

**CERTIFIED
TRANSCRIPT**

NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER
PRICING FORMULA HEARING

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

Before the Honorable Jill Clifton, Judge

---o0o---

Zionsville, Indiana

December 8, 2023

---o0o---

Reported by:

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

A P P E A R A N C E S:
FOR THE USDA ORDER FORMULATION AND ENFORCEMENT DIVISION,
USDA-AMS DAIRY PROGRAM:

Erin Taylor
Todd Wilson
Brian Hill
Michelle McMurtray

FOR THE MILK INNOVATION GROUP:

Charles "Chip" English
Ashley Vulin

FOR THE NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION:

Nicole Hancock
Brad Prowant

FOR SELECT MILK PRODUCERS, INC.:

Ryan Miltner

FOR INTERNATIONAL DAIRY FOODS ASSOCIATION:

Steve Rosenbaum

---o0o---

(Please note: Appearances for all parties are subject to
change daily, and may not be reported or listed on
subsequent days' transcripts.)

---o0o---



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

M A S T E R I N D E X

SESSIONS

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2023

PAGE

MORNING SESSION

10,262

AFTERNOON SESSION

10,390

---o0o---



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

M A S T E R I N D E X

WITNESSES IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

WITNESSES: PAGE

Tim Galloway:

Direct Examination by Mr. Rosenbaum 10,263
Cross-Examination by Ms. Taylor 10,269

Mike Brown:

Direct Examination by Mr. Rosenbaum 10,275
Cross-Examination by Ms. Hancock 10,314
Cross-Examination by Mr. English 10,352
Redirect Examination by Mr. Rosenbaum 10,356
Cross-Examination by Ms. Taylor 10,358
Cross-Examination by Mr. Vandenheuvel 10,387
Redirect Examination by Mr. Rosenbaum 10,396

Sally Keefe:

Direct Examination by Ms. Vulin 10,402

---o0o---



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

M A S T E R I N D E X

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER:

NO.	DESCRIPTION	I.D.	EVD.
439	IDFA-63	10,262	10,273
433	IDFA-57	10,274	10,398
434	IDFA-58	10,274	10,399
423	IDFA-59		10,399
423A	IDFA-59A		10,399
440	MIG-64	10,400	
441	MIG-64A	10,400	
442	MIG-64B	10,400	
443	MIG-64C	10,401	

---o0o---



1 FRIDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2023 -- MORNING SESSION

2 THE COURT: Let's go back on record.

3 We're back on record. It's 2023, December 8. It
4 is Friday. It is Day 43 of this hearing.

5 Are there any preliminary matters before we
6 continue with where we -- with what we described
7 yesterday?

8 There are none.

9 Mr. Rosenbaum.

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

12 We would call as our next witness, Mr. Tim
13 Galloway.

14 Your Honor, I have distributed copies of
15 Mr. Galloway's written testimony to the parties and the
16 government. Let me grab an extra copy for Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: Thank you so much. Is this going to
18 be Exhibit 439? I'm looking at Exhibit 439, also shown as
19 IDFA Exhibit 63.

20 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 439 was marked
21 for identification.)

22 THE COURT: I'd like the witness, please, to state
23 and spell your name.

24 THE WITNESS: Tim Galloway, G-A-L-L-O-W-A-Y.

25 THE COURT: Very good. You have a robust voice,
26 and so even though you are not close to the microphone, I
27 think we're good.

28 THE WITNESS: Okay.



1 THE COURT: We may need just a little more volume
2 or you could scoot a little closer, if you would like.

3 THE WITNESS: Okay. Sure.

4 THE COURT: That's good. That will do. All
5 right.

6 Have you previously testified in this proceeding?

7 THE WITNESS: Not in this proceeding.

8 THE COURT: I'd like to swear you in.

9 TIM GALLOWAY,

10 Being first duly sworn, was examined and
11 testified as follows:

12 DIRECT EXAMINATION

13 BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

14 Q. Good morning, Mr. Galloway.

15 Before you is Hearing Exhibit 439, which is also
16 IDFA Exhibit 63.

17 Is this a copy of your written testimony today?

18 A. It is, but I think I have a different copy in
19 front of me than what you have.

20 THE COURT: And let's go off record for just a
21 moment. We're off record at 8:04.

22 (An off-the-record discussion took place.)

23 THE COURT: Let's go back on record.

24 We're back on record at 8:04.

25 MR. ROSENBAUM: This is Steve Rosenbaum for the
26 International Dairy Foods Association.

27 BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

28 Q. Do you now have before you the document that has



1 been marked as IDFA Exhibit 63, which is also Hearing
2 Exhibit 439?

3 A. Yes, I have.

4 Q. And is that your written testimony today?

5 A. It is.

6 Q. Could you please read it into the record?

7 A. Thank you.

8 This is my testimony in opposition to Proposal 21,
9 increasing the Class II differential.

10 Good morning. My name is Tim Galloway. I'm CEO
11 of Galloway Company, a four-generation processor of
12 concentrated dairy ingredients for further food and
13 beverage manufacturing. We are located in Neenah,
14 Wisconsin.

15 The milk in our products are regulated by Federal
16 Order 30. Galloway Company and our wholly-owned
17 subsidiary, Classic Mix Partners, only manufactures
18 industrial ingredients that are considered Class II items
19 by the Federal Milk Marketing Order. Specifically, we
20 make sweetened condensed milk, ice cream mixes, beverage
21 bases, and non-sweetened concentrated dairy products. We
22 primarily use local milk, but in some months we have to
23 use some additional cream for condensed skim milk. We
24 make no retail items, and our ingredients are sold
25 nationwide.

26 I have testified at every FMMO hearing since 1990.
27 At times, it seems like the hearings are similar to the
28 movie Groundhog Day, as the same supposed issues and



1 solutions come up each time. A good example is the Farm
2 Bureau Class II differential proposal. I'm not here to
3 debate their economic analysis, I'm here to explain why,
4 as a real-world processor of Class II items, their
5 proposal will not attract more milk to Class II uses,
6 increase the blend price, reduce depooling and negative
7 PPDs.

8 In fact, it has the likelihood of taking more
9 Class II milk out of the pool, replaced by regulated
10 Class IV ingredients or milk ingredients from unregulated
11 areas. In Federal Order 30, milk purchases have to be
12 competitive to the dominant Class III market, and on the
13 sales side, we have to be competitive to competing
14 ingredients such as condensed skim milk, nonfat dry milk,
15 concentrated milk fat, and anhydrous milk fat.

16 There is no financial justification for the
17 rewetting of solids theory. Let me give you just two
18 examples from the real world of manufacturing food and
19 beverage products. The first is ice cream mix. Some
20 manufacturers, like our Classic Mix, think the flavor and
21 functionality of the ice cream is better if made with
22 liquid dairy components. But as was abundantly clear when
23 the Class II price was tied to the Class III cheese price
24 back in the 1990s, many retail and ice cream mix
25 manufacturers switched to dry dairy solids and anhydrous
26 milk fat due to the vast discrepancy in price between
27 Class III and Class II.

28 To make ice cream, you need to combine a number of



1 ingredients, both liquid and dry, hydrate to the proper
2 total solids, and pasteurize. No rewetting needs to be
3 done as the corn sweetener and the liquid sugar are at
4 high enough temperature to fully hydrate the dry milk
5 solids.

6 To make the point even finer, we do not, in the
7 industry, take nonfat dry milk and make tanks of condensed
8 skim milk out of it, we just put it in the vat and make
9 the product. Therefore, if the Class II ingredient
10 differential gets more expensive in the proponent's scheme
11 of more than doubling the differential than it gives an
12 incentive to use Class IV ingredients.

13 The customer makes the ultimate decision on cost.
14 The implication that there would be more Class II milk at
15 a higher differential is speculative and I think
16 counterproductive -- and may be counterproductive. The
17 FMMO would be creating ingredients manufactured --
18 manufacturers, winners and losers, and promote disorderly
19 marketing.

20 The same can be said for sweetened condensed milk
21 as an ingredient for further food manufacturing. This is
22 an industrial product used in unregulated food products,
23 unlike retail yogurt, cottage cheese, frozen ice cream,
24 and other Class II retail products.

25 As I testified in the 2006 hearing, in 2005, the
26 sweetened condensed milk industry for industrial use had
27 lost over 65 million pounds of production over the prior
28 ten years. At an average of 28% total milk solids, that



1 equates to 54 million pounds of milk not going into
2 Class II, but instead, going into Class IV. Our
3 competitors' sweetened uncondensed milk is butter powder,
4 it's not other manufacturers'.

5 We finally got this right at the 2006 hearing,
6 even if the differential jumped from \$0.30 to \$0.70 a
7 hundredweight. Our customers didn't like the increase,
8 but have stuck with us to date. I don't think they will
9 at \$1.56 on raw milk, particularly when that equates to
10 \$2.58 of finished sweetened condensed milk.

11 THE COURT: And that's \$1.56 per hundredweight,
12 and when you say it equates to \$2.58, that's also per
13 hundredweight?

14 THE WITNESS: That is correct, ma'am.

15 As testified at the last hearing, when a food
16 manufacturer makes the decision to put processing
17 equipment in place to blend and hydrate butter and powder,
18 they don't switch back and forth with liquid ingredients.
19 The capital investment has now some cost that needs to be
20 amortized over time. Again, it is the FMMO that is
21 causing the disorderly marketing.

22 Regulations of the FMMO should not result in
23 arbitrary or capricious results, but let me give you two
24 examples. One, the end user or retail manufacturer should
25 be able to select the best ingredients for their product.
26 The FMMO should not decide what that ingredient is based
27 on arbitrary pricing mechanism.

28 To the point of being capricious, I can state that



1 due to capacity restraints in the sweetened condensed milk
2 industry, Galloway Company, two years ago, decided to
3 build the first sweetened condensed milk evaporator since
4 1998.

5 THE COURT: Say --

6 THE WITNESS: Or '88.

7 THE COURT: Read the year again.

8 THE WITNESS: 1988, which was also built by
9 Galloway Company. We did the design work, purchased the
10 equipment, purchased the concrete panels, and on
11 August 22nd of 2023, had the groundbreaking ceremony for
12 that \$65 million expansion. If the proponents' plan
13 prevails, all this effort and expense may be for naught.

14 What is the benefit to the producer and the pool?
15 The proponents state it is the upcharge from \$0.70 a
16 hundredweight to \$1.56 a hundredweight, for an increase of
17 \$122 million to the pool. I contend it is just the
18 opposite, where the current \$0.70 a hundredweight
19 differential equating to \$99.4 million may be lost to
20 Class IV sales. Be very careful what you wish for.

21 MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, Mr. Galloway is
22 available for cross-examination.

23 THE COURT: Who first has cross-examination for
24 Mr. Galloway?

25 I see no one. I invite questions from the
26 Agricultural Marketing Service.

27 //

28 //



1 CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 BY MS. TAYLOR:

3 Q. Good morning.

4 A. Good morning.

5 Q. Thank you for being here today.

6 A. Thank you.

7 Q. I appreciate your testimony on Proposal 21. I
8 just want to make sure I kind of recapture the main
9 message you're telling us.10 The first is, in your real-world examples, as I
11 read it, you don't need -- the rewetting theory, as you
12 called it in the Farm Bureau proposal, isn't reflective of
13 what happens today because you don't actually need to
14 rewet the solids as -- because the process of how you
15 manufacture your product, that's not a necessary step; is
16 that correct?17 A. I am a little uncertain as to what the term
18 "rewetting" means. We hydrate dried dairy ingredients all
19 the time, and dry stabilizers and emulsifiers and other
20 items that go into ice cream mix. If rewetting means
21 taking nonfat dry milk and making a tank of condensed skim
22 milk to be used in the process, that's not done. It would
23 be -- make no economic sense at all because you already
24 have the hot corn syrup or hot liquid sugar. You have to
25 pasteurize the ice cream mix and the sweetened condensed
26 milk anyway, so you are getting it up to temperatures
27 where that, if you are using nonfat dry milk, we just put
28 it in the vat.

1 Q. On the top of page 3, that last full sentence, at
2 the very top of the page you say, "The Federal Orders
3 would create ingredient manufacturer winners and losers
4 and promote disorderly marketing."

5 I wondered, can you just expand on why you think
6 this would promote disorderly marketing and how you would
7 define disorderly marketing?

8 A. We have local milk available to us. It needs to
9 be used. And the farmers need the processors in their
10 area to be able to most efficiently market their milk. If
11 you -- if your regulated pricing forces people to use
12 nonfat dry milk because of cost or anhydrous milk fat,
13 those aren't necessarily made in the area in which you are
14 located, so now you are bringing in product across the
15 country potentially.

16 There are many fewer manufacturers of nonfat dry
17 milk at scale than there are ice cream mix manufacturers.
18 So that, to me, is disorderly marketing, because you are
19 moving dry ingredients or concentrated butterfat over
20 tremendous distances when it can be used right from local
21 milk in your own market.

22 Q. And for your company, how close is your milk
23 supply to you?

24 A. The majority is within 100 miles. It's from the
25 Upper Peninsula of Michigan down to Central Wisconsin.

26 Q. Okay. You talk in the beginning about -- and you
27 just mentioned -- instead of using Class II milk, you --
28 manufactures will switch to powder because it be cheaper.



1 You also mentioned you might get milk ingredients
2 from unregulated markets.

3 Can you just talk a little bit about that
4 situation?

5 A. Idaho.

6 Q. Idaho?

7 A. They have an awful lot of milk out there. It's
8 unregulated. We -- they have called on us numerous times
9 to use their solids. We prefer to get it from local
10 sources. But if -- if we get into a competitive situation
11 where our competitors, particularly in ice cream mix, are
12 using all dry ingredients, we may have to go there as
13 well, because the price differential is that great.

14 Q. Okay. And you talk about your main competitor for
15 sweetened condensed milk, at least, is butter powder.

16 A. We have another manufacturer who is a competitor,
17 and a good competitor. But we have to be more concerned
18 about butter powder as being put right into the caramel,
19 right into the syrup, whatever the sweetened and
20 condensed -- the pie.

21 And as I stated that once the manufacturer makes
22 the investment to use dry ingredients, they are not going
23 to switch back to sweetened condensed milk, they are not
24 going to have two separate processes.

25 The largest -- I would state that the largest user
26 of sweetened condensed milk up through the mid-'90s did
27 switch to butter powder, and they haven't bought -- they
28 buy a little sweetened condensed milk at one factory, but



1 they have got ten of them.

2 Q. Okay.

3 THE COURT: They have got ten of what?

4 THE WITNESS: Factories making candy.

5 BY MS. TAYLOR:

6 Q. In your last paragraph of your statement you say,
7 "The current differential" -- if you increased the
8 differential as proposed in 21, it would equate to
9 99.4 million lost to Class IV sales.

10 Just, can you explain how you comprised that
11 number?

12 A. I took the \$0.70 hundredweight differential and
13 multiplied it by the pounds of Class II milk that was used
14 in the Federal Milk Marketing Orders. That isn't
15 necessarily all the milk, because obviously some might
16 have been depooled and not reported. So it was just
17 strictly a calculation of the Class II milk utilization
18 that is reported.

19 Q. Okay. All Class II milk?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. For 2022?

22 A. I believe those are the numbers I was using, yes.

23 Q. Okay. That's it from AMS.

24 MS. TAYLOR: Again, thank you for coming and
25 giving us your statement.

26 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

27 THE COURT: Mr. Rosenbaum.

28 MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, I don't have any



1 questions. I would simply move Hearing Exhibit 439 into
2 evidence.

3 THE COURT: Is there any objection to the
4 admission into evidence of Exhibit 439?

5 There is none. Exhibit 439 is admitted into
6 evidence.

7 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 439 was received
8 into evidence.)

9 THE COURT: Is there anything you would like to
10 add, Mr. Galloway, or emphasize?

11 THE WITNESS: You know, yesterday morning I went
12 out to the barn and petted my Class II cows, and they were
13 feeling kind of down in the dumps because they knew what
14 their butterfat or their skim solids price was for the
15 month, but they don't know what their fat is. And they're
16 sitting next to their Class I sisters who know both their
17 fat and solids before the month starts. But I told them
18 that, you know what, it could be worse, you could be the
19 largest utilization in the entire dairy industry in
20 Class III and not know anything until the month is over.
21 And then the poor Class IV cows get \$0.70 a hundredweight
22 less. So I said, you know, you are not doing too bad.

23 I -- I make that parable up because that is the
24 state of our industry, and it is -- milk is milk is milk.
25 There's absolutely no difference between Class II milk,
26 Class I, Class III. It all goes into the same bulk tank.
27 So why do we have these fictions?

28 THE COURT: Thank you.



1 Mr. Rosenbaum.

2 MR. ROSENBAUM: Nothing further, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Keep coming.

4 THE WITNESS: That's it.

5 MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, the IDFA calls as its
6 next witness, Mr. Mike Brown.

7 We do have a PowerPoint presentation.

8 THE COURT: Let's go off record while our sound
9 technician works with the laptop that Mr. Brown has
10 brought to the witness stand.

11 Everyone may take a five-minute stretch break.
12 Let's be back ready to go at 8:30.

13 (Whereupon, a break was taken.)

14 THE COURT: Let's go back on record.

15 We're back on record at 8:32.

16 I have before me two exhibits. I have
17 Exhibit 433, which is also IDFA Exhibit 57; and I have
18 Exhibit 434, also IDFA Exhibit 58.

19 (Thereafter, Exhibit Numbers 433 and 434 were
20 marked for identification.)

21 THE COURT: I'd like the witness please to state
22 and spell your name.

23 THE WITNESS: My name is Mike Brown, M-I-K-E,
24 B-R-O-W-N.

25 THE COURT: You remain sworn.

26 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

27 //

28 //



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

MIKE BROWN,

Having been previously sworn, was examined
and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

Q. Steve Rosenbaum for the International Dairy Foods
Association.

Good morning, Mr. Brown.

Is IDFA Exhibit 57, which has been marked as
Hearing Exhibit 433, your written testimony on
Proposal 19?

A. Yes, it is.

Q. And is Hearing Exhibit 434 the PowerPoint
presentation that you are about to present that summarizes
that written testimony?

A. Yes.

Q. Could you please take us through your PowerPoint.

A. Okay. Let's -- let's start -- and I guess I can't
really see it here, so I -- hopefully it's all there.

Cover page, of course, is our testimony in
opposition to Proposal 19.

THE COURT: And, yes, we see it on the screen.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Good.

Proposal 19 would significantly increase Class I
differentials nationwide. The facts do not support an
increase, and the methods by which the proponents have
established their specific increases are internally
inconsistent, lack factual support, and are often based on



1 considerations irrelevant to setting the Class I
2 differentials.

3 THE COURT: Now, your volume is great. Your
4 pacing could be just a bit slower. Slower, please.

5 THE WITNESS: Thank you. We'll fix that now.

6 The current supply of milk is more than adequate
7 to serve Class I needs. Temporal fluctuations in milk
8 production and incongruity between milk production and
9 fluid milk consumption require a sufficient reserve supply
10 of milk serving non-fluid milk needs in order to ensure an
11 adequate supply of milk to serve fluid needs.

12 USDA has said a reserve milk supply equal to 30 to
13 35% of the total milk in the market appears to be a
14 reasonable reserve requirement. This is from Milk in the
15 New England and Other Marketing Areas; Decision on
16 Proposed Amendments to Tentative Marketing Agreements and
17 Orders, March -- 58 FR 12634, 12646, March 5th, 1993.

18 THE COURT: Now, I'm going to have you do that
19 again slowly, beginning with F -- with the
20 identification --

21 THE WITNESS: The identification? Okay. The
22 identification for that decision is 58 FR 12634, 12646,
23 dated March 5th, 1993.

24 THE COURT: Thank you.

25 THE WITNESS: Same title. Class I utilization is
26 only 27% of FMMO milk and 20% of total milk. The reserve
27 supply is 73% of pooled milk and 80% of total milk. This
28 amount is more than double the 30 to 35% supply reserve



1 that USDA deemed to constitute a reasonable reserve.

2 All but three of the 11 Federal Orders have
3 reserve supplies in excess of 35%. The exceptions are the
4 three Southeastern orders. Special transportation and
5 delivery credits recently adopted -- and I would say the
6 final rule has been submitted, the adoption has not, the
7 vote has not taken place yet -- for the specific purpose
8 of encouraging the supply of Class I milk to these three
9 orders eliminates any need to raise the Class I
10 differentials there.

11 Again, same title: Current milk Supply is more
12 than adequate to serve Class I needs. The consistent
13 decline in shipping requirements confirms the adequacy of
14 the Class I milk supply. Since 2010, not a single Federal
15 Milk Order has increased the percentage of pooled milk
16 that must be shipped to Class I plants.

17 The requisite Class I shipping percentage was
18 lowered, not raised, in Orders 1, 33, 30, 124, and 131.
19 This can only be attributed to the degree to which the
20 milk supply is increasingly more than adequate to serve
21 Class I needs. Relatedly, "no order received any call or
22 had any issuance of milk to be shipped to Class I plants
23 in their order."

24 Fluid milk sales have undergone severe declines.

25 BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

26 Q. This is now a now topic?

27 A. Yes.

28 THE COURT: And just tell us the page number,



1 Mr. Rosenbaum.

2 MR. ROSENBAUM: This is page 6, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Thank you.

4 THE WITNESS: National fluid milk sales have
5 fallen over 21% from their peak of 55,165,000,000 pounds
6 in 1991 --

7 THE COURT: Now -- now --

8 THE WITNESS: 55 -- I'll repeat that.

9 THE COURT: Yes. You are in numbers, so really
10 slowly on these numbers.

11 THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

12 THE COURT: So let's start from the beginning of
13 that bullet.

14 THE WITNESS: Okay. National fluid milk sales
15 have fallen over 21% from their peak of 55,165,000,000
16 pounds in 1991 to only 43,448,000,000 pounds in 2022. On
17 a per capita basis, annual consumption fell from 247
18 pounds in 1975 to 130 pounds in 2022. No national
19 retailer would materially increase the price of a product
20 undergoing such a steady substantial decline in sales, nor
21 should the government do so by mandatory edict.

22 Next topic: The retail demand for fluid milk
23 products is elastic and the proposed Class I differential
24 increases will materially harm sales. Three 2023 studies
25 by leading agricultural economists demonstrate that the
26 retail own-price demand in milk is quite elastic. The
27 emergence and strengthening of plant-based beverages and
28 other substitutes is a recent phenomenon that many earlier



1 studies did not capture.

2 Same topic. Dr. Capps' predicted retail sales
3 declines from Proposal 19's \$1.49 per hundredweight
4 increase in the Class I differential are startling.

5 THE COURT: Now, so that we have \$1.49, just make
6 sure that the transcript captures what you are saying
7 there.

8 THE WITNESS: Okay. I'll repeat the sentence.

9 Dr. Capps' predicted retail sales declines from
10 Proposal 19's \$1.49 per hundredweight increase in the
11 Class I differential are startling.

12 And these numbers are from Dr. Capps' testimony,
13 the different categories in the declining sales: Total
14 milk decline, 5.98%; traditional white milk is 6.28%;
15 organic milk is 4.11%; health-enhanced milk is 5.67%;
16 lactose-free milk, 2.75%; and traditional flavored milk,
17 2.4%.

18 Again, the retail demand for fluid milk products
19 is elastic. The proposed Class I differential increases
20 will materially harm sales.

21 Next points. Demand would be further compromised
22 by NMPF Proposal 1. And Proposal 1, you may all recall,
23 was changing the skim solids formulas. That was a long
24 time ago. That was August. It was about 100 degrees
25 here.

26 Recent years show Proposal 1 would increase
27 Class I prices by an additional \$0.53 per hundredweight.
28 Using Dr. Kaiser's electricity of price transmission and



1 Dr. Capps' own-price elasticities, this would result in an
2 additional 2.08% decline in total retail milk sales.

3 Proposal 19 would significantly increase USDA food
4 program costs. But we --

5 THE COURT: Now we're on page 10.

6 THE WITNESS: Yes. Page 10.

7 And we have a table. I will read through the
8 table.

9 Estimated impacts of Proposal 19 differential
10 increase on the federal government direct purchase cost
11 for beverage milk. What this chart looks at is what the
12 program costs have been based on volume of milk, and we --
13 what we did was we took that volume of milk, just added
14 simply the change in cost of milk, and what that might do
15 to program costs.

16 Reading across. Total gallons of milk for school
17 breakfast and lunch is 403 million; daycare and preschool
18 is 24; food banks and USDA are 38; military is 23. The
19 totals are 488. And these are for 2022, these numbers.

20 BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

21 Q. Mr. Brown, I think we probably can not have to
22 read all the numbers in specifically. Just tell us how
23 the chart -- finish telling us how the chart was put
24 together and give us what the total numbers are, if you
25 will.

26 A. Okay. I'm glad to hear that.

27 The chart was put together, there is a firm, you
28 have heard of them already, Prime Consulting did a report



1 on all channel tracking. It's some of the same
2 information that Dr. Capps used for when you were looking
3 at use of product in different categories. It was
4 published in May of '23. It was put together for the
5 dairy milk promotion groups.

6 What we did is, we simply looked at the total
7 pounds of milk, and we had gallons -- of course, pounds
8 is -- 8.6 pounds per gallon -- to get a total milk used in
9 each of the different programs. We simply averaged the
10 cost of increase that Proposal 19 would incur, and that
11 cost was \$1.49 based on National Milk's own estimates.
12 The total milk increase -- and this is, again, assuming
13 that you would have a transfer cost, it reflects that cost
14 change in milk -- would be 51.8 for school breakfast and
15 lunch; 3.1 --

16 THE COURT: Now -- now, these are the most
17 important numbers.

18 THE WITNESS: Yes. It's the last line on the
19 table.

20 THE COURT: Yes. And we want to make sure that
21 the transcript, which won't have the table right in the
22 transcript, computes.

23 So what you are telling us is in millions of
24 dollars, what?

25 THE WITNESS: I'm telling you how much the cost
26 for that milk would increase --

27 THE COURT: All right.

28 THE WITNESS: -- based on Proposal 19.



1 THE COURT: So when you tell me the numbers, for
2 every number you tell me, tell me in millions of dollars.

3 THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

4 THE COURT: All right.

5 THE WITNESS: So total milk increased in millions
6 of dollars: For school breakfast and lunch program, it
7 would be 51.8 million; daycare and preschool, 3.1 million;
8 food banks and USDA, 4.9 million; military, 3.0 million;
9 for a total of increasing cost of purchasing beverage milk
10 of \$62.7 million per year.

11 BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

12 Q. And are these annual figures?

13 A. Yes, they are.

14 Q. And did you attach to your written testimony an
15 excerpt from the Prime Consulting report that provided the
16 channel distribution numbers upon which you relied?

17 A. Yes. The source data is in the attachment from
18 Prime Consulting.

19 Q. All right. Let's go on to the next topic, please.

20 A. Topic 4?

21 THE COURT: Now --

22 THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

23 THE COURT: Now, let me just make sure. So the
24 sentence below the chart reads what?

25 THE WITNESS: The sentence below the chart needs
26 corrected. The 149 increase in Class I differential --

27 THE COURT: Now, again, "the 149," I want you to
28 read that --



1 THE WITNESS: Per hundredweight.

2 THE COURT: No, but it's \$1.49 --

3 THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes.

4 THE COURT: -- per hundredweight increase; is that
5 correct?

6 THE WITNESS: Yes.

7 THE COURT: So begin again.

8 THE WITNESS: I will.

9 The \$1.49 per hundredweight increase in Class I
10 differentials would cost the government -- the slide says
11 over 67 million, it should be 62.7 million. So that 67
12 is -- needs to be adjusted.

13 MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, if we could have the
14 exhibit corrected so that that number reads 62.7 rather
15 than 67. That obviously was a typo that got left out.

16 THE COURT: All right. And do you want it to say
17 "over" or do you want it just to say "62.7 million"?

18 THE WITNESS: Just "62.7."

19 THE COURT: All right. So we'll make that
20 correction right now on the record copy of Exhibit 434,
21 also known as IDFA-58, page 10. We're striking the word
22 "over," and instead of "\$67" we will have "\$62.7" as is
23 shown in the table; is that correct?

24 THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.

25 THE COURT: And it has been done.

26 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

27 BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

28 Q. Go on to the next slide, please, and I believe



1 this is a new topic.

2 A. This is a new topic.

3 Proposal 19 is based on unevenly applied criteria,
4 many of which bear no relevance to Class I differentials.
5 USDA, in order reform, set Class I differentials based on
6 the combination of the base differential plus a location
7 differential.

8 The base differential comprised of costs unique to
9 Class I: Cost of obtaining Grade A milk, recognition of
10 balancing costs, and portion of the competitive actual --
11 excuse me -- portion of the actual competitive costs
12 incurred by fluid plants to simply compete with
13 manufacturing plants for a supply of milk.

14 The location differential reflects some of the
15 costs of moving milk from areas of production to Class I
16 processing facilities.

17 Again, same topic, Proposal 19 is based on
18 unevenly applied criteria. The University of Wisconsin
19 U.S. Dairy Sector Stimulator -- or the U.S. Simulator,
20 excuse me, S-I-M-U-L-A-T-O-R -- USDSS study did not
21 address the base differential, but rather it looked at
22 location differentials by addressing, e.g., the costs of
23 moving milk from supply areas to processing facilities.

24 Proposal 19 makes material revisions to the
25 Class I differentials calculated by the University of
26 Wisconsin model based on criteria, many of which bear no
27 relevance to Class I differentials.

28 USDA used in setting Class I differentials, what



1 did they -- what did they do? USDA, long ago, determined
2 that it would set one manufacturing price per
3 manufacturing class, which would apply uniformly across
4 the country. At the same time, the Class I differentials
5 that would be added to those manufacturing prices to set
6 the Class I price varied considerably based upon each
7 location's need to move milk from other areas. Blend
8 prices among orders necessarily did not align.

9 Same topic: NMPF criteria for setting
10 Proposal 19's Class I differentials. Multiple witnesses
11 have provided extensive information regarding the cost of
12 producing milk in general. Their testimony did not relate
13 to any special cost of producing milk for Class I
14 purposes. These general costs have not been considered by
15 USDA in setting Class I differentials themselves, but are
16 captured through the Class III and IV price to which the
17 Class I differential is added to set the Class I price.

18 A quote from USDA in 2008: "In the aggregate, the
19 costs of producing milk are reflected in the supply and
20 demand conditions for the dairy products. When the supply
21 of milk is insufficient to meet the demand for Class III
22 and IV products" -- "the Class III and Class IV
23 products" -- correction -- "the prices for these products
24 increase as the regulated minimum milk price is paid to
25 dairy farmers because the milk is more valuable and its
26 greater milk value is captured in the pricing formulas."

27 Again, a quote from USDA, 2008.

28 THE COURT: All right. Now, you varied a tiny bit



1 from what you have quoted here.

2 THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you.

3 THE COURT: So if the transcript is slightly
4 different in wording, it's your slide that we should rely
5 on.

6 THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

7 THE COURT: It didn't change the meaning, just the
8 words were --

9 THE WITNESS: As I said them, I realized that. I
10 apologize.

11 THE COURT: No worries. All right. And that was
12 on page 14.

13 THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

14 THE COURT: All right. You may proceed.

15 THE WITNESS: Active proposal -- or comments on
16 unevenly applied criteria.

17 NMPF criteria for setting Class I Proposal 9's
18 [sic] differentials, regional competition in the sale of
19 manufactured products. Witnesses insisted that Class I
20 differentials reflect regional composition at the farm
21 level, so that California (with its low Class I
22 utilization) needed to have Class I differentials such
23 that the blend price in California was similar to the
24 blend price in the Upper Midwest.

25 In other words, Class I differentials should be
26 set based upon the competitive relationship between
27 regions 1500 miles apart, with no respect to the sale of
28 manufactured milk products -- oh, excuse me -- with



1 respect to the sale of manufactured milk products.

2 Would you care to have me re-read that?

3 THE COURT: Yes, please.

4 THE WITNESS: Okay.

5 THE COURT: And, again, what you are saying in
6 this slide on page 15 is what you believe that NMPF's
7 criteria are?

8 THE WITNESS: That is correct.

9 THE COURT: And you --

10 THE WITNESS: They are our views based on
11 testimony.

12 THE COURT: Yes.

13 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

14 THE COURT: And you may re-read that bullet.

15 THE WITNESS: Okay. In other words, Class I
16 differentials should be set based upon the competitive
17 relationship between regions 1500 miles apart -- again,
18 1,500 miles apart -- with respect to the sale of
19 manufactured milk products. No such concept had
20 previously -- has previously been adopted by USDA with the
21 respect to the setting of Class I differentials.

22 Next point. Again, I'm -- NMPF criteria for
23 setting Proposal 19's Class I differentials, basing the
24 Class I on -- basing Class I on the milk supply for
25 manufacturing plants. Other witnesses supported higher
26 Class I differentials in specific locations because their
27 cooperative had contractually committed to sell most of
28 its milk to a large Class III cheese plant, and a higher



1 differential was needed to attract additional milk to
2 serve Class I customers.

3 We have not, nor historically has USDA, seen this
4 as a basis to increase, via federal legal mandate, the
5 amount Class I members in the order would have to pay for
6 their milk supply.

7 Give me just a minute. I need to wet my throat.

8 THE COURT: Yes. And I would like us to take a
9 five-minute stretch break. We're about to begin page 17.
10 Just five minutes. We'll go back on record at 9 o'clock.

11 (Whereupon, a break was taken.)

12 THE COURT: Let's go back on record.

13 We're back on record at 9:00 a.m.

14 Mr. Rosenbaum.

15 BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

16 Q. Mr. Brown, could you please continue?

17 A. I certainly can. We're on Slide 17, same -- same
18 topic: Proposal 19 is based on unevenly applied criteria,
19 many of which bear no relevance to Class I differentials.

20 Again, next topic: NMPF -- or next issue -- NMPF
21 criteria used in setting Proposal 19's Class I
22 differentials, increase blend prices in areas with limited
23 Class I needs. Witnesses discussed the need to discourage
24 milk from moving from Minnesota and Maine, respectively,
25 in order to maintain blend price equivalence in their
26 local markets, even though milk in both locations may well
27 be needed to the south of those locations. This position
28 contradicts the fundamental purpose of establishing



1 Class I differentials in order to encourage movement to
2 where it is needed.

3 Next slide: NMPF criteria used in setting
4 Proposal 19's differentials, an undefined base
5 differential. As the lead "umbrella witness" providing
6 overview, Dr. Vitaliano suggested that the base
7 differential should be raised from \$1.60 \$2.20 per
8 hundredweight. Other proponents did not include any
9 change in the base differential for the Nashville,
10 Winchester, Virginia, and Charleston, West Virginia.

11 Proposal 19, again, on unevenly applied criteria,
12 inconsistent approaches to transportation cost data.
13 Dr. Vitaliano indicated that Proposal 19 differential
14 increases were conservative because the University of
15 Wisconsin study and Proposal 19 itself utilized 2021
16 transportation cost data, even though 2022 related
17 transportation cost data would supposedly show higher
18 transportation costs.

19 But many proponent witnesses relied upon 2022 and
20 2023 transportation cost data as justification for
21 Proposal 19, including in support of Class I differentials
22 in excess of those that the University of Wisconsin study
23 supported.

24 Proponents argued that the University of Wisconsin
25 model does not account for traffic delays, but never
26 provide a specific analysis of the dollar amount by which
27 the study's transportation costs are allegedly understated
28 for this reason.



1 Next issue under this topic: A refusal to allow
2 the "fundamental determinants" of changes in milk supply
3 locations and costs of transportation to actually play a
4 role in setting Class I differentials. Dr. Nicholson
5 testified that there have been considerable changes to
6 where milk is produced and where population growth has
7 taken place.

8 Yet many proponents abjured Class I differential
9 changes that would reflect these new realities in the
10 location and quantity of milk production, and the impacts
11 of higher transportation costs, demanding instead that the
12 new differentials preserve existing relationships,
13 although, this principle was not uniformly applied to all
14 areas, such as Western Pennsylvania.

15 Q. We're up to Slide 21. Are you now introducing a
16 new topic?

17 A. Yes, I am. And I'm giving my throat a chance to
18 moisten up here.

19 USDA should not raise Class I differentials in a
20 doomed effort to reduce or eliminate depooling. Depooling
21 becomes a realistic option when the Class III or Class IV
22 price exceeds the blend price. In the largest FMMO,
23 Order 30, there were 34 months (out of 46), between
24 January 2020 and October 2023, in which either the
25 Class III or Class IV price exceeded the blend price. If
26 Proposal 19's \$1.26 increase in the Class I price for
27 Order 30 had been in place, there would still have been 33
28 months in which either the Class III or Class IV exceeded



1 the blend price.

2 THE COURT: All right. I want you to read that
3 one again. That's important, and I want you to go slowly.

4 THE WITNESS: Yes, I will. Thank you.

5 If Proposal 19's \$1.26 per hundredweight increase
6 in the Class I price in Order 30 had been in place, there
7 would still have been 33 months in which either the
8 Class III or Class IV price exceeded the blend price.

9 The Class I differential would have to increase to
10 \$41.32 in order to decentivize [sic] pooling entirely in
11 Order 30 and to provide some clarification.

12 That was a maximum month, would have been 41.32 to
13 completely eliminate depooling incentives during that
14 period of time.

15 THE COURT: Do you remember the month?

16 THE WITNESS: July 2020.

17 THE COURT: July 2020.

18 MR. ROSENBAUM: And, Mr. Brown, does your written
19 testimony include as attachments, spreadsheets that show
20 all the calculations?

21 THE WITNESS: Yes. There's detail in the
22 attachment, that is correct.

23 THE COURT: All right. And -- and rather than
24 "decentivize," your actual word there is "disincentivize";
25 is that correct?

26 THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. Thank you.

27 THE COURT: They probably mean the same thing.

28 Okay.



1 THE WITNESS: One is probably better grammar, but
2 I'm not the one to ask.

3 BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

4 Q. Next slide, please.

5 A. All right. Thank you.

6 My testimony thus far explains why Proposal 19
7 should be rejected in its entirety. Now I will -- I will
8 now address some specific shortcomings in that proposal
9 were USDA, nonetheless, to consider adopting any aspects
10 of it.

11 Q. Now we're on a new topic.

12 A. New topic: USDA should not raise Class I
13 differentials in the three Southeastern orders. This --
14 this topic I'll walk through a couple of slides. And,
15 again, we did some analysis to our best estimates and what
16 the cost increases of that proposal would -- would provide
17 to -- or charge to our processors.

18 USDA recently published in a final decision to
19 adopt significantly increased current and new
20 transportation and delivery credits for those bringing
21 milk to fluid milk plants in the three Southeastern
22 orders, subject to, of course, to producer referendum
23 approval.

24 We'll walk through a chart which is at the bottom
25 of Slide 23. And this is -- chart is titled "Current
26 Credits versus Combined New Transportation and Plant
27 Delivery Credits." Again, these --

28 THE COURT: So, and what kind of plants?



1 THE WITNESS: Distributing plant, fluid milk
2 plant.

3 And these are in dollars per hundredweight, and we
4 have three different Federal Orders. We show the current
5 delivery credit, the new one, and what the change would
6 be.

7 So, for example, in Order 5, which is the
8 Appalachian order, the current delivery credit is \$0.07,
9 the new would be \$0.90, and the increase is \$0.83 per
10 hundredweight.

11 In Order 6, which is the Florida Federal Order,
12 there is no current transportation in-plant delivery
13 credit. The new would be \$0.85, with an increase of
14 \$0.85.

15 In Order 7, the Southeast Federal Order, the
16 current combined credit is \$0.30, or -- \$0.30, which is --
17 just one. The new would be \$1.10, with an increase of
18 \$0.80 per hundredweight.

19 Same topic. These credits will be paid on top of
20 Class I prices, including Class I differentials. They are
21 not netted against Class I differentials. These credits
22 were not taken into account when the University of
23 Wisconsin created this model or when the proponents
24 developed 19.

25 And that's an important point. This information
26 was not available then, but it certainly can impact
27 changes that may or may not be made.

28 BY MR. ROSENBAUM:



1 Q. Next slide, still same topic.

2 A. These credits are equal to more than 40% of the
3 Proposal 19's proposed Class I differential increases.

4 Q. I think you just -- I don't think there's a need
5 to do the precise numbers, just tell us what the
6 percentage is that the new credits represent or new credit
7 increases represent of the proposed --

8 A. Of the current Class I differential. Okay.

9 So the numbers I'll be giving you is a percent
10 increase from these credits to the current Class I
11 differential in these different markets.

12 In Order 5, Appalachian --

13 Q. Actually, I think that's slightly -- I think this
14 is a percentage that the new credits represent of the
15 proposed increase for Class I.

16 A. Yes. Thank you for that clarification.

17 So these indicate the percentage from this
18 transportation change in the order that is in the final
19 decision relative to the request for increase in
20 differential. Thank you for that.

21 Order 5, Appalachian, is 43%; Order 6, Florida, is
22 46% of the proposed new differentials; Order 7, the
23 Southeast, is equals to 42% of the proposed change in
24 differentials.

25 Q. All right. Let's go on now to a new topic, the
26 next page, 26.

27 A. New topic: The \$0.40 Grade A adjustments --
28 adjustment is archaic and no longer relevant and should be



1 eliminated.

2 In earlier times, only a fraction of milk produced
3 in the United States was Grade A and eligible for fluid
4 use. Only 60% in 1960 was Grade A; only 84% in 1980.

5 Today, by contrast, over 99% of all milk produced
6 is Grade A milk, and in the vast majority of states, there
7 is no Grade B milk whatsoever. With 99% of all United
8 States-produced milk already being Grade A, there is no
9 longer any need to incentivize farmers to become Grade A.

10 Next page, same topic. And there's a chart on
11 this page which compares the Class I utilization with a
12 Grade A share of total milk sales.

13 And to give you a point of reference, in 1976, we
14 were roughly 80% Grade A, and for the last 11 years we
15 have been 99% Grade A. Class I utilization of Federal
16 Order milk has gone from around 55% in 1976, to last year
17 it was 27%. So becoming a Grade A farm no longer has any
18 real relationship between serving the fluid market. It
19 serves all markets.

20 The percentage of milk that is Grade A has
21 steadily risen, even as the percentage of FMMO milk that
22 is Class I has steadily fallen.

23 Q. Next slide, same topic.

24 A. Same topic. Many uses of milk other than Class I
25 products require Grade A milk. The PMO itself defines
26 Grade A milk products to include cottage cheese and whey
27 and whey products, as well as all milk products with the
28 standard of identity provided in 21 Code of Federal



1 Regulations Part 131 (excluding sweetened condensed milk),
2 including yogurt, sour cream, eggnog, and other products.

3 Continuing on this topic. Many plants producing
4 manufactured products have extra butterfat in the form of
5 cream. If they themselves use that cream to make packaged
6 cream products or sell the cream to customers that do so,
7 then the plant milk needs to have been Grade A milk.

8 Similarly, if the plant makes whey products that
9 then go into a product that must be Grade A, such as
10 yogurt, the whey must be made from Grade A milk.

11 Furthermore, many manufacturers of Grade AA butter
12 require that their supply be Grade A whether the milk
13 comes directly from farmers or their cooperatives or from
14 a manufacturing plant that has extra cream to sell.

15 Q. So next slide I think you are going to put some
16 facts behind these, some numbers behind these statements.

17 Can you please explain that.

18 A. Yes, I can. And for your reference, the plant
19 list we refer here is an attachment. It's actually a
20 digital Excel spreadsheet attachment to the testimony.

21 Q. This list you reference is an attachment to your
22 written testimony?

23 A. Yes. The October IMS plant list, based on our
24 analysis --

25 THE COURT: So that we're sure that's correct in
26 the transcript, what are you saying after the word
27 October?

28 THE WITNESS: IMS, Interstate Milk Shippers.



1 THE COURT: Ah, that's what IMS is.

2 THE WITNESS: Yeah, sorry. There's too many
3 acronyms in our industry, and we all think everybody knows
4 what they are. And of course sometimes we forget what
5 they are.

6 THE COURT: I think everyone in this room knew
7 that but me. But you may start again with that bullet
8 point.

9 THE WITNESS: I will. And everybody has to --
10 everybody has to be able to read the record, whether they
11 are in this room or not.

12 The October IMS, Interstate Milk Shippers, plant
13 list includes around 131 plants that primarily manufacture
14 Class III and IV products. IMS rules require that these
15 plants use only Grade A milk, even though they are not
16 fluid milk plants.

17 BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

18 Q. And, Mr. Brown, did you personally review that
19 list and make those determinations?

20 A. Yes. It was quite a chore. Yes.

21 Q. Okay.

22 A. I think we -- it was kind of like Santa Claus, we
23 made a list and checked it probably three or four times.

24 This includes all of the large mozzarella plants,
25 the large Hilmar and Glanbia cheddar cheese plant, and to
26 the best of my belief, all of the large mozzarella cheese
27 and butter powder plants.

28 1,748 bulk tank unit, or BTU, facilities also



1 appear on the IMS list. Not surprising is 99% plus of all
2 milk is Grade A.

3 For point of reference, bulk tank units are the
4 inspection units that are used to determine that farms are
5 meeting Grade A qualifications. So any farm that ships
6 Grade A milk is part of a bulk tank unit.

7 Q. So just to be clear here, to be on the IMS list,
8 the Interstate Milk Shippers list, you have to be Grade A,
9 correct?

10 A. Absolutely. Both your milk supply and your plant
11 has to pass inspection.

12 Q. So for Hilmar and Glanbia's cheddar cheese plants
13 to be on that list, which they are, they have to be
14 receiving nothing but Grade A milk; is that right?

15 A. That is correct. And it's for different reasons.
16 Some -- some cheese customers want Grade A milk, but in a
17 lot of cases it's the sale of cream that requires the
18 plant be IMS certified and the milk be Grade A.

19 Q. That is to say that what you referred to on the
20 previous slide, that cheddar cheese companies like Hilmar
21 and Glanbia end up with something they want to sell to
22 somebody else?

23 A. And the price -- the price is significantly higher
24 if it's Grade A cream versus Grade B cream.

25 On to Slide 31. Again, commenting on the Grade A
26 adjustments. 99% of milk already being Grade A, the only
27 real cost is maintaining Grade A status. And we looked at
28 the USDA requirements for plants for grading, and compared



1 that to the IMS list to come up with a -- what we thought
2 were differences that could significantly -- not even
3 significantly, but it would be recognizable costs. And we
4 really came up with two.

