

NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING

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

Before the Honorable Jill Clifton, Judge

---000---

Carmel, Indiana
October 4, 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:
3	Erin Taylor Todd Wilson
5	Brian Hill Michelle McMurtray
6	FOR THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION:
7	Roger Cryan
8	FOR THE MILK INNOVATION GROUP:
9 L0	Ashley Vulin (Remotely) Charles "Chip" English Grace Bulger
11	FOR THE NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION:
12	Nicole Hancock Brad Prowant
13	FOR SELECT MILK PRODUCERS, INC.:
14	Ryan Miltner
15	FOR EDGE DAIRY COOPERATIVES:
16 17	Dr. Marin Bozic
18	FOR INTERNATIONAL DAIRY FOODS ASSOCIATION:
19	Steve Rosenbaum
20	000
21	
22	
23	(Please note: Appearances for all parties are subject to
24	change daily, and may not be reported or listed on
25	subsequent days' transcripts.)
26	
27	000
28	



TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS October 04, 2023 NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING

1	MASTER INDEX	
2	SESSIONS	
3	WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2023	PAGE
4	MORNING SESSION AFTERNOON SESSION	6815 6931
5	AFIERNOON SESSION	0931
6		
7	000	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21 22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		



1	MASTER INDEX	
2	WITNESSES IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER	
3	WITNESSES: PAGE	
4	Dr. Marin Bozic:	
5	Clarification Testimony 6815	
6	Dr. Peter Vitaliano:	
7	Direct Examination by Ms. Hancock 6820 Cross-Examination by Mr. English 6842	
8	Dr. Charles Nicholson:	
9	Direct Examination by Ms. Hancock 6916	
10	Cross-Examination by Mr. English 6961 Cross-Examination by Mr. Miltner 7000	
11	Cross-Examination by Mr. Milther 7000 Cross-Examination by Mr. English 7009 Cross-Examination by Mr. Milther 7011	
12	Cross-Examination by Mr. Mitther 7011 Cross-Examination by Mr. Rosenbaum 7012 Cross-Examination by Ms. Taylor 7021	
13	Cross-Examination by Mr. Wilson 7048 Cross-Examination by Mr. English 7052	
14	Closs Brammacion by III. Bigitsii 7032	
15	000	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		



1		MASTER IND	E X	
2		INDEX OF EXHIBITS	S	
3	IN CHRONO	LOGICAL ORDER:		
4	NO.	DESCRIPTION	I.D.	EVD.
5	297	Edge-15 Corrected	6815	6818
6	298	Edge-15B Corrected	6815	6818
7	299	Testimony of Dr. Peter Vitaliano	6820	
8	300	MIG-28	6883	
9	301	MIG-29	6884	
10	302	Testimony of	6917	7053
11	302	Dr. Charles Nicholson	0917	7033
12	303	Summary of Testimony	6917	7053
13				
14		000		
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				



1	WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2023 MORNING SESSION
2	THE COURT: Let's go back on record.
3	We're back on record. It's 8:03 in the morning on
4	October 4, 2023. It's a Wednesday.
5	Dr. Bozic, would you identify yourself, please?
6	DR. BOZIC: Dr. Marin Bozic for Edge Dairy Farmer
7	Cooperative.
8	THE COURT: And you remain sworn.
9	MARIN BOZIC,
10	Having been previously sworn, was examined
11	and testified as follows:
12	THE COURT: And we have been anticipating that you
13	would clear up some questions that we had left over. How
14	would you like to proceed? I have got two new exhibit
15	numbers to give you. I have got, for example, 297, which
16	could be for your Edge-15 corrected, and 298 for your
17	Edge-15B corrected, if that's what you want.
18	THE WITNESS: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: Very good.
20	You may proceed.
21	(Exhibit Numbers 297 and 298 were marked for
22	identification.)
23	THE WITNESS: This should take only four minutes.
24	If we can have the slides on the screen.
25	Mr. Wilson asked me yesterday morning how come
26	that my baseline PPD was much higher than was published in
27	the Journal of Dairy Science. Upon the urging of Your
28	Honor, I did some forensics, and turns out that because I



wanted to use the version of the file that hasn't been modified or further automated since the Journal of Dairy Science article was published, I had on this slide a mix of two different orders.

So the first four columns, the baseline PPD, trends, III/IV spreads and advanced price -- the first five columns -- advanced prices and Class I reform, all of that was for Southwest Order, and then the depooling and actual PPD were for the Mideast order.

THE COURT: No wonder you couldn't figure it out.

THE WITNESS: So to err on the side of transparency, I've now included -- I have obviously modified all of these slides to properly be titled Southwest, and the last two columns corrected. But I also included additional slides for Mideast, as while I was testifying on Monday I read off some pooling numbers that were for Mideast. So just to, you know, err on the side of transparency, I included everything.

No conclusions are changed, no numbers presented, relative size of these numbers or the absolute values of those numbers, none of that changes. That's all from the file that has been previously part of a package that was reviewed for the Journal of Dairy Science. It was just wrong. The order of the -- the title of the order was wrong, so I now have both Southwest and Mideast.

In the Exhibit 15 I only included Southwest. And in the Exhibit 29- --

THE COURT: 298?



2.

2.0

2.1

1	THE WITNESS: This is 298?
2	THE COURT: Oh, okay. So, I'm sorry. In 297, we
3	have Exhibit 15 corrected
4	THE WITNESS: Yes.
5	THE COURT: and in 298, 15B corrected.
6	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
7	In the Exhibit 297 I have modified only slides
8	only the titles and appropriate sentences to to clarify
9	that it's the Southwest, not Mideast.
10	In the Exhibit 298, I have both Southwest and
11	Mideast.
12	Those are the full extent of my corrections.
13	THE COURT: Now, for our viewing audience, who
14	haven't seen anything up on the screen, that will come.
15	THE WITNESS: Yes, these exhibits will be posted
16	on the Federal Order website sometime today, I assume.
17	THE COURT: Very good.
18	And in the meantime, I still would like to
19	entertain moving them into evidence, even though, we
20	know we know what to expect. We just haven't seen all
21	of it yet.
22	What did you do in an attempt to alert the people
23	who are in the room?
24	THE WITNESS: This morning, between 6:30 and
25	7 o'clock, I sent these files to the to the AMS team as
26	well as the counsels for all other parties.
27	THE COURT: What questions would anybody like to
28	ask Dr. Bozic about this topic?



1	There are none.
2	Is there any objection to the admission into
3	evidence of Exhibit 297, which is the corrected Edge-15,
4	and includes the corrections to the did you say titles?
5	THE WITNESS: To the titles and some text in
6	the on the related to the waterfall charts, related
7	to the depooling analysis.
8	THE COURT: Is there any objection to that
9	document being admitted? That's Exhibit 297.
10	There is none. Exhibit 297 is admitted into
11	evidence.
12	(Exhibit Number 297 was received into
13	evidence.)
14	THE COURT: With regard to Exhibit 298, which is
15	the Edge-15B corrected, including both Southwest and
16	Mideast orders, is there any objection?
17	There is none. Exhibit 298 is admitted into
18	evidence.
19	(Exhibit Number 298 was received into
20	evidence.)
21	THE WITNESS: Your Honor, this is I anticipate
22	this is my last time on the stand, so I just want to
23	express my gratitude for the hard work of your colleague
24	that was here the first few weeks, yourself, AMS team, as
25	well as all of the parties, and all I can say is we should
26	do this more often. Thank you.
27	THE COURT: That's great.
28	You know, every participant in this hearing is so



valued. The Secretary cannot possibly address these issues without hearing from different parts of the country, different aspects of the business, and everyone is valued. And I appreciate your collegiality, and I have enjoyed, Dr. Boze (sic), welcoming all different people's explanations, and trying to puzzle through it, and trying to help the Secretary find something that would work. And I appreciate very much his good humor.

THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.

THE COURT: You're welcome.

Now, Dr. Vitaliano.

And I'm going to take just a minute to talk about the FEMA Emergency System trial that will happen at 2:20 Eastern today throughout the entire country, an alert, to see if it works as an emergency alert. So help me remember that we should all go off record about 2:15, so wherever our devices are showing the alert, I think it will be on television as well as devices. So we'll see how that works. But help me be off record by 2:15, if you will.

Would you state and spell your name, please?

THE WITNESS: Peter Vitaliano, P-E-T-E-R, V as in

Victor, I-T-A-L-I-A-N-O. It's the word "Italian" with a V
on the front and an O on the back.

THE COURT: Have you previously testified in this proceeding?

THE WITNESS: I have, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You remain sworn.



2.

2.0

2.1

1	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
2	PETER VITALIANO,
3	Having been previously sworn, was examined
4	and testified as follows:
5	MS. HANCOCK: Good morning, Dr. Vitaliano.
6	Just for the record, Your Honor, not only has he
7	been previously sworn in and testified, but he's also been
8	previously designated as an expert in this matter.
9	THE COURT: Excellent.
10	DIRECT EXAMINATION
11	BY MS. HANCOCK:
12	Q. Dr. Vitaliano, did you prepare Exhibit NMPF-35 in
13	support of National Milk's proposals related to Class I
14	differentials?
15	A. I have.
16	MS. HANCOCK: And, Your Honor, I believe we're at
17	Exhibit 299?
18	THE COURT: Yes.
19	MS. HANCOCK: If we could mark that exhibit. I
20	missed the 300 by one exhibit.
21	(Exhibit Number 299 was marked for
22	identification.)
23	THE COURT: Well, you want to step down for a
24	minute?
25	THE WITNESS: In the interest of moving the
26	hearing along, I will forego that privilege. Thank you.
27	BY MS. HANCOCK:
28	Q. Okay. Dr. Vitaliano, would you proceed with your



written testimony, please?

A. Yes.

2.

2.1

This is a -- I have testified on all five of National Milk's proposals. My written testimony has followed the same form in all five. A -- start -- begins with an introductory section of a few pages describing our process of arriving at our package of proposals, and has a section later on on economic impact.

My original testimony on Proposal 1 on the very first day of this hearing -- seems like ages ago -- I read the full testimony into the record. Those repetitive parts I have not read subsequently, and I will follow basically that same procedure.

But since this testimony on Proposal 19 bookends that original one and the whole series, I will re-read a few selected paragraphs from those common sections to kind of refresh your memory and for the benefit of Your Honor.

I will note that the version -- the short version of my written testimony that we're handing out is just the textual part. The full version on the website is about 80-some pages and contains the full list of the 3100-some counties, city, and parish differentials that we are proposing.

Q. And, Dr. Vitaliano, I forgot to mention. We originally submitted this in September at some point, I can't remember what the deadline was, and you have since amended just the counties, which is that last part of your testimony that begins on page 12; is that correct?



1 Α. That's correct. 2. And what did you change in the counties that was resubmitted? Do you recall? 3 From our technical group that put these together, 4 I received only two, believe it or not, two corrections, 5 to two counties in Texas. And the version that's posted 6 on the website as Exhibit NMPF-35 has the corrected 7 8 versions. I'm not sure whether the Appendix A version has 9 them yet. 10 The two corrections are, for those of you who have 11 those, Comanche County in Texas should be \$3.85. 12 THE COURT: Do you know what page? 13 THE WITNESS: I don't have that. If you give me 14 the page number for the -- I don't have the full version 15 in front of me. 16 MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, your version should be 17 corrected. I think he's just noting the difference that 18 happened. But it should be on page 69. 19 THE COURT: Very good. Thank you. 2.0 And say it again, please, Dr. Vitaliano? 2.1 THE WITNESS: Comanche County, Texas should be 22 \$3.85. 23 And then a few pages later, Travis County, 24 Texas -- there are a lot of counties in Texas, it takes up 25 several pages -- it should be \$4.35 --26 MS. HANCOCK: And that's on page 73. 27 THE WITNESS: -- instead of 4.70 -- \$4.70.



28

With that, let me begin my statement.

I'm Peter Vitaliano, Vice President of Economic Policy and Market Research for the National Milk Producers Federation.

Skipping to the last paragraph on page 2, those of you following.

NMPF has engaged in an almost two-year comprehensive study of needed updates to the Federal Order pricing formula provisions. NMPF has undertaken this important activity with the essential and dedicated assistance of dozen of marketing experts from the staffs of its member cooperative marketing associations.

In a series of well over 200-monthly virtual meetings by this mostly virtual meetings, this team examined every detail of the current federal pricing formulas of the Federal Order uniform pricing regulations in 7 CFR, paragraph 1000.50 through 52.

The goal was developed -- to develop a comprehensive, integrated, and balanced program of updates to these formulas, to realign them more fully with the structural realities of the current dairy industry, and to address the disorderly marketing conditions which the growing misalignment has allowed to develop. This effort included considerations of mechanisms for making further updates in the future as the industry continues to evolve.

The comprehensive package which resulted includes seeking additional legislative authority for USDA to conduct mandatory studies of manufacturing costs and product yield factors, seeking a change via ordinary rule



2.

2.0

2.1

making for the regulation implementing the dairy product mandatory reporting program, and five recommendations for amendments to the uniform pricing provisions for all Federal Orders.

The NMPF Board of Directors unanimously approved this package of recommendations, including the five recommendations for proposed amendments to all Federal Orders which NMPF has submitted as Proposals 1, 3, 7, 13, and 19.

This testimony today is in support of Proposal 19 concerning the Class I and Class II differentials. NMPF requests that the Secretary amend 7 CFR 1000.50(b) and (c) and 1052 applicable --

THE COURT: Sorry, that's .52.

THE WITNESS: .52.

THE COURT: And please go very slowly through this. This is very hard to capture just by hearing it.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

-- applicable to all Federal Milk Marketing
Orders, as well as 7 CFR, paragraph 1005.51(b), paragraph
1006.51(b), and paragraph 1007.51(b), as specified at the
conclusion of this testimony, which would increase the
Class I differentials for all counties, parishes, and
cities of the 48 contiguous United States to reflect the
current cost of providing adequate supplies of fresh milk
to fluid processing plants.

The majority of Federal Order Class I differentials have remained unchanged since Federal Order



2.

2.1

Reform, as reviewed and revised by Congress. The differentials in the Appalachian, Florida, and Southeast orders were modestly updated in 2008.

Just as the Make Allowances embedded in the milk component pricing formulas are out of date, so, too, are the underlying cost assumptions embedded in the Class I differentials. Since the current Federal Order Class I differentials were established, one of their key determinants, fuel costs and the basic per mile cost of hauling milk, have increased significantly. Truck driver per-day hours have been reduced, which has required more truck drivers and investment in more rolling stock.

Additionally, federal requirements for in-truck electronic driver and truck logs were implemented during this period. Higher capital investments have also driven up overall milk hauling costs.

Other structural changes have increased both the costs and general availability of milk hauling, including increased road tolls, restrictive and variable road weight limits, labor shortages, and truck, trailer, tire, and replacement parts and shortages, as well as significant diesel fuel cost increases.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, go back again to the "and replacement parts," and finish from there, please.

THE WITNESS: And replacement parts and shortages --

THE COURT: So --

THE WITNESS: -- of replacement parts.



2.

2.1

1 THE COURT: So replacement parts costs? 2. THE WITNESS: Costs and shortages thereof. Thank you. You may continue. 3 THE COURT: 4 THE WITNESS: Thank you. Driven by the increase --5 6 THE COURT: I'm sorry, I didn't mean for you to 7 abandon the rest of your sentence. THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. 8 9 -- as well as significant diesel fuel cost 10 increases. 11 Driven by the increased cost of hauling milk per 12 loaded mile, the cost per hundredweight for 100 miles has 13 almost tripled since the current Class I differentials 14 were established. Compounding this greater expense, 15 opportunities for reducing costs through backhauls have 16 become more limited. 17 For example, in the Florida Order, the marketing 18 area most distant from a reserve milk supply, backhauls of 19 orange juice and orange juice concentrate used to be 20 common. However, today, reduction in the Florida citrus 2.1 industry and the availability of juice concentrate from 22 other countries have nearly eliminated juice backhauls out 23 of Florida. Where backhauls may still be an option, 24 processors often forbid the possibility by requiring

Changes in the relative locations of farms and fluid milk processing plants have also increased the cost

tanker trailers to remain dedicated to delivering milk and



dairy products only.

25

26

27

of delivering Class I milk to markets. Development in exurban fringes has displaced dairy farms. The location of milk production is increasingly distant from human population centers, while Class I processing plants remain in cities due to the higher per unit cost of transporting packaged fluid milk relative to bulk unprocessed milk. The miles that bulk raw milk must travel to get from dairy farms to processing plants have increased.

The combination of increased miles milk must move to serve Class I markets and the significant increases in the per mile cost of moving milk is threatening the reliability of milk supplies for Class I use in many Federal Orders. The Class I differentials which continue to be the fundamental regulatory mechanism of the Federal Order program for attracting an adequate supply of farm milk for fluid milk processing remain largely unchanged since Federal Order reform 23 years ago.

In addition to increases in milk hauling costs since 2000, all contributors to the costs of producing Grade A milk at the farm have also increased. Class I prices are the only Federal Order prices for which the cost to producers is taken into account, albeit in an indirect fashion.

The Federal Order base Class I differential has historically recognized that there has been a difference in the cost of producing milk solely for manufacturing use and the cost of producing for daily delivery to the Class I market. Over time, and with the Federal Order



2.

2.0

2.1

reform changes in manufacturing class use prices eliminating any competitive milk procurement factor in a base milk price, the Class I differential base price now represents a modest nod to production costs at the producer level.

Since 2000, those costs have risen far more than the limited increase in the base Class I differential from \$1.60 per hundredweight to \$2.20 per hundredweight as embedded in the NMPF proposal, Proposal 19 that is. The base Class I differential also plays an important role in reducing instances of class price inversions, the importance of which the Department stressed in Federal Order reform, as previously reviewed in my testimony on Proposal 13 earlier in this hearing.

NMPF recognizes and supports USDA's longstanding policy of maintaining federally-regulated prices as minimum prices and allowing market forces to fine-tune market prices. However, structural changes in the industry are limiting the reach and effectiveness of over-order pricing for milk used in fluid milk products.

Larger fluid milk plants, higher costs of hauling, increased distances raw unprocessed milk must travel to supply Class I processing needs, and growing resistance by handlers to accept over-order prices are leaving many costs of serving Class I processors increasingly uncovered. The result is disorderly marketing conditions. As costs increase and the capacity for over-order prices to keep up with these costs wane, pricing equity between



2.

2.0

2.1

competing processing plants is threatened. Worse, dairy farmers are subsidizing shortfalls of Class I prices to cover the full cost of supplying Class I milk to processors.

Taken together, milk transportation costs, producer production costs, and other factors have created a market environment in which the Federal Orders operate which is antithetical to the goals of the Federal Order system. That is, ensuring adequate supplies of milk for fluid processing, equitable treatment of producers and processors, and providing for the orderly marketing of milk. It is important for USDA to ameliorate this, as well as other changes that are eroding the effectiveness of the Federal Order system.

Our proposed solution to update the current Class I differentials for all counties, parishes, and cities in the contiguous United States.

NMPF's proposal to address these multiple challenges and to help alleviate the economic stresses on milk marketers who have accepted the responsibility of supplying the marketplace with milk for Class I use is to update the adjusted Class I differentials for every U.S. county, parish, and city currently listed 7 CFR, paragraph 1000.52.

The method NMPF has followed to develop its proposed update to the Class I differentials follows the general process previously used during Federal Order reform. This method also follows certain precepts of



2.

2.1

price alignment accepted by the Secretary in the Southeastern Order pricing hearing held in 2007.

In brief, NMPF commissioned an update to the University of Wisconsin, previously Cornell University, national price surface model using 2021 model input data, including milk supplies, dairy product demand, cost of processing milk, and the cost of transporting milk and dairy products. The model has been greatly expanded to include many more supply and demand points, as well as considerably more point-to-point road mileages.

NMPF used the model outputs from the University of Wisconsin model as a starting point. NMPF then applied local knowledge of milk movement, plant locations, and historic price relationships to refine the model results and prepare a rational regulated Class I value surface, using time-honored Class I price alignment techniques and processes. NMPF's final Class I recommendations deviated somewhat from the model results due to a variety of real-world milk movement considerations, as will be addressed in further hearing testimony.

In all locations, as would be expected given the substantial increases in the cost of milk hauling, the recommended regulated Class I differential surface increased versus the current regulated Class I differentials. The tilt, or slope, of the price surface from reserve supply points to Class I demand points has become steeper, and the geographic locations representing the reserve supply of milk have generally shifted toward



2.

2.0

2.1

western states. Similar to the general nature of the existing Class I differential price surface, the updated price surface slopes from lower values in the Northwest and West areas of reserve supply, with increasing values when moving toward the milk deficit areas of the Southeast.

The updated Class I differentials, as proposed, which resulted from this NMPF analysis, reflect less than the full cost of moving milk, and thereby maintain the Department's longstanding principle of minimum prices. Tn developing this proposal, NMPF used the expertise of numerous individuals responsible for marketing milk in NMPF member cooperatives, as well as others that have longstanding expertise in the national Class I price Their expertise was used to further refine the surface. model results to develop the proposed pricing surface that best fits the reality of today's marketplace. As such, the proposal does not follow the model's results in every instance, as there are both positive and negative deviations from the model results to better support a more orderly marketing system.

The results of the NMPF study, analysis, and price alignment processes are included in Figure 1 below. It is a color-coded representation map, as shown, that visibly presents the 3,108 counties, parishes, and independent cities and each civil district's Class I differentials.

Exhibit USDA-46, which is Hearing Exhibit

Number 46, provides a summary of the Proposal 19 national



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

average Class I differentials by Federal Order.

This testimony provides an overview of NMPF's justification for adoption of Proposal 19. More detailed testimony will follow that supports all or key portions of Proposal 19, including testimony provided by Jeff Sims, representing NMPF member cooperative Lone Star Milk Producers, as well as an expert witness from the University of Wisconsin who will testify about the national price surface model used to develop Proposal 19, also, other members of the NMPF task force that developed NMPF's Federal Order modernization proposals, and producers who are members of NMPF member dairy cooperatives.

I will read a few more paragraphs from the following section on the economic market impacts of NMPF's proposed changes, starting in the top of page 8:

Figure 2 provides a perspective on the key issue of the impact of NMPF's proposals on consumers of the Federal Order program and potential changes to the regulatory provisions of that program. This figure charts the monthly consumer price indices (CPIs) reported by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) over the past decade and a half for all items -- which is the line in red -- which is the general measure of overall consumer price inflation, also referred to as the overall cost of living, together with the aggregate CPIs for all food and beverages shown in green, for all dairy products shown in the bright blue, and for all fluid milk products shown in



2.

2.1

a sort of darker shade of blue, the principal -- which is
the principal regulatory focus of the Federal Order
program, that is, fluid milk.

These CPIs reflect actual retail prices paid in
all U.S. cities, but they are expressed in the form of

all U.S. cities, but they are expressed in the form of indices with their respective U.S. average retail prices during the 36-month period of 1982 through '84, each set to the value zero to facilitate comparisons.

THE COURT: Now, mine doesn't say "zero," so you will need to explain to me.

THE WITNESS: Oh, set to the value 100, to facilitate --

THE COURT: So, it's not me.

THE WITNESS: Excuse me?

THE COURT: I'm just making a joke.

THE WITNESS: Oh.

THE COURT: So I don't quite understand that, but I'm sure I will before we finish.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. The use of indexing is a standard method when you want to compare something like, you know, the cost -- the cost of a product A might have been \$2 each in a base period, and the cost of another product B that you want to make a comparison to may have been \$3, and so if -- if both of them have increased at, let's say the same rate, in ten years from that base period, they will still be different.

If you want to show how the price of both products changed relative to each other, you would take that base



6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

period, you would divide the \$2 product price by \$2 and get it down to say, you know, basically 100. If you divide \$2 by \$2, you don't get a dollar figure, you just get an index number. That would be 100, or basically, you know, 100% starting out. You would divide the \$3 product price, product B, by \$3, and put its higher price down to an index value of 100. So the two of them would start out at the same relative price.

So over time, let's say ten years out, if product A price stayed fixed, and product B's went up by 10%, at the end of that ten years, the index of product A would still be 100, the index of product B would be 110, so you could see instantly that product B inflated more than product A. Whereas, if you looked at a chart of \$2 and \$3 starting out, and \$2 and, you know, 3 -- you know, 3.30, in ten years, it wouldn't be quite as obvious how they changed relative to each other. So it's just a way of putting them on a common denominator so you can compare.

And so index -- or Figure 2 then shows the relative rate in which general inflation in red, all food and beverage inflation, which is an aggregate number, everything put together, that's the way CPIs are done, where some of them are very broad and some of them get more and more specific. You can get down to -- you know, the price of butter has its own CPI. And then you can compare how a somewhat more disaggregated category, like dairy, which is embedded in that all food and beverages,



2.

2.1

you can see how dairy in the brighter blue line has inflated relative to all food and beverages, and you can see how dairy, over time, has gotten less and less expensive relative to all food and beverages.

They started out the same at 100 during that base period in the early 1980s, but as I'll show in my continued text here, going back to 2008, although that's, what, 25 years after the base period, they still -- all four of these indices were pretty close to each other. That means in 2008, the overall cost of living was -- had gone up about the same as all food and beverages, which was about the same as all dairy, which was about the same as fluid. They were all about the same. You could have -- you could have updated them to an index of 2008, and this chart would look very similar. That's just indexing chart mathematics -- arithmetic is what it is really.

THE COURT: Whoa, thank you. I would never have been able to figure it out without your explanation, and I appreciate that.

THE WITNESS: I'm happy to give it an explanation, because it's a pretty simple concept once you look at it.

So what this chart shows us is over these

15 years, how much have consumers needed to pay -- how
much more have consumers needed to pay for the overall
cost of living, everything they spend money on? How much
more they have had to pay for food and beverages, how much
they have had to pay for all dairy as an aggregate



2.

2.0

2.1

category, how much more they have had to pay for fluid milk.

So continuing to -- Figure 2 shows that the retail prices represented by all four of the measures pictured had increased as of 2008 by about the same amount, slightly more than doubling during the quarter century since the index base period.

And that is because the index period they were all at 100 in the early '80s, in 2008 they were about 210, meaning they had, both slightly -- all of them had slightly more than doubled. That's what going from 100 index value to 210 means. They had all kind of gone up the same.

From 2008, the overall cost of living and the cost of all food and beverages have both continued to increase at a relatively steady pace, which accelerated during the recent bout of inflation, mostly last year and the year before, 2021/2022, at a relative -- with food and beverage prices slightly outpacing the overall inflation rate particularly in recent months.

And that's where those -- toward the right-hand side where everything started going up faster, that was the inflationary period that we have all read about in the last couple of years.

The less aggregated dairy and fluid milk CPIs have shown a greater sensitivity to the price of producer milk, including the 2009 price plunge, the price spikes of 2014 and 2022, and the stagnation of prices between these two



2.

2.1

peaks. This closer connection between farm and retail prices for dairy stems from the fact that the cost of raw milk has averaged about 31% of the retail value of dairy products since 2002, while the farm value of most food and beverage products represents a much smaller share of the total retail value of the finished products, which accordingly, reflect more closely the main drivers of overall retail price inflation, including such factors as energy, labor, and transportation.

That means when you have such broad categories, all food and beverages, it's a very specific part of the economy, but it's so broad that the rate of inflation that's affected food is not all that different, slightly faster, than affecting everything in the economy, which is a much broader measure. Because it's -- food and beverage is such a big category by itself, whereas dairy is more specific and a little different because the value of the raw product, milk itself, raw milk, is a much bigger portion of the retail price than, say, how much a box of corn flakes -- how much the price of raw corn affects a price of a box of corn flakes, which is much smaller.

However, those factors have also caused retail prices, price inflation for dairy products, to outpace general and food/beverage price inflation during the recent bout of general price inflation. That's 2022 particularly. But also, it's caused dairy prices to recover more quickly from that bout of inflation with dairy product retail prices actually dropping this year,



2.

2.1

while the two more general CPIs, overall inflation and food and beverages, continue to increase.

And you can see from this figure that food and beverage inflation has -- has actually recently outpaced overall inflation slightly, that's the green line, diverging above -- increasingly above the red line, overall inflation.

But you will note that the dairy line has actually -- it went up faster during the -- than the another two broader categories, during this recent inflationary period, but it's now dropping. And fluid milk has stayed generally below the overall dairy rate of inflation during most of this period. It experienced a bout of increased inflation along with all these other categories, but is now dropping down again below the overall dairy line.

Of particular significance to the -- for the current purpose, the overall cost -- and this -- general purpose, we have had a lot of discussion about the impact of prices to consumers and its effect on fluid milk consumption. The overall cost to consumers of dairy products, and fluid milk products in particular, has declined during the illustrated period relative to both overall inflation, as well as general food and beverage price inflation.

One noteworthy datum is that the simple difference by which the monthly CPI for all fluid milk has fallen below the monthly CPI for all food and beverages reached



2.

2.1

its highest level ever in July 2023. That's the difference over on the far right-hand side between the green line where it -- where it ends against that right margin, and the duller blue line representing fluid, which is the lowest of these. You can see how that fluid milk has diverged more and more below the overall cost of food and beverages.

Agricultural production enjoys built-in productivity advantages due to its biological basis, which can generate increases in production per animal, or increases in production per planted unit as a result of genetic improvements and other productivity, which are enhancements unique to biological production processes. These advances generate unit cost reductions which the competitive nature of farming passes on up the various agricultural and food marketing channels, eventually to consumers. This consumer cost reduction aspect of agriculture varies in direct relation to the proportion which the basic agricultural commodity represents of the total retail value of the resulting food products, which, as mentioned, is relatively high for dairy products.

This aspect of agricultural production, coupled with the great productivity of U.S. agriculture, has resulted in the general cost of food representing one of the smallest proportions of total consumer income in the United States compared to that in all other countries.

It is, therefore, very difficult to consider the facts presented in Figure 2 which reflect the relative



2.

2.0

2.1

influence of all economic factors at play in producing general, food and beverage, overall dairy product, and fluid milk product price inflation over the past decade and a half, which is a period that includes the continuous operation of the Federal Order program — to go back and repeat the beginning — it is, therefore, difficult to consider these facts and conclude that Federal Orders have had a deleterious effect on consumer welfare via the retail price of dairy products and retail prices of fluid milk and retail prices of dairy products in general.

Skipping then to last section on the bottom of page 10.

NMPF sincerely wishes to thank Secretary Vilsack and the Department for holding this important hearing, and for thoughtfully considering adoption of its proposed amendments to the Federal Milk Marketing Order regulations. NMPF has devoted considerable time and resources to thoughtfully considering and recommending the important changes it considers necessary to correct the growing misalignment between the dynamic changes in the U.S. dairy industry since Federal Order reform and the largely unchanged factors in the critical Federal Order component and Class IV class price formulas originally adopted at that time, the time of Federal Order reform.

Together, NMPF is requesting the Secretary to amend certain provisions of 7 CFR 1000.50.52 -- excuse me -- dash, 52, those three sections, 1000.50, 1000.51, and 1000.52, which are applicable to all Federal Milk



2.

2.1

Marketing Orders, and 7 CFR 1005.51(b), paragraph 1006.51(b), and paragraph 1007.51(b). The changes in these regulations that Proposal 19 would entail are as follows, which includes, as we have always portrayed them -- the proposed regulatory changes we are portraying in our testimony at this hearing, include all of the five proposals' language. We have not singled out a single one of them.

And the changes that Proposal 19 would bring are relatively simple on this -- this page.

Section (b) of 1000.50, class prices, component prices and advanced pricing factors, (b), Class I skim milk price: The Class I skim milk price per hundredweight shall be the adjusted Class I differential specified in paragraph 1000.52 -- strike "plus the adjustment Class I prices" in those three sections indicated, which our Proposal 19 would propose that those separate -- separate amended -- or increased Class I differentials in the three Southeastern Orders be reincorporated back into 1000.52. Since our proposal redoes the entire differential surface, there's no need to keep those separated. And to simplify, those would be struck, plus "the simple" -- the higher of the advanced pricing factors, etcetera. That's our language -- proposed language for Proposal 13.

(c), the Class I butterfat price: Similarly, the Class I butterfat price per pound shall be the Class -- adjusted Class I differential specified in 1000.52 divided by 100, strike the language that adds those three



2.

2.1

1	Southeastern Order butterfat differential sections.
2	They'd be reincorporated into section
3	paragraph 1000.52, along with the skim milk price factors.
4	And then we would delete propose to delete in
5	their entirety, Sections paragraph 1005.51(b),
6	paragraph 1006.51(b), and paragraph 1007.51(b). Those are
7	the sections in the three Southeastern orders that specify
8	those those adjustments to the base Class I
9	differentials that would now we would roll into
10	1000.52.
11	And then the adjusted Class I differentials,
12	adjusted for location to be used in 1000.50(b) and (c)
13	shall be as follows: We would delete everything that
14	follows in that in section in the language of
15	paragraph 1000.52 and substitute the list that is on
16	page starting page 12 through page 82 of Exhibit 299,
17	which includes the recommended price surface Class I
18	differential price surface that National Milk is proposing
19	in Proposal 19.
20	So that concludes my read/spoken testimony.
21	MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, at this time we would
22	make Dr. Vitaliano available for cross-examination.
23	THE COURT: Thank you.
24	MR. ENGLISH: Good morning, Your Honor.
25	CROSS-EXAMINATION
26	BY MR. ENGLISH:
27	Q. My name is Chip English for the Milk Innovation



Group.

Good morning, Dr. Vitaliano.

- A. Good morning, Mr. English.
- Q. So let me start off, and I might end here as well, is this the last time you will be presenting for National Milk at this hearing as far as you know?
- A. As far as I know, this is the last time I will be presenting testimony. With this hearing, I have stopped making predictions.
 - Q. And so I thank you for that.

So let me begin at the bottom of page 2 of your statement, and that is the discussion about a two-year long comprehensive study.

When precisely did National Milk Producers Federation begin the comprehensive study?

A. I began probably in the summer of 2021, or two years ago, by looking at all of the current Federal Order product price formulas as shown in the USDA AMS fact sheets that were handed out here, the Class I, Class II, Class III, Class IV. Looked at each of those pieces in every -- every part of those proposals, and looked at, you know, what -- what might need to be updated.

And then there was discussion with it. It probably started rolling into a higher gear in late 2021, when we formally put together a task force of our member specialists. We hired a consultant, Mr. Jim Sleper, to manage that process.

So there was not a kickoff date where we said, we're now in the process. But by the end of 2021, we were



2.

2.1

fully engaged in this process.

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. Would it be fair to say that that was also in line with when the International Dairy Foods Association engaged about Make Allowances?
- A. I don't know your exact timeline, but I know that was a -- that was an effort that the International Dairy Foods Association undertook.
- Q. So when did Class I come into the equation, at the same time or after the Make Allowances conversation?
- A. The Class I surface discussion was the last piece because it was going to be the lengthiest, and we needed the University of Wisconsin study results to begin that. And so that -- that part could not proceed in earnest until we had -- you know, turned out to be the third iteration of the model results to -- to work with.
- Q. So -- so actually, there's a lot to unpack there, so I appreciate it very much, because you anticipated about the next eight or nine questions.

So when did National Milk Producers Federation retain the University of Wisconsin to perform the model study -- the first model study?

- A. I can't give an exact time, but I would say it was basically in -- sometime in the springtime of 2022.
- Q. Which would be consistent with the fact that the runs that Dr. Nicholson provided were for May of 2021 and October 2021, correct?
- A. Yes. We wanted to include to -- to include a -- you know, a recent period, but we wanted to avoid using



2022 numbers that were probably subject to this recent bout of inflation that I illustrated in Figure 2, on the assumption that that might be a little non-representative. We may end up being wrong there. But we intentionally did not take the most recent highest cost in that current bout of inflation. We intentionally limited it to 2021.

- Q. So when did National Milk Producers Federation receive the first iteration of the model results?
- A. Probably would have been sometime in the spring of 2021, 2022.
- Q. And what did the University of Wisconsin do for that study, that model run, if you know?
- A. That first model run, the University of Wisconsin crew -- there's a long pedigree to that model. They have updated it and run it for various purposes several times, I think including several times since 2021. The model has grown in size and complexity as the computing power in a laptop has grown.

And so I think during -- during recent years, the keepers of that model have updated a lot of the components of it, even prior to us engaging them. But the one thing -- among others, the one thing that they really looked to our help for was to update the plant list, because our task force had a lot of knowledge of current plants, plants that were going to be closed, plants that were soon coming online.

And so the first model run, the University of Wisconsin folks, you know, running the model, had -- had



2.

2.1

updated a lot of the parts of it. Then, you know -- well, go ahead. So that answers that question.

Q. Okay. So -- so you received the results of the first iteration.

And what, if anything, did you ask with respect to, say, maybe this plant information with respect to the second run -- now, I am focusing on the second iteration right now rather than the third. What, if anything, did you ask with respect to the second iteration?

A. We took a look at it, at the results, and even after the first run, we concluded that the model results even of that first run were a relatively good representation of what our specialists, with all of their local knowledge, understood might be a -- you know, a reasonable current Class I differential surface.

We -- we didn't -- other than providing some updated plant information, I don't recall we made any major changes. We will -- our -- our next witness is one of the -- is the current keeper of that model, and so he probably would be better -- you know, better informed in terms of what we fed back to them at that time. And so I would recommend you keep that question, make sure you ask him that question as well.

Q. I appreciate your attempt to deflect to him, but for the moment, if I may, I at least want to explore, since you are the witness for National Milk Producers Federation, and the other witnesses, 20 or so, are either Dr. Nicholson or individual NMPF members. I'm trying to



2.

2.1

just focus and understand from everybody. So I get it if you don't have the precision, that's fine, I just want to understand what you recollect.

So when did you receive the results of the second iteration?

- A. It would have been several months after that, after we received the first one. It took some time between -- between the iterations of the model.
 - Q. So early summer, mid-summer 2022?
 - A. Probably around that time, yes.
- Q. And then after you received the second iteration, what did you ask of University of Wisconsin before it ran the third iteration?
- A. We might have added a few more -- given a few more updated plant information, but I don't recall there was anything of great significance that we -- you know, we fed back. There was some -- you know, all of our individual task force members looked at the numbers in their particular regions because they were gearing up for the task of taking the final run and working through the process of up- -- of adding their institutional knowledge of -- of, you know, the realities of the industry in their regions to those results.

So they wanted to make sure that -- that the model results were -- were reasonably correct, because we did not -- we specifically did not want to end up making major changes to what the model showed. So we wanted to just make sure that the results in all of those areas looked



2.

2.0

2.1

reasonable enough so that when we applied the -- the art part of the process, that we would stick as close as possible to what the model results showed.

- Q. So a few minutes ago you mentioned, whether it was the second iteration or the third iteration -- and I'm going to take it apart -- at first you provided University of Wisconsin information with respect to closed facilities, correct?
 - A. Yes.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. So those were plants that were closed, not closing, correct?
- A. There may have been a few that were -- we knew were going to be closing, and so we didn't, you know -- to the extent that we were sure that they were going to close, we -- we felt it was not going to be useful to have that in the model results. We wanted to have it as current as possible.
- Q. And what about the plants that you understood to be being built, what -- what categories of plants would that include?
- A. I remember there was, I think, a butter powder plant. But again, I would refer you to our task force members' testimony because they would know much more specifically what they fed into that process in their own regions.
- Q. You mentioned the art. Other than the plants that were closed or closing, or the plants that were planned or you thought would open, and recognizing I should ask



others the details, did you, for the third iteration, provide the University of Wisconsin with any information about the art?

- A. No, because we understood particularly by the third run, what the model could do, which was amazing, all the detail that it could do. But everybody who was involved in that art part had done this sort of thing before, and they knew the kinds of things that was just not likely to be incorporated in the model. Because we had a very good idea of what the model could and what the model couldn't do, and we were planning to, and preparing for, and did, apply that institutional knowledge that the model was not able to take into account. And there will be plenty of testimony about what those things are originally.
 - Q. I'm very well aware.
- 17 A. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. But -- but what kind of experience -- so let's backtrack for a minute.
- The last time the Class I differentials were updated nationwide was during Federal Order reform, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And then the only other changes were from the Southeast hearing, which was decided at the end of February 2008, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. So did these -- when you say that these people had



been involved, are you saying that outside the Southeast, these were people who had been involved in Federal Order reform in this art?

- A. They were people who were aware of that process of the model results, and -- and what would -- what was generally needed to -- to work with the model results supplying that institutional knowledge of their local areas.
- Q. And is it National Milk Producers Federation's view that the use of the art made modest changes to the model?
 - A. Yes, we think it has.
- Q. So to the extent that we have seen on the USDA website the results of the model, you would agree with me that even after the third iteration, the model used the current base Class I differential of \$1.60, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. When did the concept of increasing the base price from \$1.60 to \$2.20 arise?
- A. Throughout the current, the entire process of working with the various runs of the University of Wisconsin model, the University of Wisconsin personnel, Dr. Nicholson, Dr. Mark Stephenson emphasized to us what we already kind of knew, that the model did not solve for the base -- the lowest differential, that it only solved for relative differences. That the model basically came out with -- and, again, the differences between the various locations. And that they continuously asked us



2.

2.0

2.1

what should we set the base differential, the \$1.60, even though that did not affect -- they did not need that information for their actual analysis of the spatial differences.

Our group was preparing to do the hard work of looking at taking the geographic spatial relationships and -- and modifying them for things that the model could not do. We specifically put off the discussion of what the minimum differential should be until we completed that other process, and then turned our attention to what it should be. The \$1.60 was maintained through the model runs because it was what was in the current Federal Order provisions.

Subsequent discussions with working with the model results led us to conclude that since the \$1.60 was based on several cost factors, and those cost factors had gone up, just like the cost factors affecting the spatial differences had gone up, that we needed to look at modifying that \$1.60, and we concluded that that should now be raised. The lowest Class I differential should be raised to \$2.20.

- Q. So isn't it true that one of the considerations for National Milk was that when you saw the third iteration, or maybe even the first and second at \$1.60, there were locations, especially in the West, Southwest, where the differential went down from the current location?
 - A. I believe there were some of those, yes.



2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. So how specifically did National Milk Producers Federation develop the base \$2.20 used in the model to add the \$0.60 to the \$1.60?
- A. There will be, again, extensive testimony on that. But we used the basic framework that USDA used, that USDA and Federal Order Reform identified three components of that \$1.60, and we basically updated those three components.
- Q. So just to be clear, in the \$1.60 today, transportation costs are not part of the \$1.60, are they?
 - A. No. They are part of the spatial differences.
- Q. Did National Milk, in considering the development of the \$2.20 instead of \$1.60, include transportation costs in any way in that \$2.20?
- A. I'm not sure that it officially incorporated transportation costs. There is a component of the cost of assuring a supply of Class I milk in one of the three factors. But our concern -- our -- our feeling was transportation costs were properly covered in the spatial differences that were solved for the University of -- in the University of Wisconsin model, as modified in some cases by the further work of our task force members who had knowledge of local market conditions that would not be reflected fully in the model.
- Q. And I appreciate that. And, yeah, again, I'm going to have that opportunity to examine the other witnesses for National Milk, the members of National Milk. And again, I'm just trying to understand from you what



2.

2.0

2.1

your understanding was.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.2

23

2.4

25

26

27

28

So -- so you mentioned that there's the three elements of the \$1.60.

As I read the testimony, there's extensive discussion of the issue of Grade A in the testimony that's going to follow you, correct?

- A. That is correct.
- Q. And there's testimony about the inversion issue, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. But I did not see any discussion about the other two factors in the base; is that correct?
 - A. What are other the two factors?
- Q. I think one is viewed as balancing, and one is viewed as the cost of the incentive to get milk away from manufacturing facilities.
 - A. Okay.
 - Q. I did not see that in the discussion.
- A. I thought those were two of the three.
- Q. Right. Those are two of the three, and the Grade A is the third, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. I just wanted to be clear that as I read the testimony -- and there's a lot of testimony here and I could miss something -- as I read it, the discussion is focused on the Grade A and then separately this issue of inversion.
 - Am I correct in the universe there as I understand



1 it? 2. In terms of our testimony, I can't answer that. think you will have to wait for the testimony to follow to 3 speak for itself. 4 5 Ο. Okay. THE COURT: Mr. English, can you remember where 6 7 you are and let us take a ten-minute break? MR. ENGLISH: Absolutely, Your Honor. 8 9 THE COURT: Excellent. Let's go off record -well, first of all, when you come back. Come back at 10 9:30. Let's go off record at 9:17. 11 12 (Whereupon, a break was taken.) 13 THE COURT: Let's go back on record. 14 We're back on record at 9:35 a.m. 15 Mr. English, you may proceed. 16 MR. ENGLISH: So I want to start where I left off, 17 and then go backwards just for a couple seconds. 18 BY MR. ENGLISH: 19 I understand and appreciate your comment that you 2.0 believe there are other people who know more or the 2.1 details of the 2.20, correct? 22 Α. Yes. 23 There's a lot of testimony. 0. 24 So could you help me, which of the witnesses who 25 are going to come after you are the best ones, in your 26 view, to talk about the 2.20? 27 Α. The first NMPF witness, Mr. Jeffrey Sims, will 28 spend time in his testimony on the 2.20.



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. And Mr. Eric Erba is going to spend some time on that as well.
 - Q. So you think -- I -- I'm not saying others can't or won't, but those two --
 - A. Right. Those two are going to hit, you know, the main substance of that.
 - Q. I forgot to ask earlier because -- well, whatever reason.

When did National Milk receive the third iteration of the model?

- A. That was, I think, as late as early October of 2022.
 - Q. And in reference to a question I asked, you said that there were some modest number of changes to the model.

Is there anywhere we can find a summary of the changes?

A. Probably the best way to get that information is -- would be to -- to ask Dr. Nicholson from the University of Wisconsin because he received those changes and was responsible for making them, so he has that knowledge of the actual work of doing that.

But mostly it was basically plant lists, updating plant lists, and specifically the recommendation on the fuel costs to use. Which, as I had mentioned earlier, we intentionally did not want to have -- we wanted to have 2021 fuel costs, which was, you know, prior to a major



- Q. Do you recall whether he declined to accept any of your suggestions?
- A. I don't recall that he declined to accept any of them. He was very interested in our knowledge for updating the model, and he very specifically did not indicate in any way that he thought any of the things that we provided him in the way of updated data were inappropriate for -- you know, for the purposes of his analysis.
- Q. And I apologize because we actually just digressed, which was my fault.

What I was referring to was, when we were talking very briefly and just initially about the art that was applied after the third iteration, I thought we talked about the fact that there was sort of a modest number of modest changes; is that correct? By -- from the art?

- A. How would you describe -- define changes?
- Q. Okay. So you received the third iteration --
- A. Yes.
- Q. -- and after you received the third iteration, that's when your experts got together and consulted and applied, I thought you used the word art, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And I thought, and I might -- we might have misunderstood or miscommunicated -- that you said that there were -- you know, those -- that art resulted in



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

modest changes to the results of the model.

Did I have that right?

- A. Yes. But there were modest -- modest changes to the numbers that the model came out. We did not ask that any of those changes were incorporated back into the model.
 - O. 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. The model was an objective thing. We were -- we were doing that art part, you know, before -- you know, during -- starting with -- with some of the earlier iterations, because we were under a timeline to present our final recommended price surface to our decision-making bodies.
 - O. So -- thank you.

And I think you answered a question that you -you did not go back to the University of Wisconsin,
when -- again, when you made the art changes, correct?
You did not?

- A. No, we did not.
- Q. And so when I asked my question imprecisely and asked about the National Milk modifications to the numbers from the model, I was asking is there somewhere where there's a one-page or two-page or whatever summary of what those modifications were, or are?
 - A. I don't know of one that is publicly available.
- Q. So essentially, one needs to read the 20, plus or minus, testimonies that are about to follow in order to get all of that?



Q. So a moment ago you said that the process to provide the National Milk modifications started at some point prior, I think to the third iteration.

Do you know when they started?

- A. Probably would have started sometime during -- during the summer of 2022. I did not keep a log of all of these changes.
- Q. Were there central principles involved for the changes?
- A. The central principles were basically understood, you know, by the folks -- the task force members that were specifically going to work on that in their regions. And they were made based -- you know, by people who had done this sort of thing before. I can't tell you exactly which -- which process and procedures they were used for, but the people involved had experience with this, and so they kind of knew what was involved.

You take, in this case, you know, the results of a computer model that does a wonderful job of getting you, pick a number, 90% of the way, but there inevitably -- when you are doing something as important as setting -- of recommending what the Class I differential should be, you cannot take the results of a model, no matter how wonderful it is, without adding some particular --



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

particular things to it that based upon the institutional knowledge of experts who know about moving milk in their particular areas.

- Q. Was somebody overall in -- for want of a better phrase, in charge of these committees?
- A. Mr. Jeff Sims was formally the chair of the Class I surface working group, but there was no, you know, master plan. There was basically -- it was primarily, you know, getting -- getting the folks to get the work done and putting their individual expertise in. And particularly in the areas where there was no one person who had the detailed institutional knowledge of what the changes to the model for the Class -- you know, for the differentials in a particular region. Nobody in the group had that knowledge of every one of the 3100-some county, city, and parish differentials. It was a rather decentralized process.
 - Q. But were there sort of common precepts?
 - A. Yes.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. What were the common precepts?
- A. The common precepts were things such as -- let me give you an example of the ones, because I was not detailed involved in a lot of this.

As I recall, the model showed that there should be a different differential for the cities in Texas of Dallas from Fort Worth, because those cities are some distance apart with respect to the major milk supply serving those cities in West Texas to the Texas Panhandle. For



institutional purposes, it was decided to -- that the differential, despite what the model said, should be the same for those two cities because of historic price alignment.

There was a considerable -- without being enslaved to the past, there was considerable effort and care taken to make sure that the updating did not do -- you know, I might say, you know, disruptive -- make -- make disruptive changes to existing price relationships, particularly, you know, amongst plants that are located relatively close to each other. We tried to respect the fact that the existing differential surface, even though it was outdated, imposed certain competitive relationships that we did not want to be disruptive of, to the extent possible.

- Q. Okay. Anything else?
- A. Oh, things like there was a feeling that the differences between cities or plants where there was a mountain range in between, where -- where travel times would be, you know, more difficult than -- than would have appeared based on the model results, some of those things needed to be modified.

And, again, you will -- you will receive voluminous testimony from those who have the expert knowledge in their areas of those -- exactly those kind of things.

Q. Believe me, I'm aware there's voluminous testimony.



2.

2.1

Is it your understanding that the model does not take into consideration issues like mountain ranges?

A. It must -- it -- it takes it into account -- the model basically uses standard road mileages between point to point, and it has several millions of those point-to-point arcs. It does not necessarily reflect differences in travel time for terrain. There are a lot of areas where there's a lot of congestion on roads where the travel -- travel distance would be a lot slower, and therefore more costly in terms of driver time than the model was able to take into account.

Again, the model does an incredible job of incorporating an awful lot of complexity, but there is another level of complexity that really needs to be -- to be taken into account to accommodate some changes from the results of even an almost perfect model.

- O. Anything else?
- A. Those are things that I would mention at this point. And, again, you will hear many of them in the subsequent testimony.
- Q. So on page 6 of Exhibit 299, in the middle of the page, which is the fourth paragraph, and you refer to National Milk used the expertise of numerous individuals responsible for marketing milk in National Milk Producers' member cooperatives, as well as others that have longstanding expertise in the national Class I price surface.

Who were those others that have longstanding



2.

2.0

2.1

expertise in the national Class I price surface who are not members of National Milk?

- A. I did not imply that those were members outside of National Milk.
 - Q. Okay.

2.

2.0

2.1

- A. Those were particularly people who were -- who had knowledge of things like transportation, trucking costs, as opposed to people who necessarily were involved in the daily movement of milk. The people who were responsible for moving milk on a daily basis are the people we relied on to really have that -- that -- that boots-on-the-ground type knowledge of these sorts of things.
 - Q. Now, were trucking costs considered in the model?
- A. The costs of transportation were included in the model, and I assume that that included however you define trucking costs.
- Q. So I think I'm trying to ask -- and, again, maybe imprecisely -- with respect to the modifications, the art that National Milk employed after the model numbers came out, were there persons outside of National Milk who assisted you in providing analysis for those modifications?
- A. I guess, how would you define outside of National Milk? I think the vast majority of those -- those changes were made by people who worked for National Milk cooperatives and were direct -- as directly involved in moving milk as -- as we thought was necessary for that purpose.



- Q. So for instance, was Select Milk Producers consulted?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Was Edge Cooperative consulted?
- A. No.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

16

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

- Q. What about the fluid milk proprietary customers, those who are members of IDFA, those who are members of the Milk Innovation Group, who are --
- A. The only members of IDFA that I know we -- were involved were those who were also members of National Milk Producers Federation at the time.
- 12 Q. Was Organic Valley consulted?
- 13 A. Not to my knowledge.
- Q. So do you know precisely who it was from National Milk who was in each back room where it happened?
 - A. I'm not aware there were any back rooms.
- Q. Okay. These were closed-door meetings of National Milk members, correct?
- 19 A. Can you define closed-door?
- Q. Well, we have just said that Select wasn't invited, correct?
 - A. Select was not a member of National Milk during most of that time.
 - Q. So what I'm getting at is, you know, you talked about employing the expertise of industry, while I think what you are telling me is the expertise in the industry was limited to National Milk members.
 - A. The expertise was based upon the task force that



- Q. But, in fact, you know, you excluded two cooperatives, Organic Valley and Select, correct? Or three, actually, Edge. Edge, Organic Valley, and Select, correct?
- A. We -- we invited anybody who wished to participate in the process, in the task force process who was a member of National Milk and was willing to supply the expertise -- time and expertise of their members -- of their staff that had the knowledge we needed.
- Q. Was an invitation issued to anybody who was not a member of National Milk?
 - A. Not that I'm aware of.
- Q. Wouldn't it be fair to say that entities like Select Milk Producers, Edge, Organic Valley, and members of IDFA who are proprietary operations would also have local knowledge of the markets?
- A. Well, let's say if we wanted to have an open seminar or workshop and invited everybody in the country that might have been able to contribute, we would have had a much bigger process.

We felt that we had all the expertise we needed. We were not trying to exclude anybody. We were trying to get a job done, and we felt that we had the resources to do that.

Q. Wouldn't you agree that there's at least an



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

appearance of unfairness when some members of the industry get to give input to change the model results and others don't?

(Court Reporter clarification.)

BY MR. ENGLISH:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

28

- Q. Wouldn't you agree that there's at least an appearance of unfairness when some members of the industry get to give input to change the model results and others don't?
- A. I don't think there's any -- any reason why that -- why that sense would be -- would be significant, you know. If you are telling me that you have that sense, that's your privilege.
- Q. Would National Milk Producers Federation accept a model that has been modified by Select to specifically reflect markets where it has plants and understands the conditions in the market?
- A. If Select chose to forward a model of that sort, we would take a look at it and see if -- and take a position on it. But that's -- there's -- that is not a proposal at this hearing.
- Q. We have to -- we appear to have -- and I said 20 earlier, and maybe that's because I was counting some other witnesses -- 17 National Milk witnesses discussing different regions on the departures from the model.

Are there others involved in the National Milk Producers Federation meetings only who made red-pencil adjustments who are not testifying?



- A. There may be some. I don't have a full list of those folks. But we feel that there's a very generous number of our task force members who are involved in the process who are going to provide extensive testimony on what they did in their area, and they will all be available to be cross-examined.
- Q. So what kind of horse trading went on in the back rooms given that some members operated Class I plants and others don't?
- A. I'm not aware of any horse trading. There were -- no horses were involved, just colored pencils, electronic versions.
- Q. So when you look at the model results, the model provided by University of Wisconsin, gave you a May number, which is spring, and an October number, which is fall, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And then National Milk calculated an average, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. When National Milk made its modifications, did it consistently use one, that is to say, all spring, all average, or all fall?
- A. Could you define what you meant by all spring, all average, all fall?
- Q. All right. So you will have an opportunity in a moment to look at the spreadsheets.

The University of Wisconsin provided you a column



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

1 of spring numbers, correct? 2. Α. Correct. Which are generally, not exclusively, but 3 generally lower than the fall, correct? 4 Correct. 5 6 Ο. And then it provided a column of fall numbers, 7 correct? 8 Α. Correct. That's -- that's the way the model 9 usually --10 Ο. Yes. 11 Α. -- is run. A spring flush month and a fall --12 fall --13 Ο. Whatever. 14 -- tighter supply period month. Α. 15 As I asked, and you agreed, that National Milk Ο. 16 added a column that was average, correct? 17 Α. Right. 18 Okay. 0. Because we knew that the Class I differentials in 19 Α. 2.0 paragraph 1000.52 were a single number. They are not --2.1 they are not seasonably variable. So we knew that we had 22 to work with a single number that combined the two, and 23 the easiest way to do it was to take a simple average. 24 And all of the art part of the process was based upon 25 that -- the average numbers. 26 Are you sure? Q. 27 As far as I know. But you can, again, ask the --



28

ask the individual groups that -- that made the

modifications to the model results. But to the best of my knowledge, we always worked with the average because we knew we had to come up with a single number.

- Q. So you are not aware whether, for some locations, spring value was selected?
 - A. Not to my knowledge.
- Q. And similarly, you are not aware whether in some instances the fall number was selected?
- A. No. I don't recall where the difference between the spring and fall numbers was considered of great significance or taken as a major factor that was used in adjusting the numbers.
- Q. What ultimately is the purpose of the model if it is so significantly altered?
 - A. Define significantly.
- Q. I'll move on.

So on the bottom of page 2 -- the good news is I have moved on to part 2. This is page 2 of Exhibit 299, at least I thought it was.

You reference in your testimony that some precepts were followed from the Southeast hearing in 2007, the decision in 2008, correct?

- A. That experience was -- was available to members of the task force, yes.
- Q. Are you aware that in that case -- I think there were three people in this room who were at that proceeding -- in that case, SMA, followed by USDA, applied an 80% of hauling cost concept?



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. I'm not aware of the details of the considerations in making that 2008 Southeast region differentials.
- Q. To your knowledge, is there any 80% of hauling cost concept applied in the National Milk Producers Federation modifications?
- A. I don't recall a fixed number because the transportation costs -- the primary impact of transportation costs in the National Milk recommendation in Proposal 19 came from the model, which is based upon the road network, the fuel costs, labor costs, and the like. It was basically from public sources. We did not dictate a particular transportation cost number to the University of Wisconsin personnel.

