:24,25,27 1560:8 1673:7 1702:17

bottom 1554:7 1572:11 1590:1 1594:3 1603:8,23 1626:8 1685:28 1687:25 1700:9 1701:19 1718:21 1726:17

bought 1678:13 1733:17

Boulevard 1611:26

bound 1675:17

bounds 1668:10,11

Bower 1594:1 1759:4

Box 1728:10,12 1731:1 1735:1,5

boxes 1626:1

brand 1552:24 1632:26 1633:2

branded 1676:6,8,9,18,20 1677:1,7 1678:8,13,19

bravely 1641:11

breach 1641:12

breached 1576:4

break 1532:6 1591:22,25 1638:21 1639:3,15 1640:9 1688:13 1698:7 1706:21,25

breakdown 1751:20

breakfast 1660:20

Breaking 1620:10



breathed 1695:6

breaths 1695:17

Brian 1718:24

briefly 1679:17 1702:25

briefs 1718:28

brilliant 1695:17

bring 1532:18 1541:8 1568:14 1569:15 1574:1 1576:8 1610:21 1661:21,26 1740:10

bringing 1527:15 1569:14 1590:24 1689:19

broad 1735:6

broader 1687:15 1703:26

brought 1675:10

Brown 1522:20 1542:5,6

1759:6

budget 1709:4

build 1580:22 1581:24

building 1580:21 1581:9

built 1582:13 1585:23

bulk 1557:5 1607:8,10,12 1608:5,11 1669:9,10 1748:23 1751:3

bunch 1633:26

burden 1758:20

Bureau 1574:12,14 1575:9, 17 1576:18,20 1577:4 1580:28 1581:7,13,16 1583:24 1587:7 1602:11 1738:18 1754:22

burned 1542:15,20

business 1551:17 1552:1 1580:12,16 1587:15,18 1588:19,20 1602:25 1607:2 1613:1 1723:1

butter 1595:11,12,13,14,25 1604:2,4,5,7,10,14 1607:16, 21 1615:3 1618:17,18,19 1630:26 1635:10 1665:16 1691:14 1726:4,5

butterfat 1604:12,15 1617:26

buy 1558:1 1667:27 1669:27 1709:6

buyer 1634:24

buyers 1557:25 1616:1 1722:10

buying 1560:17 1587:12 1589:5 1634:24,28 1635:2 1678:12

byproduct 1597:6,8,17 1732:26

С

calculate 1617:10 1647:24 1650:11 1651:16.23 1688:4

calculated 1578:23 1600:10 1645:15 1649:12 1653:23, 24,26 1685:18 1700:28

calculating 1649:25

calculation 1615:28 1616:12,21,28 1618:7,14,26 1619:8 1621:16,28 1622:14 1636:10 1644:22 1647:10,27

calculations 1589:26 1617:26 1744:24

California 1564:22,24,27 1565:2,3

call 1519:17,24 1543:28 1583:12 1595:10 1596:16 1597:12 1652:13 1667:17 1673:25 1695:18 1703:17 1708:2,4 1720:28 1722:16 1729:10,15 1730:14 1751:17

called 1519:22 1550:5 1571:23 1596:22 1663:18 1675:5 1682:22 1683:6 1689:1 1693:6 1702:26 1720:28

calling 1519:13 1546:1 1727:15

calls 1587:13

campaigns 1702:16

cancer 1697:3

candidate 1687:12

candor 1549:20

capabilities 1609:19

capable 1540:18 1718:13

capacity 1577:3 1607:22 1609:11,18,24,27 1620:8,11 1623:4,8,11 1624:16 1724:27 1725:4,13 1730:21, 23,24 1740:9,11 1741:6,7,9 1747:2 1748:2,3,10,12

capita 1556:15,23 1559:16, 18,28 1560:11,14 1561:11, 18,24 1563:2,7 1564:7 1566:27 1659:26 1660:12,14 1672:12 1701:27 1702:19 1705:5

capitalization 1728:9

capitalize 1728:7

Capps 1557:22 1690:3,11 1692:27 1693:12,21,23 1717:28 1718:1,20 1719:13

Capps' 1691:25

capture 1676:12

captured 1619:13 1712:17 1713:1

capturing 1712:25 1747:22

cards 1525:25

care 1757:3

career 1552:13,15 1566:21 1642:22

careful 1550:17 1584:2

carefully 1587:9 1689:25

carry 1560:24

carrying 1527:16

carryover 1726:3

carts 1704:6

case 1534:13 1542:7 1567:24 1608:6 1650:13,20 1660:15 1667:15,16 1673:24 1676:2 1681:1 1685:13 1697:10 1701:19 1718:14 1723:23 1735:15 1745:24 1747:11 1757:28

cases 1577:7 1605:10 1615:11 1632:18 1683:9 1739:26

Cashman 1759:9

catastrophic 1576:3

catch 1588:27

categories 1621:5 1681:12 1746:22

category 1569:7 1628:16 1634:17 1669:12 1670:2

Caucasians 1686:21

caught 1524:7

causative 1705:10

caused 1559:28 1603:12 1619:10 1730:17

causing 1561:13 1623:7 1704:15 1705:4

caveat 1548:24

ceiling 1708:25

central 1688:17

cents 1734:21 1744:8 1745:7

CEO 1722:28

cereal 1566:1,8

certainty 1730:8

CFR 1631:22 1639:20 1718:6 1719:15 1720:18

chain 1612:4

challenges 1625:22,24

chance 1527:12 1548:13 1577:17 1586:19 1591:2

change 1534:18 1547:23 1555:25 1556:1 1561:13 1562:15 1572:4,7 1576:24 1583:19 1584:9 1586:25 1587:1,3,22 1639:8 1660:26 1667:16 1702:21 1704:10,15 1705:22 1709:16 1710:4 1716:14 1744:17 1747:9

changed 1546:10 1583:12, 15 1589:25 1605:8,11,15 1622:20,22 1623:1 1711:4

changing 1555:28 1559:3 1626:14 1660:25 1686:24 1705:4

character 1689:9

characterization 1601:21 1697:7

characterize 1694:16 1717:11

charges 1557:8

charging 1557:9 **Charles** 1551:14

chart 1646:11 1743:1

charted 1700:24

charts 1726:2

chatted 1682:1

cheap 1709:7

cheaper 1633:24

check 1519:14 1578:7 1580:21 1582:19 1587:4

checkoff 1553:16 1643:17

checks 1578:6

cheddar 1592:21 1593:8 1597:25,26 1599:16,23,28 1600:1 1601:9 1604:21 1615:2,19,21,22 1616:16,17, 18 1617:28 1618:5,6,10,11,



12,15,22,23,24,25 1619:1, 12,21 1620:6,11,12,14,16, 17,19,23,25,26 1621:7,19 1622:13,22 1624:27 1625:4 1627:18 1628:11 1629:28 1631:19 1634:10,13,15 1635:6,13 1636:6 1720:21 1726:18,24 1735:23 1736:10,12 1739:6,8 1741:3 1747:5,6 1749:21 1750:11, 26 1751:8

cheese 1577:2 1589:23 1592:15,19,20,21 1593:2,3, 7,9,15,19,20,25 1594:26 1595:23,27 1596:16,24 1597:9,11 1598:17,21,22,26 1599:12,16,23,28 1600:1,13 1601:8,9 1602:25 1603:12, 17,25 1604:20,21 1605:12 1606:3,4,9 1607:2,23,24,25 1608:7,9,11,14 1612:26,28 1614:23 1615:1,8,10,11,12, 15,19,20 1616:11,13,14,15, 17,18,19,20 1617:20,22,28 1618:6,11,15,22,23,24,25 1619:1,6,21,22,25,27 1620:5,6,7,8,10,11,15,17,20, 22,23,26,27,28 1621:1,2,3,4, 5,7,8,10,11,12,20,22,24 1622:2,9,13 1623:28 1624:9, 10 1625:9,10,12,14,20,27 1627:17,19 1628:5,10,12,14, 15,16 1629:16,18,20 1630:1 1631:3,19 1632:7,13,18 1633:9,10 1634:10,13,15,16, 17 1635:1,6,10,13,15 1636:2,6,8,9 1637:4,18 1638:9 1665:16 1708:6,8 1720:21 1723:18,24 1724:23 1725:21 1727:8,13,14 1729:28 1731:21,23 1732:23,25 1733:3,7 1735:23,24,26,27 1736:7,10, 12,20 1739:6,8,11,12 1740:6 1741:3 1742:8,25 1745:10, 12,16,18,28 1746:6,9,10,12, 15,27 1749:7,10,12,14 1750:5,11,12 1751:8,17 1753:26 1754:10 1755:7

cheese-making 1577:2

cheeses 1614:25,26 1620:19 1634:24 1737:23

Chicago 1613:9 1630:11

chief 1534:13 1597:10

children 1561:15,16 1566:7 1661:10,12

Chip 1654:17 1721:21 1753:13,19

choice 1549:21 1606:22 1667:18

chose 1606:17

chosen 1615:14

Christian 1759:6

chronology 1522:12

Chuck 1709:21

chunking 1734:1

chunks 1634:15,23

circumstances 1532:17 1540:13 1546:26 1628:27 1638:1

cite 1571:10 1685:1 1695:1

cited 1557:11 1685:2 1717:28 1718:13

Cities 1552:10

City 1581:19 1585:13 1586:9 1687:6

civil 1699:8

claim 1538:7 1661:16 1682:2

claimed 1673:11

claiming 1530:26

Claire 1552:7

clarification 1586:23 1706:5 1715:18 1722:22 1752:4

clarify 1569:13,14 1570:11 1702:4 1703:24 1705:23 1710:28 1752:8

clarifying 1694:8

clarity 1627:23

class 1521:3,5,6 1534:2,14 1535:1,11,15,18 1538:25 1539:6,7 1549:28 1550:2 1557:9 1561:26,27 1562:1,3, 6,7,12,15,24,26 1563:10,18, 24,26 1564:6,13,14,23 1565:24 1567:13 1568:3 1572:3,5,7,14,18,28 1573:12,13,18 1576:24,26, 27 1577:1,2,9,27 1578:14, 19,20,21,23,24 1579:12,16 1581:22 1583:13,15,16 1584:9,14 1587:9,23,27 1588:4 1589:17,24,27 1590:4,28 1594:6,12,23,26 1595:8,28 1596:1 1603:18 1615:28 1616:10,21,24,26 1617:13.25 1618:14.22 1619:8 1621:12,15,22,28 1622:9,13 1629:19 1630:18, 19 1635:23 1636:10 1637:3, 18.19 1646:16 1647:20 1653:19,27 1655:3,7,8

1656:13,14,15,20,22 1664:18 1666:15 1671:10 1672:22 1680:2,4 1685:25, 26 1688:4 1705:16,26 1707:22 1709:15 1711:16, 17,24 1712:14 1722:9 1724:19 1729:20,21,25 1732:19 1742:20 1743:13, 17,18,19,20,21,22,24,25 1744:7,21,24,25,26 1745:2 1753:23,24

classes 1528:5 1541:9 1591:1

classified 1557:7 1656:27 1672:28

clean 1736:28

clear 1534:23 1545:12 1547:17 1568:28 1601:16 1624:12 1629:10 1638:27 1639:22 1671:15 1690:20 1698:25 1715:21 1738:23 1753:26 1754:2,6,8,11

clearance 1690:21,25

clearing 1722:13,16,20 1723:5

clears 1597:23

client 1584:8 1653:10 1700:2

clients 1539:18 1655:8 1667:5 1689:16

close 1549:4 1666:9 1721:15 1740:24

closely 1594:21 1613:1

closer 1609:14,21 1637:20 1638:5 1701:13 1722:17 1746:5

CME 1587:13 1592:16 1596:4 1599:13 1600:16 1601:9 1616:17 1620:14,23, 27 1621:3 1627:18 1630:22, 27 1631:3 1634:12 1726:13 1734:25 1735:25 1736:17 1753:26 1754:10,26 1755:7,

co-authored 1689:20

co-op 1739:24

co-ops 1599:24

co-product 1597:12

code 1551:21 1676:24 1720:14 1757:23,27

coefficient 1534:8

coffee 1659:10,12 1703:7

cohort 1561:17,23,25 1566:17,25 1660:7,10,16 1672:11 1680:26 1704:23, 25,27 1705:2,3,7

cohorts 1561:17 1704:21

coincidence 1648:9,10

cola 1703:7

Colby 1620:18

collating 1733:23

colleague 1709:20

colleagues 1628:4

collective 1695:7

collectively 1696:23 1711:22

collegial 1539:21

color 1596:27 1633:5

coloring 1596:26

column 1711:11 1743:12,17

columns 1743:4 1744:27

combination 1580:12

combined 1625:11 1727:5

Combining 1579:11

comfortable 1628:2 1740:28

comma 1745:3

command 1677:1

commanded 1678:17

comment 1708:15

comments 1716:15

commercial 1612:11 1658:2 1732:5 1737:14

committee 1695:18

commodities 1635:9 1702:11 1731:14

commodity 1579:8 1580:5 1582:7 1595:19 1597:12,20 1601:8 1607:8,10,12,13 1608:9,11 1612:23 1615:20 1616:13,15 1620:10 1627:17 1628:5 1630:15,22 1635:14 1636:9 1637:4,18 1638:13 1723:24 1724:23 1727:8,13, 14,15 1736:5 1746:6,9,12,14 1749:10,12 1750:20,23

common 1740:6

communicated 1541:5

communities 1576:13 1582:24,26



community 1576:8 1587:2

companies 1601:7 1620:21 1624:18 1627:17 1629:4,7,8, 10,12 1730:9 1736:12 1737:27 1748:24

company 1593:14 1624:4 1737:23 1746:26,28

compare 1708:5

compared 1595:12,25 1597:22 1598:12 1605:28 1606:3 1616:20 1627:20 1701:10 1702:8

comparison 1564:16 1627:15 1708:7

compete 1560:23

competing 1661:9 1667:24 1672:4,17 1673:4 1674:17 1684:5

competition 1680:28 1708:13

competitive 1560:5 1652:17 1672:4 1683:16,19,26 1738:2

competitors 1676:11,13

complementary 1558:16

complete 1527:11 1569:28

completely 1537:21 1669:25 1681:23

completes 1706:17

complex 1536:21

complicated 1536:20

complied 1528:7

component 1535:13 1608:4 1617:11,27

components 1534:15 1535:11.19 1729:21

composed 1682:4

compounding 1706:4

compromise 1531:19 1536:16,17 1537:16 1542:22.24

computations 1536:22 1752:10

computed 1563:1

computer 1522:5,27 1541:25,26 1543:12,18

con- 1634:19 **conceal** 1523:25

concede 1605:13

concentrate 1596:20

concept 1529:15 1702:23 1703:26

concepts 1529:28

concern 1584:13 1586:6

concerned 1527:7

concerns 1549:23 1595:6

conclude 1678:6 1699:5 1722:15

concluded 1604:12 1759:14

concludes 1564:17

conclusion 1580:11 1595:15 1621:6 1650:13 1696:22 1699:23

conclusions 1696:19 1697:4,6 1719:24

conditions 1605:19,22 1622:3 1626:26

conduct 1716:23

conducted 1659:21

confer 1519:10

conference 1585:13

confidence 1648:13 1649:11,20 1650:23 1651:20,26 1652:4,6,9 1696:19

confident 1652:2

confidential 1712:2

confirm 1654:23 1695:5

confirmed 1541:5 1695:13

conflicts 1564:7

confront 1660:27

confronting 1662:10

confuse 1664:8

confusing 1578:6

confusion 1704:11,20

congratulations 1666:27 1667:6

Congress 1567:2 1583:21 1643:2,8,14 1662:23 1690:4, 12,17 1691:25 1692:27 1693:12 1718:5 1719:6

Congressional 1691:20

connection 1605:2

conscious 1638:17

consensus 1581:21,24 1585:23,27 1586:8,14,16 1611:10 1640:3

consequences 1587:23

consequent 1564:2

conservative 1627:27 1744:2,4

considered 1557:24,27 1597:10 1604:18 1606:17 1664:20 1694:21 1696:11,23 1722:13 1732:16 1750:20,22

considers 1661:6

consistent 1557:7 1617:3 1619:14 1621:14 1628:8 1662:8 1701:7,9 1722:18,25 1740:14

consistently 1526:10 1557:1 1694:14

consolidation 1580:7

constant 1556:17 1558:27 1704:23 1711:13

constructed 1556:11 1604:19

consult 1529:23 1531:15

consulted 1610:28

consume 1557:25 1558:8, 10,12 1560:18,26 1566:7 1658:24 1686:21,22 1704:2

consumed 1560:15,16 1561:2,8,9 1634:17 1658:19 1685:16 1703:8,23,27

consumer 1554:22 1564:5 1646:28 1657:14 1667:26 1669:6 1678:12 1700:25 1710:5.14

consumers 1555:21 1557:27,28 1558:4 1561:7 1566:8 1661:25,27 1665:25 1667:12,26 1669:1,26 1672:6,21,22,27,28 1673:1 1674:16 1677:7 1678:7 1687:16 1708:25

consumers' 1667:15

consuming 1558:12 1687:16 1705:7

consumption 1559:5,16 1560:15,19 1561:11,12,19, 25 1565:24,28 1566:6,15 1645:16 1653:28 1654:7 1655:17 1656:6 1658:3,11, 15 1659:23,25 1660:6,12,16 1661:19 1662:5,6,7,11 1664:4,21 1668:7 1672:12, 15 1680:4 1682:1 1686:21 1701:22,28 1702:19,24 1704:21,24,26 1705:2,3,28 1706:9,14 1708:19

contemplated 1644:24

content 1632:5,6,10 1734:5

contents 1715:15 1719:27

continue 1533:23 1542:25 1544:6 1550:12 1567:5 1576:7 1580:6 1584:18 1627:11

continued 1578:14

continuing 1611:11

contraction 1623:8

contracts 1577:20 1599:16, 18,21 1600:20

contractual 1607:27 1729:16

contradiction 1702:3

contrasts 1694:27

contribute 1579:13 1662:16 1728:12

contributed 1589:16 1678:21 1727:26 1728:17

contributing 1670:14 1725:25

contribution 1642:9,12

control 1556:2 1680:22

controversial 1758:21

convenience 1560:17 1672:16 1756:25 1757:24

conversation 1525:23 1543:10,11 1544:14 1610:27 1664:5 1680:24

conversations 1527:20 1534:18 1539:19,22 1541:13

convert 1710:23 1738:24,27 1739:2 1743:26

converted 1744:5

converters 1615:9

cooperate 1522:24 1523:11 1524:7 1528:14

cooperation 1524:6 1526:18 1719:21

cooperative 1522:15 1544:10 1552:19 1589:7,9 1614:16,21



cooperatives 1600:2 1617:4 1622:1

coordinated 1544:25

copies 1720:28

copy 1721:5 1757:23

cordial 1539:21 1544:9

Cornell 1551:15,20 1552:16, 17 1560:7

corner 1602:4

correct 1554:16 1571:14 1573:20,24,25 1575:6 1583:17,18 1584:6,16,27,28 1585:20,21 1587:24,25 1593:7 1599:17 1606:11 1626:7,17 1629:2,3,4,20,25 1630:1,8,10,12,13,23,24,28 1631:1,4,5,23,26 1632:3,4,7, 8,11,12,14,15,16,20,21,27, 28 1633:6,7,12,15,21,26 1634:6,10,11,26 1635:3,15 1636:3,18,19 1637:9,15 1638:3 1642:3,10,13 1643:6, 7,9,19,25,26,28 1644:4,5,8, 9,10,12,13,18,20,26 1647:10,22,25,26,28 1648:1, 12 1649:14 1650:14,16,17 1651:11,16 1652:15,16 1653:28 1654:1,28 1655:1,4, 5,8,9,11,12,15,16,18 1656:13,15,16,23,28 1657:1, 9,10,12,13,15,16,19,20 1658:24 1660:3.18.22.23.24. 27,28 1661:19 1662:16,24 1663:15,16,28 1664:2,22,23 1665:16,17,25,26 1666:22, 23 1667:20,21 1668:3,9,14, 18,19 1669:12,28 1670:8,9, 11,12,15,16 1673:5,8,12 1674:1,2 1675:6,7,15,20,21, 24,25 1676:6,7,22,23,26,27, 28 1677:2,3,5,13 1678:9,15, 16,19,20 1679:1,2,16,28 1680:6 1681:9,10 1682:5,6, 7,8,9,10,12,13 1683:10,13, 14.17.18 1684:12.16.17 1685:18,19 1690:16,18 1692:3 1693:7 1701:21,24, 25 1702:2 1705:14 1706:11, 16 1708:9,18 1713:26 1714:11 1722:6,11 1724:2,5, 9,10 1726:5,6,10,11,15,24, 25,26,28 1727:2,3,19,24,27 1737:14 1738:25 1739:5 1742:3,4,5,9,13,27 1745:9 1747:21 1751:17

corrected 1689:11

correction 1634:3 1639:26

correctly 1575:5 1588:27 1592:10 1720:15 1748:17

corrects 1720:24

correlate 1735:1

correlated 1615:24 1617:12 1618:24

correlation 1565:28 1566:5 1594:25 1615:26 1619:24 1635:17,19 1722:5,14 1723:4

correspond 1571:12

corrugated 1633:11

cost 1563:26 1576:5 1616:22 1617:5,7,11 1622:11 1633:15 1634:6 1646:23,24,25 1654:3,26 1659:3,6 1665:28 1666:13, 15,16 1667:14 1679:9,14 1710:12 1729:27 1735:14

costs 1576:7 1594:6 1617:21 1633:12 1646:5 1647:11,16,21 1659:6 1675:23 1711:28 1712:5 1730:2 1745:11,17 1756:16

counsel 1519:6,10 1520:15 1538:8 1539:20 1544:11,15 1720:15

counter 1630:19

countereffect 1670:19

counterpart 1618:18

counting 1544:12

country 1575:22 1585:19 1590:18 1634:10 1635:6,15 1667:14 1723:25 1724:24 1727:9 1746:6

counts 1543:23

couple 1541:20 1552:22 1564:19 1570:27 1580:3 1592:6 1598:15 1603:6 1689:27 1691:10,14 1706:8 1748:2 1749:6 1752:1

court 1519:2.6 1520:8.26 1521:24,28 1524:4,27 1525:13,17,20 1526:1,4,13, 28 1529:5 1530:6 1531:21, 23,28 1532:12 1533:26 1535:6,25 1536:27 1537:4 1538:11,17,28 1539:16 1540:22 1543:5,20,23 1544:1,4,22,28 1545:7,15, 18,21 1546:20 1547:10,18, 22,25 1548:16 1549:9,12,17, 22 1550:14,25 1551:6 1554:24 1555:7 1568:17,26 1569:11,20,24 1570:9,21,24, 26 1573:28 1574:8,19,21,27 1575:3,7 1583:4 1585:7 1586:23 1588:11 1591:12,