5 One, with Grade A you have to be inspected twice a
6 year, biannual, rather than annual farm inspections, which
7 are required for Grade B.

8 Another one, which I have personal experience with
9 as a kid, is that barn walls with permeable surfaces need
10 to be painted once a year. So that was always fun getting
11 ready for the whitewashing the barn as I was a kid.

12 Q. Just to be clear about this, you -- in making this
13 list, you were comparing the USDA guidelines for, what do
14 you call it, manufacture? Strike that, let me start that
15 again.

16 You were comparing the USDA guidelines for -- that
17 applied to a farm, even if it's not Grade A, correct?

18 A. That is correct.

19 Q. And you were comparing that to the PMO
20 requirements applicable to plants that are Grade A,
21 correct?

22 A. Yes. And when you look at maintenance, these are
23 the two costs that you could identify.

24 Q. Okay. So that what you are focusing here on,
25 given that 99% of milk is already Grade A, you are asking
26 the question, what do these farms need to do to maintain
27 Grade A status as opposed to what they would have to be
28 doing if they weren't Grade A, correct?



1 A. Yes. And just a little color on this -- on this
2 slide.

3 Farms don't go back from Grade A to Grade B unless
4 they fail their inspection and they become Grade B. I
5 mean, they simply don't make that decision, except in
6 cases where pricing regulations, specifically in
7 California, more in the past, if they wanted not to
8 participate in the pool, they would become Grade B so they
9 didn't have to participate. So it was -- it was an
10 economic decision unrelated to milk quality, it was all
11 about price regulation.

12 Q. And did they actually even change their farms in
13 order --

14 A. No, they didn't do anything, other than they only
15 had one inspection a year instead of two. That was it.
16 Because the plant requirements for milk remain strong.

17 And Hilmar is the best example in California, they
18 actually no longer allow that because of Grade A needs
19 for -- particularly marketing cream and some of their whey
20 products.

21 Q. Let's go on to the next slide, and slightly
22 different topic, although it still relates to the question
23 of what requirements are imposed on milk. So please talk
24 to us about that.

25 A. Okay. Back to Grade A, but this is more
26 specifically talking also about the -- the requirements
27 for milk quality and what reality is as an industry. And
28 so let's walk through these points.



1 The privately-negotiated agreements to supply
2 Class I processors milk with somatic cell counts lower
3 than the 750,000 cell limit imposed by the PMO are not a
4 relevant consideration.

5 Q. And let me just interrupt you. The reason you are
6 covering this topic is because some of the proponents of
7 Proposal 19 have pointed to the fact that some of their
8 Class I customers have imposed requirements regarding
9 somatic cell count that are more stringent than the
10 750,000 limit that the PMO itself imposes in order to
11 qualify for Grade A, correct?

12 A. I would observe all of their Class III and
13 Class IV customers are doing the same thing, yes.

14 Q. That's --

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. But that's --

17 A. We'll talk about that.

18 Q. But that's why you are raising this topic.

19 A. That's right. Because it's -- and this really --
20 again, this 750,000 cell limit is a federal limit, but in
21 reality, it's not really a limit anymore, and there's a
22 couple reasons.

23 First of all, cooperatives or other companies
24 exporting manufacturing -- manufactured dairy products to
25 any of the 27 European countries of the EU must already
26 meet the European standard of no more than 400,000 somatic
27 cell count.

28 And a really important point: Lower somatic cell



1 counts directly benefit farmers themselves. Reducing
2 somatic cell counts, for example, from 400,000 to 200,000
3 increases milk production by 312 pounds per cow. And
4 there's a reference to that, where that article came from,
5 it's from Ohio State, in the written testimony.

6 Q. So just to orient ourselves. To the extent that
7 there are Class I handlers who have imposed a private
8 obligation on their suppliers to meet a somatic cell count
9 limit lower than 750,000, you have made two points here.

10 One is, they already have to meet lower limits if
11 they are going to be trying to export anything to Europe
12 because Europe has a lower limit, right?

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. Of 400,000, correct?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And then second, there -- there are all kinds of
17 incentives why farmers would want to have lower somatic
18 cell counts completely apart from whether that obligation
19 is being imposed by Class I handlers; is that what you are
20 saying?

21 A. That is correct. And a lot of the reason for that
22 is cream, again. Because products with cream in them are
23 sent to Europe. So any plant, as we talked earlier, a lot
24 of plants sell cream, any of those plants would need to
25 meet that EU requirement. So it's not just Class I, it's
26 all plants.

27 Q. So the last point you have said, even going below
28 the 700,000 limit that Europe imposes, that actually is



1 something a farmer would want to do for his own purposes?

2 A. Yes. I referenced the most recent study I could
3 find, which is 2017, so it's pretty recent. But they have
4 been doing studies on somatic cell counts for decades,
5 showing that it affects the productivity. Lower the
6 count, the healthier the cow, the more milk you get.

7 Q. And lower somatic cell counts reflect health
8 considerations for the cow?

9 A. They do. And as our next slide would show,
10 farmers have been very successful managing somatic cell
11 counts.

12 As we mentioned, lower cell counts mean healthier,
13 more productive cows. Data from Federal Orders with the
14 somatic cell count, or SCC, programs show dairy farmers
15 are achieving very low cell counts in all parts of the
16 country serving all different types of milk processors.

17 And, again, the chart shows averages for Federal
18 Orders with somatic cell count programs in 2018 to 2022.
19 Six Federal Orders currently have a somatic cell count
20 adjustment on price, again, rewarding lower counts.

21 So as a result, they have got very complete data
22 of somatic cell for all six orders, because it's tested
23 along with their butterfat and their protein.

24 And what you find is that all of them are below
25 250,000 based on the last five years, and they continue to
26 get lower. Three are under 200,000, three of the orders.
27 But the Southeast, which are heavy -- heavy Class I use.
28 The other three orders are very heavy cheese use,



1 particularly Upper Midwest. So we have all different
2 kinds of farms and all different kinds of locations
3 shipping to all different kinds of plants, and they have
4 all achieved very good somatic cell counts.

5 So when you look at, for example, Class I
6 utilization based on order pools, they range from 9.6% in
7 the Upper Midwest in Class I to as high as just under
8 83% in Florida. So, again, these are -- these are
9 dairies, different locations, different markets, all have
10 achieved very low somatic cell count. So it isn't just
11 one farm that's doing this in the market, it's the entire
12 market has done a very good job getting their counts down.

13 And they have dropped over the years. Again,
14 there's milk production incentives to do it, and your cows
15 are healthier.

16 Q. So bottom line, even in orders that have very low
17 Class I utilization, the Upper Midwest being the prime
18 example, with only 9.6% Class I utilization, there the
19 average somatic cell count is under -- well under 200,000,
20 in fact, it's 173,000; is that correct?

21 A. That is correct.

22 Q. Okay. And so what conclusion do you draw as to
23 whether it's reasonable for proponents of Proposal 19 to
24 say, well, Class I processors are imposing somatic cell
25 count limits under the -- more stringent than the 750,000
26 in the PMO and so they should have to pay for that?

27 A. I think all plants require quality milk, and it is
28 very evident, all producers, with few exceptions, are



1 making very high quality milk. It's in everyone's
2 benefit, including the producer.

3 I think the other -- the other thing I would -- I
4 would observe on other qualifications as well, it's all
5 about making milk that lasts in the store. Gives you
6 better cheese yield because your protein quality is better
7 if your cell counts are low. There's all kinds of reasons
8 to do this, and it's good for the industry.

9 There's been a lot of frustration, including with
10 National Milk, on -- on the FDA not being willing to lower
11 somatic cell count from 750,000. I think we all realize
12 it's become very, very irrelevant. It may be legal milk,
13 but nobody wants it. So basically it's become standard
14 practice across the entire industry to have high quality
15 milk, and our dairymen in this country have done a
16 remarkable job providing it.

17 Q. And they get more milk out of their cows as a
18 result?

19 A. Yeah. And the cows are happier, too. That's
20 right.

21 MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, that completes
22 Mr. Brown's PowerPoint presentation. You may recall that
23 there was one exhibit I used when Dr. Scott Brown --

24 THE WITNESS: Yes, Scott Brown. No relation.
25 He's got a lot more degrees than I do.

26 MR. ROSENBAUM: -- testified that I explained that
27 Mr. Brown, Mr. Mike Brown, had put together, and he would
28 testify about. It's been a couple of days. You may have



1 forgotten.

2 But in any event, I can do that right now or we
3 could have that separate after we finish the cross on
4 these topics. I will leave it to Your Honor how you want
5 to --

6 THE COURT: I think it would be good if we revisit
7 that now.

8 MR. ROSENBAUM: Okay. Your Honor, that was -- the
9 document that I referenced was Hearing Exhibit 423, which
10 was marked as IDFA Exhibit 59, when -- in Mr. Brown
11 getting ready to testify today about this, he noted that
12 the list of data sources had been inadvertently cut short.
13 There was one additional data source. The numbers
14 themselves are absolutely unchanged, but I do have a
15 corrected version of the Hearing Exhibit, which I would
16 like to distribute, and which I would like to end up being
17 the official version.

18 As I say, the numbers are completely unchanged,
19 it's just adding a third reference source, data source.

20 So I will distribute that now.

21 THE COURT: All right. And we'll take a
22 five-minute stretch break while that happens.

23 Please move around and come back by 9:35.

24 (Whereupon, a break was taken.)

25 THE COURT: Let's go back on record.

26 We're back on record at 9:35.

27 Mr. Rosenbaum.

28 ///



1 BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

2 Q. Mr. Brown, before I turn to corrected Hearing
3 Exhibit 423, I do want to clarify one thing so that IDFA's
4 position is clear.

5 You are here today testifying in opposition to
6 Proposal 19, which would increase Class I differentials;
7 is that correct?

8 A. That is correct.

9 Q. IDFA is not at these hearings advocating a
10 decrease in the current Class I differentials; is that
11 correct?

12 A. We are not.

13 Q. When you talk about how you believe the \$0.40
14 component of the base differential is archaic and should
15 be eliminated, the concept here is that if USDA is
16 otherwise inclined to increase the Class I differentials,
17 under that circumstance, it should deduct \$0.40 from what
18 otherwise the increase would be; is that right?

19 A. That is correct. And let me clarify that for a
20 second.

21 If we're going to use real market conditions, we
22 have to recognize, we can discuss that differentials need
23 to change. We have had a lot of evidence. We'll hear
24 more. But at the same time, I think it's important that
25 we recognize that when we're looking at what the base
26 would be, whatever that is, there certainly isn't room to
27 raise Grade A. And I think you could argue there's no
28 reason for it, just because all milk's Grade A.



1 Q. I'm sorry, there's a reason to eliminate Grade A;
2 is that what you said?

3 A. Yes. There is a reason to eliminate it. If we're
4 going to recognize real cost, it's not a real cost
5 anymore. So as you are evaluating all the options at
6 USDA, and I don't want to -- I don't want to put a lot of
7 weight on anybody's shoulder, but differentials is going
8 to be a difficult topic. It was difficult for all of us,
9 and it's going to be difficult for -- it's just a lot of
10 work there, a lot to go through, and I think you got to
11 look at everything. If you are going to change it, you
12 got to look at everything.

13 Q. Including, for example, the elasticity results
14 that you provided from Dr. Capps, correct?

15 A. Yes. And in my experience -- and, again, you can
16 talk about time periods. As working for a retailer,
17 milk's elastic. And I think the big thing is
18 substitutions, is that cross-elasticity with other
19 products, it's real, and it does -- it does affect -- it
20 does affect sales.

21 Q. And when you say as "a retailer," you are
22 referring to your --

23 A. My previous employment at Kroger, we talked about
24 that all the time, because my dairy team -- and don't
25 anybody get offended -- we also bought the plant
26 beverages, I won't call it milk, but we bought the plant
27 beverages as well within our team. And so we're very
28 aware of retail strategy on those products as well. And



1 Kroger does a lot of internal elasticity work as well. I
2 can't share numbers, but I can assure you I wasn't
3 surprised at what Dr. Capps' numbers shows.

4 THE COURT: And, again, just listening to both of
5 you, it's very hard to distinguish between a person saying
6 "elastic" and a person saying "inelastic." So when you do
7 talk about that, please emphasize whether it's inelastic
8 you are talking about, or elastic.

9 MR. ROSENBAUM: I believe both of us were using
10 the word "elastic" in our colloquy.

11 THE WITNESS: Yeah, we were using the general
12 term, which is elastic, which can include the whole range
13 of elasticities. But I will be very sure if I use the
14 word inelastic, I will make it clear so we -- I don't
15 want -- I don't want to cause any more trouble than it is.
16 And we all have to review this record, and so we need to
17 make sure we get it right the first time.

18 THE COURT: Amen. Thank you.

19 BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

20 Q. So now, Mr. Brown, retur- -- turning to corrected
21 Hearing Exhibit 423, which is also IDFA Exhibit 59, just
22 if you'd turn to the last page which shows the data
23 sources.

24 Is it the third data source that you have added to
25 the original Hearing Exhibit 423?

26 A. Yes. Yes, it is the third one. You could
27 actually calculate -- in some of the older months, looking
28 at block and barrel, we had to do that. You can calculate



1 the weighted average from the data in the other two
2 reports, but it's much simpler just to pull the numbers
3 from USDA. And so they are pulled out of that Table 5,
4 Exhibit 16. That's where the weighted average cheddar
5 price comes from.

6 Q. All right. Let's then turn back to page 1 --

7 THE COURT: Now, I just have to ask. I'm just
8 looking at the old one and the new one. So in the old
9 one, your next to the last page ended with Row 314, and
10 then on the final page you started over with -- with
11 different numbers for your rows.

12 Does that make any -- does that -- is that going
13 to foul us up? If we don't keep the old one, is it going
14 to foul us up when we look at the testimony of a witness
15 who was looking at the old one?

16 MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, I -- I -- I think the
17 answer is I don't believe so, because they are all -- the
18 numbers in the tables are still the same. I see the
19 Roman -- I don't have the old version in front of me, but
20 I -- I will take your word for the renumbering, which was
21 not intentional.

22 THE WITNESS: It's --

23 THE COURT: No, no. Do you understand? Let's say
24 a witness was telling me about page 9.

25 MR. ROSENBAUM: Yes.

26 THE COURT: And the witness referred to Row 19,
27 which is on the old version on page 9. But now the row
28 numbers are a continuum between page 8 and 9, and so they



1 have different number for the row. The contents of the
2 row may be identical, but I -- if I have testimony in the
3 record, I maybe need this not to replace the old one. In
4 other words, I may need to hang on to the old one in order
5 to understand the testimony.

6 MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, I think I understand
7 your point. Why don't we -- I would suggest that we
8 call -- change the name of this to corrected Hearing
9 Exhibit 423A.

10 THE COURT: Perfect.

11 MR. ROSENBAUM: That's the document that we just
12 distributed, and let's go ahead and call it also
13 IDFA Exhibit 59A.

14 THE COURT: Excellent.

15 MR. ROSENBAUM: And they will both be there.

16 THE COURT: Thank you. That solves my problem.

17 Now, and you may continue, if you have any other
18 questions for this witness on this document.

19 MR. ROSENBAUM: Yes, I do.

20 BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

21 Q. I simply want to go through the columns one by one
22 and just ask you what source each column came from if
23 someone wants to duplicate your effort.

24 So once again, the document as a whole is called
25 "Comparison of Monthly NDPSR Block Cheddar Price with the
26 Barrel Cheddar and Weighted Average NDPSR Cheddar Prices."

27 So Column A is obviously just a list of months.

28 Where does the information from Column B come



1 from?

2 A. Column B comes from USDA Exhibit 16, which is
3 Table 5, which is the Announcement of Monthly Class and
4 Component Prices. The numbers were cut and pasted from
5 that spreadsheet into this one.

6 Q. Then Column C, which is the block prices, where
7 did that come from?

8 A. Two different places, because it was reported
9 originally by NASS, and then in 2000 -- I think it was
10 March of 2012, NDPSR picked up the reporting of those
11 prices. The reason for that was to provide audits, make
12 sure they were accurate, and it was a good change.

13 But the two pieces of information we were never
14 put together. So, for example, you could go to Datamark
15 where you can get infor- -- some of this, particularly
16 pricing information. It's a nice database. It only goes
17 back to 2012. And the reason for that is because before
18 that, that data was NASS, it wasn't NDPSR. Same use --
19 used for the same purpose, but it was a different agency
20 reporting it, and the two were never put together, which
21 is why you have the two sources. If you look at page 3 --
22 I mean, page 9, the very end, you have National Dairy
23 Product Sales Report, which is the current NDPSR, and you
24 have the dairy products prices report, which previous to
25 the change was used to determine these prices. So we used
26 both. It's a lot more work with the old dairy product
27 pricing report.

28 Now, I have been collecting those for a long time,



1 so I had the data. But if you need to check it -- we did
2 some randoms to be sure. We just pull up months, and
3 calculate it, and figure out what the price was to make
4 sure they were correct, because there wasn't available
5 digital sources previous to 2012.

6 So we did it -- we did it -- we took what I had
7 and I made sure that the data was correct at its source.
8 I did random spot checks.

9 Q. Now, you've been describing what you used for
10 Column C, which is the block price?

11 A. And D is the same.

12 Q. D is the same?

13 A. Yeah.

14 Q. All right.

15 A. And they both come from the same report.

16 Q. And then E, which is barrel plus \$0.03?

17 A. Yeah. Again, using Column D as the base and the
18 formula for Class III protein adds \$0.03 to the barrel
19 price. So it's simply that barrel price reported plus
20 \$0.03.

21 Q. All right. What about Column G, which is under
22 the subheading "NDPSR Cheese Price Comparisons," and
23 Column G specifically is block versus barrel.

24 How was that calculated?

25 A. That is the barrel price is subtracted from the
26 block price. So Column D is subtracted from Column C.

27 Q. And block versus barrel plus \$0.03, how was that
28 calculated?



1 A. The barrel plus \$0.03 price is subtracted from the
2 block price.

3 Q. Just tell us what columns you are dealing with.

4 A. Yeah. So Column E is subtracted from Column C.

5 Q. And then Column I, how is that calculated?

6 A. That is calculated by subtracting the weighted
7 average price, Column B, from Column C, which is the block
8 price.

9 MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, that completes my
10 examination, and the witness is available for
11 cross-examination.

12 THE COURT: Thank you. And when we talk about
13 what exhibits we're going to consider, I'll wait until
14 after cross-exam, but it will include not only today's
15 exhibits, but also the previous version of Exhibit 423.

16 Who would like to go first with cross-examination?

17 CROSS-EXAMINATION

18 BY MS. HANCOCK:

19 Q. Good morning, Mr. Brown.

20 Nicole Hancock with National Milk.

21 A. Good morning.

22 Q. Just want to -- I want to maybe bounce around a
23 little bit.

24 You had, at the very tail end of your testimony,
25 clarified that your -- IDFA is not advocating for a
26 reduction in Class I differentials; is that right?

27 A. We are not advocating for -- we're advocating for,
28 if they are going to be evaluated, then other parts than



1 just the mileage change, differential change, needs to be
2 looked at. That's what we're saying.

3 So we're not saying they need to go away. We're
4 just saying if you are going to do an evaluation, you look
5 at everything.

6 Q. So will you be coming back to testify in
7 opposition to Proposal 20?

8 A. We are neutral on Proposal 20. We have members on
9 both sides, so we are taking no position.

10 Q. Okay. But other than taking into account the
11 transportation credits that are the subject of being voted
12 on, you are not proposing a decrease in the Class I
13 differentials; is that correct?

14 A. We are not. Let's put it this way: If you look
15 at the current differential map, we are not proposing any
16 decreases from the way it's currently done.

17 Q. Okay. Does that mean that you believe that those
18 differentials, other than taking into account those
19 changes in the transportation credits, are properly set
20 where they are right now?

21 A. I think what I would say is that when you start to
22 look at changing them, you need to look at things, for
23 example, is Grade A relevant anymore? I think not. Do
24 you need to change it? IDFA's view is, within the current
25 differentials, we wouldn't change it. If you are going to
26 look at putting other changes in, it should be part of
27 that decision.

28 As you know, we had no proposal on differential



1 map, so -- so we don't have a proposal to remove Grade A.
2 We just ask that it be considered as part of the broader
3 picture of the differential map if there's going to be
4 changes need.

5 Q. Okay. I'm just going to walk through maybe -- I'm
6 going to walk through Exhibit 434, which is your
7 PowerPoint presentation.

8 I want to start with page 3. And this is in both
9 your testimony and in your PowerPoint presentation, but
10 you quote from the 19- -- that March 5th of 1993, the
11 USDA -- talking about a reserve supply of milk.

12 Do you see where I'm at?

13 A. Yes, ma'am.

14 Q. Okay. And at the time that this quote was
15 published, USDA was using a 70% Class I utilization as a
16 threshold; is that right?

17 A. I honestly -- I don't recall that specific. I'd
18 take your word for it.

19 Q. Do you think that this criteria that you have
20 quoted from 1993 is still relevant today?

21 A. I do.

22 Q. And why is that?

23 A. Because if you look at -- first of all,
24 seasonality of milk isn't as bad as it was at that point
25 in time, so that reserve supply doesn't vary as much month
26 to month as it used to. I think that's -- I think that's
27 part of it.

28 And I think the other part, in erring on the side



1 of plenty, we are nowhere close to that as far as
2 non-Class I use and -- in any market but III. And so I
3 believe there's plenty of milk. And going back to the
4 final decision that was just released on transportation
5 credits for the Southeast, that's working to identify
6 where there's reserve milk is needed, to get help to get
7 that milk to the market.

8 Q. In 1993, was there a government dairy supply price
9 support program that was --

10 A. There was.

11 THE COURT: Whoa, whoa.

12 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

13 BY MS. HANCOCK:

14 Q. That's okay. You probably know where I'm going,
15 but it will be better if the sentence is complete.

16 A. That's right.

17 Q. In 1993, was there a government Dairy Price
18 Support Program that was the market-clearing outlet for
19 any surplus milk converted into cheese, milk powder, and
20 butter?

21 A. There was. Was it effective, I think is the
22 question. Did it really function at that point with the
23 level -- at a level that really created a lot of use of
24 that market? And it was waning by that time. So it -- it
25 did exist. Its function wasn't near as -- it wasn't used
26 near as heavily example as it was used in the early '80s.

27 Q. And then that was repealed by the 2002 Farm Bill?

28 A. Yes.



1 Q. And the domestic commercial market and world
2 markets today are the market-clearing locations; is that
3 right?

4 A. That would be correct from my -- from my point of
5 view.

6 Q. So there is a competitive market difference than
7 what it was back in 1993; is that fair?

8 A. We've certainly grown our participation in the
9 world market. That would be true.

10 Q. And then we have also had other market changing
11 factors, such as construction of new manufacturing plants
12 adjacent to where the milk supply is the greatest?

13 A. Generally, you are not going to build a plant
14 without knowing you are going to have a milk supply. And
15 generally there's agreements on supply that are made
16 either with individual producers or cooperatives before
17 the first -- first piece of stainless is put in the
18 building. I mean, that is true.

19 But as you can imagine, the risk of supply that
20 they -- try to working -- work really hard to make sure
21 you have a supply before you start to build anything.

22 Q. And there's good examples that have already been
23 put into the record such as Greenville Venture Partners in
24 Greenville.

25 Is that an example of where there's a new plant
26 that was built near the milk supply?

27 A. Yes.

28 Q. And Glanbia at St. Johns?



1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And Daisy at Wooster, Ohio?

3 A. I'm not familiar with that one. I mean, I know
4 what the plants there, but I don't know the story behind
5 it.

6 Q. Okay. And when dairy farmers are selling their
7 milk, who is usually the one that is paying those delivery
8 costs?

9 A. It's directly paid by the co-op or the farmer.
10 But generally, the service charge that you pay to purchase
11 milk, it may not be a direct, but it's in there. But you
12 do find more and more transportation, particularly in
13 energy costs, fuel costs, you will see adjustments in that
14 premium that's calculated on a per hundredweight or per
15 truck basis.

16 So as far as directly paying it, it's farmers or
17 their co-ops. How they divide that money up is -- really
18 varies from my experience. Sometimes plants do pay that
19 cost, but generally, it's not direct, it's just -- it's
20 considered as part of the premium. If there's an
21 additional cost to move milk, they'll try to negotiate
22 that in premium.

23 Q. And the ability to negotiate that in a premium,
24 that has a big contributing factor in determining where
25 the best place is to deliver that milk; is that fair?

26 A. I think it is. But we can talk more about
27 negotiating premiums. But certainly -- certainly I'm sure
28 different customers are different to work with. I would



1 expect nothing but that. So I would say, yes, that's
2 true.

3 Q. And those are, again, additional differences as
4 compared to the market circumstances back in -- or the
5 market factors back in 1993?

6 A. Well, there's two things that have happened since
7 then. The -- your buyers are bigger companies, but so are
8 your cooperatives. You have a lot less of them. There's
9 been a lot of very successful mergers, which does help.

10 And the other thing, I'm going to insert my own
11 personal experience, is how effective the marketing
12 agencies in common are in different markets. They were
13 all fighting back around 2015, we saw premiums drop. They
14 have coordinated and done an effective job working
15 together. They are starting to rise again.

16 And so a lot of that, again, we're talking a
17 minimum price here, that -- that ability to negotiate
18 price, which Federal Orders do give marketing agencies in
19 common, which is a great asset I think to the cooperative
20 industry. It plays a big role in how effective that
21 happens. If those agencies work, then premiums generally
22 are easier to get.

23 Q. And even with what you described as an increase in
24 the size of the buyers, and an increase in the size of
25 cooperatives, even with that market dynamics,
26 cooperatives, even though they have grown, are still
27 cooperatives, and the dairy farmers are still the ones who
28 are primarily responsible for those hauling costs; is that



1 right?

2 A. They are. But those costs are often included in,
3 again, the negotiation premiums, but they are not direct.
4 It's not necessarily X cents to get the truck from A to B.
5 It's part of that overall negotiation.

6 Q. So if they have sufficient bargaining power and
7 can negotiate that into over-order premium, they might be
8 able to get their ultimate buyer to cover some of those
9 costs; is that what you are saying?

10 A. I say yes. And it's going to depend on market.
11 It depends on the market power of the cooperatives. If
12 they are all working together, it's a lot easier to do
13 than if they are not. I know they have, for certain.

14 Q. Okay. Let's turn to -- let's move to page 5 of
15 your PowerPoint presentation in Exhibit 434.

16 A. Okay.

17 Q. On this slide you are talking about how the
18 current supply of milk is more than adequate to serve the
19 Class I needs, and you describe what you believe proves
20 that that current supply is justification for not needing
21 to increase differentials.

22 Is that a fair characterization?

23 A. The characterization is when you -- when you
24 change shipping percentages, when you lower them, that
25 means in order to make sure milk can access the pool, you
26 have to be more generous in diversions, what can be
27 allowed, not to be -- the shipping requirement has to be
28 weaker.



1 So I would say yes. Again, market to market is
2 different, but overall, yes, we do believe that.

3 Is that the only reason? No. It's an example, I
4 think, of one that's evident because we have evidentiary
5 record of the request and the granting of the changes.

6 Q. You describe in the third bullet point that the
7 shipping percentages in the orders that you cite here was
8 lowered, not raised. And in the next bullet point you
9 say, "This can only be attributed to the degree to which
10 the milk supply is increasingly more than adequate to
11 serve the Class I needs."

12 Do you see that?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. It can also be because the demand for Class I
15 conventional fluid milk has just decreased at the retail
16 level; is that fair?

17 A. It is. But when it's decreased, that means that
18 you have more supply, unless the supply also responds.

19 I thought one of the most interesting things that
20 Dr. Brown talked about was the inelasticity of supply.
21 There's no question as farms have gotten bigger and very
22 modern and the way they produce, you don't have the
23 elasticity, you don't have the supply response, you don't
24 have the 50-cow dairy farms around anymore. They just
25 say, I'm done. I'm going to quit. I'm going to retire.

26 So there is -- that supply tends to be a little
27 more consistent, you know. Weather and price, obviously,
28 plays a big role in that.



1 So from my perspective, the -- the -- when the
2 Class I percentages are lower, it's because Class I sales
3 are lower, which is unfortunate. I think we all would
4 love to see that change. But it also means the milk
5 supply is remaining the same or it's increased.

6 Q. And you have worn a lot of hats in the dairy
7 industry, so it's fair to say that when we see that
8 consolidation in those smaller dairy farmers that are --
9 are not as prevalent as they used to be, that's due, in
10 part, because they have gone out of business because they
11 haven't been able to financially survive in the current
12 economic conditions.

13 A. Yeah. They -- their cost structure,
14 unfortunately, doesn't always -- isn't always competitive
15 today, which is unfortunate, but it's the case.
16 Particularly when you reach retirement, you have an asset
17 that its best value isn't a 50-cow dairy. The land to
18 grow corn for the 1,000-cow dairy next door may be a
19 better use. So they are making good economic decisions,
20 but those dairies aren't being passed on to generations
21 like the larger ones generally are.

22 Q. And the financial pressures that the dairy farmers
23 face are just increasingly more difficult to absorb when
24 you have a smaller farm as opposed to a larger farm, that
25 can -- that can absorb some of those additional increases?

26 A. You know, I was raised on one of those smaller
27 farms, so, yes, you are -- you are correct. But that's --
28 that's not -- that's an issue of an overall supply/demand.



1 We can't forget that butter, powder, whey, and cheese
2 determine our milk price, and those markets are ultimately
3 going to determine what the value of the products are,
4 which will determine, depending how you disseminate it,
5 what the value of the milk is.

6 Q. And the only -- the only control factor for a
7 dairy farmer is at the price for which it sells its milk;
8 is that right?

9 A. I didn't catch the price.

10 Q. Yeah. The only way that the dairy farmer can
11 capture the increase in its costs to service the market,
12 is through the price through which it sells its product?

13 A. They either have to find ways to make milk a
14 little more efficiently, which we all know is very
15 difficult, or they have to -- they have to, you know,
16 hopefully find a better market.

17 I spent a lot of time in my life working on
18 specialty cheese plants, both from the standpoint of small
19 processors as well as farming groups, and it sounds great
20 until you realize the dent that makes in total milk demand
21 is tiny. Those little -- you are not going to build an
22 8-million-pound-a-day specialty cheese plant. And so
23 unfortunately, the overall impact on the industry isn't as
24 great, plus they tend to cost more to operate.

25 Q. And if we just walk through that supply chain and
26 we get to the fluid milk handlers, they have the ability
27 to affect their margins by controlling expenses, right?

28 A. As does the farm.



1 Q. Yes.

2 A. To an extent -- and we all know there's limits to
3 that. But, yes.

4 Q. Yeah.

5 A. And they try their best to do that.

6 Q. And -- and then also, the fluid milk handler has
7 the ability to control its prices and negotiate prices to
8 which its selling its product?

9 A. Yeah. Let's just discuss that for a minute,
10 because those fluid suppliers are facing the same larger
11 buyers as we talked about farms. In fact, I'd argue it's
12 worse. And so they have limited -- they have limited
13 ability to do that, and you would think they would.

14 And a good example, quite honestly, we had the
15 witness from United Dairy talking about that \$0.06 per
16 hundredweight. I have never bought packaged milk where a
17 difference between the number one and number two bid was
18 more than a cent and a half. Most of the times it's under
19 a penny. It's an extremely competitive business, just
20 like farming is. And so they struggle with this common
21 fear of the same margin issues.

22 And if you look at the shrinkage in the number of
23 Class I plants, and currently it's just like farms, if
24 they were really profitable, numbers wouldn't be dropping.
25 But they are.

26 Q. And -- and certainly, when -- that -- I want to
27 talk for a second about that very competitive environment
28 that handlers have to operate within in order to sell



1 their fluid milk products, because that's -- that's really
2 where their biggest pinch is in order to continue to
3 survive, is being able to sell at a price point that is
4 commensurate with where their competitors are selling; is
5 that fair?

6 A. It's very -- true across most industries, and milk
7 is no exception, for certain.

8 Q. And so by increasing price differentials across
9 the board as opposed to just trying to negotiate one-off
10 contracts, that is a levelling of the playing field
11 amongst those competitors; is that fair?

12 A. Depends how you do it. I would argue the
13 proposals that have been made by National Milk, a lot of
14 them maybe make good sense, they are not very consistent
15 from market to market, and you are creating winners and
16 losers. And there will be more testimony on that coming
17 up, but that's one of the biggest concerns is changing the
18 competitive surface.

19 Q. Okay. But assuming that we're in the same market
20 and we're talking about the same differentials between two
21 fluid milk handlers, having the differentials raised for
22 both is -- means that when they both go to negotiate or
23 provide bids to their retail outlets, they are on the same
24 playing field; is that fair?

25 A. Couple things. First of all, if that was always
26 the case, they were always in the same differential zone,
27 but they are not. And that's -- and that's the -- that's
28 the struggle. It's a function -- just like with milk with



1 transportation.

2 But when you are setting a -- actual rather and a
3 negotiated value, for example, serving a plant that's
4 maybe a little more difficult to -- when I worked for
5 Kroger, we had a plant in Atlanta, and we always had
6 people wanting to sell that milk, but they often didn't
7 think about the traffic, and they were right, it's
8 horrible.

9 But the -- the -- I guess the point I would make
10 is that we can't -- we shouldn't, by regulation, change
11 that competitive -- and that's difficult, but we have to
12 be very careful we don't change that the competitive
13 difference.

14 And the other thing I would get into, again,
15 having -- is making sure milk, to the extent it can,
16 because we all know the majority of the milk price is
17 based on the commodity markets --

18 THE COURT: Based on commodity what?

19 THE WITNESS: Commodity markets for butter,
20 cheese, powder, and whey. And so you're always going to
21 have fluctuation. But I think there's a -- there's a -- I
22 think, a legitimate concern that we make sure we keep milk
23 products as competitive as we possibly can, with,
24 unfortunately, our competitors who would love to take our
25 markets away from us.

26 MS. HANCOCK: Okay. And then can we have
27 Exhibit 301?

28 THE COURT: Yes. I think this is -- remember



1 where you are. This is a perfect time for us to take our
2 15-minute break.

3 So please be back and ready to go at 10:21.

4 (Whereupon, a break was taken.)

5 THE COURT: Let's go back on record.

6 We're back on record at 10:22.

7 Now, Ms. Hancock, you mentioned Exhibit 301.

8 MS. HANCOCK: Made everybody run out of the room.

9 THE COURT: I have appreciated so much how whether
10 you are the questioner or the witness, you really don't
11 have enough surface area for everything you need in front
12 of you. And you may proceed.

13 MS. HANCOCK: Thank you, Your Honor.

14 BY MS. HANCOCK:

15 Q. Mr. Brown, I want to just look at a couple of
16 locations.

17 If we just turn to, under -- I'm going to use
18 Column A, and turn to 712, which is Marion County,
19 Indiana.

20 A. Okay.

21 Q. Kroger has a fluid milk plant in Marion County,
22 Indiana; is that right?

23 A. I'm sorry?

24 Q. Kroger has a fluid milk plant in Indianapolis,
25 which is in Marion County?

26 A. Yes, they do.

27 Q. And that if we look at 712, under Column A, that
28 is current -- the model average for that one, that county,



1 is \$3.75; is that right?

2 A. Yes, Column L.

3 Q. And the proposal from National Milk is \$3.70; is
4 that right?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And so that's \$0.05 under what the model average
7 is; is that right?

8 A. Uh-huh. Yes.

9 THE COURT: I'm getting your questions
10 beautifully. I'm not getting the responses.

11 THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes, it is. It's \$0.05
12 difference.

13 BY MS. HANCOCK:

14 Q. And to the extent we're measuring if that's a good
15 thing or a bad thing for Kroger, the winners or losers,
16 that's a 5% better price for Kroger than what the model
17 would suggest that National Milk is proposing; is that
18 right?

19 A. It's \$0.05 -- in this market, yes.

20 Q. Okay. And let's look at 752, which is Wayne
21 County, Indiana.

22 Prairie Farms has a fluid milk plant in Wayne
23 County, in Richmond; is that right?

24 A. I don't know. I have no reason not to believe
25 you.

26 Q. Okay. And the model average for Richmond,
27 Indiana, or Wayne County, is \$3.60; is that right?

28 A. Yes.



1 THE COURT: I got the question; I didn't hear the
2 answer.

3 THE WITNESS: Yes.

4 BY MS. HANCOCK:

5 Q. And the proposal from National Milk is \$3.70; is
6 that right?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And so that's \$0.10 more than what the model
9 average --

10 A. In this specific example, yes, it's \$0.10 more.

11 Q. And those two locations are about 70 miles apart.
12 Does that sound right?

13 A. I honestly don't know where Wayne County is, so I
14 can't speak to that. Is Fort Wayne where Wayne County is?
15 I mean, I just don't know.

16 Q. Richmond, Indiana.

17 A. Oh, Richmond. Okay.

18 Yeah, that sounds about right, distance-wise.

19 Q. Let's go to Tennessee. We'll go to 2469. That's
20 on page 43 of Exhibit 301.

21 A. Uh-huh. I'm about there. Robertson? No,
22 Rutherford County. Okay.

23 Q. And Kroger has a plant in Rutherford County?

24 A. That's Murfreesboro, yes.

25 Q. And in that scenario, the model average came out
26 with \$5.05 a hundredweight; is that right?

27 A. Yes.

28 Q. And the proposal by National Milk is \$4.85; is



1 that right?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And so that's a 20% improvement over what the
4 model average is; is that right?

5 A. \$0.20, yes.

6 Q. Sorry. \$0.20 is what I meant to say.

7 A. Yeah.

8 Q. Okay. Let's look at 2413 --

9 THE COURT: Wait, now, I'm not reading this right.
10 We're on Row 2470, correct?

11 MS. HANCOCK: The far column on the left is 2470,
12 but Column A is what I have been using just because I can
13 say A, and that's 2469 for Rutherford, Tennessee.

14 THE WITNESS: Yes. That's the reference I was
15 using, yes.

16 THE COURT: And the model average is \$5.05?

17 MS. HANCOCK: I think that's what he agreed with
18 under Column L.

19 THE COURT: And the proposed is lower?

20 MS. HANCOCK: At \$4.85.

21 THE COURT: Yes.

22 BY MS. HANCOCK:

23 Q. So National Milk's proposal for Rutherford, for
24 Rutherford County, Tennessee, is \$0.20 less than the model
25 average; is that right?

26 A. In this, again, we've got lots of lines here. In
27 this case, that is true.

28 Q. Okay. And that is a location in which Kroger has



1 a fluid milk plant; is that right?

2 A. Yes, they do.

3 Q. And about 34 miles away in Nashville, DFA has a
4 competing fluid milk plant; is that right?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Okay. If you go to Column A, 2413 --

7 A. Davidson.

8 Q. -- in Davidson County, Tennessee, that's where
9 Nashville is; is that right?

10 A. Yes. Best of my recollection it is, yes.

11 Q. And the model average is \$4.85; is that right?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And National Milk's recommendation is \$4.85; is
14 that right?

15 A. That is correct.

16 Q. And so in that case where DFA has a plant,
17 National Milk recommended what the model average is; is
18 that right?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Whereas, 34 miles away where Kroger's plant was
21 located, National Milk recommended a price differential
22 that was \$0.20 less than the model average; is that right?

23 A. Yes. And I believe both markets, the proposal was
24 \$4.85. It was the same.

25 Q. And so that would mean that both Kroger and DFA
26 would be on a level playing field in selling that milk?

27 A. As far as minimum cost, yes.

28 Q. Okay. And let's look at Ohio. I want to go to



1 Column A, 2054.

2 A. I feel like I'm doing Bible drills here. Find the
3 page and the chapter.

4 THE COURT: How are you doing?

5 THE WITNESS: Well, my eyes are saying, I hope we
6 don't do too many of these, but I'm doing fine so far.

7 I'm -- excuse me, Nicole, could you give me the
8 line number again?

9 MS. HANCOCK: Sure. 2054. It's on page 36.

10 THE WITNESS: Thank you. It's Licking County.

11 THE COURT: Would you spell that, please,
12 Mr. Witness?

13 THE WITNESS: Just like you think, L-I-C-K-I-N-G.
14 Got some very creative county names, particularly in the
15 East.

16 BY MS. HANCOCK:

17 Q. And in Newark, Ohio, which is Licking County --

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. -- Kroger has a fluid milk plant; is that right?

20 A. Yes, they do.

21 Q. And in Licking County, Ohio, the model average is
22 \$4 a hundredweight; is that right?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And the proposal from National Milk is \$4 a
25 hundredweight; is that right?

26 A. Yes.

27 Q. And if we look at Springfield, Ohio, which is in
28 Clark County, and that is under Column A, 2021, so the



1 prior page, on page 35, DFA has a fluid milk plant in
2 Springfield, Ohio, Clark County; is that right?

3 A. Yes, they do.

4 Q. And that's about 86 miles from Kroger's plant in
5 Newark, Ohio?

6 A. How many miles?

7 Q. 86.

8 A. I would -- it could be right. I thought it would
9 be a little farther than that, but it might be correct. I
10 won't argue with that.

11 Q. Under 100 miles, how about if we say that?

12 A. Yep.

13 Q. Okay. So within a competitive range; is that
14 fair?

15 A. I think so. They are both going to serve some of
16 the same metropolitan markets.

17 Q. And in Springfield, Ohio, the model average was
18 \$3.80?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. And the recommendation by National Milk was to
21 increase that to \$4 a hundredweight; is that right?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And so the delta difference between those two
24 competing plants is that the model predicted \$4, National
25 Milk recommended \$4 where Kroger's plant was located, but
26 National Milk actually recommended \$0.20 more a
27 hundredweight for the competing DFA plant location; is
28 that right?



1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Okay. Let's look at -- I'm just going to look at
3 one more example, in Texas.

4 A. If I can get my vision back here in a minute?

5 Q. In a minute.

6 A. What page is it on, Nicole?

7 Q. It's going to be 2704 for Fort Worth.

8 A. All right.

9 Q. And that's on page 47.

10 A. Almost there. Okay.

11 Q. I said 2704. I meant 2709, sorry.

12 A. Yeah. Tarrant County, yes.

13 Q. Yeah.

14 THE COURT: 2709?

15 MS. HANCOCK: 2709. Same page, 47, Tarrant,
16 T-A-R-R-A-N-T, County, Texas.

17 BY MS. HANCOCK:

18 Q. And Kroger has a plant located in Fort Worth,
19 Texas, which is in Tarrant County; is that right?

20 A. That is true.

21 Q. And if we look at the model average for Tarrant
22 County, it was \$3.70?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And the recommendation was \$4 a hundredweight by
25 National Milk; is that right?

26 A. Yes.

27 Q. If we go to 2701, so just a few lines up, in Smith
28 County, Texas, that's Tyler, Texas; is that right?



1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And there is a fluid milk plant there, Hiland.

3 Are you familiar with that?

4 A. Yes, I'm familiar with that. I'm familiar with

5 Tyler. Been there a couple of times visiting farmers.

6 Q. And that's a joint venture between Prairie Farms
7 and DFA?

8 A. I would expect that's true. I don't know what
9 those ownerships -- I know there's a lot of relationships.
10 I don't know what they all are, but I have no reason not
11 to believe you.

12 Q. And the model in Tyler, Texas, averaged \$3.85; is
13 that right?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And National Milk's recommendation is \$4.35?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And that's an increase of \$0.50 over the model
18 recommendation?

19 A. It is.

20 Q. And whereas, if we contrast that with Tarrant
21 County, that was only a \$0.30 increase over what the model
22 recommendation was?

23 A. Yes. Can you tell me how far Fort Worth is from
24 Tyler?

25 Q. By my calculations, it's 132 miles.

26 A. Yeah.

27 Q. Does that sound right?

28 A. It does sound about right. I have never driven



1 it, but I know about where they are. Yes, that sounds
2 about right. I was just curious.

3 Q. Within a competitive range for fluid milk plants;
4 is that fair?

5 A. Some degree. Milk movement may be a little
6 different out in Tyler than it would be out of -- you are
7 going to have more south and east from Tyler than you're
8 going to from Fort Worth, but --

9 Q. And you would --

10 A. I do know all of these plants have some overlap,
11 they do, if they are reasonably close to each other.

12 Q. You would agree with me in the examples that we
13 have just covered for Kroger milk plants as compared to
14 DFA plants, or a DFA-Prairie Farms joint venture plant,
15 Kroger benefitted from National Milk's recommended
16 proposal as compared to the DFA plants; is that right?

17 A. With the simple examples you gave, yes, but
18 there's exceptions.

19 Let me just say, I don't think there was a lot of
20 evil intent with the differential map. I just think it's
21 extremely difficult to do.

22 Q. Yeah. And I appreciate that. And I think that
23 that's just kind of the point, right?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. That there's a lot of ways to slice and dice this
26 information and look at it through different lenses; is
27 that fair?

28 A. It is. And I would say, because I know a couple



1 of your witnesses said, you know, we're all giving poor
2 D- -- I- -- USDA to help us solve this dilemma. So I
3 would say the same thing, that it's extremely difficult to
4 do.

5 Q. And we looked at --

6 A. It is.

7 Q. Oh, I'm sorry.

8 A. No, no, that's fine. That's it.

9 Q. And we looked at some examples from other
10 witnesses where there are some examples where you can see
11 that there might be a cooperative plant where the proposal
12 looks more beneficial than other plants in some
13 neighboring area; is that fair?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And so it really is just a lens that you look
16 through trying to make the right adjustments for the
17 entire country; is that fair?

18 A. It is. But you can really kill or help a single
19 plant, and that's why it's so important that this be --
20 whatever changes, if changes are elected to be made by
21 USDA, that there's a lot of diligence that we don't -- we
22 don't disadvantage through -- you know, if you can't
23 compete because you are not good at what you do or your
24 shelf life is lousy is one thing. But if it's a regulated
25 price that's keeping you from being competitive or
26 changing that surface, you got to be really careful. And
27 that's, I think, one of our -- certainly our biggest
28 concern is there's so many changes. And the size of the



1 spreadsheet kind of defines how big the problem is, how
2 big the -- how big the solve is.

3 Q. And in your experience as a buyer for Kroger, did
4 Kroger require something in excess of Grade A quality
5 standards?

