

NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING

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

Before the Honorable Channing D. Strother, Judge

---000---

Carmel, Indiana
September 1, 2023

---000---

Reported by:

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

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



TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS September 01, 2023 NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING

		<u> </u>	_
1	MASTER INDE	X	
2	SESSIONS		
3	FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 2023	PAGE	
4	MORNING SESSION AFTERNOON SESSION	1767 1865	
5	AT THROOM BUBBION	1003	
6			
7	000		
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20 21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			



1	MACTEDINDEY		
	MASTER INDEX		
2	WITNESSES IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER		
3	WITNESSES: PAGE		
4	Darin Hanson:		
5	Redirect Examination by Ms. Hancock Recross-Examination by Mr. Rosenbaum	1769 1771	
6 7	Paul Bauer:		
8	Direct Examination by Ms. Hancock Cross-Examination by Mr. English	1775 1794	
9	Cross-Examination by Mr. Miltner Cross-Examination by Dr. Cryan	1806 1813	
10	Cross-Examination by Mr. Rosenbaum Cross-Examination by Ms. Taylor	1814 1832	
11	Josh Tranel:		
12	Testimony Read Into the Record Cross-Examination by Ms. Taylor	1866 1873	
13	Gerben Leyendekker:		
14	Testimony Read Into the Record	1879	
15	Cross-Examination by Ms. Taylor	1883	
16	Raymond Diedrich:		
17 18	Testimony Read Into the Record Cross-Examination by Dr. Cryan Cross-Examination by Ms. Taylor	1886 1889 1891	
19	Jared Fernandes:		
20	Direct Examination by Ms. Hancock	1894	
21	Cross-Examination by Mr. Miltner Cross-Examination by Dr. Cryan	1899 1900	
22	Michael Crinion:		
23	Direct Examination by Ms. Taylor Cross-Examination by Dr. Cryan	1904 1907	
24		100,	
25	Kristopher Scheider:		
26	Direct Examination by Ms. Hancock Cross-Examination by Dr. Cryan Cross-Examination by Ms. Taylor	1909 1914 1916	
27	CLOSS Examinación by Mb. Taylor	1710	
28			



1	MASTER INDEX		
2	WITNESSES IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER WITNESSES:	PAGE	
3		FAGE	
4	Lorie Cashman:		
5	Direct Examination by Mr. Hill Cross-Examination by Mr. Rosenbaum	1922 1927	
б	Cross-Examination by Dr. Cryan Cross-Examination by Mr. Miltner	1929 1930	
7	Christian Edmiston:		
8	Direct Examination by Ms. Hancock Cross-Examination by Mr. Rosenbaum	1932 1937	
9	Cross-Examination by Dr. Cryan	1955 1955 1959	
10	Cross-Examination by Mr. Miltner	1959	
11	000		
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			



		EKAL MILK MAKKETING OKDEK		
1		MASTER	INDEX	
2		INDEX OF EX	KHIBITS	
3	NO.	DESCRIPTION	I.D.	EVD.
4	119	Testimony of Paul Bauer	1776	1863
5 6	120	Testimony of Josh Tranel	1866	1876
7	121	MIG-7	1866	1876
8	122	Testimony of Gerben Leyendekker	1879	1886
9	123	Testimony of Jared Fernandes	1894	1902
11	124	Testimony of Michael Crinion	1904	1908
12 13	125	Testimony of Kristopher Scheider	1909	1917
14	59	Document	1923	1931
15	126	Testimony of Christian Edmiston	1933	
16		000-		
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				



1 FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 2023 - - MORNING SESSION 2. THE COURT: On the record. Good morning. Mr. English. 3 4 MR. ENGLISH: Good morning, your Honor. Chip 5 English for the Milk Innovation Group. And so overnight looking at the schedule and having conversations by e-mail 6 7 and otherwise early this morning, the lawyers who are here 8 have had a discussion about the submission deadline for 9 Issue 5, which is presently set for Wednesday, 10 September 13th. We have also consulted with USDA. 11 And I had a request, and National came back with a 12 response. And we have settled on a proposed resolution 13 where we are agreeing and we're asking that that deadline for Issue 5 submissions, instead of being 8 a.m. on 14 15 Wednesday the 13th, be Saturday night -- Sunday morning --16 at midnight, basically midnight Saturday night the 16th, 17 September 16th. Eastern Time. Eastern Time, yes. 18 not going to get to the -- I quarantee you, it is Eastern 19 Time. I don't stay up that late. 20 And I believe I'm correctly stating what the 2.1 compromise is, and I want to express my gratefulness for 22 the fact that parties either said they had no position or 23 they were okay. And my understanding is USDA is also okay 24 with moving that one deadline. 25 MS. TAYLOR: That's fine. 26 MR. HILL: That's correct.



27

28

parties being able to work well together on this.

THE COURT: Okay. Great. I also appreciate the

1	that works for me if it works for you all.
2	Which I'm sorry, Mr. English, I shouldn't let
3	you walk away. Which
4	MR. ENGLISH: So this is Issue 5, which is
5	Proposals 19, 20, and 21. 19 is submitted by National
6	Milk; 20 is by the Milk Innovation Group; and 21 is
7	American Farm Bureau. And so, again, the deadlines will
8	be moved to midnight Eastern on Saturday, the 16th.
9	THE COURT: Very good, sir.
10	MR. ENGLISH: Thank you.
11	And I appreciate USDA, National Milk, and also
12	having consulted both with IDFA and the lawyer for Select.
13	And I am grateful. Thank you.
14	THE COURT: Very good, sir.
15	Ms. Hancock rises.
16	Good morning, Ms. Hancock.
17	MS. HANCOCK: Good morning, your Honor. And just
18	to the extent you want it on the record, we agree, think
19	that that's the right plan.
20	And then one more other administrative matter. We
21	had Darin Hanson testify yesterday. We left one issue
22	outstanding that USDA had asked about on a citation, and
23	we would like to just put him on really briefly just to
24	clear up that citation issue so that we can move on to the
25	next witness.
26	THE COURT: Yes.
27	Welcome back T won't swear you in again Let's



just say you are still under oath.

1 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 2. So -- should I just get started? 3 MS. HANCOCK: Hang on one second. 4 THE WITNESS: Okay. REDIRECT EXAMINATION 5 BY MS. HANCOCK: 6 7 Ο. Good morning, Mr. Hanson. Thank you for following up from your testimony yesterday. We were looking at your 8 9 testimony, which has been admitted as Exhibit 117. 10 Do you have a copy of that in front of you? 11 Α. Yes. 12 And there were two questions that the USDA asked 13 that we left outstanding to address, the first one of 14 which was addressing your Table 4, which I believe is on 15 page 7 of your testimony, right? 16 Α. Correct. 17 Ο. And there was a question with respect to whether 18 those were weekly or monthly calculations there? 19 I spoke to the analyst on my team who put Α. Yes. the table together. That's weekly data, weighted average 2.0 2.1 block and barrel weekly with prices. 22 Ο. Okav. 23 And it is aggregated into a monthly price. Α. 24 All right. Thank you for that. Ο. 25 The other question was with respect to the table 26 in which you have your calculation of 9% showing that 27 that's the percentage that barrels make up of the cheese 28 market?



A. Yes, that's correct.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. And let me try to find that page number.

 That's on page 8 of your testimony, Table 5?
- A. Uh-huh. Correct.
- Q. And I think there was a question because cheddar barrels are not reported at the citation that you have there. I'm wondering if you could tell us how it is that you got to that 9% calculation?
- A. Right. So the 1.2 billion barrel pound number, that's an estimate based on, you know, my experience in the industry and data that we collect. That 1.2 billion is a total capacity of barrel production.

And that's what we have outlined in that first paragraph on that page, where it says that total barrel cheese production in the U.S. is estimated at 1.2 billion pounds annually, which is only 9%. And then we took that barrel production capacity from all cheddar cheese production that was -- that came from the USDA to arrive at block production and then barrel production.

So I just wanted to make it clear that in that Table 5 that cheddar barrel is my estimate of what total barrel production capacity is in the U.S.

- Q. And the other items that are noted in Table 5, that comes from the source that's listed there below that?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And when you say the cheddar barrel estimate was based on the total cheese production capacity in the United States, does that mean that that 9% would be as if



1 it was at maximum capacity? 2. Α. Correct. And so if that amount went down and there was a Ο. 3 4 barrel production at something less than 100% capacity, that 9% number could potentially be less? 5 6 Α. Correct. 7 And could it go higher? No, because the capacity number is -- would be the 8 Α. maximum of what that could be. 9 10 Okay. So when you were talking about the 9% not Ο. being reflected in the cheese -- the 9% of barrel 11 12 production not being accurately reflected in the cheese 13 prices, it actually could be worse than what you even 14 talked about in your testimony? 15 Α. Correct. 16 Okay. Thank you for that clarification. Ο. 17 appreciate it. 18 MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, we would submit him for 19 any questions that anybody has. 2.0 THE COURT: Yes. 2.1 Cross-examination, Mr. Rosenbaum. 22 RECROSS-EXAMINATION 23 BY MR. ROSENBAUM: 2.4 Steve Rosenbaum for the International Dairy Foods Ο. 25 Association. 26 Just following up on this explanation about 27 Table 5, and I'd like to compare Table 5 to Table 2, which



28

is on page 5 of your report. So if I understand you

correctly, you have explained that the cheddar barrel figure you have here is your own estimate in Table 5 as opposed to a USDA reported number.

A. Correct.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

19

2.4

25

26

27

- Q. And Table 2, by contradistinction, that is -those are actually USDA figures as to how many pounds of
 barrel cheese is included in the survey that is then used
 to set the minimum price as compared to how many pounds of
 blocks are included, correct?
- 10 A. Correct.
- 11 Q. And those are -- those are roughly -- those are 12 fairly close to each other --
- 13 A. Right.
 - 0. -- correct?
- In terms of total pounds of block versus total pound of barrels, correct?
- 17 A. The survey volumes?
- 18 Q. Exactly.
 - A. They are similar, yes.
- Q. Okay. Now, yesterday, you recall, I showed you the regulation which was marked as -- as marked and admitted as Hearing Exhibit 118 as to the criteria for inclusion in the survey, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. And do you recall that one of the criteria is -- strike that. Let me start that question over again.
 - Do you recall that both for barrel cheese and for block cheese, one requirement is that the cheese can be



not less than four days or more than 30 days old on the date of sale?

A. Correct.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. And is that the reason why there are more barrels, relatively speaking, than -- than block cheese in the survey, namely it is much more common to hold block cheese before sale for more than 30 days?
- A. I don't believe so. I think most cheese, whether it is block and barrel, is sold when it is less than 30 days. And with blocks, there's an age requirement anyway. If it goes for aging, it can't be included in the survey.
- Q. Right. And that's what I'm saying. Isn't it that you are, in the industry -- I don't mean you personally -- but in the industry, it is more common to hold block cheese for that purpose?
 - A. For the purpose of aging, yeah.
 - Q. Than barrel, correct?
- A. Correct. I mean, you can hold barrel longer than that too, but it is for a different purpose. And that -- those volumes do get included in the survey.
- Q. The cheese that -- any -- the cheese that -- any cheese that is -- that meets the other specifications and is more than four days old and less than 30 days old will be included in the survey, correct?
- A. Correct, unless it -- yeah, unless it is block for aging.
 - Q. Okay. And there's -- from a -- from a finished



product point of view, there is, generally speaking, not a reason to age barrel cheese if it's going to be turned into processed cheese; is that fair to say?

- A. Generally, that's true.
- Q. Okay. Whereas, by contradistinction, there are certain cheeses that are made out of block cheese that -- for which aging is an important component of the process, correct?
 - A. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

- Q. And is it your understanding the reason why there is this 30-day limit is because the effort here is to determine the relationship between price at which cheese is sold and the cost of production and things of that nature, and if you were to include cheese that were old, that you would have a -- relatively speaking, old, you would have a disconnect potentially between those two?
- A. Right. I think the demand for cheese is less than 30 days. So that's when people want to make that transaction. Once you start getting past 30 days, there's going to be less demand for that -- in general, less demand for that cheese. They want to keep it in that window where the supply and demand is the most effective.
 - O. Thank you.
 - MR. ROSENBAUM: That's all I have.
- 25 | THE COURT: Any further cross-examination?
- 26 | Redirect?
- 27 | MS. HANCOCK: I have nothing further, your Honor.
- Thank you, Mr. Hanson, for your time.



1		THE WITNESS: Thank you.
2		THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Hanson.
3		Thank you, all counsel, for the diligence and care
4	in crea	ting a clear record.
5		MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, we call Paul Bauer as
6	our next	t witness.
7		THE COURT: Raise your right hand.
8		PAUL BAUER,
9		Being first duly sworn, was examined and
10		testified as follows:
11		THE COURT: Your witness, Ms. Hancock.
12		MS. HANCOCK: Thank you, your Honor.
13		DIRECT EXAMINATION
14	BY MS. 1	HANCOCK:
15	Q.	Good morning, Mr. Bauer.
16		Would you mind stating and spelling your name for
17	the rec	ord, please?
18	Α.	Paul Bauer. Paul, P-A-U-L, Bauer, B-A-U-E-R.
19	Q.	And could you provide your mailing address, your
20	busines	s mailing address?
21	Α.	232 North Wallace Street, Ellsworth, Wisconsin
22	5441.	
23	Q.	Did you where are you employed
24	Α.	Excuse me. 54011.
25	Q.	Okay. I thought there was a number short in
26	there.	I looked at the court reporter, and she seemed to
27		so I thought it was all right.
28		Where are you employed?



NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING 1 Α. The Ellsworth Cooperative Creamery. 2. Ο. And where is it located? In Ellsworth, Wisconsin. 3 Α. Okay. Did you prepare a testimony in preparation 4 Ο. for the hearing and in support of National Milk's barrel 5 elimination proposal? 6 7 Α. I did. And is that what's been identified as Exhibit 8 Ο. 9 NMPF-8? 10 Α. Yes. MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, if we could mark this as 11 12 the next exhibit for identification purposes. 13 THE COURT: Yes, 119. 14 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 119 was marked 15 for identification.) 16 MS. HANCOCK: Thank you. 17 BY MS. HANCOCK: 18 Mr. Bauer, would you mind providing us with your Ο. 19 prepared testimony? 2.0 My name is Paul Bauer, and since 2008 I've been Α. 2.1 the CEO and general manager of the Ellsworth Cooperative 22 Creamery (Ellsworth), headquartered in Ellsworth. 23 worked 30 plus years in various senior leadership roles 24 with other cheese cooperatives and private companies.

Ellsworth Cooperative Creamery has been in business since 1910 and has 220 member-owners producing 777 million pounds of milk annually. Ellsworth has three dairy processing operations with 380 employees. In the



25

26

27

Village of Ellsworth, Wisconsin, we have a barrel plant in which we sort cheese curds to sell at retail and to sell in bulk to other businesses. At this location, we operate a sweet drying whey plant which we sell condensed whey, as well as a separate retail packaging operation for cheese curds.

Our Menomonie, Wisconsin plant makes 40-pound block cheese products, including #2 yellow USDA graded cheddar, cheese in horns, and traditional brined Muenster Cheese. The plant also has a cut-and-wrap operation. Our New London, Wisconsin plant makes American processed cheese into 42-pound blocks to 2.5 pound loafs. In all, we manufacture over 130 million pounds of cheese a year.

I am here in support of removing the 500-pound barrel ungraded USDA barrel cheese from the protein price calculation. The Federal Milk Marketing Order (FMMO) currently includes this value while the entire industry has changed since it was included.

The original concept to include the 500-pound barrel cheddar cheese price series in the Class III price calculation was to get more input tonnage for the use in estimating the most accurate price of cheese sales into the market. The 500-pound barrel cheese price incorporated adjustments to get to a synthetic 40-pound block cheddar cheese price.

Today, including the 500-pound barrel cheese prices is doing the very opposite of what was intended by creating disorderly marketing in the FMMOs by artificially



2.

2.1

pulling down the price that do not correlate to the actual market, resulting in a reduction in Class III prices for dairy farmers.

The protein component value in the FMMO is the only value to use two different products to price a series to establish its value. The number of pounds and value of barrel cheese, adjusted to represent 40-pound block cheese equivalent, and #2 yellow cheddar cheese sold to external customers are reported to establish an average price of cheese and to be used to calculate the protein price. The volume of each type of cheese is reported and averaged so the number of barrels or blocks will change over time.

Since the volume varies by week, there is the added variability and volatility to the price discovery process. The FMMOs have allowed the use of the two different products to set the cheese price used in the calculation of the Class III protein price. No other component has this set up.

Whereas the 40-pound block cheddar cheese has a robust market and many uses, 500-pound barrel cheese is singularly focused on processed cheese, a market driven by a few processors and purchasers. The smaller statistical information captured by including the barrel cheese results in skewing, rather than making the market more accurate. The actual cheese price in the market because of this small market report can be entirely disconnected from the rest of the cheese market.

The long-term fix is to have the protein price



2.

