

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
September 18, 2023

---000---

Reported by:

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

1	APPEARANCES:
2	FOR THE USDA ORDER FORMULATION AND ENFORCEMENT DIVISION, USDA-AMS DAIRY PROGRAM:
4	Erin Taylor Todd Wilson Brian Hill
5 6	FOR THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION:
7	Roger Cryan
8	FOR THE INTERNATIONAL DAIRY FOODS ASSOCIATION:
9	Steve Rosenbaum
10	FOR THE MILK INNOVATION GROUP:
11	Ashley Vulin Charles "Chip" English
12	FOR THE NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION:
13	Nicole Hancock Brad Prowant
14	FOR SELECT MILK PRODUCERS, INC.:
15	Ryan Miltner
16	Ryan Milither
17	
18	
19	000
20	
21	(Please note: Appearances for all parties are subject to
22	change daily, and may not be reported or listed on
23	subsequent days' transcripts.)
24	
25	000
26	
27	
28	



TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS September 18, 2023 NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING

1	MASTER INDEX	
2	SESSIONS	
3	MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2023	PAGE
4	MORNING SESSION AFTERNOON SESSION	4221 4369
5	III IBINOON BEBBION	1305
6	000	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19 20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		



1	M A S T E R I N D E X	
2	WITNESSES IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDE	ER
3	WITNESSES:	PAGE
4	Mike Brown:	
5	Direct Examination by Mr. Rosenbaum Cross-Examination by Mr. Miltner	4221 4259
6	Cross-Examination by Ms. Hancock Cross-examination by Ms. Taylor	4300 4327
7	Chris Allen:	
8	Direct Examination by Mr. Miltner	4337
9	Cross-Examination by Mr. English Cross-Examination by Ms. Hancock	4359 4369
10	Cross-Examination by Ms. Taylor Redirect Examination by Mr. Miltner	4376 4384
11	-	
12	Harmoni Campbell:	
13	Direct Examination by Mr. Miltner Cross-Examination by Mr. English	4387 4401 4405
14	Cross-Examination by Mr. Wilson Cross-Examination by Ms. Taylor	4405
15	Cross-Examination by Mr. Wilson Redirect Examination by Mr. Miltner	4407 4408
16	Cheslie Stehouwer:	
17	Direct Examination by Mr. Miltner Cross-Examination by Mr. English	4410 4425
18	Cross-Examination by Ms. Taylor	4429
19	Cross-Examination by Mr. Wilson Redirect Examination by Mr. Miltner	4431 4432
20	Chris Allen:	
21	Direct Examination by Mr. Miltner Cross-Examination by Mr. English	4433
22	Cross-Examination by Ms. Taylor	4444 4446
23	Redirect Examination by Mr. Miltner	4449
24	Chris Allen:	
25	Direct Examination by Mr. Miltner Cross-Examination by Mr. English	4451 4461
26	Cross-Examination by Ms. Taylor	4464
27	Mike Brown:	
28	Redirect Examination by Mr. Rosenbaum	4468



TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS September 18, 2023 NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING

		TRAD MIDK MAKKETII		1 01010111 1111111111	
1	MASTER INDEX				
2	INDEX OF EXHIBITS				
3	IN CHRONO:	LOGICAL ORDER:			
4	NO.	DESCRIPTION		I.D.	EVD.
5	214	Testimony of M	ike Brown	4221	4337
6	215	IDFA-42		4222	4337
7	216	Testimony of C	hris Allen	4339	4386
8	179	E-Mail			4386
9	217	Testimony of Harmoni Campbe	11	4388	4409
10	218	Testimony of Cheslie Stehou	wer	4411	4433
12	219	Testimony of C	hris Allen	4434	4451
13	220	Testimony of C	hris Allen	4452	4467
14	221	Corrected page Exhibit 215	12 of	4469	4474
15			000		
16			000		
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					



1	MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2023 MORNING SESSION
2	THE COURT: Let's go on the record.
3	Good morning, again on the record. What do we
4	have up first?
5	MR. ROSENBAUM: Steve Rosenbaum for the
6	International Dairy Foods Association, your Honor. We are
7	recalling Mike Brown to testify about Make Allowances.
8	THE COURT: Welcome back, Mr. Brown.
9	MIKE BROWN,
10	Being first duly sworn, was examined and
11	testified as follows:
12	THE COURT: Your witness.
13	DIRECT EXAMINATION
14	BY MR. ROSENBAUM:
15	Q. Good morning, Mr. Brown. I have placed before you
16	two documents. The first one is called IDFA Exhibit 6.
17	Is this your written testimony regarding
18	Make Allowance Proposals 7, 8, and 9?
19	A. Yes, it is.
20	MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, I would ask that this
21	be marked with the next Hearing Exhibit number.
22	THE COURT: I don't quite have my list up. Is it
23	200? 214?
24	This will be IDFA Exhibit 6 is marked 214 for
25	identification.
26	(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 214 was marked
27	for identification.)
28	BY MR. ROSENBAUM:



1	Q. And have you also, Mr. Brown, prepared a
2	PowerPoint presentation which you are going to use to
3	present your testimony in a more summary fashion?
4	A. Yes, I am.
5	Q. And is that the document that's been marked as
6	updated IDFA Exhibit 42?
7	A. Yes.
8	MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, I ask that that be
9	marked as Hearing Exhibit 215.
10	THE COURT: So marked.
11	(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 215 was marked
12	for identification.)
13	BY MR. ROSENBAUM:
14	Q. Mr. Brown, why don't we go to page 2 of your
15	PowerPoint presentation, and please describe to us what
16	you are showing here.
17	A. Okay. How Make Allowances work. Make Allowances
18	are used to determine a minimum milk price obligation to
19	farmers. 100% of the price at which referenced
20	commodities are sold minus the Make Allowances at minimum
21	milk price.
22	To quote USDA from 2008, "The ability of a
23	manufacturer to offset cost increases is limited by the
24	level of Make Allowances in the Class III and Class IV
25	price formulas. Manufacturing processors are charged the
26	FMMO price for producer milk used to produce Class III and
27	Class IV products. However, plant manufacturing cost



increases may not be recovered because Class III and

Class IV product price formulas use Make Allowances that are fixed, regardless of marketing conditions, and change only by regulatory action."

- Q. And is that why we're here today seeking regulatory action to change the Make Allowances to reflect plant manufacturing cost increases?
 - A. Yes, it is.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. Okay. If we turn to the next page, please, page 3.
- A. According to USDA past records, it said, plant costs, not farmer costs, determine Make Allowance levels. "Opponents of increasing Make Allowances argue a number of points, that they are already set at too high a level, that dairy farmer production costs have also increased significantly due to higher energy and feed costs, that processors should look beyond asking dairy farmers to receive less for their milk by charging more for manufactured products, and that Make Allowance increases should be made only when all dairy farmer production costs are captured in their milk pay price."

These are not valid arguments for opposing how

Make Allowances should be determined or what levels

Make Allowances need to be in the Class III and Class IV

product pricing formulas.

"When dairy farmer production costs exceed the value for which products are sold in the marketplace, no source of revenue from the marketplace is available to cover those costs." Again, quotes from 2008



Make Allowance decision.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. Okay. Take us to page 4, please.
- A. Again, from that decision: "In the aggregate, the costs of producing milk are reflected in the supply and demand conditions for the dairy products. When the supply of milk is insufficient to meet the demand for Class III and Class IV products, prices for those products increase as do regulated minimum milk prices paid to dairy farmers, because the milk is more valuable, and this greater milk value is captured in the pricing formulas.

"It is reasonable to conclude that the Make Allowances used in the Class III and Class IV product price formulas should be updated to reflect changes in the costs manufacturers incur in producing cheese, butter, dry whey and nonfat dry milk. It is necessary to reflect changes in manufacturing costs, so that with the prevailing market prices for manufactured products, minimum Federal Order classified prices can be set."

- Q. Okay. If you turn to the next page, is there another document where USDA set forth its position regarding how properly to set Make Allowances?
- A. Yes. After that 2008 decision that the Department was sued on the cost of production issue, and they were successful in defending that attack.

This is a quote: "It is, therefore, neither inappropriate or surprising that while USDA considers producer costs in fixing prices, it declined to modify the Make Allowances to account for those costs. The



Make Allowance is the input in the product-pricing formula that accounts the costs manufacturers incur when transforming raw milk into other dairy products.

"In order to extrapolate the value that raw milk contributes to the commodity prices of dairy products, and thereby approximate raw milk's true value in the marketplace, these manufacturer costs must be included as part of the formula.

"The cost of producing milk, in contrast, are in

the aggregate reflected in the supply and demand conditions, that affect the NASS commodity prices of dairy products. See Federal Reg. 73 at 35.234 (sic). Plaintiffs' -- plaintiffs' insistence that the Make Allowance -- rather than the product -- the formula as a whole -- reflect producer costs misapprehends the underlying price mechanisms."

- Q. And then if we turn to the next page, still focusing on this fight that broke out regarding the last update of Make Allowances, could you tell us what the ultimate resolution was?
- A. "In sum, the Secretary considered the cost of producing milk to producers, but reasoned that those costs could be recouped through the market mechanisms. The Make Allowances, by contrast, represent the cost of handlers and are the only mechanism through which manufacturers' costs can be recouped under the pricing formulas.

"The Secretary concluded it was necessary to



2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. And you're quoting from the decision that affirmed USDA's 2008 Make Allowances; is that correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. Okay. And turn to page 7, please, and tell us about some additional guidance on -- that you think is relevant.
 - A. Okay. I certainly can. This goes back to '99.

USDA has also emphasized the need for those allowances that result in minimum milk prices that clear markets. And the quote is: "The importance of using minimum prices that are market-clearing for milk used to make cheese and butter, nonfat dry milk cannot be overstated. The prices for milk used in these products must reflect supply and demand and must not exceed a level that would require handlers to pay more for milk than needed to clear the market and make a profit."

Q. Okay. Let's turn to page 8, and now switch, if you will, from the philosophy of how to set

Make Allowances to the question of how one determines what the cost of manufacturer actually is. Obviously, we have already heard from Dr. Stephenson and Dr. Schiek regarding



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

the survey information, and then for Dr. Schiek the econometric study that he then performed.

Tell us what the history has been on these subjects.

- A. Since Order Reform, that's always been the case. The quote from the decision in April of '99: "The Make Allowances contained in the proposed rule were developed primarily from Make Allowance studies conducted at and published by Cornell University and an analysis of manufacturing plant size in relationship to the data contained in the Cornell studies. Audited cost of production data published by the California Department of Food and Agriculture was also used in determining a reasonable level of Make Allowances."
- Q. Now, are you aware that Dr. Stephenson was at Cornell when he performed some of his Make Allowance analyses, or I should say cost of manufacture analyses?
 - A. Yes, I was.
- Q. Okay. And does the IDFA proposal now -- that is now pending before USDA, does it depend upon a combination of study by Dr. Stephenson as well as information from the California Department of Food and Agriculture?
 - A. Yes, it does.
 - Q. Okay. If we turn to the next page, please.
- A. December 7th, 2000 decision, increasing

 Make Allowances: "Manufacturing costs used to determine

 appropriate Make Allowances for cheddar cheese, butter and

 nonfat dry milk in this proceeding are calculated



2.

2.0

2.1

1	primarily from a weighted average of the RBCS" which is
2	the Rural Business Cooperative Service "and CDFA"
3	California Department of Food and Agriculture "surveys,
4	with a check against the NCI, National Cheese Institute,
5	survey cost of manufacturing cheddar cheese. The cost of
5	manufacturing nonfat dry milk continues to be used as the
7	cost of making whey powder due to the nature of the
8	information in the hearing record about the actual cost of
9	drying whey."

- Q. So in this December 7, 2000, decision, was USDA continuing to rely upon survey data to determine a cost of manufacture?
 - A. Yes, they were.
- Q. And at that particular juncture, I think there was not an updated Cornell study, so they relied here on the Rural Business Cooperative Service study; is that correct?
 - A. To the best of my memory, yes.
- Q. That was not an audited or mandatory study; is that correct?
- 20 A. No, it was not.
 - Q. And the National Cheese Institute survey, to which reference is made, that also was not an audited or mandatory survey, correct?
 - A. That is correct.
 - Q. All right. If we turn to the next page, please, we're going forward chronologically. We're now up to the decisions in 2006 and 2008 by USDA regarding

 Make Allowances. So tell us what happened there.



11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

A. Okay. In November 2006, USDA, in their decision,
said: "This tentative final decision finds that combining
the weighted average manufacturing cost of the most recent
CDFA survey and CPDMP, Cornell Program on Dairy Markets
and Policy, study for cheese, nonfat dry milk, and butter,
into a single weighted average is appropriate for updating
Make Allowances for those three products. The CPDMP study
weighted average manufacturing cost of dry whey without
California should be used for the dry whey
Make Allowance."

- Q. And once again, the Cornell study upon which USDA relied, was that an audited mandatory study?
 - A. It was not.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. Okay. And then finally, to bring us up to date, so to speak, since we're now under the 2008

 Make Allowances, tell us what happened in the June 2008

 USDA decision.
- A. That decision relies on the 2006 and '07 Cornell cost studies led by Mark Stephenson and the CDFA study, both separately and in combination.
- Q. Is that -- is it the case that for some of the commodities USDA combined the two, and some of the commodities -- for some of the commodities USDA found one of the two numbers preferable and went with that?
 - A. Yes, it was a mix.
- Q. Okay. Okay. So let's now go to page 11, and we're now up to this hearing. Tell us about the 2023 Stephenson study that, as we will see, forms part of the



basis for IDFA's milk allowance proposal.

A. Well, we were very pleased with that study because we got good participation. And if you read Mark's study, it was a combination of cooperatives and privately held companies, it was a mix. And what -- what pleased us is that we were over 50% of the NASS annual survey for those four products actually included in the cost survey. It's the highest average by far ever.

And so when you look at the -- this is a quick summary -- 55.6% of cheddar cheese production was included in the survey; 50.8% of human whey; 91.2% of human nonfat dry milk; and 80.1% of butter.

- Q. Okay. And just so we're clear as to how you did the calculations to go through the columns, you have a column called USDA NASS 2002 annual production. Tell us where you got that information.
- A. I got it from the dairy products annual summary. It's published every April, and I used the one published this April which had '22 numbers from this past April.
- Q. Okay. And with respect to the columns -- the three columns that have the super heading, if you will, "2023 Stephenson Cost Survey," you show the number of participating plants.

Did that come from Dr. Stephenson's report?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And then the average annual production, did that come from Dr. Stephenson's report?
 - A. Yes.



2.

2.1

- Q. And how about the total survey annual production?
- A. Simply the average production by the number of plant gives you the total of survey production.
- Q. So the first column, participating plants, times the average annual production, gives you the total survey annual production, correct?
 - A. Yes.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

2.1

22

25

26

27

- Q. And then finally, your column survey production share of USDA NASS, just tell us how you calculated that.
- A. I took the total annual survey production, divided it by the NASS 2022 annual production, to come up with the percentage.
- Q. So that for cheddar cheese, for example, you took the total survey annual production of 2,203,279,668 and divided it by 3,963,741,000; is that correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. And that's where you get the 55.6% survey production share, correct?
- 19 A. Yes.
 - Q. And in your footnote do you indicate where specifically you got those USDA NASS 2022 annual production numbers?
- A. Yes, I did. They are online and downloadable from the Cornell USDA website.
 - Q. Okay. So let's turn to the next page, which is page 12.
 - Did you make a comparison between -- well, let me start that question again.



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 did you do that -- and this is on the top half of the page -- with respect to Dr. Stephenson's survey of 2019 costs which ultimately resulted in a report that's sometimes been called the 2021 Stephenson report?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. And just tell us what the shares are of the survey production, share of the NASS production in that survey.
- A. A lot of variation on products. Cheddar cheese was 16.3%; dry whey was 29.7%; nonfat dry milk was 69.6%; and butter was 95.7%.
- Q. Is it fair to say that for cheddar cheese, whey, and nonfat dry milk, the 2023 survey was significantly more robust than the 2021 survey?
- A. Yes, with the exception of butter, but they were both very high.
- Q. Now, one issue, of course we don't want to necessarily go into this in detail, but was in the 2019 survey, Dr. Stephenson engaged in some transformation adjustments with respect to butter and nonfat dry milk when he actually calculated cost of manufacture, correct?
 - A. Yes, that is correct.
- Q. And tell me, did you personally have discussions with -- with manufacturers when they saw those reports -- with that report I should say, regarding that?



- A. I did not. The only -- only time I heard anything was in the hearing record back during that hearing time.
- 3 But, no, no direct discussion --
- Q. No, I'm talking about in the 2000 -- when
- 5 Dr. Stephenson --
- 6 A. Oh, in 2019?
- Q. I'm still in the 2019, I'm sorry. Let me start again.
- 9 A. Yes, I was.
- Q. Let me start again, because we may have confused things.
- 12 A. Yeah.
- Q. When Dr. Stephenson published in 2021, his report on 2019 cost of manufacture, that's the report in which he used various transformation factors, correct?
- 16 A. Right.
- 17 Q. Which had not been the past practice, correct?
- 18 | A. We --
- Q. Is that right, that had not been the past practice?
- 21 A. It had not been the past practice.
- Q. And so what was the reaction when industry saw -- well, based upon your exposure to people in the industry,
- 24 | what was the reaction?
- A. Two things. First of all, just confusion trying to understand how they worked.
- 27 But the other thing is, is that standard 28 accounting practice has always been to spread fixed costs



- Q. And those California studies went all the way back to, what, the year 2002, I think?
- A. Actually earlier than that, but that's the earliest that we could find. As you know, we had copies from '02 through '16.
- Q. Okay. And they had consistently used a methodology which spread costs based upon pounds of solids, correct?
- A. That's generally accepted accounting practice in plants from my experience.
- Q. Okay. And did you have conversations with both proprietary handlers and co-op handlers regarding the 2021 Stephenson survey and these issues relating to the transformation factor?
 - A. Yes. Both, yes.
- Q. Okay. And what was -- I mean, what was their -- did they have a different -- was there a different point of view between the proprietaries and the co-ops?
- A. It was remarkably consistent. Every single company I talked to had the same request: When this is updated, if we update it, because it wasn't certain at that point, we need to go back to allocation of fixed cost based on pounds of solids.
 - Q. All right. Let's go down, then, to the second



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

- half of slide 12, where you discuss the 2006 data, which ultimately went into the 2008 Make Allowance decision.
- Tell us what the -- what the robustness is, if you will, of that survey as compared to the 2023 survey.
- A. 2023 is -- is more robust, particularly with butter. Cheddar cheese was basically 42%; it's 56 in the new study. Whey was 38.6; it's 50% in the new study.

 Nonfat dry milk was 39.5%; it's roughly 80% in the new survey. Butter was only 15.9%, and as we all know, it also was in that -- it was much higher in the most recent survey.
 - Q. Could you go back and look at the nonfat dry milk number, I think, what percentage that was in 2023?
 - A. It was 91, excuse me.
 - Q. Okay. Is that -- that's the correct number?
 - A. Yes. Not 80, 91. Butter is the one that's a little over 80.
 - Q. Okay. And so, once again, have you provided the data sources you relied upon for both pieces, if you will, of the analysis that appears on page 12?
 - A. Yes, I have.
- Q. All right. And then let's go on to page 13.
 And what have you set forth here?
 - A. Okay. Updating comparable data has been submitted at this hearing.

Just a quick background, and that is that it was very evident that we needed to get the best updated research-based data as we possibly could to have an



12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

24

25

26

27

- effective proposal for the hearing so we could be comfortable with what we had. And so we did hire Dr. Stephenson to do that again, and we were delighted with the amount of participation, both again from co-ops and non-co-ops.
 - But those establish the following manufacturing costs: Cheese was .2643; dry whey was .3361; nonfat dry milk was .275; butter was .3176.
 - Q. All right. And these numbers reflect

 Dr. Stephenson's return to the traditional method of allocating costs based upon pounds of solids; is that correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. With respect to nonfat dry milk and butter, correct?
 - A. Yes.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

22

23

2.4

25

- Q. And then second, these numbers are more current in that they reflect 2022 costs, whereas Dr. Stephenson's 2021 report reflected 2019 costs; is that correct?
- 20 A. That is correct. And as we all know, there are 21 significant cost increases between '19 and '22.
 - Q. Just as the general inflation as well as specific?
 - A. Anything you looked at, bought, or borrowed or rented was higher, a lot higher --
 - Q. Higher in what year?
- A. -- costs -- oh, '21, '22. Particularly '22 was the worst. It was very high.
 - Q. Okay. All right. Let's turn to page 14 now, and



just briefly summarize what Dr. Schiek did. He obviously has testified, so we're not going to go into this in great detail.

- A. Well, Dr. Schiek, again, I think we -- we have all heard, employed econometric techniques to the CDFA audited dairy manufacturing cost data from '03 to '16 to estimate 2022 manufacturing costs for cheese, dry whey, nonfat dry milk, and butter. His study establishes the following, 2022 costs: Cheese .3006; dry whey .2953; nonfat dry milk .2653; and butter .2364.
- Q. All right. Now, if we turn to the next page, have you done on this, page 15, some comparisons between the result of the Stephenson survey and the result of the Schiek survey/econometric study?
 - A. Yes. Yes, I did.
- Q. And for cheese, dry whey, and nonfat dry milk, how similar are they?
- A. Well, they are fairly similar when you consider the breadth of the studies. Minus cheese was -- in Stephenson, was 13.7% lower; dry whey was 12.1% higher, nonfat dry milk was 3.5% higher, and if you understand the California industry, those even make more sense.
 - Q. All right. Well, tell us what you mean by that.
- A. What I mean is that in the case of cheese, in particular, the average size of the survey plants was very large, and so that would skew it versus perhaps what Mark would find when he has a -- more of a range in plant sizes, would be my speculation.



2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. Okay. And -- and just to be clear, that with respect to cheese, the Stephenson number is lower than Schiek. With respect to the other two, dry whey and nonfat dry milk, it's -- it's the other way around, right? Stephenson is higher than Schiek, correct?
 - A. Yes.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. Okay. Now, we then come to butter, but I think you discovered something sort of interesting, and I'll have you explain why in a minute, but the difference between the two numbers for 2000 -- with respect to the information we're presenting today, namely the Stephenson 2023 report versus the Schiek 2022 report, there's about a 25.6% difference between the two, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Then did you go back and check what the relationship had been back in 2008 when the Make Allowances were last set?
- A. We did because we knew it was wide. We were very surprised to find it was the exact same percent difference 25.6 in '08 as it was in 2023.
- Q. So to the tenth of a percent, the percentage difference between Stephenson and, if you will, CDFA, which is what Schiek relied upon of course, the difference between the two was that Stephenson was 25.6% higher, and that actually turns out to be the exact same percentage to the tenth of a percent as the difference had been back in 2008 between the Cornell study and the CDFA number; is that correct?



A. That is correct.

2.

2.1

- Q. And do you have a reason why makes sense that a -that a survey based solely upon California butter would -might well be different than a national survey?
- A. Well, I think, again, if you know the California industry, you have got probably ten or so butter makers, but you have two extremely large ones, extremely successful ones. And so when you weight average the cost, they are the bulk of the pounds, so -- and they are that large, we assume they are very efficient, and as a result you would expect theirs costs to be lower.
- Q. All right. Let's turn to the next page, 16. And is this -- does this page set forth the ultimate

 Make Allowances that IDFA and Wisconsin Cheese Makers

 Association is seeking, although it's under a -- in a stair-step method, which we'll get to in a minute?
- A. Yes. These are the numbers that the -- at the end step with the Make Allowances would be for cheese, dry whey, nonfat dry milk, and butter. And they are equal weighting, in other words, the simple average of the Schiek and the Stephenson studies.
- Q. Let me just press on that to make sure the record is clear.

Within the Stephenson study and within the Schiek study, are the numbers they produced weighted average cost of production?

A. Yes. Schiek's is based on weighted average data, so his projections are weighted average. And Stephenson,



as well, used the weighted average, again, average cost on total pounds.

- Q. Okay. And let's just be clear what that means. If it's -- if the Stephenson report is a weighted average cost of production, and Schiek also, does that mean that half of the commodity, for each commodity, is produced at a cost equal to or less than the Make Allowance and half is produced at a cost equal to or more than?
 - A. That's essentially, yes, that's correct.
 - Q. And that's what a weighted average means?
 - A. That's what a weighted average means, yes.
- Q. Is there any sense that one could state the Make Allowances proposed by IDFA is a guarantee of profitability?
- A. No, it's not. And if you use Mark's as an example, he breaks out high-cost and low-cost operations, and you can see with the weighted average there's certainly going to be a fair number that will be below average cost -- be above average cost. And below, both.
- Q. Do either of the surveys take into account the fact that there are -- at least some at the time, perhaps a lot of the time -- over-order premiums paid by manufacturers to dairy farmers?
- A. No. In my understanding, Federal Order pricing is minimum pricing, and -- and that is what's required for a regulated plant. They can pay over that any way that they wish. If they would like to pay over, they can.
 - Q. Okay. And if -- if the dairy farmers are able to



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

insist on that as a condition of supplying the milk, then the manufacturer -- you can't find somebody else to supply the milk more cheaply?

- A. There's -- there's good old competition, yes, in that pricing.
- Q. Okay. But that -- that would, if you will, drive down the actual money available to the manufacturer to pay its costs of manufacture, correct?
- A. Yes, it would. I mean depending what that

 Make Allowance is, the higher it is, the less opportunity
 they are going to have to pay some kind of premium.
- Q. Okay. And if they are paying a premium above the minimum price, then that is, if you will, a deduction from the assumed Make Allowance, leaving less money to actually pay the actual cost; is that fair?
 - A. That is also correct.
- Q. Okay. Now, why is it you decided to propose equal weighting -- you -- I should say IDFA and Wisconsin Cheese Makers Association -- equal weighting?
- A. We elected on equal weighting for a couple reasons. If you look at past history, both these studies were used. The advantage of Bill Schiek's study is the data is audited. So even though it ended in 2016, you have a lot of confidence that the data was done at the best way possible. I mean, they had accountants at CDFA that collected the data.
- Mark's data is broader, includes more plants across more of the country. It is not audited. But we



2.

2.1

- Q. Okay. Now, if USDA determined that instead of a simple average they wanted it to be a weighted average between Stephenson and Schiek, is there information in the record that would allow that to be done?
- A. There's current information on Mark's. You can take Bill's -- you can take the past weights in the CDFA survey and use those if you wanted to do that.
- Q. Okay. So we -- Dr. Schiek admitted -- had admitted into the record during his testimony the actual California Department of Food and Agriculture annual studies from 2002 to 2016; is that correct?
- 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 are there in those -- in many of those reports actual production data, that is to say a recitation of how many pounds of --
 - A. Yes.
- Q. -- each commodity is included in the -- in the survey?
 - A. Yeah. Very similar to Mark's.
- Q. Okay. And so one could look at that and figure out what the poundage is covered by the California surveys, correct?
 - A. Yes, they could. In fact, they give the percent



1 | in the studies.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. Okay. And you have already, on page 11, set forth the poundage that's covered by -- by Dr. Stephenson's study, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. So is that enough information to -- to do a weighted average if you wanted to?
- A. I think it's the most complete as far as volume covered that we have ever had.
- 10 Q. Okay. Let's turn to page 17, then.
- 11 Now, you previously told us what the IDFA/
- 12 | Wisconsin Cheese Makers Association proposed
- 13 Make Allowances are in absolute dollars. That is what's
- 14 on page 16.
- Now, on page 17, have you translated, if you will, those increases so that they now are stated in terms of percentage increase over current Make Allowances?
- 18 A. That is correct.
- Q. And the current Make Allowances, once again, are those that were put in place in 2008, mainly based on 2006 data?
- 22 A. '6 and '7, yes.
- Q. Okay. Why don't you just read those numbers if you would.
- A. Okay. The cheese Make Allowance increases by
 41.79%; the dry whey Make Allowance increases by 59.32%;
 nonfat dry milk is 61.86%; and butter is 62.39%.
 - Q. All right. On the next page, 18, did you compare



those percentage increases to certain testimony in the record as to what the actual increases on a percentage basis are that various cooperatives have indicated they have themselves experienced during this timeframe?

- A. Yes, we did. Where we had III and I cheese,
 Land O'Lakes was butter/powder and Darigold was all four
 products, Darigold and Land O'Lakes -- Darigold said they
 had an 80% increase, so --
 - Q. Sorry, 8-0?
- 10 A. 8-0%.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

23

24

25

26

27

28

Land O'Lakes gave numbers. We took back and looked at those numbers and assigned them to butter/powder and then that fixed cost, which is again, fixed cost being used as solids, and that works out to 81%.

AMPI quoted the number of 40% on their commercial cheese --

- O. Now, what's the number? You said 40.
- 18 A. 81.
- 19 | O. No, no, for AMPI?
- 20 A. 47.
- 21 Q. 47%?
- 22 A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. And then -- so how do IDFA's proposed Make Allowances increases, which you list here in the second column on page 18, compare to the testimony from these three cooperatives regarding the percentage increases that they have experienced over the same timeframe?



- A. Yes. We were -- we -- we learned that they were actually higher in these three cases.
- Q. Okay. The cost increases experienced by these cooperatives were in all cases higher than the proposed increase in IDFA's proposal as an -- on a percentage basis, correct?
 - A. That is correct.
 - Q. Okay. And let's turn to page 19.

 THE COURT: Wait. Just a quick break.

 Off the record.

(Off-the-record.)

THE COURT: Back on the record.

BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

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. On page 19 you mentioned a minute ago that Land O'Lakes had provided some data in their testimony, that you had determined reflected an 81% increase in the cost of making nonfat dry milk and butter.

Can you tell us on page 19 how you actually came up with that 81% figure?

A. Well, Land O'Lakes provided the 2007 cost survey numbers, and they provided the percent increases. So we simply multiplied the survey times the percent increase to come up with a set increase per pound. And that was for processing, labor, and utilities in both butter and nonfat dry milk.

Land O'Lakes put all the fixed costs together in one number for nonfat dry milk, and in butter, and that was up 112%, so it was \$0.113 increased. And, again, that



method uses a solids based allocation on that fixed cost.

So when you take those costs, and you look at what we call our standard yields in a hundred pounds of milk, so you have basically, roughly, 8.5 pounds of nonfat dry milk and about 4.2 pounds of butter, when you -- when you run those numbers, what you find, if you take those pounds of each of those by their costs, you add them all together, you get an increase in price per pound of 14.24%, which is 80% of the current number, which is 17.5, which was also supplied by Land O'Lakes.

- Q. All right. So basically you calculated based upon the information provided that Land O'Lakes costs had been \$0.175, correct?
- A. Yes, that's what they -- that's what they showed when you add up the costs it come to.
- Q. And when you -- when you add up Land O'Lakes' own information as to the percentage increases in those costs over time, that indicates that the total increase in costs, was \$0.1424; is that correct?
- A. Yes.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. And then you simply then divided 14.24 by 17.50, to calculate that this reflected an 81% increase in the cost?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Now, let's go to the next page. You have testified -- to page 20. You have testified that under your approach, you were using a Schiek report and a Stephenson report, both of -- each of which calculated a



weighted average cost of manufacture, correct?

A. Yes.

2.

2.1

Q. And how does that methodology compare to what USDA has done in the past?

And I think you can just summarize this. You don't have to read the whole thing.

A. Good. Because I can hardly see it on my screen. Apologize for that. We used to call these cooperative extension slides, where they have so much stuff on the slide you can't read them. Or I have had a few consultants that were good at that, too.

Basically, they used the weighted average cost in the 2008 decision. And basically -- so the precedent in that decision in 2008, although they took some numbers combined from both studies, what they used was those weighted average costs in -- within those studies to determine those Make Allowances.

- Q. Okay. Let's turn to page 21, and tell us, you know, what your view is about the need for prompt action.
- A. Well, I -- I think it is very critical. I'll be very honest, I took this job I have now, when I retired from Kroger, because I thought this was so urgently important to happen.

"Make Allowances below costs cause dairy processors to face financial losses, risk financial ruin, and/or lack appropriate financial incentive either to reinvest, expand, or build new plants, to meet both market demand and milk supply needs.



- Q. Okay. Let's now switch on page 22 to an issue I alluded to, which is the proposed staggered phase in.
- A. Well, because -- because the increases, we have waited so long to make the changes, they are very significant. And an accommodation to farmers and to make the transition a little easier, IDFA's proposing that half of that change in Make Allowances apply at the initiation of the new Federal Order, and then for the next three years, a sixth of that total is added until you get at the beginning of the fourth year the full amount of the make.

And, again, 50% of that average the first year, and we're using January '25 in our example. That seems to be everybody's wish for an order. We'll see what really happens. And then January 1st the next three years, that difference, one-third of the difference or one-sixth of the total is added until you get to the full amount.

- Q. Okay. So if we go back to page 17 just for a second, that's the percentage increase that would be experienced at the end of year four, correct --
 - A. Correct.
- Q. -- when there's a full implementation of the proposal?
 - A. Right.
 - Q. So if we were to begin in, as we would hope, but



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

- we'll see how things play out, that the first year increase would be effective on or about January 1, 2025, these percentage increases would not actually occur until January 1, 2028; is that correct?
 - A. That is correct.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

- Q. And the -- if you want to figure out what the percentage increase is in year one, IDFA is proposing that half of the increase be incurred in year one, correct?
 - A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. You could cut all those percentages in half, and that would tell you what -- on page 17, and that would tell what you the percentage increase is in year one, correct?
- A. That is correct.
- Q. Now, have you gone back and looked at how large a percentage increase for a particular commodity USDA has previously made?
 - A. I -- I can't recollect.
 - Q. Okay. Well, if -- all right. If one were to go back to the 2008 decision, one would be able there to find, readily, what the butter Make Allowance had been before that decision --
 - A. Yes.
- Q. -- if it came as a result of that decision?
 Okay. And assume with me --
- A. Yeah, I'm -- this is coming back now. I remember that one in particular. So go ahead.
 - Q. Do you remember the number?



- A. I don't remember the number. I just know it was very significant.
 - Q. Okay. So assume with me that the butter
 Make Allowance went up by 42% in one fell swoop --
 - 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

28

O. -- in 2008.

And do you recall that the Make Allowance increases in 2008 were -- were imposed on an emergency basis?

- A. They were, and they were immediate. Full amount was -- when the orders -- the change orders were voted in, it was an immediate change.
- Q. All right. And that's -- so the 42%, that was imposed immediately for butter with -- on an emergency basis is, you know, materially higher than the -- any of the year one Make Allowance increases that you are proposing; is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And of course, this is not -- and unlike then, this is not an emergency hearing. I mean, there's going to be a recommended decision and a final decision here, correct --
 - A. Yes, that is correct.
 - Q. -- what we're doing right now?
- Okay. So let's go then to page 23. And does this document set forth your -- the actual phase-in amounts going from year one through year four?
 - A. Yes, it does.



- Q. All right. Let's switch to -- on page 24 to a comparison of National Milk's Make Allowance proposal, which is Proposal 7, and tell us what your view is about that.
- A. Well, what page 7 talks about is National Milk has a one-time change in makes that they are recommending and then no further adjustments, and they were negotiated by National Milk's members, and the numbers are published here.

Again, we used our two studies, averaged them, used the weighted averages from both studies, averaged them to come up with a full-year -- I mean, a full cost change -- and keep in mind, these are 2022 costs. These aren't 2028 costs. And then we are proposing that that full amount be put in again, half in the first year and then a third of that -- what's remaining the next three years. So it is gradual.

And what that -- what that does is basically, again, gives time for industry to adjust, when you are basically requiring makes to people making commodity cheese, which makes them lose money, they do need to be corrected and -- but we are trying to do it in a way that is reasoned. And I was very pleased our board strongly supported the gradual implementation. I thought that was a very good thing.

Q. I mean, the effect of that phase-in means that, on a weighted average basis, the industry -- the manufacturing industry is, essentially, going to be



2.

2.1

continuing to suffer insufficient Make Allowances --

Α. Yeah.

1

2.

3

6

7

8

9

10

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- -- for another four-plus years, right? Ο.
- And it wouldn't be honest to say everybody thought 4 that was a great idea, but the strong consensus was it was 5 a more reasonable approach, so we adopted it.
 - Ο. Okav. Now, there has -- and let me just -- the survey here is as of 2022, correct?
 - Α. Yes.
 - Ο. That's the Stephenson survey --
- 11 Α. Yes.
- -- 2022 costs? 12 Ο.
- 13 Α. Yes.
- 14 I mean, although inflation has come down somewhat 0. 15 in 2023, we still are suffering from inflation, correct?
 - Α. Oh, heavens, yeah. I mean, energy has certainly come back a little bit, but a lot of the other costs are still actually going up.
 - Okay. So I mean, you would have to actually enter Ο. into a deflationary period in order for there to be any risk that the 2022-based Make Allowances are too high, correct?
 - Yes. And historically that simply hasn't happened Α. in modern times with manufacturing costs.
 - And, indeed, the fact you are phasing it in over Ο. time and you won't hit your full proposed Make Allowances until January 1, 2028, which is, as I say, more than four years from now, I mean you would have to have real



deflation?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

25

26

27

- A. Yeah, you would. And as we look at what's happening, continuing with labor costs in particular, which are a huge part of this growth in costs, if you look at Mark's numbers, that would -- that's -- generally we don't go backwards on labor costs. They just continue to go up. It is just the rate of change moves around.
- Q. Have you read that the automobile manufacturers are now -- their workforce has gone on strike asking for a 30-plus percent increase in their labor rates over four years?
- A. You can't listen to the morning radio and not know that. It is all over the place.
- Q. Yeah. And -- and the manufacturers have countered at 20%, I think is their number.
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. You are aware of that?
- 18 A. Yes.
- Q. And no one's asking for a material decrease in labor costs; is that fair?
- 21 A. No, they are not.
- Q. All right. So page 25, please. Let's talk about the notion that, well, we should wait for mandatory audits.
 - A. Well, IDFA has put a clause in their proposal that basically says if that mandated audit is approved and completed ahead of the four years schedule, we would recommend support that those numbers be implemented when



they are ready so that we could move to that when it became -- became -- when it became available.

That -- that's ambitious. I don't want to say it's not possible. We'll talk about that in a minute, the steps.

But National Milk isn't near as specific. In fact, we have had testimony that basically says that, you know, over a certain percent we're not going to support, even if there are audited surveys, which is a little troubling.

And so basically, we would stay at their negotiated levels, if that was adopted by USDA, with no change possible until there was that mandated survey completed, which as we know with our current Congress, it seems logical, it has very broad support, both farm groups, co-ops, and IDFA are all supporting that, but that doesn't mean it's going to happen. And so there's a -- there's a -- I think there's a real concern that -- that we won't get it done in time to -- to be effective.

- Q. All right. And if we turn to page 26 and 27, do you list some of the steps that would have to be completed before one would actually be in a position -- USDA would be in a position to impose Make Allowances based upon mandatory audited surveys?
- A. Yes. And thank you to USDA for a very good brochure on the steps for Federal Order changes because I think everybody's used those, and this takes care of some that too. Although the first few steps aren't actually



2.

2.0

2.1

part of that.

2.

2.0

2.1

First of all, you have Congress enacts legislation. There's still ambition of having a Farm Bill done by December, but there's always ambition for a Farm Bill to be done by December of the Farm Bill year, and it rarely happens. We'll just have to see.

And then once that -- the enabling legislation is in there and the funding, USDA has to promulgate or develop the regulations through which such a survey is carried out and the authority how they would use it. They have to devise the survey, conduct the survey, audit the results, and publish the results.

- Q. Now, let me just pause you there. I mean, this survey would potentially cover companies that have never participated in such a cost of production survey; is that correct?
- A. Yeah, I think that's likely. In fact, it's absolutely -- well, if you look at the percentage of the coverage particularly, some of the products, yeah, you will have a lot that aren't currently in the survey.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. And there may be limits on how small they have to go, all those kind of things. They are part of the rulemaking. But, yes, it will be broader than what we have seen so far. It will be more similar to California where most of the products was caught in their surveys in the past.
 - Q. Keep going, please.



A. And then -- so after we do all that and then, we have the result, and then we start the rulemaking Federal Order hearing process.

Once that's the result -- when those results are out -- and, again, industry can petition USDA at any time on anything, but if they were to petition -- wait until that survey to be done, then you would start the more classic hearing process where they would petition USDA, hold hearings to raise Make Allowances to reflect the new survey.

And this next page looks very familiar to everybody in this room. It is that you -- when you -- there's a process that USDA follows for a survey -- I mean, for a Federal Order Reform at AMS, and these are kind of the Cliff Notes of what those -- what those summaries -- those decisions are.

And as we look at our timeclock for this hearing today, albeit this is not as complicated as the one we have on the many issues we're covering, it would be a significant amount of time.

So, for example, if you were to get the survey completed -- say -- say, they did complete the survey by 2028, which would be admirable because it's a complex job. It would likely be a year and a half to years before anything would be implemented based on the time it normally takes, by the time people petition for a normal hearing. So we could be five, six, seven years -- I would say five out from where we are now.



2.

2.1

- Q. And even if things move faster, even if it could get done, let's say, by 2017, or some time in 2017, you still would, under the National Milk proposal, be living under, admittedly, lower than actual cost to manufacture Make Allowances for all of 2025, all of 2026, into 2027, correct?
- A. Yeah. And if you think of the National Milk levels, let's take cheese for a simple example, their proposal is actually below the California number from the actual survey from 2016.
- Q. Okay. Let's just make clear about that. National Milk's proposed --
 - A. Is \$0.24.
- 14 Q. Okay.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 15 A. CDFA survey was \$0.245 in '16.
 - Q. In 2016?
 - A. Yes. And so those levels are -- are teens levels, someplace in the mid to late teens, that's our estimate what they would be. So you, again, could be ten years out before you got to contemporary numbers, if -- you know, assuming how quick things can get done and the hearing process can take place.
 - Q. Okay. If we turn to page 28, you have made reference a couple of times to the concern whether even if we had audited mandatory surveys that USDA would simply be able to implement those without a major disputed hearing.
 - And what's your view about that?
 - A. Well, the view is under current rules, they



probably can't, it would have to be enabled, probably through statute or through some other process. I don't pretend to be an expert on how you do rulemaking on rulemaking but --

- Q. Right now the assumption is you have to go through an order --
- A. Yeah, it would be -- it would be the classic formal hearing is -- maybe emergency, but it would be formal hearing. That would be our best estimate.
 - Q. Okay.

2.

2.0

2.1

- A. And what we -- what we heard, which is a little troubling, was "even if credible and reliable information regarding costs of manufacture existed, and it suggested a Make Allowance change of more than a few cents per pound, we would be restrained from advocating for the full implementation of the change due to the impact on milk prices and profitability of our farmer-owners." And that was Ed Gallagher from DFA's testimony earlier this last week actually.
- Q. Okay. Now, if you turn to page 29. Is the notion that Make Allowances have gotten out of kilter with reality a brand new subject?
- A. No, it's not. There's -- we all know -- 2020 changed everything as far as progress, but we have known that. The CDFA surveys in general have shown increases in costs on all commodities. Certainly Mark's study in 2019 did that as well, although the allocations and maybe some sampling caused some strange numbers. In 2022, of course,



he just did that one, showed it again. We also see it in
that and the most empirical evidence is basically the
gap between mailbox prices and announced prices,
particularly when you adjust for component levels of milk
which we have through Federal Orders. We can estimate
what those are.

We saw positives in some markets go to significant negatives, and even though we acknowledge hauling is part of those costs, the share of hauling of that increase, between 30% hauling, and you are seeing a dollar and some change in some cases, doesn't begin to cover it. And that' simply because there's less -- there's less dollars able to pay premiums for milk than there was in the past because the Make Allowances are out of line with real costs.

- Q. Okay. And turn to the last page, please. Just read that one, if you would.
- A. "The long-needed update to inadequate Make Allowances cannot be delayed any longer."
- MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, Mr. Brown is available for cross-examination.
- THE COURT: Who has questions for this witness other than AMS?
 - Mr. Miltner.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

26 BY MR. MILTNER:

- O. Good morning, Mr. Brown.
- A. Good morning.



2.0

2.1

- Q. Ryan Miltner representing Select Milk Producers.

 I wanted to start with your IDFA Exhibit 6,

 Exhibit 214, your full statement.
 - A. Okay.

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 I'm looking at page 3. You give this example of a cheddar cheese sale at \$2 a pound, with manufacturing costs of \$0.28 per pound. And we have had these discussions with other witnesses on the stand. Similar examples were presented, right?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. I don't know that you have been asked these questions, so I just want to make sure we have the same understanding.

If this manufacturing plant has actual manufacturing costs that are at all different from those that are incorporated in the Make Allowance formulas, your further analysis about the profitability of this plant would change, would it not?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Similarly, if this plant had different yields of products than were assumed in the Federal Formulas, this analysis would probably change as well, correct?
- A. Yes. But not a lot, but it could change. You know, an average is an average. A milk plant is going to be the average. That's what we have to work with.
- Q. Yeah. And really, there probably is no plant that's exactly average, correct?
 - A. No.



- Q. So all of the statements that you make that say that, you know, plants are guaranteed to lose money or that they absolutely can't make a profit, we can't ascribe that to any particular plant, can we?
- A. No. But on the average we can because we have average cost data, and we know what the NDPSR surveys show. And so if you are making a commodity products, that's -- that's what you are -- that's what your margin will be.

We heard some testimony last week of people who have done some value add to help counter that, particularly from Nasonville up in Wisconsin did an excellent job explaining how they try to work with that.

But on the average, it is true. And, again, that gets down to what's our idea of our pricing. I mean, USDA in 2008, took weighted average costs. We're recommending the same thing again. And we're recommending that because we recognize that we can't -- we don't expect that price to keep everyone in business because there would probably -- the make would have to be very high. And no one -- no one that I know thinks that's the right solution.

- Q. Right. And so you said on the average, your statements about profit and loss are -- are -- you stand by those, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. But even if we're looking at the average, if a plant has average manufacturing costs, that doesn't



2.

2.1

necessarily mean that same plant has average sales prices, right?

- A. No. But NDPSR, of course, collects commodity cheddar. In my experience, buying commodity cheddar, there's not much difference if you are buying a short-hold fresh cheddar 40-pound block, or even a 640, from those averages. I mean, they all -- most of them use CME. There's some that use NDPSR to determine that price. But they are remarkably close. If you are a volume buyer, they are remarkably close. And I have some experience with that, buying and selling honestly.
 - Q. Within a few pennies you would say?
- A. Yes. Yes, definitely.
- Q. You mentioned Nasonville. I think, if I'm remembering correctly, they testified that they -- their diversification of products isn't exactly a new thing for them, correct?
- A. Oh, no. And pretty typical for your Wisconsin family-owned cheese makers. I think that they have diversified their product.
- Q. And I think for them, their diversification even predated USDA's adoption of end-product pricing, correct?
- A. Yes. They have been in that business for a long time.
 - Q. So at least for them, their diversification of products really couldn't tie that to any Make Allowance at any point in time, could you?
 - A. You couldn't. But you also have to acknowledge



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

that those products are made on demand. They're made by order. You have that wall of milk, so you are going to make cheddar, commodity cheddar even. I mean, they make some retail cheddar as well. So that's always going to be part of their business, and so that does affect their profitability, because it's 42% of their cheese, I think they said, was commodity cheddar.

- Q. Okay. And a lot of that ended up being cut-and-wrap, too, correct?
- A. Part of it. But a lot of their cheddar -- like cheddar for aging, if you go to their website, they put every insertion you can think of in a pound of cheddar cheese. Some of it does. But what's your opportunity cost in that? That's the other question you have to ask, too. You can go buy that cheese, and a lot of those plants do -- will buy outside cheese to supplement if they have strong orders for their specialty products. That commodity cheddar market short hold for fresh cheddar is a buy/sell market. And everybody knows who makes a product like they like, and they will work -- and they will work with that.

The other thing is, is his cost of production. If you looked at what he put together on his cheddar relative to his specialty cheeses and how the costs are allocated, the cheddar takes a much lower share as a percentage of cheese made than his other products. Those other products are more expensive to make.

Q. And presumably -- well, not even presumably --



2.

2.0

2.1

they actually have a very different cost structure and sales structure?

- A. Yeah. They do their best to reflect that, obviously, out of the market. You are correct.
- Q. On page 5 of your written statement there's a statement about "if the formulas overestimate how much finished product is being obtained from a quantity of raw milk," that section there.

You or IDFA, you are not offering any other statement in here about yields, right?

- A. We don't have any data --
- 12 Q. Okay.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

28

A. -- to support a change in yields at this time. I think we're hoping that USDA will get that job as well as the Make Allowance when they move forward with the audited hearing.

(Court Reporter clarification.)

18 BY MR. MILTNER:

Q. So, again, at the top of page 7 you have got a -in the first sentence, again, you refer to "forcing
manufacturers to lose money on every pound."

Just, again, a question that's been asked of others, but you have repeated this statement. No Class III or Class IV manufacturer is forced to participate in the Federal Order system, correct?

- A. That is correct.
- Q. So I mean, there would be economic reasons why they might or might not participate, correct?



- A. There is, but there's economic reasons why they need to if they are in a market with significant Class I to be competitive and buy milk.
- Q. They are not forced to lose money on every pound of dairy product produced, are they?
 - A. No. Some of them just leave.
 - O. Some do.

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

- A. And then we have more milk than we can fit in the plants.
- Q. It's similar to how farmers, some of them just have to leave, don't they?
 - A. Yes, that's correct.
 - O. Economics work on both sides of the buy/sell --
- 14 A. They do. And there's lots of reasons for those 15 exits, we know that, too.
 - Q. Correct.
 - A. We have all experienced that.
 - Q. At the bottom of page 7, and this is when I need some help understanding. The second sentence of the final paragraph: "Cooperative associations will pass on to their milk producer members, or put to other business uses, all of the wholesale sales value of dairy products in excess of that needed to cover the total cost of manufacturing."
 - What do you mean to convey with that sentence?
 - A. When I mean is that the real costs of your total product value, what you can seal, whatever it is, added value or commodity, less what it costs to make it, is the



pool of money you have left to pay producers, maintain plants, invest into -- invest into further improvements or changes, or to, you know, retire as -- as an equity payment at the end of the year. That's the real dollar amount. There isn't -- that's what they have got, except for, of course, for any pool draw they may have, but that would be what they have to pay producers.

- Q. And so is the argument or the conclusion you would like people to draw from this section, that if the -- if a cooperative that manufactures products has a lower, say Class III price, that the lower revenue from the sale of milk will be made up with higher value in the product sold from the plant?
- A. No. What I'm saying is regardless of that relationship, they have options. I mean, if you are a proprietary plant and your plant is pooled, you have to pay the regulated minimum price to your producers. Now, we all know with depooling, that number can be a little weird, but what's what you are required to pay.

If you're a cooperative, you have options. And certainly, cooperatives strive to pay the producers as much as they possibly can. But they do have flexibility if they need it. And with any plant, whether you are a co-op or not, those -- that revenue that you get back from your sales and that costs, there is maintenance -- we know all those things, growth, product development, whatever it may be. That's -- that's your capital that you have to pay producers, as well as all those other myriad of things



2.

2.1

that a growing business tries to do.

- Q. Does that analysis work equally for a cooperative like Prairie Farms that is predominantly Class I?
- A. Not -- well, yes, actually it does. Because you -- same thing, you have got receipts from sales or whatever you make. You have a requirement both to the pool and to your producers and what they will be paid, and after you pay your pool, your pool requirement, what you have left is to reinvest, market, repairs, maintenance, and then also to -- to obviously pay your producers. So it is really not that different except the Class I's mandatory, you don't have an option not to be pooled.
- Q. Does it also work for a cooperative that might be relatively smaller, that is a true milk marketing cooperative selling all of its producer milk to plants that are not cooperative owned?
- A. They have the same -- they have the same -- it's a little different, because they don't have plants to reinvest in. But from the standpoint, you know, what you get, what it costs to deliver it, is what you have left is what you are going to pay your producers, whether you are a cooperative or not. That's the pool of money you have to work with or to grow your business or whatever else you feel that's the most important use of that money. And as we know, co-ops have different strategies in how to best allocate that and how to reinvest in their business.
- Q. For that co-op that I just described, would you expect them to recover from the marketplace the income



2.

2.1

that is lost if the formula prices are reduced?

A. Let's take the other side. How about the ones that have invested tens and hundreds of millions dollars in plants who can't cover their costs and they have that investment in a fixed asset that they are struggling to make a margin on? Some of those plants, as we know in the co-op world, are very large commodity plants.

So my question is -- look at reblends. There's all kinds of deals. Most manufacturing plants are not pooled. The milk may be pooled, but the plant isn't. So there's a lot of flexibility on how that milk is moved into that plant.

The second thing is, is we seem to have extra milk. We have supply management programs pretty much across the country. So we're basically telling our dairymen, well, you can't grow, and so hopefully you can get a margin that's going to work for you. We're not giving them an alternative right now because of lack of plant capacity to do that growth, which we know most of our dairymen want to do.

So it's not as simple as price. It simply is not as simple as price. And price will take care of it over time. If you look at farm exits, what you really see, if margins get tight on the farm, farm exits don't change near as much as growth slows down. That's been true for four years, and I think that will continue to be the case.

And so talking about a make when a make is a very small portion of the total value of that milk and the



2.

2.1

products, we're giving it a little too much -- a little too much credit, I think.

Q. Usually someone doesn't preface the answer with I'm going to answer a different question or state a different question, they just divert it. So I appreciate all you said.

But for the co-op that doesn't own any manufacturing plants and is purely a milk marketing co-op, is it your testimony that you expect them to receive from the marketplace income to offset the reductions in the minimum prices?

- A. No. Because the minimum prices are too high.
- 0. 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

24

25

26

27

- A. That's why we have gone to our challenge with negative -- negative prices relative to -- to blends in many markets.
 - O. Thanks.
- A. I admire co-ops that invest in plants and grow for their producers, and I know it's not easy, and we don't need to make it harder for those. And that's the future.
 - Q. And it's extraordinarily expensive, correct?
 - A. Oh, goodness, yes.
- Q. And I think I have -- I mean, per load of daily milk coming into the plant, millions of dollars per load of capacity, right?
- A. Yes, absolutely. Yes, it's a -- it's a -- it's a commitment for sure. Both of the cooperative's employees as well as its member-owners. It's a big commitment.



- Q. Do you recall any witness who has testified as a processor, who only produces those commodities surveyed in the NDPSR?
 - A. No. It's completely that, no.
- Q. And so to gauge the profitability of a plant, you would have to truly look at its entire operations, correct?
 - A. Yes.

2.

2.1

- Q. A plant that manufactures multiple products, you might be able to allocate costs and revenues and estimate the profitability of each individual product line, wouldn't you?
- 13 A. If you have got good accountants, you should be 14 able to, yes.
 - Q. But the profitability of that enterprise is a function of each of those individual products produced, correct?
 - A. I'm going to give you a but. Yes. But those products are all paid off -- are sold, if you are talking American-style cheeses, off the same commodity market. And so the opportunity to add value on large bulk commodities of any type, whether it's cheddar or Monterey Jack, or whatever that product may be, is difficult, because everybody has that same -- all the suppliers are looking at it the same way.
 - And I'll use Jack as an example. Monterey Jack is a little higher moisture than cheddar, a little lower fat, so its ingredients cost are a little bit lower. So you



- think of it as a specialty, it's not. Of course, there's so much of it sold these days. In fact, at Kroger, the Mexican blend, which is Jack, cheddar, and the Asiago -- not Asiago --
 - O. Asadero.
 - A. Yeah, thank you.

 (Court Reporter clarification.)
- 8 BY MR. MILTNER:

6

7

9

- O. Asadero.
- 10 A. Asadero. I'm too German-Irish for that word.
- 11 They -- those costs are -- they are all
- 12 | calculated. And a good buyer knows that there's more
- 13 | moisture and less fat, and they are going to negotiate
- 14 | that price with the same commodity mentality as you do
- 15 | with a cheddar because there's someone willing to make it
- 16 | for you.
- 17 | O. And, again -- I mean, it sounds like I'm
- 18 | belaboring the point, but since you brought up those
- 19 cheeses, those cheeses have different costs of
- 20 | manufacturing, correct?
- 21 A. Yes. Although they are very similar.
- 22 Q. Similar but different, correct?
 - A. Yes, that is correct.
- Q. And the sales price pegged to a commodity, perhaps similar, but not identical, correct?
- 26 A. That is correct.
- Q. And I don't know, but I presume Jack cheese has a somewhat different yield profile than cheddar, similar but



different?

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. Yes, because it's a little higher moisture.
- Q. Thank you.

On page 10 now of your written statement, again, there's a statement here that I think is a little more absolute than maybe I would think it should be.

"No one thinks the current manufacturing allowances remotely reflect current manufacturing costs."

Now, I don't recall perhaps exactly who said it, but I think there has been some testimony from some processors that they might even be producing some products at costs lower than the current Make Allowances.

- A. Proposed, yes. Current, I'm not so confident that's true.
- Q. Okay. In your direct examination with Mr. Rosenbaum you stated that -- something along the lines of there would have to be deflation for there to be any risk of Make Allowances reaching the levels reported in 2022.

Does that sound correct, or am I misstating what you were answering?

A. A little bit -- I meant a little different, so let me give my clarification.

What I'm saying is that when you look at plant input costs, the one cost that seems to vary the most is no surprise to anyone, is energy. And there's several reasons for that. One is some people use forward buys on energy, and sometimes those look smart, sometimes they



don't look so smart.

2.

2.1

But if you look at core -- kind of like production per cow. You know, it always seems to go up. Your core costs outside of energy tend to be in a rising curve. They can bounce around a little bit, but they tend to be on a rising curve. And that's been my experience my entire career, that they just continue to creep up. You do what you can to avoid it. Sometimes you can counter that. That's one of the reasons that Bill Schiek used the productivity factor in his projections. But a lot of time, there's only -- only so much blood to squeeze out of that turnip, and you -- you accept your costs are going up. And that's I think what we saw particularly the last few years.

- Q. So when you were referring to the 2022 costs, were you referring to those specifically contained in any of the economic reports here or just generally to 2022 costs?
- A. You could almost make it general, but certainly both the Schiek and Stephenson studies, so significant cost increase. But if you look at trend, particularly with Schiek's study, because it's easier to do because it is a projection, energy is the one thing that bounces around, and the energy was the one factor that had the lowest correlation with -- with the trend. It's just because it does bounce.

Other things -- it's amazing how things do follow trends over time. Sometimes I wonder when I do a big analysis why I wasted my time because trend gave me almost



the same accuracy as the analysis did. Maybe I'm just a bad economist that doesn't know how to use Excel. That could be it, too.

- Q. Let the record reflect he's just admitted he's a bad economist.
 - A. I have a degree in cow milking, Ryan.

MR. MILTNER: Your Honor, I have gone through the questions I have from his written statement. I have questions from his presentation. I'm happy to proceed, but it's 9:20, and if the court reporter would like a break, this would be a good spot for me.

THE COURT: Yes. We have been going about an hour and 25 minutes. Let's -- let's come back at 9:30 -- actually, 9:35.

(Whereupon, a break was taken.)

THE COURT: Back on the record.

BY MR. MILTNER:

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. Mr. Brown, I'm now looking at the printout of the PowerPoint slides you presented, Exhibit 215. And I just want to make sure this is clear.

On slide 5.

- A. Okay.
- Q. At the bottom of the quote you present, you note this is from a brief.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Do you know if this -- if this brief was the brief before the District Court or the Court of Appeals in that case?



- 1 A. Oh, boy. I don't.
- Q. Do you know if this was -- I think it says here,
- 3 | this is the 2008 Make Allowance announcement --
 - A. Yes.

5

8

- O. -- not the 2007 Make Allowance announcement?
- A. Yes, that is correct. From what I understand, yes.
 - Q. You are aware there were lawsuits in both -- following both changes?
- 10 A. There's always lawsuits.
- 11 Q. Always lawsuits.
- 12 A. Don't know the details, but I know there were,
- 13 | yes. Thankfully, I wasn't involved with those.
- 14 Q. Is it fair to characterize this statement here as
- 15 | the statements of counsel for USDA and not a statement of
- 16 AMS itself?
- 17 A. It's a brief from USDA DOJ, isn't it?
- 18 O. I don't know.
- 19 A. If you read, the attribution is it's a brief from
- 20 USDA DOJ -- oh, excuse me. Yeah, I honestly -- I don't
- 21 | know. I just know the second -- the next slide kind of
- 22 | walks through what they did.
- 23 | O. Okav. So --
- 24 A. Again, having me read legal stuff is like having
- 25 | you read cheese recipes probably, so it's not my strength.
- 26 | I won't pretend it is.
- 27 | O. That's fair.
- 28 So on the next slide, which you just referred to,



- this is -- is this the statement of the Court then on this --
 - A. This is from the decision, I believe. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. So it's the Court's decision --
 - A. Yes.

4

5

6

9

18

19

2.0

- Q. -- separate from USDA's regulatory decision?
- 7 A. Right. This is the response back, you might kind 8 of say, I quess.
 - Q. I'm now looking at page, slide 11.
- 10 A. Okay.
- 11 Q. In the final column, I understand the numbers 12 there represent a fraction where the numerator is the
- 13 | total survey annual production number.
- 14 A. Correct.
- Q. And the denominator is USDA NASS annual production number.
- 17 A. Yes.
 - Q. We can look up the definition, so I don't want to belabor this too much, but what is your understanding of what is included in that category of cheddar cheese for
- 21 NASS's data?
- A. All cheddar. Basically, if it's a cheddar,
 barrel, block, cheddar for aging, it would all be part of
- 24 | that number.
- Q. And do you believe that all cheddar has a similar manufacturing cost?
- A. Except for if you're making like a cheddar for aging, because it's low in moisture, higher fat, so it



costs more, and it's usually a slower make process. But the bulk of cheddar is made in a very, very similar process. It may be different types of equipment, but the process is very similar.