6 A. Everybody requires something in excess of Grade A
7 quality standards. But, yes, they did.

8 Q. Okay. Do you -- do you have the ability to share
9 what those standards were that were in excess of Grade A?

10 A. I can't because I don't have them all memorized.
11 Certainly I think cell count is 250, and they are not real
12 rigorous in enforcing it, because when a load milk shows
13 up, you are not going to reject a load of milk under the
14 cell count.

15 Temperature is 41. Temperature is more rigorous.

16 And, again, it's the same with cheese, you just
17 get better product quality and shelf life.

18 Beyond that, those are the two that we always
19 talked about. I know there's others, obviously. But --
20 but -- and some of the plants, depending what they make in
21 Class II, may have slightly different requirements. But
22 they are generally the same for everybody, for all the
23 plants.

24 Q. And in your experience, did Kroger sell its
25 conventional milk product as a loss leader?

26 A. At times. It's -- you know, we had that
27 discussion yesterday on -- it's all about to do with
28 competition. If -- if Walmart and Target, Aldi, all



1 want -- want the business, Kroger is going to compete.
2 And if you don't -- if you are the only store in town,
3 it's kind of like if you are the only supplier in town for
4 milk or for raw milk, you have a different leverage. And
5 so it plays a role.

6 But, yes, they do. And I can tell you when they
7 do that, they sell -- if you look in aggregate, people buy
8 a lot of milk when it's -- when you are running a real
9 deep discount sale. And what's interesting with that is
10 that -- it's kind of like it's true with cheese, it's true
11 with butter. In aggregate, they buy more product.
12 Because once they buy that, they consume it. And then the
13 next week some are going to need milk again anyways.

14 So -- but, you know, it's an old joke, it's easy
15 to sell if you lose money, so you try not to do that more
16 than you have to. It is an incentive. For example, this
17 time of year, it's butter. Everybody loses money on
18 butter. But they are hoping when you come and buy your
19 butter, you are going to buy your ham, you're going to buy
20 your vegetables, you're going to buy everything else to go
21 with it.

22 I can speak from experience, butter and eggs and
23 milk are probably the biggest tools for loss leaders in, I
24 think, most grocery stores. They run big specials to get
25 people in the door. And you have butter makers that are
26 willing to cooperate with that as far as the national
27 brands.

28 Q. And in your experience, are the health-enhanced



1 fluid milk ever used as a loss leader?

2 A. No.

3 Q. In your experience, are the organic milks ever
4 used as a loss leader?

5 A. At times, yes.

6 Q. Not as frequent as the conventional milk?

7 A. No, but they are.

8 Q. In your experience, is the lactose-free used as a
9 loss leader?

10 A. Not really. But it -- again, it depends on the
11 market. Kroger has some markets where they actually offer
12 HTST gallon of lactose-free milk, where we have large
13 amounts of populations that want -- who need lactose-free,
14 and they will run it with a promotion.

15 But in most markets, it's a -- it's in ESL half
16 gallons. And, no, they don't. I mean, they are
17 competitive, they are well below the cost generally of the
18 national brands, but they don't necessarily run a lot of
19 specials. But they do some. They do some.

20 A lot of that specials on those kinds specialty
21 milks, or high-protein, high-nutrition milks, is competing
22 with the national brand, try the Kroger brand.

23 Whereas, with regular milk, it's more like, milk
24 is milk. Our milk's good if you have good quality, and
25 come buy it from us, and, oh, by the way, please fill the
26 rest of your grocery basket while you are at it.

27 Q. And is the -- is your understanding of the
28 requirement for something in excess of Grade A by Kroger,



1 is that so that that conventional milk has an extended
2 shelf life or can extend it out as much as possible?

3 A. It's to keep the shelf life as consistent as
4 possible. I would argue, pretty much everybody does that.
5 That's not unique to Kroger.

6 Q. Yeah.

7 A. It's not unique to non-co-ops because it just
8 makes good business sense.

9 Q. That's the market for fluid milk today?

10 A. It is. I would argue in a lot of places it's the
11 market for cheese milk, too. They have -- they have
12 standards as well.

13 Same with -- even with powder, because of mold
14 spore formations, you may have some special requirements
15 on -- on even some powder milk in some markets.

16 Now, those plants tend to be run by co-ops, so
17 it's within the co-op. There will be -- there will be
18 incentives or disincentives if you can't keep your spore
19 counts at a point where they can export.

20 Q. You performed some calculations and talked about
21 increasing the differentials will lower -- or increasing
22 the differentials will -- will raise those Class I prices,
23 and on page 10 --

24 A. Of the testimony or the overhead?

25 Q. Page 10 of the PowerPoint presentation in
26 Exhibit 434.

27 A. Yeah. Overheads, I'm aging myself here.

28 Q. Overheads.



1 A. At least I didn't say acetates.

2 THE COURT: Can we put our Exhibit 301 away for
3 now?

4 MS. HANCOCK: You can.

5 THE COURT: That would be good.

6 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

7 BY MS. HANCOCK:

8 Q. When you were performing your calculations on the
9 prior page, on page 9 as well, did you take into account
10 that there's a potential for increased Make Allowance
11 costs?

12 A. I did not. It was an absence -- it was looking at
13 the single proposal.

14 Q. You would agree with me that if Make Allowances
15 are increased, that that would have a corresponding effect
16 on --

17 A. It would -- it would change --

18 THE COURT: Whoa.

19 THE WITNESS: Sorry.

20 BY MS. HANCOCK:

21 Q. -- it would have a corresponding effect on the
22 Class I prices as well?

23 A. It would change what that chart looked like, yes.

24 Q. Okay. I want to turn to page 31 of your
25 PowerPoint presentation in Exhibit 434.

26 A. Okay. I am there.

27 Q. And you talk about the cost of maintaining the
28 Grade A status on this slide; is that fair?



1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And you understand that that cost of maintaining
3 the Grade A status is one of the costs that is -- that was
4 used to set the current differentials?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And that's why you are discussing it here?

7 A. We just think in the broader context you need to
8 look at it, because it's no longer -- it's no longer a
9 cost. It's in addition, because there's no B milk to
10 speak of, just a few -- a few farms left. And because
11 the -- both the economic incentive on milk price, just
12 regulated price -- because I can assure you Grade B milk
13 is not sold at the regular price. And the -- and just the
14 need -- incentive to keep a clean, well-running dairy, you
15 just -- you just don't see it.

16 And it's everybody. I mean, Glanbia went to
17 Grade A in 2008. They had a few Grade B farms left, and
18 they went to Grade A simply because they had cream to
19 sell, its component tests went up, they had cream to sell,
20 and they also had some whey customers that wanted Grade A.
21 So they went to Grade A.

22 And for the most part it's interesting, because I
23 talked to them, because there's really two things we saw
24 when people converted: It was well location, or honest to
25 God, a milk house sink to wash your hands, which is kind
26 of amazing.

27 And so most of them just changed over. It was a
28 minimum cost. But no one, once you are there, you don't



1 go back, because you run a better dairy. Your cows are
2 healthier if you eat Grade A. And it's just common
3 husbandry. Actually, I would argue Grade A, you can be
4 pretty sloppy and still be Grade A standard. So I think
5 it's become irrelevant.

6 But it is in context of the overall cost. We're
7 not saying just remove this no matter what happens. We're
8 saying, if you are looking at the overall differential
9 map, this needs to be considered as part of what that
10 level should be.

11 Q. And --

12 A. And it certainly doesn't need to be increased.

13 Q. And you say that there's only these two items that
14 are referenced on page 31 as the cost that would be
15 incurred by a dairy farm in maintaining Grade A?

16 A. Yes, basically that's correct. There's a lot of
17 other costs to maintaining a good dairy. But they're
18 really -- we don't view them as being B versus A, again,
19 and we compared -- we compared the export guide, and
20 basically that's the standard for grading guide for -- for
21 products. They have their own set of standards. Because
22 you can use Grade B milk and make graded -- a lot of
23 graded products, versus the NCIMS, the Interstate Milk
24 Shippers rules. And we compared the two. And there's
25 a -- there's more -- there's some, of course, obviously if
26 you are going to convert --

27 (Court Reporter clarification.)

28 THE WITNESS: So there's things if you are going



1 to convert, it's true, you need to change, but that's
2 pretty much been done.

3 As far as normal maintenance, if you are in a
4 traditional barn, you got to keep the barn painted.
5 Although from talking to friends of mine, they still milk
6 cows in stall barns in New York State. They say they
7 don't get too worried about it anymore. And then, of
8 course, you have two inspections a year. Although a lot
9 of them -- a lot of the people that still buy B milk do
10 two inspections a year just because of the standpoint of
11 keeping those farms in conformance, they just feel --

12 (Court Reporter clarification.)

13 THE WITNESS: There's a lot of B dairies that
14 their buyers still require twice-annual inspections. In
15 fact, most of the time, those inspections are paid for by
16 the farm -- I mean, by the plant, or they're paid for by
17 the state. Some states actually do it for free, or as
18 part of their licensing to get your -- get your milk
19 shipper license. So it isn't necessarily an additional
20 cost.

21 And then with the barns, everything else is smooth
22 concrete. Other things that, for the most part, again, if
23 you are already -- if you are already Grade A, you are
24 already there.

25 So -- and if you look at the -- and I don't have
26 numbers on production per cow on Grade B, but if it's 70%
27 of what Grade A is, I'd be shocked. I mean, your modern
28 progressive -- well, 90% of the milk is following those



1 practices.

2 And they are fairly lenient. A lot of that is
3 because NCIMS, the states fight, so they have trouble
4 making it stricter, even though even National Milk often
5 advocated for stronger restrictions.

6 THE COURT: I hope she got that whole sentence.

7 THE WITNESS: Let me try again.

8 THE COURT: You know, there's a chance that I
9 could appoint a bailiff and have the bailiff stand near
10 you. Would that help?

11 THE WITNESS: I can -- "I've got COVID. Can I go?
12 See ya." No.

13 THE COURT: Do that explanation again.

14 THE WITNESS: Of course I will. Yes.

15 A couple things. Again, at the risk of being too
16 repetitive. The Grade A standard, even a lot of the
17 buyers of Grade B milk enforce the Grade A standards,
18 which aren't that different, particularly the inspection
19 frequency, because they just think it's good business
20 practice to have two inspections a year, or more if they
21 are needed.

22 The -- as far as farms converting from B to A,
23 they have pretty much all done that. My experience with
24 that is limited really to two groups of people. One is
25 small farms going Grade A, often organic, and often, a lot
26 of times in the Midwest, and that's often putting in a
27 well. And with the difference in price of milk, it
28 doesn't take long to pay for that.



1 The other thing is, basically milk house setup has
2 to change slightly. They may have to put in an extra
3 sink, they may have to redo their walls, but they are
4 fairly minor. But that's already been done, because
5 almost all farms are already -- are already Grade A.

6 BY MS. HANCOCK:

7 Q. And once -- once the cow is milked, there's
8 additional costs that the dairy farm incurs in order to
9 maintain that Grade A status, like maintaining the
10 temperature.

11 A. Yes. But, again, if you look at requirements for
12 milk versus -- we talk a lot about super-high quality
13 milk. I wouldn't call it super-high quality, but most
14 plants enforce, for example, temperature requirements.
15 Again, if you look at the shipping export requirements,
16 some of that is in there, even though it's not technically
17 always in the Grade B.

18 Very few states have Grade B regs anymore.

19 Q. Yeah, I'm just talking about what actual costs are
20 incurred at the farm level. In addition to what you are
21 talking about here, there are additional costs, such as
22 the sanitation and the temperature control, in order to
23 maintain that Grade A status until the point of delivery?

24 A. I would argue, if you are running a good dairy,
25 there aren't, because you are going to do that regardless.
26 If you are currently B, you may have some savings. If you
27 are A and want to go to B, there's really no savings.

28 Q. Okay. So you are just saying it was already going



1 to be done anyway, so we don't have to talk about that in
2 differentials?

3 A. I know it. I know it's already being done --

4 Q. Okay.

5 A. -- because it's expected of them by their milk
6 buyers, whether they are a co-op or a private plant.

7 Q. That's your point, though, is that because it's
8 already being done, we don't have compensate for it?

9 A. Exactly. I think everybody is expecting Grade A.
10 Back when you had people who were converting, you
11 go back to 1950, when 60% of the milk was B, it probably
12 was a real issue. Today, it's not.

13 And the reason it's not is because everybody who
14 is practicing good husbandry and good sanitation is there,
15 and because so many of the manufacturing plants require
16 Grade A now and are IMS certified, it's becoming
17 ubiquitous. To say it's an added cost anymore, I don't
18 think it really is.

19 Q. Okay. If you turn to page 33 of Exhibit 434.
20 You're talking, on this slide you have a chart there that
21 says, "Averages for Federal Orders with Somatic Sell Count
22 Programs."

23 Do you see that?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. And you have Appalachian, Florida, and Southeast
26 as the first three there.

27 Are you saying that those three orders have a
28 somatic cell count requirement?



1 A. They apparently do because they have reported
2 data. I took the counties based on USDA's -- it was the
3 sheet -- it was the -- I should have had the reference on
4 here, it's in the document. It's the report of all the
5 pounds of components that are produced by class, and the
6 very last column is somatic cell count. That's the only
7 one that it's on.

8 Q. And you didn't include Southwest order.

9 Why not?

10 A. Because I missed it. If it should be there, I
11 missed it. It's my mistake.

12 Q. Okay. Do you believe that -- does -- does IDFA
13 believe or support Class I prices being higher than
14 manufacturing prices?

15 A. We support the current differential program. So
16 the answer would be yes.

17 Q. And does IDFA support the continuation of having a
18 Federal Order in general?

19 A. Well, you will hear more testimony from more of
20 our members, and members of MIG, and you will find that,
21 again, some think they don't need it anymore. A lot of
22 them -- like you heard, even though he has a lot of
23 concerns, our witness from United Dairy -- they still see
24 value. It's just to make sure that they're structured
25 properly.

26 Q. And that's the delicate line that you are walking
27 the balance between; is that fair?

28 A. It is. And it's -- it's very interesting,



1 particularly in manufacturing. Because if you are not in
2 a Federal Order, you often have a competitive advantage,
3 particularly in the West where there isn't. I mean, Idaho
4 is 3% Class I maybe. If you count organic, it may be 4.

5 So it's -- it's kind of relevant to the market.
6 You get further east, particularly, for example, the
7 Northeast, where being part of the pool is more important.
8 And, of course, they have regulations there to keep that
9 pool more disciplined on depooling. And then you'll find
10 that most of the cheese manufacturers there believe it is
11 still important. And so it really depends on the market.

12 Q. Do you know what percentage of your membership
13 supports the continuation of the Federal Order system?

14 A. We don't. But we haven't had a vote to get rid of
15 it, so that should tell you. If someone wanted to, they'd
16 bring it up. And we haven't had -- we haven't had that
17 discussion. The discussion's been about, how do we make
18 it work better.

19 Q. You just know that you have a split in opinion in
20 your membership; is that fair?

21 A. Yes. And you do in yours, too, but you might not
22 know it.

23 Q. Okay.

24 MS. HANCOCK: Thank you for your time, Mr. Brown.

25 THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.

26 MR. ENGLISH: Your Honor, my name is Chip English,
27 good morning. I represent the Milk Innovation Group. I
28 had not intended on getting up today.



1 good. 2055. Okay. That is -- that's Licking -- again,
2 that's Licking County, yes.

3 BY MR. ENGLISH:

4 Q. And so I only want to look at Column L, which is
5 the University of Wisconsin three-year average, and
6 Column O.

7 And so for Licking, where Kroger has a plant, for
8 the average, I see they are both at \$4, correct?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. So National Milk proposed no change for the model
11 for Kroger's operation in Licking, Ohio, correct?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. So now please turn to Row 2086 --

14 A. Okay.

15 Q. -- Stark County, Ohio --

16 (Court Reporter clarification.)

17 MR. ENGLISH: Stark, S-T-A-R-K.

18 BY MR. ENGLISH:

19 Q. And there is a cooperative-owned plant recently
20 purchased there, correct?

21 A. I believe -- I know where it is, so if it's Stark
22 County, yes. That's Canton, I think.

23 Q. Yes. That's Canton.

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. City of Canton. All right.

26 So let's go again and look at the University of
27 Wisconsin average under Column L, and then the National
28 Milk under O, and I believe you will find that the average



1 was \$4, just like Kroger, but the proposal was \$3.70,
2 correct?

3 A. That is correct.

4 Q. Which is \$0.30 down, correct?

5 A. That is correct.

6 Q. While Kroger was held the same, correct?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. So, now, you and NMPF counsel discussed the DFA
9 plant in Wayne County, Ohio, just east of here, and that
10 is Row 2095.

11 Do you see Row 2095?

12 A. Yep, that's Wooster.

13 THE COURT: He's using the farthest left column.

14 THE WITNESS: Oh, I found it.

15 MR. ENGLISH: I'm using the row.

16 THE WITNESS: It's Wayne County. Wooster's a town
17 in Wayne County.

18 BY MR. ENGLISH:

19 Q. And the plant there is known as Smith Foods.

20 But that's the one now owned by DFA, correct?

21 A. I believe so, yes.

22 Q. All right. So now let's look again at Column L
23 for University of Wisconsin average, which was \$3.95,
24 correct?

25 A. Yes.

26 Q. And then let's look at Column O.

27 And this is where I may have got confused, but I
28 see \$3.70, correct?



1 A. I do, too -- 3.70.

2 Q. Which is actually down \$0.25, correct?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And maybe we don't have to do this by row, but you
5 have been here for most of the hearing, correct?

6 A. I'm a Hilton Diamond for the first time of my
7 life, yes. I'm not sure it was worth it.

8 Q. Kroger has a plant in Lynchburg, Virginia,
9 correct?

10 A. They sure do.

11 Q. And you have heard the testimony that your Kroger
12 plant in Lynchburg and a cooperative-owned plant in
13 Newport News have been set by -- proposed by National Milk
14 to have the same value in terms of proposal, correct?

15 A. That is true.

16 Q. And that was a \$0.50 divergence from the model,
17 correct?

18 A. Yes.

19 MR. ENGLISH: That's all I have. Thank you, Your
20 Honor.

21 Thank you for your time.

22 THE COURT: Thank you.

23 When we were on Wayne County, Ohio, you mentioned
24 Wooster.

25 THE WITNESS: Wooster is the county seat. It's
26 the city of any size in Wayne County, Ohio. I just gave
27 myself a point of reference.

28 THE COURT: Spell it.



1 THE WITNESS: Wooster, just like "Rooster" with a
2 "W." W-O-O-S-T-E-R. It isn't like the sauce from
3 Britain. W-O-O-S-T-E-R.

4 THE COURT: Excellent.

5 Who next has questions? Is there anyone else who
6 would like to ask questions before I call on the
7 Agricultural Marketing Service?

8 Mr. Rosenbaum.

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

11 I just want to ask a question to help make sure we
12 have IDFA's position clear on various proposals.

13 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

14 BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

15 Q. So in your testimony you point out the fact that
16 there has been a recent decision by USDA to increase the
17 transportation credits in the Southeast orders, as well as
18 provide, for the first time, an additional set of credits
19 in those orders, correct?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And you have calculated what the dollar amount of
22 those are, correct?

23 A. We -- best I could figure it out, yes, we have.

24 Q. Okay. And you also provided an indication of what
25 the percentage those numbers represent of Proposal 19
26 increases, correct?

27 A. That is correct.

28 Q. So just -- but to get -- be clear about this, IDFA



1 is not proposing that the current differentials be reduced
2 as a result of the adoption of these new credits; is that
3 correct?

4 A. Yeah. We -- we are supporting the current
5 differential map as it exists everywhere.

6 Q. The point you are making with your testimony
7 regarding the increased credits in Florida and the other
8 Southeast orders, is that if USDA were to consider
9 increasing the Class I differentials, as Proposal 19 would
10 do, USDA should take into account the fact that -- that
11 all these additional credits are, upon referendum
12 approval, going to be provided for as a wholly separate
13 mechanism, correct?

14 A. Yes. And -- and just -- in -- it's all a matter
15 of timing. When the proposals were made, there wasn't the
16 final decision. Now there is a final decision, so we
17 believe that that decision should be part of the
18 determination, because it is significantly raising costs
19 for the Southeast three orders.

20 MR. ROSENBAUM: Okay. That's all I have.

21 THE COURT: All right. I'm going to remove the
22 301. I'll give it back to him, but it just gives him more
23 space to look at his prepared testimony if I have it off
24 his witness stand. All right.

25 The Agricultural Marketing Service may ask
26 questions.

27 //

28 //



1 CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 BY MS. TAYLOR:

3 Q. Good morning.

4 A. Good morning.

5 Q. I want to go through your Exhibit 434, is your
6 PowerPoint presentation. I'm going to stick to that, and
7 I promise to not make you look at Exhibit 301, so --8 A. That's great, because you are kind of blurry right
9 now.10 Q. All right. Let's see. I want to start on
11 slide 4, and this is where you are talking about an
12 adequate supply. And you have some numbers in there, both
13 looking at reserve supply based on pooled milk and a
14 reserve supply based on total milk.15 A. That's based our estimates on current production,
16 current order participation, yes.17 Q. So when you -- when IDFA thinks about a reserve
18 supply, which one of those do you think should be looked
19 at to determine an adequate reserve supply?20 A. Since all milk is Grade A, and all milk is NBTU,
21 it's all eligible to supply the market, we know with
22 depooling those numbers move up and down depending what
23 class has got an advantage. We'd all love it if that
24 didn't happen, but it does. So we believe it's -- it's
25 actually closer to 80, but we still think 73% is ample.26 Q. And can you speak about how pricing versus pooling
27 provisions in Federal Orders affect what that reserve
28 supply looks like, at least when you are looking at the

1 pooled milk number?

2 A. Well, it really depends on the market. It depends
3 on performance requirements as far as -- but -- and,
4 again, I can't remember when we last had an order call. I
5 don't know even if they even exist anymore.

6 Q. I don't believe they do.

7 A. Yeah. So which is kind of weird, because that's
8 one of the premises of having orders, to make sure there's
9 a supply. But thankfully we haven't needed it. We have
10 had a supply of milk, and it's worked.

11 So in -- in our minds, or at least in my personal
12 mind, and, again, my experience in manufacturing markets
13 is mostly cheese, my experience in fluid milk markets is
14 more the South because that's where Kroger's plants are.

15 But in general, we believe that that milk is
16 available, because it's a function, particularly if you
17 have fairly liberal repooling requirements, they can pull
18 that milk back on, if they need to, fairly quickly. And,
19 again, when you have the ample supplies, and in
20 particularly the Northern markets where you are mostly
21 25% or less Class I -- I'm sorry, thank you, thank you,
22 Erin -- 25% or less Class I, there's more than enough
23 milk, because the milk, it is there.

24 I -- we just -- my personal experience, I have had
25 not had trouble getting milk. Couple snowstorms once in a
26 while, but I'll tell you -- and that's -- that's
27 challenging for everyone. And that's one of the things
28 with the universal receiving credits, which are so common,



1 if it causes delays and you need more milk to get to your
2 stores in a hurry, you pay for that. And you should,
3 because it's causing some disruption to your supplier. So
4 in my mind, is there really isn't -- really isn't a
5 concern.

6 The Southeast is different. I guess, from my
7 opinion, that's one of the reasons we now have our new
8 final rule for the Southeast, is to help move that milk
9 because those markets don't have adequate reserve supply,
10 especially some times a year.

11 So I don't know if I answered your question, but I
12 generally find that that milk, it needs to be found, it
13 will be found. And they will -- and they will move into
14 the market. We have so much extra in a lot of the
15 markets. Depending what class is pooled, we still seem to
16 have adequate supply if there is depooling.

17 Q. So another way, in your opinion, neither of those
18 really affect what you consider to be a reserve supply?

19 A. No, I don't. I think empirically I haven't. You
20 know, I have certainly seen ups and downs, particularly
21 with the opening of the big new cheese plant in Michigan,
22 which really tightened up supply. We still had no trouble
23 getting milk.

24 And we had, to their credit, excellent suppliers.
25 Very good suppliers.

26 Q. Okay. On the next page, page 5, talking again, on
27 the same topic of adequate supply for Class I needs.

28 There's been discussion in this hearing about there is a



1 lot of milk, but now maybe it's not where it needs to be,
2 and maybe the suppliers who have been supplying the milk
3 might not be willing to supply it in the future because of
4 the cost they incur to get it to those plants.

5 Can you -- can you talk about how that should be,
6 or not be, a consideration?

7 A. When you start looking at individual markets with
8 differential maps, you get yourself in trouble. I mean,
9 that's some of the things that we're seeing. Again, we --
10 we think National Milk's proposal was made with great
11 intentions, there's a lot of good work there, but you can
12 create winners and losers. That's where market premiums
13 play a role.

14 If you're difficult to serve, if you are in a
15 city, if your receipts, from my experience --

16 (Court Reporter clarification.)

17 THE WITNESS: If you're in a city where it's
18 difficult to get to, or if your receipts, your daily milk
19 intake isn't consistent, you pay for that, and you should
20 because you're incurring costs.

21 I think the same thing is true when you move milk
22 from distances. Before the final decision we now have,
23 which we fully expect will be implemented, we had seen
24 significant increases in transportation charges, and they
25 were fair, I mean, because their costs had gone up.

26 So to me, that's a role -- we can't encase every
27 dollar into the regulated price. This is a minimum price
28 system. It's to help promote orderly flow of milk. And



1 as part of that, I think, again, you got to look at what
2 those -- a couple things.

3 Are we putting the dollars in differentials where
4 the milk really needs to be or are we putting the dollars
5 in the differentials where the differentials are low so it
6 helps raise that price, even if utilization is very, very
7 low?

8 The second thing: So, is that slope right? Are
9 we getting that slope right? And that's a huge challenge.
10 I don't -- I don't envy anybody that job.

11 I think the other part of that, though, is
12 expectations that we shouldn't have the Federal Order
13 system build in the premium programs. They should be
14 separate. There should be minimum pricing. I don't care
15 if it's butter, powder, cheese, yogurt, or milk. So let's
16 leave room for that market to make those movements where
17 milk needs to go.

18 And then one final comment is that when you have
19 marketing agencies in common, which are very effective in
20 negotiating, and they are legal. And they do help
21 farmers, there's no doubt about that. But they also tend
22 to make it more difficult to customize needs for certain
23 plants, because a lot of times you even ask for that, they
24 don't want to do it. You know, this is the rules.

25 And -- and I think, for example, in the case of
26 Kroger, there's places having adjustments would help
27 Kroger, there's places it would probably hurt Kroger, but
28 it makes it kind of inflexible. And that's not a Federal



1 Order issue, that's a marketing issue. And, again, that's
2 between our milk suppliers and us. We are 100% co-op.
3 We -- I'm no longer at Kroger. Kroger is 100% co-op
4 supply, so they -- they understand that value of the
5 market, the service that it brings.

6 Q. So if I take what you just said, and I want to go
7 one step further, right? What I'm hearing, I think, from
8 you is, I think maybe everyone in the room, we might
9 agree, Federal Orders are kind of a foundation for the
10 industry to operate under.

11 But what I'm hearing is, the differentials should
12 never be updated to reflect current market realities, that
13 it should always be left up to the market to operate on
14 top of that, and so we would never recalibrate these
15 things to reflect structural changes in the industry?

16 A. I expect we'll see recalibration. I think, from
17 our position, it's got to be right, and if you can't get
18 it right, you do more damage by overvaluing milk and
19 making plants uncompetitive than you do by undervaluing
20 it, because markets can make up that difference.

21 So it would be dishonest to say we don't think
22 there's times we need adjustments, just like we need
23 adjustments in Make Allowances.

24 But it's just -- it's a -- it's a job I don't envy
25 anyone having, but I think it's very, very important
26 that -- that there's a lot of investment, a lot of
27 infrastructure that's been built around the current
28 differential map. So when we make adjustments to that



1 map, we need to be careful that we're not creating winners
2 and losers.

3 And I don't think that's wicked or intentional,
4 but you still need to be careful because it can happen.
5 That's my view.

6 Q. So how would you suggest getting it right? I
7 mean, it's been 25 years.

8 A. My suggestion would have been if we had a broader
9 conversation, maybe it would have helped.

10 I think you have got lots of -- you know, we're
11 pretty fond of Mark Stephenson and Chuck Nicholson's work.
12 You can argue over the \$1.60. But as far as the way the
13 map works, we're fond of it. And I understand there needs
14 to be tinkering to that to make things work, we just need
15 to be careful that we don't create winners and losers.

16 I don't know what that answer is. I think we have
17 got a good record that will hopefully help USDA figure out
18 what that needs to be. I don't envy you and your team
19 that job, Erin, but --

20 Q. I don't envy us, either.

21 A. Okay. So --

22 Q. So --

23 A. I don't want to pawn it off on you, but in the
24 end, you are the folks who are going to help us figure
25 this out.

26 Q. Okay. So it's important to get it right. And
27 what I heard from that is, there might be tinkering that
28 needs to be done, but you are not quite sure what that is?



1 A. Personally, I'm not. I think you are going to
2 have testimony from people that are affected. I mean, we
3 just had some discussion on different markets and how they
4 relate, and how those changes -- changes occur.

5 I do have a lot of faith in the Wisconsin model,
6 just because it's become more sophisticated. I thought
7 Mark's presentation yesterday really helped me better
8 understand how that model worked. And so there's a lot of
9 good information there.

10 I also think that it's -- it's hard to do
11 something that complicated without a broader conversation
12 reflecting all sides of the industry. We really didn't
13 have that, unfortunately.

14 Q. Well, luckily this hearing provides that as part
15 of that broader --

16 A. Oh, you are getting it now. That's why we are --
17 that's why I'm Hilton Diamond, you are getting lots of
18 good information, so --

19 Q. All right.

20 A. Yeah.

21 Q. If I can turn to page 7. Let me turn to page 6
22 first.

23 And here you are talking about the decline in milk
24 sales, which I think everyone acknowledges those facts.
25 And there's been discussion at the hearing about, what
26 does that mean for the Federal Order program?

27 And so what I read from your slide is, we
28 shouldn't make changes to the differentials because fluid



1 milk sales have declined.

2 So my question is: Where in the Act does it say
3 that an objective of Federal Orders is to increase, or in
4 some ways, not -- at least not impact fluid milk
5 consumption?

6 A. I don't think it is there. But through -- it
7 is -- it is -- it is a reality. And Class I is the only
8 milk class that isn't really based on ingredient costs as
9 far as relative to other products.

10 I mean, Class III and IV are based basically on,
11 this is the commodity value for those products. What you
12 want to do in your plant to add value is up to you, but we
13 kind of set that base.

14 Class I is set on the premise -- again, correct me
15 if I'm wrong -- my understanding has been one of the
16 reasons we have differentials and we have a differential
17 map is to make sure the Class I market is fully, fully
18 served. And I think that's a -- that's important. It's
19 absolutely important.

20 I think the argument over what that level is, is
21 what we're having this discussion about. And I also think
22 that unconsumption, we need -- we've always kind of viewed
23 Class I as being this higher value-added product. I can
24 assure you in the grocery business, it's the lowest margin
25 section of the dairy case by far. So it is not -- it's a
26 declining market.

27 When I was at Darigold years ago -- as we all
28 know, I've worked everywhere -- when I was at Darigold



1 years ago, we -- we kind of joked that, because Darigold's
2 a very good, nonfat dry milk manufacturer as well, that
3 fluid milk was really no different than powder. It's a
4 commodity. And it is a very, very competitive market, and
5 it's tough to make it work.

6 And so I do -- I -- again, we are not opposing
7 Federal Orders, we're not opposing eliminating
8 differentials at IDFA, but any changes need to be proposed
9 for -- frankly, with extreme cautions.

10 And kind of the physician's oath, first do no
11 harm. Let's not make -- as best we can help it -- not
12 make winners and losers. Because investments have been
13 made based on the current map, so how you change that
14 could -- could really change that, what that could look
15 like.

16 Q. You mentioned, in your experience in the Class I
17 sales with Kroger at least, Class I isn't the highest
18 value product because it has the thinnest margins, I think
19 you just said.

20 And so are you equating value with margin?

21 A. I'm equating -- I am equating -- equating -- there
22 isn't -- we don't have a market value for fluid milk, we
23 derive one --

24 Q. Uh-huh.

25 A. -- based on the other markets. And what that
26 added value of fluid is, if you look at how -- I mean,
27 people are eating more dairy, but they are eating it, not
28 drinking it. So what -- what is the added value to that



1 milk? I think it is a fair question to ask: If we
2 lowered the price, how much would it -- we think it does
3 have an effect.

4 I do know from the standpoint of promotions, it's
5 a lot easier to do obviously when prices are lower. But I
6 also think that you need to be cognizant.

7 And I think the thing we haven't talked about as
8 much at this hearing, as I thought, is the competitors to
9 milk, because they are real. I mean, I was in Meijer the
10 other day, and they're running a sale on almond milk.
11 It's cheaper than two quarts of milk. And that gets scary
12 for me. And -- and I think that's one of the things we
13 have to be cognizant of, make sure we keep milk
14 competitive because it competes with products that aren't
15 dairy.

16 Again, you can't build a formula around that,
17 Erin, but it's something to keep in the back of your mind.

18 Q. That is a great thought, leads me to my next set
19 of questions on page 7.

20 A. Okay.

21 Q. Where you are talking about own-price demand, and
22 there's been a lot of discussion about elasticities at
23 this hearing. And I -- you know, the model that we
24 used -- well, the USDSS model, back in reform, didn't
25 contain any type of elasticities. We didn't necessarily,
26 to my knowledge, consider own-price elasticities or
27 cross-price elasticities when setting differentials.

28 But is it your opinion that those should be



1 considered now?

2 A. Again, not an easy task, but, yes, I would say
3 that they do. Again, we're looking at adjustments to
4 differentials, we're not looking at removing them. There
5 are some things there that we can see that may help guide
6 us to what the best decision is, and I don't have the
7 answer from that. If I did, I would have been happy to
8 present it. I won't pretend I know.

9 Q. On the next slide 8, you list the elasticities
10 that came from Dr. Capps' presentation. And if I remember
11 correctly, they were for about 75% of what he considered
12 total fluid milk sales. It didn't contain schools,
13 foodservice, prisons, et cetera.

14 A. That is correct.

15 Q. And so how do you think we should consider that,
16 the kind of -- like, that missing piece that's not in
17 these numbers?

18 A. Well, I think -- might be one that other 25% is
19 declining, but I don't think it's necessarily elastic.
20 And neither does Dr. Capps, and he said that in his paper.

21 So you have to kind of look at the other
22 three-quarters, I guess, in a great way. And so if you
23 are saying, how much milk is in package? Say we had, you
24 know, 40 billion pounds of Class I sales, realistically,
25 the top 70 covers 3 billion of it -- 30 billion of it.
26 And that's how we viewed it as we did analysis, internally
27 figuring out what we thought it could do.

28 We just assumed there was no elasticity in



1 foodservice and schools, which probably isn't true, but
2 it's probably close to true, so -- and that -- that lowers
3 the impact overall if you -- if you exclude a fourth of
4 the sales.

5 Q. Okay. Can we turn to slide 11.

6 And here you have outlined kind of the three
7 components of the base differential. There's been a lot
8 of talk about Grade A costs. There's been some talk about
9 balancing costs.

10 But I wanted to talk a bit about the competitive
11 costs you list in that third bullet there and what you do
12 believe makes up competitive costs incurred by fluid
13 plants to get a supply and compete with manufacturing
14 plants that also need a supply.

15 A. I think often the biggest difference, and the
16 differential map talks about that, is access to those
17 plants isn't always quite as easy. Those plants don't
18 necessarily take milk as even. So it takes a little more
19 money if you are going to serve that market. The
20 incentive to serve a market isn't quite as consistent as,
21 for example, some of your manufacturing markets are.

22 Fluid milk plants -- I mean, ice cream plants
23 aren't demand plants. They are, but you make use -- you
24 store stuff. When -- you make ice cream in December when
25 you have product, in January in particular, to sell in
26 June, because you can't possibly make enough in the
27 summer.

28 Just like you can't make enough butter in the



1 fourth quarter to meet consumer demand, so you make it all
2 year-round to have it ready.

3 Of course, fluid is pretty much, depending on the
4 product, it's somewhere between, you know, 20- and 120-day
5 shelf life. Most of it's around 20-day, 25. And so that
6 demand just fluctuates more.

7 And I -- in my view, that's part of that
8 competitive thing, if you want someone to observe that
9 market. Obviously, cream is a part of that. But it's a
10 recognition, it isn't as consistent to the buyer
11 generally, and plants is exception, than, for example, a
12 cheese plant would likely be.

13 Q. So do you think the competitive environment is
14 different now than it was 25 years ago, that would make
15 the costs be more or less than the assumption in the base
16 differential?

17 A. I really don't think so. No, I didn't say I
18 didn't think transportation hasn't changed. But I think
19 that competitiveness really hasn't, and some of it is
20 self-imposed, quite honestly. If you make commitments to
21 large sales, to large manufacturing plants, and your milk
22 is tight, is that the Federal Order's fault if you are
23 still below utilization? I would say it's not. That's a
24 problem they have to negotiate and they need to work with.
25 That's not the Federal Order's job.

26 So, in my mind, that competitive -- a lot of that
27 competitiveness, again, is local. And, again, I can
28 assure you that is part -- a lot part of when you



1 negotiate additional charges for milk, no matter what
2 class it is. In my experience, every class but IV tends
3 to have additional handling costs, which is fine. That it
4 can -- it can be -- a lot of that can be negotiated.
5 Having it be a portion of this, and what that is, as we
6 all know, exactly what makeup is, that differential, is
7 subject to opinion, quite honestly. And I'm among those,
8 that we all recognize there's a reason for it. Exactly
9 how many X cents is which and which, I think we can
10 discuss.

11 But -- so I think allowing for some of that is --
12 is fair. It doesn't need to cover all of it. And I would
13 say that the amount that is there now is fair.

14 To me, the biggest differential map -- the
15 differentials, the biggest issue isn't the base. The
16 biggest issue is, how do we keep that surface working from
17 the standpoint of meeting producer needs.

18 Again, the Southeast decision, three orders on --
19 on transportation. I can assure you no plant that buys
20 milk necessarily likes that. But they didn't come and
21 complain, so I guess they are -- they understand it's
22 necessary.

23 So I -- so I kind of think of this is the same
24 way. We need to leave room for the market to work. I
25 mean --

26 (Court Reporter clarification.)

27 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. We need to leave room
28 for the market to work.



1 BY MS. TAYLOR:

2 Q. So what I heard, I think, too, is you said that
3 maybe competitive costs do vary locally, and in your
4 opinion that is handled locally through premiums,
5 negotiations?

6 A. On all classes of milk that would be my
7 experience.

8 Q. Okay. On slide 13, that last bullet, this is kind
9 of going back to what was -- what happened during reform,
10 but you said, at that time, I think, the last sentence
11 there, "blend prices among orders necessarily did not
12 align."

13 And I was wondering if you could expand on that
14 statement.

15 A. Because utilizations, your map for -- your map for
16 Class I value, competitive value among regions is
17 different, and the value of that pool is very different,
18 depending on utilizations. So a good example would be
19 Mideast milk that moves into the Southeast. You have a
20 significant transportation cost. They also get to pool
21 some reserve supply milk.

22 And so -- and we -- and it's become, as you know,
23 more extreme. You look at the utilizations in the three
24 Southeast orders, it's markedly different by multiples
25 from utilization just to the north. And so your blends
26 aren't going to be the same, even though your Class I
27 prices are going to have a continuous kind of flow to
28 them.



1 So that creates -- well, it does a couple things.
2 Actually creates incentive to move milk south when they
3 need it, which is a good thing.

4 On the other hand, it means as far as a blend, a
5 regulated blend, there will be a difference. My
6 experience over time is, is that those blends blend out
7 because market conditions will make up for some of that
8 difference. They'll move milk south to get more of those
9 dollars or they will do other things. Which is, again,
10 just good business.

11 Q. So this slide, as I see there, talks about USDA's
12 criteria for setting Class I differentials.

13 And I draw from that blend price statement, it's
14 your opinion that blend price alignment was not a criteria
15 at the time of reform in setting Class I differentials?

16 A. From my understanding, yes.

17 Q. Okay.

18 A. Sorry for the long answer when you needed a short
19 one.

20 Q. No, that's okay. I enjoy all the information on
21 the record.

22 A. Say that in February.

23 Q. Or my entire next year.

24 A. Yeah. Well, you won't be alone, my friend.

25 Q. So let's see. I'm on slide 14. You are talking
26 about some witness testimony we heard during the course of
27 this hearing. And this first sub bullet, the "testimony
28 did not relate to any special costs of producing milk."



1 And I -- I wanted to know what -- what do you mean
2 by "special costs," or what would be an example of a
3 special cost, that's something you would consider a
4 special cost that wasn't considered?

5 A. I don't think there really are. There's balancing
6 costs, yes. Otherwise, I don't think there really is. A
7 lot of the costs, a lot of the talk on -- I think is
8 trying to use the Class I market to solve regional cost
9 problems. And this system is not designed to do that.

10 And you shouldn't -- for example, if you are --
11 your costs have gone up because your milk supply has gone
12 up significantly in your region, and you have kind of
13 constrained supply of your inputs, is that something the
14 Federal Order is supposed to fix? And is that fair just
15 because the inputs went up in one state and not in
16 another, that they get extra money?

17 Again, the market will take care of that if milk
18 gets tight. So that's -- that's kind of my view.

19 They talk about their costs are higher. We have a
20 lot of water issues in the West. I just don't think it's
21 the Federal Order's job to solve that type of problem.
22 Yours is to keep milk flowing where it needs to go, and
23 there will be a minimum price that reflects the real value
24 of the milk.

25 Q. Okay. And in that next bullet when you are
26 talking about general costs have not been considered by
27 USDA, are you talking there about maintaining --
28 maintaining Grade A status costs, or are you talking about



1 feed costs there? I'm just -- want to kind of get --

2 A. What we're talking about -- what -- from, again,
3 from our perspective, from my personal perspective, in
4 this there's been some -- I think we even have --

5 THE COURT: Slow.

6 THE WITNESS: -- we may have an attachment that
7 reflects -- talks from Richard McKee, our good Oklahoma
8 Market Administrator from years ago. That the -- the
9 costs, reflecting costs supply and demand is done through
10 commodity markets, and Class I is to -- to express added
11 cost of serving that market is how we look at it.

12 BY MS. TAYLOR:

13 Q. Okay. I get what you are saying now.

14 A. Okay.

15 Q. Thank you.

16 We move to slide 16. And here you are talking
17 some testimony that was heard about maybe some contractual
18 commitments between parties and some acknowledgement of
19 that in the Federal Order that went into the thinking
20 behind whatever the proposed differentials were.

21 And so my question then is, is it IDFA's position
22 that federal regulation should not be written or amended
23 to accommodate any contractual arrangements between two
24 private parties?

25 A. Absolutely not. That's not your role. As long as
26 it's legal, if they're using risk management, it follows
27 your rules that are allowed for risk management, it is
28 not. That is -- that's the market's job. And if -- if a



1 supplier overcommits to a demand for class, for a
2 manufacturing class, I don't view that as a market issue,
3 that's their personal -- their personal management issue.

4 Particularly in a lot of cases where we've had
5 suppliers who encourage vast growth in plant capacity, and
6 now they are concerned -- now they are concerned about
7 that. And I think we need to be cautious of making sure
8 the orders don't get into the middle of what I would view
9 as negotiation issues that have nothing to do with markets
10 and price surfaces.

11 Q. Okay. On the next slide 17 you talked about the
12 discussion we have heard about moving milk, trying to
13 discourage the movement of milk from, say, far out places
14 like Minnesota or Maine to the southern markets.

15 And as I remember that discussion, the reasoning
16 behind discouraging that, because it would be -- those
17 would be uneconomic shipments. And in the South, in
18 particular, that has the transportation credit provisions
19 that we have discussed here, that would be, perhaps, a
20 reason why that milk would be encouraged to move down
21 there, even though it wouldn't be an economic shipment.

22 So is that how you are looking at that bullet
23 here? I'm trying to just kind of get a little more
24 information on why that shouldn't be considered.

25 A. Well, again, it's -- one of the -- one of the --
26 one of the challenges I had was understanding the logic of
27 a lot of the regional discussion on the differential map
28 because they use opposite reasons to come to the same



1 conclusion at times, and it was a bit confusing.

2 My view of the differential map, again, I think a
3 great example is the new, you know, Federal Order
4 provisions proposed for the Southeast to help move milk,
5 encourage milk to move. But if you want milk to move, you
6 don't flatten the differential map. You don't give more
7 money to Minnesotans because, gosh, they are nice people.
8 And they are wonderfully nice people, I used to live
9 there, I love Minnesota. But is that the function of the
10 market? Particularly in the -- in a lot of those cases
11 fluid plants aren't necessarily very far from the -- any
12 farther from the fluid milk supply, quite honestly, than
13 the manufacturing plants are.

14 Q. Okay.

15 A. So keep that -- that -- that gradient to keep milk
16 moving where it needs to move is what I view is the most
17 important thing differentials can do. We need to make
18 sure that that stays.

19 Q. As I'm going to slide 19, one of the points you
20 make here, criticisms of maybe what you saw as
21 inconsistent approaches to the transportation cost data or
22 information that was provided by us.

23 And so is that because the model looked at -- I
24 forget what Dr. Stephenson said yesterday -- but there was
25 some information that came in on 2022 costs. There might
26 have been some information on 2023 costs.

27 And is your issue that that's not consistent?

28 A. I think it's more for advice. Make sure you take



1 that into consideration as you compare numbers because
2 they are from different periods. And as we all know,
3 transportation, for the most part, thank goodness, is
4 moderated a bit, fuel is down, labor is more available.
5 So -- and that's always a challenge.

6 I know in the top past, Erin, when we have talked
7 about energy costs of manufacturing, they balance, too.
8 So you have to kind of take a -- try to take a little more
9 of a trend approach.

10 And that would be our -- I guess, our observation
11 here. Let's -- let's do what we can to make sure that
12 we're -- when we look at regional differences, that we can
13 compare apples to apples the best we can.

14 Q. Okay. Turning to slide 20.

15 And your last bullet talks about how -- and during
16 some of the conversations, that testimony we have heard,
17 it was highlighted that they tried to preserve existing
18 relationships between plants.