2.1

based off the same single block market. By continuing the use of two markets of blocks and barrels, the industry has no reason to change off of one market.

Impact to the Ellsworth Producers: The difference between blocks and barrels on average has been stable prior to 2017. Since 2017, the price differences between blocks and barrels have led to disorderly marketing of milk in cheese processing areas of the FMMOs with barrel cheese manufacturing.

Producers who ship to these plants producing barrel cheese are paid significantly less than they were able to pay Federal Order minimums for price -- for milk since the barrel cheese price is too low. Ellsworth producers, for example, are losing \$0.84 per hundredweight through April of 2023.

One of the intents of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 (reenacted with amendments by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, Reference 2) was to provide orderly marketing for the commodity at the farm gate price against variations in supply and demands from larger processors.

The introduction of the FMMOs was meant to create a more stable method to price milk and create rules preventing processors from having significant market power over producers. With the inclusion of barrels within the Class III formula, this results in having two separate products price the same protein value that is being used to effectively negate the intent of FMMOs.



2.

2.1

The industry has changed, and the adjusted barrel price is no longer a good substitute for pricing block cheese. Thus, having barrel cheese not represent a fair price to calculate protein in cheese is the exact opposite of the intent of the orders.

The continued market disruption caused by the widening and increased unpredictable spread between prices of 40-pound block cheese and 500-pound barrel cheese is affecting the members of Ellsworth Cooperative Creamery and other cooperatives that produce barrel cheese.

Since 2017, our members have received \$0.84 per hundredweight less than those counterpart cooperatives without a barrel operation. This difference in value "impairs the purchasing power of farmers and destroys the value of agricultural assets." Because of this, pricing is not accurately reflected in the market pricing.

The \$0.84 per hundredweight means less money to Ellsworth producers, their families, farms, and communities. It also means the cooperative has less money to reinvest in assets to produce barrel cheese or keep them as a viable asset to process milk. Long-term, the lack of return will make barrel cheese production economically obsolete in Federal Milk Marketing Orders.

Barrel cheese and block cheese cannot be substituted at an equal exchange. White cheddar packaged in 500-pound barrels is almost exclusively used for the production of processed cheese. Processed cheese's main customers are restaurants and fast-food outlets.



2.

2.0

2.1

Because the current standard for processed cheese is 500-pound barrels of ungraded white cheddar, a 40-pound block of yellow cheese cannot easily be substituted. The color in the block cheese would make some substitutions impossible. The moisture difference would, again, change the recipe and ingredient statements to some of the processed cheese. A complete substitution between the two products would not be possible or accepted for the majority of the processed cheese industry -- cheese manufacturers and processed cheese buyers.

According to the USDA in 2020, 2.399 billion pounds of processed cheese was produced. According to the information from Dairy Farmers of Wisconsin (the dairy marketing checkoff group for Wisconsin dairy farmers), the retail market for processed cheese was approximately 165.1 million pounds of cheese in 2020. The remaining 2.234 billion pounds of processed cheese volume was used for food service, or 93.1% of the volume.

The best answer to address this issue is to price protein off of one market and support the NMPF proposal to not include barrel cheese in the calculation of protein. The answer is not to proportion 500-pound barrel cheese and 40-pound blocks in the formula as it would continue the industry to use two markets in support of the value. In essence, that would tend to blend the barrel price problem which would make it worse for producers who ship to barrel plants. In 2020, it would make the payment to producers and barrel plants an additional \$0.90 less than



2.

2.0

2.1

non-barrel processors (Table 5).

2.

2.0

2.1

Table 2 was taken from reported information from USDA website in 2020. Cheddar cheese was 30% of the total cheese produced, reported to NDPSR for blocks was 4% of all cheese, barrels represented 5% of all cheese. This means 9% of the nation's cheese production was reported and used in the Class III protein price.

When considering just cheddar cheese, the total reported volume was just 31%, with blocks being 13 and barrels being 17. In the end, 93% of cheddar cheese production is most likely priced off of -- is not priced off of barrels.

So if we assumed a blended price for which barrel cheese is 17% of all cheese, and then 93% is block cheese, it further concentrates barrels and provides a wider gap on what can be paid to producers who own and operate barrel cheese plants.

The value of cheese used in the calculation goes from \$1.80 per pound to \$1.95 per pound for the calculation of cheese. This will raise Class III price, but it will make it harder for producers with milk going to barrel cheese plants to get paid that value. This will tend to lead to further disorderly marketing in Federal Milk Marketing Orders.

The Table 4 above shows the different values as it works through the same model to calculate Class III price. The normal calculation shows a 17.81 value per hundredweight, and the second run using the 17% barrel



model shows an 18.71 value per hundredweight. So using the weighted model, it makes it worse for producers of barrel operation and creates more disorderly marketing. Producers in the orders shipping to barrel plants would receive \$0.80 less per hundredweight in barrel weighted option.

The best -- excuse me -- I support the National Milk Producers Federation proposal to remove the 500-pound barrels from the calculated -- calculation to establish the protein price in milk. By amending the Class III protein price, though it is based off of only money, one market, all components will be treated the same. Having a single market provides needed tools to processors and producers alike.

I fully recognize that barrel processors and processed cheese producers will need to find a new method to price cheese. However, the simple answer is to base Class III milk pricing on 40-pound block cheese market. Doing so will lead to greater stability in the MMOs.

Thank you for your time, and I hope the Milk Marketing Orders can be amended to treat all farmers fairly. Thank you.

O. Thank you, Mr. Bauer. I appreciate that.

I just have a couple of questions. One, I just want to do a quick correction. If you turn to page 6 of your testimony.

Under the first full paragraph that starts off with Table 2. The last sentence there, it says, "In the



2.

2.1

end, 83% of cheddar cheese production is most likely not priced off barrels."

Do you see that?

A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. I think when you were reading that you said 93%, and I just want to make sure what your testimony -- whether your verbal testimony or your written testimony is correct.
- A. It's ninety- -- excuse me, 83. If I read it wrong, I apologize.
- 11 Q. That's okay.

And then it's repeated again on the first sentence of the next paragraph, another 83%. That's correct, it should be 83%; is that right?

- A. That is right.
- Q. Okay. And -- and so the point that you are making there is that 83% of the cheddar cheese production is most likely not produced off of barrels. That's using that 9% threshold that we heard about from Mr. Hanson; is that right?
- 21 A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. And did you get there in a different way than Mr. Hanson did?
 - A. I did. I only used USDA numbers that were available off their website.
 - Q. And even just using those numbers, you still got to the same 9% estimate of barrels represented in the cheese prices?



A. Correct.

2.

2.1

Q. On the first page of your testimony, and I think you say it again, something similar later on, the last sentence of the first page says, "Today, including the 500-pound barrel cheese price -- prices is doing the very opposite of what was intended by creating disorderly marketing in the Federal Milk Marketing Orders by artificially pulling down prices that do not correlate to the actual market, resulting in a reduced Class III price for dairy farmers."

Is that the point of National Milk's proposal in eliminating barrels?

- A. Yes. It's to increase the value to farmers, and as we heard from yesterday's testimony, it is approximately \$2 billion that in the last -- since 2017, that dairy farmers have not received because of this calculation.
- Q. Okay. And when you say "disorderly marketing," I am wondering if you could tell us what that means to you.
- A. Well, in a Federal Milk Marketing Order, when they announce a Class III price, that is in relevance what would be the market-clearing price in order to stay on the order, having a barrel plant means you can't pay that. We do not have the ability on our barrel operation alone to sufficiently pay the Class III price.
 - Q. Okay. Why is that?
- A. Because the value we receive is less than in the last six years because of various factors.



- Q. And -- and what do you mean by "market-clearing price"?
- A. So the Federal Milk Marketing Order sets a minimum Class III price, and it is -- if you pool milk, unless -- you are expected to pay that price to all farmers equally.
 - Q. And maybe I back up a smidge here.

What -- what products do you -- do you use to make processed cheese?

A. We use barrel cheese, predominantly, and then, it's approximately 60% depending on the recipe and the type of cheese that we use. And then we use other market-clearing cheeses in the industry in order to make the rest of that process.

So at 2.3 billion pounds of processed cheese we estimate only 1.2 billion pounds of barrel cheese of maximum capacity. That difference of 1.1 billion pounds is other cheese in the industry that has not found a home or needs a market-clearing price.

So in reality, processed cheese is really the market-clearing aspect to the market when it comes to cheese.

- Q. Do you consider barrels to be a market-clearing product?
- A. Absolutely not. Our plant has its production sold out through 2024. That would not indicate that we are a market-clearing price.

In the making of processed cheese, you have your base cheese that you -- you make, and then as you find



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Okay. So if I'm understanding you correctly, you said that you are sold out until 2024. So you use the maximum capacity of barrels that you can get, and then you have to look to other market-clearing products in order to supplement, in order to make your processed products?
 - A. And we also buy additional barrels as well.
 - Q. Okay. From other -- other providers?
 - A. That is correct.
 - Q. Okay. And are processed cheese sales going down?
- A. In total, no. Processed cheese sales are actually going up. And it is a change in demographics. What's a little misleading is that retail processed cheese is going down, but the trend to eat away from home is continuing to grow, and food service processed cheese sales are quite strong and robust.
- Q. So while overall it's your experience that processed cheese sales are going up, a large portion of what's driving that is coming from the food service industry?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. Okay. I just want to maybe expand on a couple of the tables and the data points that you have in your testimony. Could you turn to page 3? I'm looking at Table 1 where you have the impact to your producers of the



2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

spread between blocks and barrels.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

In the title there it says that you have the spread between the blocks and barrels beyond the \$0.03 per pound. I'm wondering if you could just take us through this calculation and let us know what you have factored in here.

- A. So in the first column we have the average monthly price for barrels, just a simple average for the month and the average for blocks. And that spread is \$0.08. We made 65 million pounds of cheese priced off the barrel market. That's the number of producers that we had. The difference between that \$0.08 and then three times the number of pounds of cheese that we make came up to \$3 million divided by the total number of producer pounds.
- Q. Okay. So in this example that you are walking through in 2017, it resulted in a negative \$0.43 per hundredweight?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. Okay. And then you did that for each of the years that you have listed here. And it looks like you have year to date, in 2023 -- and I say year to date, but you have through April of 2023; is that right?
- A. Correct. That's when I put this information together, that was the most current information I had.
- Q. Okay. And so since 2017, it's an \$0.84 per hundredweight negative number; is that fair?
 - A. That is correct.
 - Q. And -- and if you look at these numbers prior to



2017, what did you see?

2.

2.1

- A. Historically, it was within that \$0.03 range.

 There were a few years that were slightly higher and a few years that were slightly lower but no significant impact.
- Q. Okay. And what is it that you believe is contributing to the market changing so much in 2017 that's driving this volatility that you have described?
- A. I think there are several factors, not one single factor, that are leading to the widening of this gap.

One is how the product is sold on the CME. We have seen dramatic volume increase in the CME since 2017. We have also seen a change in the cheese being sold. The specifications that were outlined earlier do not include a milk test on the cheese or the ability of the cheese to function, which is why our cheese production in our plants is sold out because it is a very consistent function, whereas the cheese sold primarily on the exchange is unknown to the end purchaser of what kind of cheese that will be and how it will process in their mix.

In addition, the cost of transportation from that cheese -- as all cheese on the exchange, on the CME, the transportation allowance is huge. And that also factors into the price discovery.

Historically, I -- I -- I can only say anecdotally because I don't have data for this, but I do believe it to be accurate -- the vast majority of cheese sold on the cheese exchange comes from unregulated Western markets that has a high cost of transportation to get back to the



processing plants that are primarily located in the Midwest.

In addition, we have seen difficulties in the market on new arbitrage products that are created, and that creates less opportunity for producers of barrel cheese and processors to mitigate their risk versus other types of basically cheddar block cheese.

All those I think are leading to a significant change. It's not just one factor, it's several factors.

- Q. And do you anticipate that those items could settle down in the future in a way that would make barrels less volatile and make the current pricing formula a more viable option going forward into the future?
- A. I don't. I actually see it getting more volatile in the future. One aspect of processed cheese making is, is the base cheese needs to be under 30 days of age to get the proper body of it.

So last year we saw a rise, somewhat -- a more normalcy in the market where barrel cheese was higher because fresh cheese was short. Cheese can be stored, but in making processed cheese, it is -- they need a certain requirement, depending on what they make, needs to be -- have a firm body, meaning under 30 days.

When that happens, then the market is short, and therefore barrels move up. They certainly may have other products in the mix. Certainly they use 640s, blocks.

Mozzarella is used. Everything is used in processed cheese.



2.

2.1

Q. Okay. I want to turn now, you have some testimony about some efforts that you undertook to explore whether barrels could just be reweighted in the formula calculations to just have it be better reflected in the cheese prices.

And can you just tell me a little bit more about what process you went through to make that evaluation and then ultimately what your conclusion was?

A. Well, when you -- when you use the USDA numbers, it varies every year. So what weight do you put on barrel cheese? I used a point in time of 2020 because that's when I pulled the numbers to review it. I've been reviewing this for many years because, obviously, it's a huge financial impact to our producers.

And it -- it has the fundamental problem of legitimizing barrel cheese as a synthetic substitute for 40-pound block cheese. And unless the market removes that barrier, it will still continue to suffer low prices and less income to producers. So all it does is legitimizes two component -- two product calculation for a component price, where none of the other component prices has that aspect to it.

- Q. Okay. So in your opinion, can barrels be reweighted in a way that can take out some of that effect that would allow it, though, to be brought with what you would believe to be more of an orderly market condition?
- A. No, it will actually legitimize a slight flaw in the Federal Milk Marketing Order system.



2.

2.1

Q. And --

2.

2.1

- A. At the end of the day, the industry -- excuse me. And at the end of the day, the industry needs to price cheese protein off of one source, just like all the other commodities. And when that is achieved, then we can have -- every other cheese product -- or every other dairy product has one market that they price off of, and then we can establish whether that's a good price or a bad price. With this volatility, it almost makes it impossible to continue the way it is.
- Q. Are you concerned that by removing the volume of barrels out of the cheese pricing, that somehow the statistical sampling of the pool is too small?
- A. I would contend that having a statistical sample with erroneous numbers in it actually gives us a false reading on where the market is going. By having accurate, even though they are smaller numbers, gives a better reading to the industry of where it should be going.
- Q. And I think that you agreed with the calculation as well that we heard from Mr. Hanson, in that the industry has -- or the industry, when I say the industry, I'm referring to dairy farmers, dairy producers -- that they have as a result of the volatility since 2017 lost approximately 2 billion pounds in their cheese prices; is that right?
 - A. \$2 billion. Billion dollars.
 - Q. Did I say "pounds"?
 - A. Yes, you did.



- Q. I'm sorry. My head moves faster than my mouth. Let me say it again.
- I think you agreed with Mr. Hanson that dairy farmers have lost approximately \$2 billion since 2017; is that right?
 - A. In only the areas where the Federal Milk Marketing Order is pooling that milk.
 - Q. Okay. And so the milk that's not being pooled, there can be additional losses as well?
- A. That is correct.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 11 Q. Okay. And we don't have a way to calculate those 12 numbers, do we?
- 13 A. Not to my knowledge, no.
- Q. Okay. And so if -- if dairy farmers have lost \$2 billion, who is it that would be benefitting from that loss?
 - A. The simplest answer is, and probably the most direct one is, those using the block cheese to price their product off of have gained significantly in the last six years, because they have been underpaying for their cheese protein value, and because Class III is used to calculate Class I, Class I value has been underreported or undersold in the marketplace.
 - Q. Okay. So if I'm understanding you correctly, you are saying that that would be anybody who is buying Class I or Class III?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Thank you, Mr. Bauer. That's all I have right



1	now.
2	MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, we would submit
3	Mr. Bauer for cross-examination.
4	THE COURT: Cross-examination?
5	CROSS-EXAMINATION
6	BY MR. ENGLISH:
7	Q. Chip English for the Milk Innovation Group.
8	So I'm going to start where you just ended.
9	Federal Orders establish a minimum regulated price,
10	correct?
11	A. They attempt to, yes.
12	Q. Okay. In what way do they not succeed if they
13	attempt to?
14	A. Because if it was really establishing a minimum
15	price in Federal Milk regulated areas, we would not have
16	this problem by having barrel cheese included in the
17	formula. They are significantly disadvantaged by using
18	the formula as how it is created.
19	Q. What you are saying is you don't like the minimum
20	price but right?
21	A. That's incorrect.
22	Q. Well
23	A. I'm saying that USDA's numbers matter in how they
24	are calculated and how the industry has been affected has
25	changed over time, that 500-pound barrels no longer
26	represent a synthetic 40-pound block.
27	Q. So you are talking about representation. I'm



talking about, this still is a minimum price, correct?