- Q. Okay. Well, the process might be similar, but is the manufacturing cost similar?
- A. Depends on the plant. I mean, that's -- you know, Mark talked about that. But, yeah, it depends on the plant and their efficiency. And older plants generally are less labor efficient, for example; newer ones tend to have more debt. So I mean, it's just like with farming, there's those trade-offs. So there is variation, yes.
- Q. If a reasonably efficient plant is manufacturing a 500-pound barrel and a reasonably efficient plant is manufacturing a 40-pound block, would you expect their manufacturing costs to be similar?
 - A. The biggest difference would be packaging.
- Q. What about between 640-pound blocks and 500-pound barrels?
- A. Same thing. It's mostly packaging. A lot of plants can make either. You just run the curd to a different packaging line.
- Q. Now, NASS used to survey the prices used in the formulas, correct?
 - A. That is correct. I remember that.
 - Q. And it's no longer NASS, correct?
 - A. That is also correct.
 - Q. So the percentage you have here is, to be clear,



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

not the percentage of cheese surveyed or -- yeah, not the percentage of cheese surveyed that's in the current NDPSR report, correct?

- A. That is -- that is correct, yes. This is just total production of cheddar.
- Q. Do you have an estimate as to what percentage of NDPSR production volume was surveyed by Dr. Stephenson?
- A. I don't. But based on his average plant size, which is over double what it was last time, I expect he has a lot of those larger, more efficient plants. But I don't even know who sells -- who NDPSR -- I mean, I know who they survey because I know at Glanbia we participated in those surveys, and if the cheese met the spec, you surveyed.

In fact, when NDPSR took it over, it got much better because the -- the auditors knew what they were looking for, and so it was easier, when you called to ask do I report this or not, you actually got an answer. It really helped.

But it's -- it's fairly small. And that's, again, because of the spec, and a lot of it's the timing. It's the days that causes issues with the cheese is reported or not.

- Q. Well, it's also the size of the particular commodity obviously --
- A. Yeah. 640s and 40s are probably roughly the same in total pounds. That's kind of the rule of thumb everybody uses. We could all be lying to each other, but



2.

2.0

2.1

that's what we all think.

There's a couple of people that have formally survey in the industry, so we know it's roughly a third, a third of those two.

- Q. Similarly, I think you answered specifically for cheese, but do you have any information about the percentage of NDPSR volume that's encompassed in Dr. Stephenson's surveys for any other commodities?
- A. I do not. And that information wasn't gathered, so I doubt he does, either.
 - Q. I'm going to look at slide 15, please.
- 12 A. Okay.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Q. You -- you were discussing the slide with

Mr. Rosenbaum, and you made a reference to the data for

cheese plants being skewed.

Do you recall that?

- A. Yes.
 - Q. Can you -- can you elaborate a little bit on what you meant by that?
 - A. Well, I had it backwards, but the -- what you have in California is, again, one large plant and a bunch of smaller ones, so there's a lot of diversity in costs according to -- I don't know that because CDFA has four cheddar plants that they surveyed the last few years for costs. I just have worked with all of them, so I know kind of how big they are or they are not. And one is very, very large; the others aren't tiny, but they aren't large plants.



So there were two other larger plants in California, and they both closed, so they were no longer part of that cost survey.

- Q. So do you believe that there's anything skewed in this --
 - A. Not really.

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

- O. -- in this table?
- A. That was an error on my part.
- Q. May I characterize your previous testimony as supportive of and confident in the numbers reported by Dr. Stephenson and Dr. Schiek?
- A. Of anything that's available, yes. That's the best data we have.
 - Q. Yet, if I look at -- I'm, again, on slide 15, the second data box -- which this is just butter, correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. To what do you attribute the difference between Dr. Schiek's numbers and Dr. Stephenson's numbers?
 - A. California has always had -- again, we had the correction in the butter make in 2008. California's had significantly lower butter costs because you probably have -- I don't want to give anybody a big head -- two of the very best butter makers in the country in California, and they are both very large. I believe this is from 10 or 11 plants that are in that data, but they truly did -- they did -- those two plants were the -- by far the bulk of the butter. So they are less expensive. The methodology is the same, and the questions are the same.



So I -- I would expect that that is the reasoning behind it. I just know that if you want efficiently produced butter, California's got it, you just got to figure out a way to get it transported back east so you can still afford it, because the transportation is their biggest challenge.

- Q. On slide 16 you referred to in discussion the idea of using the weighted average of Dr. Schiek's study and Dr. Stephenson's study for --
 - A. Within the study, they are weighted averages.
 - Q. So that was what I was kind of getting at.
 - A. I think I know where you are going.
- Q. When IDFA melded those studies together, explain for us what the intention was and what you believe that that then represents.
- A. We meld -- well, we didn't meld them together.

 And the -- the point -- and, again, when we were doing this, we looked back at what other decisions had been and USDA evaluated the information and picked what they thought was the best information. We expect that could well happen again. That's what Proposal 22 is all about, make it work.

We felt for simplicity sake it was the easiest way to do it. We do have volumes on Schiek's historical data, and Mark's, so it could be weighted if someone decided they wanted to do that, and all of those numbers are in the hearing record. They are not in my testimony, but they are in the hearing record.



2.

2.0

2.1

A. Yes. And in not just decision, but the way it was presented, and then USDA, the way they made their decision weighing all the different opportunities or different methods that could be used. We think we are consistent.

What would be perfect, if we had California actual cost data. We don't, so we did the best that we could do to make use of that very robust set of information.

- Q. And specifically with the California data, you're drawing an analogue between CDFA's audited cost studies and the work that Dr. Schiek has done to evaluate and model that data.
- A. It's the best information we had. We wanted to have a check to Stephenson's survey. We thought it was important. And that was done earlier. That actually was started last fall, Schiek -- the Schiek study.
- Q. And then with regard to Dr. Stephenson's study, you are drawing an analogue between his prior manufacturing cost reports and the reports he's since prepared, correct?
 - A. Yes, we do have some comparisons in this document.
 - Q. So just to draw a couple contrasts perhaps.

With respect to Dr. Stephenson's, do you recall him explaining the methodology for plant selection in his



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

2006 or 2007 report?

1

2.

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- A. I honestly don't.
- Q. Do you at all recall any discussion?
- A. I know -- I know there was no California in it.

 But I don't -- I really -- I really don't. I read the

 results, but I -- I don't remember, quite honestly.
 - Q. Do you have any recollection of him doing a -- a random sample of plants to --
 - A. Yes. Yes, he did say that.
 - Q. Okay. And -- and the study that IDFA commissioned was not a random sample, correct?
 - A. No, but the average plant size is far above the average size of plants in each of the categories.
 - Q. It was not stratified to guarantee or attempt to get representation from plants across all sizes, was it?
 - A. No, it wasn't. It was voluntary.
 - Q. And so whereas USDA in prior decisions would have been relying on a report from Dr. Stephenson that was a random sample, this would be a difference if they were going to rely on this one, it wouldn't be exactly the same type of study, would it?
 - A. No, but it skews large. So if anything, it's probably -- if you assume that larger plants have lower costs, it would -- it would skew toward large plants.

The average cheddar plant is 3.2 million pounds of milk a day in that -- in that survey. If you look at the total number of plants and the total number of production, that's multiples of what the average cheddar production



- is, so -- and that was -- that was intentional. We wanted to make very sure and we encouraged our membership to participate. We don't force them. And we don't even know all who did unless they told us because it is private.

 But we felt it was important that we get the large ones as
 - But we felt it was important that we get the large ones as well because they are a big part of the industry, and they need to be part of the survey.
 - Q. That's a great point you bring up.

 There was a document introduced and given an

10 exhibit number. We haven't admitted it yet. It was an 11 e-mail from IDFA.

- Did you happen to be in the room the day that was introduced?
- 14 A. I was listening in. It was colorful.
- 15 Q. Okay.

6

7

8

9

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

- A. Which date is that one? Because there was actually three different letters that went out.
- Q. You want me to get you one? You can look at it?
- A. I can pull it up on my computer if I need to, but is that the -- just -- is that the one that has the April 14th deadline in it?
 - 0. It is.
 - A. That's the second one.
 - Q. Okay. So for the record, I'm looking at my copy of Exhibit 179. And it -- it basically is an e-mail from Michael Dykes to IDFA's membership, and it's asking them to participate in the study. Correct?
- 28 A. Yes.



1	Q. And did you receive a copy of this e-mail?
2	MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, if I could, could I
3	just pull out a copy?
4	THE COURT: Yes, I think we should.
5	THE WITNESS: Yes, I was copied on that e-mail.
6	MR. MILTNER: Thanks.
7	BY MR. MILTNER:
8	Q. Did you help draft the e-mail?
9	A. Yes. I helped. I didn't write it, but I did
10	help, yes. I was I was the person that worked with
11	Dr. Stephenson. I was the direct liaison to IDFA. It was
12	me.
13	Q. Okay. Was this e-mail sent to all of IDFA's
14	membership?
15	A. It was sent to all membership at this point. All
16	three letters were sent in the time we had not had any
17	change in membership yet. So all co-ops and known co-ops
18	that had manufacturing plants got all three letters.
19	Q. Okay. And I'm not trying to get into
20	A. Oh, no, I'm
21	Q members
22	A. I'm just trying to clarify for you.
23	Q. Yeah. But it went to IDFA sent this to all of
24	its members that were members at the time, right?
25	A. It was sent to boards, board members, and it was
26	sent to specific plant people that in IDFA's database,
27	we also have plants. And so if people made the four



commodities, we just made sure they were copied on the

letter to their CEO or whatever their representative was. So in some cases the letter may have -- may have went to two people. Sometimes it went to three. Sometimes it only went to one.

- Q. Do you know if IDFA sent this e-mail to any other manufacturers that weren't IDFA members?
- A. We did not. It was pulled out of our own database.
- Q. And do you know what kind of response rate IDFA had to this letter as far as --
- A. I have no idea other than a couple called me who were having trouble getting ahold of Mark, so I -- Mark said, call these people. Otherwise, I don't even know who the final participants were unless they told me, or in this hearing we have heard a couple of people say they were participants.

We worked very hard to keep that wall. It was important that we -- that IDFA let mark do his work completely independent. All we did was ask our members to participate. And I believe the cheese makers did the same thing.

- Q. Do you know how many different plants are represented in IDFA's membership?
 - A. Total plants?
 - O. Yes.
- A. I can't share that. I can share you that there's around 45 companies that got this letter. I don't know how many plants that represents. That's -- give or take,



2.

2.1

that's roughly what it was.

2.

2.1

- Q. And you can't share because you don't know or that's not something you are permitted to share?
 - A. I don't know.
- Q. Okay. Now, you told your membership with this e-mail that this data was going to be used to create or form a report for the purpose of setting Make Allowances, correct?
- A. Because we were requested to provide that data. And so we worked hard to get our members to make sure we had a system. When you look at the 2021 results, particularly cheese was very weak. We knew we needed to get larger plants. We needed to get more of them just so that it was more representative of the industry, so -- but the letter went out to everyone. There was no personal selling on calls. It was all by e-mails. People called us and could ask questions, or a lot of them called Mark directly because that's what we preferred that they do.

But it was not -- there was no intention to skew anything. If we had, we would have had a lot more small plants than we did. We didn't have a lot of small plants in the survey, just based on the size of the average respondent being 3.2 million pounds of milk a day roughly.

Q. I think you said, "we were asked to provide that information."

"We" is IDFA?

A. IDFA. We were recommended to IDFA, if we are going to hold -- if we are going to request a hearing, do



whatever we can to get the very best possible data. And so we -- that's why we worked with Dr. Schiek and why we worked with Dr. Stephenson, because they are the two people in the industry -- Schiek is familiar with California for years, and Stephenson -- because of his expertise in surveys, we went to those two people. Plus USDA was familiar with Mark's survey process, and so we thought it was most suitable to use something that they already had some familiarity with. Plus I'm not sure who else in the industry would do it honestly.

Q. Okay. I just want to know, like you said "we were asked."

Was that the Department asking IDFA to do that?

- A. The Department recommended that we do whatever we can to get the best data we can get. And we told them we would likely try to get -- we might try to get another survey, and they didn't say yes or no, but they certainly didn't say, don't waste your time. So we did it.
- Q. Okay. So you made the decision at IDFA, we need to get some data to support the request we're asking for, but you didn't have to say in this e-mail, this is what we're going to use this data for? You could have simply asked plants to -- we're doing a report with Dr. Stephenson, can you participate?
- A. If you went to a board meeting, you would kind of know what it was all about. I mean, that topic was -- I mean, and IDFA's structure, you have an economic policy committee where all policy starts, and then it moves to



2.

2.1

the different boards. And so there was lots of discussion.

In fact, the economic policy committee is the one that approved the original Schiek study. And then they also approved an elasticity of milk study. You will hear more about that later. And then the study came out of meetings with USDA wondering if we could get a more robust sample of data. We figure the more information we have to present in the hearing, the more opportunities there are for people to find something they think would be workable.

- Q. Once it is very clear to a plant what this data is going to be used for, if they believe they have lower costs than the average, what incentive would they have to participate in your study?
- A. Because they are honest. Because they understand -- a lot of the plants with the lowest costs aren't even regulated. It's not in their best interest to even support this, but they are, because they think it is good for the overall health of the industry.

We have very large plants in that study, and the doubling of the average plant size from the last study kind of indicates that. And we explained to them the importance. And we also explained to them that sooner or later this is probably going to be an audited survey, so there's no sense pretending that you can put your head in the sand. Sooner or later you're going to be doing a survey we think when the Farm Bill -- I mean, that discussion was already taking place early in the year. I



2.

2.1

know last year we had it on audited surveys.

So I don't think -- I'm not going to -- I'm offended that you would think our members would cheat. I don't believe that. They all hand it to the accountants to do it, and then they would turn it in.

- Q. And I -- if you interpreted my question, as accusing anyone of cheating, I think you badly misheard it.
- A. Well, I think -- I think that you are trying to make that connection. Keep in mind there's seven co-ops in that survey, and it's a huge amount of value. Just because of the products that were surveyed, we know who make them. And they admit -- and they admitted -- they acknowledged that they participated in the survey. So we had a lot of participation, both with current members and quite honestly with some former members that participated in the survey.
- Q. So changing gears. You mentioned in response to one of my previous questions that you don't believe Dr. Stephenson's 2007 report included California plants, correct?
 - A. I believe it did not.
- Q. Okay. Did his survey this time around include California plants?
 - A. I believe it does.
- 26 Q. Do you believe --
- A. Yes, I know because Hilmar says they participated.

 So, yes, it does.



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

- Q. Do you believe that there's any risk of overweighting California production if you simply average those two surveys together?
- A. You could. You could. You would probably also have lower costs, although I have no way to know that. That's speculative.
- Q. Can I ask some questions about slide 18, please.

 Now, do you know what AMPI's cost to produce

 cheese was at the time the Make Allowances were last

 changed?
 - A. No.

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. Do you know if it was higher or lower than the Make Allowance in the current formulas?
 - A. I do not know that -- all I know is the percent change from that period of time to current.
 - Q. And the same is true for Land O'Lakes and Darigold?
 - A. That is also true. I don't know their numbers. I just know what they -- what they talked about. In the Land O'Lakes, we calculated it based on the data that they provided in their testimony.
 - Q. So within Dr. Stephenson's 2006 report, the average for a low cost cheddar plant was \$0.1459. That -- if you increased that by 47%, you would still be only slightly higher than the current Make Allowance, correct?
 - A. Yes. But this is not based on Stephenson's survey. This is based on the Make Allowances that were put in place in 2008. And if it is not labeled that way,



that is my mistake. No, I'm saying, because I apologize because it isn't quite clear.

Q. 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

24

25

26

27

- A. Yeah. And we use -- on most of our comparisons we use the adopted Make Allowances because we thought that was most appropriate because that's what they have been using for regulation since 2008.
- Q. I guess the point is that you don't know if you take whatever the base cost of manufacturing for these three entities was in 2008 and increase them by the percentage of their overall increase, you don't know what their cost is today, yet, do you?
- A. No. You just know it went up. It is all percents. As you know, people were very careful of not sharing actual cost data for the most port.
- Q. And you don't know whether that increased number more closely aligns with Proposal 7 or Proposal 8, correct?
 - A. Proposal 7 and 8 are the same.
 - Q. I'm sorry, am I getting --
 - A. 8 and 9 -- yeah, I guess you are right, 7 and 8.
- We -- we don't. But where's the data behind the National Milk proposal other than they got in a room and discussed it? That's about right. We haven't seen any documentation. We have tried to do that. So I'm -- I -- I don't know that.
- On the other hand, both -- both -- all three of the plants listed on that form have publicly



acknowledged they participated in the surveys, all three of those cooperatives, so we know that they're in it. I don't know who they are or where they are, but I know that they're all in the survey.

- Q. And you don't know where they fall within the stratification --
 - A. No, I don't.

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

- Q. -- of Dr. Stephenson's results?
- A. No. No. I'm not supposed to know that, so I don't know it.
- Q. On slide 19, are these actually Land O'Lakes' costs you represent here?
- A. They listed the Stephenson costs. They listed the percent over Stephenson. And with those two pieces of information, you -- since we have the Stephenson cost, you can calculate what that actual amount was. So that's what we did. And they put all other costs together in that -- what is called all other costs. And they assigned that equally across all milk solids, both fat, protein, and other solids.
- Q. And the -- but there are still some holes in getting to the precise figure because of that blending of both the products and all other costs, right?
- A. Well, if you assume those all other costs -- keep in mind what Mark said about his survey, is he didn't have detail on certain costs. What he did is he would -- he would -- he would -- he would blend average them.
 - So on a hundredweight basis or on an average cost



for butter and powder, we're confident these numbers are -- are actually quite accurate. Because you take the two costs they have defined, and then you add the \$0.10 or I guess it was \$0.11 addition on all other costs. And on powder, you take those processing, labor, and utility costs, you add that same other cost, which they spread equally across all product, to come up with a number.

And the price at the bottom is an aggregate because we don't know -- I didn't want to assume either, you know -- I had to assume that the \$0.1009 was across all. So I really wanted to look at it on a hundredweight average cost basis change, and to do that I used Federal Order yields on butter and on powder and came up with a -- came up with an aggregate change. That's how that was calculated.

And I'll be honest with you, it was bigger than I thought it was going to be, too, and I worked on it for about 45 minutes to make sure it was right because that seems high. But it is not inconsistent with, for example, what Darigold had offered, so we just -- we -- were pretty confident that it is in the range of being right.

And Land O'Lakes had two plants in the survey.

They had Carlisle, Pennsylvania, and Tulare, California, which he -- which Christian acknowledged. So I just -- I just kept that in math. It's more about the overall cost change than it is the actual number of cost, and that's the whole idea of this exercise, that they are -- and if you are efficient, which I assume they are, it's still a



2.

2.1

1 | big change.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Q. Is it your testimony that there is currently a lack of an appropriate financial incentive to reinvest, expand or build new plants?
 - A. Overall, yes.
 - Q. And that's your testimony despite the evidence that Glanbia has recently entered into -- or opened a joint venture plant at a cost of \$450 million plus? That's still your conclusion?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And despite --
- 12 A. You don't -- you can't assume that plants are
 13 buying milk on Class III. James made that very clear in
 14 his testimony.
- 15 | O. And --
- 16 A. Because those plants aren't pooled, so there's lots of flexibility.
- Q. And he also said we're not going to talk about specific business agreements --
- 20 A. Right.
- 21 | O. -- and I will honor that.
- A. Yep. I just quoted him, by the way, on the plants aren't pooled, he said that.
- Q. But as far as that you can't say that they are buying above or below Class III?
- A. I don't know that. I just know that there's a lot of flexibility. He did say that, those contracts are flexible. They have to be, because you got to make a



plant pay for itself.

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. You have not seen those contracts, have you?
- A. Oh, no. Of course not.
- O. The --
- A. I didn't see them when I worked there. They keep those pretty private.
- Q. And that's still your testimony even though Hilmar's doing a \$600 million plant?
- A. Yep. And what did they talk about pooling? What did they say? They said they had no plans at this time to pool, that they worked out contracts with producers in order to make the plant work, and if they'd had any idea what was going to happen with inflation in the last two years, they wouldn't have built it. That all came out of Wes's testimony.
- Q. And you don't know their milk contract either, do you?
 - A. No. No. Of course not.
 - Q. And despite Saputo's testimony about installing two and a half million dollar water polishers across its facility, that is still your conclusion?
 - A. That's a sustainability, environmental, and maybe even a regulatory issue if they are dealing with a lot of BOD in water that made them have to do that. I mean, a lot of times water cleansing is more -- I had that experience with Kroger. Michigan -- Detroit has very high BOD costs in their waste treatment system, so you could do things that seem crazy, and in the end, it still saves you



money. And I can't speculate that's why they did that, but I know that's often the case when you put in clarifiers.

- Q. And the testimony from Leprino about a \$1 billion new plant, you still conclude that there's not enough incentive, economic incentive, to expand or build new plants?
- A. Again, I don't know the -- I don't know the details of that -- of that arrangement, so I can't -- I can't speak to that. But contracts have got very -- again, when a plant is not pooled, and none of those plants are pooled, there's a lot more flexibility in how you negotiate the price of milk.
- Q. Because, again, no Class III plant is required to pool, correct?
- A. That is correct. So we give them a competitive advantage over those who need to for competitive reasons or there are supply contracts for fluid milk who have to, to some degree, pool plants.

You brought up what I think is a really important point, is that do we want to give manufacturing to unregulated areas, just let them have all of it because it's so difficult to compete when you're regulated?

Because we're reaching that point.

- Q. Are any of the plants I just asked you about in an unregulated area?
- A. No, but are they regulated? Are they regulated? It is not just where they are located, it's whether or not



2.

2.1

they participate in the regulations.

- Q. That ability to participate or not participate in the regulations hasn't changed in how -- ever?
- A. Right. We're seeing these massive plants built where they don't have to participate in regulation. You still see some growth in other markets. I won't argue with that. But the big growth is in these unregulated markets. And to me, as a buyer of a lot of cheese at Kroger, it disturbs me -- I -- I like to buy from a broad -- we like to buy from a broad group of suppliers, and it is becoming more and more difficult for profitability, particularly in the Midwest and Northeast, with current regulations.

I mean to say that we have gone 15 years without a change in make, that there isn't a need for it, is just hard to believe. And it is evident. I mean, we have -- almost every cooperative of any size has limits on milk production. And that is long-term very, very damaging. Some -- some are doing better than others; some have -- some farmers can sell base to others, and that seems to work a little better. But in a lot of cases you are kind of trapped. If you want to compete with where there aren't those limitations, with larger herds that can grow and spread those fixed costs further, it's difficult to do. Very, very hard to do.

So this whole thing about economic harm to farmers isn't just price. And, again, most of the price of milk has nothing to do with the Make Allowance. It's got to do



2.

2.1

with the price of the commodities. It's got to do with the access to market and the ability to grow. Terry Brockman from Saputo said that. The biggest question he gets isn't price, it's, "Can I sell you more milk?"

And so what do we do to make sure that that can happen for dairymen that want to sell more milk, that they have a place to send milk?

And there's dumping, but dumping is a small part of it. The supply, the quotas or whatever you want to call them, is -- base/excess programs are restricting ability to grow. And we all know in our incredibly world, at some point, you have to specialize or grow, because if you are -- if you are good at what you do, but you can't capitalize on that talent and grow your business, you'll have a hard time. I mean, you certainly work for a co-op that's probably the best at that of any. And you can't ignore that. That's a big part of the -- of the whole equation is availability of market, not just what's the Make Allowance.

- Q. That was my last question. And when we get the transcript, I'm very interested to look and see how long the answer was to a yes/no question.
- A. Well, if you ask a yes/no that can't be answered with a yes/no, you're not going to get a yes/no. You know me better than that.
- Q. That is not a criticism. I'm just interested in seeing it.

MR. MILTNER: Thank you, Mr. Brown.



2.

2.1

1 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 2. THE COURT: Further questions of this witness, other than AMS? 3 4 Ms. Hancock. THE WITNESS: Good morning. 5 6 CROSS-EXAMINATION 7 BY MS. HANCOCK: 8 Ο. Good morning. 9 I want to -- I'm just going to first touch 10 on your written testimony in Exhibit 214. You start off by providing some calculations, I think a basic product 11 12 price formula calculation and how Make Allowance works. 13 That's just for the historical perspective; is that --14 Yeah, it's just -- it's more demonstrative than 15 anything. It's not --16 (Court Reporter clarification.) 17 BY MS. HANCOCK: 18 I think the last part of my question was, you were 19 just providing that for the historical perspective, an 2.0 explanation of how it worked? 2.1 Yes. That's all that was. Α. 22 Okay. And then similarly, in the presentation 23 that you put together to summarize your testimony, the 2.4 presentation as Exhibit 215, the first third or so of 25 that, you were just providing some historical context of 26 regulatory rulings, and what we heard with Mr. Miltner was 27 some district court briefing and some other historical



anecdotes?

- A. That is correct.
- Q. And you would agree with me that to the extent that there is a historical precedent that's been set, that that's what the attorneys will cover in the briefing that will be submitted after the hearing to USDA; is that fair?
- A. What we want to make sure is our -- our views were covered. So we include them in the testimony, yes.
 - O. Yes.

2.

2.1

- A. Yes, they certainly have that -- I don't know that they have that opportunity. I'm not a lawyer. But if they do, then I expect that they will.
- Q. Okay. And you would agree, though, that to the extent that any of that prior briefing in district court challenges that were made to prior hearings or recommended decisions or any of the recommended decisions or final decisions, that those should be taken into context based on the time period that those issues were being addressed?
- A. Not always, because there have been long set precedents. I mean, I think the best example we saw that was with the California new order, because there was a lot of proposals that were outside of precedence, for example, on pooling is probably the best example. And USDA stayed consistent with their current rules on pooling in markets that are similar.

So I do think that they do look at that, and so I do think it -- we think that should be part of their decision-making. Again, they -- they have the right to do what the Secretary thinks is best. We do think that those



- Q. Right. And I was just -- I was just trying to say that those were opinions or decisions or arguments that were made based on the information that everybody had in the moment that they were made; is that fair?
 - A. That is true. Yes.
- Q. And, for example, in the federal reform hearing and then recommended decision and final decision, that -- you understand that the point of that was to update the system to best reflect the market conditions at the time?
- A. I was very, very much involved with that. Yes, you are correct.
- Q. Okay. And then similarly, where we are today, which is essentially a modernization hearing, what we're here to do is make sure that -- that any pricing formulas that are set are modernized to reflect the current market conditions; is that fair?
- A. No. I will not use the word modernize. We can use the word update, adapt. I think there's a lot of argument that some of the proposals actually are the opposite of modernization, so I will not use that term.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. Certainly we have lots of opportunities to make changes, and we're going to -- we're all getting a good



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

chance to discuss them for six weeks in Indiana.

- Q. Okay. So you would rather use a word like update rather than modernize to accurately reflect --
 - A. 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

- Q. -- what we're doing today?
- A. And I have been saying that from the beginning because modernization is very -- it's very -- that's an opinion.
 - Q. Okay. More -- more subjective?
- A. Yes, it's more subjective. Updates, which can mean modernization, it can mean other things, I think is probably a better term for my personal comfort level.
- Q. Okay. Do you think that we should be modernizing the proposal?
 - A. I think we are offering to modernize the proposal. I don't think all proposals actually modernize it.
 - Q. Okay. So you agree that, in your opinion, that -that this -- the outcome of this hearing would be best
 reflected to modernize what currently exists?
 - A. Within the realm of the proposals, yes.
 - Q. Okay. And then your presentation after you have gone through the historical information goes into your summarizing Dr. Stephenson and Dr. Schiek's analysis and why you believe that of all the data points that are in the record, that these are the best ones to use for setting Make Allowances?
 - A. Yes. We -- we, early on, made a commitment to use research-based information. We thought that it was



- 1 important that we use stuff that there's a research record 2. or an explanation or, you know, an understanding of the process how it was done. And so we made that commitment. 3 4 We made the commitment no matter what studies showed that we were going to do that. We just felt that that was --5 6 you lose credibility. We were concerned we would lose 7 credibility if we didn't use data that was -- you know, we 8 thought was well reasoned and every effort was made to
- 10 Q. And you have been working on this for years,
 11 haven't you?
- 12 A. On?

- 13 Q. On updating or --
- 14 A. Oh, gosh --

make accurate.

- 15 Q. -- modernizing Make Allowances?
- 16 A. -- yes. Yes, since the '90s.
- Q. Okay. But most recently, for this hearing in particular, you have been working on it for more than two years; is that accurate?
- 20 A. Yeah. But in different roles because I was with 21 Kroger until January.
- Q. Okay. And so what hat, what role were you wearing when you were with Kroger?
 - A. Director of dairy supply chain.
- Q. And how did that differ than the hat or role that you are performing today?
- A. I didn't have to spend 110% of my time on policy.

 I kind of like negotiating and working on risk management.



And I've got lost of friends I worked with in this room actually right now on different projects.

So this is a policy role. I was very, very 3 involved with Federal Order Reform back in 2000, 4 particularly some of the formulas, so I have a lot of 5 6 familiarity with it. And I've worked with most -- every 7 proponent or opponent on every proposal here in some way, 8 shape, or form in my career. It was -- I was not planning 9 to take this job when I left Kroger. I was planning to do 10 a little consulting and not work quite so hard. That 11 hasn't happened yet. But I thought it was a -- it was an 12 opportunity to try to work to make the system more 13 sustainable. In the long run that worked better. That 14 was my view.

- Q. And remind me again when you joined IDFA on a policy --
 - A. Last week of January.
- 18 | 0. I'm sorry?

15

16

17

- 19 A. Last week of January.
- 20 Q. Of which year?
- 21 A. This year.
- 22 O. Okay.
- 23 A. I took -- I took six hours off between jobs.
- 24 O. Okay.
- A. Not -- not smart. I don't recommend it, but that's what I did.
 - O. The last week of January of 2022 or 2023?
- 28 A. 2023. I've been with Kroger for -- this makes



nine months. End of this month will be nine months. But I have worked with them for years as a member.

- Q. So prior to you taking the new role and then throughout your current role, you had been working on the Make Allowance for the last two years?
- A. Yeah, we -- I led the economic policy committee at IDFA, so we were basically in discovery mode. But, yes. We did -- no decisions were made, but we tried to -- again, trying to assemble information so we could make what we thought would be the best decision based on the best available information. You know, nothing new was out there, so we decided we needed to try to figure out ways to find updated information. Particularly, with Mark's survey in 2021, cheese was very weak as far as -- and we needed to have more cheese plants participate, because it was only 16% of production, and we didn't feel that was enough to be a good sample.
- Q. Okay. And so you said that you were committed to -- to making an adjustment no matter what the results revealed; is that --
- A. No. We needed to -- if the results had said that what we have now is fine, we would have done nothing.
 - O. Right. But you weren't --
 - A. But it didn't.
- Q. You weren't selecting an end and trying to work backwards from there. You were saying whatever the results reveal is what we will -- what we will proceed with?



2.

2.0

2.1

- A. Yes. And we felt that that was the only honest way to approach it.
 - Q. And -- and along the way, you had Dr. Stephenson's 2021 survey results that came out?
 - A. Right.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. And at that time, you were working, even collectively or collaboratively, with National Milk as well on looking at what -- what updates could be made to the Make Allowance --
- A. Yeah.
 - O. -- is that fair?
- 12 A. That was true. Yes, at that point it certainly 13 was true.
- Q. And in fact, you were -- did you serve on the
 National Milk task force as well or participate with the
 task force in the work that they were doing?
- 17 A. Which one?
 - Q. National Milk's task force?

think is best. But we didn't do that.

- A. No, not -- we had a -- you know, National Milk, it still does, more then, has a lot of members of IDFA, and so they were -- both co-ops were involved in those discussions. And there was an attempt made to work closer with National Milk in the spring of '22. Unfortunately that never really happened. It is unfortunate, but it didn't. And I understand, people have to do what they
- Q. It did happen, right? You just didn't reach an agreement on a number; is that fair?



- Q. Okay. When you said they were generous with sharing the work that they were doing, what kind of information did they share with you?
- A. Just some of the economic background and some of the different proposals before they were proposals.
- Q. Okay. Some of the economic analysis that National Milk was performing to -- to evaluate Make Allowances?
- A. Yes, before they made any decisions, that is correct.
 - Q. And including the fact that they had --
- A. Well, not so much make. No, they didn't -- I didn't see any research on make. I saw it more on differentials, skim calculations. Not on make. I never saw any information from National Milk on makes.
- Q. Did you talk with them about their economic analysis on Make Allowances?
- A. No. Because we -- we thought we were all still working together when they came out with a proposal. Quite honestly, we were surprised.
 - Q. When they came out with a proposal in October?
 - A. October of last year, 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 at the point had IDFA already submitted its request for a hearing?
 - A. Oh, heavens, no.

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

- Q. Or submitted its position on its proposal with the Dr. Stephenson survey?
- A. No, we hadn't even decided to do the Stephenson survey yet. We had some conversations with regulators, came to the conclusion we needed to have an updated, broader survey, so we decided to work to get that accomplished.
- Q. And one of the reasons that IDFA decided that it wanted to have an updated Stephenson survey was because it had some concerns with the numbers that it saw out of the 2021 Stephenson survey; is that right?
- A. Yeah. We didn't think -- participation just simply wasn't even, and we needed to have a better representation, of particularly cheese and whey.
- Q. Okay. And then did you have some concerns with the numbers that came in on butter?
- A. On Mark's new survey?
- O. From 2021.
- A. 2021, yes. And that's where a lot of our members, co-op and non-co-op, said we need to go back to allocating across on a solids basis for fixed costs.
 - O. Because --
- A. Which is why that was the request for the new survey.
 - Q. Because Dr. Stephenson's 2021 survey revealed that



the Make Allowance would actually go down for butter?

- A. But it would take powder almost to \$0.30.
- Q. You have to answer the first question that I asked, though.
 - A. It did lower it, yes.
- Q. 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

24

25

26

27

28

- A. To the surprise of everyone, I think.
- Q. Okay.
- A. Including butter/powder operators based on my conversations.
- Q. So in that example, IDFA did not want to take Dr. Stephenson's number at face value but wanted to redo the survey to make sure that the survey results were updated in 2023?
- A. Two reasons -- well, several. One is we needed to have stronger participation on the whey side, particularly on the cheese side. We were very pleased to see the average cheese plant survey size double, which we thought was an indication we got a broad spectrum of plants.

On the butter/powder, both co-ops and non-co-ops expressed concerns over the non-traditional way of allocating figured costs. So at their -- I won't say insistence, but their recommendation, if you're going to update it, let's go back to the old method so that we can -- it's a little more apples and apples than what we had with Mark's new allocations. And that's why we specifically asked he go back to that. And he had done it before, so it wasn't particularly difficult for him to do



that.

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 you were more comfortable with the second survey results than you were with the first; is that right?
 - A. That is true.
- Q. And do you believe -- and those survey results were taken based on costs that were incurred in calendar year 2022?
- A. Yeah. There's a couple plants that were fiscal 2022, but most of them were calendar. They're all -- whatever the business year was for the participants, that's what Mark said.
- Q. Okay. So either calendar year 2022 or fiscal year --
 - A. Yes --
- Q. -- 2022?
 - A. -- which is the plus or minus off of '22 average.
 - Q. And that was at the discretion of the plant?
- A. Or the companies, yes, whatever they wanted to use. We asked them to be consistent across all plants within the organization. So, again, the allocation of costs, you can do it right. But as you can imagine, most companies have annual records on -- on that kind of information. It's much easier to access than to comprise a year that's part of the two fiscal years, so we gave people that option.
 - O. And --
 - A. And that was true in his other studies too, by the



1 | way. That's not just this last one.

- Q. Okay. So that methodology didn't change?
- A. No. No. Annual years -- if you are going to make your accountants dig up a lot of data, for heavens sakes, don't make it harder than it has to be for them, because they already had it -- most of them had it already
 - Q. And you understand that in Dr. Stephenson's cost allocation, that he's included a return on the investment for those processing products --
- 11 A. Yes.

compiled.

2.

7

8

9

10

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

23

24

- 12 Q. -- that's built into each one of his cost allocations?
- 14 A. Yes.
 - Q. So if -- if a processor were to sell their product of cheese, for example, at the cost -- or at the price that the USDA sets, and its costs came in exactly as Mr. Stephenson -- or whatever the final number was forecasted, and then they pay their dairy processors based on that, that would necessarily have embedded within that a profit margin?
- 22 A. Is there a problem with that?
 - O. I'm just asking --
 - A. If you have --
 - Q. -- if that's your understanding of --
- A. That is my understanding. Yes, that's pretty
 classic allocation. You have to basically put an
 alternate value or an opportunity cost on that investment



and that asset. That's my experience. Very common.

- Q. And I'm just asking this based on your historical perspective and overview because you provided some calculations in here. So I just want to make sure that when you do your calculations in your testimony, that I'm understanding what that includes.
 - A. Very fair.

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. And so if a processor, for example, were able to sell their cheese, in this example, at a price higher than what USDA had set, that would be an additional opportunity for an additional profit?
- A. Assuming that the manufacturing costs were consummate to allow for a greater margin, yes.
 - Q. Everything else is still the same as my first example.
 - A. Then they would be as long as it isn't surveyed, because if it's surveyed, it will end up in that NDPSR price.
 - Q. Well, I mean, but that -- how long does it take for the survey to end up in the price?
 - A. Two weeks.
 - O. So --
 - A. Most cheeses -- I'll use cheese since I'm most familiar with. Most cheese is sold on previous week CME. Some isn't. Some is priced off of Class III. Some is priced -- cream cheese is a really weird formula. But basically it is generally if you -- it's generally a two, two-and-a-half week lag. And if you look -- if you look



1 at, for example, you look at NDPSR prices compared to CME 2. prices, particularly for butter and block and barrel cheese, that lag is very, very predictable because it's 3 4 reporting. USDA bases its price on sale date, and sale date is generally based on a previous week average. And 5 it can -- I think it's even delivery with USDA, so it 6 7 probably adds another week. So there's usually a two- to 8 three-week -- they follow each other very well, but 9 there's definitely a lag with those products. And it's 10 becoming more that way. We have nonfat dry milk too. But that is a newer market. It hasn't been as robust as 11 12 butter and cheese because they have been around, I think 13 longer than me. They have been around a long time, so --

- Q. So at the strike price, at least, that lag hasn't yet caught up; is that right?
 - A. No, it's two to three weeks.
- Q. Okay. So if they sell at higher than the cheese price, that's another opportunity for a profit?
- A. Unless the market's going down, and then the other thing happens. It averages out over time, but it is painful. You say it is great when -- it's great when the market's going up; it is painful when the market is dropping, because of that lag, and you are paying off the lag price.
- Q. And if a plant is able to process more efficiently, or deadly efficiently as I have really come to enjoy --
 - A. You know --



14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. -- that's another opportunity for a processor to build in a profit opportunity?
- A. No different than a dairyman. Some dairymen have lower production costs than others. It's -- I see no difference. No -- no two plants are the same, no two farms are the same. Those who are the best at making quality products at the lowest cost, regardless of regulation, will be around over the long-term because they have the most ability to generate a margin that allows them to grow.
- Q. Okay. So is the answer yes, that the -- if they can -- if a processor can beat the Make Allowance, then that's another opportunity to find or build profit into -- into their calculations?
 - A. If they are the half that's lower, yes.
- Q. Okay. And then you said that's no different than a producer, if they can build efficiencies into their process, they might be able to find some profit margins in there as well; is that fair?
- A. As we all know, they work very, very hard to do that.
- Q. Yeah. And we have heard some other testimony in this hearing that the larger the herd, the more efficiencies that a dairy producer can build in -- into their profit margin calculations. Would you agree that's your experience as well? In your observations of the industry?
 - A. I didn't quite get the question.



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

- Q. Yeah. Just that the larger -- the larger the herd or the larger the dairy farm, the more opportunities they have to be efficient and have a higher profit margin?
 - A. Generally that is true, yes.
- Q. So the smaller dairy farmers tend to be the ones that have the thinnest margins or the most difficult time building those efficiencies into their process?
- A. It really varies. From my personal experience, it really does vary. One of the challenges you have with small dairies, even if your margin per unit of milk is high, based on your size and just the cost of living, do you generate enough margin to support that family, even though the herd itself may be fairly profitable. So it really varies.

But if you just look at herd size over time and how it has grown, that's telling us that the -- obviously the big herds seem to be the ones that are -- are doing better because they -- herd size continues to grow. Which makes perfect sense, just hopefully get better efficiencies out of the equipment and labor and everything else.

- Q. And so you would agree with me, then, that those that are most susceptible to the pressures of Make Allowances being increased are those smaller dairy farmers who might have the thinner margins and not as big of efficiencies?
- A. Well, if they are on a base/excess program like most of the country, they don't have a chance to grow if



2.

2.0

2.1

they want to. So I don't think that's -- you can't look at half that question. You simply can't.

- Q. Yeah. Is it -- I'm just asking you about that example.
- A. I know you are, but you are trying to get me to say a certain answer, aren't you? I mean, the way I look at it is the -- a farmer or producer -- Federal Order term -- a producer has, I mean, they're -- if they are selling milk more proprietary, they are guaranteed a minimum price based on their component levels in the market they are in, and all those other things. And it is the same price whether you have 10,000 cows or you have a hundred cows. There's no discrimination on size or advantage to size as far as regulated minimum price.

And so they will have those struggles regardless. And as far as whether that Make Allowance hurts their price, it depends if they own their cooperative, if they are a cooperative member, owns their manufacturing assets. They only have so much money to pay. That's where we see these mailbox prices. It's very discouraging. They get harder. And if you are not a co-op -- I mean, if they are a co-op and they are selling to someone who sells on a regulated price, those plants sometimes grow, but not as consistently.

So it's -- it's unfortunately more complex than I wish it was. And, you know, I was raised on one of those little farms, and I wish they were all still there. But it's getting tougher and tougher.



2.

2.1

I think -- and I'll go back to Idaho. There was a lot of small farms in Idaho at one time, and the order didn't matter then. It was just a function of efficiency. And you got bright kids, and they decide to be lawyers or I guess cheese makers or whatever they decide to be. It is just more difficult. And with or without regulations, unfortunately our small dairymen, unless they've got some kind of specialty market or they worked out some kind of arrangement, it is very hard. And it is unfortunate, but it is very hard.

- Q. It's been a long time since we have had small dairy farms in Idaho.
- A. Yeah, I know. When I went to Glanbia, there was a few. They are pretty much all gone now.
- Q. Did you hear the testimony from some of the processors like Glanbia and Leprino that said that it -- it's been the last four -- four -- four-ish years or at least since the pandemic since they haven't been able to beat those Make Allowances?
- A. Yeah. And they are -- they are -- I would assume they are all probably low cost operators. The way they have grown, you would assume that they are. And so they are low cost operators and can't meet the make in the last three or four years. It doesn't surprise me. The smaller ones, it's probably been a little longer. The very biggest, that would be the time. But we've had, as we all know, remarkable inflation in the last two and a half years. So it had a big effect.



2.

2.1

- Q. Does that indicate that Make Allowances that were last updated -- what, was it 15 years ago?
 - A. Yes. 2008.

2.

2.1

- Q. Does that indicate then that if they were able to beat them for 11 of those 15 years, that 15 years ago
 Make Allowances were set too high?
- A. No. Because you are talking about four of the most efficient dairy companies probably in the world. That's not your weighted average cost. It's the smaller ones that have really struggled. And a lot of them aren't tiny. They may be 3 or 4 million pounds of milk a day, but they have really struggled. And they kind of hobbled along.

And, again, I think the data that James DeJong did -- and I'm glad he did it so I didn't have to -- on the -- when you look at the -- the mailbox versus regulated minimum -- or announced price, and unfortunately, the negative, you can't explain those kind of differences away on hauling. They are much bigger than that. And that just means there's less money to go around.

And the system doesn't function if -- if it basically doesn't let competition have some room -- just like the farms -- some room and who -- who is in business in ten years and who is not.

So it isn't, sadly, that simple. And very large -- I would expect very large companies to have lower manufacturing costs. I would hope when I was at Kroger I



was a better negotiator because of the volume we had, and they never fired me, so we must have done okay.

But the point is, is that you are always going to have differences in business with or without regulation, and you have to expect that. And we have some extremely efficient private cheese companies. We have some extremely efficient block producers as well.

- Q. You were talking with Mr. Miltner about the change from NASS to NDPSR. And I think you said that when NDPSR, they took -- took over, we got better data because the auditors knew what they were doing?
- A. They got consistent direction. Under NASS -- because I was at Glanbia when NDPSR started. Under NASS, it was run by the states, and every state kind of interpreted things a little differently, and so it resulted in not consistent reporting.

When USDA took that over, I mean, they have had —they know audits. They have been doing them for decades and decades and decades. And so it wasn't malicious perhaps — I'll give you a real simple example. One cheese plant was reporting white block cheddar because they make yellow and while block. You are not supposed to report whites. So they said, oops, we're sorry, and they quit reporting the whites, just as — a very simple example of a thing that USDA caught that they had been doing incorrectly for at least ten years.

So it's -- it -- maybe not -- yeah, close to ten, maybe eight.



2.

2.1

Anyway, the -- they just made it far more consistent, which is something USDA's Dairy Division is very good at, trying to be consistent across their procedures, and it just made the data better.

I don't know how many audits there is as far as people not reporting, or it was more, a little fine things on the edge where, that no one had ever told them not to report that, and so they reported it, or they weren't reporting something they should.

Another thing I saw was on fresh cheese, very fresh cheese, some -- particularly barrels, some processors bought barrels that are two or three days old, and they were being reported rule five. So that was cheese that was no longer --

- Q. They were being reported -- I missed the last of --
- A. They were reporting cheese that was just two -- it was delivered very fresh. Barrels, fresh, have a different functionality than barrels that are two months old. And they both are important, but you kind of blend them. And they weren't -- they were less than the five days I believe it is on barrels. So it shouldn't have been reported, although it was, you know, being sold to the same customer that was buying stuff that was reported.

So, again, just trying to make sure everything is consistent because that's the only way you get comparable data is to have consistent rules on what you report.

Q. And I think you started off by saying one of the



2.

2.1

differences in the way that NASS collected and reported the data compared to NDPSR, that it wasn't maliciously motivated, but that it was just better methodology for collection.

A. Yes. I believe that is the case. And just you had -- the auditor staff had -- they had consistent training, because it's a federal program rather than a local program. So people were given the same -- basically the same tool kit to do their job, which I think made it work a whole lot better.

In my experience, the industry confidence went up a lot in NDPSR when it -- with AMS because they knew the rules were -- everybody was following the same rules. Even plants would say, well, they are not reporting. Well, you know, if they weren't or they were doing it wrong, it got corrected. So it just made the system work better. Put a lot more confidence in those numbers.

- Q. Why did it matter if the industry had confidence in the numbers?
- A. Well, why wouldn't it? If you feel that -- if you are going to be regulated, don't you want to make sure it is based on fair data? I mean -- and that was it. You want to make sure it was fair.

And, again, I don't think -- there were some issues, I think, with reporting, the states, that may have been more onerous than others. But a lot of them were just really simple like I just described, and they were generally not large volumes of product. But if you are



2.

2.1

- Q. And do you agree that for Make Allowances, if you are going to record it and audit it -- or if you are going to record it and survey it, that we should do it right?
- A. We need to use our best available data. I think Farm Bureau, National Milk, and IDFA are all working on legislative language to give USDA the opportunity to do that. But if we're going to be 2008 to 2010 before we have something we can use, that's way too long.
- Q. How long did take Dr. Stephenson to do the survey the IDFA commissioned?
 - A. He started it in February; he finished it the end of May.
 - Q. Okay. And I think when you were talking with Mr. Miltner, it was Exhibit 179 about the e-mail that was sent out to the members.

Do you recall that?

- A. Oh, yes.
- Q. And you said at the time that it was sent out you didn't know if it was the membership that existed at the time or the membership --
- A. No, I did know. It went to everyone that was a member, and we hadn't had any change yet, so everyone.
- Q. Let me finish my question because it might clarify where --
 - A. All 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

Q. -- I'm going with it.
In Exhibit --

A. I apologize.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

27

28

Q. That's okay.

In Exhibit -- this is just an awkward conversation when it's so compartmentalized.

But in Exhibit 179, when you were talking with Mr. Miltner about that, you were saying you don't know if it was the membership that existed at the time was what -- is the same membership that you have now because there had been a change in membership.

- A. No. It was whoever was a member, and so if people had joined since those letters were written or they have left since those letters were written, they -- they -- the ones that joined later didn't get a letter; those who left after the letters did get a letter. So -- so, basically, we did have some members leave in May. All of those people got the letters because they were sent in April. The final letter was actually sent in April.
 - O. Was that --
- A. The one that you saw was sent in March, the one that Ryan had.
 - 0. Okay.
 - A. Yeah.
- Q. So when you talk about the members that had left in May, was that May of 2023?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. What do you understand was the reason that



those members departed?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

16

17

18

19

24

25

26

27

- A. That's -- they can tell you.
- Q. I'm just asking you what your understanding was.
- A. I think that's private between members who have got different reasons and different letters. I don't think it is my ability -- I can't share that. I don't feel it appropriate.
- Q. Do you know what percentage of IDFA's membership left in May of 2023?
 - A. I'm not going to tell you.
- 11 | 0. Was it more than 50%?
- 12 A. No. But I'm not going to -- that's enough.
- Enough prying on that. That's private. I shouldn't even have told you that. No, it's not that. The whole staff
- 15 is still there, so they are making it work.
 - Q. Is it your understanding that you had a membership departure because of the concerns with the methodology and the approach that IDFA is taking with respect to its Make Allowance at this hearing?
- A. I think the -- from what I understand the concern was that they were looking only at Make Allowance at IDFA.

 That's the only thing we had consensus on at that time, so we moved ahead with that.
 - Q. It was the approach that IDFA was taking, with the lack of consensus from its membership?
 - A. Well, you never have 100%. They weren't happy, otherwise they wouldn't have left. Some of them I think it was budget, but most of them I think it was probably



the policy, Federal Order policy was the reason. And			
we've also had a couple of join us since then because of			
Federal Order policy. I mean, it's just you know, we			
live in a very diverse industry, and there's lots of			
opinions, and getting them all to align is a challenge.			
Q. When you say Federal Order policy, you understand			
that that's Federal Order policy that is being presented			
at this hearing			
A. Yes.			
Q that we are here for?			
A. Yes.			
MS. HANCOCK: That's all I have. Thank you so			
much for your time.			
THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.			
THE COURT: Further questions for this witness,			
other than AMS?			
We have been going about an hour and 20 minutes			
again. We can take a break. Come back at 11:00.			
(Whereupon, a break was taken.)			
THE COURT: Back on the record.			
Okay. Mr. English.			
CROSS-EXAMINATION			
BY MR. ENGLISH:			
Q. Chip English, Milk Innovation Group.			
Mr. Brown, you had a couple of questions or			
several questions from National Milk counsel about the			

27

28

What is your recollection of USDA's treatment of

issue of return on investment.

1 return on investment dating back to 1999 and the Federal 2. Order Reform? They have always included it when they are doing 3 4 their analysis on what's an adequate cost because that's -- you have an opportunity cost for that asset. 5 You have to put a value on it if you are going to have a 6 7 true cost. MR. ENGLISH: That's all I had, your Honor. 8 9 THE COURT: Anything further from anyone besides 10 AMS? 11 AMS. 12 CROSS-EXAMINATION 13 BY MS. TAYLOR: 14 Ο. Good morning. 15 Good morning again. Α. 16 You guys got very organized at the break and Ο. 17 caught me off quard. 18 The IDFA proposal seeks to implement your 19 Make Allowances over a four-year time period. 2.0 Α. That is correct. 2.1 But throughout the testimony of -- your testimony Ο. 22 and other IDFA members that have testified previously, you 23 know, obviously the emphasis is on how you all feel the 24 current makes are very inadequate and plants are losing 25 money, etcetera. 26 So I guess, how come given that reality that you 27 all testified to, you still are okay with a four-year kind 28 of staggered implementation? Why is that acceptable?



A. Because of the large increase that is being asked
for. And we think that it would it may be too much at
once to basically raise makes \$0.08 on cheese, whatever
the other numbers are, and to do it in a more gradual
basis as long as we have a schedule to get there or as,
you know, until we have a USDA audited study, gives some
time.

It's -- it's been so long, and inflation the last two years has been so rough on everyone, that we just feel that it would make more sense to give it -- give it some room. We have members that would like it all at once. It was a consensus view that it just makes it a little easier on the farm side if we do it over four years. It's never fun for anyone, but that's -- that's the view.

Q. Okay. And we have heard a lot about -- throughout the past few weeks, about plant investment, whether it's new plants being built or not being built or investments in current plants to help increase efficiencies. And a lot of that discussion was, well, we had to be innovative if Make Allowances aren't reflective of our costs to figure out how to combat that.

So given the current -- the Stephenson study and the Schiek study that you all are proposing be used, how are those efficiencies captured? Or maybe another way to put that is, capturing efficiencies can also mean increasing yields, and we're not -- you all aren't seeking an increase in yields. So how is that somehow being factored into the equation?



2.

2.0

2.1

2.4

A. You can only create so much yield. I mean, if you have a product that's 3% water and 97% solids, for example, there's only so much you can do to increase the yield. I'm -- one of the reasons I personally am very confident about a yield study with USDA as part of the make study is you are going to find that the yields are pretty much right. It is whether you fortify or you condense milk in front of the vat, which of course you would take account for.

In my experience, the only -- only -- if you are a modern efficient plant, you are already doing what you can because the last thing you can afford is to lose the solids down the drain, guite frankly.

And I think one of the reasons we really encouraged broad participation in the last survey is we wanted to make sure there was large plants in it.

One of the -- one of the opportunities I saw with Mark's 2021 study is he didn't have enough cheese in it, and his average plant size was like 1.6 million pounds. Which isn't tiny, but for an average it is kind of low. That was doubled. So I'm more confident that it reflects those -- those big efficient plants, whether they are powder dryers or cheese makers are now in the information.

And, again, we can't make anybody do anything, but we strongly encourage them to go in because we think it helps credibility. And it is a more honest picture of the industry, quite honestly.

Q. Okay. Can you turn to page 12 of your exhibit,



2.

2.1

the PowerPoint slide, Exhibit 215?

A. Sure.

2.

2.1

- Q. So under the 2019 study, that first box, under participating plants. We found that the nonfat dry milk and butter plant numbers are different than what you have in this table. So I'm just wondering if they are -- if you were referring to a different study perhaps?
 - A. Let me --
 - Q. Or that might just be an oversight?
- A. If I can, I'll check, and if it needs to be resubmitted, we will correct the table.
 - Q. Okay. So there was some talk about -- in one of your examples in your testimony, dumping milk, specifically in the Upper Midwest, because of lack of plant capacity. I'm just wondering if there might be additional reasons that could be why that milk was dumped or you attribute it all to willing -- I'll term it, willing plant capacity?
 - A. Yeah. And I think it is important that the dumped milk compared to what the supply management programs are doing on milk volume is small, but we're so tight. For example, when Hastings Creamery just closed down, and that caused some stress. We had some stress earlier in the year when we had a change in suppliers into a plant in South Dakota. And you can't live in Kenosha, Wisconsin, and not hear about the milk being dumped in the Milwaukee sewer, which amazes me because the BOD charge you are going to pay on that is going to kill them. Couldn't they



find someone else to do that.

2.

2.1

But generally when milk is dumped, either it's -it's -- has -- it's positive for antibiotics, and most of
that is handled with lagoons. I think most companies have
farmers that they work with to manage that.

The -- the other thing is -- you see, is sometimes if you, depending on where markets are, whether you have an outlet, because really the only Grade B milk anymore is when a BTU fails, and so you will have some milk that for a day or two will be B. Some plants will take that, not very many anymore because of their customers' requirements, so that can cause some.

But what you see in the Midwest isn't necessarily every day. There's 20 loads going to the Milwaukee sewer system. It's we're so tight on space, it just takes a very little thing to create some disruption. Hastings is a good example.

And it will generally resolve itself, but right now we're -- the spring in particular we were so tight in capacity, there was really no place for it to move. So it's -- it's -- it's more due to lack of space than normally. Normally I view dumped milk as being either antibiotics or someone failed a bulk tank unit with FDA.

- Q. Okay. And lack of space would be lack of willing plant capacity to take on milk?
- A. Yeah. What you find -- with that milk, if you look at the spot milk prices this year, I mean, if you wanted milk, you could buy it inexpensive. There's a



couple of things with that. One is labor is still tight. It's not as bad as it was a year ago, but labor is still tight in plants. Second is they literally don't have the room. They are running that full. Particularly the spring, I think we all know it got particularly crazy.

And what you will find when you dump milk, you are going to look, where can I send that to get rid of it, where can I sell it? If I get six bucks to sell it into some little dryer down in Kentucky, and it costs me four to get there, it's better than nothing. And so plants will do that. And there's some people that will pick up that milk. Same with cream, if you have cream that's got a high acidity, there's someone that can probably figure out a way to make something out of it, and they will buy it, and it will be at a heavy discount.

And so that's what they look for, any option they have that's better than dumping it. But unfortunately, this year there has been some of that.

My experience historically, particularly in Idaho, because you are so far from places, that processors, if they do get long, or you don't have anyone that can take B milk, then it does travel a long way, and so it is really math.

And this year, you know, sales started to get weaker. Cheese got weaker in June. No one is excited about building inventory, although thankfully we recovered nicely, and so there wasn't a place to send it. That's really what it amounts to. It's just -- this is just



2.

math. It is not only how much can I make, it's how much -- how much will I lose versus dumping it. It just makes sense to haul it, so that's what they will do. That's been my experience.

- Q. Could that -- that scenario which you just discussed and -- could that be leading to some of the decrease in the mailbox prices we see, because there's not other outlets for producers to sell their milk, and so they are being forced to take a lower price?
- A. It certainly could. Well, if you -- I think we had one testimony from a cooperative talking about how premiums have lowered because of margins. It certainly -- it certainly could.

One thing -- the other thing is when you have inventories building. So, for example, cheddar got long in June. We all know that. And -- and do you really want to make -- even if the milk's cheap, do you want to devalue the inventory you already can't sell by putting more product on the market? And that's another consideration.

They're -- like everybody else in business, what's the best for my business, and it isn't always buying cheap milk. But generally, I mean, in -- I think the biggest indicator, Erin, is all the supply management programs we have with cooperatives, all over the country. They just simply -- they have -- they would have even more milk than they could manage if they didn't have those programs in place.



2.

2.0

2.1

1	Q. Uh-huh. Okay.
2	On page well, page 22 of your PDF exhibit, you
3	talk about you would like the effective implementation
4	date to be January 1st, 2025, of the first increase.
5	And what's IDFA's position if, let's say,
6	January 1st, 2025, in the calendar of events doesn't work,
7	just for who knows what reason. What's your suggestion
8	for how your proposal should be implemented?
9	A. Well, we believe strongly there's enough urgency
10	that it doesn't need to wait. We don't think risk
11	management on Make Allowances is is something we need
12	to be careful with too much delay with that. We
13	understand just the process alone and getting through all
14	the steps, it looks like January 1st, 2025 was popular,
15	Erin. I think we all recognize, again, that's that's
16	Proposal 22. You make it work however it best fits to
17	work. We would be open to a different timeline, but we
18	would like annual adjustments like we proposed.
19	Q. Okay. So but starting at the first of the
20	calendar year isn't
21	A. It isn't crucial.
22	Q isn't crucial? Okay.
23	A. Not if it doesn't make sense regulatory-wise to do
24	that.
25	Q. Okay. And then on the give me a second. I
26	thought I marked my page, but I apparently did not.



exhibit, 214.

27

28

Page -- now I'm going to flip to your other

A. Okay.

2.

2.1

Q. On page 26, so it's 25 going into 26, more in the implementation piece, you wrote, "If USDA were nonetheless to adopt such a delay in implementing, IDFA would no longer support staggered implementation of the proposed Make Allowance." And you would propose that we just jump to year four.

I'm just wondering if you could expand on that. I don't think anyone's asked you a question on that.

A. No. And that's an excellent question.

What -- what we're saying is if there's a significant delay due to, for example, risk management concerns. Let's just use an example. Say we're going to wait 18 months over when it could possibly be implemented because of that. We think at that point that that's too long to wait for just a partial, so we would ask that you move to the full thing. That would also give the risk management folks plenty of time to adapt to the change. That's what that's about. And that would be if there's a -- a plan significant delaying implementation. And, again, I know there hasn't been broad support for that, but we just -- our folks think it is pretty important that we don't stretch it out more than the four years we already have. So that's where that comes from.

Q. Okay. So I think as I have understood the testimony so far, that I -- I don't believe anyone's asked for a delay in the Make Allowance piece, for implementing that.



- A. No. But there's -- there's been some conversation by one Upper Midwest bargaining cooperative that spent a lot of time talking about risk management and the need for delay that I don't think was specifically on Proposal 1.
 - Q. 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

- A. Proposal 1, I can see some logic because you are changing those skim formulas.
- Q. Okay. And then below that, you have, "A majority of cheese manufacturers have fewer than the 1250 employees, and then therefore qualifies as Small Businesses."
- I know we have collected information on the plants that have been here or the -- represented here at this hearing. But how did you come up with "a majority"?