19 And so is this page to -- I guess my question is,
20 are you saying that that shouldn't be considered? Handler
21 equity between similarly-situated plants is not a
22 consideration for making changes?

23 A. It is a consideration. You have to be careful you
24 don't make significant changes that will physically or --
25 I mean, financially harm certain markets if you can't make
26 sure the justifications are there.

27 I think I mentioned it earlier. I bought a lot of
28 fluid milk. Kroger doesn't buy a lot of fluid milk, but



1 where they do, those bids are usually within a cent and a
2 half of each other, and the number one and number two are
3 usually under a penny on a gallon.

4 So you start raising a differential, for example,
5 \$0.05 or \$0.06 -- \$0.05 or \$0.06 -- \$0.50, which would be
6 about \$0.045 per gallon, you make that plant uncompetitive
7 and that asset and those people. So I think, to me,
8 that's the most -- that's the biggest challenge is to make
9 sure that what changes are made, if you necessarily decide
10 they are necessary, how we keep them from being disruptive
11 to the market.

12 It's not totally unlike the Class II conversation
13 you heard this morning, how do we make sure that we
14 don't -- not intentionally -- favor or disfavor folks over
15 others. And, again, it's hard. I get that. But just
16 make sure that it's considered.

17 Q. And so the USDSS model doesn't look at that
18 factor, that's simply transportation cost, as has been
19 discussed?

20 A. Yes. And it's no -- no -- it's assuming that
21 we're starting over. There's just -- there's no
22 regulation, what would things look like, that's correct.
23 That's my understanding.

24 Q. As is mine.

25 So would the handler equity issue that we just
26 discussed, would that be an appropriate possible reason
27 for making some changes?

28 A. Yes, it would be.



1 Q. Okay.

2 THE COURT: I'm sure everyone knows what you mean,
3 but I want to make it clear. When you say a \$0.015
4 difference, what --

5 THE WITNESS: It's a \$0.015 when you -- a lot of
6 companies, a lot of stores will bid for milk, what you are
7 going to charge me delivered into my store for a gallon of
8 milk. And it's a very competitive market. And so a lot
9 of times that difference in price can be rarely more than
10 a cent and a half, and a lot of times it's under a penny.

11 Which -- and if you look at a penny, a penny on a
12 gallon of milk is \$0.086 on a hundred pounds. So if you
13 make differential changes that are significant, you can
14 change plants' competitive position quickly, and so it
15 needs to be considered in a decision.

16 BY MS. TAYLOR:

17 Q. I want to turn to slide 21, and here you are
18 talking about the depooling, and maybe we shouldn't
19 necessarily look at the Class I differentials as the end
20 all, be all, to end pooling?

21 A. And that's -- that's the point.

22 Q. Yeah.

23 A. Yeah.

24 Q. And I'm assuming these impacts are solely looking
25 at the differential changes, they are not looking at any
26 other proposal that's been heard?

27 A. No. As you can imagine, building this was enough
28 work without adding 50 variables. We very simply looked



1 at -- and we didn't even -- we just took the utilization
2 by class and -- and a blend, and we used the base city,
3 where -- for example, Chicago, where prices reported out
4 of are Boston, prices reported out of -- and we just ran
5 the pool, came up with an average value. We didn't adjust
6 for any fees or anything else. We didn't adjust for
7 components even. It was just giving us a relative idea of
8 how much -- how difficult it would be, just through
9 differentials, to manage the depooling challenges we all
10 see.

11 And it's interesting when you look at the numbers,
12 because you know in the Northeast, Northeast Order,
13 because of the depooling rules, you don't have a lot of
14 fluctuation of pooling amounts, it's pretty stable. Other
15 orders, as you know, they can be very, very wide.

16 And so what we looked at, based on -- based on
17 that, how many months would -- if you based on -- just
18 again, we're using, for example, Chicago for the Upper
19 Midwest, which is probably -- that's not where the plants
20 are, the manufacturing plants, or even the fluid plants
21 anymore. When you look at that, what -- what price would
22 it take on Class I to not incentive any class to depool?
23 They say, I'm better off in the pool, we just use a
24 break-even number.

25 So you look at what the average weighted
26 differential would be, based on the utilization, whatever
27 it might be, and you look at what your blend is, and you
28 take the blend minus the highest class price, and multiply



1 it times utilization in Class I to come up with that
2 Class I would have to look like to -- and the
3 spreadsheet's in the record, the actual spreadsheet's in
4 the record, so you can look at it, but --

5 Q. So --

6 A. -- that's what we did. So it's just get an idea
7 relative. And as you can imagine, much less in the
8 Southeast, a lot more in the big manufacturing markets,
9 there's more opportunities.

10 Q. So I know you have highlighted the Upper Midwest
11 here.

12 But did you look at other orders, I mean --

13 A. We looked at them all.

14 Q. Okay.

15 A. We looked at them all.

16 Q. And what about the time period? Because you've
17 got -- this is primarily COVID times, which we can all, I
18 think, agree that the markets did crazy things. And I
19 don't -- the higher-of might have -- has been argued here
20 in this record, had an impact on pooling decisions and
21 blend prices, et cetera.

22 So is that the right time period to look at,
23 considering those factors?

24 A. Well, we could look at it, I guess, how do you
25 pick it? I could have went back to 2000 because
26 thankfully for this -- all your wonderful exhibits, I have
27 got data I never had back that far before. And, of
28 course, can't do that now, unless I can come back in



1 January and provide something.

2 But the -- we picked it just because there was --
3 this is a very volatile time for Class III and IV
4 differences, and so we wanted to look at a volatile time.

5 Q. Okay. Turning to slide 23, this is where we're
6 talking about the transportation credits in the Southeast
7 orders.

8 You have \$0.07 listed for Appalachia for Federal
9 Order 5, but that's not the maximum allowable rate?

10 A. No, that is correct.

11 Q. Okay. And so it's just currently being charged at
12 \$0.07?

13 A. Yes, from my understanding.

14 Q. And it is your opinion, I think, as I read from
15 this, and maybe some discussions you had with your
16 counsel, that if the Department seeks to update
17 differentials, we need to kind of consider these increased
18 assessments that would be charged to Class I handlers if
19 this new decision in the Southeast is passed?

20 A. Yes. Because when the proposals were made, this
21 wasn't a final decision.

22 Q. Okay.

23 A. And so, yeah. Again, we're not arguing against
24 the final decision. We're just -- we believe it should be
25 part of the consideration for the Southeast.

26 Q. Okay. On slide 32 you were talking about somatic
27 cell count limits and the 400,000 limit that's applicable
28 for products going into the EU.



1 Do you know how much milk equivalent is exported
2 to the EU that that limit is actually subject to?

3 A. What -- from my own experience selling lots of
4 cream out of lots of plants while at Kroger, it does,
5 because whoever buys that cream wants to make sure that's
6 met in case it ends up somewhere in a plant where it's
7 going to be exported. That's -- you can -- you can talk
8 to Kroger, you can talk to Publix, you can talk to Borden,
9 they will all tell you that that has to be a
10 consideration. And so they do. They do tend to do that.

11 Because in this world of ingredients, you heard a
12 little earlier, Tim Galloway talking about ingredients, he
13 sells them all over the place. And the EU works hard to
14 make sure we don't sell them anything that they -- that --
15 they don't encourage sales from the U.S. into the EU, I
16 think is a nice way to say that, so people are pretty
17 cognizant of trying to meet that.

18 Because I was surprised, quite honestly, when I
19 came to Kroger, it was an issue in Class I, but it is.
20 You do cream contracts, they make sure that you are
21 meeting that requirement.

22 Q. Okay. So 400,000, in your opinion, is the
23 effective limit?

24 A. It is the effective limit as far as current rules,
25 yes.

26 Q. Okay. And then on --

27 A. You have customers that may have requirements on
28 cream loads, what they have. But as far as regulatory



1 limit? Yeah, it's the one that we all -- you have to at
2 least be there.

3 Q. Yeah. And then the last slide, just a couple
4 questions.

5 You have this data and this chart here, and you
6 said it's from Federal Orders with SCC programs.

7 And I know that's somatic cell count, but what
8 programs are you talking about?

9 A. I'm talking in -- when orders pay, do they have
10 that built -- I think it's that built-in incentive on
11 somatic cell. Well, all I did, I didn't go back and check
12 all the regulations, I checked where you record it, where
13 there's official USDA data. And apparently, I missed an
14 order, and I apologize for that. Because I was curious
15 how different it was in the Southeast, particularly,
16 versus the Upper Midwest. Because I know in the Upper
17 Midwest they've made remarkable improvements. But, quite
18 honestly, the biggest improvements in Florida since 2000,
19 I mean, it's amazing. So we can be very proud. We're
20 making very, very good milk.

21 But I thought it was important that we show that
22 it's not -- it's not as regional as some people might
23 think. It's everywhere we're making really good quality
24 milk.

25 Q. Okay. And I just want to make sure the record is
26 clear.

27 In Appalachia, Florida, and the Southeast, I don't
28 believe they have programs, but they do report estimates?



1 A. Yes, that would be true.

2 Q. But there's no actual reflection of any somatic
3 cell count on a producer's paycheck?

4 A. Which means there's also no incentive,
5 regulatory-wise, to lower it, correct? Yeah.

6 Q. And then just, your total milk column, is that a
7 monthly average did you say? I just want to be clear
8 about that.

9 A. It is a monthly average for those five years, yes.
10 So it's 60 months.

11 Q. Okay. And with that, I think AMS has no more
12 questions.

13 MS. TAYLOR: Thank you for your time this morning.

14 THE WITNESS: Oh, my pleasure. Thank you. Good
15 questions.

16 THE COURT: Are there any other questions before I
17 call on Mr. Rosenbaum for redirect?

18 Yes, you may come forward.

19 CROSS-EXAMINATION

20 BY MR. VANDENHEUVEL:

21 Q. Rob Vandenheuvel for California Dairies, Inc.

22 I apologize, I didn't think I'd be coming up, so I
23 don't have these printed out, but I'm hoping we can rely
24 on some official copies, because I'll be referencing only
25 previously-entered exhibits.

26 So, Mr. Brown, i just had a couple of clarifying
27 questions, and I'm specifically referring to your written
28 testimony, 433. It was summarized in the PowerPoint, but



1 just to get the more detailed information on the record.

2 Page 16. This is a section where you are
3 explaining regional competition in the sale of
4 manufactured products and referencing some prior testimony
5 given by myself on this issue.

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. In that section of testimony, in your written
8 testimony, it says, "Witness Vandeneuvel insisted that
9 Class I differentials need to reflect regional competition
10 at the farm, and insisted that California needed to have
11 Class I differentials such that the blend price in
12 California was similar to the blend price in the Upper
13 Midwest."

14 Do you see that?

15 A. Yes.

16 THE COURT: Now, you didn't read every word, but
17 the gist is the same as what you have looked at, correct?

18 THE WITNESS: Yes.

19 MR. VANDENEUEVEL: I left out items that were in
20 parentheses.

21 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

22 MR. VANDENEUEVEL: Would it be possible to get
23 Mr. Brown a copy of Exhibit 345 --

24 THE COURT: Yes, it is.

25 MR. VANDENEUEVEL: -- which is National Milk-39?

26 THE COURT: Do you know now that there are other
27 exhibits you will want to use during your questions?

28 MR. VANDENEUEVEL: And Exhibit 302.



1 THE COURT: So 345, the record copy will be
2 borrowed, and 302.

3 MR. VANDENHEUVEL: 302 is National Milk-36.

4 THE COURT: Mr. Brown, if you and I are loaned
5 these record copies, we have to make sure we give them
6 back.

7 THE WITNESS: Will do.

8 MR. VANDENHEUVEL: 345 is National Milk-39.

9 THE COURT: We need to take about a ten-minute
10 break. And what I propose, in ten minutes is when we
11 would break for lunch. You will be here another hour or
12 more in order to be able to ask these questions after
13 lunch?

14 MR. VANDENHEUVEL: Yeah. Yeah.

15 THE WITNESS: I need to use the restroom.

16 MR. VANDENHEUVEL: I wouldn't want to delay.
17 After lunch will be fine.

18 THE COURT: All right. Please be back and ready
19 to go at, let's just say 1 o'clock. 1 o'clock.

20 (Whereupon, a lunch break was taken.)

21 ---o0o---

22

23

24

25

26

27

28



1 FRIDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2023 - - AFTERNOON SESSION

2 THE COURT: Let's go back on record.

3 We're back on record at 1:01 p.m.

4 Mr. Vandenheuvel, we were about to begin with
5 Exhibit 302, Exhibit 345, and the witness's current
6 testimony, Exhibit 433. And you may resume.

7 BY MR. VANDENHEUVEL:

8 Q. Thank you. All right. Just a couple of
9 questions, Mr. Brown.

10 So I read before lunch the section of your
11 testimony, Exhibit 433, related to -- which referenced my
12 testimony earlier this hearing, but related to regional
13 competition and any engagement that has with Class I
14 differential; is that correct?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. All right. So what I'd like to ask you to draw
17 your attention to, is in Exhibit 345, which is National
18 Milk Producers Federation 39, page -- page 3, the very
19 top, there's a paragraph that starts with, "specific to
20 regional competitiveness."

21 Do you see that?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. So I'm happy to read the entire paragraph into the
24 record, but since it's already in the record, I don't want
25 to belabor the record.

26 Can you just tell me, browsing through, if you see
27 the word "blend price" anywhere in that paragraph?

28 A. Not specifically, no.



1 Q. And, in fact, would it surprise you that the word
2 "blend price" doesn't appear anywhere in this exhibit?

3 A. Not necessarily. But I'm -- I believe that it
4 doesn't. You wrote it.

5 Q. Well, the record will confirm that, that when I
6 read this testimony into the record, the word "blend
7 price" was never spoken because it's not written anywhere
8 in here.

9 In fact, wouldn't it be accurate to say that it
10 would be unreasonable to expect the blend price in
11 California to mimic or even trend along the same line as
12 the blend price in the Upper Midwest, given differences in
13 utilization between those two regions?

14 A. Because of class utilization, the odds of that are
15 fairly low.

16 Q. So is it possible that perhaps your reference to
17 and your testimony stating that in my testimony I insisted
18 that California needed to have Class I differentials such
19 that the blend price in California was similar to the
20 blend price in the Upper Midwest, that that was perhaps
21 referencing other National Milk witnesses talking about
22 blend prices within regions and not specific to my
23 testimony in my regional competition?

24 A. Others talked about it, but in cross-ex- -- your
25 cross-examination, which unfortunately isn't posted yet,
26 my recollection -- and I was watching it on my tablet, so
27 I can't say that -- I mean, I'm pretty confident that
28 there was a -- that competitiveness difference, blend or



1 not, between regions was very evident in testimony. There
2 wasn't talk about class from my recollection, but that was
3 my understanding, which is why I wrote this the way I
4 wrote it.

5 Q. But you don't -- you are not able to cite specific
6 comments made in the cross-examination --

7 A. I cannot.

8 Q. -- you only cited my exhibit here?

9 A. Yeah, because that's all I had written to look at.

10 Q. All right. Well, I may come back to that in a
11 second, but let me draw your attention to Exhibit --

12 THE COURT: Let me interrupt.

13 MR. VANDENHEUVEL: Yes.

14 THE COURT: You are doing a very good job letting
15 him finish his answer. He's starting his answer before
16 you've finished your question.

17 MR. VANDENHEUVEL: Can the record reflect the
18 dirty look by the Judge and a hand slap by Mike.

19 Bad Mike. Bad.

20 I will -- I will -- I will be more careful.

21 BY MR. VANDENHEUVEL:

22 Q. All right. I'd like to draw your attention to
23 Exhibit 302, which is National Milk Exhibit 36.

24 You got it?

25 A. Yes.

26 Q. Okay. If you could scroll to page 13 --

27 A. Okay.

28 Q. -- there is a graphic labeled Figure 5.



1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Is this the first time you are seeing this
3 graphic?

4 A. No. But this is probably going to be more time
5 than I have spent on it so far, in my testimony.

6 Q. So at the bottom of page 12 there's a paragraph
7 that explains what the different lines mean on Figure 5.

8 And so in the middle of that bottom paragraph on
9 page 12, it says, "Green lines represent milk assembly
10 flows from farms to plants, whereas orange lines represent
11 the distribution of finished properties from plants to
12 demand locations."

13 Do you see that?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. So if you scroll down to Figure 5, what this --
16 what this appears to try to demonstrate, in a simplistic
17 form, is a map with various assemblies -- various
18 bottling -- Class I bottling operations represented around
19 the country. The green lines would be where they're
20 getting their milk from, the farm to the plant, and the
21 yellow lines would be their outgoing distribution of
22 finished goods.

23 Would you agree with that assessment?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. So when you look at the right side of that map,
26 there's a lot of green lines, largely all pointing down to
27 the Southeast United States.

28 Would you -- would you agree?



1 A. For the most part, yes.

2 Q. But as you get further away from the Southeast to
3 the Northwest and to the West, you see a lot less green
4 lines, really until you get to California, where you got
5 some -- some green lines, for instance?

6 A. You have a lot of people, so you will have some
7 green lines, yes.

8 Q. A lot of people.

9 I'd like to draw your attention to kind of the
10 middle of the country, South Dakota. South Dakota doesn't
11 have a lot of people, less than a million people, if -- if
12 my numbers are accurate on the latest census, but they do
13 have quite a few cows, a growing number of cows. You can
14 see there, that really -- the milk appears to be not
15 needed in South Dakota, though, to meet demands in various
16 urban areas, whether that be Chicago or cities into the
17 Southeast.

18 Would you agree with that depiction of the map?

19 A. For South Dakota, yes, I would agree.

20 Q. So I don't want you to have to strain your eyes
21 on -- on Exhibit 301, so I'm going to --

22 A. Thank you.

23 Q. -- I'm going to ask that you trust what I'm going
24 to tell you as fact and -- and understand it will -- it
25 will be reflected in the record.

26 Would it -- would it surprise you if you were told
27 that the model, the USDSS model, generated an average
28 between those two months, May and October, and their model



1 runs, an average spatial value, or recommended Class I
2 differential, for Fresno County in California at \$1.90?

3 A. I -- I believe that could be true, yes.

4 Q. And are you generally familiar with Fresno County?

5 A. A bit.

6 Q. And that's in the Central Valley --

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. -- a lot of cows, maybe not as many people as the
9 more urban areas of California?

10 A. No, it's cow country through that part of the
11 valley.

12 Q. Very rural?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And would it surprise you if the Tulare County,
15 just below Fresno County, was \$2.10, that was the number
16 generated by the USDSS model?

17 A. Okay. I believe that's the case if that's what
18 you tell me.

19 Q. For South Dakota, the state we just looked at, a
20 lot of cows, very rural, in some ways similar to the
21 Central Valley, but maybe even a few more people in the
22 Central Valley.

23 Would you be surprised to hear that the USDSS
24 differentials range from \$2.50 to \$2.70?

25 A. If they do, that is remarkable. I would not
26 expect that.

27 Q. Is there any economic justification that you can
28 think of as to why those two regions that have very



1 similar dynamics, lots of cows, and not very many people,
2 would have a recommended regulated Class I price that is
3 as low as 40, but as much as \$0.80 difference?

4 A. My observation would be, I am surprised. Which
5 one seems out of line may be up for discussion. But I am
6 surprised of that difference.

7 Q. Is it possible that my testimony on Exhibit 345
8 was referencing that fact and why a bottler located in
9 either location, whether or not there are bottlers there,
10 but if a bottler sited in the state of South Dakota would
11 have a regulated price, as little as \$0.40, but as much as
12 \$0.80 higher than the Central Valley of California, that
13 that could have been what I was referencing? Is that
14 possible?

15 A. It's possible, yes.

16 Q. I think that's all I have.

17 MR. VANDENHEUVEL: Thank you so much.

18 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

19 THE COURT: And the witness and the Judge will
20 return the record copies.

21 Who next has questions for Mr. Brown?

22 Mr. Rosenbaum, you may return for any redirect.

23 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

24 BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

25 Q. Mr. Brown, just to follow up. Steve Rosenbaum
26 with the International Dairy Foods Association. Just to
27 follow up very briefly to make sure there's no ambiguity
28 in the record.



1 Your testimony in Hearing Exhibit 433 regarding
2 the testimony as you understood it that had been given by
3 Mr. Vandeneuvel reflects the combination of what he had
4 said in his written testimony and what you understood him
5 to have said orally; is that right?

6 A. That is correct, yes.

7 Q. The transcript of which has not yet been posted?

8 A. That is also correct, I believe, unless it showed
9 up recently.

10 Q. And to the extent that -- well, did you -- let me
11 start that question again.

12 I mean, on page 2 of Mr. Vandeneuvel's testimony,
13 which is Hearing Exhibit 345, he expressed the view that
14 the U.S. Dairy Sector Simulator, which is also referred to
15 as the University of Wisconsin model, does not reflect
16 regional competitiveness at the farm level.

17 Do you see that?

18 A. Yes. I -- it was taken away, but I recollect it,
19 yes.

20 Q. And do you see that as an appropriate criteria for
21 setting Class I differentials?

22 A. Not really. I mean, it's the cost of moving milk
23 to market, is -- and you -- and you are -- you are in a
24 big -- Central Valley has a lot more milk than it has
25 market. And I think one thing that's important is that if
26 there's -- there's other opportunities to review the model
27 of Wisconsin. We talked about California, but there's
28 other examples as well that are a bit of a head scratcher,



1 hard for me to understand the logic, I guess, is what I
2 would say, and that would include South Dakota.

3 Q. And are you aware that the proposal from National
4 Milk raises the Class I differentials in California
5 materially higher than the University of Wisconsin model
6 indicated?

7 A. From what I remember, yes.

8 Q. Okay.

9 MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, at this point I would
10 move into evidence Hearing Exhibit 433, which is
11 Mr. Brown's written testimony; Hearing Exhibit 434, which
12 is his PowerPoint presentation; and also both the original
13 version of Hearing Exhibit 423, which is the spreadsheet
14 for which we put in a corrected version; and I would also
15 move into evidence corrected Hearing Exhibit 423A, which
16 is the document we marked this morning.

17 THE COURT: Is there any objection to the
18 admission into evidence of Exhibit 433, also marked IDFA
19 Exhibit 57?

20 There is none. Exhibit 433 is admitted into
21 evidence.

22 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 433 was received
23 into evidence.)

24 THE COURT: Is there any objection to the
25 admission into evidence of Exhibit 434, marked IDFA
26 Exhibit 58?

27 There is none. Exhibit 434 is admitted into
28 evidence.



1 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 434 was received
2 into evidence.)

3 THE COURT: Is there any objection to the
4 admission into evidence of Exhibit 423, also marked IDFA
5 Exhibit 59?

6 There is none. Exhibit 423 is admitted into
7 evidence.

8 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 423 was received
9 into evidence.)

10 THE COURT: Is there any objection to the
11 admission into evidence of Exhibit 423A, also marked IDFA
12 Exhibit 59A?

13 There is none. Exhibit 423A is admitted into
14 evidence.

15 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 423A was received
16 into evidence.)

17 MR. ROSENBAUM: Thank you, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You did well.

19 THE WITNESS: Thank you. At least I still have my
20 voice. Some may not think that's good.

21 THE COURT: We thank you, and we appreciate your
22 wisdom, and we look forward to seeing you again.

23 THE WITNESS: You will. See you in January.

24 THE COURT: Ms. Vulin, what is next?

25 MS. VULIN: Ashley Vulin for the Milk Innovation
26 Group.

27 The Milk Innovation Group calls Sally Keefe to the
28 stand.



1 Your Honor, we have already distributed copies of
2 her exhibit.

3 THE COURT: And have we given the next exhibit a
4 number?

5 MS. VULIN: Not yet, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: 440.

7 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 440 was marked
8 for identification.)

9 THE COURT: Let's go off record for just a minute
10 to we make sure the laptop connection is as we want it.
11 We're off the record at 1:18 p.m.

12 (An off-the-record discussion took place.)

13 THE COURT: Let's go back on record.

14 We're back on record at 1:20.

15 I have four exhibits, and I'd like to identify
16 what I'm looking at. The first is labeled Exhibit 440,
17 also Exhibit MIG-64. That is the testimony of Sally
18 Keefe.

19 The next exhibit is labeled 441, also MIG-64A.

20 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 441 was marked
21 for identification.)

22 THE COURT: The next exhibit is 442, also MIG-64B,
23 as in boy.

24 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 442 was marked
25 for identification.)

26 THE COURT: And the fourth one is Exhibit 443,
27 also MIG-64C, like cat.

28 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 443 was marked



1 for identification.)

2 THE COURT: And I'd like the witness to state and
3 spell your name, please.

4 THE WITNESS: My name is Sally Keefe, S-A-L-L-Y,
5 K-E-E-F-E.

6 THE COURT: All right. And one of the things we
7 need to do at the beginning is make sure that you like
8 where the microphone is relative to where your mouth is
9 going to be as you are looking at both your laptop and the
10 paper.

11 THE WITNESS: Apparently I'm the first left-handed
12 witness today.

13 THE COURT: And there are two ways that we can get
14 more volume. One is for us to just ask for more volume on
15 your mic, but sometimes then we get feedback. And the
16 other is for you just to move it.

17 THE WITNESS: I think we're okay.

18 THE COURT: Okay. That does sound good.

19 All right. You have previously testified in this
20 proceeding; is that correct?

21 THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

22 THE COURT: You remain sworn.

23 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

24 SALLY KEEFE,
25 Having been previously sworn, was examined
26 and testified as follows:

27 THE COURT: Ms. Vulin again identify yourself, and
28 then you may proceed.



1 MS. VULIN: Ashley Vulin for the Milk Innovation
2 Group.

3 DIRECT EXAMINATION

4 BY MS. VULIN:

5 Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Keefe.

6 You have four documents in front of you.

7 A. Indeed.

8 Q. Exhibit 440 is your written testimony for this
9 portion of the hearing, correct?

10 A. That's correct.

11 Q. And Exhibit 441 is a series of tables, charts, and
12 maps that you created in support of your testimony,
13 correct?

14 A. Uh-huh. Yes. Correct.

15 Q. Exhibit 442 is a table of anchor city/county
16 comparisons that you created, correct?

17 A. Yes, that's correct.

18 Q. And then Exhibit 443 is a fluid plant county list
19 and comparison of differentials that you created as well,
20 correct?

21 A. Yes, that's correct.

22 Q. So I would like to start, before we get into the
23 documents, just going through the process you used to
24 evaluate this data.

25 So what's the source of the data that you utilized
26 in your analysis in Exhibits 440 and 441?

27 A. So my primary data source for my analysis were the
28 two spreadsheets that USDA posted for NMPF's proposals,



1 and so one was posted in May, and then a follow-up after
2 the information session later in the summer.

3 Q. And Exhibit 442 is the anchor cities.

4 I know the list of anchor cities came from the
5 testimony at the hearing, but where did you get the data
6 for the differentials in that table?

7 A. Again, from Exhibits 300 and 301.

8 Q. And then finally, the fluid plant county
9 comparison spreadsheet that you created in Exhibit 443,
10 where did you get the data for that spreadsheet?

11 A. So the -- most of the data there, all of it except
12 for the list of plants, is from Exhibits 300 and 301, just
13 like all the other ones that we have been looking at.

14 The plant list is -- the vast majority of it is
15 from Exhibit 52, which was a USDA exhibit that -- of
16 plants. I only included fluid plants on this list, and
17 so -- and I also relied on information from the Market
18 Administrator website. Each Market Administrator has a
19 website that has a plant and handler list, and there
20 were -- you know, things change, and so the most
21 up-to-date information is available from the Market
22 Administrators. So that was where I got it.

23 Q. And I note on page 8 of Exhibit 443, and also then
24 also at the bottom of 442, you include your sources for
25 your data?

26 A. Yes.

27 Q. So let's go back to the differential data, since
28 that's what we're mostly focused on here.



1 When did you first download the differential data
2 that you used in your analysis?

3 A. I downloaded that right at the end of May. It was
4 posted on either the 30th or the 31st, right before the
5 request for additional proposals came out. And -- and I
6 don't know, I might have had the first download of the
7 file. I was -- I was very excited to finally have it,
8 because prior to that list being available, NMPF's
9 petition regarding Proposal 5 had summary information
10 available and summary maps, but it -- it -- you know, you
11 couldn't see it at the county level.

12 Q. And then there was also a spreadsheet that you
13 obtained that had the June proposal data, correct?

14 A. Uh-huh. Yes. And so I downloaded that one later
15 in the summer, late June, July, after the information
16 session.

17 And at the information session, I remember someone
18 on the NMPF team advising that, like, they had -- you
19 know, there were a few counties that were going to be
20 changing and, you know, you know, keep your eyes open kind
21 of thing.

22 Q. And how do you manage -- for those of us who
23 aren't Excel wizards -- what's just a high-level summary
24 of how you manage and process all of this data?

25 A. So it's just a big spreadsheet. Thanks to
26 printing out Exhibits 300 and 301, you guys have all had a
27 little view into spreadsheet world. And, you know,
28 mostly, you download it. These files, much like all the



1 files that we have been using in the hearing, are locked,
2 so you have to copy the data off. You can't, like, really
3 use it in its locked form.

4 And so then once you have the data, like, my
5 personal process is, I tend to keep all the data on one
6 tab of the workbook. And so I have -- in my workbook I
7 have May on one tab, I have June on another tab, and then
8 I have tabs with lots of analyses after that.

9 Q. And is this the type of analysis or approach that
10 you have done before?

11 A. Yes. I have -- I have not done this sort of
12 analysis of all of the Class I differentials before, but
13 as far as managing a great deal of data and going through
14 the sort of very detail-oriented, meticulous review,
15 that's -- that's fun. So --

16 Q. No one objected to that, but we'll take your
17 answer.

18 And how did you generate the maps?

19 A. So for the maps, I hired an analyst who helped me
20 with the mapping, because while Excel is very much in my
21 wheelhouse, ArcGIS is not. And so I provided the data
22 files to an analyst to make the maps, and then, you know,
23 worked to validate to make sure that it was the right data
24 and all of that kind of thing.

25 Q. What does GIS stand for?

26 A. Geographic Information Systems. And I have
27 actually done projects in the past where working with
28 folks that have that kind of specialty, it's a different



1 part of, like, data analytics and statistics and things
2 like that, when you are really getting into the spatial
3 type of modeling and software.

4 And so back when I testified in August, I talked
5 about a project that I did a long time ago looking at the
6 interconnection of rural water systems. And that was,
7 again, one where it was very spatially-related, and I was
8 doing a lot of the data work alongside a GIS person, who
9 was helping with visualizing it and, like, making it
10 easier to understand than Exhibits 300 and 301, which are
11 humongous tables of data.

12 Q. And I know some others have asked if experts
13 testifying are being paid.

14 Are you?

15 A. I am being paid. This is definitely not volunteer
16 work.

17 Q. So let's get into the maps, because they are quite
18 interesting. If you could pull up Map 1, please. And
19 this is page 2 of Exhibit 441.

20 We can't see it yet, sorry, on the screen, so I'll
21 just give that a moment.

22 There we are.

23 A. Great. So Map 1 shows the current FMMO Class I
24 differentials. The buckets here are in \$0.25 increments.
25 The lowest bucket starts at \$1.60. It does go down to
26 \$1.50, because \$1.60 is the base differential today.

27 And then the buckets go up from a light creamy
28 yellow color, and increase through the country until you



1 get to that nice purple color down in Florida.

2 Q. And do you have any observations about kind of the
3 spread of differentials across the country that you would
4 like to share?

5 A. You know, it's relatively gradual. There are
6 definitely, you know, large areas of the country that are
7 pretty similar to one another. Like, on the lower end of
8 the scale you have, it does increase as you move down into
9 the Southeast, which one would expect. And it does have
10 some ridges along boundaries between FMMOs. Like, you can
11 see one in the center of the map.

12 And when I use my mouse, can people see the mouse?

13 Q. A little bit, yeah.

14 A. A little bit?

15 THE COURT: It's a white color.

16 THE WITNESS: Yeah. It's -- yeah.

17 THE COURT: It's easier to see while it is moving.
18 When it stops, it's a little hard to find it again.

19 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Like, right here, this is the
20 northern edge of Order 7, and the southern edge of
21 Order 32 there. And, like, that's an area where you see,
22 like, it's kind of distinct there between those two
23 orders.

24 And then, obviously, like I just discussed, like,
25 the differentials, as we all are well aware are, the
26 highest in the Southeast, and they are also higher
27 generally throughout the Eastern seaboard.

28 BY MS. VULIN:



1 Q. And if we could go to Map 2, please, which is
2 page 3. Those are the NMPF proposed differentials.

3 A. So these are NMPF's Proposal 19 Class I
4 differentials. The color gradients are the same on the
5 maps. And so the lowest color bucket is, again, the
6 creamy yellow, the \$1.60 to \$1.75, and then it increases
7 all the way up to the top end of the proposal, which gets
8 up to \$7.90 down in Southern Florida.

9 And, you know, the biggest thing that you notice
10 visually here is, frankly, that it's a lot higher than it
11 was, and some of the patterns that have -- like, that you
12 would see in the previous map are -- have increased over
13 time. Like, there's -- the Southeast, what I -- the
14 Southeast seems to be larger now than maybe what you would
15 see in existing differentials.

16 Q. And is it fair to say you see more ridges here?
17 Can you tell us what you see there?

18 A. Yeah. There's also definitely more ridges and
19 different ridges. And it's not to say that, like, we
20 don't have ridges today, but there are some very distinct
21 unusual patterns. I mean, this -- this ridge that runs
22 across from Missouri, Kansas, and into Colorado, is very
23 distinct and very different than the current situation.

24 The other thing that I noticed, which I thought
25 was interesting, and -- and frankly, unsurprising, is that
26 today, some of the areas that we think of as the low
27 points are in Order 51, in California. And very much, the
28 proposal, you know, acknowledges that where -- that some



1 of that distri- -- some of, like, what would drive the
2 base or the minimum areas has moved over time, and like,
3 now you see that the minimum is up here in Idaho in the
4 proposal, as opposed to further west.

5 Q. And I know in your testimony you have testified
6 that you don't believe there should be any increase in
7 Class I differentials.

8 Why not?

9 A. So the -- I think there's a bunch of them. There
10 are many reasons why not. Today I'm focused on reasons
11 related to Proposal 19.

12 And I think the most important thing to bear in
13 mind is that there are -- there's ample supply of milk for
14 fluid use today. There is plenty of milk to meet our
15 consumer needs, and the -- and that is what we're trying
16 to do here, is to meet the public interest for fluid milk.

17 Q. And if we could go to Map 9, please.

18 Map 9 is the difference by dollar amount from NMPF
19 Proposal 19 versus the current differentials. And this is
20 on page 10 of Exhibit 441.

21 So I know the maps, in a nice way, kind of speak
22 for themselves, right, with the colors. But anything you
23 want us to pay attention to in this map here?

24 A. I would say the main thing to pay attention to in
25 this map is this is why this proposal is receiving a lot
26 of attention. I mean, it's a big change from where we are
27 today. And the changes are not necessarily the same
28 everywhere. And so it is -- for some regions of the



1 country, for some particular operators, it is very, very
2 meaningful and impactful to their business. And, you
3 know -- and these are substantial increases in the areas
4 that are showing, you know, as orange to maroon on the
5 map. We're talking about increases of over \$1 per
6 hundredweight.

7 And just bear in mind that \$1 per hundredweight is
8 in the neighborhood of \$0.09 a gallon. And so when you
9 are talking about stuff that gets, you know, up towards,
10 you know, well over \$2, we're talking about changes that
11 are more than \$0.20 a gallon. Like, this is -- this --
12 that's meaningful amounts of money.

13 Q. And if we could go to Map 10, please.

14 Now, this is the difference or change by percent
15 from current to NMPF Proposal 19. And my question here
16 is, the degree of change doesn't necessarily overlap with
17 the dollar amount.

18 And so is there anything about areas that are
19 experiencing more significant percent changes that you
20 would like us to pay attention to?

21 A. Yes. So -- so change -- considering the absolute
22 change, like what we were looking at on Map 9, is
23 important. But also thinking about change in relative
24 terms is important, too.

25 And here it's very apparent that some of the
26 changes relatively that are very large are happening where
27 Order 33, Order 1, and Order 5 all meet, and in an area
28 that also has non-regulated counties sprinkled in. So



1 it's just got so much FMMO geographic fun right there.

2 And the -- the thing to know is that a 120, -25%
3 increase in the Class I differential is very, very large,
4 obviously. Like -- and when -- when I asked the analyst
5 to map this, my analyst actually thought that I had my
6 decimal places wrong when I sent the file and -- because
7 they didn't expect that I would be sending changes of this
8 magnitude. Like, typically people are talking about
9 smaller relative changes. And so it's -- I think that
10 it's a reminder of how much change.

11 And then the other thing to bear in mind is that
12 it's also a reminder of there are other places where, on a
13 relative basis, the change is not as big, but it doesn't
14 mean that it's not necessarily unimportant.

15 Q. And if we could go to Chart 1, please.

16 A. Uh-huh.

17 Q. This is the current and the Proposal 19 Class I
18 differentials. And this, I have been told, is a
19 box-and-whisker plot.

20 And so my question here -- and it's on page 15 of
21 Exhibit 441. So my question is, why do a box-and-whisker
22 plot to evaluate this data?

23 A. So one of the things that's really hard about the
24 Class I differentials and the price surface is that we
25 have a national price surface. And so we have Class I
26 differentials for all 3,108 counties in the U.S.
27 Actually, that's only the continental 48 states.

28 And the thing is, is that while the price surface



1 is national, the FMMOs are not national. We don't have
2 one FMMO that covers the whole continental 48 states. We
3 actually have 11 of them. And they don't cover even all
4 of the 48 -- the states. Like, it's -- there are areas
5 that are not regulated.

6 And so it's important to understand both the
7 forest and the trees. And in this case, if you only think
8 about what's happening in total and you don't look at the
9 different FMMOs, you -- you risk, frankly, not
10 understanding what's happening in the trees, because all
11 you are looking at is the forest.

12 And, ultimately, in this case, the individual
13 orders are the trees, and they -- that's where this change
14 is actually implemented. Like, that's where anything --
15 if -- if a change is recommended and adopted, it's going
16 to happen at the FMMO level. It's not going to happen on
17 the "all" area.

18 Q. And just briefly give us a high-level overview of
19 what -- what are the lines, the boxes, the Xs and the
20 dots. Can you just tell us what those mean.

21 A. Sure thing. So, basically, a box-and-whisker plot
22 is a way to look at the distribution of a dataset, and it
23 tells you -- so the Xs show you the average, the bar shows
24 you the median, and the dots are outliers. And the
25 whiskers go off of -- between the core tiles.

26 And so if you -- the data is summarized in tabular
27 form in Table 2. And so if you're curious about like,
28 what is a particular X, or a particular outlier or



1 something like that, you can see that in Table 2.

2 Q. So just to summarize to make sure I have this
3 right, the lower bar is the bottom 25%, the box is the
4 middle 50%, so from 25% to 75%, and the top line is 75 to
5 100%?

6 A. That's correct. And the -- and the bar in the
7 middle of the box is the middle of the dataset, it's the
8 median.

9 Q. So let's start with the "all."

10 I see that there's both a shift up overall of the
11 differentials there, but also a lot of elongation at the
12 top end; is that right?

13 A. Yes, that's right. And, you know, a shift up is
14 definitely what has been proposed. And then, also, the
15 distribution getting wider, I think, is to be expected
16 given the passage of time, frankly. So --

17 Q. And then if we look at -- let's look at Order 1.

18 So I see down there -- any observations about the
19 fact that there's no overlap in the distance between those
20 two plots?

21 A. Yes. So that's a good example of what I was
22 talking about with, like, what's happening in the
23 distribution for all of -- for all 3,000 odd counties.
24 You know, there you see that the plots, you know, have
25 overlapping area. But when you look at Order 1, you see
26 that the current, and then what's being proposed, like,
27 it's a -- it's a jump up. Like, those distributions don't
28 even overlap one another at all.



1 Q. And if we could look at Order 30, please.

2 A. Yeah, Order 30 is unique. Order 30 today is a --
3 it's a very flat box. It's a line practically. And --
4 and then, again, like, it moves up dramatically, but it
5 also continues to show a very, very flat distribution.
6 Like, it is not -- there's a not a lot of range in
7 Order 30 compared to what you see in many other places.

8 Q. And not a lot of range in the current
9 differentials, but the new differentials build in more
10 range; is that right?

11 A. Yes. The new differentials do build in more range
12 than what is currently in Order 30. And when I say "new
13 differentials," I should have stated Proposal 19.

14 Q. As should I. So thanks for catching us.

15 And then if you could look at Order 33.

16 Is there somewhat of a similar observation there?

17 A. Absolutely. 33 is doing the same kind of thing,
18 where there's no overlap between the current and the
19 Proposal 19. Whereas Order 126 is very much, you know,
20 what you see going on in 126 is very similar to what's
21 happening with the distribution as a whole.

22 Q. And we heard discussion during the Make Allowance
23 portion of the hearing about, if there are jarring
24 impacts, how phasing in changes could be important.

25 But we haven't heard any discussion of that in
26 terms of the Class I differentials, and I was just curious
27 if you had any thoughts there.

28 A. When I look at the magnitude of the changes being



1 proposed here with Proposal 19, I certainly think that
2 something that -- that phases in change over time is a
3 very reasonable discussion to have and consider, because
4 we're -- it's been a very, very long time since the
5 differentials have been updated in anywhere outside of the
6 Southeast. And because of that, there are some places
7 that are going to experience very large changes. So --

8 Q. Could experience.

9 A. Could experience very large changes.

10 Q. And so if we could then turn to Map 3.

11 And -- and when we say "could experience large
12 changes," that's if they are updated according to NMPF 19,
13 correct?

14 A. Yes, that's correct.

15 Q. Certainly they could be updated in a way that
16 there are not such significant changes to the
17 differentials?

18 A. There are other proposals that will -- I believe
19 we'll be taking about in January, not today.

20 Q. Okay. So Map 3, can you just tell us what you see
21 here.

22 A. Sure. So Map 3 is the model minimum, and so this
23 is calculated -- it's the minimum between the spring and
24 fall model estimates. And Ms. Hancock's favorite county,
25 Ada, is front and center here with the minimum, so...

26 Q. And tell us why is Ada County unique in the
27 minimum map.

28 A. Ada County is unique in the minimum map because



1 Ada County is the one county that has a fall minimum.
2 There are a number of counties where fall and spring are
3 equal. And then the -- in the other counties, in the rest
4 of the country, then you have spring being lower than
5 fall.

6 Q. And if we could go to Map 4, please.

7 A. So this is spring. As you might expect based on
8 what I just said, spring and the minimum are very visually
9 similar.

10 Q. And then if we could go to Map 6, please.

11 A. Sure. So Map 6 is going to be the fall. And so
12 this is going to -- when you watch these move from one to
13 the next, bear in mind that the color gradient is the
14 same. And so darker purple going all the way to black are
15 the highest numbers. And so --

16 Q. And I have done this a few times with the paper,
17 kind of flipping them back and forth almost like an
18 animation, to see where I'm seeing the changes between the
19 spring and the fall.

20 So when you do that, where -- can you explain to
21 us where you're observing changes when you go from spring
22 to fall.

23 A. Sure. So when you go from spring to fall, what
24 you really see is that the biggest impacts between spring
25 and fall are happening in sort of a diagonal line, running
26 from Texas up to Wisconsin, and then, you know, continuing
27 that diagonal movement down across the country to Florida.
28 So I'll just go back and forth a couple of times so people



1 can see.

2 And so you can see that in the fall, like, across
3 a large portion of the Great Plains and Missouri, here in
4 Indiana, that the fall is higher than the spring, as well
5 as very much so in the Southeast.

6 Q. And then if we could go to NMPF's proposal from
7 here, Map 2.

8 A. Uh-huh.

9 Q. Now, as I do that same exercise between the two, I
10 notice that we kind of get even more saturation or color
11 or darkness in the maps.

12 And so can you tell me any observations you have
13 between the fall, which is the high estimate of the model,
14 and NMPF's proposal.

15 A. Yeah. So here's fall for the model, and then here
16 is NMPF's proposal. And so you can see that the NMPF's
17 Proposal 19 is higher than the fall, and you can also see
18 that some of -- that the model is what I would describe as
19 a bit more vertical than the proposal. And then the
20 proposal is significantly more zoned than the model. I
21 mean, the model is a model, so --

22 Q. And so we talked a little bit earlier about some
23 of these ridges you observed in NMPF's Proposal 19. And I
24 just want to ask, let's talk about Colorado, because I
25 know it's near and dear to your heart.

26 What do you observe happening, especially the
27 difference between what the model's producing and what
28 NMPF Proposal 19 is doing with that region?



1 A. So what I see with NMPF's Proposal 19 with respect
2 to Colorado is that they have -- the proposal deviates
3 substantially from the model results. And it's very clear
4 to the naked eye. It's one of the easiest things to see
5 on the map.

6 Q. And you said earlier, we even see some ridges
7 today, but they certainly are much more pronounced in
8 NMPF's Proposal 19.

9 Can you tell us why that might be concerning?

10 A. Well, so there's other areas with ridges. Like,
11 you can see a ridge here between Oklahoma and the Texas
12 panhandle. There is an odd ridge down here where we have
13 got Alabama and Mississippi. There's just -- there's some
14 places where it, when you -- that it appears to be very --
15 sort of like gerrymandered, or even you could say
16 "dairymandered." Like, it's -- you know, it's been --

17 Q. But there's going to be a stark contrast between
18 counties that are even side by side.

19 A. There's a stark contrast between side-by-side
20 counties. And there's a difference here. There's a
21 difference between a computer and between people.

22 Proposal 2 [sic] is a lot of people. The model is
23 an algorithm. The model is a model. Like, it's sort of
24 pretty with this color gradient, you know, and this is
25 pleasing to the eye, but it is definitely people when you
26 look at it. You are like, you know, this isn't -- a
27 computer's not going to come up with this one.

28 Q. And you said "Proposal 2." You mean Map 2, which



1 is Proposal 19?

2 A. Map 2 is Proposal 19, yes.

3 Q. So then if we could go to Map 5, this is the
4 average from the model of the Class I differentials. And
5 we have seen a lot of similarity, right? With the other
6 maps we looked at with the fall and the spring.