- A. If you pool the milk, there's a minimum price.
 - Q. Thank you.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

26

27

28

And Federal Orders are, first, not a support price mechanism, correct?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. And second, they do intend for the market to be able to operate above the minimum price, correct?
 - A. That is their intent.
- Q. Okay. Are you saying as to Class I that the market price is somehow not valid?
- 11 A. I'm saying it is underreported in how the formula 12 is used in the Federal Milk Marketing Order.
- Q. Does that mean that the market price for Class I is undervalued?
 - A. In the last six years, I would say that is a fair statement.
 - Q. Okay. So you think that market prices and minimum prices are the same?
 - A. I would not say that.
 - Q. Okay. Well, so let me go back to your statement.

In the first paragraph, you say you have a federal cheese plant, and you discuss a little bit what you are making. I don't actually see that you say. Are you,

- 24 Ellsworth, making 500-pound barrels that are reported to 25 NDPSR?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. You then state that the original concept to include the 500-pound barrel cheddar cheese price series



in the Class III price calculation was to get more input tonnage for use in estimating the most accurate pricing of cheese sales in the market.

Do you have a citation for that statement?

- A. I do not.
- Q. Isn't it more correct to say that the purpose of including 500-pound barrel cheese was because it is one of the market-clearing products for cheese?
 - A. No.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. You disagree that that's what USDA said in Federal Order Reform?
 - A. I do. The reason why I go further on that is because in our task force, we discuss this at length, and when we get to other proponents, and it is coming up later, on Make Allowance, the Make Allowance is supposedly on a 40-pound block price, and then the synthetic \$0.03 difference for conversion. So everything tends to lead to that it was intended for a 40-pound block cheddar cheese price, that was the intended minimum pricing mechanism for Class III protein.
 - Q. And do you understand that in Federal Order Reform, they were trying to establish a replacement for the basic formula price?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. And they were trying to be, quote, as close as possible to be revenue neutral between the old BFP and the new Class III and IV price, correct?
 - A. Correct.



- Q. Do you know had they excluded barrels back in Federal Order Reform, whether that would have then increased the level of the new BFP -- I'm sorry -- the new Class III price relative to the basic formula price?
 - A. I don't have knowledge of that.
- Q. You and others have testified that no other component has this setup of two commodities, right?
 - A. Correct.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. Okay. So what other product that's nonfat dry milk that has a standard of identity could have been included?
- A. I have no idea.
- Q. What other product for whey could have been included?
- A. I have no idea.
- Q. So you have this statement that the long-term fix is to price off of a single block market. By continuing with the two markets of blocks and barrels, the industry has no reason to change to price off one market.
- What -- first of all, the chick Chicago Mercantile Exchange has a barrel price, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. What influence of the Federal Orders is there on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange if it does drop barrels, as you propose, to discontinue a CME barrel price?
- A. First of all, that statement is incorrect.

 There -- there is no influence on the CME. They are a totally independent group.



- Q. That's my point, actually. Thank you.

 But the point is it is independent, and so we should fully expect Chicago Mercantile Exchange to continue to have a barrel market, correct?
 - A. They could have a mozzarella market. They could have a 640 market. It is entirely up to them.
 - Q. Well, if they have a barrel market, isn't the case that even if you eliminate barrels, you are still going to have two markets?
 - A. They could or could not. All I know is that this is the only component value, and the root cause of the spread between the two is that it's included in the Federal Milk Marketing Order calculation for Class III protein.
 - Q. But you don't know --
 - A. The industry has failed to -- to -- to recognize or look at this industry or come to consensus in how they should fix it.
 - Q. So you -- on page 3 and 4, you discuss your view of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act.
 - You are not a lawyer, correct, sir?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. And so you have quoted from the declaration in the middle of Reference 2.
 - You wouldn't know whether there's a rule that the specific governs over the general, would you?
 - A. I would not.
 - Q. Okay. What consideration in preparing your



6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

statement, including the declaration, did you give to the fact that there is a specific provision in

Section 608c(15) with respect to prices set for milk?

A. None.

Q. So now I want to explore at the bottom of page 4 and some other pages where you talk about the impacts on

And you talk about the \$0.84 per hundredweight being less money to Ellsworth producers, correct?

A. Correct.

Ellsworth.

7

8

9

10

13

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 11 Q. That's their pay price in their milk check, 12 correct?
 - A. It is the lack of pay in their paycheck.
- Q. Okay. The lack of pay in their paycheck.

 But you own a plant that produces barrel cheese,

 correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. And as a result of this price disparity you are talking about, the cooperative for accounting purposes for the Federal Order has a lower accounting on that barrel cheese, correct?
 - A. I'm not -- can you explain the question, please?
 - Q. All right.

 Are you pooled on the Federal Order?
 - A. For many months, we do.
 - Q. Okay. So for those months that you do, can you -you get a pool draw. That pool draw is based upon a
 calculation that includes your barrel cheese volume at the



Federal Order barrel cheese -- I'm sorry -- at the Class III price, which includes barrel cheese, correct?

- A. I don't believe that's an accurate statement.
- Q. Would you agree that to the extent you draw from the pool, that amount that you draw is influenced by what your handler obligation is?
- A. I still would disagree with that statement because handler obligation is different than what we're talking about.
- Q. Well, I agree. So you are talking about what the producer gets paid. I'm talking about what the cooperative does within the Federal Order. Okay? That's a distinction. You agree that's different, right?
- A. It depends on what your -- what your definition of what the cooperative does.
- Q. For -- so there are months in which Ellsworth is a regulated pool handler under the order, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. For those months in which Ellsworth is a regulated pool handler, you file with the Market Administrator a pool report, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And that pool report reflects the pounds of milk processed as a handler, correct?
- A. If it's pooled pounds, then we will -- we can depool or pool, correct.
- Q. Okay. To the extent those are pooled pounds, those pounds are then multiplied by the classified prices,



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

correct?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

- A. The components are, correct.
- Q. Yes, the components are.
- And then that establishes what a minimum handler obligation is to the pool, correct?
 - A. Not to the pool. To the producer.
- Q. Okay. To the producer.
- And because you are getting a pool draw, you get money from the pool, correct?
- 10 A. Correct.
- 11 Q. Okay. And that level of a pool draw will be
- 12 | higher than it otherwise would have been if barrels are
- 13 | included in the survey price, correct?
- 14 A. Incorrect.
- 15 Q. Why is that incorrect?
- 16 A. Because barrels will lower the Class III price,
- 17 | thus lowering the value of the pooled -- the dollars that
- 18 | are available to be pooled.
- 19 Q. Okay. Does it not reduce your handler calculation
- 20 | in calculating the pool?
- 21 A. No.
- 22 | O. So let's take a simple example. Under the current
- 23 | Class III price, let's assume the value of your milk for
- 24 | the pool is \$1 million. Okay?
- 25 A. Okay.
- Q. Now, let's assume for the example that barrels are
- 27 dropped, and the obligation instead would be \$1,100,000.
- 28 | Because now the Class III price has gone up, correct?



- A. My obligation to the pool would not -- my obligation to the minimum price would go up, my obligation to the pool would not.
- Q. Okay. Okay. Your obligation for the minimum price goes up. Does that not mean that the level of your pool draw will go down?
 - A. Incorrect.
- Q. I guess what I'm getting at is, don't your dairy farmers have two streams of income, one is their milk price check and two is the fact they are owners of the plant, correct?
- 12 A. Incorrect.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

- O. They are not owners of the plant?
- 14 A. You had a two-part question. The first part was 15 incorrect.
 - Q. I'm sorry. What was the -- what was wrong with the first part? They are dairy farmers, and they get checks, correct, as dairy farmers for selling their milk?
 - A. That is correct.
 - Q. And the \$0.84 you are referring to is the \$0.84 less that they are getting in their milk check for the value of the milk, correct?
 - A. For the value of the products that they get for their milk.
 - I interpreted your question to assume, because that's how you interpreted it, that the value of their milk was coming from the pool, and that is not correct.
 - Q. Is the \$0.84 their farm gate price that you are



referring to? The loss of \$0.84, is that in your farm gate?

A. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. Okay. So it doesn't include, the \$0.84 does not include the profitability or losses on the assets that they own, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. So on page 5, you say that processed cheese's main customers are restaurants and fast-food outlets.

You agree that's a market for -- for producer milk, correct?

- A. It is a market, correct.
- Q. And are you saying that if we adopt National Milk's proposal, which you support, that restaurants and fast-food outlets will be willing to pay more for barrel cheese because you are going to change the market pricing mechanism?
- A. I have never known anyone to be willing to pay more.
- Q. So doesn't that mean that manufacturers of barrel cheese will continue to have to sell at the market price, but somehow they will be forced to price off the block in your view?
- A. Currently, we have no -- the system was set up that the raw material was equal to what the approximate value we could get for the milk. So up until 2017, there was a pretty good correlation. That correlation went haywire. We need to reset the industry to price protein



off of one price.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. Well, isn't part of what's gone haywire in 2017 and afterwards the fact that we have inadequate Make Allowances?
 - A. It could be one of the factors.
- Q. So I want to go back to what I was just asking about, but now I want to turn to page 6.

You reference the fact -- you have the statement, that the value of cheese used in the calculation goes from \$1.88 to \$1.95. That's if we make a change -- that is basically if we can make a change recognizing that barrel cheese is only 17% of the market, correct?

- A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. And then you say, "This will raise the Class III price, but it will make it harder for producers with milk going to barrel plants to get paid that value."
- A. Correct. To get paid equal to the value of the Class III. If the industry doesn't change, we won't have barrel plants in Federal Order systems.
- Q. Isn't it just the opposite, if you try to overvalue barrels, it will make it harder for producers with milk going to barrel plants to get paid that value? Isn't that what your statement is?
- A. They will go out of business. They are going out of business. We have less barrel plants than we've ever had, the pure quantity in the Federal Order system.
- Q. In the Federal Order system. But in the country, there is capacity being built, correct?



- A. In barrels? Not that I'm aware of.
- Q. You didn't hear testimony earlier this week about that?
 - A. On barrel --
 - O. Yes.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- A. On barrel plants being built, I am not aware of any barrel plants that are being built. I'm more aware of plants that are going out of business than being built.
- Q. Well -- well, if they are going out of business, even though they allegedly have this advantage, because their price is being included in the survey, won't adoption of your proposal make it worse?
- A. We assume they have an advantage, so I don't agree with the premise of the question.
- Q. If their price is lowering the Class III price, doesn't that mean, in your argument, that if you change it, they have to account to the pool for a higher price, and their losses would be greater?
- A. Or they depool. The reality is, is when you get money in from a sale, as a co-op, you only have so much money you can pay out, period, and you either pool the milk or you don't pool the milk. It is an entirely different question.

The problem becomes is that there's \$2 billion that dairy farmers are not receiving because of the split between blocks and barrels.

- Q. Co-ops have the right to reblend, correct?
- A. Correct. And depool.



1	Q. A moment ago you said that barrel plants will have	
2	the option to depool.	
3	Is the purpose of the proposal to get barrel	
4	plants not to pool?	
5	A. That isn't what I said.	
6	Q. I want to turn to Table 3 and Table 4 and see if I	
7	can connect the dots, or not.	
8	Table 3, your calculation is from 2020, correct?	
9	A. Correct.	
10	Q. Is the calculation that carries over to Table 4	
11	based upon Table 3?	
12	A. Correct.	
13	Q. So you are using 2020, correct?	
14	A. Correct.	
15	Q. Do you think 2020 is an appropriate year to use	
16	for comparisons given all the things that happened in	
17	2020, including the USDA Food Box Program?	
18	A. Certainly.	
19	MR. ENGLISH: I have no further questions.	
20	THE COURT: Further cross?	
21	CROSS-EXAMINATION	
22	BY MR. MILTNER:	
23	Q. Good morning. My name is Ryan Miltner. I	
24	represent Select Milk Producers.	
25	A. Good morning.	
26	Q. Good morning, Mr. Bauer.	
27	I think I'd like to start with just some questions	
28	somewhat related to where Mr English finished up If	



if you're manufacturing barrel cheese, you are -- at the end of the day you have two products to sell, right? You have got the cheese, and you have the whey coming off that, correct?

A. Correct.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. And so let's assume that this barrel manufacturer is buying all their milk at the Class III price. And let's further assume that they are selling their whey stream at a price that lines up with the announced whey price under the federal system. Okay?
- A. Okay.
- Q. If that cheese plant then sells their barrels at the NDPSR price, that plant pretty well makes money, right?
- A. Maybe. My experience in operations, there's more to it than just the price, because it has a lot of ability on how well you process, your efficiencies of operation, most importantly, the amount of capital you have invested in that plant in order to produce below the Make Allowance.
- Q. Okay. If your -- if that plant's Make Allowance lines up with the federal formula presumptions, in that example I laid out, would that plant at least break even, do you think?
 - A. It depends.
- Q. Okay.
- A. The basis differs between blocks and barrels.

 Would make the assumption highly unlikely that they would



make money.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. If that plant were able to sell its whey for more than the Federal Order assumes it receives, would that then allow that plant to sell its cheese at a lower price and still maintain profitability?
- A. If those assumptions were correct, that is true, they could.
- Q. For Ellsworth, what do you all do with the whey that comes off of your barrel production?
- A. We are a sweet whey drying plant that reports our numbers, plus we have condensed whey that we sell as well.
- Q. Okay. In Ellsworth's experience, is the whey that comes off of a barrel plant more valuable than the whey that comes off of a block plant?
- A. If I can expand upon your question a little bit, I would say it's at par to the market. If it's colored, it's below -- it has a negative basis to the market.
- So in our particular case, because we sell sweet dry whey, we are at parity with the market for the price. If we had colored whey and had to do some further processing to it, it is unacceptable to many customers and, therefore, would be sold at a discount.
- Q. The sweet whey you produce, is it sold as a dry whey or a 34 -- or what products do you sell?
- A. It's a dried whey. It meets the standard definition for one of the commodity pricing components. Plus some condensed whey.
 - Q. As far as the dry whey portion of your facility,



do you have the capabilities to produce a more concentrated whey product like a WPI or a WPC80?

- A. No. I mean, technically, sure, you put equipment in, you could. But as we are set up, no.
 - Q. You don't have that equipment today?
 - A. Not in that plant.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. Okay. Are those products, WPC80 and WPI, are those higher value products than a simple dry whey?
- A. They are. But they also have a higher conversion cost, and, again, they have variability within the market.
- Q. Earlier you referred to unregulated plants in the Western part of the country that were producing barrels.

Do you have knowledge of about what those plants do with their -- their whey?

- A. Not firsthand knowledge, just general industry discussions.
- Q. What is that -- what is the understanding that you do have about their whey?
- A. Many of the plants out west look to find further value in their byproducts, and one of those is whey. And they -- in the industry press, etcetera, etcetera, they find unique and creative ways to add value to those byproducts. But exactly what they do with them is only what I have read in industry trade journals.
- Q. In those journals or otherwise in discussions, has there -- have you seen or are you aware of any suggestions that those plants, in fact, view their whey products as their primary output and the cheese as a secondary output?



- A. As I read the articles, I would interpret that to be correct.
 - Q. And so if there's an incentive to produce barrel cheese because of the whey that's coming off of it, would that affect the supply and demand calculation for barrel cheese?
 - A. It certainly would.
 - Q. In your experience have you observed those types of effects in the market?
 - A. I have, because most of the cheese coming onto the exchange has been from Western plants, where they are not required or not pooling milk or have the opportunity to pool milk and are not subject to Class III minimum pricing.
 - Q. And so is the reality that you have a product, barrel cheese, that's 5 -- I think 5% of the cheese produced from your statement; is that -- did I interpret that correctly?
 - A. Based on the numbers that I have from USDA, yes.
 - Q. Okay. So a product that's 5% of the cheese produced, and it has a 56% impact on establishing the protein price, but a chunk of that fifty- -- a chunk of that 9% is -- is produced primarily to manufacture another product; is that -- is that the reality?
 - A. I don't know if I agree totally with the percentages because I haven't calculated them, but the premise I believe is correct.
 - Q. And if you agree with that premise, and you have



2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

A. Absolutely.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. And it also then helps to explain some of the price divergence that has occurred in the last five years or so?
- A. I think it is a contributing factor. I can't tell you how much it is. I mean, there's a lot of factors in the dairy industry that accumulate to one point. But I do believe that may have some impact.
 - Q. Does Ellsworth sell any of its cheese on the CME?
- A. We have sold some block cheese on the CME and -- and directly. Because in the industry, you can sell product to a broker, and then that broker can sell it on the CME. So sometimes you can sell a product and don't know where it goes.
- Q. Who would be the reason for Ellsworth to sell directly on the CME?
- A. Additional product that we have no sale for, no direct sale.
- Q. Most -- can I infer from that that most of your sales are contracted sales for a specified period of time?
 - A. That is correct.
- And if I may further clarify, the only product that we have sold on the CME is #2 yellow cheddar cheese, not barrel cheese.
- Q. Nevertheless, do you follow or track the barrel market on the CME as part of your regular job



responsibilities?

1

2.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- A. Every single day, at 11:30 Central time.
- Q. Good. I think we'll be in lunch then -- no, actually, we won't. We'll be back in here, so set a reminder.
 - A. Internal clock. I don't need a reminder.
 - Q. Very good.

I was somewhat unclear with some of the question and answer you had with Mr. English about the CME barrel market.