 Where does that --
- A. The survey. IDFA, when you -- we do annual surveys, and they give us employee numbers.
 - O. So these are IDFA members?
- A. Yes. These are IDFA members. That is correct. I can't speak for cheese makers, but for IDFA members, the majority of them are smaller. The big ones are really big, but the majority are less than that.
 - 0. Okay.
- MS. TAYLOR: I think that's all AMS has. Thank you.
- 26 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
- 27 THE COURT: Redirect?
- MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, at this point I would



1	simply move Hearing Exhibits 214 and 215 into evidence.
2	THE COURT: Any objections?
3	Hearing none, 214 and 215 are admitted into the
4	record of this proceeding.
5	(Thereafter, Exhibit Numbers 214 and 215 were
6	received into evidence.)
7	THE COURT: Mr. Miltner, do you want to move in
8	Exhibit 179 at this point?
9	MR. MILTNER: I think we'll move it after
10	Mr. Allen says what he has to say about it, if that's
11	okay.
12	THE COURT: Very well.
13	You are dismissed. Thank you, sir.
14	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
15	MR. MILTNER: Your Honor, this is Ryan Miltner
16	representing Select Milk Producers, and we would like to
17	the stand Mr. Chris Allen.
18	THE COURT: Mr. Allen, welcome. Please raise your
19	right hand.
20	CHRIS ALLEN,
21	Being first duly sworn, was examined and
22	testified as follows:
23	MR. MILTNER: Thank you, your Honor.
24	DIRECT EXAMINATION
25	BY MR. MILTNER:
26	Q. Mr. Allen, if you could state and spell your name
27	for the record, please?
28	A. Chris Allen, C-H-R-I-S, A-L-L-E-N.



- Q. And if you could also provide your business address for the record, please?
- A. 5151 Belt Line Road, Suite 455, Dallas, Texas, 75254.
 - Q. And in front of you do you have a document that's labeled in the upper right as Exhibit Select-1?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And is that your testimony on what is known as Proposal 11 in this proceeding?
- 10 A. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

27

- Q. Okay. And I understand that you -- you intend to read an abbreviated version of that statement for your testimony today, correct?
 - A. That is correct.
 - Q. Okay. Now, as you were preparing to deliver your testimony, I believe there were three small edits to that exhibit from that which was submitted USDA in advance; is that correct?
- 19 A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. So I want to go through those. And they are reflected in the versions that have been handed out, and we will submit to AMS a PDF copy of the revised version.
- On page 1, the third line from the bottom, where it reads, "0.68% of butterfat."
- That did read 0.68% of milk solids, correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And then on page 2, under the section beginning



"Philosophy and Rationale," in the fourth line, the word "processing" appeared twice, correct?

A. Correct.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

- Q. And the first one of those should have read "production"; is that correct?
 - A. Right.
- Q. And then on page 16, in your conclusion, in what is the fourth line from the bottom, there was no change to the wording, but the change to the punctuation in that sentence there, correct, where it read, 0.2% of all solids, period, butterfat losses, comma, there was a punctuation change there, correct?
- A. Yes.
- Q. But no change to the wording as I recall; is that right?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. All right. So if you would give a little bit of your revised statement on your background. If you would then pause, I would like to ask you a few more questions, and we'll proceed from there.
 - THE COURT: Did we mark this?
- MR. MILTNER: Oh, you know what, we did not.
- Could we mark that, your Honor, as the next sequential
- 24 | exhibit?
- THE COURT: Select-1 is marked 216 for identification.
- 27 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 216 was marked
- for identification.)



MR. MILTNER: Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS: I am the senior director for industry relations and analytics at Select Milk Producers, Inc. I hold a bachelor's and master's degree in economics from the University of Texas at Arlington. I have worked in the dairy industry since 2008. Among my responsibilities are market analysis and economic policy. In conjunction with Select staff, I have analyzed and developed the three proposals submitted by Select and noticed for consideration at this hearing.

BY MR. MILTNER:

2.

2.1

Q. Thank you very much.

Mr. Allen, if you could give us a little more background on the work you currently perform for Select Milk Producers and what that involves on a day-to-day basis.

- A. Sure. Currently, and really throughout the 15 years I have been in the industry, I have had various roles, but I have consistently and primarily focused on the economic analysis of the production, the supply/demand for milk, dairy products. Also focused on analysis of co-op businesses and businesses they run. And I have focused on the analysis of how changes in dairy policy impacts producer milk checks.
- Q. When you are analyzing different scenarios for your employers, and currently for Select Milk, would you be looking at the producer side of that equation, at least in part?



1 Α. Yes. 2. Would you also be looking at the sale side of the 3 equation where the cooperative is now selling producer milk to a customer? 4 Α. Correct. Yes. 5 6 Ο. On the policy, you mentioned you work in -- on 7 policy analysis. Does that include analysis of Federal Order 8 9 regulations? 10 Α. Yes. 11 Ο. Would that include issues like this proposal or 12 these proposals? 13 Α. Exactly. 14 Have you participated either as an attendee or a Ο. 15 witness in any other Federal Order proceedings? 16 Α. Yes. 17 Ο. How long have you been working with Select Milk? 18 Just over one year. Α. 19 And prior to working with Select, did you work for Ο. 2.0 another dairy cooperative? 2.1 Α. Dairy Farmers of America. Yes. 22 Ο. And how long did you work with DFA? 23 A little over 14 years. Α. 24 And the work you performed at DFA, was that Ο. 25 similar in nature to that which you now do for Select?



Α.

Yes.

26

27

28

Mr. Allen as an expert in dairy economics and cooperative

MR. MILTNER: Your Honor, we would like to qualify

economics.

2.

2.1

THE COURT: No objections that I see. Yes, I so find.

MR. MILTNER: Thank you very much.

BY MR. MILTNER:

Q. Mr. Allen, if you want to read your abbreviated statement, keeping in mind the court reporter needs to take everything down. And -- and then when you are finished, we may have a few more questions. Thank you.

A. Yes, sir.

My testimony today addresses Proposal 11 related to product yields and farm-to-plant shrink. The current yield factors incorporate farm-to-plant loss of 0.25% of all milk solids and an additional 0.015 pounds of butterfat per hundredweight on all milk. These losses are incorporated through reductions in the yield factors for each surveyed commodity. In combination, the two assumptions presumed that 0.68% of butterfat solids are lost between the farm and the plant. Select's data from its milk shipments and milk receipts at its processing plants establish that these factors are incorrect.

Select's Proposal 11 removes the adjustment for farm-to-plant milk losses, resulting in changes to the yield factors for butter, the protein value in cheese, and the butterfat value in cheese. Adoption of Proposal 11 would not change the yields for nonfat dry milk or whey. If adopted, Proposal 11 would change the yield for butter to 1.22, the yield reflecting the protein value in cheese



to 1.386, and the yield reflecting the butterfat value in cheese to 1.582.

Select's Proposal 11, and, in fact, all of Select's proposals and its evaluation of the other proposals under consideration at this hearing are governed by one overriding principle: The formulas establishing the minimum prices paid to producers should reflect the current economic realities of producing, transporting, processing, and marketing milk and dairy products. All aspects of the formulas should be reviewed rather than limiting consideration to a small subset of factors. Achievable efficiencies should be promoted rather than discouraged.

We expect that the adoption of Proposal 11 will increase the Class III and Class IV prices, thereby increasing Class I and Class II prices. I want to point out that increased minimum prices are the result of, and not the impetus for, offering Proposal 11.

Proposal 11 aims to ensure that the formulas reflect market conditions and achievable efficiencies. As representatives of Dairy Programs have occasionally said, the role of Federal Orders is not to enhance producer income. Rather, the end product pricing system is intended to construct a series of formulas that allow USDA to ascertain the value of producer milk used to manufacture defined commodities, taking into account the costs to convert milk into finished products and the yields of the products produced.



2.

2.0

2.1

2.4

I would add that while Select's proposals would increase producer income, the same proposals would increase the cost of milk to Select's processing facilities. Every proposed change to the product formulas will have an impact. Make Allowance increases will decrease minimum prices. But if make costs have increased, those factors should be adjusted.

USDA's decision to hold a hearing on Make Allowances is prudent. Utilizing manufacturing cost factors set in 2008 based on even older data calls into question the validity and accuracy of those formula elements. In the same vein, the yield factors in the formulas incorporate assumptions regarding farm-to-plant shrink that are at least as stale as the underpinnings for manufacturing costs. It is time for them to be made current.

Precision and accuracy are paramount. Producers and handlers deserve to know that the calculation of the minimum class and component prices utilized the best available data and inherent assumptions for each of the three principal formula elements: Commodity prices, manufacturing allowances, and yields.

To accomplish that goal, it is incumbent on USDA to adopt those changes that most closely tie the price discovery mechanisms to the actual conditions of the market for commodities and the processes used to convert raw milk into those commodities.

USDA's 2002 decision to reduce yields came after



2.

2.0

2.1

its recommended decision on the Class III and IV formulas, which reasoned that, "Inflating costs of production or reducing yield factors to reflect shrinkage would not properly reflect the value of producers' milk used in manufactured products."

The 2002 Final Decision reversed course, reducing the product yields and reasoning that, "The loss allowances in the Class III and IV formulas are intended to reflect actual losses that are beyond the processing handler's ability to control."

The 2002 Final Decision further stated that,

"Comments received on the recommended decision indicated
that milk solid losses between the farm and the receiving
plant are real, unavoidable, and common."

In further explanation, USDA then wrote, and I quote: "It is necessary to include such an adjustment in using end-product pricing formulas for determining component prices. Since the handlers receiving milk from producers pay the producers on the basis of farm weights and tests, handlers do not receive all of the milk components due to farm-to-plant losses. An adjustment to the price formulas to account for the difference in milk components paid for versus components actually received is appropriate."

When USDA considered a proposal to eliminate farm-to-plant shrink in 2007, it found that, "Record evidence supports concluding that farm-to-plant shrinkage remains a reality for manufacturers. ...While DPNM argued



2.

2.1

that its members' farm-to-plant shrinkage is well below
the 0.25% contained in the Class III and Class IV
product-price formulas, no evidence was offered for
examination as an alternative other than its elimination."

Our testimony at this hearing will provide evidence sufficient for USDA to establish that plant losses are within the ability of producers, cooperatives, and handlers to control and that the majority of milk shipments realize little to no losses. Accordingly, USDA's previous conclusions that farm-to-plant losses are unavoidable and common should be reconsidered and that an adjustment to yields for farm-to-plant losses is not "necessary."

My written testimony presents the USDA calculation of the product yield factors and the revisions to the formulas outlined in this proposal. In lieu of reading that portion of my testimony, I am willing to answer any questions on these calculations.

In the 2007 hearing on formula components, Select, in conjunction with Dairy Producers of New Mexico and others, proposed eliminating farm-to-plant shrink. That proposal was part of a suite of formula modifications that were "considered jointly as coordinated adjustments to the various yield factors."

To be clear, in the hearing today, Select proposes the adoption of each of Proposals 10, 11, and 12. But each proposal stands alone. Based on the record evidence, USDA could adopt one, two, or all three of Select's



2.

2.0

2.1

proposals.

2.

2.1

Also In the 2007 hearing, USDA concluded that the weight of evidence was insufficient to support the elimination of farm-to-plant shrink. In today's proceeding, Select will provide data and evidence from both its cooperative operations (which include shipments from member farms to milk buyers) and from its processing operations (which include shipments received by Select's plants from both Select's farms and other producers). This data and evidence will support the removal of the shrink yield adjustments. We also provide data from USDA sources and additional rationale to supplement the data submitted. Collectively, this body of evidence should amply support Proposal 11.

Select's membership consists of 115 dairy farms in Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas. Collectively, our members produce approximately 9.6 billion pounds of milk each year. This translates to 192,000 loads of milk per year. That's based upon a standard 50,000 load. Because many loads of milk are shipped using supertankers which carry greater volumes, the actual number of loads of milk marketed by Select each year is closer to 170,000.

Select will present testimony from its Senior

Accounting Manager, Harmoni Campbell, to provide greater

detail on Select's management and accounting of milk

shipments, including the use of farm weights and

reconciliations against plant weights. Her testimony,



which analyzed hundreds of thousands of data points for milk shipped by Select over the last year, will demonstrate that, in the aggregate, farm weights and plant weights align nearly perfectly (a difference of less than 0.1%), and her testimony will demonstrate when discrepancies occur between farm weights and plant weights, the variance is not necessarily shrink, but a different issue that is able to be addressed between the cooperative and the handler.

In the 2007 hearing on price formulas, Select found itself in a position all too common to cooperatives and producers. It lacked data on plant operations to place in the evidentiary record. At the time, Select owned a small plant in Dexter, New Mexico, used for the filtration of milk. It owned no significant processing plants of its own. As a result, Select possessed limited data that it could provide to USDA regarding plant receipts.

In 2012, Continental Dairy Products, Inc., a cooperative that merged with Select in 2014, opened a state-of-the-art powder plant in Coopersville, Michigan. That plant, Continental Dairy Facilities, LLC ("CDF"), produces a full complement of dairy powders, as well as butter and cream.

In 2019, Select commissioned a sister plant in Littlefield, Texas, to serve our producers in the Southwest. That plant, Continental Dairy Facilities Southwest, LLC ("CDF Southwest"), produces a similar suite



2.

2.1

of products as CDF.

2.

2.0

2.1

Select will present testimony from the Director of Sales and Marketing for CDF and CDF Southwest, Cheslie Stehouwer, to provide detail and data on plant receipts. Her testimony will offer insight into the other side of the farm-to-plant shrink equation.

Because CDF and CDF Southwest receive milk from both Select members and other producers and cooperatives, this testimony will be important for demonstrating that controlling farm-to-plant shrink is not uniquely achievable by Select's members, large farms, or dairies in the Southwest. Her data will show that the shrink between farm and plant at Select's plants ranges from 0.10% to 0.15%.

A cornerstone of Select's philosophy with respect to Federal Milk Marketing Orders is that they should discourage inefficiency and encourage efficiency in the production, collection, transportation, and marketing of milk. This guiding principle informs our views on the use of end product pricing and the policy decisions that USDA must make when it considers changes to the price formulas. The issue of farm-to-plant shrink is no different.

The more farms included on a milk route, the greater the chance for discrepancies between farm weights and plant weights to differ. Each time a milk truck stops to pick up milk, there is potential for spillage, loss within piping, and even errors in measurement. All of Select's members are of sufficient size to ship a full



tanker load of milk at each pickup. As a result, Select is not subject to the risk of additional losses that can occur on routes with multiple stops.

I want to explain for the record the difference in operations for a full-load milk pickup and a multiple-stop pickup to highlight both efficiencies and areas where losses might occur.

Every milk pickup involves using a hose to transfer milk into the truck tank. Some milk is regularly left in the hose once the transfer is completed. With a multi-stop pickup, a hose is used at each farm, and the loss accumulates with each separate pickup. With a full-load pickup, only a single hose is used, and the residual milk is limited to what is left in this hose. Additionally, full-load pickups can range from about 40,000 pounds to over 100,000 pounds in total milk transported to a plant.

In the case of a 100,000-pound load of milk, this is the equivalent of shipping two 50,000-pound tankers with the hose transfer occurring only once, not twice. However, the vast majority of multi-stop pickups occur with 50,000-pound or less of total collected and delivered to a plant.

The vast majority of milk produced in the United States is produced on farms with sufficient cows to produce a full tanker load at each pickup. USDA's Milk Production Report suggests that the national average per cow production is approximately 67 pounds per day. Milk



2.

2.1

must be picked up on-farm not less frequently than every 48 hours. Assuming every-other-day pickups, a farm milking 375 or more cows will fill a full 50,000-pound tanker.

The USDA Publication, Consolidation in U.S. Dairy Farming, analyzed U.S. dairy farms across multiple measures. It concluded that in 2016, seven years ago, dairy farms with more than 200 cows accounted for 80.3% of all U.S. milk production. Farms with more than 500 cows accounted for 68.4% of all milk production. It is reasonable to assume that half of the volume produced by farms milking between 200 and 499 cows comes from farms with more than 375 cows.

So in, 2016 three-quarters of all U.S. milk production was produced from farms that could fill a tanker. By comparison, in 2000, farms that could fill a full tanker accounted for less than half of U.S. production. While ERS has not yet released its findings from the most recent Census of Agriculture, given the continued consolidation of dairy farms, the percentage of farms able to fill a full tanker is undoubtedly higher in 2023.

Since 2016, the consolidation of dairy farms has only continued, if not accelerated. In 2016, the number of licensed U.S. dairy farms was 41,819. For 2022, that number was 27,932. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that the volume of milk from these farms is now well above 80%.



2.

2.0

2.1

And so, recognizing that shrinkage is most prevalent on shipments containing multiple farms but that such loads are a small and declining minority of milk shipments, USDA must ask itself whether its policy decision on yields will recognize the changes in the production and transportation of milk that have occurred since it concluded in 2002 that farm-to-plant losses were common, unavoidable, and uncontrollable.

Although farm-to-plant shrinkage is most easily controllable when producers ship full loads, that does not mean that farms with fewer than 375 cows necessarily have losses as high as assumed by the current yield factors. The data to be presented from CDF includes milk shipments from farms in multiple pickup routes. As that testimony will show, differences between the farm and plant weights from full-load shipments and multiple farm shipments are not significant. In addition, good practices and the use of available technologies can mitigate actual shrink.

It is consistent with Select's philosophy of promoting efficiencies within the entire milk marketing system, increases in minimum prices resulting from the elimination of farm-to-plant shrink should be used by producers and cooperatives, in part to improve their on-farm technologies and practices to achieve the lowest practicable shrink. Handlers, producers, and cooperatives should be working collaboratively to identify and mitigate areas of excessive shrink with the goal of achieving actual shrink that is negligible.



2.

2.1

Even those farms without the ability to fill a full tanker can adopt the use of farm scales, flow measurement, and other technologies to eliminate much of the imprecision and inaccuracies that can result from the utilization of outmoded dipsticks and similar tools.

Could some of these improvements come with a cost to the producer? Certainly, but based on the anticipated price impacts of adopting Proposal 11, the incremental income to a farm with 170 cows (approximately half the size of an average licensed dairy herd) would exceed \$3,000 per year, which based on the useful life of such improvements, still is a net improvement to the producers' bottom line.

The adoption of Proposal 11 would result in increases to the announced component prices for butterfat and protein. Based on my analysis of the changes, using five and ten-year averages of commodity prices through April 2023, I computed the component and Class price impacts presented in my written testimony.

The precise impacts on the statistical uniform or blend price will vary by order and could be further impacted by any adjustments USDA elects to make to the Class I mover. But because the Class III and Class IV impacts under the five-year and ten-year analyses are about \$0.07, it is reasonable to project that the overall impact of the full adoption of Proposal 11 would be \$0.07.

My written testimony includes the required amendments for the adoption of Proposal 11. Select



2.1

believes that the data and evidence it has and will present provide USDA with ample justification to eliminate shrink from the yield factors.

If however, USDA finds that it is appropriate to reduce the impact of shrink rather than fully adopt Proposal 11 as drafted, Select would defer to USDA's reasoned discretion based on the record evidence.

The current yield factors in Class III and Class IV formulas are lower than they would be otherwise due to USDA's policy decision to incorporate a reduction factor for farm-to-plant shrink. That policy decision was premised on the belief that such losses were beyond the handler's ability to control, unavoidable, and common.

Select believes otherwise. Producers, cooperatives, and handlers do have the ability to address and stem losses in the transportation of milk from the farm to the plant.

In addition to the measures I have discussed, actual data on farm shipments and plant receipts to be presented by Select's other witnesses will establish that the net differences in farm weights and plant weights are far less than assumed by the current formulas. In fact, Select's data will demonstrate that those differences are less than 0.2% of all solids and that butterfat losses, to the extent they occur, do not occur at a rate greater than overall solids losses assumed in the current formulas. It is time to remove this factor from the yield formulas and compensate producers for the full value of the milk they



2.

2.0

2.1

ship to handlers.

2.

2.0

2.1

Q. Thank you, Mr. Allen.

A couple of questions to provide a little more context to your testimony. And I'm looking at page 2 of what has been marked as Exhibit 216.

And you have testified that the role of Federal Orders is not to enhance producer income. Can you expand on that concept a little more for us?

A. Yeah. I think USDA has been asked to define the role of the Federal Orders over the years, and I think you can point to differences in what they have stated. But there are some core -- some core statements that I think still hold true today.

And the enhancement of producer income, or what's otherwise been interpreted as improving producer prices, I would say that just by the very creation of co-ops allowing to work on behalf of farms and negotiate on behalf of farms, that has resulted in increased prices to producers.

So USDA has already met some of that obligation, but I don't think the intent was for USDA to use the Federal Orders to continually increase producer prices. Select believes that the market should still dictate the price that goes to the producer.

Q. So you actually in preparing for this, you found I think it was a Congressional report, where USDA testified to the opposite of that, that the purpose of the orders was to increase producer income.



A. Right.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. And so do you have any thoughts on what you interpreted that concept as then versus what you're testifying to now?
- A. Again, I think the concept of increasing producer income was in the absence of the co-op's ability to collective bargain on behalf of producers. And so I do think there has been -- there was an expectation of what the Federal Orders would do, and that has been achieved. Producer income has been increased. But I don't think it was expected to continue to increase.
- Q. When you talk about cooperatives bargaining, would that include the changes in relative bargaining position that the Federal Orders create for producers and handlers?
- A. Yes. I -- I believe that at the inception of Federal Orders it was believed that the processors, the plants had unequal bargaining power, that they had the upper hand when it came to negotiating milk prices. And the implementation of the Federal Orders allowed some equalization of that -- that negotiation power, bargaining power.
- Q. And as an economist, if you -- if you stabilize the relative bargaining power of a product seller, what would you expect that to do to the income they receive?
 - A. To increase.
- Q. So in that sense, the Federal Orders do increase producer income, right?
 - A. Absolutely.



- Q. And even today, in the absence of Federal Orders, would you expect that the bargaining power -- relative bargaining power of producers to weaken if the orders were eliminated?
 - A. Absolutely. Yes. Without a doubt.
- Q. So that function of stabilizing producers' bargaining power and bargaining position remains an important consideration?
 - 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. But you also clarify that the purpose for Proposal 11 is not just to raise the price, is it?
- A. Correct.
- Q. Further on in your statement you talk a little bit about some of the milk losses that occurred with hoses, and you talk about multiple farm stops.

And I would ask you, perhaps, other than hose losses, can you think of an area where there is inherent, unavoidable, farm-to-plant loss that occurs?

- A. I guess I'm drawing a blank on where in the process for picking up at the farm to the plant that that could occur. There's a known loss when you measure what's in the bulk tank at the farm and then you transfer that product to a truck and you know that not all of that product makes it to the truck. But once the product is on the truck, if you capture the weight at that point, then you know what's going to be delivered to the plant.
- Q. And then, on page 16, of Exhibit 216, the first paragraph there that isn't a CFR citation, it says,



"Select believes that the data," do you see that paragraph
there?

A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. At the end of that paragraph, just to I guess cap -- encapsulate what you are saying is that Proposal 11 is not an all-or-nothing proposition for Select, is it?
 - A. Correct. It is not all or nothing.
- Q. Okay. One last thing. We introduced an exhibit, Exhibit 179, into the hearing record.

And you were not here when that was introduced,

11 correct?

- 12 A. I was not present. I was viewing online, but I
 13 was not here.
- 14 Q. So you are familiar with the Exhibit 179?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. Have you seen it before?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Has your name on it, doesn't it?
- 19 A. Correct.
- Q. Did you receive this e-mail from International Dairy Foods Association?
- 22 A. I did.
- Q. And the version that is Exhibit 179, is that an accurate copy of the e-mail you received as the -- in the form that you received it?
- 26 A. Yes.
- 27 O. Is Select Milk Producers a member of IDFA?
- 28 A. Yes.



1	Q.	To this day, correct?		
2	A.	Correct.		
3		MR. MILTNER: Your Honor, we would offer Mr. Allen		
4	for any	additional questions.		
5		THE COURT: Anyone have any questions for this		
6	witness, other than AMS?			
7		CROSS-EXAMINATION		
8	BY MR. ENGLISH:			
9	Q.	Good morning, Mr. Allen.		
10	A.	How are you doing?		
11	Q.	My name is Chip English, and I represent the Milk		
12	Innovation Group. Thank you for your testimony.			
13		I have I'd like to start with some, like I		
14	think maybe some philosophical questions, as I read or			
15	perhaps misread your testimony, so I I'm really trying			
16	to understand.			
17		So at some points in your testimony, you talk		
18	about the USDA should use actual conditions in the			
19	industry, correct?			
20	Α.	Yes.		
21	Q.	And then at other times you talk about achievable		
22	efficiencies, correct?			
23	Α.	Yes.		
24	Q.	In your mind are those things the same?		
25	A.	Not necessarily.		
26	Q.	Would it be fair to say that even in its		
27	terminology, achievable efficiencies doesn't necessarily			
28	mean achieved efficiencies?			



A. Correct.

2.

2.1

- Q. So when you say, "Achievable efficiencies should be promoted rather than discouraged," is it your view that Federal Orders in some way do not en- -- presently, do not encourage achievable efficiencies?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And how -- how are Federal Orders doing that in your mind?
- A. I think the underlying assumptions assume an allowable amount of shrink to just occur, that it just occurs, it is out there, and so the formulas just build that into the assumptions on the yield factors. And I think if the formulas were reflective of more of what actually occurs in the industry, again, as I described, I forgot what page it is on, but producers would benefit from the change in the formulas and be able to use that benefit to rationalize why they would make changes on their farm to better reflect the weights delivered to the plants.
- Q. So -- but until they actually do that, they may be get more income, but the plants who bought the milk from them, assuming that those smaller farms have not yet adjusted, wouldn't fully realize the benefit at the plant, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. And you talked about the income, I think you said \$3,000 for the 175-cow farm, correct?
 - A. That was the example given.



Q. As an example.

Do you know how much it would cost that farm to achieve that?

- A. There's many options that could be deployed, so I don't know exactly.
 - O. But there is a cost to achieve that?
- A. Yes.

1

2.

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. So what -- what should the Department -- I'm not here to ask the questions for the Department, but assuming -- you know, for a policy maker, I'm thinking about other issues that have been before the hearing or may come before this hearing. You understand that, for instance, with Make Allowances, USDA has used weighted averages of cost, correct?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And to the extent they used a weighted average of costs, that would arguably encourage efficiencies for those plants who are more costly than the average, correct?
- A. Ask that again, please?
- Q. So -- so to the extent Make Allowances are based on weighted average costs for plants --
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. -- those plants that are -- have higher costs than that weighted average, assuming they are currently up to date or something, those plants will obviously face a need to become more efficient and have less cost in order to meet those goals, correct?



- A. Well, I think it depends on if the plant's being priced under the Federal Order and is being held to the Federal Order price. That's the assumption that you're --
- Q. Yeah. Yeah. Thank you for that. The assumption here is that a plant is being held to the Federal Order price.
- A. If they were buying milk at the Federal Order announced price, then they would be incentivized to reduce their costs, I would agree.
- Q. Does Select have a position, thinking about achievable efficiencies, on whether the use of weighted averages, whether for Make Allowances or yields, is the right approach?
 - A. I don't believe we have gotten that far yet.
- Q. Okay. And so when you testify about Select's experiences, for instance, I'm looking at page 9, you are not actually saying that everybody achieves that kind of results, correct?
- A. On page 9, where did you want to direct me to look?
 - Q. Well, I'm sorry, actually's page 10.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. In aggregate, farm weights and plant weights align nearly perfectly with a difference of less than 0.1%, and that, you know, the losses are, you know, very, very small.
- You would agree that not everybody is presently achieving that, 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

26

27

- A. Don't know. That's the challenge. That's what we are -- that's what this section is about is we don't have data other than our own, so we are willing to submit our data for the record.
- Q. And your data reflects -- you know, you have a hundred -- this is where I was on page 9, so I got ahead of myself.
 - A. Okay.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

18

19

- Q. Your data reflects that you have 115 dairy farms, you know, translated for standard loads at 192,000 loads.
- My quick math suggested that's somewhere in the neighborhood on average of four and a half loads per day for those farms?
- 14 A. That's very fair.
- Q. Okay. Are you aware of the size of farms, say, in the Northeast?
- 17 A. Yes.
 - Q. Is it fair to say that a lot of farms in the Northeast are very small?
- 20 A. Yes, they are.
- 21 | O. Have you ever been to Maine?
- 22 A. I have.
 - O. You have? Have you ever seen tankers in Maine?
- A. They are not the same as the ones that are in Texas or in Michigan. How about that?
- Q. Okay. Do you know that they don't even hold 40,000, they are smaller than that, because the Maine roads won't take tankers that large?



- A. I can't say personally I have experienced that, but I have heard that before.
- Q. Okay. And that might very well be true in Vermont and New Hampshire, correct?
- A. I think I have seen larger tankers in Vermont without a doubt.
- Q. So you've focused some of your attention on page 12 on discussion about volumes of milk and how that has changed since 2000.

Volumes -- you focused on volumes rather than the actual number of farms, 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

2.4

25

26

27

- Q. Okay. And it's axiomatic that it would take a larger number of small farms to achieve a volume than the large farms, correct?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. So when you say that in your estimation, now, 75 or 80% of the volume is from farms that have a full tanker load, that necessarily means that more than 20% -- if 20% volume is smaller than that, that's got to be more than 20% of the farms, correct, by math?
 - A. You've got me in front of a crowd asking questions on math, so you are going to have to give me a second.

 Could you ask that again, please?
 - Q. You want me to start over?
 - A. Yeah. I don't know if you got --
 - Q. I had a question, but then the -- so given my question about axioms in terms of math, in terms of volume



- versus numbers, if -- if -- if 80% of the volume in your 1 2. view, including every-other-day tank pickups, would be full tankers, that additional -- that left-over 20% volume 3 by necessity has to be more than 20% of the farms? 4
 - And that's where I got lost was the Yes. difference between volume and farms. That's why I was asking you to repeat it.
 - Well, and I appreciate that because I got lost in Ο. your testimony between volume and farms, so --
 - Α. Understood. Understood.
- So I understand what you are trying to get at. 11 Ο.
- 12 And I understand the idea that for -- you know, for farms
- 13 there would be a financial incentive to make the
- 14 changeover.

6

7

8

9

10

19

2.0

2.1

26

- 15 But part of what you are telling us is, hey, we 16 have our evidence, but we don't know what's happening in 17 the rest of the industry, correct?
- That is correct. 18 Α.
 - Okay. And so that is one reason why you, you 0. know, would like at some point at least for there to be a study on yields, correct?
- 22 Α. Yes.
- 23 Has Select sought out to have a yield study done 24 by industry sort of like what Dr. Stephenson did on
- 25 Make Allowances?
 - I don't believe so. Α.
- Ο. And you acknowledge that each time a milk truck 28 stops to pick up milk, there's potential for spillage,



correct?

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. Yes.
- Q. Is there some risk that if your proposal is adopted without having done a yield study, that plants purchasing milk from farms in the Upper Midwest or, say, the Northeast where there are smaller farms will stop buying milk from smaller farms?
 - A. I don't think so.
- Q. Is there some risk that until that money actually gets through to the smaller farms and they can adjust, that they as small businesses may be more affected by the change in regulations than larger farms?
- A. Small businesses may be more affected than larger farms? Did you mean both farms in that scenario?
 - O. Yes.
- A. Smaller farms would be more impacted than larger farms?
- Q. Yes.
 - A. As a percentage of -- everything we're talking about is a percentage of milk, so I don't think so.
 - Q. Do you know for a fact that -- your statement on page 12 refers to assuming every-other-day pickups?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Do you know for a fact that that's actually how it occurs in the Northeast, that in order to avoid more pickups, that they actually do that, or that maybe because the routes the way they work, people actually pick up the milk from less than full loads every day?



Q. So is it fair to say that we are -- you know, obviously Select has its experience, which is terrific and it is well known for innovation and for its success.

But nonetheless, in an industry where not everyone has farms the size of Select, that your achievable efficiencies are theory and not necessarily reality?

A. There's -- there's a certain amount you can show as data. And there's a certain amount that's experience and a certain amount that's anecdotal. We felt like we did the best we could to bring data forward.

I can speak to experience where there's challenges with labor, and driver wages are becoming more and more of an issue in the industry, and where there's more of a push to cut back on how much driver time is spent at farms.

And so there's technology being invested and implemented on tankers to better reflect or -- and the goal is to reduce driver time on the farms, but what actually ends up happening is you now measure weights at the tank -- the pickup truck instead of the bulk tank. So there's other things that are going on in the industry that aren't just specific to the dynamics and the economics of just the milk price.

And so I think there's a lot that's changed in 20 years in the industry that hasn't been captured, that better reflects that what is being delivered to plants is closer to what's -- what the farms say they are shipping.



2.