18,20,26 1599:5 1600:26 1602:1,7,28 1608:27 1609:3 1610:4,7,11,17,19 1611:5,9, 18 1613:16,28 1628:20 1631:11,13 1638:16,28 1639:13,27 1641:2,8 1649:17 1654:14 1656:3,25 1662:3,6 1663:3,5 1664:7, 12,15 1673:19 1674:7,21,24 1675:1 1677:21 1678:1,4 1684:20 1693:27 1695:10, 21,24,27 1696:6 1697:14,21 1698:17 1699:10,28 1700:18 1706:5,19,26 1707:5 1715:7, 12,18,24,26 1716:1,6,10,18, 26 1717:14 1718:9,15 1719:1,11,20 1720:7,17 1721:3,10,17 1722:22 1728:27 1737:8 1741:13 1753:10,12,16 1754:4,18 1755:2,13,18,21,26 1756:6, 11,24 1757:7,15,19 1758:6, 16,24,27 1759:12

Court's 1698:21

courteous 1541:18

courtesy 1520:16 1526:6 1541:16 1542:25,26 1543:1

cover 1576:3

covered 1545:17 1707:13

covering 1549:26

COVID 1561:2,5 1578:13 1735:1

COVID-19 1589:15

cows 1575:10,11 1614:22 1674:15

CPI 1701:1 1710:26 1711:3,5

cream 1607:17,19 1665:15

create 1577:18 1582:16 1595:24 1635:17 1698:7 1699:7

created 1580:2 1603:15 1605:28

creates 1577:10 1578:25 1579:4 1594:22

credentials 1555:17

credited 1617:8

critical 1534:28 1537:27 1622:16 1702:8 1722:19,21

criticism 1699:10

criticisms 1685:3

criticize 1700:1

criticizing 1690:23

cross 1547:1 1548:17 1549:11,12 1568:22 1569:23 1570:5,11 1641:7 1649:18, 22 1684:21 1697:16 1698:18 1699:13,14 1706:20 1707:1 1715:8 1754:18

cross-exam 1548:12 1639:10

cross-examination 1533:20, 22 1540:12,16,20 1547:5 1548:14 1549:5 1568:12 1570:1 1571:2 1580:26 1583:6 1585:8 1588:13 1592:2 1599:7 1602:9 1603:2 1628:19,21 1639:16 1640:5 1641:13 1654:15 1684:22 1694:1 1707:6,13 1720:6 1721:19 1729:1 1737:9 1738:16 1741:13,16 1751:25 1756:12

cross-examine 1520:24 1538:6

cross-examined 1532:4

cross-examiner 1728:27

cross-price 1558:19 1559:2 1563:15 1684:1 1701:19 1702:5

crossed 1532:10

Cryan 1525:19,21 1526:2,6 1574:10,20,23 1575:2 1580:27,28 1583:3 1602:10, 11,27 1609:1,5 1610:3 1738:17,18 1741:11 1754:19,21,22 1755:1

cubed 1625:7

Cumulative 1578:16

cup 1704:6

curious 1649:22 1749:22,27

current 1556:3 1562:3,4 1569:7 1572:8 1578:20,26 1579:1,2 1653:9 1655:6 1681:3,24 1711:17,23 1712:15

curve 1568:6 1648:20 1651:4,5,8,15,18,22,25 1682:23,24 1713:27

customer 1599:17

customers 1615:9,13 1622:10 1740:27

cut 1630:7 1645:25 1670:25 1733:18,21 1745:1

cut-and-wrap 1625:6,25 1733:28 1734:2



cut-and-wrapped 1748:22

cuts 1547:4

cutting 1733:14

D

D-A-R-I-N 1611:23

dairy 1519:8 1526:26,28 1527:1,3 1544:21 1552:19, 24,28 1553:2,4,9,11,15 1554:8,10,11,14,17 1557:10 1563:11,19 1564:1 1567:2, 14,19 1568:28 1569:3,4,6, 10,11,15,21,28 1570:20,22 1574:1,12 1575:12,24,25,27 1576:3,12,19,22,27,28 1577:8,25,26 1578:15,21 1579:28 1580:3,4,11,14,15 1581:8,12 1582:14,15 1583:9,20,21,22,26 1584:8, 19,20 1585:3 1586:6 1587:2, 8,12 1588:20 1589:18 1592:25 1596:11 1605:8 1606:1 1608:4 1612:26,28 1614:16,21,28 1615:17 1616:2,4,22,23,25 1617:4 1618:1,2 1621:9,23 1628:23 1635:9,22 1636:8,11,26 1637:21 1641:16 1643:16 1645:18 1652:17 1656:18,19 1657:11 1660:27 1661:22,25 1662:20,27 1663:24 1667:16 1670:13,18 1672:28 1675:6, 7 1676:6 1680:28 1686:12 1687:22 1691:11 1700:26 1701:3 1720:11 1721:14 1723:8,11,16,25 1724:12,15, 17,25 1725:20,22 1728:7 1730:3,4 1732:20 1737:11 1742:18 1743:6,11 1744:10, 16 1759:7

dairyland 1575:20 1580:9

Darin 1593:14 1610:13 1611:15,23

data 1529:28 1561:6 1562:12 1573:15,23 1578:28 1579:10 1598:20 1600:10, 12,18 1626:15 1657:25 1658:1 1670:21 1681:2 1685:8 1687:7 1691:23 1696:15,18 1712:1,2 1714:3, 19 1728:2,3 1749:3,4,6,25 1753:5 1759:10

dataset 1685:15,17,21,23

date 1626:15 1632:19 1690:28

dates 1692:8

Davis 1557:12 1685:1

day 1519:12,18,21 1521:15 1522:23 1523:19,21 1524:15 1526:20 1527:5 1530:28 1531:8,9 1532:21 1536:13, 18 1537:9 1539:23 1540:10 1541:6 1542:3 1544:19 1546:14 1550:10 1588:6 1660:20 1674:28 1676:25 1700:22 1722:27 1725:26

days 1520:11 1522:4 1527:22 1530:24 1541:20 1542:1 1578:28 1585:18 1590:20 1632:19 1657:18

deadlines 1528:1

deal 1540:1,2 1725:17,18 1756:9

Dean 1678:21

debated 1575:26

decade 1564:9

decades 1580:4 1665:8

December 1627:4

decide 1527:15 1608:20 1610:18.20

decided 1582:9 1665:8

deciding 1558:13

decision 1537:5 1542:23 1546:3 1558:14 1607:7 1638:26 1717:16 1722:19 1757:20

decisional 1545:28

decisionmaker 1532:14

decisions 1558:7 1709:11

decline 1559:21,28 1561:17, 22 1644:11,24 1645:15 1653:19,27 1654:10 1666:19 1671:9 1672:9 1682:1 1701:27 1704:20,22,24,26 1705:10.18.23

declined 1561:25 1565:25 1660:13 1670:22

declines 1671:8

declining 1560:14 1660:8 1662:10 1671:3 1703:22 1704:17

decrease 1556:6,15 1557:15 1559:22,24 1561:10,14 1563:3,7,8 1567:12,27 1646:1,9 1654:27 1655:17 1680:3 1692:5 1704:15 1710:17 1748:14

decreased 1559:16,17,18

1561:4 1656:6

decreases 1567:17

decreasing 1578:10 1704:27 1705:4

deem 1680:20

deep 1543:25 1586:22

defeats 1577:12

defer 1606:28 1608:13

define 1603:27 1607:10 1703:20 1731:15

defines 1588:19

definition 1548:21 1588:23 1607:13 1646:7 1746:12

definitive 1593:16,28 1694:25 1714:14

definitively 1598:28 1657:7 1676:3

degree 1613:6,7,10

delaying 1529:2

delineate 1699:6

deliver 1597:15

demand 1535:2 1554:22 1555:19,20,25,27 1556:4,9, 12,16,19 1557:4,6,19,23 1558:15,18,19,26 1559:1,3, 7,18,20,24,26,28 1561:14,28 1563:3,5,7,8,13,15 1564:3,6, 16 1565:12 1566:13,20,22, 27 1567:3,7,12,17 1568:6 1573:24 1597:22 1598:2 1623:24 1624:7,8,9,23 1626:26,27 1635:6 1636:1,5 1641:21 1646:2,20 1647:5 1652:12 1655:21 1659:11 1665:1 1666:12,21,25 1667:2 1669:20,25 1671:2, 18,27 1672:18 1673:3 1677:13,23 1678:26 1680:27 1682:4,15,19,21,22,24 1683:5.13.26 1684:2.8 1686:26 1687:5,10 1691:11, 12 1692:23 1693:5 1694:12 1695:16 1700:11 1701:20 1703:1,4,16,18,23 1704:16 1708:2 1709:3,5 1710:11 1731:3 1732:6 1747:5

demanded 1556:2,16,23 1557:15 1567:27 1646:2,10 1666:17 1692:6 1710:17

demands 1597:18 1609:13 1634:9 1732:3

demographic 1561:13 1704:10,15

demographics 1565:27 1686:17,24 1687:9 1703:8

demonstrate 1559:6 1700:10

dense 1521:9 1530:1

Department 1540:27 1718:3

depend 1624:14 1657:4

depends 1657:22 1682:20 1732:9 1734:1 1757:26

depool 1579:5 1582:9

depooled 1577:10 1579:25 1744:21

depooling 1577:6,18 1578:12 1579:14,21 1582:20 1590:16,19,21,22 1616:26

depress 1579:7 1597:19

depressing 1754:26

depth 1584:10

derived 1617:26

describe 1567:23 1710:26

describing 1599:15 1601:13,14,17 1638:1

deserves 1757:14

designation 1602:3

designed 1584:20 1616:2 1654:6 1676:11 1723:8 1724:8

detail 1687:1

detected 1704:11

determine 1646:13 1649:26 1650:12 1734:12

determines 1652:7

determining 1649:13

develop 1540:26 1545:27 1546:2

developed 1621:20

developing 1553:21

deviate 1730:18

deviation 1648:2,26 1649:3, 4,12,19 1650:3,8,11,14 1651:16 1652:6

deviations 1529:28 1648:12, 14,20,23 1651:19,28 1652:3

devoted 1549:28

Dharmasena 1681:18

diagnostic 1572:25 1573:7



diet 1558:9

diff- 1650:2

differed 1623:2

difference 1548:6 1598:9,11 1605:27,28 1619:5 1624:27 1627:25 1634:6 1657:5 1669:1 1728:13 1731:26

differences 1579:24 1610:1 1625:3 1735:17,18 1736:16 1740:23

differential 1521:5,6 1535:2 1538:25 1561:27 1562:2 1573:18 1589:28 1705:17 1709:16

differentials 1534:14 1539:6,8 1550:1,2 1563:19 1577:18 1705:26

differentiate 1665:14 1676:10

differently 1521:18 1534:16 1606:14

difficult 1521:9 1524:24 1525:8 1534:25 1546:21.26 1661:26

difficulties 1594:22

difficulty 1529:15 1750:24

digits 1702:18

diligence 1721:11

diminished 1560:19 1619:25

dining 1672:14

dinner 1660:21

dipped 1626:20

direct 1533:19 1551:7 1574:9 1593:13 1602:22 1610:16 1611:1.4.19 1612:9 1641:5 1699:14 1758:12

directing 1594:1

direction 1562:16 1585:26

director 1612:28

disadvantage 1530:17,18

disadvantaged 1545:8,10 1756:17

disaggregated 1685:10 1714:28

disaggregation 1714:24

disagree 1638:4

disappearance 1658:2

discount 1592:27 1616:19 1728:24,25

discourage 1544:9,13

discovered 1695:4

discovery 1603:25 1755:8,

discriminate 1665:9 1707:24

discrimination 1707:22

discuss 1530:2 1594:3 1596:3,6 1606:23 1711:12

discussed 1597:4 1604:2 1605:21 1613:4 1680:8 1742:11 1750:6

discussing 1590:2 1647:28 1654:24

discussion 1550:4 1578:7 1583:25 1586:3 1587:6 1595:9 1702:22 1704:19 1720:22 1751:9 1758:13,19

discussions 1586:28 1630:17 1694:9 1730:15 1736:26

disheartening 1576:17

disincentivizing 1590:16,22

disorderly 1605:19,21 1606:1 1679:19

disparate 1621:19 1650:10,

disparity 1650:15

disposal 1672:7

disproportionate 1621:15

dispute 1604:25

disruption 1578:6 1637:21 1725:21 1730:5

disruptive 1605:14 1635:21 1636:25 1731:9

dissimilarities 1632:1 1735:16

distant 1560:6

distinct 1621:21

distinction 1676:5 1707:18 1708:1 1749:11

distinguish 1630:19

distortion 1619:10 1635:11

distributed 1651:18 1712:7

distribution 1651:8

divergence 1597:27

diverse 1634:14

diversified 1746:27

diversity 1575:23

divided 1705:5

doctor 1569:25 1654:17 1698:2 1699:12

document 1631:9 1639:21 1656:18 1700:19,21 1718:4, 8,22 1720:19,27 1721:2 1757:28

dollar 1645:16,18 1710:24 1744:10

dollars 1576:14 1579:22 1582:25 1586:5 1590:14,25

dominant 1750:27

Dong 1643:27

Dong/schmit/kaiser 1642:2 1643:25

double 1644:16 1645:3 1702:18

doubtlessly 1601:5

dove 1585:5

Downing 1759:6

downtime 1524:12,14

downward 1560:11 1564:8 1671:15

dozen 1520:3

draft 1573:9 1711:3

Drake 1613:6

dramatically 1617:24 1744:20

drastically 1577:28 1582:18, 24 1587:19 1589:25

draw 1676:4

drew 1665:5

drink 1558:6 1560:26 1659:17 1684:4.7

drinkers 1560:12 1684:3

drinking 1566:6 1660:20 1661:2 1673:15

drinks 1560:8

drive 1668:2

driven 1575:24 1667:26 1672:11 1743:20

driver 1566:22 1578:15

1589:18,27 1616:18 1737:1

drivers 1556:16,19 1558:15, 27 1559:20 1564:16 1671:14,18,27

driving 1559:7,26 1623:11 1671:14 1687:9 1700:11 1702:11,12,13 1730:16

drop 1582:18 1623:7 1655:21 1661:19 1675:18 1726:24,25 1742:1

dropped 1670:24 1734:22

dropping 1671:2 1678:27

drops 1744:20

drove 1731:4

drug 1697:2

dry 1727:2

due 1539:26 1560:12 1578:10 1714:15 1724:27

dug 1586:22

duly 1551:4 1574:6 1611:16

dump 1753:26 1754:10

dumping 1576:15 1607:19

1754:25

duplicate 1680:8 1721:27

duplicative 1714:8

dying 1669:25

dynamic 1713:22

dynamically 1711:24 **Dyson** 1551:14

Ε

e-mails 1524:18

earlier 1528:18 1541:25 1544:26 1576:16 1664:5 1679:8 1684:28 1698:6 1713:8 1716:18 1720:12 1746:26 1758:13

early 1528:8 1535:4 1547:1 1661:25 1692:9 1716:22 1717:3

earnings 1617:3,19 1730:6,9

easier 1526:28 **Eastern** 1759:8

easy 1567:23 1655:22 1688:10

eating 1560:24 1703:25



Eau 1552:6

econometric 1534:6 1554:6

economic 1553:14 1558:15 1563:25,27 1577:5 1587:3 1602:19 1609:9,16 1625:20 1694:18 1700:23

economics 1551:15 1552:8, 12 1554:22 1567:21 1613:7, 8,11,12,15 1694:19 1695:19 1699:24 1725:4

economist 1524:25 1529:12 1532:25,27 1533:10,15 1535:19 1539:25 1588:7 1597:16 1673:21 1693:24 1713:4

economists 1540:5,14,17 1558:19 1693:22 1703:17

economy 1559:9,12,15 1575:23,24 1701:11 1703:14

Edmiston 1759:6

education 1552:4

educational 1613:5

effect 1565:18 1578:17 1584:16 1621:15 1647:5 1682:11,12,14,18 1683:24

effectively 1547:16 1604:17

effects 1573:21 1702:24

efficacious 1547:3

efficacy 1532:1 1643:14 1697:2

efficiency 1521:14,20 1698:28 1739:25

efficient 1521:22 1548:15 1622:10 1742:13

efficiently 1548:25 1673:28 1674:16 1698:7 1734:3,4

effort 1554:12 1646:12 1654:2 1676:9.10

efforts 1717:19

elaborate 1566:11 1567:15 1603:13

elastic 1557:10,13 1559:22 1566:23 1644:7 1672:18,19 1683:13,27 1685:3,7 1692:15,16 1707:16,19,25 1708:4,6 1709:14 1714:22

elasticities 1529:25 1559:2 1563:15 1685:6 1687:14,26 1701:20 1703:12 1706:15

elasticity 1521:3 1535:26 1536:20 1538:21 1555:20,

24,26 1556:9,12,13,21,25,26 1557:4,17 1558:19 1562:28 1563:5,13 1567:25 1573:24 1641:21 1642:6 1644:4,15, 19,28 1645:1 1646:8,21 1647:24 1650:1 1655:19 1665:1 1669:8,20,24,27 1682:4,15,19 1684:2 1685:14,18 1689:27 1692:1 1693:14 1694:12 1695:16 1697:11 1702:6,26 1703:2, 11,21 1708:3 1714:23 1715:1

elementary 1652:9

elevated 1579:6

eligible 1600:2

eliminate 1590:27 1595:23 1606:15,21 1608:20

eliminating 1532:3,9 1578:19 1590:2 1595:23 1603:24 1621:27 1622:12 1630:6

elimination 1579:15 1613:20 1622:23

ellipses 1720:25

emergence 1652:12

Emma 1759:6

emphasize 1530:7 1602:16

empirical 1556:8 1559:1 1562:22 1647:17 1672:19 1687:4 1694:11

empirically 1567:8 1687:1 1713:15

employed 1612:1

encompassing 1685:23

encounter 1565:1

encourage 1654:7 1754:14

end 1519:9 1525:23 1530:15 1531:7 1537:9 1543:27 1586:10 1590:28 1607:6 1634:14,17 1637:23 1638:23 1698:12 1713:16 1720:25 1734:17 1735:6,25 1745:2 1756:10

ends 1745:3

engage 1615:14

engaged 1728:10

English 1520:26,27 1524:4,5 1525:24 1527:8 1529:11,21 1530:7 1533:11,27,28 1535:10 1536:8,19,21 1537:7,13 1538:13,20

1539:2 1540:4 1541:14 1545:9 1546:25 1547:10,13, 20,23,26 1548:19 1549:27 1568:28 1610:24,26 1611:7 1638:16,17 1639:1 1654:14, 16,17 1656:26 1662:4,7,12 1663:4,9 1664:11,13,16,19 1673:20 1674:7,10,11,27 1675:2 1677:18,20 1678:3,5 1684:18 1695:25,28 1696:1 1697:14,26,27 1698:26 1702:23 1705:20 1710:3 1715:27,28 1716:16 1721:12,13,18,20,21 1723:2 1728:26 1753:11,13,18,19 1754:17