If the barrels are taken out of the price formulas here, that doesn't -- that doesn't make the CME market vanish, does it?

- A. It does not. There's no control over the CME market to add standards, change transportation, or to modernize their process. There's no mechanism for the dairy industry to do that. Dairy farmers to do that, I should say.
- Q. I mean, if -- if USDA were to decide tomorrow that we were only going to survey 40-pound blocks through the NDPSR, the next day there's still going to be a 500-pound barrel price announcement at the CME, and there will still be offers and bids and trades, right?
 - A. There could be. Most likely.
- Q. So those -- so -- and -- and you agree that the barrel market is the only market that uses that as a reference price?
 - A. To my knowledge, correct. That is correct.



1 Ο. And so --2. There could be somebody that's using it, but I don't know who, other than barrel manufacturers and 3 4 processed cheese. And lawyers like to throw people into traps with 5 Ο. "only" and "never," so let me rephrase that. 6 7 The vast majority, nearly all of the people using 8 the barrel price as a reference are barrel manufacturers 9 or people participating in the barrel market, correct? 10 And processors of -- and processed cheese Α. 11 processors, yes. They would be the ones primarily using 12 the vast majority of the barrel pricing mechanism. 13 And you don't see any reason why they would not be 14 able to do that, including your cooperative, if -- if 15 Proposal 3 is adopted? 16 Α. That's correct. 17 Ο. Yeah. 18 MR. MILTNER: I don't have anything else. Thank 19 you very much. 2.0 THE COURT: Further cross aside from AMS? 2.1 You want -- who wants to go first? 22 CROSS-EXAMINATION 23 BY DR. CRYAN: Good morning. Roger Cryan for the American Farm 24 Ο. 25 Bureau Federation. 26 Mr. Bauer, I did -- I listened to your testimony. 27 I just want to make sure I understood you. 28 You do not make 640-pound blocks?



- NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING 1 Α. That is correct. 2. Ο. Okay. That's it. Thank you. DR. CRYAN: 3 CROSS-EXAMINATION 4 BY MR. ROSENBAUM: 5 Steve Rosenbaum for the International Dairy Foods 6 Ο. 7 Association. I'd like to follow up on something you said 8 9 before, which is that processors of cheese -- start that 10 question again. 11 Processors of manufactured cheese may use the 12 block price as a reference point; is that what you said? 13 I'm not -- I -- I think I need a little more 14 explanation of your question. 15 Well, you provided some testimony or estimates as 16 to how much cheese is priced off of the block price versus 17 the barrel price, correct? 18 Α. Correct. 19 And -- and you have also stated that manufacturers of processed cheese can use 500-pound blocks, but can use 2.0 2.1 other cheese as well, correct? 22 I believe I would have said 500-pound barrels. 23 Processed cheese manufacturers can use 500-pound barrels 24 plus other types. 25 Mistake was my -- was mine, not yours. Thank you 26 for that correction.

Α.

27

28

three different terms to describe three different distinct

Well, that was -- your first question was you used

processes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

- Q. All right. So let's start again?
- A. Okay.
 - Q. I'm talking about people who make processed cheese, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. And people who make processed cheese buy 500-pound barrels to do so, correct?
 - A. In my opinion, primarily, yes, plus other cheese.
- 10 Q. Okay. Plus other cheese.
- And when those process -- strike that. I'll start again.
 - When those companies that are making processed cheese are buying something other than 500-pound barrels to make that processed cheese, do they sometimes use the barrel price to price what they will pay for that other cheese?
 - A. It -- it could -- they could. It could be a fixed price or it could be referenced to the block price. It all depends on the situation.
 - Q. But it can be referenced to the 500-pound barrel price too, correct?
 - A. It could.
- 24 | Q. And it does sometimes, in your knowledge?
- 25 A. Correct.
- Q. All right. So you have -- but you have not -when you say things like only -- when you attempt to
 calculate what percentage of total cheese pounds are



- A. No, it's not, because the calculation is using the numbers that the USDA would use in order to calculate a Class III protein price.
 - O. Yes. But --

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- A. And so the Class III protein price is currently based off of two items: The 40-pound block and the -- and the 500-pound barrels.
- Q. And you -- but you have projected from the production of barrel cheese what percentage of total cheese is priced off of blocks versus barrels, correct?
 - A. I have.
- Q. And in doing so, the only cheese you have allocated to that which is priced off of 500-pound barrels is the 500-pound barrels itself, correct?
- A. Correct.
- Q. And you have acknowledged that, in fact, there is an extra billion pounds of cheese that goes into processed cheese that is not 500-pound barrel cheese, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And you have acknowledged in my earlier questioning that some proportion of that extra cheese is actually priced off of barrels, correct?
 - A. It could be.



- A. The only other significant cheese quantity -- and I don't believe it is all that significant anymore -- is to my knowledge swiss cheese is based off of the prior Class III pricing from the previous two months, which would thus include a small proportion of the barrel cheese pricing in there.
- Q. But I -- but I take it -- in everything you are describing, you are describing the terms of private sale agreements between the manufacturers of the cheese and the buyers who are using that cheese to make processed cheese, correct?
 - A. That would be correct.
- Q. You don't have access to those private agreements, correct?
- A. That is correct. And that's why when I use the number for calculation, I only use the numbers that were available from the USDA.
- Q. Yeah. But you use them to try to tell us what percentage of 500-pound barrels was being used to set cheese pricing. That's what you are doing, isn't it?
- A. That is incorrect. I was using that number to use what the -- if it was used, to use a percentage of the market of barrels.
 - Q. So let me just ask a few questions that go to the



2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

1 | sort of basics of -- of Federal Order pricing.

You do agree that the intent of the Federal Order system is to set the minimum price, correct?

- A. On regulated milk, yes.
- Q. Yes.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

And that is the milk going to make cheese, among other things, correct?

- A. No. Because milk going to cheese does not need to be regulated. Milk going to the Federal Order needs to be regulated.
- Q. Well, to the extent that a plant is participating in the Federal Order system and is making cheese, then they are paying a regulated minimum price?
- A. That is not correct, because you can depool partially of your milk depending on what order you are in.
- Q. If you have chosen to participate and you are allowed -- if you -- well, in some parts of the country you essentially have to participate, right, because the restrictions on depooling are severe?
- A. I'm not an expert on that, but I would assume that that's correct.
- Q. Okay. In some parts of the country, in fact, the pooling requirements are not strict, and you can come in or out, as you choose, if you are a Class III plant, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. So let's -- and, obviously, in the real world, part of the benefit of pooling is that, to the



extent that there is a higher Class I price and depending upon how much of the utilization is going to Class I, by participating in the pool, you get to share -- you get to share in the money coming from those plants, those Class I plants into the pool, correct?

A. Correct.

2.

2.1

- Q. I mean, that is the principal incentive to pool, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. So let's just address the situation where the -- where we have a Class III barrel plant that's participating either because it has to or participating because the economics make sense for it to because it gets to have a draw from the pool based upon the higher Class I price. Okay?
 - A. Okay.
- Q. And, indeed, those are the scenarios under which a Class III plant will participate, correct, either because they as a practical matter have to because of pooling requirements or because the draw they get out of the Class I proceeds makes it economically advantageous to participate, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. And when they just -- it's just -- when they depool, it would typically be because they happen to be in a time period when Class III price is higher than the price that would include the Class I price, and so they are better off not to be in the pool economically,



correct?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. So just to orient ourselves.

So let's assume that we're in a scenario where the market price for barrel cheese is \$2 a pound. Okay?

- A. Okay.
- Q. I'm just -- I'm making up a number. Don't chide me if it is unrealistic.
- 9 A. I would love it to be \$2, by the way. That would 10 be great.
 - Q. Yeah. I'm doing that for simplicity sake. Okay?

 And let's assume that the Make Allowance is \$0.25
 a pound, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. And we're going to have a lot of discussion later as to what the Make Allowance ought to be, but, you know, \$0.25 I think is pretty close to what National Milk is proposing, so I'm just using that because it's a sort of round number.
- A. Easy math is good, especially when you are on the stand.
 - Q. And easy math is good when you are asking questions too, I assure you.

So under that scenario, then, basically, what the Federal Order system does is make you, as a manufacturer, turn over the extra \$1.75, which is the \$2 minus the \$0.25, the \$1.75 gets -- you have to pay that into the pool, correct?



I recognize it's obviously translated into a --

- A. It really doesn't get paid into the pool.
- Q. Okay.

2.

2.1

- A. It -- it gets paid to the producer, because -- because on a Class III plant, we -- we have milk available, so we have our own Class I silo. So it really does not get paid into the pool.
- Q. Let's just take a scenario where the manufacturer -- in fact, it's not a co-op at all. It is just a freestanding cheese plant. Okay?

So in that scenario, that plant essentially pays \$1.75 to the -- for the milk it's receiving; is that fair?

- A. It would -- yeah, in simplistic terms, because you have to consider the butterfat and the other solids which go into the calculation to get that. Assuming they got \$1.75, that would translate into some equivalency. And for simple sakes, you divide it by 10.1 based on the yield factor, and that's what you get. It is certainly a lot more complicated in component pricing because then it depends on what protein level you get, what butterfat, etcetera, etcetera --
 - Q. And I --
 - A. -- in the yield.
- Q. But you do understand the Federal Order system to know that -- with greater precision perhaps than my simplistic, simplified hypothetical would provide, the concept is that that plant is, under the scenario I have set up, entitled to hold on to the \$0.25 that represents



the Make Allowance, and the rest is required to be paid to farmers for the milk, correct?

A. Correct.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. So let's assume that we are in a month where I have described to you what -- the market price for barrels is \$2. Let's assume in that same month the market price for block cheese is \$2.10, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And, in fact, you have argued that that spread is a realistic spread sometimes, correct?
- 11 A. Correct.
- Q. And, indeed, under that scenario, the amount of milk that has -- strike that.

Under that scenario, the amount that the manufacturer has to pay its farmers, if the price were being set for formula purposes based solely upon the block price, the price that the manufacturer would have to pay its farmers is \$1.85, correct?

- A. My math would be different than that.
- Q. Well, we're talking -- you want to -- okay. So --
- A. If I can take your same example. If the block market is 2.10 and the barrel market is \$2, and so the -- and using an approximately 50/50 weight, that would give an average value for simplistic purposes of \$2.05 --
 - Q. Okay.
- A. -- less the \$0.25 Make Allowance, would give \$1.80, that would supposedly need to go back to the farmer.



Q. Okay.

2.

2.1

- A. There's many other calculations that need to go in there, but for our discussion purposes, I would say the number is \$1.80.
- Q. Okay. And I'll actually -- okay. I'll accept that.

So under the current scenario, because we're blending under the current regulations the barrel price and the block price 50/50, we actually in the real world start with \$2.05, subtracting the 25% Make Allowance, and the pay obligation is \$1.80 for the barrel plant, correct?

- A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. But your complaint is that you think that the block price over time is lower -- is -- start that question again.

Your view is that over time the block price is, or at least has been in recent years, higher than the barrel price, correct?

- A. It has extreme variability to it. But overall, block prices have consistently been out of their historical norm, higher than barrel prices in the last six years.
- Q. Okay. And so you are proposing a scenario as Proposal 3, in which in every month where the barrel price exceeds the block price, that a block manufacturer is not able to cover its cost of manufacture because it's being required to pay for its milk as if the amount it is receiving for its cheese is the block price when, in fact,



what it's receiving is less, correct?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- A. Incorrect. Because your calculation uses the theoretical theory of blending. No matter what, whether it's a private or a cooperative, they have always gotten 1.75 for that cheese, always. Just because the market moved, it's not going to change what producers get at any point. It's going to change whether they pool or depool their milk. Overall, the industries would be healthier and better without the barrel market being included as a synthetic call for the 40-pound block.
- Q. Well, I'm talking about what the minimum pay obligation is by the cheese company, and I thought we went through that and you agreed with me that the obligation for the cheese company is under the scenario where the market price for barrels --
 - A. The only --
- Q. -- is \$2, and the market price for blocks is 2.10. The formula averages them, treats the market price at \$2.05, subtracts the \$0.25 Make Allowance, and therefore, the pay obligation of that scenario is \$1.80, right?
 - A. But the reality is, is they only got \$1.75.
 - Q. The processor only gets \$1.75?
 - A. Absolutely.
 - Q. In terms of what the processor has to pay?
- A. What the processor has to pay is irrespective of what the Federal Order is. The processor only received \$1.75 for the -- the \$2 less the .25 equivalency. Period. That's all they have available to pay for milk.



- Q. Exactly. That's the problem, isn't it, that they only -- that they --
 - A. You are correct.
 - Q. -- that they --
 - A. They are undervaluing barrels inappropriately. So you are correct.
 - Q. No, they are -- you are requiring the barrel manufacturer to pay, under this scenario, a dollar -- well, under your scenario where the price would now be \$2.10, right, because we're going to use the barrels as the reference price solely, correct?
- 12 A. Correct.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

18

19

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Okay. So we've got \$2.10 as the reference price,
 \$0.25 as the -- as the Make Allowance. And so the pay
 obligation for a block plant under that scenario is \$1.85,
 correct?
 - A. Not under a block plant. Under a barrel plant if they choose to pool.
 - O. Yes. And -- and --
- 20 A. Yeah.
- 21 Q. Sure. And if they choose to pool --
- 22 A. But -- but the --
 - Q. If they choose to pool, they are paying \$1.85 for their milk, meaning they only have \$0.15 left over to cover their cost of manufacture, even though their cost to manufacture is actually \$0.25. Isn't that just the very simple explanation of how the system works?
 - A. You -- you are wrong because the barrel



- Q. They are paying money, they are not getting money, right?
- A. The -- the problem -- if you had dollar bills in front of you, if you are selling barrel cheese and you make a million dollars on it, okay, and assume it is a million dollars, your Make Allowance is \$250,000. Okay? You only have \$750,000 to pay for that milk.

The other question is, it's never going to change. It's always going to be that 750. What's going to change is whether they pool or not pool within the Federal Order system. It doesn't change -- until the industry changes to price off of protein, off of one protein price, the barrel manufacturer continues to not gain any value. They are continuously behind, and the producers don't gain any value on the barrel manufacturers.

- Q. Aren't they better off by a nickel under the current scenario --
 - A. Absolutely not.
- Q. The minimum -- you are saying the minimum price obligation has not gone up by a nickel?
- A. No, it actually -- it has no impact to the producer price, at all.
- Q. I'm not asking to the producer price. I'm asking what the manufacturer has to pay.
 - A. I am not concerned about the processor. I'm



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

concerned about what producers make.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

24

27

28

- Q. All right. Well, I'm -- I may -- maybe the --
- A. There's \$2 billion that processors have gotten from producers that -- in the last six years.
- Q. But -- and if you change that, block manufacturers are going to be paid a price -- strike that.

The obligation of block manufacturers will go up to -- so that the amount it has to pay exceeds what it needs to pay that and cover its costs. Isn't that just the basics of the Federal Order system?

- A. Currently, barrel manufacturers, because the cheese has been included, have been subsidizing cheese that's been priced off of the block market, as it goes onto the Federal Order system, to the tune of \$2 billion.
- Q. Isn't -- when the -- when the block price -- strike that.
- When the barrel price is lower than the block price -- strike that.
- Do you agree that blocks provide a market-clearing function today?
 - A. One of many products, correct.
- Q. Well, it's a 1.2 billion pound contributor to that, correct?
 - A. You said blocks, and so --
- Q. If I said "blocks," once again, you have corrected my mistake, which I appreciate.
 - A. I'm listening very closely.
 - Q. And I do not -- I do not question that whatsoever.



500-pound barrels provide a market-clearing function, part of the time?

- A. They are a part of the market that helps clear, as many other products do as well.
- Q. Okay. Now, you, on the first page of your testimony here in Exhibit 119, say that the 500-pound barrel cheese price incorporated adjustments to get to a synthetic 40-pound block cheddar cheese price.

Do you see that?

10 A. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

- Q. The word "synthetic" is yours, I take it?
- 12 A. I actually have been talking to others and used 13 that as a term.
- Q. Just -- do you know whether that term was used by USDA when, in fact, it adopted order reform in 2000?
 - A. I could not confirm that.
- Q. Were you -- were you personally involved in the order reform effort back in 1998?
- 19 A. No.
- 20 Q. Or 1997, I think it even started?
- 21 A. No.
- Q. Okay. Have you -- have you gone back and read the USDA decision adopting the new reformed program. the
- 23 USDA decision adopting the new reformed program, the
- 24 | April -- I think it is April 4, 1999, or maybe it is
- 25 | April 2, 1999, decision?
- 26 A. No.
- Q. And don't quote me on the date. It is approximately right.