7 But can you just tell us, why does -- why do you
8 recommend that we not adopt the average as opposed to the
9 minimum?

10 A. So I think it's important that -- I think it's
11 important that the Class I price formula and the Class I
12 differentials there within it are not price-enhancing, and
13 using the minimum helps achieve that goal, whereas using
14 the average is going to pull the numbers up in the areas
15 where the difference between spring and fall is the
16 widest.

17 And if you pull those numbers up in places,
18 especially going across the Great Plains, going into
19 Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota,
20 Wisconsin, so these sorts of places that you -- you risk,
21 with price enhancement, you risk incenting too much milk
22 production, that then can drive prices down on the other
23 side, on the commodity side of things, with -- on
24 Class III and IV.

25 Q. Can we go to Map 7, please.

26 A. Sure.

27 Q. So this map is the difference in dollars between
28 NMPF's Proposal 19 and the model average.



1 So previously we were talking about a comparison
2 between NMPF and the current differentials, right, and the
3 impact that has. And now we're looking a bit more at how
4 NMPF approached their differentials vis-à-vis the USDSS.

5 So let's start with at least the -- or at the
6 beginning, the legend at the bottom with the colors and
7 the ranges. Can you just walk us through really briefly
8 what those colors indicate.

9 A. Yeah. So the colors take us from -- all the way
10 from negative. The buckets are in \$0.25 increments.
11 They're minus \$1 to minus \$0.75, up to \$1.01 to \$1.25, and
12 they move up by \$0.25 at a time. And so like the first
13 bucket -- like, I kind of think of the buckets a little
14 bit by the number on the right. So like, negative 75,
15 negative 50, negative 25, on up like that.

16 Q. Slow it down.

17 (Court Reporter clarification.)

18 THE WITNESS: Negative 75, negative 50, negative
19 25, zero, positive 25, and so on.

20 And so one of the things to point out, because
21 Proposal 19 is people and the model is a computer, you
22 know, there are places where the proposal is below the
23 model, there are places where the proposal is above the
24 model. And the thing that was most interesting to me here
25 is just the number of places that are so very different
26 than the model.

27 BY MS. VULIN:

28 Q. So let's start with that. Let's start with the



1 white or light gray.

2 Because anything that is white or light gray
3 deviates negative from the model by at least a quarter or
4 more, correct?

5 A. Yes. That's right. So where --

6 Q. Where do you see that?

7 A. So you can see white and light gray here in
8 Michigan. You can see it here in North Carolina. You can
9 see some pockets up here in the Northeast. This area over
10 here in Wisconsin and Illinois. And so those areas are
11 significantly below the model. They are more than \$0.25
12 below the model.

13 Q. And then we get to -- let's go the flip side.
14 \$0.25 or more above the model.

15 And those are going to be that darker orange all
16 the way to maroon, correct?

17 A. Right. So --

18 Q. Where do we see that?

19 A. Yeah. Orange to maroon, flowing through red. You
20 see most of those places in the western half of the
21 country, like west of the Mississippi. But it's not to
22 say that they are not sprinkled throughout. Like, you
23 know, there will be onesie/twosies of significant changes
24 where you can see a pop of color on a county that is east
25 of the Mississippi. And it's not necessarily universal in
26 the west, either. Like, you can see that there are places
27 in the west that are, you know, down or have a more modest
28 increase.



1 Q. And then in the extreme Northeast, right? We see
2 some dark red there as well.

3 A. Uh-huh. Yeah. The state of Maine is also
4 significantly increased relative to the model.

5 Q. And yesterday we heard some testimony from
6 Dr. Stephenson that he might be able to understand
7 differences of nickels or dimes, possibly quarters, but
8 that he would want to talk about differences that were a
9 quarter or larger.

10 And so did you -- I know it's not in your written
11 testimony, but after that, did you calculate the total
12 number of counties with a \$0.25 or greater difference from
13 the USDSS average results?

14 A. Yes, I did. So the Proposal 19 has 1,818 counties
15 that vary by more than plus or minus \$0.25. So that is
16 more than \$0.25 below the model or more than \$0.25 above.

17 Q. Would that include counties that have an
18 exact \$0.25 difference?

19 A. Yes, it would.

20 Q. Okay. And do you know the percentage of total
21 counties that have an equal to or greater than \$0.25
22 difference from the USDSS average?

23 A. Pardon me? I just said that backwards.

24 Q. Oh, okay.

25 A. So the number of -- the number of counties that
26 vary by more than \$0.25 above and below the model is
27 1,290. That is 42% of the 3,108 counties.

28 Q. So I'll -- just to be clear, 42% have -- of the



1 counties in NMPF's proposal --

2 A. More than \$0.25, and it does not include \$0.25.

3 Q. Thank you. So then let's add in that quarter
4 right on the line.

5 How many counties have a \$0.25 or greater
6 variation from the USDSS in NMPF's Proposal 19?

7 A. So I'm not -- the -- there are 1,818 counties that
8 are within the band, so that they stay within plus or
9 minus \$0.25.

10 Q. Okay. Understood. Thank you.

11 And this calculation is fairly simple math based
12 on the model results in the proposal, correct?

13 A. It is. And maybe not the easiest math to do
14 sitting right here.

15 Q. That's fair.

16 But just so we're clear, so 42% of the counties
17 fall into some range that is either higher than \$0.25 or
18 lower than \$0.25 from the model results?

19 A. Yeah. So what I think might be helpful for folks
20 to understand is that the dark gray bucket, so minus \$1 to
21 minus \$0.75, that is three counties; then there are 95
22 counties in the light gray bucket; there are 325 counties
23 in the white bucket; there are 1,000 counties in the
24 yellow bucket; there are 734 in the orange; there are 509
25 in the dark orange, so 26 to \$0.50; 339 in the red, 51 to
26 \$0.75; 91 counties that are \$0.76 to \$1; and 12 counties
27 that are \$1.01 to \$1.25.

28 Q. And I might suggest during the break we could



1 possibly put that in a written document for ease of the
2 record and circulate that when we return, but I'll just
3 make a note of that for that point in time.

4 So let's look at Map 8, if we could, please.

5 A. So Map 8 is the relative change. This is looking
6 at Proposal 19 compared to the model average on a
7 percentage basis.

8 And so, again, gray is going to be negative, and
9 the maroon is going to be positive on the other end of the
10 gradient.

11 And what you see here is that there are areas that
12 are -- have relatively -- it's the -- how closely the
13 proposal tracks to the model varies substantially across
14 the country. It's not the same everywhere. And you
15 wouldn't expect it to necessarily be exactly the same
16 everywhere, but I was candidly quite surprised to see how
17 distinct it was as far as the West versus the East,
18 particularly the Mideast and Order 5 relative to the rest
19 of the country there.

20 And this also provides an indication of areas
21 where the proposal is very -- where it deviates from the
22 theoretically, most efficient, you know, computer-driven
23 algorithm solution, which, of course, is not the real
24 world. I mean, if the computers could move the milk, none
25 of us would be sitting here today. So that's not how --
26 like, the model is obviously a model.

27 But it's -- it -- I'm concerned when I see changes
28 where the way in which the model isn't being followed



1 seems to be very -- seems to be quite variable.

2 Q. And on that point, if we could go to Table 1,
3 please, which is page 12 of Exhibit 441.

4 A. Yeah. So Table 1 compares Proposal 19 to the
5 current differentials, as well as the model average by
6 FMMO.

7 And so here, you know, what we see is that, you
8 know, like those first few maps that we looked at,
9 Proposal 19, relative to the current differentials, is a
10 substantial increase. And these are all on the average,
11 so we're just talking about that center X on the
12 box-and-whisker plots.

13 The -- and so, you know, but some are higher, some
14 are lower. Like, in Florida, the increase relative to the
15 Proposal 19 relative to the current differentials is 35%,
16 whereas you're looking at, you know, just over 60% in the
17 Northeast, Appalachian, the non-regulated areas. And then
18 you have got the Mideast looking at an 86% change, and so
19 that's like a very large increase relative to the current.
20 And then it's a region where actually, when you look at a
21 relative to the model average, it's below.

22 And the main thing that I note here is that in the
23 Mideast, in the Northeast, in the Appalachian, if you are
24 just comparing the averages, so the average of Proposal 19
25 versus the average of the model, you are going to see, you
26 know, not a lot of change relative to the model here in
27 Orders -- in Orders 1, 5, 33, Florida, the Southeast, but
28 then you see very large changes relative to the model in



1 California, the Pacific Northwest, the Southwest, Arizona.

2 I will say that in my opinion, this is not the
3 best way to consider the non-regulated areas. The
4 non-regulated areas are geographically disparate, and
5 lumping them all together is a -- like this, as one -- as a
6 12th bucket, is perhaps not the most rigorous way to do
7 it.

8 Q. And just so I'm clear on what data we're looking
9 at, under the column that says "Current," that's the
10 average of every differential within, for example, the
11 Northeast order?

12 A. Yep. And so that's looking at the average of all
13 171 counties in the Northeast. And then we look at the
14 average of all of the counties in the Appalachian Order,
15 Florida. And I have a new favorite FMMO, it is Arizona,
16 because it only has 15 counties, so...

17 Q. And so this is kind of, as you described earlier
18 with the box-and-whisker plots, there's going to be a lot
19 of ways to kind of slice and dice and look at this data.
20 Right?

21 And here the average is not going to show us the
22 same thing as the box-and-whisker plots, because it's all
23 bundled together.

24 But when we look at differences from the model, we
25 also here see different patterns from what we have seen
26 previously; is that fair?

27 A. Yeah. I mean, it's -- this is a different way to
28 look at the information. So we have looked -- you know,



1 looking at the information in a box-and-whisker plot,
2 looking at the information in a table like this, looking
3 at it on a map, you know, this is a lot of information and
4 a tremendously large dataset to get your brain around.
5 And so looking at it in a variety of different ways is
6 important in order to be able to develop sound
7 recommendations and thoughts for potential policy change.

8 Q. And in your testimony, which we're not going to
9 read into the record here just because there's a lot to
10 cover, I know you discuss the process by which NMPF comes
11 to their differentials.

12 But looking in these maps and tables and charts,
13 we're really just grappling with the final number,
14 correct?

15 A. Yes. These -- these -- all of these are about the
16 proposal. They are about the process.

17 Q. And so when I am thinking about what we are
18 gathering from all these different ways to approach it,
19 including the 42% of the counties in Proposal 19 differ by
20 more than \$0.25 from the USDSS, were you able to pull out
21 any kind of overarching principles or coherent approach
22 from Proposal 19?

23 A. My perspective on Proposal 19 is that it is very
24 disjointed, that there -- that it's an amalgamation of a
25 lot of different people's approaches, a lot of effort by
26 different groups, and that it doesn't necessarily hang
27 together very well in total. Like, it's -- it's got a lot
28 of internal contradictions, by my assessment.



1 Q. So we have been talking about the geographic
2 portion of the Class I differential that varies by county,
3 but I'd like to talk briefly about the base Class I
4 differential.

5 And so what is your understanding of what the
6 amount of the base Class I differential is today?

7 A. So today, the base Class I differential is \$1.60.
8 And, you know, we actually see it, you know, in like,
9 California, for example.

10 Q. And if we go to Map 2 with Proposal 19, what, if
11 anything, about the base differential in Proposal 19
12 concerns you or do you want to discuss?

13 A. It's interesting, because Proposal 19's -- the
14 lowest differential in Proposal 19 is \$2.20, you know, up
15 here in Idaho. But there are other places in the country
16 that are actually very, very close to the model. And in
17 the model, the base differential was run at \$1.60. And so
18 it's very hard to understand what is the base. Like,
19 what -- where is the starting point? Where are you
20 building up from?

21 Q. We have also heard testimony about over-order
22 premiums.

23 Do you have any thoughts on why or why that
24 doesn't support raising Class I differentials? Because we
25 have heard testimony that maybe they're less than they
26 historically were, or they are more difficult to obtain
27 when they are obtained.

28 And so why, in your opinion, does that not support



1 raising Class I minimum prices?

2 A. I believe that when you don't see over-order
3 premiums, that's actually a sign that the regulated
4 minimum price really is hitting a floor, and a price floor
5 is price-enhancing, and that's a problem for the market as
6 a whole.

7 And so over-order premiums are an important part
8 of keeping market forces in our highly-regulated dairy
9 markets. Like, our prices are complex, formula-driven,
10 and highly-regulated, and the over-order premium is where
11 you see the impact of the market.

12 Q. What role do you think the market should play in
13 USDA's consideration of FMMO price formulas?

14 A. I think that USDA should be mindful of the market
15 and continue setting minimum prices. The -- that minimum
16 price regulation is what is asked for. It's like -- it's
17 what is asked for to promote an orderly market and to
18 serve the public interest of meeting adequate supply of
19 milk for consumers.

20 Q. And what are the harms that can result if we do
21 have regulated prices that are price-enhancing or that are
22 above what the market can sustain?

23 A. Well, the primary one is a situation where you
24 have -- where the higher prices then incent more
25 production, and more production then winds up in products
26 that are lower priced than Class I. And you wind up with,
27 you know, situations where you have surpluses of commodity
28 products or surpluses of milk on the farm. And it -- it



1 is not orderly in any stretch of the imagination.

2 Q. What's the impact on Class I processors when
3 minimum prices or prices that are supposed to be minimum
4 are, in fact, above the minimum in price-enhancing?

5 A. So there we run into issues with -- for Class I,
6 you know, we have heard a lot about how Class I sales have
7 been declining for quite some time. And, you know,
8 when -- when -- when a Class I fluid processor is squeezed
9 by raw material costs that are higher than the market
10 would bear, that directly impacts their profitability and
11 ability to invest and to grow and to thrive and to
12 continue buying milk over the long-term.

13 Q. And we have talked a lot about processors, about
14 producers, but I know that consumers are a big part of
15 this, especially for you.

16 So what role do you think consumers should play in
17 USDA's consideration of FMMO price formulas?

18 A. I think that it is very important that we all
19 remember that without consumers, we don't sell anything,
20 and that we need to make sure that we're providing
21 consumers with a product that they want, and that -- and
22 with -- at a price that the market can bear, and that
23 the -- and that, fundamentally, that we keep the interest
24 of the consumer central to what we're doing so that they
25 also have fair prices.

26 Q. And I have four minutes -- five minutes left, but
27 that's it for now, other than perhaps providing those
28 numbers in a more easily digestible form when you return.



1 But that's all I have.

2 Oh, was there anything else, Ms. Keefe, that you
3 would like to -- oh, thank you -- share?

4 A. Yes. I would like to, in my remaining four
5 minutes, authenticate a series of documents that have been
6 used.

7 Q. By counsel? Co-counsel just reminded me of that
8 as well.

9 A. So on pages 16 and 17 of Exhibit 440, you will
10 find a list of documents that have been introduced in this
11 proceeding over the last few weeks. And so I'm just going
12 to run through the list without speaking too fast.

13 So Exhibit 300 is MIG-28. That spreadsheet is
14 entitled NMPF_final_class_1_differentials.XLSX.

15 Exhibit 301 is --

16 Q. And, Ms. Keefe, sorry, if you just say the MIG
17 exhibit number, that should give sufficient information to
18 the record without the name, because I know that's a
19 little laborious.

20 A. Thank you.

21 Q. You're welcome.

22 A. Okay. So Exhibit 301 is MIG-229; Exhibit 322 is
23 MIG-30; Exhibit 323 is MIG-31; Exhibit 344 is MIG-33;
24 Exhibit 350 is MIG-34; Exhibit 353 is MIG-31; Exhibit 354
25 is MIG-36; Exhibit 355 is MIG-35; Exhibit 358 is MIG-54;
26 Exhibit 369 is MIG-55; Exhibit 374 is MIG-57; Exhibit 402
27 is MIG-58; Exhibit 396 is MIG-61; Exhibit 405 is MIG-60;
28 Exhibit 417 is MIG-38; and Exhibit 419 is MIG-42. And I



1 am indeed the person that prepared all of those
2 spreadsheets.

3 MS. VULIN: To the extent, Your Honor, any were
4 not introduced into the record at the time they were
5 utilized -- and I apologize, I'm not sure which, if any,
6 have been held back -- but from that list we would ask
7 that they be considered introduced and admitted now.

8 THE COURT: I think all of these -- I think all of
9 these happened on my watch, and I admitted all of them
10 because I found sufficient reliability subject to
11 verification. And obviously, we don't have any time today
12 for the cross-examination about that, those preparations,
13 but nevertheless, this does properly authenticate as
14 promised.

15 MS. VULIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: How many minutes does she have left?

17 THE WITNESS: I did better, I have got a minute
18 13.

19 MS. VULIN: Going down by the moment.

20 So Ms. Keefe is available for cross-examination
21 for the remaining 25 minutes that we have? 18 minutes.

22 THE COURT: Let me go off record for just a moment
23 while we discuss how to use our last moments here.

24 (An off-the-record discussion took place.)

25 THE COURT: Let's go back on record.

26 All right. It's now 2:25. I think while off
27 record we agreed that we won't begin cross-examination of
28 Ms. Keefe today. We will begin cross-examination of



1 Ms. Keefe when we return.

2 I think we also agreed that there will be an
3 exhibit MIG-64D, like David, that will recap the evidence
4 that was given about which things deviate -- which
5 counties or areas deviate from the model by less than
6 \$0.25, more than \$0.25, or perhaps equal to \$0.25, and the
7 like. And we'll deal with that exhibit also when we get
8 back. All right.

9 And did we agree to anything else? I think not.

10 All right. Then, Ms. Vulin, I thank you both for
11 all of this work. It's obviously a lot of information to
12 go through. I'm glad you gave it to everybody before the
13 break. It's very useful.

14 So, Ms. Keefe, you may step down, and we'll deal
15 with moving these exhibits into evidence after cross.

16 MS. VULIN: I will make many notes of that. Thank
17 you, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Vulin.

19 MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, just one proposal, and I
20 think everybody's motivated to use the time that we have
21 when we reconvene in January to be as efficient as
22 possible. It might be helpful just if people know kind of
23 a range of rebuttal witnesses that -- we know that the MIG
24 witnesses will be in support of Proposal 20, but if people
25 can give kind of a rough range of how many witnesses, just
26 for our planning purposes, to see if there's a chance we
27 can actually finish the hearing.

28 MR. ENGLISH: Well, I think we sent an e-mail back



1 on November 17th -- we sent an e-mail in mid-November
2 responding to an inquiry from USDA --

3 THE COURT: You are --

4 MR. ENGLISH: -- and that has not changed.

5 THE COURT: And you are -- I can't distinguish one
6 word from another. Just slow your --

7 MR. ENGLISH: All right. We're all eager to get
8 out of here. I'm sorry, Your Honor.

9 We sent an e-mail, I believe on November 17th,
10 that answered this question, but for the record we'll
11 answer it again.

12 Obviously we have Ms. Keefe to be finished on her
13 testimony.

14 We pre-submitted testimony for 12 witnesses,
15 including two experts, Ms. Keefe and Dr. Stephenson, for
16 MIG 20, which included ten industry representatives, the
17 members of MIG. Each of those persons will then combine
18 testimony, give their opposition to 19 and their
19 affirmative testimony for 20. So that means we will have
20 12 witnesses for MIG.

21 THE COURT: 12.

22 MR. ENGLISH: 12 total for MIG.

23 I have heard people have been following the
24 internet. Now that people have seen Proposal 19, there
25 are people who are not members of MIG, maybe even not
26 members of IDFA, who have said, I may have an interest.
27 But none of them so far have said so other than MIG. They
28 have --



1 THE COURT: "None of them" --

2 MR. ENGLISH: None of them have said that they are
3 actually going to appear. So I can't predict on that.
4 I'm not going to go out and encourage people, but I can't
5 prevent people if they wish to come.

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

8 We will have, I would expect, three to five
9 witnesses in opposition to Proposal 21.

10 MS. HANCOCK: And thank you, appreciate that.

11 National Milk will likely have between two to five
12 witnesses in opposition to 20 and 21.

13 MR. MILTNER: Ryan Miltner for Select Milk
14 Producers. Select has not yet determined, but we may have
15 one or two, which is addressing all proposals other than
16 those offered by Select.

17 THE COURT: Thank you Mr. Miltner.

18 MR. SMITH: Dan Smith on behalf Maine Dairy
19 Industry Association. Keith Miller will be testifying on
20 behalf of MDIA during that time period. As far as I know
21 that's the only witness.

22 THE COURT: On what proposal?

23 MR. SMITH: He'll be speaking in general about the
24 package of proposals. He's a dairy farmer.

25 THE COURT: All right. Now, let me ask for
26 Agricultural Marketing Service to talk to us about what
27 happens after we recess today.

28 MS. COALE: Thank you, Your Honor.



1 For rescheduling purposes, to reconvene, we will
2 begin at 8:00 a.m. on Tuesday, January 16th, at the
3 502 Event Centre, which is the place we have been at in
4 Carmel, Indiana. We will meet through 5:00 p.m. on
5 January 19th, which is that Friday.

6 Provided there is a budget that has been approved
7 for USDA, we will then reconvene at 8:00 a.m. on Monday,
8 January 29th, if needed, if we haven't concluded on the
9 19th, and we will conclude this hearing on Friday -- no
10 later than Friday, February 2nd -- we hope.

11 So any questions on that?

12 MS. HANCOCK: January 29th will be at the
13 502 Event Centre in Carmel, Indiana, as well?

14 MS. COALE: Yes. January 29th will be at the
15 502 Event Centre as well.

16 THE COURT: And we would go, if needed, until
17 5 o'clock on that very final day?

18 MS. COALE: Yes. And then we will have a big ice
19 cream cake to celebrate the conclusion.

20 THE COURT: Sounds wonderful.

21 What do we get if we finish by the end of
22 January 31?

23 MS. COALE: Oh, we'll get two cakes and five
24 gallons of chocolate milk, and it gets even better as it
25 gets shorter.

26 THE COURT: That sounds great.

27 Does anyone have any questions?

28 None. All right. We will reconvene on



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

January 16th, 2024, which is a Tuesday, at 8:00 a.m.

Meanwhile, this 43rd day of the hearing is in recess.

We go off record at 2:34 p.m.

(Whereupon, the proceedings concluded.)

---o0o---



1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) SS
 2 COUNTY OF FRESNO)

3

4 I, MYRA A. PISH, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do
 5 hereby certify that the foregoing pages comprise a full,
 6 true and correct transcript of my shorthand notes, and a
 7 full, true and correct statement of the proceedings held
 8 at the time and place heretofore stated.

9

10 DATED: January 29, 2024

11 FRESNO, CALIFORNIA

12

13



14

15

16 MYRA A. PISH, RPR CSR
 17 Certificate No. 11613

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28



<u>\$</u>	10428:7,17	1,290 10422:27	19 10275:11,21,24 10280:3,9
\$0.015 10381:3,5	\$1.75 10408:6	1,500 10287:18	10281:10,28 10284:3,17,24
\$0.03 10313:16,18,20,27 10314:1	\$1.90 10395:2	1,748 10297:28	10288:18 10289:11,13,15,21
\$0.045 10380:6	\$2 10410:10	1,818 10422:14 10423:7	10292:6 10293:24 10301:7
\$0.05 10329:6,11,19 10380:5	\$2.10 10395:15	10 10280:5,6 10283:21	10304:23 10307:6 10310:26
\$0.06 10325:15 10380:5	\$2.20 10289:7 10428:14	10342:23,25 10409:20	10356:25 10357:9 10378:19
\$0.07 10293:8 10384:8,12	\$2.50 10395:24	10410:13	10408:3 10409:11,19
\$0.086 10381:12	\$2.58 10267:10,12	100 10270:24 10279:24	10410:15 10411:17
\$0.09 10410:8	\$2.70 10395:24	10334:11	10414:13,19 10415:1,12
\$0.10 10330:8,10	\$3.60 10329:27	100% 10363:2,3 10413:5	10417:17,23,28 10418:1,8
\$0.20 10331:5,6,24 10332:22 10334:26 10410:11	\$3.70 10329:3 10330:5 10335:22 10354:1,28	10:21 10328:3	10419:1,2,28 10420:21
\$0.25 10355:2 10406:24	\$3.75 10329:1	10:22 10328:6	10422:14 10423:6 10424:6
10420:10,12 10421:11,14	\$3.80 10334:18	11 10277:2 10295:14	10425:4,9,15,24 10427:19,
10422:12,15,16,18,21,26	\$3.85 10336:12	10370:5 10412:3	22,23 10428:10,11,14
10423:2,5,9,17,18 10427:20	\$3.95 10354:23	12 10393:6,9 10423:26	10434:18,24
10433:6	\$4 10333:22,24 10334:21,24, 25 10335:24 10353:8 10354:1	10425:3 10434:14,20,21,22	19's 10279:3,10 10285:10
\$0.30 10267:6 10293:16	\$4.35 10336:15	120 10411:2	10287:23 10288:21 10289:4
10336:21 10354:4	\$4.85 10330:28 10331:20 10332:11,13,24	120-day 10371:4	10290:26 10291:5 10294:3
\$0.40 10294:27 10307:13,17 10396:11	\$41.32 10291:10	124 10277:18	10428:13
\$0.50 10336:17 10355:16	\$5.05 10330:26 10331:16	126 10414:19,20	19- 10316:10
10380:5 10423:25	\$62.7 10282:10 10283:22	12634 10276:17,22	1950 10349:11
\$0.53 10279:27	\$65 10268:12	12646 10276:17,22	1960 10295:4
\$0.70 10267:6 10268:15,18 10272:12 10273:21	\$67 10283:22	12th 10426:6	1975 10278:18
\$0.75 10420:11 10423:21,26	\$7.90 10408:8	13 10373:8 10392:26	1976 10295:13,16
\$0.76 10423:26	\$99.4 10268:19	10432:18	1980 10295:4
\$0.80 10293:18 10396:3,12	---	130 10278:18	1988 10268:8
\$0.83 10293:9	---	131 10277:18 10296:1	1990 10264:26
\$0.85 10293:13,14	---	10297:13	1990s 10265:24
\$0.90 10293:9	---	132 10336:25	1991 10278:6,16
\$1 10410:5,7 10420:11	---	14 10286:12 10374:25	1993 10276:17,23 10316:10, 20 10317:8,17 10318:7
10423:20,26	---o0o--- 10389:21 10437:6	149 10282:26,27	10320:5
\$1.01 10420:11 10423:27	--as 10426:5	15 10287:6 10411:20	1998 10268:4
\$1.10 10293:17	-25% 10411:2	10426:16	19th 10436:5,9
\$1.25 10420:11 10423:27	1	15-minute 10328:2	1:01 10390:3
\$1.26 10290:26 10291:5	1	1500 10286:27 10287:17	1:18 10400:11
\$1.49 10279:3,5,10 10281:11 10283:2,9	1 10277:18 10279:22,26	16 10310:4 10312:2	1:20 10400:14
\$1.50 10406:26	10310:6 10389:19 10406:18, 23 10410:27 10411:15	10376:16 10388:2 10431:9	<u>2</u>
\$1.56 10267:9,11 10268:16	10413:17,25 10425:2,4,27	16th 10436:2 10437:1	2 10397:12 10406:19
\$1.60 10289:7 10364:12 10406:25,26 10408:6	1,000 10423:23	17 10288:9,17 10377:11	10408:1 10412:27 10413:1
	1,000-cow 10323:18	10431:9	10417:7 10418:22,28
		171 10426:13	10419:2 10428:10
		173,000 10304:20	2.08% 10280:2
		17th 10434:1,9	2.4% 10279:17
		18 10432:21	2.75% 10279:16
			20 10315:7,8 10379:14
			10433:24 10434:16,19
			10435:12
			20% 10276:26 10331:3



20- 10371:4	250,000 10303:25	325 10423:22	10309:21,25 10314:15 10398:13 10399:4,6,8
20-day 10371:5	26 10294:26 10423:25	33 10277:18 10290:27 10291:7 10349:19 10410:27 10414:15,17 10425:27	423A 10311:9 10398:15 10399:11,13,15
200,000 10302:2 10303:26 10304:19	27 10301:25	339 10423:25	43 10262:4 10330:20
2000 10312:9 10383:25 10386:18	27% 10276:26 10295:17	34 10290:23 10332:3,20	43% 10294:21
2002 10317:27	2701 10335:27	344 10431:23	43,448,000,000 10278:16
2005 10266:25	2704 10335:7,11	345 10388:23 10389:1,8 10390:5,17 10396:7 10397:13	433 10274:17,19 10275:10 10387:28 10390:6,11 10397:1 10398:10,18,20,22
2006 10266:25 10267:5	2709 10335:11,14,15	35 10334:1	434 10274:18,19 10275:13 10283:20 10316:6 10321:15 10342:26 10343:25 10349:19 10358:5 10398:11, 25,27 10399:1
2008 10285:18,27 10344:17	28% 10266:28	35% 10276:13,28 10277:3 10425:15	439 10262:18,20 10263:15 10264:2 10273:1,4,5,7
2010 10277:14	29th 10436:8,12,14	350 10431:24	43rd 10437:2
2012 10312:10,17 10313:5	2:25 10432:26	353 10431:24	440 10400:6,7,16 10402:8,26 10431:9
2015 10320:13	2:34 10437:4	354 10431:24	441 10400:19,20 10402:11, 26 10406:19 10409:20 10411:21 10425:3
2017 10303:3	2nd 10436:10	355 10431:25	442 10400:22,24 10402:15 10403:3,24
2018 10303:18	<hr/> 3 <hr/>	358 10431:25	443 10400:26,28 10402:18 10403:9,23
2020 10290:24 10291:16,17	3 10270:1 10312:21 10316:8 10369:25 10390:18 10408:2 10415:10,20,22	36 10333:9 10392:23	46 10290:23
2021 10289:15 10333:28	3% 10351:4	369 10431:26	46% 10294:22
2022 10272:21 10278:16,18 10280:19 10289:16,19 10303:18 10378:25	3,000 10413:23	374 10431:26	47 10335:9,15
2023 10262:1,3 10268:11 10278:24 10289:20 10290:24 10378:26 10390:1	3,108 10411:26 10422:27	38 10280:18	48 10411:27 10412:2,4
2024 10437:1	3.0 10282:8	39 10390:18	488 10280:19
2054 10333:1,9	3.1 10281:15 10282:7	396 10431:27	<hr/> 5 <hr/>
2055 10352:19,24 10353:1	3.70 10355:1	<hr/> 4 <hr/>	5 10293:7 10294:12,21 10310:3 10312:3 10321:14 10360:26 10384:9 10392:28 10393:7,15 10404:9 10410:27 10419:3 10424:18 10425:27 10436:17
2086 10353:13	30 10264:16 10265:11 10276:12,28 10277:18 10290:23,27 10291:6,11 10369:25 10414:1,2,7,12	4 10282:20 10351:4 10358:11 10416:6	50 10381:28 10420:15,18
2095 10354:10,11	300 10403:7,12 10404:26 10406:10 10431:13	4.11% 10279:15	50% 10413:4
21 10264:8 10269:7 10272:8 10290:15 10295:28 10381:17 10435:9,12	301 10327:27 10328:7 10330:20 10343:2 10352:4 10357:22 10358:7 10394:21 10403:7,12 10404:26 10406:10 10431:15,22	4.9 10282:8	50-cow 10322:24 10323:17
21% 10278:5,15	302 10388:28 10389:2,3 10390:5 10392:23	40 10369:24 10396:3	502 10436:3,13,15
22nd 10268:11	30th 10404:4	40% 10294:2	509 10423:24
23 10280:18 10281:4 10292:25 10384:5	31 10298:25 10343:24 10345:14 10436:22	400,000 10301:26 10302:2, 14 10384:27 10385:22	
24 10280:18	312 10302:3	402 10431:26	
2413 10331:8 10332:6	314 10310:9	403 10280:17	
2469 10330:19 10331:13	31st 10404:4	405 10431:27	
247 10278:17	32 10384:26 10407:21	41 10339:15	
2470 10331:10,11	322 10431:22	41.32 10291:12	
25 10364:7 10371:5,14 10420:15,19 10432:21	323 10431:23	417 10431:28	
25% 10359:21,22 10369:18 10413:3,4		419 10431:28	
250 10339:11		42% 10294:23 10422:27,28 10423:16 10427:19	
		423 10306:9 10307:3	



51 10408:27 10423:25	752 10329:20	abjured 10290:8	adds 10313:18
51.8 10281:14 10282:7		absence 10343:12	adequacy 10277:13
52 10403:15	<hr/> 8 <hr/>	absolute 10410:21	adequate 10276:6,11 10277:12,20 10321:18 10322:10 10358:12,19 10360:9,16,27 10429:18
54 10267:1	8 10262:1,3 10310:28 10369:9 10390:1 10403:23 10424:4,5	absolutely 10273:25 10298:10 10306:14 10366:19 10376:25 10414:17	adjacent 10318:12
55 10278:8	8-million-pound-a-day 10324:22	absorb 10323:23,25	adjust 10382:5,6
55% 10295:16	8.6 10281:8	abundantly 10265:22	adjusted 10283:12
55,165,000,000 10278:5,15	80 10358:25	access 10370:16	adjustment 10294:28 10303:20
57 10274:17 10275:9 10398:19	80% 10276:27 10295:14	access 10321:25	adjustments 10294:27 10298:26 10319:13 10338:16 10362:26 10363:22,23,28 10369:3
58 10274:18 10276:17,22 10398:26	80s 10317:26	accommodate 10376:23	Administrator 10376:8 10403:18
59 10306:10 10309:21 10399:5	83% 10304:8	account 10289:25 10293:22 10315:10,18 10343:9 10357:10	Administrators 10403:22
59A 10311:13 10399:12	84% 10295:4	accurate 10312:12 10391:9 10394:12	admission 10273:4 10398:18,25 10399:4,11
5:00 10436:4	86 10334:4,7	acetates 10343:1	admitted 10273:5 10398:20, 27 10399:6,13 10432:7,9
5th 10276:17,23 10316:10	86% 10425:18	achieve 10419:13	adopt 10292:19 10419:8
<hr/> 6 <hr/>	88 10268:6	achieved 10304:4,10	adopted 10277:5 10287:20 10412:15
6 10278:2 10293:11 10294:21 10365:21 10416:10,11	8:00 10436:2,7 10437:1	achieving 10303:15	adopting 10292:9
6.28% 10279:14	8:04 10263:21,24	acknowledgement 10376:18	adoption 10277:6 10357:2
60 10387:10	8:30 10274:12	acknowledges 10365:24 10408:28	advantage 10351:2 10358:23
60% 10295:4 10349:11 10425:16	8:32 10274:15	acronyms 10297:3	advice 10378:28
62.7 10283:11,14,17,18	<hr/> 9 <hr/>	Act 10366:2	advising 10404:18
63 10262:19 10263:16 10264:1	9 10288:10 10310:24,27,28 10312:22 10343:9 10409:17, 18 10410:22	Active 10286:15	advocated 10347:5
65 10266:27	9's 10286:17	actual 10284:10,11 10291:24 10327:2 10348:19 10383:3 10387:2	advocating 10307:9 10314:25,27
67 10283:11,15	9.6% 10304:6,18	Ada 10415:25,26,28 10416:1	affect 10308:19,20 10324:27 10358:27 10360:18
<hr/> 7 <hr/>	90% 10346:28	add 10273:10 10366:12 10423:3	affected 10365:2
7 10293:15 10294:22 10365:21 10368:19 10407:20 10419:25	91 10423:26	added 10280:13 10285:5,17 10309:24 10349:17 10367:26,28 10376:10	affects 10303:5
70 10330:11 10369:25	95 10423:21	adding 10306:19 10381:28	affirmative 10434:19
70% 10316:15 10346:26	99% 10295:5,7,15 10298:1, 26 10299:25	addition 10344:9 10348:20	afternoon 10390:1 10402:5
700,000 10302:28	99.4 10272:9	additional 10264:23 10279:27 10280:2 10288:1 10306:13 10319:21 10320:3 10323:25 10346:19 10348:8, 21 10356:18 10357:11 10372:1,3 10404:5	agencies 10320:12,18,21 10362:19
712 10328:18,27	9:00 10288:13	address 10284:21 10292:8	agency 10312:19
73% 10276:27 10358:25	9:35 10306:23,26	addressing 10284:22 10435:15	aggregate 10285:18 10340:7,11
734 10423:24	<hr/> A <hr/>		aging 10342:27
75 10413:4 10420:14,18	a.m. 10288:13 10436:2,7 10437:1		agree 10337:12 10343:14
75% 10369:11 10413:4	AA 10296:11		
750,000 10301:3,10,20 10302:9 10304:25 10305:11	ability 10319:23 10320:17 10324:26 10325:7,13 10339:8 10430:11		



10363:9 10383:18 10393:23, 28 10394:18,19 10433:9	analyst 10405:19,22 10411:4,5	area 10270:10,13 10328:11 10338:13 10407:21 10410:27 10412:17 10413:25 10421:9	10392:11,22 10394:9 10409:23,24,26 10410:20
agreed 10331:17 10432:27 10433:2	analytics 10406:1	areas 10265:11 10276:15 10284:15,23 10285:7 10288:22 10290:14 10394:16 10395:9 10407:6 10408:26 10409:2 10410:3, 18 10412:4 10418:10 10419:14 10421:10 10424:11,20 10425:17 10426:3,4 10433:5	attract 10265:5 10288:1
agreements 10276:16 10301:1 10318:15	anchor 10402:15 10403:3,4	argue 10307:27 10325:11 10326:12 10334:10 10342:4, 10 10345:3 10348:24 10364:12	attributed 10277:19 10322:9
agricultural 10268:26 10278:25 10356:7 10357:25 10435:26	anhydrous 10265:15,25 10270:12	arguing 10384:23	audits 10312:11
ahead 10311:12 10317:12	animation 10416:18	argument 10366:20	August 10268:11 10279:24 10406:4
Alabama 10418:13	Announcement 10312:3	Arizona 10426:1,15	authenticate 10431:5 10432:13
Aldi 10339:28	annual 10278:17 10282:12 10299:6	arrangements 10376:23	average 10266:28 10304:19 10310:1,4 10311:26 10314:7 10328:28 10329:6,26 10330:9,25 10331:4,16,25 10332:11,17,22 10333:21 10334:17 10335:21 10353:5, 8,27,28 10354:23 10382:5, 25 10387:7,9 10394:27 10395:1 10412:23 10419:4, 8,14,28 10422:13,22 10424:6 10425:5,10,21,24, 25 10426:10,12,14,21
algorithm 10418:23 10424:23	anybody's 10308:7	article 10302:4	averaged 10281:9 10336:12
align 10285:8 10373:12	anymore 10301:21 10308:5 10315:23 10322:24 10346:7 10348:18 10349:17 10350:21 10359:5 10382:21	Ashley 10399:25 10402:1	averages 10303:17 10349:21 10425:24
alignment 10374:14	apologize 10286:10 10386:14 10387:22 10432:5	aspects 10292:9	aware 10308:28 10398:3 10407:25
allegedly 10289:27	Appalachia 10384:8 10386:27	assemblies 10393:17	awful 10271:7
allowable 10384:9	Appalachian 10293:8 10294:12,21 10349:25 10425:17,23 10426:14	assembly 10393:9	B
Allowance 10343:10 10414:22	apparent 10410:25	assessment 10393:23 10427:28	B-R-O-W-N 10274:24
Allowances 10343:14 10363:23	apparently 10350:1 10386:13 10401:11	assessments 10384:18	back 10262:2,3 10263:23,24 10265:24 10267:18 10271:23 10274:12,14,15 10288:10,12,13 10300:3,25 10306:23,25,26 10310:6 10312:17 10315:6 10317:3 10318:7 10320:4,5,13 10328:3,5,6 10335:4 10345:1 10349:10,11 10352:3 10357:22 10359:18 10368:17,24 10373:9 10383:25,27,28 10386:11 10389:6,18 10390:2,3 10392:10 10400:13,14 10403:27 10406:4 10416:17, 28 10432:6,25 10433:8,28
allowed 10321:27 10376:27	appears 10276:13 10393:16 10394:14 10418:14	asset 10320:19 10323:16 10380:7	backwards 10422:23
allowing 10372:11	apples 10379:13	Association 10262:11 10263:26 10275:7 10356:10 10396:26 10435:7,19	bad 10273:22 10316:24 10329:15 10392:19
almond 10368:10	applicable 10299:20 10384:27	assumed 10369:28	bailliff 10347:9
alongside 10406:8	applied 10284:3,18 10286:16 10288:18 10289:11 10290:13 10299:17	assuming 10281:12 10326:19 10380:20 10381:24	balance 10350:27 10379:7
amalgamation 10427:24	apply 10285:3	assumption 10371:15	balancing 10284:10 10370:9 10375:5
amazing 10344:26 10386:19	appoint 10347:9	assure 10309:2 10344:12 10366:24 10371:28 10372:19	
ambiguity 10396:27	appreciated 10328:9	Atlanta 10327:5	
Amen 10309:18	approach 10379:9 10405:9 10427:18,21	attach 10282:14	
amended 10376:22	approached 10420:4	attachment 10282:17 10291:22 10296:19,20,21 10376:6	
Amendments 10276:16	approaches 10289:12 10378:21 10427:25	attachments 10291:19	
amortized 10267:20	approval 10292:23 10357:12	attention 10390:17	
amount 10276:28 10288:5 10289:26 10356:21 10372:13 10409:18 10410:17 10428:6	approved 10436:6		
amounts 10341:13 10382:14 10410:12	arbitrary 10267:23,27		
ample 10358:25 10359:19 10409:13	Arcgis 10405:21		
AMS 10272:23 10387:11	archaic 10294:28 10307:14		
analyses 10405:8			
analysis 10265:3 10289:26 10292:15 10296:24 10369:26 10402:26,27 10404:2 10405:9,12			



band 10423:8	beverage 10264:13,20 10265:19 10280:11 10282:9	bought 10271:27 10308:25, 26 10325:16 10379:27	10368:16 10414:9,11
banks 10280:18 10282:8	beverages 10278:27 10308:26,27	bounce 10314:22	building 10318:18 10381:27 10428:20
bar 10412:23 10413:3,6	biannual 10299:6	boundaries 10407:10	built 10268:8 10318:26 10363:27 10386:10
bargaining 10321:6	Bible 10333:2	box 10413:3,7 10414:3	built-in 10386:10
barn 10273:12 10299:9,11 10346:4	bid 10325:17 10381:6	box-and-whisker 10411:19, 21 10412:21 10425:12 10426:18,22 10427:1	bulk 10273:26 10297:28 10298:3,6
barns 10346:6,21	bids 10326:23 10380:1	boxes 10412:19	bullet 10278:13 10287:14 10297:7 10322:6,8 10370:11 10373:8 10374:27 10375:25 10377:22 10379:15
barrel 10309:28 10311:26 10313:16,18,19,23,25,27 10314:1	big 10308:17 10319:24 10320:20 10322:28 10339:1, 2 10340:24 10360:21 10383:8 10397:24 10404:25 10409:26 10411:13 10430:14 10436:18	boy 10400:23	bunch 10409:9
base 10284:6,8,21 10289:4, 6,9 10307:14,25 10313:17 10366:13 10370:7 10371:15 10372:15 10382:2 10406:26 10409:2 10428:3,6,7,11,17, 18	bigger 10320:7 10322:21	brand 10341:22	bundled 10426:23
based 10267:26 10275:28 10280:12 10281:11,28 10284:3,5,17,26 10285:6 10286:26 10287:10,16 10288:18 10296:23 10303:25 10304:6 10327:17, 18 10350:2 10358:13,14,15 10366:8,10 10367:13,25 10382:16,17,26 10416:7 10423:11	biggest 10326:2,17 10338:27 10340:23 10370:15 10372:14,15,16 10380:8 10386:18 10408:9 10416:24	brands 10340:27 10341:18	Bureau 10265:2 10269:12
bases 10264:21	Bill 10317:27	break 10274:11,13 10288:9, 11 10306:22,24 10328:2,4 10389:10,11,20 10423:28 10433:13	business 10323:10 10325:19 10340:1 10342:8 10347:19 10366:24 10374:10 10410:2
basically 10305:13 10345:16,20 10348:1 10366:10 10412:21	billion 10369:24,25	break-even 10382:24	butter 10267:3,17 10271:15, 18,27 10296:11 10297:27 10317:20 10324:1 10327:19 10340:11,17,18,19,22,25 10362:15 10370:28
basing 10287:23,24	bit 10271:3 10276:4 10285:28 10314:23 10370:10 10378:1 10379:4 10395:5 10397:28 10407:13, 14 10417:19,22 10420:3,14	breakfast 10280:17 10281:14 10282:6	butterfat 10270:19 10273:14 10296:4 10303:23
basis 10278:17 10288:4 10319:15 10411:13 10424:7	black 10416:14	briefly 10396:27 10412:18 10420:7 10428:3	buy 10271:28 10340:7,11, 12,18,19,20 10341:25 10346:9 10379:28
basket 10341:26	blend 10265:6 10267:17 10285:7 10286:23,24 10288:22,25 10290:22,25 10291:1,8 10373:11 10374:4,5,6,13,14 10382:2, 27,28 10383:21 10388:11,12 10390:27 10391:2,6,10,12, 19,20,22,28	bring 10351:16	buyer 10321:8 10339:3 10371:10
bear 10284:4,26 10288:19 10409:12 10410:7 10411:11 10416:13 10430:10,22	blends 10373:25 10374:6	bringing 10270:14 10292:20	buyers 10320:7,24 10325:11 10346:14 10347:17 10349:6
beautifully 10329:10	block 10309:28 10311:25 10312:6 10313:10,23,26,27 10314:2,7	brings 10363:5	buying 10430:12
begin 10283:7 10288:9 10390:4 10432:27,28 10436:2	blurry 10358:8	Britain 10356:3	buys 10372:19 10385:5
beginning 10270:26 10276:19 10278:12 10401:7 10420:6	board 10326:9	Brown 10274:6,9,23 10275:1,8 10280:21 10288:16 10291:18 10297:18 10305:23,24,27 10306:10 10307:2 10309:20 10314:19 10322:20 10328:15 10351:24 10352:1 10387:26 10388:23 10389:4 10390:9 10396:21,25	<hr/> C <hr/>
behalf 10435:18,20	Borden 10385:8	brought 10274:10	cake 10436:19
belabor 10390:25	borrowed 10389:2	Brown's 10305:22 10398:11	cakes 10436:23
belief 10297:26	Boston 10382:4	browsing 10390:26	calculate 10309:27,28 10313:3 10422:11
beneficial 10338:12	bottler 10396:8,10	BTU 10297:28	calculated 10284:25 10313:24,28 10314:5,6 10319:14 10356:21 10415:23
benefit 10268:14 10302:1 10305:2	bottlers 10396:9	bucket 10406:25 10408:5 10420:13 10423:20,22,23,24 10426:6	calculation 10272:17 10423:11
benefitted 10337:15	bottling 10393:18	buckets 10406:24,27 10420:10,13	calculations 10291:20 10336:25 10342:20 10343:8
	bottom 10292:24 10304:16 10393:6,8 10403:24 10413:3 10420:6	budget 10436:6	California 10286:21,23
		build 10268:3 10318:13,21 10324:21 10362:13	