2.1

```
1
             So I know that was a long way to answer your
 2
     question. But, again all I can say is we have the data we
     have, and that's the best we can do.
 3
 4
             MR. ENGLISH: Thank you. That's all I have.
 5
     Appreciate your time.
             THE COURT: Other questions for this witness,
 6
 7
     other than AMS?
 8
             MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, I have a few, but I
     don't know what we want to do for lunch time.
 9
10
             THE COURT: Either way.
                         (Off-the-record.)
11
12
             THE COURT: Let's break for lunch and come back at
13
     1:15.
14
              (Whereupon, a luncheon break was taken.)
15
                              ---000---
16
17
18
19
2.0
2.1
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```



	NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING				
1	MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2023 AFTERNOON SESSION				
2	THE COURT: Welcome back. You are still under				
3	oath.				
4	CROSS-EXAMINATION				
5	BY MS. HANCOCK:				
6	Q. Okay. Good afternoon, Mr. Allen. We have met off				
7	the record, but I'm Nicole Hancock. I represent National				
8	Milk. Thanks for being here today.				
9	I just want to cover a few things in your				
10	testimony. If you could turn to page 5. This is the				
11	section you kind of fast forwarded over just because it				
12	looks like it is just the calculation of factors and				
13	saving us some time in reading testimony. Appreciate				
14	that.				
15	Did you do this is these are your				
16	calculations that start on page 5?				
17	A. This is the USDA calculation.				
18	Q. Well, that you have included well, I guess you				
19	take USDA's numbers and then you have applied your own				
20	calculations to it as well?				
21	A. Yes.				
22	Q. Okay. So on page 5, for example, we're under the				
23	butterfat yield factor, the last sentence of the first				
24	or the last sentence of the last full paragraph on that				

butterfat yield factor, the last sentence of the first -or the last sentence of the last full paragraph on that
page, you have done a calculation dividing 1.0 by the .82
divisor in the butterfat formula results in a yield of
1.2195, which rounded to two decimal places is 1.22.



25

26

27

28

I'm just curious why you chose the rounding that

- A. I thought that was consistent with how it had previously been calculated by USDA.
- Q. Okay. And in this example it just results in a rounding up to 1.22; is that fair?
 - A. Yes.

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. Okay. And then if we go to the next page, under the cheese protein yield factor, in that example, you have stayed with -- well, you went from 1.3864, and then you rounded that one to three decimal places.

Any reason why that one you took out to three?

- A. Again, I thought we were being -- our approach here was being consistent with how USDA had presented in their testimony -- or in their final decision.
- Q. Okay. Do you have a preference which way you think it should be done?
- A. I guess for consistency sake, just do it the same way USDA had done it. Like the approach that I took, yes.
- Q. Okay. And then just so that we're clear, the same would be true on -- if we look 7 going onto page 8, for nonfat dry milk, it looks like that one we took to just two decimal places, and you rounded up there again?
 - A. Yes. Same method.
- Q. Okay. And then on dry whey yield factor, which goes over to page 9, that one you took out to two decimal places. And that one actually ended up rounding down.
 - A. Looks like.



Q. Same thing?

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

- A. Yes, slightly. Yep.
- Q. Okay. You had mentioned in your testimony that Select has recently constructed a state-of-the-art facility?
 - A. Yes.
 - O. Where is that located?
 - A. The most recent one is in Littlefield, Texas.
 - Q. Okay. How -- how many plants have been constructed in the last ten years by Select?
- 11 A. I believe two if my math is right. Well, close to 12 ten years on the one in Coopersville.
 - Q. Okay. So the two would be Littlefield, Texas, and Coopersville?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. And what do you produce in Littlefield?
 - A. It is -- it's not listed here. Yeah, it just says dairy powder. So we would do -- and I can get better -- or you will have other witnesses from Select that will be able to better answer that question if I'm not correct, but it would be nonfat dry milk and I think skim milk powder, along with condensed and cream. And butter.
 - Q. Okay. Who would be the witness that you said is coming up that would be potentially better informed about it?
 - A. Definitely Steve Cooper and then Cheslie Stehouwer, either one could answer that question specifically. I think I got it mostly correct though.



- Q. Okay. And then -- and when was that -- when did that plant open up?
 - A. The Littlefield, Texas, plant was 2014. No.
- 4 | Sorry. It's -- even I lose track of these time lines.
- 5 2019 was Littlefield.

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Okay. And then Coopersville, is that the one that was 2014?
- A. 2000 -- 2012 is when that plant was built. That's why I was saying it was around ten years. I knew it wasn't exactly ten years or within that ten-year window.
- Q. Okay. And what do you produce there?
- 12 A. Same thing, the nonfat dry milk, skim milk powder,
 13 condensed cream, and butter.
 - Q. Do you know what you spent in constructing those facilities?
 - A. I do not.
- Q. Safe to say hundreds of millions of dollars as we have seen with other plants?
- 19 A. Feel safe, yes.
 - Q. And when we -- you have had some testimony, I don't want to rehash it, but you have already had some questions and provided some responses, which I think are very candid about, you know, you recognize that you're providing somewhat of a limited dataset when you provide Select's yield data; is that fair?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And in a perfect world, or even in a much more improved world, you would have a much larger sampling size



of actual data from others as well?

A. Yes.

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

- Q. And so do you agree that having a mandatory audited cost survey that would also include yield data would be a better methodology for collecting and analyzing the numbers that are -- that you are proposing today?
- A. It would be a good methodology. When you say better -- is that the word you used was better?
 - Q. Well, better than one sample size.
- 10 A. Yes. I agree with that.
- 11 Q. Okay. But do you believe that it would be a good 12 methodology as well?
- 13 A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. And so do you support the concept of having a mandatory audited cost survey that would also include yield data as well as the cost data that we have been talking about for Make Allowances?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And you have already covered some of this with Mr. English. But it's fair to say that the farms that produce milk or from whom Select purchases its milk tend to be on the larger size; is that fair?
 - A. Our member farms are larger, but I wouldn't say that all the farms we purchase from are larger size.
 - Q. Okay. Member farms that are larger tend to build in some additional efficiencies?
 - A. Again, what are we comparing against?
 - Q. Against smaller farms?



A. I would believe that.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. Okay. And that would include also the capability of implementing some of the -- of the measuring tools or technologies or the efficiencies that you think would be potentially encouraged by -- by your proposal?
- A. I don't think those technologies are limited to just certain type -- certain size farms, no.
- Q. But do you agree that the larger farms have a greater capacity because of those efficiencies, a greater financial capacity to be able to implement those -- those tools already?
- A. Again, it depends on the tool that's being implemented. A scale is one thing. That's a large fixed cost. So that's a different approach than I -- I butchered it, but I was trying to elaborate on the scenario in the Northeast where because of hauling cost challenges, there's actually work by the co-ops to implement technology on the tankers that reduce the hauling costs associated with picking up milk, but it also creates a benefit to the farms that they have better measure of the weight of the milk collected on the tanker.

So, again, that's not necessarily a cost borne directly by those farms for that technology. It may be shared across the members of that co-op. But it is not the same as putting a scale at a single farm. There's different approaches or different solutions, different costs.

Q. Okay. And in that example, it would be a



measuring tool that was put on the tanker, and it would save the farm from having to put that into the -- become a farm expense?

- A. You assume that they have already had some sort of measuring device on their tanker -- I mean, on their farm tank, and so this just adds another tool that now captures the milk on the tank instead of the farm, bulk pickup -- or farm bulk tank.
- Q. Okay. Did Select participate in Dr. Stephenson's survey for 2021?
- 11 A. I don't believe so, but I don't know specifically.
 12 I was not a part of Select in 2021.
 - Q. And I think it -- did -- did Select participate in Dr. Stephenson's study for 2023?
 - A. I don't believe so.
 - Q. Okay. And I think you had already talked about with Mr. Miltner that you had been a recipient of IDFA's letter that was encouraging all of its members to participate in that survey; is that right?
 - A. Yes.

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. Why did Select choose not to participate?
- A. I couldn't answer that question. Just timing of when that survey came out, I was new to Select. I don't think I was fully involved to really appreciate what was going on.
- Q. And since you have been there and since you have been preparing for this hearing, have you heard any information that would help you have a better



NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING 1 understanding about why Select did not participate? 2. I have been engaged with the board on these topics and some of the other proposals, but I haven't gotten to 3 4 that level of detail, no. And then the same is true, you are not sure 5 6 whether Select participated in the 2021 survey? 7 Α. I believe I answered that, no, I don't know why 8 Select did not participate. Q. 9 Okay. 10 MS. HANCOCK: That's all I have. Thank you. 11 THE WITNESS: Sure. 12 THE COURT: Are we ready for AMS? 13 Seeing no hands raised or other volunteers, this 14 witness is in your hands, Ms. Taylor. 15 CROSS-EXAMINATION 16 BY MS. TAYLOR: 17 Ο. Good afternoon. 18 Hey there. Α. 19 Thanks for coming to testify this week. Ο. 2.0 Α. Absolutely. 2.1 Just a few questions that might not have been Ο. 22 covered by others. 23 I think on -- late in your testimony you say 2.4 there's 115 members of Select? 25 Α. Correct. 26 Okay. And that you also buy milk from other Q. 27 non-members?



Yes.

Α.

- Q. About how many non-members do you all buy milk from?
 - A. Currently about a dozen.
 - Q. And when it comes to Select's members, I'm not sure if you have listened in, I think you have been here earlier in the hearing, on the Small Business definition of \$3.75 million?
 - A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Do you know how many of Select members would meet that definition?
- A. In the Southeast Federal Order hearing, we had to answer that question, and I should have looked it up before I got up here. I believe it was only a handful of that dozen, but I don't recall specifically what that number was. It was not all 12 to be clear.
 - Q. That's of the non-members?
 - A. Of the non-members, yes.
- Q. And would any of the Select members meet the definition --
- A. Oh, no, no. Sorry.
- Q. Okay. And I'm not sure it's covered in your testimony, but where does Select market milk?
 - A. The same places our farms are located: Texas, New Mexico, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan are the primary locations, and then we do have supplies into the Southeast on a year-round basis as well.
 - Q. I'm going to turn to your testimony first.On the first page, when you are doing the overview



of your proposal, and you say, "In combination, these two assumptions presume that .68% of butterfat is lost between the farm and the plant."

Can you just tell me the math to get to this .68?

- A. Yeah. It's on -- just assume 3.5 pounds of butterfat, you have lost .25% of that, you do the assumption in the formula, and then another 0.015 pounds. So then you take your new result, divide it over the original 3.25, and that should be the .68% difference.
 - Q. Okay. He got that.
 - A. Good.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

12 Q. You can go back and read later to make sure we got 13 that.

Turning to page 10, and you list -- you are talking about a little bit summarizing the upcoming testimony of Ms. Campbell. And then you say the testimony will demonstrate in the aggregate farm weights and plant weights align nearly perfectly with a difference of less than .1%.

And then I turn to the next page, in the last sentence of that first paragraph, says, Her data will show the shrink between farm to plant in Select's plans -- I think that should be plants -- ranges from .1 to .15%. When I read those two sentences, they seem different, but trying to tell me the same thing, if that makes sense.

Is one like just on Select farms specifically and one's on all the milk Select receives?

A. And that typo was plants, to be clear. So thank



you for catching that.

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

So Harmoni will speak to Select sales of milk, so that would include our member milk and then other milk we market. So that will be sales primarily to customers. And then Cheslie will speak to the milk purchased at our plants, again, mostly from Select farms but also from other parties.

- O. Okay. So sales and purchases are different?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And just to be clear, the purchases are just for your two plants?
- A. Yes. Yes. Milk processed at those -- received and processed at those two plants, yes.
- Q. Okay. On page 12, this is where you are talking about, "The vast majority of milk produced in the U.S. is produced on farms with sufficient cows to produce a full tanker load at each pickup." And you cite some statistics that kind of leads you to that conclusion on milk production.

But have you looked up the numbers and how that stacks up against farm numbers?

- A. I guess I'm not tracking your question.
- Q. Sure. So I mean you are talking about how a majority of the milk produced, there's a difference of looking about where most of the milk is produced, and that's different than looking at the numbers of farms impacted. So I'm going to use not real numbers.
 - A. Okay.



- Q. But let's say, 75 -- 70% of the milk is produced on 15% of the U.S. farms. That is different locations than looking at the fact that 85 -- now I'm going to confuse myself -- but -- well, now these numbers aren't going to add up. But, you know, 20% of the milk is produced on, I don't know, 80% of the farms. I know my numbers don't add up. But you get the point I'm trying to make?
 - A. I get your concept, yes.
- Q. Yeah. So I guess what I'm asking is here you are talking about where the -- the milk production numbers, now I'm asking about the farm numbers, the impact of how this would impact farms.
- A. I think it would impact all farms, not just specific farms. I think --
 - Q. Can you talk into the mic?
- A. Yeah. It would impact all farms, not just specific farms. And when you are saying the impact, I don't -- you are talking about the proposal and the changes that would occur within the pricing formulas?
- Q. Yeah. Well, I think your testimony talks about how there's a capability for -- at farms that produce a lot of milk, they can ship full tanker loads, and therefore they are not experiencing these farm-to-plant losses.
 - A. Right.
- Q. So my question is, on the farms that don't produce full tanker loads of milk, so it takes three farms to fill



2.

2.0

2.1

up a tanker or whatever --

A. Right.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. -- you know, they don't have -- do they have the abilities to reduce those farm-to-plant losses, or put a different way, is you talk later on the technologies available to those farms that invest in to -- to eliminate or lessen those losses. And how frequently is that done, how prevalent is that amongst those farms, not amongst the big farms that can ship a full tanker, but amongst the smaller farms who don't have that capability?
- A. I don't know. And I guess I would say I'm not sure if this goes along with the concept, but I think it does. It's just as important as not just where the milk is produced but where it's purchased. And, again, 75% of the milk in your example was purchased from farms that were larger than a certain size. So, again, it goes back to the impacts are felt at the plant and at the farm and the milk purchased is still 75% of the milk. So there are a lot of small farms, but that is a much smaller share of the total milk supply that's being purchased.
- Q. Okay. On the next page, in that first full paragraph, you are talking about consolidation in the farm side, and in 2022 we had 27,932 farms.

The next sentence reads, "It is therefore reasonable to assume that the volume of milk produced from these farms is now well above 80%."

Who is "these farms" in this sentence?

A. Well, we had detailed statistics for the 2016 set



- of farms, which was 41,819. So we had a breakdown of that 41,819. We don't have a breakdown of the 27,932. But if you apply some of the same assumptions of percentage of farms in the different size categories, "these farms" would be that 27,932.
 - Q. But if I assume the same breakdown of -- of 2016 --
 - A. Of that same dataset in 2016 --
- 9 Q. Okay.

7

8

10

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

- A. -- you apply that to -- yeah, sorry.
- 11 Q. Okay. I got you now.
- 12 A. I lost you there, but thank you for keeping up
 13 with me somehow.
- 14 Q. Yeah. Okay.
 - On page 14 -- okay, I'm using part of this hearing to learn new things.
 - So on page 14, I think you added a word on that second -- the first full paragraph, talking about they can "adopt, you know, farm scales, flow measurement, and other technologies to eliminate much of the imprecision and inaccuracies that can result from the utilization of " -- I think you added the word outmoded dipsticks when you read your sentence.
 - A. Uh-huh.
 - O. And similar tools.
- And I guess, I'm not sure if you added that word, but if you did, could you explain what that means?
 - A. Yeah, I probably misspoke on that one. I was



reading from a bad version of my draft.

- Q. Okay.
- A. Yep.

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. Thank you.

On the analysis of impacts, you use a five- and a ten-year average.

What time period is that for?

- A. So it was the period ending April of 2023. So if you just go back 60 months and 120 months before that, you would -- you would get your time period.
- Q. Okay. And then what prices did you look at when you did this analysis, if we wanted to go back and do it ourselves?
- A. It was the --
 - Q. Announced?
- A. Yeah. The monthly announced commodity prices in the pricing formulas.
- Q. Okay. And on page 16 in your conclusion, at the very bottom, you write, "Butterfat losses to the extent they occur do not occur at a rate greater than overall solids losses."
- And I was wondering if you could just expand on that because I don't think much of your testimony covered that particular piece.
- A. Yeah. My testimony just outlined what will be discussed in more detail by the other witnesses. So I can try to elaborate, or maybe they could -- just when they give their testimony, they could address that.



1	Q. Okay. That's fine.		
2	MS. TAYLOR: I think that's it from AMS. Thank		
3	you.		
4	REDIRECT EXAMINATION		
5	BY MR. MILTNER:		
6	Q. Ryan Miltner representing Select Milk Producers.		
7	Good afternoon, Mr. Allen. I have a couple of		
8	follow-ups based on the questions you have already gotten.		
9	So do you have a calculating device near you?		
10	A. I do.		
11	Q. Okay. You had a question from Ms. Hancock about		
12	the butterfat yield factor, and I want to just clarify for		
13	the record what I think we have here.		
14	Can you just divide 1 divided by .82 and tell me		
15	what you get out to about, I don't know, four or five		
16	decimal places?		
17	A. 1.2195.		
18	Q. Okay. So if you wanted to round that to the three		
19	decimal places that are in the current regulation, what		
20	would you round to?		
21	A. 1.22.		
22	Q. So it would have rounded to 1.220 if you went to		
23	three spots, right?		
24	A. Yes.		
25	Q. Okay. Thanks.		
26	AMS asked you some questions about the breakdown		
27	of the volume of milk shipped on full tankers and the		
28	number of farms and how those broke down across size		



categories. Now, you answered a little bit about the -on the plant receipts side, and I wanted to just ask a few
more questions about that.

So, for a receiving plant, would it be correct if -- if they were -- if they were -- if that plant were receiving milk from a milk shed whose composition kind of matched the national average, you would expect that about 80% of those truckloads would come from a full single farm pickup, right?

- A. Based on the assumption we've applied using the 2016 data, yes.
- Q. And that the remaining 20% of loads or so would come from routes with multiple stops, 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

25

27

- Q. And so it would -- to the farm -- or to the plant that's making those purchases, in terms of the loss, if there's a -- if there's a difference in -- in the amount of loss on a single pickup tanker and a multi pickup tanker, would they really care how many farms are impacted or would they be more focused on what the tanker profile looks like?
 - A. How are you defining the tanker profile?
- Q. Whether it is a single farm pickup or a multi-farm pickup.
 - A. The tanker profile would have more weight.
- 26 Q. Okay.
 - A. And when I say "weight," I mean weight in that decision, not weight of milk. I just realized we're



1	talking about shrink and I'm throwing out the word			
2	weight the term weight. I meant more weight toward the			
3	decision that was being made.			
4	Q. I understood it that way, but thank you for			
5	clarifying.			
6	MR. MILTNER: Your Honor, I don't have any			
7	additional questions for Mr. Allen on this piece of			
8	testimony. We would move the admission of Exhibit 216.			
9	THE COURT: Seeing no objections, Exhibit 216 is			
10	admitted into the record.			
11	(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 216 was received			
12	into evidence.)			
13	THE COURT: You may step down from the stand.			
14	Thank you.			
15	MR. MILTNER: We did admit Exhibit 179 previously,			
16	did we?			
17	THE COURT: Yeah, I had a I was going to ask			
18	the same question.			
19	MR. MILTNER: I thought we did, but if we did not,			
20	I would like to move the admission of Exhibit 179.			
21	THE COURT: Any objections.			
22	Exhibit 179 is admitted into the record.			
23	(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 179 was received			
24	into evidence.)			
25	MR. MILTNER: Thank you.			
26	Your Honor, we would call Ms. Harmoni Campbell to			
27	testify.			
28	THE COURT: Welcome to the stand, Ms. Campbell.			



1	Please raise your right hand.
2	HARMONI CAMPBELL,
3	Being first duly sworn, was examined and
4	testified as follows:
5	THE COURT: Your witness.
6	MR. MILTNER: Thank you, your Honor. We're
7	distributing her testimony here.
8	THE COURT: Let's go off the record while we do
9	that.
10	(Off-the-record.)
11	DIRECT EXAMINATION
12	BY MR. MILTNER:
13	Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Campbell.
14	A. Hello.
15	Q. You are going to need to speak close to that mic
16	just to make sure it picks up everything.
17	A. Yes, sir.
18	Q. Would you be kind enough to state and spell your
19	name for the record?
20	A. Yes. I am Harmoni Campbell, H-A-R-M-O-N-I,
21	C-A-M-P-B-E-L-L.
22	Q. And, Ms. Campbell, could you give your business
23	address for the record as well, please?
24	A. 320 West Hermosa Drive, Artesia, New Mexico.
25	Q. 88
26	A. 88210.
27	Q. 210. Almost said 201. That's Roswell.
28	A. It is.



1	Q.	In front of you, you have a document that's		
2	labeled	Exhibit Select-2; is that correct?		
3	А.	Yes, sir.		
4	Q.	And are you familiar with that document?		
5	Α.	Yes, sir.		
6	Q.	And that's the testimony that you have prepared in		
7	support	of Select's Proposal 11, correct?		
8	Α.	That is correct.		
9	Q.	Okay. Now, Mr. Allen gave a kind of an		
10	abbrevia	ated statement different from what was printed.		
11		Are you going to provide are you going to read		
12	the ent	ire statement that you have got there?		
13	Α.	Yes, I am.		
14	Q.	Okay. Then if you want to go ahead and do that,		
15	and when you are done, we may have a few additional			
16	questions of you. Okay?			
17	Α.	Okay.		
18	Q.	Thank you.		
19		THE COURT: Should we mark it?		
20		MR. MILTNER: Yes. Let's mark the exhibit.		
21		THE COURT: This exhibit, Select-2, is marked 217,		
22	for ide	ntification.		
23		(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 217 was marked		
24		for identification.)		
25		MR. MILTNER: Thank you. I hope to not be		
26	reminde	d again.		
27		THE COURT: No worries.		
28		THE WITNESS: Hi. Thank you all for having me		



here. My name is Harmoni Campbell. I am the senior accounting manager for Select Milk Producers. I hold a Bachelor's degree in accounting from Eastern New Mexico University, and I have been employed as the accounting manager at Select Milk for ten years. Before joining Select, I worked as an accounting manager for an exploration and production oil and gas company.

I oversee a seven-person department responsible for balancing the milk receipts across plants, farms, and haulers. Our department is responsible for accounting for every single load of milk produced by our members or sold by Select to any customer.

For every milk shipment, our accounting department will invoice the receiving plant, pay the hauler, and ultimately pay our producers. Within two to four days of milk leaving the farm, Select's accounting department will have received all necessary records from the supply chain, processed that data, analyzed it, and cleared any errors or discrepancies.

Receipt balances are confirmed with every plant for the first 15 days of the month, referred to as the advance, and, again, at month end, the settlement, to confirm all shipments received at the plant for the entire month. Plants are also invoiced on these balance totals for both the advanced and settlement periods.

I was asked by Chris Allen, Select's director of industry relations and analytics, to analyze Select's available data on milk shipments, including farm weights



2.

2.1

and plant weights. I was asked to analyze this data to provide relevant information about the differences between farm and plant weights. This data and analysis was performed by me in conjunction with Chris Allen and additional Select staff. These analysis were prepared to support Select's proposal to change the yield factors used in minimum price formulas. All of the underlying data is regularly collected and maintained by Select's logistics department and accounting department as part of our regular operations.

I am aware of the purpose of Select's proposal, and that if adopted, it will impact the minimum prices paid to our members, but I am not an expert on Federal Order language and price formulas. The scope of my testimony is limited to describing the data and analysis performed by me or under my supervision to support Proposal 11.

I want to describe the data that Select collects and maintains. Select markets the milk of our member producers to multiple customers, primarily in the Southwest Marketing Area Order 126 and the Mideast Marketing Area Order 33.

In addition, some of our members' milk is marketed to customers in adjacent Federal Milk Marketing areas.

Select's customers include manufacturers of all classes of milk.

In a typical month, Select member milk is delivered to approximately 20 customer plants, with spot



2.

2.1

milk being sold to several other plants. In a typical month, significant deliveries are made to plants manufacturing products in all four classes.

For a typical load of milk produced by a Select member, a farm pickup is scheduled by Select through the contracted hauler. Select's logistic team is responsible for coordinating the pickup with the hauler and the farm. At pickup, the milk hauler scales in at the member farm, loads milk directly from the bulk tank, draws the required milk samples for analysis, tags the load, and then scales out. This farm scale weight provides the basis for Select's farm weights.

Amongst Select's customers, the procedures vary upon delivery. About half of Select's customers do not report any plant weights, except when a significant discrepancy is observed. In a typical year, our accounting staff fields less than a dozen such inquiries. For the remainder of Select's customers, the receiving plant reports back to Select plant weights which are input and confirmed and any errors cleared.

Select uses -- Select utilizes software and procedures to collect, process, and analyze producer milk production and shipments, milk composition, logistics data, quality information, and other related data points. This integrated data management tool, Mobile Manifest, allows Select to track individual milk shipments from farm to plant. It also allows Select to analyze all the shipments from a particular farm, all of the shipments to



2.

2.1

a particular customer, all shipments through a specific hauler, all shipments within a given date range or range of dates, and additional data points.

I utilized the Mobile Manifest data to perform several analysis related to the issue of farm-to-plant losses. These analysis are discussed further below, and two tables at the end of my statement summarize this information.

I pulled from Mobile Manifest a report of all Select Milk shipments for a one-year period of August 1st, 2022, through July 31st, 2023. This report encompassed 171,240 distinction milk shipments, with an aggregate manifest weight of approximately 9.8 billion pounds. Over that period, Select shipped to -- I'm sorry, let me try that again -- over that period, Select shipped milk to 88 distinct plants and utilized 27 different haulers.

From that report, I was able to determine the percentage of shipments that had a corresponding plant weight. I found that a plant weight was reported back to Select on 89,899 loads. That's 52.5%. And 81,341 loads, 47.5%, had no reported plant weight. Of all the loads with a reported plant weight, 39,337, or 23%, reported no variance.

Realistically, it is unlikely that the scale would report the exact weight as the farm, but this demonstrates that for most loads, the plant either accepts Select's farm weights outright without reporting back or that the weights are so close to farm weights as to not merit a



2.1

more precise measurement.

2.1

I then identified those loads of milk where the hauler or plant reported back a clearly erroneous weight. These clear errors included missing digits in the reported weight, decimal point errors, or where the plant weight was off by an even 1,000 or 10,000 pounds, or reported weights so different that there's a clear error or other problem. These accounted for 1,121 loads, .7%.

After removing these loads, I was left with a total of 49,442 loads of milk, 28.9% of the annual load total, with an actual reported plant weight reflecting a variance from farm weights.

I analyzed the loads for positive and negative variances. Of those loads, 21,822 which represents 44.1% of loads with variances, showed a positive variance, where the plant weight exceeded the farm weight. And 27,619 loads, or 55.9% of those with variances, showed a negative variance, where the plant weight was less than the farm weight.

I then summed the negative and positive variances for these loads. The total was a net negative variance of 1,331,434 pounds, representing a farm-to-plant shrink of .04% on the total volume of those 49,442 loads.

On the whole, the weights of the loads with reliable farm and plant weights were essentially equal. I then reviewed the remaining shipments and removed another subset of shipments where there were known issues that affected the accuracy of the farm weight and plant weight



comparison. My decision on which loads to place in this category was based on my judgment as well as the experience of my team. We identified one hauler and customer who has had issues with the consistency of plant weight reports due to the use of a drop yard. All of those loads were excluded. Similar judgments were made with respect to other customers.

After removing these loads I was left with 20,964 loads of milk, 42.4% of loads with an actual reported plant variance reflecting a variance from farm weights. I analyzed the loads for positive and negative variances. Of those, 41% showed a positive variance where the plant weight exceeded the farm weight, and 59% showed a negative variance where the plant weight was less than the farm weight. I then summed the positive and negative variances for these loads. The total was 1,191,125 pounds, representing losses of .07% on the total volume of those 20,964 loads.

I separated those loads into two categories. In the first category I placed those whose plant weights were within .5% of the farm weight. This accounted for 15,579 loads. In the second category I placed those loads with a variance that exceeded .5%. Those loads accounted for 5,385 loads. Variances over .5% could occur for multiple reasons, of which Cheslie Stehouwer from Continental Dairy Facilities will provide more context.

In most instances, these discrepancies represent identifiable fixable issues, many of which are wholly



2.

2.1

outside the producers' control or can be corrected by the producer.

Tables 1 and 2, that follow, summarize everything I just read.

So to conclude the testimony, most Select customers accept farm weights and tests and report no plant weight at all or log the farm weight as their plant weight. Of the minority of loads where a plant weight is reported, it is about as likely that the plant weight will exceed the farm weight as it is that the farm weight will exceed the plant weight.

Where the discrepancy between farm and plant weight is particularly larger, non-shrink factors are the cause in virtually every instance. Analysis of the subset of loads where variances remain, the net variance across all of these loads is less than .1%.

Thank you.

BY MR. MILTNER:

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

27

- Q. Thank you, Ms. Campbell. I wanted to follow up to get some additional detail on what you just testified to, if I could.
- The first question I would have, is you said you have worked with Select for ten years now?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. What year were you hired?
- 26 A. 2013.
 - Q. So you were not part of Select during the last time there was a hearing on formula factors in the Federal



Order backs in 2007 then, were you?

- A. I was not.
- Q. Were you working with that oil and gas company then?
 - 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

2.4

25

26

27

28

Q. Okay. So I want you to think back to the systems and the software and the tools that you had available when you started working at Select.

And what were you hired to do, by the way, when you first were hired at Select?

- A. When I was first hired, I was hired to reconcile all of the work that I do now, described in the beginning of my testimony, which is balance all of the milk and pay producers, haulers, and invoice plants. So I was the person reconciling that when I first started.
- Q. So thinking back to that time when you were hired, was there -- were there the tools and information available to you to do the type of analysis that you did in preparing your testimony here?
 - A. No, there was not.
- Q. And so if you -- if you think about the systems and the processes in place that existed then, how have they changed in the ten years that you have been doing this?
- A. We have converted to electronic manifests, and that pretty drastically changed all of the systems in place where we capture significant ly more data on pickups than we did historically.



- Q. And so before it was computerized and digitized, was there any repository that would allow you to easily analyze or sort 170,000 milk shipments?
 - A. No, there was not.
- Q. So I'd also -- now I'd like to walk through really the tables you have on the last page of your testimony.
 - A. Okay.

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 so I'm looking at Table 1 and the row which reads "no reported plant weight." Just for clarity that means that 47.5% of the shipments that are made by Select, the plant does not report any information back to Select on the weight at receipt; is that correct?
- A. That is correct.
- Q. And as a result, we certainly can't, or Select certainly can't, analyze any shrink on those loads at all, could they?
 - A. That is a correct statement.
- Q. So now the next row reads, "plant weight identical to farm weight." And you testified that in those instances you do get a weight reported at point of receipt, but it's exactly the same as the farm weight, correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. Okay. And you made an assumption that in almost every case that's not an actual plant scale weight, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Hypothetically, if you were going to include those



- 39,337 loads in the analysis that you performed, would that have materially skewed your average variance per load?
 - A. Yes, it would have. It would have understated what the shrink is.
 - O. It would have understated the shrink?
- A. Yes, sir.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

- Q. So you made the decision to exclude those loads?
- 9 A. That is correct.
 - Q. Okay. The next one you have "clearly erroneous weights," and it's a relatively small fraction of those loads. But what would you see, for instance, that would make you say, this is clearly erroneous, and you excluded it then from your analysis?
 - A. In -- in this particular set of data, a great example is one of the loads came in with 14 million pounds. Now, with the adoption of Mobile Manifest, the data flows straight into our system, so whatever the driver or receiver has put in, flows in, and we see that, which is why I was able to perform the analysis. So we all know there's not a tanker on the planet that can hold 14 million pounds of milk.
 - O. And that's an example --
 - A. Clearly erroneous.
- Q. An extreme one. But that was not the only instance of that type of data you were working from, correct?
- 28 A. That's correct. We would have some come in with



one pound. We would have some come in that would be just clearly 10,000 pounds off from, you know, what the actual scale was. All typo errors.

- Q. And you had -- did you have some that would come in with, say, an even 50,000 pounds or something like that?
 - A. Several, yes.
- Q. Okay. And so you excluded those from your analysis; is that correct?
- 10 A. That is correct.
- 11 Q. So that left you with 49,441 loads to look at.
- 12 | And then you -- you separated those out, and you said
- 13 | there were some with identifiable issues. And you noted
- 14 | that at least for a chunk of those it was a particular
- 15 | hauling company and a particular drop yard that created
- 16 | some anomalies that you felt uncomfortable with; is that
- 17 | right?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

- 18 A. That is correct.
- 19 | O. And so I just want to go through here. Where, in
- 20 | Table 2, the column of "all analyzed loads," that includes
- 21 | those -- those -- those loads that you said had
- 22 | identifiable issues, right?
- 23 A. That's correct.
- 24 | Q. And so that includes that hauler, that drop yard,
- 25 | and similar issues that you felt shouldn't be analyzed,
- 26 | correct?
- 27 A. Yes, sir.
- 28 Q. When you included those, you had an average



1 | farm-to-plant shrink of 0.04% though, right?

A. Yes.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

- Q. Now, when you excluded those loads, if I'm reading your table correctly, your farm-to-plant shrink is higher. It's 0.07%; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. So just so the record's clear, when you remove those that you had issues, it ended up with a result that somewhat less favorable than to Select's argument here, isn't it?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. But you felt that was important to show the most accurate dataset that you had available; is that right?
 - A. Yes. If we know that there's an issue, I did not want to include that in the analysis. It would skew the number in my opinion, regardless of what the outcome is.
 - Q. Okay. So one more thing that I noticed, and it's -- it is very minor. But I want you to look at page 5 of your testimony. And in the first full paragraph, the line at the very end, the total was, 1,191,125 pounds.
- 22 Do you see that?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. And if you look at Table 2, in the final column, it is 1,191,225 pounds?
 - A. Oh, that is correct.
- Q. So there's a -- there's an extra hundred pounds there.



Now, I'm sure we could go back to your work and find out which one of those two is right. But a hundred pounds of milk over 21,000 loads of milk, is that going to make a material difference --

- A. No, it is not.
- O. -- on the conclusion?
- A. No.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

16

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

28

- Q. Okay. Is there anything else that you want -- you think needs to be explained about your statement before other folks have a chance to ask you questions?
- A. No.
- Q. Okay.
- MR. MILTNER: Your Honor, we'd make the witness available for additional questioning.
- THE COURT: Who else has questions?
 - CROSS-EXAMINATION

17 BY MR. ENGLISH:

- Q. My name is Chip English, and I represent something called the Milk Innovation Group. And I want to thank you for your testimony, and I really have some, in my mind, clarifying questions.
 - Some of it is like, what's a drop yard?
- A. A drop yard is when the hauler is going to go drop the tanker in the yard and leave it up to the plant to shuttle it into receiving bays as needed.
- Q. And what kind of problem would that create with the consistency of plant weights?
 - A. We discovered that set different driver -- so we



- Q. And not saying you should throw her under the bus or anything, but --
 - 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. -- when I'm asking questions if -- if -- I don't want to spend time twice doing it, so if that's the answer, I'm perfectly happy to reserve questions like that for her.

So would that also be something to ask her about if similar judgments were made with respect to other customers, which is on page 5, right after the drop yard?

- A. No, that -- no, those were my judgments.
- Q. Okay. What -- just what categories of judgments that you were making, if you can?
- A. Identifiable known issues at the plant outside of the drop yards. There are instances over the past 12 months where a plant would inform us that they were having scale issues. So if I knew what that set of data was, I would also eliminate it, just so that we're looking at variances that we do not know there was an issue, that identifiably like actual variances between farm and plant.
 - Q. So would that go to your conclusions under 4(c) on



page 6 where you say, "Where the discrepancy between farm weight and plant weight is particularly larger, non-shrink factors are the cause in virtually every instance"? Is that what you are talking about there?

A. Yes.

2.

2.1

Q. So help me out on something else. On page 4, and a couple other times, you talk about where the plant weight exceeded the farm weight.

That's not normally what I think about happening here. So what can explain that?

- A. I don't know that I have an explanation for that.

 I -- because I don't work at the plants. I -- all I know is the data showed clearly that over 40% were coming in with a higher plant weight than farm weight.
- Q. So would I be right when I was -- and thank you, Mr. Miltner for some of your questions -- when I look at page 4 and over to page 5, what I think you did, and correct me if I'm wrong, you first did this analysis on that paragraph I was just referring to where you have 44.1% of the variances showing positive, 55.9 showing negative, and you sort of sum those up and you gave sort of an average result for all of those, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And then you didn't stop there. You went with those -- using that analysis going further, as I understand it, you then looked at those shipments and excluded the ones that were inconsistent, correct?
 - A. Correct.



- Q. And then once you were left with the loads that are described in sort of on Tables -- Table 2, the last paragraph appears to provide a bit of a range, am I right, that -- in that last paragraph you are providing sort of --
 - A. The last paragraph on page 5.
- 7 O. Yes.

8

9

19

2.0

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay.
- 10 A. The range -- the range referencing the variance.
- 11 | The 5.5%, is that what you are referring to.
- 12 O. Yes?
- 13 A. Yes.
- Q. So there were loads where variances -- and I understand that maybe someone else is going to explain it -- but there are loads, like 5,385, where a variance exceeded 0.5%, correct?
- 18 A. That's correct.
 - Q. Do you know how high that variance would have gone?
- 21 A. I do not.
- 22 | O. That's fine.
- And do you know how common the use of electronic manifests is now outside of Select, in the industry?
- 25 A. It's becoming more common. That's all I know.
- 26 Q. Okay.
- 27 A. Yes.
- 28 MR. ENGLISH: I have no further questions. I



1	thank you very much.
2	THE COURT: Any other questions other than AMS of
3	this witness?
4	Seeing none, AMS.
5	CROSS-EXAMINATION
6	BY MR. WILSON:
7	Q. Good afternoon. Todd Wilson, AMS.
8	Got a question on the bottom of page 5.
9	A. Okay.
10	Q. So after you separated loads out, results out, and
11	got kind of a good set, right, you came down to 20,000
12	20,000-plus loads of milk.
13	Then in that last paragraph, as Mr. English was
14	asking about, that $.5$ %, is that a is that a plus and a
15	minus .5%?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. Okay. And so then the second one, is anything
18	greater than a plus .5 or minus .5?
19	A. Yes.
20	MR. WILSON: Okay.
21	CROSS-EXAMINATION
22	BY MS. TAYLOR:
23	Q. Good afternoon.
24	A. Hi.
25	Q. Thanks for coming up and testifying today.
26	A. Thank you.
27	Q. Just a couple questions.
28	So for your Select Producers, do all of your



producers scale at the farm?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- A. I don't believe all of them do. I'm not an expert on the farm operations, though. I am an accountant.
 - Q. That's fair. Okay.

On page 3, you state that 47.5 of Select's loads have no reported plant weight. Can you elaborate on why that is? Do they -- there's not -- just elaborate on the reasons why they don't provide you a plant weight.

- A. I would assume that it's because it's not out of variance from the farm weight enough for them to question it. And we pay our producers on farm tests and weights, and that's what's accepted --
 - O. Okay.
 - A. -- for the majority of our loads.
- Q. Okay. And for your analysis in these numbers,
 this includes both Select members and non-members who you
 market -- or who you purchase milk from?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Okay. Also on page 3 -- and I should have said this before, I'm going out of order, I apologize -- at the top of that page, about half of Select's customers don't report any plant weights except when there's a significant discrepancy.

Can you just define what that would -- a significant discrepancy would be?

A. Most plants would be outside of that .5% there -they have some sort of percentage in their system that
will flag it. Typically, that's going to be issues that



1 we already are aware of with, you know, some -- a farm 2. scale being down or a driver has put in a very bad number on the manifest and the plant scale shows a more accurate 3 4 picture of the weight. 5 MS. TAYLOR: Okay. 6 CROSS-EXAMINATION 7 BY MR. WILSON: 8 Sorry. Todd Wilson, again. Ο. 9 Α. Okay. 10 I was trying to explain the question to --Ο. 11 Α. I saw. 12 Ο. -- my counterpart. 13 She was like, nope, take the mic. Α. 14 So of the -- of the 170,000 occurrences that you 0. 15 have, I know we have another witness coming on later, how 16 many of those are represented in the two plants of 17 Littlefield and Coopersville? Do you have an idea? 18 Α. T do not. 19 Let me ask you another question. Ο. 2.0 Α. Okay. 2.1 Is -- does Coopersville and Littlefield have plant Ο. 22 weights in your analysis? 23 Α. Yes. 2.4 MS. TAYLOR: I think that's it from AMS. 25 THE COURT: You got to introduce her exhibit. 26 MR. MILTNER: A couple quick -- couple quick 27 redirect questions. 28 ///



REDIRECT EXAMINATION

2 | BY MR. MILTNER:

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

19

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Q. Ryan Miltner, representing Select Milk.

Ms. Campbell, there was a question about that positive plant variance where the farm weight is lower than the plant weight. And I think you correctly stated that Ms. Stehouwer can comment on that a little bit.

But do you ever have issues where the calibration at a farm plant -- I'm sorry -- at a -- at a plant scale, would be -- would be off or incorrect?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And would that lead to a discrepancy between the farm weight and the plant weight?
- 14 A. Absolutely.
- Q. And do you know if -- if a -- if a truck added fuel on its journey, if that would affect the weights between the farm and the plant?
- 18 A. Yes.
 - O. And there could be other reasons that would --
- 20 A. He could have picked up lunch, too.
 - Q. Could have picked up lunch.
 - Could have picked up somebody to ride along, who knows, right?
 - A. Yes. Yes.
 - Q. And then there were some questions, I think, from Mr. Wilson about what -- whether the CDF plant deliveries were included in your dataset. And you answered that they were; is that correct?



1	А.	Yes.		
2	Q.	And this included am I correct you included all		
3	deliver	ies from any Select farm to any collect customer		
4	for an	entire 12-month period, correct?		
5	А.	That is correct.		
6	Q.	And so it would include those Select member loads		
7	delivered to Continental Dairy Facilities and Continental			
8	Dairy F	acilities Southwest; is that correct?		
9	А.	Yes.		
10	Q.	Now, would your dataset include deliveries from		
11	other cooperatives that sold milk to Continental Dairy			
12	Facilit	ies?		
13	А.	No.		
14		MR. MILTNER: That's all I have.		
15		And we would move the admission of her testimony,		
16	please,	Exhibit 216 (sic).		
17		THE COURT: Any objection?		
18		Exhibit 217 is made a part of the record.		
19		(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 217 was received		
20		into evidence.)		
21		THE COURT: Thank you. You may step down.		
22		MR. MILTNER: Thank you, your Honor.		
23		We would next call Cheslie Stehouwer.		
24		THE COURT: Raise your right hand.		
25		CHESLIE STEHOUWER,		
26		Being first duly sworn, was examined and		
27		testified as follows:		
28		THE COURT: Your witness.		



1	MR. MILTNER: Thank you, your Honor.
2	DIRECT EXAMINATION
3	BY MR. MILTNER:
4	Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Stehouwer. How are you?
5	A. Good.
6	Q. Have you had a chance to testify at a Federal
7	Order hearing before?
8	A. I have not.
9	Q. All right. You have had a chance to watch today
10	at least, though, and listen in a little bit beforehand,
11	correct?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Could we have you just state and spell your name
14	for the record, please?
15	A. Cheslie Stehouwer, C-H-E-S-L-I-E,
16	S-T-E-H-O-U-W-E-R.
17	Q. And could you also provide your business address
18	for the record?
19	A. 999 West Randall Street, Coopersville, Michigan,
20	49404.
21	Q. Thank you.
22	MR. MILTNER: Your Honor, we have given
23	Ms. Stehouwer Exhibit Select-3. Could we have that
24	marked, please, for identification?
25	THE COURT: That exhibit is marked 218 for
26	identification.
27	(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 218 was marked
28	for identification.)



1	MR. MILTNER: Thank you.
2	BY MR. MILTNER:
3	Q. And, Ms. Stehouwer, you have that exhibit in front
4	of you?
5	A. I do.
6	Q. And you are familiar with that exhibit?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. And is that your testimony in support of Select's
9	Proposal 11?
10	A. Yes, it is.
11	Q. And are you intending to read it for the record
12	today?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. Could you go ahead and do that, and then when you
15	are done, we'll have some more questions for you. Thanks.
16	A. Okay.
17	My name is Cheslie Stehouwer. I'm the director of
18	sales and marketing for Continental Dairy Facilities, LLC,
19	and Continental Dairy Facilities Southwest LLC.
20	CDF operates a butter/powder plant in
21	Coopersville, Michigan. CDF Southwest operates a
22	similarly constructed butter/powder plant in Littlefield,
23	Texas. Both CDF and CDF Southwest are wholly-owned
24	subsidiaries of Select Milk Producers, Inc.
25	I was hired by CDF in 2011 as an administrative
26	assistant. My duties then include working on projects
27	related to the construction of the CDF plant, information
28	technology, and company policies and procedures.



As the plant was commissioned, my role expanded into monitoring and coordinating milk receiving, overseeing milk balancing, and product sales.

When the design and construction of CDF Southwest began in 2015, I was added to that team to plan for its commissioning and to manage product sales. In my current role with CDF and CDF Southwest, I'm responsible for sales contracts of all bulk commodities, retail manufacturing agreements, and hedging. My oversight includes information technology and milk balancing.

In addition, I work closely with our president and general manager, Steve Cooper, on all aspects of product manufacturing. My job responsibilities also require me to work with our accounting, finance, and receiving teams to coordinate operations and analyze related performance and financial data.

In overseeing milk balancing, I receive daily reconciliation reports from my direct reports at CDF and CDF Southwest. Those reconciliation reports provide information on milk received from all suppliers, their weights and tests, and highlight any particular area of attention. I then provide guidance and feedback to our receiving teams, where appropriate, to adjust problem areas.

I was asked by Chris Allen, Select's director of industry relations and analytics, to analyze the farm weights and plant weights for all-milk received at our Michigan plant and our Texas plant, CDF Southwest, and



2.

2.1

assess the extent of farm-to-plant losses. I was asked to analyze this data to provide relevant information about the differences between farm weights and plant weights.

This data and analysis was performed by me in conjunction with Chris Allen and additional CDF staff.

These analysis were prepared for the purpose of supporting Select's proposal to change the yield factors used in the minimum price formulas. All the underlying -- underlying data is regularly collected and maintained by CDF and CDF Southwest as part of our regular operations.

I'm aware of the purpose of Select's proposal, and that if adopted, it will impact the minimum prices paid to our members. But I'm not an expert on Federal Order language and price formulas. The scope of my testimony is limited to describing the data and analysis performed by me or under my supervision to support Proposal 11.

For my analysis, I generated reports from our existing systems that produced the following data: The originating supplier, the date and time of delivery, the hauler, the ticket number, the slip weight, or farm weight, and the scale weight or plant weight. The report — these reports were generated for both plants for the period of August 1, 2022, through July 31st, 2023.

For the observed period, this encompassed deliveries from the 15 different suppliers. For the Michigan plant, there was a total of 16,396 distinct deliveries. Of this total, 8,907, or 58.3%, were from Select. The remainder were from other cooperatives and



2.1

plants.

2.

2.1

For each supplier, I then examined the difference -- differences between farm and plant weights. As would be expected, for any individual load, the farm weight might be higher or lower than the plant weight. But data on an individual basis is of little meaning when determining the overall loss of milk for the plant.

To determine the aggregate farm plant losses, I aggregated the total differences of each load for each supplier, arriving at a net difference between the farm and plant weights. Those results are reported in the table on the next page. Negative net discrepancies reflect a lower plant weight than farm weight. Positive net discrepancies represent a higher plant weight than farm weight.