They -- we wanted their objective model results. The one thing we did ask was that they use fuel costs pertinent to the 2021 months and not the higher costs of the 2022 months that were available at that time.

- Q. And candidly, that would make sense, because if you are using May and October 2021 data, you would want to have the data match up, correct?
- A. Yes. We wanted it to be consistent. We did not dictate anything of what we wanted the model to show. We simply provide updated plant information, made the recommendation on using the cost from 2021, and most of the other data was already in the model.
- Q. So on the bottom of page 4 of Exhibit 299, the last paragraph, you state, "The combination of increased miles milk must move to serve Class I markets and the



2.

2.0

2.1

significant increases in the per milk cost of moving milk is threatening the reliability for milk suppliers for Class I use in many Federal Orders."

So first I note you say "many Federal Orders," which is not the same thing as all.

So in what Federal Orders is the increased cost of moving milk threatening the reliability of milk supplies in Class I?

- A. You know, can you repeat the question again?
- Q. Given the fact that you say "many" rather than "all" in this paragraph, which Federal Orders -- in which Federal Orders is the increased cost of moving milk threatening the reliability of milk supplies in Class I?
 - A. So in which orders it is threatening --
- 15 | O. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- A. -- as opposed to --
- O. Yes.
- A. Well, the Texas order is one that we have -- you know, that came to mind particularly, and there will be testimony on that.

The Texas market, population is growing. The main urban centers are in east and south Texas, and the milk supply in Texas, the local milk supply is moving from areas closer to those population centers, is moving out pretty -- pretty specifically to the Panhandle area in West Texas.

In areas closer to Dallas/Forth Worth, Houston,
San Antonio, those more local milk supplies are declining.



And that's -- that was a kind of a -- a -- you know, a major example of areas where the milk supplies were moving to areas more distant from the consuming centers where the fluid milk plants were. Those hauling distances are increasing.

And there happens -- because the West Tex- -- the Texas Panhandle is an area of production growth, it is a fact of the current dairy industry that new plants are being built in areas where the milk supply is growing. Particularly, as the general patterns of consumption of dairy products are shifting from fluid to manufactured products such as cheese, butter, and ingredients for the growing export market and growing food manufacturing uses domestically.

So we have a situation where the milk supply is —the availability of manufacturing plants near the areas of milk supply is growing, and the availability of milk supplies closer to the fluid milk consuming areas is declining. And, therefore, hauling distances from where the milk is produced to where it's needed for Class I use are increasing. And you will see that in many of the testimonies to follow.

O. I'm going to come back there, but -- okay.

Many Federal Orders, so after Texas, which is the Southwest order, what other orders are the increased costs of moving milk threatening the reliability of milk supplies in Class I?

A. I would leave that to the individual testimony.



2.

2.0

2.1

You will have all the information you need on that.

- Q. Okay. So let me come back to Texas. And I'm going to try to avoid pulling Exhibit 39 again, but you have been here for much of the hearing when we have talked about performance standards, correct?
 - A. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. And I need -- even just yesterday, I pulled Exhibit 39, which is the changes in performance standards, correct?
 - A. Can you define the performance standards, then?
- Q. This is the order provisions with respect to what percentage of the milk needs to be, you know, shipped or -- to Class I plants, diversion limits --
- 14 A. Yes.
 - O. Okay. That's what I mean.
 - A. Yes. I don't have particular expertise in applying those because we don't -- I don't -- we don't move milk in National Milk, but I'm aware of those -- those provisions.
 - Q. But you know, one, that there's been no call for a hearing in Order 126, which is the Southwest Order, since some time in the mid-2000s to change those performance standards, correct?
 - A. Not that I'm aware of.
 - Q. And there's been no increase in the performance standards by the Market Administrator, correct?
 - A. Generally, the -- I'm not aware of increases in performance standards, but I -- I would not swear to that



under oath.

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

- Q. Okay. So isn't it true that to the extent Class I handlers, who do not have an opportunity to depool, to the extent there is any quid pro quo for paying a Class I differential, that the point of that is to get milk to their plants, correct?
 - A. Can you repeat that question, please?
- Q. You agree -- I'll break it up. You agree that Class I plants are the ones who are captive to the system and must always be in the pool, correct?
- A. Pool distributing plants must pool their milk, yes.
- Q. And whether explicit or implicit, the quid pro quo for that payment of a Class I price that is higher or at least generally higher than the other class is that they will have priority to get milk to the fluid plants, correct?
- A. Could you define the parties to the quid pro quo that you are referring to?
- Q. The order expressly provides, one, that Class I handlers will pay a Class I differential, the very thing that's at issue in Issue 5, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. The order also provides performance standards, that is to say if you want to be in the pool, for those people who don't have to pool, you have got to do certain things, correct?
- A. That's correct.



- Q. The point of those performance standards is to move milk to Class I plants, correct?
 - A. That's correct.

2.

2.1

Q. Okay. I think we have heard a fair bit of testimony this hearing, maybe not by you, that a purpose of higher Class I plants is to cause or otherwise -- I think one person used the phrase "force" -- other classes of milk to pool.

Isn't it the case that since that pooling is voluntary, when you say that the increased cost of moving milk is threatening the reliability of milk supplies of Class I in Texas, what you really mean is that the Class I differential that is already being charged is so diluted that the people actually incurring the cost of delivery don't have an incentive to do so?

A. I don't know all the mathematics of that, but -but the -- our members are telling us that the return they
are getting from supplying Class I milk, which is
expensive, is not returning enough revenue given all of
the costs that they are incurring to do it.

There's a parallel that I have pointed out, and you will hear it in other testimonies, that just as IDFA has provided testimony that the cost of manufacturing dairy products has increased and is not being covered by the current Make Allowances, a point in which our members generally agree, similarly, the cost of supplying Class I milk to fluid plants has increased, and that -- and the fundamental mechanism for ensuring that fluid plants get



adequate supplies of Class I milk are the Class I differentials. That's the basic foundation of the Federal Order program. Those current differentials are no longer adequate to the task, and we're proposing that they be adjusted for -- to conform with current realities.

Q. What I'm sort of specifically getting at here, is my understanding was when you say, on the bottom of page 4, that the combination of increased miles milk must move to serve Class I markets, and the significant increases in the per milk cost of moving milk is threatening the reliability for milk suppliers for Class I use, that you are making that statement as a justification for modifications of the University of Wisconsin model results.

Am I correct?

- A. We believe the University of Wisconsin model results reflect that the reality of supplying milk, the cost of supplying milk to -- for Class I plants throughout the United States, and we use that as a basis to come up with our recommendations in Proposal 19.
- Q. But as you have stated -- and I'll have the pleasure or opportunity, and so will Mr. Sims, to discuss at some length Texas -- you have gone through -- you, National Milk members, have gone through some significant effort to justify modifications to Texas from the University of Wisconsin model results, correct?
- A. Correct. In general, the modifications that

 National Milk made based on the institutional knowledge of



2.

2.0

2.1

their -- you know, our members' staffs that have expertise in their local markets were relatively modest compared to the -- to the results of the University of Wisconsin model, which is a greatly expanded and improved version of the model that was used by USDA to establish the current Class I differentials.

We didn't come with -- we didn't invent this process of using the University of Wisconsin -- previously Cornell University -- models as the basis and then making some fine-tuning adjustments from that. That was -- that was the procedure that the Department initiated in Federal Order reform to come up with the current differential structure which was considerably different than the previous one, which kind of zoned everything out of Eau Claire, Wisconsin.

Q. Well, let's not talk about Eau Claire.

So I think I'll probably move on, but I confess, I'm very confused about what's going on in Texas. And for those who know me, when I entered this wonderful business in 1985, it's because of Texas.

So I -- I -- what I'm trying to get at is if, as you say, there's all this new cheese production coming on in the Southwest because of the value of milk used in cheese versus fluid milk, why when we have declining milk supplies -- I'm sorry -- declining fluid milk consumption, if that is the case, why are we further increasing Class I prices?

A. We are proposing an increase in Class I prices to



2.

2.0

2.1

account for the increased costs of supplying milk to Class I fluid plants for all the reasons of I have outlined, and you will hear in great detail by further witnesses.

The fundamental purposes of the Class I differentials is to provide -- facilitate the provision of an adequate supply of fluid milk for -- for Class I manufacturing. And, therefore, we are basically just updating the standard procedures for evaluating and, you know, the proper level of the Class I differentials, which have not changed, mostly, in almost a quarter of a century, while the costs that -- that -- and the structural changes in the dairy industry that are pertinent, directly pertinent to the proper level of the Class I differentials, have not changed.

We're simply proposing an update to the -- to the current Class I differential structure based upon the provisions of the -- of the Federal Order and its principles.

We are -- we are not aware that the 1937 Act indicates that the Federal Order program is responsible for making changes in the consumption of Americans -- of the American population of fluid milk.

Q. But shouldn't it be relevant -- you said in the quarter century since they've been modified, those costs have gone up. The same time in that quarter century, Class I utilization in Federal Orders, which now includes California, is down to 28%, and if you exclude Federal



2.

2.0

2.1

Orders, it's 18%, correct?

A. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

23

27

28

- Q. So leaving aside all the testimony we have had about the Southeast, don't we really have a plentiful supply of milk, it's just that the incentives we have aren't getting to where it's needed?
 - A. Define plentiful supply of milk.
- Q. I'd say 82% of milk being used in other than Class I is plentiful.

You don't agree?

- A. No, I don't agree with that. Because manufacturing those -- transforming milk into those other dairy products in fluid is just as important to the -- you know, to the dairy industry as trans- -- as transforming that milk into fluid products.
- Q. So both in your testimony on page 6, second paragraph, and in response to some of my questions, you have referred to alignment as one of the criteria for the National Milk modifications, correct?
- 20 A. Say that word again?
- 21 Q. Alignment.
- 22 A. Alignment?
 - 0. Correct.
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. Are you quite certain the National Milk has honored alignment in its private meetings?
 - A. Yes, to my knowledge. Our members who are actually responsible for supplying milk for Class I use



are acutely aware of the disruptions that can be caused by Class I differentials in, you know, nearby counties being out of alignment --

Q. Are you --

2.

2.0

2.1

- A. -- and they have sought to correct some of those.
- Q. Are you aware of examples where National Milk Producers Federation's intent to ensure historical price alignment were made even if the model concluded that the -- that the values were significantly different?
- A. I'm not aware that we made major changes in the alignment from the model results to the final Proposal 19 results. I mentioned an example in Dallas/Fort Worth where the model showed, as you would expect, you know, where there's, what, a 30-some-mile difference between those, that there would be, you know, a small difference in the model results. For -- for -- you know, for other reasons we decided to -- to make them the same. We did not consider that to be a major deviation.

I'm not aware of anything where we -- where the model said the two nearby areas should be, you know, the same or, you know, roughly similar, and we ended up making them vastly different. We respected the general alignment scenario that the model gave us in almost all cases.

- Q. For the red -- I think you used the word electronic pens, or computers, alterations, was there a limit on the modification size? That is to say, could it be more than \$0.10?
 - A. We looked at trying to keep the modifications from



the model as minimal as possible, but we did not, to my knowledge, say this is the maximum. We had a general sense of that and -- and again, the results show that those changes from the model results were relatively modest, particularly as a percentage of the Class I price, but I'm not aware that there was a binding limit, you know, you cannot -- you cannot come up with a change that was more than X dollars per hundredweight, or cents per hundredweight.

- Q. So in answer to questions from your counsel, you indicated that the pages 12 through 82 of Exhibit 299, marked originally as Exhibit National Milk Producers Federation 35, contains the proposed county-by-county Class I differentials with the two corrections you made today, correct?
- A. Correct.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. Where in National Milk Producers Federation's pre-submitted testimony can I find the county-by-county Class I differentials that resulted from any -- one or more -- of the University of Wisconsin model runs?
- A. We submitted in our -- in everything we submitted to USDA in our petition, in our testimony, we basically used the structure of the Federal Order regulations in paragraph 1000.52 as a model, which -- which did not -- which basically stated these are our recommendations for the differential. It was not a didactic exercise that we supplied that information where we wanted to show everything we did. We're not trying to hide anything, but



we did not feel in our formal request to the Department and our testimony that it was necessary to provide all that information.

- Q. So let me just be clear. The one set of numbers that I believe -- and I could be wrong -- that are pre-submitted or at this point you have submitted as Exhibit 299 for the proposed class and differentials and any justification for them in terms of the -- as opposed to what testimony I'm going to get -- is found on pages 12 to 82 as corrected of this exhibit, correct?
- A. That is our Proposal 19. You will hear plenty of testimony from -- from task force members in their own areas of the specific changes they made to the model results and how they modified them based upon their additional information.
- Q. Now, to be clear, as you referenced a minute ago, the petition that you made to USDA and information supplied to USDA, absent somebody putting that into this record, whatever you filed with your actual petition and the backup materials that might have been submitted, are not part of the record unless somebody makes them part of the record, correct?
- A. The only thing I'm aware of as part of the record is the differentials that we proposed in Proposal 19.
 - Q. Which are found in Exhibit 299, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. But, in fact, National Milk Producers Federation submitted to USDA significant spreadsheets with respect 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

the model runs and National Milk's -- back in May and June, correct?

- A. Yes. I believe that we provided our -- you know, the model information to the Department as pertinent information to support our proposal.
- Q. Okay. But at least as of this moment, they are not in the record, correct?
 - A. I have not seen them in the record.
- Q. Is National Milk planning to put them in the record?
- A. I can't answer that because I don't know the answer to that question.
 - O. All right.

2.

2.0

2.1

MR. ENGLISH: Your Honor, it may make sense to go off the record as I pass out -- we pre-filed MIG-29 and MIG-30, I have lost track, Monday night, so it's been available since, you know, USDA posted it at least Tuesday morning. And, of course, what I will pass out has been on the USDA hearing website, if not an exhibit, since this summer, so it's not a surprise to anybody I believe. But if I may hand them out.

So pursuant to the rules, my understanding is that we must provide four printed copies as a courtesy.

Notwithstanding the expense, we have 25 with us. We can't share, you know, one for every single person, but we wanted to make available obviously to Your Honor, the witness, myself, and a few others. But we have the four, I believe in color, and to save a few pennies, the others



1	are black and white. So if we can go off the record to
2	distribute these.
3	THE COURT: All right. Let's do. I need to
4	stretch some, too, so let's take ten minutes. So please
5	be back and ready to go at 10:40.
6	We go off record at 10:27.
7	(Whereupon, a break was taken.)
8	THE COURT: Let's go back on record.
9	We're back on record at 10:41 a.m.
10	MR. ENGLISH: So, Your Honor, we have passed
11	things out. I think USDA is still maybe marking. I don't
12	believe you have a copy at the moment. I don't believe
13	the witness has a copy.
14	THE COURT: So mine comes from Emily. And are
15	they already marked? Okay.
16	MR. ENGLISH: Okay. So I earlier said MIG-29 and
17	30. I should have said MIG-28 and 29.
18	So I would ask that MIG-28 be marked as 300. I
19	believe National Milk is disappointed but you know,
20	they are not 300 on this but and that MIG-29 be 301.
21	Is USDA going to supply a copy to the witness or
22	do we need to provide that?
23	MS. TAYLOR: We can give a copy.
24	THE COURT: Okay. We remain on record. I just
25	want to state how we mark these. It is, as Mr. English
26	requested, Exhibit MIG-28 is Exhibit 300.
27	(Exhibit Number 300 was marked for
28	identification.)



1	THE COURT: Exhibit MIG-29 is 301.
2	(Exhibit Number 301 was marked for
3	identification.)
4	THE COURT: I am one of the blessed people who has
5	colored copies, but there's not much colored, actually, is
6	there, Mr. English? The person that has black and white
7	is not disadvantaged.
8	MR. ENGLISH: Well, since I don't have one in
9	black and white, I can't say. Even with my eyesight, I
10	believe they are not disadvantaged.
11	And by the way, I want to note that as we passed
12	them out, we passed them out in one binder clip so that
13	that those people in the audience should note that MIG-28
14	is the first 54 pages of what was passed out with one
15	binder clip, and then MIG-29, which is now Exhibit 301, is
16	the 54 pages that follow. So if you are confused because
17	you have only one big document, it's because we in
18	order to produce them and pass them out, we did it that
19	way, but they are two separate documents.
20	THE COURT: And just for the record, Mr. English,
21	what size paper is this that they are printed on?
22	MR. ENGLISH: I believe it is 11x17.
23	THE COURT: Thank you.
24	MR. ENGLISH: And the people who actually know say
25	I'm right.
26	THE COURT: Very good.
27	MR. ENGLISH: So as I said before we went off the
28	record, Your Honor, electronic versions were submitted to



USDA Monday night, but also I would note that these were submitted by National Milk to USDA.

It's my understanding that Exhibit 300 was submitted in May of this year, and that Exhibit 301 was submitted in June of this year. But I can -- I can ask the witness some questions.

Further, Your Honor, I represent that these documents that were submitted, were downloaded from the USDA website, and the only change is the header and footer where we added MIG Exhibit Number 28 or 29, and pages 1 of 54 as requested by USDA for submissions.

I also note that each document at the bottom has the URL where they can be found -- very small print, but it's there -- and I'm not going to attempt to read that, as they are on both the paper copies and the electronic version.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. English. And you may continue to question.

19 BY MR. ENGLISH:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

2.0

2.1

24

25

27

- Q. So, Doctor, do you recognize Exhibit 300?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And this was submitted to USDA by National Milk in May of 2023?
 - A. Yes, I believe so.
 - Q. And similarly, do you recognize Exhibit 301?
- 26 A. Yes.
 - O. And was that submitted to USDA in June?
 - A. I will take your word for it, those dates of



submission. We did -- we did supply this information to USDA. And to my understanding, that the -- Dr. Nicholson is intending to also enter these similar information into the record.

Q. Well, actually, that anticipates my next question, because it is -- would you agree with me that -- so let me say for the record that there are column letters A through S on Exhibit 300, and column letters -- well, it goes through S, but there's no numbers past O, so A through O on 301.

And so when you say that Dr. Nicholson will supply something, in fact, he can supply only a part of this, correct? Because --

- A. I'm not sure what he's planning to supply, but in terms of the basic information, we -- we have not intended to keep this private. This is -- we have made this information available.
- Q. Sir, I did not mean in any way, shape, or form to imply that's what it was. I, frankly, was concerned -- lest somebody think it was part of the record, I have had an off-the-record conversation with one of our colleagues here who was, like, oh, I didn't realize this wasn't in the record. So it certainly is not implied. Obviously we have had access to it, so I don't disagree that it's been public.
 - A. Yep.
- Q. Absolutely. But -- but let me -- let me see if I can be clear. And so let me run across the columns with



2.

2.1

1	what ha	s been called for me, my magic decoder pen.
2		So I want to start and discuss Columns A through
3	E, and	then Columns F and G.
4		Column A is simply a model county identification
5	number,	correct?
6	А.	Yes. Sequential numbers 1 through presumably
7	3100-so	mething.
8	Q.	And Column B is the county county name,
9	correct	?
10	А.	County, city, or parish.
11	Q.	County, city, or parish, thank you for the
12	clarifi	cation.
13		And Column C is the state name, correct?
14	А.	Correct. I'm working from the first page.
15	Q.	The state abbreviation, correct?
16	Α.	Correct.
17	Q.	And then the Column D is actually the full state
18	name, c	orrect?
19	А.	Correct.
20	Q.	Then we have column E which is called the FIPS
21	code.	
22		Do you we may have to ask Dr. Stephenson, but
23	do you	know what the FIPS code is?
24	Α.	It seems to be a code that identifies individual
25	countie	s.
26		THE COURT: And just for the record, would you say
27	the let	ters that comprise "FIPS"?



MR. ENGLISH: F-I-P-S.

BY MR. ENGLISH:

1

4

5

6

7

9

10

17

18

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 2. Okay. And those all came from the University of Wisconsin model, correct? 3
 - Correct. Α.
 - They were delivered to National Milk as a --Ο.
- Α. They correspond to what's currently listed in terms of identifying county, cities, and parishes in 8 paragraph 1000.52.
 - And then Column F is the model result for the Ο. spring, or May of 2021, correct?
- 11 Α. Yes.
- 12 Ο. And this is the result of the third iteration, 13 correct?
- 14 I believe so. Α.
- 15 Ο. And so Column F came from the University of 16 Wisconsin, correct?
 - Α. Correct. But you will need to direct that question also to Dr. Nicholson to confirm.
- 19 And I -- I have a cross-examination for him. Ο. So, 2.0 yes. Thank you, though.
 - But -- but you -- your understanding is that Column F came from the University of Wisconsin model?
 - This is the way we received the model results. Τ cannot confirm every single number in there. But I -- I assume that this is -- if it came from the website, I assume this is the correct final model results.
 - Ο. Okay. And then we have Column G, which is the equivalent of Column F, but this time, however, it's the



fall or October 2021 University of Wisconsin model result,
correct?

A. Correct. Correct.

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

- Q. Okay. Am I correct that once we get past
 Column G, everything else on columns -- Exhibits 300 and
 301 were derived not from the University of Wisconsin
 directly, but from National Milk?
- A. It appears to be so. You are taking differences between the May and October results, you are taking differences between the May results and current, and same thing with October.
- Q. So to be clear, if we just put, you know, something over the document, you know, everything left of the line between G and H came from the University of Wisconsin, correct?
- A. Specifically E -- excuse me -- F, G really were the main things that came from the model.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. Everything else, you know, the model results included a lot of these calculations, but the guts of what came from the model are Columns F and G.
- Q. Okay. And I guess what you are saying is
 Columns A through E are basically effectively lining up
 with the Federal Order language?
 - A. Labels.
- Q. Labels, okay.
- 27 A. Yes.
- 28 Q. And then -- but everything to the right, so to



- speak, so Columns -- on 300, Columns H, I, J, K, L, M, O,
 P, O, R, S, were added by National Milk, correct?
 - A. I assume so, because they are -- just knowing how spreadsheets work, these look like they are fairly simple calculations from Columns E, F, and the current differentials, and basically what's currently in paragraph 1000.52.
 - Q. And so maybe this would be the better way to ask the question.
 - Dr. Nicholson did not provide the information in those calculations done in Columns H through S, correct?
 - A. I don't recall exactly what -- what -- what was -- there were some calculations that the -- Dr. Nicholson's provided, just as output. But these were -- in all cases, those are simple comparisons, very simple calculations.

 And anybody -- whoever made them, they were pretty
 - Q. So while you and I may believe they are straightforward calculations, for purposes of the record, let's see if we can quickly go through.

straightforward calculations.

- So Column H is labeled October to May differences. So what is that, exactly?
 - A. That is a difference between the numbers on each line and from -- between Columns G and Column F.
- Q. And Column I labeled current differential at -- is basically if you go to part 1000.50 adjusted for the Southeast in 51, that's the current differential, correct?
 - A. Yes. Adjusted for the Southeast, yes.



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 then Column J says May-current.
 What is May-current in Column J?
 - A. That's the difference between the number in Column A on each line and the number in Column I.
 - O. I'm sorry, did I hear you say A or did you mean --
 - A. Excuse me, F. Column F and Column I.
 - Q. And then -- so K would be the difference between Column G and Column I?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. Okay. And then Column L, what is Column L?
- 11 A. Column L should be the average of the numbers in Column F and Column G.
- Q. And then so Column M is the difference between Column L and Column J?
- 15 A. Column -- Column I.
- 16 Q. I. Thank you.
- THE COURT: State again in one sentence what it's the difference of?
- MR. ENGLISH: Thank you.
- 20 BY MR. ENGLISH:

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. Column M is the difference between Column L and Column I, correct?
- 23 A. That's correct.
- Q. And Column N is certainly the Federal Order number where the county is located, correct?
- A. Yes. If the county is located in the marketing area of the Federal Order, that Federal Order number is given in Column N.



- NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING 1 Ο. Okay. And then Column O is proposed Class I, 2. correct? That is the -- that is the proposed number 3 Α. Yes. 4 that was in Proposal Number 19. So I'm a little confused. Column O is labeled 5 Proposed Class I, and Column S is New Proposal. 6 7 How are Column O and Column S different, if you 8 know? 9 Can you repeat that? Α. 10 So I'm looking at Column O, which is labeled Ο. 11 Proposed Class I, and then I look over at Column S, where 12 the label is New Proposal. And I don't know if they are
- 14 Can you explain why there are two columns and 15 whether or not they are the same or different, if you 16 know?
 - Α. No, I don't know. They appear to be the same.
 - Then Column P is proposed versus current, which 0. would be, I believe, Column O minus Column I, correct?
 - Α. That's correct.

duplicative or not.

- And then Column Q is proposed versus -- so it says Ο. proposed versus model average, which I take it would be O minus L; is that correct?
 - Α. Yes.
- 25 And then there's a column labeled R, average Ο. 26 monthly pounds, 2022, in millions.
 - Can you please explain that?
 - I would assume that that is the average monthly Α.



13

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

27

pounds that the -- that the model had assigned to each of those individual counties, cities, and parish. But that's a question, again, for Dr. Nicholson.

- Q. Well, are you sure it's for Dr. Nicholson?

 Because I don't know if he provided that data or you did.
- A. I don't recall that we went through and -- and interpolated the more aggregated numbers that were available for the pounds of milk. I assume that refers to pounds of milk.
- 10 Q. Okay.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

- A. I'm not aware that National Milk did a
 disaggregation to the county, city, parish level for all
 3100-plus counties.
 - 0. Okay.
 - A. My sense is this calculation was made by somebody else, but that can be clarified -- that can be clarified if you ask it to enough of our witnesses.
 - Q. Thank you.
 - THE COURT: Mr. English, I want you to go back to Column Q and again ask the witness how that is calculated.
- MR. ENGLISH: I believe, but the witness can correct me, that Column Q is Column P minus Column L.
- THE WITNESS: Minus Column?
- 24 BY MR. ENGLISH:
- 25 O. L.
- 26 A. Yes.
- 27 | O. Am I right?
- 28 A. That's correct.



1 Ο. Okay. I'm sorry, it's Column O. I apologize, 2. it's Column O --Column O minus Column L. 3 MR. ENGLISH: I'm not sure how many times I'm 4 going to get that wrong, Your Honor, so let me try it 5 6 again. And I thank my extremely helpful colleague. 7 BY MR. ENGLISH: So Column O is Column O, labeled Proposed Class I, 8 Ο. 9 minus Column L, which is labeled UofW v3 -- for I think 10 iteration 3 -- average. 11 Would that be correct? 12 That's correct. So, for example, that very first 13 line of Autauga County, Alabama, that indicates that the 14 changes made to the final model results resulted in a 15 lowering of the differential in Autauga County, Alabama by 16 \$0.20. 17 MR. ENGLISH: May I consult with my colleague for one moment, Your Honor? 18 19 THE COURT: Certainly, yes. 2.0 Let's go off record. It's 11:00 a.m. 2.1 (An off-the-record discussion took place.) 22 THE COURT: And let's go back on the record. still 11:00 a.m. 23 24 THE WITNESS: Time is standing still. 25 BY MR. ENGLISH: 26 Q. So as it happens, I needed a tiny bit of help from 27 my consultant, and I probably should have known myself, 28 given the fact that I am from the Commonwealth of



1	Virginia.
2	(Court Reporter clarification.)
3	BY MR. ENGLISH:
4	Q. So I think, again, for the benefit of the record,
5	when we turn because Your Honor noted color, but I
6	think there's some modifications.
7	Pages 49, 50, and 51, do have some additional
8	color, not blue, but yellow or orange. And I believe
9	you're closely enough connected to the Washington, D.C.,
10	Metropolitan Area that you can probably understand where
11	I'm going with this.
12	A. I don't have a color copy.
13	THE COURT: The witness should have a color copy.
14	MR. ENGLISH: Can I hand it to him for a moment,
15	Your Honor?
16	THE COURT: No, I'm going to exchange. I'm going
17	to take what he's got.
18	THE WITNESS: If you are going to ask me a
19	question about colors, I need to see what the colors are.
20	MR. ENGLISH: I apologize.
21	THE COURT: And I don't I can follow along
22	without them, and I have not marked them in any way.
23	Thank you so much.
24	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
25	BY MR. ENGLISH:
26	Q. So if we look let's just start with 49, and
27	I'll try to keep this really short.
28	THE COURT: But don't go fast.



NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING 1 MR. ENGLISH: Point taken, Your Honor. 2. BY MR. ENGLISH: So Virginia is a jurisdiction where there are 3 4 cities that -- and counties, and sometimes cities are inside counties, correct, Doctor? 5 Virginia has cities and counties. I'm not sure 6 Α. 7 that the cities are incorporated in the counties or 8 whether they are separate. 9 O. Okay. 10 Like, I live next door to City Falls Church and Α. 11 Fairfax County, but I do believe that those are separate. 12 They can be separate. But you can live in Falls 13 Church for Postal Service purposes, and yet be in Fairfax 14 County, correct? 15 I'm not aware of exactly what's the territory of Α. 16 Fairfax County and whether it incorporates it. 17 MR. ENGLISH: Your Honor, maybe I'll just shorten 18 it. I don't think there's any controversy here. 19 THE WITNESS: If you know the facts, I will accept 2.0 your word. 2.1 BY MR. ENGLISH: 22 Ο. I want to make a representation for the record. 23 Having, you know, gone to the University of 2.4 Virginia, which is in Charlottesville, Virginia, and 25 Charlottesville, Virginia is inside Albemarle County, and, 26 in fact, the Albemarle County courthouse is across the



Α.

27

28

I will take your word for it to speed things

street from the Charlottesville courthouse.

along.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Q. And similarly, as I look through what are marked as yellow and orange, every single one of these is an instance where there's a -- there's a city that is located in or connected to a county. And I also grew up in Falls Church, but I grew up in the part of Falls Church that is part of Fairfax County.

And so I think to simplify the conversation, it would just say that when we see these yellow and oranges, they are not significant in any material way because they just describe a peculiarity of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

MR. HILL: Mr. English? For those following electronically, could you tell us what line you are on rather than the page number --

MR. ENGLISH: Okay.

MR. HILL: -- to the left.

MR. ENGLISH: Okay. So I'll go through the line numbers: 2790 is Alexandria City; 2801 is Bristol City; 2805 is Buena Vista City; 2811 is Charlottesville; 2812 is Chesapeake City; 2815 is Colonial Heights; 2816 is Covington; 2820 is Danville City; 2823 is Emporia.

THE COURT: Now, let me stop you. Even with my black and white copy, I can see the highlighting of everything that you are reading, so I don't think you need to read them all, but --

MR. ENGLISH: I'm fine stopping, if that's okay.

MR. HILL: It's just that online it doesn't have



- 1 the page numbers. I just needed to know where you were. 2. MR. ENGLISH: Okay. So it's Virginia, starting at 2789, which is Albemarle, and it runs through the end of 3 4 Virginia, which is line number 2920, York. MR. HILL: Thank you very much. 5 MR. ENGLISH: Okay. Thank you, sir. I'm happy 6 7 not to read them all in. THE COURT: And is the Commonwealth of Virginia 8 9 the only batch of lines that has this polarity? 10 MR. ENGLISH: Looking through it very quickly, Your Honor, yes. 11 12 THE COURT: Makes you proud, doesn't it? 13 MR. ENGLISH: Wahoo-wa. 14 BY MR. ENGLISH: 15 All right. Okay. So I am really not going to Ο. 16 spend a lot more time on all this, but I am going to try 17 to clarify. 18 So let's start with -- let's turn to Exhibit 301. 19 Do you want me to keep the pages that you just Α. 2.0 referred to on number 300 or are we done with those? 2.1 We can give those back to the judge and switch if Ο. 22 you want. 23 THE COURT: No, no, no, I want the witness to keep 24 that. Thank you. 25 MR. ENGLISH: I just remembered the answer. All 26 right.
- BY MR. ENGLISH: 28
 - So we turn to 301, first it's labeled at the top, 0.



June 2023, at the very top in the header.

Are you in 301?

A. Yes, I am.

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. And so would this refresh your recollection that if it's labeled June 2023, it was probably submitted in June 2023?
 - A. I see it listed as such, yes.
- Q. I should have started there. So this -- this is different in one, at least to me, obvious respect, which is that through Columns A through Column N appears to be identical to Columns A through Columns N on Exhibit 300.

Do you agree?

- A. It would appear such.
- Q. Okay. And then it appears that this omits Exhibit 300, Columns O, P, Q, R, and substitutes with a caveat Column S for Column O. And I'll come back to the caveat in a second.

Is that -- is that correct that -- that maybe there's some differences between S and O in between 300 and 301, but in essence, you have fewer columns and you have omitted O, P, Q, R from Exhibit 300?

- A. Columns O, P, Q, and R are basically -- Column O is significant because that's the final results on Exhibit 30, the rest are just calculations. But I cannot testify exactly what -- in Exhibit 300 is -- Column S is labeled as New Proposal and Column O is listed as Proposal.
 - Q. Okay. And do you know -- if you don't, that's



1	fine whether there's any differences between the
2	numbers that appear in Column S and the numbers that
3	appear in Column S, Exhibit 300, and Exhibit 301,
4	Column O?
5	A. I do not know the answer to that question, because
6	I have not had time to go through and compare them line by
7	line.
8	THE COURT: And, Dr. Vitaliano, you mentioned
9	Exhibit 30, and you were looking at 300 at the time.
10	THE WITNESS: 300 and 301.
11	THE COURT: Thank you.
12	MR. ENGLISH: Your Honor, I only have a few more
13	questions, but for housekeeping, I move the admission of
14	Exhibits 300 and 301 having laid, I think, a sufficient
15	foundation.
16	THE COURT: Is there any objection to the
17	admission into evidence of Exhibit 300?
18	There is none. Exhibit 300 is admitted into
19	evidence.
20	(Exhibit Number 300 was received into
21	evidence.)
22	THE COURT: Is there any objection to the
23	admission into evidence of Exhibit 301? 301?
24	There is none. Exhibit 301 is admitted into
25	evidence.
26	(Exhibit Number 301 was received into
27	evidence.)
28	///



BY MR. ENGLISH: 1 2. So keeping the two exhibits handy -- and I want to 3 go to --THE COURT: Be closer to the mic. 4 MR. ENGLISH: Thank you. It's a little hard, the 5 6 size of the documents, but thank you. 7 I want to go to FIPS, F-I-P-S, Column E, code 27053, which is on page 23 for those in the hearing room. 8 THE COURT: The line number? 9 10 MR. ENGLISH: I'm getting there. 11 THE COURT: Oh, okay. 12 MR. ENGLISH: I'm sorry, I had it and then I lost 13 it. 14 27053 is -- so it's line number 1307 ironically 15 under ID, because there's one number off, it's 1307, which 16 is Hennepin County, Minnesota, otherwise known as 17 Minneapolis. 18 THE WITNESS: I see that as 1308. BY MR. ENGLISH: 19 2.0 I understand it's 1308 on the line number. Ο. 2.1 let's just omit Column A for this, because the way the 22 line numbers work --23 Okay. And they are sequential. 24 They are off by precisely one between the ID and 25 the line number. So let's use line number 1308. And the Column E 26 27 is FIPS Code 27053, and it's Hennepin County, Minnesota. 28 And I note, you would agree, that the model spring



- 1 is 2.60 in Column F, correct?
 2 A. Correct.
- Q. And for Row 1308, Column G, the October number in Column G is 2.70, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- 6 | 0. And --

- THE COURT: Now, do you want the transcript to show \$2.60?
- 9 MR. ENGLISH: Yes, \$2.60 and \$2.70. All of these
 10 numbers are in dollars. I will try to remember to say
 11 that.
- 12 THE COURT: Thank you.
- 13 BY MR. ENGLISH:
- Q. And if we go over to Column L, which is labeled
 University of Wisconsin version 3, average, the average is
 2.65, correct?
- 17 A. Correct.
- Q. And if we go all the way over to the right in Column S, the proposal, under 2 -- new proposal, it's 20 2.80, correct?
- 21 A. Correct.
- Q. Now let's go to Exhibit 3. So let's remember that's 2.80 from Exhibit 300.
- So let's please go to Exhibit 301, the June submission, same FIPS code. So I will repeat, 27053, page 23 for those who have a copy here, line 1308, Hennepin County. And I would ask you to go all the way
- over to the right in Column O, and you see \$3, correct?



A. That's correct.

2.

2.1

- Q. So what changed, in National Milk's view, from the May submission to the June petition where Proposal 19 went to \$3, which is \$0.20 higher than was submitted in May?
- A. Well, to get the definitive answers, again, you need to direct that question to the witness who will testify in that area. But it was an iterative process. Anybody who's done this kind of analysis knows that you don't often get the perfect number the first time. You need to double-check, you need to look at a number of things, and, you know, those things will change. At some point you have to say this is final and -- and submit, in this case, your final numbers in the form of a proposal. And so that number changed by \$0.20, given these documents, and you'd have to ask the person who was more directly involved what caused that change.

But as an analyst, there's nothing very surprising about this process to me.

Q. Now, if we stay on Exhibit 301 in the same FIPS code, for Hennepin County, you have a proposal for \$3, and a Column I, current differential, and \$1.70.

So you would agree that you are proposing, in Proposal 19, to increase the Class I differential in Minneapolis by \$1.30, correct?

- A. Okay. Which exhibit are you in?
- Q. I'm still in Exhibit 301.
- A. What's the MIG number?
- Q. 29.



- A. Okay. Are you still on Hennepin County?
- Q. I'm still on Hennepin County. In Column I is the current differential is \$1.30; in Column O is \$3.

And you would agree with me that that difference is \$1.30 higher, correct?

- A. I see Hennepin County, Column I is \$1.70.
- Q. Right. And Column O is \$3, correct?
- A. Correct.

1

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

- Q. And maybe the easiest thing we're going to do today is you subtract \$1.70 from \$3 and you get to \$1.30, correct?
- 12 A. That's correct.
 - O. And that's an increase, correct?
 - A. That's an increase in the number in the column labeled Proposed from the current differential.
 - Q. Okay. Going back to our conversation before either break, given the Class I utilization in the Upper Midwest, which I think is around 5 to 8%, what is the justification for increasing the Class I differential in Minneapolis by \$1.30?
 - A. The justification is basically the purpose of price alignment. We had to look -- each county, particularly counties with a -- with a city, or you know, milk plants in them, had to be aligned with those from other areas, and that was one of the overriding considerations in coming up with our proposed differentials.
 - Again, in terms of the specifics, you need to



direct that question to the person who will be testifying specifically in that region that includes Hennepin County, Minnesota.

Q. And I am reminded that maybe I have been imprecise in my questions, so let me backtrack for one moment.

Is it your understanding, if we look at MIG-29, which is what you have, which has been marked as Exhibit 301, that except for the two changes you told us about earlier today, what is found in Column O is -- in your understanding, is what is NMPF-19?

- A. NMPF Proposal 19?
- O. 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

- A. I'd have to double check that to give you an affirmative answer, but I have no reason to question why that is not the case. I don't have -- I don't have the numbers in Proposal 19 as I submitted them in front of me.
- Q. Okay. So I want to turn next, I want you to remember what we did in Minneapolis with the \$1.30 increase, which, by the way -- let me go back. Let me strike that.
- So I want to go to FIPS code 12086, which is Miami-Dade, Florida.
- THE COURT: Which is what?
- MR. ENGLISH: Miami-Dade, Florida.
- MR. HILL: Line number?
- MR. ENGLISH: I'm getting there. 12086 for those in the room. It's on page 6, and 12086 is line number 335.



1	MR. HILL: Thank you.
2	BY MR. ENGLISH:
3	Q. I'm looking on Column F, FIPS code. And I'm only
4	looking at Exhibit 301, which is Exhibit MIG-29.
5	And I want to walk you through so under
6	Column F, from the University of Wisconsin, for May we
7	have \$7.40?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. And for Column G, we have \$8.40?
10	A. Correct.
11	Q. And then the average under Column L, University of
12	Wisconsin average, is \$7.90, correct?
13	A. Correct.
14	Q. And Column O is also \$7.90, correct?
15	A. Correct.
16	Q. And so for all of this conversation in this
17	hearing about the need for more milk in the Southeast, if
18	you look at Column M, you are increasing the Class I
19	differential in Miami by \$1.90, correct?
20	A. That's correct.
21	Q. As compared to raising Minneapolis by \$1.30,
22	correct?
23	A. Correct.
24	Q. Why is it that for the greatest, as you said in
25	your testimony, the milk that needs the milk to the
26	county that needs the milk to move the farthest from the
27	farthest reserve supply, you used the average in Column O,
28	but for Minneapolis you use a number higher than either



- A. We felt that the model results for Miami-Dade were adequate for the purpose of price alignment, all of the purposes we looked at for which we commissioned the model and made adjustments to it. We chose not to make adjustments to the model results for Miami-Dade. We chose to do those for Hennepin County, Minnesota.
- Q. Wouldn't it, if we need to move milk to Florida, make more sense to increase that spread as opposed to decrease that spread?
- A. That question would spring from a much, much simpler understanding of the whole process. And, again, I then -- then we used -- and I would recommend you direct that question to Dr. Nicholson first and -- to speak for the model, and to the person who is -- to the people who are going to testify on those two different regions for the modifications that National Milk made to the model results. They will give you much better answers to those questions.
- Q. But we already said that Dr. Nicholson didn't calculate the average or any of these columns included in the proposal, correct?
 - A. What average are you referring to?
- Q. Column L, University of Wisconsin didn't provide you Column L, did it?
 - A. Probably not. But they provided the two numbers that we decided to use as the starting point in the process of making further adjustments to the model



2.

2.0

2.1

- 1 results. We did not necessarily use the average in all 2. cases, but we calculated the average as a starting point. For the primary purpose that our eventual proposal had to 3 have one number, the Class I differentials listed in the 4 Federal Order regulations have a single number, they do 5 6 not permit us to use seasonal numbers. And we saw no 7 reason to recommend further disaggregating 8 paragraph 1000.52 into regional -- or excuse me --9 seasonal -- seasonal parts.
 - Q. I want you to turn to FIPS, F-I-P-S, 80 -- I'm sorry, whoa, 08031, which is Denver, Colorado, and I will give page and line as soon as I have it.

The very bottom on page 4, line number 233.

- A. Are we still just on Exhibit 301?
- Q. Yeah, we'll stick -- unless I say otherwise -- and thank you very much. Yes. I -- let's -- I -- I think that -- I only have a very few more of these, but I think from now on we're not going to look at the fact that there was a change, we're just going to look at 301.

So if we look at 301, and line 233, Denver, you would agree that Columns F and G are identical at \$2.50, correct?

- A. Correct.
- Q. And if you look at Column I, the current differential is \$2.55. And so if you look at Column J -- I'm sorry -- well, yeah, Column J or Column K, the -- it actually is down \$0.05, correct?
 - A. Correct.



10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. And the average in Column M is down \$0.05 on the average, correct?
 - A. That's correct.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. So how did we get from a model number that went down to 2.50 to an \$0.80 increase to \$3.30 in Column L?
- A. As I explained, the model results were very accurate in many cases, very, very, very close. If you go through and look at those differences, you will see that they are generally pretty modest, but -- but in some cases, based upon the institutional knowledge of our -- the members of our task force that were looking with expertise in those regions, we chose to make a change. And, in general, those changes were -- were relatively modest, but were not in all cases modest, and you will have to direct that question to the witness that speaks to the changes made to the Colorado numbers.
- Q. So this allows me, I think, to ask and hopefully get an answer to a question that had puzzled me for a while until Ms. Keefe helped me understand it.

To the extent that a base price increase occurred from \$1.60 to 2.20, I don't see that directly reflected in MIG-29, which is 301. I believe it appears for the first time in what I think is a hard code in the Excel spreadsheet in Column O.

Would I be correct?

- A. Could you repeat that question? In other words, you are asking about the \$1.60 base differential?
 - Q. No, the 2.20. I'm asking about a change -- so you



agree with me, you said earlier, that the model results from the University of Wisconsin, so Columns F and G, were run in each of the three iterations at \$1.60, correct?

- A. That's my understanding, 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

- A. But you will have to confirm that with Dr. Nicholson, because we did not -- I don't recall that we -- that we decided on the 2.20 until after the model runs were made.
- Q. And my point is, am I correct that there's no column that delineates a change in a base price from \$1.60 to 2.20? There's just no column that says, here it is.
 - A. I don't see one in these documents.
- Q. And so would I be right that the place you need to look at in order to find and maybe then backwards derive what the base price increase is would be Column O?
- A. Column O was the final number. And I'd have to confirm that with looking at my list of these counties, cities, and parish numbers. But my understanding is that our final numbers would include the 2.20. But, yes, that would have been because it was June 2023.
 - Q. So it does, doesn't it? It must include --
 - A. Sure.
 - O. Yes, correct?
- A. It must include the 2.20, yes. Again, I'm seeing all these numbers for the first time in this particular spreadsheet format.
 - Q. But you, National Milk submitted it, correct?



- A. Yes, it's labeled National Milk.
- 2 | Q. Okay.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

26

27

28

- A. I have no reason to doubt that that's those numbers.
- Q. All right. I only have two more of these for you.

 Let's go to FIPS code 48453, which is Travis

 County, Texas, also known as city of Austin. And as you say, there's a lot of pages. So I think we're on page 47 for those in the room, and we're looking at line 2717, which is Travis, Texas, and I represent to you that it is Austin.

And if we do what we have done before exhibit -and that's MIG-29, 301 -- if we look at Column F for
Travis, it was a \$4 from the run for May, 4.20 for the run
for October, and back under Column L it's 4.10 for an
average, correct?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. And before your counsel made corrections, or you made corrections with your counsel, the number under Column O for Travis County is \$4.70, correct?
- A. It is listed as -- as such in Exhibit 301.
- O. And you have corrected it to 4.35, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Can you explain what happened between June and now, if you know?
 - A. No. I assume that -- no, I don't know. I do not know the reason for that correction. There were only two such corrections out of all of these numbers, so it's not



Q. And finally, let us turn to FIPS code 06065, Riverside, California, which is another state with a lot of counties but not as many as Texas, I think.

So page 4, line 191, FIPS code 6065, and we see for Column F, \$2.30, for Column G, \$2.50, correct?

- A. Correct.
- Q. The model average under Column L is \$2.40, and the proposal under Column O is \$3, correct?
- A. Correct.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Which is \$0.60 higher than the average, correct?
- 14 A. Correct.
- 15 | O. So California has a lot of milk, doesn't it?
- 16 A. In parts of the state, yes.
 - Q. So why is Riverside, California \$0.60 higher than the model average; Denver \$0.80 higher than the model average; and Miami, Florida, which we have heard a lot about for being the biggest deficit, the model average?
 - A. Well, your question derives from probably a somewhat too simplistic understanding of what the whole process was. But I would again direct you to direct those questions to the witnesses that are going to be testifying specifically to the changes in those regions.
 - Q. Is it too simplistic to think that Miami should have gone up the most?
 - A. Not necessarily.



MR. ENGLISH: Your Honor, I am going to go to a different section. I am mindful, I think, of certain travel plans. I don't know whether we need to have a conversation, and so maybe we need to confab, but my understanding is that Dr. Nicholson needs to be done -- done today, and if it's --

THE WITNESS: Same here.

MR. ENGLISH: Well, okay. I will let National Milk decide. I mean, if -- I have more to go. I am more than halfway done, but not two-thirds. On the other hand, this was probably the longest section. So I just want to be courteous and try to give National Milk an opportunity to figure out what they want to do.

THE COURT: Ms. Hancock, are you able to talk to us now about a proposal as to how we proceed with those two witnesses?

MS. HANCOCK: Yes, Your Honor. We have -Dr. Vitaliano will be back next week. He does have to
leave today for another commitment that he has, but
Dr. Nicholson also needs to be done today, if possible,
and he won't be back.

So I think if everybody is okay, we could put Dr. Nicholson's primary testimony on before lunch, and then after we return from lunch, have his cross-examination conducted, and then Dr. Vitaliano could pick back up next week when he returns.

THE COURT: Let me first ask, Dr. Vitaliano, how does that sound to you?



2.

2.0

2.1

That sounds fine. 1 THE WITNESS: I can be here 2. until -- I have a flight at 6:15 from this airport. THE COURT: So you possibly could be recalled 3 4 today, but it's kind of unlikely. 5 THE WITNESS: Depend -- given the length of the cross-examination, particularly of these key witnesses, I 6 7 would guess that if Dr. Nicholson goes on -- which I'm 8 happy to yield my time to him -- he will be kept occupied until he has to leave for his flight. 9 10 THE COURT: You yield back to the gentleman from 11 where? 12 THE WITNESS: Wisconsin, sorry. 13 THE COURT: That sounds the smartest. Do you agree, Ms. Hancock, just to have Dr. Vitaliano be 14 15 interrupted now to be resumed next week? 16 MS. HANCOCK: I think that's fine. And further 17 optimism, maybe that will help truncate some of his 18 examination. 19 MR. ENGLISH: Your Honor, first of all, I'm happy 20 to yield. I think what happens when you are the first 2.1 witness, you don't know who else is going to say things. 22 And I actually agree. I think it may very well be the 23 case that if -- assuming Mr. Sims gets on and off, and 24 Mr. Erba gets on and off, you know, I may have fewer 25 questions. So I do think it would make sense. 26 Besides which, I think we have routinely in this 27 proceeding recognized that the -- you know, the non-member



28

witnesses, like Dr. Nicholson and others, should have some

priority. Not quite the same priority as dairy farmers,
but I think next up.
So I am prepared to mark where I am. And I do
promise, I really do, that if I get the answers to the
questions before he gets back on, I will subtract them.
All right?
THE COURT: If you get the answers to the
questions what?
MR. ENGLISH: The questions that appear on
pages 11 through 17 of my cross-examination, having
finished 10, if I get those answers prior to his coming
back on the reason I'm asking him is he's the National
Milk witness, he's the first witness. I don't know for a
fact what other people are going to say. If I get answers
to questions that are otherwise posed for him, I will not
duplicate him. I make that assurance for everybody.
THE COURT: Very good. Well, let's take a
ten-minute break while everyone repositions. Is that a
good idea? No? Well, yeah, that's a good idea.
We can at least if we take, what, you want a
five-minute break? Can you be ready?
Okay. We'll take a five-minute break now. Please
be back and ready to go at 11:46.
We go off record at 11:41.
(Whereupon, a break was taken.)
THE COURT: Let's go back on record.
We're back on record at 11:46 a.m.



Would you state and spell your name for us,

1	please?
2	THE WITNESS: My name is Charles Nicholson,
3	C-H-A-R-L-E-S; Nicholson, N-I-C-H-O-L-S-O-N.
4	THE COURT: Thank you. I'd like to swear you in.
5	Would you raise your right hand, please.
6	CHARLES NICHOLSON,
7	Being first duly sworn, was examined and
8	testified as follows:
9	THE COURT: Thank you.
10	DIRECT EXAMINATION
11	BY MS. HANCOCK:
12	Q. Good morning, Dr. Nicholson. Thank you for being
13	here. Did you just provide your address?
14	THE COURT: I did not ask.
15	BY MS. HANCOCK:
16	Q. Sorry, for some reason I couldn't remember if you
17	just did. Could you provide your business address,
18	please?
19	A. My business address is 1675 Observatory Drive,
20	Madison, Wisconsin, 53706.
21	Q. Thank you.
22	And did you prepare Exhibits 36 and 36 well,
23	did you prepare Exhibits NMPF-36 and 36A in support of
24	your testimony today?
25	A. Yes, I did.
26	Q. Okay. And is Exhibit NMPF-36, is that the full
27	and complete written testimony that you have provided?
28	A. Yes, it is.



- Q. And is 36A a summary that you are intending to put into the record today in support of the full testimony?

 A. Yes, it is.

 MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, if we could give those

 Exhibit Numbers 302 for NMPF-36 and 303 for NMPF-36A?
 - (Exhibit Numbers 302 and 303 were marked for identification.)

THE COURT: We shall. Thank you.

BY MS. HANCOCK:

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. Before we turn to your statements, I'm wondering if you can provide an overview of your educational background.
- A. Okay. I have a bachelor's degree in economics and statistics from the University of California at Davis. I have a master of science degree in agricultural economics from Cornell University. And I have a Ph.D. in agricultural resource and managerial economics, also from Cornell University.
- Q. And can you give us an overview of your professional career?
- A. So I have, post-Ph.D., now experience going on close to 30 years. Much of it has been devoted to economic analysis of dairy industry issues, both in the United States and globally.
- Q. And we heard yesterday about a group or a kind of a brain trust of agricultural economists.
 - Do you belong to that group as well?
 - A. Yes. So that is what is now known as the Program



1	on Dairy Markets and Policy, primarily led out of the
2	University of Wisconsin. Prior to that, when it was based
3	at Cornell University, it was known as the Cornell Program
4	on Dairy Markets and Policy, and it was a group of
5	academics who met to discuss dairy industry issues and
6	offered an annual workshop for dairy economists and policy
7	an analysts.
8	MS. HANCOCK: And, Your Honor, at this time we
9	would offer Dr. Nicholson as an expert in as a dairy
10	economist. I should expand that for all the other areas
11	he's testified to as well but primarily for our
12	purposes
13	THE COURT: I will write them all down, so go
14	ahead and say what else. Dairy economist?
15	MS. HANCOCK: And applied economics.
16	THE COURT: Applied economics?
17	MS. HANCOCK: Or agricultural and applied
18	economics.
19	THE COURT: And any others?
20	MS. HANCOCK: Any others you would like to be
21	characterized as an expert for?
22	THE WITNESS: I would actually say that supply
23	chain management would be an area of expertise.
24	THE COURT: Good.
25	Does anyone like to would anyone like to voir



26

27

28

dire Dr. Nicholson about his qualifications to be accepted

as an expert witness in the areas of dairy economist,

applied -- no, agriculture and applied economics, and

supply chain management? Is there any objection to my accepting him as an expert in those three fields?

There is none. I accept Dr. Nicholson as an expert witness in those three areas, as a dairy economist, as an agricultural and applied economist, and as a supply chain management expert.

MS. HANCOCK: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MS. HANCOCK:

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. Dr. Nicholson, would you proceed in providing us your testimony?
 - A. Yes. Thank you very much.
- So, Judge Clifton and personnel of AMS Dairy

 Programs, I am appearing before you to offer a summary --
- Q. And I'm just going to interrupt you really quick. We have a court reporter who is taking down everything that we say, and so if you could read at a much more moderated pace, that will help ensure that she captures everything.
 - A. Thank you for that.

I am appearing before you to offer a summary of my written prepared statement describing in more detail the results of a recent research project that analyzed differences in the spatial values of milk in the contiguous United States, in particular the spatial differences in values at fluid milk processing plants.

I'm an agricultural economist with more than 30 years of experience in the analysis of dairy markets, including the spatial evaluation of milk values.



Importantly, I am not here to advocate for any specific policy action, but rather to offer my insights into the spatial differences in the economic values of milk. This is a summary of research performed in collaboration with Dr. Mark Stephenson, who recently retired as the director of Dairy Policy Analysis at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, but also does not represent an official statement of the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

The analyses that I will report are based on spatial economic models that have a long history of development, beginning in the 1980s at Cornell University. Earlier versions of these models have provided evidence about spatial milk values for previous Federal Milk Marketing Order hearings, notably in 1998.

For the past 20 years, I have been the lead researcher responsible for the further development and updating of data for these detailed spatial economic models, again, in collaboration with my former Cornell and UW colleague, Dr. Mark Stephenson. Analyses based on these models have appeared in refereed academic journal articles -- a number are cited in footnotes -- and book chapters -- again, cited in footnotes -- and have been used by state government and industry groups to support investment decisions.

A summary of the key findings of this research is as follows:

1. Analysis with a detailed spatial economic



2.

2.0

2.1

dairy supply chain model that accounts for all sources and uses of milk and dairy components, provides location-specific milk values consistent with the lowest possible systemwide costs, providing a competitive benchmark for those values;

- 2. The analyses suggests that there are considerable differences between the values of milk at fluid plants derived from the spatial economic modeling and the current values of Class I differentials, differences as large as \$3 per hundredweight;
- 3. These differences between current spatial economic values at fluid milk plants and current Class I differentials arise due to substantive changes over time in the locations of milk production, the composition of dairy product demand, changes in the location of demand for dairy products given regional population shifts, and the costs of transporting farm milk to plants, transporting dairy products between plant locations, and distributing products to final demand locations;
- 4. Review and adjustment of spatial values generated by the model for the purposes of revising Class I differentials are appropriate to account for local circumstances and institutional factors not included in the model analysis. Any quantitative model is, by definition, a simplification of reality, and the USDSS (U.S. Dairy Sector Simulator) does not directly represent existing commercial relationships that can be important determinations of the locations and volumes processed in



2.

2.0

2.1

existing operations.

2.

2.0

2.1

I would now like to move to a description of the U.S. Dairy Sector Simulator.

Spatial milk values are calculated using the U.S. Dairy Sector Simulator. The USDSS is a highly-detailed mathematical spatial optimization model, but at its core it solves a practical problem, how to get milk from dairy farms to plants to be processed into various dairy products, and distribute those products to consumers with the lowest cost possible. The model takes the total milk supply, plant locations, and product mix, and consumer demand as it existed for an individual month. It indicates how to move that farm milk to plants via the existing road network and distributes the finished products to consumers, also according to the road network.

For the U.S. dairy industry as a whole, the USDSS minimizes the systemwide cost of assembling milk at plants, making final and intermediate dairy products, and transporting them to other plants and locations of final demand. The model includes the principal cost between the farm gate and the retail locations for the consumer. The model minimizes this total cost subject to the physical constraints, such as mass balance and required product composition that we have imposed upon the system.

The most recent spatial milk values derive from two versions of the USDSS model: A large version with data disaggregated at the county level, 3,108 counties, and a smaller version with a few hundred multicounty



regions. Both the large and small models yield similar quantitative values and patterns of spatial milk prices.

Three, I'd like to talk about the USDSS model outputs.

There are two types of results that are provided by the USDSS. One is a primal solution, and the other is a dual solution. The primal solution describes the physical flows of product through the dairy supply chain network. The dual solution represents the relative monetary values of milk and dairy products at each model location.

An example of the primal output from the smaller USS -- USDSS model -- Figure 5 in the full written testimony -- and now if we can go to the slide that should be there -- is shown here. This shows milk assembly flows, processing locations, and distribution flows to final demand locations. The green lines represent milk assembly flows from farms to plants, whereas the orange lines represent the distribution of finished products from plants to demand locations. The plants are shown as black triangles. The size of the assembly and distribution flows are represented by the relative thickness of the lines, the green and orange lines. And the size of the plant location triangles indicates the relative volume of product processed at each plant.