1	I mean, do you know whether, in fact, that
2	decision in terms of reconciling 500-pound barrels and
3	40-pound blocks was focused entirely on the difference in
4	the cost of manufacture which it attributed entirely to
5	packaging costs?
6	A. I I cannot speak in one direction or another.
7	I rely on the information Dr. Peter Vitaliano provided.
8	Q. I mean, there is a \$0.03 adjustment between the
9	two in the current order, correct?
10	A. Correct.
11	Q. Do you know whether that \$0.03 was described by
12	USDA as entirely based upon differences in packaging costs
13	and nothing to do with differences in prices for selling
14	the two products?
15	A. I have no knowledge one way or the other.
16	MR. ROSENBAUM: If I could have one minute, your
17	Honor.
18	Your Honor, if I could have an indulgement. I am
19	having a mechanical problem on information I need for my
20	last my next question, and we've been going for a
21	while. Could we take our break, and then I can come back
22	and ask
23	THE COURT: Yes, I think so.
24	Ten minutes. Let's come back at five of.
25	MR. ROSENBAUM: Thank you, your Honor.
26	(Whereupon, a break was taken.)
27	THE COURT: Let's come to order. Back on the
28	record.



BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

1

8

9

- Q. On page 2 of your written statement, which is here in Exhibit 119, you state that -- in the second paragraph, and I'm just going to quote part of the sentence:
- "500-pound barrel cheddar cheese is singularly focused on process cheese, a market driven by a few processors and purchasers."

Do you see that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. So I'm going to list some companies and ask you whether or not they are, in fact, processors of 500-pound barrels. Okay?
- 13 A. I'll do my best.
- 14 Q. Okay. Ellsworth Cooperative Creamery?
- 15 A. That one, I do know, yes.
- 16 | Q. Okay. AMPI?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Which is Associated Milk Producers, correct?
- 19 A. Correct.
- 20 Q. First District Association?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 | O. Glanbia Foods?
- 23 A. Unknown.
- 24 | O. You don't know?
- A. I believe they do, but I don't know for a certainty. I believe that they have the ability to switch in and out of the market.
 - Q. Agropur?



- A. I do believe they have the ability to produce some.
 - O. Greenwood Milk Products?
- A. They actually have converted their plant as of September 1st to a butter manufacturing plant.
 - O. Hilmar Cheese?
 - A. I believe they have the ability.
- 8 Q. Okay. Lactalis?
 - A. I believe they have the ability.
- 10 Q. Land O'Lakes?
- 11 A. Yes.

6

7

- 12 Q. Wisconsin Whey Products?
- 13 A. Wisconsin Whey Protein Specialties, yes.
- Q. Okay. And when you say "they have the ability,"
 which you have said for some of these plants, do you know
- 16 that, in fact, they use that ability and do actually make
- 17 | 500-pound barrels?
- 18 A. On occasion. They are not always readily
- 19 | available on the market.
- 20 Q. So I'm counting ten companies -- no, you -- I
- 21 | correct that. One of them you took off my list. So I'm
- 22 | counting nine companies that make barrels, 500-pound
- 23 | barrels, either some of the time or all of the time,
- 24 | correct?
- 25 A. Correct.
- 26 Q. Now, on page 5, I know Mr. English asked you a
- 27 | little bit about this, but you described the retail market
- 28 | for processed cheese, which is the product that is most



1 commonly made from 500-pound barrels, correct? 2. Α. Correct. And you indicated that a certain percentage went 3 Ο. 4 to the retail market, and the remainder, which is the bulk, goes to food service, correct? 5 6 Α. Correct. 7 Ο. Is -- is -- are you suggesting that that is somehow a less legitimate aspect of the commercial market 8 9 for cheese that should be discounted by USDA for some 10 reason? 11 Α. No. 12 MR. ROSENBAUM: That's all I have. 13 THE COURT: Further cross? Other than AMS? 14 Seeing none, AMS. 15 CROSS-EXAMINATION 16 BY MS. TAYLOR: 17 Ο. Good morning. 18 Good morning. Α. 19 How are you today? Ο. A little nervous, to be honest. 2.0 Α. 2.1 It is almost over. Thanks for testifying today. Q. 22 Α. Thank you. 23 I'm going to try to work through this logically. 0. 24 And I'm going to start with a really easy question because 25 I have never seen this term used before, and so I got to 26 ask. 27 What is cheese in horns? 28 It's a different shape. Horn cheese is -- you see Α.



it in the delis. And they come in either four-, five- or six-inch diameter, and they are generally around 21 inches or longer.

- Q. I never knew that was called horns.
- A. A horn.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

That is a good, easy question. Keep them coming. I like where this is going.

Q. I have to go home and use that somewhere in my -- on my weekend.

Okay. A few times in your testimony you used the phrase 500-pound ungraded USDA barrel cheddar cheese. And I don't -- I think reportable barrels under NDPSR have to be at least Wisconsin State graded or at least meet USDA extra grade standards. So I'm just trying to understand why you put ungraded in there. Does just that mean they don't actually have to be graded?

- A. That is correct.
- Q. Okay.
 - A. And when you look into the standards on 500-pound barrels, it is very unique on how they word the USDA extra grade. It's very loose on standards.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. And just so you know, further, there's only two plants that I'm aware of that meets the USDA -- the Wisconsin branded on barrels anymore because there's only two of us left.
 - Q. Okay. On page 2, you talk about, you know -- and your whole testimony is talking about the long-term fix to



what you all, Ellsworth and National Milk, considers a disorderly marketing condition is to price protein off a single block market.

Does that mean you wouldn't want to see 640s added to the survey, or will there be somebody testifying in regard to any other proposals we have before us on adding additional commodities?

- A. My -- my position is we should have one product that prices cheese protein in Class III. Adding anything else will add confusion. How well intended it will be, it will add confusion further, 10, 15, 25 years later like we are today.
- Q. Okay. And at the bottom of page 2 you talk about how prices have been different since 2017. And I know Ms. Hancock asked you some -- a question about trying to piece out the reasons for that change, and I'm not sure I caught all of those.

I think I heard one, there's a change in the type of cheese being sold on the CME in which you talked about was just the functionality, that people buying cheese on the CME don't necessarily know how it will function in there when they use it?

A. Correct. Which goes back to my earlier statement on the exhibit that was presented on cheese being sold on the -- you know, extra grade barrels, that that standard is so wide, the advancement in cheese-making technology has allowed cheese to be processed differently and quicker in different settings. So we have a really robust dairy



2.

2.1

industry that can be quite creative, but because of the CME standards that doesn't necessarily equate to the same product that Ellsworth would make or others in the Upper Midwest, equal to the same cheeses being sold on the cheese exchange.

- Q. Okay. And then another reason you talked about was the transportation allowance in the CME, or CME prices?
- A. Yes, which is a little bit out of the realm of the Federal Milk Marketing Order, but it does have an implication to pricing, in that when you see the trucking cost from out west, i.e., I'll just say Idaho, to Wisconsin where the cheese processing has been, the cost of transportation has steadily gone up, but the change or the allowances within the CME have not changed, I think, since they were established. But I don't know for sure, but it's considerably a long time. So in our task force group we have had many discussions on how that creates an imbalance on the cheese market to the actual sale of the cheese.
- Q. So what you sell it for on the market isn't ultimately what you get?
 - A. Well, it becomes an advantage to buy it off the CME because of they have the delivery point in Green Bay, Wisconsin.
- Q. Right. So if you have to ship it somewhere else, it will cost you?
 - A. Yeah.



2.

2.0

2.1

Q. Yeah.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

28

You mentioned something about risk, and I didn't quite get that one.

- A. So what's interesting is, is many financial products have been developed since the component pricing has been installed. Every single component value, with the exception of barrel, has a counterability to lay off risk. There is a dry whey futures market. There is now a block market after several years of only having all cheese. There is a butter market. But barrels are -- have -- do not have a futures market. That adds extra basis risk to producers and, by extension, processors, because we are an extension of the producer.
- Q. Okay. And then the last reason I missed, something about how the CME product is sold but -- does that ring a bell? I might have misheard.
- A. I think that's with the -- the standard of the cheese.
 - 0. 0kay.
- A. It's a combination of the other ones as we have talked about earlier.
- Q. Okay. And then you further talk about, since these changes we just discussed, the difference in prices have led to disorderly marketing of milk in cheese processing areas of the Federal Orders with barrel cheese manufacturing.
- Can you expand on that? Are you meaning, you know, up where you are in Wisconsin, specific to Federal



Order areas with this processing?

2.

2.0

2.1

A. Well, the previous list, most of those barrel plants are in the Upper -- in Order 30, and those that were also on the list were in -- the vast majority of them were on unregulated areas. I don't know about the California plants.

So it puts our producers at a distinct disadvantage because we only get so many dollars in that we can pay our producers. We don't have the ability to create a loss because it is their -- it's all their money. And if we're not getting that value from the marketplace, they are getting less value than what the Class III minimum price would be, so we either depool or pay less to our producers.

- Q. Okay. And in comparison to what barrel manufacturers can do in an unregulated, if they are not regulated?
- A. If they are not regulated, they can pay whatever they want. So when our farmers compare to prices when people are pricing their product off of a block market, they have the ability or there's some residual value based on how they buy their product.
- Q. And so the discrepancy between how these producers -- different sets of producers are paid is what you would consider disorderly?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. And you -- well, I want to move to Table 3 on the table -- Table 1 on page 3, excuse me.



And you went through this, and I think I caught most of it, but I would like to just review it one more time.

- A. Table 3.
- O. Table 1, excuse me, on page 3.

So if you could just go through that one more time to make sure we're clear on what each column represents.

- A. So the first one is the average monthly barrel. Then the average monthly --
- 10 Q. Is that the NDPSR price?
- 11 A. No. CME.
- 12 Q. Okay.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

16

17

18

23

- 13 A. Likewise for block. So the -- obviously the 14 spread is the math.
- 15 | O. Uh-huh.
 - A. The number of pounds of cheese that we made that were attributed to the barrel market. Next one would be our producer pounds.
- 19 0. In that cheese?
- A. No. Our producer pounds. Because not all our cheese goes into Class III. The impact would be greater.
- 22 But we do sell milk to other processors from time to time.
 - O. So this is all of Ellsworth?
- A. All of Ellsworth producer pounds. Not cheese -not pounds allocated to cheese. All producer pounds.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. And then the math is basically the spread. And then the \$0.03 times the pounds of cheese produced gets



- the value that was lost. And then that negative million dollars is divided by the producer pounds.
 - Q. I think I just got lost. So --
- A. The \$3 million is divided across all producers, all producer milk.
 - Q. Okay. And the producer pounds is in millions as well?
 - A. Correct.

6

7

8

9

10

19

- Q. And that's not just pooled pounds, that's all pounds?
- 11 A. That's all pounds.
- Q. So in summary, this table, you have calculated that the spread has resulted in receiving \$0.84 less per hundredweight on average since 2017?
- 15 A. Through the month of April. It varies every 16 month. But that is correct.
- Q. But on average in 2017 through April of 2023 --
- 18 | A. It's --
 - Q. -- that's been the impact?
- 20 A. Correct.
- Q. Of having barrels on the -- in the price formulas?
- A. As having the spread. It is not the impact to having it in there. It's the spread.
 - Q. Okay. Okay.
- On -- at the bottom of page 3, in the middle -well, in the middle of that paragraph. And I'll quote:
 "With the inclusion of barrel cheese within the Class III
 pricing formula, this results in having two separate



products price the same protein value that is being used to effectively negate the intent of Federal Orders. The industry has changed, and an adjusted barrel price is no longer a good substitute for pricing block cheese."

When you talk about "the industry has changed," is that what you -- are you talking about what we discussed --

A. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. -- on the 2017 changes?
- 10 A. Correct.
 - Q. And I think in your testimony you talked about why the blocks and barrels are not substitutes.

So would you no longer consider barrel cheese a commodity cheese?

- A. It would -- it would still be a commodity cheese, like many other cheeses are commodity. I would also consider bulk swiss a commodity or even, you know, loaves of mozzarella as a block -- as a commodity product. It just so happens that they have a market on the CME that they have a reference to.
- Q. And is it your intention that -- or it's your opinion, though, that barrels are no longer a market-clearing product? That's not where the milk necessarily goes as a last resort?
- A. I actually take offense at that a little bit, I'm sorry, because there was earlier testimony that blocks are nothing more than a market-clearing product, and I disagree with that. We sell out our production ahead of



time, which would therefore indicate that it's not market-clearing.

My contention is, is that trying to find a Class III protein price using the block as -- and then -- price, and then adding a calculated value to add more barrels to get to the block price is no longer appropriate. The industry standard, in my opinion, should be block cheddar cheese, and that should be used to price protein levels.

Q. Okay. At the top of page 5, and this is on the section -- well, you discuss the \$0.84 again, and at the end of that paragraph that's on the top of page 5, you say, "Long term the lack of return will make barrel cheese production economically obsolete" in Federal Orders.

Can you explain what you mean by that?

- A. We're going to go out of business. We're bleeding red ink.
- Q. Because you are paying a Class -- is it because you are paying a Class III price that's higher than what you get in the market?
- A. More simply, milk will find its highest value use, and if we can't compete with other manufacturers that can pay more, our milk supply will leave, and therefore, we won't be able to produce product. Or we'll have to convert our plants to something else. We have seen a dramatic reduction in the number of barrel cheese plants.

 I.e., just earlier discussed, Greenwood just converted their plant from a barrel plant to a Class IV plant. And



2.

2.1

- I believe we'll see more of that. Not to Class IV, just conversion of plants, or they will go out of business.
 - Q. Right. Okay.
- In that page in the middle, you say, "According to the USDA in 2020, 2.399 billion pounds of processed cheese was produced."
- We are unable to verify that number. Where did that number come from?
- A. It's a USDA website where you go through and you list it. It is unique in that you have to look for processed cheese. It also includes processed cheese, cheese spread, and cheese food.
- 0. Okay.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

- 14 A. It -- it is in there. You guys got the numbers.
- 15 | But it's -- you got to look beyond natural cheese.
- 16 | Because what's interesting is that 2.39 billion, if we can
- 17 | round it to 2.4 billion, is not included in the total
- 18 | cheese production. I had to verify those numbers twice.
- 19 | Because we produce 13 billion pounds of cheese, and, oh,
- 20 by the way, we do 2.4 billion pounds of processed cheese.
- 21 | They are not totaled in there, they are separate.
- Q. Okay. I'm sure my data people back here will figure that all out for us.
- A. It is interesting because you have to look for it.

 It is interesting because you have to look for it.

 It is not part of natural cheese production.
 - Q. Right.
 - A. It is its -- its own category.
 - Q. Right. I agree with that. We were just looking



26

27

for that number and weren't able to find it. But I'm sure they are going to go back and look based on this conversation?

And then you also talk about the dairy farmers of Wisconsin estimate that retail processed cheese sales in 2020 are 165.1 million pounds.

Do you know how they came up with that estimate?

- A. I e-mailed them, asked their data department to tell me how much retail cheese sales there were in processed cheese, and they gave me the last three years. And so I wanted to compare that to where we -- so I had the same year reference. But, no, I do not know.
- Q. But that's supposed to be a U.S. -- an all-U.S. estimate?
 - A. I'm not sure where they got their estimate from.
- Q. Okay. I wanted you to walk us through again Tables 3 and 4, at the top -- and 5, I guess, because I think you used those tables to get to Table 5 to come to your \$0.90. I just wanted you to walk us through how those work together and how you did the math.
- A. So in Table 3, I used the reference to Table 1, I used the average barrel price of 1.72 and the average block price of \$2. So that's where those numbers come forward in Table 3.
 - O. From Table 1?
 - A. From Table 1.
- O. Okay.
- A. And then I used the numbers from Table 2 to get



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

- 1 the next percentages. And then I obviously multiplied 2. those out. And then I came up with the estimated average of that percentage based on the value that we had, so --3 4 then I came up with a percentage of what they were to equal that last number of \$0.29, so -- does that make 5 6 sense? 7 Ο. No. 8 Okay. So 75 --Α. 9 I got you to the \$0.75. 0. 10 Α. Okay. 11 Q. Okay. 12 Α. So -- and then take the estimated average of 17%, 13 which is again referenced in Table 2. 14 Ο. Okay. 15 And then times that should equal 29. I don't have Α. 16 a calculator to --17 Ο. Okay. So it is \$0.75 times your 17% to equal 18 \$0.29? 19 Α. Correct. 2.0 Ο. Okay. 2.1 And then the next line would do the same. Α. 22 Ο. And that's per pound? 23 Α. Correct. 24 Ο. Okay. So you added \$0.29 to \$1.66 to get the 25 1.95? 26 Α. Correct.
- 28

A. So if we used the weighted average of barrels, we



1	would have the calculated protein price for Class III, use
2	a different number. We are currently using the simplistic
3	table because it is more complicated than this using
4	that same percentages, the simple calculation was in the
5	year 2020, we used \$1.88 to base protein for Class III.
6	If we adjust that to the amount of cheese that was
7	produced for barrels in the amount that is estimated to be
8	used or priced off of blocks, we would come up with a
9	different number. It would actually be higher. If we
10	used no weighting, we would come up with a \$2 price, but
11	by weighting it, we come up with \$1.95.

Q. So what you are saying, if you weighted it, the Class III price would be higher, but you are advocating not weighting it --

(Court Reporter clarification.)