English's 1529:19 1550:3 1754:23

enhance 1742:12

enhanced 1596:19 1622:7

ensure 1584:20 1679:19 1725:4.19

ensured 1617:3

entered 1755:14,20

entire 1519:27 1521:17 1522:12,13,28 1552:15 1695:6,13

entirety 1666:3,4

entities 1654:20

entitled 1535:16

environment 1681:24

equal 1647:7

equally 1633:20 1666:25

equation 1682:3,21 1683:7 1691:11,12 1703:4

equilibrating 1609:20

equilibria 1564:3

equivalency 1734:12

equivalent 1609:20 1619:7 1710:25 1733:15

erased 1689:13

error 1534:8 1572:24

ERS 1553:21

essential 1563:22

essentially 1586:5 1590:14 1718:26

establish 1527:21 1604:15

established 1526:14 1550:6 1592:28 1631:7

establishing 1526:15 1563:23 1594:22 1595:27 1604:12 1631:18

establishment 1605:27

establishments 1560:22,24

estimate 1562:8,23 1563:8 1566:20 1567:2,12 1600:4,9, 11 1601:26 1606:10 1641:26 1655:24 1682:22,23 1688:7, 11,12 1692:17,18 1703:1 1705:18 1709:18,19,26 1743:5 1744:4 1750:8

estimated 1529:25 1556:13 1557:12 1558:22 1562:13 1620:9 1643:1 1655:12,14 1682:21 1683:6 1685:2 1692:16

estimates 1627:15 1641:21 1650:1,6 1685:15 1715:1

estimation 1712:8

et al 1557:12

etcetera 1539:15 1672:16 1703:9 1708:15 1749:8

evaluated 1691:15

evaluation 1553:14 1554:18 1567:2

evening 1519:15,27 1527:16 1542:19 1543:27

event 1634:26

eventually 1608:19 1710:4

everyone's 1530:6 1591:22 1707:1 1717:19,21 1719:20

evidence 1522:18 1562:22 1591:13,17 1610:10 1666:24 1672:20 1716:5 1717:11 1755:12,17,24 1758:4

evidentiary 1698:28 1699:8

evolution 1746:2

ex- 1601:6

exact 1533:1 1582:7 1584:23 1601:14 1670:1,22 1684:6

exam 1688:3

examination 1527:11 1531:9 1540:12 1551:7 1602:7 1611:19 1639:7 1674:8,13 1698:8 1699:14 1716:24 1720:12 1755:5

examine 1536:24 1568:13

examined 1551:4 1574:6 1585:1 1611:16



examiner 1574:9 1699:2

examples 1695:1

exasperating 1578:5

exceed 1632:13

exceeding 1616:7

exception 1690:2

exceptional 1735:3

excerpt 1720:14

excess 1607:19 1638:2,12 1725:6 1730:25 1753:26 1754:10

exchange 1519:12 1537:1 1630:12

exchanged 1525:25

exclude 1632:7 1633:14 1726:8

excluded 1633:12,17 1748:20

excluding 1529:3 1688:27 1728:16

exclusions 1633:20

excuse 1588:21 1731:22 1737:20 1750:8

excused 1591:20 1758:8

exhaustive 1690:8

exhibit 1555:3,6,8 1574:22, 25,27,28 1591:14,15,16 1592:10 1599:11 1601:1,4,5 1602:2,3 1610:6,7,9 1613:22,26,27 1614:1 1631:9,11,14,17 1639:18 1641:16,17 1700:22 1715:11,15,23 1716:3,4,10 1718:21 1720:13,24 1721:1, 4 1722:1 1726:2 1755:12,14, 16,20 1756:13,22 1757:9 1758:3

exhibits 1716:11 1721:5

exist 1533:25 1564:12

existing 1622:8

expand 1589:19 1592:18 1603:26 1604:4 1622:18,28 1750:7

expanded 1616:7

expanding 1560:22 1590:26

expect 1524:13 1535:4 1559:22 1609:19 1717:21 1748:2

expectation 1550:2 1587:2

1758:15

expected 1555:18 1579:16 1590:3 1695:12 1729:25

expenditures 1561:3,4 1658:15,26

expense 1529:17 1531:16 1540:24

expenses 1545:17 1552:1,2 1576:9,10

expensive 1529:19 1559:13 1675:22 1700:14

experience 1582:3 1601:7 1620:21 1621:3 1627:16 1628:2 1736:17,19 1738:1,4, 13 1739:11 1740:20,24

experienced 1608:14

expert 1526:25 1527:2 1529:17 1535:15 1540:17 1545:1 1551:24 1554:22,25 1596:10 1613:14 1659:9 1665:28 1666:2 1672:21 1677:10 1679:22 1681:2 1710:11

expert's 1535:21 1709:26

expertise 1656:10

experts 1538:22 1607:1 1680:19 1693:17

explain 1559:21 1572:1 1590:10 1592:24 1597:27 1609:28 1627:24 1660:15 1681:24 1702:25 1744:23 1749:22

explaining 1660:11

explains 1557:28 1572:28 1744:26

explanation 1539:12

explicit 1715:15

explicitly 1550:1 1703:10

explore 1686:28

explosion 1672:5 1702:14

export 1656:12 1737:24 1738:1

exporting 1737:27

express 1604:9

extend 1542:25 1543:2 1685:20

extended 1610:15,24 1691:15 1716:19 1735:10

extensive 1716:17

extensively 1604:2

extent 1527:26 1531:22,26 1538:22 1541:15 1593:19 1604:1,9,17 1636:20 1675:22 1678:17 1694:22 1731:17 1742:19,21

extra 1525:4 1547:6 1607:17,24 1608:3 1633:2 1646:24,25 1664:18

extraordinarily 1521:8 1728:5

extraordinary 1728:6

extreme 1642:19 1666:12 1688:15,24 1709:8

extremely 1590:17,22 1617:19

F

face 1533:23 1653:9 1671:8

faced 1617:23

facilitate 1574:14

facilities 1615:5

facility 1748:22

fact 1522:5,11 1528:27 1537:12 1541:19 1542:14 1559:8 1560:6 1564:5,7 1566:2,11 1568:2 1580:16 1581:18 1584:16 1597:24 1611:2 1631:18 1638:18 1657:2 1664:3 1670:5 1671:6 1673:25 1685:15 1687:19 1693:15 1697:8 1699:23 1700:12 1701:9 1705:2 1707:27 1714:15 1723:4 1737:26

factor 1558:13 1593:11 1652:5,6 1683:10 1687:3 1693:4

factored 1712:21

factors 1563:25 1564:11 1567:7 1686:12 1702:9 1705:10

facts 1564:5

fair 1520:12 1569:19 1584:5 1590:12,27 1616:3 1628:25 1652:18 1715:26 1716:1 1723:8,13,20,21 1725:20 1730:28 1738:9 1741:1 1756:27

fairly 1619:13 1660:8 1699:16 1722:18,25

fairness 1543:5 1579:27 1698:26

faith 1530:16 1532:16 1538:9 1570:15 1717:19

fall 1581:17

fallen 1559:9,12 1659:24,25 1700:13

falling 1569:7

falls 1612:6 1651:24

familiar 1564:25 1584:7 1586:20 1596:7 1602:21 1631:17 1637:11 1651:3,28 1678:23 1731:26 1733:8

fantastic 1693:24

farm 1534:7 1553:18 1562:9, 10,19 1571:25 1572:3 1574:12,14 1575:9,17,26 1576:5,10,11,17,18,20,25 1577:4 1578:4 1579:25,26 1580:13,28 1581:7,13,16 1582:19,22 1583:11,24 1586:5 1587:7 1588:1,20,22, 23 1589:27 1590:14,25 1591:5 1602:11 1656:8 1738:18 1754:22

farm-to-retail 1571:27 1710:6

farmer 1527:1 1553:16 1568:20,24 1569:6,10,15,21, 28 1570:7,20,22 1574:2,12, 13 1577:15,19 1583:20,26 1587:8 1657:12 1675:8 1759:7

farmer's 1577:22

farmers 1527:4 1554:8,15, 17 1563:11,20 1564:1 1567:14,19 1568:28 1569:4, 11 1575:15 1576:5,15,19,27 1577:7,9,10,11,13,19,23,25 1578:11 1580:5,14,15 1581:8,12,21 1582:14 1584:21 1585:3 1586:6 1587:24 1606:2 1645:18 1646:26 1647:19 1656:18,19 1662:20 1663:24 1670:13,18 1721:14 1723:8 1724:17 1725:20

farming 1575:12 1614:21

farms 1575:28 1576:12 1580:2,3,6,9,12 1582:23 1612:2 1613:3 1624:17

fast 1530:22 1656:4

faster 1701:15

fat 1691:13

father's 1575:11

fault 1538:15



favor 1525:11

FDA 1751:8,11

feasible 1621:13

fed 1543:1

federal 1575:14 1576:21 1577:13 1579:18,22 1581:17 1603:17 1604:15 1605:3,9 1615:17 1616:2 1617:2,25 1618:20,28 1622:16 1634:4 1654:6 1657:9 1662:27 1663:1,2,14 1672:27 1679:18 1719:26 1720:14 1723:14 1724:7 1743:14,15 1745:22 1756:28 1757:23,27

federation 1519:24 1581:1 1599:25,26 1600:3,28 1601:4 1602:11 1694:4 1738:19

Federation's 1561:28

feed 1576:7

feel 1520:8 1540:15 1545:7 1584:25 1657:6

feels 1525:13

fell 1561:21

fellow 1694:27

felt 1668:21 1669:6 1712:10, 27 1713:18,19,25

feverishly 1524:15

fewer 1660:14 1661:2 1685:13

fiberboard 1633:11

field 1696:10 1745:27

figure 1605:24 1700:24 1701:6

filed 1540:6

fill 1668:1,14,17 1686:9

filling 1574:8

final 1582:18

finally 1553:22 1561:13 1631:2

financial 1587:23 1617:23 1621:28 1730:10 1731:10

find 1554:24 1556:26 1564:3 1580:18 1607:25 1613:16 1689:17 1693:12 1740:1,2

finding 1557:6,16 1702:5 1739:21

findings 1691:26 1696:24

1697:6

finds 1556:24

fine 1538:10 1547:7 1549:14,15 1611:7,8,9,10 1675:1 1698:24 1719:9 1731:12 1735:13

finish 1553:27 1569:23 1600:7 1645:23 1651:17 1653:25 1695:10 1759:11

finished 1548:8,9 1615:10 1617:12 1635:12 1690:19 1707:1 1721:25 1759:9

firm 1568:3 1676:10

firms 1556:2

fit 1573:5

five-week 1752:23

fixed 1675:22

flat 1738:1

flew 1523:20 1526:22 1531:4

flex 1725:10,13

flexibility 1724:27 1725:1,9,

flexible 1522:26

flies 1523:20

flight 1526:24 1528:3

1531:17

flip 1735:9 1748:5

floor 1707:5

fluctuate 1617:15

fluctuations 1575:21 1582:16 1589:3

fluid 1533:2 1535:2 1553:15, 16 1554:8,18,19 1558:28 1560:19,20,25,26,27 1561:11,16,18,24,27 1563:2, 7 1567:2 1572:1 1594:6 1641:21 1643:15,16 1644:24 1653:20,27 1654:8,20,26 1656:6 1659:11,12,17 1661:22,27 1662:4,6 1665:1, 9,15 1666:2,25 1667:22,27 1668:6,16,22 1669:2,12 1670:3,8,14,15,19,26 1671:4,18,23 1672:18,23,25, 27 1674:15 1675:18,27 1677:13 1678:18 1679:9,20, 23,28 1682:1,2,15,19 1687:15,17 1691:9,11,12,16 1692:1 1693:14 1695:16 1697:11 1700:26 1701:4.10. 13,16,27 1704:26 1705:10 1707:17 1708:6 1714:16,24

flush 1740:10

fly 1523:16

FMMO 1723:7

fo- 1725:2

focus 1555:18 1644:14 1645:2 1694:16

focused 1531:12 1725:3

focusing 1600:15

folks 1526:8

follow 1526:13 1564:19 1598:28 1599:9 1670:25

follow-on 1608:21

follow-up 1737:12

followers 1604:11

food 1560:15,16,18 1561:2, 3,8,9 1658:14,21,23 1659:6 1700:26 1701:3,12,15 1703:8,23,25,26 1704:2 1708:19 1728:10,12 1730:28 1735:1,5

Foods 1519:8 1569:3 1583:9 1584:8,19 1628:23 1641:16 1678:22 1720:11 1737:11

foodservice 1615:9 1625:8

footnote 1744:23 1745:1

force 1595:15 1597:3 1604:3,6 1606:16

forces 1578:13 1589:16

forecasting 1731:10

foreclose 1529:7

foreign 1652:1

Foremost 1601:7 1612:2,7, 14,16 1613:3 1614:9,16,23, 26,28 1615:6,8,13 1620:21 1622:15 1623:20 1624:17 1627:16 1629:1 1729:22 1730:11 1732:5,23,27 1733:11,25 1736:27

Foremost's 1729:8,28 1735:15

Foremost's 1615:11

foreshadowed 1627:14

forget 1549:9 1594:13 1598:23 1610:19

forgotten 1611:12

form 1538:8 1605:5 1620:13 1651:15 1697:4

formal 1522:25,27 1528:16

forms 1592:21 1621:2,19 1734:1

formula 1576:23 1578:10,17 1581:22 1584:14,15,26 1604:23 1605:5 1606:4 1615:27 1618:23 1621:12,23 1634:4,5 1722:9 1732:19

formulas 1578:21 1595:19 1603:18 1604:16 1605:12 1606:20 1608:22 1745:3

forum 1581:16,17,24 1586:9

forward 1525:15 1539:24 1550:18 1580:19,20,24 1587:13 1641:11 1681:12

found 1556:10 1557:18 1558:17 1561:6 1562:18 1563:13.15 1566:12.23 1573:15 1576:10 1680:15 1689:28 1694:13 1703:12

foundation 1695:13 1755:25

four-month 1572:13 four-week 1752:22

fourth 1592:14 1642:2 1643:24

fraction 1543:3 frames 1623:2

frankly 1520:16 1523:24 1527:2,6 1529:6 1532:28 1542:23 1573:8

free 1545:22

Friday 1527:3 1539:13

friendly 1697:16 1698:18 1699:13,14

fringe 1625:17

front 1535:16 1543:18 1592:12 1652:17 1716:13 1721:13,14

full 1567:10 1577:9 1609:24 1694:10 1700:9 1701:18 1704:14 1710:4,12 1713:22 1716:23 1718:28 1725:4,7 1739:12,13,23,25 1740:3 1747:10

full-time 1544:24

fully 1585:5 1712:26 1713:9, 25

function 1566:21 1572:3 1757:5,6,7 1758:2

functionality 1625:12

fundamental 1615:19



funded 1687:20,24

fungible 1731:14,15

future 1577:2,20 1611:11

futures 1552:23,26 1604:10 1622:8,10 1738:8

G

gallon 1572:1 1675:24 1678:13,14 1709:14 1710:24 1711:4

gallons 1667:7

gander 1525:27 1526:3

gap 1692:9 1730:17

gas 1672:16

gate 1586:5 1590:14,25

gatekeeping 1756:4 1757:5, 6,7 1758:2

gather 1532:6 1741:27

gave 1564:28 1565:23 1661:14 1705:15 1708:11

general 1596:10 1597:21 1612:25 1685:6 1688:2 1700:23 1730:4 1731:2 1736:16

generalization 1686:23

generally 1587:11,13 1593:2 1648:13 1697:22 1708:2,10, 28 1714:13 1739:12 1740:24

generated 1617:6 1725:21

generating 1739:22

generic 1676:16

gesture 1523:10 1524:20 1530:16

get all 1525:9

give 1520:12 1522:12 1536:6 1538:2 1542:19,24 1575:3 1580:14 1593:16 1596:28 1625:11 1667:19,23 1688:3,19 1700:5 1704:17 1714:14 1721:5 1757:14

giving 1533:19 1548:3

glad 1702:27 1713:4

glitches 1544:16

global 1729:22 1738:9

goal 1527:21,25 1586:14

gold 1680:18

good 1521:28 1525:19,20,27

1526:2 1530:16 1532:16 1538:9 1548:13 1551:9,11 1557:24 1566:2,4 1570:13, 15 1583:8 1585:10,11 1588:9,15,16 1592:4,5 1595:20 1602:4,13 1603:4,5 1610:2 1611:21 1638:21 1654:17,18 1656:9 1661:4 1663:6 1681:22 1684:20,25, 26 1686:11 1688:16,25 1694:5 1703:18 1706:22 1707:8,9 1717:19 1721:10, 22,23 1729:3,4 1738:20,22 1741:18,19 1751:27,28

goodness-of-fit 1573:2

goods 1559:8,11,14 1700:12 1701:11,14

Google 1689:26

goose 1525:27 1526:2

government 1718:5,23,25 1720:13,15

grade 1632:25,26 1633:2

grading 1739:6,7

graduated 1552:14

grand 1671:13,17

graph 1572:11 1592:14 1700:28 1701:1,12

grassroots 1581:6

grateful 1530:8

great 1520:13 1537:10 1602:14 1604:1 1643:11 1731:17

greater 1580:7 1595:16 1597:18 1642:12 1669:15,19

greatest 1575:21

Greenway 1611:26

grew 1660:19

grill 1542:9

grind 1521:23

grinding 1521:10

grocery 1657:18 1658:1,4, 12 1666:26 1667:5 1676:17 1685:8,27 1704:6 1714:13,

gross 1563:10,19 1564:1 1567:14,28 1588:21 1647:18,19

group 1654:19 1721:22 1753:19

grow 1650:14

growing 1596:18 1597:8,27 1598:6 1658:16,21,26 1667:16 1669:11,16 1672:4 1673:3 1680:27 1741:3

grown 1612:15 1741:4

grows 1577:3

growth 1672:17 1701:28

guarantee 1524:12 1531:9

guess 1527:4 1532:14 1545:21 1565:23 1566:7 1570:12 1584:23 1587:5 1653:6 1656:11 1657:4 1682:26 1714:15 1722:16 1726:3 1733:26 1734:27 1738:23 1747:20 1750:8 1756:4,14

guessing 1653:3,7

guesstimate 1553:7

guidance 1698:21

guys 1524:28 1627:24 1748:20

Н

H-A-N-S-O-N 1611:23

H-A-R-R-Y 1551:11

half 1531:10 1535:8 1548:5 1552:18 1556:24,25 1572:14,20 1629:18,22,23, 25 1630:7 1688:10,11 1726:24,25 1734:24 1743:7, 23

Hall 1551:20

halt 1521:10,23

Hancock 1522:1,2 1525:24 1526:21,22 1528:3 1530:22 1532:19,20 1535:6,7 1539:27 1540:22 1541:3,4 1543:5,9,21,26 1544:3,20,23 1545:2,11,20 1549:15 1551:6,8 1554:21,26,27 1555:5,10,11 1568:10 1569:13,19,23 1570:16,18 1610:5,12 1611:18,20 1613:13,17,18,25 1614:3,4 1628:18 1641:6 1645:22,25 1677:15,19,26 1678:2 1698:19,20 1715:10 1716:12,27 1717:5,18 1718:10 1720:4 1755:4,6,11, 22 1756:3,9 1757:2 1758:9,

Hancock's 1757:11

hand 1542:28 1547:21,23 1551:2 1574:4 1611:14

1721:6 1736:4

handed 1700:19.21

handle 1671:4 1734:3,4

handlers 1579:13

Hanson 1593:14 1594:1 1600:22 1601:1,25 1610:13 1611:15,21,23 1613:13,19 1614:5 1622:17 1628:17 1720:6,8 1721:21 1729:3 1751:27 1755:7

happen 1526:7 1548:20 1646:13 1659:15 1731:18

happened 1627:1 1638:24 1670:23 1717:12 1728:4

happening 1626:21 1701:10 1705:1 1723:27 1726:13

happy 1568:14 1717:21,22

hard 1521:11 1524:24 1527:20,23 1534:26 1537:12 1680:7 1694:27 1708:27 1728:4

Harry 1522:3 1551:3,11

hate 1547:12 1550:22 1664:8

he'll 1627:14

head 1748:26

heading 1720:15,24

headquartered 1614:17

healthy 1654:8 1673:15

hear 1520:9 1521:24 1524:9 1525:5 1536:5 1537:25 1546:4,7 1570:12 1679:7 1695:25,28 1696:7 1714:11 1717:22

heard 1521:3,17 1525:26 1526:19 1527:19 1531:27 1532:5 1535:9 1541:19 1558:18 1564:21 1569:5 1578:1 1595:5 1596:17 1597:7,11 1622:22 1623:13 1664:5 1674:2 1699:4 1733:22,24 1736:14 1738:26 1739:1

hearing 1520:11,23 1521:14, 20,23 1523:6,27 1527:22,25, 26 1529:14 1530:2 1531:7 1533:23 1538:21 1539:26 1544:12 1545:4,5,9 1546:11 1549:3 1575:14 1584:9 1586:20 1587:5 1594:28 1595:3 1601:5 1605:7 1638:25 1641:17 1663:7 1698:5 1701:7 1709:22,27 1715:13 1717:1 1719:11



1720:13 1721:1 1748:11 1755:14,20 1756:22

hearings 1546:13

heavily 1576:12 1589:23 1692:20

hedge 1577:19 1615:15

hedging 1552:25

held 1612:21

helped 1581:24 1673:1

helpful 1570:6 1698:16

1719:6

helping 1520:10 1579:23

helps 1536:4

heritage 1580:9

herring 1533:25

hey 1697:18

hide 1523:25 1524:10

Higgs 1695:4

high 1552:5 1557:21 1565:4 1576:7 1579:19 1581:21 1590:6 1617:21 1619:24 1620:2 1635:17 1636:2 1727:23 1729:10 1745:17,24

higher 1556:5,26 1561:5 1563:23,26,28 1564:1,23,27 1565:5,13 1576:23 1577:17 1579:3,13 1584:15 1588:5 1589:27 1615:25 1617:1 1618:17 1619:15 1624:20 1626:24,27 1627:3 1628:1 1646:26 1661:21 1669:19, 24,28 1672:22 1673:7,10 1674:15 1678:18,19 1707:26 1714:23 1715:2 1730:1 1731:4 1742:19 1743:21 1745:11 1747:17 1748:1,5,8

higher-of 1578:4 1579:12 1581:22 1583:15 1584:22,27 1585:4,24 1586:12 1589:24

highest 1557:8 1620:2 1669:7 1689:3 1727:18 1748:28

highly 1567:24 1568:19 1615:23 1617:11,16 1618:24 1692:4 1709:5

Hill 1521:27 1525:1,15 1531:20,22,23,25,26 1532:1 1546:5,28 1568:19 1569:17 1570:22,25 1574:26 1611:5, 7 1639:14,28 1719:2,9 1757:10 1758:22

Hill's 1533:18

hinges 1563:25

hired 1553:23 1642:18

Hispanic 1620:19

Hispanics 1686:23

historical 1598:13 1623:2

1730:18

historically 1617:2 1621:11

1730:20

history 1552:8 1737:2,3

1752:3,5

hit 1702:17

hold 1556:16 1695:17

holders 1704:6

holding 1558:26

hole 1540:15

Holly 1575:10

home 1560:16,18,19,28 1561:2,3,9 1567:6 1607:25 1657:26 1658:19,24,26 1661:13 1672:14,15 1680:27 1703:9,24,27 1704:3 1708:20 1740:1

Honor 1519:4 1522:2,3,11 1523:22 1524:3 1526:22 1528:3.6 1529:21 1531:20 1532:20 1533:28 1535:7 1536:15 1537:13 1539:17 1541:4,12 1542:14,23 1543:22,24 1544:20 1545:2, 11,20 1546:28 1547:6,13 1549:15,20 1550:24 1554:21,26 1555:5 1568:11, 19 1591:19 1600:25 1601:28 1602:6 1610:5,12 1613:13, 25 1628:18 1631:9 1639:15 1641:6 1645:22 1654:13 1664:14 1674:10.27 1677:15.20 1684:19 1696:1 1697:27 1698:20 1700:7,16 1715:10 1717:26 1718:10 1720:3,5,10 1721:9,16 1753:8,11 1755:4,11,19,22 1757:2,17 1758:5,10,23

Honor's 1698:21

Hood 1542:2 1545:3

hope 1570:3 1638:23 1673:6 1707:2

hoping 1706:21

hour 1530:25 1533:20 1547:11 1548:5 1610:15 1716:19,21,28

hours 1527:24 1530:27 1532:10 1536:6 1542:19,21

1591:22 1592:6 1721:26

house 1709:8,9

huge 1577:19 1671:22

human 1673:27 1694:20

hundred 1572:2

hundredweight 1562:3 1572:2 1655:4 1661:18 1667:7 1675:17 1710:25 1744:5,8,9 1745:5,7

hundredweights 1743:27

hurt 1669:17 1672:11,14,22,

hypothesis 1687:1 1695:5

hypothetical 1609:8

hypothetically 1609:23

ı

ice 1665:15

idea 1530:24 1535:26 1536:12 1537:19,23 1570:10 1653:15 1658:27 1659:18 1681:25 1736:24

ideal 1540:13

Ideally 1617:5

identical 1676:22 1691:6,8, 10 1696:17

identification 1555:5,9 1574:22 1575:1 1602:2 1613:27 1614:2 1631:13,15

identified 1549:24 1555:3 1613:22 1756:15

identify 1751:11

identity 1751:9

IDFA 1540:14 1585:2

IDFA's 1541:28

idle 1740:7

ignorant 1733:13

II 1578:20,21,24

III 1576:26 1577:1 1583:15, 16 1586:26 1587:27 1589:24 1594:23,26 1595:8,28 1596:1 1603:18 1615:28 1616:10,21,24,26 1617:13, 25 1618:14,22 1619:8 1621:12,15,22,28 1622:9,13 1630:18 1635:23 1636:10 1637:3,18,19 1722:9 1724:19 1729:25 1732:19 1742:20 1743:13,18,20,21, 22,25 1744:7,21,24,26 1745:2 1753:24