And you will see that this figure is actually showing the milk assembly at fluid plants and packaged milk flows for May of 2021.



2.

2.1

The dual solution shows the spatial value of milk or, more specifically, the marginal value of milk at a processing location for a supply location for raw milk. Thus, the dual values provide estimates of the spatial value of milk and are the key results reported for the purposes of this component of the hearing.

Dual values are calculated by the USDSS at all milk plant locations across the country, although our focus here is on the values for fluid milk processing plants. This price surface indicates estimated spatial values of milk for each county location in the contiguous United States, consistent with the spatial aggregation used for Class I differentials. However, the indicated spatial milk values should not be interpreted directly as Class I differentials. The values should be thought of as price relatives, that is, the difference in values across locations.

The Agricultural Marketing Service of USDA used results from a previous version of the USDSS model results as input into the 1998 Federal Order hearings.

Differences between the model-generated relative spatial values of milk compared to those of the current Class I differentials suggest a potential need to modify Class I differentials.

Four, factors affecting the price relatives in the USDSS model.

The USDSS shows the spatial milk values at a given point in time, but it is also relevant to consider the



2.0

2.1

2.4

drivers of changes in these values. Three factors constitute the important causes of change in the spatial milk values, the price relatives. These factors are changes in the milk supply, demand for dairy products, and transportation costs.

The detailed written statement describes the substantive changes in the location of U.S. milk production during the past decade. It also documents changes in the product mix for U.S. industry and in the locations of the population. Transportation costs have changed over time due to the cost of purchase or lease of the vehicle, driver wages and benefits, and fuel costs.

I'd now like to discuss specific results for the spatial milk values at fluid milk plants.

The USDSS was simulated using both the smaller multi-county and large county-level versions with 2021 data with similar quantitative results and patterns. The models are run for the months of May 2021 and October '21, to represent both the flush and the short months of the year.

The general pattern is lower values in the north and western regions, and rising into the south and eastern areas of the U.S. The pattern of these values mirrors the current Class I differential structure and reflects the relative surplus and deficit regions of milk. However, the current differentials range from \$1.60 to a high of \$6, while the model suggests that the price surface is steeper moving towards the Southeast, high values more



2.

2.1

than \$7, reflecting both changing regional production and demand and higher transportation costs.

Spatial milk values for October '21 have a pattern similar to that in May 2021, but with the spatial values in the Southeast indicating an even steeper price surface and reaching a maximum value of more than \$8.

The seasonal differences in value, which are Figure 17 in the original full written testimony, indicate a fairly steep rise in values from St. Louis through Atlanta, and down to Miami, along the I-75 corridor. The western portions of the U.S. show very few seasonal differences in the calculated spatial values of milk.

The differences between the May 2021 spatial values and the current Class I differentials are considerable.

Let me refer, then, to the second of these figures. In particular, there's a band from about Norfolk, Virginia, through Montgomery, Alabama, where the current Class I differentials appear to be well below the model calculated spatial value of milk at the assumed \$1.60 per hundredweight minimum differential. There are also a few cities, such as Charleston, West Virginia, Cleveland, Ohio, and Chicago, where Class I differentials are considerably below USDSS model estimated spatial values.

The U.S. is roughly divided between east and west approximately along the Mississippi River, which separates regions where differentials are modestly low, west up to



2.

2.1

about \$0.80, to areas where the difference may cause difficulties encouraging milk to move where it is needed. Probably the reason that there is a ridge where there is a northern edge in the Southeast where current differentials are significantly below calculated values is because of the changes made in 2008 to the previous 2000 differentials.

At that time, the biggest changes, up to \$1.80 per hundredweight, were made to Florida values. More modest increases were made to Georgia and Alabama, and even less to states further north. So a similar pattern of differences exists between USDSS-calculated differentials for October '21 -- 2021 -- show that here in this figure -- and the current Class I differentials, but with somewhat smaller differences in Florida, Georgia, Tennessee, and Kentucky.

Okay. So my concluding comments. There have been formal studies of the spatial value of U.S. milk for about a century. However, it has been approaching three decades since nationwide spatial values of milk have been systematically evaluated using the U.S. Dairy Sector Simulator (USDSS) model. Over this time, there have been considerable changes to where milk is produced and where population growth has taken place. There have also been substantive changes to transportation costs. Milk supply, demand, and transportation costs all have an impact on the spatial value of milk.

The USDSS captures many aspects of these



2.

2.0

2.1

fundamental determinants of values in U.S. dairy supply chains to estimate spatial milk values that can inform the setting of Class I differentials. The USDSS provides a competitive benchmark for the differences in spatial milk values, and analysis for two months in 2021 indicates value at fluid milk plants considerably different from the current Class I differentials.

As noted, the differentials arise from the combined effects of changes in the locations and amounts of milk supply, changes in the nature and location of dairy product demand, changes in the locations and capacities of dairy processing facilities, and changes in transportation costs.

The USDSS provides evidence of the need for a change in Class I differentials because it represents an economic -- a spatial economic benchmark, but other factors such as existing commercial relationships can be important determinants of spatial organization. The model results provide relevant input for differences in county values, but may need to be adjusted based on additional information about the characteristic of the particular locations.

Any quantitative model is, by definition, a simplification of reality, and the USDSS does not directly represent existing commercial relationships that can be important determinants of the locations and volumes processed in existing operations. In fact, a review of results from a previous version of the USDSS model was



2.

2.0

2.1

used as input into an adjustment process employed by AMS to specify differentials in 1998.

And because I'm a weather nerd in addition to being a modeling nerd, I would like to use an analogy here. So there's an analogy here to the use of models that generate the weather forecasts familiar to all of us. The outputs of large-scale weather models are used as key inputs, but forecasters often adjust this so-called model guidance with professional judgment to arrive at a more accurate forecast for a particular locality.

That concludes my statement. Thank you very much.

Q. Thank you so much, Dr. Nicholson.

MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, I just have a few direct examination questions before we turn him over for cross-examination, but because we're after noon, and I fear that Dr. Nicholson probably read that as fast as he could without getting reprimanded by us, it might be a good time for lunch, and then come back.

THE COURT: That sounds good. Now, I spent all my time looking at 302. And I, most of the time, found out where you were.

Did you also cover 303 while I was in 302?

MS. HANCOCK: He read 303.

THE WITNESS: I read 303, and 302 is the full written testimony.

THE COURT: Well, it was a lot more fun to be in 302.