The table shows the suppliers, the percent of deliveries they are to the CDF plant, and the net discrepancy for each supplier.

You will see that the overall net discrepancy was negative 0.15%. Looking at only the loads from Select Milk Producers, the net discrepancy was negative 0.2%, slightly greater than the overall discrepancy. All of the cooperatives listed, other than Select, include shipments from milk from multiple farms -- multiple pickup routes.

I performed the same analysis for Texas plant over the same time period. There was a total of 27,792 deliveries. The deliveries to this account came from a much smaller set of suppliers. Accordingly, I'm not



reporting the data by supplier. In total, the aggregate net discrepancies across all deliveries was negative 0.1%.

The discrepancies of negative 0.15% for Michigan and negative 0.1% for Texas were weight discrepancies only. Neither CDF, nor CDF Southwest, regularly analyzed farm-to-plant losses on a solids basis. We do, however, measure the components of our silos and compare them with aggregate component levels of our farm tests. Those two measures are consistently aligned with one another.

Accordingly, it appears, from our internal data that losses of milk solids occur across all components equally. We do not realize losses of butterfat at a greater weight than the overall loss of milk solids.

In addition to reviewing our actual plant data for the volume of milk lost in farm-to-plant transit, I was asked to offer my opinion as why discrepancies between farm weights and plant weights occur, other than the actual loss of milk. All plant weights are scaled weights. Assuming that the farm weight is also a scale weight, there are four principal reasons why weights would be different.

The first would be scale calibration. The scales at CDF and CDF Southwest are regularly calibrated and certified. The same is true for most milk manufacturing plants. While most farm scales are also properly calibrated, some are not. Even with those that are well calibrated, problems will occur. Where there is a substantial discrepancy, there is a strong likelihood that



2.

2.0

2.1

an investigation will uncover a scale calibration issue.

The second would be hauler errors. Most of the logistics process, including weighing and testing, is being digitized. Within Select, new software has resulted in most farm shipments being manifested electronically, with data shared in realtime among farms, cooperatives, haulers, and plants.

Other cooperatives and plants use similar software and hardware systems to some extent. This movement to electronic records and data has improved timeliness and accuracy. However, the adoption of this technology is still ongoing. A significant portion of the milk received at CDF and CDF Southwest remains tracked on paper logs or manually entered by haulers. Investigations into weight discrepancies often find that numbers have been transposed, entries were simply mistyped, or weights are off by an even 1,000 or 10,000 pounds due to manual entry or errors. Hauler errors of this type are the second most common issue.

The third is drop yard and equipment changes. CDF Southwest utilizes a drop yard and yard dogs to help optimize milk deliveries and minimize demurrage costs. When we notice an unusually high number of loads with high weight variances, an investigation revealed that some tankers were scaling and using a semi tractor and scaling out using either a different semi tractor or a yard dog.

In addition, where a drop yard is used, different drivers in the equipment at scale in and scale out will



2.

2.1

also affect weights. Even in the same equipment, it is not difficult to imagine two different drivers having a weight difference of a hundred pounds or more.

Importantly, we have taken corrective action to minimize these occurrences.

And lastly, snow. While the drop yard discrepancies were isolated to CDF Southwest, the CDF plant in Michigan has its own unique discrepancy triggers, snow and ice. In cold months, tankers, trucks, and scales covered in snow and ice can add hundreds of pounds to a scale weight. A cubic foot of snow weighs up to 20 pounds, and a standard milk tanker has a footprint of over 3,000 square feet. So a single inch of snow on a tanker could weigh as much as 500 pounds.

When you consider that many of the deliveries in Michigan are made with 100,000-pound super tankers, the potential for snow and ice weight increases as well. We have observed higher than usual negative weight discrepancies during the winter months, which we have determined are attributable to frozen precipitation.

In conclusion, first is as usually measured and observed by CDF and CDF Southwest, the difference between farm weights and plant weights is less than 0.2% of total solids. Despite their different geographies, CDF and CDF Southwest show similar farm-to-plant shrink numbers.

Within the universe of deliveries to CDF, the net discrepancies for single farm shipments of Select Farms of negative .2% is very close and slightly higher than the



2.

2.1

plant average of negative 0.15%. Given that many of the non-Select shipments received by CDF come from multiple farm loads, the necessary conclusion is that management for farm-to-plant shrink is not unique to Select specifically or larger farms generally.

CDF and CDF Southwest have identified areas that are likely to contribute to farm-to-plant weight variances. Those variances are neither inherent nor unaddressable. Instead, significant farm-to-plant losses often are the result of practices and circumstances that can be addressed and do not represent actual milk losses at all.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

Q. Thank you, Ms. Stehouwer. I wanted to follow up with a few questions that I have done with the other witnesses.

So the first really doesn't deal with farm-to-plant shrink at all. It's on the first page of your testimony. You mention that you are responsible for a number of things with CDF and CDF Southwest, and among those is hedging.

What do you do for -- for the hedging -- or what do you do in the area of hedging for the companies?

- A. So myself and our business analyst are responsible for our risk management program, which includes hedging of commodities, butter, nonfat.
- Q. So would you be analyzing potential hedge positions for the sale of products out of the plant?



2.

2.0

2.1

NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING Yes. 1 Α. 2. Ο. Do you do -- you don't do any hedging on the milk purchase side at the plant, do you? 3 4 No, I do not. And there have been some discussions throughout 5 Ο. the hearing about the impacts of all of the proposals that 6 7 we're talking about, on risk management and hedging. Have you done any analysis on -- on that issue on 8 9 whether any proposals would affect the hedging activities 10 of Continental Dairy Facilities, or CDF Southwest? 11 Α. I have not. 12 Mr. Allen was asked about the products that were 13 produced at CDF and CDF Southwest. 14 Did you hear his answer? 15 T did. Α. 16 Did he miss anything? Ο. 17 Α. He did not. 18 All right. He did well. Great. Ο. 19 I wanted to call out and ask you, you analyzed 2.0 shipments for the exact same period that Ms. Campbell did. 2.1 Was that intentional? 22 Α. Yes. 23 You wanted the data to line up for comparative Ο. 24 purposes? I think so. Yes. 25 Α. 26 Q. Okay. I'd like to ask you about your table on



page 4.

27

28

Now, you have not listed names of cooperatives or

A. 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

27

28

Q. And so you also have some plants that represent a very small portion of the total.

So why would you be receiving milk from plants?

- A. Sometimes we -- we buy from non-cooperative suppliers.
- Q. Okay. Would it happen like if a plant just had too much milk that they weren't processing and they would sell it to you for processing?
- A. Yeah. Yes. Exactly.
- Q. So when you and I were going over this testimony, we looked at Cooperative A's numbers and noticed that the net discrepancy was the lowest among the group.
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. And you had -- you had stated that with respect to that particular cooperative, that as part of your reconciliations you made, in conjunction with that cooperative, adjustments to their weights; is that correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. Can you explain a little bit more about how that works?
 - A. Yeah. So when we -- we do a daily balance of receipts, we will flag anything that's over .8% and send



it back to the cooperative or supplier. And in that instance, the ones who I would say don't have reliable scale weights or noticeable that something's off, then they will either agree to take the plant weight due to the fact that they know that their weights are not reliable, or they will agree to split with us to become a little more in line with where we should be.

- Q. You were here for Ms. Campbell's testimony?
- 9 A. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Would you say that what you're describing are similar to what she said were, kind of known issues with loads?
- A. Correct. Yes.
- Q. Nevertheless, are those situations a distinct minority of instances with respect to the loads received by CDF?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Would you expect that if there were no adjustments to those loads, that the bottom line figure, I guess literally the bottom line figure in your table, would be affected much by that?
- A. I think it would be affected but not significantly. I think it would not be higher than the highest one we have stated.
- Q. Okay. On page 5 you're describing -- you make a description of the components of milk in the silo, and the components of the milk coming in based on farm tests. And you testified that those two measurements are consistently



in line with one another.

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. Is -- is that based on information provided to you by others in the company?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. It's not something you personally measure and track, is it?
 - A. That's correct. It's not in our department.
- Q. Okay. When you say those measurements are in line with one another, I assume that means that whatever the protein is in the milk coming in, is the protein in your silo, and butterfat is the same; is that your understanding?
 - A. Yes, that's my understanding.
- Q. Now, the farm-to-plant shrink figures that are in the price formulas now, they assume that you lose a certain amount of all the solids, which includes butterfat, and then additional butterfat on top of that.

Is that consistent with the tests in your silos?

- A. Not my area, but based on what I've talked to individuals in our -- in our facility, that they align.
 - Q. Yeah. The farm plants and the silo tests align?
 - A. Yes, they align.
- Q. Okay. You also go through a number of reasons why there would be plant discrepancies, and I just wanted to ask a few additional questions on those areas.
- Scale calibration, is that something that you frequently are advised about, that a farm has an issue



with their scale?

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. I would say not from the farm level that we're hearing it frequently, but we do very rarely. It's more within our plant.
- Q. I'm -- I don't know the answer to this because I haven't asked you before. But do you know how closely the scales are calibrated, to within how many pounds?
 - A. Of the farm or with our --
- Q. Within your plant scale. Like, is it calibrated to within a range or --
- A. Yeah, it's calibrated quarterly, I know that, and it is with a range. But I wouldn't be able to tell you the exact range.
- Q. Okay. So I want you to assume for a second that a farm scale is calibrated within a range, and your plant scale is calibrated within a range. Within any given load of milk, you could be within the range at both places but still show some kind of variance, wouldn't you?
 - A. I would agree.
- Q. Okay. As far as hauler errors, when I first heard Ms. Campbell's testimony, or first saw her put it together, I was -- I was surprised, actually, at the frequency of hauler errors in reporting.
- How frequently are hauler errors, do you see hauler errors in your analysis and your reconciliations?
- A. I would say every day.
 - O. Every day?
- A. Yeah, that we're receiving, you know, quite a few



1 tankers a day.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- O. Yeah. But it's not a rare occurrence?
- A. No.
- Q. You mentioned the use of drop yards and that CDF Southwest uses a drop yard.

Is there a drop yard used at the Michigan plant?

- A. No, there's not.
- Q. And you describe use of different equipment. I had to learn this in preparing for this testimony, too.

A yard dog, can you describe for us what that is?

- A. Why he. So it's a -- it's a smaller tractor.
- Doesn't have a cab, so smaller than what you would see typically on the road. And they pull in the tankers and pull them out.
 - Q. And it weighs, therefore, less than a regular semi tractor?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. And then you also -- this is one that, when we were reviewing your testimony, you know, folks weren't clear on this. Where you talk about different drivers and the equipment at scale in and scale out. Can you actually explain for us like really simply what that is?
 - A. Yeah. So I mean your driver, for example, could be someone who weighs 120 pulling it in, and then you could have a truck driver that weighs 300 pulling it out. So you could have an easily difference of 100 and 200 pounds just by the person that's in the cab.
 - Q. And this snow you note, again, something I had



1	never thought about before you had clued me into it. In
2	the winter months in Grand Rapids or Coopersville, how
3	frequently does that issue arise?
4	A. A lot. January through March is pretty
5	significant on that problem. And we'll be able to notice
6	it by all the trucks being out of variance.
7	Q. You will notice a snowstorm and then a significant
8	number of variances occurring in that same period?
9	A. That's correct.
10	Q. How many years of analysis, like, before you all
11	realized it was the snow and ice that was doing that?
12	A. I think we figured it out the first year.
13	Q. First year? Okay. Great.
14	MR. MILTNER: The witness is available for
15	additional questioning.
16	THE COURT: We have been going a little bit over
17	an hour and a half. I think it's time for a break.
18	All right. Let's come back 2:05. I'm sorry,
19	3:05.
20	(Whereupon, a break was taken.)
21	THE COURT: Back on the record.
22	CROSS-EXAMINATION
23	BY MR. ENGLISH:
24	Q. Good afternoon. My name is Chip English from the
25	Milk Innovation Group.
26	A. Nice to meet you.
27	Q. Thank you very much for being here today.



Let me actually start off, you were here, I know,

in the room when Ms. Campbell was testifying, 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

- Q. And when I asked her some questions, and she deferred to you, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And then you gave your testimony and provided some additional answers to Mr. Miltner.

Given the questions I had for her, which were about discrepancies and how things were resolved, is there anything you haven't covered in your testimony now in addition to what Mr. Miltner, going back to the questions I asked her?

- A. Going off memory, I think we covered it.
- Q. I think so, too. I just --

So let me turn primarily, maybe not exclusively, but primarily to page 4 of your testimony, which is the chart.

And let me start by asking on the accounts which are listed as Plant 1, Plant 2, Plant 3, Plant 4, I didn't hear Mr. Miltner go into this exactly, is that milk that is being reloaded at a plant and delivered to you?

- A. I'd have to go back and look at specifics, but it could also be milk that the plant is selling to us that didn't go to the facility.
 - O. So diverted milk?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Do you understand what that phrase is, diverted?
- 28 A. Yes.



- Q. Okay. So it could be diverted milk, it could be reloaded milk, correct?
 - A. Correct.

2.

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

- Q. And you don't know what --
- A. No. I'd have to go back specifically and look.

 The data is over a year, so...
 - Q. And with respect to the materials that you and Ms. Campbell have put together, I think -- if I'm wrong correct me -- I think what you put together is between the two of you, the information about the Michigan plant, correct?
- And the Texas plant -- I want to break it down if
 I can. I'm right that this information on page 4 is about
 the Michigan plant, correct?
- 15 A. That's correct.
 - Q. And then you performed the same analysis, but because of different supply issues, you didn't provide the same detail, but between you and Ms. Campbell you provided information about the Texas plant, correct?
 - A. Correct. So on page 7 is the Texas plant.

 There's no chart because it is a smaller pool of data.
 - Q. Right. Okay. So -- and when we talk about the Michigan plant, that's your plant, correct, Select's plant?
 - A. That is, yes.
- Q. And when we talk about the Texas plant, that's Select's plant, correct?
 - A. Correct.



- Q. Is there another universe of milk that is delivered to others, so purchasers of your milk, that Ms. Campbell talked about, or is that not part of the study?
- A. That is not part of this. This is just deliveries to the plants in Michigan and the plants in Texas.
 - Q. Okay. And that's what I was trying to get at.
 - A. Okay.

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. So that this is not -- well, was Ms. Campbell's testimony about milk being delivered to other plants?
 - A. Yes, that is correct.
- Q. But there isn't any information for confidentiality or competitive reasons about other plants themselves in terms of their overall receipts, correct? From others, other than Select, correct?
 - A. Can you repeat that? Sorry.
- Q. So to the extent Ms. Campbell's testimony spoke to milk delivered by Select to -- on what's purchased milk, you don't go beyond that, so you don't know what the plant -- that plant's other receipts are, correct?
 - A. I do not. My testimony is not over other plants.
- Q. And then also on page 4, the sentence that says, "All of the cooperatives listed, other than Select, include shipments of milk from multiple pickup routes."

 Does that mean that they aren't all full tanker
- A. They are all full tankers, but they have multiple -- some of the deliveries from the other co-ops



loads?

1 | have multiple farm pickups in one tanker.

- Q. Okay. Do you know what percentage of their deliveries are multiple pickups?
 - A. I do not.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. When your column on page 4, the right-hand column, is labeled "net discrepancy," so for instance, Select Milk Producers, a net discrepancy of minus 0.20%, just to be clear for the record, what a net discrepancy means is when you add up all the deliveries from Select and netted out whatever variances, it was negative 0.2%, correct?
- 11 A. That is correct.
- Q. Do you know what the range was of from, say, a load that was the most negative to the most positive?
- 14 A. I do not.
- 15 Q. Would there be a range?
- 16 A. There would -- I mean, yes, there would be a 17 range.
- 18 MR. ENGLISH: I thank you very much. I have no 19 further questions.
- THE COURT: Other questions other than AMS for this witness?
- 22 | Seeing none, Ms. Taylor.
- 23 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 24 BY MS. TAYLOR:
- 25 | O. Good afternoon.
- 26 A. Hi.
- Q. Thanks for coming to testify today. I don't have too many questions.



I did on the page 4 of the table, I just want to clarify for the record first that that negative .15% is a weighted average of all of the ones above; is that correct?

A. 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

- Q. Okay. Weighted by the percent of deliveries?
- A. Yes. By the total volume. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And then I was wondering if you had any insight why all the net discrepancies for the plants seem to be positive, but yet all the ones for the cooperatives seem to be negative?
 - A. That is a good question. I do not.
 - O. Okay. That's fair.

For the cooperatives that have -- are on the higher end the net discrepancy -- and you did mention that all of these co-ops had multiple stops on their -- on their routes, did you -- have you been able to go and look at the data to see if there's a relationship between the farm size of the co-ops on the routes and the percent discrepancy?

- A. I have not gone and looked at that. What I'll say is, not all of the smaller deliveries are just based on farm size, it's just based on how much we received from that supplier throughout the year.
- Q. Okay. So you are talking about the percent of delivery. So it might be high like, negative .32, but you only got 1% of your milk from them?
 - A. Right.



Q. When you are talking about scale calibration on
page 5 as one the reasons for plant discrepancies, I asked
this same question of your co-worker where there is a
substantial discrepancy. And I was just wondering if you
could illuminate what you deem a substantial discrepancy
or what your suppliers deem as a substantial discrepancy
enough that they would discuss with you?

- A. So depending on the weight of the load, you could see substantial discrepancies be 10,000, 20,000 pounds for each load. So it -- it's pretty -- I would -- I would say it's pretty clear to see when looking at a table of what would be substantial. It really sticks out and you know that there's no way that -- you know, it's not just 100 or 200, or even 1,000, it's going to be a quite large variance.
 - Q. Okay. Significant outliers?
- A. Yes.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CROSS-EXAMINATION

19 BY MR. WILSON:

Q. Todd Wilson, USDA AMS.

Again, my question didn't pass mustard, I don't think, with Erin.

On page 6 of your testimony, under the hauler error paragraph, the last sentence, "Hauler errors of this type are the second most common issue."

Is the second referring to within this paragraph, that these types that you are identifying of the second most hauler issues, or is hauler errors the second of the



A, B, C, D groupings?

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. I would say we're saying it's the second most common issue we see, so it kind of listed them in order. The last two are outliers between each plant; the first two is what we see at both locations.
 - Q. Okay.

MS. TAYLOR: That's it from AMS. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anyone else?

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. MILTNER:

Q. Ms. Stehouwer, I just want to finish up with a couple of clarifying questions on your testimony, and it's going to touch on Ms. Campbell's as well.

So when you were asked to prepare your testimony and your analysis, the purpose was to show, for the plant, the variance between all of the receipts regardless of source to your plant.

Was that your understanding of what your task was?

- A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. And so you personally in your role at CDF and CDF Southwest, you don't have visibility to any other plants even really within Select's world, do you?
 - A. No, I do not.
- Q. And then, you know, I think Ms. Campbell testified to this, but as you were working with her and the Select team on this whole project, was your understanding that she was presenting the other side of the same coin, the cooperative milk sales side deliveries from Select to its



1	plants regardless of who owned the plant?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. And that so in conjunction, your testimony and her
4	testimony would show what it looks like for the sale of
5	milk and what it looks like for the purchase of milk,
6	correct?
7	A. That's correct.
8	MR. MILTNER: Okay. I don't think that I have any
9	other questions.
10	And so, your Honor, we would ask the admission of
11	Exhibit 218.
12	THE COURT: Any objection?
13	Exhibit 218 is entered into the record of this
14	proceeding.
15	(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 218 was received
16	into evidence.)
17	THE COURT: Thank you. You are dismissed.
18	MR. MILTNER: We would call to the stand to talk
19	about Proposal 12, Chris Allen again, and we will
20	distribute his statement.
21	THE COURT: Let's say you are still under oath.
22	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
23	THE COURT: You were just here.
24	CHRIS ALLEN,
25	Having been previously sworn, was examined
26	and testified as follows:
27	DIRECT EXAMINATION
28	BY MR. MILTNER:



- 1 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Allen. Welcome back.
- 2. Α. Thank you.

4

5

6

8

9

10

We have already had your name and address entered into the record, and the judge has noted you are still under oath.

In front of you is a document. Marked in the 7 upper right as Exhibit Select-4.

Do you have that in front of you?

- Α. Yes.
- Are you familiar with that document? Ο.
- 11 Α. Yes.
- 12 Ο. Does it represent your written testimony submitted
- 13 to USDA in support of Proposal 12 in this hearing?
- 14 Α. Yes.
- 15 MR. MILTNER: And, your Honor, could we have
- 16 Exhibit Select-4 numbered for identification, please?
- 17 THE COURT: Yes. It is marked as identification
- 18 219.
- 19 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 219 was marked
- 2.0 for identification.)
- 2.1 MR. MILTNER: Thank you.
- 22 BY MR. MILTNER:
- 23 And, Mr. Allen, as you did previously with your
- prior testimony, are you going to read a somewhat 24
- 25 abbreviated version --
- 26 That is correct. Α.
- 27 Ο. -- of this?
- 28 Okay. Α.



MR. MILTNER: Your Honor, we previously qualified Mr. Allen as an expert in the field of dairy economics and cooperative analysis, so I just recognize his prior designation.

BY MR. MILTNER:

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. And, Mr. Allen, if you could go ahead and read your statement, that would be great.
 - A. Will do.

I am here to testify on behalf of Select Milk Producers, Inc. My testimony today addresses Proposal 12 related to the yield of nonfat dry milk, which I will also refer to as NFDM, and the inclusion of the nonfat solids in dry buttermilk powder, which I will also refer to as BMP.

Select's Proposal 12 changes the yield factor for NFDM to properly account for the value of milk solids utilized in the manufacturing of BMP. If adopted, Proposal 12 would change the yield for NFDM from 0.99 to 1.03.

The current yield factor for nonfat solids of 0.99 was set as part of the Department's 2002 Final Decision on the Class III and IV price formulas. The 2002 Final Decision "eliminates the consideration of nonfat solids that end up in buttermilk powder from the Class IV nonfat solids pricing formula."

The Department concluded then that the elimination of these nonfat solids from the Class IV formulas was appropriate because, and I quote: "[R]ecognizing a



minimum value for buttermilk powder does not materially affect the Class IV skim milk price. Record evidence indicates that the price of buttermilk powder can be a low of 70% of the nonfat dry milk price for the same period. In addition, according to the record, the Make Allowance of buttermilk powder is an additional 2 cents per pound higher than the nonfat dry milk Make Allowance. Official notice of weekly Dairy Product Prices published by the National Agricultural Statistics Service for January 2000 through May 2002 is hereby taken.

"Using the 2-cent higher Make Allowance for buttermilk and prices for nonfat dry milk and buttermilk powder for the period of January 2000 through May 2002, it was determined that the effect of including buttermilk powder in the nonfat solids price and the Class IV skim milk price was negligible. Therefore, this decision eliminates the consideration of nonfat solids that end up in buttermilk powder from the Class IV nonfat solids pricing formula."

However, the effect of buttermilk powder on the formulas was not then, nor is it now "negligible." The 2002 Final Decision did not set forth the mathematics to support its conclusion then. As further explained in this testimony, had the 2002 Final Decision properly analyzed the impacts of removing buttermilk powder, it should have arrived at a yield of 1.02.

The situation 20 years later is even more pronounced. Current data demonstrate that the spread



2.

2.0

2.1

between the prices of nonfat dry milk and buttermilk powder is minimal and not uniformly negative. USDA reported dry buttermilk prices and nonfat dry milk low/medium heat prices established a much tighter price alignment than assumed by the 2002 Final Decision.

Accordingly, the proper yield for NFDM should be increased to 1.03 to reflect the current state of the industry.

Select's Proposal 12 recognizes that the current yield factor wholly fails to compensate producers for the value of milk solids used in the manufacturing of buttermilk powder.

The 2002 Final Decision Improperly Accounted for the Value of Buttermilk Powder.

In developing Select's Proposal 12, we partially accepted the Department's reasoning in setting the NFDM yield described in the 2002 Final Decision. Specifically, we accepted that the portion of milk solids in Class IV milk used to manufacture buttermilk powder should reflect the proper value of the end product and the cost to manufacture it.

We did not accept, however, the Department's conclusion "that the effect of including buttermilk powder in the nonfat solids price and the Class IV skim milk price was negligible." Our starting point was to determine what the proper yield of NFDM would be, assuming that the yield was adjusted for the value of buttermilk powder rather than its wholesale removal from the yield formula.



2.

2.0

2.1

My written testimony provides a relevant analysis and calculation of the NFDM yield factor from USDA's 2002 Finals Decision.

Select sought to restore the proper value of the buttermilk solids in dry buttermilk. To do so we took the calculated quantity of buttermilk solids and multiplied it by 70%, reflecting the Department's conclusion regarding the value of dry buttermilk. Next, we multiplied that result by 87.5% to account for the higher make costs for buttermilk powder recited by the Department.

Next, we took the 0.9975 pounds of nonfat solids and subtracted the 0.0479 pounds of solids in dry buttermilk and restored 0.0293 pounds of those solids based on the calculation above.

Finally, we adjusted the pounds of nonfat solids to the presumed moisture content of 3.8%. That calculation results in a yield of 1.02, not 0.99. This establishes that the Department's conclusion that the value of buttermilk powder in the nonfat solids price is not "negligible." It has a real impact on the stated yield.

The price relationship between NFDM and Buttermilk Powder is closely aligned. Consistent with Select's approach and philosophy that all the elements of the minimum price formulas should reflect current realities, we next revisited the price relationship of NFDM and buttermilk powder.

For this analysis, we compared the reported prices



2.

2.1

for NFDM and BMP reported by the Dairy Market News ("DMN"). We utilized the DMN monthly averages of the mostly price series for West and East/Central dry buttermilk and for Western and East/Central NFDM. We utilized prices from January 2021 through June 2023. We selected January 2021 to provide the longest continuous representative window possible while attempting to avoid the pricing impacts triggered by the COVID-19 pandemic.

The table provided in my written testimony provides the full scope of these comparisons and analyses. This data demonstrates two important truths: First, there is little difference between the Western and Central/Eastern prices of either NFDM or BMP; second, and more relevant to Proposal 12, BMP prices are aligned very closely to NFDM. BMP as a percentage of NFDM prices was 97.0% in the west and 98.0% in the Central/East. Steve Cooper from Continental Dairy Facilities will offer additional testimony confirming that its sales of buttermilk powder align with this analysis.

Once this analysis was complete, I looked further back over the period of January 2017 through July 2023 to confirm this price alignment. The additional charts in my written testimony demonstrate the longer-term price alignment of NFDM and BMP. The Department's finding that BMP is sold at 70% of NFDM is not borne out by current realities.

Recognizing this close price alignment, I performed the same calculation of the NFDM yield performed



2.

2.0

2.1

by USDA in the 2002 Final Decision using the current price alignment. I maintained the same relationship between the cost of manufacturing BMP and NFDM (in other words, NFDM make costs are 87.5% of BMP make costs).

The arithmetic works out as follows. I took the calculated quantity of buttermilk solids and multiplied it by 97.5%, reflecting the proper price alignment. Next, I multiplied that result by 87.5% to account for the higher make costs for buttermilk powder.

Next, I took the 0.9975 pounds of nonfat solids and subtracted the 0.0479 pounds of solids in dry buttermilk. I then restored the 0.0409 pounds of those solids based on the calculation above.

Finally, I adjusted the pounds of nonfat solids to the presumed moisture content of 3.8%.

Changing the NFDM yield impacts the nonfat solids price and the Class IV prices. Based on my analysis of the changes, using five- and ten-year averages of commodity prices through April 2023, I computed the following component and Class price impacts: For the five-year average, the nonfat solids price under the current formula is 1.0219. Using Proposal 12, the nonfat solids price would be 1.0632. For that same five-year average the Class IV price under the current formula would be \$17.26; under Proposal 12, it would be \$17.62.

The ten-year average same commodities, nonfat solids price, under the current formula, the price would be 1.0021; Proposal 12 adjustments, the nonfat solids



2.

2.1

price would be 1.0426. The Class IV price for the ten-year average would have been 16.92; using Proposal 12, the Class IV price would have been 17.27.

Because the Class II price is based on the Class IV price, the Class II price would change likewise. The precise impacts on the statistical uniform price or blend price would vary by order and could be further impacted by any adjustments the Department elects to make to the Class I mover.

The adoption of Proposal 12 in full would require the following amendment to 7 CFR Part 1000 as outlined in my written testimony.

The current yield factor for nonfat dry milk in the Class IV formula is lower than it would be otherwise due to USDA's policy decision to disregard the value of milk solids that are used to manufacture buttermilk powder. That policy decision was erroneous in its conclusion that the value of those solids was negligible. Even under the assumptions regarding the relationship of NFDM and BMP prices from the 2002 Final Decision, the conclusion was incorrect.

When taking into consideration the current price relationship, the error is even more impactful. If it remains USDA's goal to utilize price discovery mechanisms that establish the true value of producer milk used in the four classes, the value of Class IV milk must be corrected and updated to reflect the values of buttermilk solids.

Q. Thank you, Mr. Allen. A few additional questions



2.

2.0

2.1

before we open you up to other questions.

I'm looking at page 4 of Exhibit 219, and it's the first two lines. I think you read a yield of 1.03, but it is 1.02 in your statement, which is consistent with the analysis on page 6. So I just want to confirm that that should be 1.02.

- A. Yes. Like the prior testimony, I think I grabbed the wrong version of the draft, and so I think you are correct, that should have been 1.02.
- 10 | O. Great.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

So as far as the approach of your analysis here, would it be fair to state that you took the rationale that USDA outlined in its prior decisions on the Class IV formulas and tried to apply current data to it?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And so there's really no change -- are you trying to change USDA's policy on this or are you just trying to update their analysis?
- A. Just update the analysis.
- Q. Now, on page 8 of your testimony, just a thing that I noticed as we were going through this. In the column -- really the fourth column, "DMN BMP East-Central Mostly Average." Dairy Market News publishes a mostly range for nonfat dry milk and for buttermilk powder in the West, but in the East/Central, it's just a pure average, right, they don't separate out a mostly?
 - A. That is correct. That was a typo. Yes.
 - Q. Yeah.



And so your numbers there are the average of the range reported, correct?

- A. Yes. Yes, that is correct.
- Q. Let me ask this: In all your work as a dairy economist, what -- what is your opinion of Dairy Market News and the reliability of the data they report?
 - A. It's the best source we have, but it is reliable.
- Q. Now, on the top of page 11, you say you took the calculated quantity of buttermilk solids and multiplied it by 97.5.

And I think this was implied but not expressly stated, that that 97.5 is just the simple average of the relationships between the Western and the -- I'm sorry -- of -- yeah, of the Western and the East/Central relationships you described in your tables, correct?

- A. That is correct. Yes.
- Q. And then finally -- maybe not finally, but next, on page 12, where you show your five- and ten-year averages, was the methodology, the lookback methodology the same as what you answered with respect to your testimony on Proposal 11 that it goes back from April of 2023?
- A. The prior -- 60 consecutive months and the prior 120 consecutive months using the announced prices in the monthly price formulas.
- MR. MILTNER: I would make Mr. Allen available for additional questioning.

THE COURT: Anyone have questions other than AMS?



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

1	Can we take a minute?
2	THE WITNESS: Yeah. Okay.
3	MS. HANCOCK: Yes, if you want to.
4	THE COURT: I wasn't thinking of a break so much
5	because
6	MS. HANCOCK: We kind of went into a different
7	topic area that I wasn't ready for yet, so I just want to
8	make sure if we want to take a break, we can, or if
9	Chip wants to go, that's fine, too.
10	MR. ENGLISH: All right. I'll go ahead and just
11	proceed, if we can muddle through a little bit here.
12	THE COURT: Okay. Your witness.
13	CROSS-EXAMINATION
14	BY MR. ENGLISH:
15	Q. Chip English again for the Milk Innovation Group.
16	Good afternoon, Mr. Allen.
17	Let me start on page 8, or more particularly, with
18	questions that that you were asked by your counsel.
19	And your response really your response is you were
20	agreeing with Mr. Miltner that Dairy Market News is the
21	best source we have, and it's very reliable, correct?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. It's not audited, correct?
24	A. It's a good question. I don't believe so.
25	Q. Thank you.
26	So let me start with a question about technology
27	and what the results are. When the skim and fat are
2.8	separated would you agree that it's inevitable that cream



includes an addition of the water and fat, small amount of 1 2. SNF? 3 I would agree, yes, sir. Α. So where -- where in the existing formula does 4 that small amount of SNF that goes with the cream show up? 5 I assume when the cream is churned to butter, and 6 Α. 7 then you have the resulting product is then dried into 8 BMP, buttermilk powder. 9 Do you know that for a fact? Ο. 10 I don't. That's my assumption. Α. 11 Ο. But it's certainly not in the nonfat dry milk, 12 correct? 13 I would agree with that. Α. 14 You would agree that there's no such thing as a 15 loss-less plant, correct? 16 Α. Yes. 17 Ο. That, somewhere in the process, whatever --18 whatever your views are about from the farm-to-plant, that 19 once the milk gets to the plant, there's going to be 2.0 losses in solids and butterfat, correct? 2.1 Α. Yes. 22 I have no further questions. MR. ENGLISH: Okay. 23 MS. HANCOCK: We don't have any questions. 24 THE COURT: Oh, no questions. 25 AMS? Or anyone else, I guess. 26 Seeing none, AMS, are you ready? 27 MS. TAYLOR: I guess we're going to be ready.



///

CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 | BY MS. TAYLOR:

1

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Well, there's a lot of math to work through here, so I'm not going to focus on that now.
 - A. Thank you.
 - Q. We'll just have to figure it out later.
- 7 A. Great.
 - Q. So the assumption, in Select's mind, if I'm correct, is that whatever doesn't go into the churn, they put it into buttermilk powder, whatever left over that goes -- it gets dried as buttermilk powder, and they sell it; is that correct?
- 13 A. Yes, that is correct. Sorry. I was just nodding.
 14 Yes, that is correct.
 - Q. And, therefore, that should be accounted for in the price formulas because that is a saleable product?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. We can go -- I'm not going through the math, but one can go through the math you provide. But do you know for a fact that that is actually what happens at butter plants?
 - A. I will have a better source speak for Select following me. I don't think he's here presently, but he's -- he may have landed here, but he's not here in -- he may have landed in town, but he's not here in the facility yet. We'll have somebody who can very much answer that question.
 - Q. Okay.



- A. It will be a better resource than me.
- Q. Okay. And so if I'm looking over on page 3 when you review our past decision, and you quote from it, and say -- the one line reads: "Record evidence indicates that the price of buttermilk can be as low as 70% of the nonfat dry milk price."

So the data that you provided, and it looks like that came from some NASS information. I have to go back and read the decision we wrote, but I'm guessing that we took official notice of something that was published by NASS to draw that conclusion, the 70% number.

So is the information you provided on 7 and 8 looking at Dairy Market News numbers, to conclude from that that the lowest -- if I was to compare the 70% then to a number now, it would be the 80.92% number as the lowest observed relationship during the two years that you looked at. Is that a fair comparison?

- A. Are you referencing that number from the chart?
- Q. Yeah -- well, if I'm looking on page 7, the min number at the very bottom is 80.92%. So if I wanted to look at the comparable number between the 70% that was quoted from in the decision, which says "can be as low," so it's not the average there, it's the min. So the min on the data you provided would be 80.92%. I just want to make sure I'm correctly comparing those numbers.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And then you go on to talk -- you -- you quote this decision where the buttermilk powder is an



2.

2.0

2.1

additional \$0.02 per pound in manufacturing costs. And then you -- you use that in your calculations to come up with the yield that you are proposing.

But what -- do you have any data that substantiates that it's still a \$0.02 difference?

- A. I believe Steve's testimony speaks to that. I could be incorrect, but I was thinking that he specifically addressed that.
 - Q. 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

- A. If not, I think we can ask him. Again, he would be a better person to speak to that than me.
- Q. Okay. So I don't think I have more questions on this exhibit, but we might think of them later since you get to come back up here.
 - A. Excited to do that.
 - O. I'm excited as well.

I do have one question since you're up here. I want to recap the last proposal because you spoke, and then we kind of got the data to substantiate your position. So now that you are back up here, I want to make sure we understand the position.

And so amongst all that testimony, I think what we heard was, in Select's view, farm-to-plant shrink should be eliminated from the formulas, because even though your data shows that it still exists, there -- that's the control of either the producer or the plant to eliminate that.

A. I think we go on to specifically state that we



- recognize that USDA has discretion in making a decision 1 2. based on the data presented on record in this hearing. And if USDA were to find that complete elimination is not 3 4 reasonable, we would be okay with that as long as the decision was based on the evidence provided in this 5 6 hearing. That's helpful. 7 Ο. Okay. 8 MS. TAYLOR: Thank you. 9 THE WITNESS: Yep. 10 MR. MILTNER: Mr. Allen, can I ask a few more 11 questions? 12 THE WITNESS: Absolutely. 13 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 14 BY MR. MILTNER: 15 So in the Class III formula, there's a -- it's Ο. 16 primarily for pricing cheese, correct? 17 Α. Yes. 18 It also prices dry whey, doesn't it? Ο. 19 Well, you mean uses dry whey to establish the Α. 2.0 price? 2.1 That's a better way to state it. Q. 22 Α. Correct. Yes. 23 Now, do all cheese plants fully utilize their whey 0. 2.4 stream? 25 Α. I mean, well, do they all sell it; is that the
- A. I mean, well, do they all sell it; is that the question you are asking about utilizing?
 - Q. Yes. Again, better phrased.
 - A. I don't believe so.



- Q. Nevertheless, those plants pay a Class III price that presumes the sale of at least dry whey, correct?
 - A. Yes.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

24

25

26

- Q. And so when you were listening in to the testimony remotely, did you hear any of the butter plants, some of them say, yes, we make buttermilk powder, and others say no? Did you hear any of that?
 - A. I don't recall specifics, no.
- Q. If a plant manufactured and sold buttermilk powder today, what's the raw input cost for that buttermilk powder?
 - A. I believe it's Class IV.
- Q. And since the formula assumes no buttermilk powder value, what are they paying for the solids that are used in that buttermilk?
 - A. I don't think it's captured in what they pay for the producers for the milk.
 - Q. So it's other than the cost of manufacturing, would it be pure profit?
 - A. I assume so.
 - Q. Thank you.
- MR. MILTNER: I don't have anything else for Mr. Allen on this topic.
 - We're prepared to offer his testimony on Proposal 10. Can we take a -- we can go right into it. We can take ten minutes before we do so. I'll defer to everyone else.
- THE COURT: Can we put this exhibit into evidence?



1	MR. MILTNER: Yes. We would move that into
2	evidence.
3	THE COURT: Yes. Exhibit 219 is offered into
4	evidence.
5	Any objections?
6	It is admitted.
7	(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 219 was received
8	into evidence.)
9	THE COURT: I guess, yeah, let's take a break.
10	Come back at come back at 4:05.
11	(Whereupon, a break was taken.)
12	THE COURT: I consider you still under oath.
13	MR. MILTNER: Hello, Mr. Allen.
14	THE WITNESS: Hey there.
15	CHRIS ALLEN,
16	Having been previously sworn, was examined
17	and testified as follows:
18	DIRECT EXAMINATION
19	BY MR. MILTNER:
20	Q. You are under oath. We know your name. We know
21	your address. And in front of you is a document in the
22	upper right. It says Exhibit Select-6.
23	Do you have that?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. And have you seen it before?
26	A. Yes.
27	Q. I believe it represents your testimony in support
28	of Select's Proposal Number 10; is that correct?



1	A. That is correct.
2	MR. MILTNER: Your Honor, could we have an exhibit
3	number assigned to Select-6, please?
4	THE COURT: Yes. This exhibit is marked 220 for
5	identification.
6	(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 220 was marked
7	for identification.)
8	MR. MILTNER: Very good.
9	BY MR. MILTNER:
10	Q. Mr. Allen, you have done this twice already today.
11	Both times you gave us a somewhat abbreviated version of
12	the testimony.
13	Is that your intent again?
14	A. Yes, I would like to do that again.
15	Q. Okay. Why don't you go ahead and do that, and
16	then I'll come ask you some questions.
17	A. Will do.
18	Okay. My testimony today addresses Proposal 10
19	related to butterfat recovery. Select's Proposal 10 would
20	update the factors for butterfat recovery in the formulas
21	for protein and cheese to reflect the currently achievable
22	and actually achieved factor of 93%. The change
23	necessitates a corresponding increase in the butterfat
24	yield in cheese to 1.624. This change to the butterfat
25	yield in cheese does not consider the correction of
26	farm-to-plant shrink.
27	The current butterfat recovery factor of



90% originated with the adoption of the 2002 Final Rule,

which reasoned, and I quote: "The recommended decision stated that even though many cheese makers may be able to achieve a higher fat retention in cheese, the use of the 1.582 factor representing 90% of fat recovery in cheese continued to be appropriate. The recommended decision also stated that as a result of the 90% level, butterfat in cheese was not overvalued, and those cheese makers who failed to recover more than 90% of the fat would not suffer a competitive disadvantage. The preponderance of the record indicates that most cheese manufacturers should be able to obtain a 90% butterfat recovery," end of quote.

In the hearing preceding the 2002 Final Rule, Select and others argued that the factor should be higher, relying on hearing testimony that butterfat recovery in cheddar cheese generally ranges between 90 and 93%. Although Kraft testified that their butterfat recovery is lower, the commenters favored a use of a factor that reflected 91 or 92% fat recovery because that level of recovery is common.

This argument was again presented in the 2007 formula hearing. Again, the Department declined to increase the recovery factor. In its reasoning then, the Department concluded, and I quote, "While the record contains evidence of what butterfat recovery in cheese production is possible by the use of more modern manufacturing methods in technology, the preponderance of evidence reflects that many cheese manufacturers generally achieve butterfat recovery near 90%. It is important that



2.

2.0

2.1

the product price formulas reflect current market conditions, not market conditions that may be possible but not widely achieved or not reflective of general industry wide conditions. Accordingly, this decision rejects the adoption of a 94% butterfat recovery factor," end of quote.

The adoption of Proposal 10 as measured by an analysis of five- and ten-year averages are reflected in the table provided in my written testimony. Based on this analysis, we would expect modest increases in the value of protein and in the Class III price overall.

I note also that the survey prices for butter and cheddar cheese could result in higher or lower Class III prices as a result of adopting Proposal 10.

I provided a table in my written testimony that demonstrates the impacts of changing the butterfat recovery factor at various cheese and butter prices.

Depending on the relationship between cheddar and butter, adopting Proposal 10 will reduce prices in certain circumstances.

Despite this fact, Select believes this change is warranted, in fact, it is compelled by our desire to have formulas that accurately reflect current realities. As noted in my prior statements, ensuring the accuracy of the formulas is more important than the result.

It is imperative that we introduce into this record the fact that Select and the majority of producer entities do not possess, or have not been authorized to



2.

2.0

2.1

introduce evidence they do possess, regarding the actual butterfat recoveries in the manufacturing of commodity cheddar cheese.

The nature of Federal Milk Marketing Order hearings are such that the protection of proprietary or otherwise confidential business information precludes the Department from compelling manufacturers to offer evidence about their actual butterfat recoveries and other relevant data regarding costs and yields.

We fully support efforts to implement mandatory audited reporting of make costs, yields, and other relevant data for those firms subject to reporting sales through the NDPSR.

We cannot, however, defer action on updating the formulas while we optimistically wait for Congress to act. While we respect the protection of such information and the confidentiality constraints upon Select which precludes us from submitting more probative evidence, such prohibitions illustrate the disadvantage facing the dairy farmer community. The fact is that producers are left to shadowbox opponents who are not obligated to engage. Select absolutely knows that not only is butterfat recovery at or above 93% achievable, we know that it is actually achieved.

Select has modeled its own cheese plants for the production of commodity cheddar and other cheeses. Select is part of multiple joint ventures that manufacture commodity cheddar. Select has conducted diligence



2.

2.1

regarding the acquisition of or partnerships with multiple cheese plants in various locations throughout the country. Select employees and employees of Select's subsidiary companies have experience in manufacturing cheese in various styles. Our claims here are neither speculative nor theoretical; they are based on actual observations and experience.

We fully expect that opponents of increasing the butterfat recovery factors will offer testimony arguing that 90% remains a rational benchmark. And as testimony offered under oath, we do not doubt its veracity. But we must note that where there is no ability to compel testimony, there is little incentive for those market participants who achieve greater butterfat recoveries than those currently utilized in the minimum price formulas to testify.

The Van Slyke formula, upon which the entire Class III pricing formula is premised, was first developed in 1894. Van Slyke observed actual butterfat retention achieved by New York cheese manufacturers. This fact was testified to by Dr. David Barbano in a hearing preceding the 2002 Final Decision, and I quote: "The values selected for percent fat recovery in the cheese for calculation can be debated. However, a 93% fat recovery in the cheese is achievable with modern cheese-making equipment and was achievable in the mid-1890s when Van Slyke developed his cheese yield formula based on observations of cheddar cheese making practice in many



2.

2.0

2.1

factories in Central New York over a two-year period."

A well-recognized academic text on cheese manufacturing teaches a "basic" Van Slyke formula incorporating the 93% butterfat recovery observed by Van Slyke. Additionally, journal articles, research, and other publications utilize the same 93% recovery factor for analysis or reference.

Without the ability to introduce data establishing that commodity cheddar manufacturers can and do achieve butterfat recoveries of 93% or greater, Select will provide expert testimony to establish these facts.

Dr. Farkye of California Polytechnic State University in San Luis Obispo will testify about his research and observations on butterfat recoveries, as well as available equipment and technologies for optimizing butterfat recovery.

The amendment to 7 CFR Part 1000 necessary to implement Proposal 10 -- the amendments, sorry, to 7 CFR Part 1000 necessary to implement Proposal 10 are provided in my written testimony.

In conclusion, recovery of 93% of butterfat used in the manufacturing of cheddar cheese was documented in the late 19th Century and incorporated in the formula, which provides the basis for the Class III pricing formula.

The 2008 Final Decision recognized that butterfat recoveries higher than 90% were achievable. In the intervening 15 years there must be a recognition that what



2.

2.0

2.1

USDA recognizes as achievable by some is now achievable by most.

While the industry consensus seems to be that mandatory survey of manufacturing costs and yields is desirable, USDA should not delay adjusting the price formulas based on the possibility of obtaining legislative authority that might never come to pass.

Q. Thank you, Mr. Allen. Let's start with a couple clarifying questions, if we could.

On page 4 of Exhibit 220 you present information on the five-year average and ten-year average.

And is it correct that those were calculated using the same periods as the calculations you provided in support of Select's other two proposals?

- A. Yes, same periods, same methods.
- Q. Further down that page you show a chart showing the calculated impact on the Class III price of a 93% butterfat recovery at various prices, and you testified that in some instances this proposal would actually have a negative effect on producer income.

And is that what this table reflects here?

- A. This reflects that the proposal could have a negative impact on the milk prices paid to producers, yes.
- Q. And it is a function of the relationship between the butter price and the price of cheese, correct?
- A. Yes. The value of butter and the value of cheese, yep.
 - Q. I did some -- I don't know, I wouldn't call it



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

analysis, let's call it arithmetic. And it appears to me that when the butter price is about 137% or higher than the cheese price, that relationship seems to flip.

Does that seem about right to you?

- A. I'm going to trust your arithmetic. That does seem about right.