Illinois 1614:20

illustrative 1559:25

imagine 1682:26

imbalance 1578:13 1589:15 1623:10 1724:26

impact 1535:2 1558:7,18 1559:5 1561:27 1563:20 1564:14 1572:6 1576:19,27 1579:16 1589:14 1590:4 1616:21,23,25,28 1617:1 1621:9 1637:19 1638:6 1656:19 1657:3 1664:17,20 1669:5,15,18 1671:16,17,22, 26 1684:8 1686:20,26 1687:9 1693:4 1700:23 1705:17 1706:1,8,14 1712:9, 10,12,15,16 1713:16 1723:1 1730:10 1743:11 1744:5,9, 10,13 1745:5,7,21,26

impacted 1594:6 1615:18 1636:8,12 1669:26 1744:26

impacting 1670:19

impacts 1555:19 1561:18 1564:15 1577:6 1582:11,20 1672:26 1743:18

implicitly 1685:14

imply 1708:5

importance 1595:16,27 1597:8 1606:19

important 1541:12 1556:20, 28 1558:23,28 1561:13 1564:4 1567:7 1569:12 1586:2,3 1590:17,23 1604:15 1611:1 1636:21 1662:10 1671:12,18 1686:17 1687:23 1704:15 1707:22 1722:17,23 1723:4 1730:11

Importantly 1701:3

imposed 1712:8

imposition 1540:24

improper 1691:19

inappropriate 1523:26 1595:17 1604:28 1605:11,15

incentive 1625:21

incentives 1577:5

incentivize 1590:23

inclined 1570:14

include 1554:18 1560:2,17 1567:3 1605:4 1615:1 1630:21,25 1635:4 1657:21,



26 1665:24 1682:2 1685:11 1691:19,21 1703:4 1714:18 1745:20

included 1606:25 1616:27, 28 1631:20 1639:21 1644:19 1667:17 1680:11 1690:5 1691:12,25 1701:2 1702:28 1711:27 1712:3 1722:14 1732:18 1743:23

includes 1617:4 1649:19 1701:3

including 1543:24 1552:23 1581:4,22 1595:14,25 1597:10 1604:28 1605:18 1612:9,26,28 1618:24 1621:22 1622:1 1672:15 1732:23

inclusion 1605:12 1606:4 1618:21 1619:7 1631:7 1635:25

income 1578:1 1682:7,11, 14,18,24 1702:24,26,28 1703:7,10,12,14,18,21 1733:6

income-compensated 1682:22

inconsistent 1523:27

inconvenience 1547:16

incorporate 1615:10

incorporated 1615:27 1722:8

incorrect 1733:2

increase 1535:15 1538:26 1539:5 1556:5,7,14,22 1557:14 1558:25,26 1559:23 1561:9 1562:1,6,7,10,23,24, 27 1563:2,6,9,10,19 1566:25,26 1567:13,14,19, 25 1572:7,8,13,15 1573:14, 17,19,22 1577:22 1579:17 1590:5 1623:4 1644:9,12,23 1645:17,28 1646:1,9,10,19 1647:6 1653:18,26 1654:26 1655:3,7,10 1659:3 1663:24 1666:4,15,19 1667:7,13 1670:15.18 1671:4.20 1675:16 1676:11 1692:5 1703:14,15,16 1705:25,26 1706:10,13 1711:24,25 1729:27

increased 1561:3 1562:26 1576:7 1618:27 1665:28 1708:13,19 1712:14

increases 1646:16 1668:21, 24 1679:9,14 1737:1

increasing 1521:4 1535:1,11

1539:3,4,6,7 1560:15 1561:26 1563:18 1595:20 1598:21 1662:1 1703:23 1705:21 1730:16

increasingly 1560:4 1602:18 1603:11 1621:6 1660:23 1661:26 1683:16,19,25

incurred 1617:5

independent 1536:23 1553:14 1589:7

index 1592:17,19 1593:7 1599:13 1600:17 1601:10 1615:12 1616:14,17 1620:15,20,24,28 1621:5,26 1622:5 1627:19 1628:14 1711:1 1736:6,8 1743:10 1746:15 17

indexed 1615:20 1736:21

Indiana 1614:19

indicative 1627:10

indicators 1696:11

indices 1700:25

indifferent 1732:14

individual 1587:9 1650:5 1683:6 1694:23 1696:10 1697:8,23 1699:20,23 1704:21 1705:11

individuals 1519:25 1540:18 1642:12

industry 1526:26 1527:1 1544:21 1553:1,2,4,9 1554:10,11 1575:25 1580:7 1592:22 1605:8,11,15 1612:19,22 1623:6 1624:3 1652:18 1660:27 1661:6,25 1670:27 1671:4,24 1675:13 1686:13 1728:16,17 1730:16 1732:28 1736:27

industry's 1728:10

inefficient 1527:13

inelastic 1533:2,3 1535:20 1555:21,28 1556:4,10 1557:2,7,16,19,24 1559:3 1563:14,16,28 1564:6 1565:12 1567:24 1568:5 1646:7,21 1647:4 1654:26 1665:2 1669:10 1684:3 1691:27,28 1692:4 1694:13, 15 1701:20 1703:13 1707:25,26,27,28 1708:2,8, 11,24 1709:5,13 1710:11

inelasticity 1532:26 1533:10 1535:18 1665:13 1666:12, 21,25 1667:1 1668:26

inexpensive 1709:4

infallible 1543:21,24

inference 1539:8

inferior 1680:21

inferred 1521:5

influenced 1541:1

inform 1532:14 1545:23

information 1523:6 1525:25 1528:10 1537:1 1541:10,24 1546:6,11 1548:23,24,26 1573:20 1597:1,13 1603:16 1630:7 1751:19

informative 1688:5

informing 1695:19

ingredient 1659:6

ingredients 1625:11

initially 1543:11 1691:8 1745:25

initiated 1663:13

Innovation 1654:19 1721:22 1753:19

input 1622:11

inputs 1576:6

insights 1563:22

insignificant 1595:17

instability 1603:12

instance 1529:27 1556:10 1657:8.19 1733:16

insufficient 1679:23,24 1725:13

insults 1671:23

intend 1519:24 1758:2

intended 1530:21 1649:19

intending 1725:8

intentional 1536:26

intentionally 1537:17

interactions 1544:11

interchangable 1742:2

interchangeable 1621:20 1625:15

interchangeably 1749:13

interest 1545:4 1665:22,24 1679:17

interested 1687:2

interesting 1687:23

interfering 1527:26

International 1519:8 1569:3 1583:9 1584:8,19 1628:23 1641:15 1720:11 1737:11

interpret 1649:3 1704:13

interpretation 1651:1 1723:16

interpreted 1705:20 1715:23

interrelated 1725:28

interrupt 1549:12 1550:22 1649:22 1664:8

interrupts 1522:18

interval 1649:11 1652:10

intimate 1524:8,9

intro 1696:6

introduced 1560:5 1702:20

introduction 1697:15

inversions 1591:2

inverted 1626:23 1627:4

1734:24

investigate 1686:28 investigation 1730:15

investment 1554:8

involved 1520:17 1526:15 1527:1,19 1538:19 1541:15 1552:28 1586:28 1592:24 1601:24 1602:24 1604:7 1607:2 1642:1 1670:8

involvement 1642:20

lowa 1614:19

IRI 1658:1

1683:9

irregular 1568:20 1569:21

issue 1530:11 1533:13,14, 25 1534:2,3,10,13,14 1535:4,13 1539:2,3,4,10,26, 27 1540:8 1549:26 1596:3 1604:13 1647:17 1665:13 1678:26 1690:22 1725:12 1730:11

issues 1534:27 1540:19 1553:10 1585:19 1586:1 1662:23 1698:13

Italian 1614:25,26 1615:1

items 1585:27 1586:4,8 1700:25 1701:4



Ithaca 1551:20 1720:2

IV 1576:27 1577:2 1578:14 1583:16 1586:26 1587:27 1589:17,24,27 1630:19 1656:13,14,20,22 1743:21, 22,25

J

Jack 1620:18

job 1525:8 1544:24 1759:1

ioin 1715:28

joined 1543:12

jointly 1583:20

journal 1553:6 1690:2

Judd 1691:25 1693:23

juice 1703:7

July 1627:5,6 1727:28

1734:22,25

jump 1623:9 1716:13

jumped 1678:24

June 1734:20,24

justification 1563:23

1618:28

K

K-A-I-S-E-R 1551:12

Kaiser 1519:24 1520:6,21 1522:3,8 1523:19 1526:19 1531:16 1532:18,26 1533:1 1538:12 1540:8,22 1545:14, 15,16,22 1547:15 1549:13, 25 1550:26 1551:1,3,9,11,16 1554:21,28 1555:12 1564:18 1570:1,2,26 1571:6 1573:28 1610:21 1638:23 1639:9 1640:4,7 1641:2,15 1643:4, 7,27 1684:25 1694:5 1695:25 1700:27 1707:4 1719:28 1720:1,4 1758:7

Kaiser's 1520:1 1523:3 1638:18

Kansas 1581:19 1585:13 1586:9

Keefe 1594:5

keeper 1716:11 1721:5

keeping 1580:8 1590:11,15,

16 1740:3

Kevin 1574:2,5,11 1575:8

key 1554:7 1635:9

kids 1708:21

kind 1522:25 1534:23 1537:4 1552:21 1566:14 1570:9 1590:9 1605:17 1608:8 1664:26 1677:17 1680:22 1688:12 1696:15 1708:7 1712:12,17 1713:21 1739:19 1741:23 1743:2 1745:27

kindness 1523:10

kinds 1698:15 1750:25

knock 1570:19

knowing 1573:10

knowledge 1751:13,15

1754:25

Krentz 1574:2,3,5,11,23 1575:3,8 1581:1 1583:8

1585:10

label 1596:22 1676:14,15, 16,17,22 1677:4,8 1678:8,14

L

labeled 1700:21 1752:5

labels 1674:19

labor 1625:21,24

lack 1548:2 1560:20 1642:19 1725:25

lactose-intolerant 1558:5

lag 1578:25 1579:10 1706:7 1711:17 1712:7 1714:4

lags 1572:11,12,28 1712:11,

Land 1552:19,25 1612:27

landed 1734:23

large 1558:17 1560:11 1577:28 1579:24 1587:19 1614:16,23

largely 1727:26

larger 1619:5,9 1634:25 1637:4

largest 1561:16 1566:22 1593:15 1660:10

late 1528:9 1543:12 1622:24 1627:5 1638:19 1692:9

law 1542:27

lawyer 1539:8 1700:4 1754:28

lay 1755:25 1759:1

lead 1576:28 1609:25 1692:5

leadership 1581:13

leading 1578:6 1579:3 1699:13

leads 1605:17 1703:15

leaned 1522:5 1543:14

leave 1528:4 1540:23 1552:17 1570:25 1580:7

leaves 1620:12

leaving 1661:1

lectern 1721:12

led 1605:19

leeway 1700:5,7

left 1540:20 1542:19 1576:1 1586:5 1687:11 1716:28 1743:12 1758:11

legal 1754:27

length 1750:6

lengthening 1590:20

lessen 1591:1

letting 1520:15

level 1524:2 1556:13 1557:26 1562:8 1571:25,26 1576:2,3,8 1618:16 1632:14 1646:14 1648:13 1649:20 1650:24 1651:26 1666:22 1685:10 1698:1 1705:3 1713:10

lever 1624:3

levers 1623:19

likelihood 1649:14,26

1650:12

Likewise 1563:14 1602:15

limited 1685:17,21 1687:4

lines 1626:2 1747:6

linked 1578:13 1589:15

liquidity 1755:8

list 1519:16,25 1522:6,7,28 1541:26 1543:13,14 1557:3 1642:8 1643:23 1653:13 1690:8 1711:11 1759:4

listed 1571:13 1642:2,8 1643:4 1686:8 1692:11 1703:22

listen 1530:8

lists 1522:12

literally 1524:16 1542:28 1567:25 1703:26 1704:2

literature 1697:4,5

litigation 1520:17

Liu 1643:5,7

live 1526:24

loaves 1634:15,23

located 1614:19 1615:3

lock 1587:15 1588:28

locking 1587:15,16

lodged 1568:27

LOG(T) 1534:9 1711:27

logic 1670:25

logistical 1729:12

logistics 1612:8

long 1520:11 1527:22 1531:10 1532:24 1535:9 1547:2 1548:12 1550:8 1569:9 1570:22 1575:15,17 1578:25 1604:18 1612:13,19 1674:28 1687:4,5,7 1690:20 1712:12 1714:5

long-term 1662:2 1705:21,

longer 1521:12 1529:13

1584:26 1619:6 1713:15 1742:7 1745:22

longstanding 1569:4 1695:6

looked 1572:10 1587:26 1588:4 1595:9,13 1598:16 1604:17,19 1606:19 1612:24 1675:28 1687:6 1714:12

loose 1653:22

lose 1604:24 1666:16,17 1667:22

losers 1577:11

loses 1661:25 losing 1702:6

loss 1576:1 1645:16

losses 1578:13,16 1589:16

lost 1560:7 1578:9 1591:5 1664:4,21 1678:14,19 1743:6

lot 1521:12,21 1529:22 1538:21 1558:12 1566:21 1583:12 1623:3,11 1625:5,7, 25 1627:8 1628:4,14 1687:5, 21 1693:23 1695:2 1702:13 1725:5 1730:6 1731:1,5,9,10

Index: Ithaca..lot



1733:28 1738:7 1741:6 1746:15,21,22 1747:10 1750:25 1751:2,10,16,18,19

love 1686:13

low 1557:19 1579:4 1659:5 1702:6

lower 1555:26 1557:9 1561:15 1563:9 1564:2 1565:7,8,10 1567:13 1588:5 1597:23 1623:24 1625:18 1637:8,10 1656:28 1660:8,9 1669:9 1673:1 1708:20,21 1724:24

lowered 1564:13 1635:25

lowest 1576:2 1620:4 1656:15 1689:2 1749:2

lunch 1523:12 1524:21 1528:23,24 1529:12,13 1530:17 1532:2 1533:19,20 1534:22 1536:6,23 1537:6, 19 1538:2 1542:21 1547:2 1548:4,9 1568:15,23 1569:16,17 1570:20,23,25 1610:15,21,24,28 1611:2 1639:3 1640:1,6 1716:19,20,

luncheon 1640:9

lunchtime 1532:6

luxury 1557:28 1695:15

Lynne 1594:28

M

made 1522:22 1538:13 1576:24 1578:6 1586:25 1587:1 1603:7 1605:4 1606:24 1638:26 1654:2 1657:5 1738:23

magnitude 1636:7,11 1644:23

mailbox 1657:12

mailing 1551:18 1611:25

main 1664:28 1665:2 1671:14,27 1672:2 1708:12 1712:4 1741:25 1742:14

maintain 1579:23

maintenance 1739:14,15

major 1585:27 1586:4,6,8 1687:8 1701:27

majored 1552:8

majority 1556:8 1585:26 1591:8 1606:19 1628:5 1694:11 1723:24 1746:17 make 1537:4 1542:6 1545:12,19 1546:2 1548:6 1565:16 1580:17 1596:26 1609:15 1617:9 1623:19,20, 21,28 1624:12,18,21 1629:1, 4,5,8,9,10,11,13 1635:11 1639:22 1653:6 1654:6 1662:18 1672:17,19 1676:18 1685:12 1689:9 1692:19 1701:19 1705:9 1709:10,13 1713:3 1715:21 1716:24 1719:14 1720:1 1725:6,15, 16,19,24 1730:9 1741:20 1744:4 1747:8 1748:20

makers 1745:21

makes 1528:25 1536:18 1565:6 1606:27 1608:19,22 1609:9 1611:4 1639:1,2 1723:20 1742:13

making 1548:15 1594:18 1605:2 1608:21 1614:25 1623:19 1624:18 1635:1 1638:5,26 1640:2 1701:8

manage 1577:23,24 1622:11

management 1551:15 1582:12 1588:26 1612:5,10, 11,17,24 1613:2,14 1615:14 1622:6,9 1742:12,13

manager 1612:26,27 1627:26

Mandatory 1618:1

manifest 1711:25

manifests 1712:9

manner 1715:16.20

manufacture 1598:26 1617:7 1725:8 1733:11 1735:14

manufactured 1557:10 1595:13 1616:4 1620:27 1707:16 1723:12,25 1735:24 1749:15 1751:18

manufacturer 1593:6 1597:5 1599:16 1614:23 1623:17 1732:7,8,11,12,13,15 1733:5,6,17 1736:9

manufacturers 1577:7,9 1593:15 1597:15 1599:23 1600:1 1614:26 1617:20,22 1618:1 1624:16 1634:15 1723:21 1724:13,16,18 1731:21,24,28 1732:23 1745:11,16,26 1753:25 1754:8

manufacturers' 1578:12

manufactures 1733:25

manufacturing 1579:19 1590:6 1591:1 1596:8 1615:1,2,3 1624:4 1733:8 1735:18 1737:1

March 1659:20,21

margin 1576:3 1587:15,17 1588:28 1589:3 1678:18,19 1731:17

margins 1576:2 1659:5 1675:26 1676:1 1679:15

mark 1555:6 1574:19,21 1602:1 1613:26 1689:10,14 1695:21

marked 1555:7,8 1574:24, 27,28 1613:28 1614:1 1631:9,13,14 1639:18 1720:12 1721:28 1756:8

market 1552:24 1558:5 1560:4,7,10 1565:7,13,15,20 1575:21 1576:28 1577:14,21 1578:15 1579:2 1582:9.16 1589:18,23 1592:26,27,28 1595:6,11,24 1596:4,18 1597:18,20,22,23,25,28 1598:5 1601:24 1603:12,17 1605:21 1607:18 1609:26 1615:12.19 1616:14.16 1620:19 1621:5 1622:2,4,7, 20 1623:25 1624:1,6,15,17, 27 1626:14,21 1628:6,15 1630:7 1637:7 1647:4 1656:12 1658:12 1676:12 1679:19 1680:25 1681:3,20, 24 1683:15,20,25 1687:6,10, 11 1708:14 1722:13,16,20 1723:5,23 1732:4 1736:15, 18 1738:2,8 1739:21 1740:2 1741:3 1742:8,25 1746:3,7, 9,10,15 1747:9 1748:16 1753:26,27 1754:1,2,6,7,10,

market-clearing 1623:14 1624:7 1637:12,15,16,17,24 1638:3.6.12

marketed 1596:21

marketing 1553:10 1575:14 1577:13 1579:18,22 1581:17 1604:7 1605:19 1606:1 1615:18 1662:22,28 1663:2, 14,19,23 1672:27 1676:9 1711:28 1712:5 1718:3 1724:8

marketplace 1579:14 1624:24 1638:7 1653:10 1677:2 1723:17,27 1727:11, 12 1730:5,21,26 1738:10 1746:5

markets 1552:26 1564:3 1565:2 1576:28 1592:22,24 1593:1 1598:3 1604:10 1605:16 1608:15 1609:6,15, 28 1615:7,23 1621:21 1625:1

markup 1593:5

Master's 1552:9 1613:7,10

match 1754:9

matched 1571:11

material 1530:1 1587:3 1596:14

materials 1612:9,10

matter 1519:5 1521:14,20 1535:19 1551:26 1683:20 1694:23,24 1708:26 1720:11 1756:25

matters 1554:25

maximize 1739:16

MBA 1613:8

Mcbride 1594:28

Mcbride's 1750:16

meaning 1526:5 1644:11 1669:19 1722:5

meaningful 1549:21

means 1521:12 1529:28 1537:20 1555:21 1559:13 1567:25 1572:13,27 1578:27 1579:2 1590:10 1655:21 1660:26 1668:13,17 1674:24 1675:18,23 1676:9 1678:18 1696:20 1700:13 1701:22 1703:18 1736:7

meant 1677:4 1703:24

measure 1573:2 1587:19 1650:4 1688:2,16 1693:13

measured 1556:9,12 1561:3 1563:13 1694:12

measures 1555:24 1571:25 1572:26 1573:4,5,6,7 1687:28

measuring 1650:21

media 1695:2,3

median 1556:21 1563:4 1645:1 1687:26 1688:1,3,4, 5,9,17,23 1692:12

medians 1529:27

meet 1588:23 1609:13 1632:25 1633:1 1751:8

meeting 1527:24 1585:16 1586:10

Index: love..meeting



meets 1751:14

member 1574:15 1589:7 1612:17 1615:6 1739:26

members 1595:5 1597:3 1599:23 1614:17 1730:8

members' 1740:4

membership 1581:13 1599:27 1600:3 1729:9,19

memorized 1543:14

memory 1522:8 1610:22 1686:18

mention 1576:6 1672:1 1710:23 1746:9

mentioned 1529:11 1534:2 1589:6 1591:5 1681:15,17 1712:13 1731:19

Mercantile 1630:11

mere 1534:11

message 1699:5 1741:25

met 1585:19

meta 1696:26,28 1697:7

methodologies 1691:5,6,18

Michigan 1614:19 1615:5

middle 1522:19 1572:21 1603:9

Middleton 1611:27 1614:17

Midwest 1575:15 1596:26

MIG 1540:14

MIG's 1532:25,27 1535:19 1541:27

Mike 1522:20 1759:6

milk 1519:17,23 1520:4,21, 27 1521:15,24,26 1524:13 1525:3 1526:11 1528:6 1529:3.6.17 1530:4.9.16 1531:15 1533:2 1535:2,14 1536:26 1538:8 1553:15,16 1554:9 1555:19.20 1556:9. 12,14 1557:2,4,6,8,9,12,14, 18,24,25,27 1558:1,6,9,12, 13,17,18,23,26,28 1559:1,3, 5,7,8,10,11,13,16,17,21,23, 26,28 1560:3,7,9,10,11,12, 14,19,21,23,25,26,27 1561:11,14,18,24,28 1562:16,20,25 1563:3,6,7, 13,15,21,24,28 1564:2,12, 16,21,22,23 1565:2,3,7,8,12, 13,14,24 1566:6,10,12,15, 18,20,23,27 1567:2 1571:5 1572:1 1573:1,11,24 1575:10,14 1576:2,15