THE WITNESS: That's what people say about



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

```
economic analysis all the time.
 1
 2
             MS. HANCOCK: Nope.
 3
             THE COURT: Very good. Let's see.
             Agricultural Marketing Service, that sounded like
 4
 5
     a good plan, yes?
             MR. HILL: That's fine.
 6
 7
             THE COURT: All right. Great. So we'll just
 8
     leave everything where it sits, we'll have lunch, and we
 9
     normally take an hour. Is that still good?
10
             MR. HILL: Yes.
11
             THE COURT: Good. Please be back and ready to go
12
     at 1:15. We go off record at 12:11.
13
             (Whereupon, a luncheon break was taken.)
14
15
16
17
18
19
2.0
2.1
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```



1	WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2023 AFTERNOON SESSION
2	THE COURT: Let's go back on record.
3	We're back on record at 1:16 p.m.
4	Ms. Hancock.
5	MS. HANCOCK: Thank you.
6	BY MS. HANCOCK:
7	Q. Dr. Nicholson, thanks for being back here with us
8	and providing your testimony. Just a few questions to
9	help clarify some of the things that you have in your
10	statement and the work that you did.
11	The USDSS model, I'm wondering if you can talk
12	about the dual values that are that's utilized in
13	that in that model. Maybe we can start there.
14	A. Okay. So as I indicated in a previous statement,
15	the dual values are the things that are providing us with
16	the spatial milk values, and in particular, that lead to
17	the mapping of the pattern of spatial milk values across
18	the United States.
19	And without trying to get too much into the
20	complications, essentially what those dual values
21	represent are, in the math of the model, we have a large
22	number of constraints. And the constraint would be
23	something like, if you are going to make a dairy product,
24	you have to have a sufficient amount of milk to be able to
25	make that dairy product based on the physical yield

So the dual value is essentially saying, how much would a dairy plant be willing to pay to have an



relationships. Okay?

26

27

additional hundred pounds of milk at that plant, based on the mathematics of that particular constraint? And so it is kind of a mathematical result. But it indicates the marginal value of milk, how much more would a plant be willing to pay for milk at that location.

- Q. And so, for example, if you had two plants that were across the street from one another, so same location essentially, and you had a cheese plant on one side and a butter nonfat dry plant on the other, how would the model take those into account to quantify that?
- A. Okay. So in the example of a cheese plant and a fluid milk plant right across the road, the model has a fairly myopic view of what the value difference would be between those two plants. We know that the component utilization in the cheese plant, like, in terms of the butter and the protein and the other nonfat solids, would be a little bit different at the cheese plant from the fluid milk plant, but we also know that the model is really only taking into account the transportation costs between those two plants based on difference.

And if we, dare I say it, imagine a thought experiment as a logical outgrowth of previous conversations, we would think about the fact that if those plants are really right across the road from one another, the transportation cost difference that would be captured by our estimate of transportation costs would be really pretty small. So we would have every expectation that just looking at those values from the model, they ought to



2.

2.1

be fairly similar. And that is, in fact, what we see.

- Q. And if -- if -- if instead of being a cheese plant and a butter nonfat dry milk plant, what if it was a Class I plant and a Class III plant, would that output -- would that outcome change?
- A. No. Essentially if you have two plants essentially of any type across the road from one another, again, the model is only taking into account to estimate those marginal or dual values. Any difference in component utilization and the transportation cost difference, that will be very minimal between those two plants.
- So, no, we would, again, not expect, regardless of the two plants that are being compared, that we would see a significant difference between those two plants in the marginal value of milk. Thank you.
- Q. Okay. I want to talk for just a second about this model, this -- you understand that previously Class I differentials were set based on 1998 modeling that was done previously; is that right?
- A. Modeling done in 1998 or prior to 1998, I understand was one of the inputs into the Class I differential surface that was promulgated in 2000.
- Q. And what is your understanding about how the current model that you have deployed compares to the model that was used in 1998?
- A. Well, there are some basic similarities in the sense that we're using the same mathematical approach 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

try and minimize the cost systemwide of moving milk from farms to plants and to final products. But there are a number of significant refinements that have taken place since 2000 that make this model much more appropriate for today's dairy industry.

So some of those refinements are increasing the number of spatial locations where farms, plants, and consumers can be located. This most recent version of the model went from a number in the hundreds of multi-county aggregations for milk supply, for example, to a milk supply in every county, 3,108, a significant scaling up of the analysis.

Also, and perhaps more importantly, what we're looking at is a very different set of product categories that are now in the model that the 1998 model version, if I'm recalling correctly, really only had four products to represent four product classes. We now have in the tens of different product categories, and we account for a larger number of what we call intermediate products, products that flow from one dairy plant to another, such as the use of nonfat dry milk and cheese making.

So other refinements on this really relate to the data which we have updated. We have a very different set of population distributions, we have a very different set of dairy product demands, and we have a very different set of both farm production locations and components in farm milk than we had back in 1998.

So all of those things represent a major overhaul



2.

2.1

to the model structure since the time it was originally used.

- Q. And National Milk approached you, was it in 2021, to help them with some modeling work?
- A. So my recollection is that National Milk approached Dr. Mark Stephenson in March of 2022 to ask about the possibility of us updating the USDSS model from its 2016 database to 2021.
- Q. And how is that you got involved to take over that modeling work?
- A. So I originally became involved in taking over the responsibility for the USDSS when I went to Cornell University in 2000. I had previously done graduate work, as I noted in the earlier session this morning. I came back to be a senior researcher at Cornell and was tasked with the job of updating the particular model that we're talking about, the USDSS.

So since 2000 I have been the primary programmer of the model, and the primary person who has collaborated with others to put together the datasets that we need to run the model.

- Q. And so at some point -- so Dr. Stephenson asked if you would do the modeling work that National Milk was asking to be done because you were the one that was in charge of this database and the information?
- A. Typically this has been a team effort between Dr. Stephenson and myself. My role has been primarily to make sure that the programming code and the model results



2.

2.0

2.1

are run. I'm the guy who flips the switch on the model on a computer to make it actually generate the numbers, and I'm the one who knows how to do that.

We have shared responsibilities for the collection and updating of the data that the model needs to actually do its magic in a particular month of a particular year. So it's been a shared effort.

And so when Mark was approached as the better known of the duo doing modeling by National Milk, he would need to ask me if I'm interested in collaborating to make that happen.

- Q. Because you are the one that's in charge of the model?
- A. I'm the one who is in charge of the model. I'm the one who has the model on my laptop, and I'm the one that needs to flip the switch.
- Q. And did National Milk give you any kind of directives or guidance or any kind of outcomes that they were hoping to achieve when they asked you to perform this modeling work for them?
- A. What I recollect is, whenever somebody has asked us to do an update to the model, and this has happened on a number of occasions, they always want to know what's the latest information that you can use so that it's the most recent.

So we had to have a little bit of a conversation about what year. And that's why, even though we were midway into 2022 at that point, the data availability was



2.

2.0

2.1

such that we could only do 2021.

2.

2.0

2.1

We also have typically, as I noted in the statement this morning, used the approach of doing two months within a given year to represent more of a flush or surplus season for milk, and a fall season in which milk is in shorter supply, so that we have the contrast between those two months.

So we have, on occasion, used months other than the May and October that you see reported, so we had a bit of a conversation about, are May and October okay? And that seemed to be okay.

But other than that, it was up to us to update the data and provide some initial results to the National Milk team for discussion.

- Q. Okay. So did they tell you, we're hoping to at least increase it by a certain amount, or here's some information that might help influence where the numbers are going to go?
- A. No. The initial model analyses that we undertook were completely independent of any direct input from National Milk, other than the things that I have mentioned.
- Q. Okay. And so that first time that you ran it in May of 2022, you were using 2021 data; is that right?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And what was the transportation -- what was the transportation costs that you were using in the initial run?



A. So the transportation costs that we have in the model, what we do is create a large matrix of costs that link every origin point to every destination point in the model. To do that we use a transportation cost function that relates distance to the amount that it costs to move either a hundredweight of farm milk, or an intermediate plant product like cream, or a distribution route like packaged milk.

The things that are easier for us to change to make it more applicable to 2021 would be something like a fuel diesel price and a wage rate. And so we did adjust the diesel price to 2021, and we did adjust the wage rates to 2021 based on Bureau of Labor Statistics data and data from -- I think it's the U.S. Department of Energy on the fuel costs.

- Q. Okay. And -- and that was so that you were matching the transportation costs with the year in which you were evaluating the other data as well?
- A. Yeah. To be consistent, I mean, one can imagine running a scenario, we had originally did this, where we used the much higher 2022 diesel fuel prices, which would generally tend to raise the nature of that price relative surface. In part based on our assessment and in part based on conversations with the folks at National Milk, we decided it was probably better to be consistent because we had 2021 data for farm milk supplies, dairy product demands, and processing plant locations, and used 2021 diesel fuel values, even though they were lower than the



2.

2.1

high values that we saw in 2022.

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. And did you feel like that was National Milk attempting to be fair about ensuring that the data that they were using in the model was going to be more accurately representative of the 2021 calendar year?
- A. It struck me as being both fair and also more consistent, given that the rest of the data in the model were 2021.
- Q. Okay. And certainly not National Milk trying to puff up its numbers, right?
- A. I guess I don't want to speak to what National Milk's intentions were, but I can say I never had any impression that -- other than providing us with relevant input to help us do our job, that they were trying to influence the result in a particular way.
- Q. Okay. And after running those initial results, National Milk asked you to run them again in June of that year; is that right?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. What additional information did National Milk provide you, or what additional guidance did National Milk provide you in order to have you re-run the numbers?
- A. Yeah, maybe it's helpful here for me to point out that we have always tried to be folks that are more in the role of an analyst and not of an advocate. So when someone asks us to do modeling work such as this, we can have legitimate discussions about what scenarios are relevant, that is, what assumptions we will use when we're



going to run a model like this. And an example would be, should we use the 2021 May and October diesel price or should we use the 2022 diesel price as a way of evaluating what that price surface would be?

So we had conversations with them about what scenarios would be most appropriate, and one of the conversations related to the diesel price.

We had another conversation that was related to what we call the plant lists, which is the processing plant locations and processing capacity values that we have for plants in the model. And at that point, the National Milk team had reviewed our plant list and suggested that maybe we should not use the plants that had already closed. And so we made some minor modifications to a couple of specific plants based on the area of specific knowledge of the National Milk team in order to run an additional set of scenarios.

- Q. And that original plant list that you had for the initial run, did -- was that something that you already had prior to National Milk?
- A. Yes. So that plant list has been something that has been developed over a long number of years and adapted from information on various sources. And that can actually include personal contacts with people in the industry, where they will say there's going to be a plant coming online, it's going to make these products. We also have some states where there are lists of licensed plants. Like, in Wisconsin, we have a licensed dairy plant list



2.

2.0

2.1

that we can look at. And we also have information that comes from public press announcements about plant closures or plant openings.

And so we had developed that list over a long number of years and agreed to share that list with National Milk to solicit their input on how we could make the list more accurate.

- Q. And so National Milk, in providing you with some updated information about plants opening or closing, did you take that into account when you re-ran the model?
- A. So we kept the results from the first of our simulations, and then through two iterations, we made adjustments based on allowing plants that were scheduled to come online to be included, so that meant we had to add those into the entire structure of the model for the analysis, and then also to sort of disallow processing of facilities that had either already been closed or slated to be closed, so we made those adjustments.

I don't remember the exact number, but I think we're probably talking about a total of six to eight plants switching from one category to another out of several hundred, that are across the different product categories.

- Q. And how much did this affect the model results?
- A. So not -- not very much. And actually, I remember remarking to Mark that we were going to have to do a lot of work to review the entire plant list when it wasn't going to make a dang bit of difference. So it can make



2.

2.1

some difference if you have a very large plant in a specific location, that can be impactful.

We did analysis when there was a Kraft Foods plant in Canton, New York that was going to shut down and stop making cheese, and we saw that right in that localized area, yes, it actually had a fairly significant impact, like \$0.50 hundredweight, on the producer value of milk in that area, but it did not affect the overall price patterns for the United States. And the same is true for the changes that we made to either close plants, not allow them to be part of the model solution, or to allow plants to enter.

- Q. And notwithstanding the additional work that it required from you, and even understanding that it might have nominal or no effect on the results, you understood that National Milk was just trying to get to an accurate result?
- A. Yeah. I think -- so one of the things that happens when we do a model like this, is people often want to know why is that number \$3.50 at this particular location? And that's a difficult answer to give for this kind of modeling approach, because there are millions of pieces of information that all come together and interact to create that \$3.50 number.

So when National Milk team reviewed the model results, people are always trying to wonder, "In my particular area, why did you get that \$3.50?" And that leads them to say, "Well, did you have the right plants in



2.

2.1

place for the analysis? And if you'd had that one open, then you shouldn't have. And if you had that one closed, then you probably should open it up."

And I think that was the motivation for making the plant list more up to date, even though we recognize that in the broad picture, it was not going to change the nature of the results we were going to get.

I think that was what motivated in part, let's make sure that you are not getting an answer for my particular part of the world that I'm familiar with that is different than what I think because you don't have the right plants.

And so we appreciated the fact that we could update and make more accurate the plant list, and also try to say, we still think we're getting the right numbers for the right reasons.

- Q. And what are the major drivers of the model's dual price results?
- A. So the model, again, has both the dual results, which have no values, and then also the primal results, which are the physical flows through the supply chain.

And as I noted in the statement this morning, there are some key things that are part of those millions of pieces of information that drive that. So the key things really are, where do we have milk, and what is its composition spatially throughout the United States? Where is the milk located? What's its composition? What's the composition and location of dairy product demand? What is



2.

2.1

the location and processing capacities of different dairy processing facilities?

And what are the transportation costs that link a farm to a processing plant in terms of milk assembly, the movement -- excuse me -- of intermediate products from one dairy processing facility to another, and the transportation costs associated with distribution.

So all of those are part of the core database that make up the USDSS analysis, and all of those things are a part of why we get the spatial price surface that we get.

Q. And I think in your testimony throughout, you refer to the model results as a benchmark.

Why do you consider them to be a benchmark?

A. So the terminology that I have used is a competitive benchmark. And in this case I'm kind of drawing upon the economic idea of perfect competition where we don't -- we say, everybody is sort of equal, they are all small, they all take the same price or receive the same price from people, and that means that we're not really fully accounting for a number of institutional factors that could be relevant to refining the model results to come up with what might be a more appropriate industrywide Class I price surface.

So what I'm saying competitive benchmark, what I mean is, this is sort of like the lowest possible systemwide cost that we can imagine in a perfect world. Right? And so we recognize, though, that that perfect world isn't the world in which the dairy industry lives.



2.

2.1

Q. Okay. And we heard Dr. Vitaliano talk about some -- some -- what I would -- that he called art, or what is an overlay over the numbers that -- that come out of the benchmark.

Do you recall him talking about that?

A. Yes, I do.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. And is that the additional information that you believe would -- is -- is used or applied to the model results that come out of this model?
- A. I guess I -- I don't know exactly what information was used in the process, not having been a part of any of the discussions of what has been called the colored-pencils sort of adjustments. All I can do is comment on the things that I think the model does not fully incorporate that might be relevant.
 - O. Okay. And what would those be?
- A. I think they come into maybe three categories -- well, four.

So one is really we use average transportation costs on the basis of difference in distance between a start and an endpoint for moving milk. We do actually adjust those for local conditions in the sense of having a different fuel cost and a different wage cost. But what we don't account for, for example, is like the density of the milk supply in a particular county.



So I used to work at Penn State University in the top-ranked supply chain management department, and from that I know that there are counties in Pennsylvania where there are a lot of plain sect folks, Amish, who have small farms. And our model would say, all that milk is at one location in the county, and to move that county down to the next county would all be the same costs. And the reality is that if you're trying to serve that particular set of farms, the cost would probably deviate a bit from what the model would say would be the cost to move it from one county to another.

Another example from when I worked in California is I'm quite familiar with how traffic can be in the Los Angeles area. So our model assumes all the costs are on the basis of a distance movement, which would say there's such and such a distance going from Bakersfield to Los Angeles, and the cost would be this, but we don't account for the fact that that time cost and the driver cost associated with it could be much different. Right?

So those are transportation cost examples that are probably more widely relevant for places that I haven't lived and worked that the others from the National Milk team may want to speak to.

Second thing is that the model has no compassion about keeping plants open because there's always been a plant there. In presentations that I have given about this model previously, I like to use the example of a model being a dairy dictator, like the Vladimir Putin of



2.

2.1

dairy supply chain allocations. And it would say, if you have a plant that's not in a good location, the model is not going to keep that plant operating. But for an individual company, that would probably not be an easy decision for them to make, especially in the short-term. So the model doesn't account for that existing capacity that an organization would want to keep using.

Another example is commercial relationships.

Again, we're hardhearted, we just want to get the milk and the dairy products from the farm to the plant, and to the consumer as a low cost as possible, with the analytical approach we're using here. We don't know anything about the commercial relationships that might link a particular farm milk supply to a farm, to a plant that actually has a contractual obligation on that milk. All right? So the model is going to show more flexibility than the real world in terms of not respecting that contractual obligation.

And the one last thing that's kind of important that often people have maybe been a little bit confused about is we use the model to generate these price relatives to provide a base of information for Class I differentials, but the model itself is a competitive benchmark from a supply chain perspective, it does not know anything at all about Federal Orders. It does not know anything about pooling provisions, it does not know anything about current order boundaries.

And so one of the things that can arise -- and



2.

2.1

although I was not a part of the team at Cornell that did the modeling work in 1998, my understanding was that when the folks at Dairy Programs AMS were doing their version of the adjustment process to the model results, one of the things that they were interested in understanding and making sure was okay was sort of price alignment at Order boundaries. So we don't have any Order boundaries in the model, and therefore, we could come up with price relationships in nearby space that would be perfectly fine from a model perspective, but may not be acceptable from an Order boundary or price alignment perspective.

So we have sort of those four things that I think are relevant for why adjustments might be necessary to the raw results from the USDSS model that include some more detailed knowledge of local transportation conditions, the existing contractual arrangements, the existing capacity in wanting to maintain open a plant that you have invested in, and the issue of price alignment across orders in particular.

- Q. Okay. And these four areas, these are the areas that you believe would be taken into account on top of the model results which are the benchmark that you have described?
- A. Now, again, I can't say what was taken into account in coming up with any differences between the model results and the proposal that's being put forward by National Milk. What I'm trying to do is point out that there are factors that I would consider relevant factors



2.

2.0

2.1

that would mean adjustments to the model would be appropriate.

Q. Okay. And one of -- one of the elements that we have heard about, and maybe you will hear more about as your cross-examination continues, is what the base was that was included in your model.

Can you talk about that?

A. Yeah. Sure. So another thing that's important for me to maybe clarify is when we run this model, we get a series of price relatives, as I've said. And it's basically about how steep is the price difference, so the marginal value difference between two locations.

So typically what we need to do to actually convert that to something that is equivalent to what we might think of as the current Class I differential surface is we need to establish \$1.60 as the minimum. So it would be fairly typical in a model simulation run to have one location that says the marginal value of milk is zero. We don't need any more milk here. There is no additional value from having another hundredweight of milk at this location.

Well, we don't fully believe that the value of milk at any location is zero. And so what we do to come up with the results that have been shared in the written testimony, and parts of here in the oral testimony this morning, is if we have a value of zero, we say, to align that with the current Class I differential surface, we're going to add a value of \$1.60 per hundredweight to that



2.

2.0

2.1

and every other location. So it maintains the price relatives the same, but it takes the level, the minimum level, up to the current minimum level of Class I differentials of \$1.60.

And that's important, in part, to be able to compare the apples to apples that you have. Our model simulation results start with \$1.60 per hundredweight, so do the Class I differential current surface, and then it makes it a lot more consistent to evaluate the differences between the spatial values of milk in our model and the current Class I differentials.

- Q. Okay. And that's what you did here in this case?
- 13 A. Yes. That's what we did.
 - Q. And so for all of the different iterations that you ran, did you always use that \$1.60 base?
 - A. Yes. So we always made sure that the minimum marginal value of milk was \$1.60 throughout the entire U.S. for fluid milk plants.
- Q. And then at some point did National Milk come to you and say, "We would like you to increase that to \$2.20"?
- A. No. I have no idea where the \$2.20 number came from.
- Q. Okay. So that's not something that National Milk tried to direct you to do?
 - A. They did not direct, and it did not happen, I guess.
 - Q. And we also -- and maybe along those same lines,



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

26

27

was there anything that National Milk ever told you to try and influence your results?

- A. So I mentioned before that the only influence was really on the design of the experiments that we were going to do, these scenarios. And those were really limited to what were the months and year we were going to look at, what was the diesel price, and let's be sure that we have the appropriate plant list that is consistent with updated information. Other than that, the scenarios that we ran were entirely based on our own data.
- Q. Is there anything that you could have done differently in any of the iterations that you ran that would have made it more accurate or more reflective of the market conditions?
- A. I think we have about as accurate a representation as we can with the available information, and it did actually help, even though it did not change the model solutions very much at all, and created a lot of additional work on a weekend that I didn't want to do, to have the additional information to update the plant list. And so that was the source of information that we were able to tap into the knowledge of the National Milk team to be able to improve in that sense.
- Q. And Mr. English, when we was conducting the cross-examination of Dr. Vitaliano, he looked at a change that your model had predicted, or that your model had -- the model results for Miami and the increase that was -- the increase that was proposed by National Milk based on



2.

2.0

2.1

that model, and then as compared to Minnesota.

Were you in the room when he was asking those questions?

- A. I had the pleasure of hearing that discussion.
- Q. Is there any insight you can provide as to, if -if the Southeast is in such dire need of milk, why the
 results didn't come up with something even more
 significant?
- A. I guess I'd make two points in that regard. One, in the testimony that I gave this morning I noted that the largest divergence between the spatial models predicted by USDSS and the current Class I differentials are not in Florida, they are north of Florida. And I also offered a suggestion that one reason for that may have been that the differentials in that part of the country were already adjusted in 2008.
 - O. 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. And one other point that I make on that is we still actually do see the largest spatial values of milk in that South Florida area, up to \$8, and so there's a considerable difference between what the model is suggesting would be the spatial value of milk at that location and the current Class I differential.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. Just not the biggest divergence at this point.
- Q. Meaning that area specifically had already had an update since the 1998 model results.
 - A. We can't correctly analyze that with the model.



But in comparing the current Class I differentials to the model spatial values, we can begin to understand that that is a possible explanation for why those -- the differences are higher north of that area than they are in that area.

- Q. And would you mind pulling up your Figure 3 from your testimony in Exhibit 303?
 - A. I can ask the -- there you go.
- Q. Can you talk about whether this helps illustrate what you were just describing?
- A. Yeah. This is the pattern that I talked about in the summary this morning. The darker colors there, the oranges and the reds, are the places where there is a larger divergence between the current Class I differentials and the model-generated values.

And so you can see in that area down in Florida, that green area, it's a little bit hard to see the scaling on this, but that kind of generally falls in the \$1.50 to \$1, maybe \$2 range. Whereas, north of that we actually get up into things that look more -- well, definitely above \$2, maybe 2.50 to 2.75. And the brightest red spot there, which I think is around Charleston, West Virginia, is the thing that I cited as the largest of the difference of \$3.

THE COURT: What location is that red spot?

THE WITNESS: I don't know if I have my geography right, but I'm thinking it's Charleston, West Virginia?

THE COURT: We're getting nods "yes."

THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you for helping my



2.

2.0

2.1

geography-challenged brain.

BY MS. HANCOCK:

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. And when you were talking about the transportation costs that are built in to the current model, were those same transportation costs built into the model back in 1998 when it was originally run?
- A. So some of like I mentioned before, the basic structure of the model had some similarities. But I was not part of the modeling team in 1998. What I do understand is the initial version of that model had a straight line transportation function, where the cost of transportation increased linearly mile by mile.

One of the things that we have, I think, learned through the additional analysis of data on the transportation costs is, at least up to a certain point where you might run into an hours-of-service limitation, the costs increase with distance, but they don't increase linearly. They taper off. They increase a little bit more slowly because you have covered some fixed costs initially, right? If you do hit that hour-of-service limitation, and you've got to go another day or have another driver, then actually that could make that cost go up again, but that's not captured directly in our transportation cost analysis.

- O. Okay.
- A. So there's a very big difference in terms of the data that's been used, and also the form of the relationship that determines the cost between two



locations.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. Okay. And back to my original question, which was, the modeling that was -- this model that was used in 1998 to set differentials, that, likewise, took into account transportation costs, it's just that the methodology of how it was taken into account has become more precise with updates to the system?
- A. Yes. Both models includes some representation of the transportation costs for farm milk assembly, interplant flows, and distribution routes. It's just that the nature of the estimation and the updating is different.
- Q. Okay. And in this very tight-knit world in which we live in the dairy industry, you're familiar with Dr. Stephenson using the modeling in support of MIG's proposals for their differentials; is that right?
- A. I recently became aware of the fact that Dr. Stephenson had used model results to provide input to the MIG proposal.
- Q. And I think you said earlier that you're kind of the keeper of the model.
- Did he have to come to you and ask you for some information?
- A. So we have shared a lot of the information, both the inputs and the outputs, throughout the modeling process that was undertaken for National Milk.
- In regard to this particular question, I shared information with Dr. Stephenson to allow him to confirm



- Q. Okay. And what do you understand is the difference in the methodology that he's deploying as compared to what you are doing?
- A. Well, the same model is generating the information. And what's happening, somewhat like I described, we make a calculation that makes sure we have a \$1.60 minimum Class I differential.

Dr. Stephenson is taking the information from the same model and using it to do some alternative calculations and for a different purpose.

- Q. Okay. And what do you understand is the differences in how he's doing his calculation?
- A. Okay. So what I understand is a core part of the analysis that's been submitted is to consider the model-generated differences in spatial milk values at Class III and Class I plants, without incorporating the \$1.60 differential that is included in our analyses.
- Q. Okay. And in your opinion, is it appropriate to use a Class I and Class III comparison in order to evaluate these numbers?
- A. So it's a perfectly fine calculation to do to look at the difference between a Class III price and a Class I price, not including what the \$1.60 differential would be.

Where I think I have a bit of a difference of opinion is that we have never used this model to try and



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

determine what that minimum Class I differential should be. That is, we have never used this model to try and determine whether \$1.60 is an appropriate number. And part of the reason that we have not done that is the model does not really represent the factors that underlie the justification for that \$1.60 minimum Class I differential.

So my assessment is, given that the model was not really designed to evaluate what the minimum differential should be because it doesn't incorporate those factors, it is probably not appropriate to use the difference between a Class III model-generated value and a Class I model-generated value to suggest what the minimum Class I differential should be.

Q. Okay. And then I want to take us full circle, which was all the way back to my very first question that I asked when we started, which is, now we're back to we have two plants across the street from one another. And I posed you the question early on, if you have a Class I plant and a Class III plant across the street from each other, how the model impacts the decision to go one way or the other.

Do you remember that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And I asked you, well, if you just took those plants and you replaced them with a cheese plant and butter nonfat dry milk plant, would the results change?

And what was your answer?

A. My answer was that regardless of the plant types,



2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. So is the point there that this model doesn't tell you one way or another which one is the bigger driver between the -- between the classes of milk?
- A. So I guess I would say that the model is not going to accurately represent what a fluid milk plant should pay to get milk into the plant relative to what a cheese plant should pay. It's really good at describing how the differences across space exist for different fluid milk plants, but it's not designed to account for the fact -- or the factors that affect what that minimum Class I differential should be.
- Q. And your role here today, Dr. Nicholson, are you here as an advocate for National Milk's proposal or to object or oppose any other proposal?
- A. No. So I -- you had mentioned earlier that I was a part of something called the Program on Dairy Markets and Policy, and that was a group of academic economists with an interest and focus on dairy. And one of the things that was a requirement for membership in that group was some kind of commitment to the fact that we want to play an educational role and we want to play an analytical



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

role by providing information that can help the industry to make better decisions, and that we were not to be advocates for any particular position, in part, because as you mentioned, this is a small industry. We have worked with people on all different sides of different questions. We wanted to maintain the credibility that we were a neutral, unbiased source of information.

So I'm here at the request of National Milk, but I'm not actually here to say I think the National Milk proposal is a wonderful idea or it's a bad idea, or MIG's proposal is good or bad. I'm here to try and help provide some insights about the spatial milk values and how they changed over time.

- Q. And we heard Dr. Bozic here yesterday, or a few days ago, I can't remember when it was, and he said that he's going to be stopping the work that he's doing within that Program for Dairy Markets because he's leaving the academic side; is that accurate, your understanding of what's happening?
- A. With all due respect to Marin, who I've known for a long time, that was an appropriate decision. And it's not as if we kind of are gatekeepers. We actually sort of semi-lost a number of people through retirement that go back many years in my time. Most recently we can still count a little bit on folks like Mark Stephenson and Andy Novakovic, but essentially it's down to Dr. Chris Wolf at Cornell and myself that are the ones that are trying to make that program happen.



2.

2.0

2.1

1 Ο. And that's because Dr. Stephenson is retiring as 2. well; is that right? Is retired. 3 Α. 4 Ο. Okay. MS. HANCOCK: I have no further questions at this 5 We would make him available for cross-examination, 6 7 Your Honor. THE COURT: Dr. Nicholson, would you state again 8 9 and spell the names of your two colleagues who still work 10 with you in this program? 11 THE WITNESS: Okay. So there's one colleague who 12 is definitely not retired and still working, and his name 13 is Christopher, C-H-R-I-S-T-O-P-H-E-R, Wolf, W-O-L-F. 14 Members that are still available to us, although 15 they have retired, are Mark Stephenson, I can spell that 16 if you wish. 17 THE COURT: I don't need that one. 18 THE WITNESS: Okay. And Andrew Novakovic. I can 19 spell those if you would like as well. 2.0 THE COURT: Yes, please. 2.1 THE WITNESS: Okay. I hope Andy is not listening 22 because if I get his name wrong, it's going to be trouble 23 for me. So Andrew, A-N-D-R-E-W, and Novakovic is 24 N-O-V-A-K-O-V-I-C with a special Serbian accent over it. 25 THE COURT: So -- so I got N-O-V-A. 26 THE WITNESS: K-O-V-I-C, I believe. Help me out

27

28

in the audience if I'm not getting it right.

THE COURT: N-O-V-A-K.

1 THE WITNESS: Ο. 2. THE COURT: V-I. 3 THE WITNESS: V-I-C. 4 THE COURT: Pronounced? THE WITNESS: "Novakovich," proud Serbian 5 6 heritage. 7 THE COURT: Excellent. Now, I see we already have 8 someone else who wants to ask questions. 9 Would you identify yourself, please, sir. 10 MR. ENGLISH: Certainly, Your Honor. My name is 11 Chip English for the Milk Innovation Group. 12 And I had a little time to get up here because you 13 were going through some spelling of -- of names. 14 CROSS-EXAMINATION 15 BY MR. ENGLISH: 16 Good afternoon, Dr. Nicholson. Ο. 17 Α. Good afternoon, Chip. Mr. English, excuse me. 18 So I think, although I may get corrected, I just 19 want to have, I think, one question based upon the last 2.0 line of questioning, and I'll let Dr. Stephenson speak for 2.1 himself. 22 But when you talked about the data -- or the 23 request for information, I want to be clear that my 24 understanding is that because of proprietary information, 25 that is to say the work you did for National Milk was 26 proprietary, that the data that Dr. Stephenson used was 27 not the 2021 data, but rather 2016 data for another



project; is that correct?

- 1 A. Yes. Excuse me for that. Yes, that's correct.
 - Q. Okay. So I want to be very clear that whatever he did was not use the data that was paid for by National Milk, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Okay. And that was important to him, correct?
- 7 A. Yes.

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

24

25

26

27

- Q. So I am going to try very hard to shorten my cross-examination because a number of questions that I had were questions that National Milk Producers' counsel asked. And forgive me if I do duplicate, but I'm going to try hard not to.
- 13 A. Thank you.
 - Q. So you were not, as you said, part of the work for Federal Order reform, correct?
 - A. The 1998 effort? No.
 - Q. Yep. And in fact, just to be clear, the 1998 effort was USDA's proposed rule, but it was actually based upon a report dated July 1997, correct? Do you remember?
 - A. That's the best of my knowledge, yes.
 - Q. And are you familiar with that report?
- A. I have reviewed that report, but it has been quite some time.
 - Q. But you reviewed it, you certainly reviewed it in light of the fact that you have been, over time, updating the underlying data, correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And you couldn't update that without having looked



at it some time in the past, correct?

A. At some time in the past, yes.

MR. ENGLISH: So, Your Honor, one of the things I want to try to do -- and I believe I have agreement of all counsel so I got to speed it up -- but that's -- is that rather than asking him to go through in some level of detail that report, I represent the following:

The 1997 report, July 1997, known as RB 9709 -- and why don't I make this simpler by handing you a copy.

THE COURT: Thank you. So that's RB, as in boy.

MR. ENGLISH: Yes, 9709. Entitled --

THE COURT: That's 97-09.

And then what were you going to say?

MR. ENGLISH: It's entitled "A Description of the Methods and Data Employed in the U.S. Dairy Sector Simulator, Version 97.3," authors: James Pratt, Phillip Bishop, Eric Erba, E-R-B-A, Andy Novakovic, whose name you just got spelled, and Mark Stephenson.

This study, Your Honor, is cited six times in the Federal Order Reform proposed rule. But I also specify, and let me read from preface, page ii: "Funding for this project has been provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture through the National Institute for Livestock and Dairy Policy and through USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service Dairy Division and Federal Milk Market Administrators."

As -- as such -- and, by the way, it is cited, like I said, six times in the Federal Order reform, and it



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	in amonifically footpoted. And within Deday 1 And
1	is specifically footnoted. And within Federal Order
2	reform it says, "We, USDA, had two partnerships, one with
3	Cornell University and one with Texas A&M to assist us
4	with Federal Order reform."
5	Rather than making
6	THE COURT: To assist us with what?
7	MR. ENGLISH: "To assist us with Federal Milk
8	Order reform."
9	I I believe that this is basically a public
10	document funded by the federal government, submitted to
11	the federal government, recognized by the federal
12	government.
13	Rather than making it an exhibit and, you know,
14	helping the paper companies sell more paper, I simply
15	propose with a citation I'll give in a moment to
16	take official notice of it. I believe I have agreement of
17	all the parties. Maybe it will shorten my
18	cross-examination by 30, 45 minutes.
19	THE COURT: Now, are you going to put this if I
20	take official notice of it, are you going to submit it so
21	that it's part of what USDA receives as a document, or are
22	you just going to leave the citation in the record be
23	adequate?
24	MR. ENGLISH: Yes. The second is the case, Your
25	Honor.
26	THE COURT: All right.
27	MR. ENGLISH: So the citation I have is



28

THE COURT: Just one second before you do that.

1 I want to ask if there's any objection to our 2. proceeding in this manner? There is none. 3 Thank you, Mr. English. Now you may tell me 4 everything that you want in the record about this citation 5 of this document of which I will take official notice. 6 7 MR. ENGLISH: All right. The citation is 8 dairymarkets.org/pubPod/pubs/RB9709.PDF. 9 THE COURT: Great. 10 THE WITNESS: So, Mr. English, if I may? So that 11 is an online reference through the DairyMarkets.org 12 website, which, since Mark has retired, has been less well 13 maintained. But that document, the RB stands for research 14 bulletin, and it is also available perhaps in a more 15 permanent and accessible form at the Charles H. Dyson 16 School of Applied Economics and Management web page under 17 research bulletins. So just in case there would be any 18 issues with the link that would make that available, there 19 is an alternative source. 2.0 MR. ENGLISH: I'm grateful. The link worked this 2.1 morning. 22 THE WITNESS: Excellent. 23 MR. ENGLISH: I don't quarantee it works this 2.4 afternoon. 25 THE WITNESS: I don't either. 26 THE COURT: I'd like you to spell the name that is 27 part of the identification of where a person would find 28 this report.



THE WITNESS: So this is Cornell University, the Dyson School, D-Y-S-O-N, School of Applied Economics and Management. And I imagine that a Google search of research bulletin, Cornell Dyson, would take you somewhere close to accessing it through that set of links.

THE COURT: Excellent. Thank you both.

I do take official notice of this document,

R.B. 97-09, the name of the document -- well, first of
all, the date of the document is July 1997 (printed

December 1997). Name of the document is "A Description of
the Methods and Data Employed in the U.S. Dairy Sector

Simulator, Version 97.3." Down at the bottom it says "A

Publication of the Cornell Program on Dairy Markets and

Policy."

15 BY MR. ENGLISH:

2.

2.1

- Q. So now, Doctor, counsel for NMPF took you through some of the updates since that time, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. So I just want to, as quickly as we can, nonetheless, talk about the robustness subject of the updates, nonetheless so this record has the robustness of what was in there in 1997, to the best of your recollection.

I'm going to give you some ideas, and you can tell me whether I'm right or not. Does that work?

- A. Yeah. Okay.
- Q. And part of that is, and for your Honor's benefit, since this was -- you know, we had informal rulemaking for



Federal Order reform. That is to say Congress passed a statute that said, you know, go do all this stuff, but don't be here in this hearing room. And for whatever reason, people decided they prefer this process.

And so -- but this is a different process. It's

And so -- but this is a different process. It's a formal rulemaking, and so things that were just -- there's no -- there's no hearing record, to my knowledge, from that proceeding, but there's a hearing record here, so I -- just bear with me, and again, I'm trying to move as fast as I can.

THE COURT: I don't want you to go fast. I know that Dana Coale wants you to go fast.

MR. ENGLISH: And I think Dr. Nicholson wants me to go fast.

THE WITNESS: And my students, and the Department of Ag in the State of Wisconsin, but other than that, we're fine.

MR. HILL: Mr. English, this is Brian Hill.

Before you get started, I know Your Honor wanted to have a break at some point because of the test. It's now 2:14, and so I wanted to alert you to that before we started moving.

THE COURT: Six minutes until we're to get FEMA's emergency system test --

MR. ENGLISH: Turn off all our phones.

THE COURT: -- this is just a test. We're supposed to have, yeah -- I'll go off record, you can move around, and see if you get it. It's supposed to go on to



2.

2.0

2.1

televisions, mobile devices, and the like. It's just a 1 2. test. All right. Let us do go off record now at 2:14. 3 4 You are free to move around. Come back by 2:25. (Whereupon, a break was taken.) 5 THE COURT: We're back on record at 2:25. 6 7 MR. ENGLISH: Thank you, Your Honor. And thank you, Mr. Hill, for reminding us about 8 9 how our phones are going to blow up. 10 BY MR. ENGLISH: 11 Ο. So before the break I was going to attempt to 12 summarize with the witness some of the robustness subject 13 to -- robustness of the 1997 materials which have been subsequently updated, some of which the most recent 14 15 materials came from counsel for National Milk Producers 16 Federation. 17 So as I understand it, there were objective 18 functions, such as raw milk assembly costs, correct? 19 Are you looking at the Table of Contents? Α. 2.0 Ο. Yes. 2.1 Is it possible to have you guide me through that a Α. 22 bit? 23 So I'm thinking about page -- starting on 2.4 the Table of Contents, United States Dairy Sector 25 Simulator, Explanation of Objective Function and 26 Constraints, the fifth line down, there's a series of 27 functions listed, and one of them is, you know, Raw Milk



Assembly.

- A. So the -- I guess what I would like to perhaps help distinguish is the objective function is the overall set of costs for everything in the model that has a particular equation. It is not similar to the remaining ones which are constraints which must be satisfied. So --
 - O. I appreciate --
- A. -- they are all -- they are all equations, but they are of a different type when you go from the first line to the next line.
- Q. All right. Then in that case, help me out understanding what they are, because that's exactly what I'm having a problem with.
 - A. Okay.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

- Q. Just identify the reason why you are testifying and I'm not.
- So let's start with that. So what is a function versus a constraint?
- A. So a function is any mathematical relationship, and in an optimization model like the one that provides the information from the United States Dairy Sector Simulator, the objective function has got a combination of the variables in the model. And typically, in this case, it's also going to have the associated costs that go along with the variable.
- So, for example, a variable would be the movement of milk from one county location to a plant in a different county location. A cost associated with that would be the cost to move the milk that distance if it's a farm milk



assembly movement, right? So you would have a combination of a cost per unit, times a volume of milk flowing from one location to another. You multiply those two things together, and you actually get a dollar value. And then you do that about 6 million more times, and you've got the objective function for the current version of the USDSS.

So it's adding up the total value in terms of the costs for the month either of May or October 2021.

- Q. And so when you said 6 million more times, that's just for the raw milk piece?
- A. Those are all the variables that are part of the objective function, which would include the milk assembly flows, the processing at different locations, the distribution flows, the interplant flows, all those things are variables that are included.

It's not -- that 6 million number is not just for milk assembly.

- Q. Okay. So that's -- the milk assembly, the receiving of milk components at plants are included?
- A. So -- so the objective function is all in terms of values. The other functions tend to be in terms of physical quantities, because they are putting constraints on that for the most part represent a mass balance that says, if you are going to have so much cheese come out of a cheese plant, you have to have so much milk and other ingredients come into that cheese plant to be able to mathematically describe the relationship between the milk inflow and other products I mentioned already, nonfat or



2.

2.1

1 | cream, and the cheese product that comes out.

Most of the other of those equations that are described as the constraints are in terms of physical units. The main one that's in terms of dollars is the objective function.

- Q. And is the restriction on use of components from intermediate products a constraint?
- A. Yes. So that would be, for example, you can't make cheese entirely from nonfat dry milk.
- Q. And when you talk about -- so actually, I'm going to turn to the data now.

So what is involved in these data and how many data points are there, if you know?

- A. I can talk about that. Do you want me to talk about the 1997 version or talk about the --
 - Q. I'm happy -- I'm happy -- I'm happy to have you sort of --
 - A. Okay.
 - Q. -- combine. The whole point was to give people a chance to see how much was there, but I do think we want to talk about present time rather than 1997.
- THE COURT: You are just going too fast,

 Mr. English.
- MR. ENGLISH: That's because I'm not reading anymore. I will slow down.

THE WITNESS: Okay. So I had previously mentioned that the key data inputs in the current version of the model are the amounts of milk and their composition at



2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

26

27

different supply locations, either the multi-county regions or the 3,108 individual counties, many of which in the United States will have zero milk, the locations of plants of different processing types and their capacities to the extent that we know them, and the dairy product demand at different locations based on population and per capita dairy product demand values that we have calculated based on publicly available data.

The other part of the information that is included in our version of the model is the transportation costs, which I have described a little bit before as being based on functions that differ for farm milk assembly and differ for interplant flows from, say of cream, from a fluid plant to an ice cream manufacturer, and for the distribution routing of final products from a plant to a customer location.

So if it's -- if it's helpful for me to go through and say which of the things that are listed on data here are things that are data that are included in the model, I could do that.

BY MR. ENGLISH:

- Q. That would help, yes.
- A. Okay. So cities and distances, yes, we have a network of cities, and we have the distances that connect them. It's greatly upscaled in the county level version of the current model. I have mentioned previously farm milk supply, the areas of quantity, and composition. I have mentioned previously processing locations, and



2.

2.0

2.1

actually maybe if it's helpful, I can refer to the page numbers that are cited on this, if that helps those following along. Okay.

All right. So cities, and if we're on page iii of the Table of Contents, down at the bottom under Data, the Cities and Distances are listed on page 26 of this document. Okay. Are you with me? Okay.

Farm Milk Supply, Areas, Quantities, and Composition, 30.

Processing Locations, I have mentioned, page 34 described here.

Intermediate Products, Description and Composition, yes, although the number and form of intermediate products was greatly expanded in the current version of the model.

Consumption Areas, we have demand locations.

That's what I would call those consumption areas.

We have the Consumption of Final Dairy Products --

- Q. Wait a minute, that was page 41.
- A. Page 41, excuse me.

Consumption of Final Dairy Products, that's essentially the demand that needs to be met at different geographic locations in the United States. Here you see that's divided into two basic product categories, fluid and manufactured dairy products.

In the testimony, the written testimony submitted, there's a complete listing of both the final intermediate and tradable products that are included in the current



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

version of the model.

2.

2.1

Dairy Product Composition, so Components in Fluid Milk Products, line 56. Okay? Components in Manufactured Products.

One difference that I'll note with the current version of the model is, I believe I'm correct in stating -- and I'd have to go to page 56 to be sure about it -- that fixed values were used for the composition of fluid and manufactured dairy products.

One of the modifications that we made -- and I recall this in part because it took a great deal of programming effort and time -- was to actually make the product composition, say, of cheese be endogenous to the ingredients that were used at the processing facility.

So there are a number of different ways in which you can make cheese. Not that I'm expert in that category, but I've studied enough the math of the cheese yield process, and we decided that milk coming into a plant would not be the same -- not sort of yield the same product yield as milk from another farm that had a different composition. So we expanded the role of components to account for the fact that milk with a different farm composition could result in a different product yield or require a different sort of make formula that is alternative ingredients to be used to account for an appropriate composition of a product, particularly cheese, that would be complicated mathematically in this case.



- Q. If I could interrupt for one second.
- A. Yes, please.

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. Turn to cost data and transportation cost. And before you go into what was, I think my understanding is that there's been a significant change since 1997 that, at some point, there was a separate transportation function created, separate function model created, that I think probably replaces all of this material about transportation; is that correct?
- A. So I would have to go remind myself of the specific equations that are here.
- Q. And I don't want to ask about the specific equations, and I think they're proprietary, and we respect that.
- So I just -- it's my understanding that some time after 2010, USDS created a separate transportation model that is used to input into the USDS; is that correct?
- A. Yes. It's different than what was used in this version of the model in 1997.
- Q. Okay. And so I would rather, in this case, not talk about what was in 1997, because I think what's relevant -- because I assume that that model was then used



for purposes of what has been submitted for this hearing, correct?

A. Yes.

2.

2.0

2.1

Q. Okay. And I do not, first of all, think I understand all the equations. Secondly, I don't think that they are necessarily public, and so I don't want to go into equations.

But if you could generally describe the broad parameters of the equations and what they cover from the separate transportation model.

A. Okay. So one of the things that's important that I have somewhat noted before is that this was a joint effort to develop the data sources that were used for any of the updates that we have done to the USDSS since the 1997 model formulation. And that joint effort has involved both Dr. Stephenson and myself, and it may be helpful to clarify who did what.

Dr. Stephenson's expertise in looking at farm milk production data and allocating that farm milk to places where the model needed to have a value appropriately in assessing the composition of the farm milk at those different locations. And Dr. Stephenson also contributed to the development of the transportation cost function, and I'll come back to that in a moment if I may. And also, Dr. Stephenson contributed the data on the processing costs for the different products at the different facilities. Okay?



So to come back to the transportation costs. What I understand Mark Stephenson to have done is there is a program that is available that -- actually it was an outgrowth originally of an extension related transportation calculator for milk haulers that allows one to estimate the costs of transportation, particularly for milk assembly, but also for final product distribution and for interplant flows.

And that cost of transportation function would take into account the core costs for a trucking company that would include overhead and maintenance and replacement of equipment. It would include some notion of the fuel costs, it would include some notion of the driver time required. And Dr. Stephenson would, in a sense, simulate the values of transportation that were required for a particular set of routes, some number of them, and then he would develop a statistical relationship that would show the cost relationship to distance travelled by that particular transportation movement.

And so over time, we have used that same basic approach, but to update the transportation cost functions we go back and look at new data for things like fuel costs and wages and -- and overhead and tires and things like that, that are associated with usual trucking costs. And I have to say I work a little bit in transportation logistics, but I don't know how to operate a trucking company. So I'm not sure all the things that might be included in that, but I trust Mark's judgment for that



2.

2.0

2.1

particular thing.

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. Do you understand that tire costs are included?
- A. Tire costs are included. Apparently that's some kind of big deal. You blow out a lot of tires on a heavy truck and trailer unit. I see them on the road.
 - Q. So Mark was very comprehensive, correct?
- A. I believe these are reasonably comprehensive estimates of what the transportation costs would be.
- Q. And in fact, do you know whether for you or for Dr. Stephenson, the model -- this particular -- the transportation model, has been used to consult with members of the dairy industry to help them understand their hauling costs?
- A. I don't know if anything like the current version of this program has been used to consult. I know that Dr. Stephenson has maintained contact with trucking companies who haul milk in Wisconsin and Minnesota. I don't know if they were providers of information or whether they were receivers of information or both.

I do know that a much earlier version of this was actually an extension tool that was available online to help hauling companies understand what their costs might be in part, so that they could set appropriate contractual rates to avoid going out of business. I think that was the original purpose for the tool.

Q. So I understand and appreciate National Milk Producers' counsel's questions to you about using 2021 data.



How much impact does hauling cost have on the actual model results, say, the relationship between locations?

A. So that's actually a little bit of a difficult question to answer, because it's fairly common for people to ask me, as I mentioned earlier, why did this change in this way? And so I can say intuitively, if we have higher transportation costs, that will tend to raise the steepness of the pricing surface.

But to actually say something other than like, what effect does the change in the diesel price have, and to generalize that to what effect does transportation cost have, to come up with the best answer I would actually need to go away and do two model versions where I have one set of transportation costs, so it includes all the stuff, including the tires, not just the diesel, and then run another of those, and then I can say, here's what difference this makes.

If it's helpful, for the purpose of this question, what we do find is that something like a diesel fuel price can have a significant impact on the steepness of the slope but does not tend to change the basic patterns that exist in the spatial milk value surface.

- Q. I think that was the question I was trying to ask.
- A. Okay.
- Q. It's fair to say that the current model has a lot of constraints, correct?
 - A. Yes. I -- I can't exactly remember the number,



2.

2.1

but I believe it's something like 250,000, maybe more for
the bigger of the models.

- Q. And it has a lot of variables, correct?
- A. In the millions, yes.
- Q. And it also has, I think, something called activities.
- A. Activities are the synonym in linear programming world language for variables.
 - Q. Okay.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

- A. So they would include things like how much milk moves, how much milk is processed at a plant, how much product is produced at a plant, how much product is consumed at a location.
- Q. Does the model make any assumptions about whether it is the producer or the processor who bears the hauling transportation cost?
 - A. No, it does not.
- Q. So in terms of, say, maybe one example of what has changed over time, I think I understand from one conversation I had with somebody that -- and I don't know when it changed, but at one time, the model produced a surprising result in terms of moving milk from the west side of one of the Great Lakes to the east side.
- Does this -- do you have a recollection about this?
- A. I can envision this being a kind of conversation.

 I don't remember a specific instance that I can say, yeah,

 it was this location to that location.



- Q. I think -- so, for instance, one of the -- the kinds of things you do is when you learn about that, you say -- you put a limitation in that says, you can't cross a lake without a bridge, correct?
- A. Well, let's -- maybe I can clarify. That the current version of the model is based on the existing road network. We don't assume that the truck is going to get on a ferry and go across Lake Michigan, even though maybe in principle that's possible for some trucks. So it does rely on the existing road network.

And if I'm remembering correctly, there were times in past years where there was milk that could not be processed in Southern Michigan and actually ended up going into Wisconsin. So it went around the lake and through Chicago and up into Wisconsin.

But the -- all the movements have to be consistent with the existing road network. And so there's no kind of imaginary line that connects the city on one side of the lake with another side of the lake.

Q. So recognizing -- so let me go back to federal order reform.

Do you know that USDA itself, in Federal Order reform, took the results of the model and made adjustments? That is to say, USDA made the adjustments based upon its knowledge. Do you know that?

A. So I was not a part of the process of doing the modeling work that contributed to this document in 1997, and to the discussions, and I certainly was not in the



2.

2.0

2.1

8

9

- room, if there was a room when AMS was having
- conversations about this. So the knowledge that I have is
- 3 secondhand knowledge that comes from the people who were
- 4 involved in that process. And that's the basis for my
- 5 | statement that I believe there's a similarity between the
- 6 use of model results and making adjustments and -- in that
- 7 | era and what is being done here.
 - Q. The difference being that one thing maybe -- if USDA is doing it versus private industry.
 - A. I would say that's a difference.
- 11 Q. So if an adjustment is made, say, to, you know,
- 12 one county, and just by hypothetical, \$0.50 to the value,
- 13 does that then alter the entire model because you are
- 14 | talking about the relative value of milk, or does it
- 15 | create some -- if you don't build it back in, some
- 16 | inconsistencies because the model would have said it
- 17 | should be X and now it's Y?
- 18 A. Again, maybe it's helpful to clarify that, again,
- 19 | the model doesn't know anything about Federal Orders, it
- 20 only knows really about transportation costs. And also,
- 21 | all of the adjustments that were made, again, as I
- 22 understand it in the previous 1997, 1998 process, and the
- 23 adjustments that were made here, were made after the fact
- 24 based on the existing model results. Okay?
- 25 So what we can't say with this particular model
- 26 and tool is if you added \$0.50 here, is that going to mess
- 27 | everything up in Federal Orders, because the tool is
- 28 | simply not designed so address that question.



O. I understand.

2.

2.0

2.1

But leaving Federal Orders aside for a moment, does it impact the value in other counties if you have altered one county but not others? In the model itself, if you left out Federal Orders, would it alter the value in other counties?

A. The model does not allow us to actually change a value in one county arbitrarily. The model provides a result of what the value in the county would be, and it is what it is, again, based on the millions of interactions that are part of the model structure.

So there's no way to go in -- you can make a change to something like there's no plant there anymore, or there is a plant there, or we lost all the farms in that county, and you can evaluate what the impact of that would be in a multi-county area. But we can't actually go in and change one value and then see what happens with everything else. It's just not the way the model is designed.

Q. Okay. So I want to turn to your discussion with the counsel for National Milk for Canton, New York. And part of it is, I want to make sure I understand it, and then I want to understand if there is a limitation.

It sounds like by making a change for an individual plant, it wouldn't change the big picture. It doesn't alter the big picture as you said, that's -- that -- I think that's understood; is that right?

A. So if you were to open or close one plant of a



modest or moderate size, it would not change the bigger picture.

- Q. But would it change the localized impact? Would it have a localized impact?
- A. So changing the availability of a plant, either bringing one online or taking one offline, can have an impact close by that plant, but it depends on a number of factors.

One factor would be, are there any other plants anywhere near that location? In the Canton case, that really was the only plant within a number of counties, and it was actually processing a fairly large volume of milk.

So if there are other plants that can take up that milk, then the impact is likely to be fairly small. And it also, as I mentioned, depends on how big a plant was that. If it was a fairly large plant, the impact would be likely to be larger; if it was a fairly small plant, then even the localized impact -- there will be some. The numbers will always be somewhat different. But in general, it takes a fairly large plant in a location where there aren't alternatives to have a significant localized impact.

- Q. And what happens if you add a demand center in a county that doesn't otherwise already exist?
- A. I guess we'd actually have to be creating people somehow to make that happen. But essentially we have -- we have full coverage of the population of the demand for dairy products now. We could do something, and we have



2.

2.1

done things like this in the past, where we say, add an export demand.

It's actually one of the things that's also different from the current version of the model to the previous version of the model. We actually account for the specific product exports by port district in this model, and we allow dairy product imports. The export side, of course, is much more important now than it used to be.

So if we had, say, a scenario where there was increased export demand, we could actually evaluate sort of the systemwide impacts of that, and we could actually do it either in a particular port location like Los Angeles, or we could do it spritzing a percentage increase across all the different port districts. And we have done some of those kinds of analysis as a part of work that we did for the state of Pennsylvania in 2017.

- Q. So I want to go back to your answers to questions about the sort of the base.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. How would the gradient change if the base was 2.20 versus \$1.60?
- A. So the price relatives are the same regardless of you choose \$1.60 base or 2.20 base. Because the model starts from the assumption that we have a minimum value that would be, in the case of what we have actually presented, \$1.60, and then we build the price relatives off that.



2.

2.0

2.1

So on a percentage basis, maybe the slope changes, but the slope would actually be the same regardless of what the base would be. And that's kind of consistent with the idea that this model was not designed to figure out what the base should be.

- Q. The gradient is -- a gradient is independent of the base, 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

26

27

28

Q. Okay. So could you go back to showing Figure 3 that National Milk just counsel brought up?

So I think maybe there was -- perhaps, on somebody's part, and it may be mine -- a misunderstanding of what I thought I was driving at with respect to the questions about Miami.

And I certainly understand the fact that I was there in 2007, so I know about the Southeast decision.

And I know, I think, what that creates, a bit of a ridge to the north of it.

But Miami is green -- I know I'm -- my eyesight's not great, but Miami is in the green section, correct, of the map?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And Minneapolis is somewhat in a blue section, correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And blue is a smaller increase in this than green; is that correct?
 - A. Yes. Confusingly, based on the color scheme in



NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING 1 this diagram, it's not a defined gradient, yes. 2. Okay. So I think the point of my questions was what about -- well, let me start over. 3 The model suggests that the Miami price should go 4 up more than the Minnesota price, correct? 5 Well, the model suggests that the difference 6 Α. 7 between the model-generated spatial of milk price values in the current Class I differentials is larger in Miami 8 9 than it is in Minneapolis, yes. 10 And Denver is in a blue -- I think dark blue area, Ο. 11 correct? 12 I actually -- I can't exactly tell. I think it's 13 to the west of that dark blue --14 MR. ENGLISH: Blue or purple --15 (Excessive crosstalk.) 16 THE COURT: Which one of you would like to talk? 17 MR. ENGLISH: He would like to talk. 18 THE WITNESS: I believe that the Denver area is to the west of the blue. 19 2.0 BY MR. ENGLISH: 2.1 So in the purple? Q. 22

- - Α. It's purple or some shade of purple, yeah.
- 23 And purple's even --Ο.
 - Purple is a smaller value than the blue --Α.
- 25 Ο. Okay.
- 26 -- in this scheme of colors. Α.
- 27 Ο. Okay.
- 28 Which, by the way, I must give full credit to Mark Α.



1 Stephenson for also doing the mapping.

Q. He'll appreciate that.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- So that would suggest, as with Minneapolis, that the relative value spread between Denver and Miami has gotten larger, correct?
- A. Yes. Because that is a smaller value difference there than in Miami.
 - Q. And finally, for Riverside, which I believe is also purple, it's a -- that would be the same as Denver, correct? It should be a greater spread?
- 11 A. Yes. Roughly approximately equal to the Denver value.
- Q. So I would like now to have you turn to Exhibits 300 and 301.
- 15 A. I was hoping you would ask.
- 16 THE COURT: So you have those?
- MR. ENGLISH: He has his own set, but I guess Your
 Honor may need a set again.
- THE COURT: I have two sets. Does anybody need one? I do. I have two.
- MR. ENGLISH: My briefcase is full enough. All right.
- 23 BY MR. ENGLISH:
- Q. So first, as I talk about this, I have been told to stop calling them line numbers and call them row numbers.
- So you were here, as you said with counsel for National Milk, riveted in the conversation I had with



Dr. Vitaliano, correct?

- A. I was hoping you would do more line numbers, yes.
- Q. Well, I'm actually hoping not to do any line numbers. I think I mostly want to do column numbers, or column letters.
 - A. Okay.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

- Q. Can you confirm with me -- and I'll try to shorten it -- that Columns A, B, C, D, and E are literally there because of that's how the Federal Order uses them?
- A. Yes. Can I actually ask, though, are you referring to 300 or 301?
- 12 Q. For now, 300.
- 13 A. 300. Okay.
- 14 Yes. Those are reporting columns.
- Q. Okay. And then the results of your model were Columns F and G, correct?
- 17 A. Yes.
 - Q. Have you ever seen, before today, columns after Column G?
 - A. Yes. So in fact, in the results that were provided to National Milk, we had Columns F, G, H, which is the October to May differences; Column I, the current differentials; Column J, May current; and Column K, October to current difference. That was information the core information that was derived from the model were Columns F and G; the core information from the existing Class I differentials was Column I; and the others were basic calculations reporting differences.



So Columns F through K were things that were reported to National Milk from us.

- Q. Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

 But after that, did -- did you do Column L?
- A. No.
- O. Okay. Or Column M?
- 7 A. No.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Column N -- well, that's easy, that's just an order number.
- 10 A. Yeah.
- 11 Q. Basically, to your knowledge, none of the other 12 columns after you get past Column K?
 - A. No. None of the other columns past Column K were -- had anything to do with the information we provided.
 - Q. Let me specifically ask about Column R. This is the average monthly pounds you -- have you ever seen that column before?
 - A. So we actually do have that information in the model because we have to have -- actually, no. Sorry.

 No. Column R is not something that we reported, because we only have monthly information on pounds of milk for the months of May and October 2021. So we -- and I also do not believe that we provided that information on the milk pounds for those two months to National Milk. So Column R is something different.
 - Q. Okay. So do you have with you, or can you make available if National Milk permits, what you gave National



Milk so the record can have 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

A. So I actually was checking my computer to see what I did and did not have. It turns out that the model can run on a laptop, but actually runs on a University of Wisconsin laptop that has more bandwidth, and most of the files that are associated with that are on that laptop and not on this one.

So the question of whether or not it can be made available, I suppose, is up to discussion by the National Milk team since they had sponsored this particular research.

- Q. I only asked -- just -- this is not for you, this is for the record. In terms of the foundational piece, I just -- it seems to me it would help for foundation, but I leave that to National Milk.
- A. May I also add, though, that I don't have any reason to doubt that the information that's here is what was provided.
 - Q. And that's fine. Thank you. I appreciate that.

 And I think -- I think I got an answer from

National Milk, but -- and maybe there was also a question; I may have missed it from counsel. I don't believe that National Milk consulted with you about your columns in terms of any modifications that they proposed, correct?

- A. No.
- Q. Okay. Are there any areas from your model results that indicated -- apparently one of us had a double negative or something.



THE COURT: What -- it was unclear exactly what you just established.

MR. ENGLISH: So that's two people who advised me of that. Obviously it was.

BY MR. ENGLISH:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

- Q. National Milk Producers Federation did not consult with you about any of their modifications, correct?
- A. That is correct. They did not consult with either me or Mark Stephenson about any of their modifications.
- Q. Are there any areas, any counties for your model, that indicated using the \$1.60 base, the Class I values would decrease rather than increase?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Hasn't production grown faster than milk requirements for Class I in a number of areas?
 - A. Can I ask you to repeat that? Sorry.
- Q. Hasn't milk production grown faster than the requirements for Class I in a number of areas?
- A. That may be true, but I guess I don't have data before me to help establish that.
- Q. Would -- would a value at a \$1.60 that is lower than the present suggest that at least as to that location, production has grown faster than the requirements for Class I?
- A. So if we're looking at -- let me again, maybe make a little bit more of a lengthy explanation of this.
- So what determines the values at a particular location, I have previously said is somewhat difficult to



assess because it relies on not just the values at that particular location, but also the system values, which, again, involves these millions of points of data.

So the factors that influence whether that value would go up or down or be higher or lower than the current Class I differentials do depend on the local milk supply and demand balance at that location, but they also do depend on the interaction of all of the other connections within the modeling structure.

So I guess I would say it's maybe a little bit oversimplistic to say, well, if it went down by a nickel, that must mean that there was more than enough milk available at that location, because it depends on the systemwide impacts to really be able to say that. And as I indicated before, highlighting the change at any one location is actually pretty difficult given that it's part of this broader system set of outcomes.

- Q. Thank you for that correction/clarification.
- A. Trying not to be too much of a lecturing professor.
- Q. So could you put Figure 3 back up again? That was fast.

So given what you see there in the purple sections in the central part of the country, does that at least suggest that, say from the Great Plains from the north to south, at least until you get to Central Or East Texas, that the value for milk in Class I relative to other locations has gone down?



2.

2.1

- A. I'm sorry, can you maybe parse that question out into the different components for me again?
 - Q. So going back to Colorado for a moment.
 - A. Okay.

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

- Q. Relative to places to the east where you see the green, I think what we're talking about -- you know, for Miami would apply also, say, comparing to, say, where we are today in Indiana, that the value -- the relative value of milk used in Class I has gone up more in Indiana than in Colorado, correct?
- A. Again, the difference in the spatial milk values between the model and the Class I differentials, yes, is larger in Indiana than in that part of the country. And maybe it also helps, I like to think about this as having the slope is now steeper, right?
 - Q. The slope is steeper --
- A. The slope is steeper in the model than it is in the Class I price surface as we have it today.
 - O. It is steeper moving west to east.
- A. Yes. I guess either way, it depends whether you are going up slope or down slope. But, yes.
 - O. Steeper up?
 - A. Steeper up.
- Q. You agree with me that prices in the -- that values in the fall are generally going to be higher than the spring, correct?
 - A. So we actually report a seasonal price difference, I think it's in the column here on H on Exhibit 300, and



- Q. So recognizing the model doesn't know what Federal Orders exist, nonetheless, this is likely to be used in some way for Federal Orders, correct?
- A. I guess I have no idea whether this will be used or not. I guess I kind of like to think there's some input that's valuable.
- Q. If we set prices based upon the fall run when values are generally higher than the spring, given the fact there's a minimum pricing system, would that suggest that we result in pricing being too high during the spring flush?
- A. I guess we can't really conclude that on the basis of the model analysis, because the model does not know about Federal Orders.

And I will remark here that about five years ago we recognized that one of the limitations of a tool like this is that it's primarily got a supply chain value focus, and so it does not allow us to examine the implications of making changes to the Class I differential surface in terms of what that would mean in terms of blend prices or supply responses or demand responses.

And so with some fairly minimal support from AMS,



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

we actually began working on an alternative to that that would allow for more of that responsiveness, in essence, to develop a model that would allow me to give you a better model-based answer to your question about, is this kind of change too high?

But we actually can't do it on the basis of the analysis that we have here, because it relies on understanding the impacts of that change, and this model is just reporting what is, not what would happen.

- Q. Since this is a minimum price, since the Federal Order system is a minimum pricing system, do you have a view about using the minimum over the average or the high value from your model?
- A. I don't have a recommendation to make in that regard, because I think I -- as I mentioned, this model doesn't allow us to think through from a research perspective what the implications of using one of those values versus another would be, because it doesn't include the regulation structure under orders.
 - Q. So how is organic milk accounted for in the model?
- A. It's included in the total milk supply, and it's not treated any differently than the conventional milk supply.
- Q. Would you expect -- I understand it's included that way, but if it were separated out, would you expect a different result for organic milk?
- A. So what I know of the distribution network for organic milk and its processing differences from



2.

2.0

2.1

conventional milk are that it tends to move longer distances, because there are smaller processing volumes and smaller shipments going into individual stores. That would tend to suggest that there would be a higher supply chain cost for that distribution network, but I haven't done any work to analyze what that difference would actually be.

- Q. And following up on -- on some of the questions from National Milk, would you agree that any model has inherent limitations?
 - A. Yes.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. Can this model tend to reinforce current market conditions?
 - A. So I'm not sure this model has a lot to say about whether it reinforces current marketing conditions or not. Because as -- again, as I mentioned, it's not actually modeling a market, it's modeling the logistics of milk assembly and distribution. So it's providing what I think of, again, as a competitive benchmark for the costing structures.

And it -- again, it -- it knows something about what milk goes into what plant. The only place that it really recognizes a class distinction is really through the addition of the 1.60 minimum value that's applied to Class I milk. Otherwise, it doesn't really know or doesn't really care where the milk is being used or what the current market structure is or whether some product was at a Class IV plant or Class III plant.



- Q. And as you have stated to me and also to counsel for National Milk, the model doesn't consider the existence of Federal Milk Marketing Orders, correct?
 - A. That's correct.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. And so it doesn't consider depooling or performance standards or PPDs or anything like that, correct?
 - A. It does not.
- Q. So would it be fair to say that the USDSS is more like a traffic cop but not a driver of the cars? Sort of reports on what's going on, but it doesn't actually drive the cars?
- A. So the USDSS takes existing market conditions and provides us with an assessment of what the spatial milk value surface would look like. And in economics, we can talk about different kinds of models where a key distinction is whether or not the model has a behavioral component, right?

And by that I mean people will base their decisions or the behaviors on the outputs of the model. In this case, this is a pure, let's minimize costs throughout the system. I described it earlier as being an impassioned -- or a dispassionate dairy dictator that did not care about where a plant was currently located, it wants to get the lowest overall costs.

In that sense, this is not a behavioral model, because the only behavior that's being represented here is that ruthless cost reduction idea. So it doesn't include



Q. So I want to go back to your very last statement -- your last sentence in your statement, which sort of used an analogy to weather forecasting.

Do you remember that?

- A. I absolutely do.
- Q. And you reference sort of like the national weather forecast, and then there's the local forecasters, 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

27

- Q. You are a fully neutral expert applying this model, correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And in the case of local weathermen, they don't have a financial stake in whether or not it rains or the sun shines, do they?
 - A. I guess it depends on whether they have invested in solar panels or something like that, but generally I would say, no, they do not.
 - MR. ENGLISH: Thank you. That's all I have.
- THE COURT: Well done, Mr. English. Thank you.
 - Do we need five minutes to stretch before the next cross-examiner comes forward?



1	MS. TAYLOR: Yes.
2	THE COURT: Yes. Okay. Please be back and ready
3	to go at 3:22. We go off record at 3:16.
4	(Whereupon, a break was taken.)
5	THE COURT: Let's go back on record.
6	We're back on record at 3:26.
7	Who next has questions for Dr. Nicholson?
8	Mr. Miltner.
9	CROSS-EXAMINATION
10	BY MR. MILTNER:
11	Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Nicholson.
12	A. Good afternoon.
13	Q. This is a change. My name is Ryan Miltner. I
14	represent Select Milk Producers.
15	So I want to start by perhaps exposing my
16	ignorance. You noted that the model does not, you said,
17	doesn't recognize Federal Orders or it doesn't take into
18	account Federal Orders; is that correct?
19	A. It does not take into account the full set of
20	regulations under Federal Milk Marketing Orders. It does
21	address different class plants as a part of calculating
22	what a spatial price surface would be, but it doesn't
23	represent the full range of incentives that would be
24	available to dairy farmers, dairy co-ops, dairy
25	processors, or consumers.
26	Q. That's helpful.
27	When the model attempts to create or determine the



28

spatial value of milk, is it looking to determine the

value of that milk to a plant that is purchasing it or the value received by the producer who might or might not be pooled on a Federal Order?

- A. I guess I'd say the model is not really representing either of those things. What it's looking at is what I call the price relatives: The margin, the differences in marginal value, the value of an additional hundred pounds of milk at a location. So it's not, for example, representing the pay price that a producer would get or the payment that a Class I plant would make. It's only looking at based on essentially the supply chain and logistics costs that are relevant there what the differences are in spatial values of milk.
- Q. So for that additional hundred pounds of milk, when it's -- when it's determining that value -- and I hope I'm -- we're not ships passing in the night or whatever -- but is it -- the value that is determined, whose -- whose value is determined?
- A. Yes, I come back. It's no one's specific value because it's a marginal value of having an additional hundred pounds of milk at that plant at that time.
- Q. Okay. I'd like to ask about the \$1.60 base.

 And do you still have a copy of Exhibit 300 with you?
 - A. Yes, I do.
 - Q. Excellent. I brought my copy as well.

 So this is Row 518, Ada County, Idaho.

 Which one is Ada -- that's where you live --



2.

2.0

2.1

that's where Ms. Hancock lives, so --

- A. Must be an excellent location.
- O. I'm sure it is.

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

When I look at the row for Ada County, Idaho, I see as I look down Column F, that the May '21 model returned \$1.70 as its output, and then October '21 returned \$1.60 as its output.

Aside from the fact that that -- that's a bit of the inverse that the fall would usually be a higher value than the spring, does that reflect that that value for Ada County in October was no higher than the base value?

- A. So -- yes. So the \$1.60 implies that that is the value with the addition of \$1.60 to the original model result.
- Q. Okay. Granted there's over 3,000 rows to look at, and I suppose I could have done some sort of sort function too, but I did not see \$1.60 show up anywhere else in either of May '21 or October '21.

Do you happen to recall if there was another instance where \$1.60 appeared?

- A. So I have to admit that I don't recall of the 3,108 different values that we're looking at in two months, so over 6,000 values, but perhaps I can shed a little bit of the intuition of what is happening there.
 - O. Great.
- A. So that October value for Ada is suggesting that at that month, at that county location, the model was saying there is no positive marginal value for milk in



that month at that location. That is, nobody would want to pay to have an additional hundred pounds of milk at that location in that month, right?

So that is the raw output of the model that would be used to adjust to the current Class I differential surface by adding \$1.60. So essentially the model says that value for us at that month is zero. To make it consistent with the minimum current pricing system so that we can compare apples to apples throughout the spatial analysis, that value is set to 1.60.

I don't know if there are other values for May that are equivalent to 1.70, but what that's suggesting is that the value of an additional hundredweight of milk at that location in May was \$0.10. Somebody would be willing to pay only \$0.10 to have an additional hundred pounds of milk at that location at that time. And then we added the 1.60 to get to 1.70.

THE COURT: Mr. Miltner, may I ask probably an ignorant question, but I -- I am just puzzled. When an area is not regulated, where do you get your inputs for the model?

THE WITNESS: So you are saying that to me?
THE COURT: Yes.

THE WITNESS: Okay. So, again, the model does not rely on information about whether an area is regulated or not regulated, it only relies on the core data of the milk supplies and composition, the population and the demand for dairy products, the plant locations and their



2.

2.0

2.1

capacity, and the transportation network that connects them.

So the model itself is not trying to capture the current full regulation, it's trying to represent a competitive cost benchmark in the absence of regulation.

THE COURT: Is milk composition readily available online for an unregulated area?

THE WITNESS: So much of the milk composition information comes from state-level national statistics offices. They -- for major dairy states, they tend to report more information than for states that are not major dairy states. For some states what we need to do is use a statistical relationship that compares the butterfat value to the other components in the milk because that information is not reported. Information is also sometimes reported through the Federal Milk Marketing Order statistics for things like milk composition that we can also use to develop the composition at different locations, whether they are regulated or not.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

MR. MILTNER: Changing gears a little bit.

BY MR. MILTNER:

Q. Mr. English asked you about the relative values of milk in Colorado and here in Indiana.

Do you recall that questioning he asked of you?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. I understand that the model when making --



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

if you are comparing those two locations, what the model shows is that the change in the incremental value of milk in Colorado is a lower magnitude than the change in the incremental hundredweight in Indiana.

- A. Again, I think I would be careful about using change so much as saying there is a divergence between the current Class I value at that location that is bigger in Indiana than it is in Colorado. So -- because we're not actually making a change in the values, we're just looking at the fact that there is a difference between those values and those locations and the size of the difference is different.
- Q. And so it's not that the -- it's not that the value -- I'm not going to get my terms right. It's not that the value of milk in Colorado has declined since 1998, it's that the rate or the magnitude of the difference between the measurement in '98 and the measurement in '21 is smaller in magnitude than the same measurements for Indiana?
- A. Again, so if we take the current Class I differential surfaces representing 1998, but actually we should also probably incorporate the changes that were made in 2008. That's why I want to be a bit careful about this.

What it's saying is that the divergence has become bigger in a place like where we are here in Indiana than it became in -- in that supply location in Colorado for that plant location in Colorado.



2.

2.0

2.1

2.4

- Q. Much more articulately stated than I tried to.
- A. I'm trying.

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. Do you have a copy of your testimony as you presented it, NMPF-36A?
 - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Great. I'm looking at Figure 1 there. And so I'm looking at the state of New Mexico, and you have got a plant there in Albuquerque. And, again, the yellow lines show the flows of the product from the plant to the consumer, correct?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. Now, I note that for that plant in Albuquerque, as least as it's presented here, there are no green lines.

Can you explain how -- how milk inflows to plants are represented on here?

A. Okay. So the absence of a green inflow line of that Albuquerque location is indicating that the milk that went into that plant originated at that same location. So one of the things that's important to note about this particular figure is that the mapping is based on the smaller model configuration that did not have -- it had multiple counties aggregated into one supply location, like at Albuquerque, and therefore, it doesn't pick up the full disaggregated information that would be all of the counties which would actually definitely show a green line if that was going to be a supply plant that was distributing to those other locations.



And the reason to use this small model version rather than the big model version, is if you have 3,108 different lines going to every consumption point in the United States, you basically can't discern any reasonable patterns with that information.

So this is trying to represent the kind of information that is provided by the model, but there's a much more detailed distribution routing that would be present in the full 3,108-county model that's not shown here because it's just too messy.

- Q. So, for example, in as -- if the milk supplies in Albuquerque and Bernalillo County had -- had declined as farms had gone out of business and milk was being pulled from the Roswell area in Eastern New Mexico, those counties could be aggregated under -- under the model as it was used to create this map, and it wouldn't show that milk movement across the state graphically?
- A. Yes, that's correct. So it's not going to show the movements of milk that would come from anything other than the multi-county region that's represented here.
- Q. And the same would be true for the plants in El Paso there, correct?
- A. Yeah. A similar situation applies there, though I'm -- I think there may be a green line underneath that that's may be coming from Las Cruces going down to El Paso.
 - O. There could be.
 - A. I can't tell. Yes.



2.

2.0

2.1

Q. Okay. Now, New Mexico is the ninth largest state in dairy production, and they have lost production that's down about 10% year over year in '23.

So that loss of production, since it occurred since this model was run, wouldn't be incorporated into the model, correct?

- A. That's correct, because the model is based on 2021 data.
- Q. Time still flies. I mean, from -- because it's a spatial model, if -- if a significant milk shed had a decline of 10% of its milk supply, would that -- do you think that would have a meaningful effect on the output?
- A. So it could have a meaningful effect on the output. It does depend on the -- as you mentioned, the percentage decrease, the magnitude of that, but also what the base was that we started from. So I don't know what the milk production is in Rhode Island, but if we lose 100% of it, it doesn't make any difference to anybody.
 - O. Right.
- A. So to give you a better answer to the question, we would actually have to look at that magnitude of milk production reduction, preferably in the full county model to have the better spatial disaggregation, and we can assess what the impact would be. In general, we would expect that the marginal value of milk in that region would be lower, sorry, might be higher with the lack of milk that's available from that location.
 - Q. Mr. English did a fine job of eliminating lots of



2.

2.1

my questions. Actually, I think he's done a fine job of getting rid of the rest of my questions, so I don't have anything further.

MR. MILTNER: Thank you very much, Dr. Nicholson.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. English?

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ENGLISH:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Q. So a bit of a follow-up, and from what Mr. Miltner just asked, I'm not sure if we need to bring the map up or not.

How big are the multi-county regions?

- A. They vary depending on the state location. I actually wonder if there is -- yeah. So I do have in 97-09, R.B. 97-09, these have been modified somewhat for the small version of the model, but you get the basic idea that we have denser representation.
 - Q. Sorry, what page are you looking at?
 - A. Sorry, 32, and thank you for asking me about that.

MR. HILL: What exhibit?

MR. ENGLISH: This is not an exhibit. This is the official notice document.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. This is not the exact replica of the multi-county regions that are present in the small version of the model, but it indicates that areas where we have a greater proportion of the milk supply, at least at that time, received smaller aggregations of counties into the multiple-county region.



BY MR. ENGLISH:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

- Q. So that's, of course, back in 1997.

 What are the multi-county regions now?
- A. Well, they are similar to this, but I can't tell you just by looking at this what the differences are between the current version of the multi-county, what we call the small model, and the county-level analysis.
- Q. But we know, of course, it has definitely shifted west, correct?
- A. Yes. So the dots that are represented on that Figure 6 do indicate the locations and the relative magnitudes of the milk supplies in those multiple-county regions.
- So for example, if you look at the Central Valley of California, it's nearly every county has its own representation. And each of those dots is large. There's a somewhat similar story in Wisconsin, and there's a similar story in New York.
- So the principle that's being applied here is the same. I can't tell you without actually doing further checking what the differences are.
- Q. So just to be clear, we don't have in the record what the multiple-county supply areas are in 2021 for the purpose of the model?
 - A. For the small version of the model, we do not.
- Q. Okay. I'm sorry. I may have missed something.

 Is there a large version of the model that we do
 have it for?



A. Yes. Actually in my well, we don't have a
map well, we do not have, I think in the record, a map
that shows the county-level milk supplies in a way similar
to that Figure 6 on page 32 of this document. We also
don't have the similar version for the multi-county
regions for the updated version of the model.

All I was trying to do by showing you that figure is to illustrate the basic idea that back in 1997 we couldn't solve a model that was bigger than this, and it was a challenge at the time. It required actually like mainframe computing. And so the multiple-county regions were put together to allow the problem to be tractable, to be solved, to provide information.

Q. So how many -- there were 240 multiple-county supply areas back in 1997.

How many are there today, do you know?

A. I don't know off the top of my head.

MR. ENGLISH: Thank you, sir.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. MILTNER:

- Q. Just to quickly follow up on that. The calculations that are really the output that National Milk has utilized, that was based on an analysis of all counties, right? The aggregation of counties was really limited to providing that figure showing flows of milk; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct. Although I would note that the



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

differences between the analyses, we actually ran the smaller model first because we had difficulties getting the larger model to solve because of its extended size. But we also recognize that it's a lot easier graphically to show the flows from that model, even if it loses some of the spatial detail.

I'd also -- I guess I would say that the flows are there more to illustrate the kinds of outputs from the primal side of the model than to be a focal point for what the marginal values of milk would be.

MR. MILTNER: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Thanks.

THE COURT: Mr. Rosenbaum.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

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. Steve Rosenbaum, International Dairy Foods Association.

So you described the map as establishing, if you will, the value of marginal milk at a particular location, correct?

- A. It's the marginal value of milk at a particular location.
- Q. But, obviously, for these purposes, we're considering whether to what extent to use these for purposes of setting Class I differentials, correct?
 - A. That's my understanding.
- Q. So that at that point, they become an actual payment obligation by processors, correct?



A. Well, so --

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

- O. Differentials --
- A. -- the -- let me be clear. The model is generating spatial milk values at a differential surface. Whether that is used to create a system that results in processor obligations is not -- that's not part of what I have analyzed. It's -- it's not part of what the model is designed to do.

It's suggesting that there are differences in the spatial value of milk that might be accounted for in setting or making adjustments to a Class I price surface.

- Q. And I mean, to the extent that they are relied upon for that purpose, they will then help set the actual minimum price that has to be paid, right?
- A. That depends on the extent to which any of the results are relied upon for that purpose, yeah.
- Q. But you do understand that's the reason we're looking at this information, right?
- A. I do understand that there is interest in evaluating whether our current Class I differential price surface is appropriate in the world of now as exemplified through model analysis from 2021.
- Q. Okay. But you're here presumably because you think this information has something to contribute to the conclusion?
- A. I'm here because I think this information has something to contribute to the decision-making processes related to whether or not those Class I differentials



should be modified.

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 -- okay. And just so we're clear, to the extent that they are modified based upon this information, then that becomes a mandatory payment obligation for Class I handlers, correct?
- A. So I can certainly say that if the Class I differentials are changed, it becomes a mandatory obligation on handlers.
- Q. And when you are assessing value, let's say at a place like Miami, that value reflects the cost of getting the milk to Miami, correct?
- A. So as I have stated on a number of kind of previous responses, yes, that's one of the factors that affects what the value is in Miami. But it's not just what happens in Miami. It's not just about the transportation flow from any particular location to Miami. It's about the broader systemwide interactions that create that value at Miami.
- Q. One of the factors affecting the value in Miami is the cost of getting milk to Miami; is that fair?
- A. Yes. I previously noted that both the farm milk assembly, the interplant transportation costs, and the distribution costs are part of the transportation costs that are considered in the analysis.
- Q. And -- and captured by your -- to the extent -- hopefully captured by the numbers that your model establishes as values, correct?
 - A. They are definitely a part of the computations



that lead to that value being established.

- Q. Okay. So -- and you have said more than once and -- that the model is, if you will, ignorant as to the terms of the Federal Order system, correct?
- A. The model does not take into account the -- what I would call the behavioral incentives that Federal Milk Marketing Orders provide. It is simply a supply chain model designed to evaluate milk values.
- Q. Does it take into account the provisions of the orders with respect to, for example, transportation credits?
 - A. No, it does not.
- Q. Okay. So that -- okay. So that -- that sort of goes beyond behavioral aspects of the model to payment obligations of the order -- let's start that question again.

That goes -- that goes beyond the behavioral aspects of the orders to the payment obligation to the orders; is that right?

- A. So this model does not determine the payment obligations under the orders because it does not contain most of the Federal Order structure. It's simply a supply chain model. It's trying to come up with the spatial value differences for milk used in different classes.
- Q. To the extent that the model would be relied upon to set Class I differentials, the people using the model in that fashion should recognize that the model does not reflect, for example, whether there are transportation



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

credits provided for in the orders; is that fair?

- A. Yes. As I have previously stated, this is a -what I think of as a competitive benchmark that is
 ruthless about trying to have the system costs be the
 lowest possible that they can be. And so it does not take
 into account, as I mentioned before, anything related to
 passion about keeping a particular plant open, it does not
 think about the pooling provisions, or any of the pool
 dollars that are generated, and how that might influence
 behavior.
- Q. And so to the extent that, for example, there is a recommended decision, awaiting final decision to require Class I handlers in the Southeast orders to pay for the transportation of milk into those locations, wholly apart from the Class I differential, that's -- that's something that your system -- your model just doesn't account for at all, correct?
- A. So the model accounts for the transportation costs that would be -- and throughout the dairy supply chain, but it is not dealing with specific obligations on the part of anyone to make that payment.
- Q. It -- so it does not account for the fact that Class I handlers may be required by law to pay for those transportation costs under the recommended decision, wholly apart from whatever their Class I differential obligations are; is that right?
- A. It does not include any of the payments that would be required under Federal Milk Marketing Orders because it



2.

2.0

2.1

focuses only on logistics costs.

2.

2.1

- Q. And -- all right. Are you willing to go so far as to say it would be wrong to use the values established by your model in setting Class I differentials to the extent that there's another provision in those three Southeast orders which is on the cusp of being adopted that requires Class I handlers separately to pay for the cost of getting milk to those locations?
- A. Actually, first, I have tried to state previously that I'm here to provide information as an analyst. So questions of right or wrong are not really, I think, generally within my purview.

And second, if I were trying to understand the implications of having a transportation payment requirement in addition to the transportation costs that are represented in this model, I would actually want to have the ability to model that and analyze it to come up with a better answer to say, here's what I think the implications would be. And that's kind of different than saying right or wrong.

- Q. I take it you were not asked by National Milk to take a look at the recommended decision regarding transportation credits in the three Southeast orders and determine to what extent that might affect how the work you had done that we have been looking at today might need to be adjusted?
- A. So I was not asked to look at that decision. But I also think that the nature of what is included in the



model and what is not included in the model really implies that it would not be possible to consider that even if I had reviewed that decision.

It's actually not saying who pays what is essentially what we're talking about here. So it's not saying who pays those things. It's considered as a broad systemwide cost.

- Q. Right. But I mean, we both know this whole exercise is being undertaken for the purpose of determining what Class I differentials should be, correct? That's why we're here, correct?
 - A. I would not disagree.
- Q. Okay. Let me switch to a different topic, which is the question of adjustments being made after your model was completed, okay? Do you know what I'm talking about?
 - A. Uh-huh.
 - Q. You should say yes or no.
- A. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Q. Okay. So your model attempts to determine value based upon the current locations of milk supply.

Obviously, you do a lot more than that, but I mean, that's part of what you are doing, correct?

- A. Yes. That's part of what we're doing.
- Q. Let's assume a situation which 25 years ago when the model was last -- the precursor model was last used to determine what the Class I differentials would be. And let's assume at that time you had two large cities, 30 miles apart, and the milk was being supplied, at that



time -- I'm going to make the example somewhat oversimplified -- from the south of those two cities, okay? And those cities lay east and west of each other, okay?

So under that scenario, it would be -- it would have been the case the model would have potentially showed values the same in those two cities because the milk was coming from south, and cities were equal distance from those sources of milk; is that fair? That would be how the model would work?

A. So I think you have captured some of the logic.
But I do have to remind us all that we can talk about one
milk supply and two cities, but the values and the surface
are determined by the interaction of all of the millions
of variables and possibilities.

So in general, we see a certain kind of gradient. We might say if we had a different demand at a different location, that could modify somewhat what that gradient might be. But it's difficult to state if you have two cities and one milk source, what the implication of that would be in the basis of a modeling event, even like what we did in the simpler version in 1997 -- well, they did in 1997.

- Q. What's the -- there's a term -- I think I could say it, but I'm going to ask you to say it instead -- in Latin, where economists use it all the time, all other things remaining the same? Is it ceteris paribus?
 - A. Ceteris paribus.



2.

2.0

2.1

1 Q. Okay. Ceteris paribus? 2. Α. Uh-huh. THE COURT: Do you know how to spell that in 3 4 Latin? MR. ROSENBAUM: C-E-T-E-R-U-S (sic)? Ceteris 5 6 paribus? 7 THE WITNESS: C-E-T-E-R -- and I think it's "I," but you're saying "U" -- I-S, paribus, P-A-R-I-B-U-S. And 8 9 that's some card I should carry in my wallet as an 10 economist that I always have it available to me to spell 11 that, but I don't. 12 THE COURT: And it means everything is always the 13 same? 14 MR. ROSENBAUM: Everything else remaining the 15 same. 16 THE WITNESS: Other things being equal. 17 THE COURT: Oh, of course. 18 MR. ROSENBAUM: Yes. 19 THE COURT: Thank you. 2.0 BY MR. ROSENBAUM: 2.1 So if -- if now the milk is coming from the west Ο. 22 rather than from the south to those cities, then other 23 things remaining the same, your model today could well 2.4 produce a value in the -- in the western of the two cities 25 that would be lower than the value in the eastern because 26 now the milk has to go an extra X miles to get to the --27 to the eastern city.

28

Is that -- is that just a fair way to -- a

1 | simplified way to think about how the model would work?

- A. It's a simplified enough example, but I get the idea. So generally if you have to move milk a longer distance along the same trajectory from the same source, you would expect to see a higher marginal value of milk at that city location than a city closer to that same supply source, again, ceteris paribus.
 - MR. ROSENBAUM: That's all I have. Thank you.
- 9 THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you.
- THE COURT: Are there other questions before I
- 11 | call on the Agricultural Marketing Service?
- There are none. I invite the Agricultural
- 13 | Marketing Service to question Dr. Nicholson.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

15 BY MS. TAYLOR:

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

14

16

18

19

2.0

23

2.4

- Good afternoon.
- 17 A. Good afternoon.
 - Q. I was thinking we might not be done by 5 o'clock today, but you might luck out.
 - A. I'm counting on USDA to come through for me.
- Q. Okay. Well, let's see how we can go through these questions.
 - I'm going to try to stick to questions out of Exhibit Number 302, which is your longer statement.
 - A. Is it okay if I pull it up on my computer?
- Q. Yes. Because I'll probably refer to some page numbers, etcetera.
- 28 A. I have that up now.



Q. Okay. Some of the questions is just to help us kind of synthesize what we have heard over the past few hours just to make sure we're all clear, and there will be some other kind of more technical questions.

So in the start, in your summary you talk about how the model is -- produces these location-specific values to be used as a competitive benchmark. And I think what I heard you define that earlier was it's kind of like in the perfect world that's the lowest cost solution?

Okay.

A. Yes.

2.

2.1

Q. And your number 3 listed in your summary of key results talked about some of the reasons that we will see differences in these spatial values. You list a number of things, supply lo- -- changes in supply, changes in demand locations, etcetera.

And one of my questions was to ask you, is there a way we could kind of delineate those factors. But I think heard you say before that that's not really possible. If we wanted to see how much is the change in supply or the supply is now and figure out what impact did that have, we are not able to do that with these results currently?

A. With the current results, that's correct. So in principle, and we have done analyses along these lines, we could say what if we have the equivalent 2016 supply, which is the last time prior to this that we updated it, and in 2021, and the same thing we would do in terms of changing demand.



I think the key is, it's possible to do that, but it has to be sort of done one thing at a time to understand the implications of, say, a supply change versus a demand change versus a transportation cost change versus a plant location type change.

So in principle, it's possible to use the tool to do that. It's a bit challenging to think about whether we should use, like, a change over six years from 2015 to 2021 to accomplish that. That would only tell you in these six years, this is what happened.

- Q. Okay. So on the next page, page 4, you are talking about how the large model is 3108 counties. The smaller model, I think, had about 100 or so different -- a few hundred multi-county regions is how you describe it in your paper.
- A. Yeah. And actually if you have a copy of the R.B. 97-09, again, that Figure 6 provides a rough idea of the way in which the multi-county regions were aggregated.
- Q. And so when you have a sentence that says, "the smaller model also allows more direct comparison with prior analyses," are you talking about the '98 run, or are you talking about what you just mentioned, which was 2016? What is the prior one you are talking about?
- A. More like 2016. So when we began developing the database for this, one of the things we do is run a series of different model checks to make sure that we have at least reasonably consistent data, and then one of the things that we also typically do is go back and look at --



2.

2.1

once we have generated initial price surface, we go back and look at a previous year's price surface, in this case, the last one prior to that was 2016, and say, is there something crazy going on here that would suggest that there is an issue with the model data.

Q. Okay.

2.

2.0

2.1

- A. So we typically do that kind of check as an informal visual thing, just to highlight whether or not we should go back and look at any particular aspects of the data inputs for the model.
 - Q. And you did this in this case?
 - A. Yes. For both the spring and the fall months.
- Q. Okay. And if I heard correctly from some previous questions, one of the reasons you do both the large and the small versions of the model is, one, it's -- as according to your paper, it's quicker to do the smaller version, but also, you can see your product flows on the map because you have less lines, let's say. So visually you get an idea of what's going on?
- A. Yeah. So, for example, I didn't even ask -Dr. Stephenson is the one who does the mapping for these.
 I didn't even ask him to do the map for the fluid milk
 distribution routing because it would basically be this
 massive, ugly, spiderweb of orange lines, and it wouldn't
 help us to -- and the sizes of the flows are also
 indicated by the thickness of the lines. And so you would
 have a lot of lines that were a mess, and then they would
 also be very similar in size because of the smaller



amounts of milk going to individual counties.

- Q. Okay. And so when you did the different model types, is it just the large model run results that you gave to National Milk?
- A. So, yeah. So we did both of those, and the assessment is that they generate very similar outcomes. When we have the 3,108 model, we actually have more data points in a sense to work with, and so that was -- that was what we did and reported only the mapping for the smaller versions of the model to give a -- and, again, the primal part is really to focus on providing an example of what the kind of information that the model provides, not so much to be important for the setting of Class I differentials.
- Q. Okay. And so for the way you ran the model, I think it's in here somewhere, but I want to make sure is it clear, that are the results constrained by the capacity of each processing location? I know you talked about how you went through and you talked some in cross and you got help from National Milk on plant locations, for example, on which plants might be closing.

But how did you come up with processing volumes, would be one question? And the second question is, does the model -- is the model constrained by those volumes?

A. So, yes, let me start with the second of the questions.

So the model is constrained in the sense that plants can only process up to the allowable volume, and



2.

2.1

this is expressed in terms of a total milk volume, farm milk volume that can go into the plant, not in terms of the products that can come out of it.

So the data for that are, to be honest, incomplete. So we have estimates that primarily were developed by Dr. Stephenson over time of the capacities at most of the larger plant locations. But particularly for smaller plant locations, there's some ice cream maker in Wisconsin, we don't really know what their capacity is. So we allow the ones for which we have information to be constrained, and that's, you know, the largest proportion of the milk and products that would be produced are under those constraint plant locations. Which actually then kind of conditions what the rest of the model is going to do, because that milk will probably go there first, and then only be available to some of those smaller facilities like — it's not after in the sense of time, but would be made available to those plants that are not constrained.

So since we have some plants that are constrained when we have the data, and we have other plants that are not constrained, but the not constrained plants tend to be the smaller plants.

- Q. And so they would kind of be filled second in a way; is that what I'm hearing?
- A. It's kind of along those lines. Basically if you have a favored plant location, then you would want to use all the available capacity at that plant location, and then once you can't do that anymore, then you got to think



2.

2.0

2.1

- about, where else do I go with that milk, if you will.

 But it depends crucially on that constrained plant
- location being a location that the model thinks is good in this broader system to minimize costs.
 - Q. And so could you give an estimate of -- of the plants that were accounted for in the data, how many of them do you think had volumes so they were constrained, and percentage-wise maybe how many were -- or maybe by volume, total volume of milk?
 - A. Yeah. I'd actually have to try and go back and look at that. But I think that we do have the majority of milk going into the different plant types, particularly fluid, cheese, butter, and powder plants were under constraints. For an MPC product, or ice cream product, we have less coverage for those, but they tend not to be the big volume drivers.
 - Q. Okay. Your model took into account imports and exports --
 - A. Yes.
- 20 Q. -- locations. And exports have certainly changed 21 a lot since 2000.
 - So I'm curious if you can maybe opine a little bit on how you think that might have influenced the results or had an impact on the results, if at all?
 - A. Yeah. I guess this falls again in the general category of it's a little bit hard to determine what causes what without doing a little bit more parsing out of the different influences. But I can say that one of the



key differences between this model version and even some of the previous ones in the 2010 era were that we used to have -- because when exports and imports were less important to the U.S., we used to have three import and export nodes, like major ports. I think they were L.A., Houston, and New York. And with the growing amount of export volume going out through different ports, you think about a port like Seattle taking a lot of powder products to Asia, we decided that we would actually use Census Bureau-generated port district data to assign the actual export quantities for the different products to those locations. So it's like an extra demand at that particular demand node. Right?

So why it's difficult to answer your question about what difference did exports make is that the total volume of exports is up, but also so is the total volume of milk supply. And so we can try and, like, take out the milk equivalent of those exports and see what difference it makes, but without doing something like that, it's kind of difficult to parse out exactly what that difference made. But we did want to account for that to recognize that that is a part of this broader system that determines those price relatives.

- Q. Okay. Which would probably make sense if we're exporting close to 20% of our milk to account for that demand, right?
 - A. Yes, that's why we did it.
 - Q. Okay. I wanted to turn to page 8. This is your



2.

2.0

2.1

table of product categories. And I just want to make sure we're clear on the record what two column headings mean.

A. Okay.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. So the first column is the product, and then the next two columns indicate whether it's a final product or it's an intermediate product. And so I just want you to -- so the fourth and fifth column, if you could just make clear for the record what those two columns mean.
- A. Okay. So if it's okay, I'll say the final product in this model is things that went to final demand. We can think about that being consumers, but we can also think about it being foodservice or institutional buyers.

An intermediate product in the terminology that we're using here is a dairy product that is used by another dairy manufacturing process but came from a dairy plant, and I have got examples there of the different products.

So the IP allowed to make this product is basically saying, for fluid, that that can be a combination of cream and skim based on the idea that when most milk hits a processing plant, it's often separated into those two different entities and then brought back together in the correct proportions to make the different fat milk that's sold at retail. Right?

So something like ice cream, we actually have a separate product category for ice cream mix that can be produced at particular plants. That is the input into ice cream manufacturer.



1	Nonfat dry milk, the IP allowed to make this
2	product, in our terminology, skim milk and cream are
3	considered these intermediate products. So to make
4	nonfat, we would dehydrate the skim milk, and the I
5	guess that's the fifth of the columns, says product
6	allowed as IP in, basically we're saying that you can use
7	nonfat dry milk in the manufacture of fluid milk. And
8	actually I should note that that's really only in
9	California to meet their higher composition standards.
10	But it can be used to make yogurt, it can be used to make
11	American cheese, other cheese, casein, and ice cream mix.
12	So does that give you enough examples of what the

- definitions are? It does. Thank you.
 - Α. Okay.

Ο.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- I want to turn to page 11. 2.8, Processing and Ο. Transportation Costs. You mentioned how Dr. Stephenson was -- you know, you all kind of separated assignments when it comes to data, and I think you said that processing costs came from Dr. Stephenson.
 - And you mention --
 - Α. Yes.
- -- that these costs are based on previous cost of processing studies updated to reflect 2021 cost structures.

There's been a few studies of his on costs put into this hearing record, so I'm trying to figure out which one you are talking about.



A. So the input for processing costs in this model derived from sort of a long series of our looking at the evolution of processing costs over time. And essentially, what we did was look at the 2016 processing costs that we had, and Mark provided an adjustment factor that he thought was relevant to bring that to 2021.

And I imagine that he used information available from at least the first of the costs of processing studies that he had done, but I don't know specifically how he arrived at what that adjustment factor should be.

Q. Okay. Thanks.

And then down when you are talking about transportation costs, and you used a standalone transportation cost simulation program. I was wondering if you could expand on that.

And in my mind, what I think I hear you saying, which is something that Dairy Programs can do itself sometimes when we do modeling, we figure some other things out externally, and then input those results into the model, so I -- that's what I'm interpreting that as what you did, but I would like you to kind of expand on how that was done.

A. Yeah, you have the basic idea. We used a separate model to provide the transportation cost inputs for this model.

And I think I mentioned earlier that there's been an evolution of a model. It started out as an extension-based tool to help haulers understand the full



2.

2.0

2.1

cost of moving milk from a farm to a processing plant, and that has been refined to be a little bit broader structure to allow the assessment of the different costs that I mentioned.

And I think I mentioned previously that the way in which this tool was used was -- again, this is something that my good friend Dr. Stephenson is responsible for -- was to run a large number of different possible routes with that standalone transportation costing tool, and then to understand what the statistical relationship was between the distance of those routes -- and these are the actual road mileage type routes, somewhat similar to how we have done this in the model here -- and then to establish a statistical relationship that is typically a non-linear relationship that would look at all of those different cost points relative to the distance and establish what sort of a mean value would be at a distance of X number of miles.

So does that provide enough information to help you understand how we use this approach?

Q. It does.

And I had another question kind of later on. In think you mentioned you used updated fuel cost data to reflect 2021 diesel prices. Are those factors in this model or that just gives you the relationship and then your USDSS model puts in diesel prices separately, for example?

A. Yeah. So let me try and clarify that, because I



2.

2.0

2.1

think it's an important point.

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

The initial transportation cost model is used to generate what we call a cost matrix that has a cost to go from any origin of the 3,108 to any destination of the 3,108, which relates to that function of distance. Okay? We then -- and that actually includes the operating costs that would include wages and tires and fuel in that initial estimate.

But then in order to better reflect regional differences in fuel costs and wages, we adjust that by a factor that shows how the average -- or how a wage or a fuel cost in a particular location is related to the national average.

So if it's 95 -- if diesel is 95% of the national average cost, that 95% is used to reduce the diesel cost at the starting location where that pattern exists. And it could be, you know, 5% more in which case you would multiply it by 1.05.

So we start with a base of the transportation cost from the model -- sorry, I'm using my professor hand -- and --

- Q. I appreciate this lecture, so this is good.
- A. Okay. And so we then adjust that in the -- in the actual model simulations with the USDSS model to account for the regional differences in wages and in fuel costs.
- Q. Okay. And so I think I remember you stating you used DOE data for fuel costs?
 - A. Right. And so that would actually, excuse me,



O. Right. 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

25

26

27

28

So the data you did -- you use for kind of like your beginning index, I'll call it that, is for May of 2021?

- A. May and October for preceding months, yeah. So the base, if you will, that you are going to adjust up or down is that May and October value.
- Q. Okay. And then the wage data, what -- you used wage data from BLS. I'm assuming that was specific to trucking?
- A. Yeah. I don't remember the specific BLS category, but it was designed to be specific to trucking labor.
- Q. It's a little bit different as Mr. English talked about, and before -- when we did reform, it was informal, and we kind of knew these things or could work with the people. This is our only opportunity to ask these questions.
 - A. I appreciate that.
- Q. Okay. I want to turn to the Figure 5, which is on page 13.
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And I think in that figure what you said, because this is using the smaller run, less locations, so kind of plant locations might be grouped together in a larger



triangle to represent a few plants that are there.

A. Absolutely. Yes.

2.

2.1

- Q. I did have a question. If we noticed -- well, let me -- I just want to get your feel on how kind of accurate you think those plant locations are, if, for example, based on looking of these things -- you know, our own knowledge, and not my knowledge, but the people sitting behind me's knowledge, working out in our Federal Order offices see a dot, let's say in the part of South Dakota where they're not quite sure there's a plant there, but no dot maybe in North Dakota where we think there is a plant there, I mean, I think you talked earlier about the plant list was probably the hardest part of this whole -- putting together the plant list is probably the hardest part to put together for the model.
 - A. It is. It's the place where the least amount of publicly available information exists. I think is -- that makes it the bigger challenge.
 - Q. Okay. So one question is, is kind of these differences in where maybe a plant is or isn't, because this is a smaller model, is that like a mapping problem based on the fact that you just used the smaller runs to do this, not necessarily all the plant locations that you did in the larger run?
 - A. So this has been a question that we have been getting -- well, at least I have been getting since the time I started working on this model in 2000, and they actually got it before in 1997. It has to do with exactly



what you are talking about, the aggregation of plants that are at other specific locations to the locations that are available in the model.

And so I can't remember the specific instance, but it was -- there was a conversation they were having, and somebody said, "You don't have my plant on there. My plant's over here, it's not over here." I said, "Yes, we know, because that actual triangle location is accounting for all the processing capacity, whether it's right there or not. It's like, in the multi-county region, this is the location that we chose to aggregate where that plant location -- or plant capacity was available."

- Q. And that multi-county region is kind of going back to the study from 1998 and the circles, right? So that region could be a large circle where that dot represents or a small circle?
- A. Yes. And as I noted, and in locations where there was a good deal of milk supply in a dense area, like the Central Valley of California, it's pretty much county by county. In other regions where at least at that time there was less milk supply, you had less dense coverage, and you were aggregating more plant capacity at a given location. So I can understand how the specific flows here would make it look like it's not representing the plants that you are aware of.
- Q. So we had one question, if we can compare Figure 5 to Figure 4. So Figure 4 is on page 7.
 - A. Yep. Thank you.



2.

2.1

Q. And Figure 5 is on page 13.

And I want to point to the area in North Carolina on the coast where there's on Figure 5, there's a triangle there. So that would represent some fluid plant in that area?

A. Let me look at the Figure 5.

Okay. I don't know the reason why there isn't a blue dot where there is a dot in Figure 5. So, again, these maps were, again, generated by Dr. Stephenson.

- Q. Maybe I'll get the privilege to ask him that question.
 - A. Perhaps you will.
- Q. Okay. I want to make sure it's clear for the record, because we just had the question come up. I think what I heard from you in regards to -- earlier, I think this was questioning for you from Mr. English -- or Mr. Rosenbaum, while if there's a kind of a plant there in your map that's not really there, or a plant -- a plant missing that is there, in the big picture that doesn't really change your results?

So, for example, maybe the missing plant in North Carolina or something, that doesn't -- in the big picture -- doesn't in the big picture kind of change the results out of the model?

A. Actually, I think the Figure 5 is actually showing that the supply plant is there. It's just omitted in the general graphic that's talking about the dairy process -- and actually, I think maybe one of the reasons that that



2.

2.1

may be omitted is we didn't have a capacity for that plant, and therefore it didn't show up in the capacity graphs that are shown in Figure 4. I don't know. I'd have to actually better understand that.

But -- so the plant is definitely there for the purposes of processing something in the analysis that we did. What seems funny is that it doesn't show up as listed in Figure 4.

Q. Okay. Okay. I'm on page 14, into 15. So here you are talking about milk assembly -- well, that's the figure, Figure 6. I don't want to talk about 6.

But I did want to move to the second -- page 15 in that top paragraph. The second sentence from the bottom of that paragraph says, "The model results are not sensitive to changes of plus or minus 5%, and demand values are estimated transportation costs."

So I just wanted to make sure it's clear, what you are saying is if -- if there's only a small change, the model's not going to pick that up or won't change its results if there wasn't the change greater than 5% in one of those variables?

A. Yeah, that's the correct interpretation. And perhaps a little bit of background on that is helpful to have.

I mentioned in the starting statement that I made that this has actually been peer-reviewed research that's been published. And one of the things that the reviewers required us to do was that kind of analysis to assess the



2.

2.1

sensitivity of our results to those kinds of changes.

And so I mentioned earlier that we can tweak those things to evaluate their impacts. And in general, what we find is it takes a really large change, like the shifts in population that we have seen and the locations of milk supply and the transportation costs being markedly different, for us to see a markedly different result from the model.

Q. On page 17 you have Figure 8, milk production by region. And you list the four regions, but I don't think they are defined anywhere of what encompasses those regions.

So could you elaborate on that a little bit?

A. Yeah. So, again, we talked about the division of labor between Dr. Stephenson and myself, and I mentioned that he was the one who was responsible for pulling together the milk supply data.

I hope you will have the opportunity to rigorously question him about Figure 8.

Q. Well, hopefully the person calling him on the stand might know that we were going to ask him these questions, so thank you.

This is -- I don't -- I'm trying not to go back and forth. I want to go to page 21 where you show the pie charts of the changes in the transportation costs as a percentage of the total from 2011 to 2021.

So, for example, fuel costs represented 35% of transportation costs in 2011, while they only represented



2.

2.1

1 | 25% in 2021.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

28

We were wondering if you have kind of what are the -- what are those values for those two years?

A. I agree that the breakout is perhaps relevant to show the shifts among costs, but actually figuring out what the total costs would be is also important.

And I will again ask you to refer to my esteemed colleague, Dr. Mark Stephenson, to provide additional details because he did that component of it.

Q. Okay. I will wait. And I wrote Mark on my sticky, so we're going to come back to that.

And I assume then that he also did the Figure 13?

- A. Yes, he did.
- Q. This is why we're going to get done by 5:00.
- 15 A. Excellent.
 - Q. I did have a question. So your results that you gave to National Milk, they are in Exhibit 300 that we have discussed, include the base differential of a \$1.60.
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. The proposed results that are kind of -- from National Milk's proposal results in Column S on Exhibit 300 include a 2.20 base differential.
 - A. That's my understanding, but I have not had any direct input at how that was calculated.
 - Q. But assuming that's their -- that's what's in that -- assuming that the 2.20 is what they put in their base differential, then is it right to say that \$0.60 -- part of the \$0.60 difference between what the model came



up with versus what they proposed could be attributed to the different base differential that you -- that each party assumed?

- A. Again, I -- I don't know enough about how that process was done to say you are just adding \$0.60. I actually don't think that was what was done. But I don't know exactly how that set of values was assigned and the role that the 2.20 played in that.
- Q. I'll look forward to asking National Milk about that.
 - A. I think you will have an opportunity.
- Q. Okay. On the bottom of 23 you talk about Kriging, K-R-I-G-I-N-G, is employed. And I think what I think you are saying is, right, we get all these values at certain locations, and you put it in this -- use this method to kind of make a one continuous map. Even though there might not be milk or a plant in a lot of locations, you still assign a value in that?
- A. Yeah, that's -- that's exactly the idea. It is an algebraic algorithm that allows you to extrapolate values based on -- if you think about -- say you have got a series of marginal values at Class III plants, but you don't have one in every county that you can use to say that would be the value in that county.

This is an algorithm that allows you to take those existing values, use different weighting schemes, and assign the value to every county. And it's fairly commonly used in this kind of spatial mapping type work.



2.

2.1

I guess one other thing I'll add is, that in contrast to some of the previous work that we have done, there are different ways to implement this algorithm. And the way we initially were implementing it when we started this process, we'd say if a -- if -- it's the linear distance between two points, so if you are going to cross, like, Lake Erie, you would say you can just take the value and go right across there, and we realized that that was not appropriate.

And so it's been modified to reflect the fact that it actually has to respect the borders that are part of that mapping system so that you are not coming up with funny values for things that look to be closer than they are, because the straight line distance is not the same as what you have to have happen by moving the product.

- Q. And when you say that's what you did initially, is that what was done back in the '90s or what -- what that's the initial period?
- A. Well, initially in the '90s, but also in the early iterations of this model in the 2000 era we were using that without recognizing the importance of accounting for that geography.
- Q. Okay. We're looking at Figure 15 on page 24 with all these pretty lines, pretty wavy lines. And this might be a Mark thing --
 - A. It is a Mark thing.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. Can I say that to everything and then we'll be



2.

2.0

2.1

done really quickly or --

MR. ENGLISH: No.

THE WITNESS: I guess I'm under oath. Sorry.

BY MS. TAYLOR:

2.

2.1

Q. Well, I'll ask it anyways in case you know, but I'll write it down here to ask him.

Is the difference between lines, like, a 10% change in -- is that -- because this -- yeah, \$0.10, sorry, not 10% -- \$0.10 change? Because some of these numbers are kind of hard to read.

A. Yeah, this is actually the way that we used to map it was only with the lines and then some colored gradation. What I think is a little bit challenging about this is you actually have the individual county levels being mapped, and on top of it you have this line surface.

And technically, we wouldn't need the line surface to help us interpret that so much except for the fact that there's kind of this very broad range of values that goes again from 1.60, you know, up into the 7s. And I think in putting the lines in there, Mark was trying to help guide the eyes to kind of where the break points were as opposed to just using the colors.

Q. Okay. Okay. Another question for you, and you talked a little bit about this with somebody, about kind of the art that goes into kind of taking the model results and then trying to bring them into the real world, not just what the model spits out.

And you talked about what kind of things might



people look at, factors go into different changes. And one, you talked about competitive relationships that currently exist, which the model does not account for. You also talk about places where geography gets in the way, so maybe that's mountain ranges or a lake.

A. So let me expand on that just a little bit, if I may.

so the geography that we have here is the road network. So if the road is going over a mountain and the milk and products are moving over a mountain, they are going over the mountain or they are not. It's not whether or not there is a mountain range. We don't account for any differential costs on a movement that would be going over a mountain range versus traveling flat across the plains once you got east of there. But we can have geography if it's based on the existing road network.

So when I was thinking about things that were more related to the transportation network, I was kind of thinking about we don't account for traffic congestion in metropolitan areas, for example.

- Q. And maybe, back to my mountain example, maybe you don't count for it might cost more to go over that mountain, even though --
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Uh-huh. And that's something that -- that's kind of the art of people with knowledge of that marketing area might be able to attest to?
 - A. Yeah. And I should also say there's -- and I grew



2.

2.0

2.1

up in San Diego, so I'm a little bit familiar with the California geography, but we can also think about how many arteries there really are to move product from a location like the west, and there aren't that many. So that actually might account for greater congestion on those routes, and we didn't account for that in the system that we use, which is sort of like this average costing of routing plus an adjustment for fuel and wages.

Q. Okay. I think in your statement somewhere you define disorderly marketing can result when differentials are greater than transportation costs.

Does that ring a bell?

- A. I'm not sure I used the word disorderly marketing. Let me have a look and see.
- Q. My notes say it's on page 23, so we'll all flip there.

It's on the bottom of 22 into 23. So the sentence says, "If these values" -- and you are talking about differentials -- "were larger than the cost of transportation, then 'disorderly' marketing conditions could result with excess milk trying to find its way to the higher valued plants."

- A. I'm still looking for where you are.
- Q. At the bottom of page 22.
- A. Sorry, I was on 23.
- Q. Yeah, sorry. And then the sentence starts there and goes on to 23.
 - A. Thank you.



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. Yep.

2.

2.1

2.4

- A. Okay. So --
- Q. The question is, can you comment if you think you see where -- if there are any instances of that in your model results or you feel confident that your results are not overstating transportation costs?
- A. So I guess I haven't done a systematic analysis to look at, like, whether a Class I differential for a particular movement was a bigger value than the transportation cost. I think generally what we see in the model results is that we're not really actually talking about the disorderly marketing per se, we're talking about can we evaluate what those transportation costs would be and how they affect what the marginal value of milk would be, for example, at that Class I plant.

But we don't have any kind of more systematic analysis of is the model saying something is too big relative to what the current Class I differential is.

- Q. Okay. And then for your -- particularly for the fluid plants that you had in your data, does the model differentiate between ESL plants and traditional HTST plants? And do you -- if it does, do you think it impacted the results in any way considering they have kind of different distribution networks?
- A. It does not currently make a distinction between those two milk products. Again, I mentioned earlier, nor does it deal with the differences in distribution for organic milk. But we have actually started talking about



Q. Okay. Not going to ask you questions I don't think you're here to answer. Save that. Let's see.

So you talked a little bit about it, and I know we looked at the results from 1998, but does your -- did your model put out different surfaces for different product categories, the four classes of products, for example?

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 does each one of those kind of have a zero point? I mean, they are all spatial values, so I assume just like the Class I surface you produced, those also have kind of like a zero starting point somewhere.
- A. I guess I would have to go back and look at the data. My recollection is we have fewer of those zero points in part because of the way that manufacturing capacity is spread around the country.
- Q. And do you -- would you know maybe what the range was in those surfaces?
- A. So if we're thinking about whether or not there is a -- dare I say it -- a Class III price surface, the spatial analysis, which suggests that there is, my recollection is that surface largely goes from west to east -- and this is an approximate value, and I'm not remembering it so much from this as from previous work -- that might be like \$0.50.



- Q. Okay. And does the model solve for all four of those surfaces simultaneously?
- A. It's generating a marginal milk value at all locations where plants are processing. We then can actually look at -- for the plants that would be doing products that would be in any of the classes, we can assign a value for that.

And so all of the information is being generated at one time, just as I have talked about everything kind of happens as a part of this broader system. And we don't typically map any of the other surfaces other than Class I. We have, for our own interest, occasionally done that, and then most people do not want to talk to us about a Class III price surface.

MS. TAYLOR: I think Mr. Wilson has a question for you.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. WILSON:

2.

2.1

- Q. First of all, I'm not an economist to any degree, so there are terms that I don't know if you have used them today, but other people have used them in the past, related to shadow pricing.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. That's equivalent to the -- to the marginal spatial price cost that you are talking about, right?
- A. So the base marginal values generated in the model would be called by economists shadow prices or shadow values, and the only place where we depart from that is



when we add the \$1.60 to get to something that's comparable to the current Class I differential surface.

- Q. Are there occasions where that shadow price is, on Class I, a lot different than the other II, III, or IV shadow prices? And if they are, what's your view on what's causing that?
- A. So I think you are -- maybe you are talking about a broad set of differences between a Class III and a Class I value?
 - O. Correct.

2.

2.0

2.1

A. Yeah. So I mentioned numerous times that the way this model works is it's looking at all this information simultaneously. So as an example, we might expect that a Class III value would be different than a Class I value, except for that 1.60, in a location where there's a lot of cheese plants and a lot of milk going into cheese plants that are satisfying a demand. And it'd be particularly the case if there isn't a lot of demand for milk to go into a fluid plant. And I'm kind of thinking about in my mind an example of Idaho and Montana, right?

So there you could actually get differences between the need for milk to make cheese, which is big and strong, and saying, I need this right here based on the capacity, and not so much demand for fluid milk, and also a much sparser network of fluid plants in that region that mean you actually have to move that farm milk a lot longer distance to get it to a fluid plant.

Q. So if you had that county in Idaho that maybe had



a fluid plant sitting next to a cheese plant, and one of them was a lot more -- if Class -- if the cheese value shadow price was significantly greater than the fluid value, what's that telling you? What's that -- what's that telling us?

A. Okay. So I can imagine a situation in the real world where that might happen. In the model world, if you have a cheese plant right next to a fluid milk plant, the model only knows about the value differences due to what I mentioned before, like, there's a little bit of different component mix that's going into those different plants, and it only knows about what would the transportation costs be for me to go from one to the other.

So the model won't generate big differences in a Class III value and a Class I value, again, ignoring the 1.60 part, if they are right next to each other, because it's only accounting for those specific differences in the component use and in the transportation that would take you to go kind of this hypothetically across the road from one plant to another.

So the model won't generate something that looks like a big difference between those two values, other than that 1.60 that would come into play. And so the model can't really inform very much about what would happen if we saw that.

Q. So in looking back at some of the maps that you didn't create, we see these assembly points for the fluid.

Okay? And so I think of these shadow prices for the fluid



2.

2.1

side as milk is trying to get to the Southeast of the United States, that shadow price gets larger and larger, meaning that it's costing more money to get that milk to processing. And so it's an assembly. It's -- it's -- that shadow price is driven from the assembly side of farm to processor -- transportation, not assembly, right?

A. Yeah. So it -- again, I apologize for kind of keep saying this, but we have to think about this as a broader system that includes all the different elements.

I agree with the basic idea that the model is saying milk wants to move to the Southeast, it needs to move longer distances. And that's actually both the longer distances that we're looking at for a farm milk assembly to a plant, as well as the distribution routings that would take place, right?

So the basic idea I think is there. What exactly causes that has a broader set of factors. But the map, actually even for the small model, tends to suggest we have a lot of milk that wants to move through kind of a stair-step to the Southeast, and that's part of what's generating those larger differences between the current Class I differential and the model-generated marginal values at that location. It's just more costly to get the milk into those locations.

MR. WILSON: Thank you, Dr. Nicholson.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

MS. TAYLOR: That's it from AMS. How about that?

THE COURT: Mr. English?



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

1 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2. BY MR. ENGLISH: I have one follow-up question. 3 On page 14, Figure 6, a question that Ms. Taylor 4 asked a couple of different times about North Carolina. 5 Isn't it, sir, that that is likely the Port of Wilmington, 6 7 North Carolina, and is an export node? 8 Let me look. So I'm looking at Figure 5 --Α. 9 Yes. Ο. 10 And I'm looking at the fact that that is Α. 11 representing a fluid plant, which is not an exportable 12 product in the model. And it's also apparently, at least 13 if my eyes are not deceiving me, distributing milk. 14 Ο. Okay. 15 So I think the omission is on the previous figure Α. 16 where it wasn't represented with the blue dot, it's not 17 the omission for that, and it's not just an export 18 location. Although Wilmington is an export location in 19 the model. 2.0 MR. ENGLISH: All right. Thank you, sir.

THE WITNESS: Sure.

THE COURT: Ms. Hancock?

MS. HANCOCK: Thank you, Your Honor. We have no further questions. Appreciate your time.

We would move for admission of Exhibits 302 and 303.

THE COURT: Is there any objection to the admission into evidence of Exhibit 302?



2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

1	There is none. Exhibit 302 is admitted into			
2	evidence.			
3	(Exhibit Number 302 was received into			
4	evidence.)			
5	THE COURT: Is there any objection to the			
6	admission into evidence of Exhibit 303?			
7	There is none. Exhibit 303 is admitted into			
8	evidence.			
9	(Exhibit Number 303 was received into			
10	evidence.)			
11	MS. HANCOCK: And may the witness be excused, Your			
12	Honor?			
13	THE COURT: Is there anything you would like to			
14	add?			
15	THE WITNESS: No. I thank everyone for the			
16	opportunity to make this presentation, and I thank you for			
17	helping me meet my other obligations.			
18	Thank you very much.			
19	THE COURT: Wonderful. Thank you, Dr. Nicholson.			
20	e really appreciate it.			
21	And the witness may be excused.			
22	THE WITNESS: Thank you.			
23	MS. HANCOCK: I would just maybe tell you what I			
24	understand or I don't know if, Erin, if you want to go?			
25	MS. TAYLOR: Sure. So on my list of people that			
26	need to go tomorrow, from National Milk, a Dr. Koontz, and			
27	from MIG, Dean Sommer.			
2.8	THE COURT: I'm sorry say those again?			



1	MS. TAYLOR: Dr. Koontz, K-O-O-N-T-Z. And then			
2	that would be a witness for National Milk. A witness for			
3	the Milk Innovation Group would be Dean Sommer, I think			
4	did I write that down correct?			
5	MR. ENGLISH: You did, but it's really IDFA.			
6	MS. TAYLOR: That would be an IDFA witness. I			
7	think Mr. English said his name earlier.			
8	THE COURT: Dean Sommer.			
9	And then I had written down last night Jeffrey			
10	Sims?			
11	MS. HANCOCK: Yes. Well, for the he didn't			
12	have the need to go and be off by tomorrow, but assuming			
13	that we get Dr. Koontz on and off, and Mr. Sommer on and			
14	off, we would be prepared to put on Jeff Sims, Dr. Eric			
15	Erba. I think that Sally Keefe still at some point would			
16	like to go on.			
17	MS. TAYLOR: That will take us through tomorrow			
18	and part of Friday.			
19	And then Friday I have one in-person dairy farmer			
20	that I know from National Milk that's coming, and we have			
21	six farmers signed up to virtual testimony in the			
22	afternoon.			
23	THE COURT: You know, that is wonderful because			
24	you just announced and you said, if you would like to			
25	testify, let us know by noon or something, and you filled			
26	it up.			
27	MS. TAYLOR: People are listening.			



28

THE COURT: I love it.