BY MS. TAYLOR:

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. So am I understanding this correctly, if we reweighted it according to the weight you are assuming under here, you would end up at, in your simple example, \$1.95?
- 21 A. Correct.
 - Q. You are advocating not weighting it at all and just using blocks, and you would end up with \$2?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Okay. So -- okay.

 And then what's Table 4 show us?
 - A. It's my simple way to come up with what the Class III price would be. I used the price of cheese,



- which is bringing that number forward, 37.5 cents for whey 1 2. and butter, because they impact how you calculate Class III. So the top section uses the existing simple 3 4 formula to come up with what milk costs would be. you run through those formulas less the Make Allowance, 5 you come up with 17.8139 per hundredweight. I take the 6 7 same formula and run it through with a different cheese 8 price going out to four decimals, and I come up with 9 18.7168, which is exactly what you would expect, that if 10 you use a higher cheese price, you will come up with a 11 higher Class III price.
- 12 Q. Where did the \$1.86 come from?
- A. I believe that was the actual average. And if I look back, it should probably have been \$1.88.
- Q. Okay. So under your simple calculation -- hold on a second.
 - Sorry. Okay. I have some less weedy questions for you.
- 19 A. Good.

18

23

24

25

- Q. Sorry. This is our only opportunity to ask
 questions on the math, or else we get back and think we
 have no idea what we should be looking at.
 - A. It is a little nerve-racking. It's like, oh, my God, I missed \$0.02 there.
 - Q. No problem?
 - So you -- Ellsworth produces barrels.
- And did I hear they also produce blocks? Did I hear that correctly?



A. Yes.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. Okay. So can you share with us any measures you have taken or how Ellsworth as a cooperative has -- what you have been -- what you have done to remain financially viable due to the spread between blocks and barrels?
- A. Well, first and foremost, we just built a brand new plant that will make blocks. It does make blocks. It's a pretty significant investment for the Ellsworth Cooperative Creamery to do that. We have diversified into other value-added segments, and we also purchased a processed cheese plant. So we have totally diversified -- in the 15 years that I have been there, we moved from strictly barrels and -- and sweet dried whey to multiple different products.

I believe -- I did a presentation for my members the other day. I think we went from approximately 15 SKUs, standard stock keeping units, to over 380.

- Q. Okay. So I realize that your testimony here has been mostly about wearing your producer hat for Ellsworth, not necessarily your manufacturing handler hat for Ellsworth.
 - A. It's hard to wear both.
 - 0. It is.

But a question is, if a barrel plant today can't pay the Class III price because blocks are in it and it is higher than what they get out of the market, how will removing the barrel survey improve its abilities to pay Class III?



A. Because the industry is locked in the concept that that's what we have. When we deal with the industry, and I have for many years, different task forces brought together, no one can move off the concept that barrel price is used in the Class III formula, so therefore, it should be included in how we price and process other products.

As I said in my testimony, I fully recognize that there will be a transfer period. But this is the only commodity price that has two separate units to price, and that has caused disruption in how plants process and move and have the ability to pay producers.

O. So --

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- A. It will not be an overnight thing to fix the industry.
- Q. So eventually, then, what I'm hearing, you think the industry will evolve, barrels will be priced plus or minus off of blocks --
- A. Yes.
 - Q. -- and eventually people will figure it out, and then perhaps expect that that barrel cheese might not be pooled?
 - A. What was the last part?
 - Q. I mean, what would be the incentive to pool?
- A. Pool or pull?
 - Q. Pool. I'm from Maryland. They say I have an accent, even though I don't hear it. My nieces will be finding this funny that you asked me this question.



A. The question on whether to pool milk in the Upper
Order 30 where most barrel plants exist is not related
to solely related to whether they make blocks or
barrels. There are other factors. And I greatly
appreciate the USDA Federal Milk Marketing Order putting
on an estimate of what the pool is. That will determine
whether we pool or not. There are so many other factors
determining whether that milk will be pooled. What I am
most concerned about is the \$2 billion that have not been
distributed producers because of the calculation that has
been in effect for 25 years.

- Q. And so then it's not necessary the pool draw that makes a big part of your decision-making on whether to pool that milk or not? There's a bunch of other factors?
 - A. There are many factors, correct.
- Q. Okay. If I can ask another question in regards to your producers. I think in the beginning of your statement you said, you have 220 member-owners?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Can you talk about your membership, about the size and --
- A. I was waiting for that question, because I know you're trying to distinguish what the size is.
 - O. Yes.
- A. And out of the 220 members -- since I wrote this, we're down to about 216, so we have lost a few members -- I have calculated that four farms would exceed the -- would be on the large farm category. So approximately the



2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

other 200 farms would be considered small farms.

- Q. Okay. And do you know a little bit about -- if your members utilize risk management tools?
- A. They use all kinds of risk management tools. And one of the distinct problems with the risk management tools as they are today is they cannot protect their basis because of the difference between blocks and barrels. So why they think they are perfectly hedged and have all their -- their income relatively secure, the basis changes make it very difficult for them to secure adequate or estimated revenue because of that large swing in blocks and barrels. That basis is huge for our producers.
- Q. Okay. One last question, I think on the last page. You talk about how -- you mention -- oh, there's a sentence that reads: "Having a single market provides the needed tools to processors and producers alike."

Could you expand on what the needed tools are you are talking about there?

A. Well, I have already started discussion with many of my customers, and what's a unique aspect of going to a single protein price market is they have the tools in the futures market to know what they are going to pay for processed cheese should the industry or -- start moving towards having protein priced off of a single component.

So we have others that ask us, hey, can you give me a fixed price for X, Y, or Z, whether it is barrel cheese, cheese curds -- I forgot to mention cheese curds, by the way, we do a lot of cheese curds -- I don't have



2.

2.1

	NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA REARING
1	the ability to protect that because there's not a
2	reasonable way to protect where that range is going to
3	come in between blocks and barrels, with any degree of
4	certainty.
5	Q. Okay. Thank you.
6	MS. TAYLOR: I think that's it from AMS. Thank
7	you.
8	THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Rosenbaum.
9	CROSS-EXAMINATION
10	BY MR. ROSENBAUM:
11	Q. Steve Rosenbaum for the International Dairy Foods
12	Association.
13	I want to follow up with some of AMS's questions
14	about your table. So if you could look at page 6 for me,
15	please.
16	So in Table 2, you have information with a heading
17	called or I should say a row called "NDPSR Blocks," and
18	you show that as 44% of the NDPSR.
19	Do you see that?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. And then you have the next row being "NDPSR
22	Barrels," and you show that as being 56%.
23	Do you see that?
24	A. I do.
25	Q. Okay. Now, in the in Table 3, you have a row
26	called barrels, a row called blocks, and a column called
27	percent NDPSR, but the numbers there are the reverse of



the numbers in Table 2.

And my question is, is that just an error in the table, or is that -- or is -- and if not an error, can you explain?

- A. It's an error I made. It should be reversed. I apologize for that.
- Q. Okay. And in the next column in Table 3 is called "NDPSR," and you have 0.75.

Is that -- is that dollars --

A. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. -- that's \$0.75?

 And then for blocks it is \$1.12, correct?
- A. Correct.
 - Q. And then you have the next row is called spread.

 And this -- you know, the simple math indicates to me,
 with maybe a slight rounding, that the spread is adding
 the entry for barrels and the entry for blocks, which is
 not at least in my common understanding what spread would
 normally be, which normally a spread is the difference
 between two things.

So can you tell me, is that an error, or if not, can you explain what it is you mean when you use the word "spread" in this context?

- A. Well, there's actually two parts to that.

 The first one is just the difference, you know, \$2 versus \$1.72 is \$0.28.
 - Q. Right.
 - A. And then the next column, it should be the total.
 - Q. So you mean \$1.88 should be called the total and



1 | not the spread?

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- A. Correct.
- Q. And in that context, what does \$1.88 represent to you?
- A. It would be representing the approximate value of the cheese value to be used to calculate Class III protein.
- Q. Okay. And the fact that you -- you accidentally flipped those numbers, the 44% and 56%, in Table 3, I guess my question is, does that mean that the numbers in your column "NDPSR" are incorrect?
- A. You are correct. I would have to recalculate that.
 - Q. Okay. So the number -- so the number for barrels -- let me be more specific. Start that question again.
 - In the row in Table 3 called "Barrels," with the column "NDPSR," that should be whatever the result is of 1.72, or \$1.72 -- I'm going to have to start that again. I messed that up.
 - In Table 3 in the row "Barrels," if we want to figure out what number should be in the column "NDPSR," we should multiply \$1.72 times 56%, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. And similarly, in the row for "Blocks," in order to figure out what should appear in the column "NDPSR," we should multiply \$2 times 44%, correct?
 - A. Correct.



- Q. And -- and then in the row that's called "Spread," you have indicated that the figure in the first column, which indicates \$0.28, that -- that would remain the same, correct?
 - A. The first number times 17.
- Q. I'm sorry, I asked you a question while you were doing math.
 - A. Yeah, I'm just double checking.
- Q. I think I asked you a question that's different than the math you were doing, so let me just -- so I mean, if you're going to provide corrected numbers for that "NDPSR" column, then why don't you go ahead and do that.
- 13 A. I had it all perfectly calculated.
 - The first column should be .53. Be 1.72 times 56% equals .53. \$2 times 44% would be .88.
 - Q. All right. I think there's something wrong there because you -- you're multiplying barrels now by a higher percentage, and yet you are coming up with a lower number. I think it's got to become a higher number.
 - \$1.72 times 56%. It's got to be higher than \$0.75, just doing the math in my head.
 - A. You are correct, .9632.
 - Q. I'm sorry, I didn't catch that.
- 24 A. .9632.
 - Q. Okay. So the number that appears in the row for "Barrels" under "NDPSR" should be -- I'm sorry, just say it one more time.
 - A. .9632.



2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

25

26

27

- 1 Q. .96. So that's 96.32 cents?
- 2 A. Correct.

8

18

19

27

- Q. And then four blocks, what should the number be in the "NDPSR" column?
 - A. .88. .8800.
- Q. Okay. All right. And then does that -- that seems -- sorry.
 - A. That actually widens the spread.
- 9 | O. What is -- well --
- 10 A. So I came up with a total of 1.8432.
- 11 | Q. Yeah. Okay. It is lower. It is not -- it is
- 12 | lower. It's 1.84 rather than 1.88, correct?
- 13 A. That is correct.
- Q. Okay. But spread in this context, that's not the difference between the two, it is -- between barrels and blocks, that's adding them together, correct?
- 17 A. Correct.
 - Q. And so as you said already, the term really isn't spread, it's total for that, correct?
- 20 A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. Now, you have -- and the next column is called "Estimated Average," where you have 0.17 for barrels and 0.83 for blocks.
- And my initial question is, do -- do any of the corrections of the errors that we have been discussing for the last few minutes affect those numbers?
 - A. It doesn't appear so, no.
 - Q. And then you have an average, which is your last



- column, which currently is \$0.29 for barrels, \$1.66 for blocks, and a spread of \$1.95.
 - First of all, is the term "total" more correct than "spread" in that context?
 - A. Correct.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

- Q. And then second, does correcting the errors that we have corrected affect those numbers?
 - A. It -- it does slightly.
- Q. Okay. Can you give us what the correct numbers would be?
- 11 A. Well, the --
- Q. I don't know how you calculated those numbers, so I can't take you through a calculation.
 - A. So -- if you could repeat the question.
 - Q. I'm just trying to see -- given the fact that we know that you flipped the 44% and 56%, the barrels should have been 56%, the blocks should have been 44%, I'm trying to figure out now that we know that error and you have explained how that -- correcting that error, what the number should be in the "NDPSR" column, I'm asking you whether you can provide me corrected numbers for the "Average" column.
 - A. The average on that column would still be the same.
 - Q. That's -- okay.
- So it would still be the \$0.29 for barrels, the \$1.66 for blocks, and the total -- and the total, as you said, which is more accurate than spread, would still be



NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING 1 \$1.95? 2. Α. Correct. That's all I've got -- oh, no, sorry, that's not 3 4 all I have. So do these things affect Table 4? 5 6 Α. They do slightly. 7 Ο. All right. And so -- so the price would -- that appears in Table 4, there's a row called "Price," a 8 heading called "Cheese." You currently have \$1.86 in that 9 10 for the number -- for the sale that reflects the price in 11 cheese. 12 And that would be now \$1.84 rather than \$1.86 13 under your approach; is that right? 14 Correct. Α. 15 Okay. And that would affect -- so the net would Ο. 16 come down by \$0.02; is that right, in the row called "Net" 17 under "Cheese"? 18 Α. Approximately. 19 Okay. The yield, I presume, does not change; is Ο. 2.0 that -- that's a -- that's just a yield -- cheese yield 2.1 number or something? 22 Α. Correct. 23 Okay. And the hundredweight would change, 24

- correct, because you are using a different net at that 25 point, right?
- 26 Α. Correct.
 - Ο. And what about the -- do the whey -- does the whey column or the butter column get affected by these



27

corrections?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- A. It does not.
- Q. And -- okay. And then there's a -- what I have been asking you is questions relating to the information under the heading in Table 4, "Should Value Based on Selling Price."

And now let me ask you, with respect to the second heading in Table 4, "If based on only a percentage of cheese the impact," do any of these numbers get affected by the corrections that you have made?

- 11 A. They do not.
- MR. ROSENBAUM: That's all I have. Thank you.
- 13 THE COURT: Mr. Cryan.
- 14 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 15 BY DR. CRYAN:
- 16 O. Good morning.
- 17 A. Good morning.
- 18 Q. I'm Roger Cryan for the American Farm Bureau
 19 Federation.

Ms. Taylor asked some wonderful questions, and I have some follow-up based on those questions and your answers to those.

I appreciate your response and talking about these cheeses of last resort, and I would like to ask you to confirm that it is always the intent of cheese makers to run their plants full?

- A. Correct.
- Q. Because it is too expensive to maintain idle



capacity because cheese capacity is expensive?

- A. There's full, and then there's super full, so --
- Q. Right. Right. But it is -- okay.

And I guess I also want to mention, I appreciate that you are bringing cheese curds across the country, even if they don't necessarily squeak by the time they get to Washington, it is nice to have them.

Also, could you talk generally about -- since you are speaking as a -- with your co-op hat on and you brought up depooling, and you brought up basis, could you -- could you talk about the impacts on your members and on the co-op of depooling and negative PPDs, such as the kind of chaos we had in 2020 and to a lesser degree in other years?

- A. Well, it is interesting as a manufacturing co-op, I don't believe we're as affected as many others that have a high Class I utilization. In the Order 30 we have a very low Class I utilization. So depooling becomes a necessary tool in order for survival of the co-op.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. So without it, it would be detrimental.
- Q. Okay. Any other thoughts on that, the impact on farmers?
 - A. Because we're an extension of farmers, our job is to make sure we get as much income as we can for them.
 - Q. Okay. And the negative PPDs, how does that affect producers?
 - A. Well, obviously, it takes money away from them,



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

24

25

26

27

1 but at the end of the day, the co-op gets whatever money 2. in, less what it costs, all go back to the producer. DR. CRYAN: Very good. Thank you very much. 3 Anything else before we get to 4 THE COURT: redirect? AMS doesn't have any. 5 6 Re-cross after that, re-cross? 7 Very good, Ms. Hancock, your witness. MS. HANCOCK: Thank you, your Honor. 8 9 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 10 BY MS. HANCOCK: And thank you, Mr. Bauer, for providing the 11 Ο. 12 on-the-fly calculations. I appreciate that. 13 I just have a couple of follow-up questions I want 14 to -- to chat about. 15 Let's see. For the other cheeses that are used in 16 processed cheese we talked about, whether it's 17 market-clearing or not, I'm curious to know that those 18 other cheeses -- not the barrel cheese, but the other 19 cheeses that Mr. English was talking with you about -- has 2.0 most of that sold already prior to you having -- or you 2.1 being able to use that in your processed cheese? 22 I would say the vast majority has already gone 23 through one sale. So therefore, it would not be -either, one, it is not the type of cheese that would be 24 25 reported to AMS or, in addition, it would be a flat sale 26 of some sort. Generally there's some pre-arranged, but 27 it -- it's really cheese that is off -- does not meet the



28

standards, as they would, to package it in one form or

another.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Okay. So if I'm understanding that correctly, it means that if it's already been sold once, to the extent that it was subject to a Federal Order price, it would have already received that price the first time it was sold?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. And so a secondary sale, do you have an understanding about whether that would be subjected to the Federal Order pricing?
 - A. Second order sales are not reported on AMS.
- Q. Okay. This is just if somebody can capture some additional value for this other cheese, they can have a secondary resale market?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And does that just get sold under whatever market prices are in effect at that time?
- A. It could be whatever market. It could be flat price. It could be relative to the barrel price or it could be relative to the block price depending on the manufacturer and how they want to purchase it. So it is an individual basis contract.
- Q. You were also asked about how -- or I think, if I understood it correctly, you were asked about whether this proposal, is it really just an out -- a consequence of inadequate Make Allowances.
 - Do you remember that discussion?
 - A. I do.