1577:13 1578:6,7,20 1579:5, 18,19,22,25 1580:21 1581:5, 17 1582:18 1585:12 1586:21 1587:20 1589:22 1590:6 1595:5 1596:1 1597:3 1599:24,26 1600:28 1601:4 1604:25 1606:2,9,16 1607:24,25 1608:4 1609:12, 25 1612:10,17 1614:18 1615:4,6,8,15,18,28 1616:3, 10 1617:5,6,11,21,25 1621:15 1622:12 1623:20,23 1630:4,19,27 1635:7,12 1636:6,10,21,22 1637:3,18 1638:2 1641:21 1642:6 1643:1,15,16 1644:25 1645:15 1646:14,27 1647:12,13 1652:13,14,25, 27 1653:2.5.12.20.27 1654:8,19,20,25,26 1655:21, 24 1656:6,7,9 1657:18,24, 26,27 1658:2,18,23,26 1659:11,12,16,17,23,25 1660:5,11,20 1661:2,3,6,14, 27 1662:4,6,7,10,23,27 1663:2,14,23 1664:21 1665:1,9,15,22 1666:2,5,25 1667:17,19,20,23,27 1668:6, 16,22 1669:2,7,9,10,12 1670:3,8,15,19,22,23,26 1671:4,19,23 1672:4,8,14, 18,23,25,27 1673:6,10,11, 12,15,23,24,25,26 1674:15, 17 1675:4,18,19,27 1677:13 1678:18 1679:9,20,23,28 1680:5 1681:1 1682:2,15,19 1683:7,26 1684:2,3,4,7,8,10, 24 1685:2.9.13.16 1686:20. 21,22,26 1687:5,9,10,15,17 1689:27 1691:12,13 1692:1, 17,19,24 1693:3,4,14 1694:3.12.15 1695:16 1697:11 1700:11,12,13,26 1701:1,4,10,13,16,20,22,28 1702:6,8 1703:4,5,6,16 1704:16,26 1705:1,5 1707:17 1708:7,11,17,22,24 1709:12.16 1710:11.26 1711:26 1714:12,13,17,20, 24,25 1721:22 1722:9 1723:9.14.19 1724:8.24 1725:6.22 1727:2 1729:6.8. 9,11,12,18 1730:2 1739:26 1740:2,4,10 1741:28 1742:7, 20 1743:13,17 1744:8,24

Milk's 1551:25 1555:1 1593:18 1596:2 1608:10 1613:20

1745:11,17,21 1746:7

1753:19

milk-consuming 1561:17 1660:10

Milk-drinking 1672:11

Milkpep 1675:5,8

million 1578:9,17 1588:21 1614:24,25 1655:26 1656:7, 19 1744:17

million-dollar 1661:7

Mills 1612:25

Miltner 1539:16,17 1569:26, 27 1570:18,27 1571:1,3,4 1573:27 1585:9,12 1586:24 1588:26 1592:3,5 1599:4 1684:23,24 1714:6 1716:6,7, 13 1717:25,26 1718:19,23 1719:4,10,18 1729:2,5 1741:21

Miltner's 1541:13 1710:21

mind 1555:12 1591:28

mine 1601:21 1642:19 1691:22 1701:5 1721:7

minimize 1580:14

minimum 1530:12 1563:24 1564:12,14 1629:19 1630:4, 27 1635:14,25 1636:21 1638:2 1653:19,26 1662:19

Minnesota 1552:9,18 1613:8 1614:19

minor 1564:15

minus 1557:20,21 1593:10 1617:7 1619:23 1620:4 1626:9 1649:5 1692:2 1736:11,13

minute 1664:7 1695:27

minutes 1542:15,20 1549:2 1570:2 1591:23 1716:28 1717:4,6,8,9 1758:11,14

misalignments 1577:1

mislead 1524:10

missed 1711:5

missing 1539:11,15

misspoke 1664:26

misstepped 1543:2

mixture 1682:26

model 1553:21 1554:6 1571:28 1744:7

modeled 1710:10

modeling 1554:5

moisture 1619:2 1632:5,6, 10,13 1635:18 1734:5,13 1737:15,18,19 1752:26

moisture-adjust 1734:9

moisture-adjusted 1598:12 1618:9 1734:8

moment 1530:28 1543:3 1655:25,27 1659:10 1665:18 1705:19

Monday 1750:17

money 1554:13 1561:7 1577:8 1658:19

monitor 1732:2

month 1562:5 1572:5 1577:27 1578:22,24,27 1579:9 1587:10,20 1588:3 1590:28 1621:19 1711:18 1712:14,16 1730:7 1752:15

monthly 1562:12 1572:4 1620:2 1687:7 1714:3 1727:18 1748:28 1749:4,6 1752:16,18,22 1753:5

months 1572:11 1587:14,28 1589:1 1681:25,26 1711:18, 19,20 1712:10,26 1713:9,16, 18,24 1731:7 1735:8 1743:21

morning 1519:1,16,23 1520:23 1523:13,21 1525:19,20 1528:4 1532:5 1533:5,6 1536:5,10 1538:2 1540:2 1546:24,27 1547:12 1551:9,11 1568:21 1569:22 1583:8 1585:10,11 1588:15, 16 1592:4,5 1602:13 1603:4, 5 1611:21 1638:24 1710:20 1712:13 1716:18 1741:24

mother 1661:12

mothers 1661:13

motions 1755:26,27

move 1525:15 1582:9 1586:25 1598:5 1609:12,24 1610:6 1687:16 1715:11 1722:24

moved 1575:18 1585:26 1613:2

movement 1649:4

mover 1576:24,26 1579:12 1583:13 1584:9,14 1587:23 1588:4 1743:24

moving 1530:22 1576:23 1578:3 1580:19,23 1589:24 1722:17

mozzarella 1593:6,8,9,15,27 1595:1,2 1620:17 1623:22, 28 1631:3 1727:15 1736:9, 14,17 1737:24,27 1746:1



1747:5,8,10 1750:13,14,21, 23,24,28 1751:10

multiplied 1710:23

multiply 1576:11 1652:7

Ν

names 1519:27 1642:18

NASS 1749:20,21 1750:2,9 1752:5

nation 1586:7

national 1519:16,23 1520:4, 21,27 1521:15,24,26 1524:13 1525:3 1526:11 1528:6 1529:3,6,17 1530:4, 9,16 1531:15 1535:14 1536:26 1538:8 1551:25 1555:1 1561:28 1565:19 1581:5 1593:18 1595:5 1596:2 1597:2 1599:24,26 1600:11,28 1601:4 1604:24 1606:16 1608:10,19 1613:20 1618:2 1622:12 1635:7 1694:3 1709:16 1741:28

nationally 1576:5

nationwide 1562:1

natural 1557:23 1559:27 1592:15 1593:3 1598:22 1599:12 1600:13 1601:8 1604:21 1620:22,27 1621:2, 4 1624:23 1625:8 1627:17 1628:10,12,16 1634:16,24 1735:24,27 1736:20

nature 1530:18 1557:2 1623:15 1627:27 1694:15 1698:15

NDPSR 1604:11 1615:25 1616:5,6,18 1618:8,18 1619:13,20,27 1626:9 1726:9,13 1742:6,26 1743:8, 9 1747:15,23 1751:7 1752:5, 14,19 1753:24

necessarily 1586:15 1594:15 1595:20 1680:21 1683:23 1694:23,25 1697:8 1746:19 1747:3 1757:10

necessity 1557:27

needed 1573:13 1689:28

negative 1563:20 1577:6,17, 18,28 1578:2 1579:4,26 1581:23 1582:17,21 1584:18 1587:18,19 1589:14 1591:6 1605:1 1644:4,6 1647:5,24, 25 1654:9

negatively 1561:18 1621:9 1669:26 1670:19 1745:25

neighbor 1577:16 1581:28 1582:1

neighborhood 1529:26 1572:20 1581:28 1582:5

net 1558:11 1647:15

network 1615:1 1623:18 1624:5 1628:4 1746:24

neutralize 1565:18,20

newly 1702:21

news 1576:15

nice 1688:13 1713:21

Nicholson 1709:21

Nielsen 1657:25 1658:1 1714:19

night 1520:25 1521:8,17,18 1522:5,9 1523:20 1524:1,15 1526:22 1528:18,21 1530:10,20 1533:5 1541:21

nit 1689:17

NMPF's 1655:2

NMPF-48 1555:3

NMPF-7 1602:3 1613:23,26

Nobel 1695:18

non-examination 1698:15

non-journal 1690:6

non-milk 1558:4

non-peer-reviewed 1680:13,

non-ph.d. 1713:6

non-pooled 1579:5

non-value-added 1607:26

nonetheless 1641:25 1726:7

nonfat 1635:11 1727:2

noon 1759:8

normal 1648:20,24 1703:17

note 1521:1 1528:6 1532:23 1534:4 1541:12 1556:28 1639:17 1643:21 1758:10

noted 1539:28 1610:25 1611:11 1716:2

notice 1520:20 1526:16 1542:24 1648:2 1717:27 1718:7,25 1756:2,3

notify 1544:26

notion 1651:4 1652:3 1717:3

November 1626:25 1627:1 1727:28

number 1555:8 1573:9,12 1574:25,28 1576:9,22 1577:5 1581:9,21 1589:14 1591:16 1600:4 1601:5,15, 16 1606:17 1610:9 1614:1 1618:4 1628:1,2 1631:9,14 1633:18 1639:24 1644:6 1647:27 1648:7,15 1649:5, 14,19,25,26 1651:20 1653:2, 5,6,15 1654:20 1670:1 1681:28 1689:20 1691:20 1697:11 1714:16 1716:4 1750:9 1752:11 1755:16,28 1756:13 1758:3

numbers 1604:19 1627:24, 28 1645:4 1650:3,15,20,22 1655:23 1688:15,20,22 1691:24 1697:9,12 1699:24 1704:18 1705:27 1749:23

nutrition 1673:7,10 1674:16

nutritional 1596:19

nutritionist 1673:13,16 1674:4

0

O'LAKES 1552:19,25 1612:27

oat 1659:16 1667:19 1673:11

oath 1591:28 1641:4 1720:9

object 1520:7 1677:15 1696:1 1756:7 1757:13

objected 1715:16,19

objecting 1699:1 1715:15,22

objection 1538:3,4 1547:14, 27 1548:22 1550:14 1569:1, 5,10 1591:14 1610:27 1678:2 1698:6 1715:12 1718:10 1719:11 1757:9,10, 12 1758:24

objectionable 1698:27

objections 1568:26,27 1610:7,25 1611:11 1716:2 1721:3 1755:13,21

objects 1639:8

observation 1732:22

observations 1650:5

observed 1704:5

obvious 1564:7 1565:6

occasions 1731:5

occurred 1541:13 1616:27 1652:21

occurs 1527:10

off-the-record 1534:18 1758:26

offer 1531:18 1554:21 1591:13 1609:7 1613:13 1614:5 1639:4 1755:8,11

offered 1520:21 1522:23 1523:10 1541:17 1542:21

offering 1542:19

official 1717:27 1718:4,7,25 1721:5 1756:2,3

officially 1543:28

officials 1553:20

offset 1615:15

Oftentimes 1676:21

Ohio 1614:20

older 1578:28

Olympic 1689:1

omission 1524:2

omitted 1712:3.4

one-hour 1528:24

one-page 1757:28

one-third 1615:7

one-time 1705:26 1706:1,8

ongoing 1563:23

online 1528:10 1741:6 1748:3,10,12

open 1522:5 1599:19 1624:16 1740:9

operate 1538:9 1663:18

operating 1532:16 1568:5 1654:20 1662:22 1725:3

operation 1732:10

operations 1597:9 1614:22 1729:28 1731:25 1733:20,28 1734:2

operators 1739:13

opinion 1654:25 1665:28 1666:2,10,11 1671:28 1672:22 1681:2 1685:24 1687:27 1688:17 1710:12 1723:6 1731:13 1732:6,22 1733:1 1746:7 1750:22

opponents 1529:7

opportunities 1622:6



opportunity 1547:5 1548:4 1549:6 1568:15 1579:4 1580:14 1582:17 1609:12 1614:7 1622:15,26 1641:24 1666:16 1699:5 1716:23

opposed 1530:10 1576:23 1661:2 1698:2 1735:13

opposing 1520:15

opposite 1629:9 1670:22 1684:6

opposition 1586:11,13

optimal 1568:6

option 1606:17

options 1559:4 1622:8

orange 1703:6

order 1541:26,28 1575:14 1576:21 1579:5,23 1580:10 1581:17 1603:17 1604:16 1605:3,9 1616:2 1617:2 1618:20,28 1622:16,24 1636:7 1639:5 1641:10 1642:9 1654:6 1657:9 1662:28 1663:1,14 1668:2 1679:19 1723:14 1724:8 1743:14,15 1745:22 1753:25

orders 1577:13 1579:18 1582:24 1590:18 1615:18 1617:25 1623:26 1663:23 1672:27

organic 1714:25

organizations 1583:27

organized 1741:22

original 1618:28

originally 1554:16 1573:12 1711:2

outcome 1545:4

outdated 1725:15,24

outlet 1747:13

outlier 1688:25 1714:11

outliers 1688:27

Output 1534:6

outweigh 1646:9

outweighed 1619:10

overarching 1605:6

overcapacity 1623:6

overdue 1575:15

overheard 1539:21

overrepresent 1621:24

overrepresented 1636:28

overrepresenting 1637:4 1638:6

Overruled 1678:4

overstate 1595:26

overstated 1616:12

oversupply 1597:21,25 1748:13

overview 1722:2

overweighting 1692:15

overwhelming 1556:8 1557:5 1694:11

Р

p.m. 1640:8 1759:11

pack 1735:17

package 1633:11,24,25

packaged 1608:5

packaging 1608:6 1633:8, 12,15 1634:6 1735:17 1740:23 1750:25

pages 1532:24 1534:5,11 1679:3 1680:8

paid 1545:12,14,15 1551:28 1584:21,22 1730:8

pandemic 1576:16 1735:4

paper 1639:25 1644:22 1649:1

paragraph 1555:16 1567:11 1603:9 1694:10 1700:9 1701:8,18 1704:13,14 1735:25 1749:9

parental 1661:11

parenthetical 1548:26

parmesan 1620:18

part 1520:16 1526:1 1527:4 1532:3 1536:26 1539:1,2,23 1544:14 1558:4 1560:11 1566:9 1571:16 1572:11 1581:8 1599:24 1628:16 1659:28 1660:11 1661:16 1675:12 1677:16 1698:6 1708:27 1709:4 1710:2,8 1714:2 1718:26 1720:20 1726:17,22 1727:26 1728:9 1732:2 1756:28 1757:8

participants 1539:20 1545:5 1718:27

participate 1553:11 1583:25

participated 1642:23 1652:22

participating 1519:11 1545:5

particle 1695:1,4,12

parties 1544:26 1545:3 1638:28 1741:14

partly 1578:10

parts 1682:4

pass 1667:11,12 1679:9,14

passed 1646:28 1666:1 1710:4,13

passing 1646:5 1666:5

past 1546:12,13 1560:6 1598:19 1612:15 1616:20 1619:14,15 1621:8 1627:6 1636:24 1672:3 1724:21 1725:3 1731:2 1741:4,5,8 1742:17 1747:16 1748:2

patterns 1730:25

Paul 1759:4

paused 1542:7

pay 1577:7,9 1636:25 1646:26 1729:19,21

paying 1545:1 1549:3 1585:2 1617:21 1745:11,16

payments 1578:11

pays 1580:5

PDL 1712:17

PDL01 1712:6

peak 1734:28

peaked 1734:27

peer 1553:6 1680:23 1689:28 1690:4,5,8 1694:24

peer-reviewed 1557:6 1680:12,14,17

penalizing 1529:3,5 1577:23

penalty 1529:7

penny 1615:24 1744:7 1745:4,6

people 1519:21 1520:9,12 1525:2 1527:24,27 1532:6 1535:27 1537:2,8 1544:5 1545:27 1546:11,13 1549:17 1558:5,6,8,11 1560:18,25 1562:19 1566:6,14 1568:15 1583:12 1642:21 1658:20 1659:24 1660:6 1661:1,19 1672:13 1684:3,7 1690:22 1693:21 1697:28 1704:16 1708:15 1709:1,9 1733:22

people's 1589:12 1658:25

per-pound 1633:27 1634:2

percent 1572:15,20 1589:22 1703:8 1729:11

percentage 1555:25 1556:5, 6 1563:9 1567:27 1573:19 1618:17 1646:1 1647:6 1658:12 1666:18,19 1672:9 1726:21,23 1729:10 1747:17 1748:1,5,8

perfect 1598:1 1709:3 1746:4

perfectly 1547:7 1568:28 1700:1 1704:28 1735:13

perform 1758:2

performed 1553:14 1692:10

period 1532:7 1553:13 1559:15,24 1572:13 1584:13 1591:7 1619:28 1620:3 1623:5 1626:24 1670:24 1687:8 1715:20 1727:19 1734:25 1743:28 1749:1

periodic 1579:19 1590:6

periods 1714:5 1735:7,10,11

permanent 1537:18 1538:4 1711:25

permitted 1520:6

person 1527:1 1532:10 1569:8 1704:27

personal 1542:11 1640:3 1644:14 1645:2 1685:24 1699:11

personally 1638:24 1642:1 1652:22 1704:5

personnel 1540:3

perspective 1546:5,17 1628:13 1729:22

pertinent 1717:15

Peter 1602:12 1694:3

Ph.d. 1552:9.14 1713:4

phenomenon 1652:15

phrase 1648:25

physically 1625:28

physics 1695:1

pick 1527:4 1625:28 1720:5



piece 1639:25 1722:21

pieces 1696:10,21

piling 1671:23

Pillsbury 1612:23

pits 1577:15,16

pitted 1581:28

pizza 1751:17

place 1584:22 1606:5 1608:12 1624:3 1729:11

places 1718:20

plan 1759:2

planned 1592:6

plant 1582:9,10 1615:3 1623:18 1676:24 1732:24 1739:12,13,23,25 1740:3

plant-based 1560:9 1566:18 1652:13,25 1668:18 1692:24

plants 1582:6 1609:24 1614:28 1615:2,3 1654:20 1675:20,22 1724:28 1725:1, 2,7,10 1729:8,18,28 1739:12 1740:7

play 1673:16

played 1706:10

playing 1745:27

plethora 1523:7

pockets 1577:8

point 1525:5 1532:3 1540:18,20 1546:9 1547:18 1548:1 1549:1,2,7 1568:24 1574:17 1587:6 1594:18 1605:2 1626:21,26 1628:27 1635:28 1650:7 1653:7 1658:10 1678:24 1681:1,4 1697:1 1698:11 1701:7 1708:24,25 1709:13 1731:12 1744:18 1746:25 1748:14 1752:26 1756:27 1757:4,11,

pointblank 1638:23

pointed 1536:21 1720:15,19

pointing 1526:9

points 1536:19 1635:24 1636:1 1637:6 1691:23 1749:6

policy 1553:9 1581:7,10 1670:17 1723:14

politically 1693:7

polynomial 1712:7

pool 1577:8 1578:10,14,16 1579:7,23 1589:16 1590:11, 15,24 1637:4

pooled 1579:24 1582:10 1743:14,15 1744:19 1745:21

pooling 1579:20 1590:7

pop- 1705:5

popular 1652:24 1695:3

population 1561:15,21,23 1660:12,25 1672:10 1686:20,25 1703:8 1704:17, 21,23 1705:6,11 1708:21

pork 1670:11

portion 1568:6 1584:17 1639:20

position 1525:9,11 1540:11 1541:2 1548:23 1608:10 1612:13,15 1718:17

positions 1581:4,5

positive 1561:24 1588:1,2 1619:23 1627:3,7 1657:3 1703:13,15 1731:8

positively 1576:19

possibility 1527:17 1686:27 1753:28

possibly 1546:19

post 1523:11 1540:23

post-hearing 1718:28

posted 1519:19 1520:2,3 1521:1 1523:8,9 1524:11 1528:9 1535:3,22

posting 1521:7

postpone 1549:9

potentially 1582:6 1729:26

pound 1572:2 1598:11 1615:25 1616:8 1618:8 1619:2,22,23,24 1620:1,2,3, 4 1727:19 1740:22 1744:6 1749:1.2

pounds 1614:18,24,25 1620:6,7,9,12 1629:15 1633:1 1638:8 1655:21,26 1656:7,19 1726:19 1743:13, 18,19 1744:19,21 1746:16 1749:8 1750:10

powder 1726:27

powders 1612:26 1613:1

powerful 1696:11,23

PPD 1577:17,28 1579:7

PPDS 1577:18 1578:2 1579:4,26 1581:23 1582:17, 21 1584:18 1587:18,19 1588:1 1589:14 1591:6

practically 1557:20 1563:12

practice 1519:9 1520:14,17 1527:28 1542:27 1550:8 1558:8 1569:4 1696:13

practiced 1526:10 1542:28

precise 1686:19 1698:23

Precisely 1713:14

precision 1721:11

predecessors 1567:4

predict 1548:20 1708:28

predictable 1617:3 1619:5 1621:18 1722:25

predicted 1549:25,27

predominantly 1666:9

prefer 1521:25 1526:17 1537:5,10 1639:5 1688:2 1735:12

preference 1569:18 1660:26 1702:21

preferred 1560:27

prejudice 1538:4 1547:24 1548:22

prejudiced 1528:20 1537:17,18 1550:13

preliminary 1519:4

premise 1605:6 1671:20

premium 1565:5 1592:27 1593:5 1596:18 1597:14 1677:2 1678:8

preparation 1548:2 1639:8

prepare 1519:18,20 1521:8 1523:14 1524:17 1525:2 1527:12 1528:21 1529:9,12 1530:9 1533:20,21 1536:24 1537:1,3,19,20 1542:18 1548:13,14,17 1549:7 1554:28 1570:4 1613:19 1697:28 1715:21

prepared 1520:4,23,24 1521:11 1524:16 1525:13,15 1527:9 1528:19 1538:5 1596:6 1689:17 1720:23

preparing 1519:28 1523:16 1527:28 1530:11 1549:4 1568:16

present 1526:27 1689:16

presentation 1522:18 1542:7

presented 1534:1 1548:25 1690:17 1715:17,20 1718:28

presenting 1536:20

preserve 1718:18

preserved 1550:14 1568:27

president 1574:11,12,13,18, 23 1575:9 1581:1 1587:8 1612:4

press 1733:20

presupposing 1653:18,21

pretty 1548:13,15 1566:4 1567:23 1581:20 1585:27 1587:8 1671:15 1719:16 1734:20 1750:27

prevent 1679:19

preventative 1739:15

previous 1610:25,26 1611:10 1694:8 1702:22 1707:13 1711:18,19,20 1721:2

price 1521:5,6 1529:25

previously 1522:10 1568:14

1530:12 1532:25 1533:2,10 1534:7 1535:2,25 1539:4 1555:20,23,24,25,28 1556:2, 3,5,9,12,14,20,23,24 1557:2, 4,8,10,13,14,16,19,26 1558:1.2.6.9.13.16.25 1559:4,6,8,10,17,21,23,26 1560:2 1561:26,27 1562:2,6, 7,8,9,10,11,12,15,16,20,24, 25,26,28 1563:2,5,6,10,13, 18,28 1564:6,11 1565:5,7,9, 10,11,14 1567:13,19,24,26, 28 1568:3,4,5,7 1571:24,27 1572:1,3,5,6,7,8,14,15,18,28 1573:1,11,12,13,14,17,19,22 1577:1,10,14,18,27 1578:23 1579:12,23 1582:1,18 1584:15 1589:3,26 1590:12 1591:2 1592:16.19.27 1593:8.9.10.27 1594:4.16. 23,24,27 1595:7,8,11 1597:14,19,23 1598:7 1599:13 1600:16 1601:9 1603:12,18,19,25 1604:2,12 1605:20 1609:20 1610:1 1615:12,15,21,22,26,27,28 1616:3,6,7,8,10,17,18,21 1617:10,11,13,18,23,25,27, 28 1618:4,5,6,9,13,22 1619:3,4,7,8,11,20,26 1620:14,20,23,28 1621:2,3, 8,16,17,25,27,28 1622:6,10, 13,21 1627:19 1628:14