```
1
              All right. Is there anything else before we go
 2
     off record for the day?
 3
              There is none. See you tomorrow morning at
 4
     8:00 a.m.
              We go off record at 5:02 p.m.
 5
 6
               (Whereupon, the proceedings concluded.)
 7
                               ---000---
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```



	WITOWAL FIDEWAL FILE FANKETING ONDER TRICING TOWNSER HERKING				
1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) ss COUNTY OF FRESNO)				
2	COUNTY OF FRESHO)				
	T MVDA A DIGH Contified Chemthand Depositor do				
4	I, MYRA A. PISH, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do				
5	hereby certify that the foregoing pages comprise a full,				
6	true and correct transcript of my shorthand notes, and a				
7	full, true and correct statement of the proceedings held				
8	at the time and place heretofore stated.				
9					
10	DATED: November 29, 2023				
11	FRESNO, CALIFORNIA				
12					
13	1 Mars Republication				
14	Migral				
15					
16	MYRA A. PISH, RPR CSR Certificate No. 11613				
17	CCICILICACE NO. 11015				
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					



- \$0.05 6908:27 6909:1
- **\$0.10** 6879:27 7003:14,15 7043:8.9
- **\$0.20** 6894:16 6903:4,14
- **\$0.50** 6942:7 6982:12,26 7047:28
- **\$0.60** 6852:3 6912:13,17 7040:27,28 7041:5
- **\$0.80** 6909:5 6912:18 6927:1
- **\$1** 6953:18
- **\$1.30** 6903:24 6904:3,5,10, 20 6905:18 6906:21
- **\$1.50** 6953:17
- \$1.60 6828:8 6850:16,19 6851:1,11,15,19,24 6852:3, 7,9,10,13 6853:3 6909:21,27 6910:3,11 6925:26 6926:21 6949:16,28 6950:4,7,15,17 6956:10,20,26 6957:3,6 6985:22,24,27 6992:11,21 7001:22 7002:7,12,13,17,20 7003:6 7040:18 7049:1
- **\$1.70** 6903:21 6904:6,10 7002:6
- **\$1.80** 6927:8
- **\$1.90** 6906:19
- **\$2** 6833:22 6834:1,3,14,15 6953:18,20
- **\$2.20** 6828:8 6850:19 6851:21 6852:2,13,14 6950:21.22
- **\$2.30** 6912:8
- **\$2.40** 6912:10
- **\$2.50** 6908:21 6912:8
- **\$2.55** 6908:25
- **\$2.60** 6902:8,9
- **\$2.70** 6902:9
- **\$3** 6833:24 6834:5,6,15 6902:28 6903:4,20 6904:3,7, 10 6912:11 6921:10 6953:23
- **\$3.30** 6909:5
- **\$3.50** 6942:20.24.27
- **\$3.85** 6822:11.22
- **\$4** 6911:14
- **\$4.35** 6822:25
- **\$4.70** 6822:27 6911:20

- **\$6** 6925:27
- **\$7** 6926:1
- **\$7.40** 6906:7
- **\$7.90** 6906:12,14
- **\$8** 6926:6 6952:20
- \$8.40 6906:9

(

- **(b)** 6841:11,12
- (c) 6824:12 6841:25 6842:12

-

---o0o--- 7055:7

0

06065 6912:4

08031 6908:11

1

- **1** 6821:9 6824:8 6831:23 6885:10 6887:6 6920:28 7006:6
- **1.05** 7033:18
- **1.60** 6997:24 7003:10,17 7043:19 7049:15 7050:16,23
- **1.70** 7003:12,17
- **10** 6840:12 6915:11
- **10%** 6834:11 7008:3,11 7043:7,9
- **100** 6826:12 6833:11 6834:2, 4,7,12 6835:5 6836:9,11 6841:28 7023:13
- **100%** 6834:5 7008:18
- **1000.50** 6823:16 6840:27 6841:11 6890:26
- **1000.50(b)** 6824:12 6842:12
- **1000.50.52** 6840:26
- 1000.51 6840:27
- **1000.52** 6829:24 6840:28 6841:15,19,27 6842:3,10,15 6867:20 6880:24 6888:8 6890:7 6908:8
- **1005.51(b)** 6824:20 6841:1 6842:5
- **1006.51(b)** 6824:21 6841:2 6842:6

- **1007.51(b)** 6824:21 6841:2 6842:6
- **1052** 6824:13
- 10:27 6883:6
- 10:40 6883:5
- 10:41 6883:9
- **11** 6915:10 7030:16
- 110 6834:12
- 11:00 6894:20,23
- **11:41** 6915:24
- **11:46** 6915:23,27
- 11x17 6884:22
- **12** 6821:28 6842:16 6880:11 6881:9
- **12086** 6905:21,26,27
- **126** 6872:21
- **12:11** 6930:12
- **13** 6824:8 6828:14 6841:24 7034:24 7037:1 7040:12
- **1307** 6901:14,15
- **1308** 6901:18,20,26 6902:3, 26
- **14** 7038:9 7052:4
- **15** 6816:26 6817:3 6835:24 7038:9,12 7042:23
- **15B** 6817:5
- **1675** 6916:19
- **17** 6865:24 6915:10 6926:8 7039:9
- **18%** 6878:1
- **19** 6821:14 6824:9,10 6828:9 6831:28 6832:3,5,9 6841:3, 9,17 6842:19 6869:9 6875:20 6879:11 6881:11,24 6892:4 6903:3,23 6905:11, 16
- **191** 6912:7
- **1937** 6877:20
- **1980s** 6835:6 6920:12
- **1982** 6833:7
- **1985** 6876:20
- 1997 6962:19 6963:8 6966:9, 10,22 6968:13 6971:15,21 6975:11,25,27 6976:15 6981:27 6982:22 7010:2 7011:8,15 7019:22,23 7035:28

- **1998** 6920:15 6924:20 6929:2 6933:19,21,26 6934:15,27 6948:2 6952:27 6954:6,9 6955:4 6962:16,17 6982:22 7005:16,21 7036:14 7047:8
- 1:15 6930:12
- 1:16 6931:3

2

- 2 6823:4 6832:17 6834:20 6836:3 6839:28 6843:10 6845:2 6868:17,18 6902:19 6921:6
- **2.20** 6854:21,26,28 6909:21, 28 6910:8,12,20,25 6985:21, 24 7040:22,26 7041:8
- 2.50 6909:5 6953:20
- **2.60** 6902:1
- **2.65** 6902:16
- **2.70** 6902·4
- **2.75** 6953:20
- **2.8** 7030:16
- **2.80** 6902:20,23 **20** 6846:27 6857:26 6865:22
- 6920:16 **20%** 7028:25
- 200-monthly 6823:12
- **2000** 6827:19 6828:6 6927:6 6933:23 6934:4 6935:13,18 7027:21 7035:27 7042:20
- **2002** 6837:4
- **2007** 6830:2 6868:21 6986:16
- **2008** 6825:3 6835:7,10,14 6836:5,9,14 6849:26 6868:22 6869:2 6927:6 6952:16 7005:23
- **2009** 6836:27
- **2010** 6975:22 7028:2
- **2011** 7039:26,28
- 2014 6836:27
- 2015 7023:8
- **2016** 6935:8 6961:27 7022:25 7023:22,24 7024:3 7031:4
- **2017** 6985:17
- **2021** 6830:5 6843:15,23,28

Index: \$0.05..2021



6844:25,26 6845:6,10,16 6855:28 6869:16,19,24 6888:10 6889:1 6923:28 6925:16,18 6926:4,13 6927:13 6928:5 6935:3,8 6937:1,24 6938:10,12,13,26, 27 6939:5,8 6940:2 6961:27 6970:8 6978:27 6990:23 7008:7 7010:23 7013:22 7022:27 7023:9 7030:24 7031:6 7032:24 7034:8 7039:26 7040:1

2021/2022 6836:18

2022 6836:28 6837:25 6844:23 6845:1,10 6847:9 6855:13 6856:1,2 6858:10 6869:17 6892:26 6935:6 6936:28 6937:24 6938:21 6939:1 6940:3

2023 6815:1,4 6839:1 6885:23 6899:1,5,6 6910:21 6931:1

21 6925:18 6926:3 6927:13 7002:5,6,18 7005:18 7039:24

210 6836:9,12

22 7045:17,24

23 6827:17 6901:8 6902:26 7008:3 7041:12 7045:15,17, 25,27

233 6908:13,20

24 7042:23

240 7011:14

25 6835:8 6882:24 7018:24

25% 7040:1

250,000 6980:1

26 6973:6

27053 6901:8,14,27 6902:25

2717 6911:9

2789 6898:3

2790 6897:19

28 6885:10

28% 6877:28

2801 6897:19

2805 6897:20

2811 6897:20

2812 6897:20

2815 6897:21

2816 6897:21

2820 6897:22

2823 6897:22

29 6883:17 6885:10 6903:28

29- 6816:27

2920 6898:4

297 6815:15,21 6817:2,7 6818:3,9,10,12

298 6815:16,21 6816:28 6817:1,5,10 6818:14,17,19

299 6820:17,21 6842:16 6861:21 6868:18 6869:26 6880:11 6881:7,25

2:14 6967:20 6968:3

2:15 6819:16,19

2:20 6819:14

2:25 6968:4,6

3

3 6824:8 6834:15 6894:10 6902:15,22 6921:11 6953:5 6986:9 6993:21 7022:12

3,000 7002:15

3,108 6831:25 6922:27 6934:11 6972:2 7002:22 7007:2 7025:7 7033:4,5

3,108-county 7007:9

3.30 6834:16

30 6883:17 6899:24 6900:9 6917:22 6919:26 6964:18 6973:9 7018:28

30-some-mile 6879:14

300 6820:20 6883:18,20,26, 27 6885:3,20 6886:8 6889:5 6890:1 6898:20 6899:11,15, 19,21,25 6900:3,9,10,14,17, 18,20 6902:23 6988:14 6989:11,12,13 6994:28 7001:23 7040:17,22

301 6883:20 6884:1,2,15 6885:4,25 6886:10 6889:6 6898:18,28 6899:2,20 6900:3,10,14,23,24,26 6902:24 6903:19,26 6905:8 6906:4 6908:14,19,20 6909:22 6911:13,21 6988:14 6989:11

302 6917:5,7 6929:20,22,24, 27 7021:24 7052:25,28 7053:1,3

303 6917:5,7 6929:22,23,24 6953:6 7052:26 7053:6,7,9

31% 6837:3

3100-plus 6893:13

3100-some 6821:21 6859:15

3100-something 6887:7

3108 7023:12

32 7009:19 7011:4

335 6905:28

34 6973:10

35 6880 13

35% 7039:27

36 6916:22

36-month 6833:7

36A 6916:23 6917:1

39 6872:3,8

3:16 7000:3

3:22 7000:3

3:26 7000:6

4

4 6815:1,4 6869:26 6875:8 6908:13 6912:7 6921:20 6931:1 7023:11 7036:27 7038:3,8

4.10 6911:15

4.20 6911:14

4.35 6911:22

4.70 6822:27

41 6973:19,20

45 6964:18

46 6831:28 **47** 6911:8

48 6824:24

48453 6911:6

49 6895:7,26

5

5 6873:22 6904:18 6923:13 7021:18 7034:23 7036:26 7037:1,3,6,8,25 7052:8

5% 7033:17 7038:15,20

50 6895:7

51 6890:27 6895:7

518 7001:27

52 6823:16 6824:14,15 6840:27

53706 6916:20

54 6884:14,16 6885:11

56 6974:3,7

5:00 7040:14

5:02 7055:5

6

6 6861:21 6878:16 6905:27 6970:5,9,16 7010:11 7011:4 7023:17 7038:11 7052:4

6.000 7002:23

6065 6912:7

69 6822:18

00 0022.10

6:15 6914:2 **6:30** 6817:24

7

7 6817:25 6823:16 6824:8, 12,20 6829:23 6840:26 6841:1 7036:27

73 6822:26

7s 7043:19

8

8 6832:16 7028:28 7039:9,19

8% 6904:18

80 6908:10

80% 6868:28 6869:3

80-some 6821:21

80s 6836:9

82 6842:16 6880:11 6881:10

82% 6878:8

84 6833:7

8:00 7055:4

8:03 6815:3

9

Index: 2021/2022..95%

90% 6858:24

90s 7042:17,19

95 7033:14

95% 7033:14,15



97-09 6963:12 6966:8 7009:15 7023:17

97.3 6963:16 6966:12

9709 6963:8,11

98 7005:17 7023:21

9:17 6854:11

9:30 6854:11

9:35 6854:14

Α

A&m 6964:3

A-N-D-R-E-W 6960:23

a.m. 6854:14 6883:9 6894:20,23 6915:27 7055:4

abandon 6826:7

abbreviation 6887:15

ability 7017:17

absence 7004:5 7006:17

absent 6881:18

absolute 6816:20

absolutely 6854:8 6886:27 6999:11 7035:2

academic 6920:21 6958:24 6959:18

academics 6918:5

accelerated 6836:16

accent 6960:24

accept 6828:24 6856:3,5 6865:14 6896:19 6919:3

acceptable 6948:10

accepted 6829:20 6830:1 6918:26

accepting 6919:2

access 6886:24

accessible 6965:15

accessing 6966:5

accommodate 6861:15

accomplish 7023:9

account 6827:22 6849:13 6861:3,11,15 6877:1 6921:22 6932:10,19 6933:8 6934:18 6941:10 6945:27 6946:17 6947:6 6948:21,25 6955:5,6 6958:16 6974:22, 25 6977:10 6985:5 7000:18, 19 7015:5,9 7016:6,16,22 7027:17 7028:21,25 7033:24 7044:3,12,19 7045:5,6

accounted 6958:5 6996:20 7013:10 7027:6

accounting 6944:20 7036:8 7042:21 7050:17

accounts 6921:1 7016:18

accurate 6909:7 6929:10 6941:7 6942:16 6943:14 6951:13,15 6959:18 7035:4

accurately 6939:5 6958:12

achieve 6936:19

Act 6877:20

action 6920:2

activities 6980:6,7

activity 6823:9

actual 6816:9 6833:4 6851:3 6855:23 6881:19 6979:2 7012:27 7013:13 7028:10 7032:12 7033:24 7036:8

acutely 6879:1

Ada 7001:27,28 7002:4,10,

adapted 6940:22

add 6852:2 6941:14 6949:28 6984:23 6985:1 6991:16 7042:1 7049:1 7053:14

added 6847:14 6867:16 6885:10 6890:2 6982:26 7003:16

adding 6847:21 6858:28 6970:7 7003:6 7041:5

addition 6827:18 6929:3 6997:24 7002:13 7017:15

additional 6816:15 6823:26 6881:15 6895:7 6928:20 6932:1 6939:20,21 6940:17 6942:13 6945:10 6949:19 6951:19,20 6954:14 7001:7, 14,20 7003:2,13,15 7040:8

Additionally 6825:13

address 6819:1 6823:21 6829:18 6916:13,17,19 6982:28 7000:21

addressed 6830:20

adds 6841:28

adequate 6824:25 6827:15 6829:9 6875:1,4 6877:7 6907:3 6964:23

adjust 6929:8 6938:11,12

6945:25 7003:5 7033:10,23 7034:10

adjusted 6829:22 6841:14, 27 6842:11,12 6875:5 6890:26,28 6928:20 6952:16 7017:26

adjusting 6868:12

adjustment 6841:15 6921:20 6929:1 6948:4 6982:11 7031:5,10 7034:4 7045:8

adjustments 6842:8 6865:28 6876:10 6907:5,6, 28 6912:2 6941:13,18 6945:16 6948:13 6949:1 6981:24 6982:6,21,23 7013:11 7018:14

Administrator 6872:26

Administrators 6963:26

admission 6818:2 6900:13, 17,23 7052:25,28 7053:6

admit 7002:21

admitted 6818:9,10,17 6900:18.24 7053:1.7

adopted 6840:24 7017:6

adoption 6832:3 6840:15

advanced 6816:6,7 6841:12, 23

advances 6839:14

advantages 6839:9

advised 6992:3

advocate 6920:1 6939:25 6958:20

advocates 6959:3

affect 6851:2 6941:24 6942:8 6958:17 7017:24 7046:14

affected 6837:13

affecting 6837:14 6851:17 6924:25 7014:19

affects 6837:20 7014:14

affirmative 6905:14

afternoon 6931:1 6961:16, 17 6965:24 7000:11,12 7021:16,17 7054:22

Ag 6967:16

ages 6821:10

aggregate 6832:26 6834:22 6835:28 7036:11

aggregated 6836:25 6893:7 7006:23 7007:15 7023:18

aggregating 7036:22

aggregation 6924:12 7011:25 7036:1

aggregations 6934:10 7009:27

agree 6850:14 6864:28 6865:6 6873:8 6874:26 6878:10,11 6886:6 6899:12 6901:28 6903:22 6904:4 6908:21 6910:1 6914:14,22 6994:24 6997:9 7040:4 7051:10

agreed 6867:15 6941:5

agreement 6963:4 6964:16

agricultural 6839:8,16,19,22 6917:15,17,26 6918:17 6919:5,26 6924:18 6930:4 6963:24 7021:11,12

agriculture 6839:18,23 6918:28 6963:23

ahead 6846:2 6918:14

airport 6914:2

Alabama 6894:13,15 6926:18 6927:10

albeit 6827:22

Albemarle 6896:25,26 6898:3

Albuquerque 7006:8,13,18, 24 7007:12

alert 6817:22 6819:15,17 6967:21

Alexandria 6897:19

algebraic 7041:20

algorithm 7041:20,25 7042:3

align 6949:26

aligned 6904:24

alignment 6830:1,16 6831:23 6860:4 6878:18,21, 22,26 6879:3,8,11,22 6904:22 6907:3 6948:6,11,

alleviate 6829:19

allocating 6976:20

allocations 6947:1

allowable 7025:28

Allowances 6825:4 6844:4,9



6874:25

allowed 6823:22 7029:18 7030:1,6

allowing 6828:17 6941:13

alter 6982:13 6983:5,26

alterations 6879:25

altered 6868:14 6983:4

alternative 6956:12 6965:19 6974:25 6996:1 6999:6

alternatives 6984:21

amazing 6849:5

ameliorate 6829:12

amend 6824:12 6840:26

amended 6821:27 6841:18

amendments 6824:3,7 6840:16

American 6877:23 7030:11

Americans 6877:22

Amish 6946:4

amount 6836:5 6931:24 6937:16 6938:5 7028:6 7035:16

amounts 6928:9 6971:28 7025:1

AMS 6817:25 6818:24 6843:17 6919:12 6929:1 6948:3 6982:1 6995:28 7051:27

analogy 6929:4,5 6999:9

analyses 6920:10,20 6921:6 6937:19 6956:20 7012:1 7022:24 7023:21

analysis 6818:7 6831:8,22 6851:3 6856:11 6862:21 6903:8 6917:23 6919:27 6920:6,28 6921:24 6928:5 6930:1 6934:12 6941:16 6942:3 6943:1 6944:9 6954:14,24 6956:17 6985:16 6995:19 6996:7 7003:10 7010:7 7011:24 7013:22 7014:24 7038:6,28 7046:7, 17 7047:24

analyst 6903:17 6939:25 7017:10

analysts 6918:7

analytical 6947:11 6958:28

analyze 6952:28 6997:6 6999:4 7017:17

analyzed 6919:22 7013:7

Andrew 6960:18,23

Andy 6959:25 6960:21 6963:17

Angeles 6946:14,17 6985:14

animal 6839:10

announced 7054:24

announcements 6941:2

annual 6918:6

answers 6846:2 6903:5 6907:18 6915:4,7,11,14 6985:18

anticipate 6818:21

anticipated 6844:17

anticipates 6886:5

anticipating 6815:12

antithetical 6829:8

Antonio 6870:28

anymore 6971:25 6983:13 7026:28

apologize 6856:12 6894:1 6895:20 7051:7

Appalachian 6825:2

apparently 6978:3 6991:27 7052:12

appearance 6865:1,7

appeared 6860:21 6920:21 7002:20

appearing 6919:13,20

appears 6889:8 6899:10,14 6909:22

Appendix 6822:8

apples 6950:6 7003:9

applicable 6824:13,19 6840:28 6938:10

applied 6830:12 6848:1 6856:16,24 6868:27 6869:4 6918:15,16,17,28 6919:5 6945:11 6965:16 6966:2 6997:24 7010:19

applies 7007:23

apply 6849:12 6994:7

applying 6872:17 6999:16

appreciated 6943:13

approach 6933:28 6937:3 6942:22 6947:12 6977:21

7032:20

approached 6935:3,6 6936:8

approaching 6927:19

appropriately 6975:4 6976:21

approved 6824:5

approximate 7047:26

approximately 6926:27 6988:11

arbitrarily 6983:8

arcs 6861:6

area 6826:18 6866:5 6870:25 6871:7 6891:27 6895:10 6903:7 6918:23 6940:15 6942:6,8,27 6946:14 6952:20,26 6953:4, 15,16 6983:16 6987:10,18 7003:20,25 7004:7 7007:14 7036:18 7037:2,5 7044:26

areas 6831:4,5 6847:28 6850:8 6859:3,11 6860:25 6861:8 6870:24,27 6871:2,3, 9,16,18 6879:20 6881:13 6904:25 6918:10,27 6919:4 6925:23 6927:1 6948:20 6972:27 6973:8,16,17 6991:26 6992:10,15,18 7009:25 7010:23 7011:15 7044:20

arise 6850:19 6921:13 6928:8 6947:28

arithmetic 6835:16

arrangements 6948:16

arrive 6929:9

arrived 7031:10

arriving 6821:7

art 6848:1,26 6849:3,7 6850:3,10 6856:15,18,24,28 6857:9,17 6862:18 6867:24 6945:5 7043:25 7044:26

arteries 7045:3

article 6816:3

articles 6920:22

articulately 7006:1

Asia 7028:9

asks 6939:26

aspect 6839:17,22

aspects 6819:3 6927:28 7015:14,18 7024:9

assembling 6922:17

assembly 6923:15,18,21,27 6944:4 6955:9 6968:18,28 6970:1,12,17,18 6972:12 6977:7 6997:18 7014:22 7038:10 7050:27 7051:4,5,6,

assess 6993:1 7008:24 7038:28

assessing 6976:22 7014:9

assessment 6938:23 6957:7 6998:14 7025:6 7032:3

assign 7028:10 7041:18,27 7048:7

assigned 6893:1 7041:7

assignments 7030:18

assist 6964:3,6,7

assistance 6823:10

assisted 6862:21

Association 6844:3,7 7012:17

associations 6823:11

assume 6817:16 6862:15 6888:25,26 6890:3 6892:28 6893:8 6911:26 6975:28 6981:7 7018:24,27 7040:12 7047:13

assumed 6926:20 7041:3

assumes 6946:14

assuming 6914:23 7034:13 7040:25,26 7054:12

assumption 6845:3 6985:25

assumptions 6825:6 6939:28 6980:14

assurance 6915:16

assuring 6852:17

Atlanta 6926:10

attempt 6817:22 6846:24 6885:14 6968:11

attempting 6939:3

attempts 7000:27 7018:19

attention 6851:10

attest 7044:27

attracting 6827:15

attributed 7041:1

audience 6817:13 6884:13 6960:27



Austin 6911:7,11

Autauga 6894:13,15

authority 6823:26

authors 6963:16

automated 6816:2

availability 6825:18 6826:21 6871:16,17 6936:28 6984:5

average 6832:1 6833:6 6866:18,23,25 6867:16,23, 25 6868:2 6891:11 6892:22, 25,28 6894:10 6902:15 6906:11,12,27 6907:1,21,23 6908:1,2 6909:1,2 6911:16 6912:10,13,18,19,20 6945:22 6990:17 6996:12 7033:11,13,15 7034:1,2 7045:7

averaged 6837:3

avoid 6844:28 6872:3 6978:24

awaiting 7016:12

aware 6849:16 6850:4 6860:27 6863:16 6864:15 6866:10 6868:4,7,25 6869:1 6872:18,24,27 6877:20 6879:1,6,10,19 6880:6 6881:23 6893:11 6896:15 6955:17 7036:25

awful 6861:13

В

B's 6834:10

bachelor's 6917:13

back 6815:2,3 6819:24 6825:23 6835:7 6840:5 6841:19 6846:21 6847:17 6854:10,13,14 6857:5,16 6863:15,16 6866:7 6871:23 6872:2 6882:1 6883:5,8,9 6893:19 6894:22 6898:21 6899:16 6904:16 6905:19 6911:15 6913:18,21,26 6914:10 6915:5,12,23,26,27 6929:18 6930:11 6931:2,3,7 6934:27 6935:15 6954:5 6955:2 6957:15,16 6959:24 6968:4,6 6976:25 6977:1,22 6981:20 6982:15 6985:18 6986:9 6993:21 6994:3 6999:7 7000:2,5,6 7001:19 7010:2 7011:8,15 7023:28 7024:1,9 7027:10 7029:22 7036:13 7039:23 7040:11 7042:17 7044:21 7047:16 7050:26

background 6917:12 7038:23

backhauls 6826:15,18,22,23

backtrack 6849:19 6905:5

backup 6881:20

backwards 6854:17 6910:15

bad 6959:10,11

Bakersfield 6946:16

balance 6922:23 6970:23 6993:7

balanced 6823:18

balancing 6853:14

band 6926:17

bandwidth 6991:5

base 6827:24 6828:3,7,10 6833:22,25,28 6835:5,8 6836:7 6842:8 6850:16,18, 25 6851:1 6852:2 6853:12 6909:20,27 6910:11,16 6947:22 6949:5 6950:15 6985:19,21,24 6986:3,5,7 6992:11 6998:19 7001:22 7002:11 7008:16 7033:19 7034:10 7040:18,22,27 7041:2 7048:26

based 6851:15 6858:17 6859:1 6860:21 6863:28 6867:24 6869:9 6875:28 6877:17 6881:14 6909:10 6918:2 6920:10.20 6928:20 6931:25 6932:1,20 6933:19 6938:13,23,24 6940:15 6941:13 6951:10,28 6958:4 6961:19 6962:18 6972:6.8. 11 6981:6,25 6982:24 6983:10 6986:28 6995:13 7001:11 7006:21 7008:7 7011:24 7014:3 7018:20 7029:20 7030:23 7034:4 7035:6,22 7041:21 7044:16 7049:23

baseline 6815:26 6816:5

basic 6825:9 6839:19 6852:5 6875:2 6886:15 6933:27 6945:2 6954:7 6973:24 6977:20 6979:22 6989:28 7009:16 7011:8 7031:23 7047:2 7051:10,16

basically 6821:13 6834:2,4 6844:23 6850:26 6852:7 6855:24 6858:14 6859:8 6861:4 6869:11 6877:8 6880:22,25 6889:23 6890:6, 26 6899:22 6904:21 6949:11 6964:9 6990:11 7007:4 7024:23 7026:25 7029:19 7030:6

basis 6839:9 6862:10 6875:19 6876:9 6945:23 6946:15 6982:4 6986:1 6995:18 6996:6 7019:21

batch 6898:9

bear 6967:9

bears 6980:15

began 6843:15 6996:1 6999:5 7023:24

begin 6822:28 6843:10,14 6844:12 6953:2

beginning 6840:6 6920:12 7034:7

begins 6821:5,28

behavior 6998:27 7016:10

behavioral 6998:17,26 7015:6,14,17

behaviors 6998:20

bell 7045:12

belong 6917:27

benchmark 6921:5 6928:4, 16 6944:12,13,15,24 6945:7 6947:24 6948:22 6997:19 7004:5 7016:3 7022:7

benefit 6821:17 6895:4 6966:27

benefits 6925:12

Bernalillo 7007:12

beverage 6834:22 6836:18 6837:5,15 6838:4,24 6840:2

beverages 6832:27 6834:28 6835:2,4,11,27 6836:15 6837:11 6838:2,28 6839:7

big 6837:16 6884:17 6954:26 6978:4 6983:25,26 6984:15 7007:2 7009:12 7027:16 7037:19,22,23 7046:17 7049:22 7050:14,22

bigger 6837:18 6864:23 6958:9 6980:2 6984:1 7005:7,26 7011:9 7035:18 7046:9

biggest 6912:20 6927:8 6952:25

binder 6884:12,15

binding 6880:6

biological 6839:9,13

Bishop 6963:17

bit 6874:4 6894:26 6932:17 6936:26 6937:9 6941:28 6946:9 6947:20 6953:16 6954:18 6956:27 6959:25 6968:22 6972:11 6977:25 6979:4 6986:17 6992:26 6993:10 7002:8,24 7004:22 7005:23 7009:9 7023:7 7027:22,26,27 7032:2 7034:17 7038:23 7039:13 7043:13,24 7044:6 7045:1 7047:7 7050:10

black 6883:1 6884:6,9 6897:24 6923:20

blend 6995:26

blessed 6884:4

blow 6968:9 6978:4

BLS 6832:22 7034:13,15

blue 6832:28 6833:1 6835:1 6839:4 6895:8 6986:23,26 6987:10,13,14,19,24 7037:8 7052:16

Board 6824:5

bodies 6857:13

book 6920:22

bookends 6821:14

boots-on-the-ground 6862:11

borders 7042:11

bottom 6840:11 6843:10 6868:17 6869:26 6875:7 6885:12 6908:13 6966:12 6973:5 7038:13 7041:12 7045:17.24

boundaries 6947:27 6948:7

boundary 6948:11

bout 6836:17 6837:25,27 6838:14 6845:2,5

box 6837:19,21

boy 6963:10

Boze 6819:5

Bozic 6815:5,6,9 6817:28 6959:14

brain 6917:26 6954:1

break 6854:7,12 6873:8 6883:7 6904:17 6915:18,21, 22,25 6930:13 6967:20 6968:5,11 7000:4 7043:21

Index: Austin..Brian

breakout 7040:4

Brian 6967:18



bridge 6981:4

briefcase 6988:21

briefly 6856:15

bright 6832:28

brighter 6835:1

brightest 6953:20

bring 6841:9 7009:10 7031:6 7043:26

bringing 6984:6

Bristol 6897:19

broad 6834:24 6837:10,12 6943:6 6976:8 7018:6 7043:18 7049:8

broader 6837:15 6838:10 6993:17 7014:17 7027:4 7028:22 7032:2 7048:10 7051:9,17

brought 6986:10 7001:26 7029:22

Buena 6897:20

build 6982:15 6985:27

built 6848:19 6871:9 6954:4,

built-in 6839:8

bulk 6827:6,7

bulletin 6965:14 6966:4

bulletins 6965:17

Bureau 6832:22 6938:13

Bureau-generated 7028:10

business 6819:3 6876:19 6916:17,19 6978:24 7007:13

butter 6834:26 6848:21 6871:12 6932:9,16 6933:3 6957:26 7027:13

butterfat 6841:25,26 6842:1 7004:13

buyers 7029:12

С

C-E-T-E-R 7020:7

C-E-T-E-R-U-S 7020:5

C-H-A-R-L-E-S 6916:3

C-H-R-I-S-T-O-P-H-E-R 6960:13

0300.13

calculate 6907:21

calculated 6866:18 6893:20

6908:2 6922:4 6924:7 6926:12,20 6927:5 6972:7 7040:24

calculating 7000:21

calculation 6893:15 6956:9, 15.24

calculations 6889:20 6890:5,11,13,15,17,19 6899:24 6956:13 6989:28 7011:23

calculator 6977:5

calendar 6939:5

California 6877:28 6912:5, 15,17 6917:14 6946:12 7010:15 7030:9 7036:19 7045:2

call 6872:20 6934:19 6940:9 6973:17 6988:25 7001:6 7010:7 7015:6 7021:11 7033:3 7034:7

called 6887:1,20 6945:5,15 6958:23 6980:5 7048:27

calling 6988:25 7039:20

candidly 6869:18

Canton 6942:4 6983:21 6984:10

capacities 6928:12 6944:1 6972:4 7026:6

capacity 6828:27 6940:10 6947:6 6948:16 7004:1 7025:17 7026:9,27 7036:9, 12,22 7038:1,2 7047:19 7049:24

capita 6972:7

capital 6825:15

captive 6873:9

capture 6824:17 7004:3

captured 6932:25 6954:23 7014:25,26 7019:11

captures 6919:17 6927:28

card 7020:9

care 6860:6 6997:26 6998:24

career 6917:20

careful 7005:5,23

Carolina 7037:2,22 7052:5,7

carry 7020:9

cars 6998:10,12

case 6858:22 6868:25,27 6874:9 6876:26 6903:13 6905:15 6914:23 6944:15 6950:12 6964:24 6965:17 6969:10,22 6974:28 6975:26 6984:10 6985:26 6998:21 6999:19 7019:6 7024:2,11 7033:17 7043:5 7049:18

casein 7030:11

cases 6852:22 6879:23 6890:14 6908:2 6909:7,10,

categories 6837:10 6838:10, 15 6848:19 6934:14,18 6941:23 6945:20 6973:24 7029:1 7047:10

category 6834:27 6836:1 6837:16 6941:21 6974:17 7027:26 7029:26 7034:15 7047:2

caused 6837:22,26 6879:1 6903:16

causing 7049:6

caveat 6899:16,17

Census 7028:9

center 6984:23

centers 6827:4 6870:22,24 6871:3

central 6858:12,14 6993:24, 26 7010:14 7036:19

cents 6880:8

century 6836:6 6877:12,25, 26 6927:19

ceteris 7019:27,28 7020:1,5 7021:7

CFR 6823:16 6824:12,20 6829:23 6840:26 6841:1

chain 6918:23 6919:1,6 6921:1 6923:8 6943:21 6946:2 6947:1,24 6995:23 6997:5 7001:11 7015:7,23 7016:19

chains 6928:2

chair 6859:6

challenge 7011:10 7035:18 7047:2

challenges 6829:19

challenging 7023:7 7043:13

chance 6971:20

change 6822:2 6823:28 6865:2,8 6872:22 6880:7

6885:9 6903:11,16 6908:19 6909:12,28 6910:11 6925:2 6928:15 6933:5 6938:9 6943:6 6951:17,25 6957:26 6975:11 6979:6,11,22 6983:7,13,17,24,25 6984:1,3 6985:21 6993:15 6995:3 6996:5,8 7000:13 7005:2,3, 6,9 7022:20 7023:3,4,5,8 7037:20,23 7038:18,19,20 7039:4 7043:8,9

changed 6816:19 6833:28 6834:17 6877:11,15 6903:2, 14 6925:11 6959:13 6980:19,21 7014:7 7027:20

changing 6926:1 6984:5 7004:22 7022:28

channels 6839:16

chapters 6920:23

characteristic 6928:21

characterized 6918:21

charge 6859:5 6935:25 6936:12,14

charged 6874:13

Charles 6916:2,6 6965:15

Charleston 6926:22 6953:21,26

Charlottesville 6896:24,25, 27 6897:20

chart 6834:14 6835:15,16,23

charts 6818:6 6832:20 7039:25

check 6905:13 7024:7

checking 6991:2 7010:21

checks 7023:26

cheese 6871:12 6876:22,24 6932:8,11,15,17 6933:2 6934:21 6942:5 6957:25 6958:6,13 6970:24,25,26 6971:1,9 6974:13,16,17,27 7027:13 7030:11 7049:16,22 7050:1,2,8

Chesapeake 6897:21

Chicago 6926:23 6981:15

Chip 6842:27 6961:11,17

choose 6985:24

chose 6865:18 6907:5,6 6909:12 7036:11

Chris 6959:26

Christopher 6960:13



Church 6896:10,13 6897:6

circle 6957:14 7036:15.16

circles 7036:14

circumstances 6921:23

citation 6964:15,22,27 6965:5,7

cited 6920:22,23 6953:22 6963:19,27 6973:2

cities 6824:24 6827:5 6829:17 6831:26 6833:5 6859:25,26,28 6860:3,18 6888:7 6893:2 6896:4,6,7 6910:19 6926:22 6972:23,24 6973:4,6 7018:27 7019:2,3, 7,8,13,20 7020:22,24

citrus 6826:20

city 6821:22 6829:23 6859:16 6887:10,11 6893:12 6896:10 6897:4,19,20,21,22 6904:23 6911:7 6981:18 7020:27 7021:6

civil 6831:26

Claire 6876:15,16

clarification 6865:4 6887:12 6895:2 6990:3

clarified 6893:16

clarify 6817:8 6898:17 6931:9 6949:9 6976:17 6981:5 6982:18 7032:28

class 6816:7 6820:13 6824:11,23,27 6825:6,7 6826:13 6827:1,4,10,12,13, 20,24,28 6828:1,3,7,10,11, 23,25 6829:2,3,16,21,22,26 6830:15,16,17,23,24,26 6831:2,7,14,26 6832:1 6840:23 6841:11,12,13,14, 15,18,25,26,27 6842:8,11,17 6843:18,19 6844:8,10 6846:15 6849:20 6850:16 6851:20 6852:17 6858:26 6859:7,13 6861:26 6862:1 6866:8 6867:19 6869:28 6870:3,8,13 6871:20,27 6872:13 6873:2,4,9,14,15, 20,21 6874:2,6,12,18,26 6875:1,9,11,18 6876:6,26,28 6877:2.5.7.10.15.17.27 6878:9,28 6879:2 6880:5,14, 19 6881:7 6892:1,6,11 6894:8 6903:23 6904:17,19 6906:18 6908:4 6921:9,12, 22 6924:13,15,22,23 6925:24 6926:14,19,23 6927:14 6928:3,7,15 6933:4, 18,22 6944:23 6947:22 6949:15,27 6950:3,8,11

6952:12,23 6953:1,13 6956:10,19,22,25 6957:1,6, 11,12,18,19 6958:3,17 6987:8 6989:27 6992:11,15, 18,24 6993:6,27 6994:9,12, 18 6995:25 6997:23,25,28 6999:3 7000:21 7001:10 7003:5 7005:7,20 7012:25 7013:11,20,28 7014:5,6 7015:26 7016:13,15,23,25 7017:4,7 7018:10,26 7025:13 7041:22 7046:8,15, 18 7047:14,23 7048:12,14 7049:2,4,8,9,14 7050:2,15 7051:22

classes 6874:7 6934:17 6958:10 7015:24 7047:10 7048:6

clear 6815:13 6852:9 6853:23 6881:4,16 6886:28 6889:12 6961:23 6962:2,17 7010:22 7013:3 7014:2 7022:3 7025:17 7029:2,8 7037:13 7038:17

Cleveland 6926:23

Clifton 6919:12

clip 6884:12,15

close 6835:9 6848:2,15 6860:10 6909:7 6917:22 6942:10 6966:5 6983:28 6984:7 7028:25

closed 6845:25 6848:7,10, 27 6940:14 6941:17,18 6943:2

closed-door 6863:17,19

closely 6837:7 6895:9

closer 6837:1 6870:24,27 6871:18 6901:4 7021:6 7042:13

closing 6848:11,13,27 6941:9 7025:21

closures 6941:2

co-ops 7000:24

Coale 6967:12

coast 7037:3

code 6887:21,23,24 6901:7, 27 6902:25 6903:20 6905:21 6906:3 6909:23 6911:6 6912:4,7 6935:28

collaborated 6935:19

collaborating 6936:10

collaboration 6920:5,19

colleague 6818:23 6894:6,

17 6920:20 6960:11 7040:8

colleagues 6886:21 6960:9

collection 6936:4

collegiality 6819:4

Colonial 6897:21

color 6882:28 6895:5,8,12, 13 6986:28

color-coded 6831:24

Colorado 6908:11 6909:16 6994:3,10 7004:25 7005:3,8, 15,27,28

colored 6866:11 6884:5 7043:12

colored-pencils 6945:16

colors 6895:19 6953:11 6987:26 7043:22

column 6866:28 6867:6,16 6886:7,8 6887:4,8,13,17,20 6888:9.15.22.27.28 6889:5 6890:21,24,25 6891:1,2,4,6, 8,10,11,12,13,14,15,21,22, 24,28 6892:1,5,6,7,10,11,18, 19,21,25 6893:20,22,23 6894:1,2,3,8,9 6899:10,16, 22,25,26 6900:2,3,4 6901:7, 21,26 6902:1,3,4,14,19,28 6903:21 6904:2,3,6,7,14 6905:9 6906:3.6.9.11.14.18. 27 6907:1.24.25 6908:24.25. 26 6909:1,5,24 6910:11,12, 16,17 6911:13,15,20 6912:8, 10,11 6989:4,5,19,22,23,27 6990:4,6,8,12,13,16,18,21, 25 6994:28 7002:5 7029:2,4, 7 7040:21

columns 6816:5,7,14 6886:28 6887:2,3 6889:5,21, 23 6890:1,5,11,24 6892:14 6899:10,11,15,20,22 6907:21 6908:21 6910:2 6989:8,14,16,18,21,26 6990:1,12,13 6991:23 7029:5,8 7030:5

Comanche 6822:11,21

combination 6827:9 6869:27 6875:8 6969:21 6970:1 7029:20

combine 6971:19

combined 6867:22 6928:9

comment 6854:19 6945:17 7046:3

comments 6927:17

commercial 6921:27 6928:17,25 6947:8,13 **commissioned** 6830:3 6907:4

commitment 6913:19 6958:27

committees 6859:5

commodity 6839:19

common 6821:16 6826:20 6834:18 6859:18,20,21 6979:5

commonly 7041:28

Commonwealth 6894:28 6897:11 6898:8

companies 6964:14 6978:17,22

company 6947:4 6977:10,27

comparable 7049:2

compare 6833:20 6834:19, 27 6900:6 6950:6 7003:9 7036:26

compared 6839:26 6876:2 6906:21 6924:22 6933:14 6952:1 6956:6 6995:5

compares 6933:25 7004:13

comparing 6953:1 6994:7 7005:1

comparison 6833:23 6956:22 7023:20

comparisons 6833:8 6890:15

compassion 6946:24

competing 6829:1

competition 6944:16

competitive 6828:2 6839:15 6860:13 6921:4 6928:4 6944:15,24 6947:23 6997:19 7004:5 7016:3 7022:7

complete 6916:27 6973:27

completed 6851:9 7018:15

completely 6937:20

complexity 6845:17 6861:13.14

complicated 6974:27

complications 6931:20

component 6825:5 6840:23 6841:11 6852:16 6924:6 6932:14 6933:10 6998:18 7040:9 7050:11,18



components 6845:20 6852:6,8 6921:2 6934:26 6970:19 6971:6 6974:2,3,22 6975:2,4 6994:2 7004:14

composition 6921:14 6922:24 6943:26,27,28 6971:28 6972:27 6973:9,13 6974:2,8,13,21,23,26 6975:5 6976:22 7003:27 7004:6,8, 17,18 7030:9