A. Yes, please.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Yeah. Is there any reason to believe that an inadequate Make Allowance would be to blame for the spread between barrels and blocks?
- A. It would be -- it would be hard to draw that conclusion that -- that the spread is solely caused by an inadequate Make Allowance.
- Q. Okay. And I think you -- you conceded that it could be a factor in there, but even if you changed Make Allowances, in your opinion, would it remedy the spread that we're seeing in the volatility -- or the volatility of the spread between block and barrels?
 - A. No, it would not.
- Q. Okay. And you also have now spent a good amount of time talking about Tables 2 and 3 and the fact that you had gone through all that calculation we just did with Mr. Rosenbaum.
- 21 A. Yes.
 - Q. And you did receive a question about -- you know, you used -- the example that you had there was based on the 2020 numbers from Table 2, I believe; is that right? From Table 1.
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. And we know that Table 1 shows 2020 had a higher impact per hundredweight than some of the other years; is



1	that right?
2	A. That's correct.
3	Q. If you used the calculation with the other
4	numbers, do you still see the spread in the example that
5	you have performed in Tables 3 and 4?
6	A. For all years except 2022 where the spread
7	narrowed considerably
8	Q. Okay. And in
9	A for half the year.
10	Q. Excuse me.
11	And in 2022, we see that that impact is actually a
12	positive number in Table in Table 1; is that right?
13	A. That is correct.
14	Q. And then in 2023, it so far, at least up until
15	April of 2023, the spread was considerably larger than
16	even what we saw in 2020; is that right?
17	A. That's correct.
18	Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Bauer. I appreciate your
19	time.
20	MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, we would offer Exhibit
21	Number 119 into evidence.
22	THE COURT: Any objections?
23	Exhibit 119 is entered into the record.
24	(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 119 was received
25	into evidence.)
26	THE COURT: You are dismissed. Thank you. You
27	didn't seem nervous at all.



We were going to do lunch I think starting at

```
1
     11:00 today. Let's go off the record.
                (Whereupon, a luncheon break was taken.)
 2
 3
                                 ---000---
 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
```



1	FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 2023 AFTERNOON SESSION
2	THE COURT: Let's go on the record. We're back
3	from lunch and off into the virtual world.
4	Who wants to talk first? Who wants to
5	MS. TAYLOR: I'll go, Judge.
6	THE COURT: Give a little introduction, I guess.
7	MS. TAYLOR: Thank you.
8	This is Erin Taylor from AMS. We're going to
9	start our virtual dairy farmer testimony via Zoom.
10	So, Josh, thank you for being our guinea pig and
11	helping us make this work. I don't think you will be able
12	to see us in the room, we haven't figured out how to make
13	that part work, but we can see you. So I will turn it
14	over to you to introduce yourself.
15	THE COURT: Or did we have
16	MS. TAYLOR: Oh, I think we have some exhibits to
17	go on the record. So we'll let Mr. English introduce
18	those.
19	MR. ENGLISH: Good afternoon. This is Chip
20	English for the Milk Innovation Group. And we
21	presubmitted this morning and have provided copies to USDA
22	and the participants of what is labeled MIG Exhibit 6,
23	which is the testimony of Josh, and MIG Exhibit 7, which
24	is an attachment. And I would like to have them marked,
25	if possible, and then I'll get out of the way.
26	THE COURT: Yeah. I don't have open my list of
27	exhibits what's the next exhibit?
28	Okay. Let's mark MIG Exhibit 6, Exhibit 120 for



1	identification in the record.
2	(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 120 was marked
3	for identification.)
4	THE COURT: And Exhibit MIG Exhibit 7,
5	Exhibit 121.
6	(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 121 was marked
7	for identification.)
8	MR. ENGLISH: Thank you, your Honor. And I'll sit
9	down.
10	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Tranel Ms. Hancock has
11	risen.
12	MS. HANCOCK: I didn't know if we were labeling
13	all of them right now.
14	THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'll take all the help in
15	the housekeeping that I can get.
16	Very well. Mr. Tranel, thanks for being with us,
17	and the floor is yours. You may proceed with your
18	statement, testimony.
19	JOSH TRANEL,
20	Was examined and testified as follows:
21	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
22	And good afternoon, USDA Dairy Programs.
23	First, I would like to take the time to thank all
24	of you for making time for us dairy farmers to give
25	testimony to this very important issue. Additionally, I
26	understand I get the honor of being a little bit of a
27	guinea pig for this process, and I cannot express my
28	gratitude enough for allowing all of us to virtually give



witness as it wasn't 20 minutes ago I was still in the barn feeding cattle.

My name is Josh Tranel, and I operate an organic dairy farm with my wife Kalyn, my three first cousins and their wives, and a few other children in Grant County near Cuba City, Wisconsin. We also operate, in conjunction with various other family members, operating another dairy and custom heifer operations.

As a family, we manage 2500 organic acres and milk 600 cows along with managing as many as 1,000 young stock in a given year. We have a crossbred of Holstein and Jersey herds, but also practice beef on dairy to maximize our opportunity in the conventional-fed cattle market.

Our family has been dairy farming since coming over to America and our family has transitioned to organic dairy production about 20 years ago. We have marketed milk through CROPP Cooperative for 20 years and employ up to 10 full-time people on our dairy, as well as offer many part-time opportunities for extended family members. We also offer some custom bailing and harvesting services to local farmers in the area.

In 2020, I was appointed to the Wisconsin Farm Service Agency executive committee, and I currently am the committee chair. Other family members associated with Tranel Family Farms are extensively invested in the community and agricultural industry. For example, we have a family member that serves in the Wisconsin State Legislature, where he chairs the Agriculture Committee, a



2.

2.1

family member heavily involved with Iowa State University Extension, the Grant County Township board, the Organic Meat Company Board of Directors, as well as a few of CROPP Cooperative's other committees.

Additionally, I get the opportunity and the pleasure to serve as one of seven elected board members for CROPP Cooperative, which is more commonly known by our flagship brand Organic Valley.

Our cooperative is made up of over 1400 organic dairy farmers in over 32 states. The farmer-owned cooperative that makes organic dairy products across all four FMMO classes as either branded products or as bulk and ingredient offerings for commercial organic dairy buyers.

That said, the majority of our business is dedicated to fluid within Class I. The cooperative relies on an extensive network of co-manufacturers to bottle for us.

We continue to bring on new farms and are actively in procurement mode, with over 140 farms expected to join the cooperative over the course of the next three years.

We are the cooperative of small family farmers, and our average herd size is 78 cows.

While the organic market has grown over the last decade using -- over the last decade, existing USDA FMMO pricing regulations have placed an inequitable burden on our members of our cooperatives. Let me describe a little more of how we operate and the impact this has.



2.

2.1

Our pay price is determined annually by the Board of Directors and the cooperative leadership. It is set by our expected performance in the marketplace and the ability to manage inventories and supply. We strive for an organic product utilization of 98% of all of our milk received.

The co-op seeks to provide farmers with a predictable and fair pay price which does not fluctuate on a monthly basis outside of agreed-upon seasonal adjustments and typical quality premiums.

Like most in the dairy industry, CROPP Cooperative farmers are paid on components for farm gate milk. While monthly FMMO classified pricing gyrations do not impact the monthly base price offered to farmers, it for certain does impact our pay price decisions on an annual basis and impacts things such as our co-op's operations and cash flow positions.

In aggregate, this cooperative faces a multi-million dollar draw each year with extreme variability month to month, all of which is detached from our actual business of sourcing, processing, and selling organic fluid milk.

I strongly disagree with the USDA's decision to accept -- to not accept what's in the scope of this hearing, Proposal 6, that would exempt organic milk from pooling obligations if producers are paid above Class I premiums.

The USDA's response to myself and 174 other



2.

2.1

organic dairy farmers on 11 -- urging inclusion of organic exemption in the hearing proceedings was insufficient and we believe in error. I urge the USDA and Judge Strother to reconsider that decision.

The USDA Action Plan issued on June 1st stated,
"The USDA is providing the opportunity for invested
parties to submit additional proposals regarding potential
amendments to the current pricing provisions acceptable to
all FMMOs."

It did not specify in that Action Plan that only amendments directly impacting uniform pricing formulas would be in scope, an assertion made only once a hearing was announced.

Even with that arbitrary narrowing of scope, the USDA cannot consider an assortment of proposals that increase Class I differentials, that modify the Class I mover, and ultimately the spread between Class I and Class III, and somehow assert that these will not impact the pricing we are able to offer cooperative farmers.

Many of these changes will take price away from organic dairy farmers who do not benefit at all from the Federal Milk Marketing Orders. As a specialty milk defined under federal law, organic milk is not substitutable with non-organic milk.

The imposition on our Class I business position is a constant multi-million dollar draw, undercuts better pricing opportunities for our farmers, end-of-year dividends for our farmers, or operational enhancements



2.

2.0

2.1

that could enhance the farmer-owners' security and equity.

This frustration is further amplified by the fact that the organic industry has historically offered farmer pay prices far above the uniform regulated minimums mandated by the orders.

The essential question of how do organic dairies fit in the FMMO system needs to be addressed at this hearing.

Organic dairy farming requires significant ongoing investments and innovative methods to improve soil health and animal health, for example. These investments are directly competing with payments into the FMMO system. As farmers, we cannot fund a system that does not directly support our farming operations.

In addition to reinserting the organic exemption proposal within these proceedings, I want to voice support for Proposal 20 that demonstrates the lack of logic and economic justification for current Class I differentials.

I'll also note other proposals that seek to expand Class I differentials only further burden organic dairy farmers and the market by demanding more from our portion of the industry, which receives no benefit.

I appreciate the opportunity to share these remarks and the farmer letter with the USDA and Judge Strother. I welcome any questions.

THE COURT: Mr. English.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ENGLISH:



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

	NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING
1	Q. So, sir, this is Chip English with the Milk
2	Innovation Group, and I just I just want to try to do
3	something that's maybe hard to do. But on you twice
4	referred to draw. The second time you called it a draw
5	from our cooperative. But the first time, in the written
6	statement, the term was pool obligation.
7	Do you view pool obligation and draw from the
8	cooperative as being the sale thing?
9	A. Yeah, the pool obligation and our cooperative
10	can you mute.
11	Q. We heard you, yes.
12	A. The pool obligation our cooperative has to face i

- A. The pool obligation our cooperative has to face is indirectly a draw from our farmers. The payment we have to pull into there we could use in much better ways and give back to our farmers if we weren't pulling into the system.
- MR. ENGLISH: Thank you, sir. I just wanted to clarify that.
- THE COURT: Okay. Are we going to have cross for these virtual witnesses?
- I guess we're going to have the opportunity for cross of these virtual witnesses.
- Anyone have any questions other than AMS for Mr. Tranel?
- Does AMS have any questions for Mr. Tranel?

 MS. TAYLOR: We do, your Honor. I'm over here,

 hidden.
- THE COURT: Oh. I see you now. Yes, Ms. Taylor.



13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

MS. TAYLOR: Thank you. 1 2. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. TAYLOR: 3 Good afternoon. Thank you for being with us to 4 Ο. testify today. I appreciate it. 5 I wanted to ask a question -- well, first, you 6 talk about your crop farm. I think you said the average 7 8 herd size is 70? I can't find that right now. 9 Α. 78, yeah. 10 And for your farm specifically, we're asking Ο. questions of dairy farmers, the Small Business 11 12 Administration defines a small business for dairy farms as 13 one that receives \$3.75 million or less in annual gross 14 revenue on their farm. 15 Would you qualify as a small business? 16 So, technically, Tranel Family Farms is slightly Α. 17 larger than SBA's definition of a small business for a 18 dairy. 19 But you should know that the farm has four 2.0 principal owners, and if you divide the total number of 2.1 cows or the total number of income by us four owners, we 22 would for sure meet the definition of an SBA. 23 I'll also note that the cooperative, by market 24 milk, with an average I said of 78 cows, so the vast 25 majority of our 1400 farmers do qualify as small 26 businesses. 27 Ο. Okay. Thank you.



28

And can you talk a little bit about if your farm

A. So we do not use any risk management tools or do any milk -- or do any options on our milk sales. Since we engage in the organic market, there is no tool set up for us to trade across or use any kind of risk management tool because there's not a futures market for the organic dairy industry.

We do, however, use some risk management tools on our input side of our dairy, so example, for fuel or cropping needs. And we also use crop insurance and some other programs that are offered by the USDA.

Q. Okay. Thank you.

And then in the middle of page 2, you are talking about CROPP, and it says, "We strive for an organic product sales utilization of 98% of all milk received."

Can you talk a little bit more about that and, in particular, what happens to the other 2%?

A. Yeah. So that's actually a pretty big piece of our cooperative stability, we feel, is that if we are able to utilize 98% or more of our milk into the organic marketplace, we feel we can keep that stable pay price way above the federal minimums.

There's a few more people at the CROPP who can provide more -- able to explain how this all happens. But



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

we do sell some milk into the conventional market on occasion if we have areas that we can't find a home or a processor for that milk organically. Typically, it's a very, very, very minute volume, and in many cases, we're selling that at a huge loss compared to the organic marketplace and usually well under class prices.

O. Okay. Thank you.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

And then just I wanted to summarize in regards to your supporting Proposal 20 and opposition to any other proposals and that impact any of the Class I prices. And I take it, if I could summarize what I heard, that your opposition is because that would raise the Class I price, it would impact the obligation CROPP has as a co-op, and that impacts the pay price you all -- you farmers get from your co-op; is that correct?

- A. Yes. That's exactly correct.
- O. Okay. Thank you.

MS. TAYLOR: I don't have any more questions. I'm not sure if anyone else does in the room.

THE COURT: We'll find out.

Any -- anybody -- anything in the nature of follow-up to AMS's questions?

Back to you, Mr. English.

MR. ENGLISH: First, I want to thank you very much, Mr. Tranel, for taking your time.

And, your Honor, I would move admission of Exhibits 120 and 121.

THE COURT: Exhibits 120 and 121 are admitted into



1 the record. 2. (Thereafter, Exhibit Numbers 120 and 121 were received into evidence.) 3 4 MR. ENGLISH: Thank you, sir. THE COURT: Wait a minute. Before we let the 5 witness go, I do have a procedural question. This witness 6 7 has asked that the scope of the -- I'm not sure I'm using 8 the right words here. He has asked that we consider 9 proposals rejected by the Administrator, as I understand 10 it, similar to contentions by MIG and NAJ. 11 What am I -- and he asked me, he hopes I can do 12 something with that. What am I to do -- what do the 13 parties think I should do with that? 14 MR. ENGLISH: I think you -- at -- you can fold it 15 I don't think it's, you know, anything really new. 16 It is not certainly new legal argument. Doesn't 17 constitute any briefing. I think you can just fold it in. 18 I don't think it -- I mean, it adds his personal 19 perspective, but more than that, I don't think it changes 20 the transcript you have already received. 2.1 THE COURT: Okay. I mean, one question would be 22 whether I should give other participants the opportunity 23 to respond to those. 24 MR. ENGLISH: If they want to, fine. I think it's 25 the statement of a producer. We have had other statements, obviously, different on proposals, that we 26 27 could have asked about. But I don't -- I don't think it's



28

sub- -- my view, I don't believe -- while it is his view,

1 and it is very important because it's a witness testifying 2. rather than a lawyer, I think that at least in my view -well, I'll leave it -- if people want to respond, they can 3 4 respond, but I think you have the legal arguments already before you. 5 6 THE COURT: I don't want to preclude anybody. 7 AMS has nothing to add. National Milk doesn't wish to answer. 8 9 All right. 10 MS. HANCOCK: Well, I just want to clarify. It is 11 not that we don't want to answer. We just -- I agree with 12 Mr. English. I think that we have already addressed this 13 in briefing and argument. This is just testimony. So 14 there's not really a rebuttal to testimony unless we put 15 it through our own witnesses, which we'll -- if we're 16 going to do, we'll do. 17 THE COURT: Well, now I'm beginning to see why you are concerned about housekeeping. We did put in the other 18 19 request to consider as exhibits. We didn't have a witness testify to it, so --20 2.1 MR. ENGLISH: She and I agree. 22 THE COURT: Oh, let's get that on the record. 23 Okay. Yeah, I think I can roll with -- when I get 24 to the other two requests. Very well, sir. Thank you, Mr. Tranel. Really 25 26 appreciate you taking time and going through the effort 27 with the virtual equipment to testify before us today.



You're dismissed.

1	And we have another witness.
2	MR. TRANEL: Thank you for the opportunity to.
3	MS. TAYLOR: And, Judge, we do have another
4	witness, who should be coming on there momentarily. I'll
5	give him a second.
6	I believe it will be Gerben I'm afraid to
7	attempt Leyendekker. Thank you. Assist from the
8	audience.
9	THE COURT: The only thing I didn't do is swear in
10	the last witness.
11	Everybody agree to waive the swearing in?
12	Okay. I'll swear you in, though, Mr. Leyendekker.
13	And we may have enough time to get it right.
14	Please raise your right hand.
15	GERBEN LEYENDEKKER,
16	Being first duly sworn, was examined and
17	testified as follows:
18	THE COURT: The witness is available for
19	examination.
20	Any direct?
21	Is anyone managing this witness?
22	MS. HANCOCK: I am, your Honor. We're just asking
23	if we could move that there we go.
24	Okay. Your Honor, we would ask that Exhibit
25	NMPF-64 be marked for identification purposes.
26	THE COURT: Yes, the next in order I have is 121,
27	so I'm sorry 122. Exhibit NMPF-64 is marked for
28	identification 122.