10300:7,17 10387:21 10388:10,12 10391:11,18,19 10394:4 10395:2,9 10396:12 10397:27 10398:4 10408:27 10426:1 10428:9	cautious 10377:7	chapter 10333:3	10420:17
call 10262:12 10277:21 10299:14 10308:26 10311:8, 12 10348:13 10356:6 10359:4 10387:17	celebrate 10436:19	characterization 10321:22, 23	clarified 10314:25
called 10269:12 10271:8 10311:24	cell 10301:2,3,9,20,27,28 10302:2,8,18 10303:4,7,10, 12,14,15,18,19,22 10304:4, 10,19,24 10305:7,11 10339:11,14 10349:28 10350:6 10384:27 10386:7, 11 10387:3	charge 10292:17 10319:10 10381:7	clarify 10307:3,19
calls 10274:5 10399:27	census 10394:12	charged 10384:11,18	clarifying 10387:26
candidly 10424:16	cent 10325:18 10380:1 10381:10	charges 10361:24 10372:1	Clark 10333:28 10334:2
candy 10272:4	center 10407:11 10415:25 10425:11	Charleston 10289:10	class 10264:9,18 10265:2,4, 5,9,10,12,23,27 10266:9,12, 14,24 10267:2 10268:20 10270:27 10272:9,13,17,19 10273:12,16,20,21,25,26 10275:24 10276:1,7,25 10277:8,9,12,14,16,17,21,22 10278:23 10279:4,11,19,27 10282:26 10283:9 10284:4, 5,9,15,25,27,28 10285:3,4,6, 10,13,15,16,17,21,22 10286:17,19,21,22,25 10287:15,21,23,24,26,28 10288:2,5,19,21,23 10289:1, 21 10290:4,8,19,21,25,26,28 10291:6,8,9 10292:12 10293:20,21 10294:3,8,10, 15 10295:11,15,22,24 10297:14 10301:2,8,12,13 10302:7,19,25 10303:27 10304:5,7,17,18,24 10307:6, 10,16 10312:3 10313:18 10314:26 10315:12 10316:15 10321:19 10322:11,14 10323:2 10325:23 10339:21 10342:22 10343:22 10350:5, 13 10351:4 10357:9 10358:23 10359:21,22 10360:15,27 10366:7,8,10, 14,17,23 10367:16,17 10369:24 10372:2 10373:16, 26 10374:12,15 10375:8 10376:10 10377:1,2 10380:12 10381:19 10382:2, 22,28 10383:1,2 10384:3,18 10385:19 10388:9,11 10390:13 10391:14,18 10392:2 10393:18 10395:1 10396:2 10397:21 10398:4 10405:12 10406:23 10408:3 10409:7 10411:3,17,24,25 10414:26 10419:4,11,24 10428:2,3,6,7,24 10429:1,26 10430:2,5,6,8
Canton 10353:22,23,25	central 10270:25 10395:6, 21,22 10396:12 10397:24 10430:24	charts 10402:11 10427:12	checked 10297:23 10386:12
capacity 10268:1 10377:5	Centre 10436:3,13,15	cheaper 10270:28 10368:11	checks 10313:8
capita 10278:17	cents 10321:4 10372:9	check 10313:1 10386:11	cheddar 10297:25 10298:12, 20 10310:4 10311:25,26
capital 10267:19	CEO 10264:10	checked 10297:23 10386:12	cheese 10265:23 10266:23 10287:28 10295:26 10297:25,26 10298:12,16,20 10303:28 10305:6 10313:22 10317:19 10324:1,18,22 10327:20 10339:16 10340:10 10342:11 10351:10 10359:13 10360:21 10362:15 10371:12
Capps 10281:2 10308:14 10369:20	ceremony 10268:11	checks 10313:8	Chicago 10382:3,18 10394:16
Capps' 10279:2,9,12 10280:1 10309:3 10369:10	certified 10298:18 10349:16	cheddar 10297:25 10298:12, 20 10310:4 10311:25,26	Chip 10351:26
capricious 10267:23,28	cetera 10369:13 10383:21	cheese 10265:23 10266:23 10287:28 10295:26 10297:25,26 10298:12,16,20 10303:28 10305:6 10313:22 10317:19 10324:1,18,22 10327:20 10339:16 10340:10 10342:11 10351:10 10359:13 10360:21 10362:15 10371:12	chocolate 10436:24
capture 10279:1 10324:11	chain 10324:25	Chicago 10382:3,18 10394:16	chore 10297:20
captured 10285:16,26	challenge 10362:9 10379:5 10380:8	Chip 10351:26	Chuck 10364:11
captures 10279:6	challenges 10377:26 10382:9	chocolate 10436:24	circulate 10424:2
caramel 10271:18	challenging 10359:27	chore 10297:20	circumstance 10307:17
care 10287:2 10362:14 10375:17	chance 10290:17 10347:8 10433:26	chuck 10364:11	circumstances 10320:4
careful 10268:20 10327:12 10338:26 10364:1,4,15 10379:23 10392:20	change 10280:14 10281:14 10286:7 10289:9 10293:5 10294:18,23 10300:12 10307:23 10308:11 10311:8 10312:12,25 10315:1,24,25 10321:24 10323:4 10327:10, 12 10343:17,23 10346:1 10348:2 10353:10 10367:13, 14 10381:14 10403:20 10409:26 10410:14,16,21, 22,23 10411:10,13 10412:13,15 10415:2 10424:5 10425:18,26 10427:7	circulate 10424:2	cite 10322:7 10392:5
Carmel 10436:4,13	changing 10279:23 10315:22 10318:10 10326:17 10338:26 10404:20	circumstance 10307:17	cited 10392:8
Carolina 10421:8	channel 10281:1 10282:16	circumstances 10320:4	cities 10394:16 10403:3,4
case 10323:15 10326:26 10331:27 10332:16 10362:25 10366:25 10385:6 10395:17 10412:7,12		circumstances 10320:4	city 10353:25 10355:26 10361:15,17 10382:2
cases 10298:17 10300:6 10377:4 10378:10		circumstances 10320:4	city/county 10402:15
cat 10400:27		cite 10322:7 10392:5	clarification 10291:11 10294:16 10345:27 10346:12 10353:16 10361:16 10372:26
catch 10324:9		circumstances 10320:4	
catching 10414:14		cities 10394:16 10403:3,4	classes 10373:6
categories 10279:13 10281:3		city 10353:25 10355:26 10361:15,17 10382:2	Classic 10264:17 10265:20
causing 10267:21 10360:3		city/county 10402:15	Claus 10297:22
cautions 10367:9		clarification 10291:11 10294:16 10345:27 10346:12 10353:16 10361:16 10372:26	clean 10344:14



close 10262:26 10270:22 10317:1 10337:11 10370:2 10428:16	common 10320:12,19 10325:20 10345:2 10359:28 10362:19	completes 10305:21 10314:9	conservative 10289:14
closely 10424:12	companies 10298:20 10301:23 10320:7 10381:6	complex 10429:9	considerable 10290:5
closer 10263:2 10358:25	company 10264:11,16 10268:2,9 10270:22	complicated 10365:11	considerably 10285:6
Co-counsel 10431:7	compare 10379:1,13	component 10307:14 10312:4 10344:19	consideration 10301:4 10361:6 10379:1,22,23 10384:25 10385:10 10429:13 10430:17
co-op 10319:9 10342:17 10349:6 10363:2,3	compared 10298:28 10320:4 10337:13,16 10345:19,24 10414:7 10424:6	components 10265:22 10350:5 10370:7 10382:7	considerations 10276:1 10303:8
co-ops 10319:17 10342:16	compares 10295:11 10425:4	composition 10286:20	considered 10264:18 10285:14 10316:2 10319:20 10345:9 10369:1,11 10375:4,26 10377:24 10379:20 10380:16 10381:15 10432:7
COALE 10435:28 10436:14, 18,23	comparing 10299:13,16,19 10425:24	comprised 10272:10 10284:8	consistent 10277:12 10322:27 10326:14 10342:3 10361:19 10370:20 10371:10 10378:27
Code 10295:28	comparison 10311:25 10402:19 10403:9 10420:1	compromised 10279:21	consolidation 10323:8
cognizant 10368:6,13 10385:17	comparisons 10313:22 10402:16	computer 10352:27 10418:21 10420:21	constitute 10277:1
coherent 10427:21	compensate 10349:8	computer's 10418:27	constrained 10375:13
collecting 10312:28	competete 10284:12 10338:23 10340:1 10370:13	computer-driven 10424:22	construction 10318:11
colloquy 10309:10	competes 10368:14	computers 10424:24	Consulting 10280:28 10282:15,18
color 10300:1 10406:28 10407:1,15 10408:4,5 10416:13 10417:10 10418:24 10421:24	competing 10265:13 10332:4 10334:24,27 10341:21	computes 10281:22	consume 10340:12
Colorado 10408:22 10417:24 10418:2	competition 10286:18 10339:28 10388:3,9 10390:13 10391:23	concentrated 10264:12,21 10265:15 10270:19	consumer 10371:1 10409:15 10430:24
colors 10409:22 10420:6,8,9	competitive 10265:12,13 10271:10 10284:10,11 10286:26 10287:16 10318:6 10323:14 10325:19,27 10326:18 10327:11,12,23 10334:13 10337:3 10338:25 10341:17 10351:2 10367:4 10368:14 10370:10,12 10371:8,13,26 10373:3,16 10381:8,14	concept 10287:19 10307:15	consumers 10429:19 10430:14,16,19,21
column 10311:22,27,28 10312:2,6 10313:10,17,21, 23,26 10314:4,5,7 10328:18, 27 10329:2 10331:11,12,18 10332:6 10333:1,28 10350:6 10353:4,6,27 10354:13,22, 26 10387:6 10426:9	competitiveness 10371:19, 27 10390:20 10391:28 10397:16	concern 10327:22 10338:28 10360:5	consumption 10276:9 10278:17 10366:5
columns 10311:21 10314:3	competitor 10271:14,16,17	concerned 10271:17 10377:6 10424:27	contend 10268:17
combination 10284:6 10397:3	competitors 10271:11 10326:4,11 10327:24 10368:8	concerns 10326:17 10350:23 10428:12	contents 10311:1
combine 10265:28 10434:17	competitors' 10267:3	conclude 10436:9	context 10344:7 10345:6
combined 10292:26 10293:16	complain 10372:21	concluded 10436:8 10437:5	continental 10411:27 10412:2
commensurate 10326:4	complete 10303:21 10317:15	conclusion 10304:22 10378:1 10436:19	continuation 10350:17 10351:13
comment 10362:18	completely 10291:13 10302:18 10306:18	concrete 10268:10 10346:22	consume 10340:12
commenting 10298:25		condensed 10264:20,23 10265:14 10266:7,20,26 10267:10 10268:1,3 10269:21,25 10271:15,20, 23,26,28 10296:1	consumer 10371:1 10409:15 10430:24
comments 10286:15 10392:6		conditions 10285:20 10307:21 10323:12 10374:7	consumers 10429:19 10430:14,16,19,21
commercial 10318:1		confident 10391:27	consumption 10276:9 10278:17 10366:5
commitments 10371:20 10376:18		confirm 10391:5	contend 10268:17
committed 10287:27		confirms 10277:13	contents 10311:1
commodity 10327:17,18,19 10366:11 10367:4 10376:10 10419:23 10429:27		conformance 10346:11	context 10344:7 10345:6
		confused 10352:14,15 10354:27	continental 10411:27 10412:2
		confusing 10378:1	continuation 10350:17 10351:13
		connection 10400:10	continue 10262:6 10288:16 10303:25 10311:17 10326:2 10429:15 10430:12



contractual 10376:17,23	10380:22 10384:10 10387:5 10388:17 10390:14 10397:6, 8 10401:20 10402:9,10,13, 14,16,17,20,21 10404:13 10413:6 10415:13,14 10421:4,16 10423:12 10427:14	10427:19 10433:5	10432:8,16,22,25 10433:18 10434:3,5,21 10435:1,17,22, 25 10436:16,20,26
contractually 10287:27		countries 10301:25	
contradictions 10427:28		country 10270:15 10285:4 10303:16 10305:15 10338:17 10393:19 10394:10 10395:10 10406:28 10407:3,6 10410:1 10416:4,27 10421:21 10424:14,19 10428:15	cover 10275:20 10321:8 10372:12 10412:3 10427:10
contradicts 10288:28			covered 10337:13
contrast 10295:5 10336:20 10418:17,19	corrected 10282:26 10283:14 10306:15 10307:2 10309:20 10311:8 10398:14, 15	counts 10301:2 10302:1,2, 18 10303:4,7,11,12,15,20 10304:4,12 10305:7 10342:19	covering 10301:6
contributing 10319:24	correction 10283:20 10285:23		covers 10369:25 10412:2
control 10324:6 10325:7 10348:22	correctly 10369:11	county 10328:18,21,25,28 10329:21,23,27 10330:13, 14,22,23 10331:24 10332:8 10333:10,14,17,21,28 10334:2 10335:12,16,19,22, 28 10336:21 10353:2,15,22, 10354:9,16,17 10355:23,25, 26 10395:2,4,14,15 10402:18 10403:8 10404:11 10415:24,26,28 10416:1 10421:24 10428:2	COVID 10347:11 10383:17
controlling 10324:27			cow 10302:3 10303:6,8 10346:26 10348:7 10395:10
conventional 10322:15 10339:25 10341:6 10342:1	cost 10266:13 10267:19 10270:12 10280:10,14 10281:10,11,13,25 10282:9 10283:10 10284:9 10285:11, 13 10289:12,16,17,20 10292:16 10298:27 10308:4 10319:19,21 10323:13 10324:24 10332:27 10341:17 10343:27 10344:2, 9,28 10345:6,14 10346:20 10349:17 10361:4 10373:20 10375:3,4,8 10376:11 10378:21 10380:18 10397:22		cows 10273:12,21 10303:13 10304:14 10305:17,19 10345:1 10346:6 10394:13 10395:8,20 10396:1
conversation 10364:9 10365:11 10380:12	costs 10280:4,12,15 10284:8,10,11,15,22 10285:14,19 10289:18,27 10290:3,11 10299:3,23 10319:8,13 10320:28 10321:2,9 10324:11 10343:11 10344:3 10345:17 10348:8,19,21 10357:18 10361:20,25 10366:8 10370:8,9,11,12 10371:15 10372:3 10373:3 10374:28 10375:2,6,7,11,19,26,28 10376:1,9 10378:25,26 10379:7 10430:9	couple 10292:14 10301:22 10305:28 10326:25 10328:15 10336:5 10337:28 10347:15 10359:25 10362:2 10374:1 10386:3 10387:26 10390:8 10416:28	creamy 10406:27 10408:6
conversations 10379:16		court 10262:2,17,22,25 10263:1,4,8,20,23 10267:11 10268:5,7,23 10272:3,27 10273:3,9,28 10274:3,8,14, 21,25 10275:22 10276:3,18, 24 10277:28 10278:3,7,9,12 10279:5 10280:5 10281:16, 20,27 10282:1,4,21,23,27 10283:2,4,7,16,19,25 10285:28 10286:3,7,11,14 10287:3,5,9,12,14 10288:8, 12 10291:2,15,17,23,27 10292:28 10296:25 10297:1, 6 10306:6,21,25 10309:4,18 10310:7,23,26 10311:10,14, 16 10314:12 10317:11 10327:18,28 10328:5,9 10329:9 10330:1 10331:9, 16,19,21 10333:4,11 10335:14 10343:2,5,18 10345:27 10346:12 10347:6, 8,13 10352:5,26 10353:16 10354:13 10355:22,28 10356:4 10357:21 10361:16 10372:26 10376:5 10381:2 10387:16 10388:16,21,24,26 10389:1,4,9,18 10390:2 10392:12,14 10396:19 10398:17,24 10399:3,10,18, 21,24 10400:3,6,9,13,22,26 10401:2,6,13,18,22,27 10407:15,17 10420:17	cream 10264:20,23 10265:19,21,24,28 10266:23 10269:20,25 10270:17 10271:11 10296:2,5,6,14 10298:17,24 10300:19 10302:22,24 10344:18,19 10370:22,24 10371:9 10385:4,5,20,28 10436:19
convert 10345:26 10346:1			create 10270:3 10361:12 10364:15
converted 10317:19 10344:24			created 10293:23 10317:23 10402:12,16,19 10403:9
converting 10347:22 10349:10			creates 10374:1,2
cooperate 10340:26			creating 10266:17 10326:15 10364:1
cooperative 10287:27 10320:19 10338:11			creative 10333:14
cooperative-owned 10353:19 10355:12			credit 10293:5,8,13,16 10294:6 10360:24 10377:18
cooperatives 10296:13 10301:23 10318:16 10320:8, 25,26,27 10321:11			credits 10277:5 10292:20, 26,27 10293:19,21 10294:2, 6,10,14 10315:11,19 10317:5 10356:17,18 10357:2,7,11 10359:28 10384:6
coordinated 10320:14			criteria 10284:3,18,26 10285:9 10286:16,17 10287:7,22 10288:18,21 10289:3,11 10316:19 10374:12,14 10397:20
copies 10262:14 10387:24 10389:5 10396:20 10400:1			criticisms 10378:20
copy 10262:16 10263:17,18 10283:20 10388:23 10389:1 10405:2			cross 10306:3 10433:15
core 10412:25			cross-elasticity 10308:18
corn 10266:3 10269:24 10323:18			cross-ex- 10391:24
correct 10267:14 10269:16 10283:5,23 10287:8,13 10291:22,25 10296:25 10298:9,15 10299:17,18,21, 28 10301:11 10302:13,14,21 10304:20,21 10307:7,8,11, 19 10308:14 10313:4,7 10315:13 10318:4 10323:27 10331:10 10332:15 10334:9 10345:16 10352:22 10353:8, 11,20 10354:2,3,4,5,6,20,24, 28 10355:2,5,9,14,17 10356:19,22,26,27 10357:3, 13 10366:14 10369:14	cottage 10266:23 10295:26		cross-exam 10314:14
	counsel 10354:8 10384:16 10431:7		
	count 10301:9,27 10302:8 10303:6,14,18,19 10304:10, 19,25 10305:11 10339:11,14 10349:21,28 10350:6 10351:4 10384:27 10386:7 10387:3		
	counterproductive 10266:16		
	counties 10350:2 10404:19 10410:28 10411:26 10413:23 10416:2,3 10418:18,20 10422:12,14, 17,21,25,27 10423:1,5,7,16, 21,22,23,26 10426:13,14,16		



cross-examination 10268:22,23 10269:1 10314:11,16,17 10352:10 10358:1 10387:19 10391:25 10392:6 10432:12,20,27,28	damage 10363:18 Dan 10435:18 Darigold 10366:27,28 Darigold's 10367:1 dark 10422:2 10423:20,25 darker 10416:14 10421:15 darkness 10417:11 data 10282:17 10289:12,16, 17,20 10303:13,21 10306:12,13,19 10309:22,24 10310:1 10312:18 10313:1,7 10350:2 10378:21 10383:27 10386:5,13 10402:24,25,27 10403:5,10,11,25,27 10404:1,13,24 10405:2,4,5, 13,21,23 10406:1,8,11 10411:22 10412:26 10426:8, 19 database 10312:16 Datamark 10312:14 dataset 10412:22 10413:7 10427:4 date 10267:8 dated 10276:23 David 10433:3 Davidson 10332:7,8 day 10262:4 10264:28 10368:10 10436:17 10437:2 daycare 10280:17 10282:7 days 10305:28 deal 10405:13 10433:7,14 dealing 10314:3 dear 10417:25 debate 10265:3 decades 10303:4 December 10262:1,3 10370:24 10390:1 decentivize 10291:10,24 decide 10267:26 10380:9 decided 10268:2 decimal 10411:6 decision 10266:13 10267:16 10276:15,22 10292:18 10294:19 10300:5,10 10315:27 10317:4 10356:16 10357:16,17 10361:22 10369:6 10372:18 10381:15 10384:19,21,24	decisions 10323:19 10383:20 decline 10277:13 10278:20 10279:14 10280:2 10365:23 declined 10366:1 declines 10277:24 10279:3, 9 declining 10279:13 10366:26 10369:19 10430:7 decrease 10307:10 10315:12 decreased 10322:15,17 decreases 10315:16 deduct 10307:17 deemed 10277:1 deep 10340:9 define 10270:7 defines 10295:25 10339:1 degree 10277:19 10322:9 10337:5 10410:16 degrees 10279:24 10305:25 delay 10389:16 delays 10289:25 10360:1 delicate 10350:26 deliver 10319:25 delivered 10381:7 delivery 10277:5 10292:20, 27 10293:5,8,12 10319:7 10348:23 delta 10334:23 demand 10278:22,26 10279:18,21 10285:20,21 10322:14 10324:20 10368:21 10370:23 10371:1, 6 10376:9 10377:1 10393:12 demanding 10290:11 demands 10394:15 demonstrate 10278:25 10393:16 dent 10324:20 Department 10384:16 depend 10321:10 depending 10324:4 10339:20 10358:22 10360:15 10371:3 10373:18 depends 10321:11 10326:12 10341:10 10351:11 10359:2	depiction 10394:18 depool 10382:22 depoled 10272:16 depooling 10265:6 10290:20 10291:13 10351:9 10358:22 10360:16 10381:18 10382:9,13 derive 10367:23 describe 10321:19 10322:6 10417:18 describing 10313:9 design 10268:9 designed 10375:9 detail 10291:21 detail-oriented 10405:14 detailed 10388:1 determinants 10290:2 determination 10357:18 determinations 10297:19 determine 10298:4 10312:25 10324:2,3,4 10358:19 determined 10285:1 10435:14 determining 10319:24 develop 10427:6 developed 10293:24 deviate 10433:4,5 deviates 10418:2 10421:3 10424:21 DFA 10332:3,16,25 10334:1, 27 10336:7 10337:14,16 10354:8,20 DFA-PRAIRIE 10337:14 diagonal 10416:25,27 Diamond 10355:6 10365:17 dice 10337:25 10426:19 differ 10427:19 difference 10273:25 10318:6 10325:17 10327:13 10329:12 10334:23 10347:27 10363:20 10370:15 10374:5,8 10381:4,9 10391:28 10396:3,6 10409:18 10410:14 10417:27 10418:20,21 10419:15,27 10422:12,18,22
<hr/> D <hr/>			
D- 10338:2 daily 10361:18 dairies 10304:9 10323:20 10346:13 10387:21 dairy 10262:11 10263:26 10264:12,21 10265:22,25 10269:18 10273:19 10275:6 10281:5 10284:19 10285:20, 25 10301:24 10303:14 10308:24 10312:22,24,26 10317:8,17 10319:6 10320:27 10322:24 10323:6, 8,17,18,22 10324:7,10 10325:15 10344:14 10345:1, 15,17 10348:8,24 10350:23 10356:10 10366:25 10367:27 10368:15 10396:26 10397:14 10429:8 10435:7,18,24 dairymandered 10418:16 dairymen 10305:15 Daisy 10319:2 Dakota 10394:10,15,19 10395:19 10396:10 10398:2			



<p>differences 10299:2 10320:3 10379:12 10384:4 10391:12 10422:7,8 10426:24</p> <p>differential 10264:9 10265:2 10266:10,11,15 10267:6 10268:19 10271:13 10272:7, 8,12 10278:23 10279:4,11, 19 10280:9 10282:26 10284:6,7,8,14,21 10285:17 10288:1 10289:5,7,9,13 10290:8 10291:9 10294:3,8, 11,20 10307:14 10315:1,15, 28 10316:3 10326:26 10332:21 10337:20 10345:8 10350:15 10357:5 10361:8 10363:28 10366:16 10370:7, 16 10371:16 10372:6,14 10377:27 10378:2,6 10380:4 10381:13,25 10382:26 10390:14 10395:2 10403:27 10404:1 10406:26 10411:3 10426:10 10428:2,4,6,7,11, 14,17</p> <p>differentials 10275:25 10276:2 10277:10 10283:10 10284:4,5,22,25,27,28 10285:4,10,15 10286:18,20, 22,25 10287:16,21,23,26 10288:19,22 10289:1,4,21 10290:4,12,19 10292:13 10293:20,21 10294:22,24 10307:6,10,16,22 10308:7 10314:26 10315:13,18,25 10321:21 10326:8,20,21 10342:21,22 10344:4 10349:2 10357:1,9 10362:3, 5 10363:11 10365:28 10366:16 10367:8 10368:27 10369:4 10372:15 10374:12, 15 10376:20 10378:17 10381:19 10382:9 10384:17 10388:9,11 10391:18 10395:24 10397:21 10398:4 10402:19 10403:6 10405:12 10406:24 10407:3,25 10408:2,4,15 10409:7,19 10411:18,24,26 10413:11 10414:9,11,13,26 10415:5, 17 10419:4,12 10420:2,4 10425:5,9,15 10427:11 10428:24</p> <p>difficult 10308:8,9 10323:23 10324:15 10327:4,11 10337:21 10338:3 10361:14, 18 10362:22 10382:8 10428:26</p> <p>digestible 10430:28</p> <p>digital 10296:20 10313:5</p> <p>dilemma 10338:2</p> <p>diligence 10338:21</p>	<p>dimes 10422:7</p> <p>direct 10263:12 10275:4 10280:10 10319:11,19 10321:3 10402:3</p> <p>directly 10296:13 10302:1 10319:9,16 10430:10</p> <p>dirty 10392:18</p> <p>disadvantage 10338:22</p> <p>disciplined 10351:9</p> <p>discount 10340:9</p> <p>discourage 10288:23 10377:13</p> <p>discouraging 10377:16</p> <p>discrepancy 10265:26</p> <p>discuss 10307:22 10325:9 10372:10 10427:10 10428:12 10432:23</p> <p>discussed 10288:23 10354:8 10377:19 10380:19, 26 10407:24</p> <p>discussing 10344:6</p> <p>discussion 10263:22 10339:27 10351:17 10360:28 10365:3,25 10366:21 10368:22 10377:12,15,27 10396:5 10400:12 10414:22,25 10415:3 10432:24</p> <p>discussion's 10351:17</p> <p>discussions 10384:15</p> <p>disfavor 10380:14</p> <p>dishonest 10363:21</p> <p>disincentives 10342:18</p> <p>disincentivize 10291:24</p> <p>disjointed 10427:24</p> <p>disorderly 10266:18 10267:21 10270:4,6,7,18</p> <p>disparate 10426:4</p> <p>disruption 10360:3</p> <p>disruptive 10380:10</p> <p>disseminate 10324:4</p> <p>distance 10413:19</p> <p>distance-wise 10330:18</p> <p>distances 10270:20 10361:22</p> <p>distinct 10407:22 10408:20, 23 10424:17</p>	<p>distinguish 10309:5 10434:5</p> <p>distri- 10409:1</p> <p>distribute 10306:16,20</p> <p>distributed 10262:14 10311:12 10400:1</p> <p>Distributing 10293:1</p> <p>distribution 10282:16 10393:11,21 10412:22 10413:15,23 10414:5,21</p> <p>distributions 10413:27</p> <p>divergence 10355:16</p> <p>diversions 10321:26</p> <p>divide 10319:17</p> <p>document 10263:28 10306:9 10311:11,18,24 10350:4 10398:16 10424:1</p> <p>documents 10402:6,23 10431:5,10</p> <p>dollar 10289:26 10356:21 10361:27 10409:18 10410:17</p> <p>dollars 10281:24 10282:2,6 10293:3 10362:3,4 10374:9 10419:27</p> <p>domestic 10318:1</p> <p>dominant 10265:12</p> <p>doomed 10290:20</p> <p>door 10323:18 10340:25</p> <p>dots 10412:20,24</p> <p>double 10276:28</p> <p>doubling 10266:11</p> <p>doubt 10362:21</p> <p>download 10404:1,6,28</p> <p>downloaded 10404:3,14</p> <p>downs 10360:20</p> <p>dramatically 10414:4</p> <p>draw 10304:22 10374:13 10390:16 10392:11,22 10394:9</p> <p>dried 10269:18</p> <p>drills 10333:2</p> <p>drinking 10367:28</p> <p>drive 10409:1 10419:22</p> <p>driven 10336:28</p>	<p>drop 10320:13</p> <p>dropped 10304:13</p> <p>dropping 10325:24</p> <p>dry 10265:14,25 10266:1,4,7 10269:19,21,27 10270:12, 16,19 10271:12,22 10367:2</p> <p>due 10265:26 10268:1 10323:9</p> <p>duly 10263:10</p> <p>dumps 10273:13</p> <p>duplicate 10311:23</p> <p>dynamics 10320:25 10396:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">E</p> <hr/> <p>e-mail 10433:28 10434:1,9</p> <p>e.g. 10284:22</p> <p>eager 10434:7</p> <p>earlier 10278:28 10295:2 10302:23 10379:27 10385:12 10390:12 10417:22 10418:6 10426:17</p> <p>early 10317:26</p> <p>ease 10424:1</p> <p>easier 10320:22 10321:12 10368:5 10406:10 10407:17</p> <p>easiest 10418:4 10423:13</p> <p>easily 10430:28</p> <p>east 10333:15 10337:7 10351:6 10354:9 10421:24 10424:17</p> <p>Eastern 10407:27</p> <p>easy 10340:14 10369:2 10370:17</p> <p>eat 10345:2</p> <p>eating 10367:27</p> <p>economic 10265:3 10269:23 10300:10 10323:12,19 10344:11 10377:21 10395:27</p> <p>economists 10278:25</p> <p>edge 10407:20</p> <p>edict 10278:21</p> <p>effect 10343:15,21 10368:3</p> <p>effective 10317:21 10320:11,14,20 10362:19 10385:23,24</p>
---	--	---	--



efficient 10424:22 10433:21	engagement 10390:13	evaluate 10402:24 10411:22	10273:1,4,5,7 10274:17,18, 19 10275:9,10,13 10283:14, 20 10305:23 10306:9,10,15 10307:3 10309:21,25 10310:4 10311:9,13 10312:2 10314:15 10316:6 10321:15 10327:27 10328:7 10330:20 10342:26 10343:2,25 10349:19 10358:5,7 10388:23,28 10390:5,6,11, 17 10391:2 10392:8,11,23 10394:21 10396:7 10397:1, 13 10398:10,11,13,15,18,19, 20,22,25,26,27 10399:1,4,5, 6,8,11,12,13,15 10400:2,3,7, 16,17,19,20,22,24,26,28 10402:8,11,15,18 10403:3,9, 15,23 10406:19 10409:20 10411:21 10425:3 10431:9, 13,15,17,22,23,24,25,26,27, 28 10433:3,7
efficiently 10270:10 10324:14	England 10276:15	evaluated 10314:28	exhibits 10274:16 10314:13, 15 10383:26 10387:25 10388:27 10400:15 10402:26 10403:7,12 10404:26 10406:10 10433:15
effort 10268:13 10290:20 10311:23 10427:25	English 10351:26 10352:7, 11,26,27 10353:3,17,18 10354:15,18 10355:19 10433:28 10434:4,7,22 10435:2	evaluating 10308:5	exist 10317:25 10359:5
eggnog 10296:2	enhancement 10419:21	evaluation 10315:4	existing 10290:12 10379:17 10408:15
eggs 10340:22	enjoy 10374:20	evaporator 10268:3	exists 10357:5
elastic 10278:23,26 10279:19 10308:17 10309:6, 8,10,12 10369:19	ensure 10276:10	event 10306:2 10436:3,13, 15	expand 10270:5 10373:13
elasticities 10280:1 10309:13 10368:22,25,26,27 10369:9	entire 10273:19 10304:11 10305:14 10338:17 10374:23 10390:23	everybody's 10433:20	expansion 10268:12
elasticity 10308:13 10309:1 10322:23 10369:28	entirety 10292:7	everyone's 10305:1	expect 10320:1 10336:8 10361:23 10363:16 10391:10 10395:26 10407:9 10411:7 10416:7 10424:15 10435:8
elected 10338:20	entitled 10431:14	evidence 10273:2,4,6,8 10307:23 10398:10,15,18, 21,23,25,28 10399:2,4,7,9, 11,14,16 10433:3,15	expectations 10362:12
electricity 10279:28	environment 10325:27 10371:13	evident 10304:28 10322:4 10392:1	expected 10349:5 10413:15
eligible 10295:3 10358:21	envy 10362:10 10363:24 10364:18,20	evidentiary 10322:4	expecting 10349:9
eliminate 10290:20 10291:13 10308:1,3	equal 10276:12 10294:2 10416:3 10422:21 10433:6	evil 10337:20	expense 10268:13
eliminated 10295:1 10307:15	equals 10294:23	exact 10422:18	expenses 10324:27
eliminates 10277:9	equate 10272:8	examination 10263:12 10275:4 10314:10 10356:13 10396:23 10402:3	expensive 10266:10
eliminating 10367:7	equates 10267:1,9,12	examined 10263:10 10275:2 10401:25	experience 10299:8 10308:15 10319:18 10320:11 10339:3,24 10340:22,28 10341:3,8 10347:23 10359:12,13,24 10361:15 10367:16 10372:2 10373:7 10374:6 10385:3 10415:7,8,9,11
elongation 10413:11	equating 10268:19 10367:20,21	examples 10265:18 10267:24 10269:10 10318:22 10337:12,17 10338:9,10 10397:28	experiencing 10410:19
emergence 10278:27	equipment 10267:17 10268:10	exceeded 10290:25,28 10291:8	experts 10406:12 10434:15
emphasize 10273:10 10309:7	equity 10379:21 10380:25	exceeds 10290:22	explain 10265:3 10272:10
empirically 10360:19	equivalence 10288:25	Excel 10296:20 10404:23 10405:20	
employment 10308:23	equivalent 10385:1	excellent 10311:14 10356:4 10360:24	
emulsifiers 10269:19	Erin 10359:22 10364:19 10368:17 10379:6	exception 10326:7 10371:11	
encase 10361:26	erring 10316:28	exceptions 10277:3 10304:28 10337:18	
encourage 10289:1 10377:5 10378:5 10385:15 10435:4	ESL 10341:15	excerpt 10282:15	
encouraged 10377:20	established 10275:27	excess 10277:3 10289:22 10339:4,6,9 10341:28	
encouraging 10277:8	establishing 10288:28	excited 10404:7	
end 10267:24 10298:21 10306:16 10312:22 10314:24 10364:24 10381:19,20 10404:3 10407:7 10408:7 10413:12 10424:9 10436:21	estimate 10417:13	exclude 10370:3	
ended 10310:9	Estimated 10280:9	excluding 10296:1	
ends 10385:6	estimates 10281:11 10292:15 10358:15 10386:28 10415:24	excuse 10284:11,20 10286:28 10333:7	
energy 10319:13 10379:7	EU 10301:25 10302:25 10384:28 10385:2,13,15	exercise 10417:9	
enforce 10347:17 10348:14	Europe 10302:11,12,23,28	exhibit 10262:18,19,20 10263:15,16 10264:1,2	
enforcing 10339:12	European 10301:25,26		



10296:17 10416:20	fail 10300:4	fear 10325:21	fine 10333:6 10338:8 10372:3 10389:17
explained 10305:26	fair 10318:7 10319:25 10321:22 10322:16 10323:7 10326:5,11,24 10334:14	February 10374:22 10436:10	finer 10266:6
explaining 10388:3	10337:4,27 10338:13,17 10343:28 10350:27	federal 10264:15,19 10265:11 10270:2 10272:14 10277:2,14 10280:10 10288:4 10293:4,11,15 10295:15,28 10301:20 10303:13,17,19 10320:18 10349:21 10350:18 10351:2, 13 10358:27 10362:12,28 10363:9 10365:26 10366:3 10367:7 10371:22,25 10375:14,21 10376:19,22 10378:3 10384:8 10386:6	finish 10280:23 10306:3 10392:15 10433:27 10436:21
explains 10292:6 10393:7	10351:20 10361:25 10368:1 10372:12,13 10375:14 10408:16 10423:15 10426:26 10430:25		finished 10267:10 10392:16 10393:11,22 10434:12
explanation 10347:13			firm 10280:27
export 10302:11 10342:19 10345:19 10348:15	fairly 10347:2 10348:4 10359:17,18 10391:15 10423:11		five-minute 10274:11 10288:9 10306:22
exported 10385:1,7	faith 10365:5		fix 10276:5 10375:14
exporting 10301:24	fall 10415:24 10416:1,2,5, 11,19,22,23,25 10417:2,4, 13,15,17 10419:6,15 10423:17	Federation 10390:18	flat 10414:3,5
express 10376:10	fallen 10278:5,15 10295:22	feed 10376:1	flatten 10378:6
expressed 10397:13	familiar 10319:3 10336:3,4 10395:4	feedback 10401:15	flavor 10265:20
extend 10342:2	farm 10265:1 10269:12 10286:20 10295:17 10298:5 10299:6,17 10304:11 10317:27 10323:24 10324:28 10345:15 10346:16 10348:8,20 10388:10 10393:20 10397:16 10429:28	feel 10333:2 10346:11	flavored 10279:16
extended 10342:1		feeling 10273:13	flip 10421:13
extensive 10285:11	farmer 10303:1 10319:9 10324:7,10 10435:24	fees 10382:6	flipping 10416:17
extent 10302:6 10325:2 10327:15 10329:14 10397:10 10432:3	farmers 10270:9 10285:25 10295:9 10296:13 10302:1, 17 10303:10,14 10319:6,16 10320:27 10323:8,22 10336:5 10362:21	fell 10278:17	floor 10429:4
extra 10262:16 10296:4,14 10348:2 10360:14 10375:16		fewer 10270:16	Florida 10293:11 10294:21 10304:8 10349:25 10357:7 10386:18,27 10407:1 10408:8 10416:27 10425:14, 27 10426:15
extreme 10367:9 10373:23 10422:1	farming 10324:19 10325:20	fictions 10273:27	flow 10361:28 10373:27
extremely 10325:19 10337:21 10338:3	farms 10298:4 10299:26 10300:3,12 10304:2 10322:21,24 10323:27 10325:11,23 10329:22 10336:6 10337:14 10344:10, 17 10346:11 10347:22,25 10348:5 10393:10	field 10326:10,24 10332:26	flowing 10375:22 10421:19
eye 10418:4,25	farther 10334:9 10378:12	fight 10347:3	flows 10393:10
eyes 10333:5 10394:20 10404:20	farthest 10354:13	fighting 10320:13	fluctuates 10371:6
F	fast 10431:12	figure 10313:3 10356:23 10364:17,24 10392:28 10393:7,15	fluctuation 10327:21 10382:14
face 10323:23	fat 10265:15,26 10270:12 10273:15,17	figures 10282:12	fluctuations 10276:7
facilities 10284:16,23 10297:28	fault 10371:22	figuring 10369:27	fluid 10276:9,11 10277:24 10278:4,14,22 10279:18 10284:12 10292:21 10293:1 10295:3,18 10297:16 10322:15 10324:26 10325:6, 10 10326:1,21 10328:21,24 10329:22 10332:1,4 10333:19 10334:1 10336:2 10337:3 10341:1 10342:9 10359:13 10365:28 10366:4 10367:3,22,26 10369:12 10370:12,22 10371:3 10378:11,12 10379:28 10382:20 10402:18 10403:8, 16 10409:14,16 10430:8
facing 10325:10	favor 10380:14	file 10404:7 10411:6	FMMO 10264:26 10266:17 10267:20,22,26 10276:26 10290:22 10295:21 10406:23 10411:1 10412:2, 16 10425:6 10426:15 10429:13 10430:17
fact 10265:8 10301:7 10304:20 10325:11 10346:15 10356:15 10357:10 10391:1,9 10394:24 10396:8 10413:19 10430:4	FDA 10305:10	files 10404:28 10405:1,22	
factor 10319:24 10324:6 10380:18		fill 10341:25	
Factories 10272:4		final 10277:6 10292:18 10294:18 10310:10 10317:4 10357:16 10360:8 10361:22 10362:18 10384:21,24 10427:13 10436:17	
factors 10318:11 10320:5 10383:23		finally 10267:5 10403:8 10404:7	
factory 10271:28		financial 10265:16 10323:22	
facts 10275:25 10296:16 10365:24		financially 10323:11 10379:25	
factual 10275:28		find 10303:3,24 10319:12 10324:13,16 10333:2 10350:20 10351:9 10353:28 10360:12 10407:18 10431:10	



FMMOS 10407:10 10412:1,9	frequent 10341:6	generate 10405:18	Grade 10284:9 10294:27
focused 10403:28 10409:10	Fresno 10395:2,4,15	generated 10394:27 10395:16	10295:3,4,6,7,8,9,12,14,15, 17,20,25,26 10296:7,9,10, 11,12 10297:15 10298:2,5,6, 8,14,16,18,24,25,26,27 10299:5,7,17,20,25,27,28 10300:3,4,8,18,25 10301:11 10307:27,28 10308:1 10315:23 10316:1 10339:4, 6,9 10341:28 10343:28 10344:3,12,17,18,20,21 10345:2,3,4,15,22 10346:23, 26,27 10347:16,17,25 10348:5,9,17,18,23 10349:9, 16 10358:20 10370:8 10375:28
focusing 10299:24	Friday 10262:1,4 10390:1 10436:5,9,10	generations 10323:20	graded 10345:22,23
folks 10364:24 10380:14 10405:28 10423:19	friend 10374:24	generous 10321:26	gradient 10378:15 10416:13 10418:24 10424:10
follow 10396:25,27	friends 10346:5	geographic 10405:26 10411:1 10428:1	gradients 10408:4
follow-up 10403:1	front 10263:19 10310:19 10328:11 10402:6 10415:25	geographically 10426:4	grading 10298:28 10345:20
fond 10364:11,13	frozen 10266:23	gerrymandered 10418:15	gradual 10407:5
food 10264:12 10265:18 10266:21,22 10267:15 10280:3,18 10282:8	frustration 10305:9	GIS 10405:25 10406:8	grammar 10292:1
Foods 10262:11 10263:26 10275:6 10354:19 10356:10 10396:26 10435:7	fuel 10319:13 10379:4	gist 10388:17	granting 10322:5
foodservice 10369:13 10370:1	full 10270:1	give 10265:17 10267:23 10280:24 10288:7 10295:13 10320:18 10333:7 10352:3 10357:22 10378:6 10389:5 10406:21 10412:18 10431:17 10433:25 10434:18	graphic 10392:28 10393:3
forces 10270:11 10429:8	fully 10266:4 10361:23 10366:17	giving 10272:25 10290:17 10294:9 10338:1 10382:7	grappling 10427:13
forest 10412:7,11	fun 10299:10 10405:15 10411:1	glad 10280:26 10433:12	gray 10421:1,2,7 10423:20, 22 10424:8
forget 10297:4 10324:1 10378:24	function 10317:22,25 10326:28 10359:16 10378:9	Glanbia 10297:25 10298:21 10318:28 10344:16	great 10271:13 10276:3 10320:19 10324:19,24 10358:8 10361:10 10368:18 10369:22 10378:3 10405:13 10406:23 10417:3 10419:18 10436:26
forgotten 10306:1	functionality 10265:21	Glanbia's 10298:12	greater 10285:26 10422:12, 21 10423:5
form 10296:4 10393:17 10405:3 10412:27 10430:28	fundamental 10288:28 10290:2	goal 10419:13	greatest 10318:12
formations 10342:14	fundamentally 10430:23	God 10344:25	green 10393:9,19,26 10394:3,5,7
formula 10313:18 10368:16 10419:11	future 10361:3	good 10262:25,27 10263:4, 14 10264:10 10265:1 10269:3,4 10271:17 10275:8,23 10304:4,12 10305:8 10306:6 10312:12 10314:19,21 10318:22 10323:19 10325:14 10326:14 10329:14 10338:23 10341:24 10342:8 10343:5 10345:17 10347:19 10348:24 10349:14 10351:27 10352:5,13 10353:1 10358:3,4 10360:25 10361:11 10364:17 10365:9, 18 10367:2 10373:18 10374:3,10 10376:7 10386:20,23 10387:14 10392:14 10399:20 10401:18 10402:5 10413:21	Greenville 10318:23,24
formula-driven 10429:9	G-A-L-L-O-W-A-Y 10262:24	goods 10393:22	grocery 10340:24 10341:26 10366:24
formulas 10279:23 10285:26 10429:13 10430:17	gallon 10281:8 10341:12 10380:3,6 10381:7,12 10410:8,11	gosh 10378:7	groundbreaking 10268:11
Fort 10330:14 10335:7,18 10336:23 10337:8	gallons 10280:16 10281:7 10341:16 10436:24	government 10262:16 10278:21 10280:10 10283:10 10317:8,17	Groundhog 10264:28
forward 10387:18 10399:22	Galloway 10262:13,24 10263:9,14 10264:10,11,16 10268:2,9,21,24 10273:10 10385:12	grab 10262:16	Group 10351:27 10399:26, 27 10402:2
foul 10310:13,14	Galloway's 10262:15		groups 10281:5 10324:19 10347:24 10427:26
found 10354:14 10360:12,13 10432:10	gathering 10427:18		grow 10323:18 10430:11
foundation 10363:9	gave 10337:17 10355:26 10433:12		growing 10394:13
four-generation 10264:11	general 10285:12,14 10309:11 10350:18 10359:15 10375:26 10435:23		grown 10318:8 10320:26
fourth 10370:3 10371:1 10400:26	generally 10318:13,15 10319:10,19 10320:21 10323:21 10339:22 10341:17 10360:12 10371:11 10395:4 10407:27		
FR 10276:17,22			
fraction 10295:2			
frankly 10367:9 10408:10,25 10412:9 10413:16			
free 10346:17			
frequency 10347:19			



growth 10290:6 10377:5	hats 10323:6	10396:12 10398:5 10407:26	10319:14 10325:16
guess 10275:18 10327:9 10360:6 10369:22 10372:21 10379:10,19 10383:24 10398:1	hauling 10320:28	10408:10 10417:4,17 10423:17 10425:13 10429:24 10430:9	10330:26 10333:22,25 10334:21,27 10335:24 10410:6,7
guide 10345:19,20 10369:5	He'll 10435:23	higher-of 10383:19	hurry 10360:2
guidelines 10299:13,16	head 10397:28	highest 10367:17 10382:28 10407:26 10416:15	hurt 10362:27
guys 10404:26	health 10303:7	highlighted 10379:17 10383:10	husbandry 10345:3 10349:14
<hr/> H <hr/>	health-enhanced 10279:15 10340:28	highly-regulated 10429:8,10	hydrate 10266:1,4 10267:17 10269:18
half 10325:18 10341:15 10380:2 10381:10 10421:20	healthier 10303:6,12 10304:15 10345:2	Hiland 10336:2	<hr/> I <hr/>
ham 10340:19	hear 10280:26 10307:23 10330:1 10350:19 10395:23	Hilmar 10297:25 10298:12, 20 10300:17	I- 10338:2
Hancock 10314:18,20 10317:13 10327:26 10328:7, 8,13,14 10329:13 10330:4 10331:11,17,20,22 10333:9, 16 10335:15,17 10343:4,7, 20 10348:6 10351:24 10433:19 10435:10 10436:12	heard 10280:28 10350:22 10355:11 10364:27 10373:2 10374:26 10376:17 10377:12 10379:16 10380:13 10381:26 10385:11 10414:22,25 10422:5 10428:21,25 10430:6 10434:23	Hilton 10355:6 10365:17	ice 10264:20 10265:19,21, 24,28 10266:23 10269:20,25 10270:17 10271:11 10370:22,24 10436:18
Hancock's 10415:24	hearing 10262:4 10263:15 10264:1,26 10266:25 10267:5,15 10273:1 10275:10,13 10306:9,15 10307:2 10309:21,25 10311:8 10355:5 10360:28 10363:7,11 10365:14,25 10368:8,23 10374:27 10390:12 10397:1,13 10398:10,11,13,15 10402:9 10403:5 10405:1 10414:23 10433:27 10436:9 10437:2	historically 10288:3 10428:26	Idaho 10271:5,6 10351:3 10409:3 10428:15
hand 10374:4 10392:18	hearings 10264:27 10307:9	hitting 10429:4	idea 10382:7 10383:6
handled 10373:4	heart 10417:25	hold 10352:7	idea 10382:7 10383:6
handler 10325:6 10379:20 10380:25 10403:19	heavily 10317:26	hold 10352:7	idea 10382:7 10383:6
handlers 10302:7,19 10324:26 10325:28 10326:21 10384:18	heavy 10303:27,28	honest 10344:24	idea 10382:7 10383:6
handling 10372:3	held 10354:6 10432:6	honestly 10316:17 10325:14 10330:13 10371:20 10372:7 10378:12 10385:18 10386:18	idea 10382:7 10383:6
hands 10344:25	helped 10364:9 10365:7 10405:19	Honor 10262:14,16 10268:21 10272:28 10274:2, 5 10278:2 10283:13 10305:21 10306:4,8 10310:16 10311:6 10314:9 10328:13 10351:26 10352:3, 27 10355:20 10398:9 10399:17 10400:1,5 10432:3,15 10433:17,19 10434:8 10435:28	idea 10382:7 10383:6
hang 10311:4 10427:26	helpful 10423:19 10433:22	hope 10333:5 10347:6 10436:10	idea 10382:7 10383:6
happen 10358:24 10364:4 10412:16	helping 10406:9	hoping 10340:18 10387:23	idea 10382:7 10383:6
happened 10320:6 10373:9 10432:9	helps 10362:6 10419:13	horrible 10327:8	idea 10382:7 10383:6
happening 10410:26 10412:8,10 10413:22 10414:21 10416:25 10417:26	high 10266:4 10304:7 10305:1,14 10417:13	hot 10269:24	idea 10382:7 10383:6
happier 10305:19	high-level 10404:23 10412:18	hour 10389:11	idea 10382:7 10383:6
happy 10369:7 10390:23	high-nutrition 10341:21	house 10344:25 10348:1	idea 10382:7 10383:6
hard 10309:5 10318:20 10365:10 10380:15 10385:13 10398:1 10407:18 10411:23 10428:18	high-protein 10341:21	HTST 10341:12	idea 10382:7 10383:6
harm 10278:24 10279:20 10367:11 10379:25	higher 10266:15 10287:25, 28 10289:17 10290:11 10298:23 10350:13 10366:23 10375:19	huge 10362:9	idea 10382:7 10383:6
harms 10429:20		humongous 10406:11	idea 10382:7 10383:6
		hundred 10381:12	idea 10382:7 10383:6
		hundredweight 10267:7,11, 13 10268:16,18 10272:12 10273:21 10279:3,10,27 10283:1,4,9 10289:8 10291:5 10293:3,10,18	idea 10382:7 10383:6