Compounding 6826:14

comprehensive 6823:7,18, 25 6843:12,14 6978:6,7

comprise 6887:27

computations 7014:28

computer 6858:23 6936:2 6991:2 7021:25

computers 6879:25

computing 6845:17 7011:11

concentrate 6826:19.21

concept 6835:22 6850:18 6868:28 6869:4

concern 6852:18

concerned 6886:19

conclude 6840:7 6851:15 6995:18

concluded 6846:11 6851:19 6879:8 7055:6

concludes 6842:20 6929:11

concluding 6927:17

conclusion 6824:22 7013:25

conclusions 6816:19

conditions 6823:21 6828:26 6852:23 6865:17 6945:25 6948:15 6951:14 6997:13,15 6998:13 7026:14 7045:20

conduct 6823:27

conducted 6913:25

conducting 6951:24

confab 6913:4

confess 6876:17

confident 7046:5

configuration 7006:22

confirm 6888:18,24 6910:6, 18 6955:28 6989:7

conform 6875:5

confused 6876:18 6884:16 6892:5 6947:20

Confusingly 6986:28

congestion 6861:8 7044:19 7045:5

Congress 6825:1 6967:1

connect 6972:24

connected 6895:9 6897:5

connection 6837:1

connections 6993:8

connects 6981:18 7004:1

considerable 6840:17 6858:2 6860:5,6 6921:7 6926:15 6927:23 6952:21

considerably 6830:10 6876:13 6926:24 6928:6

consideration 6861:2

considerations 6823:23 6830:19 6851:22 6869:1 6904:26

considered 6862:13 6868:10 7014:24 7018:6 7030:3

considers 6840:19

consistent 6844:24 6869:21 6921:3 6924:12 6938:19,25 6939:7 6950:9 6951:8 6981:16 6986:3 7003:8 7023:27

consistently 6866:22

constitute 6925:2

constrained 7025:17,24,27 7026:11,18,19,21 7027:2,7

constraint 6931:22 6932:2 6969:17 6971:7 7026:13

constraints 6922:23 6931:22 6968:26 6969:5 6970:22 6971:3 6979:27 7027:14

consult 6894:17 6978:11,15 6992:6.8

consultant 6843:25 6894:27

consulted 6856:23 6863:2,4, 12 6991:23

consumed 6980:13

consumer 6832:21,24 6839:17,25 6840:8 6922:11, 21 6947:11 6999:2 7006:10

consumers 6832:18 6835:24,25 6838:20,21 6839:17 6922:9,15 6934:8 7000:25 7029:11 consuming 6871:3,18

consumption 6838:21 6871:10 6876:25 6877:22 6973:16,17,18,21 7007:3

contact 6978:16

contacts 6940:24

Contents 6968:19,24 6973:5

contiguous 6824:24 6829:17 6919:24 6924:11

continue 6826:3 6827:13 6838:2 6885:18

continued 6835:7 6836:15

continues 6823:24 6949:5

continuing 6836:3

continuous 6840:4 7041:16

continuously 6850:28

contractual 6947:15,17 6948:16 6978:23

contrast 6937:6 7042:2

contribute 6864:22 7013:24,

contributed 6976:23,26 6981:27

contributors 6827:19

controversy 6896:18

conventional 6996:22 6997:1

conversation 6844:9 6886:21 6897:8 6904:16 6906:16 6913:4 6936:26 6937:10 6940:8 6980:20,26 6988:28 7036:5

conversations 6932:23 6938:24 6940:5,7 6982:2

convert 6949:14

cooperative 6815:7 6823:11 6832:6 6863:4

cooperatives 6831:13 6832:13 6861:25 6862:26 6864:5

cop 6998:10

copies 6882:23 6884:5 6885:15

copy 6883:12,13,21,23 6895:12,13 6897:24 6902:26 6963:9 7001:23,26 7006:3 7023:16

core 6922:6 6944:8 6956:16 6977:10 6989:25,26 7003:26

corn 6837:20,21

Cornell 6830:4 6876:9 6917:16,18 6918:3 6920:12, 19 6935:12,15 6948:1 6959:27 6964:3 6966:1,4,13

correct 6821:28 6822:1 6840:19 6844:26 6847:25 6848:8,11 6849:22,23,26,27 6850:16,17 6853:6,7,9,10, 12,21,22,28 6854:21 6856:18,24 6857:17 6863:18,21 6864:5,7 6866:16,17,19,20 6867:1,2, 4,5,7,8,16 6868:22 6869:20 6872:5,9,23,26 6873:6,10, 17,22,23,27,28 6874:2,3 6875:15,26,27 6878:1,19,23 6879:5 6880:15,16 6881:10, 22,25,26 6882:2,7 6886:13 6887:5,9,13,14,15,16,18,19 6888:3.4.10.13.16.17.26 6889:2,3,4,15 6890:2,11,27 6891:9,22,23,25 6892:2,19, 20,23 6893:22,28 6894:11, 12 6896:5,14 6899:18 6902:1,2,4,5,16,17,20,21,28 6903:1,24 6904:5,7,8,11,12, 13 6906:10,12,13,14,15,19, 20,22,23 6907:22 6908:22, 23,27,28 6909:2,3,25 6910:3,10,24,28 6911:16,17, 20,22,23 6912:8,9,11,12,13, 14 6939:19 6956:1 6961:28 6962:1.4.5.6.15.19.26 6963:1 6966:17 6968:18 6974:6 6975:1,15,23 6976:2 6978:6 6979:27 6980:3 6981:4 6986:7,20,24,27 6987:5,11 6988:5,10 6989:1, 16 6991:24 6992:7,8 6994:10,26 6995:9 6998:3,4, 7 6999:14,17 7000:18 7006:10,11 7007:18,22 7008:6,7 7010:9 7011:27,28 7012:20,25,28 7014:5,11,27 7015:4 7016:17 7018:10,11, 22 7022:23 7029:23 7038:22 7040:19 7044:24 7049:10 7054:4

corrected 6815:16,17 6816:14 6817:3,5 6818:3,15 6822:7,17 6881:10 6911:22 6961:18

correction 6911:27

correction/clarification 6993:18

corrections 6817:12 6818:4 6822:5,10 6880:14 6911:18, 19,28 6912:2

correctly 6934:16 6952:28 6981:11 7024:13



correspond 6888:6

corridor 6926:10

cost 6824:25 6825:6,9,22 6826:9,11,12,28 6827:5,11, 22,26,27 6829:3 6830:6,7,22 6831:9 6832:25 6833:21,22 6835:10.26 6836:14 6837:2 6838:18,21 6839:6,14,17,24 6845:5 6851:16,17 6852:16 6853:15 6868:28 6869:4,12, 24 6870:1,6,12 6874:10,14, 23,26 6875:10,18 6922:10, 17,20,22 6925:11 6932:25 6933:10 6934:1 6938:4 6944:26 6945:26 6946:9,10, 17,18,20 6947:11 6954:11, 22.24.28 6969:27.28 6970:2 6975:9 6976:24 6977:9,18, 21 6979:1,12 6980:16 6997:5 6998:28 7004:5 7014:10.20 7017:7 7018:7 7022:9 7023:4 7030:23,24 7031:14,24 7032:1,16,23 7033:2.3.12.15.19 7044:22 7045:19 7046:10 7048:25

costing 6997:19 7032:9 7045:7 7051:3

costly 6861:10 7051:23

costs 6823:27 6825:9,16,18 6826:1,2,15 6827:18,19 6828:4,6,21,25,27,28 6829:5,6 6852:10,14,16,19 6855:26,28 6856:1 6862:7, 13,14,16 6869:7,8,10,15,16 6871:25 6874:20 6877:1,12, 25 6921:4,17 6925:5,10,12 6926:2 6927:25,26 6928:13 6932:19,26 6937:27 6938:1, 2,5,15,17 6944:3,7 6945:23 6946:7.14 6954:4.5.15.17.19 6955:5,9 6968:18 6969:3,23 6970:8 6972:10 6976:27 6977:1.6.10.13.22.24 6978:2,3,8,13,22 6979:8,15 6982:20 6998:21,25 7001:12 7014:22,23 7016:4,18,24 7017:1,15 7027:4 7030:17, 20,23,26 7031:1,3,4,8,13 7032:3 7033:6,10,25,27 7038:16 7039:6,25,27,28 7040:5,6 7044:13 7045:11 7046:6,13 7050:13

counsel 6880:10 6911:18,19 6962:10 6963:5 6966:16 6968:15 6983:21 6986:10 6988:27 6991:22 6998:1

counsel's 6978:27

counsels 6817:26

count 6959:25 7044:22

counties 6821:22,27 6822:2, 6,24 6824:23 6829:16 6831:25 6879:2 6887:25 6893:2,13 6896:4,5,6,7 6904:23 6910:18 6912:6 6922:27 6946:3 6972:2 6983:3,6 6984:11 6992:10 7006:23,26 7007:15 7009:27 7011:25 7023:12 7025:1

counting 6865:23 7021:20

countries 6826:22 6839:26

country 6819:3,14 6864:21 6924:8 6952:15 6993:24 6994:13 7047:19

county 6822:11,21,23 6829:23 6859:15 6887:4,8, 10,11 6888:7 6891:25,26 6893:12 6894:13,15 6896:11,14,16,25,26 6897:5, 7 6901:16,27 6902:27 6903:20 6904:1,2,6,22 6905:2 6906:26 6907:7 6911:7,20 6922:27 6924:11 6928:19 6934:11 6945:28 6946:6.7.11 6969:26.27 6972:25 6982:12 6983:4.8.9. 15 6984:24 7001:27 7002:4, 11,27 7007:12 7008:22 7010:15 7036:19,20 7041:23,24,27 7043:14 7049:28

county-by-county 6880:13,

county-level 6925:16 7010:7 7011:3

couple 6836:24 6854:17 6940:15 6995:4 7052:5

coupled 6839:22

court 6815:2,8,12,19 6816:10,28 6817:2,5,13,17, 27 6818:8,14,27 6819:10,25, 28 6820:9,18,23 6822:12,19 6824:14,16 6825:23,27 6826:1,3,6 6833:9,13,15,17 6835:18 6842:23 6854:6,9, 13 6865:4 6883:3.8.14.24 6884:1,4,20,23,26 6885:17 6887:26 6891:17 6893:19 6894:19,22 6895:2,13,16,21, 28 6897:23 6898:8.12.23 6900:8,11,16,22 6901:4,9,11 6902:7,12 6905:23 6913:14, 27 6914:3,10,13 6915:7,17, 26 6916:4,9,14 6917:6 6918:13,16,19,24 6919:15 6929:19,26 6930:3,7,11 6931:2 6953:24,27 6960:8, 17,20,25,28 6961:2,4,7 6963:10,12 6964:6,19,26,28 6965:9,26 6966:6 6967:11,

23,26 6968:6 6971:22 6987:16 6988:16,19 6992:1 6999:26 7000:2,5 7003:18, 23 7004:6,20 7009:6 7012:13 7020:3,12,17,19 7021:10 7051:28 7052:22,27 7053:5,13,19,28 7054:8,23, 28

courteous 6913:12

courtesy 6882:23

courthouse 6896:26.27

cover 6829:3 6929:22 6976:9

coverage 6984:27 7027:15 7036:21

covered 6852:19 6874:24 6954:19

Covington 6897:22

CPI 6834:26 6838:27,28

CPIS 6832:21,26 6833:4 6834:23 6836:25 6838:1

crazy 7024:4

cream 6938:7 6971:1 6972:13,14 7026:8 7027:14 7029:20,25,26,28 7030:2,11

create 6938:2 6942:24 6982:15 7000:27 7007:16 7013:5 7014:17 7050:27

created 6829:6 6951:18 6975:13.22

creates 6986:17

creating 6984:25

credibility 6959:6

credit 6987:28

credits 7015:11 7016:1 7017:23

crew 6845:14

criteria 6878:18

critical 6840:22

cross 6981:3 7025:19 7042:6

cross-examination 6842:22, 25 6888:19 6913:25 6914:6 6915:10 6929:15 6949:5 6951:25 6960:6 6961:14 6962:9 6964:18 7000:9 7009:7 7011:20 7012:14 7021:14 7048:17 7052:1

cross-examined 6866:6

cross-examiner 6999:28

crosstalk 6987:15

Cruces 7007:25

crucially 7027:2

curious 7027:22

current 6823:14,20 6824:25 6825:7 6826:13 6829:15 6830:24 6838:18 6843:16 6845:5,24 6846:15,19 6848:17 6850:16,20 6851:12,26 6871:8 6874:25 6875:3,5 6876:5,12 6877:17 6889:10 6890:5,25,27 6892:18 6903:21 6904:3,15 6908:24 6921:9,11,12 6924:22 6925:24,26 6926:14,19 6927:4,14 6928:7 6933:25 6947:27 6949:15,27 6950:3,8,11 6952:12.23 6953:1.13 6954:4 6970:6 6971:27 6972:26 6973:14,28 6974:5 6978:14 6979:26 6981:6 6985:4 6987:8 6989:22,23, 24 6993:5 6997:12,15,27 7003:5,8 7004:4 7005:7,20 7010:6 7013:20 7018:20 7022:23 7046:18 7049:2 7051:21

cusp 7017:6

customer 6972:16

customers 6863:6

D

D-Y-S-O-N 6966:2

D.C. 6895:9

daily 6827:27 6862:9,10

dairy 6815:6,27 6816:2,23 6823:20 6824:1 6826:26 6827:2,7 6829:1 6830:6,8 6832:12,27 6834:28 6835:1, 3,12,28 6836:25 6837:2,3, 16,23,26,28 6838:8,12,16,21 6839:21 6840:2,9,10,21 6844:3,6 6871:8,11 6874:24 6877:13 6878:13,14 6915:1 6917:23 6918:1,4,5,6,9,14, 27 6919:4,12,27 6920:6 6921:1,2,15,16,18,26 6922:3,5,7,8,16,18 6923:8, 10 6925:4 6927:21 6928:1, 11,12 6931:23,25,28 6934:5, 20,25 6938:26 6940:28 6943:28 6944:1,6,28 6946:28 6947:1.10 6948:3 6955:14 6958:23,25 6959:17 6963:15,24,25 6966:11,13 6968:24 6969:20 6972:5,7 6973:18,21,25 6974:2,9



6978:12 6984:28 6985:7 6998:23 6999:1,2 7000:24 7003:28 7004:10,12 7008:2 7012:16 7016:19 7029:14,15 7031:17 7037:27 7054:19

Dairymarkets.org 6965:11

dairymarkets.org/pubpod/pubs/rb9709.pdf. 6965:8

Dakota 7035:9,11

Dallas 6859:25

Dallas/fort 6879:12

Dallas/forth 6870:27

Dana 6967:12

dang 6941:28

Danville 6897:22

dare 6932:21 7047:23

dark 6987:10,13

darker 6833:1 6953:11

dash 6840:27

data 6830:5 6856:9 6869:19, 20.25 6893:5 6920:18 6922:27 6925:17 6934:23 6936:5,28 6937:13,24 6938:13,18,26 6939:3,7 6951:10 6954:14,27 6961:22,26,27 6962:3,26 6963:15 6966:11 6971:11, 12,13,27 6972:8,18,19 6973:5 6975:9 6976:13,20, 26 6977:22 6978:28 6992:19 6993:3 7003:26 7008:8 7023:27 7024:5,10 7025:7 7026:4,20 7027:6 7028:10 7030:19 7032:23 7033:27 7034:4.6.12.13 7039:17 7046:20 7047:3,17

database 6935:8,25 6944:8 7023:25

datasets 6935:20

date 6825:5 6843:27 6943:5 6966:9

dated 6962:19

dates 6885:28

datum 6838:26

Davis 6917:14

day 6821:10 6954:21 7055:2

days 6959:15

deadline 6821:26

deal 6974:11 6978:4 7036:18 7046:27

dealing 7016:20

Dean 7053:27 7054:3,8

decade 6832:22 6840:3 6925:8

decades 6927:19

deceiving 7052:13

December 6966:10

decentralized 6859:17

decide 6913:9

decided 6849:25 6860:1 6879:17 6907:27 6910:8 6938:25 6967:4 6974:18 7028:9

decision 6868:22 6947:5 6957:20 6959:21 6986:16 7016:12,24 7017:22,27 7018:3

decision-making 6857:12 7013:27

decisions 6920:25 6959:2 6998:20

decline 7008:11

declined 6838:23 6856:3,5 7005:15 7007:12

declining 6870:28 6871:19 6876:24.25

decoder 6887:1

decrease 6907:10 6992:12 6995:5 7008:15

dedicated 6823:9 6826:25

deficit 6831:5 6912:20 6925:25

define 6856:19 6862:15,23 6863:19 6866:24 6868:15 6872:10 6873:18 6878:7 7022:8 7045:10

defined 6987:1 7039:11

definition 6921:25 6928:23

definitions 7030:13

definitive 6903:5

deflect 6846:24

degree 6917:13,15 7048:19

dehydrate 7030:4

delete 6842:4,13

deleterious 6840:8

delineate 7022:18

delineates 6910:11

delivered 6888:5

delivering 6826:25 6827:1

delivery 6827:27 6874:14

demand 6830:6,9,26 6921:15,19 6922:12,20 6923:17,20 6925:4 6926:2 6927:26 6928:11 6943:28 6972:6,7 6973:16,22 6984:23,27 6985:2,11 6993:7 6995:27 7003:27 7019:17 7022:15,28 7023:4 7028:12,13,26 7029:10 7038:15 7047:3 7049:17,18,

demands 6934:25 6938:27

denominator 6834:18

dense 7036:18,21

denser 7009:17

density 6945:27

Denver 6908:11,20 6912:18 6987:10,18 6988:4,9,11

depart 7048:28

department 6828:12 6840:14 6876:11 6881:1 6882:4 6938:14 6946:2 6963:22 6967:15

Department's 6831:10

departures 6865:25

depend 6914:5 6993:6,8 7008:14

depending 7009:13

depends 6984:7,15 6993:13 6994:20 6999:22 7013:15 7027:2

deployed 6933:25

deploying 6956:5

depool 6873:3

depooling 6816:8 6818:7 6998:5

derive 6910:15 6922:25

derived 6889:6 6921:8 6989:25 7031:2

derives 6912:21

describe 6856:19 6858:1 6897:11 6970:27 6976:8 7023:14

describes 6923:7 6925:6 7034:2

describing 6821:6 6919:21

6953:9 6958:14

description 6922:2 6963:14 6966:10 6973:12

design 6951:4

designated 6820:8

designed 6957:8 6958:16 6982:28 6983:19 6986:4 7013:8 7015:8 7034:16

destination 6938:3 7033:4

detail 6823:14 6849:6 6858:2 6877:3 6919:21 6963:7 7012:6

detailed 6832:3 6859:12,23 6920:18,28 6925:6 6948:15 7007:8

details 6849:1 6854:21 6869:1 7040:9

determinants 6825:9 6928:1,18,26

determinations 6921:28

determine 6957:1,3 7000:27,28 7015:20 7017:24 7018:19,26 7027:26

determined 6912:1 7001:17, 18 7019:14

determines 6954:28 6992:27 7028:22

determining 7001:15 7018:10

develop 6823:17,22 6829:25 6831:16 6832:9 6852:2 6976:13 6977:17 6996:3 7004:18

developed 6823:17 6832:10 6940:22 6941:4 7026:6

developing 6831:11 7023:24

development 6827:1 6852:12 6920:12,17 6976:24

deviate 6946:9

deviated 6830:17

deviation 6879:18

deviations 6831:20

devices 6819:17,18 6968:1

devoted 6840:17 6917:22

diagram 6987:1

dictate 6869:12,22

dictator 6946:28 6998:23

didactic 6880:26



Diego 7045:1

diesel 6825:22 6826:9 6938:11,12,21,28 6940:2,3,7 6951:7 6979:11,16,20 7032:24,26 7033:14,15 7034:3

differ 6972:12

difference 6822:17 6827:25 6838:26 6839:2 6868:9 6879:14,15 6890:23 6891:3, 7,13,18,21 6904:4 6924:16 6927:1 6932:13,20,25 6933:9,11,15 6941:28 6942:1 6945:23 6949:11,12 6952:21 6953:22 6954:26 6956:5,25,27 6957:10 6974:5 6979:18 6982:8,10 6987:6 6988:6 6989:24 6994:11,27 6997:6 7005:10, 11,17 7008:18 7028:15,18, 20 7040:28 7043:7 7050:22

differences 6850:26,27 6851:4,18 6852:11,20 6860:18 6861:7 6889:8,10 6890:21 6899:19 6900:1 6909:8 6919:23,25 6920:3 6921:7,10,11 6924:21 6926:7,12,13 6927:12,15 6928:4,19 6948:25 6950:9 6953:3 6956:15,18 6958:2,4, 15 6989:22,28 6996:28 7001:7,13 7010:5,21 7012:1 7013:9 7015:24 7022:14 7028:1 7033:10,25 7035:20 7046:27 7049:8,21 7050:9, 14,17 7051:21

differential 6827:24 6828:3, 7,10 6830:23 6831:2 6841:14,20,27 6842:1,18 6846:15 6850:16.25 6851:1. 9,20,26 6858:26 6859:25 6860:2,12 6873:5,21 6874:13 6876:12 6877:17 6880:26 6890:25,27 6894:15 6903:21,23 6904:3,15,19 6906:19 6908:25 6909:27 6925:24 6926:21 6933:23 6949:15,27 6950:8 6952:23 6956:10,20,26 6957:1,6,8,13 6958:18 6995:25 7003:5 7005:21 7013:4,20 7016:15, 25 7040:18,22,27 7041:2 7044:13 7046:8.18 7049:2 7051:22

differentials 6820:14 6821:22 6824:11,23,28 6825:2,7,8 6826:13 6827:13 6829:16,22,26 6830:25 6831:7,26 6832:1 6841:18 6842:9,11 6849:20 6859:14, 16 6867:19 6869:2 6875:2,3 6876:6 6877:6,10,15 6879:2 6880:14,19 6881:7,24 6890:6 6904:27 6908:4 6921:9,13,22 6924:13,15,23, 24 6925:26 6926:14,19,23, 28 6927:4,7,12,14 6928:3,7, 8,15 6929:2 6933:19 6947:23 6950:4,11 6952:12, 15 6953:1,14 6955:4,16 6987:8 6989:23,27 6993:6 6994:12 6999:3 7012:25 7013:2,28 7014:7 7015:26 7017:4 7018:10,26 7025:14 7045:10,19

differentiate 7046:21

differently 6951:12 6996:22

difficult 6839:27 6840:6 6860:20 6942:21 6979:4 6992:28 6993:16 7019:19 7028:14,20

difficulties 6927:2 7012:2

digressed 6856:13

diluted 6874:13

dire 6918:26 6952:6

direct 6820:10 6839:18 6862:26 6888:17 6903:6 6905:1 6907:13 6909:15 6912:23 6916:10 6929:13 6937:20 6950:25,26 7023:20 7040:24

directives 6936:18

directly 6862:26 6877:14 6889:7 6903:16 6909:21 6921:26 6924:14 6928:24 6954:23

director 6920:6

Directors 6824:5

disadvantaged 6884:7,10

disaggregated 6834:27 6922:27 7006:25

disaggregating 6908:7

disaggregation 6893:12 7008:23

disagree 6886:24 7018:12

disallow 6941:16

disappointed 6883:19

discern 7007:4

discuss 6875:22 6887:2 6918:5 6925:13

discussed 7040:18

discussing 6865:24

discussion 6838:19 6843:11,22 6844:10 6851:8 6853:5,11,18,25 6894:21 6937:14 6952:4 6983:20 6991:9

discussions 6851:14 6939:27 6945:15 6981:28

disorderly 6823:21 6828:26 7045:10,13,20 7046:12

dispassionate 6998:23

displaced 6827:2

disruptions 6879:1

disruptive 6860:8,14

distance 6859:26 6861:9 6938:5 6945:23 6946:15,16 6954:17 6969:28 6977:18 7019:8 7021:4 7032:11,16, 17 7033:5 7042:6,14 7049:27

distances 6828:22 6871:4, 19 6972:23,24 6973:6 6997:2 7051:12,13

distant 6826:18 6827:3 6871:3

distinction 6997:23 6998:17 7046:25

distinguish 6969:2

distribute 6883:2 6922:9

distributes 6922:14

distributing 6873:11 6921:19 7006:28 7052:13

distribution 6923:16,19,21 6938:7 6944:7 6955:10 6970:14 6972:15 6977:7 6996:27 6997:5,18 7007:8 7014:23 7024:23 7046:24,27 7051:14

distributions 6934:24

district 6985:6 7028:10

district's 6831:26

districts 6985:15

diverged 6839:6

divergence 6952:11,25 6953:13 7005:6,25

diverging 6838:6

diversion 6872:13

divide 6834:1,3,5

divided 6841:27 6926:26 6973:24

division 6963:25 7039:14

Doctor 6885:20 6896:5 6966:16

document 6818:9 6884:17 6885:12 6889:13 6964:10,21 6965:6,13 6966:7,8,9,10 6973:7 6981:27 7009:22 7011:4

documents 6884:19 6885:8 6901:6 6903:15 6910:13 6925:8

DOE 7033:27 7034:4

dollar 6834:3 6970:4

dollars 6880:8 6902:10 6971:4 7016:9

domestically 6871:14

door 6896:10

dot 7035:9,11 7036:15 7037:8 7052:16

dots 7010:10,16

double 6905:13 6991:27

double-check 6903:10

doubled 6836:11

doubling 6836:6

doubt 6911:3 6991:17

downloaded 6885:8

dozen 6823:10

drawing 6944:16

drive 6916:19 6943:24 6998:11

driven 6825:15 6826:5,11 7051:5

driver 6825:10,14 6861:10 6925:12 6946:18 6954:22 6958:9 6977:13 6998:10

drivers 6825:12 6837:7 6925:1 6943:17 7027:16

driving 6986:13

dropping 6837:28 6838:11,

dry 6932:9 6933:3 6934:21 6957:26 6971:9 7030:1,7

dual 6923:7,9 6924:1,4,7 6931:12,15,20,27 6933:9 6943:17,19

due 6827:5 6830:18 6839:9 6921:13 6925:11 6959:20 7050:9

Index: Diego..due



duller 6839:4

duly 6916:7

duo 6936:9

duplicate 6915:16 6962:11

duplicative 6892:13

dynamic 6840:20

Dyson 6965:15 6966:2,4

E

E-R-B-A 6963:17

earlier 6828:14 6855:8,26 6857:10 6865:23 6883:16 6905:9 6910:1 6920:13 6935:14 6955:20 6958:22 6978:20 6979:6 6998:22 7022:8 7031:26 7035:12 7037:15 7039:2 7046:26 7054:7

early 6835:6 6836:9 6847:9 6855:12 6957:18 7042:19

earnest 6844:13

easier 6938:9 7012:4

easiest 6867:23 6904:9

east 6870:22 6926:26 6980:23 6993:26 6994:5,19 7019:3 7044:15 7047:26

eastern 6819:14 6925:22 7007:14 7020:25,27

easy 6947:4 6990:8

Eau 6876:14,16

economic 6821:8 6823:1 6829:19 6832:15 6840:1 6917:23 6920:3,11,18,28 6921:8,12 6928:16 6930:1 6944:16

economics 6917:13,15,17 6918:15,16,18,28 6965:16 6966:2 6998:15

economist 6918:10,14,27 6919:4,5,26 7020:10 7048:19

economists 6917:26 6918:6 6958:24 7019:26 7048:27

economy 6837:12,14

edge 6815:6 6863:4 6864:6, 17 6927:4

Edge-15 6815:16 6818:3

Edge-15b 6815:17 6818:15

educational 6917:11

6958:28

effect 6838:20 6840:8 6942:15 6979:11,12 7008:12,13

effectively 6889:23

effectiveness 6828:19 6829:13

effects 6928:9

effort 6823:22 6844:6 6860:6 6875:25 6935:26 6936:7 6962:16,18 6974:12 6976:13,15

EI 7007:21,25

elaborate 7039:13

electronic 6825:13 6866:11 6879:25 6884:28 6885:15

electronically 6897:14

elements 6853:3 6949:3

eliminated 6826:22

eliminating 6828:2 7008:28

embedded 6825:4,6 6828:9 6834:28

emergency 6819:13,15 6967:24

Emily 6883:14

emphasized 6850:23

employed 6862:19 6929:1 6963:15 6966:11 7041:13

employing 6863:25

Emporia 6897:22

encompasses 7039:11

encouraging 6927:2

end 6834:11 6843:3,28 6845:4 6847:26 6849:25 6898:3

ended 6879:21 6981:13

endogenous 6974:13

endpoint 6945:24

ends 6839:3

energy 6837:9 6938:14

engaged 6823:6 6844:1,4

engaging 6845:21

English 6842:24,26,27 6843:2 6854:6,8,15,16,18 6865:5 6882:14 6883:10,16, 25 6884:6,8,20,22,24,27 6885:17,19 6887:28 6888:1 6891:19,20 6893:19,21,24 6894:4,7,17,25 6895:3,14, 20,25 6896:1,2,17,21 6897:13,16,18,27 6898:2,6, 10,13,14,25,27 6900:12 6901:1,5,10,12,19 6902:9,13 6905:24,26 6906:2 6913:1,8 6914:19 6915:9 6951:24 6961:10,11,15,17 6963:3,11, 14 6964:7,24,27 6965:4,7, 10,20,23 6966:15 6967:13, 18,25 6968:7,10 6971:23,24 6972:21 6987:14,17,20 6988:17,21,23 6992:3,5 6999:25,26 7004:24 7008:28 7009:6,8,21 7010:1 7011:18 7034:17 7037:16 7043:2 7051:28 7052:2,20 7054:5,7

enhancements 6839:13

enjoyed 6819:5

enjoys 6839:8

enslaved 6860:5

ensure 6879:7 6919:17

ensuring 6829:9 6874:28 6939:3

entail 6841:3

enter 6886:3 6942:12

entered 6876:19

entertain 6817:19

entire 6819:14 6841:20 6850:20 6941:15,27 6950:17 6982:13

entirety 6842:5

entities 6864:16 7029:22

entitled 6963:11,14

environment 6829:7

envision 6980:26

equal 6944:17 6988:11 7019:8 7020:16

equation 6844:8 6969:4

equations 6969:7 6971:2 6975:17,19 6976:5,7,9

equipment 6977:12

equitable 6829:10

equity 6828:28

equivalent 6888:28 6949:14 7003:12 7022:25 7028:18 7048:24

era 6982:7 7028:2 7042:20

Erba 6855:2 6914:24 6963:17 7054:15

Eric 6855:2 6963:17 7054:14

Erie 7042:7

Erin 7053:24

eroding 6829:13

err 6816:11,17

escalation 6856:1

ESL 7046:21 7047:1

essence 6899:20 6996:2

essential 6823:9

essentially 6857:26 6931:20,27 6932:8 6933:6,7 6959:26 6973:22 6984:26 7001:11 7003:6 7018:5 7031:3

establish 6876:5 6949:16 6992:20 7032:14,17

established 6825:8 6826:14 6992:2 7015:1 7017:3

establishes 7014:27

establishing 7012:18

esteemed 7040:7

estimate 6928:2 6932:26 6933:8 6977:6 7027:5 7033:8

estimated 6924:10 6926:24 7038:16

estimates 6924:4 6978:8 7026:5

estimation 6955:11

etcetera 6841:23 7021:27 7022:16

evaluate 6950:9 6956:23 6957:8 6983:15 6985:11 7015:8 7039:3 7046:13

evaluated 6927:21

evaluating 6877:9 6938:18 6940:3 7013:20

evaluation 6919:28

event 7019:21

eventual 6908:3

eventually 6839:16

evidence 6817:19 6818:3, 11,13,18,20 6900:17,19,21, 23,25,27 6920:13 6928:14 7052:28 7053:2,4,6,8,10



evolution 7031:3,27

evolve 6823:24

exact 6844:5,22 6941:19 7009:23

examination 6820:10 6912:1 6914:18 6916:10 6929:14

examine 6852:26 6995:24

examined 6815:10 6820:3 6823:14 6916:7

examples 6879:6 6946:20 7029:16 7030:12

Excel 6909:23

excellent 6820:9 6854:9 6961:7 6965:22 6966:6 7001:26 7002:2 7040:15

exceptions 6995:3

excess 7045:21

excessive 6987:15

exchange 6895:16

exclude 6864:25 6877:28

excluded 6864:4

exclusively 6867:3

excuse 6833:14 6840:26 6889:16 6891:6 6908:8 6944:5 6961:17 6962:1 6973:20 7033:28

excused 7053:11.21

exemplified 7013:21

exercise 6880:26 7018:9

exhibit 6815:14,21 6816:26, 27 6817:3,7,10 6818:3,9,10, 12,14,17,19 6820:12,17,19, 20,21 6822:7 6831:27 6842:16 6861:21 6868:18 6869:26 6872:3,8 6880:11, 12 6881:7,10,25 6882:19 6883:26.27 6884:1.2.15 6885:3,4,10,20,25 6886:8 6898:18 6899:11,15,21,24, 25 6900:3,9,17,18,20,23,24, 26 6902:22,23,24 6903:19, 25,26 6905:8 6906:4 6908:14 6911:12,21 6916:26 6917:5,7 6953:6 6964:13 6994:28 7001:23 7009:20,21 7021:24 7040:17,22 7052:28 7053:1,3,6,7,9

exhibits 6817:15 6889:5 6900:14 6901:2 6916:22,23 6988:14 7052:25

exist 6958:15 6979:23 6984:24 6995:8 7044:3

existed 6922:12

existence 6998:3

existing 6831:2 6860:9,12 6921:27 6922:1,14 6928:17, 25,27 6947:6 6948:16 6981:6,10,17 6982:24 6989:26 6998:13 7041:26 7044:16

exists 6927:12 7033:16 7035:17

expand 6918:10 7031:15,21

expanded 6830:8 6876:4 6973:14 6974:21

expect 6817:20 6879:13 6933:13 6958:2,4 6996:24, 25 7008:25 7021:5 7049:13

expectation 6932:27

expected 6830:21

expense 6826:14 6882:24

expensive 6835:4 6874:19

experience 6849:18 6858:20 6868:23 6917:21 6919:27

experienced 6838:13

experiment 6932:22

experiments 6951:4

expert 6820:8 6832:7 6860:24 6918:9,21,27 6919:2,4,6 6974:16 6999:16

expertise 6831:11,14,15 6859:10 6861:23,26 6862:1 6863:25,26,28 6864:11,24 6872:16 6876:1 6909:12 6918:23 6976:19

experts 6823:10 6856:23 6859:2

explain 6833:10 6892:14,27 6911:24 7006:15

explained 6909:6

explanation 6835:19,21 6953:3 6968:25 6992:26

explanations 6819:6

explicit 6873:13

explore 6846:25

export 6871:13 6985:2,7,11 7028:5,7,11 7052:7,17,18

exportable 7052:11 exporting 7028:25

exports 6985:6 7027:18,20 7028:3,15,16,18

exposing 7000:15

express 6818:23

expressed 6833:5 7026:1

expressly 6873:20

extended 7012:3

extension 6977:4 6978:21

extension-based 7031:28

extensive 6852:4 6853:4 6866:4

extent 6817:12 6848:14 6850:13 6860:14 6873:2,4 6909:20 6972:5 7012:24 7013:12,15 7014:3,25 7015:25 7016:11 7017:4,24

externally 7031:19

extra 7020:26 7028:12

extrapolate 7041:20

extremely 6894:6

exurban 6827:2

eves 7043:21 7052:13

eyesight 6884:9

eyesight's 6986:19

F

F-I-P-S 6887:28 6901:7 6908:10

facilitate 6833:8,12 6877:6

facilities 6848:8 6853:16 6928:12 6941:17 6944:2 6976:28 7026:16

facility 6944:6 6974:14 6999:2

fact 6837:2 6843:17 6844:24 6856:17 6860:11 6864:4 6870:10 6871:8 6881:27 6886:12 6894:28 6896:26 6908:18 6915:14 6928:27 6932:23 6933:1 6943:13 6946:18 6955:17 6958:16,27 6962:17,25 6974:22 6978:9 6982:23 6986:15 6989:20 6995:15 7002:8 7005:10 7016:22 7035:22 7042:10 7043:17 7052:10

factor 6828:2 6868:11 6984:9 7031:5,10 7033:11

factors 6823:28 6829:6 6837:8,22 6840:1,22

6841:12,23 6842:3 6851:16, 17 6852:18 6853:12,13 6921:23 6924:25 6925:1,3 6928:17 6944:21 6945:1 6948:28 6957:5,9 6958:1,5, 17 6984:8 6993:4 7014:13, 19 7022:18 7032:24 7044:1 7051:17

facts 6839:28 6840:7 6896:19

fair 6844:2 6864:16 6874:4 6939:3,6 6979:26 6998:9 7014:20 7016:1 7019:9 7020:28

Fairfax 6896:11,13,16 6897:7

fairly 6890:4 6926:9 6932:13 6933:1 6942:6 6949:17 6979:5 6984:12,14,16,17,20 6995:28 7041:27

fall 6866:16,23,25 6867:4,6, 11,12 6868:8,10 6889:1 6937:5 6994:25 6995:13 7002:9 7024:12

fallen 6838:27

falls 6896:10,12 6897:5,6 6953:17 7027:25

familiar 6929:6 6943:10 6946:13 6955:14 6962:21 7045:1

farm 6827:15,20 6837:1,4 6921:17 6922:13,21 6934:26 6938:6,26 6944:4 6947:10, 14 6955:9 6969:28 6972:12, 26 6973:8 6974:20,23 6976:19,20,22 7014:21 7026:1 7032:1 7049:26 7051:5,13

farmer 6815:6 7054:19

farmers 6829:2 6915:1 7000:24 7054:21

farming 6839:15

farms 6826:27 6827:2,8 6922:8 6923:18 6934:2,7 6946:5,9 6983:14 7007:13

farthest 6906:26,27

fashion 6827:23 7015:27

fast 6895:28 6929:16 6967:10,11,12,14 6971:22 6993:22

faster 6836:22 6837:14 6838:9 6992:14,17,23

fat 7029:24



fault 6856:13

favored 7026:26

fear 6929:16

February 6849:26

fed 6846:21 6847:16 6848:24

federal 6817:16 6823:7,14, 15 6824:4,7,19,27,28 6825:7,13 6827:13,14,17,21, 24,28 6828:12 6829:7,8,14, 27 6832:1,11,19 6833:2 6840:5,7,16,21,22,24,28 6843:16 6849:21 6850:2 6851:12 6852:6 6870:3,4,6, 11,12 6871:24 6875:2 6876:11 6877:18,21,27,28 6880:23 6889:24 6891:24,27 6908:5 6920:14 6924:20 6947:25 6962:15 6963:20, 25,28 6964:1,4,7,10,11 6967:1 6981:20,22 6982:19, 27 6983:2,5 6989:9 6995:7, 9,20 6996:10 6998:3 7000:17,18,20 7001:3 7004:16 7015:4,6,22 7016:28 7035:8

federally-regulated 6828:16

Federation 6823:3 6843:14 6844:19 6845:7 6846:27 6852:2 6863:11 6865:14,27 6869:5 6880:13 6881:27 6968:16 6992:6

Federation's 6850:9 6879:7 6880:17

feel 6866:2 6881:1 6939:2 7035:4 7046:5

feeling 6852:18 6860:17

felt 6848:15 6864:24,26 6907:2

FEMA 6819:13

FEMA's 6967:23

ferry 6981:8

fewer 6899:20 6914:24 7047:17

fields 6919:2

figure 6816:10 6831:23 6832:17,20 6834:3,20 6835:19 6836:3 6838:3 6839:28 6845:2 6913:13 6923:13,26 6926:8 6927:14 6953:5 6986:4,9 6993:21 7006:6,21 7010:11 7011:4,7, 26 7022:21 7023:17 7030:27 7031:18 7034:23,26 7036:26,27 7037:1,3,6,8,25 7038:3,8,11 7039:9,19 7040:12 7042:23 7052:4,8,

figured 6864:1

figures 6926:17

figuring 7040:5

file 6816:1,22

filed 6881:19

files 6817:25 6991:6

filled 7026:23 7054:25

final 6830:17 6847:20 6857:12 6879:11 6888:26 6894:14 6899:23 6903:12,13 6910:17,20 6921:19 6922:18,19 6923:17 6934:2 6972:15 6973:18,21,27 6977:7 7016:12 7029:5,9,10

finally 6912:4 6988:8

financial 6999:20

find 6819:7 6855:17 6880:18 6910:15 6965:27 6979:20 7039:4 7045:21

findings 6920:26

fine 6847:2 6897:27 6900:1 6914:1,16 6930:6 6948:9 6956:24 6967:17 6991:19 7008:28 7009:1

fine-tune 6828:17

fine-tuning 6876:10

finish 6825:24 6833:18

finished 6837:6 6915:11 6922:14 6923:19

FIPS 6887:20,23,27 6901:7, 27 6902:25 6903:19 6905:21 6906:3 6908:10 6911:6 6912:4,7

fits 6831:17

five-minute 6915:21,22

fixed 6834:10 6869:6 6954:19 6974:8 6975:2

flakes 6837:20,21

flat 7044:14

flexibility 6947:16

flies 7008:9

flight 6914:2,9

flip 6936:16 7045:15

flips 6936:1

Florida 6825:2 6826:17,20, 23 6905:22,24 6907:8 6912:19 6927:9,15 6952:13, 20 6953:15

flow 6934:20 7014:16

flowing 6970:2

flows 6923:8,16,18,22,28 6943:21 6955:10 6970:13,14 6972:13 6977:8 7006:9 7011:26 7012:5,7 7024:17, 25 7036:23

fluid 6824:26 6826:28 6827:6,16 6828:20,21 6829:10 6832:28 6833:3 6835:13 6836:1,25 6838:11, 20.22.27 6839:4.5 6840:3.9 6863:6 6871:4,11,18 6873:16 6874:27,28 6876:24.25 6877:2.7.23 6878:13,15 6919:25 6921:8, 12 6923:27 6924:9 6925:14 6928:6 6932:12,18 6950:18 6958:6,12,15 6972:13 6973:24 6974:2,9 7024:22 7027:13 7029:19 7030:7 7037:4 7046:20 7049:19.24. 25,27 7050:1,3,8,27,28 7052:11

flush 6867:11 6925:19 6937:4 6995:17

focal 7012:9

focus 6833:2 6847:1 6924:9 6958:25 6995:24 7025:11

focused 6853:26

focuses 7017:1

focusing 6846:7

folks 6845:28 6858:15 6859:9 6866:2 6938:24 6939:24 6946:4 6948:3 6959:25

follow 6821:12 6831:18 6832:4 6853:6 6854:3 6857:27 6858:1 6871:22 6884:16 6895:21 7011:22

follow-up 7009:9 7052:3

food 6832:26 6834:21,28 6835:2,4,11,27 6836:15,18 6837:4,11,13,15 6838:2,3, 24,28 6839:6,16,20,24 6840:2 6871:13

food/beverage 6837:24

Foods 6844:3,7 6942:3 7012:16

foodservice 7029:12

footer 6885:9

footnoted 6964:1

footnotes 6920:22,23

forbid 6826:24

force 6832:10 6843:24 6845:24 6847:18 6848:22 6852:22 6858:15 6863:28 6864:9 6866:3 6868:24 6874:7 6881:12 6909:11

forces 6828:17

forecast 6929:10 6999:13

forecasters 6929:8 6999:13

forecasting 6999:9

forecasts 6929:6

forego 6820:26

forensics 6815:28

forgive 6962:11

forgot 6821:24 6855:8

form 6821:5 6833:5 6886:18 6903:13 6954:27 6965:15 6973:13

formal 6881:1 6927:18 6967:6

formally 6843:24 6859:6

format 6910:27

formula 6823:8 6974:24

formulas 6823:15,19 6825:5 6840:23 6843:17

formulation 6975:2 6976:15

Fort 6859:26

forward 6865:18 6948:26 6999:28 7041:9

found 6881:9,25 6885:13 6905:9 6929:20

foundation 6875:2 6900:15 6991:14

foundational 6991:13

fourth 6861:22 7029:7

framework 6852:5

frankly 6886:19

free 6968:4

fresh 6824:25

Friday 7054:18,19

Index: fault..fringes

friend 7032:7

fringes 6827:2



front 6819:24 6822:15 6905:16

fuel 6825:9,22 6826:9 6855:26,28 6869:10,15 6925:12 6938:11,15,21,28 6945:26 6977:13,22 6979:20 7032:23 7033:7,10,12,25,27 7039:27 7045:8

full 6817:12 6821:11,20,21 6822:14 6829:3 6831:9 6866:1 6887:17 6916:26 6917:2 6923:13 6926:8 6929:24 6957:14 6984:27 6987:28 6988:21 6995:1 7000:19,23 7004:4 7006:25 7007:9 7008:22 7031:28

fully 6823:19 6844:1 6852:24 6944:20 6945:18 6949:22 6999:16

fun 6929:26

function 6938:4 6954:11 6968:25 6969:2,16,18,21 6970:6.12.20 6971:5 6975:12,13 6976:24 6977:9 7002:16 7033:5

functions 6968:18,27 6970:21 6972:12 6977:21

fundamental 6827:14 6874:28 6877:5 6928:1

funded 6964:10

Funding 6963:21

funny 7038:7 7042:13

future 6823:24

G

gate 6922:21

gatekeepers 6959:22

gave 6866:14 6879:23 6952:10 6990:28 7025:4 7040:17

gear 6843:23

gearing 6847:19

gears 7004:22

general 6825:18 6829:27 6831:1 6832:24 6834:21 6837:24,25 6838:1,18,24 6839:24 6840:2,10 6871:10 6875:27 6879:22 6880:2 6909:13 6925:21 6984:20 7008:24 7019:16 7027:25 7037:27 7039:3

generalize 6979:12

generally 6830:28 6838:12 6850:6 6867:3,4 6872:27 6873:15 6874:26 6909:9 6938:22 6953:17 6976:8 6994:25 6995:2.6.14 6999:23 7017:12 7021:3 7046:10

generate 6839:10,14 6929:6 6936:2 6947:21 7025:6 7033:3 7050:14,21

generated 6921:21 7016:9 7024:1 7037:9 7048:8,26

generating 6956:7 7013:4 7048:3 7051:21

generous 6866:2

genetic 6839:12

gentleman 6914:10

geographic 6830:27 6851:6 6973:23

geography 6953:25 7042:22 7044:4,8,16 7045:2

geography-challenged 6954:1

Georgia 6927:10,15

get all 6857:28 7041:14

give 6815:15 6822:13 6835:21 6844:22 6859:22 6865:2,8 6883:23 6898:21 6905:13 6907:18 6908:12 6913:12 6917:4,19 6936:17 6942:21 6964:15 6966:24 6971:19 6987:28 6996:3 7008:20 7025:10 7027:5 7030:12

globally 6917:24

goal 6823:17

goals 6829:8

good 6815:19 6817:17 6819:8 6820:5 6822:19 6842:24 6843:1.2 6846:12 6849:10 6868:17 6884:26 6915:17,19 6916:12 6918:24 6929:18,19 6930:3,5,9,11 6947:2 6958:14 6959:11 6961:16,17 7000:11,12 7021:16.17 7027:3 7032:7 7033:22 7036:18

Google 6966:3

government 6920:24 6964:10,11,12

gradation 7043:13

Grade 6827:20 6853:5,21,26

gradient 6985:21 6986:6 6987:1 7019:16,18

graduate 6935:13

Granted 7002:15

graphic 7037:27

graphically 7007:17 7012:4

graphs 7038:3

grateful 6965:20

gratitude 6818:23

great 6818:27 6839:23 6847:16 6868:10 6877:3 6930:7 6965:9 6974:11 6980:23 6986:20 6993:25 7002:25 7006:6

greater 6826:14 6836:26 6988:10 7009:26 7038:20 7045:5,11 7050:3

greatest 6906:24

greatly 6830:8 6876:4 6972:25 6973:14

green 6832:27 6838:5 6839:3 6923:17,23 6953:16 6986:19,20,26 6994:6 7006:14,17,26 7007:24

grew 6897:5,6 7044:28

group 6822:4 6842:28 6851:5 6859:7,14 6863:8 6917:25.27 6918:4 6958:24. 26 6961:11 7054:3

grouped 7034:28

groups 6867:28 6920:24

growing 6823:22 6828:23 6840:20 6870:21 6871:9,13, 17 7028:6

grown 6845:17,18 6992:14, 17,23

growth 6871:7 6927:24

guarantee 6965:23

guess 6862:23 6889:22 6914:7 6939:11 6945:13 6950:27 6952:9 6958:11 6969:1 6984:25 6988:17 6992:19 6993:10 6994:20 6995:10,11,18 6999:22 7001:4 7012:7 7027:25 7030:5 7042:1 7043:3 7046:7 7047:16

guidance 6929:9 6936:18 6939:21

guide 6968:21 7043:20

guts 6889:20

guy 6936:1

н

half 6832:23 6840:4

halfway 6913:10

Hancock 6820:5.11.16.19.27 6822:16,26 6842:21 6913:14,17 6914:14,16 6916:11,15 6917:4,9 6918:8, 15,17,20 6919:7,8 6929:13, 23 6930:2 6931:4,5,6 6954:2 6960:5 7002:1 7052:22,23 7053:11,23 7054:11

hand 6882:21 6895:14 6913:10 6916:5 7033:20

handed 6843:18

handing 6821:19 6963:9

handlers 6828:24 6873:3,21 7014:5,8 7016:13,23 7017:7

handy 6901:2

happen 6819:13 6936:11 6950:26 6959:28 6984:26 6996:9 7002:19 7042:15 7050:7,24

happened 6822:18 6863:15 6911:24 6936:22 7023:10

happening 6956:8 6959:19 7002:24

happy 6835:21 6898:6 6914:8,19 6971:16

hard 6818:23 6824:17 6851:5 6901:5 6909:23 6953:16 6962:8,12 7027:26 7043:10

hardest 7035:13,14

hardhearted 6947:9

haul 6978:17

haulers 6977:5 7031:28

hauling 6825:10,16,18 6826:11 6827:18 6828:21 6830:22 6868:28 6869:3 6871:4,19 6978:13,22 6979:1 6980:15

He'll 6988:2

head 7011:17

header 6885:9 6899:1

headings 7029:2

hear 6861:19 6874:22 6877:3 6881:11 6891:5



6949:4 7031:16

heard 6874:4 6912:19 6917:25 6945:4 6949:4 6959:14 7022:2,8,19 7024:13 7037:15

hearing 6818:28 6819:2 6820:26 6821:10 6824:17 6828:14 6830:2,20 6831:27 6840:14 6841:6 6843:5,7 6849:25 6865:21 6868:21 6872:4,21 6874:5 6882:19 6901:8 6906:17 6924:6 6952:4 6967:3,7,8 6976:1 7026:24 7030:27

hearings 6920:15 6924:20

heavy 6978:4

Heights 6897:21

held 6830:2

helped 6909:19

helpful 6894:6 6939:23 6972:17 6973:1 6976:17 6979:19 6982:18 7000:26 7038:23

helping 6953:28 6964:14 7053:17

helps 6953:8 6973:2 6994:14

Hennepin 6901:16,27 6902:27 6903:20 6904:1,2,6 6905:2 6907:7

heritage 6961:6

hide 6880:28

high 6839:21 6925:26,28 6939:1 6995:16 6996:5,12

higher 6815:26 6825:15 6827:5 6828:21 6834:6 6841:22 6843:23 6856:2 6869:16 6873:14,15 6874:6 6903:4 6904:5 6906:28 6912:13,17,18 6926:2 6938:21 6953:4 6979:7 6993:5 6994:25 6995:6,14 6997:4 7002:9,11 7008:26 7021:5 7030:9 7045:22

highest 6839:1 6845:5

highlight 7024:8

highlighting 6897:24 6993:15

highly-detailed 6922:5

Hill 6897:13,17,28 6898:5 6905:25 6906:1 6930:6,10 6967:18 6968:8 7009:20

hired 6843:25

historic 6830:14 6860:3

historical 6879:7

historically 6827:25

history 6920:11

hit 6855:6 6954:20

hits 7029:21

holding 6840:14

honest 7026:4

Honor 6815:18,28 6817:6
6818:21 6819:27 6820:6,16
6821:17 6822:16 6842:21,24
6854:8 6882:14,26 6883:10
6884:28 6885:7 6894:5,18
6895:5,15 6896:1,17
6898:11 6900:12 6913:1,17
6914:19 6917:4 6918:8
6919:7 6929:13 6960:7
6961:10 6963:3,19 6964:25
6967:19 6968:7 6988:18
7052:23 7053:12

Honor's 6966:27

honored 6878:26

hope 6960:21 7001:16 7039:18

hoping 6936:19 6937:15 6988:15 6989:2,3

horse 6866:7,10

horses 6866:11

hour 6930:9

hour-of-service 6954:20

hours 6825:11 7022:3

hours-of-service 6954:16

housekeeping 6900:13

Houston 6870:27 7028:6

HTST 7046:21

human 6827:3

humor 6819:8

hundred 6922:28 6932:1 6941:22 7001:8,14,21 7003:2,15 7023:14

hundreds 6934:9

hundredweight 6826:12 6828:8 6841:13 6880:8,9 6921:10 6926:21 6927:9 6938:6 6942:7 6949:20,28 6950:7 7003:13 7005:4

hypothetical 6958:6

6982:12

hypothetically 7050:19

•

I-75 6926:10

I-S 7020:8

I-T-A-L-I-A-N-O 6819:23

ice 6972:14 7026:8 7027:14 7029:25,26,27 7030:11

ID 6901:15.24

Idaho 7001:27 7002:4 7049:20,28

idea 6849:10 6915:19 6944:16 6950:22 6959:10 6986:4 6995:10 6998:28 7009:16 7011:8 7021:3 7023:17 7024:19 7029:20 7031:23 7041:19 7051:10,16

ideas 6966:24

identical 6899:11 6908:21

identification 6815:22 6820:22 6883:28 6884:3 6887:4 6917:8 6965:27

identified 6852:6

identifies 6887:24

identify 6815:5 6961:9 6969:14

identifying 6888:7

IDFA 6863:7,9 6864:18 6874:22 7054:5,6

ignorance 7000:16

ignorant 7003:19 7015:3

ignoring 7050:15

ii 6824:11 6843:18 6963:21 7049:4

iii 6843:19 6933:4 6956:19, 22,25 6957:11,19 6973:4 6997:28 7041:22 7047:23 7048:14 7049:4,8,14 7050:15

III/IV 6816:6

illustrate 6953:8 7011:8 7012:8

illustrated 6838:23 6845:2

imaginary 6981:18

imagine 6932:21 6938:19 6944:26 6966:3 7031:7 7050:6

impact 6821:8 6832:18 6838:19 6869:7 6927:26 6942:6 6979:1,21 6983:3,15 6984:3,4,7,14,16,18,22 7008:24 7022:21 7027:24

impacted 7046:23

impactful 6942:2

impacts 6832:15 6957:20 6985:12 6993:14 6996:8 7039:3

impassioned 6998:23

implement 7042:3

implemented 6825:14

implementing 6824:1 7042:4

implication 7019:20

implications 6995:25 6996:17 7017:14,19 7023:3

implicit 6873:13

implied 6886:23

implies 7002:12 7018:1

imply 6862:3 6886:19

import 7028:4

importance 6828:12 7042:21

important 6823:9 6828:10 6829:12 6840:14,19 6858:25 6878:13 6921:27 6925:2 6928:18,26 6945:1 6947:19 6949:8 6950:5 6962:6 6976:11 6985:8 7006:20 7025:13 7028:4 7033:1 7040:6

importantly 6920:1 6934:13

imports 6985:7 7027:17 7028:3

imposed 6860:13 6922:24

imposition 6999:2

imprecise 6905:4

imprecisely 6857:20 6862:18

impression 6939:13

improve 6951:23

improved 6876:4

improvements 6839:12

Index: heard..in-truck

in-person 7054:19

in-truck 6825:13



inappropriate 6856:10

incentive 6853:15 6874:15

incentives 6878:5 7000:23 7015:6

include 6830:9 6841:6 6844:27 6848:20 6852:13 6910:20,22,25 6940:24 6948:14 6970:12 6977:11, 12,13 6980:10 6996:18 6998:28 7016:27 7033:7 7040:18,22

included 6816:12,15,18,26 6823:23 6831:23 6862:14,15 6889:20 6907:21 6921:23 6941:14 6949:6 6956:20 6958:1 6970:15,19 6972:9, 19 6973:28 6977:28 6978:2, 3 6996:21,24 7017:28 7018:1

includes 6818:4 6823:25 6840:4 6841:4 6842:17 6877:27 6905:2 6922:20 6955:8 6979:15 7033:6 7051:9

including 6818:15 6824:6 6825:18 6830:6 6832:5 6836:27 6837:8 6845:16 6919:27 6956:26 6979:16

income 6839:25

incomplete 7026:5

inconsistencies 6982:16

incorporate 6945:18 6957:9 7005:22

incorporated 6849:9 6852:15 6857:5 6896:7 7008:5

incorporates 6896:16

incorporating 6861:13 6956:19

increase 6824:22 6826:5 6828:7,27 6836:15 6838:2 6872:25 6876:28 6903:23 6904:13,14 6905:19 6907:9 6909:5,20 6910:16 6937:16 6950:20 6951:27,28 6954:17,18 6985:14 6986:26

increased 6825:10,17,19 6826:11,28 6827:8,9,20 6828:22 6830:24 6833:24 6836:5 6838:14 6841:18 6869:27 6870:6,12 6871:25 6874:10,24,27 6875:8 6877:1 6954:12 6985:11

increases 6825:22 6826:10 6827:10,18 6830:22

6839:10,11 6870:1 6872:27 6875:10 6927:10

increasing 6831:4 6850:18 6871:5,21 6876:26 6904:19 6906:18 6934:6

increasingly 6827:3 6828:25 6838:6

incredible 6861:12

incremental 7005:2,4

incurring 6874:14,20

independent 6831:25 6937:20 6986:6

index 6834:4,7,11,12,20 6835:14 6836:7,8,12 7034:7

indexing 6833:19 6835:16

Indiana 6994:8,9,13 7004:25 7005:4,8,19,26

indicating 6926:5 7006:18

indices 6832:21 6833:6 6835:9

indirect 6827:23

individual 6846:28 6847:17 6859:10 6867:28 6871:28 6887:24 6893:2 6922:12 6947:4 6972:2 6983:25 6997:3 7025:1 7043:14

individuals 6831:12 6861:23

industry 6823:20,24 6826:21 6828:19 6840:21 6847:22 6863:25,26 6865:1, 7 6871:8 6877:13 6878:14 6917:23 6918:5 6920:24 6922:16 6925:9 6934:5 6940:25 6944:28 6955:14 6959:1,4 6978:12 6982:9

industrywide 6944:23

inevitably 6858:24

inflated 6834:13 6835:2

inflation 6832:25 6834:21,22 6836:17,19 6837:8,12,23,24, 25,27 6838:1,4,5,7,13,14,24, 25 6840:3 6845:2,6

inflationary 6836:23 6838:11

inflow 6970:28 7006:17

inflows 7006:15

influence 6840:1 6937:17 6939:15 6951:2,3 6993:4 7016:9

influenced 7027:23

influences 7027:28

inform 6928:2 7050:24

informal 6966:28 7024:8 7034:18

information 6846:6,17 6847:15 6848:7 6849:2 6851:3 6855:19 6864:2 6869:23 6872:1 6880:27 6881:3,15,17 6882:4,5 6886:1,3,15,17 6890:10 6928:21 6935:25 6936:24 6937:17 6939:20 6940:23 6941:1,9 6942:23 6943:24 6945:10,13 6947:22 6951:9, 16,20,21 6955:23,24,28 6956:3,8,11 6959:1,7 6961:23,24 6969:20 6972:9 6978:18,19 6989:24,25,26 6990:14,19,22,24 6991:17 7003:25 7004:9,11,15 7006:25 7007:5,7 7011:13 7013:18,24,26 7014:4 7017:10 7025:12 7026:10 7031:7 7032:19 7035:17 7048:8 7049:12

informed 6846:20

ingredients 6871:12 6970:26 6974:14,25

inherent 6997:10

initial 6937:13,19,27 6939:16 6940:19 6954:10 7024:1 7033:2,8 7042:18

initially 6856:15 6954:20 7042:4,16,19

initiated 6876:11

Innovation 6842:27 6863:8 6961:11 7054:3

input 6830:5 6865:2,8 6924:20 6928:19 6929:1 6937:20 6939:14 6941:6 6955:18 6975:23 6995:12 7029:27 7031:1.19 7040:24

inputs 6929:8 6933:22 6955:25 6971:27 7003:20 7024:10 7031:24

inside 6896:5.25

insight 6952:5

insights 6920:2 6959:12

instance 6831:19 6863:1 6897:4 6980:27 6981:1 7002:20 7036:4

instances 6828:11 6868:8 7046:4

instantly 6834:13

Institute 6963:23

institutional 6847:21 6849:12 6850:7 6859:1,12 6860:1 6875:28 6909:10 6921:23 6944:20 7029:12

integrated 6823:18

intended 6886:15

intending 6886:3 6917:1

intent 6879:7

intentionally 6845:4,6 6855:27

intentions 6939:12

interact 6942:23

interaction 6993:8 7019:14

interactions 6983:10 7014:17

interest 6820:25 6958:25 7013:19 7048:12

interested 6856:6 6936:10 6948:5

intermediate 6922:18 6934:19 6938:6 6944:5 6971:7 6973:12,14,27 7029:6,13 7030:3

International 6844:3,6 7012:16

interplant 6955:10 6970:14 6972:13 6977:8 7014:22

interpolated 6893:7

interpret 7043:17

interpretation 7038:22

interpreted 6924:14

interpreting 7031:20

interrupt 6919:14 6975:7

interrupted 6914:15

introductory 6821:6

intuition 7002:24

intuitively 6979:7

invent 6876:7

inverse 7002:9

inversion 6853:8,27

inversions 6828:11 invested 6948:17 6999:22

investment 6825:12 6920:25

investments 6825:15



invitation 6864:13

invite 7021:12

invited 6863:21 6864:8,21

involved 6849:7 6850:1,2 6858:12,20,21 6859:23 6862:8,26 6863:10 6865:26 6866:3,11 6903:16 6935:9, 11 6971:12 6976:16 6982:4

involves 6993:3

IP 7029:18 7030:1,6

ironically 6901:14

Island 7008:17

issue 6832:17 6853:5,8,26 6873:22 6948:18 7024:5

issued 6864:13

issues 6819:2 6861:2 6917:23 6918:5 6965:18

Italian 6819:23

items 6832:23

iteration 6844:15 6845:8 6846:4,7,9 6847:5,11,13 6848:5 6849:1 6850:15 6851:24 6855:10 6856:16, 20,22 6858:7 6888:12 6894:10

iterations 6847:8 6857:11 6910:3 6941:12 6950:14 6951:12 7042:20

iterative 6903:7

IV 6840:23 6843:19 6997:28 7049:4

J

James 6963:16

Jeff 6832:5 6859:6 7054:14

Jeffrey 6854:27 7054:9

Jim 6843:25

job 6858:23 6861:12 6864:26 6935:16 6939:14 7008:28 7009:1

joint 6976:12,15

joke 6833:15

journal 6815:27 6816:2,23 6920:21

judge 6898:21 6919:12

judgment 6929:9 6977:28

juice 6826:19,21,22

July 6839:1 6962:19 6963:8 6966:9

June 6882:2 6885:5,27 6899:1,5,6 6902:24 6903:3 6910:21 6911:24 6939:17

jurisdiction 6896:3

justification 6832:3 6875:12 6881:8 6904:19,21 6957:6

justify 6875:25

Κ

K-O-O-N-T-Z 7054:1

K-O-V-I-C 6960:26

K-R-I-G-I-N-G 7041:13

Keefe 6909:19 7054:15

keeper 6846:19 6955:21

keepers 6845:20

keeping 6901:2 6946:25 7016:7

Kentucky 6927:16

key 6825:8 6832:4,17 6914:6 6920:26 6924:5 6929:7 6943:23,24 6971:27 6998:16 7022:12 7023:1 7028:1

kickoff 6843:27

kind 6821:16 6836:12 6849:18 6850:24 6858:21 6860:25 6866:7 6871:1 6876:14 6903:8 6914:4 6917:25 6932:3 6936:17,18 6942:22 6944:15 6947:19 6953:17 6955:20 6958:27 6959:22 6978:4 6980:26 6981:17 6986:3 6995:11 6996:5 7007:6 7014:12 7017:19 7019:16 7022:2,4,8, 18 7024:7 7025:12 7026:14, 23,25 7028:19 7030:18 7031:21 7032:22 7034:6,19, 27 7035:4,19 7036:13 7037:17,23 7038:28 7040:2, 20 7041:16,28 7043:10,18, 21,24,25,28 7044:18,25 7046:16,23 7047:12,15 7048:9 7049:19 7050:19 7051:7,19

kinds 6849:8 6981:2 6985:16 6998:16 7012:8 7039:1

knew 6848:12 6849:8 6850:24 6858:21 6867:19,21 6868:3 7034:19

knowing 6890:3

knowledge 6830:13 6845:24 6846:14 6847:21 6849:12 6850:7 6852:23 6855:23 6856:6 6859:2,12,15 6860:25 6862:7,12 6863:13 6864:12,19 6868:2,6 6869:3 6875:28 6878:27 6880:2 6909:10 6940:16 6948:15 6951:22 6962:20 6967:7 6981:25 6982:2,3 6990:11