- Q. Now, on page 5 you talk about supporting evidence, and I think it's fair to say that Select respects the right of participants in these hearings to protect what they believe to be confidential information.

Would that be correct?

A. Yes.

1

2.

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. And obviously, Select wants to protect the confidential information of its partners and to some extent its own operations, correct?
- A. Yes.
- Q. When you were listening to parts of the hearing, did you happen to hear the testimony from Mr. DeJong from Glanbia?
- A. Portions.
- Q. Did you hear him discuss the butterfat recoveries of the Glanbia's plants?
 - A. If I did, I'm failing to recollect what he said.
 - Q. Okay. I believe he stated that all of Glanbia's plants achieved higher than 93%. I hope I'm not misstating my recollection. But if that were stated, would that surprise you?
 - A. No, not based on some of the information we have



available.

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

- Q. Okay. And you also go through and you describe, beginning at the bottom of page 5, several points of data that Select, through one person or one area or another, might have some information on butterfat recovery or butterfat retention.
- Your -- each of those data points informs your testimony and Select's proposal, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And I don't -- I hope you are not suggesting that any or all joint ventures Select is in achieves 93% across the board, are you?
 - A. No.
- Q. And I don't think you are suggesting either that every model that Select has done for a cheese plant achieves 93% or more or less, correct?
 - A. Correct. No, I'm not assuming that.
- Q. In fact, I imagine that some of these observations and data points that Select has probably fall on the other side of the line of that 93% line, correct?
 - A. That would be correct.
- Q. But out of respect for other confidentiality agreements, Select does not feel comfortable putting all of this data into the record?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. I imagine Dr. Farkye can answer this question for me too when he testifies, but I literally found this book after we submitted all of the testimony here. It's a book



called the Science and Practice of Cheese Making, and it was written by Lucius L. Van Slyke in 1916.

And in his book he has the formula, which we now call the Van Slyke formula, and it says the yield of cheese is equal to -- and the formula looks familiar to most of us here -- fat minus .007%. And you make reference to that -- the age of that formula.

Do you think it's a bit anomalous that our formulas recognize a butterfat retention that is lower than what is in this 110-year old book?

- A. I do find that hard to believe.
- Q. And more -- more to the point, not only hard to believe, is that consistent with your observations and understanding about what the industry is doing today?
 - A. No.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

2.1

23

24

25

26

27

- MR. MILTNER: We would offer Mr. Allen for any additional questions, your Honor.
- 18 THE COURT: Anyone have questions for Mr. Allen?

 19 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 20 BY MR. ENGLISH:
 - Q. Getting familiar, aren't we?
- 22 A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Chip English, Milk Innovation Group. Good afternoon, again.
 - So I do want to -- you know, Mr. Miltner just discussed the formula. The formula, of course, the depends on what's in the vat, correct?
 - A. Yes.



- Q. So if, for instance -- well, are you aware that inevitably in the plant milk solids are lost in wastewater?
 - A. Yes.

2.

3

4

5

9

17

18

23

24

- Q. So that doesn't end up in the vat, right?
- 6 A. Correct.
- Q. And as I asked you earlier, and you agreed, there's no such thing as loss-less plant, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. So where in the formula are those kinds of losses accounted for?
- 12 A. That's where I would be speaking beyond my 13 expertise.
- Q. But if there are losses, why would you think that a cheese plant would be able to recover 100% of the fat?
- 16 A. 100% of the fat?
 - Q. In terms of its ability to even achieve something -- there's going to be loss fat, correct?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. And you focus on the butterfat recovery. But do
 you make Grade AA butter of the type that can be reported
 to NDPSR?
 - A. I believe so.
 - Q. Do you use whey cream in your AA butter?
- 25 A. I don't know.
- Q. Isn't it true that whey cream can't be priced as Grade AA butter -- can't be graded as AA butter?
 - A. I believe that is correct.



Just so we're clear, we'll have another person that can testify to that. Yeah.

- Q. Are you aware that dry whey typically has a fat test of 1.25%?
- A. I couldn't say specifically that I would know that off the top of my head. I could go look it up, but I don't know that.
- Q. So just one last series of questions. I already asked this question once, but it seems to have come up again.

IDFA commissioned a study on Make Allowances. And you could have commissioned a survey on yields, correct?

- A. Select could have.
- Q. Select could have commissioned or sought the industry to commission a study on yields, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. And you didn't do that, correct?
- 18 A. Correct.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

22

23

24

25

26

- Q. And one of the purposes of a study like that would be to allow people to provide, like they did
- 21 Dr. Stephenson, confidential information, correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And then, as I think -- I wasn't going to bring it up yet because it really was in Mr. Cooper's testimony, but since National Milk Producers counsel brought it up, Select did not participate in the Stephenson study, correct?
- 28 A. As far as I know we didn't.



- Q. Okay. Is that a little incongruous that -- I mean, as I hear it, you are implicitly criticizing cheese companies for not coming forward and talking about their butterfat recovery, and yet, you didn't commission a study and you didn't participate in Stephenson's study?
- A. Again, as I explained earlier, I can't explain why we didn't participate.

MR. ENGLISH: I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Other questions?

I guess you are up, AMS.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. TAYLOR:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

24

27

28

O. We're moving right through today. All right.

I want to turn to page 5 -- and I think you talked about this a little with Mr. Miltner, and I apologize if I missed some of those answers -- about at the bottom you talk about Select has modeled its own cheese plants. And I guess you are using this as the basis to say that you know that butterfat recovery of 93% is achievable; is that right?

- A. It's one of the means, yes.
- Q. And so how many plants are you talking about there?
 - A. I wouldn't be able to say. Proprietary.
- Q. Okay. So we're not sure how many cheese plants that incorporates but --
 - A. Well, to be clear, this includes cheese plants that we have looked at acquisitions. I mean, this



includes not just plants owned and operated today by Select.

- Q. Oh, but plants maybe Select looked at purchasing at some point in time?
- A. Yes. That's why I don't want to start throwing out numbers.
- Q. Okay. How do those plants compare to maybe other areas that I don't know where those plants are located, but to other plants in the country, cheddar plants?

 Older, newer, certain locations versus other parts of the country, I mean?
- A. A mix, yes. Both newer and both on the older side of I guess of average, whatever you want to call average in this industry. I don't know that I would have a good number to pinpoint for average, but some more -- relatively newer and some older.
- Q. We have had some discussion at the hearing about using UF to take out some water or condensing before it goes in the vat.

Do those impact butterfat recovery at all?

- A. Wouldn't be able to speak to that. I just don't know.
- Q. Your testimony talks about that these 93% -- this 93% butterfat recovery is achievable at modern plants.

Do you know what a guess on what percent of the cheddar production is from these types of plants?

A. I don't. I'm trying to recall if Dr. Farkye's testimony will reference that or not, but I do not know.



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. And so that -- Dr. Farkye is going to get a little more into the technical side of things?
- A. Absolutely more technical than I can possibly be. Yeah.
 - Q. Okay. We'll save some questions for him.

So on a very technical note, we do try to run everyone's numbers again to make sure we see them, and on your five- and ten-year averages that you use, and I think you said you started in April of I guess '21 through April of '23 to do that -- oh, five years, so '19?

- A. Yeah, you're throwing me off. Right.
- Q. I haven't had enough coffee today.
- A. Start with May, end in April. So I think May of '18 through April of 2023, I believe that's right. Am I off a year? Oh, sorry, to be clear I will -- for the record, it ends April of 2023, and it includes the five consecutive years before that.
 - Q. So it would have started in May of --
 - A. I believe that is correct, May, yes.
- MS. TAYLOR: I think we'll save the rest of the questions for later. Thank you.
 - THE COURT: Anything else?
- MR. MILTNER: I don't have any addition al questions, your Honor. We would ask the admission of Exhibit 220.
- THE COURT: Seeing no objections, Exhibit 220 is admitted into the record.
 - (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 220 was received



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

into evidence.)

2.

2.1

MR. MILTNER: So, your Honor, we -- we have two additional statements to present. I am astonished at how quickly we have gone through what we did today.

Mr. Cooper, I think his flight landed in the last 45 minutes or so. We would be prepared to present him in the morning.

Dr. Farkye is actually here, just in full disclosure. He took a red eye in. Otherwise, he would not have arrived until much later tonight, which was his original plan, which is why I had told everyone that we would be prepared to put him on Tuesday.

So my preference would be to start with both of those witnesses first thing in the morning and proceed from there, but we will, of course, defer to your Honor's direction.

THE COURT: Okay. I will defer to the will of the parties, if I can.

Mr. Rosenbaum has stood up.

MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, I have no objection to what was just stated.

I am standing on a different issue, which is when Mr. Brown was testifying this morning, USDA pointed out they thought there was an error in the calculations on page 12 of his PowerPoint presentation, which has been marked as Hearing Exhibit 215, and they were correct.

And so we would like to have Mr. Brown retake the stand. I think this is a five-minute undertaking, just to



1	put in the corrected numbers.				
2	THE COURT: Okay. That seems like a good use of				
3	time unless someone's got got a concern about				
4	let's I mean, we can come back do we want to handle				
5	whether we take up Mr. Cooper and Mr. Farkye first thing				
6	in the morning after this, or do we				
7	MS. TAYLOR: I think AMS thinks that's a good				
8	idea, to start that in the morning.				
9	THE COURT: I don't see an objections from anyone				
10	else.				
11	So let's do let's do as you proposed,				
12	Mr. Miltner, you're betting general support from the				
13	audience.				
14	Welcome back. Mr. Brown, you are still under				
15	oath.				
16	MIKE BROWN,				
17	Having been previously sworn, was examined				
18	and testified as follows:				
19	REDIRECT EXAMINATION				
20	BY MR. ROSENBAUM:				
21	Q. Mr. Brown, I have put before you a one-page				
22	document that is entitled in the upper right-hand corner				
23	Updated IDFA Exhibit 42, corrected page 12.				
24	Do you see that?				
25	A. Yes.				
26	MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, I would ask that this				
27	document be marked with the next Hearing Exhibit number.				
28	THE COURT: This page is marked Exhibit 221.				



1	(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 221 was marked					
2	for identification.)					
3	MR. ROSENBAUM: Could I have that again, please,					
4	your Honor?					
5	THE COURT: 221.					
6	MR. ROSENBAUM: Thank you very much.					
7	BY MR. ROSENBAUM:					
8	Q. Now, is Hearing Exhibit 221 a corrected page 12 of					
9	your PowerPoint presentation that was marked as Hearing					
10	Exhibit 215?					
11	A. Yes.					
12	Q. All right. And so if we just if you get before					
13	you Hearing Exhibit 215, page 12, turn it to page 12, and					
14	then just side by side have new Hearing Exhibit 221.					
15	Could you just indicate what corrections you have made in					
16	your calculations of the percentage of various commodities					
17	in terms of total production that were addressed by the					
18	2019 Stephenson survey that resulted in the 2021					
19	Stephenson report? What changes have you made?					
20	A. Okay. The error was in participating plants. The					
21	original had 29 nonfat dry milk plants and 14 butter; the					
22	correct numbers are 27 and 12.					
23	I also double checked the rest of the numbers to					
24	make sure that they were in alignment, and they are.					
25	And so those survey production shares dropped for					
26	both nonfat dry milk and butter. Nonfat dry milk dropped					
27	from 59.6 to 64.8; butter dropped from 95.7 to 82.1.					



I also had an error in one of the reference

- documents, dairy products, and those have also been corrected, and the pages are listed where the data came from.
 - Ο. And so just to make sure we're actually all Okay. looking at the exact same information.

Under the heading 2019 USDA NASS and Stephenson cost survey dairy products volumes, the information with respect to cheddar cheese and whey are unchanged, correct?

- Α. That is correct.
- And for nonfat dry milk, the corrected version, Ο. which is Exhibit 221, has 27 plants rather than 29, correct?
- 13 Α. Correct.
- 14 The average annual production remains the same, 0. 15 correct?
- 16 Α. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

17

18

23

24

25

26

27

- But the total survey annual production has gone down because there are two fewer -- T-W-O, fewer plants, 19 correct?
- 2.0 Α. Correct.
- 2.1 And so that number is now the -- that number is Ο. 22 now 1,199,496,654, correct?
 - Α. Correct.
 - And as -- and as a share of total NASS production of nonfat dry milk, the percentage has now gone down in terms of what percentage was surveyed from 69.6 to 64.8, correct?
- 28 Α. Yes.



- Q. And similarly for butter, there now are only 12 participating plants, correct?
 - A. Correct.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. The average annual production per plant is unchanged, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Because that's from the Stephenson survey itself, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. But the total survey annual production has fallen because now you are multiplying the average annual production by 12 plants rather than 14 plants, correct?
- 13 A. Correct.
 - Q. And that actually drops the percentage of total production covered rather materially, instead of 95.7% it's now 82.1%, correct?
- 17 A. Correct.
 - Q. And so if we go back to page 11 of Hearing Exhibit 215, that's where you had the percentage covered by the 2023 Stephenson survey of 2022 costs that actually is the source of information used by IDFA and calculated its proposed Make Allowance, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. All right. So just one by one, let's go through each of the commodities so we know the correct numbers.

In the 2023 Stephenson study, what percentage of the total cheddar cheese production in the United States was covered by the Stephenson survey?



- 1 A. 55.6%.
- Q. And that compares as to what percentage in the Stephenson 2021 report?
 - A. 16.3%.

5

6

8

9

- O. So --
- A. It's -- it's actually more than three times.
- 7 Q. More than three times as much coverage.

And for whey, the -- and by that I mean the 2023 report has more than three times as much coverage --

- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. -- as the 2001 report -- 2021 report; is that 12 correct?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 0. Okay. And then for whey, what's the 2023 number?
- 15 A. It's 50.8%. The 2019 number is 29.7%. So it's 16 about 21% higher.
- Q. Okay. Well, 21 percentage points higher. But, I mean, in terms of -- well, you can look at it different ways. But 21 percentage points higher, correct?
- 20 A. Right.
- Q. And then for nonfat dry milk in the 2023 report,
 what percentage of total nonfat dry milk production was
 covered by the survey?
- 24 A. 91.2%.
- Q. And what percentage had been covered back in 2019?
- 26 A. 64.8%.
- Q. Okay. So once again, a materially higher coverage in the 2023 report, correct?



- 1 A. Correct.
- Q. And now, lastly, in terms of butter, what percentage was covered in the 2023 report?
 - A. 80.1%.

5

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. And what percentage in the 2019 report?
- 6 A. 82.1%.
 - Q. So the 2021 study continues to cover more butter than the 2023 report, but at this point now it's only slightly more as opposed to the rather substantially more that had been shown in your original version --
- 11 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 12 Q. -- version of Hearing Exhibit 12; is that right?
- 13 | A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. Now I think going to Hearing Exhibit 221, and going back to page 12 of Hearing Exhibit 215, did you also -- there's a second part of that page that talks about the 2006 USDA NASS and Stephenson cost survey dairy product volumes, correct?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. And the numbers in that part of this page are unchanged, correct?
- 22 A. That is correct.
- Q. Did you, though, change one of the citations in the data sources?
- 25 A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Okay. Is that -- is the -- does Hearing
- 27 | Exhibit 221 reflect the corrected --
- 28 A. Yes, it does. And it was -- it was -- essentially



1	it was the page references that need to be updated.				
2	MR. ROSENBAUM: Okay. That's all I have, your				
3	Honor.				
4	THE COURT: Questions for this witness?				
5	AMS? No? No?				
6	Seeing no cross, I guess we can move Exhibit 221				
7	into the record, and it's accepted into the record as				
8	evidence.				
9	(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 221 was received				
10	into evidence.)				
11	MR. ROSENBAUM: Thank you, your Honor.				
12	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Rosenbaum.				
13	I guess, immediately prior to this witness				
14	retaking the stand, we talked about having those two				
15	witnesses, Cooper and Farkye, come up first thing tomorrow				
16	morning, so we'll do that.				
17	Is there anything we can do to make productive use				
18	of the last 15 minutes?				
19	MS. TAYLOR: For tomorrow as well, we have a				
20	witness from American Farm Bureau Federation that would				
21	like to testify in the morning, so we would like they				
22	were here he was here last week. He's coming back to				
23	testify tomorrow, so we do need to squeeze him in.				
24	THE COURT: Okay. Do we need to figure out an				
25	order?				
26	MS. TAYLOR: I mean, I would think he could go				
27	first, if possible. I don't is that okay?				
28	MR. MILTNER: I think that's fine, yes.				



1	MS. TAYLOR: Okay. We would like him to go first,				
2	and then we can proceed with the rest of Select's				
3	witnesses.				
4	THE COURT: Okay. Very good.				
5	MR. ROSENBAUM: Just to round out the order, we				
6	have two witnesses, then, Ms. Krebs and Mr. Brown,				
7	addressing these yield issues that are raised by Select				
8	Milk.				
9	THE COURT: Very good.				
10	And they can come after the three witnesses we				
11	were just talking about.				
12	MR. ROSENBAUM: Yes, your Honor.				
13	THE COURT: Thank you.				
14	Off the record.				
15	(Off-the-record.)				
16	THE COURT: On record.				
17	In off-the-record discussion we talked about the				
18	next witnesses who we will take up tomorrow morning and				
19	afternoon. And with that, we're seeing no other business.				
20	We're adjourned until tomorrow at 8:00.				
21	(Whereupon, the proceedings concluded.)				
22	000				
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					



	WITOWAL THERE WINKETING ORDER TRICING TOWNS HEAVING
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	
LO	DATED: November 2, 2023
11	FRESNO, CALIFORNIA
12	
13	1 M. Carl
14 15	Mry Con
16	MYRA A. PISH, RPR CSR
17	Certificate No. 11613
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	



Index: "CDF..1st

п	4415:3 4418:1	1.386 4343:1	14 4236:28 4341:23 4382:15, 17 4398:16,22 4469:21
HODE 4040.00	0.2% 4339:10 4354:24 4414:21 4417:23 4429:10	1.3864 4370:10	4471:12
"CDF 4348:22	0.20% 4429:7	1.582 4343:2 4453:4	14.24 4246:21
\$	0.25 % 4342:13 4346:2	1.6 4329:19	14.24% 4246:9
\$0.02 4448:1,5	0.5% 4404:17	1.624 4452:24	14th 4284:21
\$0.07 4353:25,26	0.68% 4338:25,26 4342:18	10 4272:4 4280:24 4346:26 4362:21 4378:14 4450:25	15 4237:12 4279:11 4280:14
\$0.08 4328:3	0.99 4435:18,20 4438:17	4451:28 4452:18,19 4454:7,	4298:14 4319:2,5 4340:18 4389:21 4413:25 4457:28
\$0.10 4294:3	0.9975 4438:11 4440:10	14,19 4457:18,19	4474:18
\$0.1009 4294:10	007% 4461:6	10,000 4317:12 4393:6 4399:2 4416:17 4431:9	15% 4378:23 4380:2 4430:2
\$0.11 4294:4	02 4234:9	100 4424:26 4431:13	15,579 4394:21
\$0.113 4245:28	03 4237:6	100% 4222:19 4325:26	15.9% 4235:9
\$0.1424 4246:19	04 % 4393:23	4462:15,16	16 4234:9 4237:6 4239:12 4243:14 4257:15 4281:7
\$0.1459 4291:23	07 4229:18	100,000 4350:16	4339:7 4357:27 4383:18
\$0.175 4246:13	07% 4394:17	100,000-pound 4350:18 4417:16	16% 4306:16
\$0.24 4257:13	08 4238:20	1000 4441:11 4457:17,19	16,396 4413:26
\$0.245 4257:15		11 4229:26 4243:2 4276:9	16.3% 4232:13 4472:4
\$0.28 4260:7	1	4280:25 4319:5 4338:9	16.92 4441:2
\$0.30 4310:2	1 4249:2,4 4252:27 4336:4,6	4342:11,22,25,27 4343:3,14, 18,19 4346:26 4347:14	17 4243:10,15 4248:21
\$1 4297:4	4338:24 4378:23 4384:14 4395:3 4397:8 4413:23	4353:8,14,26,28 4354:6	4249:11
\$17.26 4440:25	4426:19	4357:11 4358:5 4388:7 4390:17 4411:9 4413:16	17.27 4441:3
\$17.62 4440:25	1% 4378:19 4395:16	4443:8,21 4471:18	17.5 4246:9
\$2 4260:6	4430:27	110% 4304:27	17.50 4246:21
\$3,000 4353:11 4360:27	1,000 4393:6 4416:17 4431:14	110-year 4461:10	170 4353:9
\$3.75 4377:7	1,121 4393:8	112 % 4245:28	170,000 4347:23 4397:3 4407:14
\$450 4295:8	1,191,125 4394:16 4400:21	115 4347:15 4363:9 4376:24	171,240 4392:12
\$600 4296:8	1,191,225 4400:25	11:00 4326:18	175-cow 4360:27
	1,199,496,654 4470:22	12 4231:26 4232:1 4235:1,20 4329:28 4346:26 4364:8	179 4284:25 4323:17 4324:7
-	1,331,434 4393:22	4366:22 4377:15 4379:14	4337:8 4358:9,14,23 4386:15,20,22,23
00o 4368:15 4475:22	1.0 4369:25	4402:23 4433:19 4434:13 4435:10,15,18 4437:8,14	18 4221:1 4243:28 4244:25
	1.0021 4440:28	4439:14 4440:22,25,28 4441:2,10 4443:18 4467:25	4291:7 4335:14 4369:1
0	1.02 4436:26 4438:17	4468:23 4469:8,13,22	4466:14
0.015 4342:14 4378:7	4442:4,6,9	4471:1,12 4473:12,15	1894 4456:19
0.0293 4438:13	1.0219 4440:22	12-month 4409:4	19 4236:21 4245:8,14,18 4293:11 4466:10
0.04% 4400:1	1.03 4435:19 4437:7 4442:3	12.1% 4237:20	1916 4461:2
0.0409 4440:12	1.0426 4441:1	120 4383:9 4424:24 4443:24	192,000 4347:19 4363:10
0.0479 4438:12 4440:11	1.0632 4440:23	1250 4336:9	1999 4327:1
0.07% 4400:5	1.2195 4369:27 4384:17	126 4390:21	19th 4457:23
0.1% 4348:5 4362:24	1.22 4342:28 4369:27 4370:6 4384:21	13 4235:22	1:15 4368:13
4415:2,4 0.10% 4349:13	1.220 4384:22	13.7% 4237:20	1st 4248:18 4334:4,6,14
0.10% 4349.13 0.15% 4349:14 4414:20	1.25 % 4463:4	137% 4459:2	4392:10
V.13/0 4043.14 4414.20			
		•	•



2 4222:14 4338:28 4355:4 4395:3 4399:20 4400:24 4404:2 4426:19 4436:6

2% 4417:28

2,203,279,668 4231:14

2-cent 4436:11

20 4246:26 4326:17 4331:14 4367:26 4390:28 4417:11 4436:27

20% 4253:15 4364:20,21 4365:3,4 4380:5 4385:12

20,000 4405:11 4431:9

20,000-plus 4405:12

20,964 4394:8,18

200 4221:23 4351:8,12 4424:26 4431:14

2000 4227:25 4228:10 4233:4 4238:10 4305:4 4351:16 4364:9 4372:8 4436:9,13

2001 4472:11

2002 4230:15 4234:6 4242:16 4344:28 4345:6,11 4352:7 4435:21,22 4436:10, 13,22,24 4437:5,12,16 4438:2 4440:1 4441:20 4452:28 4453:12 4456:22

2006 4228:27 4229:1,18 4235:1 4243:20 4283:1 4291:22 4473:17

2007 4245:20 4275:5 4283:1 4290:20 4345:26 4346:19 4347:2 4348:10 4396:1 4453:20

2008 4222:22 4223:28 4224:22 4226:9 4228:27 4229:15,16 4235:2 4238:16, 27 4243:20 4247:13,14 4249:20 4250:6,8 4261:16 4275:3 4280:20 4291:28 4292:7,10 4319:3 4323:10 4340:6 4344:10 4457:26

201 4387:27

2010 4323:10

2011 4411:25

2012 4348:19 4372:8

2013 4395:26

2014 4348:20 4372:3,7

2015 4412:5

2016 4241:23 4242:16 4257:10,16 4351:7,14,23,24 4381:28 4382:7,8 4385:11

2017 4257:2 4439:21

2019 4232:7,21 4233:6,7,14 4236:19 4258:26 4330:3 4348:25 4372:5 4469:18 4470:6 4472:15,25 4473:5

2020 4258:23

2021 4232:8,17 4233:13 4234:16 4236:19 4287:11 4306:14 4307:4 4309:14,21, 22,28 4329:18 4375:10,12 4376:6 4439:5,6 4469:18 4472:3,11 4473:7

2022 4231:11,21 4236:18 4237:7,9 4238:12 4251:13 4252:8,12 4258:28 4272:19 4273:15,17 4305:27 4311:8, 10,13,16 4351:25 4381:23 4392:11 4413:23 4471:20

2022-based 4252:21

2023 4221:1 4229:27 4230:22 4232:16 4235:4,5, 13 4238:12,20 4252:15 4305:27,28 4310:14 4324:26 4325:9 4351:22 4353:18 4369:1 4375:14 4383:8 4392:11 4413:23 4439:5,21 4440:19 4443:22 4466:14,16 4471:20,26 4472:8,14,21,28 4473:3.8

2025 4249:2 4257:5 4334:4, 6,14

2026 4257:5

2027 4257:5

2028 4249:4 4251:14 4252:27 4256:23

21 4236:26 4247:18 4466:9 4472:17,19

21% 4472:16

21,000 4401:3

21,822 4393:14

210 4387:27

214 4221:23,24,26 4260:3 4300:10 4334:28 4337:1,3,5

215 4222:9,11 4274:19 4300:24 4330:1 4337:1,3,5 4467:26 4469:10,13 4471:19 4473:15

216 4339:25,27 4355:5 4357:27 4386:8,9,11 4409:16

217 4388:21,23 4409:18,19

218 4410:25,27 4433:11,13,

219 4434:18,19 4442:2 4451:3,7

22 4230:19 4236:21,26 4248:5 4281:21 4307:23 4311:17 4334:2.16

220 4452:4,6 4458:10 4466:25,26,28

221 4468:28 4469:1,5,8,14 4470:11 4473:14,27 4474:6,

23 4250:25 4466:10

23% 4392:22

2364 4237:10

24 4251:1

25 4248:16 4253:22 4274:13 4335:2

25% 4378:6

25.6 4238:20

25.6% 4238:13,24

26 4254:20 4335:2

2643 4236:7

2653 4237:10

27 4254:20 4392:16 4469:22 4470:11

27,619 4393:17

27,792 4414:26

27,932 4351:26 4381:23 4382:2.5

275 4236:8

28 4257:23

28.9% 4393:10

29 4258:20 4469:21 4470:11

29.7% 4232:13 4472:15

2953 4237:9

2:05 4425:18

3

3 4223:9 4260:5 4319:11 4406:5,19 4426:19 4447:2

3% 4329:2

3,000 4417:13

3,963,741,000 4231:15

3.2 4283:25 4287:23

3.25 4378:9

3.5 4378:5

3.5% 4237:21

3.8% 4438:16 4440:15

30% 4259:10

30-plus 4253:10

300 4424:25

3006 4237:9

3176 4236:8

31st 4392:11 4413:23

32 4430:26

320 4387:24

33 4390:22

3361 4236:7

35.234 4225:12

375 4351:3.13 4352:11

38.6 4235:7

39,337 4392:22 4398:1

39.5% 4235:8

3:05 4425:19

4

4 4224:2 4319:11 4403:6,17 4419:27 4426:16,19 4427:13 4428:22 4429:5 4430:1 4442:2 4458:10

4(c) 4402:28

4.2 4246:5

40 4244:17

40% 4244:15 4403:13

40,000 4350:16 4363:27

40-pound 4262:6 4277:15

40s 4278:26

41% 4394:12

41,819 4351:25 4382:1,2

41.79% 4243:26

42 4222:6 4468:23

42% 4235:6 4250:4,13 4263:6

42.4% 4394:9

44.1% 4393:15 4403:20

Index: 2..44.1%



45 4286:27 4294:18 4467:6

455 4338:3

47 4244:20

47% 4244:21 4291:24

47.5 4406:5

47.5% 4392:21 4397:10

48 4351:2

49,441 4399:11

49,442 4393:10,23

49404 4410:20

499 4351:12

4:05 4451:10

5

5 4264:5 4274:21 4369:10, 16,22 4400:19 4402:17 4403:17 4404:6 4405:8,18 4421:25 4431:2 4459:7 4460:3 4464:14

5% 4394:21,23,24 4405:14, 15 4406:26

5,385 4394:24 4404:16

5.5% 4404:11

50% 4230:6 4235:7 4248:15 4325:11

50,000 4347:20 4399:5

50,000-pound 4350:19,22 4351:3

50.8% 4230:11 4472:15

500 4351:9 4417:14

500-pound 4277:14,18

5151 4338:3

52.5% 4392:20

55.6% 4230:10 4231:17 4472:1

55.9 4403:20

55.9% 4393:17

56 4235:6

58.3% 4413:27

59% 4394:13

59.32% 4243:26

59.6 4469:27

6

6 4221:16,24 4243:22 4260:2 4403:1 4431:23 4442:5

60 4383:9 4443:23

61.86% 4243:27

62.39% 4243:27

64.8 4469:27 4470:26

64.8% 4472:26

640 4262:6

640-pound 4277:18

640s 4278:26

67 4350:28

68 4378:4

68% 4378:2,9

68.4% 4351:10

69.6 4470:26

69.6% 4232:13

7

7 4221:18 4226:11 4228:10 4243:22 4251:3,5 4264:19 4265:18 4292:17,19,21 4370:21 4427:20 4441:11 4447:12,19 4457:17,18

7% 4393:8

70% 4380:1 4436:4 4438:7 4439:25 4447:5,11,14,21

73 4225:12

75 4364:18 4380:1

75% 4381:14,18

75254 4338:4

7th 4227:25

8

8 4221:18 4226:24 4292:17, 19,21 4370:21 4442:20 4444:17 4447:12

8% 4420:28

8,907 4413:27

8-0 4244:9

8-0% 4244:10

8.5 4246:4

80 4235:16,17

80% 4235:8 4244:8 4246:9 4351:28 4364:18 4365:1 4380:6 4381:26 4385:8

80.1% 4230:12 4473:4

80.3% 4351:8

80.92% 4447:15,20,24

81 4244:18

81% 4244:14 4245:16,19 4246:22

81,341 4392:20

82 4369:25 4384:14

82.1 4469:27

82.1% 4471:16 4473:6

85 4380:3

87.5% 4438:9 4440:4,8

88 4387:25 4392:15

88210 4387:26

89,899 4392:20

8:00 4475:20

9

9 4221:18 4292:21 4362:16, 19 4363:6 4370:26

9.6 4347:18

9.8 4392:13

90 4453:15

90% 4452:28 4453:4,6,8,11, 28 4456:10 4457:27

90s 4304:16

91 4235:14.16 4453:18

91.2% 4230:11 4472:24

92% 4453:18

93% 4452:22 4453:15 4455:23 4456:24 4457:4,6, 10,21 4458:18 4459:25 4460:11,16,20 4464:19 4465:23,24

94% 4454:5

95.7 4469:27

95.7% 4232:14 4471:16

97% 4329:2

97.0% 4439:16

97.5 4443:10,12

97.5% 4440:7

98.0% 4439:16

99 4226:14 4227:6

999 4410:19

9:20 4274:10

9:30 4274:13

9:35 4274:14

Α

A's 4420:16

A-L-L-E-N 4337:28

AA 4462:21.24.27

abbreviated 4338:12 4342:6 4388:10 4434:25 4452:11

abilities 4381:4

ability 4222:22 4298:2 4299:2,11 4315:9 4325:6 4345:10 4346:7 4353:1 4354:13,15 4356:6 4456:12 4457:8 4462:17

absence 4356:6 4357:1

absolute 4243:13 4272:6

absolutely 4255:18 4261:3 4269:26 4356:28 4357:5 4376:20 4408:14 4449:12 4455:22 4466:3

academic 4457:2

accelerated 4351:24

accept 4273:12 4395:6 4437:21

acceptable 4327:28

accepted 4234:13 4406:12 4437:15,17 4474:7

accepts 4392:26

access 4299:2 4311:24

accommodation 4248:9

accomplish 4344:23

accomplished 4309:10

account 4224:28 4240:20 4329:9 4343:26 4345:22 4414:27 4435:16 4438:9 4440:8

accountant 4406:3

accountants 4241:25 4270:13 4290:4 4312:4

accounted 4351:8,10,17 4393:8 4394:21,23 4437:12 4446:15 4462:11



accounting 4233:28 4234:13 4347:25,26 4389:2, 3,4,6,10,13,16 4390:9 4391:17 4412:14

accounts 4225:2 4426:18

accumulates 4350:12

accuracy 4274:1 4344:11,17 4393:28 4416:11 4454:24

accurate 4294:2 4304:9,19 4323:3 4358:24 4400:13 4407:3

accurately 4303:3 4454:23

accusing 4290:7

achievable 4343:12,20 4349:11 4359:21,27 4360:2, 5 4362:11 4367:7 4452:21 4455:23 4456:25,26 4457:27 4458:1 4464:19 4465:24

achieve 4352:24 4361:3,6 4364:14 4453:3,28 4456:14 4457:9 4462:17

achieved 4356:9 4359:28 4452:22 4454:3 4455:24 4456:20 4459:25

achieves 4362:17 4460:11, 16

achieving 4352:27 4362:28

acidity 4332:13

acknowledge 4259:8 4262:28 4365:27

acknowledged 4290:14 4293:1 4294:24

acquisition 4456:1

acquisitions 4464:28

act 4455:15

action 4223:3,5 4247:19 4417:4 4455:14

activities 4419:9

actual 4228:8 4241:7,15 4242:14,19 4244:2 4250:26 4257:4,10 4260:14 4282:10 4292:15 4293:16 4294:26 4344:25 4345:9 4347:22 4352:18,28 4354:19 4359:18 4364:11 4373:1 4393:11 4394:9 4397:25 4399:2 4402:27 4415:14,18 4418:11 4455:1,8 4456:6,19

actually's 4362:21

adapt 4302:23 4335:18

add 4246:7,15,16 4261:11

4270:21 4294:3,6 4344:1 4380:5,7 4417:10 4429:9

added 4248:13,20 4265:27 4382:17,22,26 4408:15 4412:5

addition 4294:4 4352:17 4354:18 4390:23 4412:11 4415:14 4416:27 4426:11 4436:5 4445:1 4466:23

additional 4226:12 4248:4 4313:10,11 4330:16 4342:14 4347:12 4350:2 4359:4 4365:3 4373:26 4386:7 4388:15 4390:5 4392:3 4395:20 4401:14 4413:5 4422:18,26 4425:15 4426:7 4436:6 4439:18,22 4441:28 4443:27 4448:1 4461:17

Additionally 4350:15 4457:5

address 4338:2 4354:15 4383:28 4387:23 4410:17 4434:3 4451:21

addressed 4301:17 4348:8 4418:11 4448:8 4469:17

addresses 4342:11 4435:10 4452:18

addressing 4475:7

adds 4314:7 4375:6

adequate 4327:4

adjacent 4390:24

adjourned 4475:20

adjust 4226:7 4251:19 4259:4 4366:10 4412:23

adjusted 4344:7 4360:23 4437:26 4438:15 4440:14

adjusting 4458:5

adjustment 4306:19 4342:22 4345:16,21 4346:12

adjustments 4232:23 4251:7 4334:18 4346:23 4347:11 4353:22 4420:22 4421:18 4440:28 4441:8

administrative 4411:25

admirable 4256:23

admire 4269:18

admission 4386:8,20 4409:15 4433:10 4466:24

admit 4290:13 4386:15

admitted 4242:13,14 4274:4 4284:10 4290:13 4337:3

4386:10,22 4451:6 4466:27

admittedly 4257:4

adopt 4335:4 4344:24 4346:28 4353:2 4354:5 4382:19

adopted 4252:6 4254:12 4292:5 4342:27 4366:4 4390:12 4413:12 4435:17

adopting 4353:8 4454:14,19

adoption 4262:22 4342:25 4343:14 4346:26 4353:14, 26,28 4398:17 4416:11 4441:10 4452:28 4454:5,7

advance 4338:17 4389:22

advanced 4389:25

advantage 4241:22 4297:17 4317:14

advised 4422:28

advocating 4258:15

affect 4225:11 4263:5 4408:16 4417:1 4419:9 4436:2

affected 4366:11,13 4393:28 4421:21.22

affirmed 4226:8

afford 4281:5 4329:12

afternoon 4369:1,6 4376:17 4384:7 4387:13 4405:7,23 4410:4 4425:24 4429:25 4434:1 4444:16 4461:24 4475:19

age 4461:7

aggregate 4224:3 4225:10 4294:8,14 4348:3 4362:23 4378:17 4392:12 4414:8 4415:1,8

aggregated 4414:9 4420:3

aging 4263:11 4276:23,28

agree 4301:2,12 4303:17 4315:25 4316:22 4323:4 4362:9,27 4373:3,10 4374:8 4421:4,6 4423:19 4444:28 4445:3,13,14

agreed 4462:7

agreeing 4444:20

agreement 4307:28

agreements 4295:19 4412:9 4460:23

Agricultural 4436:9

Agriculture 4227:13,22 4228:3 4242:15 4351:19

ahead 4249:27 4253:27 4325:23 4363:6 4388:14 4411:14 4435:6 4444:10 4452:15

ahold 4286:12

aims 4343:19

albeit 4256:18

align 4326:5 4348:4 4362:23 4378:18 4422:21,22,23 4439:19

aligned 4415:9 4438:23 4439:14

alignment 4437:5 4439:22, 24,27 4440:2,7 4469:24

aligns 4292:17

all-milk 4412:27

all-or-nothing 4358:6

Allen 4337:10,17,18,20,26, 28 4340:13 4341:28 4342:6 4355:2 4359:3,9 4369:6 4384:7 4386:7 4388:9 4389:26 4390:4 4412:25 4413:5 4419:12 4433:19,24 4434:1,23 4435:2,6 4441:28 4443:26 4444:16 4449:10 4450:23 4451:13,15 4452:10 4458:8 4461:16.18

allocate 4267:26 4270:10

allocated 4263:24

allocating 4236:11 4309:23 4310:22

allocation 4234:26 4246:1 4311:21 4312:9.27

allocations 4258:27 4310:26 4312:13

allowable 4360:10

allowance 4221:18 4223:11, 18 4224:1 4225:1,14 4227:8, 16 4229:10 4230:1 4235:2 4240:7 4241:10,14 4242:4 4243:25,26 4249:21 4250:4, 7,16 4251:2 4258:14 4260:16 4262:26 4264:15 4275:3,5 4291:13,25 4298:28 4299:19 4300:12 4306:5 4307:9 4310:1 4315:12 4317:16 4325:19,21 4335:6,27 4344:5 4436:5,7, 11 4471:22

allowances 4221:7 4222:17, 20,24 4223:1,5,12,22,23 4224:12,21,28 4225:19,24



4226:1,2,7,9,16,26 4227:7,
14,26,27 4228:28 4229:7,16
4238:17 4239:14,18 4240:13
4243:13,17,19 4244:24
4247:17,24 4248:11 4252:1,
21,26 4254:23 4256:9
4257:5 4258:21 4259:14,19
4272:8,12,18 4287:7 4291:9,
27 4292:5 4303:26 4304:15
4308:14,23 4316:24 4318:19
4319:1,6 4323:4 4327:19
4328:20 4334:11 4344:9,22
4345:8 4361:13,21 4362:12
4365:25 4373:17 4463:11

allowed 4356:19

allowing 4355:17

alluded 4248:6

alternate 4312:28

alternative 4268:18 4346:4

amazes 4330:27

amazing 4273:26

ambition 4255:3,4

ambitious 4254:3

amendment 4441:11 4457:17

amendments 4353:28 4457:18

America 4341:21

American 4474:20

American-style 4270:20

amount 4226:3 4236:4 4248:14,20 4250:10 4251:15 4256:20 4266:5 4290:11 4293:16 4360:10 4367:9,10, 11 4385:17 4422:17 4445:1, 5

amounts 4250:26 4332:28

AMPI 4244:15,19

AMPI's 4291:8

ample 4354:2

amply 4347:14

AMS 4256:14 4259:23 4275:16 4300:3 4322:12 4326:16 4327:10,11 4336:24 4338:22 4359:6 4368:7 4376:12 4384:2,26 4405:2,4, 7 4407:24 4429:20 4431:20 4432:7 4443:28 4445:25,26 446:10 4468:7 4474:5

analogue 4282:14,22

analyses 4227:17 4353:24

4439:10

analysis 4226:4 4227:9 4235:20 4260:17,22 4267:2 4273:28 4274:1 4303:23 4308:13,23 4327:4 4340:7, 20,21,23 4341:7,8 4353:16 4383:5,12 4390:3,5,15 4391:10 4392:5,6 4395:14 4396:18 4398:1,14,20 4399:9 4400:15 4403:18,25 4406:15 4407:22 4413:4,6, 15,17 4414:25 4419:8 4423:25 4425:10 4427:16 4432:15 4435:3 4438:1,28 4439:19,20 4440:17 4442:5, 11,18,19 4454:8,10 4457:7 4459:1

analyst 4418:24

analytics 4340:3 4389:27 4412:26

analyze 4389:27 4390:1 4391:22,27 4397:3,15 4412:15,26 4413:2

analyzed 4340:8 4348:1 4351:6 4389:18 4393:13 4394:11 4399:20,25 4415:5 4419:19 4436:24

analyzing 4340:25 4373:5 4418:27

and/or 4247:26

anecdotal 4367:11

anecdotes 4300:28

announced 4259:3 4319:17 4353:15 4362:8 4383:15,16 4443:24

announcement 4275:3,5

annual 4230:6,15,17,26 4231:1,5,6,10,11,14,21 4242:15 4276:13,15 4311:23 4312:3 4334:18 4336:16 4393:10 4470:14,17 4471:4, 10.11

anomalies 4399:16

anomalous 4461:8

answering 4272:21

answers 4426:7 4464:16

antibiotics 4331:3,23

anticipated 4353:7

anymore 4331:8,11

anyone's 4335:9,26

apologize 4247:8 4292:1 4324:3 4406:20 4464:15

apparently 4334:26

Appeals 4274:27

appeared 4339:2

appears 4235:20 4404:3 4415:10 4459:1

apples 4310:25

applied 4369:19 4385:10

apply 4248:4,11 4382:3,10 4442:14

approach 4246:27 4252:6 4282:4 4307:2 4325:18,24 4362:13 4370:13,19 4374:14 4438:24 4442:11

approaches 4282:5 4374:26

approved 4253:26 4289:4,5

approximate 4225:6

approximately 4347:17 4350:28 4353:9 4390:28 4392:13

April 4227:6 4230:18,19 4284:21 4324:18,19 4353:18 4383:8 4440:19 4443:21 4466:9,13,14,16

area 4297:26 4357:17 4390:21,22 4412:21 4418:23 4422:20 4444:7 4460:4

areas 4297:22 4350:6 4352:27 4390:24 4412:24 4418:6 4422:26 4465:8

arguably 4361:17

argue 4223:12 4298:6

argued 4282:3 4345:28 4453:13

arguing 4456:9

argument 4266:8 4302:24 4400:9 4453:20

arguments 4223:21 4302:7

arise 4425:3

arithmetic 4440:5 4459:1,5

Arlington 4340:5

arrangement 4297:9 4318:9

arrived 4436:26 4467:10

arriving 4414:10

Artesia 4387:24

articles 4457:5

Asadero 4271:5,9,10

ascertain 4343:25

ascribe 4261:3

Asiago 4271:3,4

aspects 4343:10 4412:12

assemble 4306:9

assess 4413:1

asset 4268:5 4313:1 4327:5

assets 4317:18

assigned 4244:12 4293:18 4452:3

assistant 4411:26

Association 4221:6 4239:15 4241:19 4243:12 4358:21

associations 4265:20

assume 4239:10 4249:25 4250:3 4283:23 4293:24 4294:9,10,28 4295:12 4318:20,22 4351:11,26 4360:9 4375:4 4378:5 4381:25 4382:6 4406:9 4422:10,16 4423:14 4445:6 4450:20

assumed 4241:14 4260:21 4352:12 4354:22,26 4437:5

assumes 4450:13

assuming 4257:21 4313:12 4351:2 4360:22 4361:10,25 4366:22 4415:19 4437:25 4460:17

assumption 4258:5 4362:3, 4 4378:7 4385:10 4397:24 4445:10 4446:8

assumptions 4342:18 4344:13,20 4360:9,12 4378:2 4382:3 4441:19

astonished 4467:3

attack 4224:24

attempt 4248:1 4283:14 4307:22

attempting 4439:7

attendee 4341:14

attention 4364:7 4412:22

attorneys 4301:4

attributable 4417:20

attribute 4280:17 4330:17

attribution 4275:19

audience 4468:13

audit 4253:26 4255:11

4323:5



audited 4227:11 4228:18,22 4229:12 4237:5 4241:23,28 4254:9,24 4257:25 4264:15 4282:14 4289:24 4290:1 4328:6 4373:4,15 4444:23 4455:11

auditor 4322:6

auditors 4278:16 4320:11

audits 4253:24 4320:18 4321:5

August 4392:10 4413:23

authority 4255:10 4458:7

authorized 4454:28

automatically 4248:3

automobile 4253:8

availability 4299:18

average 4228:1 4229:3,6,8 4230:8,26 4231:2,5 4237:25 4239:8,20,25,27,28 4240:1, 4,10,11,17,19 4242:2,3,7 4243:7 4247:1,12,16 4248:15 4251:27 4260:24, 25,27 4261:5,6,14,16,23,27, 28 4262:1 4278:8 4281:8 4283:12,13,25,28 4287:22 4289:13,21 4291:2,23 4293:27,28 4294:12 4310:18 4311:17 4314:5 4319:9 4329:19,20 4350:27 4353:10 4361:17,19,22,25 4363:12 4383:6 4385:7 4398:2 4399:28 4403:22 4418:1 4430:3 4440:21,24,26 4441:2 4442:23,25 4443:1, 12 4447:23 4458:11 4465:13,15 4470:14 4471:4,

averaged 4251:10,11

averages 4242:4 4251:11 4262:7 4281:10 4314:20 4353:17 4361:14 4362:12 4439:2 4440:18 4443:19 4454:8 4466:8

avoid 4273:8 4366:25 4439:7

aware 4227:15 4253:17 4275:8 4363:15 4390:11 4407:1 4413:11 4462:1 4463:3

awkward 4324:5

axiomatic 4364:13

axioms 4364:28

В

bachelor's 4340:4 4389:3

back 4221:8 4226:14 4233:2 4234:5.26 4235:12 4238:15. 16,26 4244:11 4245:12 4248:21 4249:15,20,26 4252:17 4266:24 4274:13,16 4276:7 4281:4,18 4305:4 4309:23 4310:24,27 4318:1 4326:18.20 4327:1 4367:16 4368:12 4369:2 4378:12 4381:16 4383:9,12 4391:19 4392:19,27 4393:3 4396:6, 16 4397:11 4401:1 4402:3 4421:1 4425:18,21 4426:11, 22 4427:5 4434:1 4439:21 4443:21 4447:8 4448:14,20 4451:10 4468:4,14 4471:18 4472:25 4473:15 4474:22

background 4235:26 4308:11 4339:18 4340:14

backs 4396:1

backwards 4253:6 4279:20 4306:26

bad 4274:2,5 4332:2 4383:1 4407:2

badly 4290:7

balance 4389:24 4396:13 4420:27

balances 4389:20

balancing 4389:9 4412:3,10,

Barbano 4456:21

bargain 4356:7

bargaining 4336:2 4356:12, 13,17,20,23 4357:2,3,7

barrel 4276:23 4277:14 4314:2

barrels 4277:19 4321:11,12, 18.19.22

base 4292:9 4298:20

base/excess 4299:10 4316:27

based 4233:23 4234:11,27 4236:11 4239:3,27 4243:20 4246:1,11 4254:23 4256:25 4278:8 4287:22 4291:20,26, 27 4301:16 4302:8 4306:10 4310:9 4311:7 4312:19 4313:2 4314:5 4316:11 4317:10 4322:22 4344:10 4346:27 4347:19 4353:7,11, 16 4354:7 4361:21 4384:8

4385:10 4394:2 4421:27 4422:3,20 4430:22,23 4438:14 4440:13,17 4441:4 4449:2,5 4454:9 4456:6,27 4458:6 4459:28

bases 4314:4

basic 4300:11 4457:3

basically 4235:6 4246:4,11 4247:12,13 4251:18,20 4253:26 4254:7,11 4259:2 4268:15 4276:22 4284:25 4306:7 4312:27 4313:27 4319:23 4322:8 4324:16 4328:3

basis 4230:1 4244:3 4245:6 4250:9,15 4251:27 4293:28 4294:12 4309:24 4328:5 4340:16 4345:19 4377:26 4391:11 4414:6 4415:6 4457:24 4464:18

bays 4401:25

beat 4315:12 4318:19 4319:5

began 4412:5

begin 4248:28 4259:11

beginning 4248:14 4303:6 4338:28 4396:12 4460:3

behalf 4355:17,18 4356:7 4435:9

belabor 4276:19

belaboring 4271:18

belief 4354:12

believed 4356:16

believes 4354:1,14 4355:23 4358:1 4454:21

Belt 4338:3

benchmark 4456:10

benefit 4360:15,17,23 4374:20

betting 4468:12

big 4269:28 4273:27 4279:26 4280:22 4284:6 4295:1 4298:7 4299:17 4316:17,25 4318:28 4329:22 4336:21,22 4381:9

bigger 4294:16 4319:19

biggest 4277:17 4281:6 4299:3 4318:26 4333:23

Bill 4241:22 4255:3,5 4273:9 4289:27

Bill's 4242:11

billion 4297:4 4347:18 4392:13

bit 4252:17 4270:28 4272:22 4273:5 4279:18 4339:17 4357:13 4378:15 4385:1 4402:5 4404:3 4408:7 4410:10 4420:25 4425:16 4444:11 4461:8

blank 4357:19

blend 4271:3 4293:27 4321:20 4353:21 4441:7

blending 4293:22

blends 4269:15

block 4262:6 4276:23 4277:15 4314:2 4320:7,21, 22

blocks 4277:18

blood 4273:11

BMP 4435:14,17 4439:1,13, 14,15,24,25 4440:3,4 4441:20 4442:22 4445:8

board 4251:23 4285:25 4288:25 4376:2 4460:12

boards 4285:25 4289:1

BOD 4296:24,27 4330:27

body 4347:13

book 4460:27,28 4461:3,10

borne 4374:22 4439:25

borrowed 4236:23

bottom 4265:18 4274:23 4294:8 4338:24 4339:8 4353:13 4383:19 4405:8 4421:19,20 4447:20 4460:3 4464:16

bought 4236:23 4321:12 4360:21

bounce 4273:5,25

bounces 4273:22

box 4280:15 4330:3

boy 4275:1

brand 4258:22

breadth 4237:19

break 4245:9 4274:11,15 4326:18,19 4327:16 4368:12,14 4425:17,20 4427:12 4444:4,8 4451:9,11

breakdown 4382:1,2,6 4384:26



breaks 4240:16

briefing 4300:27 4301:4,13

briefly 4237:1

bright 4318:4

bring 4229:14 4284:8 4367:12 4463:23

broad 4254:15 4298:10 4310:19 4329:15 4335:21

broader 4241:27 4255:24 4309:9

brochure 4254:26

Brockman 4299:3

broke 4225:18 4384:28

brought 4271:18 4297:20 4463:25

Brown 4221:7,8,9,15 4222:1,14 4259:20,27 4274:18 4299:28 4326:25 4467:23,27 4468:14,16,21 4475:6

BTU 4331:9

bucks 4332:8

budget 4325:28

build 4247:27 4295:4 4297:6 4315:2,13,17,24 4360:11 4373:25

building 4316:7 4332:26 4333:15

built 4296:14 4298:4 4312:12 4328:17 4372:8

bulk 4239:9 4270:21 4277:2 4280:26 4331:23 4357:22 4367:21 4375:7,8 4391:9 4412:8

bunch 4279:21

Bureau 4323:8 4474:20

bus 4402:8

business 4228:2,16 4261:19 4262:23 4263:5 4265:21 4267:1,23,26 4295:19 4299:14 4311:11 4319:24 4320:4 4333:21,22 4338:1 4377:6 4387:22 4410:17 4418:24 4455:6 4475:19

businesses 4336:11 4340:22 4366:11.13

butchered 4374:15

butter 4224:14 4226:19 4227:27 4229:5 4230:12 4232:14,18,23 4235:6,9,16 4236:8,14 4237:8,10 4238:7 4239:3,6,19 4243:27 4245:17,24,27 4246:5 4249:21 4250:3,14 4280:15, 20,21,23,27 4281:3 4294:1, 13 4309:19 4310:1 4314:2, 12 4330:5 4342:24,27 4348:24 4371:22 4372:13 4418:26 4445:6 4446:21 4450:5 4454:12,17,18 4458:25,26 4459:2 4462:21, 24,27 4469:21,26,27 4471:1 4473:2.7

butter/powder 4244:6,12 4310:9,20 4411:20,22

butterfat 4338:25 4339:11 4342:15,18,25 4343:1 4353:15 4354:24 4369:23,26 4378:2,6 4383:19 4384:12 4415:12 4422:12,18 4445:20 4452:19,20,23,24,27 4453:6, 11,14,16,24,28 4454:5,16 4455:2,8,22 4456:9,14,19 4457:4,10,14,15,21,26 4458:18 4459:21 4460:5,6 4461:9 4462:20 4464:4,19 4465:20,24

buttermilk 4435:13,24 4436:1,3,6,12,14,18,20,25 4437:1,3,11,13,18,22,26 4438:5,6,8,10,13,19,22,27 4439:4,19 4440:6,9,12 4441:16,27 4442:24 4443:9 4445:8 4446:10,11 4447:5, 28 4450:6,9,10,13,15

buy 4263:15,16 4265:3 4298:9,10 4331:28 4332:14 4376:26 4377:1 4420:9

buy/sell 4263:19 4265:13

buyer 4262:9 4271:12 4298:8

buyers 4347:7

buying 4262:4,5,11 4295:13, 25 4321:24 4333:22 4362:7 4366:7

buys 4272:27

С

C-A-M-P-B-E-L-L 4387:21

C-H-E-S-L-I-E 4410:15

C-H-R-I-S 4337:28

cab 4424:12,27

calculate 4246:22 4293:16

calculated 4227:28 4231:9 4232:24 4246:11,28 4271:12

4291:20 4294:15 4370:4 4438:6 4440:6 4443:9 4458:12,17 4471:21

calculating 4384:9

calculation 4300:12 4344:18 4346:14 4369:12,17,25 4438:2,14,17 4439:28 4440:13 4456:24

calculations 4230:14 4300:11 4308:20 4313:4,5 4315:14,25 4346:18 4369:16,20 4448:2 4458:13 4467:24 4469:16

calendar 4311:7,10,13 4334:6.20

calibrated 4415:23,26,27 4423:7,9,11,15,16

calibration 4408:8 4415:22 4416:1 4422:27 4431:1

California 4227:12,22 4228:3 4229:9 4234:3,5 4237:22 4239:3,5 4242:15, 26 4255:25 4257:9 4279:21 4280:2,19,23 4282:10,13 4283:4 4288:5 4290:20,24 4291:2 4294:23 4301:20 4457:12

California's 4280:20 4281:3

call 4246:3 4247:8 4286:13 4299:10 4386:26 4409:23 4419:19 4433:18 4458:28 4459:1 4461:4 4465:13

called 4221:16 4230:15 4232:8 4278:17 4286:11 4287:16,17 4293:18 4401:19 4461:1

calls 4287:16 4344:10

Campbell 4347:25 4378:16 4386:26,28 4387:2,13,20,22 4389:1 4395:19 4408:4 4419:20 4426:1 4427:8,18 4428:3 4432:24

Campbell's 4421:8 4423:21 4428:9,17 4432:13

candid 4372:23

cap 4358:5

capability 4374:2 4380:22 4381:10

capacity 4268:19 4269:25 4330:15,18 4331:20,25 4374:9,10

capital 4266:27

capitalize 4299:14

capture 4357:25 4396:27

captured 4223:20 4224:10 4328:24 4367:26 4450:16

captures 4375:6

capturing 4328:25

care 4254:27 4268:22 4385:19

career 4273:7 4305:8

careful 4292:14 4334:12

Carlisle 4294:23

carried 4255:10

carry 4347:21

case 4227:5 4229:21 4237:24 4268:26 4274:28 4297:2 4322:5 4350:18 4397:25

cases 4245:2,4 4259:11 4286:2 4298:21

catching 4379:1

categories 4283:13 4382:4 4385:1 4394:19 4402:19

category 4276:20 4394:2,20,

caught 4255:26 4314:15 4320:25 4327:17

caused 4258:28 4330:23

CDF 4348:28 4349:1,3,7 4352:13 4408:26 4411:20, 21,23,25,27 4412:4,7,18,19, 28 4413:5,9 4414:17 4415:5, 23 4416:13,20 4417:7,22,24, 26 4418:2,6,20 4419:10,13 4421:16 4424:4 4432:20

CDFA 4228:2 4229:4,19 4237:5 4238:22,27 4241:25 4242:11 4257:15 4258:25 4279:23

CDFA's 4282:14

Census 4351:19

Central 4457:1

Central/east 4439:16

Central/eastern 4439:13

cents 4258:14 4436:6

Century 4457:23

CEO 4286:1

certified 4415:24

CFR 4357:28 4441:11 4457:17,18

Index: breaks..CFR



chain 4304:24 4389:17

challenge 4269:14 4281:6 4326:5 4363:1

challenges 4301:14 4316:9 4367:13 4374:17

chance 4302:4 4303:1 4316:28 4349:24 4401:10 4410:6,9

change 4223:2,5 4248:11 4250:11,12 4251:6,13 4253:7 4254:13 4258:14,16 4259:11 4260:18,22,23 4264:13 4268:24 4285:17 4291:15 4294:12,14,26 4295:1 4298:15 4312:2 4320:8 4323:25 4324:11 4330:24 4335:18 4339:8,9, 12,14 4342:26,27 4344:4 4360:16 4366:12 4390:6 4413:7 4435:18 4441:5 4442:16,17 4452:22,24 4454:21 4473:23

changed 4234:4 4258:24 4291:10 4298:3 4364:9 4367:25 4396:23,26

changeover 4365:14

changing 4290:18 4336:7 4440:16 4454:16

characterize 4275:14 4280:9

charge 4330:27

charged 4222:25

charging 4223:17

chart 4426:17 4427:21 4447:18 4458:16

charts 4439:22

cheap 4333:17,22

cheaply 4241:3

cheat 4290:3

cheating 4290:7

check 4228:4 4238:15 4282:18 4330:10

checked 4469:23

checks 4340:24

cheddar 4227:27 4228:5 4230:10 4231:13 4232:12,15 4235:6 4260:6 4262:4,6 4263:3,4,7,10,11,12,18,23, 25 4270:22,27 4271:3,15,28 4276:20,22,23,25,27 4277:2 4278:5 4279:24 4283:25,28 4291:23 4320:21 4333:15 4453:15 4454:13,18 4455:3, 26,28 4456:28 4457:9,22 4465:9,26 4470:8 4471:27

cheese 4224:14 4226:19 4227:27 4228:4,5,21 4229:5 4230:10 4231:13 4232:12,15 4235:6 4236:7 4237:7,9,16, 19,24 4238:2 4239:14,18 4241:18 4243:12,25 4244:5, 16 4251:21 4257:8 4260:6 4262:19 4263:6,13,15,16,26 4271:27 4275:25 4276:20 4278:1,2,13,22 4279:6,15 4286:20 4287:12 4291:9 4298:8 4306:14,15 4309:17 4310:17,18 4312:16 4313:9, 23,24,26 4314:3,12,17 4318:5 4320:6,21 4321:10, 11,14,17 4328:3 4329:18,23 4332:25 4336:9.20 4342:24. 25,28 4343:2 4370:9 4449:16,23 4452:21,24,25 4453:2,3,4,7,10,15,24,27 4454:13,17 4455:3,25 4456:2,4,20,23,25,27,28 4457:2,22 4458:25,26 4459:3 4460:15 4461:1.5 4462:15 4464:2,17,25,27 4470:8 4471:27

cheese-making 4456:25

cheeses 4263:24 4270:20 4271:19 4313:23 4455:26

Cheslie 4349:3 4371:26 4379:5 4394:25 4402:4 4409:23,25 4410:15 4411:17

Chip 4326:24 4359:11 4401:18 4425:24 4444:9,15 4461:23

choose 4375:21

chose 4369:28

Chris 4337:17,20,28 4389:26 4390:4 4412:25 4413:5 4433:19,24 4451:15

Christian 4294:24

chronologically 4228:26

chunk 4399:14

churn 4446:9

churned 4445:6

circumstances 4418:10 4454:20

citation 4357:28

citations 4473:23

cite 4379:17

claims 4456:5

clarification 4264:17 4271:7 4272:23 4300:16

clarifiers 4297:3

clarify 4285:22 4323:26 4357:10 4384:12 4430:2

clarifying 4386:5 4401:21 4432:12 4458:9

clarity 4397:9

class 4222:24,26,27,28 4223:1,23 4224:6,7,12 4264:24 4265:2 4266:11 4267:3,11 4295:13,25 4297:14 4313:25 4343:15,16 4344:19 4345:1,8 4346:2 4353:18,23 4354:8,9 4435:22,24,27 4436:2,15,18 4437:17,23 4440:17,20,24 4441:1,3,4,5,9,14,26 4442:13 4449:15 4450:1,12 4458:17

classes 4390:25 4391:3 4441:26

classic 4256:8 4258:7 4312:27

classified 4224:18

clause 4253:25

cleansing 4296:25

clear 4226:16,23 4230:13 4238:1 4239:23 4240:3 4257:11 4274:20 4277:28 4289:11 4292:2 4295:13 4346:25 4370:20 4377:15 4378:28 4379:10 4393:4,7 4400:7 4424:20 4429:8 4431:11 4463:1 4464:27 4466:15

cleared 4389:18 4391:20

Cliff 4256:15

close 4262:9,10 4320:27 4371:11 4387:15 4392:28 4417:28 4439:27

closed 4280:2 4330:22

closely 4292:17 4344:24 4412:11 4423:6 4438:23 4439:15

closer 4307:22 4347:23 4367:28

clued 4425:1

CME 4262:7 4313:24 4314:1

co-op 4234:16 4266:24 4267:27 4268:7 4269:7,8 4299:15 4309:23 4317:21,22 4340:22 4374:24

co-op's 4356:6

co-ops 4234:22 4236:4 4254:16 4267:25 4269:18 4285:17 4290:10 4307:21 4310:20 4355:16 4374:17 4428:28 4430:16,19

co-worker 4431:3

coffee 4466:12

coin 4432:27

cold 4417:9

collaboratively 4307:7 4352:26

collect 4391:22 4409:3

collected 4241:26 4322:1 4336:12 4350:22 4374:21 4390:8 4413:9

collecting 4373:5

collection 4322:4 4349:18

collective 4356:7

collectively 4307:7 4347:13,

collects 4262:3 4390:18

colorful 4284:14

column 4230:15 4231:4,8 4244:25 4276:11 4399:20 4400:24 4429:5 4442:22

columns 4230:14,20,21

combat 4328:21

combination 4227:20 4229:20 4230:4 4342:17 4378:1

combined 4229:22 4247:15

combining 4229:2

comfort 4303:12

comfortable 4236:2 4311:2 4460:23

comma 4339:11

comment 4302:4 4408:7

commenters 4453:17

Comments 4345:12

commercial 4244:15

commission 4463:15 4464:4

commissioned 4283:10 4323:13 4348:25 4412:1 4463:11,12,14



commissioning 4412:6

commitment 4269:27,28 4303:27 4304:3,4

committed 4306:18

committee 4288:28 4289:3 4306:6

commodities 4222:20 4229:22,23 4232:2 4258:26 4270:2,22 4279:8 4285:28 4299:1 4343:26 4344:26,27 4412:8 4418:26 4440:26 4469:16 4471:25

commodity 4225:5,11 4240:6 4242:22 4248:1 4249:16 4251:20 4261:7 4262:3,4 4263:3,7,18 4265:28 4268:7 4270:20 4271:14,24 4278:25 4342:17 4344:21 4353:17 4383:16 4440:19 4455:2,26,28

common 4313:1 4345:14 4346:11 4348:11 4352:8 4354:13 4404:23,25 4416:19 4431:25 4432:3 4453:19

community 4455:20

companies 4230:5 4255:14 4286:27 4311:19,23 4319:8, 27 4320:6 4331:4 4418:23 4456:4 4464:3

company 4234:24 4389:7 4396:3 4399:15 4411:28 4422:4

comparable 4235:24 4321:26 4447:21

comparative 4419:23

compare 4234:4 4243:28 4244:25 4247:3 4415:7 4447:14 4465:7

compared 4235:4 4314:1 4322:2 4330:20 4438:28

compares 4472:2

comparing 4373:27 4447:25

comparison 4231:27 4251:2 4351:16 4394:1 4447:17

comparisons 4237:12 4282:25 4292:4 4439:10

compartmentalized 4324:6

compel 4456:12

compelled 4454:22

compelling 4455:7

compensate 4354:28 4437:9

compete 4297:23 4298:22

competition 4241:4 4319:23

competitive 4265:3 4297:16, 17 4428:13 4453:9

compiled 4312:7

complement 4348:23

complete 4243:8 4256:22 4439:20 4449:3

completed 4253:27 4254:14, 21 4256:22 4350:10

completely 4270:4 4286:19

complex 4256:23 4317:25

complicated 4256:18

component 4259:4 4317:10 4344:19 4345:18 4353:15,18 4415:8 4440:20

components 4345:21,23 4346:19 4415:7,11 4421:26,

composition 4385:6 4391:23

comprise 4311:24

computed 4353:18 4440:19

computer 4284:19

computerized 4397:1

concept 4355:8 4356:3,5 4373:14 4380:9 4381:12

concern 4254:18 4257:24 4325:20 4468:3

concerned 4304:6

concerns 4309:13,18 4310:21 4325:17 4335:13

conclude 4224:11 4297:5 4395:5 4447:13

concluded 4225:28 4347:2 4351:7 4352:7 4435:26 4453:23 4475:21

concluding 4345:27

conclusion 4266:8 4295:9 4296:21 4309:8 4339:7 4379:18 4383:18 4401:6 4417:21 4418:3 4436:23 4437:22 4438:7,18 4441:18, 21 4447:11 4457:21

conclusions 4346:10 4402:28

condense 4329:8

condensed 4371:22 4372:13

condensing 4465:18

condition 4241:1

conditions 4223:2 4224:5 4225:11 4302:14,21 4343:20 4344:25 4359:18 4454:2,4

conduct 4255:11

conducted 4227:8 4232:3 4455:28

confidence 4241:24 4322:11.17.18

confident 4272:13 4280:10 4294:1,21 4329:5,21

confidential 4455:6 4459:10,14 4463:21

confidentiality 4420:1 4428:13 4455:17 4460:22

confirm 4389:23 4439:22 4442:5

confirmed 4389:20 4391:20

confirming 4439:18

confuse 4380:4

confused 4233:10

confusion 4233:25

Congress 4254:14 4255:2 4455:15

Congressional 4355:26

conjunction 4340:8 4346:20 4390:4 4413:5 4420:21 4433:3

connection 4290:10

consecutive 4443:23,24 4466:17

consensus 4252:5 4325:22, 25 4328:12 4458:3

consider[ing 4226:5

consideration 4333:20 4340:10 4343:5,11 4357:8 4435:23 4436:17 4441:22

considered 4225:21 4345:25 4346:23

considers 4224:26 4349:21

consistency 4282:4 4370:18 4394:4 4401:27

consistent 4234:23 4282:9 4301:23 4311:20 4320:12,16 4321:2,3,26,27 4322:6 4352:19 4370:3,14 4422:19 4438:23 4442:4 4461:13 consistently 4234:10 4317:24 4340:19 4415:9 4421:28

consists 4347:15

consolidation 4351:5,20,23 4381:22

constitutes 4226:5

constraints 4455:17

construct 4343:24

constructed 4371:4,10 4411:22

constructing 4372:14

construction 4411:27 4412:4

consultants 4247:11

consulting 4305:10

consummate 4313:13

contained 4227:7,11 4273:16 4346:2

contemporary 4257:20

content 4438:16 4440:15

context 4300:25 4301:16 4355:4 4394:26

Continental 4348:19,22,27 4394:25 4409:7,11 4411:18, 19 4419:10 4439:17

continually 4355:22

continue 4253:6 4268:26 4273:7 4356:11

continued 4351:20,24 4453:5

continues 4228:6 4316:18 4473:7

continuing 4228:11 4252:1 4253:3 4370:1

continuous 4439:6

contract 4296:16

contracted 4391:6

contracts 4295:27 4296:2, 11 4297:10,18 4412:8

contrast 4225:9,24

contrasts 4282:26

contribute 4418:7

contributes 4225:5

control 4345:10 4346:8 4354:13 4395:1 4448:26



controllable 4352:10

controlling 4349:10

conversation 4324:5 4336:1

conversations 4234:15 4309:7 4310:10

convert 4343:27 4344:26

converted 4396:25

convey 4265:25

Cooper 4371:26 4412:12 4439:17 4467:5 4468:5 4474:15

Cooper's 4463:24

cooperative 4228:2,16 4247:8 4265:20 4266:10,20 4267:2,13,15,16,22 4298:17 4317:17,18 4333:11 4336:2 4341:3,20,28 4347:6 4348:9, 20 4420:2,3,4,16,20,22 4421:1 4432:28 4435:3

cooperative's 4269:27

cooperatives 4230:4 4244:3,26 4245:4 4266:21 4293:2 4333:25 4346:7 4348:11 4349:8 4352:23,25 4354:15 4356:12 4409:11 4413:28 4414:23 4416:6,8 4419:28 4428:23 4430:10,14

Coopersville 4348:21 4371:12,14 4372:6 4407:17, 21 4410:19 4411:21 4425:2

coordinate 4412:15

coordinated 4346:23

coordinating 4391:7 4412:2

copied 4285:5,28

copies 4234:8

copy 4284:24 4285:1,3 4338:22 4358:24

core 4273:2,3 4355:12

Cornell 4227:9,11,16 4228:15 4229:4,11,18 4231:24 4234:2 4238:27

corner 4468:22

cornerstone 4349:15

correct 4226:9,10 4228:16, 19,23,24 4231:6,15,16,18 4232:9,24,25 4233:15,17 4234:12 4235:15 4236:12, 13,15,19,20 4238:5,13,28 4239:1 4240:9 4241:8,16 4242:16,27 4243:4,18 4245:6,7 4246:13,19 4247:1

4248:23,24 4249:4,5,8,9,13, 14 4250:17,22,23 4252:8,15, 22 4255:16 4257:6 4260:22, 27 4261:25 4262:17,22 4263:9 4264:4,25,26,28 4265:12,16 4269:21 4270:7, 17 4271:20,22,23,25,26 4272:20 4275:6 4276:14 4277:24,25,26,27 4278:3,4 4280:15 4282:24 4283:11 4284:27 4287:8 4290:21 4291:25 4292:18 4297:15,16 4301:1 4302:16 4308:16 4327:20 4330:11 4336:19 4338:13,14,18,19,26 4339:2, 3,5,10,12 4341:5 4357:12 4358:7,11,19 4359:1,2,19,22 4360:1,24,25,27 4361:14,19, 28 4362:18,28 4364:4,11,15, 21 4365:17,18,21 4366:1,23 4371:20,28 4376:25 4385:4, 13 4388:2,7,8 4395:24 4397:12,13,17,22,23,26,27 4398:9,27,28 4399:9,10,18, 23,26 4400:5,6,26 4403:18, 22,23,27,28 4404:17,18 4406:18 4408:28 4409:2,4,5, 8 4410:11 4420:2.5.18.23.24 4421:13 4422:2.5.8 4424:17 4425:9 4426:1,4 4427:2,3,9, 11,14,15,19,20,23,27,28 4428:11,14,15,20 4429:10, 11 4430:4,5 4432:19 4433:6, 7 4434:26 4442:9,27 4443:2, 3.15.16 4444:21.23 4445:12. 15,20 4446:9,12,13,14 4449:16,22 4450:2 4451:28 4452:1 4458:12,25 4459:11, 15 4460:8.16.17.20.21.25 4461:27 4462:6,8,9,18,28 4463:12,15,16,17,18,21,27 4466:19 4467:26 4469:22 4470:8,9,12,13,15,19,20,22, 23,27 4471:2,3,5,6,8,12,13, 16,17,22,23,25 4472:12,19, 28 4473:1,11,18,21,22