10383:7	including 10289:21 10293:20 10296:2 10305:2,9 10308:13 10427:19 10434:15	industry 10266:7,26 10268:2 10273:19,24 10297:3 10300:27 10305:8, 14 10320:20 10323:7 10324:23 10363:10,15 10365:12 10434:16 10435:19	interconnection 10406:6
impact 10293:26 10324:23 10366:4 10370:3 10383:20 10420:3 10429:11 10430:2	incongruity 10276:8	inelastic 10309:6,7,14	interest 10409:16 10429:18 10430:23 10434:26
impactful 10410:2	inconsistent 10275:28 10289:12 10378:21	inelasticity 10322:20	interesting 10322:19 10340:9 10344:22 10350:28 10382:11 10406:18 10408:25 10420:24 10428:13
impacts 10280:9 10290:10 10381:24 10414:24 10416:24 10430:10	increase 10265:6 10267:7 10268:16 10275:24,26 10278:19 10279:4,10,26 10280:3,10 10281:10,12,26 10282:26 10283:4,9 10285:24 10288:4,22 10290:26 10291:5,9 10293:9,13,17 10294:10,15, 19 10307:6,16,18 10320:23, 24 10321:21 10324:11 10334:21 10336:17,21 10356:16 10366:3 10406:28 10407:8 10409:6 10411:3 10421:28 10425:10,14,19	inflexible 10362:28	internal 10309:1 10427:28
implemented 10361:23 10412:14	increased 10272:7 10277:15 10282:5 10292:19 10323:5 10343:10,15 10345:12 10357:7 10384:17 10408:12 10422:4	infor- 10312:15	internally 10275:27 10369:26
implication 10266:14	increases 10275:27 10278:24 10279:19 10289:14 10292:16 10294:3, 7 10302:3 10323:25 10356:26 10361:24 10408:6 10410:3,5	information 10281:2 10285:11 10293:25 10311:28 10312:13,16 10337:26 10365:9,18 10374:20 10377:24 10378:22,25,26 10388:1 10403:2,17,21 10404:9,15, 17 10405:26 10426:28 10427:1,2,3 10431:17 10433:11	International 10262:11 10263:26 10275:6 10356:10 10396:26 10435:7
important 10281:17 10291:3 10293:25 10301:28 10307:24 10338:19 10351:7, 11 10363:25 10364:26 10366:18,19 10378:17 10386:21 10397:25 10409:12 10410:23,24 10412:6 10414:24 10419:10, 11 10427:6 10429:7 10430:18	increasing 10264:9 10282:9 10326:8 10342:21 10357:9	infrastructure 10363:27	internet 10434:24
imposed 10300:23 10301:3, 8 10302:7,19	increasingly 10277:20 10322:10 10323:23	ingredient 10266:9,21 10267:26 10270:3 10366:8	interrupt 10301:5 10392:12
imposes 10301:10 10302:28	increments 10406:24 10420:10	ingredients 10264:12,18,24 10265:10,14 10266:1,12,17 10267:18,25 10269:18 10270:19 10271:1,12,22 10385:11,12	Interstate 10296:28 10297:12 10298:8 10345:23
imposing 10304:24	incur 10281:10 10361:4	innovation 10351:27 10399:25,27 10402:1	introduced 10431:10 10432:4,7
improvement 10331:3	incurred 10284:12 10345:15 10348:20 10370:12	inputs 10375:13,15	introducing 10290:15
improvements 10386:17,18	incurring 10361:20	inquiry 10434:2	invest 10430:11
IMS 10296:23,28 10297:1, 12,14 10298:1,7,18 10299:1 10349:16	incurs 10348:8	insert 10320:10	investment 10267:19 10271:22 10363:26
in-plant 10293:12	Indiana 10328:19,22 10329:21,27 10330:16 10417:4 10436:4,13	insisted 10286:19 10388:8, 10 10391:17	investments 10367:12
inadvertently 10306:12	Indianapolis 10328:24	inspected 10299:5	invite 10268:25
incent 10429:24	indication 10356:24 10424:20	inspection 10298:4,11 10300:4,15 10347:18	Iowa 10419:19
incenting 10419:21	individual 10318:16 10361:7 10412:12	inspections 10299:6 10346:8,10,14,15 10347:20	irrelevant 10276:1 10305:12 10345:5
incentive 10266:12 10340:16 10344:11,14 10370:20 10374:2 10382:22 10386:10 10387:4	indicated 10361:20	instance 10394:5	issuance 10277:22
incentives 10291:13 10302:17 10304:14 10342:18	industrial 10264:18 10266:22,26	insufficient 10285:21	issue 10288:20 10290:1 10323:28 10349:12 10363:1 10372:15,16 10377:2,3 10378:27 10380:25 10385:19 10388:5
incentivize 10295:9	industries 10326:6	intake 10361:19	issues 10264:28 10325:21 10375:20 10377:9 10430:5
inclined 10307:16		intended 10351:28	items 10264:18,24 10265:4 10269:20 10345:13 10388:19
include 10289:8 10291:19 10295:26 10309:12 10314:14 10350:8 10398:2 10403:24 10422:17 10423:2		intent 10337:20	IV 10265:10 10266:12 10267:2 10268:20 10272:9 10273:21 10285:16,22 10290:21,25,28 10291:8 10297:14 10301:13 10366:10 10372:2 10384:3 10419:24
included 10321:2 10403:16 10434:16		intentional 10310:21 10364:3	
includes 10297:13,24		intentionally 10380:14	J
		intentions 10361:11	January 10290:24 10370:25 10384:1 10399:23 10415:19



10433:21 10436:2,5,8,12,14, 22 10437:1	10433:22,25	leading 10278:25	list 10296:19,21,23 10297:13,19,23 10298:1,7,8, 13 10299:1,13 10306:12 10311:27 10369:9 10370:11 10402:18 10403:4,12,14,16, 19 10404:8 10431:10,12 10432:6
jarring 10414:23	kinds 10302:16 10304:2,3 10305:7 10341:20	leads 10368:18	listed 10384:8
job 10304:12 10305:16 10320:14 10362:10 10363:24 10364:19 10371:25 10375:21 10376:28 10392:14	knew 10273:13 10297:6	leave 10306:4 10362:16 10372:24,27	listening 10309:4
Johns 10318:28	knowing 10318:14	left 10283:15 10331:11 10344:10,17 10354:13 10363:13 10388:19 10430:26 10432:16	live 10378:8
joint 10336:6 10337:14	knowledge 10368:26	left-handed 10401:11	load 10339:12,13
joke 10340:14	Kroger 10308:23 10309:1 10327:5 10328:21,24 10329:15,16 10330:23 10331:28 10332:25 10333:19 10335:18 10337:13,15 10339:3,4,24 10340:1 10341:11,22,28 10342:5 10352:20 10353:7 10354:1,6 10355:8,11 10362:26,27 10363:3 10367:17 10379:28 10385:4, 8,19	legal 10288:4 10305:12 10362:20 10376:26	loads 10385:28
joked 10367:1		legend 10420:6	loaned 10389:4
Judge 10392:18 10396:19		legitimate 10327:22	local 10264:22 10270:8,20 10271:9 10288:26 10371:27
July 10291:16,17 10404:15		lenient 10347:2	locally 10373:3,4
jump 10413:27		lens 10338:15	located 10264:13 10270:14 10332:21 10334:25 10335:18 10396:8
jumped 10267:6		lenses 10337:26	location 10284:6,14,22 10290:10 10331:28 10334:27 10344:24 10396:9
June 10370:26 10404:13,15 10405:7	Kroger's 10332:20 10334:4, 25 10353:11 10359:14	letting 10392:14	location's 10285:7
	L	level 10286:21 10317:23 10322:16 10332:26 10345:10 10348:20 10366:20 10397:16 10404:11 10412:16	locations 10287:26 10288:26,27 10290:3 10304:2,9 10318:2 10328:16 10330:11 10393:12
justification 10265:16 10289:20 10321:20 10395:27	L-I-C-K-I-N-G 10333:13	levelling 10326:10	locked 10405:1,3
justifications 10379:26	labeled 10392:28 10400:16, 19	leverage 10340:4	logic 10377:26 10398:1
K	labor 10379:4	liberal 10359:17	long 10279:23 10285:1 10312:28 10347:28 10374:18 10376:25 10406:5 10415:4
K-E-E-F-E 10401:5	laborious 10431:19	license 10346:19	long-term 10430:12
Kaiser's 10279:28	lack 10275:28	licensing 10346:18	longer 10294:28 10295:9,17 10300:18 10344:8 10363:3
Kansas 10408:22 10419:19	lactose-free 10279:16 10341:8,12,13	Licking 10333:10,17,21 10352:19 10353:1,2,7,11	looked 10281:6 10284:21 10298:27 10315:2 10338:5,9 10343:23 10358:18 10378:23 10381:28 10382:16 10383:13,15 10388:17 10395:19 10419:6 10425:8 10426:28
Keefe 10399:27 10400:18 10401:4,24 10402:5 10431:2,16 10432:20,28 10433:1,14 10434:12,15	land 10323:17	life 10324:17 10338:24 10339:17 10342:2,3 10355:7 10371:5	lose 10340:15
keeping 10338:25 10346:11 10429:8	laptop 10274:9 10400:10 10401:9	likelihood 10265:8	losers 10266:18 10270:3 10326:16 10329:15 10361:12 10364:2,15 10367:12
Keith 10435:19	large 10287:28 10297:24,25, 26 10341:12 10371:21 10407:6 10410:26 10411:3 10415:7,9,11 10417:3 10425:19,28 10427:4	likes 10372:20	loss 10339:25 10340:23 10341:1,4,9
kid 10299:9,11	largely 10393:26	limit 10301:3,10,20,21 10302:9,12,28 10352:12 10384:27 10385:2,23,24 10386:1	
kill 10338:18	larger 10323:21,24 10325:10 10408:14 10422:9	limited 10288:22 10325:12 10347:24	
kind 10269:8 10273:13 10292:28 10297:22 10337:23 10339:1 10340:3, 10 10344:25 10351:5 10358:8 10359:7 10362:28 10363:9 10366:13,22 10367:1,10 10369:16,21 10370:6 10372:23 10373:8, 27 10375:12,18 10376:1 10377:23 10379:8 10384:17 10394:9 10404:20 10405:24, 28 10407:2,22 10409:21 10414:17 10416:17 10417:10 10420:13 10426:17,19 10427:21	lasts 10305:5	limits 10302:10 10304:25 10325:2 10384:27	
	late 10404:15	lines 10331:26 10335:27 10393:7,9,10,19,21,26 10394:4,5,7 10412:19	
	latest 10394:12	liquid 10265:22 10266:1,3 10267:18 10269:24	
	lead 10289:5		
	leader 10339:25 10341:1,4,9		
	leaders 10340:23		



<p>lost 10266:27 10268:19 10272:9</p> <p>lot 10271:7 10298:17 10302:21,23 10305:9,25 10307:23 10308:6,9,10 10309:1 10312:26 10317:23 10320:8,9,16 10321:12 10323:6 10324:17 10326:13 10336:9 10337:19,25 10338:21 10340:8 10341:18, 20 10342:10 10345:16,22 10346:8,9,13 10347:2,16,25 10348:12 10350:21,22 10360:14 10361:1,11 10362:23 10363:26 10365:5, 8 10368:5,22 10370:7 10371:26,28 10372:4 10375:7,20 10377:4,27 10378:10 10379:27,28 10381:5,6,8,10 10382:13 10383:8 10393:26 10394:3, 6,8,11 10395:8,20 10397:24 10406:8 10408:10 10409:25 10413:11 10414:6,8 10418:22 10419:5 10425:26 10426:18 10427:3,9,25,27 10430:6,13 10433:11</p> <p>lots 10331:26 10364:10 10365:17 10385:3,4 10396:1 10405:8</p> <p>lousy 10338:24</p> <p>love 10323:4 10327:24 10358:23 10378:9</p> <p>low 10286:21 10303:15 10304:10,16 10305:7 10362:5,7 10391:15 10396:3 10408:26</p> <p>lower 10301:2,28 10302:9, 10,12,17 10303:5,7,12,20,26 10305:10 10321:24 10323:2, 3 10331:19 10342:21 10368:5 10387:5 10407:7 10413:3 10416:4 10423:18 10425:14 10429:26</p> <p>lowered 10277:18 10322:8 10368:2</p> <p>lowers 10370:2</p> <p>lowest 10366:24 10406:25 10408:5 10428:14</p> <p>luckily 10365:14</p> <p>lumping 10426:5</p> <p>lunch 10280:17 10281:15 10282:6 10389:11,13,17,20 10390:10</p> <p>Lynchburg 10355:8,12</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <p>M-I-K-E 10274:23</p> <p>made 10265:21 10270:13 10293:27 10296:10 10297:23 10302:9 10313:7 10318:15 10326:13 10328:8 10338:20 10357:15 10361:10 10367:13 10380:9 10384:20 10386:17 10392:6</p> <p>magnitude 10411:8 10414:28</p> <p>main 10269:8 10271:14 10409:24 10425:22</p> <p>Maine 10288:24 10377:14 10422:3 10435:18</p> <p>maintain 10288:25 10299:26 10348:9,23</p> <p>maintaining 10298:27 10343:27 10344:2 10345:15, 17 10348:9 10375:27,28</p> <p>maintenance 10299:22 10346:3</p> <p>majority 10270:24 10295:6 10327:16 10403:14</p> <p>make 10264:20,24 10265:28 10266:6,7,8 10269:8,23 10273:23 10279:5 10281:20 10282:23 10283:19 10296:5 10297:19 10300:5 10309:14, 17 10310:12 10312:11 10313:3 10318:20 10321:25 10324:13 10326:14 10327:9, 22 10338:16 10339:20 10343:10,14 10345:22 10350:24 10351:17 10352:8 10356:11 10358:7 10359:8 10362:16,22 10363:20,23,28 10364:14 10365:28 10366:17 10367:5,11,12 10368:13 10370:23,24,26,28 10371:1,14,20 10374:7 10378:17,20,28 10379:11, 24,25 10380:6,8,13,16 10381:3,13 10385:5,14,20 10386:25 10389:5 10396:27 10400:10 10401:7 10405:22, 23 10413:2 10414:22 10424:3 10430:20 10433:16</p> <p>makers 10340:25</p> <p>makes 10266:13 10267:16 10271:21 10284:24 10296:8 10324:20 10342:8 10362:28 10370:12</p> <p>makeup 10372:6</p> <p>making 10269:21 10272:4</p>	<p>10299:12 10305:1,5 10323:19 10327:15 10347:4 10357:6 10363:19 10377:7 10379:22 10380:27 10386:20,23 10406:9</p> <p>manage 10382:9 10404:22, 24</p> <p>management 10376:26,27 10377:3</p> <p>managing 10303:10 10405:13</p> <p>mandate 10288:4</p> <p>mandatory 10278:21</p> <p>manufacture 10269:15 10297:13 10299:14</p> <p>manufactured 10266:17 10286:19,28 10287:1,19 10296:4 10301:24 10388:4</p> <p>manufacturer 10267:16,24 10270:3 10271:16,21 10367:2</p> <p>manufacturers 10265:20,25 10266:18 10270:16,17 10296:11 10351:10</p> <p>manufacturers' 10267:4</p> <p>manufactures 10264:17 10270:28</p> <p>manufacturing 10264:13 10265:18 10266:21 10284:13 10285:2,3,5 10287:25 10296:14 10301:24 10318:11 10349:15 10350:14 10351:1 10359:12 10370:13,21 10371:21 10377:2 10378:13 10379:7 10382:20 10383:8</p> <p>map 10315:15 10316:1,3 10337:20 10345:9 10357:5 10363:28 10364:1,13 10366:17 10367:13 10370:16 10372:14 10373:15 10377:27 10378:2, 6 10393:17,25 10394:18 10406:18,23 10407:11 10408:1,12 10409:17,18,23, 25 10410:5,13,22 10411:5 10415:10,20,22,27,28 10416:6,10,11 10417:7 10418:5,28 10419:2,3,25,27 10424:4,5 10427:3 10428:10</p> <p>mapping 10405:20</p> <p>maps 10361:8 10402:12 10404:10 10405:18,19,22 10406:17 10408:5 10409:21 10417:11 10419:6 10425:8 10427:12</p>	<p>March 10276:17,23 10312:10 10316:10</p> <p>margin 10325:21 10366:24 10367:20</p> <p>margins 10324:27 10367:18</p> <p>Marion 10328:18,21,25</p> <p>Mark 10364:11</p> <p>Mark's 10365:7</p> <p>marked 10262:20 10264:1 10274:20 10275:9 10306:10 10398:16,18,25 10399:4,11 10400:7,20,24,28</p> <p>markedly 10373:24</p> <p>market 10265:12 10270:10, 21 10276:13 10295:18 10304:11,12 10307:21 10317:2,7,24 10318:1,6,9,10 10320:4,5,25 10321:10,11 10322:1 10324:11,16 10326:15,19 10329:19 10341:11 10342:9,11 10351:5,11 10358:21 10359:2 10360:14 10361:12 10362:16 10363:5,12,13 10366:17,26 10367:4,22 10370:19,20 10371:9 10372:24,28 10374:7 10375:8,17 10376:8,11 10377:2 10378:10 10380:11 10381:8 10397:23,25 10403:17,18,21 10429:5,8, 11,12,14,17,22 10430:9,22</p> <p>market's 10376:28</p> <p>market-clearing 10317:18 10318:2</p> <p>marketing 10264:19 10266:19 10267:21 10268:26 10270:4,6,7,18 10272:14 10276:15,16 10300:19 10320:11,18 10356:7 10357:25 10362:19 10363:1 10435:26</p> <p>markets 10271:2 10288:26 10294:11 10295:19 10304:9 10318:2 10320:12 10324:2 10327:17,19,25 10332:23 10334:16 10341:11,15 10342:15 10359:12,13,20 10360:9,15 10361:7 10363:20 10365:3 10367:25 10370:21 10376:10 10377:9, 14 10379:25 10383:8,18 10429:9</p> <p>maroon 10410:4 10421:16, 19 10424:9</p> <p>material 10284:24 10430:9</p>
--	---	---	--



materially 10278:19,24 10279:20 10398:5	mid-'90s 10271:26	10269:21,22,26,27 10270:8, 10,12,17,21,22,27 10271:1, 7,15,23,26,28 10272:13,14, 15,17,19 10273:24,25 10276:6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13, 14,26,27 10277:8,11,14,15, 20,22,24 10278:4,14,22,26 10279:14,15,16,18 10280:2, 11,12,13,14,16 10281:5,7,8, 12,14,26 10282:5,9 10284:9, 13,15,23 10285:7,12,13,19, 21,24,25,26 10286:28 10287:1,19,24,28 10288:1,6, 24,26 10290:2,6,10 10292:21 10293:1 10295:2, 5,6,7,8,12,16,20,21,24,25, 26,27 10296:1,7,10,12,28 10297:12,15,16 10298:2,6,8, 10,14,16,18,26 10299:25 10300:10,16,23,27 10301:2 10302:3 10303:6,16 10304:14,27 10305:1,5,10, 12,15,17 10308:26 10314:20 10316:11,24 10317:3,6,7,19 10318:12,14,26 10319:7,11, 21,25 10321:18,25 10322:10,15 10323:4 10324:2,5,7,13,20,26 10325:6,16 10326:1,6,13,21, 28 10327:6,15,16,22 10328:21,24 10329:3,17,22 10330:5,28 10332:1,4,17,21, 26 10333:19,24 10334:1,20, 25,26 10335:25 10336:2 10337:3,5,13 10339:12,13, 25 10340:4,8,13,23 10341:1, 6,12,23,24 10342:1,9,11,15 10344:9,11,12,25 10345:22, 23 10346:5,9,18,28 10347:4, 17,27 10348:1,12,13 10349:5,11 10351:27 10353:10,28 10355:13 10358:13,14,20 10359:1,10, 13,15,18,23,25 10360:1,8, 12,23 10361:1,2,18,21,28 10362:4,15,17 10363:2,18 10365:23 10366:1,4,8 10367:2,3,22 10368:1,9,10, 11,13 10369:12,23 10370:18,22 10371:21 10372:1,20 10373:6,19,21 10374:2,8,28 10375:11,17, 22,24 10377:12,13,20 10378:4,5,12,15 10379:28 10381:6,8,12 10385:1 10386:20,24 10387:6 10390:18 10391:21 10392:23 10393:9,20 10394:14 10397:22,24 10398:4 10399:25,27 10402:1 10409:13,14,16 10419:21 10424:24 10429:19,28 10430:12 10435:11,13 10436:24	mid-november 10434:1	middle 10377:8 10393:8 10394:10 10413:4,7	Mideast 10373:19 10424:18 10425:18,23	Midwest 10286:24 10304:1, 7,17 10347:26 10382:19 10383:10 10386:16,17 10388:13 10391:12,20	MIG 10350:20 10431:16 10433:23 10434:16,17,20, 22,25,27	MIG-229 10431:22	MIG-28 10431:13	MIG-30 10431:23	MIG-31 10431:23,24	MIG-33 10431:23	MIG-34 10431:24	MIG-35 10431:25	MIG-36 10431:25	MIG-38 10431:28	MIG-42 10431:28	MIG-54 10431:25	MIG-55 10431:26	MIG-57 10431:26	MIG-58 10431:27	MIG-60 10431:27	MIG-61 10431:27	MIG-64 10400:17	MIG-64A 10400:19	MIG-64B 10400:22	MIG-64C 10400:27	MIG-64D 10433:3	Mike 10274:6,23 10275:1 10305:27 10392:18,19	mileage 10315:1	miles 10270:24 10286:27 10287:17,18 10330:11 10332:3,20 10334:4,6,11 10336:25	military 10280:18 10282:8	milk 10264:15,19,20,22,23 10265:5,9,10,11,14,15,26 10266:4,7,8,14,20,26,28 10267:1,3,9,10 10268:1,3	milk's 10281:11 10307:28 10308:17 10331:23 10332:13 10336:15 10337:15 10341:24 10361:10	Milk-36 10389:3	Milk-39 10388:25 10389:8	milked 10348:7	milks 10341:3,21	Miller 10435:19	million 10266:27 10267:1 10268:12,17,19 10272:9 10280:17 10282:7,8,10 10283:11,17 10394:11	millions 10281:23 10282:2,5	Miltner 10435:13,17	mimic 10391:11	mind 10359:12 10360:4 10368:17 10371:26 10409:13 10410:7 10411:11 10416:13	mindful 10429:14	minds 10359:11	mine 10346:5 10380:24	minimum 10285:24 10320:17 10332:27 10344:28 10361:27 10362:14 10375:23 10409:2, 3 10415:22,23,25,27,28 10416:1,8 10419:9,13 10429:1,4,15 10430:3,4	Minnesota 10288:24 10377:14 10378:9 10419:19	Minnesotans 10378:7	minor 10348:4	minus 10382:28 10420:11 10422:15 10423:9,20,21	minute 10288:7 10325:9 10335:4,5 10400:9 10432:17	minutes 10288:10 10389:10 10430:26 10431:5 10432:16, 21	missed 10350:10,11 10386:13	missing 10369:16	Mississippi 10418:13 10421:21,25	Missouri 10408:22 10417:3 10419:19	mistake 10350:11
math 10423:11,13	matter 10345:7 10357:14 10372:1	matters 10262:5	maximum 10291:12 10384:9	Mckee 10376:7	MDIA 10435:20	meaning 10286:7	meaningful 10410:2,12	means 10269:18,20 10321:25 10322:17 10323:4 10326:22 10374:4 10387:4 10434:19	meant 10331:6 10335:11	measuring 10329:14	mechanism 10267:27 10357:13	median 10412:24 10413:8	meet 10285:21 10301:26 10302:8,10,25 10371:1 10385:17 10394:15 10409:14,16 10410:27 10436:4	meeting 10298:5 10372:17 10385:21 10429:18	Meijer 10368:9	members 10288:5 10315:8 10350:20 10434:17,25,26	membership 10351:12,20	memorized 10339:10	mentioned 10270:27 10271:1 10303:12 10328:7 10355:23 10367:16 10379:27	mergers 10320:9	message 10269:9	met 10385:6	methods 10275:26	meticulous 10405:14	metropolitan 10334:16	mic 10401:15	Michigan 10270:25 10360:21 10421:8	microphone 10262:26 10401:8																															



mix 10264:17 10265:19,20, 24 10269:20,25 10270:17 10271:11	mouth 10401:8	NDPSR 10311:25,26 10312:10,18,23 10313:22	10417:28 10420:2,4 10427:10
mixes 10264:20	move 10273:1 10285:7 10306:23 10319:21 10321:14 10358:22 10360:8, 13 10361:21 10374:2,8 10376:16 10377:20 10378:4, 5,16 10398:10,15 10401:16 10407:8 10416:12 10420:12 10424:24	necessarily 10270:13 10272:15 10285:8 10321:4 10341:18 10346:19 10368:25 10369:19 10370:18 10372:20 10373:11 10378:11 10380:9 10381:19 10391:3 10409:27 10410:16 10411:14 10421:25 10424:15 10427:26	NMPF's 10287:6 10402:28 10404:8 10408:3 10417:6, 14,16,23 10418:1,8 10419:28 10423:1,6
model 10284:26 10289:25 10293:23 10328:28 10329:6, 16,26 10330:8,25 10331:4, 16,24 10332:11,17,22 10333:21 10334:17,24 10335:21 10336:12,17,21 10353:10 10355:16 10365:5, 8 10368:23,24 10378:23 10380:17 10394:27,28 10395:16 10397:15,26 10398:5 10415:22,24 10417:13,15,18,20,21 10418:3,22,23 10419:4,28 10420:21,23,24,26 10421:3, 11,12,14 10422:4,16,26 10423:12,18 10424:6,13,26, 28 10425:5,21,25,26,28 10426:24 10428:16,17 10433:5	moved 10409:2	needed 10286:22 10288:1, 27 10289:2 10317:6 10347:21 10359:9 10374:18 10388:10 10391:18 10394:15 10436:8,16	Nmpf_final_class_1_ differentials.xlsx. 10431:14
model's 10417:27	movement 10289:1 10337:5 10377:13 10416:27	needing 10321:20	non-class 10317:2
modeling 10406:3	movements 10362:16	Neenah 10264:13	non-co-ops 10342:7
moderated 10379:4	moves 10373:19 10414:4	negative 10265:6 10420:10, 14,15,18 10421:3 10424:8	non-fluid 10276:10
modern 10322:22 10346:27	movie 10264:28	negotiate 10319:21,23 10320:17 10321:7 10325:7 10326:9,22 10371:24 10372:1	non-regulated 10410:28 10425:17 10426:3,4
modest 10421:27	moving 10270:19 10284:15, 23 10288:24 10377:12 10378:16 10397:22 10407:17 10433:15	negotiated 10327:3 10372:4	non-sweetened 10264:21
moisten 10290:18	mozzarella 10297:24,26	negotiating 10319:27 10362:20	nonetheless 10292:9
mold 10342:13	Multiple 10285:10	negotiation 10321:3,5 10377:9	nonfat 10265:14 10266:7 10269:21,27 10270:12,16 10367:2
moment 10263:21 10406:21 10432:19,22	multiples 10373:24	neighborhood 10410:8	normal 10346:3
moments 10432:23	multiplied 10272:13	neighboring 10338:13	north 10373:25 10421:8
Monday 10436:7	multiply 10382:28	netted 10293:21	Northeast 10351:7 10382:12 10421:9 10422:1 10425:17, 23 10426:11,13
money 10319:17 10340:15, 17 10370:19 10375:16 10378:7 10410:12	Murfreesboro 10330:24	neutral 10315:8	northern 10359:20 10407:20
month 10273:15,17,20 10291:12,15 10316:25,26	N	Newark 10333:17 10334:5	Northwest 10394:3 10426:1
monthly 10311:25 10312:3 10387:7,9	naked 10418:4	Newport 10355:13	note 10403:23 10424:3 10425:22
months 10264:22 10290:23, 28 10291:7 10309:27 10311:27 10313:2 10382:17 10387:10 10394:28	names 10333:14	News 10355:13	noted 10306:11
morning 10262:1 10263:14 10264:10 10269:3,4 10273:11 10275:8 10314:19, 21 10351:27 10358:3,4 10380:13 10387:13 10398:16	Nashville 10289:9 10332:3,9	nice 10312:16 10352:9 10378:7,8 10385:16 10407:1 10409:21	notes 10433:16
motivated 10433:20	NASS 10312:9,18	Nicholson 10290:4	notice 10408:9 10417:10
mouse 10407:12	national 10278:4,14,18 10281:11 10305:10 10312:22 10314:20 10326:13 10329:3,17 10330:5,28 10331:23 10332:13,17,21 10333:24 10334:20,24,26 10335:25 10336:15 10337:15 10340:26 10341:18,22 10347:4 10353:10,27 10355:13 10361:10 10388:25 10389:3,8 10390:17 10391:21 10392:23 10398:3 10411:25 10412:1 10435:11	Nicholson's 10364:11	noticed 10408:24
	nationwide 10264:25 10275:25	nickels 10422:7	November 10434:1,9
	naught 10268:13	Nicole 10314:20 10333:7 10335:6	number 10262:20 10265:28 10272:11 10273:7 10277:28 10282:2 10283:14 10311:1 10325:17,22 10333:8 10359:1 10380:2 10382:24 10394:13 10395:15 10398:22 10399:1,8,15 10400:4,7,20,24,28 10416:2 10420:14,25 10422:12,25 10427:13 10431:17
	NBTU 10358:20	NMPF 10279:22 10285:9 10286:17 10287:22 10288:20 10289:3 10354:8 10404:18 10408:2 10409:18 10410:15 10415:12	numbers 10272:22 10274:19 10278:9,10 10279:12 10280:19,22,24 10281:17 10282:1,16 10294:5,9 10296:16 10306:13,18 10309:2,3 10310:2,11,18,28 10312:4 10325:24 10346:26 10356:25 10358:12,22 10369:17 10379:1 10382:11
	NCIMS 10345:23 10347:3		



10394:12 10416:15 10419:14,17 10430:28 numerous 10271:8	operate 10324:24 10325:28 10363:10,13 operation 10352:20 10353:11 operations 10393:18 operators 10410:1 opinion 10351:19 10360:7, 17 10368:28 10372:7 10373:4 10374:14 10384:14 10385:22 10426:2 10428:28 opportunities 10383:9 10397:26 opposed 10299:27 10323:24 10326:9 10409:4 10419:8 opposing 10367:6,7 opposite 10268:18 10377:28 opposition 10264:8 10275:21 10307:5 10315:7 10434:18 10435:9,12 option 10290:21 options 10308:5 orally 10397:5 orange 10393:10 10410:4 10421:15,19 10423:24,25 order 10264:16,19 10265:11 10276:10 10277:15,21,23 10284:5 10288:5,25 10289:1 10290:23,27 10291:6,10,11 10293:7,8,11,15 10294:12, 18,21,22 10295:16 10300:13 10301:10 10304:6 10311:4 10321:25 10325:28 10326:2 10348:8,22 10350:8,18 10351:2,13 10358:16 10359:4 10362:12 10363:1 10365:26 10375:14 10376:19 10378:3 10382:12 10384:9 10386:14 10389:12 10407:20,21 10408:27 10410:27 10413:17,25 10414:1,2,7,12,15,19 10424:18 10426:11,14 10427:6 Order's 10371:22,25 10375:21 orderly 10361:28 10429:17 10430:1 orders 10270:2 10272:14 10276:17 10277:2,4,9,18 10285:8 10292:13,22 10293:4 10303:13,18,19,22, 26,28 10304:16 10320:18 10322:7 10349:21,27 10356:17,19 10357:8,19 10358:27 10359:8 10363:9	10366:3 10367:7 10372:18 10373:11,24 10377:8 10382:15 10383:12 10384:7 10386:6,9 10407:23 10412:13 10425:27 organic 10279:15 10341:3 10347:25 10351:4 orient 10302:6 original 10309:25 10398:12 originally 10312:9 outgoing 10393:21 outlet 10317:18 outlets 10326:23 outlier 10412:28 outliers 10412:24 outlined 10370:6 over-order 10321:7 10428:21 10429:2,7,10 overarching 10427:21 overcommits 10377:1 overhead 10342:24 Overheads 10342:27,28 overlap 10337:10 10410:16 10413:19,28 10414:18 overlapping 10413:25 overvaluing 10363:18 overview 10289:6 10412:18 own-price 10278:26 10280:1 10368:21,26 owned 10354:20 ownerships 10336:9	panels 10268:10 panhandle 10418:12 paper 10369:20 10401:10 10416:16 parable 10273:23 paragraph 10272:6 10390:19,23,27 10393:6,8 Pardon 10422:23 parentheses 10388:20 part 10296:1 10298:6 10315:26 10316:2,27,28 10319:20 10321:5 10323:10 10344:22 10345:9 10346:18, 22 10351:7 10357:17 10362:1,11 10365:14 10371:7,9,28 10379:3 10384:25 10394:1 10395:10 10406:1 10429:7 10430:14 participate 10300:8,9 participation 10318:8 10358:16 parties 10262:15 10376:18, 24 partly 10352:14 Partners 10264:17 10318:23 parts 10303:15 10314:28 pass 10298:11 passage 10413:16 passed 10323:20 10384:19 past 10300:7 10379:6 10405:27 pasted 10312:4 pasteurize 10266:2 10269:25 patterns 10408:11,21 10426:25 pawn 10364:23 pay 10288:5 10304:26 10319:10,18 10347:28 10360:2 10361:19 10386:9 10409:23,24 10410:20 paycheck 10387:3 paying 10319:7,16 peak 10278:5,15 Peninsula 10270:25 Pennsylvania 10290:14 penny 10325:19 10380:3 10381:10,11
<hr/> O <hr/>			
oath 10367:10 objected 10405:16 objection 10273:3 10398:17, 24 10399:3,10 objective 10366:3 obligation 10302:8,18 observation 10379:10 10396:4 10414:16 observations 10407:2 10413:18 10417:12 observe 10301:12 10305:4 10371:8 10417:26 observed 10417:23 observing 10416:21 obtain 10428:26 obtained 10404:13 10428:27 obtaining 10284:9 occur 10365:4 October 10290:24 10296:23, 27 10297:12 10394:28 odd 10413:23 10418:12 odds 10391:14 off-the-record 10263:22 10400:12 10432:24 offended 10308:25 offer 10341:11 offered 10435:16 official 10306:17 10386:13 10387:24 Ohio 10302:5 10319:2 10332:28 10333:17,21,27 10334:2,5,17 10352:16,19 10353:11,15 10354:9 10355:23,26 Oklahoma 10376:7 10418:11 10419:19 older 10309:27 one-off 10326:9 onesie/twosies 10421:23 open 10404:20 opening 10360:21			
			<hr/> P <hr/>
		p.m. 10390:3 10400:11 10436:4 10437:4 pace 10352:6 Pacific 10426:1 pacing 10276:4 package 10369:23 10435:24 packaged 10296:5 10325:16 pages 10431:9 paid 10285:24 10293:19 10319:9 10346:15,16 10406:13,15 painted 10299:10 10346:4	



<p>people 10270:11 10327:6 10340:7,25 10344:24 10346:9 10347:24 10349:10 10365:2 10367:27 10378:7,8 10380:7 10385:16 10386:22 10394:6,8,11 10395:8,21 10396:1 10407:12 10411:8 10416:28 10418:21,22,25 10420:21 10433:22,24 10434:23,24,25 10435:4,5</p> <p>people's 10427:25</p> <p>percent 10294:9 10410:14, 19</p> <p>percentage 10277:15,17 10294:6,14,17 10295:20,21 10351:12 10356:25 10422:20 10424:7</p> <p>percentages 10321:24 10322:7 10323:2</p> <p>perfect 10311:10 10328:1</p> <p>performance 10359:3</p> <p>performed 10342:20</p> <p>performing 10343:8</p> <p>period 10291:14 10383:16, 22 10435:20</p> <p>periods 10308:16 10379:2</p> <p>permeable 10299:9</p> <p>person 10309:5,6 10406:8 10432:1</p> <p>personal 10299:8 10320:11 10359:11,24 10376:3 10377:3 10405:5</p> <p>personally 10297:18 10365:1</p> <p>persons 10434:17</p> <p>perspective 10323:1 10376:3 10427:23</p> <p>petition 10404:9</p> <p>petted 10273:12</p> <p>phases 10415:2</p> <p>phasing 10414:24</p> <p>phenomenon 10278:28</p> <p>physically 10379:24</p> <p>physician's 10367:10</p> <p>pick 10383:25</p> <p>picked 10312:10 10384:2</p> <p>picture 10316:3</p> <p>pie 10271:20</p>	<p>piece 10318:17 10369:16</p> <p>pieces 10312:13</p> <p>pinch 10326:2</p> <p>place 10263:22 10267:17 10277:7 10290:7,27 10291:6 10319:25 10385:13 10400:12 10432:24 10436:3</p> <p>places 10312:8 10342:10 10362:26,27 10377:13 10411:6,12 10414:7 10415:6 10418:14 10419:17,20 10420:22,23,25 10421:20,26 10428:15</p> <p>Plains 10417:3 10419:18</p> <p>plan 10268:12</p> <p>planning 10433:26</p> <p>plant 10287:28 10292:26 10293:1,2 10296:7,8,14,18, 23 10297:12,25 10298:10,18 10300:16 10302:23 10308:25,26 10318:13,25 10324:22 10327:3,5 10328:21,24 10329:22 10330:23 10332:1,4,16,20 10333:19 10334:1,4,25,27 10335:18 10336:2 10337:14 10338:11,19 10346:16 10349:6 10353:7,19 10354:9,19 10355:8,12 10360:21 10366:12 10371:12 10372:19 10377:5 10380:6 10385:6 10393:20 10402:18 10403:8,14,19</p> <p>plant-based 10278:27</p> <p>plants 10277:16,22 10284:12,13 10287:25 10292:21,28 10296:3 10297:13,15,16,24,27 10298:12,28 10299:20 10302:24,26 10304:3,27 10318:11 10319:4,18 10324:18 10325:23 10334:24 10337:3,10,13,14, 16 10338:12 10339:20,23 10342:16 10348:14 10349:15 10359:14 10361:4 10362:23 10363:19 10370:13,14,17,22,23 10371:11,21 10378:11,13 10379:18,21 10382:19,20 10385:4 10393:10,11 10403:12,16</p> <p>plants' 10381:14</p> <p>play 10290:3 10361:13 10429:12 10430:16</p> <p>playing 10326:10,24 10332:26</p>	<p>plays 10320:20 10322:28 10340:5</p> <p>pleasing 10418:25</p> <p>pleasure 10387:14</p> <p>plenty 10317:1,3 10409:14</p> <p>plot 10411:19,22 10412:21 10427:1</p> <p>plots 10413:20,24 10425:12 10426:18,22</p> <p>PMO 10295:25 10299:19 10301:3,10 10304:26</p> <p>pockets 10421:9</p> <p>point 10266:6 10267:28 10287:22 10293:25 10295:13 10297:8 10298:3 10301:28 10302:27 10311:7 10316:24 10317:22 10318:4 10322:6,8 10326:3 10327:9 10337:23 10342:19 10348:23 10349:7 10355:27 10356:15 10357:6 10381:21 10398:9 10420:20 10424:3 10425:2 10428:19</p> <p>pointed 10301:7</p> <p>pointing 10393:26</p> <p>points 10279:21 10300:28 10302:9 10378:19 10408:27</p> <p>policy 10427:7</p> <p>pool 10265:9 10268:14,17 10300:8 10321:25 10351:7,9 10373:17,20 10382:5,23</p> <p>pooled 10276:27 10277:15 10358:13 10359:1 10360:15</p> <p>pooling 10291:10 10358:26 10381:20 10382:14 10383:20</p> <p>pools 10304:6</p> <p>poor 10273:21 10338:1</p> <p>pop 10421:24</p> <p>population 10290:6</p> <p>populations 10341:13</p> <p>portion 10284:10,11 10372:5 10402:9 10414:23 10417:3 10428:2</p> <p>position 10288:27 10307:4 10315:9 10356:12 10363:17 10376:21 10381:14</p> <p>positive 10420:19 10424:9</p> <p>possibly 10327:23 10370:26 10422:7 10424:1</p>	<p>posted 10391:25 10397:7 10402:28 10403:1 10404:4</p> <p>potential 10343:10 10427:7</p> <p>potentially 10270:15</p> <p>pounds 10266:27 10267:1 10272:13 10278:5,16,18 10281:7,8 10302:3 10350:5 10369:24 10381:12</p> <p>powder 10267:3,17 10270:28 10271:15,18,27 10297:27 10317:19 10324:1 10327:20 10342:13,15 10362:15 10367:3</p> <p>power 10321:6,11</p> <p>Powerpoint 10274:7 10275:13,17 10305:22 10316:7,9 10321:15 10342:25 10343:25 10358:6 10387:28 10398:12</p> <p>PPDS 10265:7</p> <p>practically 10414:3</p> <p>practice 10305:14 10347:20</p> <p>practices 10347:1</p> <p>practicing 10349:14</p> <p>Prairie 10329:22 10336:6</p> <p>pre-submitted 10434:14</p> <p>precise 10294:5</p> <p>predict 10435:3</p> <p>predicted 10279:2,9 10334:24</p> <p>prefer 10271:9</p> <p>preliminary 10262:5</p> <p>premise 10366:14</p> <p>premises 10359:8</p> <p>premium 10319:14,20,22,23 10321:7 10362:13 10429:10</p> <p>premiums 10319:27 10320:13,21 10321:3 10361:12 10373:4 10428:22 10429:3,7</p> <p>preparations 10432:12</p> <p>prepared 10357:23 10432:1</p> <p>preschool 10280:17 10282:7</p> <p>present 10275:14 10369:8</p> <p>presentation 10274:7 10275:14 10305:22 10316:7, 9 10321:15 10342:25 10343:25 10358:6 10365:7</p>
---	--	---	---