Koontz 7053:26 7054:1,13

Kraft 6942:3

Kriging 7041:12

7035:7,8 7044:26

L

L.A. 7028:5

label 6892:12

labeled 6890:21,25 6892:5, 10,25 6894:8,9 6898:28 6899:5,26 6902:14 6904:15 6911:1

Labels 6889:25,26

labor 6825:20 6832:22 6837:9 6869:10 6938:13 7034:16 7039:15

lack 7008:26

laid 6900:14

lake 6981:4,8,14,19 7042:7 7044:5

Lakes 6980:23

language 6841:7,24,28 6842:14 6889:24 6980:8

laptop 6845:18 6936:15 6991:4,5,6

large 6921:10 6922:26 6923:1 6925:16 6931:21 6938:2 6942:1 6958:4 6984:12,16,20 7010:16,27 7018:27 7023:12 7024:14 7025:3 7032:8 7036:15 7039:4

large-scale 6929:7

largely 6827:16 6840:22 7047:25

larger 6828:21 6934:19 6953:13 6984:17 6987:8 6988:5 6994:13 7012:3 7026:7 7034:28 7035:24 7045:19 7051:2,21

largest 6952:11,19 6953:22 7008:1 7026:11

Las 7007:25

late 6843:23 6855:12

latest 6936:24

Latin 7019:26 7020:4

law 7016:23

lay 7019:3

lead 6920:16 6931:16 7015:1

leads 6942:28

learn 6981:2

learned 6954:13

lease 6925:11

leave 6871:28 6913:19 6914:9 6930:8 6964:22 6991:15

leaving 6828:24 6878:3 6959:17 6983:2

lecture 7033:22

lecturing 6993:19

led 6851:15 6918:1

left 6815:13 6854:16 6889:13 6897:17 6983:5

legislative 6823:26

legitimate 6939:27

length 6875:23 6914:5

lengthiest 6844:11

lengthy 6992:26

letters 6886:7,8 6887:27 6989:5

level 6828:5 6839:1 6861:14 6877:10,14 6893:12 6922:27 6950:2,3 6963:6 6972:25

levels 7043:14

licensed 6940:27.28

light 6962:25

likewise 6955:4

limit 6879:26 6880:6

limitation 6954:16,21 6981:3 6983:23

limitations 6995:22 6997:10

limited 6826:16 6828:7 6845:6 6863:27 6951:5 7011:26

limiting 6828:19

limits 6825:20 6872:13



linear 6980:7 7042:5

linearly 6954:12,18

lines 6898:9 6923:17,19,23 6950:28 7006:8,14 7007:3 7022:24 7024:18,24,26,27 7026:25 7042:24 7043:7,12, 20

lining 6889:23

link 6938:3 6944:3 6947:13 6965:18,20

links 6966:5

list 6821:21 6842:15 6845:23 6866:1 6910:18 6940:12,18,21,28 6941:4,5, 7,27 6943:5,14 6951:8,20 7022:14 7035:13,14 7039:10 7053:25

listed 6829:23 6888:6 6899:7,26 6908:4 6911:21 6968:27 6972:18 6973:6 7022:12 7038:8

listening 6960:21 7054:27

listing 6973:27

lists 6855:24.25 6940:9.27

literally 6989:8

live 6896:10,12 6955:14 7001:28

lived 6946:22

lives 6944:28 7002:1

Livestock 6963:23

living 6832:25 6835:10,26 6836:14

lo- 7022:15

loaded 6826:12

local 6830:13 6846:14 6850:7 6852:23 6858:4 6864:19 6870:23,28 6876:2 6921:22 6945:25 6948:15 6993:6 6999:13,19

locality 6929:10

localized 6942:5 6984:3,4, 18,21

located 6860:10 6891:25,26 6897:4 6934:8 6943:27 6998:24

location 6827:2 6842:12 6851:27 6921:15 6923:11,24 6924:3,11 6925:7 6928:10 6932:5,7 6942:2,21 6943:28 6944:1 6946:6 6947:2 6949:18,21,23 6950:1 6952:23 6953:24 6969:26,27 6970:3 6972:16 6980:13,28 6984:10,20 6985:13 6992:23,28 6993:2,7,13,16 7001:8 7002:2,27 7003:1,3, 14,16 7005:7,27,28 7006:18, 19,23 7008:27 7009:13 7012:19,22 7014:16 7019:18 7021:6 7023:5 7025:18 7026:26,27 7027:3 7033:12, 16 7036:8,11,12,23 7045:3 7049:15 7051:23 7052:18

location-specific 6921:3 7022:6

locations 6826:27 6830:13, 21,27 6850:28 6851:25 6868:4 6921:14,18,19,28 6922:11,19,21 6923:16,17, 20 6924:8,17 6925:10 6928:9,11,22,26 6934:7,26 6938:27 6940:10 6949:12 6955:1 6970:13 6972:1,3,6, 28 6973:10,16,23 6976:23 6979:3 6993:28 7003:28 7004:19 7005:1,11 7006:28 7010:11 7016:14 7017:8 7018:20 7022:16 7025:20 7026:7,8,13 7027:20 7028:12 7034:27,28 7035:5, 23 7036:2.17 7039:5 7041:15,17 7048:4 7051:24

log 6858:10

logic 7019:11

logical 6932:22

logistics 6977:26 6997:17 7001:12 7017:1

logs 6825:14

Lone 6832:6

long 6843:12 6845:14 6920:11 6940:22 6941:4 6959:21 7031:2

longer 6875:3 6997:1 7021:3,24 7049:26 7051:12, 13

longest 6913:11

longstanding 6828:15 6831:10,14 6861:26,28

looked 6834:14 6843:19,20 6845:23 6847:18,28 6879:28 6907:4 6951:25 6962:28 7047:8

Los 6946:13,16 6985:13

lose 7008:17

loses 7012:5

loss 7008:4

lost 6882:16 6901:12 6983:14 7008:2

lot 6822:24 6838:19 6844:16 6845:20,24 6846:1 6853:24 6854:23 6859:23 6861:7,8,9, 13 6889:20 6898:16 6911:8 6912:5,15,19 6929:26 6941:26 6946:4 6950:9 6951:18 6955:24 6978:4 6979:26 6980:3 6997:14 7012:4 7018:21 7024:27 7027:21 7028:8 7041:17 7049:4,15,16,18,26 7050:2 7051:19

lots 6945:1 7008:28

Louis 6926:9

love 7054:28

low 6926:28 6947:11

lower 6831:3 6867:4 6925:21 6938:28 6992:21 6993:5 7005:3 7008:26 7020:25

lowering 6894:15

lowest 6839:5 6850:25 6851:20 6921:3 6922:10 6944:25 6998:25 7016:5 7022:9

luck 7021:19

lunch 6913:23,24 6929:18 6930:8

luncheon 6930:13

M

made 6846:17 6850:10 6857:17 6858:3,17 6862:25 6865:27 6866:21 6867:28 6869:23 6875:28 6879:8,10 6880:14 6881:13,17 6886:16 6890:16 6893:15 6894:14 6907:5,17 6909:16 6910:9 6911:18,19 6912:3 6927:6,9, 10 6940:14 6941:12,18 6942:10 6950:16 6951:13 6974:10 6981:23,24 6982:11,21,23 6991:8 7005:23 7018:14 7026:18 7028:21 7038:25

Madison 6916:20 6920:7,9

magic 6887:1 6936:6

magnitude 7005:3,16,18 7008:15,21

magnitudes 7010:12

main 6837:7 6855:7 6870:21 6889:17 6971:4

mainframe 7011:11

maintain 6831:9 6948:17 6959:6

maintained 6851:11 6965:13 6978:16

maintaining 6828:16

maintains 6950:1

maintenance 6977:11

major 6846:18 6847:26 6855:28 6859:27 6868:11 6871:2 6879:10,18 6934:28 6943:17 7004:10,11 7028:5

majority 6824:27 6862:24 7027:11

make 6825:4 6833:23 6842:22 6844:4,9 6846:22 6847:24,28 6860:7,8 6869:18 6874:25 6879:17 6882:14,26 6896:22 6907:5, 9 6909:12 6914:25 6915:16 6931:23,25 6934:4 6935:28 6936:2,10 6938:10 6940:26 6941:6.28 6943:9.14 6944:9 6947:5 6952:9,18 6954:22 6956:9 6959:2,28 6960:6 6963:9 6965:18 6971:9 6974:12,16,24 6980:14 6983:12,22 6984:26 6990:27 6992:25 6996:14 7001:10 7003:7 7008:18 7016:21 7019:1 7022:3 7023:26 7025:16 7028:15,24 7029:1, 8,18,23 7030:1,3,10 7036:24 7037:13 7038:17 7041:16 7046:25 7049:22 7053:16

maker 7026:8

makes 6881:21 6898:12 6950:9 6956:9 6979:18 7028:19 7035:18

making 6823:23 6824:1 6833:15 6843:8 6847:26 6855:22 6869:2 6875:12 6876:9 6877:22 6879:21 6907:28 6922:18 6934:21 6942:5 6943:4 6948:6 6964:5,13 6982:6 6983:24 6995:25 7004:28 7005:9 7013:11

manage 6843:26

management 6918:23 6919:1,6 6946:2 6965:16 6966:3

managerial 6917:17

mandatory 6823:27 6824:2 7014:4,7



manner 6965:2

manufacture 7030:7

manufactured 6871:11 6973:25 6974:3,9 6975:6

manufacturer 6972:14 7029:28

manufacturing 6823:27 6827:26 6828:1 6853:16 6871:13,16 6874:23 6877:8 6878:12 7029:15 7047:18

map 6831:24 6986:21 7007:16 7009:10 7011:2 7012:18 7024:18,22 7037:18 7041:16 7043:11 7048:11 7051:17

mapped 7043:15

mapping 6931:17 6988:1 6995:1 7006:21 7024:21 7025:9 7035:21 7041:28 7042:12

maps 7037:9 7050:26

March 6935:6

margin 6839:4 7001:6

marginal 6924:2 6932:4 6933:9,16 6949:12,18 6950:17 7001:7,20 7002:28 7008:25 7012:10,19,21 7021:5 7041:22 7046:14 7048:3,24,26 7051:22

Marin 6815:6,9 6959:20

mark 6820:19 6850:23 6883:25 6915:3 6920:5,20 6935:6 6936:8 6941:26 6959:25 6960:15 6963:18 6965:12 6977:2 6978:6 6987:28 6992:9 7031:5 7040:8,10 7042:25,26 7043:20

Mark's 6977:28

marked 6815:21 6820:21 6880:12 6883:15,18,27 6884:2 6895:22 6897:2 6905:7 6917:7

markedly 7039:6,7

market 6823:2 6827:28 6828:17,18 6829:7 6832:15 6852:23 6865:17 6870:21 6871:13 6872:26 6951:14 6963:25 6997:12,17,27 6998:13

marketers 6829:20

marketing 6823:10,11,21 6824:19 6826:17 6828:26 6829:11 6831:12,21 6839:16 6840:16 6841:1 6861:24 6891:26 6920:15 6924:18 6930:4 6963:24 6997:15 6998:3 7000:20 7004:16 7015:7 7016:28 7021:11,13 7044:26 7045:10,13,20 7046:12

marketplace 6829:21 6831:17

markets 6827:1,10 6864:19 6865:16 6869:28 6875:9 6876:2 6918:1,4 6919:27 6958:23 6959:17 6966:13

marking 6883:11

mass 6922:23 6970:23

massive 7024:24

master 6859:8 6917:15

match 6869:20

matching 6938:17

material 6897:10 6975:14

materials 6881:20 6968:13,

math 6931:21 6974:17

mathematical 6922:6 6932:3 6933:28 6969:18

mathematically 6970:27 6974:27

mathematics 6835:16 6874:16 6932:2

matrix 6938:2 7033:3

matter 6820:8 6858:27

maximum 6880:2 6926:6

May-current 6891:1,2

me's 7035:8

meaning 6836:10 6952:26 7051:3

meaningful 7008:12,13

means 6835:10 6836:12 6837:10 6944:19 7020:12

meant 6866:24 6941:14

meantime 6817:18

measure 6832:24 6837:15

measurement 7005:17,18

measurements 7005:19

measures 6836:4

mechanism 6827:14 6874:28

mechanisms 6823:23

meet 7030:9 7053:17

meetings 6823:13 6863:17 6865:27 6878:26

member 6823:11 6831:13 6832:6,12 6843:24 6861:25 6863:22 6864:9,14

members 6832:10,12 6846:28 6847:18 6852:22,27 6858:15 6862:2,3 6863:7,9, 10,18,27 6864:11,17 6865:1, 7 6866:3,8 6868:23 6874:17, 25 6875:24 6878:27 6881:12 6909:11 6960:14 6978:12

members' 6848:23 6876:1

membership 6958:26

memory 6821:17

mention 6821:24 6861:18 7030:21

mentioned 6839:21 6848:4, 26 6853:2 6855:26 6879:12 6900:8 6937:22 6951:3 6954:7 6958:22 6959:4 6970:28 6971:26 6972:26,28 6973:10 6979:6 6984:15 6996:15 6997:16 7008:14 7016:6 7023:22 7030:17 7031:26 7032:4,5,23 7038:25 7039:2,15 7046:26 7049:11 7050:10

mess 6982:26 7024:27

messy 7007:10

met 6918:5 6973:22

method 6829:25,28 6833:20 7041:15

methodology 6955:6 6956:5

Methods 6963:15 6966:11

metropolitan 6895:10 7044:20

Mexico 7006:7 7007:14 7008:1

Miami 6906:19 6912:19,26 6926:10 6951:27 6986:14, 19,20 6987:4,8 6988:4,7 6994:7 7014:10,11,14,15,16, 18,19,20

Miami-dade 6905:22,24 6907:2,6

mic 6901:4

Michigan 6981:8,13

mid-2000s 6872:22

mid-summer 6847:9

middle 6861:21

Mideast 6816:9,15,17,25 6817:9,11 6818:16

midway 6936:28

Midwest 6904:18

MIG 6885:10 6903:27 6955:19 7053:27

MIG's 6955:15 6959:10

MIG-28 6883:17,18,26 6884:13

MIG-29 6882:15 6883:16,20 6884:1,15 6905:6 6906:4 6909:22 6911:13

MIG-30 6882:16

mile 6825:9 6826:12 6827:11 6954:12

mileage 7032:12

mileages 6830:10 6861:4

miles 6826:12 6827:7,9 6869:28 6875:8 7018:28 7020:26 7032:18

milk 6823:2 6824:19,25 6825:4.10.16.18 6826:11.18. 25,28 6827:1,3,6,7,9,11,12, 16,18,20,26 6828:2,3,20,21, 22 6829:3,5,9,12,20,21 6830:6,7,13,19,22,28 6831:5,9,12 6832:6,28 6833:3 6836:2,25,26 6837:3, 18 6838:12,20,22,27 6839:5 6840:3,10,16,28 6841:13 6842:3,18,27 6843:5,13 6844:19 6845:7 6846:26 6850:9 6851:23 6852:1.12. 17,27 6853:15 6855:10 6857:21 6858:6 6859:2,27 6861:23,24 6862:2,4,9,10, 19,20,24,25,27 6863:1,6,8, 10,15,18,22,27 6864:1,10, 14,17 6865:14,24,26 6866:18,21 6867:15 6869:4, 8,28 6870:1,2,7,12,13,22,23, 28 6871:2,4,9,15,17,18,20, 26 6872:12,18 6873:5,11,16 6874:2,8,11,18,27 6875:1,8, 10,11,17,18,24,28 6876:23, 24,25 6877:1,7,23 6878:5,7, 8,12,15,19,25,28 6879:6 6880:12,17 6881:27 6882:9 6883:19 6885:2,22 6888:5 6889:7 6890:2 6893:8,9,11 6904:24 6906:17,25,26 6907:8,17 6910:28 6911:1 6912:15 6913:9,12 6915:13 6919:23,25,28 6920:4,14 6921:2,3,7,12,14,17 6922:4,

Index: manner..milk



7,10,13,17,25 6923:2,10,15, 17,27,28 6924:1,2,3,5,8,9, 11,14,22,27 6925:3,4,7,14, 25 6926:3,12,20 6927:2,18, 20,23,25,27 6928:2,4,6,10 6931:16,17,24 6932:1,4,5, 12,18 6933:3,16 6934:1,10, 21,27 6935:3,5,23 6936:9,17 6937:5,13,21 6938:6,8,24,26 6939:2,9,17,20,21 6940:12, 16,20 6941:6,8 6942:7,16,25 6943:25,27 6944:4 6945:24, 28 6946:5,22 6947:9,14,15 6948:27 6949:18,19,20,23 6950:10,17,18,19,24 6951:1, 22,28 6952:6,19,22 6955:9, 26 6956:1,18 6957:26 6958:7,10,12,13,15 6959:8, 9.12 6961:11.25 6962:4.10 6963:25 6964:7 6968:15,18, 27 6969:26,28 6970:2,10,12, 17,18,19,25,27 6971:9,28 6972:3,12,27 6973:8 6974:3, 18,20,22 6976:19,20,22 6977:5,7 6978:17,26 6979:23 6980:10,11,22 6981:12 6982:14 6983:21 6984:12,14 6986:10 6987:7 6988:28 6989:21 6990:2.22. 24,25,28 6991:1,10,15,21,23 6992:6,14,17 6993:6,12,27 6994:9,11 6996:20,21,22,26, 28 6997:1,9,17,22,25,26 6998:2,3,14 7000:14,20,28 7001:1,8,13,14,21 7002:28 7003:2,13,16,26 7004:6,8, 14,16,17,25 7005:2,15 7006:15,18 7007:11,13,17, 19 7008:10,11,17,21,25,27 7009:26 7010:12 7011:3,23, 26 7012:10,19,21 7013:4,10 7014:11,20,21 7015:6,8,24 7016:14,28 7017:8,21 7018:20,28 7019:7,9,13,20 7020:21,26 7021:3,5 7024:22 7025:1,4,20 7026:1, 2,12,15 7027:1,9,12 7028:17,18,25 7029:21,24 7030:1,2,4,7 7032:1 7036:18,21 7038:10 7039:5, 9.17 7040:17 7041:9.17 7044:10 7045:21 7046:14. 26,28 7047:1 7048:3 7049:16,18,22,24,26 7050:8 7051:1.3.11.13.19.24 7052:13 7053:26 7054:2,3,

Milk's 6820:13 6821:4 6882:1 6903:2 6939:12 6958:20 7040:21

million 6970:5,9,16

millions 6861:5 6892:26 6942:22 6943:23 6980:4

6983:10 6993:3 7019:14

Miltner 7000:8,10,13 7003:18 7004:22,23 7009:4, 9 7011:21 7012:11

mind 6870:19 6953:5 7031:16 7049:20

mindful 6913:2

mine 6833:9 6883:14 6986:12

minimal 6880:1 6933:11 6995:28

minimize 6934:1 6998:21 7027:4

minimizes 6922:17,22

minimum 6828:17 6831:10 6851:9 6926:21 6949:16 6950:2,3,16 6956:10 6957:1, 6,8,12 6958:17 6985:25 6995:15 6996:10,11,12 6997:24 7003:8 7013:14

Minneapolis 6901:17 6903:24 6904:20 6905:18 6906:21,28 6907:1 6986:23 6987:9 6988:3

Minnesota 6901:16,27 6905:3 6907:7 6952:1 6978:17 6987:5

minor 6940:14

minus 6857:27 6892:19,23 6893:22,23 6894:3,9 7038:15

minute 6819:12 6820:24 6849:19 6881:16 6973:19

minutes 6815:23 6848:4 6883:4 6964:18 6967:23 6999:27

mirrors 6925:23

misalignment 6823:22 6840:20

miscommunicated 6856:27

missed 6820:20 6991:22 7010:26

missing 7037:19,21

Mississippi 6926:27

misunderstanding 6986:12

misunderstood 6856:27

mix 6816:3 6922:11 6925:9 7029:26 7030:11 7050:11

mobile 6968:1

model 6830:5,8,11,12,14,18

6831:16,20 6832:9 6844:15, 20.21 6845:8.12.13.14.16. 20,27,28 6846:11,19 6847:8, 24,27 6848:3,16 6849:5,9, 10,11,13 6850:5,6,11,14,15, 22,24,26 6851:7,11,14 6852:2,21,24 6855:11,16 6856:7 6857:1,4,6,8,22 6858:3,23,27 6859:13,24 6860:2,21 6861:1,4,11,12,16 6862:13,15,19 6865:2,8,15, 18,25 6866:13 6867:8 6868:1,13 6869:9,14,22,25 6875:13,16,26 6876:4,5 6879:8,11,13,16,20,23 6880:1,4,20,24 6881:13 6882:1,4 6887:4 6888:3,9, 22,23,26 6889:1,17,19,21 6892:22 6893:1 6894:14 6901:28 6907:2,4,6,15,17,28 6909:4,6 6910:1,8 6912:10, 18,20 6921:1,21,24 6922:6, 10,20,22,26 6923:3,10,13 6924:19,26 6925:27 6926:20,24 6927:22 6928:18,23,28 6929:8 6931:11,13,21 6932:9,12,18, 28 6933:8,18,25 6934:4,9,15 6935:1,7,16,19,21,28 6936:1,5,13,14,15,22 6937:19 6938:2,4 6939:4,7 6940:1,11 6941:10,15,24 6942:11,19,25 6943:19 6944:12,21 6945:11,12,17 6946:5,10,14,24,27,28 6947:2,6,16,21,23 6948:4,8, 10,14,22,26 6949:1,6,9,17 6950:6.10 6951:17.26.27 6952:1,21,27,28 6953:2 6954:4,5,8,10 6955:3,18,21 6956:2,7,12,28 6957:2,4,7, 20 6958:1,5,8,11 6969:3,19, 22 6971:28 6972:10,19,26 6973:15 6974:1,6 6975:3,13, 22,25,28 6976:10,15,21 6978:10,11 6979:2,14,26 6980:14,21 6981:6,23 6982:6,13,16,19,24,25 6983:4,7,8,11,18 6985:4,5,7, 24 6986:4 6987:4,6 6989:15, 25 6990:20 6991:3,26 6992:10 6994:12.17 6995:7. 19 6996:3,8,13,15,20 6997:9,12,14 6998:2,17,20, 26 6999:4,17 7000:16,27 7001:4 7002:5,13,27 7003:4, 6,21,24 7004:3,28 7005:1 7006:22 7007:1,2,7,9,15 7008:5,6,7,10,22 7009:16,25 7010:7,24,25,27 7011:6,9 7012:2,3,5,9 7013:3,7,22 7014:26 7015:3,5,8,14,20, 23,25,26,27 7016:16,18 7017:4,16,17 7018:1,14,19, 25 7019:6,10 7020:23

7021:1 7022:6 7023:12,13, 20,26 7024:5,10,15 7025:2, 3,7,10,12,15,24,27 7026:14 7027:3,17 7028:1 7029:10 7031:1,20,24,25,27 7032:13, 25,26 7033:2,20,24 7035:15, 21,27 7036:3 7037:24 7038:14 7039:8 7040:28 7042:20 7043:25,27 7044:3 7046:5,11,17,20 7047:9 7048:1,26 7049:12 7050:7,9, 14,21,23 7051:10,18 7052:12,19

model's 6831:18 6943:17 7038:19

model-based 6996:4

model-generated 6924:21 6953:14 6956:18 6957:11,12 6987:7 7051:22

modeling 6921:8 6929:4 6933:19,21 6935:4,10,23 6936:9,20 6939:26 6942:22 6948:2 6954:9 6955:3,15,25 6981:27 6993:9 6997:17 7019:21 7031:18

models 6876:9 6920:11,13, 19,21 6923:1 6925:18 6929:5,7 6952:11 6955:8 6980:2 6998:16

moderate 6984:1

moderated 6919:17

modernization 6832:11

modest 6828:4 6850:10 6855:15 6856:17,18 6857:1, 3 6876:2 6880:5 6909:9,14 6927:9 6984:1

modestly 6825:3 6926:28

modification 6879:26

modifications 6857:21,24 6858:6 6862:18,22 6866:21 6868:1 6869:5 6875:13,25, 27 6878:19 6879:28 6895:6 6907:17 6940:14 6974:10 6991:24 6992:7,9

modified 6816:2,13 6817:7 6852:21 6860:22 6865:15 6877:25 6881:14 7009:15 7014:1,3 7042:10

modify 6924:23 7019:18

modifying 6851:7,19

moment 6846:25 6858:5 6866:27 6882:6 6883:12 6894:18 6895:14 6905:5 6964:15 6976:25 6983:2 6994:3

Index: Milk's..moment



Monday 6816:16 6882:16 6885:1

monetary 6923:10

money 6835:26 7051:3

Montana 7049:20

Montgomery 6926:18

month 6867:11,14 6922:12 6936:6 6970:8 7002:27 7003:1,3,7

monthly 6832:21 6838:27,28 6892:26,28 6990:17,22

months 6836:20 6847:6 6869:16,17 6925:18,19 6928:5 6937:4,7,8 6951:6 6990:23,25 7002:23 7024:12 7034:9

morning 6815:1,3,25 6817:24 6820:5 6842:24 6843:1,2 6882:18 6916:12 6935:14 6937:3 6943:22 6949:26 6952:10 6953:11 6965:21 7055:3

motivated 6943:8

motivation 6943:4

mountain 6860:19 6861:2 7044:5,9,10,11,12,14,21,23

move 6827:9 6868:16 6869:28 6872:18 6874:2 6875:9 6876:17 6900:13 6906:26 6907:8 6922:2,13 6927:2 6938:5 6946:6,10 6967:9,27 6968:4 6969:28 6997:1 7021:3 7038:12 7045:3 7049:26 7051:11,12,

moved 6868:18

movement 6830:13,19 6862:9 6944:5 6946:15 6969:25 6970:1 6977:19 7007:17 7044:13 7046:9

movements 6981:16 7007:19

moves 6980:11

moving 6817:19 6820:25 6827:11 6831:5,9 6859:2 6862:10,27 6870:1,7,12,23, 24 6871:2,26 6874:10 6875:10 6925:28 6934:1 6945:24 6967:22 6980:22 6994:19 7032:1 7042:15 7044:10

MPC 7027:14

multi-county 6925:16 6934:9 6972:1 6983:16 7007:20 7009:12,24 7010:3, 6 7011:5 7023:14,18 7036:10,13

multicounty 6922:28

multiple 6829:18 7006:23

multiple-county 7009:28 7010:12,23 7011:11,14

multiply 6970:3 7033:18

myopic 6932:13

Ν

N-I-C-H-O-L-S-O-N 6916:3

N-O-V-A 6960:25

N-O-V-A-K 6960:28

N-O-V-A-K-O-V-I-C 6960:24

names 6960:9 6961:13

national 6820:13 6821:4 6823:2 6830:5 6831:14,28 6832:9 6842:18 6843:4,13 6844:19 6845:7 6846:26 6850:9 6851:23 6852:1,12, 27 6855:10 6857:21 6858:6 6861:23,24,26 6862:1,2,4, 19,20,23,25 6863:10,14,17, 22,27 6864:1,10,14 6865:14, 24,26 6866:18,21 6867:15 6869:4,8 6872:18 6875:24, 28 6878:19,25 6879:6 6880:12,17 6881:27 6882:1, 9 6883:19 6885:2,22 6888:5 6889:7 6890:2 6893:11 6903:2 6907:17 6910:28 6911:1 6913:8,12 6915:12 6935:3,5,23 6936:9,17 6937:13,21 6938:24 6939:2, 9,11,17,20,21 6940:12,16,20 6941:6,8 6942:16,25 6946:22 6948:27 6950:19,24 6951:1,22,28 6955:26 6958:20 6959:8,9 6961:25 6962:3,10 6963:23 6968:15 6978:26 6983:21 6986:10 6988:28 6989:21 6990:2,25, 28 6991:9,15,21,23 6992:6 6997:9 6998:2 6999:12 7004:9 7011:23 7017:21 7025:4,20 7033:13,14 7034:2 7040:17,21 7041:9 7053:26 7054:2,20

nationwide 6849:21 6927:20

nature 6831:1 6839:15 6928:10 6938:22 6943:7 6955:11 7017:28

nearby 6879:2,20 6948:9

necessarily 6861:6 6862:8

6908:1 6912:28 6976:6 7035:23

needed 6823:7 6835:24,25 6844:11 6850:6 6851:18 6860:22 6864:3,12,24 6871:20 6878:6 6894:26 6898:1 6912:2 6927:2 6976:21

negative 6831:19 6991:28

nerd 6929:3,4

network 6869:10 6922:14,15 6923:9 6972:24 6981:7,10, 17 6996:27 6997:5 7004:1 7044:9,16,18 7049:25

networks 7046:24

neutral 6959:7 6999:16

news 6868:17

Nicholson 6844:25 6846:28 6850:23 6855:20 6886:2,11 6888:18 6890:10 6893:3,4 6907:14,20 6910:7 6913:5, 20 6914:7,28 6916:2,3,6,12 6918:9,26 6919:3,9 6929:12, 16 6931:7 6958:19 6960:8 6961:16 6967:13 7000:7,11 7009:4 7021:13 7051:25 7053:19

Nicholson's 6890:13 6913:23

nickel 6993:11

night 6882:16 6885:1 7001:16 7054:9

ninth 7008:1

NMPF 6823:6,8 6824:5,8,11 6828:9,15 6829:25 6830:3, 11,12 6831:8,11,13,22 6832:6,10,12 6840:13,17,25 6846:28 6854:27 6905:11 6966:16

NMPF's 6829:18 6830:17 6832:2,11,15,18

NMPF-19 6905:10

NMPF-35 6820:12 6822:7

NMPF-36 6916:23,26 6917:5

NMPF-36A 6917:5 7006:4

nod 6828:4

node 7028:13 7052:7

nodes 7028:5

nods 6953:27

nominal 6942:15

non-linear 7032:15

non-member 6914:27

non-representative 6845:3

nonetheless 6966:20,21 6995:8

nonfat 6932:9,16 6933:3 6934:21 6957:26 6970:28 6971:9 7030:1,4,7

noon 6929:15 7054:25

Norfolk 6926:18

north 6925:21 6927:11 6952:13 6953:4,18 6986:18 6993:25 7035:11 7037:2,21 7052:5,7

northern 6927:4

Northwest 6831:3

notably 6920:15

note 6821:18 6838:8 6870:4 6884:11,13 6885:1,12 6901:28 6974:5 7006:12,20 7011:28 7030:8

noted 6895:5 6928:8 6935:14 6937:2 6943:22 6952:10 6976:12 7000:16 7014:21 7036:17

notes 7045:15

noteworthy 6838:26

notice 6964:16,20 6965:6 6966:7 7009:22

noticed 7035:3

noting 6822:17

notion 6977:12,13

notwithstanding 6882:24 6942:13

Novakovic 6959:26 6960:18, 23 6963:17

Novakovich 6961:5

number 6818:12,19 6820:21 6822:14 6831:28 6834:4,22 6855:15 6856:17 6858:24 6866:3,15 6867:20,22 6868:3,8 6869:6,12 6883:27 6884:2 6885:10 6887:5 6888:24 6897:15 6898:4,27 6892:3,4 6897:15 6898:4,20 6900:20,26 6901:9,14,15,20, 25,26 6902:3 6903:9,10,14, 27 6904:14 6905:25,28 6906:28 6908:4,5,13 6909:4 6910:17 6911:19 6920:22 6931:22 6934:3,7,9,19 6936:23 6940:22 6941:5,19



6942:20,24 6944:20 6950:22 6957:3 6959:23 6962:9 6970:16 6973:13 6974:15 6977:16 6979:28 6984:7,11 6990:9 6992:15,18 7014:12 7021:24 7022:12,14 7032:8, 18 7053:3.9

numbers 6815:15,21 6816:16,19,20,21 6845:1 6847:18 6856:2 6857:4,21 6862:19 6867:1,6,25 6868:10,12 6881:4 6886:9 6887:6 6890:23 6891:11 6893:7 6897:19 6898:1 6900:2 6901:22 6902:10 6903:13 6905:16 6907:26 6908:6 6909:16 6910:19,20, 26 6911:4,28 6917:5,7 6936:2 6937:17 6939:10,22 6943:15 6945:6 6956:23 6973:2 6984:19 6988:25,26 6989:2,4 7014:26 7021:27 7043:10

numerous 6831:12 6861:23 7049:11

0

oath 6873:1 7043:3

object 6958:21

objection 6818:2,8,16 6900:16,22 6919:1 6965:1 7052:27 7053:5

objective 6857:8 6864:2 6869:14 6968:17,25 6969:2, 21 6970:6,12,20 6971:5

obligation 6947:15,18 7012:28 7014:5,8 7015:18

obligations 7013:6 7015:15, 21 7016:20,26 7053:17

Observatory 6916:19

obvious 6834:16 6899:9

occasion 6937:8

occasionally 7048:12

occasions 6936:23 7049:3

occupied 6914:8

occurred 6856:1 6909:20 7008:4

October 6815:1,4 6844:26 6855:12 6866:15 6869:19 6889:1,9,11 6890:21 6902:3 6911:15 6925:18 6926:3 6927:13 6931:1 6937:9,10 6940:2 6970:8 6989:22,24 6990:23 6995:5,6 7002:6,11, 18,26 7034:3,9,11 off-the-record 6886:21 6894:21

offer 6918:9 6919:13,20 6920:2

offered 6918:6 6952:13

offices 7004:10 7035:9

official 6920:8 6964:16,20 6965:6 6966:7 7009:22

officially 6852:15

offline 6984:6

Ohio 6926:23

omission 7052:15,17

omit 6901:21

omits 6899:14

omitted 6899:21 7037:26 7038:1

one's 7001:19

one-page 6857:23

online 6845:26 6897:28 6940:26 6941:14 6965:11 6978:21 6984:6 7004:7 7047:1

open 6848:28 6864:20 6943:1,3 6946:25 6948:17 6983:28 7016:7

opening 6941:9

openings 6941:3

operate 6829:7 6977:26

operated 6866:8

operating 6947:3 7033:6

operation 6840:5

operations 6864:18 6922:1 6928:27

opine 7027:22

opinion 6956:21,28

opportunities 6826:15

opportunity 6852:26 6866:26 6873:3 6875:22 6913:12 7034:20 7039:18 7041:11 7053:16

oppose 6958:21

opposed 6862:8 6870:16 6881:8 6907:9 7043:21

optimism 6914:17

optimization 6922:6 6969:19

option 6826:23

oral 6949:25

orange 6826:19 6895:8 6897:3 6923:18,23 7024:24

oranges 6897:9 6953:12

order 6816:8,9,24 6817:16 6823:7,15 6824:27,28 6825:7 6826:17 6827:15,17, 21,24,28 6828:13 6829:8,14, 27 6830:2 6832:1,11,19 6833:2 6840:5,16,21,22,24 6842:1 6843:16 6849:21 6850:2 6851:12 6852:6 6857:27 6870:18 6871:25 6872:11,21 6873:20,24 6875:3 6876:12 6877:18,21 6880:23 6884:18 6889:24 6891:24,27 6908:5 6910:15 6920:15 6924:20 6939:22 6940:16 6947:27 6948:6,7, 11 6956:22 6962:15 6963:20,28 6964:1,4,8 6967:1 6981:21,22 6989:9 6990:9 6996:11 7001:3 7004:17 7015:4,15,22 7033:9 7035:8

orderly 6829:11 6831:21

orders 6816:4 6818:16 6824:4,8,20 6825:3 6827:13 6829:7 6840:7 6841:1,19 6842:7 6870:3,4,6,11,12,14 6871:24,25 6877:27 6878:1 6947:25 6948:18 6982:19,27 6983:2,5 6995:8,9,20 6996:19 6998:3 7000:17,18, 20 7015:7,10,18,19,21 7016:1,13,28 7017:6,23

ordinary 6823:28

organic 6863:12 6864:5,6,17 6996:20,26,28 7046:28

organization 6928:18 6947:7

origin 6938:3 7033:4

original 6821:9,15 6926:8 6940:18 6955:2 6975:2 6978:25 7002:13

originally 6821:25 6840:23 6849:15 6880:12 6935:1,11 6938:20 6954:6 6977:4

originated 7006:19

outcome 6933:5

outcomes 6936:18 6993:17 7025:6

outdated 6860:13

outgrowth 6932:22 6977:4

outlined 6877:3

outpace 6837:23

outpaced 6838:4

outpacing 6836:19

output 6890:14 6923:12 6933:4 7002:6,7 7003:4 7008:12,14 7011:23

outputs 6830:11 6923:4 6929:7 6955:25 6998:20 7012:8

over-order 6828:20,24,27

overhaul 6934:28

overhead 6977:11,23

overlay 6945:6

overriding 6904:25

oversimplified 7019:2

oversimplistic 6993:11

overstating 7046:6

overview 6832:2 6917:11,19

Р

P-A-R-I-B-U-S 7020:8

P-E-T-E-R 6819:22

p.m. 6931:3 7055:5

pace 6836:16 6919:17

package 6816:22 6821:7 6823:25 6824:6

packaged 6827:6 6923:27 6938:8

pages 6821:6,21 6822:23,25 6880:11 6881:9 6884:14,16 6885:10 6895:7 6898:19 6911:8 6915:10

paid 6833:4 6962:3 7013:14

panels 6999:23

Panhandle 6859:28 6870:25 6871:7

paper 6884:21 6885:15 6964:14 7023:15 7024:16

paragraph 6823:4,16 6824:20,21 6829:23 6841:1, 2,15 6842:3,5,6,15 6861:22 6867:20 6869:27 6870:11 6878:17 6880:24 6888:8 6890:7 6908:8 7038:13,14

paragraphs 6821:16 6832:14



parallel 6874:21

parameters 6976:9

paribus 7019:27,28 7020:1, 6.8 7021:7

parish 6821:22 6829:23 6859:16 6887:10,11 6893:2, 12 6910:19

parishes 6824:23 6829:16 6831:25 6888:7

parse 6994:1 7028:20

parsing 7027:27

part 6816:22 6821:20,27 6837:11 6843:20 6844:13 6848:2 6849:7 6852:10,11 6857:9 6867:24 6868:18 6881:21,23 6886:12,20 6890:26 6897:6,7 6938:23 6942:11 6943:8.10.23 6944:8,10 6945:14 6948:1 6950:5 6952:15 6954:9 6956:16 6957:4 6958:23 6959:3 6962:14 6964:21 6965:27 6966:27 6970:11,23 6972:9 6974:11 6978:23 6981:26 6983:11.22 6985:16 6986:12 6993:16,24 6994:13 7000:21 7013:6,7 7014:23, 28 7016:21 7018:22.23 7025:11 7028:22 7035:9,13, 15 7040:28 7042:11 7047:18 7048:10 7050:16 7051:20 7054:18

participant 6818:28

participate 6864:8

parties 6817:26 6818:25 6873:18 6964:17

partnerships 6964:2

parts 6819:2 6821:12 6825:21,24,25,28 6826:1 6846:1 6908:9 6912:16 6949:25

party 7041:3

Paso 7007:22,26

pass 6882:15,18 6884:18

passed 6883:10 6884:11,12, 14 6967:1

passes 6839:15

passing 7001:16

passion 7016:7

past 6832:22 6840:3 6860:6 6886:9 6889:4 6920:16 6925:8 6963:1,2 6981:12 6985:1 6990:12,13 7022:2

7048:21

pattern 6925:21,23 6926:3 6927:11 6931:17 6953:10 6995:2,6 7033:16

patterns 6871:10 6923:2 6925:17 6942:9 6979:22 7007:5

pay 6835:24,25,27,28 6836:1 6873:21 6931:28 6932:5 6958:12,14 7001:9 7003:2,15 7016:13,23 7017:7

paying 6873:4

payment 6873:14 7001:10 7012:28 7014:4 7015:14,18, 20 7016:21 7017:14

payments 7016:27

pays 7018:4,6

peaks 6837:1

peculiarity 6897:11

pedigree 6845:14

peer-reviewed 7038:26

pen 6887:1

pencils 6866:11

Penn 6946:1

pennies 6882:28

Pennsylvania 6946:3 6985:17

pens 6879:25

people 6817:22 6849:28 6850:2,4 6854:20 6858:17, 20 6862:6,8,9,10,25 6868:26 6873:26 6874:14 6884:4,13, 24 6907:15 6915:14 6929:28 6940:24 6942:19,26 6944:19 6947:20 6959:5,23 6967:4 6971:19 6979:5 6982:3 6984:25 6992:3 6998:19 7015:26 7034:20 7035:7 7044:1,26 7048:13,21 7053:25 7054:27

people's 6819:5

per-day 6825:11

percentage 6872:12 6880:5 6985:14 6986:1 7008:15 7039:26

percentage-wise 7027:8

perfect 6861:16 6903:9 6944:16,26,27 7022:9

perfectly 6948:9 6956:24

perform 6844:20 6936:19

performance 6872:5,8,10, 22,25,28 6873:24 6874:1 6998:6

performed 6920:4

period 6825:14 6833:7,22,26 6834:1 6835:6,8 6836:7,8,23 6838:11,13,23 6840:4 6844:28 6867:14 7042:18

permanent 6965:15

permit 6908:6

permits 6990:28

person 6859:11 6874:7 6882:25 6884:6 6903:15 6905:1 6907:15 6935:19 6965:27 7039:20

personal 6940:24

personnel 6850:22 6869:13 6919:12

persons 6862:20

perspective 6832:17 6947:24 6948:10,11 6996:17

pertinent 6858:4 6869:16 6877:14 6882:4

Peter 6819:22 6820:2 6823:1

petition 6880:22 6881:17,19 6903:3

Ph.d. 6917:16

Phillip 6963:16

phones 6967:25 6968:9

phrase 6859:5 6874:7

physical 6922:22 6923:8 6931:25 6943:21 6970:22 6971:3

pick 6858:24 6913:26 7006:24 7038:19

picture 6943:6 6983:25,26 6984:2 7037:19,23

pictured 6836:4

pie 7039:24

piece 6844:10 6970:10 6991:13

pieces 6843:19 6942:23 6943:24

place 6894:21 6910:14 6927:24 6934:3 6943:1 6997:22 7005:26 7014:10 7035:16 7048:28 7051:15 **places** 6946:21 6953:12 6976:20 6994:5 6995:4 7044:4

plain 6946:4

plains 6993:25 7044:15

plan 6859:8 6930:5

planned 6848:27

planning 6849:11 6882:9 6886:14

plans 6913:3

plant 6830:13 6845:23 6846:6,17 6847:15 6848:22 6855:24,25 6869:23 6921:18 6922:11 6923:24,25 6924:8 6931:28 6932:1,4,8,9,11,12, 15,17,18 6933:2,3,4 6934:20 6938:7,27 6940:9,10,12,18, 21.25.28 6941:2.3.27 6942:1,3 6943:5,14 6944:4 6946:26 6947:2,3,10,14 6948:17 6951:8,20 6957:19, 25.26.28 6958:3.6.7.12.13 6969:26 6970:25,26 6972:14,15 6974:19 6980:11,12 6983:13,14,25, 28 6984:5,7,11,15,16,17,20 6997:22,28 6998:24 7001:1, 10.21 7003:28 7005:28 7006:8,9,12,19,27 7016:7 7023:5 7025:20 7026:2,7,8, 13,26,27 7027:2,12 7029:16, 21 7032:1 7034:28 7035:5. 10,11,12,14,20,23 7036:6, 11,12,22 7037:4,17,18,21,26 7038:2,5 7041:17 7046:15 7049:19,27 7050:1,8,20 7051:14 7052:11

plant's 7036:7

planted 6839:11

plants 6824:26 6826:28 6827:4.8 6828:21 6829:1 6845:25 6848:10,18,19,26, 27 6860:10,18 6865:16 6866:8 6871:4,8,16 6872:13 6873:6,9,11,16 6874:2,6,27, 28 6875:18 6877:2 6904:24 6919:25 6921:8.12.17 6922:8,13,18,19 6923:18,20, 27 6924:10 6925:14 6928:6 6932:6,14,20,24 6933:6,12, 14,15 6934:2,7 6940:11,13, 15,27 6941:9,13,21 6942:10, 11,28 6943:12 6946:25 6950:18 6956:19 6957:17,25 6958:16 6970:19 6972:4 6984:9,13 7000:21 7006:15 7007:21 7025:21,28 7026:18,19,20,21,22 7027:6, 13 7029:27 7035:1 7036:1,



24 7041:22 7045:22 7046:20,21,22 7048:4,5 7049:16,25 7050:11

play 6840:1 6958:28 7050:23

played 7041:8

plays 6828:10

pleasure 6875:22 6952:4

plentiful 6878:4,7,9

plenty 6849:14 6881:11

plunge 6836:27

point 6821:25 6830:12 6858:7 6861:4,5,19 6873:5 6874:1,25 6881:6 6896:1 6903:12 6907:27 6908:2 6910:10 6924:28 6935:22 6936:28 6938:3 6939:23 6940:11 6948:27 6950:19 6952:18,25 6954:15 6958:8 6967:20 6971:19 6975:12 6987:2 6999:5 7007:3 7012:9,27 7033:1 7037:2 7047:13,15 7054:15

point-to-point 6830:10 6861:6

pointed 6874:21

points 6830:9,26 6952:9 6971:13 6993:3 7025:8 7032:16 7042:6 7043:21 7047:18 7050:27

polarity 6898:9

policy 6823:2 6828:16 6918:1,4,6 6920:2,6 6958:24 6963:24 6966:14

pool 6873:10,11,25,26 6874:8 7016:8

pooled 7001:3

pooling 6816:16 6874:9 6947:26 7016:8

population 6827:4 6870:21, 24 6877:23 6921:16 6925:10 6927:24 6934:24 6972:6 6984:27 7003:27 7039:5

port 6985:6,13,15 7028:8,10 7052:6

portion 6837:19

portions 6832:4 6926:11

portrayed 6841:4

portraying 6841:5

ports 7028:5,7

posed 6915:15 6957:18

position 6865:20 6959:3

positive 6831:19 7002:28

possibilities 7019:15

possibility 6826:24 6935:7

possibly 6819:1 6914:3

post-ph.d. 6917:21

Postal 6896:13

posted 6817:15 6822:6 6882:17

potential 6832:19 6924:23 6999:1

potentially 7019:6

pound 6841:26

pounds 6892:26 6893:1,8,9 6932:1 6990:17,22,25 7001:8,14,21 7003:2,15

powder 6848:21 7027:13 7028:8

power 6845:17

PPD 6815:26 6816:5,9

PPDS 6998:6

practical 6922:7

Pratt 6963:16

pre-filed 6882:15

pre-submitted 6880:18 6881:6

preceding 7034:9

precepts 6829:28 6859:18, 20,21 6868:20

precise 6955:7

precisely 6843:13 6863:14 6901:24

precision 6847:2

precursor 7018:25

predicted 6951:26 6952:11

predictions 6843:8

preface 6963:21

prefer 6967:4

preferably 7008:22

prepare 6820:12 6830:15 6916:22.23

prepared 6915:3 6919:21 7054:14

preparing 6849:11 6851:5

present 6857:11 6971:21 6992:22 7007:9 7009:24

presentation 7053:16

presentations 6946:26

presented 6816:19 6839:28 6985:27 7006:4,13

presenting 6843:4,7

presents 6831:25

President 6823:1

press 6941:2

pretty 6835:9,22 6870:25 6890:16 6909:9 6932:27 6993:16 7036:19 7042:24

previous 6876:14 6920:14 6924:19 6927:6 6928:28 6931:14 6932:22 6982:22 6985:5 7014:13 7024:2,13 7028:2 7030:23 7042:2 7047:27 7052:15

previously 6815:10 6816:22 6819:25 6820:3,7,8 6828:13 6829:27 6830:4 6876:8 6933:18,20 6935:13 6946:27 6971:26 6972:26,28 6992:28 7014:21 7016:2 7017:9 7032:5

price 6816:6 6828:3,11 6830:1,5,14,16,25 6831:2,3, 14,22 6832:9,21,24 6833:27 6834:1,6,8,10,26 6836:26,27 6837:8,19,20,21,23,24,25 6838:25 6840:3.9.23 6841:13,25,26 6842:3,17,18 6843:17 6850:18 6857:12 6860:3.9 6861:26 6862:1 6873:14 6879:7 6880:5 6904:22 6907:3 6909:20 6910:11.16 6924:10.16.25 6925:3,27 6926:5 6938:11, 12,22 6940:2,3,4,7 6942:8 6943:18 6944:10,18,19,23 6945:3 6947:21 6948:6,8,11, 18 6949:10,11 6950:1 6951:7 6956:25,26 6979:11, 20 6985:23,27 6987:4,5,7 6994:18,27 6996:10 7000:22 7001:6,9 7013:11,14,20 7024:1,2 7028:23 7034:2 7047:23 7048:14,25 7049:3 7050:3 7051:2,5

prices 6816:7 6827:21 6828:1,16,17,18,24,27 6829:2 6831:10 6833:4,6 6836:4,19,28 6837:2,23,26, 28 6838:20 6840:9,10 6841:11,12,16 6876:27,28 6923:2 6938:21 6994:24 6995:13,27 7032:24,26 7048:27 7049:5 7050:28

pricing 6823:8,14,15 6824:3 6825:5 6828:20,28 6830:2 6831:16 6841:12,23 6979:9 6995:15,16 6996:11 7003:8 7048:22

primal 6923:6,7,12 6943:20 7012:9 7025:11

primarily 6859:8 6918:1,11 6935:27 6995:23 7026:5

primary 6869:7 6908:3 6913:23 6935:18,19

principal 6833:1,2 6922:20

principle 6831:10 6981:9 7010:19 7022:24 7023:6

principles 6858:12,14 6877:19

print 6885:13

printed 6882:23 6884:21 6966:9

prior 6845:21 6855:28 6858:7 6915:11 6918:2 6933:21 6940:20 7022:26 7023:21,23 7024:3

priority 6873:16 6915:1

private 6878:26 6886:16 6982:9

privilege 6820:26 6865:13 7037:10

pro 6873:4,13,18

problem 6922:7 6969:12 7011:12 7035:21

procedure 6821:13 6876:11

procedures 6858:19 6877:9

proceed 6815:14,20 6820:28 6844:13 6854:15 6913:15 6919:9

proceeding 6819:26 6868:27 6914:27 6965:2 6967:8

proceedings 7055:6

process 6821:7 6829:27 6843:26,28 6844:1 6847:21 6848:2,24 6850:4,20 6851:10 6858:5,19 6859:17 6864:3,9,23 6866:4 6867:24 6876:8 6903:7,18 6907:12, 28 6912:23 6929:1 6945:14 6948:4 6955:26 6967:4,5 6974:18 6981:26 6982:4,22



7025:28 7029:15 7037:27 7041:5 7042:5

processed 6921:28 6922:8 6923:25 6928:27 6980:11 6981:13

processes 6830:17 6831:23 6839:13 7013:27

processing 6824:26
6826:28 6827:4,8,16
6828:23 6829:1,10 6830:7
6919:25 6923:16 6924:3,9
6928:12 6938:27 6940:9,10
6941:16 6944:1,2,4,6
6970:13 6972:4,28 6973:10
6974:14 6976:27 6984:12
6996:28 6997:2 6999:2
7025:18,22 7029:21
7030:16,20,24 7031:1,3,4,8
7032:1 7036:9 7038:6
7048:4 7051:4

processor 6980:15 7013:6 7051:6

processors 6826:24 6828:25 6829:4,11 7000:25 7012:28

procurement 6828:2

produce 6884:18 7020:24

produced 6871:20 6927:23 6980:12,21 7026:12 7029:27 7047:14

producer 6828:5 6829:6 6836:26 6942:7 6980:15 6999:1 7001:2,9

producers 6823:2 6827:22 6829:10 6832:7,12 6843:13 6844:19 6845:7 6846:26 6850:9 6852:1 6863:1,11 6864:17 6865:14,27 6869:4 6879:7 6880:12,17 6881:27 6968:15 6992:6 7000:14

Producers' 6861:24 6962:10 6978:27

produces 7022:6

producing 6827:19,26,27 6840:1

product 6823:28 6824:1 6830:6 6833:21,23 6834:1,5, 6,10,11,12,13,14 6837:18,28 6840:2,3 6843:17 6921:15 6922:11,23 6923:8,25 6925:9 6928:11 6931:23,25 6934:14,17,18,25 6938:7,26 6941:22 6943:28 6958:3 6971:1 6972:5,7 6973:24 6974:2,13,20,24,26 6975:5 6977:7 6980:12 6985:6,7 6997:27 7006:9 7024:17

7027:14 7029:1,4,5,6,9,13, 14,18,26 7030:2,5 7042:15 7045:3 7047:9 7052:12

production 6827:3 6828:4 6829:6 6839:8,10,11,13,22 6871:7 6876:22 6921:14 6925:8 6926:1 6934:26 6976:20 6992:14,17,23 7008:2,4,17,22 7039:9

productivity 6839:9,12,23

products 6826:26 6828:20 6830:8 6832:27,28 6833:27 6837:4,5,6,23 6838:22 6839:20,21 6840:9,10 6871:11,12 6874:24 6878:13,15 6921:16,18,19 6922:9,15,18 6923:10,19 6925:4 6934:2,16,19,20 6940:26 6944:5 6947:10 6970:28 6971:7 6972:15 6973:12,14,18,21,25,28 6974:3,4,9 6976:27 6984:28 7003:28 7026:3,12 7028:8, 11 7029:17 7030:3 7044:10 7046:26 7047:10 7048:6

professional 6917:20 6929:9

professor 6993:20 7033:20

program 6823:18 6824:2 6827:15 6832:19,20 6833:3 6840:5 6875:3 6877:21 6917:28 6918:3 6958:23 6959:17,28 6960:10 6966:13 6977:3 6978:15 7031:14

programmer 6935:18

programming 6935:28 6974:12 6980:7

Programs 6919:13 6948:3 7031:17

project 6919:22 6961:28 6963:22

promise 6915:4

promulgated 6933:23

Pronounced 6961:4

proper 6877:10,14

properly 6816:13 6852:19

proportion 6839:18 7009:26 7026:11

proportions 6839:25 7029:23

proposal 6821:9,14 6824:10 6828:9,14 6829:18 6831:11, 18,28 6832:3,5,9 6841:3,9, 17,20,24 6842:19 6865:21