corrected 4251:22 4322:16 4395:1 4441:26 4468:1,23 4469:8 4470:2,10 4473:27

correction 4280:20 4452:25

corrections 4469:15

corrective 4417:4

correctly 4262:15 4400:4 4408:6 4447:25

correlation 4273:24

cost 4222:23,27 4223:6 4224:23 4225:9,21,24 4226:27 4227:11,17 4228:5, 7,8,11 4229:3,8,19 4230:7, 22 4232:24 4233:14 4234:26 4236:21 4237:6 4239:8,25

4240:1,5,7,8,19 4241:15 4244:13 4245:3,17,20 4246:1,23 4247:1,12 4251:12 4255:15 4257:4 4261:6 4263:14.22 4264:1 4265:23 4270:28 4272:25 4273:20 4276:26 4277:6 4280:3 4282:11,14,23 4291:8,23 4292:9,12,15 4293:15,28 4294:6,12,25,26 4295:8 4312:8,12,16,28 4315:7 4316:11 4318:21,23 4319:9 4327:4,5,7 4344:3,9 4353:6 4361:2,6,14,27 4373:4,15,16 4374:14,16,22 4437:19 4440:3 4450:10,18 4470:7 4473:17

costly 4361:18

costs 4223:11,14,15,19,25, 28 4224:4,14,16,27,28 4225:2.7.15.22.26 4226:2 4227:26 4232:7 4233:28 4234:11 4236:7,11,18,19,26 4237:7,9 4239:11 4241:8 4245:26 4246:2,7,12,15,17, 19 4247:16,24 4248:2,4 4251:13.14 4252:12.17.24 4253:3,4,6,20 4258:13,26 4259:9,15 4260:7,15 4261:16,28 4263:24 4265:26,28 4266:25 4267:20 4268:4 4270:10 4271:11,19 4272:8,12,25 4273:4,12,15, 17 4277:1.16 4279:22.25 4280:21 4283:24 4289:13,16 4291:5 4293:12,13,17,18,23, 24,26 4294:3,4,6 4296:27 4298:24 4309:24 4310:22 4311:7,22 4312:17 4313:12 4315:4 4319:28 4328:20 4332:9 4343:27 4344:6,15 4345:2 4361:17,22,24 4362:9 4374:19,27 4416:22 4438:9 4440:4,9 4448:1 4455:9,11 4458:4 4471:20

counsel 4275:15 4326:26 4444:18 4463:25

counter 4261:11 4273:8

countered 4253:14

counterpart 4407:12

country 4241:28 4268:15 4280:23 4316:28 4333:25 4456:2 4465:9,11

couple 4241:20 4257:24 4279:2 4282:26 4286:11,15 4311:9 4326:2,25 4332:1 4355:3 4384:7 4403:7 4405:27 4407:26 4432:12 4458:8

court 4221:2,8,12,22

4222:10 4245:9,12 4259:22 4264:17 4271:7 4274:10,12, 16,27 4276:1 4285:4 4300:2, 16,27 4301:13 4326:15,20 4327:9 4336:27 4337:2,7,12, 18 4339:21,25 4342:2,7 4359:5 4368:6,10,12 4369:2 4376:12 4386:9,13,17,21,28 4387:5,8 4388:19,21,27 4401:15 4405:2 4407:25 4409:17,21,24,28 4410:25 4425:16,21 4429:20 4432:8 4433:12,17,21,23 4434:17 4443:28 4444:4,12 4445:24 4450:28 4451:3,9,12 4452:4 4461:18 4464:9 4466:22,26 4467:17 4468:2,9,28 4469:5 4474:4,12,24 4475:4,9,13,16

Court's 4276:4

cover 4223:28 4248:2 4255:14 4259:11 4265:23 4268:4 4301:4 4369:9 4473:7

coverage 4255:19 4472:7,9,

covered 4242:26 4243:3,9 4301:7 4373:19 4376:22 4377:21 4383:23 4417:10 4426:10,13 4471:15,19,28 4472:23,25 4473:3

covering 4256:19

COVID-19 4439:8

cow 4273:3 4274:6 4350:28

cows 4317:12,13 4350:25 4351:3,8,9,12,13 4352:11 4353:9 4379:16

CPDMP 4229:4.7

crazy 4296:28 4332:5

cream 4313:26 4332:12 4348:24 4371:22 4372:13 4444:28 4445:5,6 4462:24,

Creamery 4330:22

create 4287:6 4329:1 4331:16 4356:14 4401:26

created 4399:15

creates 4374:20

creation 4355:16

credibility 4304:6,7 4329:26

credible 4258:12

credit 4269:2

creep 4273:7



critical 4247:20

criticism 4299:26

criticizing 4464:2

cross 4474:6

cross-examination 4259:21, 25 4300:6 4326:22 4327:12 4359:7 4369:4 4376:15 4401:16 4405:5,21 4407:6 4425:22 4429:23 4431:18 4444:13 4446:1 4461:19 4464:11

crowd 4364:22

crucial 4334:21.22

cubic 4417:11

curd 4277:21

curious 4369:28

current 4236:17 4242:10 4243:17,19 4246:9 4254:14 4257:28 4272:7,8,12,13 4278:2 4290:15 4291:13,15, 25 4298:13 4301:23 4302:20 4306:4 4327:24 4328:18,22 4342:12 4343:8 4344:16 4352:12 4354:8,22,26 4384:19 4412:6 4435:20 4436:28 4437:7,8 4438:25 4439:25 4440:1,22,24,27 4441:13,22 4442:14 4452:27 4454:1,23

curve 4273:4,6

customer 4321:24 4341:4 4389:12 4390:28 4392:1 4394:4 4409:3

customers 4379:4 4390:20, 24,25 4391:13,14,18 4394:7 4395:6 4402:17 4406:21

customers' 4331:11

cut 4249:10 4367:16

cut-and-wrap 4263:9

D

daily 4269:23 4412:17 4420:27

dairies 4316:10 4349:11

dairy 4221:6 4223:14,16,19, 25 4224:5,8 4225:3,5,11 4229:4 4230:17 4237:6 4240:23,28 4247:24 4265:5, 22 4304:24 4312:19 4315:24 4316:2,5,24 4318:12 4319:8 4321:2 4340:6,21,23 4341:20,21,28 4343:9,21 4346:20 4347:15 4348:19,

22,23,27 4351:5,6,8,20,23, 25 4353:10 4358:21 4363:9 4371:18 4394:25 4409:7,8, 11 4411:18,19 4419:10 4435:2 4436:8 4439:1,17 4442:23 4443:4,5 4444:20 4447:13 4455:19 4470:1,7 4473:17

dairyman 4315:3

dairymen 4268:16,20 4299:6 4315:3 4318:7

Dakota 4330:25

Dallas 4338:3

damaging 4298:18

Darigold 4244:6,7 4291:17 4294:20

data 4227:10,12 4228:11 4235:1.19.24.28 4237:6 4239:27 4241:23,24,26,27 4242:19 4243:21 4245:15 4261:6 4264:11 4276:21 4279:14 4280:13.15.25 4281:24 4282:11,13,16 4287:6,9 4288:1,15,20,22 4289:8,11 4291:20 4292:15, 22 4303:24 4304:7 4312:4 4319:14 4320:10 4321:4,27 4322:2.22 4323:7 4342:19 4344:10,20 4347:5,10,11,12 4348:1,12,17 4349:4,12 4352:13 4354:1,19,23 4358:1 4363:3.4.5.9 4367:10,12 4368:2 4372:25 4373:1,4,16 4378:21 4385:11 4389:18,28 4390:1, 3,7,15,18 4391:24,25 4392:3,4 4396:27 4398:15, 18,26 4402:24 4403:13 4412:16 4413:2,4,9,15,18 4414:6 4415:1,10,14 4416:6, 10 4419:23 4427:6,21 4430:18 4436:28 4439:11 4442:14 4443:6 4447:7,24 4448:4,19,25 4449:2 4455:9, 12 4457:8 4460:3.7.19.24 4470:2 4473:24

database 4285:26 4286:8

dataset 4372:24 4382:8 4400:13 4408:27 4409:10

date 4229:14 4284:16 4314:4,5 4334:4 4361:26 4392:2 4413:19

dates 4392:3

dating 4327:1

David 4456:21

day 4283:26 4284:12 4287:23 4319:11 4331:10,14

4350:28 4359:1 4363:12 4366:28 4423:26,27 4424:1

day-to-day 4340:15

days 4271:2 4278:22 4321:12,22 4389:15,21

deadline 4284:21

deadly 4314:26

deal 4418:17

dealing 4296:23

deals 4268:9

debated 4456:24

debt 4277:11

decades 4320:18,19

December 4227:25 4228:10 4255:4.5

decide 4318:4.5

decided 4241:17 4281:25 4306:12 4309:6,9,11

decimal 4369:27 4370:1,2, 11,23,26 4384:16,19 4393:5

decision 4224:1,3,22 4226:8
4227:6,25 4228:10 4229:1,2,
17,18 4235:2 4247:13,14
4249:20,22,24 4250:21
4276:3,4,6 4282:6,7 4288:19
4302:12 4306:10 4344:8,28
4345:1,6,11,12 4352:5
4354:10,11 4370:15 4385:28
4386:3 4394:1 4398:8
4435:21,23 4436:16,22,24
4437:5,12,16 4438:3 4440:1
4441:15,17,20 4447:3,9,22,
28 4449:1,5 4453:1,5 4454:4
4456:22 4457:26

decision-making 4301:27

decisions 4228:27 4256:16 4281:18 4283:17 4301:15,16 4302:7 4306:8 4308:15 4349:20 4442:13

declined 4224:27 4453:21

declining 4352:3

decrease 4253:19 4333:7 4344:6

decreased 4226:3

deduction 4241:13

deem 4431:5,6

defending 4224:24

defer 4354:6 4450:26 4455:14 4467:15,17

deferred 4426:4

define 4355:9 4406:24

defined 4294:3 4343:26

defining 4385:22

definition 4276:18 4377:6, 10.19

deflation 4253:1 4272:17

deflationary 4252:20

degree 4274:6 4297:19 4340:4 4389:3

Dejong 4319:14 4459:18

delay 4334:12 4335:4,12,27 4336:4 4458:5

delayed 4259:19

delaying 4335:20

delighted 4236:3

deliver 4267:20 4338:15

delivered 4321:18 4350:22 4357:26 4360:18 4367:27 4390:28 4409:7 4426:21 4428:2,10,18

deliveries 4391:2 4408:26 4409:3,10 4413:25,27 4414:17,27 4415:2 4416:22 4417:15,26 4428:5,28 4429:3,9 4430:6,22 4432:28

delivery 4314:6 4391:14 4413:19 4430:26

demand 4224:5,6 4225:10 4226:21 4247:28 4263:1

demonstrate 4348:3,5 4354:23 4378:17 4436:28 4439:23

demonstrates 4392:25 4439:11 4454:16

demonstrating 4349:9

demonstrative 4300:14

demurrage 4416:22

denominator 4276:15

departed 4325:1

department 4224:22 4227:12,22 4228:3 4242:15 4288:13,14 4361:8,9 4389:8, 10,13,16 4390:9 4422:8 4435:26 4438:10 4441:8 4453:21,23 4455:7

Department's 4435:21 4437:15,21 4438:7 4439:24



Department's 4438:18

departure 4325:17

depend 4227:20

depending 4241:9 4323:2 4331:7 4431:8 4454:18

depends 4277:7,8 4317:17 4362:1 4374:12 4461:27

deployed 4361:4

depooling 4266:18

describe 4222:15 4390:18 4424:8.10 4460:2

describing 4390:15 4413:15 4421:10,25

description 4421:26

deserve 4344:18

design 4412:4

designation 4435:4

desirable 4458:5

desire 4454:22

detail 4232:21 4237:3 4293:26 4347:26 4349:4 4376:4 4383:26 4395:20 4427:18

detailed 4381:28

details 4275:12 4297:9

determine 4222:18 4223:11 4227:26 4228:11 4247:17 4262:8 4392:17 4414:8 4437:25

determined 4223:22 4242:6 4245:16 4417:20 4436:14

determines 4226:26

determining 4226:6 4227:13 4345:17 4414:7

Detroit 4296:26

devalue 4333:18

develop 4255:9

developed 4227:8 4340:9 4456:18.27

developing 4437:14

development 4266:26

device 4375:5 4384:9

devise 4255:11

Dexter 4348:14

DFA 4341:22,24

DFA's 4258:18

dictate 4355:23

differ 4304:25 4349:25

difference 4238:9,13,19,22, 23,26 4242:2 4248:19 4262:5 4277:17 4280:17 4283:19 4315:5 4345:22 4348:4 4350:4 4362:24 4365:6 4378:9,18 4379:24 4385:17 4401:4 4414:3,10 4417:3,22 4424:26 4439:12 4448:5

differences 4319:19 4320:4 4322:1 4352:15 4354:21,23 4355:11 4390:2 4413:3 4414:3,9

differentials 4308:20

differently 4320:15

difficult 4234:4 4270:23 4297:23 4298:11,24 4310:28 4316:6 4318:6 4417:2

dig 4312:4

digitized 4397:1 4416:4

digits 4393:4

diligence 4455:28

dipsticks 4353:5 4382:22

direct 4221:13 4233:3 4272:15 4285:11 4308:2 4337:24 4362:19 4387:11 4410:2 4412:18 4433:27 4451:18

direction 4308:6 4320:12 4467:16

directly 4287:18 4374:23 4391:9

director 4304:24 4340:2 4349:2 4389:26 4411:17 4412:25

disadvantage 4453:9 4455:19

disclosure 4467:9

discount 4332:15

discourage 4349:17

discouraged 4343:13 4360:3

discouraging 4317:20

discovered 4238:8 4401:28

discovery 4306:7 4344:25 4441:24

discrepancies 4348:6

4349:24 4389:19 4394:27 4414:12,14 4415:2,3,4,16 4416:15 4417:7,19,27 4422:25 4426:9 4430:9

4431:2,9

discrepancy 4391:16 4395:12 4403:1 4406:23,25 4408:12 4414:18,19,21,22 4415:28 4417:8 4420:17 4429:6,7,8 4430:15,20 4431:4,5,6

discretion 4311:18 4354:7 4449:1

discrimination 4317:13

discuss 4235:1 4303:1 4431:7 4459:21

discussed 4292:24 4333:6 4354:18 4383:26 4392:6 4461:26

discussing 4279:13

discussion 4233:3 4281:7 4283:3 4289:2,28 4328:19 4364:8 4465:17 4475:17

discussions 4232:26 4260:8 4307:22 4419:5

dismissed 4337:13 4433:17

disputed 4257:26

disregard 4441:15

disruption 4331:16

distinct 4392:16 4413:26 4420:2 4421:14

distinction 4392:12

distribute 4433:20

distributing 4387:7

district 4274:27 4300:27 4301:13

disturbs 4298:9

diverse 4326:4

diversification 4262:16,21,

diversified 4262:20

diversity 4279:22

divert 4269:5

diverted 4426:25,27 4427:1

divide 4378:8 4384:14

divided 4231:10,15 4246:21 4384:14

dividing 4369:25

Division 4321:2

divisor 4369:26

DMN 4439:2 4442:22

DMN" 4439:2

document 4222:5 4224:20 4250:26 4282:25 4284:9 4338:5 4388:1,4 4434:6,10 4451:21 4468:22,27

documentation 4292:25

documented 4457:22

documents 4221:16 4470:1

dog 4416:26 4424:10

dogs 4416:21

DOJ 4275:17,20

dollar 4259:10 4266:4 4296:20

dollars 4243:13 4259:12 4268:3 4269:24 4323:2 4372:17

double 4278:9 4310:18 4469:23

doubled 4329:21

doubling 4289:21

doubt 4279:10 4357:5 4364:6 4456:11

downloadable 4231:23

dozen 4377:3,14 4391:17

DPNM 4345:28

draft 4285:8 4383:1 4442:8

drafted 4354:6

drain 4329:13

drastically 4396:26

draw 4266:6,9 4282:26 4447:11

drawing 4282:14,22 4357:19

draws 4391:9

dried 4445:7 4446:11

drive 4241:6 4387:24

driver 4367:14,16,19 4398:19 4401:28 4402:3 4407:2 4424:23,25

drivers 4416:28 4417:2 4424:20

drop 4394:5 4399:15,24 4401:22,23 4402:5,17,22 4416:20,21,27 4417:6



4424:4,5,6

dropped 4469:25,26,27

dropping 4314:23

drops 4471:14

dry 4224:14,15 4226:19
4227:28 4228:6 4229:5,8,9
4230:12 4232:13,16,23
4235:8,12 4236:7,14 4237:7,
9,16,20,21 4238:3,4
4239:18,19 4243:26,27
4245:17,25,27 4246:4
4314:10 4330:4 4342:26
4370:22,25 4371:21 4372:12
4435:11,13 4436:4,7,12
4437:1,3 4438:5,8,12 4439:3
4440:11 4441:13 4442:24
4445:11 4447:6 4449:18,19
4450:2 4463:3 4469:21,26
4470:10,25 4472:21,22

dryer 4332:9

dryers 4329:23

drying 4228:9

due 4223:15 4228:7 4258:16 4331:21 4335:12 4345:21 4354:10 4394:5 4416:17 4421:4 4441:15

duly 4221:10 4337:21 4387:3 4409:26

dump 4332:6

dumped 4330:16,19,26 4331:2,22

dumping 4299:8 4330:13 4332:17 4333:2

duties 4411:26

Dykes 4284:26

dynamics 4367:23

Ε

e-mail 4284:11,25 4285:1,5, 8,13 4286:5 4287:6 4288:21 4323:17 4358:20,24

e-mails 4287:16

earlier 4234:2,7 4258:18 4282:19 4330:23 4377:6 4462:7 4464:6

earliest 4234:8

early 4289:28 4303:27

easier 4248:10 4273:21 4278:17 4311:24 4328:12

easiest 4281:23

easily 4352:9 4397:2 4424:26

east 4281:4

East-central 4442:22

East/central 4439:3,4 4442:25 4443:14

Eastern 4389:3

easy 4269:19

econometric 4227:2 4237:5

economic 4264:27 4265:1 4273:17 4288:27 4289:3 4297:6 4298:26 4306:6 4308:11,13,22 4340:7,20 4343:8

economics 4265:13 4340:4 4341:28 4342:1 4367:23 4435:2

economist 4274:2,5 4356:22 4443:5

Ed 4258:18

edge 4321:7

edits 4338:16

effect 4251:26 4318:28 4436:14,20 4437:22 4458:20

effective 4236:1 4249:2 4254:19 4334:3

efficiencies 4315:17,24 4316:7,20,26 4328:18,24,25 4343:12,20 4350:6 4352:20 4359:22,27,28 4360:2,5 4361:18 4362:11 4367:8 4373:26 4374:4,9

efficiency 4277:9 4318:3 4349:17

efficient 4239:10 4277:10, 13,14 4278:10 4294:28 4316:3 4319:8 4320:6,7 4329:11,22 4361:27

efficiently 4281:2 4314:26

effort 4304:8

efforts 4455:10

elaborate 4279:18 4374:15 4383:27 4406:6,7

elasticity 4289:5

elected 4241:20

electronic 4396:25 4404:23 4416:10

electronically 4416:5

elects 4353:22 4441:8

elements 4344:12,21 4438:24

eliminate 4345:25 4353:3 4354:2 4381:6 4382:20 4402:25 4448:26

eliminated 4357:4 4448:24

eliminates 4435:23 4436:17

eliminating 4346:21

elimination 4346:4 4347:4 4352:22 4435:26 4449:3

embedded 4312:20

emergency 4250:8,14,20 4258:8

emphasis 4327:23

emphasized 4226:15

empirical 4259:2

employed 4237:5 4282:5 4389:4

employee 4336:17

employees 4269:27 4336:10 4456:3

employers 4340:26

en- 4360:4

enabled 4258:1

enabling 4255:7

enacts 4255:2

encapsulate 4358:5

encompassed 4279:7 4392:11 4413:24

encourage 4329:25 4349:17 4360:5 4361:17

encouraged 4284:2 4329:15 4374:5

encouraging 4375:18

end 4239:17 4248:23 4266:4 4296:28 4306:1,25 4313:17, 20 4323:14 4343:23 4349:20 4358:4 4389:22 4392:7 4400:20 4430:15 4435:24 4436:17 4437:19 4453:11 4454:5 4462:5 4466:13

end-product 4262:22 4345:17

ended 4241:23 4263:8 4370:27 4400:8

ending 4383:8

ends 4367:19 4466:16

energy 4223:15 4252:16 4272:26,28 4273:4,22,23

engage 4455:21

engaged 4232:22 4376:2

English 4326:21,23,24 4327:8 4359:8,11 4368:4 4373:20 4401:17,18 4404:28 4405:13 4425:23,24 4429:18 4444:10,14,15 4445:22 4461:20,23 4464:8

enhance 4343:22 4355:7

enhancement 4355:14

enjoy 4314:27

ensure 4343:19 4402:1

ensuring 4454:24

enter 4252:19

entered 4295:7 4416:14 4433:13 4434:3

enterprise 4270:15

entire 4270:6 4273:7 4352:20 4388:12 4389:23 4409:4 4456:17

entities 4292:10 4454:28

entitled 4468:22

entries 4416:16

entry 4416:17

environmental 4296:22

equal 4239:19 4240:7,8 4241:17,19,20 4393:25 4461:5

equalization 4356:20

equally 4267:2 4293:19 4294:7 4415:12

equation 4299:18 4328:28 4340:27 4341:3 4349:6

equipment 4277:3 4316:20 4416:20,28 4417:1 4424:8, 21 4456:26 4457:15

equity 4266:3

equivalent 4350:19

Erin 4333:24 4334:15 4431:22

erroneous 4393:3 4398:10, 13.24 4441:17

error 4280:8 4393:7 4431:24 4441:23 4467:24 4469:20,28

errors 4349:27 4389:18 4391:20 4393:4,5 4399:3



4416:2,18 4423:20,23,24,25 4431:24.28

ERS 4351:18

essentially 4240:9 4251:28 4302:18 4393:25 4473:28

establish 4236:6 4342:21 4346:6 4354:20 4441:25 4449:19 4457:11

established 4437:4

establishes 4237:8 4438:18

establishing 4343:6 4457:8

estimate 4237:6 4257:18 4258:9 4259:5 4270:10 4278:6

estimation 4364:17

etcetera 4327:25

evaluate 4282:15 4308:14

evaluated 4281:19

evaluation 4343:4

events 4334:6

every-other-day 4351:2 4365:2 4366:22

everybody's 4248:17 4254:27

everyone's 4466:7

evidence 4259:2 4295:6 4337:1,6 4345:27 4346:3,6, 27 4347:3,5,10,13 4354:1,7 4365:16 4386:12,24 4409:20 4433:16 4436:2 4447:4 4449:5 4450:28 4451:2,4,8 4453:24,27 4455:1,7,18 4459:7 4467:1 4474:8,10

evident 4235:27 4298:16

evidentiary 4348:13

exact 4238:19,25 4392:25 4419:20 4423:13 4470:5

examination 4221:13 4272:15 4337:24 4346:4 4384:4 4387:11 4408:1 4410:2 4432:9 4433:27 4449:13 4451:18 4468:19

examine 4232:1

examined 4221:10 4337:21 4387:3 4409:26 4414:2 4433:25 4451:16 4468:17

examples 4260:9 4330:13

exceed 4223:25 4226:21 4353:10 4395:10,11

exceeded 4393:16 4394:13, 23 4403:8 4404:17

Excel 4274:2

excellent 4261:13 4335:10

exception 4232:18

excess 4265:23

excessive 4352:27

excited 4332:25 4448:15,16

exclude 4398:8

excluded 4394:6 4398:13 4399:8 4400:3 4403:27

exclusively 4426:15

excuse 4235:14 4242:3 4275:20

exercise 4294:27

exhibit 4221:16,21,24,26 4222:6,9,11 4260:2,3 4274:19 4284:10,25 4300:10,24 4323:17 4324:2, 5,7 4329:28 4330:1 4334:2, 28 4337:5,8 4338:6,17 4339:24,27 4355:5 4357:27 4358:8,9,14,23 4386:8,9,11, 15,20,22,23 4388:2,20,21,23 4407:25 4409:16,18,19 4410:23,25,27 4411:3,6 4433:11,13,15 4434:7,16,19 4442:2 4448:13 4450:28 4451:3,7,22 4452:2,4,6 4458:10 4466:25,26,28 4467:26 4468:23,27,28 4469:1,8,10,13,14 4470:11 4471:19 4473:12,14,15,27 4474:6.9

Exhibits 4337:1

existed 4258:13 4323:22 4324:9 4396:22

existing 4413:18 4445:4

exists 4303:19 4448:25

exits 4265:15 4268:23.24

expand 4247:27 4295:4 4297:6 4335:8 4355:7 4383:22

expanded 4412:1

expect 4239:11 4261:18 4267:28 4269:9 4277:15 4278:9 4281:1,20 4301:11 4319:27 4320:5 4343:14 4356:24 4357:2 4385:7 4421:18 4454:10 4456:8

expectation 4356:8

expected 4356:11 4414:4

expense 4375:3

expensive 4263:27 4269:21 4280:27

experience 4234:14 4262:4, 10 4273:6 4296:26 4313:1 4315:26 4316:8 4322:11 4329:10 4332:19 4333:4 4367:4,10,13 4394:3 4456:4,

experienced 4244:4,27 4245:3 4248:23 4265:17 4364:1

experiences 4362:16

experiencing 4380:24

expert 4258:3 4341:28 4390:13 4406:2 4413:13 4435:2 4457:11

expertise 4288:6 4462:13

explain 4238:9 4281:13 4319:18 4350:4 4382:27 4403:10 4404:15 4407:10 4420:25 4424:22 4464:6

explained 4289:22,23 4401:9 4436:23 4464:6

explaining 4261:13 4282:28

explanation 4300:20 4304:2 4345:15 4403:11

exploration 4389:7

exposure 4233:23

expressed 4310:21

expressly 4443:11

extension 4247:9

extent 4301:2,13 4354:25 4361:16,21 4383:19 4413:1 4416:9 4428:17 4459:15

extra 4268:13 4400:27

extraordinarily 4269:21

extrapolate 4225:4

extreme 4398:25

extremely 4239:7 4320:5,7

eye 4467:9

F

face 4247:25 4310:12 4361:26

facilities 4344:4 4348:22,27 4372:15 4394:26 4409:7,8, 12 4411:18,19 4419:10 4439:17 facility 4296:21 4371:5 4422:21 4426:24 4446:26

facing 4455:19

fact 4240:21 4242:28 4252:25 4254:7 4255:17 4271:2 4278:15 4289:3 4307:14 4308:17 4343:3 4354:22 4366:21,24 4380:3 4421:5 4445:9 4446:20 4454:21,22,27 4455:20 4456:20 4460:18

factor 4234:18 4273:10,23 4354:11,27 4369:23 4370:9, 25 4384:12 4435:15,20 4437:9 4438:2 4441:13 4452:22,27 4453:4,13,17,22 4454:5,17 4457:6

factored 4328:28

factories 4457:1

factors 4233:15 4342:13,16, 21,24 4343:11 4344:7,10,12 4345:3 4346:15,24 4352:12 4354:3,8 4360:12 4369:12 4390:6 4395:13,28 4403:3 4413:7 4452:20 4456:9

facts 4457:11

failed 4331:23 4453:8

failing 4459:23

fails 4331:9 4437:9

fair 4232:15 4240:18 4241:15 4253:20 4275:14,27 4282:3 4301:5 4302:9,21 4307:11,28 4313:7 4315:19 4322:22,23 4359:26 4363:14,18 4367:3 4370:6 4372:25 4373:20,22 4406:4 4430:13 4442:12 4447:17

fairly 4237:18 4278:20 4316:13

fall 4282:20 4293:5 4460:19

fallen 4471:10

familiar 4256:11 4288:4,7 4313:24 4358:14 4388:4 4411:6 4434:10 4461:5,21

familiarity 4288:9 4305:6

family 4316:12

family-owned 4262:19

Farkye 4457:12 4460:26 4466:1 4467:8 4468:5 4474:15

Farkye's 4465:27



farm 4254:15 4255:3,4,5 4268:23,24 4289:27 4316:2 4323:8 4328:13 4342:19 4345:13,19 4347:27 4348:3, 6 4349:13,24 4350:11 4351:2 4352:15,16 4353:2,9 4354:17,19,21 4357:15,20, 22 4360:18,27 4361:2 4362:23 4374:25 4375:2,3,5, 7,8 4378:3,17,22 4379:21 4380:12 4381:17,22 4382:19 4385:8,15,23 4389:16,28 4390:3 4391:5,7,8,11,12,26, 28 4392:25,27,28 4393:12, 16,19,25,28 4394:10,13,14, 21 4395:6,7,10,12 4397:19, 21 4402:27 4403:1,8,14 4406:1,3,10,11 4407:1 4408:5.9.13.17 4409:3 4412:26 4413:3,20 4414:3,4, 8,10,13,15 4415:8,17,19,25 4416:5 4417:23,27 4418:3 4421:27 4422:22,28 4423:2, 8,15 4429:1 4430:19,23 4474:20

farm-to-plant 4342:12,13,23 4344:13 4345:21,26,27 4346:1,10,12,21 4347:4 4349:6,10,22 4352:7,9,22 4354:11 4357:18 4380:24 4381:4 4392:5 4393:22 4400:1,4 4413:1 4415:6,15 4417:25 4418:4,7,9,18 4422:15 4445:18 4448:23 4452:26

farmer 4223:11,14,19,25 4317:7 4455:20

farmer-owners 4258:17

farmers 4222:19 4223:16 4224:8 4240:23,28 4248:9 4265:10 4298:20,26 4316:5, 25 4331:5 4341:21

farming 4277:11 4351:6

farms 4267:3 4315:6 4317:27 4318:2,12 4319:24 4347:7,9,15 4349:11,23 4350:25 4351:6,8,9,12,15, 16,20,21,23,25,27 4352:2, 11,14 4353:1 4355:17,18 4360:22 4363:9.13.15.18 4364:11,14,15,18,21 4365:4, 6,9,12 4366:5,6,7,10,12,14, 16,17 4367:7,16,19,28 4373:20,23,24,25,28 4374:7, 8,20,23 4377:23 4378:26 4379:6,16,26 4380:2,6,13, 14,15,17,18,22,27,28 4381:6,8,9,10,15,19,23,26, 27 4382:1,4 4384:28 4385:19 4389:9 4414:24 4416:6 4417:27 4418:5

fashion 4222:3

fast 4369:11

faster 4257:1

fat 4270:27 4271:13 4276:28 4293:19 4444:27 4445:1 4453:3,4,8,18 4456:23,24 4461:6 4462:15,16,18 4463:3

favorable 4400:9

favored 4453:17

FDA 4331:23

February 4323:14

federal 4224:18 4225:12 4240:24 4248:12 4254:26 4256:2,14 4259:5 4260:21 4264:25 4294:12 4302:11 4305:4 4317:7 4322:7 4326:1,3,6,7 4327:1 4341:8, 15 4343:22 4349:16 4355:6, 10,22 4356:9,14,16,19,26 4357:1 4360:4,7 4362:2,3,5, 7 4377:11 4390:13,24 4395:28 4410:6 4413:13

Federation 4474:20

feed 4223:15 4226:6

feedback 4412:22

feel 4267:24 4306:16 4322:20 4325:7 4327:23 4328:9 4372:19 4460:23

feet 4417:13

fell 4250:4

felt 4281:23 4284:5 4304:5 4307:1 4367:11 4381:17 4399:16,25 4400:12

fewer 4336:9 4352:11 4470:18

field 4435:2

fields 4391:17

fight 4225:18

figure 4242:25 4245:19 4249:6 4281:4 4289:8 4293:22 4306:12 4328:21 4332:13 4421:19,20 4446:6 4474:24

figured 4310:22 4425:12

figures 4422:15

fill 4351:3,15,16,21 4353:1 4380:28

filtration 4348:15

final 4229:2 4250:21

4265:19 4276:11 4286:14 4301:15 4302:12 4312:18

4324:19 4345:6,11 4370:15 4400:24 4435:21,22

4436:22,24 4437:5,12,16 4440:1 4441:20 4452:28 4453:12 4456:22 4457:26

finally 4229:14 4231:8 4438:15 4440:14 4443:17

Finals 4438:3

finance 4412:14

financial 4247:25,26 4295:3 4365:13 4374:10 4412:16

find 4234:8 4237:27 4238:19 4241:2 4246:6 4249:21 4289:10 4306:13 4315:13,18 4329:6 4331:1,26 4332:6 4342:3 4401:2 4416:15 4449:3 4461:11

finding 4439:24

findings 4351:18

finds 4229:2 4354:4

fine 4306:22 4321:6 4384:1 4404:22 4444:9 4474:28

finish 4323:26 4432:11

finished 4264:7 4323:14 4342:9 4343:27

fired 4320:2

firms 4455:12

fiscal 4311:9,13,25

fit 4265:8

fits 4334:16

five- 4383:5 4440:18 4443:18 4454:8 4466:8

five-minute 4467:28

five-year 4353:24 4440:21, 23 4458:11

fixable 4394:28

fixed 4223:2 4233:28 4234:26 4244:13 4245:26 4246:1 4268:5 4298:24 4309:24 4374:13

fixing 4224:27

flag 4406:28 4420:28

flexibility 4266:22 4268:11 4295:17.27 4297:12

flexible 4295:28

flight 4467:5

flip 4334:27 4459:3

flow 4353:2 4382:19

flows 4398:18,19

fluid 4297:18

FMMO 4222:26

focus 4446:4 4462:20

focused 4340:19,21,23 4364:7,10 4385:20

focusing 4225:18

folks 4335:18,22 4401:10 4424:19

follow 4273:26 4314:8 4395:3,19 4418:14

follow-ups 4384:8

Food 4227:13,22 4228:3 4242:15

Foods 4221:6 4358:21

foot 4417:11

footnote 4231:20

footprint 4417:12

force 4284:3 4307:15,16,18

forced 4264:24 4265:4 4333:9

forcing 4264:20

forecasted 4312:19

forgot 4360:15

form 4287:7 4292:28 4305:8 4358:25

formal 4258:8.9

formally 4279:2

forms 4229:28

formula 4225:1,8,14 4268:1 4300:12 4313:26 4344:11,21 4346:19,22 4369:26 4378:7 4395:28 4435:25 4436:19 4437:28 4440:22,24,27 4441:14 4445:4 4449:15 4450:13 4453:21 4456:17, 18,27 4457:3,23,25 4461:3, 4,5,7,26 4462:10

formulas 4222:25 4223:1,24 4224:10,13 4225:27 4260:16,21 4264:6 4277:24 4291:13 4302:19 4305:5 4336:7 4343:6,10,19,24 4344:4,13 4345:1,8,17,22 4346:3,16 4348:10 4349:21 4354:9,22,26,27 4360:11,13, 16 4380:20 4383:17 4390:7,

Index: farm..formulas



14 4413:8,14 4422:16 4435:22,27 4436:21 4438:25 4442:14 4443:25 4446:16 4448:24 4452:20 4454:1,23, 25 4455:15 4456:15 4458:6 4461:9

fortify 4329:7

forward 4228:26 4264:15 4272:27 4367:12 4464:3

forwarded 4369:11

found 4229:23 4308:6 4330:4 4345:26 4348:11 4355:25 4392:19 4460:27

four-ish 4318:17

four-plus 4252:3

four-year 4327:19,27

fourth 4248:14 4339:1,8 4442:22

fraction 4276:12 4398:11

frankly 4329:13

frequency 4423:23

frequently 4351:1 4381:7 4422:28 4423:3,24 4425:3

fresh 4262:6 4263:18 4321:10,11,18

friends 4305:1

front 4329:8 4338:5 4364:22 4388:1 4411:3 4434:6,8 4451:21

frozen 4417:20

fuel 4226:6 4408:16

full 4248:14,20,25 4250:10 4251:12,15 4252:26 4258:15 4260:3 4332:4 4335:17 4348:23 4349:28 4350:26 4351:3,17,21 4352:10 4353:2,26 4354:28 4364:19 4365:3 4366:28 4369:24 4379:16 4380:23,28 4381:9, 21 4382:18 4384:27 4385:8 4400:19 4428:25,27 4439:10 4441:10 4467:8

full-load 4350:5,13,15 4352:16

full-year 4251:12

fully 4354:5 4360:23 4375:24 4449:23 4455:10 4456:8

fun 4328:14

function 4270:16 4318:3 4319:22 4357:6 4458:24

functionality 4321:19

funding 4255:8

future 4269:20

G

Gallagher 4258:18

gap 4259:3

gas 4389:7 4396:3

gathered 4279:9

gauge 4270:5

gave 4244:11 4273:28 4311:25 4388:9 4403:21 4426:6 4452:11

gears 4290:18

general 4236:22 4258:25 4273:18 4412:12 4454:3 4468:12

generally 4234:13 4253:5 4273:17 4277:9 4313:27 4314:5 4316:4 4322:28 4331:2,18 4333:23 4418:5 4453:15.27

generate 4315:9 4316:12

generated 4413:17,22

generous 4308:4,8

geographies 4417:24

German-irish 4271:10

give 4242:28 4260:5 4270:18 4272:23 4280:22 4286:28 4297:16,21 4320:20 4323:9 4328:10 4334:25 4335:17 4336:17 4339:17 4340:13 4364:23 4383:28 4387:22

giving 4268:18 4269:1

glad 4319:15

Glanbia 4278:12 4295:7 4318:13,16 4320:13 4459:19

Glanbia's 4459:22,24

goal 4344:23 4352:27 4367:18 4441:24

goals 4361:28

good 4221:3,15 4230:3 4241:4 4247:7,11 4251:25 4254:25 4259:27,28 4270:13 4271:12 4274:11 4289:19 4299:13 4300:5,8 4302:28 4306:17 4321:3 4327:14,15 4331:17 4352:17 4359:9 4369:6 4373:7,11 4376:17 4378:11 4384:7 4387:13 4405:7,11,23 4410:4,5 4425:24 4429:25 4430:12 4434:1 4444:16,24 4452:8 4461:23 4465:14 4468:2,7 4475:4,9

goodness 4269:22

gosh 4304:14

governed 4343:5

grabbed 4442:7

Grade 4331:8 4462:21,27

graded 4462:27

gradual 4251:17,24 4328:4

Grand 4425:2

great 4237:2 4252:5 4284:8 4314:21 4398:15 4419:18 4425:13 4435:7 4442:10 4446:7

greater 4224:9 4313:13 4347:21,25 4349:24 4354:25 4374:9 4383:20 4405:18 4414:22 4415:13 4456:14 4457:10

group 4298:10 4326:24 4359:12 4401:19 4420:17 4425:25 4444:15 4461:23

groupings 4432:1

groups 4254:16

grow 4267:23 4268:16 4269:18 4298:23 4299:2,11, 12,14 4315:10 4316:18,28 4317:23

growing 4267:1

grown 4316:16 4318:22

growth 4253:4 4266:26 4268:19,25 4298:6,7

guarantee 4240:13 4283:14

guaranteed 4261:2 4317:9

guard 4327:17

guess 4276:8 4292:8,21 4294:4 4318:5 4327:26 4357:19 4358:4 4369:18 4370:18 4379:22 4380:10 4381:11 4382:26 4421:19 4445:25,27 4451:9 4464:10, 18 4465:13,25 4466:9 4474:6,13

guessing 4447:9

guidance 4226:12 4412:22

guiding 4349:19

guys 4327:16

н

H-A-R-M-O-N-I 4387:20

half 4232:5 4235:1 4240:6,7 4248:10 4249:8,10 4251:15 4256:24 4296:20 4315:15 4317:2 4318:27 4351:11,17 4353:9 4363:12 4391:14 4406:21 4425:17

Hampshire 4364:4

Hancock 4300:4,7,17 4326:12 4368:8 4369:5,7 4376:10 4384:11 4444:3,6 4445:23

hand 4290:4 4292:27 4337:19 4356:18 4387:1 4409:24

handed 4338:21

handful 4377:13

handle 4468:4

handled 4331:4

handler 4348:9

handler's 4345:10 4354:13

handlers 4225:25 4226:22 4234:16 4344:18 4345:18,20 4346:8 4352:25 4354:15 4355:1 4356:14

handlers' 4226:1

hands 4376:13,14

happen 4247:23 4254:17 4281:21 4284:12 4296:13 4299:6 4307:27 4420:11 4459:18

happened 4228:28 4229:16 4252:23 4305:11 4307:24

happening 4253:3 4365:16 4367:20 4403:9

happy 4274:9 4325:26 4402:13

hard 4286:17 4287:10 4298:16,25 4299:15 4305:10 4315:20 4318:9,10 4461:11, 12

harder 4269:20 4312:5 4317:21

hardware 4416:9

harm 4298:26

Harmoni 4347:25 4379:2 4386:26 4387:2,20 4389:1



Hastings 4330:22 4331:16

hat 4304:22.25

haul 4333:3

hauler 4389:14 4391:6,7,8 4392:2 4393:3 4394:3 4399:24 4401:23 4413:20 4416:2,18 4423:20,23,24,25 4431:23,24,28

haulers 4389:10 4392:16 4396:14 4416:7,14

hauling 4259:8,9,10 4319:19 4374:16,19 4399:15

head 4280:22 4289:25 4463:6

heading 4230:21 4470:6

health 4289:19

hear 4289:5 4318:15 4330:26 4419:14 4426:20 4450:5,7 4459:18,21 4464:2

heard 4226:28 4233:1 4237:5 4258:11 4261:10 4286:15 4300:26 4315:22 4328:15 4364:2 4375:27 4423:20 4448:23

hearing 4221:21 4222:9 4228:8 4229:27 4233:2 4235:25 4236:1 4250:20 4256:3,8,17,27 4257:21,26 4258:8.9 4264:16 4281:27. 28 4286:15 4287:28 4289:9 4301:5 4302:11,18 4303:18 4304:17 4309:2 4315:23 4325:19 4326:8 4336:14 4337:1,3 4340:10 4343:5 4344:8 4346:5,19,25 4347:2 4348:10 4358:9 4361:11,12 4375:27 4377:6,11 4382:15 4395:28 4410:7 4419:6 4423:3 4434:13 4449:2,6 4453:12,14,21 4456:21 4459:17 4465:17 4467:26 4468:27 4469:8.9.13.14 4471:18 4473:12,14,15,26

hearings 4256:9 4301:14 4455:5 4459:9

heat 4437:4

heavens 4252:16 4309:3 4312:4

heavy 4332:15

hedge 4418:27

hedging 4412:9 4418:21,22, 23,25 4419:2,7,9

held 4230:4 4362:2,5

helped 4278:19 4285:9

helpful 4449:7

helps 4329:26

herd 4315:23 4316:1,13,15, 18 4353:10

herds 4298:23 4316:17

Hermosa 4387:24

hey 4365:15 4376:18 4451:14

high 4223:13 4232:19 4236:27 4252:21 4261:20 4269:12 4294:19 4296:26 4316:11 4319:6 4332:13 4352:12 4404:19 4416:23 4430:26

high-cost 4240:16

higher 4223:15 4235:10 4236:24,25 4237:20,21 4238:5,24 4241:10 4245:2,4 4248:2,3,4 4250:15 4266:12 4270:27 4272:2 4276:28 4291:12,25 4313:10 4314:17 4316:3 4351:21 4361:24 4400:4 4403:14 4414:5,14 4417:18,28 4421:23 4430:15 4436:7,11 4438:9 4440:8 4453:3,13 4454:13 4457:27 4459:2,25 4472:16,17,19,27

highest 4230:8 4421:24

highlight 4350:6 4412:21

Hilmar 4290:27

Hilmar's 4296:8

hire 4236:2

hired 4395:25 4396:9,10,11, 16 4411:25

historical 4281:24 4300:13, 19,25,27 4301:3 4303:22 4313:2

historically 4252:23 4332:19 4396:28

history 4227:3 4241:21

hit 4252:26

hobbled 4319:12

hold 4256:9 4263:18 4287:28 4340:4 4344:8 4355:13 4363:26 4389:2 4398:21

holes 4293:21

honest 4247:21 4252:4 4289:15 4294:16 4307:1 4329:26 honestly 4262:11 4275:20 4283:2,6 4288:10 4290:16 4308:26 4329:27

honor 4221:6,20 4222:8 4259:20 4274:7 4285:2 4295:21 4327:8 4336:28 4337:15,23 4339:23 4341:27 4359:3 4368:8 4386:6,26 4387:6 4401:13 4409:22 4410:1,22 4433:10 4434:15 4435:1 4452:2 4461:17 4466:24 4467:2,20 4468:26 4469:4 4474:3,11 4475:12

Honor's 4467:15

hope 4248:28 4319:28 4388:25 4459:25 4460:10

hoping 4264:14

hose 4350:8,10,11,13,14,20 4357:16

hoses 4357:14

hour 4274:12 4326:17 4425:17

hours 4305:23 4351:2

huge 4253:4 4290:11

human 4230:11

hundred 4246:3 4317:13 4363:6 4400:27 4401:2 4417:3

hundreds 4268:3 4348:1 4372:17 4417:10

hundredweight 4293:28 4294:11 4342:15

hurts 4317:16

Hypothetically 4397:28

ı

. . .

I's 4267:11

ice 4417:9,10,17 4425:11

Idaho 4318:1,2,12 4332:19

idea 4252:5 4261:15 4281:7 4286:11 4294:27 4296:12 4365:12 4407:17 4468:8

identical 4271:25 4397:18

identifiable 4394:28 4399:13,22 4402:21

identifiably 4402:27

identification 4221:25,27 4222:12 4339:26,28 4388:22,24 4410:24,26,28 4434:16,17,20 4452:5,7 4469:2

identified 4393:2 4394:3 4418:6

identify 4352:26

identifying 4431:27

IDFA 4221:16,24 4222:6 4227:19 4239:14 4240:13 4241:18 4243:11 4249:7 4253:25 4254:16 4260:2 4264:9 4281:13 4283:10 4284:11 4285:11,23 4286:5, 6,9,18 4287:26,27 4288:13, 19 4305:15 4306:7 4307:20 4309:1,11 4310:11 4323:8, 13 4325:18,21,24 4327:18, 22 4335:4 4336:16,18,19,20 4358:27 4463:11 4468:23 4471:21

IDFA's 4230:1 4244:23 4245:5 4248:10 4282:4 4284:26 4285:13,26 4286:23 4288:27 4325:8 4334:5 4375:17

ignore 4299:17

II 4343:16 4441:4,5

III 4222:24,26,28 4223:23 4224:6,12 4244:5 4264:24 4266:11 4295:13,25 4297:14 4313:25 4343:15 4345:1,8 4346:2 4353:23 4354:8 4435:22 4449:15 4450:1 4454:11,13 4456:18 4457:24

illuminate 4431:5

illustrate 4455:19

imagine 4311:22 4417:2 4460:18,26

immediately 4250:14 4474:13

impact 4258:16 4344:5 4353:26 4354:5 4380:12,13, 14,17,18 4390:12 4413:12 4438:20 4458:17,23 4465:20

impacted 4353:22 4366:16 4379:27 4385:19 4441:8

impactful 4441:23

impacts 4340:24 4353:8,19, 20,24 4381:17 4383:5 4419:6 4436:25 4439:8 4440:16,20 4441:6 4454:16

imperative 4454:26

impetus 4343:18

implement 4257:26 4327:18 4374:10,18 4455:10



4457:18,19

implementation 4248:25 4251:24 4258:16 4327:28 4334:3 4335:3,5,20 4356:19

implemented 4253:28 4256:25 4334:8 4335:14 4367:17 4374:13

implementing 4335:4,27 4374:3

implicitly 4464:2

implied 4443:11

importance 4226:17 4289:23

important 4247:23 4267:24 4282:19 4284:5 4286:18 4297:20 4302:1 4304:1 4321:20 4330:19 4335:22 4349:9 4357:8 4381:13 4400:12 4439:11 4453:28 4454:25

Importantly 4417:4

impose 4254:23

imposed 4250:8,14

imprecision 4353:4 4382:20

Improperly 4437:12

improve 4352:23

improved 4372:28 4416:10

improvement 4353:12

improvements 4266:2 4353:6.12

improving 4355:15

inaccuracies 4353:4 4382:21

inadequate 4259:18 4327:24

inappropriate 4224:26

incentive 4247:26 4289:13 4295:3 4297:6 4365:13 4456:13

incentivized 4362:8

inception 4356:15

inch 4417:13

include 4290:23 4301:7 4341:8,11 4345:16 4347:6,8 4356:13 4373:4,15 4374:2 4379:3 4390:25 4397:28 4400:15 4409:6,10 4411:26 4414:23 4428:24

included 4225:7 4230:7,10 4232:2 4242:22 4276:20

4290:20 4312:9 4327:3 4349:23 4369:18 4393:4 4399:28 4408:27 4409:2

includes 4241:27 4313:6 4352:13 4353:27 4399:20,24 4406:16 4412:9 4418:25 4422:17 4445:1 4464:27 4465:1 4466:16

including 4308:17 4310:9 4347:27 4365:2 4389:28 4416:3 4436:14 4437:22

inclusion 4435:12

income 4248:4 4267:28 4269:10 4343:23 4344:2 4353:9 4355:7,14,28 4356:6, 10,24,27 4360:21,26 4458:20

incongruous 4464:1

inconsistent 4294:19 4403:27

incorporate 4342:13 4344:13 4354:10

incorporated 4260:16 4342:16 4457:23

incorporates 4464:26

incorporating 4457:4

incorrect 4342:21 4408:10 4441:21 4448:7

incorrectly 4320:26

increase 4224:7 4226:1 4243:17 4244:8 4245:5,16, 22,23 4246:8,18,22 4248:22 4249:2,7,8,12,16 4253:10 4259:9 4273:20 4292:10,11 4328:1,18,27 4329:3 4334:4 4343:15 4344:2,3 4355:22, 28 4356:11,25,26 4452:23 4453:22

increased 4223:14 4226:1,2 4245:28 4291:24 4292:16 4316:24 4343:17 4344:7 4355:18 4356:10 4437:6

increases 4222:23,28 4223:6,18 4236:21 4243:16, 25,26 4244:1,2,24,27 4245:3,21 4246:17 4248:7 4249:3 4250:8,16 4258:25 4344:5 4352:21 4353:15 4417:17 4454:10

increasing 4223:12 4227:25 4328:26 4343:16 4356:5 4456:8

incredibly 4299:11

incremental 4353:8

incumbent 4344:23

incur 4224:14 4225:2

incurred 4249:8 4311:7

independent 4286:19

Indiana 4303:1 4347:16 4377:24

indication 4310:19

indicator 4333:24

individual 4270:11,16 4391:26 4414:4,6 4420:4

individuals 4422:21

industry 4233:22,23 4237:22 4239:6 4251:19,27, 28 4256:5 4279:3 4284:6 4287:14 4288:4,10 4289:19 4315:27 4322:11,18 4326:4 4329:27 4340:3,6,18 4359:19 4360:14 4365:17,24 4367:6,15,22,26 4389:27 4404:24 4412:26 4437:7 4454:3 4458:3 4461:14

inefficiency 4349:17

inevitable 4444:28

inevitably 4462:2

inexpensive 4331:28

Inflating 4345:2

inflation 4236:22 4252:14,15 4296:13 4318:27 4328:8

inform 4402:23

information 4227:1.21 4228:8 4230:16 4238:11 4242:8,10 4243:6 4246:12, 17 4258:12 4279:6,9 4281:19,20 4282:12,17 4287:25 4289:8 4293:15 4302:8 4303:22.28 4306:9. 11,13 4308:10,21 4311:24 4329:23 4336:12 4375:28 4390:2 4391:24 4392:8 4396:17 4397:11 4411:27 4412:10,20 4413:2 4422:3 4427:10,13,19 4428:12 4447:8.12 4455:6.16 4458:10 4459:10,14,28 4460:5 4463:21 4470:5,7 4471:21

informed 4371:24

informs 4349:19 4460:7

ingredients 4270:28

inherent 4344:20 4357:17 4418:8

initiation 4248:11

innovation 4326:24 4359:12 4367:5 4401:19 4425:25 4444:15 4461:23

innovative 4328:19

input 4225:1 4272:25 4391:19 4450:10

inquiries 4391:17

insertion 4263:12

insight 4349:5 4430:9

insist 4241:1

insistence 4225:13 4310:23

installing 4296:19

instance 4361:13 4362:16 4395:14 4398:12,26 4403:3 4421:2 4429:6 4462:1

instances 4367:1 4394:27 4397:20 4402:22 4421:15 4458:19

Institute 4228:4,21

insufficient 4224:6 4252:1 4347:3

integrated 4391:25

intend 4338:11

intended 4343:24 4345:8

intending 4411:11

intent 4355:21 4452:13

intention 4281:14 4287:19

intentional 4284:1 4419:21

interest 4289:17

interested 4299:21,26

interesting 4238:8

internal 4415:10

International 4221:6 4358:20

interpreted 4290:6 4320:15 4355:15 4356:3

intervening 4457:28

introduce 4407:25 4454:26 4455:1 4457:8

introduced 4284:9,13 4358:8,10

inventories 4333:15

inventory 4332:26 4333:18

invest 4266:2 4269:18 4381:6



invested 4268:3 4367:17

investigation 4416:1,24

Investigations 4416:14

investment 4268:5 4312:9, 28 4326:27 4327:1 4328:16

investments 4328:17

invoice 4389:14 4396:14

invoiced 4389:24

involved 4275:13 4302:15 4305:4 4307:21 4375:24

involves 4340:15 4350:8

isolated 4417:7

issue 4224:23 4232:20 4248:5 4296:23 4326:27 4348:8 4349:22 4367:15 4392:5 4400:14 4402:5,26 4416:1,19 4419:8 4422:28 4425:3 4431:25 4432:3 4467:22

issues 4234:17 4256:19 4278:22 4301:17 4322:25 4341:11 4361:11 4393:27 4394:4,28 4399:13,22,25 4400:8 4402:21,24 4406:28 4408:8 4421:11 4427:17 4431:28 4475:7

IV 4222:24,27 4223:1,23 4224:7,12 4264:24 4343:15 4345:1,8 4346:2 4353:23 4354:9 4435:22,24,27 4436:2,15,18 4437:17,23 4440:17,24 4441:1,3,5,14,26 4442:13 4450:12

J

Jack 4270:23,26 4271:3,27

James 4295:13 4319:14

January 4248:16,18 4249:2, 4 4252:27 4304:21 4305:17, 19,27 4334:4,6,14 4425:4 4436:9,13 4439:5,6,21

job 4247:21 4256:23 4261:13 4264:14 4305:9 4322:9 4412:13

jobs 4305:23

join 4326:2

joined 4305:15 4324:13,15

joining 4389:5

joint 4295:8 4455:27 4460:11

jointly 4346:23

journal 4457:5

journey 4408:16

judge 4434:4

judgment 4394:2

judgments 4394:6 4402:16, 18.19

July 4392:11 4413:23 4439:21

jump 4335:6

juncture 4228:14

June 4229:16 4332:25 4333:16 4439:5

justification 4354:2

Κ

keeping 4342:7 4382:12

Kenosha 4330:25

Kentucky 4332:9

kids 4318:4

kill 4330:28 kilter 4258:21

kind 4241:11 4255:23 4256:15 4273:2 4275:21 4276:7 4278:27 4279:26 4281:11 4286:9 4288:25 4289:22 4298:21 4304:28 4308:9 4311:23 4318:8 4319:12,18 4320:14 4321:20 4327:27 4329:20 4362:17 4369:11 4379:18 4385:6 4387:18 4388:9 4401:26 4405:11 4421:11 4423:18

4432:3 4444:6 4448:19 **kinds** 4268:9 4462:10

kit 4322:9

knew 4238:18 4278:16 4287:12 4320:11 4322:12 4372:9 4402:24

knowing 4308:5

Kraft 4453:16

Krebs 4475:6

Kroger 4247:22 4271:2 4296:26 4298:9 4304:21,23 4305:9,28 4319:28

L

labeled 4291:28 4338:6 4388:2 4429:6 labor 4245:24 4253:3,6,10, 20 4277:10 4294:5 4316:20 4332:1,2 4367:14

lack 4247:26 4268:18 4295:3 4325:25 4330:14 4331:21,24

lacked 4348:12

lag 4313:28 4314:3,9,14,23,

lagoons 4331:4

Land 4244:6,7,11 4245:15, 20,26 4246:10,12,16 4291:16,20 4293:11 4294:22

landed 4446:24,25 4467:5

language 4323:9 4390:14 4413:14

large 4237:26 4239:7,10 4249:15 4268:7 4270:21 4279:21,27,28 4280:24 4283:22,24 4284:5 4289:20 4319:27 4322:28 4328:1 4329:16 4349:11 4363:28 4364:15 4374:13 4431:14

larger 4278:10 4280:1 4283:23 4287:13 4298:23 4315:23 4316:1,2 4364:5,14 4366:12,13,16 4372:28 4373:22,23,24,25 4374:8 4381:16 4395:13 4403:2 4418:5

lastly 4417:6 4473:2

late 4257:18 4376:23 4457:23

lawsuits 4275:8,10,11

lawyer 4301:10

lawyers 4318:4

lead 4248:3 4408:12

leading 4333:6

leads 4379:18

learn 4382:16 4424:9

learned 4245:1

leave 4265:6,11 4324:17 4401:24

leaving 4241:14 4248:3 4389:16

led 4229:19 4306:6

left 4266:1 4267:9,20 4305:9 4324:14,15,25 4325:9,27 4350:10,14 4393:9 4394:8 4399:11 4404:1 4446:10 4455:20 left-over 4365:3

legal 4275:24

legislation 4255:3,7

legislative 4323:9 4458:6

Leprino 4297:4 4318:16

less-than-full 4367:2

lessen 4381:7

letter 4286:1,2,10,27 4287:15 4324:15,16,19 4375:18

letters 4284:17 4285:16,18 4324:13,14,16,18 4325:5

level 4222:24 4223:13 4226:21 4227:14 4303:12 4376:4 4423:2 4453:6,18

levels 4223:11,22 4254:12 4257:8,17 4259:4 4272:18 4317:10 4415:8

liaison 4285:11

licensed 4351:25 4353:10

lieu 4346:16

life 4353:11

likelihood 4415:28

likewise 4441:5

limitations 4298:23

limited 4222:23 4348:16 4350:14 4372:24 4374:6 4390:15 4413:15

limiting 4343:11

limits 4255:22 4298:17

lines 4272:16 4372:4 4442:3

list 4221:22 4244:24 4254:21 4378:14

listed 4292:28 4293:13 4371:17 4414:23 4419:28 4426:19 4428:23 4432:3 4470:2

listen 4253:12 4410:10

listened 4377:5

listening 4284:14 4450:4 4459:17

literally 4332:3 4421:20 4460:27

Littlefield 4348:26 4371:8, 13,16 4372:3,5 4407:17,21 4411:22

Index: invested..live

live 4326:4 4330:25



living 4257:3 4316:11

LLC 4348:22,28 4411:18,19

load 4269:23,24 4347:20 4350:1,18,26 4364:19 4379:17 4389:11 4391:4,10 4393:10 4398:3 4414:4,9 4423:16 4429:13 4431:8,10

loads 4331:14 4347:19,20, 22 4352:3,10 4363:10,12 4366:28 4367:2 4380:23,28 4385:12 4391:9 4392:20,21, 26 4393:2,8,9,10,13,14,15, 17,21,23,24 4394:1,6,8,9,11, 16,18,19,22,23,24 4395:8, 15,16 4397:15 4398:1,8,12, 16 4399:11,20,21 4400:3 4401:3 4404:1,14,16 4405:10,12 4406:5,14 4409:6 4414:20 4416:23 4418:3 4421:12,15,19 4428:26

local 4322:8

located 4297:28 4371:7 4377:23 4465:8

locations 4377:24 4380:2 4432:5 4456:2 4465:10

log 4395:7

logic 4336:6

logical 4254:15

logistic 4391:6

logistics 4390:8 4391:23 4416:3

logs 4416:13

long 4248:8 4262:23 4299:21 4301:18 4305:13 4313:16,19 4314:13 4318:11 4323:11,12 4328:5,8 4332:21,22 4333:15 4335:16 4341:17,22 4368:1 4449:4

long-needed 4259:18

long-term 4298:18 4315:8

longer 4259:19 4277:26 4280:2 4314:13 4318:25 4321:14 4335:5

longer-term 4439:23

longest 4439:6

lookback 4443:19

looked 4236:23 4244:12 4249:15 4263:23 4281:18 4302:2 4377:12 4379:20 4403:26 4420:16 4430:21 4439:20 4447:17 4464:28 4465:3 lose 4251:21 4261:2 4264:21 4265:4 4304:6 4329:12 4333:2 4372:4 4422:16

losing 4327:24

loss 4261:24 4342:13 4345:7 4349:26 4350:12 4357:18,21 4385:16,18 4414:7 4415:13,18 4462:18

loss-less 4445:15 4462:8

losses 4247:25 4339:11 4342:15,23 4345:9,13,21 4346:7,9,10,12 4350:2,7 4352:7,12 4354:12,16,24,26 4357:14,17 4362:25 4380:25 4381:4,7 4383:19,21 4392:6 4394:17 4413:1 4414:8 4415:6,11,12 4418:9,11 4445:20 4462:10,14

lost 4268:1 4305:1 4342:19 4365:5,8 4378:2,6 4382:12 4415:15 4462:2

lot 4232:12 4236:24 4240:22 4241:24 4252:17 4255:20 4260:23 4263:8,10,15 4268:11 4273:10 4277:20 4278:10,21 4279:22 4287:17,20,21 4289:16 4290:15 4295:26 4296:23,25 4297:12 4298:8,21 4301:20 4302:23 4305:5 4307:20 4309:22 4312:4 4318:2 4319:10 4322:10,12,17,26 4328:15,19 4336:3 4363:18 4367:25 4380:23 4381:19 4425:4 4446:3

lots 4265:14 4289:1 4295:17 4302:27 4323:2 4326:4

low 4276:28 4291:23 4318:21,23 4329:20 4436:3 4447:5.22

low-cost 4240:16

low/medium 4437:4

lower 4237:20 4238:2 4239:11 4257:4 4263:25 4266:10,11 4270:27,28 4272:12 4280:21 4283:23 4289:12 4291:5,12 4310:5 4315:4,15 4319:27 4333:9 4354:9 4408:5 4414:5,13 4441:14 4453:17 4454:13 4461:9

lowered 4333:12

lowest 4273:24 4289:16 4315:7 4352:24 4420:17 4447:14,16 **Lucius** 4461:2

Luis 4457:13

lunch 4368:9,12 4408:20,21

luncheon 4368:14

ly 4396:27

lying 4278:28

М

made 4223:19 4228:22 4234:4 4249:17 4257:23 4263:1,26 4266:12 4277:2 4279:14 4282:7 4285:27,28 4288:19 4295:13 4296:24 4301:14 4302:8,9 4303:27 4304:3,4,8 4306:8 4307:8,22 4308:15 4321:1,4 4322:9,16 4344:15 4386:3 4391:2 4394:6 4397:10,24 4398:8 4402:16 4409:18 4417:16 4420:21 4469:15,19

mailbox 4259:3 4317:20 4319:16 4333:7

Maine 4363:21,23,27

maintain 4266:1

maintained 4390:8 4413:9

maintains 4390:19

maintenance 4266:25 4267:9

major 4257:26

majority 4336:8,14,21,22 4346:8 4350:21,24 4379:15, 24 4406:14 4454:27

make 4221:7,18 4222:17,20, 24 4223:1,5,11,12,18,22,23 4224:1,12,21,28 4225:1,14, 19,24 4226:1,2,7,9,19,23,26 4227:7,8,14,16,26,27 4228:28 4229:7,10,16 4231:27 4235:2 4237:22 4238:17 4239:14,18,22 4240:7,13 4241:10,14 4242:4 4243:13,17,19,25,26 4244:24 4247:17,24 4248:8, 9,11,14 4249:21 4250:4,7,16 4251:2 4252:1,21,26 4254:23 4256:9 4257:5,11 4258:14,21 4259:14,19 4260:12,16 4261:1,3,20 4262:26 4263:3,27 4264:15 4265:28 4267:6 4268:6,27 4269:20 4271:15 4272:12,18 4273:18 4274:20 4275:3,5 4277:1.21 4280:20 4281:22 4282:12 4284:2 4287:7,10

4290:10,13 4291:9,13,25,27 4292:5 4294:18 4295:28 4296:12 4298:15,28 4299:5, 19 4300:12 4301:6 4302:3, 19,27 4303:26 4304:9,15 4305:12 4306:5,9 4307:9 4308:14,18,19,20,23 4310:1, 13 4312:3,5 4313:4 4315:12 4316:24 4317:16 4318:19,23 4319:1,6 4320:22 4321:25 4322:21,23 4323:4 4325:19, 21 4327:19 4328:10,20 4329:6,16,24 4332:14 4333:1,17 4334:11,16,23 4335:6,27 4344:5,6,9 4349:21 4353:22 4360:17 4361:13,21 4362:12 4365:13,25 4373:17 4378:12 4380:8 4387:16 4398:13 4401:4,13 4421:25 4436:5,7, 11 4438:9 4440:4,9 4441:8 4443:26 4444:8 4447:25 4448:21 4450:6 4455:11 4461:6 4462:21 4463:11 4466:7 4469:24 4470:4 4471:22 4474:17

maker 4361:10

makers 4239:6,14 4241:19 4243:12 4262:19 4280:23 4286:20 4318:5 4329:23 4336:20 4453:2,7

makes 4239:2 4251:6,20,21 4263:19 4305:28 4308:21 4316:19 4327:24 4328:3,12 4333:3 4357:24 4378:25

making 4228:7 4245:17 4251:20 4261:7 4276:27 4306:19 4315:6 4325:15 4385:16 4402:20 4449:1 4456:28 4461:1

malicious 4320:19

maliciously 4322:2

manage 4331:5 4333:27 4412:6

management 4268:14 4304:28 4330:20 4333:24 4334:11 4335:12,18 4336:3 4347:26 4391:25 4418:3,25 4419:7

manager 4347:25 4389:2,5,6 4412:12

mandated 4253:26 4254:13

mandatory 4228:18,23 4229:12 4253:23 4254:24 4257:25 4267:12 4373:3,15 4455:10 4458:4

manifest 4391:25 4392:4,9, 13 4398:17 4407:3



manifested 4416:5

manifests 4396:25 4404:24

manual 4416:17

manually 4416:14

manufacture 4227:17 4228:12 4232:24 4233:14 4241:8 4247:1 4257:4 4258:13 4343:26 4437:18,20 4441:16 4455:27

manufactured 4223:18 4224:17 4345:5 4450:9

manufacturer 4222:23 4225:7 4226:27 4241:2,7 4264:24

manufacturers 4224:14 4225:2 4232:27 4240:23 4248:1 4253:8,14 4264:21 4286:6 4336:9 4345:28 4390:25 4453:10,27 4455:7 4456:20 4457:9

manufacturers' 4225:26

manufactures 4266:10

manufacturing 4222:25,27 4223:6 4224:16 4227:10,26 4228:5,6 4229:3,8 4236:6 4237:6,7 4251:28 4252:24 4260:6,14,15 4261:28 4265:24 4268:9 4269:8 4277:20 4272:7,8 4276:26 4277:6,13,15,16 4282:23 4285:18 4292:9 4297:21 4313:12 4317:18 4319:28 4344:9,15,22 4391:3 4412:8, 13 4415:24 4435:17 4437:10 4440:3 4448:1 4450:18 4453:26 4455:2 4456:4 4457:3,22 4458:4

March 4324:21 4425:4

margin 4261:8 4268:6,17 4312:21 4313:13 4315:9,25 4316:3,10,12

margins 4268:24 4315:18 4316:6,25 4333:12

mark 4229:19 4237:26 4277:8 4286:12,18 4287:17 4293:25 4311:12 4339:21,23 4388:19,20

Mark's 4230:3 4240:15 4241:27 4242:10,24 4253:5 4258:26 4281:25 4288:7 4306:13 4309:20 4310:26 4329:18

marked 4221:21,24,26 4222:5,9,10,11 4334:26 4339:25,27 4355:5 4388:21, 23 4410:24,25,27 4434:6,17, 19 4452:4,6 4467:26 4468:27,28 4469:1,9

market 4224:17 4225:23 4226:4,23 4247:27 4263:18, 19 4264:4 4265:2 4267:9 4270:20 4299:2,18 4302:14, 20 4314:11,22 4317:11 4318:8 4333:19 4340:7 4343:20 4344:26 4355:23 4377:22 4379:4 4406:17 4439:1 4442:23 4443:5 4444:20 4447:13 4454:1,2

market's 4314:19,22

market-clearing 4226:18

marketed 4347:22 4390:23

marketing 4223:2 4267:14 4269:8 4343:9 4349:3,16,18 4352:20 4390:21,22,24 4411:18 4455:4

marketplace 4223:26,27 4225:7 4267:28 4269:10

markets 4226:17 4229:4 4259:7 4269:16 4298:6,8 4301:23 4331:7 4390:19

massive 4298:4

master's 4340:4

matched 4385:7

material 4253:19 4401:4

materially 4250:15 4398:2 4436:1 4471:15 4472:27

materials 4427:7

math 4294:25 4332:23 4333:1 4363:11 4364:21,23, 28 4371:11 4378:4 4446:3, 19

mathematics 4436:22

matter 4304:4 4306:19 4318:3 4322:18

meaning 4414:6

means 4240:3,10,11 4251:26 4319:20 4364:19 4382:27 4397:10 4422:10 4429:8 4464:21

meant 4272:22 4279:19 4386:2

measure 4357:21 4367:20 4374:21 4415:7 4422:6

measured 4417:21 4454:7

measurement 4349:27 4353:3 4382:19 4393:1

measurements 4421:28 4422:9

measures 4351:7 4354:18 4415:9

measuring 4374:3 4375:1,5

mechanism 4225:25

mechanisms 4225:16,23 4344:25 4441:24

meet 4224:6 4247:27 4318:23 4361:28 4377:9,18 4425:26

meeting 4288:25

meetings 4289:7

meld 4281:16

melded 4281:13

member 4306:2 4317:18 4323:25 4324:12 4347:7 4358:27 4373:23,25 4379:3 4390:19,27 4391:5,8 4409:6

member-owners 4269:28

members 4251:8 4265:21 4285:21,24,25 4286:6,19 4287:10 4290:3,15,16 4307:20 4309:22 4323:18 4324:17,25 4325:1,4 4327:22 4328:11 4336:18, 19,20 4347:17 4349:8,11,28 4374:24 4375:18 4376:24 4377:4,9,18 4389:11 4390:13 4406:16 4413:13

members' 4346:1 4390:23

membership 4284:2,26 4285:14,15,17 4286:23 4287:5 4323:22,23 4324:9, 10,11 4325:8,16,25 4347:15

memory 4228:17 4426:13

mentality 4271:14

mention 4418:19 4430:15

mentioned 4245:14 4262:14 4290:18 4341:6 4371:3 4424:4

merged 4348:20

merit 4392:28

met 4278:13 4355:20 4369:6

method 4236:10 4239:16 4246:1 4310:24 4370:24

methodology 4234:11 4247:3 4280:28 4282:28 4312:2 4322:3 4325:17 4373:5,7,12 4443:19 methods 4282:9 4453:26 4458:15

Mexican 4271:3

Mexico 4346:20 4347:16 4348:14 4377:24 4387:24 4389:3

mic 4380:16 4387:15 4407:13

Michael 4284:26

Michigan 4296:26 4347:16 4348:21 4363:25 4377:24 4410:19 4411:21 4412:28 4413:26 4415:3 4417:8,16 4424:6 4427:10,14,23 4428:6

mid 4257:18

mid-1890s 4456:26

Mideast 4390:21

Midwest 4298:12 4330:14 4331:13 4336:2 4366:5

Mike 4221:7,9 4468:16

milk 4222:18,21,26 4223:17, 20 4224:4,6,8,9,15 4225:3,4, 9,22 4226:16,18,19,20,22 4227:28 4228:6 4229:5 4230:1,12 4232:13,16,23 4234:1 4235:8,12 4236:8,14 4237:8.9.16.21 4238:4 4239:19 4241:1.3 4243:27 4245:17,25,27 4246:3,5 4247:28 4248:3 4251:5 4254:6 4257:3.7 4258:16 4259:4,13 4260:1,24 4263:2 4264:8 4265:3,8,21 4266:12 4267:14,15 4268:10,11,14, 28 4269:8,24 4283:26 4287:23 4289:5 4292:23 4293:19 4295:13 4296:16 4297:13,18 4298:17,27 4299:4,6,7 4307:7,15,19,23 4308:3,14,21 4314:10 4316:10 4317:9 4319:11 4323:8 4326:24,26 4329:8 4330:4,13,16,20,21,26 4331:2,8,9,22,25,26,27,28 4332:6,12,22 4333:8,23,26 4337:16 4338:26 4340:3,15, 21,24,26 4341:4,17 4342:14, 15,20,23,26 4343:9,25,27 4344:3,27 4345:4,13,18,20, 22 4346:8 4347:7.18.19.20. 22,26 4348:2,15 4349:7,16, 19,23,25,26 4350:1,5,8,9,14, 16,18,24,26,28 4351:9,10, 14,27 4352:3,6,13,20 4354:16,28 4356:18 4357:14 4358:27 4359:11 4360:21 4362:7 4364:8 4365:27,28 4366:5,7,20,28 4367:24

Index: manifested..milk



4369:8 4370:22 4371:21 4372:12 4373:21 4374:19.21 4375:7 4376:26 4377:1,22 4378:27 4379:2,3,5,12,15, 18,24,25 4380:1,5,11,23,28 4381:13,15,18,20,25 4384:6, 27 4385:6,28 4389:2,5,9,11, 13,16,28 4390:19,23,24,26, 27 4391:1,4,8,9,10,22,23,26 4392:10,12,15 4393:2,10 4394:9 4396:13 4397:3 4398:22 4401:3,19 4405:12 4406:17 4408:3 4409:11 4411:24 4412:2,3,10,17,20 4414:7,21,24 4415:11,13,15, 18,24 4416:12,22 4417:12 4418:11 4419:3 4420:8,12 4421:26,27 4422:11 4423:17 4425:25 4426:20.23.25 4427:1,2 4428:1,2,10,18,24 4429:6 4430:27 4432:28 4433:5 4435:9,11,16 4436:2, 4,7,12,16 4437:1,3,10,17,18, 23 4441:13,16,25,26 4442:24 4444:15 4445:11.19 4447:6 4450:17 4455:4 4458:23 4461:23 4462:2 4463:25 4469:21.26 4470:10,25 4472:21,22 4475:8

milk's 4225:6 4251:2,8 4257:12 4307:18 4333:17

milking 4274:6 4351:3,12

million 4283:25 4287:23 4295:8 4296:8,20 4319:11 4329:19 4377:7 4398:16,22

millions 4268:3 4269:24 4372:17

Miltner 4259:24,26 4260:1 4264:18 4271:8 4274:7.17 4285:6,7 4299:28 4300:26 4320:8 4323:17 4324:8 4337:7,9,15,23,25 4339:22 4340:1,11 4341:27 4342:4,5 4359:3 4375:17 4384:5,6 4386:6,15,19,25 4387:6,12 4388:20,25 4395:18 4401:13 4403:16 4407:26 4408:2,3 4409:14,22 4410:1,3,22 4411:1,2 4425:14 4426:7,11, 20 4432:10 4433:8,18,28 4434:15,21,22 4435:1,5 4443:26 4444:20 4449:10,14 4450:22 4451:1,13,19 4452:2,8,9 4461:16,25 4464:15 4466:23 4467:2 4468:12 4474:28

Milwaukee 4330:26 4331:14

min 4447:19,23

mind 4251:13 4290:10

4293:25 4342:7 4359:24 4360:8 4401:20 4446:8

minimal 4437:2

minimize 4416:22 4417:4

minimum 4222:18,20 4224:8,18 4226:16,18 4240:25 4241:13 4266:17 4269:11,12 4317:10,14 4319:17 4343:7,17 4344:6, 19 4352:21 4390:7,12 4413:8,12 4436:1 4438:25 4456:15

minor 4400:18

minority 4352:3 4395:8 4421:15

minus 4222:20 4237:19 4311:17 4405:15,18 4429:7 4461:6

minute 4238:9 4239:16 4245:14 4254:4 4444:1

minutes 4274:13 4294:18 4326:17 4450:26 4467:6 4474:18

misapprehends 4225:15

misheard 4290:7

misread 4359:15

missed 4321:15 4464:16

missing 4393:4

misspoke 4382:28

misstating 4272:20 4459:26

mistake 4292:1

mistyped 4416:16

mitigate 4352:18,26

mix 4229:25 4230:5 4465:12

Mobile 4391:25 4392:4,9 4398:17

mode 4306:7

model 4282:16 4460:15

modeled 4455:25 4464:17

modern 4252:24 4329:11 4453:25 4456:25 4465:24

modernization 4302:18,25 4303:7,11

modernize 4302:22 4303:3, 15.16.19

modernized 4302:20

modernizing 4303:13 4304:15

modest 4454:10

modifications 4346:22

modify 4224:27

moisture 4270:27 4271:13 4272:2 4276:28 4438:16 4440:15

moment 4302:9

MONDAY 4221:1 4369:1

money 4241:7,14 4251:21 4261:2 4264:21 4265:4 4266:1 4267:22,24 4297:1 4317:19 4319:20 4327:25 4366:9

monitoring 4412:2

Monterey 4270:22,26

month 4306:1 4389:21,22,24 4390:27 4391:2

monthly 4383:16 4439:2 4443:25

months 4306:1 4321:19 4335:14 4383:9 4402:23 4417:9,19 4425:2 4443:23, 24

morning 4221:1,3,15 4253:12 4259:27,28 4300:5, 8 4327:14,15 4359:9 4467:7, 14,23 4468:6,8 4474:16,21 4475:18

motivated 4322:3

move 4254:1 4257:1 4264:15 4331:20 4335:17 4337:1,7,9 4386:8,20 4409:15 4451:1 4474:6

moved 4268:11 4325:23

movement 4416:9

mover 4353:23 4441:9

moves 4253:7 4288:28

moving 4464:13

muddle 4444:11

multi 4385:18

multi-farm 4385:23

multi-stop 4350:11,21

multiple 4270:9 4350:3 4351:6 4352:2,14,16 4357:15 4385:13 4390:20 4394:24 4414:24 4418:2 4428:24,28 4429:1,3 4430:16 4455:27 4456:1

multiple-stop 4350:5

multiples 4283:28

multiplied 4245:22 4438:6,8 4440:6,8 4443:9

multiplying 4471:11

mustard 4431:21

myriad 4266:28

N

names 4419:28

Nasonville 4261:12 4262:14

NASS 4225:11 4230:6,15 4231:9,11,21 4232:11 4276:15 4277:23,26 4320:9, 12,13 4322:1 4447:8,11 4470:6,24 4473:17

NASS's 4276:21

national 4228:4,21 4239:4 4251:2,5,8 4254:6 4257:3,7, 11 4292:23 4307:7,15,18,19, 23 4308:3,13,21 4323:8 4326:26 4350:27 4369:7 4385:7 4436:9 4463:25

nature 4228:7 4341:25 4455:4

NCI 4228:4

NDPSR 4261:6 4262:3,8 4270:3 4278:2,7,11,15 4279:7 4313:17 4314:1 4320:9,13 4322:2,12 4455:13 4462:22

necessarily 4232:21 4262:1 4312:20 4331:13 4348:7 4352:11 4359:25,27 4364:19 4367:8 4374:22

necessitates 4452:23

necessity 4365:4

needed 4226:23 4235:27 4265:23 4287:12,13 4306:12,15,21 4309:8,16 4310:15 4401:25

negative 4269:15 4319:18 4393:13,18,20,21 4394:11, 13,15 4403:21 4414:12,20, 21 4415:2,3,4 4417:18,28 4418:1 4429:10,13 4430:2, 11,26 4437:2 4458:20,23

negatives 4259:8

negligible 4352:28 4436:16, 21 4437:24 4438:20 4441:18

negotiate 4271:13 4297:13 4355:17



negotiated 4251:7 4254:12

negotiating 4304:28 4356:18

negotiation 4356:20

negotiator 4320:1

neighborhood 4363:12

net 4248:4 4353:12 4354:21 4393:21 4395:15 4414:10, 12,14,17,19,21 4415:2 4417:26 4420:17 4429:6,7,8 4430:9,15

netted 4429:9

newer 4277:10 4314:11 4465:10,12,16

News 4439:1 4442:23 4443:6 4444:20 4447:13

NFDM 4435:12,16,18 4437:6,15,25 4438:2,22,26 4439:1,4,13,15,24,25,28 4440:3,16 4441:20

Nice 4425:26

nicely 4332:27

Nicole 4369:7

nodding 4446:13

non-co-op 4309:23

non-co-ops 4236:5 4310:20

non-cooperative 4420:9

non-members 4376:27 4377:1,16,17 4406:16

non-select 4418:2

non-shrink 4395:13 4403:2

non-traditional 4310:21

nonetheless 4335:3 4367:6

nonfat 4224:15 4226:19 4227:28 4228:6 4229:5 4230:11 4232:13,16,23 4235:8,12 4236:7,14 4237:7, 9,16,21 4238:4 4239:19 4243:27 4245:17,24,27 4246:4 4314:10 4330:4 4342:26 4370:22 4371:21 4372:12 4418:26 4435:11, 12,20,23,24,27 4436:4,7,12, 15,17,18 4437:1,3,23 4438:11,15,19 4440:10,14, 16,21,22,26,28 4441:13 4442:24 4445:11 4447:6 4469:21,26 4470:10,25 4472:21,22

normal 4256:26

Northeast 4298:12 4363:16, 19 4366:6,25 4374:16

note 4274:23 4424:28 4454:12 4456:12 4466:6

noted 4399:13 4434:4 4454:24

Notes 4256:15

notice 4416:23 4425:5,7 4436:8 4447:10

noticeable 4421:3

noticed 4340:10 4400:17 4420:16 4442:21

notion 4253:23 4258:20

November 4229:1

number 4221:21,26 4222:11 4223:12 4230:22 4231:2 4235:13,15 4238:2,27 4240:18 4244:15,17 4245:27 4246:9 4249:28 4250:1 4253:15 4257:9 4266:18 4276:13,16,24 4283:27 4284:10 4292:16 4294:7,26 4307:28 4310:12 4312:18 4339:27 4347:22 4351:24.26 4364:11,14 4377:15 4384:28 4386:11,23 4388:23 4400:16 4407:2 4409:19 4410:27 4413:20 4416:23 4418:20 4422:24 4425:8 4433:15 4434:19 4447:11,15,18,20, 21 4451:7,28 4452:3,6 4465:15 4466:28 4468:27 4469:1 4470:21 4472:14,15 4474:9

numbered 4434:16

numbers 4229:24 4230:19 4231:22 4236:9,17 4238:10 4239:17,25 4243:23 4244:11,12 4245:21 4246:6 4247:14 4251:8 4253:5,28 4257:20 4258:28 4276:11 4280:10.18 4281:26 4291:18 4294:1 4309:13,19 4322:17, 19 4323:2 4328:4 4330:5 4336:17 4337:5 4365:1 4369:19 4373:6 4379:20,21, 26,27 4380:4,7,11,12 4406:15 4416:15 4417:25 4420:16 4443:1 4447:13,25 4465:6 4466:7 4468:1 4469:22,23 4471:25 4473:20

numerator 4276:12

0

O'LAKES 4244:6,7,11 4245:15,20,26 4246:10,12

4291:16,20 4294:22

O'LAKES' 4246:16 4293:11

oath 4369:3 4433:21 4434:5 4451:12,20 4456:11 4468:15

Obispo 4457:13

objection 4409:17 4433:12 4467:20

objections 4337:2 4342:2 4386:9,21 4451:5 4466:26 4468:9

obligated 4455:21

obligation 4222:18 4355:20

observations 4315:26 4456:6,28 4457:14 4460:18 4461:13

observed 4391:16 4413:24 4417:18,22 4447:16 4456:19 4457:4

obtain 4453:11

obtained 4264:7

obtaining 4458:6

occasionally 4343:21

occur 4249:3 4348:6 4350:3, 7,21 4354:25 4357:21 4360:10 4380:20 4383:20 4394:24 4415:11,17,27

occurred 4352:6 4357:14

occurrence 4424:2

occurrences 4407:14 4417:5

occurring 4350:20 4425:8

occurs 4357:18 4360:11,14 4366:25

October 4308:6,27,28

off-the-record 4245:11 4368:11 4387:10 4475:15,17

offended 4290:3

offer 4349:5 4359:3 4415:16 4439:17 4450:24 4455:7 4456:9 4461:16

offered 4294:20 4346:3 4451:3 4456:11

offering 4264:9 4303:15 4343:18

official 4436:7 4447:10

offset 4222:23 4269:10

Ohio 4347:16 4377:24

oil 4389:7 4396:3

Oklahoma 4347:16

older 4277:9 4344:10 4465:10,12,16

on-farm 4351:1 4352:24

one's 4253:19 4378:27

one-page 4468:21

one-sixth 4248:19

one-third 4248:19

one-time 4251:6

one-year 4392:10

onerous 4322:26

ongoing 4416:12

online 4231:23 4358:12

oops 4320:23

open 4334:17 4372:2 4442:1

opened 4295:7 4348:20

operated 4465:1

operates 4411:20,21

operations 4240:16 4270:6 4347:6,8 4348:12 4350:5 4390:10 4406:3 4412:15 4413:10 4459:15

operators 4310:9 4318:21, 23