Index: piece..price



1630:7,18 1635:8,11,19,23, 26 1636:3,10,26 1637:12,15, 17,19,23,24 1638:2,3,11,12 1641:21 1644:3,9,12 1645:19,28 1646:9,13,16,19, 22,26 1647:4,7,13,20 1652:11 1653:26 1654:9 1655:3,11,12,14 1656:15,25, 27,28 1657:3,5 1658:6 1659:1,2,4,11 1664:9 1665:9 1666:3,5,14,20,27 1668:21, 24 1669:27 1670:22,25 1671:3,4,5,6,20,28 1678:8 1680:2 1682:2,4,14,18 1684:7,8 1685:2 1692:1,5 1693:2 1694:12,14 1697:11 1700:10,12,25 1701:11,23 1702:7,10,15,20 1703:1,5,6 1705:15.16 1706:10.13 1707:16,19,21,23,26 1708:6, 11,17,24,25,26 1709:1,2,7,8, 10,12 1710:4,21,22,23,24, 26,28 1711:1,4,6,16,17,24, 26 1712:14,15,27 1713:10 1714:23 1722:5,8,9,14 1723:8,13,19,20,21,26 1724:4,8,19,22,24 1727:9 1729:20,25 1731:6 1734:9, 12 1735:26 1736:2,6,8,10, 11,13,16,21,22 1737:16,23, 27,28 1738:2,6,9,11 1740:21,26 1742:6,19,20,26 1743:22 1744:8,26 1745:22, 23 1746:8 1752:14 1753:2, 24 1754:9,27 1755:8,10

priced 1565:9,13 1592:25 1593:3,20 1606:10 1615:11 1616:13,16 1628:5,11,13,15 1669:9 1709:12 1724:1 1736:12,14,17 1738:8 1742:25 1746:3,7,10,15,16

prices 1535:12,15,18 1539:7 1557:9 1562:3 1563:24 1564:2,13,14,26 1571:25 1577:21 1578:14,19,22,23, 26,27 1579:1,2,3,6,8,17,18 1581:27 1582:8 1587:9 1589:17 1590:4,5 1593:26 1594:12,14,21 1597:27 1598:3,12 1605:4,25 1606:14 1609:14,26 1615:20,21 1617:12,14,15, 16,21,27 1618:8,10,12,23,24 1619:1,12,18,25,27,28 1620:25 1621:12,14,22 1622:2 1623:7,9 1624:15,20 1625:9,17 1626:24 1629:19 1630:4,27 1635:14 1636:21 1653:19 1654:25 1655:7,8 1657:9,12,14 1661:21 1662:1,19 1663:24 1664:1,9, 22 1665:15,22 1670:18 1671:10 1672:22,23 1673:1, 2 1676:1 1677:7 1678:7,27

1683:20 1684:5 1701:15,16 1702:11 1712:16,19 1724:5, 21 1730:1,2 1732:3 1744:14 1745:12,17 1748:14,16

pricing 1557:7 1565:17
1576:22 1578:21 1579:8,10,
15,27,28 1580:4 1590:2,28
1592:17 1599:13 1600:17
1601:10 1604:16 1607:7
1612:12 1613:2 1615:15,19
1616:2 1617:2 1618:26
1620:15,23 1621:5,12
1622:4,27 1627:19 1634:5
1635:9 1672:28 1712:20
1723:7 1725:22 1738:6
1742:23 1743:24 1745:2

primarily 1603:15,19 1605:23 1615:20 1666:14,16 1694:7

primary 1539:18 1598:25 1732:25 1733:1,3

principle 1534:5

prior 1553:20 1554:4 1561:1 1615:23 1635:16 1659:21 1730:20 1743:20

priori 1594:16

priorities 1580:8

private 1527:28 1552:20 1589:10 1599:16,18,21 1600:1 1676:14,15,16 1677:4,8 1678:8,13

prize 1695:19

pro 1545:16

proactively 1614:13

probability 1534:9 1579:13 1648:18 1650:23 1651:24

probative 1697:23

problem 1531:2 1548:10 1550:24 1570:8 1662:2,3,4, 13 1689:5 1705:21 1716:7 1725:18

problems 1662:10,18

procedural 1639:2 1720:10

procedure 1520:10 1699:8 1700:23

procedures 1529:10 1550:7,

Proceed 1575:7

proceeding 1539:18 1663:13 1699:1 1755:15

proceedings 1520:18 1526:9 1759:14

process 1581:7,9 1590:19, 21,22 1626:3 1713:22,23 1739:27 1748:24

processed 1598:17,21,26 1621:1 1624:9 1625:10,12, 19,26 1628:14,15 1634:17 1635:1 1731:20,23

processes 1564:21,22 1599:27 1615:6

processing 1596:11 1625:27 1725:14 1751:5

processor 1553:16 1554:19 1583:21 1584:1 1617:5,15 1646:21 1666:26 1667:13,14 1675:6,13 1676:18 1678:18

processors 1554:9,15 1563:26 1579:28 1580:16, 17,23 1581:25 1594:7 1616:4 1617:3,8,20 1621:10 1622:1,4,6 1625:26 1635:21 1645:20,28 1647:8,18,21 1666:3,14 1670:14 1675:19, 27 1679:8,13 1680:2,4 1712:2 1723:12 1725:22

procurement 1612:8,17,24, 25,27 1613:14

produce 1580:5 1589:21 1606:3 1607:15,17,24 1609:11 1614:18 1634:23 1750:14

produced 1565:2 1592:15 1593:3 1597:17 1599:12 1607:27 1618:11 1629:17 1674:15 1724:23 1727:10,12 1731:27 1732:7.8

producer 1564:21 1577:17 1578:1 1579:17 1583:22 1587:2 1590:4,13 1600:28 1601:4 1616:23 1742:7

producer-funded 1675:5

producers 1519:24 1522:21 1542:2,7 1561:28 1565:17 1571:5 1575:19 1579:24,28 1580:17,23 1581:25,27 1582:4 1585:12,18 1586:21 1590:23 1594:27 1599:24,26 1615:17 1616:3,22,25 1621:9,23 1635:22 1636:8, 11,26 1637:21 1657:3 1664:1,18 1672:25 1684:24 1694:3 1723:16,25 1724:12, 15,25 1725:23 1728:7 1729:6,19 1730:4 1732:20 1742:18 1743:6,11 1744:11, 16

produces 1599:27

producing 1582:7 1597:6

1607:21 1614:24

product 1555:19 1558:23 1560:27 1577:12,27 1578:22 1582:10,17 1589:3,5 1590:11 1592:26 1593:19 1594:20 1595:18,19 1597:5, 9,10,22 1598:4 1599:12 1603:17 1606:15,20 1607:6, 11,12,14,15,16,20,27 1608:1,2,9,12 1617:12 1618:1 1623:19 1624:7,8,13, 19 1628:26 1630:28 1631:4 1635:12 1636:15.22 1637:6. 9 1638:13 1652:25 1654:8 1659:16 1676:10,20,21,22 1677:1 1678:8,13 1707:25, 26 1715:2 1727:4,15 1732:16,24,25 1733:1,3 1739:22 1740:22 1746:12, 14,19,20,23 1747:8 1748:23 1749:26 1750:23 1754:1,26

production 1587:20 1596:16,25 1600:12 1604:7, 21 1608:23 1609:13 1618:12,16,19 1620:5,7,8, 10,11,12 1621:25 1623:4,23 1626:2 1637:5 1726:5 1727:9 1730:21,25 1736:7 1746:27 1747:2 1749:8,10, 12 1750:5,11,12 1751:14

products 1557:9,10 1558:17 1559:18 1560:5,9,21,23 1562:17,25 1564:6,8 1578:24 1587:11 1592:25 1593:20 1595:28 1596:13, 19,27 1604:28 1607:8,9 1612:26,28 1615:7,10 1616:4 1617:4,6,7 1618:3 1621:1,20 1625:1,3,5,7,8,9, 10,13,16 1630:15,18 1632:1 1634:9,14 1652:14 1654:26 1661:3 1665:10 1667:19,24 1668:22 1669:2,8,13,20 1672:4,7,17 1673:4,11,28 1674:17 1676:6 1677:8 1678:17 1680:28 1683:12,17 1685:13.26 1687:17 1692:28 1700:14.26 1701:2.4.23 1702:7,14,16 1703:6 1707:16 1708:14,15,16 1710:27 1714:12,17,24,27, 28 1723:11,18,22 1724:1,5 1725:7 1732:19 1739:18 1742:1 1749:15 1751:8

profession 1693:23

professional 1541:18 1542:26 1544:10 1552:4,13, 15 1607:13

professor 1528:5 1533:9 1541:9 1544:24 1551:14 1569:25 1717:28 1718:1 1720:1



profile 1614:9 1737:18

profit 1659:5

profitability 1582:19

1617:15

profitable 1580:1

profound 1687:9

program 1553:12 1554:19 1607:7 1662:21 1675:5,6,8,9 1723:14 1724:9 1728:10,12 1731:1 1735:1,5

programs 1552:28 1553:16 1612:12 1613:2 1643:15,16, 17 1670:10,14 1673:23,24 1675:4

progression 1522:21

projects 1552:23

promotion 1553:12 1554:12 1643:15,16 1670:8,10,11 1673:23,24 1675:4 1705:9

pronouncing 1575:5

proper 1595:28

properly 1537:19 1538:6 1604:19 1606:8

proponents 1523:18 1539:18

proportion 1561:14,20 1599:28 1616:11 1704:16,24 1708:20.21

proportionately 1559:5

proportions 1704:22

proposal 1539:1 1542:8 1562:1 1584:7,20 1585:2 1594:10,11,14 1595:1,14 1596:5 1608:20 1613:20 1630:21,25 1631:2 1661:17 1671:10 1675:16 1687:19,20

proposals 1523:18 1535:13 1551:25 1555:1 1575:14,16 1580:13 1581:3,4 1586:20 1605:7 1630:20 1655:2

propose 1670:20

proposed 1573:13 1581:11 1583:20 1618:20 1709:16

proposing 1595:22

proposition 1661:24

protect 1582:14 1587:14,17 1589:2

Protection 1577:26,27 1582:15 1587:12

protein 1564:23 1565:4 1596:19,20 1615:27 1616:12 1617:13,26,27 1618:7,22 1619:8 1673:26,28 1722:8 1745:23

protocol 1642:7

proud 1576:20

prove 1697:1

provide 1523:22 1525:3 1551:17 1552:3 1603:24 1611:25 1616:2 1627:23 1652:3 1719:23 1720:28 1723:8 1733:5

provided 1519:26 1528:11

providing 1555:12 1637:15

provision 1709:27

provisions 1576:21 1663:21

proxy 1711:28 1712:3

public 1665:22,24 1679:17 1718:4,6,12

publication 1642:5

publications 1645:6

published 1550:11 1552:27 1553:5 1557:5 1642:4 1718:2

pull 1589:4

pulled 1717:23 1749:6

purchase 1558:14 1559:14 1700:14 1709:11

purchased 1575:11 1589:9

purchases 1555:22 1558:2 1654:27 1657:17 1714:21 1729:13,14,15,17

purchasing 1680:5

pure 1595:19

purportedly 1650:21

purpose 1577:12 1607:6 1663:22,25 1664:26,28 1665:2,19 1670:13 1674:12, 25 1679:18 1694:8

purposes 1555:6 1603:25 1613:27 1618:26 1629:19 1630:26 1674:8 1733:27 1754:26

pursuant 1718:6

push 1638:22

put 1523:12,15 1526:11 1528:22 1530:16 1534:21,25 1535:10,24 1540:17 1542:2, 5 1543:27 1546:24 1548:8 1549:13 1567:5 1569:20 1570:7 1580:15 1607:19 1608:3 1624:1 1625:6,7 1626:1,6 1627:28 1642:18 1644:22 1674:17 1687:19 1691:22 1708:23 1712:22 1716:19 1719:7 1731:12 1733:21 1739:14 1754:1 1755:28 1756:16 1758:12,19

puts 1587:12 1745:27

putting 1524:21 1533:19 1535:14 1545:8 1548:3,7 1549:8 1733:23

Q

qualified 1554:24

quality 1598:9 1680:22 1718:18

quantified 1672:3

quantitative 1597:1

quantity 1556:1,6,16,23 1557:15 1567:27,28 1572:19 1597:17 1646:2,10 1647:7 1666:17 1676:2 1692:5 1710:17

quarter 1730:7

quarterly 1714:3

question 1531:3 1537:14,22, 27 1557:23 1559:27 1566:2 1584:24 1593:13,24 1598:14 1599:1 1600:7,16 1601:25 1602:22 1605:18 1607:1 1608:13,18 1627:9 1629:10, 23 1636:14 1637:28 1639:17 1645:21 1649:13,21 1650:19 1653:14 1654:24 1656:9 1659:14,15 1661:4,5,7 1665:11,14 1666:28 1668:4, 24 1671:25 1674:26 1677:27 1678:25 1681:11,19 1682:16 1686:11 1687:23 1689:8,10, 14 1695:21 1696:4,7 1698:23 1699:18,22 1705:1 1708:5,27 1714:6,7 1740:28 1746:11 1747:14,20 1748:25 1749:17,19 1753:13 1754:23 1756:25

questioned 1756:20

questions 1564:19 1568:12 1570:2,4,13,19,27 1571:6 1583:4 1585:7 1588:9,11,25 1589:11,12 1598:15 1599:2, 5,10 1603:21 1607:3 1608:16 1609:2 1610:6 1622:18,23 1641:25 1664:9, 13 1679:4 1684:18,21,27 1692:22,25 1694:7,8 1698:28 1699:7,13 1700:3,5 1702:23 1704:11 1706:18 1707:12 1710:21 1714:9 1716:20 1728:26 1731:11 1737:12 1741:20 1750:20 1751:22 1752:2 1753:14,21 1754:17 1757:22

quick 1524:5 1568:21 1569:27

quickly 1546:11 1550:27 1585:28 1759:1

quizzed 1663:20,21

quote 1634:18 1686:18 1693:3 1740:26

quoted 1692:1

R

R-SQUARED 1534:9 1572:22,23,26 1573:3

racial 1686:16,19 1687:8

radius 1576:11

raise 1519:5 1535:27 1551:2 1556:3 1568:7 1574:4 1611:14 1646:22 1647:4 1758:17

raised 1698:14 1709:13

raising 1550:2 1647:19,20 1662:19 1664:1 1666:14 1680:2

rally 1579:2

ran 1573:16 1744:6

random 1651:14,24

range 1556:4 1619:23 1620:1

ranging 1557:19 1558:11 1614:22

rate 1704:20

rationale 1563:23,25

re-cross 1608:28 1707:2 1754:18

reached 1578:16 1626:16

react 1669:1

reaction 1706:9

read 1521:2,4 1534:15,28 1535:3,20 1567:1 1600:21 1601:13 1614:13 1629:14 1634:12 1639:25 1641:25 1686:1,5,9 1689:22,24 1741:23 1744:12



reading 1639:23

reads 1603:10

ready 1524:28 1536:3 1542:16,17 1550:26 1568:17 1570:18 1591:22 1611:3

real 1559:8,10,23 1586:11 1670:21 1673:25 1700:12 1702:16 1703:14 1706:22 1733:5

realities 1653:9

reality 1523:15 1524:11,23 1530:9,19 1531:6,11 1637:27 1638:5 1746:5

realize 1529:16 1531:4 1539:17 1540:24 1546:25 1697:16 1717:20

realized 1742:18

reargue 1717:10

reason 1526:11 1528:19 1573:8 1660:11 1684:1 1688:18 1712:22 1714:22 1718:1

reasonable 1536:16 1538:15,18,23 1539:8 1573:3 1677:9,11 1678:6,11

reasons 1560:1 1565:23,24 1661:15 1681:28 1685:6 1686:4,5,7 1687:16 1688:28 1708:12,17 1730:24 1741:28 1742:15 1747:23

rebuttal 1522:19 1532:26 1533:7,22,27 1534:12 1539:28 1698:4

recall 1532:7 1583:24 1585:14 1586:10 1587:1,5 1594:8 1595:4 1643:11 1692:25 1721:24

receipt 1715:23

receive 1666:20 1745:12

received 1519:16 1591:17 1597:20 1610:9 1617:14,22 1695:2 1716:4 1737:13 1745:17 1755:16 1758:3 1759:10

receives 1588:20

receiving 1578:11

recent 1561:6 1579:6 1598:11 1605:27 1615:17 1641:26,28 1643:3,13,22 1645:8,9 1652:15,21 1683:3 1690:24,26 1711:3 1737:2,3

recently 1560:8,9 1576:16 1643:2 1695:8

reciprocity 1520:19

recognizing 1742:26

recollection 1678:3

recommend 1593:12 1602:22

recommends 1562:1 1622:12

reconfirm 1541:21

reconsider 1757:20

record 1519:2 1520:12 1524:9 1525:10 1531:12,15, 24 1534:23 1535:24 1537:25,26 1539:12,15 1540:21,27 1545:23,24,27 1546:2,6,19 1548:23,24,26 1551:10,17,23 1570:28 1590:8,9 1591:14,26 1592:18 1610:8 1611:22 1624:12 1639:19 1641:2 1676:5 1688:6 1698:16,25 1701:7 1706:26 1707:18 1708:13 1716:3.11.16.24 1717:14 1718:12,18,22,27 1719:7,24 1748:27 1752:4 1755:15,20 1756:1,7,16,23 1758:18,19,20,21,22,25,27 1759:2