10369:10 10398:12 preserve 10290:12 10379:17 pressures 10323:22 pretend 10369:8 pretty 10303:3 10342:4 10345:4 10346:2 10347:23 10364:11 10371:3 10382:14 10385:16 10391:27 10407:7 10418:24 prevails 10268:13 prevalent 10323:9 prevent 10435:5 previous 10298:20 10308:23 10312:24 10313:5 10314:15 10408:12 previously 10263:6 10275:2 10287:20 10401:19,25 10420:1 10426:26 previously-entered 10387:25 price 10265:6,23,26 10271:13 10273:14 10278:19 10279:28 10285:2, 6,16,17,24 10286:23,24 10288:25 10290:22,25,26 10291:1,6,8 10298:23 10300:11 10303:20 10310:5 10311:25 10313:3,10,19,22, 25,26 10314:1,2,7,8 10317:8,17 10320:17,18 10322:27 10324:2,7,9,12 10326:3,8 10327:16 10329:16 10332:21 10338:25 10344:11,12,13 10347:27 10361:27 10362:6 10368:2 10374:13,14 10375:23 10377:10 10381:9 10382:21,28 10388:11,12 10390:27 10391:2,7,10,12, 19,20 10396:2,11 10411:24, 25,28 10419:11,21 10429:4, 13,16 10430:17,22 price-enhancing 10419:12 10429:5,21 10430:4 priced 10429:26 prices 10279:27 10285:5,8, 23 10288:22 10293:20 10311:26 10312:4,6,11,24, 25 10325:7 10342:22 10343:22 10350:13,14 10368:5 10373:11,27 10382:3,4 10383:21 10391:22 10419:22 10429:1, 9,15,21,24 10430:3,25 pricing 10267:27 10270:11 10285:26 10300:6 10312:16,	27 10358:26 10362:14 primarily 10264:22 10297:13 10320:28 10383:17 primary 10402:27 10429:23 prime 10280:28 10282:15,18 10304:17 principle 10290:13 principles 10427:21 printed 10387:23 printing 10404:26 prior 10266:27 10334:1 10343:9 10388:4 10404:8 prisons 10369:13 private 10302:7 10349:6 10376:24 privately-negotiated 10301:1 problem 10311:16 10339:1 10371:24 10375:21 10429:5 problems 10375:9 proceed 10286:14 10328:12 10401:28 proceeding 10263:6,7 10401:20 10431:11 proceedings 10437:5 process 10269:14,22 10402:23 10404:24 10405:5 10427:10,16 processes 10271:24 processing 10267:16 10284:16,23 processor 10264:11 10265:4 10430:8 processors 10270:9 10292:17 10301:2 10303:16 10304:24 10324:19 10430:2, 13 produce 10322:22 produced 10290:6 10295:2, 5 10350:5 producer 10268:14 10292:22 10305:2 10372:17 producer's 10387:3 producers 10304:28 10318:16 10390:18 10430:14 10435:14 producing 10285:12,13,19 10296:3 10374:28 10417:27	product 10266:9,22 10267:25 10269:15 10270:14 10278:19 10281:3 10296:9 10312:23,26 10324:12 10325:8 10339:17, 25 10340:11 10366:23 10367:18 10370:25 10371:4 10430:21 production 10266:27 10276:8 10284:15 10290:10 10302:3 10304:14 10346:26 10358:15 10419:22 10429:25 productive 10303:13 productivity 10303:5 products 10264:15,21 10265:19 10266:22,24 10278:23 10279:18 10285:20,22,23 10286:19,28 10287:1,19 10295:25,26,27 10296:2,4,6,8 10297:14 10300:20 10301:24 10302:22 10308:19,28 10312:24 10324:3 10326:1 10327:23 10345:21,23 10366:9,11 10368:14 10384:28 10388:4 10429:25, 28 profitability 10430:10 profitable 10325:24 program 10280:4,12,15 10282:6 10317:9,18 10350:15 10365:26 programs 10281:9 10303:14,18 10349:22 10362:13 10386:6,8,28 progressive 10346:28 project 10406:5 projects 10405:27 promise 10358:7 promised 10432:14 promote 10266:18 10270:4, 6 10361:28 10429:17 promotion 10281:5 10341:14 promotions 10368:4 pronounced 10418:7 proper 10266:1 properly 10315:19 10350:25 10432:13 properties 10393:11 proponent 10289:19	proponent's 10266:10 proponents 10268:15 10275:26 10289:8,24 10290:8 10293:23 10301:6 10304:23 proponents' 10268:12 proposal 10264:8 10265:2,5 10269:7,12 10275:11,21,24 10279:3,10,22,26 10280:3,9 10281:10,28 10284:3,17,24 10285:10 10286:15,17 10287:23 10288:18,21 10289:4,11,13,15,21 10290:26 10291:5 10292:6, 8,16 10294:3 10301:7 10304:23 10307:6 10315:7, 8,28 10316:1 10329:3 10330:5,28 10331:23 10332:23 10333:24 10337:16 10338:11 10343:13 10354:1 10355:14 10356:25 10357:9 10361:10 10381:26 10398:3 10404:9, 13 10408:3,7,28 10409:4,11, 19,25 10410:15 10411:17 10414:13,19 10415:1 10417:6,14,16,17,19,20,23, 28 10418:1,2,8,22,28 10419:1,2,28 10420:21,22, 23 10422:14 10423:1,6,12 10424:6,13,21 10425:4,9,15, 24 10427:16,19,22,23 10428:10,11,13,14 10433:19,24 10434:24 10435:9,22 proposals 10326:13 10356:12 10357:15 10384:20 10402:28 10404:5 10415:18 10435:15,24 propose 10389:10 proposed 10272:8 10276:16 10278:23 10279:19 10294:3, 7,15,22,23 10331:19 10353:10 10355:13 10367:8 10376:20 10378:4 10408:2 10413:14,26 10415:1 proposing 10315:12,15 10329:17 10357:1 protein 10303:23 10305:6 10313:18 proud 10386:19 proves 10321:19 provide 10289:26 10291:11 10292:16 10312:11 10326:23 10356:18 10384:1 provided 10282:15 10285:11 10295:28 10308:14 10356:24
---	--	---	--



10357:12 10378:22 10405:21 10436:6 providing 10289:5 10305:16 10430:20,27 provisions 10358:27 10377:18 10378:4 public 10409:16 10429:18 published 10281:4 10292:18 10316:15 Publix 10385:8 pull 10310:2 10313:2 10359:17 10406:18 10419:14,17 10427:20 pulled 10310:3 purchase 10280:10 10319:10 purchased 10268:9,10 10353:20 purchases 10265:11 purchasing 10282:9 purple 10416:14 purply 10407:1 purpose 10277:7 10288:28 10312:19 purposes 10285:14 10303:1 10433:26 10436:1 put 10266:8 10267:16 10269:27 10271:18 10280:23,27 10281:4 10296:15 10305:27 10308:6 10312:14,20 10315:14 10318:17,23 10343:2 10348:2 10398:14 10424:1 putting 10315:26 10347:26 10362:3,4	question 10299:26 10300:22 10317:22 10322:21 10330:1 10356:11 10360:11 10366:2 10368:1 10376:21 10379:19 10392:16 10397:11 10410:15 10411:20,21 10434:10 questioner 10328:10 questions 10268:25 10273:1 10311:18 10329:9 10356:5,6 10357:26 10368:19 10386:4 10387:12,15,16,27 10388:27 10389:12 10390:9 10396:21 10436:11,27 quickly 10359:18 10381:14 quit 10322:25 quote 10285:18,27 10316:10,14 quoted 10286:1 10316:20	reads 10282:24 10283:14 ready 10274:12 10299:11 10306:11 10328:3 10371:2 10389:18 real 10265:18 10295:18 10298:27 10307:21 10308:4, 19 10339:11 10340:8 10349:12 10368:9 10375:23 10424:23 real-world 10265:4 10269:10 realistic 10290:21 realistically 10369:24 realities 10290:9 10363:12 reality 10300:27 10301:21 10366:7 realize 10305:11 10324:20 realized 10286:9 reason 10289:28 10301:5 10302:21 10307:28 10308:1, 3 10312:11,17 10322:3 10329:24 10336:10 10349:13 10372:8 10377:20 10380:26 reasonable 10276:14 10277:1 10304:23 10415:3 reasoning 10377:15 reasons 10298:15 10301:22 10305:7 10360:7 10366:16 10377:28 10409:10 rebuttal 10433:23 recalibrate 10363:14 recalibration 10363:16 recall 10279:22 10305:22 10316:17 recap 10433:3 recapture 10269:8 receipts 10361:15,18 received 10273:7 10277:21 10398:22 10399:1,8,15 receiving 10298:14 10359:28 10409:25 recent 10278:28 10279:26 10303:2,3 10356:16 recently 10277:5 10292:18 10353:19 10397:9 recess 10435:27 10437:3 recognition 10284:9 10371:10	recognizable 10299:3 recognize 10307:22,25 10308:4 10372:8 recollect 10397:18 recollection 10332:10 10391:26 10392:2 recommend 10419:8 recommendation 10332:13 10334:20 10335:24 10336:15,18,22 recommendations 10427:7 recommended 10332:17,21 10334:25,26 10337:15 10395:1 10396:2 10412:15 reconvene 10433:21 10436:1,7,28 record 10262:2,3 10263:20, 21,23,24 10264:6 10274:8, 14,15 10283:20 10288:10, 12,13 10297:10 10306:25,26 10309:16 10311:3 10318:23 10322:5 10328:5,6 10352:15 10364:17 10374:21 10383:3, 4,20 10386:12,25 10388:1 10389:1,5 10390:2,3,24,25 10391:5,6 10392:17 10394:25 10396:20,28 10400:9,11,13,14 10424:2 10427:9 10431:18 10432:4, 22,25,27 10434:10 10437:4 red 10421:19 10422:2 10423:25 redirect 10356:13 10387:17 10396:22,23 redo 10348:3 reduce 10265:6 10290:20 reduced 10357:1 Reducing 10302:1 reduction 10314:26 refer 10296:19 reference 10295:13 10296:18,21 10298:3 10302:4 10306:19 10331:14 10350:3 10355:27 10391:16 referenced 10303:2 10306:9 10345:14 10390:11 referencing 10387:24 10388:4 10391:21 10396:8, 13 referendum 10292:22 10357:11 referred 10298:19 10310:26
<hr/> Q <hr/>	<hr/> R <hr/>		
qualifications 10298:5 10305:4 qualify 10301:11 quality 10300:10,27 10304:27 10305:1,6,14 10339:4,7,17 10341:24 10348:12,13 10386:23 quantity 10290:10 quarter 10371:1 10421:3 10422:9 10423:3 quarters 10422:7 quarts 10368:11	raise 10277:9 10290:19 10292:12 10307:27 10342:22 10362:6 raised 10277:18 10289:7 10322:8 10323:26 10326:21 raises 10398:4 raising 10301:18 10357:18 10380:4 10428:24 10429:1 ran 10382:4 random 10313:8 randoms 10313:2 range 10304:6 10309:12 10334:13 10337:3 10395:24 10414:6,8,10,11 10423:17 10433:23,25 ranges 10420:7 rarely 10381:9 rate 10384:9 raw 10267:9 10340:4 10430:9 re-read 10287:2,14 reach 10323:16 read 10264:6 10268:7 10269:11 10280:7,22 10282:28 10291:2 10297:10 10365:27 10384:14 10388:16 10390:10,23 10391:6 10427:9 reading 10280:16 10331:9		



10397:14	relationship 10286:26 10287:17 10295:18	reporting 10312:10,20	resume 10390:6
referring 10308:22 10387:27	relationships 10290:12 10336:9 10379:18	reports 10310:2	retail 10264:24 10265:24 10266:23,24 10267:24 10278:22,26 10279:2,9,18 10280:2 10308:28 10322:15 10326:23
reflect 10286:20 10290:9 10303:7 10363:12,15 10388:9 10392:17 10397:15	relative 10294:19 10366:9 10382:7 10383:7 10401:8 10410:23 10411:9,13 10422:4 10424:5,18 10425:9,14,15,19,21,26,28	represent 10294:6,7,14 10351:27 10356:25 10393:9, 10	retailer 10278:19 10308:16, 21
reflected 10285:19 10394:25	released 10317:4	representatives 10434:16	retire 10322:25
reflecting 10365:12 10376:9	relevance 10284:4,27 10288:19	represented 10393:18	retirement 10323:16
reflection 10387:2	relevant 10294:28 10301:4 10315:23 10316:20 10351:5	request 10294:19 10322:5 10404:5	return 10396:20,22 10424:2 10430:28 10433:1
reflective 10269:12	reliability 10432:10	required 10299:7	review 10297:18 10309:16 10397:26 10405:14
reflects 10281:13 10284:14 10375:23 10376:7 10397:3	relied 10282:16 10289:19 10403:17	require 10276:9 10295:25 10296:12 10297:14 10304:27 10339:4 10346:14 10349:15	revisions 10284:24
reform 10284:5 10368:24 10373:9 10374:15	rely 10286:4 10387:23	requirement 10276:14 10302:25 10321:27 10341:28 10349:28 10385:21	revisit 10306:6
refusal 10290:1	remain 10274:25 10300:16 10401:22	requirements 10277:13 10298:28 10299:20 10300:16,23,26 10301:8 10339:21 10342:14 10348:11,14,15 10359:3,17 10385:27	rewarding 10303:20
region 10375:12 10417:28 10425:20	remaining 10323:5 10431:4 10432:21	requires 10298:17 10339:6	rewet 10269:14
regional 10286:18,20 10375:8 10377:27 10379:12 10386:22 10388:3,9 10390:12,20 10391:23 10397:16	remarkable 10305:16 10386:17 10395:25	requisite 10277:17	rewetting 10265:17 10266:2 10269:11,18,20
regions 10286:27 10287:17 10373:16 10391:13,22 10392:1 10395:28 10409:28	remember 10291:15 10327:28 10359:4 10369:10 10377:15 10398:7 10404:17 10430:19	rescheduling 10436:1	Richard 10376:7
regs 10348:18	reminded 10431:7	reserve 10276:9,12,14,26,28 10277:1,3 10316:11,25 10317:6 10358:13,14,17,19, 27 10360:9,18 10373:21	Richmond 10329:23,26 10330:16,17
regular 10341:23 10344:13	reminder 10411:10,12	respect 10286:27 10287:1, 18,21 10418:1	rid 10351:14
regulated 10264:15 10265:9 10270:11 10285:24 10338:24 10344:12 10361:27 10374:5 10396:2, 11 10412:5 10429:3,21	remove 10316:1 10345:7 10357:21	responding 10434:2	ridge 10408:21 10418:11,12
regulation 10300:11 10327:10 10376:22 10380:22 10429:16	removing 10369:4	responds 10322:18	ridges 10407:10 10408:16, 18,19,20 10417:23 10418:6, 10
regulations 10267:22 10296:1 10300:6 10351:8 10386:12	renumbering 10310:20	responses 10329:10	rigorous 10339:12,15 10426:6
regulatory 10385:28	repealed 10317:27	response 10322:23	rise 10320:15
regulatory-wise 10387:5	repeat 10278:8 10279:8	responses 10329:10	risen 10295:21
reject 10339:13	repetitive 10347:16	responsible 10320:28	risk 10318:19 10347:15 10376:26,27 10412:9 10419:20,21
rejected 10292:7	replace 10311:3	rest 10341:26 10416:3 10424:18	Rob 10387:21
relate 10285:12 10365:4 10374:28	replaced 10265:9	restraints 10268:1	Robertson 10330:21
related 10289:16 10390:11, 12 10409:11	repooling 10359:17	restrictions 10347:5	robust 10262:25
Relatedly 10277:21	report 10280:28 10282:15 10312:23,24,27 10313:15 10350:4 10386:28	restroom 10389:15	role 10290:4 10320:20 10322:28 10340:5 10361:13, 26 10376:25 10429:12 10430:16
relates 10300:22	reported 10272:16,18 10312:8 10313:19 10350:1 10382:3,4	result 10267:22 10280:1 10303:21 10305:18 10357:2 10429:20	Roman 10310:19
relation 10305:24	Reporter 10345:27 10346:12 10353:16 10361:16 10372:26 10420:17	results 10267:23 10308:13 10418:3 10422:13 10423:12, 18	room 10297:6,11 10307:26 10328:8 10362:16 10363:8 10372:24,27
			Rooster 10356:1



Rosenbaum 10262:9,10 10263:13,25,27 10268:21 10272:27,28 10274:1,2,5 10275:5,6 10277:25 10278:1,2 10280:20 10282:11 10283:13,27 10288:14,15 10291:18 10292:3 10293:28 10297:17 10305:21,26 10306:8,27 10307:1 10309:9,19 10310:16,25 10311:6,11,15, 19,20 10314:9 10356:8,9,14 10357:20 10387:17 10396:22,24,25 10398:9 10399:17 10435:6	Sally 10399:27 10400:17 10401:4,24	10347:6 10373:10	shortcomings 10292:8
rough 10433:25	sanitation 10348:22 10349:14	separate 10271:24 10306:3 10357:12 10362:14	shorter 10436:25
roughly 10295:14	Santa 10297:22	series 10402:11 10431:5	shoulder 10308:7
row 10310:9,26,27 10311:1, 2 10331:10 10352:17,19,24 10353:13 10354:10,11,15 10355:4	saturation 10417:10	serve 10276:7,11 10277:12, 20 10288:2 10321:18 10322:11 10334:15 10361:14 10370:19,20 10429:18	show 10279:26 10289:17 10291:19 10293:4 10303:9, 14 10386:21 10412:23 10414:5 10426:21
rows 10310:11	sauce 10356:2	served 10366:18	showed 10397:8
rule 10277:6 10360:8	savings 10348:26,27	serves 10295:19	showing 10303:5 10410:4
rules 10297:14 10345:24 10362:24 10376:27 10382:13 10385:24	scale 10270:17 10407:8	service 10268:26 10319:10 10324:11 10356:7 10357:25 10363:5 10435:26	shown 10262:18 10283:23
run 10328:8 10340:24 10341:14,18 10342:16 10345:1 10428:17 10430:5 10431:12	scary 10368:11	session 10262:1 10390:1 10403:2 10404:16,17	shows 10303:17 10309:3,22 10339:12 10406:23 10412:23
running 10340:8 10348:24 10368:10 10416:25	SCC 10303:14 10386:6	set 10284:5 10285:2,5,17 10286:26 10287:16 10315:19 10344:4 10345:21 10355:13 10356:18 10366:13,14 10368:18	shrinkage 10325:22
runs 10395:1 10408:21	scenario 10330:25	setting 10276:1 10284:28 10285:9,15 10286:17 10287:21,23 10288:21 10289:3 10290:4 10327:2 10352:5 10368:27 10374:12, 15 10397:21 10429:15	sic 10286:18 10291:10 10418:22
rural 10395:12,20 10406:6	scheme 10266:10	setup 10348:1	side 10265:13 10316:28 10393:25 10418:18 10419:23 10421:13
Rutherford 10330:22,23 10331:13,23,24	school 10280:16 10281:14 10282:6	severe 10277:24	side-by-side 10418:19
Ryan 10435:13	schools 10369:12 10370:1	share 10295:12 10309:2 10339:8 10407:4 10431:3	sides 10315:9 10365:12
S	scoot 10263:2	sheet 10350:3	sign 10429:3
S-A-L-L-Y 10401:4	Scott 10305:23,24	shelf 10338:24 10339:17 10342:2,3 10371:5	significant 10361:24 10373:20 10379:24 10381:13 10410:19 10415:16 10421:23
S-I-M-U-L-A-T-O-R 10284:20	scratcher 10397:28	shift 10413:10,13	significantly 10275:24 10280:3 10292:19 10298:23 10299:2,3 10357:18 10375:12 10417:20 10421:11 10422:4
S-T-A-R-K 10353:17	screen 10275:22 10406:20	shipment 10377:21	similar 10264:27 10286:23 10388:12 10391:19 10395:20 10396:1 10407:7 10414:16,20 10416:9
sale 10286:18,27 10287:1,18 10298:17 10340:9 10368:10 10388:3	scroll 10392:26 10393:15	shipments 10377:17	similarity 10419:5
sales 10265:13 10268:20 10272:9 10277:24 10278:4, 14,20,24 10279:2,9,13,20 10280:2 10295:12 10308:20 10312:23 10323:2 10365:24 10366:1 10367:17 10369:12, 24 10370:4 10371:21 10385:15 10430:6	seaboard 10407:27	shipped 10277:16,22	Similarly 10296:8
	seasonality 10316:24	shipper 10346:19	similarly-situated 10379:21
	seat 10355:25	shippers 10296:28 10297:12 10298:8 10345:24	simple 10337:17 10423:11
	section 10366:25 10388:2,7 10390:10	shipping 10277:13,17 10304:3 10321:24,27 10322:7 10348:15	simpler 10310:2
	Sector 10284:19 10397:14	ships 10298:5	simplistic 10393:16
	seeks 10384:16	shocked 10346:27	simply 10273:1 10280:14 10281:6,9 10284:12 10300:5 10311:21 10313:19 10344:18 10380:18 10381:28
	select 10267:25 10435:13, 14,16	short 10306:12 10352:2 10374:18	Simulator 10284:19 10397:14
	self-imposed 10371:20		single 10277:14 10338:18 10343:13
	sell 10287:27 10296:6,14 10298:21 10302:24 10325:28 10326:3 10327:6 10339:24 10340:7,15 10344:19 10349:21 10370:25 10385:14 10430:19		



sink 10344:25 10348:3	solids 10265:17,25 10266:2,5,28 10269:14 10271:9 10273:14,17 10279:23	speak 10330:14 10340:22 10344:10 10358:26 10409:21	stand 10274:10 10347:9 10357:24 10399:28 10405:25
sir 10399:18	solution 10424:23	speaking 10352:6 10431:12 10435:23	standard 10295:28 10301:26 10305:13 10345:4,20 10347:16
sisters 10273:16	solutions 10265:1	special 10277:4 10285:13 10342:14 10374:28 10375:2,3,4	standards 10339:5,7,9 10342:12 10345:21 10347:17
sited 10396:10	solve 10338:2 10339:2 10375:8,21	specials 10340:24 10341:19,20	standpoint 10324:18 10346:10 10368:4 10372:17
sitting 10273:16 10423:14 10424:25	solves 10311:16	specialty 10324:18,22 10341:20 10405:28	stark 10353:15,17,21 10418:17,19
situation 10271:4,10 10408:23 10429:23	somatic 10301:2,9,26,28 10302:2,8,17 10303:4,7,10,14,18,19,22 10304:4,10,19,24 10305:11 10349:21,28 10350:6 10384:26 10386:7,11 10387:2	specific 10275:27 10277:7 10287:26 10289:26 10292:8 10316:17 10330:10 10390:19 10391:22 10392:5	start 10275:18 10278:12 10297:7 10299:14 10315:21 10316:8 10318:21 10352:15 10358:10 10361:7 10380:4 10397:11 10402:22 10413:9 10420:5,28
situations 10429:27	sophisticated 10365:6	specifically 10264:19 10280:22 10300:6,26 10313:23 10387:27 10390:28	started 10310:10
size 10320:24 10338:28 10355:26	sort 10405:11,14 10416:25 10418:15,23	speculative 10266:15	starting 10320:15 10380:21 10392:15 10428:19
skim 10264:23 10265:14 10266:8 10269:21 10273:14 10279:23	sorts 10419:20	spell 10262:23 10274:22 10333:11 10355:28 10401:3	startling 10279:4,11
slap 10392:18	sound 10274:8 10330:12 10336:27,28 10401:18 10427:6	spent 10324:17 10393:5	starts 10273:17 10390:19 10406:25
slice 10337:25 10426:19	sounds 10324:19 10330:18 10337:1 10436:20,26	split 10351:19	state 10262:22 10267:28 10268:15 10271:25 10273:24 10274:21 10302:5 10346:6,17 10375:15 10395:19 10396:10 10401:2 10422:3
slide 10283:10,28 10286:4 10287:6 10288:17 10289:3 10290:15 10292:4,25 10294:1 10295:23 10296:15 10298:20,25 10300:2,21 10303:9 10321:17 10343:28 10349:20 10358:11 10365:27 10369:9 10370:5 10373:8 10374:11,25 10376:16 10377:11 10378:19 10379:14 10381:17 10384:5,26 10386:3	sour 10296:2	spoken 10391:7	stated 10271:21 10414:13
slides 10292:14	source 10282:17 10306:13,19 10309:24 10311:22 10313:7 10402:25,27	spore 10342:14,18	statement 10272:6,25 10373:14 10374:13
slightly 10286:3 10294:13 10300:21 10339:21 10348:2	sources 10271:10 10306:12 10309:23 10312:21 10313:5 10403:24	spot 10313:8	statements 10296:16
slope 10362:8,9	south 10288:27 10337:7 10359:14 10374:2,8 10377:17 10394:10,15,19 10395:19 10396:10 10398:2	spread 10407:3	states 10295:3,6 10346:17 10347:3 10348:18 10352:12 10393:27 10411:27 10412:2,4
sloppy 10345:4	Southeast 10293:15 10294:23 10303:27 10317:5 10349:25 10356:17 10357:8,19 10360:6,8 10372:18 10373:19,24 10378:4 10383:8 10384:6,19,25 10386:15,27 10393:27 10394:2,17 10407:9,26 10408:13,14 10415:6 10417:5 10425:27	spreadsheet 10296:20 10312:5 10339:1 10352:4 10398:13 10403:9,10 10404:12,25,27 10431:13	States-produced 10295:8
slow 10376:5 10420:16 10434:6	southern 10377:14 10407:20 10408:8	spreadsheet's 10383:3	stating 10391:17
slower 10276:4	Southwest 10350:8 10426:1	spreadsheets 10291:19 10402:28 10432:2	statistics 10406:1
slowly 10276:19 10278:10 10291:3	space 10357:23	spring 10415:23 10416:2,4,7,8,19,21,23,24 10417:4 10419:6,15	status 10298:27 10299:27 10343:28 10344:3 10348:9,23 10375:28
small 10324:18 10347:25	spatial 10395:1 10406:2	Springfield 10333:27 10334:2,17	stay 10423:8
smaller 10323:8,24,26 10411:9	spatially-related 10406:7	sprinkled 10410:28 10421:22	stays 10378:18
Smith 10335:27 10354:19 10435:18,23		squeezed 10430:8	steadily 10295:21,22
smooth 10346:21		St 10318:28	steady 10278:20
snowstorms 10359:25		stabilizers 10269:19	step 10269:15 10363:7 10433:14
software 10406:3		stable 10382:14	
sold 10264:24 10344:13		stainless 10318:17	
solely 10381:24		stall 10346:6	



Stephenson 10364:11 10378:24 10422:6 10434:15	substitutes 10278:28	10289:23	tabs 10405:8
Steve 10262:10 10263:25 10275:6 10356:9 10396:25 10435:6	substitutions 10308:18	supporting 10357:4	tabular 10412:26
stick 10358:6	subtracted 10313:25,26 10314:1,4	supports 10351:13	tail 10314:24
Stimulator 10284:19	subtracting 10314:6	supposed 10264:28 10375:14 10430:3	takes 10370:18
stops 10407:18	successful 10303:10 10320:9	supposedly 10289:17	taking 10265:8 10269:21 10315:9,10,18 10415:19
store 10305:5 10340:2 10370:24 10381:7	sufficient 10276:9 10321:6 10431:17 10432:10	surface 10326:18 10328:11 10338:26 10372:16 10411:24,25,28	talk 10270:26 10271:3,14 10300:23 10301:17 10307:13 10308:16 10309:7 10314:12 10319:26 10325:27 10343:27 10348:12 10349:1 10361:5 10370:8,10 10375:7,19 10385:7,8 10392:2 10417:24 10422:8 10428:3 10435:26
stores 10340:24 10360:2 10381:6	sugar 10266:3 10269:24	surfaces 10299:9 10377:10	talked 10302:23 10308:23 10322:20 10325:11 10339:19 10342:20 10344:23 10368:7 10377:11 10379:6 10391:24 10397:27 10406:4 10417:22 10430:13
story 10319:4	suggest 10311:7 10329:17 10364:6 10423:28	surplus 10317:19	talking 10300:26 10309:8 10316:11 10320:16 10321:17 10325:15 10326:20 10346:5 10348:19, 21 10349:20 10358:11 10360:26 10365:23 10368:21 10374:25 10375:26,27,28 10376:2,16 10381:18 10384:6,26 10385:12 10386:8,9 10391:21 10410:5,9,10 10411:8 10413:22 10420:1 10425:11 10428:1
strain 10394:20	suggested 10289:6	surpluses 10429:27,28	talks 10370:16 10374:11 10376:7 10379:15
strategy 10308:28	suggestion 10364:8	surprise 10391:1 10394:26 10395:14	tank 10269:21 10273:26 10297:28 10298:3,6
strengthening 10278:27	summarize 10413:2	surprised 10309:3 10385:18 10395:23 10396:4,6 10424:16	tanks 10266:7
stretch 10274:11 10288:9 10306:22 10430:1	summarized 10387:28 10412:26	surprising 10298:1	Target 10339:28
stricter 10347:4	summarizes 10275:14	survive 10323:11 10326:3	Tarrant 10335:12,15,19,21 10336:20
strictly 10272:17	summary 10404:9,10,23	sustain 10429:22	task 10369:2
Strike 10299:14	summer 10370:27 10403:2 10404:15	swear 10263:8	TAYLOR 10269:2 10272:5, 24 10358:2 10373:1 10376:12 10381:16 10387:13
striking 10283:21	super-high 10348:12,13	sweetened 10264:20 10266:20,26 10267:3,10 10268:1,3 10269:25 10271:15,19,23,26,28 10296:1	team 10308:24,27 10364:18 10404:18
stringent 10301:9 10304:25	supplier 10340:3 10360:3 10377:1	sweetener 10266:3	technically 10348:16
strong 10300:16	suppliers 10302:8 10325:10 10360:24,25 10361:2 10363:2 10377:5	switch 10267:18 10270:28 10271:23,27	technician 10274:9
stronger 10347:5	supplies 10277:3 10359:19	switched 10265:25	telling 10269:9 10280:23 10281:23,25 10310:24
structural 10363:15	supply 10270:23 10276:6,9, 11,12,27,28 10277:8,11,14, 20 10284:13,23 10285:19,20 10287:24 10288:6 10290:2 10296:12 10298:10 10301:1 10316:11,25 10317:8 10318:12,14,15,19,21,26 10321:18,20 10322:10,18, 20,23,26 10323:5 10324:25 10358:12,13,14,18,19,21,28 10359:9,10 10360:9,16,18, 22,27 10361:3 10363:4 10370:13,14 10373:21 10375:11,13 10376:9 10378:12 10409:13 10429:18	sworn 10263:10 10274:25 10275:2 10401:22,25	
structure 10323:13	supply/demand 10323:28	syrup 10269:24 10271:19	
structured 10350:24	supplying 10361:2	system 10351:13 10361:28 10362:13 10375:9	
struggle 10325:20 10326:28	support 10275:25,28 10289:21 10317:9,18 10350:13,15,17 10402:12 10428:24,28 10433:24	systems 10405:26 10406:6	
stuck 10267:8	supported 10287:25		
studies 10278:24 10279:1 10303:4		T	
study 10284:20 10289:15,22 10303:2		T-A-R-R-A-N-T 10335:16	
study's 10289:27		tab 10405:6,7	
stuff 10370:24 10410:9		table 10280:7,8 10281:19,21 10283:23 10310:3 10312:3 10402:15 10403:6 10412:27 10413:1 10425:2,4 10427:2	
subheading 10313:22		tables 10310:18 10402:11 10406:11 10427:12	
subject 10292:22 10315:11 10372:7 10385:2 10432:10		tablet 10391:26	
submitted 10277:6			
subsidiary 10264:17			
substantial 10278:20 10410:3 10425:10			
substantially 10418:3 10424:13			



tells 10412:23	theory 10265:17 10269:11	15 10383:16,22 10384:3,4	tough 10367:5
temperature 10266:4 10339:15 10348:10,14,22	thing 10291:27 10301:13 10305:3 10307:3 10308:17 10320:10 10327:14 10329:15 10338:3,24 10348:1 10361:21 10362:8 10368:7 10371:8 10374:3 10378:17 10397:25 10404:21 10405:24 10408:9, 24 10409:12,24 10411:2,11, 28 10412:21 10414:17 10420:24 10425:22 10426:22	10387:13 10393:2,4 10406:5 10408:13 10409:2 10413:16 10415:2,4 10420:12 10424:3 10430:7 10432:4,11 10433:20 10435:20	town 10340:2,3 10354:16
temperatures 10269:26			tracking 10281:1
Temporal 10276:7		times 10264:27 10271:8 10295:2 10297:23 10325:18 10336:5 10339:26 10341:5 10347:26 10360:10 10362:23 10363:22 10378:1 10381:9,10 10383:1,17 10416:16,28	tracks 10424:13
ten 10266:28 10272:1,3 10389:10 10434:16			traditional 10279:14,16 10346:4
ten-minute 10389:9		timing 10357:15	traffic 10289:25 10327:7
tend 10324:24 10342:16 10362:21 10385:10 10405:5	things 10315:22 10320:6 10322:19 10326:25 10344:23 10345:28 10346:22 10347:15 10359:27 10361:9 10362:2 10363:15 10364:14 10368:12 10369:5 10374:1,9 10380:22 10383:18 10401:6 10403:20 10406:1 10411:23 10418:4 10419:23 10420:20 10433:4	tinkering 10364:14,27	transcript 10279:6 10281:21,22 10286:3 10296:26 10397:7
Tennessee 10330:19 10331:13,24 10332:8		tiny 10285:28 10324:21	transfer 10281:13
Tentative 10276:16		title 10276:25 10277:11	transmission 10279:28
term 10269:17 10309:12		titled 10292:25	transportation 10277:4 10289:12,16,17,18,20,27 10290:3,11 10292:20,26 10293:12 10294:18 10315:11,19 10317:4 10319:12 10327:1 10356:17 10361:24 10371:18 10372:19 10373:20 10377:18 10378:21 10379:3 10380:18 10384:6
terms 10355:14 10410:24 10414:26	thinking 10376:19 10410:23 10427:17	today 10263:17 10264:4 10269:5,13 10295:5 10306:11 10307:5 10316:20 10318:2 10323:15 10342:9 10349:12 10351:28 10401:12 10406:26 10408:20,26 10409:10,14,27 10414:2 10415:19 10418:7 10424:25 10428:6,7 10432:11,28 10435:27	trees 10412:7,10,13
tested 10303:22	thinks 10358:17	today's 10314:14	tremendous 10270:20
testified 10263:6,11 10264:26 10266:25 10267:15 10275:3 10290:5 10305:26 10401:19,26 10406:4 10409:5	thinnest 10367:18	told 10273:17 10394:26 10411:18	tremendously 10427:4
testify 10305:28 10306:11 10315:6	thought 10299:1 10322:19 10334:8 10365:6 10368:8,18 10369:27 10386:21 10408:24 10411:5	tools 10340:23	trend 10379:9 10391:11
testifying 10307:5 10406:13 10435:19	thoughts 10414:27 10427:7 10428:23	top 10270:1,2 10293:19 10363:14 10369:25 10379:6 10390:19 10408:7 10413:4, 12	trouble 10309:15 10347:3 10359:25 10360:22 10361:8
testimony 10262:15 10263:17 10264:4,8 10269:7 10275:10,15,20 10279:12 10282:14 10285:12 10287:11 10291:19 10292:6 10296:20,22 10302:5 10310:14 10311:2,5 10314:24 10316:9 10326:16 10342:24 10350:19 10355:11 10356:15 10357:6, 23 10365:2 10374:26,27 10376:17 10379:16 10387:28 10388:4,7,8 10390:6,11,12 10391:6,17, 23 10392:1 10393:5 10396:7 10397:1,2,4,12 10398:11 10400:17 10402:8,12 10403:5 10409:5 10422:5,11 10427:8 10428:21,25 10434:13,14,18,19	three-quarters 10369:22	topic 10277:26 10278:22 10279:2 10282:19,20 10284:1,2,17 10285:9 10288:18,20 10290:1,16 10292:11,12,14 10293:19 10294:1,25,27 10295:10,23, 24 10296:3 10300:22 10301:6,18 10308:8 10360:27	truck 10319:15 10321:4
tests 10344:19	three-year 10353:5	topics 10306:4	true 10318:9,18 10320:2 10326:6 10331:27 10335:20 10336:8 10340:10 10346:1 10355:15 10361:21 10370:1, 2 10387:1 10395:3
Texas 10335:3,16,19,28 10336:12 10416:26 10418:11 10419:19	threshold 10316:16	total 10266:2,28 10276:13, 26,27 10279:13 10280:2,16, 24 10281:6,8,12 10282:5,9 10295:12 10324:20 10358:14 10369:12 10387:6 10412:8 10422:11,20 10427:27 10434:22	trust 10394:23
thankfully 10359:9 10383:26	thrive 10430:11	totally 10380:12	Tuesday 10436:2 10437:1
themselves 10409:22	throat 10288:7 10290:17	totals 10280:19	Tulare 10395:14
theoretically 10424:22	tied 10265:23		turn 10307:2 10309:22 10310:6 10321:14 10328:17, 18 10343:24 10349:19 10353:13 10365:21 10370:5 10381:17 10415:10



typically 10411:8	United 10295:3,7 10325:15 10350:23 10393:27	10362:6 10371:23 10373:25 10382:1,26 10383:1 10391:13,14	viewed 10366:22 10369:26
typo 10283:15	units 10298:3,4	utilizations 10373:15,18,23	views 10287:10
U	universal 10359:28 10421:25	utilized 10289:15 10402:25 10432:5	Virginia 10289:10 10355:8
U.S. 10284:19 10385:15 10397:14 10411:26	University 10284:18,25 10289:14,22,24 10293:22 10353:5,26 10354:23 10397:15 10398:5	V	vis-à-vis 10420:4
ubiquitous 10349:17	unlike 10266:23 10380:12	validate 10405:23	vision 10335:4
Uh-huh 10329:8 10330:21 10367:24 10402:14 10404:14 10411:16 10417:8 10422:3	unreasonable 10391:10	valley 10395:6,11,21,22 10396:12 10397:24	visiting 10336:5
ultimate 10266:13 10321:8	unregulated 10265:10 10266:22 10271:2,8	valuable 10285:25	visualizing 10406:9
ultimately 10324:2 10412:12	unrelated 10300:10	value-added 10366:23	visually 10408:10 10416:8
umbrella 10289:5	unsurprising 10408:25	Vandenheuvel 10387:20,21 10388:8,19,22,25,28 10389:3,8,14,16 10390:4,7 10392:13,17,21 10396:17 10397:3	Vitaliano 10289:6,13
uncertain 10269:17	unusual 10408:21	Vandenheuvel's 10397:12	voice 10262:25 10399:20
unchanged 10306:14,18	up-to-date 10403:21	variable 10425:1	volatile 10384:3,4
uncompetitive 10363:19 10380:6	upcharge 10268:15	variables 10381:28	volume 10263:1 10276:3 10280:12,13 10401:14
uncondensed 10267:3	update 10384:16	variation 10423:6	volunteer 10406:15
unconsumption 10366:22	updated 10363:12 10415:5, 12,15	varied 10285:6,28	vote 10277:7 10351:14
undefined 10289:4	Upper 10270:25 10286:24 10304:1,7,17 10382:18 10383:10 10386:16 10388:12 10391:12,20	varies 10319:18 10424:13 10428:2	voted 10315:11
undergoing 10278:20	ups 10360:20	variety 10427:5	W
undergone 10277:24	urban 10394:16 10395:9	vary 10316:25 10373:3 10422:15,26	W-O-O-S-T-E-R 10356:2,3
understand 10310:23 10311:5,6 10344:2 10363:4 10364:13 10365:8 10372:21 10394:24 10398:1 10406:10 10412:6 10422:6 10423:20 10428:18	USDA 10276:12 10277:1 10280:3,18 10282:8 10284:5,28 10285:1,15,18, 27 10287:20 10288:3 10290:19 10292:9,12,18 10298:28 10299:13,16 10307:15 10308:6 10310:3 10312:2 10316:11,15 10338:2,21 10356:16 10357:8,10 10364:17 10375:27 10386:13 10402:28 10403:15 10429:14 10434:2 10436:7	vast 10265:26 10295:6 10377:5 10403:14	wait 10314:13 10331:9
understanding 10341:27 10366:15 10374:16 10377:26 10380:23 10384:13 10392:3 10412:10 10428:5	USDA's 10350:2 10374:11 10429:13 10430:17	vat 10266:8 10269:28	walk 10292:14,24 10300:28 10316:5,6 10324:25 10420:7
understated 10289:27	USDSS 10284:20 10368:24 10380:17 10394:27 10395:16,23 10420:4 10422:13,22 10423:6 10427:20	vegetables 10340:20	walking 10350:26
understood 10397:2,4 10423:10	user 10267:24 10271:25	venture 10318:23 10336:6 10337:14	walls 10299:9 10348:3
undervaluing 10363:19	utilization 10272:17 10273:19 10276:25 10286:22 10295:11,15 10304:6,17,18 10316:15	verification 10432:11	Walmart 10339:28
uneconomic 10377:17		version 10306:15,17 10310:19,27 10314:15 10398:13,14	waning 10317:24
unevenly 10284:3,18 10286:16 10288:18 10289:11		versus 10292:26 10298:24 10313:23,27 10345:18,23 10348:12 10358:26 10386:16 10409:19 10424:17 10425:25	wanted 10300:7 10344:20 10351:15 10370:10 10375:1 10384:4
unfortunate 10323:3,15		vertical 10417:19	wanting 10327:6
uniformly 10285:3 10290:13		view 10315:24 10318:5 10345:18 10364:5 10371:7 10375:18 10377:2,8 10378:2,16 10397:13 10404:27	wash 10344:25
unimportant 10411:14			watch 10416:12 10432:9
unique 10284:8 10342:5,7 10414:2 10415:26,28			watching 10391:26
unit 10297:28 10298:6			water 10375:20 10406:6
			Wayne 10329:20,22,27 10330:13,14 10354:9,16,17 10355:23,26
			ways 10324:13 10337:25 10366:4 10395:20 10401:13 10426:19 10427:5,18
			weaker 10321:28



Weather 10322:27	witnesses 10285:10 10286:19 10287:25 10288:23 10289:19 10338:1, 10 10391:21 10433:23,24,25 10434:14,20 10435:9,12	10387:27 10388:7 10391:7 10392:9 10397:4 10398:11 10402:8 10422:10 10424:1
website 10403:18,19	wizards 10404:23	wrong 10366:15 10411:6
week 10340:13	wondered 10270:5	wrote 10391:4 10392:3,4
weeks 10431:11	wonderful 10383:26 10436:20	<hr/> X <hr/>
weight 10308:7	wonderfully 10378:8	Xs 10412:19,23
weighted 10310:1,4 10311:26 10314:6 10382:25	wondering 10373:13	<hr/> Y <hr/>
weird 10359:7	Wooster 10319:2 10354:12 10355:24,25 10356:1	ya 10347:12
well-running 10344:14	Wooster's 10354:16	year 10268:7 10282:10 10295:16 10299:6,10 10300:15 10340:17 10346:8, 10 10347:20 10360:10 10374:23
west 10289:10 10351:3 10375:20 10394:3 10409:4 10421:21,26,27 10424:17	word 10283:21 10291:24 10296:26 10309:10,14 10310:20 10316:18 10388:16 10390:27 10391:1, 6 10434:6	year-round 10371:2
western 10290:14 10421:20	wording 10286:4	years 10266:28 10268:2 10279:26 10295:14 10303:25 10304:13 10364:7 10366:27 10367:1 10371:14 10376:8 10387:9
wet 10288:7	words 10286:8,25 10287:15 10311:4	yellow 10393:21 10406:28 10408:6 10423:24
whatsoever 10295:7	work 10268:9 10308:10 10309:1 10312:26 10318:20 10319:28 10320:21 10351:18 10361:11 10364:11,14 10367:5 10371:24 10372:24,28 10381:28 10406:8,16 10433:11	yesterday 10262:7 10273:11 10339:27 10365:7 10378:24 10422:5
wheelhouse 10405:21	workbook 10405:6	yield 10305:6
whew 10295:26,27 10296:8, 10 10300:19 10324:1 10327:20 10344:20	worked 10327:4 10359:10 10365:8 10366:28 10405:23	yogurt 10266:23 10296:2,10 10362:15
whiskers 10412:25	working 10308:16 10317:5 10318:20 10320:14 10321:12 10324:17 10372:16 10405:27	York 10346:6
white 10279:14 10407:15 10421:1,2,7 10423:23	works 10274:9 10364:13 10385:13	<hr/> Z <hr/>
whitewashing 10299:11	world 10265:18 10318:1,9 10385:11 10404:27 10424:24	zone 10326:26
whoa 10317:11 10343:18	worn 10323:6	zoned 10417:20
wholly 10357:12	worried 10346:7	
wholly-owned 10264:16	worries 10286:11	
wicked 10364:3	worse 10273:18 10325:12	
wide 10382:15	worth 10335:7,18 10336:23 10337:8 10355:7	
wider 10413:15	written 10262:15 10263:17 10264:4 10275:10,15 10282:14 10291:18 10296:22 10302:5 10376:22	
widest 10419:16		
Winchester 10289:10		
wind 10429:26		
winds 10429:25		
winners 10266:18 10270:3 10326:15 10329:15 10361:12 10364:1,15 10367:12		
Wisconsin 10264:14 10270:25 10284:18,26 10289:15,22,24 10293:23 10353:5,27 10354:23 10365:5 10397:15,27 10398:5 10416:26 10419:20 10421:10		
wisdom 10399:22		
witness's 10390:5		