opinion 4303:8,17 4400:16 4415:16 4443:5

opinions 4302:7 4326:5

opponent 4305:7

opponents 4223:12 4455:21 4456:8

opportunities 4282:8 4289:9 4302:27 4316:2 4329:17

opportunity 4241:10 4263:13 4270:21 4301:10 4305:12 4312:28 4313:11 4314:18 4315:1,2,13 4323:9 4327:5 4418:13

opposed 4370:1 4473:9

opposing 4223:21

opposite 4302:25 4355:27

optimistically 4455:15

optimize 4416:22

optimizing 4457:15

option 4267:12 4311:26 4332:16



options 4266:15,20 4361:4

order 4224:18 4225:4
4227:5 4240:24 4248:12,17
4252:20 4254:26 4256:3,14
4258:6 4263:2 4264:25
4294:13 4296:12 4301:20
4305:4 4317:7 4318:2
4326:1,3,6,7 4327:2 4341:8,
15 4353:21 4361:27 4362:2,
3,5,7 4366:25 4377:11
4390:14,21,22 4396:1
4406:20 4410:7 4413:13
4432:3 4441:7 4455:4
4474:25 4475:5

orders 4250:11 4259:5 4263:17 4343:22 4349:16 4355:7,10,22,27 4356:9,14, 16,19,26 4357:1,3 4360:4,7

organization 4311:21

organized 4327:16

original 4289:4 4378:9 4467:11 4469:21 4473:10

originated 4452:28

originating 4413:19

outcome 4303:18 4400:16

outlet 4331:8

outlets 4333:8

outliers 4431:16 4432:4

outlined 4346:16 4383:25 4441:11 4442:13

outmoded 4353:5 4382:22

outright 4392:27

over-order 4240:22

overestimate 4264:6

overriding 4343:6

oversee 4389:8

overseeing 4412:3,17

oversight 4330:9 4412:9

overstated 4226:20

overvalued 4453:7

overview 4313:3 4377:28

overweighting 4291:2

owned 4267:16 4348:14,15 4433:1 4465:1

owns 4317:18

Ρ

packaging 4277:17,20,22

pages 4470:2

paid 4224:8 4240:22 4267:7 4270:19 4343:7 4345:23 4390:13 4413:12 4458:23

painful 4314:21,22

pandemic 4318:18 4439:8

paper 4416:13

paragraph 4265:20 4357:28 4358:1,4 4369:24 4378:21 4381:22 4382:18 4400:20 4403:19 4404:3,4,6 4405:13 4431:24,26

paramount 4344:17

part 4225:8 4229:28 4253:4 4255:1,23 4259:8 4263:5,10 4276:23 4280:3,8 4284:6,7 4299:8,17 4300:18 4301:26 4311:25 4329:5 4340:28 4346:22 4352:23 4365:15 4375:12 4382:15 4390:9 4395:27 4409:18 4413:10 4420:20 4428:3,5 4435:21 4441:11 4455:27 4457:17,19 4473:16,20

partial 4335:16

partially 4437:14

participants 4286:14,16 4311:11 4456:14 4459:9

participate 4264:25,28 4284:3,27 4286:20 4288:24 4289:14 4298:1,2,5 4306:15 4307:15 4375:9,13,19,21 4376:1,8 4463:26 4464:5,7

participated 4255:15 4278:12 4290:14,16,27 4293:1 4341:14 4376:6

participating 4230:23 4231:4 4330:4 4469:20 4471:2

participation 4230:3 4236:4 4290:15 4309:15 4310:16 4329:15

parties 4379:7 4467:18

partners 4459:14

partnerships 4456:1

parts 4459:17 4465:10

pass 4265:20 4431:21 4458:7

past 4223:10 4230:19 4233:17,19,21 4241:21 4242:11 4247:4 4255:27 4259:13 4302:2 4328:16 4402:22 4447:3 pause 4255:13 4339:19

pay 4223:20 4226:22 4240:26,27 4241:7,11,15 4259:13 4266:1,7,17,19,21, 28 4267:8,10,21 4296:1 4312:19 4317:19 4330:28 4345:19 4389:14,15 4396:13 4406:11 4450:1,16

paying 4241:12 4314:23 4450:14

payment 4266:4

PDF 4334:2 4338:22

pegged 4271:24

pending 4227:20

pennies 4262:12

Pennsylvania 4294:23

people 4233:23 4251:20 4256:26 4261:10 4266:9 4272:27 4279:2 4285:26,27 4286:3,13,15 4287:16 4288:4,6 4289:10 4292:14 4307:25 4311:26 4321:6 4322:8 4324:12,18 4332:11 4366:27 4463:20

percent 4238:19,21,26 4242:28 4245:21,22 4253:10 4254:8 4291:14 4293:14 4414:16 4430:6,19,25 4456:23 4465:25

percentage 4231:12 4232:1 4235:13 4238:21,25 4243:17 4244:1,2,26 4245:5 4246:17 4248:22 4249:3,7,12,16 4255:18 4263:25 4277:28 4278:1,2,6 4279:7 4292:11 4325:8 4351:20 4366:19,20 4382:3 4392:18 4406:27 4429:2 4439:15 4469:16 4470:25,26 4471:14,19,26 4472:2,17,19,22,25 4473:3,5

percentages 4249:10

percents 4292:14

perfect 4282:10 4316:19 4372:27

perfectly 4348:4 4362:24 4378:18 4402:13

perform 4340:14 4392:4 4398:20

performance 4412:15

performed 4227:2,16 4341:24 4390:4,16 4398:1 4413:4,15 4414:25 4427:16 4439:28 performing 4304:26 4308:14

period 4252:20 4291:15 4301:17 4327:19 4339:11 4383:7,8,10 4392:10,14,15 4409:4 4413:23,24 4414:26 4419:20 4425:8 4436:4,13 4439:21 4457:1

periods 4389:25 4458:13,15

permitted 4287:3

person 4285:10 4396:15 4424:27 4448:11 4460:4 4463:1

personal 4287:15 4303:12 4316:8

personally 4232:26 4308:3 4329:4 4364:1 4422:6 4432:20

perspective 4300:13,19 4313:3

petition 4256:5,6,8,26

phase 4248:6

phase-in 4250:26 4251:26

phasing 4252:25

philosophical 4359:14

philosophy 4226:25 4339:1 4349:15 4352:19 4438:24

phrase 4426:27

phrased 4449:27

pick 4332:11 4349:26 4365:28 4366:27

picked 4281:19 4351:1 4367:2 4408:20,21,22

picking 4357:20 4374:19

picks 4387:16

pickup 4350:1,5,6,8,11,12, 13,26 4352:14 4367:21 4375:7 4379:17 4385:9,18, 23,24 4391:5,7,8 4414:24 4428:24

pickups 4350:15,21 4351:2 4365:2 4366:22,26 4396:27 4429:1.3

picture 4329:26 4407:4

piece 4335:3,27 4383:24 4386:7

pieces 4235:19 4293:14

pinpoint 4465:15

piping 4349:27



place 4243:20 4253:13 4257:22 4289:28 4291:28 4299:7 4331:20 4332:27 4333:28 4348:13 4394:1 4396:22,27

places 4332:20 4369:27 4370:1,2,11,23,27 4377:23 4384:16,19 4423:17

plaintiffs' 4225:13

plan 4335:20 4412:5 4467:11

planet 4398:21

planning 4305:8,9

plans 4296:10 4378:22

plant 4222:27 4223:6,10 4227:10 4231:3 4237:27 4240:26 4260:14,17,20,24, 26 4261:4.28 4262:1 4266:13,16,23 4268:10,12, 19 4269:24 4270:5,9 4272:24 4277:7,9,13,14 4278:8 4279:21 4282:28 4283:12,25 4285:26 4289:11,21 4291:23 4295:8 4296:1.8.12 4297:5.11.14 4310:18 4311:18 4314:25 4320:21 4328:16 4329:11,19 4330:5,15,18,24 4331:25 4342:19 4345:14 4346:6 4347:28 4348:3,6,12,14,17, 21,22,25,27 4349:4,13,25 4350:17.23 4352:15 4354:17,19,21 4357:20,26 4360:23 4362:5,23 4372:2,3, 8 4378:3.17.22 4381:17 4385:2,4,5,15 4389:14,20,23 4390:1,3 4391:15,19,27 4392:18,19,21,22,26 4393:3, 5,11,16,18,25,28 4394:4,10, 12,14,20 4395:7,8,9,11,12 4397:9,11,18,25 4401:24,27 4402:21,23,27 4403:2,7,14 4406:6,8,22 4407:3,21 4408:5,6,9,13,17,26 4411:20.22.27 4412:1.27.28 4413:3,21,26 4414:3,5,7,8, 11,13,14,17,25 4415:14,17, 18 4417:8,23 4418:1,28 4419:3 4420:11 4421:4 4422:25 4423:4,9,15 4424:6 4426:19,21,23 4427:10,12, 14.19.20.23.24.26.27 4428:20 4431:2 4432:4,15, 17 4433:1 4445:15.19

4462:2,8,15 4471:4 plant's 4362:1 4428:20

plants 4230:23 4231:4 4234:14 4237:25 4241:27 4247:27 4261:2 4263:16

4448:26 4450:9 4460:15

4265:9 4266:2 4267:15,18 4268:4,6,7,9 4269:8,18 4277:9,21 4278:10 4279:15, 24,28 4280:1,25,26 4283:8, 13,15,23,24,27 4285:18,27 4286:22,24,28 4287:13,21 4288:23 4289:16,20 4290:20,24 4292:28 4294:22 4295:4,12,16,22 4297:7,12, 19,25 4298:4 4306:15 4310:19 4311:9,20 4315:5 4317:23 4322:14 4327:24 4328:17,18 4329:16,22 4330:4 4331:10 4332:3,10 4336:12 4342:21 4347:9 4348:16 4349:13 4356:17 4360:19,21 4361:18,22,24, 26 4366:4 4367:27 4371:9 4372:18 4378:23.28 4379:6. 11,13 4389:9,24 4390:28 4391:1,2 4392:16 4396:14 4403:12 4406:26 4407:16 4413:22 4414:1 4415:25 4416:7,8 4420:1,6,8 4422:22 4428:6,10,13,21 4430:9 4432:21 4433:1 4446:21 4449:23 4450:1,5 4455:25 4456:2 4459:22,25 4464:17, 22.25,27 4465:1,3,7,8,9,24, 26 4469:20,21 4470:11,18 4471:2,12

play 4249:1

pleased 4230:2,5 4251:23 4310:17

plenty 4335:18 4367:1

point 4234:21,26 4262:27 4271:18 4281:17 4284:8 4285:15 4292:8 4297:21,24 4299:12 4302:13 4307:12 4309:1 4320:3 4335:15 4336:28 4337:8 4343:16 4355:11 4357:25 4365:20 4380:7 4393:5 4397:20 4437:24 4461:12 4465:4

pointed 4467:23

points 4223:13 4303:24 4348:1 4359:17 4391:24 4392:3 4460:3,7,19 4472:17, 19

policies 4411:28

policy 4229:5 4288:27,28 4289:3 4304:27 4305:3,16 4306:6 4308:6 4326:1,3,6,7 4340:7,23 4341:6,7 4349:20 4352:4 4354:10,11 4361:10 4441:15,17 4442:17

polishers 4296:20

Polytechnic 4457:12

pool 4266:1,6 4267:7,8,22 4296:11 4297:15,19 4427:21

pooled 4266:16 4267:12 4268:10 4295:16,23 4297:11,12

pooling 4296:9 4301:22,23

popular 4334:14

port 4292:15

portion 4268:28 4346:17 4416:12 4420:7 4437:17

Portions 4459:20

position 4224:20 4254:22,23 4309:4 4334:5 4348:11 4356:13 4357:7 4362:10 4448:20,21

positions 4418:28

positive 4331:3 4393:13,15, 20 4394:11,12,15 4403:20 4408:5 4414:13 4429:13 4430:10

positives 4259:7

possess 4454:28 4455:1

possessed 4348:16

possibility 4458:6

possibly 4235:28 4266:22 4335:14 4466:3

potential 4349:26 4365:28 4417:17 4418:27

potentially 4255:14 4371:24 4374:5

pound 4245:23 4246:8 4258:14 4260:6,7 4263:12 4264:21 4265:4 4399:1 4436:6 4448:1

poundage 4242:26 4243:3

pounds 4234:1,11,27 4236:11 4239:9 4240:2 4242:20 4246:3,4,5,6 4278:27 4283:25 4287:23 4319:11 4329:19 4342:14 4347:18 4350:16,28 4378:5, 7 4392:13 4393:6,22 4394:16 4398:17,22 4399:2, 5 4400:21,25,27 4401:3 4416:17 4417:3,10,12,14 4423:7 4424:27 4431:9 4438:11,12,13,15 4440:10, 11,12,14

powder 4228:7 4294:1,5,13 4310:2 4329:23 4348:21 4371:18,22 4372:12 4435:13,24 4436:1,3,6,13, 15,18,20,25 4437:2,11,13, 18,22,27 4438:10,19,23,27 4439:19 4440:9 4441:17 4442:24 4445:8 4446:10,11 4447:28 4450:6,9,11,13

powders 4348:23

power 4356:17,20,21,23 4357:2,3,7

Powerpoint 4222:2,15 4274:19 4330:1 4467:25 4469:9

practicable 4352:25

practice 4233:17,20,21,28 4234:13 4456:28 4461:1

practices 4352:17,24 4418:10

Prairie 4267:3

precedence 4301:21

precedent 4247:13 4301:3

precedents 4301:19 4302:1

preceding 4453:12 4456:21

precipitation 4417:20

precise 4293:22 4353:20 4393:1 4441:6

Precision 4344:17

precludes 4455:6,18

predated 4262:22

predictable 4314:3

predominantly 4267:3

preface 4269:3

preferable 4229:24

preference 4370:16 4467:13

preferred 4287:18

premised 4354:12 4456:18

premium 4241:11,12

premiums 4240:22 4259:13 4333:12

prepare 4432:14

prepared 4222:1 4282:24 4388:6 4390:5 4413:6 4450:24 4467:6.12

preparing 4338:15 4355:25 4375:27 4396:19 4424:9

preponderance 4453:9,26

present 4222:3 4274:23 4289:9 4347:24 4349:2 4354:2 4358:12 4458:10 4467:3,6



presentation 4222:2,15 4274:9 4282:3 4300:22,24 4303:21 4467:25 4469:9

presented 4260:9 4274:19 4282:7 4326:7 4352:13 4353:19 4354:20 4370:14 4449:2 4453:20

presenting 4238:11 4432:27

presently 4360:4 4362:27 4446:23

presents 4346:14

president 4412:11

press 4239:22

pressures 4316:23

presume 4271:27 4378:2

presumed 4342:18 4438:16 4440:15

presumes 4450:2

pretend 4258:3 4275:26

pretending 4289:25

pretty 4262:18 4268:14 4294:20 4296:6 4312:26 4318:14 4329:7 4335:22 4396:26 4425:4 4431:10,11

prevailing 4224:17

prevalent 4352:2 4381:8

previous 4280:9 4282:5 4290:19 4313:24 4314:5 4346:10

previously 4243:11 4249:17 4327:22 4370:4 4386:15 4433:25 4434:23 4435:1 4451:16 4468:17

price 4222:18,19,21,25,26 4223:1.20 4224:13 4225:16 4226:4 4241:13 4246:8 4261:18 4262:8 4266:11,17 4268:21,22 4271:14,24 4294:8 4297:13 4298:27 4299:1,4 4300:12 4312:16 4313:9,18,20 4314:4,14,18, 24 4317:10,12,14,17,23 4319:17 4333:9 4344:24 4345:22 4348:10 4349:21 4353:8.18.21 4355:24 4357:11 4362:3,6,8 4367:24 4390:7,14 4413:8,14 4422:16 4435:22 4436:2.3.4. 15,16 4437:4,23,24 4438:19, 22,25,26 4439:3,22,23,27 4440:1,7,17,20,21,23,24,27 4441:1,3,4,5,6,7,22,24 4443:25 4446:16 4447:5,6 4449:20 4450:1 4454:1,11

4456:15 4458:5,17,25 4459:2.3

priced 4313:25,26 4362:2 4462:26

prices 4224:7,8,17,18,27 4225:5,11 4226:6,16,18,20 4242:1 4248:2,3 4258:17 4259:3 4262:1 4268:1 4269:11,12,15 4277:23 4314:1,2 4317:20 4331:27 4333:7 4343:7,15,16,17 4344:6,19,21 4345:18 4352:21 4353:15,17 4355:15,18,22 4356:18 4383:11,16 4390:12 4413:12 4436:8,12 4437:1,3,4 4438:28 4439:5,13,14,15 4440:17,19 4441:20 4443:24 4449:18 4454:12,14,17,19 4458:18,23

pricing 4223:24 4224:10 4225:26 4240:24,25 4241:5 4261:15 4262:22 4302:19 4343:23 4345:17 4349:20 4380:20 4383:17 4435:25 4436:19 4439:8 4449:16 4456:18 4457:24

primarily 4227:8 4228:1 4340:19 4379:4 4390:20 4426:15,16 4449:16

primary 4377:24

principal 4344:21 4415:20

principle 4343:6 4349:19

printed 4388:10

printout 4274:18

prior 4232:3 4282:22 4283:17 4301:13,14 4306:3 4341:19 4434:24 4435:3 4442:7,13 4443:23 4454:24 4474:13

private 4284:4 4296:6 4320:6 4325:4.13

privately 4230:4

probative 4455:18

problem 4312:22 4393:8 4401:26 4412:23 4425:5

problems 4415:27

procedures 4321:4 4391:13, 22 4411:28

proceed 4274:9 4306:27 4339:20 4444:11 4467:14 4475:2

proceeding 4227:28 4337:4 4338:9 4347:5 4433:14

proceedings 4341:15 4475:21

process 4256:3,8,13 4257:22 4258:2 4277:1,3,4,5 4288:7 4304:3 4314:25 4315:18 4316:7 4334:13 4357:20 4391:22 4416:3 4445:17

processed 4379:12,13 4389:18

processes 4344:26 4396:22

processing 4245:24 4294:5 4312:10 4339:2 4342:20 4343:9 4344:3 4345:9 4347:7 4348:15 4420:12,13

processor 4270:2 4312:15 4313:8 4315:1.12

processors 4222:25 4223:16 4247:25 4272:11 4312:19 4318:16 4321:12 4332:20 4356:16

produce 4222:26 4291:8 4347:17 4350:26 4371:16 4372:11 4373:21 4379:16 4380:22,27

produced 4239:25 4240:6,8 4265:5 4270:16 4281:3 4343:28 4350:24,25 4351:11,15 4379:15,16,24, 25 4380:1,6 4381:14,25 4389:11 4391:4 4413:18 4419:13

producer 4222:26 4224:27 4225:15 4265:21 4267:15 4315:17,24 4317:7,8 4340:24,27 4341:3 4343:22, 25 4344:2 4353:7 4355:7,14, 15,22,24,28 4356:5,10,27 4391:22 4395:2 4441:25 4448:26 4454:27 4458:20

producers 4225:22 4226:3,5
4260:1 4266:1,7,17,21,28
4267:7,10,21 4269:19
4296:11 4320:7 4333:8
4337:16 4340:3,15 4343:7
4344:17 4345:19 4346:7,20
4347:9 4348:12,26 4349:8
4352:10,23,25 4354:14,28
4355:19 4356:7,14 4357:3
4358:27 4360:15 4384:6
4389:2,15 4390:20 4396:14
4405:28 4406:1,11 4411:24
4414:21 4429:7 4435:10
4437:9 4450:17 4455:20
4458:23 4463:25

producers' 4345:4 4353:12 4357:6 4395:1

produces 4270:2 4348:23,

28

producing 4224:4,14 4225:9,22 4272:11 4343:8

product 4223:1,24 4224:12 4225:14 4248:2 4262:20 4263:19 4264:7 4265:5,27 4266:12,26 4270:11,23 4294:7 4300:11 4312:15 4322:28 4329:2 4333:19 4342:12 4343:23 4344:4 4345:7 4346:15 4349:20 4356:23 4357:23,24 4412:3, 6,12 4436:8 4437:19 4445:7 4446:16 4454:1 4473:18

product-price 4346:3

product-pricing 4225:1

production 4223:14,19,25 4224:23 4227:12 4230:10, 15,26 4231:1,2,3,5,6,8,10, 11.14.18.22 4232:2.11 4239:26 4240:5 4242:19 4255:15 4263:22 4273:2 4276:13,15 4278:5,7 4283:27,28 4291:2 4298:18 4306:16 4315:4 4339:5 4340:20 4345:2 4349:18 4350:27.28 4351:9.10.15.18 4352:6 4379:19 4380:11 4389:7 4391:23 4453:25 4455:26 4465:26 4469:17.25 4470:14,17,24 4471:4,10,12, 15,27 4472:22

productive 4474:17

productivity 4273:10

products 4222:27 4223:18, 26 4224:5,7,17 4225:3,5,12 4226:20 4229:7 4230:7,17 4232:12 4244:7 4255:19,26 4260:21 4261:7 4262:16,26 4263:1,17,26 4265:22 4266:10 4269:1 4270:9,16, 19 4272:11 4290:12 4293:23 4312:10 4314:9 4315:7 4340:21 4343:9,27,28 4345:5 4348:19 4349:1 4391:3 4418:28 4419:12 4470:1.7

profile 4271:28 4385:20,22,

profit 4226:23 4261:3,24 4312:21 4313:11 4314:18 4315:2,13,18,25 4316:3 4450:19

profitability 4240:14 4258:17 4260:17 4263:6 4270:5,11,15 4298:12

profitable 4316:13



program 4229:4 4316:27 4322:7,8 4418:25

programs 4268:14 4299:10 4330:20 4333:24,27 4343:21

progress 4258:24

prohibitions 4455:19

project 4353:25 4432:26

projection 4273:22

projections 4239:28 4273:10

projects 4305:2 4411:26

promoted 4343:12 4360:3

promoting 4352:20

prompt 4247:19

promulgate 4255:8

pronounced 4436:28

proper 4437:6,19,25 4438:4 4440:7

properly 4224:21 4345:4 4415:25 4435:16 4436:24

proponent 4305:7

proposal 4227:19 4230:1 4236:1 4245:5 4248:26 4251:2,3 4253:25 4257:3,9 4281:21 4292:17,19,23 4303:14,15 4305:7 4308:2, 25,27 4309:4 4327:18 4334:8.16 4336:4.6 4338:9 4341:11 4342:11,22,25,27 4343:3,14,18,19 4345:25 4346:16,22,27 4347:14 4353:8,14,26,28 4354:6 4357:11 4358:5 4366:3 4374:5 4378:1 4380:19 4388:7 4390:6,11,17 4411:9 4413:7,11,16 4433:19 4434:13 4435:10,15,18 4437:8,14 4439:14 4440:22, 25.28 4441:2.10 4443:21 4448:18 4450:25 4451:28 4452:18,19 4454:7,14,19 4457:18,19 4458:19,22 4460:8

proposals 4221:18 4301:21 4302:24 4303:16,20 4308:12 4340:9 4341:12 4343:4,5 4344:1,2 4346:26 4347:1 4376:3 4419:6,9 4458:14

propose 4241:17 4242:4 4335:6

proposed 4227:7 4240:13 4243:12 4244:23 4245:4 4248:6 4252:26 4257:12 4272:13 4334:18 4335:5 4344:4 4346:21 4468:11 4471:22

proposes 4346:25

proposing 4248:10 4249:7 4250:17 4251:14 4328:23 4373:6 4448:3

proposition 4358:6

proprietaries 4234:22

proprietary 4234:16 4266:16 4317:9 4455:5 4464:24

protect 4459:9,13

protection 4455:5,16

protein 4293:19 4342:24,28 4353:16 4370:9 4422:11 4452:21 4454:11

provide 4287:9,24 4338:1 4346:5 4347:5,11,25 4348:17 4349:4 4354:2 4355:3 4372:24 4388:11 4390:2 4394:26 4404:3 4406:8 4410:17 4412:19,22 4413:2 4427:17 4439:6 4446:19 4457:11 4463:20

provided 4235:18 4245:15, 20,21 4246:12 4291:21 4313:3 4372:22 4422:3 4426:6 4427:18 4439:9 4447:7,12,24 4449:5 4454:9, 15 4457:19 4458:13

providing 4300:11,19,25 4372:24 4404:4

prudent 4344:9

prying 4325:13

Publication 4351:5

publications 4457:6

publicly 4292:28

publish 4255:12

published 4227:9,12 4230:18 4233:13 4251:8 4436:8 4447:10

publishes 4442:23

pull 4284:19 4285:3 4424:13.14

pulled 4286:7 4392:9

pulling 4424:24,25

pulls 4402:2,3

punctuation 4339:9,12

purchase 4373:24 4406:17 4419:3 4433:5

purchased 4379:5 4381:14, 15,18,20 4428:18

purchasers 4428:2

purchases 4373:21 4379:8, 10 4385:16

purchasing 4366:5 4465:3

pure 4442:25 4450:19

purely 4269:8

purpose 4287:7 4355:27 4357:10 4390:11 4413:6,11 4432:15

purposes 4419:24 4463:19

push 4367:15

put 4243:20 4245:26 4251:15 4253:25 4263:11,23 4265:21 4289:25 4291:28 4293:17 4297:2 4300:23 4312:27 4322:17 4327:6 4328:25 4375:1,2 4381:4 4398:19 4407:2 4423:21 4427:8,9 4446:10 4450:28 4467:12 4468:1,21

putting 4333:18 4374:25 4460:23

Q

qualified 4435:1

qualifies 4336:10

qualify 4341:27

quality 4315:7 4391:24

quantity 4264:7 4438:6 4440:6 4443:9

quarterly 4423:11

question 4226:26 4231:28 4263:14 4264:22 4268:8 4269:4,5 4290:6 4299:3,20, 22 4300:18 4310:3 4315:28 4317:2 4323:26 4335:9,10 4344:11 4364:27,28 4368:2 4371:20,27 4375:22 4377:12 4379:22 4380:27 4384:11 4386:18 4395:22 4405:8 4406:10 4407:10,19 4408:4 4430:12 4431:3,21 4444:24, 26 4446:27 4448:17 4449:26 4460:26 4463:9

questioning 4401:14 4425:15 4443:27

questions 4259:22 4260:12 4274:8,9 4280:28 4287:17 4290:19 4291:7 4300:2 4326:15,25,26 4339:19 4342:9 4346:18 4355:3

4359:4,5,14 4361:9 4364:22 4368:6 4372:22 4376:21 4384:8,26 4385:3 4386:7 4388:16 4401:10,15,21 4402:11,13 4403:16 4404:28 4405:2,27 4407:27 4408:25 4411:15 4418:15 4422:26 4426:3,8,11 4429:19,20,28 4432:12 4433:9 4441:28 4442:1 4443:28 4444:18 4445:22,23,24 4448:12 4449:11 4452:16 4458:9 4461:17,18 4463:8 4464:8,9 4466:5,21,24 4474:4

quick 4230:9 4235:26 4245:9 4257:21 4363:11 4407:26

quickly 4467:4

quit 4320:24

quotas 4299:9

quote 4222:22 4224:25 4226:17 4227:6 4274:23 4345:16 4435:28 4447:3,28 4453:1,11,23 4454:6 4456:22

quoted 4244:15 4295:22 4447:22

quotes 4223:28

quoting 4226:8

R

R]ecognizing 4435:28

radio 4253:12

raise 4248:1 4256:9 4328:3 4337:18 4357:11 4387:1 4409:24

raised 4317:26 4376:13 4475:7

Randall 4410:19

random 4283:8,11,19

range 4237:27 4294:21 4350:15 4392:2 4404:3,10 4423:10,12,13,15,16,17 4429:12,15,17 4442:24 4443:2

ranges 4349:13 4378:23 4453:15

Rapids 4425:2

rare 4424:2

rarely 4255:6 4423:3

rate 4253:7 4286:9 4354:25 4383:20



rates 4253:10

rational 4456:10

rationale 4339:1 4347:12

4442:12

rationalize 4360:17

raw 4225:3,4,6 4264:7 4344:27 4450:10

RBCS 4228:1

reach 4307:27

reaching 4272:18 4297:24

reaction 4233:22,24

read 4230:3 4243:23 4247:6, 10 4253:8 4259:17 4275:19, 24,25 4283:5 4338:12,26 4339:4,10 4342:6 4359:14 4378:12,24 4382:22 4388:11 4395:4 4411:11 4434:24 4435:6 4442:3 4447:9

readily 4249:21

reading 4346:16 4369:13 4383:1 4400:3

reads 4338:25 4381:24 4397:9.18 4447:4

ready 4254:1 4376:12 4444:7 4445:26,27

real 4252:28 4254:18 4259:14 4265:26 4266:4 4320:20 4345:14 4379:27 4438:20

Realistically 4392:24

realities 4343:8 4438:25 4439:26 4454:23

reality 4258:22 4327:26 4345:28 4367:8

realize 4346:9 4360:23 4415:12

realized 4385:28 4425:11

realm 4303:20

realtime 4416:6

reason 4239:2 4324:28 4326:1 4334:7 4365:19 4370:12

reasonable 4224:11 4227:14 4252:6 4351:11,26 4353:25 4381:25 4449:4

reasoned 4225:22 4251:23 4304:8 4345:2 4354:7 4453:1

reasoning 4281:1 4345:7 4437:15 4453:22

reasons 4241:21 4264:27 4265:1,14 4272:27 4273:9 4297:17 4309:11 4310:15 4325:5 4329:4,14 4330:16 4394:25 4406:8 4408:19 4415:20 4420:1 4422:24 4428:13 4431:2

reblends 4268:8

recall 4250:7 4270:1 4272:9 4279:16 4282:27 4283:3 4323:19 4339:14 4377:14 4450:8 4465:27

recalling 4221:7

recap 4448:18

receipt 4389:20 4397:12,21

receipts 4267:5 4342:20 4348:18 4349:4 4354:19 4385:2 4389:9 4420:28 4428:14,20 4432:16

receive 4223:17 4269:9 4285:1 4345:20 4349:7 4356:24 4358:20 4412:17

received 4226:3 4337:6 4345:12,23 4347:8 4358:24, 25 4379:12 4386:11,23 4389:17,23 4409:19 4412:20,27 4416:12 4418:2 4421:15 4430:23 4433:15 4451:7 4466:28 4474:9

receiver 4398:19

receives 4378:27

receiving 4345:13,18 4385:4,6 4389:14 4391:18 4401:25 4412:2,14,23 4420:8 4423:28

recent 4229:3 4235:10 4351:19 4371:8

recently 4295:7 4304:17 4371:4

recipes 4275:25

recipient 4375:17

recitation 4242:19

recited 4438:10

recognition 4457:28

recognize 4261:18 4334:15 4352:5 4372:23 4435:3 4449:1 4461:9

recognized 4457:26

recognizes 4437:8 4458:1

recognizing 4352:1 4439:27

recollect 4249:18 4459:23

recollection 4283:7 4326:28 4459:26

recommend 4253:28 4305:25

recommendation 4310:23

recommended 4250:21 4287:27 4288:14 4301:14,15 4302:12 4345:1,12 4453:1,5

recommending 4251:6 4261:16,17

reconcile 4396:11

reconciliation 4412:18,19

reconciliations 4347:28 4420:21 4423:25

reconciling 4396:15

reconsidered 4346:11

record 4221:2,3 4226:5 4228:8 4233:2 4239:22 4242:9,14 4244:2 4245:10, 12 4274:4,16 4281:27,28 4284:24 4303:25 4304:1 4323:1,5,6 4326:20 4337:4, 27 4338:2 4345:26 4346:27 4348:13 4350:4 4354:7 4358:9 4363:4 4369:7 4384:13 4386:10,22 4387:8, 19,23 4409:18 4410:14,18 4411:11 4425:21 4429:8 4430:2 4433:13 4434:4 4436:2,5 4447:4 4449:2 4453:10,23 4454:27 4460:24 4466:16,27 4474:7 4475:14, 16

record's 4400:7

records 4223:10 4311:23 4389:17 4416:10

recouped 4225:23,26

recover 4267:28 4453:8 4462:15

recovered 4222:28 4332:26

recoveries 4455:2,8 4456:14 4457:10,14,27 4459:21

recovery 4452:19,20,27 4453:4,11,14,16,18,19,22, 24,28 4454:5,17 4455:23 4456:9,23,24 4457:4,6,16,21 4458:18 4460:5 4462:20 4464:4,19 4465:20,24

red 4467:9

redirect 4336:27 4384:4 4407:27 4408:1 4432:9 4449:13 4468:19

redo 4310:12

reduce 4344:28 4354:5 4362:8 4367:19 4374:18 4381:4 4454:19

reduced 4268:1

reducing 4345:3,6

reduction 4354:10

reductions 4269:10 4342:16

refer 4264:20 4435:12,13

reference 4228:22 4257:24 4279:14 4457:7 4461:7 4465:28 4469:28

referenced 4222:19

references 4474:1

referencing 4404:10 4447:18

referred 4275:28 4281:7 4389:21

referring 4273:15,16 4330:7 4403:19 4404:11 4431:26

refers 4366:22

reflect 4223:5 4224:13,15 4225:15 4226:1,21 4236:9, 18 4256:9 4264:3 4272:8 4274:4 4302:14,20 4303:3 4343:7,20 4345:3,4,9 4360:18 4367:18 4414:13 4437:7,18 4438:25 4441:27 4452:21 4454:1,23 4473:27

reflected 4224:4 4225:10 4236:19 4245:16 4246:22 4303:19 4338:21 4453:18 4454:8

reflecting 4342:28 4343:1 4393:11 4394:10 4438:7 4440:7

reflective 4328:20 4360:13 4454:3

reflects 4329:21 4363:5,9 4367:27 4453:27 4458:21,22

reform 4227:5 4256:14 4302:11 4305:4 4327:2

Reg 4225:12

regard 4282:21

regular 4390:10 4413:10 4424:15

regularly 4350:9 4390:8 4413:9 4415:5,23

regulated 4224:8 4240:26 4266:17 4289:17 4297:23,27 4317:14,23 4319:17 4322:21



regulation 4292:7 4298:5 4315:8 4320:4 4384:19

regulations 4255:9 4298:1, 3,13 4318:6 4341:9 4366:12

regulators 4309:7

regulatory 4223:3,5 4276:6 4296:23 4300:26

regulatory-wise 4334:23

rehash 4372:21

reinvest 4247:27 4267:9,19, 26 4295:3

rejects 4454:4

related 4342:11 4391:24 4392:5 4411:27 4412:15 4435:11 4452:19

relating 4234:17

relations 4340:3 4389:27 4412:26

relationship 4227:10 4238:16 4266:15 4430:18 4438:22,26 4440:2 4441:19, 23 4447:16 4454:18 4458:24 4459:3

relationships 4443:13,15

relative 4263:23 4269:15 4356:13,23 4357:2

released 4351:18

relevant 4226:13 4390:2 4413:2 4438:1 4439:14 4455:8,12

reliability 4443:6

reliable 4258:12 4393:25 4421:2.5 4443:7 4444:21

relied 4228:15 4229:12 4235:19 4238:23

relies 4229:18

reloaded 4426:21 4427:2

rely 4228:11 4283:20

relying 4283:18 4453:14

remain 4395:15

remainder 4391:18 4413:28

remaining 4251:16 4385:12 4393:26

remains 4345:28 4357:7 4416:13 4441:24 4456:10 4470:14

remarkable 4318:27

remarkably 4234:23 4262:9,

10

remember 4249:26,28 4250:1 4277:25 4283:6

remembering 4262:15

remind 4305:15

reminded 4388:26

reminder 4302:1

remotely 4272:8 4450:5

removal 4347:10 4437:27

remove 4354:27 4400:7

removed 4393:26

removes 4342:22

removing 4393:9 4394:8 4436:25

rented 4236:24

repairs 4267:9

repeat 4365:7 4428:16

repeated 4264:23

report 4230:24,27 4232:7,8, 28 4233:13,14 4236:19 4238:12 4240:4 4246:27,28 4278:3,18 4283:1,18 4287:7 4288:23 4290:20 4291:22 4320:23 4321:8,27 4350:27 4355:26 4391:15 4392:9,11, 17,25 4395:6 4397:11 4406:22 4413:22 4443:6 4469:19 4472:3,9,11,21,28 4473:3,5,8

reported 4272:18 4278:22 4280:10 4321:8,13,15,23,24 4322:1 4392:19,21,22 4393:3,4,6,11 4394:9 4395:9 4397:9,20 4406:6 4414:11 4437:3 4438:28 4439:1 4443:2 4462:21

reporter 4264:17 4271:7 4274:10 4300:16 4342:7

reporting 4314:4 4320:16, 21,24 4321:6,9,17 4322:14, 25 4392:27 4415:1 4423:23 4455:11,12

reports 4232:27 4242:18 4273:17 4282:23 4391:19 4394:5 4412:18,19 4413:17,

repository 4397:2

represent 4225:24 4276:12 4293:12 4359:11 4369:7 4394:27 4401:18 4414:14 4418:11 4420:6 4434:12 representation 4283:15 4309:17

representative 4286:1 4287:14 4439:7

representatives 4343:21

represented 4286:23 4336:13 4407:16

representing 4260:1 4337:16 4384:6 4393:22 4394:17 4408:3 4453:4

represents 4281:15 4286:28 4393:14 4451:27

request 4234:24 4287:28 4288:20 4309:2,26

requested 4287:9

require 4226:22 4412:13 4441:10

required 4240:25 4266:19 4297:14 4353:27 4391:9

requirement 4267:6,8

requirements 4331:12

requiring 4251:20

research 4304:1 4308:19 4457:5.13

research-based 4235:28 4303:28

reserve 4402:13

residual 4350:14

resolution 4225:20

resolve 4331:18

resolved 4426:9

resource 4447:1

respect 4230:20 4232:6,23 4236:14 4238:2,3,10 4282:27 4325:18 4349:15 4394:7 4402:16 4420:19 4421:15 4427:7 4443:20 4455:16 4460:22 4470:8

respects 4459:8

respondent 4287:23

response 4276:7 4286:9 4290:18 4444:19

responses 4372:22

responsibilities 4340:7 4412:13

responsible 4389:8,10 4391:6 4412:7 4418:19,24

rest 4365:17 4466:20

4469:23 4475:2

restore 4438:4

restored 4438:13 4440:12

restrained 4258:15

restricting 4299:10

resubmitted 4330:11

result 4226:16 4237:13 4239:10 4249:24 4256:2,4 4343:17 4348:16 4350:1 4353:4,14 4378:8 4382:21 4397:14 4400:8 4403:22 4418:10 4438:9 4440:8 4453:6 4454:13,14,25

resulted 4232:7 4320:16 4355:18 4416:4 4469:18

resulting 4342:23 4352:21 4445:7

results 4255:12 4256:4 4283:6 4287:11 4293:8 4306:19,21,27 4307:4 4310:13 4311:3,6 4362:18 4369:26 4370:5 4405:10 4414:11 4438:17 4444:27

retail 4263:4 4412:8

retake 4467:27

retaking 4474:14

retention 4453:3 4456:19 4460:6 4461:9

retire 4266:3

retired 4247:21

return 4236:10 4312:9 4326:27 4327:1

reveal 4306:27

revealed 4306:20 4309:28 4416:24

revenue 4223:27 4266:11.24

revenues 4270:10

reversed 4345:6

review 4447:3

reviewed 4343:10 4393:26

reviewing 4415:14 4424:19

revised 4338:22 4339:18

revisions 4346:15

revisited 4438:26

rid 4332:7

ride 4408:22

right-hand 4429:5 4468:22



rising 4273:4,6

risk 4247:25 4252:21 4272:18 4291:1 4304:28 4334:10 4335:12,17 4336:3 4350:2 4366:3,9 4418:25 4419:7

road 4338:3 4424:13

roads 4363:28

robust 4232:17 4235:5 4282:12 4289:7 4314:11

robustness 4235:3

role 4304:22,25 4305:3 4306:3,4 4343:22 4355:6,10 4412:1,7 4432:20

roles 4304:20 4340:19

room 4256:12 4284:12 4292:23 4305:1 4319:23,24 4328:11 4332:4 4426:1

Rosenbaum 4221:5,14,20, 28 4222:8,13 4245:13 4259:20 4272:16 4279:14 4285:2 4336:28 4467:19,20 4468:20,26 4469:3,6,7 4474:2.11.12 4475:5.12

Roswell 4387:27

rough 4328:9

roughly 4235:8 4246:4 4278:26 4279:3 4287:1,23

round 4384:18,20 4475:5

rounded 4369:27 4370:11, 23 4384:22

rounding 4369:28 4370:6,27

route 4349:23

routes 4350:3 4352:14 4366:27 4385:13 4414:24 4428:24 4430:17,19

row 4397:8,18 4420:4

ruin 4247:25

rule 4227:7 4278:27 4321:13 4452:28 4453:12

rulemaking 4226:5 4255:24 4256:2 4258:3,4

rules 4257:28 4301:23 4321:27 4322:13

rulings 4300:26

run 4246:6 4277:21 4305:13 4320:14 4340:22 4466:6

running 4332:4

Rural 4228:2,16

Ryan 4260:1 4274:6 4324:22 4337:15 4384:6 4408:3

S

S-T-E-H-O-U-W-E-R 4410:16

sadly 4319:26

safe 4372:17,19

sake 4281:23 4370:18

sakes 4312:4

sale 4260:6 4266:11 4314:4 4341:2 4418:28 4433:4 4450:2

saleable 4446:16

sales 4262:1 4264:2 4265:22 4266:25 4267:5 4271:24 4332:24 4349:3 4379:2,4,8 4411:18 4412:3,6,7 4432:28 4439:18 4455:12

sample 4283:8,11,19 4289:8 4306:17 4373:9

samples 4391:10

sampling 4258:28 4372:28

San 4457:13

sand 4289:26

Saputo 4299:3

Saputo's 4296:19

save 4375:2 4466:5,20

saves 4296:28

saving 4369:13

scale 4374:13,25 4391:11 4392:24 4397:25 4399:3 4402:2,3,6,24 4406:1 4407:2,3 4408:9 4413:21 4415:19,22 4416:1,28 4417:11 4421:3 4422:27 4423:1,9,15,16 4424:21 4431:1

scaled 4415:18

scales 4353:2 4382:19 4391:8,10 4415:22,25 4417:9 4423:7

scaling 4416:25

scenario 4333:5 4366:14 4374:16

scenarios 4340:25

schedule 4253:27 4328:5

scheduled 4391:5

Schiek 4226:28 4227:1

4237:1,4,14 4238:3,5,12,23 4239:21,24 4240:5 4242:8, 13 4246:27 4273:9,19 4280:11 4282:15,20 4288:2, 4 4289:4 4328:23

Schiek's 4239:27 4241:22 4273:21 4280:18 4281:8,24 4303:23

Science 4461:1

scope 4390:14 4413:14 4439:10

screen 4247:7

seal 4265:27

Secretary 4225:21,28 4226:2 4301:28

section 4264:8 4266:9 4338:28 4363:2 4369:11

seeking 4223:4 4239:15 4328:26

seeks 4327:18

Select 4260:1 4337:16 4340:3,8,9,14,26 4341:17, 19,25 4346:19,25 4347:5,22, 24 4348:2,10,13,16,20,25 4349:2,8 4350:1 4353:28 4354:6,14 4355:23 4358:1,6, 27 4362:10 4365:23 4367:4, 7 4371:4.10.19 4373:21 4375:9,12,13,21,23 4376:1, 6,8,24 4377:9,18,22 4378:26,27 4379:2,6 4384:6 4389:2,5,6,12 4390:5,18,19, 27 4391:4,5,19,21,26,27 4392:10,14,15,20 4395:5,23, 27 4396:8,10 4397:10,11,14 4404:24 4405:28 4406:16 4408:3 4409:3,6 4411:24 4413:28 4414:20,23 4416:4 4417:27 4418:4 4428:15,18, 23 4429:6,9 4432:25,28 4435:9 4438:4 4446:22 4453:13 4454:21,27 4455:17,22,25,26,28 4456:3 4457:10 4459:8,13 4460:4, 11,15,19,23 4463:13,14,26 4464:17 4465:2,3 4475:7

Select's 4343:4 4344:1,3 4346:28 4347:8,9,15,26 4349:11,13,15,28 4352:19 4354:20,23 4362:15 4372:25 4377:4 4378:22 4388:7 4389:16,26,27 4390:6,8,11, 25 4391:6,12,13,14,18 4392:26 4400:9 4406:5,21 4411:8 4412:25 4413:7,11 4427:23,27 4432:22 4435:15 4437:8,14 4438:23 4446:8 4448:23 4451:28 4452:19 4456:3 4458:14 4460:8 4475:2

Select-1 4338:6 4339:25

Select-2 4388:2.21

Select-3 4410:23

Select-4 4434:7,16

Select-6 4451:22 4452:3

selected 4439:6 4456:23

selecting 4306:25

selection 4282:28

Select's 4342:19,22 4343:3

sell 4298:20 4299:4,6 4312:15 4313:9 4314:17 4332:8 4333:8,18 4420:13 4446:11 4449:25

seller 4356:23

selling 4262:11 4267:15 4287:16 4317:9,22 4341:3 4426:23

sells 4278:11 4317:22

semi 4416:25,26 4424:15

send 4299:7 4332:7,27 4420:28

senior 4340:2 4347:24 4389:1

sense 4237:22 4239:2 4240:12 4289:25 4316:19 4328:10 4333:3 4334:23 4356:26 4378:25

sentence 4264:20 4265:19, 25 4339:10 4369:23,24 4378:21 4381:24,27 4382:23 4428:22 4431:24

sentences 4378:24

separate 4276:6 4350:12 4442:26

separated 4394:19 4399:12 4405:10 4444:28

separately 4229:20

SEPTEMBER 4221:1 4369:1

sequential 4339:23

series 4343:24 4439:3 4463:8

serve 4307:14 4348:26

Service 4228:2,16 4436:9

SESSION 4221:1 4369:1

set 4223:13 4224:18,20,21 4226:25 4235:23 4238:17 4239:13 4243:2 4245:23

Index: rising..set



4250:26 4282:12 4301:3,18 4302:20 4313:10 4319:6 4344:10 4381:28 4398:15 4401:28 4402:24 4405:11 4414:28 4435:21 4436:22

sets 4312:17

setting 4287:7 4303:26 4437:15

settlement 4389:22,25

seven-person 4389:8

sewer 4330:27 4331:14

shadowbox 4455:21

shape 4305:8

share 4231:9,18 4232:11 4259:9 4263:25 4286:26 4287:2,3 4308:3,10 4325:6 4381:19 4470:24

shared 4374:24 4416:6

shares 4232:10 4469:25

sharing 4292:15 4308:9

shed 4385:6

ship 4349:28 4352:10 4355:1 4380:23 4381:9

shipment 4389:13

shipments 4342:20 4346:9 4347:6,8,27 4352:2,4,13,16 4354:19 4389:23,28 4391:23,26,28 4392:1,2,10, 12,18 4393:26,27 4397:3,10 4403:26 4414:23 4416:5 4417:27 4418:2 4419:20 4420:3 4428:24

shipped 4347:21 4348:2 4384:27 4392:14,15

shipping 4350:19 4367:28

short 4263:18

short-hold 4262:5

show 4230:22 4261:7 4349:12 4352:15 4367:9 4378:21 4400:12 4417:25 4423:18 4432:15 4433:4 4443:18 4445:5 4458:16

showed 4246:14 4259:1 4304:4 4393:15,17 4394:12, 13 4403:13

showing 4222:16 4403:20 4458:16

shown 4258:25 4473:10

shows 4407:3 4414:16 4448:25

shrink 4342:12 4344:14 4345:26 4346:21 4347:4,11 4348:7 4349:6,10,12,22 4352:18,22,25,27,28 4354:3, 5,11 4360:10 4378:22 4386:1 4393:22 4397:15 4398:5,6 4400:1,4 4417:25 4418:4,18 4422:15 4448:23 4452:26

shrinkage 4345:3,27 4346:1 4352:1,9

shuttle 4401:25

sic 4225:12 4409:16

side 4268:2 4310:16,17 4328:13 4340:27 4341:2 4349:5 4381:23 4385:2 4419:3 4432:27,28 4460:20 4465:12 4466:2 4469:14

sides 4265:13

significant 4236:21 4248:9 4250:2 4256:20 4259:7 4265:2 4273:19 4335:12,20 4348:15 4352:17 4391:2,15 4396:27 4406:22,25 4416:12 4418:9 4425:5,7 4431:16

significantly 4223:15 4232:16 4280:21 4421:23

silo 4421:26 4422:12.22

silos 4415:7 4422:19

similar 4237:17,18 4242:24 4255:25 4260:8 4265:10 4271:21,22,25,28 4276:25 4277:2,4,5,6,16 4301:24 4341:25 4348:28 4353:5 4382:25 4394:6 4399:25 4402:16 4416:8 4417:25 4421:11

similarly 4260:20 4279:5 4300:22 4302:17 4411:22 4471:1

simple 4239:20 4242:3,7 4257:8 4268:21,22 4319:26 4320:20,24 4322:27 4443:12

simplicity 4281:23

simply 4231:2 4245:22 4246:21 4252:23 4257:25 4259:12 4268:21 4288:22 4291:2 4309:16 4317:2 4333:26 4337:1 4416:16 4424:22

single 4229:6 4234:23 4350:13 4374:25 4385:8,18, 23 4389:11 4417:13,27 4420:2

sir 4337:13 4342:10 4387:17 4388:3,5 4398:7 4399:27

4400:11 4433:22 4445:3 4461:22

sister 4348:25

situation 4436:27

situations 4421:14

sixth 4248:13

size 4227:10 4237:25 4278:8,24 4283:12,13 4287:22 4289:21 4298:17 4310:18 4316:11,15,18 4317:13,14 4329:19 4349:28 4353:10 4363:15 4367:7 4372:28 4373:9,22,24 4374:7 4381:16 4382:4 4384:28 4430:19,23

sizes 4237:28 4283:15

skew 4237:26 4283:24 4287:19 4400:15 4402:6

skewed 4279:15 4280:4 4398:2

skews 4283:22

skim 4308:20 4336:7 4371:21 4372:12 4436:2,15 4437:23 4444:27

slide 4235:1 4247:10 4274:21 4275:21,28 4276:9 4279:11,13 4280:14 4281:7 4291:7 4293:11 4330:1

slides 4247:9 4274:19

slightly 4291:25 4371:2 4414:22 4417:28 4473:9

slip 4413:20

slower 4277:1

slows 4268:25

Slyke 4456:17,19,27 4457:3, 5 4461:2.4

small 4255:22 4268:28 4278:20 4287:20,21 4299:8 4316:10 4318:2,7,11 4330:21 4336:10 4338:16 4343:11 4348:14 4352:3 4362:26 4363:19 4364:14 4366:11,13 4377:6 4381:19 4398:11 4420:7 4445:1,5

smaller 4267:14 4279:22 4316:5,24 4318:24 4319:9 4336:21 4360:22 4363:27 4364:20 4366:6,7,10,16 4373:28 4381:10,19 4414:28 4424:11,12 4427:21 4430:22

smart 4272:28 4273:1 4305:25

SNF 4445:2,5

snow 4417:6,9,10,11,13,17 4424:28 4425:11

snowstorm 4425:7

software 4391:21 4396:7 4416:4.8

sold 4222:20 4223:26 4266:12 4270:19 4271:2 4313:24 4321:23 4389:11 4391:1 4409:11 4439:25 4450:9

solely 4239:3

solid 4345:13

solids 4234:1,12,27 4236:11 4244:14 4246:1 4293:19,20 4309:24 4329:2,13 4338:26 4339:11 4342:14,18 4354:24,26 4383:21 4415:6, 11,13 44417:24 4422:17 4435:12,16,20,23,25,27 4436:15,17,18 4437:10,17, 23 4438:5,6,11,12,13,15,19 4440:6,10,11,13,14,16,21, 23,27,28 4441:16,18,27 4443:9 4445:20 4450:14 4466:2

solution 4261:22

solutions 4374:26

someone's 4468:3

someplace 4257:18

something's 4421:3

sooner 4289:23,26

sort 4238:8 4365:24 4375:4 4397:3 4403:21 4404:2,4 4406:27

sought 4365:23 4438:4 4463:14

sound 4272:20

sounds 4271:17

source 4223:27 4432:17 4443:7 4444:21 4446:22 4471:21

sources 4235:19 4347:12 4473:24

South 4330:25

Southeast 4377:11,25

Southwest 4348:27,28 4349:3,7,12 4390:21 4409:8 4411:19,21,23 4412:4,7,19, 28 4413:10 4415:5,23 4416:13,21 4417:7,22,25 4418:6,20 4419:10,13

Index: sets..Southwest



4424:5 4432:21

space 4331:15,21,24

speak 4229:15 4297:10 4336:20 4367:13 4379:2,5 4387:15 4402:4 4446:22 4448:11 4465:21

speaking 4462:12

speaks 4448:6

spec 4278:13,21

specialize 4299:12

specialty 4263:17,24 4271:1 4318:8

specific 4236:22 4254:6 4285:26 4295:19 4367:23 4380:15,18 4392:1

specifically 4231:21 4273:16 4279:5 4282:13 4310:27 4330:14 4336:4 4371:28 4375:11 4377:14 4378:26 4418:5 4427:5 4437:16 4448:8,28 4463:5

specifics 4426:22 4450:8

spectrum 4310:19

speculate 4297:1

speculation 4237:28

speculative 4291:6 4456:5

spell 4337:26 4387:18 4410:13

spend 4304:27 4402:12

spent 4336:2 4367:16 4372:14

spillage 4349:26 4365:28

split 4421:6

spoke 4428:17 4448:18

spot 4274:11 4331:27 4390:28

spots 4384:23

spread 4233:28 4234:11 4294:6 4298:24 4436:28

spring 4307:23 4331:19 4332:5

square 4417:13

squeeze 4273:11 4474:23

stabilize 4356:22

stabilizing 4357:6

stacks 4379:21

staff 4322:6 4325:14 4340:8

4390:5 4391:17 4413:5

staggered 4248:6 4327:28 4335:5

stair-step 4239:16

stale 4344:14

stand 4260:8 4261:24 4337:17 4386:13,28 4433:18 4467:28 4474:14

standard 4233:27 4246:3 4347:20 4363:10 4417:12

standing 4467:22

standpoint 4267:19

stands 4346:27

start 4231:28 4233:7,10 4256:2,7 4260:2 4300:10 4359:13 4364:25 4369:16 4425:28 4426:18 4444:17,26 4458:8 4465:5 4466:13 4467:13 4468:8

started 4282:20 4320:13 4321:28 4323:14 4332:24 4396:8,15 4466:9,18

starting 4334:19 4437:24

starts 4288:28

state 4240:12 4269:4 4320:14 4337:26 4387:18 4406:5 4410:13 4437:7 4442:12 4448:28 4449:21 4457:12

state-of-the-art 4348:21 4371:4

stated 4243:16 4272:16 4345:11 4355:11 4408:6 4420:19 4421:24 4438:20 4443:12 4453:2,6 4459:24, 26 4467:21

statement 4260:3 4264:5,6, 10,23 4272:4,5 4274:8 4275:14,15 4276:1 4282:2 4338:12 4339:18 4342:7 4357:13 4366:21 4388:10,12 4392:7 4397:17 4401:9 4433:20 4435:7 4442:4

statements 4261:1,24 4275:15 4355:12 4454:24 4467:3

states 4320:14 4322:25 4350:25 4471:27

statistical 4353:20 4441:6

statistics 4379:17 4381:28 4436:9

statute 4258:2

stay 4254:11

stayed 4301:22 4370:10

Stehouwer 4349:4 4371:27 4394:25 4408:7 4409:23,25 4410:4,15,23 4411:3,17 4418:14 4432:11

stem 4354:16

step 4239:18 4386:13 4409:21

Stephenson 4226:28 4227:15,21 4229:19,28 4230:22 4232:8,22 4233:5, 13 4234:17 4236:3 4237:13, 20 4238:2,5,11,22,24 4239:21,24,28 4240:4 4242:8 4246:28 4252:10 4273:19 4278:7 4280:11 4283:18 4285:11 4288:3,5, 24 4293:13,14,15 4303:23 4309:5,6,12,14 4312:18 4323:12 4328:22 4365:24 4463:21,26 4469:18,19 4470:6 4471:7,20,26,28 4472:3 4473:17

Stephenson's 4230:24,27 4232:6 4236:10,18 4243:3 4279:8 4280:18 4281:9 4282:18,21,27 4290:20 4291:22,26 4293:8 4307:3 4309:28 4310:12 4312:8 4375:9,14 4464:5

steps 4254:5,21,26,28 4334:14

Steve 4221:5 4371:26 4412:12 4439:16

Steve's 4448:6

sticks 4431:12

stood 4467:19

stop 4366:6 4403:24

stops 4349:25 4350:3 4357:15 4365:28 4385:13 4430:16

straight 4398:18

strange 4258:28

strategies 4267:25

stratification 4293:6

stratified 4283:14

stream 4449:24

Street 4410:19

strength 4275:25

stress 4330:23

stretch 4335:23

strike 4253:9 4314:14

strive 4266:21

strong 4252:5 4263:17 4415:28

stronger 4310:16

strongly 4251:23 4329:25 4334:9

structure 4264:1,2 4288:27

struggled 4319:10,12

struggles 4317:15

struggling 4268:5

studies 4227:8,11 4229:19 4234:2,5 4237:19 4239:21 4241:21 4242:16 4243:1 4247:15,16 4251:10,11 4273:19 4281:13 4282:14 4304:4 4311:28

study 4227:2,21 4228:15,16, 18 4229:5,7,11,12,19,28 4230:2,3 4234:3 4235:7 4237:8,14 4238:27 4239:24, 25 4241:22 4243:4 4258:26 4273:21 4281:8,9,10 4282:20,21 4284:27 4289:4,5,6,14,20,21 4284:27 4289:4,5,6,14,20,21 4328:6,22,23 4329:5,6,18 4330:3,7 4365:21,23 4366:4 4375:14 4428:4 4463:11,15, 19,26 4464:4,5 4471:26 4473:7

stuff 4247:9 4275:24 4304:1 4321:24

styles 4456:5

subject 4258:22 4350:2 4455:12

subjective 4303:9,10

subjects 4227:4

submit 4338:22 4363:3

submitted 4235:24 4301:5 4309:1,4 4338:17 4340:9 4347:13 4434:12 4460:28

submitting 4455:18

subset 4343:11 4393:27 4395:14

subsidiaries 4411:24

subsidiary 4456:3

substantial 4415:28 4431:4, 5,6,9,12

substantially 4473:9



substantiate 4448:19

substantiates 4448:5

subtracted 4438:12 4440:11

success 4367:5

successful 4224:24 4239:8

sued 4224:23

suffer 4252:1 4453:9

suffering 4252:15

sufficient 4346:6 4349:28 4350:25 4379:16

suggested 4258:13 4363:11

suggesting 4460:10,14

suggestion 4334:7

suggests 4350:27

suitable 4288:8

suite 4338:3 4346:22 4348:28

sum 4225:21 4403:21

summaries 4256:16

summarize 4237:1 4247:5 4300:23 4392:7 4395:3

summarizing 4303:23 4378:15

summary 4222:3 4230:10,17

summed 4393:20 4394:15

super 4230:21 4417:16

supertankers 4347:21

supervision 4390:16 4413:16

supplement 4263:16 4347:12

supplied 4246:10

supplier 4413:19 4414:2,10, 18 4415:1 4421:1 4430:24

suppliers 4270:24 4298:10 4330:24 4412:20 4413:25 4414:16,28 4420:10 4431:6

supplies 4377:25

supply 4224:4,5 4225:10 4226:21 4241:2 4247:28 4268:14 4297:18 4299:9 4304:24 4330:20 4333:24 4381:20 4389:17 4427:17

supply/demand 4340:20

supplying 4241:1

support 4253:28 4254:8,15 4264:13 4288:20 4289:18 4316:12 4335:5,21 4347:3, 10,14 4373:14 4388:7 4390:6,16 4411:8 4413:16 4434:13 4436:23 4451:27 4455:10 4458:14 4468:12

supported 4251:24

supporting 4254:16 4413:6 4459:7

supportive 4280:10

supports 4345:27

supposed 4293:9 4320:22

surprise 4272:26 4310:7 4318:24 4459:27

surprised 4238:19 4308:26 4423:22

surprising 4224:26

survey 4227:1 4228:5,11,21, 23 4229:4 4230:6,7,11,22 4231:1,3,5,8,10,14,17 4232:6,10,11,16,17,22 4234:17 4235:4,9,11 4237:13.25 4239:3.4 4242:12,23 4245:20,22 4252:8,10 4254:13 4255:9, 11,14,15,20 4256:7,10,13, 21,22 4257:10,15 4276:13 4277:23 4278:12 4279:3 4280:3 4282:18 4283:26 4284:7 4287:22 4288:7,17 4289:24,27 4290:11,14,17, 23 4291:27 4293:4,25 4294:22 4306:14 4307:4 4309:5,7,9,12,14,20,27,28 4310:13.18 4311:3.6 4313:20 4323:6.12 4329:15 4336:16 4373:4,15 4375:10, 19,23 4376:6 4454:12 4458:4 4463:12 4469:18.25 4470:7,17 4471:7,10,20,28 4472:23 4473:17

survey/econometric 4237:14

surveyed 4270:2 4278:1,2,7, 14 4279:24 4290:12 4313:16,17 4342:17 4470:26

surveys 4228:3 4232:3 4240:20 4242:27 4254:9,24 4255:26 4257:25 4258:25 4261:6 4278:13 4279:8 4288:6 4290:1 4291:3 4293:1 4336:17

susceptible 4316:23

sustainability 4296:22

sustainable 4305:13

switch 4226:24 4248:5 4251:1

swoop 4250:4

sworn 4221:10 4337:21 4387:3 4409:26 4433:25 4451:16 4468:17

system 4264:25 4287:11 4296:27 4302:14 4305:12 4319:22 4322:16 4331:15 4343:23 4352:21 4398:18 4406:27

systems 4396:6,21,26 4413:18 4416:9

Т

T-W-O 4470:18

table 4280:7 4330:6,11 4397:8 4399:20 4400:4,24 4404:2 4414:12,16 4419:26 4421:20 4430:1 4431:11 4439:9 4454:9,15 4458:21

tables 4392:7 4395:3 4397:6 4404:2 4443:15

tags 4391:10

takes 4254:27 4256:26 4263:25 4331:15 4380:28

taking 4289:28 4306:3 4325:18,24 4343:26 4441:22

talent 4299:14

talk 4253:22 4254:4 4295:18 4296:9 4308:22 4324:25 4330:12 4334:3 4356:12 4357:13,15 4359:17,21 4380:16 4381:5 4403:7 4424:20 4427:22,26 4433:18 4447:27 4459:7 4464:17

talked 4234:24 4277:8 4291:19 4360:26 4375:16 4422:20 4428:3 4464:14 4474:14 4475:17

talking 4233:4 4268:27 4270:19 4319:7 4320:8 4323:16 4324:7 4333:11 4336:3 4366:19 4373:17 4378:15 4379:14,23 4380:11,19 4381:22 4382:18 4386:1 4403:4 4419:7 4430:25 4431:1 4464:3,22 4475:11

talks 4251:5 4380:21 4465:23 4473:16

tank 4331:23 4350:9 4357:22 4365:2 4367:20,21 4375:6,7,8 4391:9 tanker 4350:1,26 4351:4,16, 17,21 4353:2 4364:19 4374:21 4375:1,5 4379:17 4380:23,28 4381:1,9 4385:18,19,20,22,25 4398:21 4401:24 4402:1,2 4417:12,13 4428:25 4429:1

tankers 4350:19 4363:23,28 4364:5 4365:3 4367:18 4374:18 4384:27 4416:25 4417:9,16 4424:1,13 4428:27

task 4307:15,16,18 4432:18

Taylor 4327:13 4336:24 4376:14,16 4384:2 4405:22 4407:5,24 4429:22,24 4432:7 4445:27 4446:2 4449:8 4464:12 4466:20 4468:7 4474:19,26 4475:1

teaches 4457:3

team 4391:6 4394:3 4412:5 4432:26

teams 4412:14,23

technical 4466:2,3,6

techniques 4237:5

technologies 4352:18,24 4353:3 4374:4,6 4381:5 4382:20 4457:15

technology 4367:17 4374:18,23 4411:28 4412:10 4416:11 4444:26 4453:26

teens 4257:17,18

telling 4268:15 4316:16 4365:15

ten 4239:6 4257:19 4319:25 4320:26,27 4371:10,12 4372:9,10 4389:5 4395:23 4396:23 4450:26

ten-year 4353:17,24 4372:10 4383:6 4440:18,26 4441:2 4443:18 4454:8 4458:11 4466:8

tend 4273:4,5 4277:10 4316:5 4373:21,25

tens 4268:3

tentative 4229:2

tenth 4238:21,26

term 4302:25 4303:12 4317:8 4330:17 4386:2

terminology 4359:27

terms 4243:16 4364:28 4385:16 4428:14 4462:17



4469:17 4470:26 4472:18 4473:2

terrific 4367:4

Terry 4299:2

test 4463:4

testified 4221:11 4237:2 4246:26 4262:15 4270:1 4327:22,27 4337:22 4355:6, 26 4387:4 4395:20 4397:19 4409:27 4421:28 4432:24 4433:26 4451:17 4453:16 4456:21 4458:19 4468:18

testifies 4460:27

testify 4221:7 4362:15 4376:19 4386:27 4410:6 4418:13 4429:27 4435:9 4456:16 4457:13 4463:2 4474:21,23

testifying 4356:4 4405:25 4426:1 4467:23

testimony 4221:17 4222:3 4242:14 4244:1.25 4245:15 4254:7 4258:18 4261:10 4269:9 4272:10 4280:9 4281:27 4282:1 4291:21 4295:2,6,14 4296:7,15,19 4297:4 4300:10,23 4301:7 4313:5 4315:22 4318:15 4327:21 4330:13 4333:11 4335:26 4338:8,13,16 4342:11 4346:5,14,17 4347:24,28 4348:5 4349:2,5, 9 4352:14 4353:19,27 4355:4 4359:12,15,17 4365:9 4369:10,13 4370:15 4371:3 4372:20 4376:23 4377:22,27 4378:16 4380:21 4383:23,25,28 4386:8 4387:7 4388:6 4390:15 4395:5 4396:13,19 4397:6 4400:19 4401:20 4402:5 4409:15 4411:8 4413:14 4418:19 4420:15 4421:8 4423:21 4424:9,19 4426:6, 10.16 4428:10.17.21 4431:23 4432:12,14 4433:3, 4 4434:12,24 4435:10 4436:24 4438:1 4439:9,18, 23 4441:12 4442:7.20 4443:21 4448:6,22 4450:4, 24 4451:27 4452:12,18 4453:14 4454:9,15 4456:9, 10,13 4457:11,20 4459:18 4460:8,28 4463:24 4465:23, 28

testing 4416:3

tests 4345:20 4395:6 4406:11 4412:21 4415:8 4421:27 4422:19,22 Texas 4338:3 4340:5 4347:16 4348:26 4363:25 4371:8,13 4372:3 4377:23 4411:23 4412:28 4414:25 4415:4 4427:12,19,20,26 4428:6

text 4457:2

thankfully 4275:13 4332:26

that' 4259:12

theoretical 4456:6

theory 4367:8

thing 4233:27 4247:6 4251:25 4261:17 4262:16 4263:22 4267:5 4268:13 4273:22 4277:20 4286:21 4298:26 4314:20 4320:25 4321:10 4325:22 4329:12 4331:6,16 4333:14 4335:17 4358:8 4371:1 4372:12 4374:13 4378:25 4400:17 4442:20 4445:14 4462:8 4467:14 4468:5 4474:15

things 4233:11,25 4249:1 4255:23 4257:1,21 4266:26, 28 4273:26 4296:28 4302:2 4303:11 4317:11 4320:15 4321:6 4332:1 4359:24 4367:22 4369:9 4382:16 4402:6 4418:20 4426:9 4466:2

thinking 4361:10 4362:10 4396:16 4444:4 4448:7

thinks 4261:21 4272:7 4301:28 4468:7

thinner 4316:25

thinnest 4316:6

thought 4242:1 4247:22 4251:24 4252:4 4281:20 4282:18 4288:8 4292:5 4294:17 4303:28 4304:8 4305:11 4306:10 4308:24 4310:18 4334:26 4370:3,13 4386:19 4425:1 4467:24

thoughts 4356:2

thousands 4348:1

three-quarters 4351:14

three-week 4314:8

throw 4402:8

throwing 4386:1 4465:5 4466:11

thumb 4278:27

ticket 4413:20

tie 4262:26 4344:24

tight 4268:24 4330:21 4331:15,19 4332:1,3

tighter 4437:4

time 4233:1,2 4240:21,22 4246:18 4251:19 4252:26 4254:19 4256:5,20,25,26 4257:2 4262:24,27 4264:13 4268:23 4273:11,27,28 4278:9 4285:16,24 4288:18 4290:23 4291:9,15 4296:10 4299:15 4301:17 4302:14 4304:27 4307:6 4314:13,20 4316:6,15 4318:2,11,26 4323:21,23 4324:9 4325:22 4326:13 4327:19 4328:7 4335:18 4336:3 4344:15 4348:13 4349:25 4354:27 4365:27 4367:16,19 4368:5, 9 4369:13 4372:4 4383:7,10 4395:28 4396:16 4402:12 4413:19 4414:26 4425:17 4465:4 4468:3

timeclock 4256:17

timeframe 4244:4,28

timeline 4334:17

timeliness 4416:10

times 4231:4 4245:22 4252:24 4257:24 4296:25 4359:21 4403:7 4452:11 4472:6,7,9

timing 4278:21 4375:22

tiny 4279:27 4319:11 4329:20

today 4223:4 4238:11 4256:18 4292:12 4302:17 4303:5 4304:26 4338:13 4342:11 4346:25 4355:13 4357:1 4369:8 4373:6 4405:25 4410:9 4411:12 4418:13 4425:27 4429:27 4435:10 4450:10 4452:10,18 4461:14 4464:13 4465:1 4466:12 4467:4

today's 4347:4

Todd 4405:7 4407:8 4431:20

told 4243:11 4284:4 4286:14 4287:5 4288:15 4321:7 4325:14 4467:11

tomorrow 4474:15,19,23 4475:18,20

tonight 4467:10

tool 4322:9 4374:12 4375:1, 6 4391:25

tools 4353:5 4374:3,11 4382:25 4396:7,17

top 4232:5 4264:19 4406:21 4422:18 4443:8 4463:6

topic 4288:26 4444:7 4450:23

topics 4376:2

total 4231:1,3,5,10,14 4232:2 4240:2 4246:18 4248:13,20 4265:23,26 4268:28 4276:13 4278:5,27 4283:27 4286:24 4350:16,22 4381:20 4393:10,11,21,23 4394:16,17 4400:20 4413:26,27 4414:9,26 4415:1 4417:23 4420:7 4430:7 4469:17 4470:17,24 4471:10,14,27 4472:22

totals 4389:24

touch 4300:9 4432:13

tougher 4317:28

town 4446:25

track 4372:4 4391:26 4422:7

tracked 4416:13

tracking 4379:22

tractor 4416:25,26 4424:11,

trade-offs 4277:12

traditional 4236:10

training 4322:7

transcript 4299:21

transfer 4350:9,10,20 4357:22

transformation 4232:22 4233:15 4234:18

transforming 4225:3

transit 4415:15

transition 4248:10

translated 4243:15 4363:10

translates 4347:18

transportation 4281:5 4349:18 4352:6 4354:16

transported 4281:4 4350:17

Index: terrific..travel

transporting 4343:8

transposed 4416:16

trapped 4298:22

travel 4332:22



treatment 4296:27 4326:28

trend 4273:20.24.28

trends 4273:27

triggered 4439:8

triggers 4417:8

trouble 4286:12

troubling 4254:10 4258:12

truck 4349:25 4350:9 4357:23,24,25 4365:27 4367:21 4402:1,3 4408:15 4424:25

truckloads 4385:8

trucks 4417:9 4425:6

true 4225:6 4261:14 4267:14 4268:25 4272:14 4291:16,18 4302:10 4307:12,13 4311:5, 28 4316:4 4327:7 4355:13 4364:3 4370:21 4376:5 4415:24 4441:25 4462:26

trust 4459:5

truths 4439:11

Tuesday 4467:12

Tulare 4294:23

turn 4223:8 4224:19 4225:17 4226:11,24 4227:24 4228:25 4231:25 4236:28 4237:11 4239:12 4243:10 4245:8 4247:18 4254:20 4257:23 4258:20 4259:16 4290:5 4329:28 4369:10 4377:27 4378:20 4426:15 4464:14 4469:13

Turning 4378:14

turnip 4273:12

turns 4238:25

two- 4314:7

two-and-a-half 4313:28

two-year 4457:1

type 4270:22 4283:21 4374:7 4396:18 4398:26 4416:18 4431:25 4462:21

types 4277:3 4431:27 4465:26

typical 4262:18 4390:27 4391:1,4,16

typically 4406:28 4424:13 4463:3

typo 4378:28 4399:3 4442:27

U

U.S. 4351:5,6,9,14,17,25 4379:15 4380:2

UF 4465:18

Uh-huh 4334:1 4382:24

ultimate 4225:20 4239:13

ultimately 4232:7 4235:2 4389:15

unaddressable 4418:9

unavoidable 4345:14 4346:11 4352:8 4354:13 4357:18

unchanged 4470:8 4471:5 4473:21

uncomfortable 4399:16

uncontrollable 4352:8

uncover 4416:1

underlying 4225:16 4360:9 4390:7 4413:8

underpinnings 4344:14

understand 4233:26 4234:3 4237:21 4275:6 4276:11 4289:16 4302:13 4307:25 4312:8 4324:28 4325:20 4326:6 4334:13 4338:11 4359:16 4361:12 4365:11,12 4403:26 4404:15 4426:27 4448:21

understanding 4240:24 4260:13 4265:19 4276:19 4304:2 4312:25,26 4313:6 4325:3,16 4376:1 4422:13, 14 4432:18,26 4461:14

understated 4398:4,6

understood 4335:25 4365:10 4386:4

undertaking 4467:28

undoubtedly 4351:21

unequal 4356:17

unfortunate 4307:24 4318:9

uniform 4353:20 4441:6

uniformly 4437:2

unique 4417:8 4418:4

uniquely 4349:10

unit 4316:10 4331:23

United 4350:24 4471:27

universe 4417:26 4428:1

University 4227:9 4340:5 4389:4 4457:12

unlike 4250:19

unregulated 4297:22,26 4298:7

unusually 4416:23

upcoming 4378:15

update 4225:19 4234:25 4259:18 4302:13,23 4303:2 4310:24 4442:18,19 4452:20

updated 4222:6 4224:13 4228:15 4234:25 4235:27 4306:13 4309:8,12 4310:14 4319:2 4441:27 4468:23 4474:1

updates 4303:10 4307:8

updating 4229:6 4235:24 4304:13 4455:14

upper 4330:14 4336:2 4338:6 4356:18 4366:5 4434:7 4451:22 4468:22

urgency 4334:9

urgently 4247:22

USDA 4222:22 4223:10 4224:20,26 4226:15 4227:20 4228:10,27 4229:1,11,17,22, 23 4230:15 4231:9,21,24 4242:6 4247:3 4249:16 4254:12,22,25 4255:8 4256:5,8,13 4257:25 4261:15 4264:14 4275:15, 17,20 4276:15 4281:19 4282:5.7 4283:17 4288:7 4289:7 4301:5,22 4312:17 4313:10 4314:4,6 4320:17, 25 4323:9 4328:6 4329:5 4335:3 4338:17 4343:24 4344:23 4345:15,25 4346:6, 14,28 4347:2,11 4348:17 4349:20 4351:5 4352:4 4353:22 4354:2,4 4355:9,20, 21,26 4359:18 4361:13 4369:17 4370:4,14,19 4431:20 4434:13 4437:2 4440:1 4442:13 4449:1.3 4458:1,5 4467:23 4470:6 4473:17

USDA's 4226:9 4262:22 4276:6 4321:2 4326:28 4344:28 4346:10 4350:26 4354:6,10 4369:19 4438:2 4441:15,24 4442:17

USDA'S 4344:8

usual 4417:18

utilities 4245:24

utility 4294:5

utilization 4353:5 4382:21

utilize 4441:24 4449:23 4457:6

utilized 4344:19 4392:4,16 4435:17 4439:2,5 4456:15

utilizes 4391:21 4416:21

utilizing 4344:9 4449:26

٧

valid 4223:21

validity 4344:11

valuable 4224:9

values 4441:27 4456:22

Van 4456:17,19,27 4457:3,4 4461:2.4

variance 4348:7 4392:23 4393:12,15,18,21 4394:10, 12,14,23 4395:15 4398:2 4404:10,16,19 4406:10 4408:5 4423:18 4425:6 4431:15 4432:16

variances 4393:14,15,17,20 4394:11,15,24 4395:15 4402:26,27 4403:20 4404:14 4416:24 4418:8 4425:8 4429:10

variation 4232:12 4277:12

varies 4316:8,14

vary 4272:25 4316:9 4353:21 4391:13 4402:4 4441:7

vast 4350:21,24 4379:15

vat 4329:8 4461:27 4462:5 4465:19

vein 4344:12

venture 4295:8

ventures 4455:27 4460:11

veracity 4456:11

Vermont 4364:3,5

version 4338:12,23 4358:23 4383:1 4434:25 4442:8 4452:11 4470:10 4473:10,12

versions 4338:21

versus 4237:26 4238:12 4319:16 4333:2 4345:23 4356:3 4365:1 4465:10

view 4234:22 4247:19

Index: treatment..view



4251:3 4257:27,28 4305:14 4328:12,14 4331:22 4360:3 4365:2 4448:23

viewing 4358:12

views 4301:6 4349:19 4445:18

virtually 4395:14 4403:3

visibility 4432:21

volume 4243:8 4262:9 4278:7 4279:7 4320:1 4330:21 4351:11,27 4364:14,18,20,28 4365:1,3, 6,9 4381:25 4384:27 4393:23 4394:17 4415:15 4430:7

volumes 4281:24 4322:28 4347:21 4364:8,10 4470:7 4473:18

voluntary 4283:16

volunteers 4376:13

voted 4250:11

W

wages 4367:14

wait 4245:9 4253:23 4256:6 4334:10 4335:14,16 4455:15

waited 4248:8

walk 4397:5

walks 4275:22

wall 4263:2 4286:17

wanted 4242:7,12 4243:7 4260:2 4281:26 4282:17 4284:1 4294:11 4309:12 4310:12 4311:19 4329:16 4331:28 4383:12 4384:18 4385:2 4395:19 4418:14 4419:19,23 4422:25 4447:20

warranted 4454:22

waste 4288:18 4296:27

wasted 4273:28

wastewater 4462:3

watch 4410:9

water 4296:20,24,25 4329:2 4445:1 4465:18

ways 4306:12 4472:19

weak 4287:12 4306:14

weaken 4357:3

weaker 4332:25

wearing 4304:22

website 4231:24 4263:11

week 4258:19 4261:10 4305:17,19,27 4313:24,28 4314:5,7 4376:19 4474:22

weekly 4436:8

weeks 4303:1 4313:21 4314:16 4328:16

weigh 4417:14

weighing 4282:8 4416:3

weighs 4417:11 4424:15,24, 25

weight 4239:8 4347:3
4357:25 4374:21 4385:25,
27,28 4386:2 4391:11
4392:13,19,21,22,25 4393:3,
5,11,16,18,19,28 4394:5,13,
14,15,21 4395:7,8,9,10,11,
13 4397:9,12,18,19,20,21,25
4402:4,7 4403:2,8,14
4406:6,8,10 4407:4 4408:5,
6,13 4413:20,21 4414:5,13,
14,15 4415:4,13,19,20
4416:14,24 4417:3,11,17,18
4418:7 4421:4 4431:8

weighted 4228:1 4229:3,6,8 4239:25,27,28 4240:1,4,10, 11,17 4242:2,3,7 4243:7 4247:1,12,16 4251:11,27 4261:16 4281:8,10,25 4319:9 4361:13,16,22,25 4362:11 4430:3,6

weighting 4239:20 4241:18, 19.20

weights 4242:11 4345:19 4347:27,28 4348:3,4,6,7 4349:24,25 4352:15 4354:21 4360:18 4362:23 4367:20 4378:17,18 4389:28 4390:1, 3 4391:12,15,19 4392:27,28 4393:7,12,24,25 4394:10,20 4395:6 4398:11 4401:27 4406:11,22 4407:22 4408:16 4412:21,27 4413:3 4414:3, 11 4415:17,18,19,20 4416:16 4417:1,23 4420:22 4421:3,5

weird 4266:19 4313:26

well-reasoned 4226:4

well-recognized 4457:2

Wes's 4296:15

west 4387:24 4410:19 4439:3,16 4442:25

Western 4439:4,12 4443:13, 14

whey 4224:15 4228:7,9 4229:8,9 4230:11 4232:13, 15 4235:7 4236:7 4237:7,9, 16,20 4238:3 4239:19 4243:26 4309:17 4310:16 4342:26 4370:25 4449:18, 19,23 4450:2 4462:24,26 4463:3 4470:8 4472:8,14

white 4320:21

whites 4320:23,24

wholesale 4265:22 4437:27

wholly 4394:28 4437:9

wholly-owned 4411:23

wide 4238:18 4454:4

widely 4454:3

Wilson 4405:6,7,20 4407:7,8 4408:26 4431:19,20

window 4372:10 4439:7

winter 4417:19 4425:2

Wisconsin 4239:14 4241:18 4243:12 4261:12 4262:18 4330:25

witnesses 4260:8 4354:20 4371:19 4383:26 4418:16 4467:14 4474:15 4475:3,6, 10.18

wondering 4289:7 4330:6, 15 4335:8 4383:22 4430:8 4431:4

word 4271:10 4302:22,23 4303:2 4339:1 4373:8 4382:17,22,26 4386:1

wording 4339:9,14

words 4239:20 4440:3

work 4222:17 4260:25 4261:13 4263:20 4265:13 4267:2,13,23 4268:17 4281:22 4282:15 4286:18 4296:12 4298:21 4299:15 4305:10,12 4306:25 4307:16,22 4308:1,2,4,9 4309:9 4315:20 4322:10,16 4325:15 4331:5 4334:6,16, 17 4340:14 4341:6,19,22,24 4355:17 4366:27 4374:17 4396:12 4401:1 4403:12 4412:11,14 4443:4 4446:3

workable 4289:10

worked 4233:26 4279:25 4285:10 4286:17 4287:10 4288:2,3 4294:17 4296:5,11 4300:20 4305:1,6,13 4306:2 4318:8 4340:5 4389:6 4395:23 workforce 4253:9

working 4304:10,18,28 4306:4 4307:6 4308:25 4323:8 4341:17,19 4352:26 4396:3,8 4398:26 4411:26 4432:25

works 4244:14 4300:12 4420:26 4440:5

world 4268:7 4299:11 4319:8 4372:27,28 4432:22

worries 4388:27

worst 4236:27

write 4285:9 4383:19

written 4221:17 4264:5 4272:4 4274:8 4282:2 4300:10 4324:13,14 4346:14 4353:19,27 4434:12 4438:1 4439:9,23 4441:12 4454:9, 15 4457:20 4461:2

wrong 4322:16 4403:18 4427:8 4442:8

wrote 4335:3 4345:15 4447:9

Υ

yard 4394:5 4399:15,24 4401:22,23,24 4402:5,17 4416:20,21,26,27 4417:6 4424:5,6,10

yards 4402:22 4424:4

year 4234:6 4236:25 4248:14,15,23 4249:1,7,8,12 4250:16,27 4251:15 4255:5 4256:24 4266:4 4289:28 4290:1 4305:20,21 4308:28 4311:8,11,13,14,25 4330:24 4331:27 4332:2,18,24 4334:20 4335:7 4341:18 4347:18,19,23 4348:2 4353:11 4391:16 4395:25 4425:12,13 4427:6 4430:24 4466:15

year-round 4377:26

years 4248:13,18 4251:17 4252:3,28 4253:11,27 4256:24,27 4257:19 4268:26 4273:14 4279:24 4288:5 4296:14 4298:14 4304:10,19 4306:2,5 4311:25 4312:3 4318:17,24,28 4319:2,5,25 4320:26 4328:9,13 4335:23 4340:18 4341:23 4351:7 4355:10 4367:26 4371:10,12 4372:9,10 4389:5 4395:23 4396:23 4425:10 4436:27 4447:16 4457:28 4466:10,17



TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING yellow 4320:22 yes/no 4299:22,23,24 yet all 4430:10 yield 4271:28 4329:1,4,5 4342:13,16,24,27,28 4343:1 4344:12 4345:3 4346:15,24 4347:11 4352:12 4354:3,8, 27 4360:12 4365:23 4366:4 4369:23,26 4370:9,25 4372:25 4373:4,16 4384:12 4390:6 4413:7 4435:11,15, 18,20 4436:26 4437:6,9,16, 25,26,27 4438:2,17,21 4439:28 4440:16 4441:13 4442:3 4448:3 4452:24,25 4456:27 4461:4 4475:7 yields 4246:3 4260:20 4264:10,13 4294:13 4328:26,27 4329:6 4342:12, 26 4343:28 4344:22,28 4345:7 4346:12 4352:5 4362:12 4365:21 4455:9,11 4458:4 4463:12,15 York 4456:20 4457:1 ...while 4345:28



Index: yellow.....while