RECROSS-EXAMINATION 1609:4 1753:17 1754:20

red 1533:25

Redirect 1591:12 1608:27 1610:4 1753:10 1755:3,5

reduce 1579:12 1594:12,16 1621:28 1705:27

reduced 1566:15 1660:16 1662:6.7 1677:13 1744:16

reduces 1556:23 1621:23

reducing 1577:5 1726:20,23

refer 1558:20 1583:13 1703:25 1722:4

refereed 1642:5,8,25 1643:3

reference 1592:25 1593:4 1603:19 1735:28

referenced 1571:16 1583:11 1585:17 1756:5

references 1571:7,15 1756:21

referred 1562:14 1573:2 1617:8 1642:26 1643:24 1696:26 1703:17 1718:20,27 1755:28 1756:12,27 1757:12

referring 1603:15 1700:23

1749:14

reflect 1530:22 1531:24 1608:22 1634:5 1635:5 1677:13 1681:3,8 1716:17 1746:8

reflected 1678:14 1681:2 1745:23

reflecting 1647:9,11

reflective 1622:2 1634:9 1636:5,22 1688:22

reflects 1635:28 1653:9 1716:25 1742:7

reform 1575:15,16 1576:21, 22 1605:3,10 1606:23 1607:7 1618:20,28 1622:16, 24

reforms 1580:6

regard 1651:2 1672:5

Register 1719:26

regressed 1711:15

regression 1572:24 1573:16 1711:9

regular 1539:23 1557:26

regularly 1557:25 1558:1

regulated 1555:19 1557:8 1635:26 1662:19

regulation 1631:18 1720:20 1755:23

regulations 1528:27 1720:14 1757:1,24,27

reiterate 1544:27

relate 1573:23

related 1552:28 1553:2,3,4,8 1612:8 1701:13 1716:8 1740:3 1752:2

relates 1563:27 1573:21 1720:21

relations 1544:9 1612:18

relationship 1561:24 1577:20 1587:27 1621:7,13 1702:5 1730:19

relationships 1701:23

relative 1559:8,11,14,17 1616:13 1617:21 1642:9 1671:14,18 1675:23 1700:12,14 1707:21 1708:7 1731:3 1745:11,17

released 1690:24

relevance 1705:8

relevant 1665:13 1682:14,18 1720:22 1736:2

reliant 1589:23

relief 1695:7

rely 1687:28 1728:3

relying 1549:24 1550:4

remain 1576:6

remained 1619:13

remaining 1557:18 1615:8 1739:17

remember 1522:20 1524:1 1560:6 1583:23 1606:7 1702:17 1714:26 1722:26

remind 1537:8 1641:4

reminded 1702:27

remotely 1529:23

removed 1579:20 1590:7 1720:25

removes 1637:21

removing 1579:8,10 1618:13 1622:26 1727:9

repeat 1654:22 1668:24 1698:6 1745:14

repeatedly 1541:5 1666:18

repeating 1696:14

rephrase 1665:12 1672:25 1682:17 1693:10 1742:24

replicates 1720:20

report 1535:21 1598:20 1618:3 1632:9 1643:1,8,14 1690:4,11,14,16 1691:2,3,5, 7,14,25 1692:18,27 1693:12 1717:27 1718:4,20,25 1719:5,13 1722:27 1749:21 1752:23

reported 1557:13 1595:12 1616:24 1617:14 1618:2,10 1619:12,18 1626:15 1632:6 1726:20,24,27 1749:16,25 1752:16

reporter 1586:23 1591:23 1600:8 1648:5 1656:3 1706:5 1715:18 1722:22 1754:4

reporting 1618:2 1726:9

reports 1567:1 1691:20 1719:5 1749:21 1750:2

represent 1526:8 1532:15



1557:5 1571:5 1583:9 1604:20 1606:9 1608:11 1619:6 1635:8 1637:27 1654:19 1723:24 1724:23 1726:16 1727:10 1736:1

representative 1700:2 1727:5,8 1742:24

represented 1562:5 1618:12,13 1619:17,19

representing 1524:3 1570:11,14 1618:15 1620:6 1684:24 1729:5

represents 1561:22 1571:23 1593:14 1618:18 1620:26 1636:9 1648:20 1693:13 1723:26 1726:4.12 1735:24

request 1576:25 1716:9 1718:8 1728:10

requests 1591:23 1759:10

required 1522:14 1523:22 1528:11,13,15,26 1529:4 1553:17 1590:20 1719:25

requirement 1521:16 1525:3 1564:23,25 1565:4,17 1633:9

requirements 1528:7 1631:7 1632:17 1633:5 1747:26

requires 1525:10 1677:22

research 1552:23 1557:20 1558:22 1564:10 1571:10 1642:17 1687:14,15 1694:18 1696:10,21 1730:14

researched 1557:4

researchers 1552:22 1557:13 1687:22 1695:4

researching 1695:8

reserve 1606:28

residual 1595:19 1608:2 1624:7

resort 1608:3,12 1624:3,13, 17,19 1628:26 1636:15,23 1637:9 1746:20,23

resources 1538:5

respect 1594:25 1596:14 1660:5 1684:2 1690:11 1693:23

respective 1666:19

respects 1654:6

respond 1520:28 1624:23

responding 1716:15

response 1555:22 1609:1 1644:9,15 1666:15

responsibilities 1612:7

responsibility 1732:2

responsible 1561:10

rest 1565:15 1570:4 1573:4 1599:2

restate 1713:3,6

restaurant 1703:25

restaurants 1560:17,21 1657:19,21 1658:4,6,11,28 1659:4,9 1672:16

restoring 1575:18

result 1548:14 1556:1,5 1557:1 1558:11 1562:24 1564:1 1572:14 1576:4 1585:2 1600:18 1615:26 1616:10 1618:14 1622:3 1644:24 1645:17,27 1646:10 1653:19,27 1654:27 1655:7, 17 1659:4 1680:4 1694:14 1704:25 1705:21 1706:14 1716:19 1722:4 1725:14

resultant 1598:3

resulted 1559:23 1598:10 1606:1

resulting 1616:21 1617:19 1680:3

results 1563:17 1566:26 1645:14 1650:10 1651:9 1655:10 1661:18 1691:17,28 1694:26 1696:17

resumed 1570:26 1591:27 1641:2

retail 1534:7 1535:2 1556:13,14,20 1557:14 1559:25 1560:2 1561:27 1562:8,9,10,12,16,25,26,28 1563:2,4,6 1564:26 1571:26 1572:1,6,8,15,18 1573:1,11, 14,19,22 1615:9 1625:8 1646:2,14,19 1647:13 1654:27 1655:11 1666:22 1667:2 1703:5 1710:21,22, 24,26,28 1711:4,6,16,26 1712:15,16,27 1713:10

retailer 1647:1,3 1667:18,27 1668:1 1710:13

retailers 1666:5 1667:11,12, 22 1668:13 1679:10,14

retained 1579:22

return 1554:8 1591:24 1736:24 returned 1584:15

returning 1585:23 1586:11

revealing 1550:9

revenue 1556:7 1564:1 1577:25,26 1578:10 1582:15 1587:12 1588:22 1616:24,25 1617:6 1621:23 1645:28 1646:10,20,21 1647:7,8,14, 15,18,19 1725:21 1744:16

revenues 1563:11,19 1567:14,28 1568:1,7 1664:9

reversed 1731:7

review 1586:19

reviewed 1553:6 1680:19,23 1689:28 1690:5,8,12 1694:24

revisions 1693:19

ridiculous 1535:7

right-hand 1602:4

rigorous 1693:19

rises 1715:13 1755:18

rising 1662:1

risk 1548:8 1577:19,22,24 1580:15 1582:12 1588:26 1612:5,10,11,17,24 1613:2, 14 1615:13,14,16 1622:6,8, 11 1627:26 1742:12,13 1753:25

road 1580:21

robust 1581:6,9 1630:3 1696:18 1697:5

Roger 1525:21 1580:28 1602:11,13 1738:18 1759:6

role 1552:20,21 1574:8 1587:7 1604:11 1612:3,18

roles 1612:21 1613:3

rolled 1659:16

room 1523:1 1539:20 1549:3 1585:26 1586:11 1673:6 1693:8 1716:23 1717:15

root 1666:13

Rosenbaum 1519:3,4,7 1520:14 1523:24 1524:9 1525:24,26 1527:8 1529:19 1530:10 1531:21 1535:10 1536:9,15,28 1537:7,15 1540:4 1541:14 1545:10 1546:25 1547:10 1549:19, 20,23 1569:2 1583:5,7,9 1585:6 1586:27 1599:6,8 1600:24,27 1601:28 1602:5, 6 1610:25 1611:8 1627:14 1628:20,22,23 1631:8,12,16 1638:15 1639:6,10,23 1641:11,14,15 1645:24 1646:3 1649:17,23,24 1654:12,22 1659:14 1665:4 1680:9,25 1698:26 1715:13, 14,19,25 1716:16 1717:2,6 1720:10,18 1721:6,9,25 1737:8,10,11 1738:15 1755:18,19 1756:19,20 1757:16,17 1758:5

rough 1645:3

roughly 1562:19,20 1572:2, 19 1575:27 1577:14 1579:26 1601:19 1629:15,18,23,24 1643:18 1645:3 1646:18 1696:22

row 1721:14

rule 1719:15

ruled 1569:11 1610:20 1716:18

rules 1546:9 1697:27 1699:8,16

ruling 1640:2

run 1575:10 1675:19 1712:12 1739:12

running 1609:24 1739:25 1747:6

Ryan 1571:4 1585:12 1684:24,26 1729:5

S

S-L-U-T-S-K-Y 1682:3

sabbatical 1552:17

sake 1595:20

sale 1597:18 1600:17 1617:6,14 1632:19 1653:20 1678:19

sales 1560:11 1563:21 1564:8,10,15 1597:19 1598:17,21,22 1618:3 1644:11,25 1645:16 1655:24 1657:24,26 1667:22 1668:3, 16,23 1669:3 1670:3,15,19, 24 1676:12 1692:23 1705:5 1714:17,20 1725:21 1747:7

Sally 1594:5

salt 1709:4

salted 1607:21

sample 1618:27 1619:9 1714:16,20 1727:5



satisfied 1757:16

satisfy 1631:19

sauces 1625:13

save 1599:2

savings 1729:12

savior 1670:26

scale 1534:19

scanner 1685:8

scenario 1754:12

scene 1702:18

schedule 1524:16 1542:9

1638:18,27

scheduled 1717:8

schedules 1522:22 1542:11,

scheduling 1527:7,19

1544:15

scheme 1671:13,17

Scholar 1689:26

school 1541:10 1551:14

1552:5

science 1694:20,21 1695:6,

14

sciences 1694:28

scientist 1674:6

scientists 1694:27 1713:7

scope 1534:20 1612:6

scrutiny 1693:17

search 1689:26

searching 1695:9

seasonally 1740:10

secondary 1733:7

Secretary 1663:13,18

section 1536:1 1549:28 1631:22 1700:24 1719:26

1720:16,26

sector 1552:20 1575:24

1725:14

securing 1595:16

seek 1604:27

seeking 1604:3 1741:28

seemingly 1618:16

segment 1669:11,16,25

segments 1705:11

Select 1571:5 1585:12 1586:21 1684:24 1729:6

sell 1565:5 1567:20 1593:9 1667:28 1740:25 1747:9 1748:23

11 10.20

sellers 1616:1 1722:10

selling 1582:6 1616:19 1620:16,20 1647:3 1739:20

sells 1564:22 1615:8

send 1607:23

senior 1612:4

sense 1528:25 1536:18 1565:6,16 1596:10 1609:9 1611:4 1639:1,3 1669:26

1701:10

sensed 1704:19

sensitive 1555:22 1558:1 1658:7 1659:1,2,4,6 1701:23

1709:1,10

sentence 1535:1,3,21 1567:11 1601:13 1603:10 1686:3 1723:7 1744:24

1745:3,16 1748:28

separate 1609:7,26 1702:25 1703:11

separately 1633:25 1750:3

separation 1615:4 1740:20

September 1531:7 1537:26 1539:13 1540:9

series 1594:17 1615:21,26 1617:10,28 1618:4,14 1621:25,27 1633:17 1635:8, 9,10 1641:20 1650:10,20

1664:13 1722:5,24 1727:9 1736:16

serve 1638:28

served 1607:4

service 1570:27 1600:12 1703:25 1718:3

services 1559:9,11,14 1700:13 1701:11,14

serving 1563:26

session 1519:1,10 1641:1

1706:27

set 1527:3 1568:4 1631:22 1635:14 1654:23 1679:5 1734:2,3 1758:14

sets 1696:18

setting 1556:2 1563:27 1629:19 1630:4,27 1638:1, 11 1665:21 1753:24

settlement 1577:21

severely 1545:8

shape 1538:8

share 1525:25 1560:7,10 1582:21 1585:22 1676:12

1702:6 1725:20 1741:3

shared 1582:22

sharing 1579:6

Shehadey 1542:2 1545:3

shelf 1667:24 1668:2

shelves 1668:14

shift 1658:17 1713:25

shifters 1703:1

shifting 1658:4,11

shifts 1617:24 1622:3

shipper 1589:8

shock 1565:13

shop 1659:18

shopping 1704:6

shops 1659:10,12

short 1569:9 1587:20 1607:18 1665:5 1706:22

shortchanged 1635:22

shorter 1548:17 1735:10

shot 1731:6

shoulder 1543:14

show 1697:13 1743:3

1757:23

showed 1584:17 1700:24

1749:3

showing 1631:17 1744:12

shown 1557:1 1559:2 1567:8 1648:3 1652:22

1694:14 1713:9

shows 1562:22 1571:21

1616:23 1646:15

shred-type 1625:6

shreds 1634:16,23

sic 1589:17 1619:28 side 1583:20.21 1584:1

1687:22 1691:16 1713:5 1721:14,15

sides 1520:20 1525:11

sigh 1695:7

significance 1694:17

significant 1560:7 1578:15 1582:15 1584:17 1599:27 1606:19 1616:19,26 1628:10

1650:7 1671:11 1711:20

significantly 1558:2 1561:4 1563:20 1566:15 1603:11 1616:7,12 1617:1 1619:25

1650:2 1660:9 1724:22

silence 1715:22

similar 1573:4 1577:1 1592:26 1606:25 1607:23 1609:15 1613:3 1676:19,21 1691:6,9,16,17,18,24,26

1696:16 1701:1 1734:6,7,9 1735:14 1746:11

similarities 1632:1 similarly 1630:25

simple 1568:8 1650:16 1709:17 1733:14 1752:13

simpler 1607:15

simply 1520:16 1558:6 1572:26 1573:16 1600:15 1636:2 1657:5 1670:17 1671:9 1703:18 1705:5

single 1520:5 1530:25 1594:20 1606:20 1617:10 1683:7 1696:12,24 1697:11

sir 1525:18 1574:21 1583:2 1592:1 1721:10,23 1753:12

sit 1544:5

1706:1

1720:13

sitting 1522:27 1713:4

situation 1522:25 1534:26 1565:1 1595:24 1598:2 1609:22 1681:3 1697:17

situations 1609:28 1730:1

six-month 1626:24

six-pound 1751:2

size 1618:27 1619:9 1668:13 1735:18 1750:21 1751:1,3

sizes 1614:21 1615:8 1750:25 1751:2

skewed 1692:11

skim 1578:20 1692:17

skimmed 1689:24

skip 1555:16 1614:8 1670:28

Index: satisfied..skip



slack 1609:10,24

sleep 1530:27

slices 1625:14

slicing 1734:1 1751:5

slightly 1588:2 1619:15 1633:5 1659:15 1686:2

slippage 1529:9

slower 1663:7

slowly 1614:13

Slutsky 1682:3

small 1576:13 1580:6 1588:19,20 1618:16 1671:17 1680:3 1703:15,16

smaller 1556:22 1563:4 1567:27 1666:18 1714:20

snack-sized 1634:16,23

social 1654:2 1694:20

society 1685:16

soda 1560:8

soft 1614:25 1694:21

sold 1592:16 1599:13 1601:8 1620:15,22 1627:18 1629:16 1677:23 1685:27 1747:6

sole 1663:22,25 1664:26 1665:19

solid 1617:27 1633:11 1677:24

solids 1691:13

solution 1532:8 1686:14 1725:17,19 1746:4

solve 1689:5

someplace 1695:22

somethings 1633:26

sooner 1548:3,7 1549:8

sort 1520:10,15 1536:22 1546:1 1547:18 1593:5,27 1607:14,28 1625:12 1675:13 1682:20 1705:22 1728:24

sound 1639:24

sounds 1569:19 1570:13 1648:21 1677:9 1678:10,11

source 1598:25 1749:19,20, 24.27

Southeast 1576:17

soy 1652:27 1653:2,5,12,15 1667:20 1673:11 1693:3,6

soybean 1670:11

space 1667:18,24

span 1557:1 1681:16

spanning 1694:13

spans 1552:15

speak 1586:13

speaker 1531:24

speaking 1531:25 1553:28 1584:2 1590:13 1605:22 1706:13 1708:2 1709:1

spec- 1714:14

special 1718:17

specially 1608:5

specialty 1552:11 1668:22 1669:2.12

specific 1537:1 1550:4 1554:10,11 1587:6 1624:15 1696:7 1697:9 1700:28 1749:26

specifically 1519:13 1526:23 1553:9 1556:22 1585:25 1629:7 1702:26

specification 1712:18

specifications 1631:19,26 1739:5,6,7,8

speculate 1566:4 1748:15

speculation 1566:9

speculative 1661:15

spell 1551:10 1611:21

spend 1568:15 1658:20 1742:28

spending 1520:22 1554:13 1561:7

spent 1519:27 1521:17 1576:11,14 1582:25 1585:14

spoke 1581:17 1587:22

sports 1560:8

spot 1592:22,26,28 1593:1 1599:19 1604:10 1623:25 1624:1 1729:15,17 1737:25 1739:20 1747:9

spread 1594:4 1598:7 1603:12 1605:26 1615:24 1616:5,23 1617:16,18,23 1619:4,11,20,24,26 1620:3 1621:17 1622:21 1626:9,22 1627:3,7 1635:20 1636:12 1697:12 1722:18,24,26,27 1727:18 1728:18,21 1731:4, 8 1734:18,23,27 1735:6,9 1743:8,9,27 1744:3,5,6,7 1745:4,6,25 1749:1 1752:3,5

spreads 1579:12

squeeze 1679:15

stable 1730:21

staff 1540:5

stage 1654:23 1679:5

stake 1544:23

stakeholders 1576:25

stance 1635:7

stand 1522:17,28 1537:24 1549:6 1570:26 1574:1 1591:27 1640:7 1641:3 1693:16 1698:3,10 1720:8

standalone 1693:13

standard 1529:27 1534:8 1572:24 1593:5 1607:21 1608:6 1632:11 1648:2,12, 14,15,19,23,24,26 1649:3,4, 12,19 1650:2,8,11,14 1651:16,19,28 1652:3,5 1680:18 1699:8 1750:28 1751:9,11,14

standardization 1578:8 1580:22 1590:16.24

standards 1633:2 1751:7

standing 1698:2

standpoint 1583:24 1590:13

stands 1697:14 1712:7

staple 1557:24

Starbucks 1659:16,19

start 1529:24 1541:9 1600:7 1603:6,8 1610:15 1629:23 1641:27 1651:5 1663:10 1684:27 1717:8 1721:28 1759:3.4

started 1519:2 1538:2 1543:10 1552:16 1560:6 1567:4 1612:23 1623:6 1626:14 1675:7 1717:4,7

starting 1552:4 1592:6,7,8 1626:22 1759:8

state 1551:9 1567:11 1573:11 1576:13 1577:25 1578:3 1611:21 1632:26 1633:2 1709:15

stated 1538:24 1547:7 1607:7 1658:3 1701:8

statement 1534:5 1538:27 1567:16 1571:7 1575:4

1589:13,20 1590:10 1591:13 1592:9 1599:10 1684:28 1686:1 1704:14 1716:8 1717:28 1734:15 1735:22

statements 1540:6 1603:7, 22 1698:1

states 1559:9 1561:19 1574:15 1599:12 1600:13 1644:25 1652:25 1653:20,28 1654:21 1694:10 1718:2

stations 1672:16

Statistic 1600:12

statistical 1571:28 1572:25 1573:6,7 1650:22 1688:2,26

statistically 1650:1,6

statisticians 1571:20

statistics 1648:16 1650:9,18 1651:2 1652:9

statute 1665:19,21 1690:16

statutory 1663:17

stay 1589:2 1590:24

stayed 1582:10

steady 1559:28 1560:10 1701:27 1705:22

step 1573:28 1720:1

stepping 1649:18

steps 1641:11

Steve 1519:7 1569:2 1583:8 1628:23 1641:15 1737:11

Stockholm 1695:19

stole 1741:21

stop 1544:7 1548:28 1580:11

stopped 1522:21 1554:3 1566:14 1643:12 1664:17 1711:21 1734:17

stopping 1566:17

store 1657:25 1658:1 1666:26 1667:6 1676:17 1685:27 1714:13,17

stores 1560:17 1657:18 1658:4,13 1672:16 1685:8 1704:6

strategies 1612:24,25

straw 1665:5 **stray** 1689:9

stream 1596:12,15



streamline 1520:12

streams 1598:10

stress 1696:15

stricken 1696:5

strictly 1706:9

strike 1584:12 1633:23 1634:28 1637:7 1641:27 1696:6

strikes 1546:1

stringent 1590:19 1747:26

strive 1556:3 1739:13

strong 1615:26 1717:23 1722:4,14 1723:3

strongly 1622:12

structure 1605:8 1661:11 1712:9

struggling 1536:12

studies 1529:26 1556:8,11, 21,24,28 1557:4,6,11,18 1559:1 1563:1,12,14 1567:8 1571:12 1643:21.22 1644:3. 15 1645:1 1652:21 1657:21, 24,28 1659:21 1668:20,26 1672:26 1675:11 1677:6 1678:15 1679:13 1680:10, 12,14,15,17 1681:2,16 1682:25 1688:11 1689:7,21, 22 1690:22 1691:22 1692:1, 8,10,14,18,23 1693:15 1694:11,13,20,25 1696:14, 18 1697:7,9,10,22,23 1699:19,20 1702:28 1703:11 1714:25

study 1557:12,14,20,22 1558:21 1567:3 1641:28 1642:2,24,27,28 1643:5,7, 25,27 1653:11,12 1657:23 1664:28 1666:21 1667:1,4 1675:9 1677:12,17,22 1680:19 1681:5,6,8,16,17 1682:19 1685:1,4,21,22 1687:26 1690:24 1691:20,28 1692:2,19 1693:2,21 1694:23 1695:15,17 1696:24 1697:5,13,25 1714:10,12 1719:27

studying 1566:12

stuff 1521:11 1524:24 1531:13

stunningly 1695:17

style 1614:25

styles 1620:18

subject 1693:17 1696:22

1716:14

submit 1568:12 1628:18

submitted 1523:6 1528:8,9 1584:9 1617:28 1653:11 1718:5 1719:6

subset 1685:9 1714:12

substance 1757:3

substantial 1579:16 1590:3 1609:10 1634:9 1733:5

substantially 1563:9 1567:12

substantive 1532:23 1534:1

substitute 1558:23,28 1598:5 1602:17 1701:23,28 1703:6

substituted 1721:1

substitutes 1558:16 1563:16 1566:19 1597:26 1598:1 1602:19,20 1672:7 1683:12 1684:9,10 1702:12 1731:16

substituting 1721:4

substitution 1682:9,11 1683:10,24 1685:9

subtle 1695:9

subtract 1722:15 1739:15

subtracted 1743:28

successful 1669:11 1687:24 1702:17

successfully 1707:23

sufficient 1520:22 1595:7 1596:4 1597:17 1679:20.27

suggest 1563:17 1639:14 1685:20 1721:7 1728:2,15 1734:26 1747:21 1754:8 1758:22

suggested 1644:23

suggesting 1536:25,28

suggestion 1533:18 1736:28

suggestions 1546:3,4

suitable 1596:27

Suite 1611:26

suited 1596:3

sum 1572:12 1712:11

summarization 1752:2

summarize 1685:17 1708:12 1741:23.25

summarized 1664:27

summary 1563:12

summer 1576:16

super 1689:24

superseded 1721:7

supply 1564:3 1565:8 1598:2 1612:4 1626:26 1635:5 1636:5 1679:20,23,

support 1554:28 1576:20 1581:3,4,10,21 1590:19 1636:2 1696:23 1719:23 1724:9 1730:3 1731:1

supported 1575:16 1577:3

supporting 1575:19 1576:18 1583:28 1724:13,15,17

supports 1719:26

suppose 1547:8 1688:19 1717:4,17 1732:24 1734:11 1754:1,12 1757:24

surely 1637:24

surprise 1524:8 1533:14 1653:1 1679:7,11 1747:28

surprised 1748:7

surrebuttal 1532:27

survey 1595:2 1600:20 1604:4,26,28 1606:8,14 1607:8 1617:28 1618:10,26 1629:24,26,28 1630:3,22,26 1631:3,7,20 1694:17 1696:20 1697:3,22,25 1699:19 1724:4 1729:23 1732:18 1745:20 1747:16, 22,23 1748:20 1751:7

surveyed 1629:19 1747:17, 27

surveys 1530:12 1616:1 1687:15 1696:21 1708:23 1722:10

suspend 1640:5

sustainably 1575:19

swap 1729:12,16

swear 1574:3

swing 1619:6

Swiss 1593:27

switch 1578:10 1579:11 1677:7.12 1678:7 1708:16

switched 1578:4

switching 1560:12 1566:18

1677:10

sworn 1551:4 1574:6 1611:16

symmetry 1580:18

symptom 1725:18

synonymous 1676:15

synthetic 1619:3,7 1635:17

Syracuse 1720:2

system 1543:23 1575:18 1579:10 1580:4,23 1582:14 1618:2 1654:6 1662:28 1663:1,15 1666:1 1712:20 1724:8 1745:22

systems 1683:5

Т

t-statistic 1534:9

table 1556:11 1557:3 1571:11,13,16 1616:23 1619:17 1620:25 1626:5,6 1685:6 1689:8,23 1692:20 1702:28 1711:8 1713:5 1726:8,18,22 1727:1,17,20 1734:15 1744:12 1749:5,15, 17,20 1750:9 1752:2

takes 1572:6 1582:16 1690:19 1712:26 1730:4 1743:19

taking 1577:8 1635:7 1637:20 1733:22

talk 1521:26 1523:1 1530:3 1531:16 1533:14 1537:9 1544:4,6 1552:13 1565:26 1575:22 1582:2 1585:19 1603:23 1605:18 1622:19 1623:16 1631:6 1648:23 1652:9 1685:25 1687:25 1698:19 1707:14,15,18,21 1710:5 1739:18,20 1745:10, 15 1749:7,9 1750:13

talked 1533:16 1543:10 1555:17 1568:13 1581:26 1582:11 1586:1 1622:24 1678:28 1679:17 1704:10 1713:8 1714:10 1741:24 1750:19

talking 1529:24 1535:8,12 1538:20 1565:19 1585:14 1589:14 1622:26 1623:14 1627:10 1645:13 1647:14,15 1648:23 1649:7,10 1652:1, 11 1662:25,27 1670:2,3 1671:21 1685:26 1704:3 1739:19,21 1746:26 1750:9



talks 1521:4 1708:10

target 1597:5

task 1595:15 1597:3 1604:3, 6 1606:16

taste 1667:15

taught 1568:2

Taylor 1549:11,14 1588:12, 14 1591:10 1603:1,3 1608:26 1609:6 1610:17,18 1707:3,4,5,7 1715:4 1741:17 1751:22 1753:14,22 1758:28 1759:3