6869:9 6875:20 6879:11 6881:11,24 6882:5 6892:4,6, 12 6899:26,27 6902:19 6903:3,13,20,23 6905:11,16 6907:22 6908:3 6912:11 6913:15 6948:26 6955:19 6958:20,21 6959:10,11 7040:21

proposals 6820:13 6821:4,7 6824:8 6832:11,18 6843:20 6955:16

proposals' 6841:7

propose 6841:17 6842:4 6964:15

proposed 6824:7 6829:15, 26 6831:7,16 6832:16 6840:15 6841:5,24 6880:13 6881:7,24 6892:1,3,6,11,18, 21,22 6894:8 6904:15,26 6951:28 6962:18 6963:20 6991:24 7040:20 7041:1

proposing 6821:23 6842:18 6875:4 6876:28 6877:16 6903:22

proprietary 6863:6 6864:18 6961:24,26 6975:19

protein 6932:16

proud 6898:12 6961:5

provide 6849:2 6858:6 6866:4 6869:23 6877:6 6881:2 6882:23 6883:22 6890:10 6907:24 6916:13,17 6917:11 6924:4 6928:19 6937:13 6939:21,22 6947:22 6952:5 6955:18 6959:11 7011:13 7015:7 7017:10 7031:24 7032:19 7040:8

provided 6832:5 6844:25 6848:6 6856:9 6866:14,28 6867:6 6874:23 6882:3 6890:14 6893:5 6907:26 6916:27 6920:13 6923:5 6963:22 6989:21 6990:15,24 6991:18 7007:7 7016:1 7031:5

providers 6978:18

providing 6824:25 6829:11 6846:16 6862:21 6919:9 6921:4 6931:8,15 6939:13 6941:8 6959:1 6997:18 7011:26 7025:11

provision 6877:6 7017:5

provisions 6823:8 6824:3 6832:20 6840:26 6851:13 6872:11,19 6877:18 6947:26 7015:9 7016:8 **public** 6869:11 6886:25 6941:2 6964:9 6976:6

Publication 6966:13

publicly 6857:25 6972:8
 7035:17

published 6815:26 6816:3 7038:27

puff 6939:10

pull 7021:25

pulled 6872:7 7007:13

pulling 6872:3 6953:5 7039:16

purchase 6925:11

purchasing 7001:1

pure 6998:21

purple 6987:14,21,22,24 6988:9 6993:23

purple's 6987:23

purpose 6838:18,19 6862:28 6868:13 6874:5 6904:21 6907:3 6908:3 6956:2,13 6978:25 6979:19 7010:24 7013:13,16 7018:9

purposes 6845:15 6856:10 6860:1 6877:5 6890:19 6896:13 6907:4 6918:12 6921:21 6924:6 6976:1 7012:23,25 7038:6

pursuant 6882:22

purview 7017:12

put 6822:4 6834:6,23 6843:24 6851:8 6864:1 6882:9 6889:12 6913:22 6917:1 6935:20 6948:26 6956:3 6964:19 6981:3 6993:21 7011:12 7030:26 7035:15 7040:26 7041:15 7047:9 7054:14

Putin 6946:28

puts 7032:26

putting 6834:18 6859:10 6881:18 6970:22 7035:14 7043:20

puzzle 6819:6

puzzled 6909:18 7003:19

Q

qualifications 6918:26 quantify 6932:10



quantitative 6921:24 6923:2 6925:17 6928:23

quantities 6970:22 6973:8 7028:11

quantity 6972:27

quarter 6836:6 6877:11,25, 26

question 6846:2,22,23 6855:14 6857:15,20 6870:9 6873:7 6882:12 6885:18 6886:5 6888:18 6890:9 6893:3 6895:19 6900:5 6903:6 6905:1,14 6907:11, 14 6909:15,18,26 6912:21 6955:2,27 6957:15,18 6961:19 6979:5,19,24 6982:28 6991:8,21 6994:1 6996:4 7003:19 7008:20 7015:15 7018:14 7021:13 7025:23 7028:14 7032:22 7035:3,19,25 7036:26 7037:11,14 7039:19 7040:16 7043:23 7046:3 7048:15 7052:3,4

questioning 6961:20 7004:26 7037:16

questions 6815:13 6817:27 6844:18 6878:17 6880:10 6885:6 6900:13 6905:5 6907:19 6912:24 6914:25 6915:5,8,9,15 6929:14 6931:8 6952:3 6959:5 6960:5 6961:8 6962:9,10 6978:27 6985:18 6986:14 6987:2 6997:8 6999:4 7000:7 7009:1,2 7017:11 7021:10,22,23 7022:1,4,17 7024:14 7025:26 7034:21 7039:22 7047:5 7052:24

quick 6919:14

quicker 7024:16

quickly 6837:27 6890:20 6898:10 6966:19 7011:22 7043:1

quid 6873:4,13,18

quo 6873:4,13,18

R

R.B. 6966:8 7009:15 7023:17

rains 6999:20

raise 6916:5 6938:22 6979:8

raised 6851:20,21

raising 6906:21

ran 6847:12 6937:23 6950:15 6951:9,12 7012:1 7025:15

range 6860:19 6925:26 6953:18 7000:23 7043:18 7044:12,14 7047:20

ranges 6861:2 7044:5

rate 6833:25 6834:21 6836:19 6837:12 6838:12 6938:11 7005:16

rates 6938:12 6978:24

rational 6830:15

raw 6827:7 6828:22 6837:2, 18,20 6924:3 6948:14 6968:18,27 6970:10 7003:4

RB 6963:8,10 6965:13

re-ran 6941:10

re-read 6821:15

re-run 6939:22

reach 6828:19

reached 6838:28

reaching 6926:6

read 6816:16 6821:10,12 6832:14 6836:23 6853:4,23, 25 6857:26 6885:14 6897:26 6898:7 6919:16 6929:16,23, 24 6963:21 7043:10

read/spoken 6842:20

readily 7004:6

reading 6897:25 6971:24

ready 6883:5 6915:21,23 6930:11 7000:2

real 6947:16 7043:26 7050:6

real-world 6830:19

realign 6823:19

realities 6823:20 6847:22 6875:5

reality 6831:17 6875:17 6921:25 6928:24 6946:8

realize 6886:22 6956:2

realized 7042:8

reason 6855:9 6865:10 6905:14 6908:7 6911:3,27 6915:12 6916:16 6927:3 6952:14 6957:4 6967:4 6969:14 6991:17 6999:5 7007:1 7013:17 7037:7

reasonable 6846:15 6848:1 7007:4

reasons 6877:2 6879:17 6943:16 7022:13 7024:14 7037:28

recall 6822:3 6846:17 6847:15 6856:3,5 6859:24 6868:9 6869:6 6890:12 6893:6 6910:7 6945:8 6974:11 7002:19,21 7004:26

recalled 6914:3

recalling 6934:16 6975:1

receive 6845:8 6847:4 6855:10 6860:23 6944:18

received 6818:12,19 6822:5 6846:3 6847:7,11 6855:21 6856:20,22 6888:23 6900:20,26 7001:2 7009:27 7053:3.9

receivers 6978:19

receives 6964:21

receiving 6970:19

recent 6836:17,20 6837:25 6838:10 6844:28 6845:1,5, 19 6919:22 6922:25 6934:8 6936:25 6968:14

recently 6838:4 6920:5 6955:17 6959:24

recognize 6885:20,25 6943:5 6944:27 7000:17 7012:4 7015:27 7028:21

recognized 6827:25 6914:27 6964:11 6995:22

recognizes 6828:15 6997:23

recognizing 6848:28 6981:20 6995:7 7042:21

recollect 6847:3 6936:21

recollection 6899:4 6935:5 6966:23 6980:24 7047:17,25

recommend 6846:22 6907:13 6908:7

recommendation 6855:25 6869:8,24 6996:14

recommendations 6824:2,6, 7 6830:17 6875:20 6880:25

recommended 6830:23 6842:17 6857:12 7016:12,24 7017:22

recommending 6840:18 6858:26

record 6815:2,3 6819:16,19 6820:6 6821:11 6854:9,11, 13,14 6881:19,21,22,23 6882:7,8,10,15 6883:1,6,8,9,

24 6884:20,28 6886:4,7,20, 23 6887:26 6890:19 6894:20,22 6895:4 6896:22 6915:24,26,27 6917:2 6930:12 6931:2,3 6964:22 6965:5 6966:21 6967:7,8,27 6968:3,6 6991:1,13 7000:3, 5,6 7010:22 7011:2 7029:2,8 7030:27 7037:14 7055:2,5

recover 6837:27

red 6832:23 6834:21 6838:6 6879:24 6953:20,24

red-pencil 6865:27

redoes 6841:20

reds 6953:12

reduce 7033:15

reduced 6825:11

reducing 6826:15 6828:11

reduction 6826:20 6839:17 6998:28 7008:22

reductions 6839:14

refer 6848:22 6861:22 6926:16 6944:12 6973:1 7021:26 7040:7

refereed 6920:21

reference 6855:14 6868:20 6965:11 6999:12

referenced 6881:16

referred 6832:25 6878:18 6898:20

referring 6856:14 6873:19 6907:23 6989:11

refers 6893:8

refine 6830:14 6831:15

refined 7032:2

refinements 6934:3,6,22

refining 6944:21

reflect 6824:24 6831:8 6833:4 6837:7 6839:28 6861:6 6865:16 6875:17 7002:10 7015:28 7030:24 7032:24 7033:9 7042:10

reflected 6852:24 6909:21

reflecting 6926:1

reflective 6951:13

reflects 6925:24 7014:10

reform 6816:7 6825:1 6827:17 6828:1,13 6829:28 6840:21,24 6849:21 6850:3



6852:6 6876:12 6962:15 6963:20,28 6964:2,4,8 6967:1 6981:21,23 7034:18

refresh 6821:17 6899:4

regard 6818:14 6952:9 6955:27 6996:15

region 6859:14 6869:2 6905:2 7007:20 7008:25 7009:28 7036:10,13,15 7039:10 7049:25

regional 6858:3 6908:8 6921:16 6926:1 7033:9,25 7034:3

regions 6847:19,23 6848:25 6858:16 6865:25 6907:16 6909:12 6912:25 6923:1 6925:22,25 6926:28 6972:2 7009:12,24 7010:3,13 7011:6,11 7023:14,18 7036:20 7039:10,12

regulated 6830:15,23,24 7003:20,25,26 7004:19

regulation 6824:1 6996:19 7004:4.5

regulations 6823:15 6840:17 6841:3 6880:23 6908:5 7000:20

regulatory 6827:14 6832:20 6833:2 6841:5

reincorporated 6841:19 6842:2

reinforce 6997:12

reinforces 6997:15

relate 6934:22

related 6818:6 6820:13 6940:7,8 6977:4 7013:28 7016:6 7033:12 7044:18 7048:22

relates 6938:5 7033:5

relation 6839:18

relationship 6954:28 6969:18 6970:27 6977:17,18 6979:2 7004:13 7032:10,14, 15.25

relationships 6830:14 6851:6 6860:9,13 6921:27 6928:17,25 6931:26 6947:8, 13 6948:9 7044:2

relative 6816:20 6826:27 6827:6 6833:28 6834:8,17, 21 6835:2,4 6836:18 6838:23 6839:28 6850:26 6923:9,22,24 6924:21 6925:25 6938:22 6958:13 6982:14 6988:4 6993:27 6994:5,8 7004:24 7010:11 7032:16 7046:18

relatives 6924:16,25 6925:3 6945:3 6947:22 6949:10 6950:2 6985:23,27 7001:6 7028:23

relevant 6877:24 6924:28 6928:19 6939:13,28 6944:21 6945:18 6946:21 6948:13,28 6975:28 7001:12 7031:6 7040:4

reliability 6827:12 6870:2,7, 13 6871:26 6874:11 6875:11

relied 6862:10 6976:18 7013:12,16 7015:25

relies 6993:1 6996:7 7003:26

rely 6981:10 7003:25

remain 6815:8 6819:28 6826:25 6827:4,16 6883:24

remained 6824:28

remaining 6969:4 7019:27 7020:14.23

remark 6995:21

remarking 6941:26

remember 6819:16 6821:26 6848:21 6854:6 6902:10,22 6905:18 6916:16 6941:19,25 6957:22 6959:15 6962:19 6979:28 6980:27 6999:10 7033:26 7034:15 7036:4

remembered 6898:25

remembering 6981:11 7047:27

remind 6975:16 7019:12

reminded 6905:4

reminding 6968:8

repeat 6840:6 6870:9 6873:7 6892:9 6902:25 6909:26 6992:16

repetitive 6821:11

replaced 6957:25

replacement 6825:21,24,25, 28 6826:1 6977:12

replaces 6975:14

replica 7009:23

report 6920:10 6962:19,21, 22 6963:7,8 6965:28 6994:27 6995:1 7004:11

reported 6832:21 6924:5 6937:9 6990:2,21 7004:15, 16 7025:9

reporter 6865:4 6895:2 6919:15

reporting 6824:2 6989:14,28 6996:9

reports 6998:11

repositions 6915:18

represent 6885:7 6911:10 6920:8 6921:26 6923:17,19 6925:19 6928:25 6931:21 6934:17,28 6937:4 6957:5 6958:12 6963:7 6970:23 7000:14,23 7004:4 7007:6 7035:1 7037:4

representation 6831:24 6846:13 6896:22 6951:15 6955:8 7009:17 7010:16

representative 6939:5

represented 6836:4 6923:22 6998:27 7006:16 7007:20 7010:10 7017:16 7039:27,28 7052:16

representing 6830:27 6832:6 6839:4,24 7001:5,9 7005:21 7036:24 7052:11

represents 6828:4 6837:5 6839:19 6923:9 6928:15 7036:15

reprimanded 6929:17

request 6881:1 6959:8 6961:23

requested 6883:26 6885:11

requesting 6840:25

requests 6824:12

require 6974:24 7016:12

required 6825:11 6922:23 6942:14 6977:14,15 7011:10 7016:23,28 7038:28

requirement 6958:26 7017:15

requirements 6825:13 6992:15,18,24

requires 7017:6

requiring 6826:24

research 6823:2 6919:22 6920:4,26 6965:13,17 6966:4 6991:11 6996:16 7038:26

researcher 6920:17 6935:15

reserve 6826:18 6830:26,28 6831:4 6906:27

resistance 6828:23

resource 6917:17

resources 6840:18 6864:26

respect 6846:5,6,9 6848:7 6859:27 6860:11 6862:18 6872:11 6881:28 6899:9 6959:20 6975:19 6986:13 7015:10 7042:11

respected 6879:22

respecting 6947:17

respective 6833:6

response 6878:17

responses 6995:27 6999:1 7014:13

responsibilities 6936:4

responsibility 6829:20 6935:12

responsible 6831:12 6855:22 6861:24 6862:9 6877:21 6878:28 6920:17 7032:7 7039:16

responsiveness 6996:2

rest 6826:7 6899:24 6939:7 7009:2 7026:14

restriction 6971:6

restrictive 6825:19

resubmitted 6822:3

result 6828:26 6839:11 6888:9,12 6889:1 6932:3 6939:15 6942:17 6974:23 6980:22 6983:9 6995:16 6996:26 7002:14 7039:7 7045:10.21

resulted 6823:25 6831:8 6839:24 6856:28 6880:19 6894:14

resulting 6839:20

results 6830:14,18 6831:16, 18,20,22 6844:12,15 6845:8 6846:3,10,11 6847:4,23,25, 28 6848:3,16 6850:5,6,14 6851:15 6857:1 6858:3,22, 27 6860:21 6861:16 6865:2, 8 6866:13 6868:1 6869:14 6875:14,17,26 6876:3 6879:11,12,16 6880:3,4 6881:14 6888:23,26 6889:9, 10,19 6894:14 6899:23 6907:2,6,18 6908:1 6909:6 6910:1 6919:22 6923:5



6924:5,19 6925:13,17 6928:19,28 6935:28 6937:13 6939:16 6941:11,24 6942:15,26 6943:7,18,19,20 6944:12,22 6945:12 6948:4, 14,22,26 6949:24 6950:7 6951:2,27 6952:7,27 6955:18 6957:26 6979:2 6981:23 6982:6,24 6989:15, 20 6991:26 7013:5,16 7022:13,22,23 7025:3,17 7027:23,24 7031:19 7037:20,24 7038:14,20 7039:1 7040:16,20,21 7043:25 7046:5,11,23 7047:8

resumed 6914:15

retail 6833:4,6 6836:3 6837:1,3,6,8,19,22,28 6839:20 6840:9,10 6922:21 7029:24

retain 6844:20

retired 6920:6 6960:3,12,15 6965:12

retirement 6959:23

retiring 6960:1

return 6874:17 6913:24

returned 7002:6.7

returning 6874:19

returns 6913:26

revenue 6874:19

review 6921:20 6928:27 6941:27

reviewed 6816:23 6825:1 6828:13 6940:12 6942:25 6962:22,24 7018:3

reviewers 7038:27

revised 6825:1

revising 6921:21

Rhode 7008:17

rid 7009:2

ridge 6927:3 6986:17

right-hand 6836:21 6839:2

rigorously 7039:18

ring 7045:12

rise 6926:9

risen 6828:6

rising 6925:22

River 6926:27

Riverside 6912:5,17 6988:8

riveted 6988:28

road 6825:19 6830:10 6861:4 6869:10 6922:14,15 6932:12,24 6933:7 6958:7 6978:5 6981:6,10,17 7032:12 7044:8,9,16 7050:19

roads 6861:8

robustness 6966:20,21 6968:12,13

role 6828:10 6935:27 6939:25 6958:19,28 6959:1 6974:21 7041:8

roll 6842:9

rolling 6825:12 6843:23

room 6817:23 6863:15 6868:26 6901:8 6905:27 6911:9 6952:2 6967:3 6982:1

rooms 6863:16 6866:8

Rosenbaum 7012:13,15,16 7020:5,14,18,20 7021:8 7037:17

Roswell 7007:14

rough 7023:17

roughly 6879:21 6926:26 6988:11

route 6938:7

routes 6955:10 6977:16 7032:8,11,12 7045:6

routinely 6914:26

routing 6972:15 7007:8 7024:23 7045:8

routings 7051:14

row 6902:3 6988:25 7001:27 7002:4

rows 7002:15

rule 6823:28 6962:18 6963:20

rulemaking 6966:28 6967:6

rules 6882:22

run 6845:12,13,15,27 6846:7,11,12 6847:20 6849:5 6867:11 6886:28 6910:3 6911:14 6925:18 6935:21 6936:1 6937:28 6939:17 6940:1,17,19 6949:9,17 6954:6,16 6979:16 6991:4 6995:13 7008:5 7023:21,25 7025:3 7032:8 7034:27 7035:24

running 6845:28 6938:20 6939:16

runs 6844:25 6850:21 6851:12 6880:20 6882:1 6898:3 6910:9 6991:4 7035:22

ruthless 6998:28 7016:4

Ryan 7000:13

S

Sally 7054:15

San 6870:28 7045:1

satisfied 6969:5

satisfying 7049:17

save 6882:28 7047:6

scaffolding 6945:2

scaling 6934:11 6953:16

scenario 6879:23 6938:20 6985:10 7019:5

scenarios 6939:27 6940:6, 17 6951:5,9

scheduled 6941:13

scheme 6986:28 6987:26

schemes 7041:26

School 6965:16 6966:2

science 6815:27 6816:3,23 6917:15

screen 6815:24 6817:14

search 6966:3

season 6937:5

seasonably 6867:21

seasonal 6908:6,9 6926:7, 11 6994:27

Seattle 7028:8

secondhand 6982:3

seconds 6854:17

Secretary 6819:1,7 6824:12 6830:1 6840:13,25

sect 6946:4

section 6821:6,8 6832:15 6840:11 6841:11 6842:2,14 6913:2,11 6986:20,23

sections 6821:16 6840:27 6841:16 6842:1,5,7 6993:23

Sector 6921:26 6922:3,5 6927:21 6963:15 6966:11 6968:24 6969:20

seeking 6823:26,28

Select 6863:1,20,22 6864:5, 6,17 6865:15,18 7000:14

selected 6821:16 6868:5,8

sell 6964:14

semi-lost 6959:23

seminar 6864:21

senior 6935:15

sense 6865:11,12 6869:18 6880:3 6882:14 6893:15 6907:9 6914:25 6933:28 6945:25 6951:23 6977:14 6998:26 7025:8,27 7026:17 7028:24

sensitive 7038:15

sensitivity 6836:26 7039:1

sentence 6826:7 6891:17 6999:8 7023:19 7038:13 7045:17.26

sentences 6817:8

separate 6841:17 6884:19 6896:8,11,12 6975:12,13,22 6976:10 7029:26 7031:23 7047:2

separated 6841:21 6996:25 7029:21 7030:18

separately 6853:26 7017:7 7032:26

separates 6926:27

September 6821:25

sequential 6887:6 6901:23

Serbian 6960:24 6961:5

series 6821:15 6823:12 6949:10 6968:26 7023:25 7031:2 7041:22

serve 6827:10 6869:28 6875:9 6946:8

Service 6896:13 6924:18 6930:4 6963:25 7021:11.13

serving 6828:25 6859:27

session 6815:1 6931:1 6935:14

set 6833:7,11 6851:1 6881:4 6933:19 6934:14,23,24,25 6940:17 6946:9 6955:4 6966:5 6969:3 6977:16 6978:23 6979:15 6988:17,18

Index: resumed..set



6993:17 6995:13 7000:19 7003:10 7013:13 7015:26 7041:7 7049:8 7051:17

sets 6988:19

setting 6858:25 6928:3 7012:25 7013:11 7017:4 7025:13

shade 6833:1 6987:22

shadow 7048:22,27 7049:3, 5 7050:3,28 7051:2,5

shape 6886:18

share 6837:5 6882:25 6941:5

shared 6936:4,7 6949:24 6955:24,27

shed 7002:23 7008:10

sheets 6843:18

shifted 6830:28 7010:8

shifting 6871:11

shifts 6921:16 7039:4 7040:5

shines 6999:21

shipments 6997:3

shipped 6872:12

ships 7001:16

short 6821:18 6895:27 6925:19

short-term 6947:5

shortages 6825:20,21,26 6826:2

shorten 6896:17 6962:8 6964:17 6989:7

shorter 6937:6

shortfalls 6829:2

show 6833:27 6835:6 6869:22 6880:3,27 6902:8 6926:11 6927:13 6947:16 6977:18 7002:17 7006:9,26 7007:16,18 7012:5 7038:2,7 7039:24 7040:5

showed 6847:27 6848:3 6859:24 6879:13 7019:6

showing 6819:17 6923:27 6986:9 7011:7,26 7037:25

shown 6831:24 6832:27,28 6836:26 6843:17 6923:15,20 7007:9 7038:3

shows 6834:20 6835:23 6836:3 6923:15 6924:1,27

7005:2 7011:3 7033:11

shut 6942:4

sic 6819:5 7020:5

side 6816:11,17 6836:22 6839:2 6932:8 6959:18 6980:23 6981:18,19 6985:8 7012:9 7051:1,5

sides 6959:5

signed 7054:21

significance 6838:17 6847:16 6868:11

significant 6825:21 6826:9 6827:10 6865:11 6870:1 6875:9,24 6881:28 6897:10 6899:23 6933:15 6934:3,11 6942:6 6952:8 6975:11 6979:21 6984:21 7008:10

significantly 6825:10 6868:14,15 6879:9 6927:5 7050:3

similar 6831:1 6835:15 6879:21 6886:3 6923:1 6925:17 6926:4 6927:11 6933:1 6958:2 6969:4 7007:23 7010:4,17,18 7011:3,5 7024:28 7025:6 7032:12

similarities 6933:27 6954:8

similarity 6982:5

similarly 6841:25 6868:7 6874:26 6885:25 6897:2

simple 6835:22 6838:26 6841:10,22 6867:23 6890:4,

simpler 6907:12 6963:9 7019:22

simplification 6921:25

simplified 7021:1,2

simplify 6841:21 6897:8

simplistic 6912:22,26

simply 6869:23 6877:16 6887:4 6964:14 6982:28 7015:7,22

Sims 6832:5 6854:27 6859:6 6875:22 6914:23 7054:10,14

simulate 6977:15

simulated 6925:15

simulation 6949:17 6950:7 7031:14

simulations 6941:12 7033:24

Simulator 6921:26 6922:3,5 6927:22 6963:16 6966:12 6968:25 6969:21

simultaneously 7048:2 7049:13

sincerely 6840:13

single 6841:7 6867:20,22 6868:3 6882:25 6888:24 6897:3 6908:5

singled 6841:7

sir 6886:18 6898:6 6961:9 7011:18 7052:6,20

sits 6930:8

sitting 7035:7 7050:1

situation 6871:15 6958:6 7007:23 7018:24 7050:6

size 6816:20 6845:17 6879:26 6884:21 6901:6 6923:21,23 6984:1 7005:11 7012:3 7024:28

sizes 7024:25

skim 6841:12,13 6842:3 7029:20 7030:2.4

Skipping 6823:4 6840:11

slated 6941:17

Sleper 6843:25

slide 6816:3 6923:14

slides 6815:24 6816:13,15 6817:7

slightly 6836:6,10,11,19 6837:13 6838:5

slope 6830:25 6979:22 6986:1,2 6994:15,16,17,21

slopes 6831:3

slow 6971:25

slower 6861:9

slowly 6824:16 6954:19

SMA 6868:27

small 6879:15 6885:13 6923:1 6932:27 6944:18 6946:4 6959:4 6984:14,17 7007:1 7009:16,24 7010:7, 25 7024:15 7036:16 7038:18 7051:18

smaller 6837:5,21 6922:28 6923:12 6925:15 6927:15 6986:26 6987:24 6988:6

6997:2,3 7005:18 7006:22 7009:27 7012:2 7023:13,20 7024:16,28 7025:10 7026:8, 16,22 7034:27 7035:21,22

smallest 6839:25

smartest 6914:13

so-called 6929:8

solar 6999:23

sold 7029:24

solely 6827:26

solicit 6941:6

solids 6932:16

solution 6829:15 6923:6,7,9 6924:1 6942:11 7022:9

solutions 6951:18

solve 6850:24 7011:9 7012:3 7048:1

solved 6850:25 6852:20 7011:13

solves 6922:7

somebody's 6986:12

Sommer 7053:27 7054:3,8, 13

sort 6833:1 6849:7 6856:17 6858:18 6859:18 6865:18 6875:6 6941:16 6944:17,25 6945:16 6948:6,12 6959:22 6971:17 6974:19,24 6985:11,19 6998:10 6999:9, 12 7002:16 7015:13 7023:2 7031:2 7032:17 7045:7

sorts 6862:12

sought 6879:5

sound 6913:28

sounded 6930:4

sounds 6914:1,13 6929:19 6983:24

source 6951:21 6959:7 6965:19 7019:20 7021:4,7

sources 6869:11 6921:1 6940:23 6976:13 7019:9

south 6870:22 6925:22 6952:20 6993:26 7019:2,8 7020:22 7035:9

Southeast 6825:2 6831:6 6849:25 6850:1 6868:21 6869:2 6878:4 6890:27,28 6906:17 6925:28 6926:5 6927:4 6952:6 6986:16 7016:13 7017:5,23 7051:1,



11,20

Southeastern 6830:2 6841:19 6842:1,7

Southern 6981:13

Southwest 6816:8,14,25,26 6817:9,10 6818:15 6851:25 6871:25 6872:21 6876:23

space 6948:9 6958:15

sparser 7049:25

spatial 6851:3,6,17 6852:11, 19 6919:23,24,28 6920:3,11, 14,18,28 6921:8,11,20 6922:4,6,25 6923:2 6924:1, 4,10,12,14,21,27 6925:2,14 6926:3,4,12,13,20,24 6927:18,20,27 6928:2,4,16, 18 6931:16,17 6934:7 6944:10 6950:10 6952:11, 19,22 6953:2 6956:1,18 6959:12 6979:23 6987:7 6994:11 6998:14 7000:22.28 7001:13 7003:9 7008:10,23 7012:6 7013:4,10 7015:23 7022:14 7041:28 7047:13,24 7048:25

spatially 6943:26

speak 6854:4 6890:1 6907:14 6939:11 6946:23 6961:20

speaks 6909:15

special 6960:24

specialists 6843:25 6846:13

specific 6834:25 6837:11,17 6881:13 6920:2 6925:13 6940:15,16 6942:2 6975:17, 18 6980:27 6985:6 7001:19 7016:20 7034:13,15,16 7036:2,4,23 7050:17

specifically 6847:26 6848:24 6851:8 6852:1 6855:25 6856:7 6858:16 6865:15 6870:25 6875:6 6889:16 6905:2 6912:25 6924:2 6952:26 6964:1 6990:16 7031:9

specifics 6904:28

speed 6896:28 6963:5

spell 6819:21 6915:28 6960:9,15,19 6965:26 7020:3,10

spelled 6963:18

spelling 6961:13

spend 6835:26 6854:28 6855:2 6898:16

spent 6929:19

spiderweb 7024:24

spikes 6836:27

spits 7043:27

sponsored 6991:10

spot 6953:20,24

spread 6907:9,10 6988:4,10 7047:19

spreads 6816:6

spreadsheet 6909:24 6910:27

spreadsheets 6866:27 6881:28 6890:4

spring 6845:9 6866:15,22,24 6867:1,11 6868:5,10 6888:10 6901:28 6907:11 6994:26 6995:14,16 7002:10 7024:12

springtime 6844:23

spritzing 6985:14

St 6926:9

staff 6864:12

staffs 6823:10 6876:1

stagnation 6836:28

stair-step 7051:20

stake 6999:20

stand 6818:22 7039:21

standalone 7031:13 7032:9

standard 6833:20 6861:4 6877:9

standards 6872:5,8,10,23, 26,28 6873:25 6874:1 6998:6 7030:9

standing 6894:24

stands 6965:13

Star 6832:6

start 6821:5 6834:7 6843:3 6854:16 6887:2 6895:26 6898:18 6931:13 6945:24 6950:7 6969:16 6987:3 7000:15 7015:15 7022:5 7025:25 7033:19

started 6835:5 6836:22 6843:23 6858:6,8,9 6899:8 6957:16 6967:19,21 7008:16 7031:27 7035:27 7042:4 7046:28

starting 6830:12 6832:16

6834:5,15 6842:16 6857:10 6898:2 6907:27 6908:2 6968:23 7033:16 7038:25 7047:15

starts 6985:25 7045:26

state 6819:21 6869:27 6883:25 6887:13,15,17 6891:17 6912:5,16 6915:28 6920:24 6946:1 6960:8 6967:16 6985:17 7006:7 7007:17 7008:1 7009:13 7017:9 7019:19

state-level 7004:9

stated 6875:21 6880:25 6998:1 7006:1 7014:12 7016:2

statement 6822:28 6843:11 6875:12 6919:21 6920:8 6925:6 6929:11 6931:10,14 6937:3 6943:22 6982:5 6999:8 7021:24 7038:25 7045:9

statements 6917:10

states 6824:24 6829:17 6831:1 6839:26 6875:19 6917:24 6919:24 6924:12 6927:11 6931:18 6940:27 6942:9 6943:26 6968:24 6969:20 6972:3 6973:23 7004:10,11,12 7007:4 7051:2

stating 6974:7 7033:26

statistical 6977:17 7004:13 7032:10,14

statistics 6832:22 6917:14 6938:13 7004:9,17

statute 6967:2

stay 6903:19

stayed 6834:10 6838:12

steady 6836:16

steep 6926:9 6949:11

steeper 6830:27 6925:28 6926:5 6994:15,16,17,19,22,

steepness 6979:9,21

stems 6837:2

step 6820:23

Stephenson 6850:23 6887:22 6920:5,20 6935:6, 22,27 6955:15,18,28 6956:11 6959:25 6960:1,15 6961:20,26 6963:18 6976:16,23,26 6977:2,14 6978:10,16 6988:1 6992:9 7024:21 7026:6 7030:17,20 7032:7 7037:9 7039:15 7040:8

Stephenson's 6976:19

Steve 7012:16

stick 6848:2 6908:15 7021:23

sticky 7040:11

stock 6825:12

stop 6897:23 6942:4 6988:25

stopped 6843:7

stopping 6897:27 6959:16

stores 6997:3

story 7010:17,18

straight 6954:11 7042:14

straightforward 6890:17,19

street 6896:27 6932:7 6957:17.19

stressed 6828:12

stresses 6829:19

stretch 6883:4 6999:27

strike 6841:15,28 6905:20

strong 7049:23

struck 6841:22 6939:6

structural 6823:20 6825:17 6828:18 6877:13

structure 6876:13 6877:17 6880:23 6925:24 6935:1 6941:15 6954:8 6983:11 6993:9 6996:19 6997:27 7015:22 7032:2

structures 6997:20 7030:25

students 6967:15

studied 6974:17

studies 6823:27 6927:18 7030:24,26 7031:8

study 6823:7 6831:22 6843:12,14 6844:12,21 6845:12 6963:19 7036:14

stuff 6967:2 6979:15

subject 6845:1 6922:22 6966:20 6968:12

submission 6886:1 6902:25 6903:3

submissions 6885:11



submit 6903:12 6964:20

submitted 6821:25 6824:8 6880:21 6881:6,20,28 6884:28 6885:2,4,5,8,22,27 6899:5 6903:4 6905:16 6910:28 6956:17 6964:10 6973:26 6976:1

subsequent 6851:14 6861:20

subsequently 6821:12 6968:14

subsidizing 6829:2

substance 6855:7

substantial 6830:22

substantive 6921:13 6925:7 6927:25

substitute 6842:15

substitutes 6899:15

subtract 6904:10 6915:5

sufficient 6900:14 6931:24

suggest 6924:23 6957:12 6988:3 6992:22 6993:25 6995:15 6997:4 7024:4 7051:18

suggested 6940:13

suggesting 6952:22 7002:26 7003:12 7013:9

suggestion 6952:14

suggestions 6856:4

suggests 6921:6 6925:27 6987:4,6 7047:24

summarize 6968:12

summary 6831:28 6855:17 6857:23 6917:1 6919:13,20 6920:4,26 6953:11 7022:5, 12

summer 6843:15 6847:9 6858:10 6882:20

sun 6999:21

supplied 6880:27 6881:18 7018:28

suppliers 6870:2 6875:11

supplies 6824:25 6827:12 6829:9 6830:6 6870:7,13,28 6871:2,18,27 6874:11 6875:1 6876:25 6938:26 7003:27 7007:11 7010:12 7011:3

supply 6826:18 6827:15 6828:23 6830:9,26,28

6831:4 6852:17 6859:27 6864:10 6867:14 6870:23 6871:9,15,17 6877:7 6878:5, 7 6883:21 6886:1,11,12,14 6906:27 6918:22 6919:1,5 6921:1 6922:11 6923:8 6924:3 6925:4 6927:25 6928:1,10 6934:10,11 6937:6 6943:21 6945:28 6946:2 6947:1,14,24 6972:1, 27 6973:8 6993:6 6995:23, 27 6996:21,23 6997:4 7001:11 7005:27 7006:23,27 7008:11 7009:26 7010:23 7011:15 7015:7,22 7016:19 7018:20 7019:13 7021:6 7022:15,20,21,25 7023:3 7028:17 7036:18,21 7037:26 7039:6.17

supplying 6829:3,21 6850:7 6874:18,26 6875:17,18 6877:1 6878:28

support 6820:13 6824:10 6831:20 6882:5 6916:23 6917:2 6920:24 6955:15 6995:28 7047:3

supports 6828:15 6832:4

suppose 6991:9 7002:16

supposed 6967:27,28

surface 6830:5,15,23,25 6831:2,3,15,16 6832:9 6841:20 6842:17,18 6844:10 6846:15 6857:12 6859:7 6860:12 6861:27 6862:1 6924:10 6925:27 6926:5 6933:23 6938:23 6940:4 6944:10,23 6949:15,27 6950:8 6979:9,23 6994:18 6995:26 6998:15 7000:22 7003:6 7013:4,11,21 7019:13 7024:1,2 7043:15, 16 7047:14,23,25 7048:14

surfaces 7005:21 7047:9,21 7048:2.11

surplus 6925:25 6937:5

surprise 6882:20

surprising 6903:17 6912:1 6980:22

swear 6872:28 6916:4

switch 6898:21 6936:1,16 7018:13

switching 6941:21

sworn 6815:8,10 6819:28 6820:3,7 6916:7

synonym 6980:7

synthesize 7022:2

system 6819:13 6829:9,14 6831:21 6873:9 6922:24 6955:7 6967:24 6993:2,17 6995:15 6996:11 6998:22 7003:8 7013:5 7015:4 7016:4,16 7027:4 7028:22 7042:12 7045:6 7048:10 7051:9

systematic 7046:7,16

systematically 6927:21

systemwide 6921:4 6922:17 6934:1 6944:26 6985:12 6993:14 7014:17 7018:7

Т

table 6968:19,24 6973:5 7029:1

takes 6822:24 6861:3 6922:10 6950:2 6984:20 6998:13 7039:4

taking 6847:20 6851:6 6889:8,9 6919:15 6932:19 6933:8 6935:11 6956:11 6984:6 7028:8 7043:25

talk 6819:12 6854:26 6876:16 6913:14 6923:3 6931:11 6933:17 6945:4 6949:7 6953:8 6966:20 6971:10,14,15,21 6975:27 6987:16,17 6988:24 6998:16 7019:12 7022:5 7038:11 7041:12 7044:4 7048:13

talked 6856:16 6863:24 6872:4 6953:10 6961:22 7022:13 7025:18,19 7034:17 7035:12 7039:14 7043:24,28 7044:2 7047:7 7048:9

talking 6856:14 6935:17 6941:20 6945:8 6954:3 6982:14 6994:6 7018:5,15 7023:12,21,22,23 7030:28 7031:12 7036:1 7037:27 7038:10 7045:18 7046:11, 12,28 7048:25 7049:7

tanker 6826:25

tap 6951:22

taper 6954:18

task 6832:10 6843:24 6845:24 6847:18,20 6848:22 6852:22 6858:15 6863:28 6864:9 6866:3 6868:24 6875:4 6881:12 6909:11

tasked 6935:15

Taylor 6883:23 7000:1 7021:15 7043:4 7048:15 7051:27 7052:4 7053:25 7054:1,6,17,27

team 6817:25 6818:24 6823:13 6935:26 6937:14 6940:12,16 6942:25 6946:23 6948:1 6951:22 6954:9 6991:10

technical 6822:4 7022:4

technically 7043:16

techniques 6830:16

television 6819:18

televisions 6968:1

telling 6863:26 6865:12 6874:17 7050:4,5

ten 6833:25 6834:9,11,16 6883:4

ten-minute 6854:7 6915:18

tend 6938:22 6970:21 6979:8,22 6997:4,12 7004:10 7026:21 7027:15

Tennessee 6927:16

tens 6934:17

term 7019:24

terminology 6944:14 7029:13 7030:2

terms 6846:21 6854:2 6861:10 6881:8 6886:15 6888:7 6904:28 6932:15 6944:4 6947:17 6954:26 6970:7,20,21 6971:3,4 6980:18,22 6991:13,24 6995:26 7005:14 7015:4 7022:27 7026:1,2 7048:20

terrain 6861:7

territory 6896:15

test 6967:20,24,26 6968:2

testified 6815:11 6819:25 6820:4,7 6821:3 6916:8 6918:11

testify 6832:8 6899:25 6903:7 6907:16 7054:25

testifying 6816:16 6865:28 6905:1 6912:24 6969:14

testimonies 6857:27 6858:1 6871:22 6874:22

testimony 6821:1,4,9,11,14, 19,28 6824:10,22 6828:13 6830:20 6832:2,4,5 6841:6 6842:20 6843:7 6848:23

Index: submit..testimony



6849:14 6852:4 6853:4,5,8, 24 6854:2,3,23,28 6860:24, 28 6861:20 6866:4 6868:20 6870:20 6871:28 6874:5,23 6878:3,16 6880:18,22 6881:2,9,12 6906:25 6913:23 6916:24,27 6917:2 6919:10 6923:14 6926:8 6929:25 6931:8 6944:11 6949:25 6952:10 6953:6 6973:26 6995:2 7006:3 7054:21

Tex- 6871:6

Texas 6822:6,11,21,24 6859:25,28 6870:18,21,22, 23,26 6871:7,24 6872:2 6874:12 6875:23,25 6876:18,20 6911:7,10 6912:6 6964:3 6993:26

text 6818:5 6835:7

textual 6821:20

thereof 6826:2

thickness 6923:22 7024:26

thing 6845:22 6849:7 6857:8 6858:18 6869:15 6870:5 6873:21 6881:23 6889:11 6904:9 6946:24 6947:19 6949:8 6953:22 6978:1 6982:8 7022:27 7023:2 7024:8 7034:1 7042:1,25,26

things 6849:8,14 6851:7 6856:8 6859:1,21 6860:17, 21,26 6861:18 6862:7,12 6873:27 6883:11 6889:17 6896:28 6903:11 6914:21 6931:9.15 6934:28 6937:21 6938:9 6942:18 6943:23,25 6944:9 6945:17 6947:28 6948:5,12 6953:19 6954:13 6958:26 6963:3 6967:6 6970:3,14 6972:18,19 6975:3 6976:11 6977:22,23, 27 6980:10 6981:2 6985:1,3 6990:1 7001:5 7004:17 7006:20 7018:6 7019:27 7020:16,23 7022:15 7023:25,28 7029:10 7031:18 7034:19 7035:6 7038:27 7039:3 7042:13 7043:28 7044:17

thinking 6945:2 6953:26 6968:23 7021:18 7044:17,19 7047:22 7049:19

thinks 7027:3

thought 6848:28 6853:19 6856:8,16,24,26 6862:27 6868:19 6924:15 6932:21 6986:13 7031:6

thoughtfully 6840:15,18

threatened 6829:1

threatening 6827:11 6870:2, 7,13,14 6871:26 6874:11 6875:11

tight-knit 6955:13

tighter 6867:14

tilt 6830:25

time 6818:22 6827:28 6834:9 6835:3 6840:17,24 6842:21 6843:4,6 6844:9,22 6846:21 6847:7,10 6849:20 6854:28 6855:2 6861:7,10 6863:11,23 6864:11 6869:17 6872:22 6877:26 6888:28 6894:24 6898:16 6900:6,9 6903:9 6909:23 6910:26 6914:8 6918:8 6921:13 6924:28 6925:11 6927:8.22 6929:18,20 6930:1 6935:1 6937:23 6946:18 6959:13. 21,24 6960:6 6961:12 6962:23,25 6963:1,2 6966:17 6971:21 6974:12 6975:21 6977:14,20 6980:19,21 7001:21 7003:16 7008:9 7009:27 7011:10 7018:27 7019:1,26 7022:26 7023:2 7026:6,17 7031:3 7035:27 7036:20 7048:9 7052:24

time-honored 6830:16

timeline 6844:5 6857:11

times 6845:15,16 6860:19 6894:4 6963:19,28 6970:2,5, 9 6981:11 7049:11 7052:5

tiny 6894:26

tire 6825:20 6978:2.3

tires 6977:23 6978:4 6979:16 7033:7

title 6816:24

titled 6816:13

titles 6817:8 6818:4,5

today 6817:16 6819:14 6824:10 6826:20 6852:9 6880:15 6904:10 6905:9 6913:6,19,20 6914:4 6916:24 6917:2 6958:19 6989:18 6994:8,18 7011:16 7017:25 7020:23 7021:19 7048:21

today's 6831:17 6934:5

told 6905:8 6951:1 6988:24

tolls 6825:19

tomorrow 7053:26 7054:12, 17 7055:3

tool 6978:21,25 6982:26,27 6995:22 7023:6 7031:28 7032:6,9

top 6832:16 6898:28 6899:1 6948:21 7011:17 7038:13 7043:15

top-ranked 6946:2

topic 6817:28 7018:13

total 6837:6 6839:20,25 6922:10,22 6941:20 6970:7 6996:21 7026:1 7027:9 7028:15,16 7039:26 7040:6

track 6882:16

tractable 7011:12

tradable 6973:28

trading 6866:7,10

traditional 7046:21

traffic 6946:13 6998:10 7044:19

trailer 6825:20 6978:5

trailers 6826:25

trajectory 7021:4

trans- 6878:14 transcript 6902:7

transforming 6878:12,14

transparency 6816:12,18

transportation 6829:5 6837:9 6852:10,13,16,19 6862:7,14 6869:7,8,12 6925:5,10 6926:2 6927:25, 26 6928:13 6932:19,25,26 6933:10 6937:26,27 6938:1, 4,17 6944:3,7 6945:22 6946:20 6948:15 6954:3.5. 11,12,15,24 6955:5,9 6972:10 6975:9,12,15,22 6976:10,24 6977:1,5,6,9,15, 19,21,25 6978:8,11 6979:8, 12,15 6980:16 6982:20 7004:1 7014:16,22,23 7015:10,28 7016:14,18,24 7017:14,15,23 7023:4 7030:17 7031:13,14,24 7032:9 7033:2,19 7038:16 7039:6,25,28 7044:18 7045:11,20 7046:6,10,13 7050:12,18 7051:6

transporting 6827:5 6830:7 6921:17,18 6922:19

travel 6827:7 6828:22 6860:19 6861:7,9 6913:3

traveling 7044:14

travelled 6977:18

Travis 6822:23 6911:6,10, 14,20

treated 6996:22

treatment 6829:10

trends 6816:6

trial 6819:13

triangle 7035:1 7036:8 7037:3

triangles 6923:21,24

tripled 6826:13

trouble 6960:22

truck 6825:10,12,14,20 6978:5 6981:7

trucking 6862:7,13,16 6977:10,24,26 6978:16 7034:14,16

trucks 6981:9

true 6851:22 6873:2 6942:9 6992:19 7007:21

truncate 6914:17

trust 6917:26 6977:28

Tuesday 6882:17

turn 6895:5 6898:18,28 6905:17 6908:10 6912:4 6917:10 6929:14 6967:25 6971:11 6975:9 6983:20 6988:13 7028:28 7030:16 7034:23

turned 6844:14 6851:10

turns 6815:28 6991:3

tweak 7039:2

two-page 6857:23

two-thirds 6913:10

two-year 6823:6 6843:11

type 6862:12 6933:7 6958:3 6969:8 7023:5 7032:12 7041:28

types 6923:5 6957:28 6972:4 7025:3 7027:12

typical 6949:17

typically 6935:26 6937:2 6949:13 6969:22 7023:28 7024:7 7032:14 7048:11



U

U.S 6921:26

U.S. 6829:22 6832:22 6833:5,6 6839:23 6840:21 6922:3,4,16 6925:7,9,23 6926:11,26 6927:18,21 6928:1 6938:14 6950:18 6963:15,22 6966:11 7028:4

ugly 7024:24

Uh-huh 7018:16 7020:2 7044:25

ultimately 6868:13

unanimously 6824:5

unbiased 6959:7

unchanged 6824:28 6827:16 6840:22

unclear 6992:1

uncovered 6828:26

underlie 6957:5

underlying 6825:6 6962:26

underneath 7007:24

understand 6833:17 6847:1, 3 6852:28 6853:28 6854:19 6895:10 6901:20 6909:19 6933:18,22 6953:2 6954:10 6956:4,14,16 6968:17 6976:5 6977:2 6978:2,12,22, 26 6980:19 6982:22 6983:1, 22,23 6986:15 6996:24 7004:28 7013:17,19 7017:13 7023:3 7031:28 7032:10,20 7036:23 7038:4 7053:24

understanding 6853:1 6861:1 6875:7 6882:22 6885:3 6886:2 6888:21 6905:6,10 6907:12 6910:4, 19 6912:22 6913:5 6933:24 6942:14 6948:2,5 6959:18 6961:24 6969:11 6975:10,21 6996:8 7012:26 7040:23

understands 6865:16

understood 6846:14 6848:18 6849:4 6858:14 6942:15 6983:27

undertaken 6823:8 6955:26 7018:9

undertook 6844:7 6937:19

unfairness 6865:1,7

uniform 6823:15 6824:3

unique 6839:13

unit 6827:5 6839:11,14 6970:2 6978:5

United 6824:24 6829:17 6839:26 6875:19 6917:24 6919:24 6924:12 6931:18 6942:9 6943:26 6968:24 6969:20 6972:3 6973:23 7007:4 7051:2

units 6971:4

universe 6853:28

University 6830:4,11 6832:8 6844:12,20 6845:11,13,27 6847:12 6848:6 6849:2 6850:21,22 6852:20,21 6855:21 6857:16 6866:14,28 6869:13 6875:13,16,26 6876:3,8,9 6880:20 6888:2, 15,22 6889:1,6,14 6896:23 6902:15 6906:6,11 6907:24 6910:2 6917:14,16,18 6918:2,3 6920:7,8,12 6935:13 6946:1 6964:3 6966:1 6991:4

unpack 6844:16

unprocessed 6827:6 6828:22

unregulated 7004:7

Uofw 6894:9

up- 6847:21

update 6829:15,22,26 6830:3 6845:23 6877:16 6936:22 6937:12 6943:14 6951:20 6952:27 6962:28 6977:21

updated 6825:3 6831:2,7 6835:14 6843:21 6845:15,20 6846:1,17 6847:15 6849:21 6852:7 6856:9 6869:23 6934:23 6941:9 6951:8 6968:14 6975:3 7011:6 7022:26 7030:24 7032:23

updates 6823:7,18,24 6955:7 6966:17,21 6976:14

updating 6855:24 6856:7 6860:7 6877:9 6920:18 6935:7,16 6936:5 6955:11 6962:25

Upper 6904:17

upscaled 6972:25

urban 6870:22

urging 6815:27

URL 6885:13

USDA 6823:26 6829:12 6843:17 6850:13 6852:5

6868:27 6876:5 6880:22 6881:17,18,28 6882:17,19 6883:11,21 6885:1,2,9,11, 22,27 6886:2 6924:18 6964:2,21 6981:22,24 6982:9 7021:20

USDA's 6828:15 6962:18 6963:24

USDA-46 6831:27

USDS 6975:22,23

USDSS 6921:25 6922:5,16, 26 6923:3,6,13 6924:7,19, 26,27 6925:15 6926:24 6927:22,28 6928:3,14,24,28 6931:11 6935:7,12,17 6944:9 6948:14 6952:12 6970:6 6976:14 6998:9,13 7032:26 7033:24

USDSS-CALCULATED

6927:12

USS 6923:13

usual 6977:24

utilization 6877:27 6904:17 6932:15 6933:10

utilized 6931:12 7011:24

UW 6920:20

٧

V-I 6961:2

V-I-C 6961:3

v3 6894:9

Valley 6863:12 6864:5,6,17 7010:14 7036:19

valuable 6995:12

valued 6819:1,4 7045:22

values 6816:20 6831:3,4 6879:9 6919:23,25,28 6920:3,14 6921:3,5,7,9,12, 20 6922:4,25 6923:2,10 6924:4,7,9,11,14,15,16,22, 27 6925:1,3,14,21,23,28 6926:3,4,9,12,14,25 6927:5, 9,20 6928:1,2,5,20 6931:12, 15,16,17,20 6932:28 6933:9 6938:28 6939:1 6940:10 6943:20 6950:10 6952:19 6953:2,14 6956:1,18 6959:12 6970:21 6972:7 6974:8 6977:15 6987:7 6992:11,27 6993:1,2 6994:11,25 6995:6,14 6996:18 7001:13 7002:22.23 7003:11 7004:24 7005:9,11 7012:10 7013:4 7014:27

7015:8 7017:3 7019:7,13 7022:7,14 7038:16 7040:3 7041:7,14,20,22,26 7042:13 7043:18 7045:18 7047:13 7048:26,28 7050:22 7051:23

variable 6825:19 6867:21 6969:24,25

variables 6969:22 6970:11, 15 6980:3,8 7019:15 7038:21

varies 6839:18

variety 6830:18

vary 7009:13

vast 6862:24

vastly 6879:22

vehicle 6925:12

version 6816:1 6821:18,20 6822:6,8,14,16 6876:4 6885:16 6902:15 6922:26,28 6924:19 6928:28 6934:8,15 6948:3 6954:10 6963:16 6966:12 6970:6 6971:15,27 6972:10,25 6973:15 6974:1, 6 6975:3,25 6978:14,20 6981:6 6985:4,5 7007:1,2 7009:16,25 7010:6,25,27 7011:5,6 7019:22 7024:17

versions 6822:8 6866:12 6884:28 6920:13 6922:26 6925:16 6979:14 7024:15 7025:10

versus 6830:24 6876:24 6892:18,21,22 6969:17 6982:9 6985:22 6996:18 7023:4,5 7041:1 7044:14

Vice 6823:1

Victor 6819:23

view 6850:10 6854:26 6903:2 6932:13 6996:12 7049:5

viewed 6853:14,15

viewing 6817:13

Vilsack 6840:13

Virginia 6895:1 6896:3,6,24, 25 6897:12 6898:2,4,8 6926:18,22 6953:21,26

virtual 6823:12,13 7054:21

Index: U.S..visual

visibly 6831:24

Vista 6897:20

visual 7024:8



yesterday 6815:25 6872:7

vield 6823:28 6914:8,10,20

6923:1 6931:25 6974:18,19,

York 6898:4 6942:4 6983:21

Index: visually..zoned

6917:25 6959:14

yogurt 7030:10

7010:18 7028:6

zoned 6876:14

20.24

visually 7024:18

Vitaliano 6819:11,22 6820:2, 5,12,28 6821:24 6822:20 6823:1 6842:22 6843:1 6900:8 6913:18,25,27 6914:14 6945:4 6951:25 6989:1

Vladimir 6946:28

voir 6918:25

volume 6923:24 6970:2 6984:12 7025:28 7026:1,2 7027:9,16 7028:7,16

volumes 6921:28 6928:26 6997:2 7025:22,24 7027:7

voluminous 6860:24,27

voluntary 6874:10

W

W-O-L-F 6960:13

wage 6938:11,12 6945:26 7033:11 7034:12,13

wages 6925:12 6977:23 7033:7,10,25 7045:8

Wahoo-wa 6898:13

wait 6854:3 6973:19 7040:10

walk 6906:5

wallet 7020:9

wane 6828:28

wanted 6816:1 6844:27,28 6847:24,27 6848:16 6853:23 6855:27 6864:20 6869:14, 21,22 6880:27 6882:26 6959:6 6967:19,21 7022:20 7028:28 7038:17

wanting 6948:17

Washington 6895:9

waterfall 6818:6

wavy 7042:24

ways 6974:15 7042:3

weather 6929:3,6,7 6999:9,

weathermen 6999:19

web 6965:16

website 6817:16 6821:20 6822:7 6850:14 6882:19 6885:9 6888:25 6965:12

Wednesday 6815:1,4 6931:1

week 6913:18,26 6914:15

weekend 6951:19

weeks 6818:24

weight 6825:19

weighting 7041:26

welcoming 6819:5

welfare 6840:8

west 6831:4 6851:25 6859:28 6870:26 6871:6 6926:22,26,28 6953:21,26 6980:22 6987:13,19 6994:19 7010:9 7019:3 7020:21 7045:4 7047:25

western 6831:1 6925:22 6926:11 7020:24

white 6883:1 6884:6,9 6897:24

whoa 6835:18 6908:11

wholly 7016:14,25

widely 6946:21

Wilmington 7052:6,18

Wilson 6815:25 7048:15,18 7051:25

Wisconsin 6830:4,12 6832:8 6844:12,20 6845:11,13,28 6847:12 6848:7 6849:2 6850:22 6852:21 6855:21 6857:16 6866:14,28 6869:13 6875:13,16,26 6876:3,8,15 6880:20 6888:3,16,22 6889:1,6,15 6902:15 6906:6, 12 6907:24 6910:2 6914:12 6916:20 6918:2 6920:7,9 6940:28 6967:16 6978:17 6981:14,15 6991:5 7010:17 7026:9

wished 6864:8

wishes 6840:13

witnesses 6846:27 6852:27 6854:24 6865:24 6877:4 6893:17 6912:24 6913:16 6914:6,28

Wolf 6959:26 6960:13

wonderful 6858:23,28 6876:19 6959:10 7053:19 7054:23

wondering 6917:10 6931:11 7031:14 7040:2

word 6819:23 6856:24 6878:20 6879:24 6885:28 6896:20,28 7045:13

words 6909:26

work 6818:23 6819:7
6844:15 6850:6 6851:5
6852:22 6855:23 6858:16
6859:9 6867:22 6890:4
6901:22 6931:10 6935:4,10,
13,23 6936:20 6939:26
6941:27 6942:13 6946:1
6948:2 6951:19 6959:16
6960:9 6961:25 6962:14
6966:25 6977:25 6981:27
6985:16 6997:6 7017:24
7019:10 7021:1 7025:8
7034:19 7041:28 7042:2
7047:27

worked 6862:25 6868:2 6946:12,22 6959:4 6965:20

working 6847:20 6850:21 6851:14 6859:7 6887:14 6960:12 6996:1 6999:5 7035:8,27

works 6819:15,19 6965:23 7049:12

workshop 6864:21 6918:6

world 6943:10 6944:26,28 6947:17 6955:13 6980:8 7013:21 7022:9 7043:26 7050:7

Worse 6829:1

Worth 6859:26 6870:27 6879:12

write 6918:13 7043:6 7054:4

written 6821:1,4,19 6916:27 6919:21 6923:13 6925:6 6926:8 6929:25 6949:24 6973:26 7054:9

wrong 6816:24,25 6845:4 6881:5 6894:5 6960:22 7017:3,11,20

wrote 7040:10

Υ

year 6836:17 6837:28 6885:4,5 6925:20 6936:6,27 6937:4 6938:17 6939:5,18 6951:6 7008:3

year's 7024:2

years 6827:17 6833:25 6834:9,11,16 6835:8,24 6836:24 6843:16 6845:19 6917:22 6919:26 6920:16 6940:22 6941:5 6959:24 6981:12 6995:21 6999:6 7018:24 7023:8,10 7040:3

yellow 6895:8 6897:3,9 7006:8