Taylor's 1522:6 1543:14 1609:2

teaches 1528:5

teaching 1540:23

team 1610:28 1612:11 1687:22 1695:3,8 1732:5

teams 1613:1

tease 1540:19 1546:15

technical 1598:4

technically 1555:26 1558:20 1571:23 1690:18

technique 1712:8

techniques 1696:17

teens 1659:26 1661:22

telephone 1695:18

telling 1544:7 1547:18

tells 1650:11 1671:6 1674:6 1713:21

tempted 1649:18

ten 1530:24 1554:3 1566:17 1591:23 1619:14 1654:20 1681:18,21 1685:12 1722:26 1737:5,6 1741:4 1758:11,14

tend 1609:14,25 1630:14 1684:3 1685:7 1703:12 1715:2

tendency 1688:17

term 1596:17 1598:4 1608:2 1637:11 1653:21 1676:8,14 1707:21 1712:3

terms 1538:21 1546:11 1559:7 1573:18 1582:1 1599:20 1600:15 1604:13 1605:25 1632:5 1633:8,23 1645:16 1647:6 1658:12 1688:26 1697:1 1700:11 1704:13 1712:27 1720:16 1726:19 1737:15,22 1749:13 terrible 1576:27

test 1649:20 1696:15

testified 1532:25,28 1533:10,16 1542:6 1551:5 1574:7 1594:5 1595:1,26 1611:17 1659:23 1662:23 1735:23

testify 1520:6 1521:16 1522:4 1523:19 1526:23 1532:22 1533:9,12 1535:20 1536:4,14 1541:7,8 1545:14 1549:25 1551:25 1554:25 1583:10 1588:17 1604:8 1614:8 1622:16 1707:10 1759:9

testifying 1520:7 1521:18 1569:6,8,10 1697:18 1709:22 1759:7

testimonies 1520:3 1523:5,7 1528:8 1535:23

testimony 1519:19 1520:1 1521:9 1522:19 1523:3,4,8, 17 1525:6 1528:12 1531:1 1532:24 1533:6,7,19 1534:27 1535:28 1538:23,25 1540:1 1544:18 1546:10,14 1550:1,27 1551:28 1554:28 1555:13,18 1556:19 1557:3, 11 1562:4,14 1564:17,21 1567:10 1574:24 1581:2,26 1583:11 1594:8 1595:4 1596:6 1598:24 1599:11 1600:21 1601:3,14 1603:7, 22 1613:19 1614:6 1622:18, 19 1626:4 1627:13,21 1628:25 1629:15 1641:17,18 1658:10 1660:5 1662:9 1663:28 1664:12 1671:3,15 1672:1 1675:18 1679:8,22 1681:15 1689:16 1700:22 1707:15 1708:10,23 1710:2 1712:14 1719:22,23,24 1721:28 1741:24,27 1742:10 1743:2 1750:16 1756:10 1758:12

testing 1687:2

Texas 1567:5 1690:22 1693:21

text 1571:6

the-higher 1586:26

thin 1595:24

thing 1533:1 1534:12 1536:1,22 1539:11 1544:8 1554:7 1566:4 1567:23 1577:24 1601:14,18 1639:2, 14 1649:10 1650:21 1652:7 1658:9 1664:25 1688:14 1693:20 1697:2 1705:24 1712:13 1722:17,19 1733:18 1758:17

things 1520:12 1523:25 1532:23 1535:27 1537:11 1581:22 1593:27 1625:14,22 1633:17 1638:20 1659:8 1671:13 1686:9 1689:27 1691:14 1698:9 1719:21 1751:6 1752:14 1755:26

thinking 1610:14 1639:24 1674:25

thinks 1654:5

thinness 1595:6,10

thought 1535:22 1610:27 1639:27 1643:8,12 1658:10 1664:16 1687:22 1696:2 1697:23 1745:26 1748:6 1756:9

thoughts 1532:7,13 1696:2

three-and-a-half-cent 1730:18

threshold 1566:16

throw 1577:28 1689:2

Thursday 1519:1 1564:20 1641:1

tight 1528:1 1619:24 1635:19 1731:6

tightness 1740:17

time 1519:20 1520:2,13 1523:14.15 1524:23 1525:2 1527:13 1529:8,18,19,20 1531:4 1532:3,8 1533:14,21 1536:7 1538:2,6,24 1540:24 1542:10.12.15.16.18 1543:2 1545:6,9 1546:16 1547:6 1548:16 1549:18 1550:8,20 1552:19,24 1558:24,28 1559:15,24 1560:1,5 1561:8 1562:27 1566:12 1567:7 1568:16 1569:10 1570:20 1571:19 1572:6,9 1575:26 1576:4 1579:10 1585:14 1587:20 1591:7 1598:19,24 1605:3,9 1609:7 1617:24 1621:14 1623:2,3,5,6 1626:21,26 1628:19,27 1635:25 1636:1.14.25 1637:6 1638:21 1642:4,5 1654:12 1658:16,20,21 1660:8 1661:14 1663:3 1675:3 1681:1,4 1686:17,23 1687:5,7 1690:20 1701:16 1711:23 1712:12 1714:5,9 1715:20 1716:21 1717:3,8, 15 1720:4 1722:12 1731:7 1734:25 1735:8,10,11 1738:1 1739:14,15,17

1742:28 1743:28 1750:19 1757:13 1758:1,13 1759:8

timeframe 1554:2

times 1567:28 1572:1 1637:8,14 1647:7 1671:25 1738:7 1740:7 1744:9 1746:23 1747:4,11

timing 1638:25

title 1551:12

today 1519:17,25 1520:6,7 1521:10,19,23 1522:8 1523:8 1524:25 1525:7 1526:23 1531:27 1534:22 1537:24 1539:12 1540:7,10 1541:6,7 1544:25 1546:7,23 1548:20 1564:20 1572:7 1583:10,28 1588:17 1614:8 1622:8 1624:6 1637:27 1638:7 1652:25 1663:10 1666:2 1681:1 1707:10 1716:28 1717:12,20 1722:27 1724:27 1725:2,9 1746:8

told 1519:20,23 1522:10 1532:21 1533:11 1541:20,22 1543:9 1653:5

tomorrow 1521:21 1522:7 1526:24 1528:2 1529:16 1536:11 1543:15 1638:20 1712:16 1758:15 1759:2,3,5,

tonight 1524:17

tool 1582:16

tools 1622:9 1742:12

top 1602:4 1614:26 1639:18 1705:21,22 1707:14 1735:23 1745:18 1749:7

topic 1535:25 1598:15 1622:16 1725:26 1731:11 1733:13 1736:24

topics 1725:27

total 1564:7 1595:12 1616:13 1618:6,11,12,18 1620:5,7,8,10 1621:4,24 1629:28 1636:9 1645:18 1670:3 1705:5 1712:12 1726:5 1727:13 1729:27 1735:27 1736:5 1743:26 1744:24 1749:7,10 1750:11

totally 1565:20

touched 1606:6 1710:3

Index: talks..town

tough 1527:24

touting 1673:25

town 1582:5



track 1587:9 1598:16

tracked 1598:18

trade 1592:26

trade-off 1595:21 1604:26,

28

traded 1630:11,22,27 1631:4

trades 1729:11

Tradition 1721:13

traditional 1668:22 1669:2

traditionally 1698:27

transactions 1599:19

transcript 1571:4

transfers 1615:12

translate 1562:7 1573:13,17 1646:18

translated 1603:17 1667:7 1723:18

translates 1675:17 1724:24 1744:7 1745:4,6

transmission 1562:8 1571:24,27 1572:16 1603:16 1655:13,14 1705:15,18 1710:6

Transmissions 1534:7

transmit 1713:23

transmitted 1571:26

transparency 1578:8 1579:27 1580:21

travel 1552:2

treated 1594:19 1667:9

tremendous 1560:10

tremendously 1536:21

trend 1560:11,15 1561:2 1567:6 1671:14 1672:13 1703:23 1711:27,28 1712:3 1731:7

trending 1564:8

trends 1564:11

trigger 1589:4

trouble 1527:27 1543:25 1663:7

true 1520:1 1522:9 1566:3, 10 1644:2 1647:22 1657:27 1660:21,23 1674:3,9,13 1683:4,6 1696:25 1725:12 1740:8

trust 1580:22 1610:22

truth 1674:25 1718:22 1756:26

Tuesday 1542:3 1564:20

turn 1641:16 1655:10 1680:7 1706:28 1711:8 1727:17

turned 1528:7

TV 1673:16,19,21

Twin 1552:9

two-hour 1610:28 1638:21 1639:3 1640:1,6 1716:21

two-thirds 1615:6

type 1554:5 1560:24 1607:16 1615:2 1625:6 1751:3

types 1592:21 1596:7 1613:3 1625:8,11 1628:10 1658:1 1731:27 1732:3 1745:28 1749:26

typical 1699:24 1703:3 1737:17

typically 1566:24 1592:22 1620:20 1629:11 1634:14 1635:2 1677:1,7 1740:26

typo 1711:2

U

U.S. 1561:21 1592:16 1598:17 1601:8 1618:11,15, 19 1620:5,8,15,22,27 1621:4,24 1627:18 1726:5 1735:24,27 1749:7

uh-huh 1549:22 1586:17 1599:14 1614:12 1632:24 1636:17 1638:10 1648:4 1655:28 1656:3 1668:8 1683:11 1726:14 1729:24 1737:7 1743:16 1744:15,22 1747:1 1750:15 1753:20 1754:3.24

ultimately 1577:15 1711:25

unanimous 1586:15,16

unbleached 1596:23

uncertainty 1617:23 1622:1 1730:6

uncolored 1596:16 1597:14

uncompensated 1682:23,24

under- 1744:25

undercut 1534:17

undergraduate 1552:7

underlie 1606:4

underlying 1563:25 1600:10,18

underneath 1651:23

underpaid 1584:26 1606:2

understand 1521:7,15 1525:1,2,6,7 1526:4 1528:22 1531:13 1536:27 1540:7 1544:17,22 1547:25 1548:18,22 1550:15 1551:24 1564:4 1567:16 1586:27 1624:26 1627:25 1641:9 1665:3,7,11,27 1668:4 1669:18 1670:5 1678:28 1679:18 1682:16 1686:9 1688:10 1690:21 1691:13

understanding 1547:14 1581:20 1583:19 1593:12 1596:24 1598:20 1648:11 1650:9 1651:21 1705:25

1718:11 1719:1

1734:16 1744:27

understates 1616:25

understood 1548:25 1665:24 1667:16 1705:20 1718:13

undertake 1670:17

undervalued 1616:11

underwent 1693:18

undifferentiated 1607:26,28

unexpected 1539:27

unfair 1519:28 1520:6 1699:3 1723:20

unfortunate 1534:25

unhealthy 1725:14

uniform 1579:18,23 1590:5 1657:9 1664:22

unimportance 1559:25

unimportant 1559:6 1671:7, 13 1700:10

unintended 1534:25

unique 1530:26

unit 1669:10

United 1559:9 1561:19 1599:12 1600:13 1644:25 1652:25 1653:20,28 1654:21 1718:2

University 1551:15,20 1552:6,9,16,18 1613:6,7,9 1709:20 **unsalted** 1595:14 1604:5 1630:26

unusual 1728:5

upcoming 1607:1

updated 1720:23 1721:1

upend 1695:13

Upper 1596:25

upwards 1688:16

urgent 1575:16

URL 1719:7,12,19

USA 1612:2

USDA 1519:10 1520:18 1532:14 1545:27 1547:8 1553:21 1575:13 1580:20 1585:22 1598:19 1600:11 1606:24 1608:19 1618:20,28 1622:15 1632:26 1633:2 1636:20 1639:4,8 1653:12 1665:8,14 1675:10 1690:20 1693:17 1718:12 1721:13 1722:14 1728:9 1749:16,25 1759:9

USDA's 1722:19

usefulness 1685:21

users 1604:10

usual 1641:10

utilized 1557:8 1630:7

٧

validating 1563:22

validity 1719:26

valuable 1732:12

value-added 1732:16

valued 1669:7

values 1579:19,25 1590:6

variability 1731:9

variable 1534:8 1567:3 1617:17,19 1651:14,24 1710:21,22,26 1711:11,14, 28 1712:4 1735:7

variables 1703:4 1711:11 1712:4

variation 1572:27 1581:26 1582:1

varieties 1560:20 1593:25

Index: track..vast

variety 1600:14

vast 1628:5 1746:17



vastly 1582:8

vegan 1558:8

vegans 1558:5

verify 1644:2

versed 1709:27

version 1720:23

versus 1582:1 1623:7,9 1624:21,22 1626:2 1658:12, 20 1665:15,16 1667:19 1704:21 1712:10 1731:28 1735:19

vested 1545:4

viable 1725:4

vice 1612:4

view 1525:5 1538:3 1550:13 1569:7 1634:19 1680:3,16 1723:3 1732:24 1733:1 1742:22

views 1545:24 1717:23

virgin 1596:17 1597:4 1598:9

virtually 1759:8

Vitaliano 1523:13 1550:24 1591:27 1592:4 1599:9 1623:14 1627:21 1694:2,3,6 1695:11,23 1696:8 1697:20 1698:22 1699:4,21 1700:6,8, 16,20 1706:6,17 1746:11

Vitaliano's 1569:23 1627:15, 20

volatile 1577:22 1594:14,24, 25 1603:11 1605:25 1619:10 1621:6,18

volatility 1594:4,6,12,16,18, 21 1598:6 1603:15 1605:20, 23 1617:20 1623:12 1627:8, 10

volume 1563:21 1567:20 1579:6 1595:20,23 1598:16 1603:25 1604:4,14,18,23,24, 25,26,27 1614:24 1616:13, 24,27,28 1618:10,25 1619:18 1621:24 1668:2 1675:19 1726:19,28 1736:5 1743:22,24,26 1744:10,20, 25 1755:9 1757:27

volume-weighted 1618:7

volumes 1595:12,16 1619:13,14 1629:26 1726:20 1747:15

W

W-A-R-R-E-N 1551:19

wait 1547:3 1643:6 1653:11 1658:8 1664:7 1695:27

waiting 1532:2,9

waive 1538:3

waiving 1547:13,27 1548:21 1610:26

walk 1571:20 1743:2

walked 1743:2

Walmart 1714:18,19

wandering 1524:26

wanted 1542:6 1545:12 1554:7 1584:25 1601:2 1603:6,21 1639:22 1641:9 1679:4,5 1684:27 1686:8,10 1687:18 1692:13 1693:10 1707:14,17 1711:8,22,23 1714:3 1734:11 1750:13 1752:8

wanting 1541:2

warehousing 1612:9

warning 1520:12

Warren 1551:19,20

waste 1598:24

water 1558:24,25,27 1560:8 1668:17 1673:7 1702:17

ways 1537:14 1595:13 1604:3 1648:22 1682:21,23 1717:11,12 1753:15

weak 1684:9

weakened 1697:8 1699:23

website 1523:4,8 1546:12 1719:5

week 1522:11,13 1523:4,5 1528:12,18 1535:8,23 1541:21,23 1544:26 1663:11 1679:8 1709:22

week's 1752:14

weekends 1524:15

weekly 1578:28 1615:28 1618:2 1722:9 1752:19

weeks 1529:14 1536:13 1539:26 1544:18 1578:22 1627:7 1663:12

Wegman's 1676:16

weighing 1730:26

weight 1606:13 1757:14

weighted 1578:21 1605:5 1632:10 1692:20 1753:2

Western 1576:16

whatever's 1726:13

whey 1596:7,12,15,17,20,23, 24,26 1597:4,6,8,9,14 1598:9,10 1635:10 1726:27 1731:27 1732:3,7,8,9,11,16, 18,24 1733:4 1736:25,28

whichever 1720:2

white 1597:4,6 1732:11 1736:28

wholesale 1571:26 1573:22 1607:9,10,12 1608:11

wide 1625:18 1635:20 1734:20,23 1735:8

widely 1621:13 1695:5 1742:23

widened 1621:17

wider 1603:11

wife 1575:10

wilderness 1524:26

Wilson 1751:22,26 1753:7

winners 1577:11

Wisconsin 1552:6 1574:12, 14 1575:9,11,20,23,25,27 1576:12,17,20 1578:2 1580:15 1581:8,13 1582:23 1583:24 1589:21,22 1611:27 1614:17,19 1615:4,5 1632:26 1633:1 1709:21

Wisconsin's 1575:22 1580:9

witness's 1717:28

witnesses 1519:11,22
1520:24 1522:16,19,21
1525:26 1526:12,16,18
1527:19 1530:3,4,11
1533:12,15,17,22 1535:11
1537:9 1539:22 1540:1
1541:26,27,28 1542:10,14
1543:16,18,27 1545:8
1549:6 1550:9,18 1592:23
1593:19,23 1596:2,5
1598:27 1599:3 1602:24
1608:13,17 1759:5,7

wobble 1695:9

won 1695:19

Wonderful 1741:10

wondering 1567:15 1589:19 1603:26 1622:28 1638:20

1708:22 1749:11 1756:13

word 1544:10 1653:22 1674:17

words 1556:24 1557:16 1558:27 1559:3 1686:9 1703:13 1723:13 1736:9

work 1527:23 1528:28 1529:2 1537:11 1540:6 1569:24 1570:21 1638:26 1642:8 1643:3 1644:14 1645:2 1664:22 1687:5,21 1716:22

worked 1530:25 1553:20 1612:19 1635:16,18 1661:13 1675:3 1705:17

working 1524:14 1527:23 1580:20 1612:11 1613:1 1675:7

workplaces 1704:1

works 1520:19 1530:19 1531:19 1580:4

world 1520:18 1737:14 1738:2

worried 1638:22 1639:13 1645:20

worry 1521:22 1639:11 1698:12 1711:13

worse 1662:18

worth 1687:3

worthwhile 1758:14

worthy 1680:20

WPC80 1732:10,16

WPI 1732:13

wrapped 1633:10

write 1592:15 1663:8 1721:7

writer 1717:16

writing 1562:4 1643:11

written 1564:17 1574:23 1592:9 1641:17 1686:3 1698:1 1718:22

wrong 1531:24 1632:17 1647:10 1648:12 1653:1 1720:16

wrote 1592:10 1686:2

Υ

Index: vastly..year

Yang 1681:17

year 1541:10 1552:18 1553:17 1561:6 1588:22



1626:19,25 1691:23 1695:20 1702:18 1706:4,12 1719:3 1728:5,6,19 1734:24 1735:3

yearly 1734:16 1752:11

years 1539:9 1546:12 1552:16 1553:14,19 1554:1, 3,4,17 1557:1 1561:21 1564:9 1565:25 1566:12,13, 17,26 1576:9 1580:3 1581:9 1605:10,28 1609:23 1612:15,20 1615:17 1616:20 1619:14,16 1621:9 1636:24 1642:23 1643:18 1661:26 1672:5 1673:22 1681:16,19, 21 1687:7 1693:1 1694:13 1695:3 1700:25 1706:8 1722:26 1724:21 1728:20 1731:2 1737:5,6 1740:6 1741:5,8 1742:17 1747:16 1748:2,12

yellow 1618:5

yesterday 1519:12,15,26 1525:23 1532:25,28 1533:4, 11,17 1535:20 1543:10 1544:27 1550:4 1564:20 1568:2 1594:5 1595:26 1606:6 1622:23

yields 1608:19,22

York 1551:20 1573:10 1687:6

young 1561:14,16 1566:6,25 1659:24 1660:6 1661:1,19 1704:16 1708:20,21

younger 1566:17 1642:21

youngest 1561:23

youth 1659:23 1660:14 1680:26

youthful 1704:25

Ζ

zero-point 1692:2

zip 1551:21