(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 122 was marked 1 2. for identification.) MS. HANCOCK: Thank you. 3 Mr. Leyendekker, if you want to proceed with your 4 It is identified as Exhibit 122. 5 testimony. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. 6 7 MS. TAYLOR: If I may interrupt for a quick second. If you could spell your first and last name for 8 9 the court reporter before you begin, that would be great. 10 THE WITNESS: Okay. I will. Gerben, G-E-R-B-E-N, Leyendekker, 11 12 L-E-Y-E-N-D-E-K-K-E-R. 13 THE COURT: The floor is yours, Mr. Leyendekker. 14 You may proceed. 15 THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. 16 Well, thank you for the opportunity to allow me to 17 testify. And my name is Gerben Leyendekker. I have been 18 in the dairy business in California all my life. My father immigrated from Holland, coming from a dairy 19 2.0 family. He started his own dairy in California in 1958 2.1 with my mother, and raised their children to work and know 22 dairy. 23 I started my own dairy business with my wife 24 Pauline in 1983, and I have been dairying in Visalia, 25 California, for 40 years. My two sons are now having 26 their own business with their families. So we continue as 27 a dairy -- family to dairy.



28

My wife and I have two dairies and milk

approximately 4,000 cows. I am currently serving on the
Board of Directors for California Dairies California
Dairies, or CDI, currently in the ninth consecutive year
of service on the board and 18 years of service overall
since CDI was created in 1991. I am also serving on the
board of National Milk Producers Federation.

I am in full support of National Milk's package of the Federal Milk Marketing Order amendments.

Specifically, I support:

2.

2.0

2.1

Proposals 1, the updates on milk composition, which I'll be talking about in a minute;

The elimination of barrels from Class III calculation and relying only on cheddar blocks for monthly price discovery;

Adjustment to Make Allowances for butter, nonfat dry milk, cheddar cheese, and dry whey. The cross of processing keeps getting higher and higher with no adjustment in these formulas for 15 years to capture those increases;

The return of higher-of calculation of the Class I skim price. Dairy farmers left a large amount of money on the table with a previous change following the 2018 Farm Bill;

The updates to the Class I differentials. The cost of producing and transporting milk has continued to escalate, supporting an update in this county-by-county map, most of which is more -- now more than 20 years old.

National Milk's proposal reflects a comprehensive



approach which is critical for the future of our industry. We must look collectively at the needs of the dairymen, processors, and our farmer-owned cooperatives. The proposal takes a measured approach with the information we have available.

Going forward, NMPF is fully engaged in Farm Bill efforts to grant USDA with the ability to collect plant cost data for future milk price formula adjustments. This information will be critical in the future as the industry seeks to make necessary adjustments to our milk price formulas in a timely manner.

Now, I would like to specifically address

Proposal 1 on milk composition. It is important to update our current formula for the monthly skim milks and ensure they reflect the current industry norms. It is also important to provide a mechanism for those updates to be implemented as they occur going forward.

The current formulas are using outdated assumptions about the average composition of U.S. milk production, and these need to be updated to reflect more current realities. The average component levels in the U.S. milk production have continued to rise. Dairy farmers have improved what cows produce by utilizing technology to get better and quicker information about what our animals need, enhancing animal comfort using nutritional information to improve our feed rations, and continually improving genetics of our overall U.S. dairy herd.



2.

2.0

2.1

When we look back at the milk -- when we look back at our average milk components in my home state of California 20 years ago -- you see the attachment of California Department of Food and Agriculture Report, 2001 to 2005, the statewide average components -- we can see that the average butterfat levels had ranged from a 3.67 to a 3.68% and the average solids nonfat levels ranged from an 8.71 to 8.8%.

Compare that to the average test of the producer receipts reported by the California Federal Milk Marketing Order in 2022 -- and this is also attached -- which shows an average butterfat levels of 4.04% and an average solids fat level of 9.06%. And there's 3.31 protein and 5.75% other solids.

While most of our milk produced in California falls into either Class III or IV, which does appropriately value our milk based on actual components, the Class I formula is still structured in a way that made sense in 2000, but not in 2023.

We have worked hard to increase our components with improvements and have also increased our costs, without appropriate adjustment in the Class I formula -- without the appropriate adjustment in the Class I formula. That needs to change, and I am in support of both immediate change and an ongoing opportunity to be updated without a hearing when the information supports an adjustment.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak today, and



2.

2.0

2.1

1	once again, I want to say that I fully support the
2	broad-based comprehensive package of amendments proposed
3	by National Milk Producers Federation. We have a balanced
4	approach that considers the producers, processors,
5	farmer-owned farmer dairy-owned cooperatives, and the
6	consumer that rely on the industry to produce a nutritious
7	milk and dairy products they consume each day. Thank you.
8	THE COURT: Questions for this witness?
9	Looking at you, Ms. Taylor.
10	MS. TAYLOR: Thank you, Judge.
11	CROSS-EXAMINATION
12	BY MS. TAYLOR:
13	Q. Good afternoon.
14	A. Good afternoon.

Q. Thank you so much for joining us to testify today.

Just a couple quick questions.

On your first page when you talk about returning to the higher-of calculation, you mentioned dairy farmers left a huge amount of money on the table with the previous change following the 2018 Farm Bill.

Can you just tell us what you mean by that?

- A. Before -- before that, we had -- we had the higher-of, and we took that off on the Farm -- 2018 Farm Bill, and which we left several hundred millions of dollars that we did not receive, or could have received.
- Q. Could have received if you had the old formula in place?
 - A. That's correct.



15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

Q. Okay. Thank you.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

And a couple quick questions. We have been asking of all of our producers who've testified over the past two weeks, you mentioned in your statement that you milk approximately 4,000 cows. The Small Business Administration defines a small dairy farm as one receiving \$3.75 million or less in annual gross revenue.

And just if you could indicate for the record whether you meet that definition.

- A. No, I do not.
- Q. Okay. And the last question, there's also been discussion -- and I'm not sure if you have been able to tune in at all for the last couple of weeks -- but on risk management and the impact that any changes to the pricing formulas could have on dairy farmers' ability to utilize risk management tools.

And I'm just curious if you could indicate whether or not you are able to use any of those risk management tools to help you manage your risk?

- A. Yes, I do use some of the tools. I don't use them all. But I do use the tools that are available as I -- I go forward. So I'm not going to say I don't use them. I do look into it.
 - O. Okay. Thank you.
 - MS. TAYLOR: That's all the questions I have.
- 26 THE COURT: Anyone else have any questions?
- 27 Ms. Hancock.
- MS. HANCOCK: We would move to admit Exhibit 122,



1	your Honor.
2	THE COURT: Exhibit 122 is admitted into the
3	record.
4	(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 122 was received
5	into evidence.)
6	THE COURT: With that, you're dismissed from the
7	stand. Mr. Leyendekker, thank you for testifying today.
8	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
9	MS. TAYLOR: Thank you so much. I think next on
10	deck will be coming Mr. Raymond Diederich. I'm not sure
11	if I said that right. My apologies.
12	THE COURT: All right. Welcome. I need to swear
13	you in. Please raise your right hand.
14	RAYMOND DIEDERICH,
15	Being first duly sworn, was examined and
16	testified as follows:
17	THE COURT: Okay. Whose witness?
18	I mean, I could handle well, Ms. Hancock, you
19	are doing a lot of the work around here.
20	MS. HANCOCK: I agree.
21	THE COURT: We're grateful. I'm grateful anyway.
22	Do we have a statement for this witness?
23	MS. HANCOCK: I don't have a statement for this
24	witness.
25	And so maybe I'll just start off with,
26	Mr. Diederich, would you mind stating your name and
27	spelling it for the record, and letting us know who you
28	are here to represent.



1	THE WITNESS: Okay. My name is Raymond Diederich,
2	R-A-Y-M-O-N-D, D-I-E-D-E-R-I-C-H. And I represent
3	Diederich Farm, LLC.
4	MS. HANCOCK: And did you did you prepare a
5	written statement, Mr. Diederich?
6	THE WITNESS: No, I did not.
7	MS. HANCOCK: Okay. Would you go ahead and offer
8	us your testimony now, then?
9	THE WITNESS: Okay. Will do.
10	As I said, my name is Raymond Diederich. We milk
11	500 cows up by Green Bay, Wisconsin. Go Packers. And we
12	milk with robust milkers. So we are a high technical
13	operation.
14	I've been milking cows all my life. You can tell
15	by my gray hair, those of you that can see me, that I have
16	been around for a while.
17	I'm not representing any organization. I'm here
18	representing dairy farmers of Wisconsin, which has just
19	I'm talking specifically dairy farmers.
20	I'd like to have this opportunity today, and I
21	appreciate doing it virtually because, like the other
22	gentleman mentioned, I was out moving heifers in our
23	grazing pasture just this morning, and it is really nice
24	to be able to do this without having to travel very far
25	and be a part of it.
26	We ship our milk to a private milk plant, and



27

28

really appreciate their taking our product and making it

into quality cheese and putting it on the market.

Therein lies part of my concern. We really need to protect our processors. They are part of our three-legged thing here: Consumer, me, and the processors. It takes all of us to make this work.

But in the last ten, 15 years, since they changed the Make Allowance, we haven't lost a lot of processors, but we did lose a lot of farmers. So in my opinion, it seems like we have a disconnect between the consumer and me. We need to somehow get that back together.

Federal Orders were created years back so that we could create a good, stable market product for consumers. And today, that is really being disrupted by some of our new technologies and some of the way we can utilize the processors that are out there.

Depooling, in my opinion, is not very good. We were supposed to all share in the profit, share in the loss. And if we're depooling, that means we're not all sharing.

As I said before, there's a big disconnect between me and the consumer. I think somehow or another we need to get our price more connected to the consumer. We need to get our money out of the consumer and not out of the government.

The government has done a really good service for us with the DMC program. We utilize that. And it's really great that we had it this year because, otherwise, we'd been gone a long time ago too.

Year to date, we are \$209,000 off from gross



2.

2.0

2.1

receipts just because of lost revenue in dairy. That needs to change.

And it gets me to my next point, which is better price discovery. As was stated before about taking barrel cheese out, making it all cheddar, but most of our cheese today is mozzarella cheese, and that's not even part of the equation. Somehow or other I think that ought to be part of the equation. I know it is not in what the Federal Orders are talking about, but it's something you need to think about as you are going through this process.

And then the other one is, for the Make Allowance, every processor should be included. What they are doing, how they are doing it, how they are making cheese, that all needs to be part of the equation. So every processor needs to be part of the discovery process in getting our price discovery.

In closing, I'd like to say that I think the Make Allowance should be adjusted because processors, like everybody else, needs to have their price adjusted every now and then. The Class I price differential, which we lost before, we want back. And, quite frankly, we shouldn't have lost it. I'm not sure why we did. I follow the markets, follow everything really good, but it just really seems to me like there's some disconnect there.

At this time, I would like to thank you for listening to my testimony as a dairyman who is out here milking cows every day. And I'm part of a lot of



2.

2.1

1	organizations but not representing any of them today.
2	Thank you for your time.
3	THE COURT: Any questions from anyone for this
4	dairy farmer witness?
5	CROSS-EXAMINATION
6	BY DR. CRYAN:
7	Q. Roger Cryan with the American Farm Bureau
8	Federation.
9	Good afternoon, Mr. Diederich. How are you?
10	A. Good afternoon.
11	Q. Are you a Farm Bureau member?
12	A. Yes, I am.
13	Q. Were you aware Kevin Krentz was here yesterday to
14	testify?
15	A. Yes, I was aware that he was there.
16	Q. Good.
17	You talked about depooling. Could you could
18	you talk about the impacts that depooling has specifically
19	on you and your neighbors, the sort of impacts in terms of
20	depooling and negative PPDs in terms of your milk check
21	and your risk management and other things that are
22	disruptive to your operations?
23	A. It did have a great impact on our operation
24	because we did lose revenue, but I don't have those
25	numbers in particular to share with you. I guess I felt
26	it wasn't really important. The whole number, which is
27	what all dairymen are involved with, is what really needs



28

to be brought out in the conversation. But we did lose a

lot of money because we did have a negative PPD in our milk check.

- Q. And I'm sorry. I wasn't really asking for numbers. But the principle that you are laying out is really what I was asking about.
 - A. Okay.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Q. And you talked about price discovery, and you talked about having everybody involved in the price discovery.

Would you -- would you say that it would be reasonable to -- would you like to see all the -- before there's a Make Allowance increase, to have it be based on a mandatory audited survey of processing costs and yields?

- A. Well, I think that would be important to have a better understanding of what's really going on today. They -- in the price discovery now they ask, and I think the processors that responded to it isn't the majority and isn't probably the best run ones. I'm not really sure. I mean, we can't really say it is or isn't. But how do you get an excellent picture of what's going on if you don't ask everybody and kind of get it out of everybody?
- Q. Very good. I appreciate your opportunity -- your time. Oh, and I appreciate your participation in our forum last fall in Kansas City. That was an important --
 - A. Excellent. Thank you.

DR. CRYAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Anybody else have any questions other than AMS?



1	Seeing none, Ms. Taylor, you again?
2	MS. TAYLOR: Yes. Thank you, Judge.
3	CROSS-EXAMINATION
4	BY MS. TAYLOR:
5	Q. Thank you, Mr. Diederich, for joining us today and
6	testifying. This is Erin Taylor from USDA AMS.
7	A. Yes. Thank you.
8	Q. Just a few quick questions.
9	For your farm up there in Wisconsin, how many cows
10	approximately do you milk?
11	A. Right around 500.
12	Q. 500. Okay.
13	And the Small Business Administration defines for
14	a dairy farm a small business is one making \$3.75 million
15	or less in gross revenue annually.
16	Would your farm meet that definition?
17	A. We're pretty close to that definition. We have
18	two operators, so I guess if you split our gross in half,
19	you would be well under that.
20	Q. Okay. Thank you.
21	And can you speak a little bit about and I
22	don't know if you have been able to tune in the past few
23	weeks. There's been discussions on risk management and
24	the availability of those tools to help dairy farmers
25	manage their risk and issues that could arise with any
26	Federal Order price changes and their ability to utilize
27	those tools.



28

So do you use risk management tools?

- A. We do use DMC. And we did use some forward contracting back right at the beginning of COVID when --when the negative PPDs came in. And so, of course, we paid a lot of money to be in that program and really didn't get anything out of it, which really discouraged me from participating going forward. Part of me says that if you are involved in those programs, it levels the playing field but doesn't give you more money at the end of the day. And, quite frankly, in our business today, we're really struggling to make ends meet, and we kind of got to watch every dollar that comes in and goes out. So we really don't use it a lot.
 - O. Okay. Thank you.

And then from your testimony what I gather is that you support better price discovery, and I think I heard that you wouldn't indeed support including mozzarella in that price discovery series, which we do have a proposal here that would do that.

- A. Right.
- Q. Okay. And then you do support adjusting
 Make Allowances, but you don't have any -- I don't expect
 you to have specific numbers, but do you -- you do
 generally, in theory, support adjusting Make Allowances
 some to reflect different numbers than they do now?
- A. Right. The Make Allowance need to be adjusted. But then the other caveat to that is, of course, we need the price discovery from more processors and not just a few that are out there.



2.

2.1

1	Q. Okay. And then the last note I wrote down is you
2	do support adjustments in the Class I differentials?
3	I would assume you mean an increase in Class I
4	differentials?
5	A. That's right.
6	Q. Thank you.
7	MS. TAYLOR: I think that's all I have. I don't
8	know if anyone else in the room has another question.
9	THE COURT: Okay. Anything further for this
10	witness? Redirect? Anything?
11	We didn't have any documents to put into the
12	record for this witness.
13	Thank you very much, Mr. Diederich, for coming in
14	and talking to us. We very much appreciate it. Thanks
15	for all
16	THE WITNESS: I appreciate the opportunity.
17	THE COURT: Very good, sir. You may step down
18	from the virtual stand.
19	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
20	MS. TAYLOR: All right. Thank you.
21	I think next is Jared Fernandes. There he is.
22	We're getting quick now. Give us one second to get you
23	spotlighted on the screen, please.
24	Ms. Hancock.
25	MS. HANCOCK: Good afternoon, Mr. Fernandes.
26	THE COURT: I should swear in the witness. My bad
27	again. I got to be quicker.



28

Hi, Mr. Fernandes. I need to swear you in.

1	Please raise your right hand.
2	JARED FERNANDES,
3	Being first duly sworn, was examined and
4	testified as follows:
5	THE COURT: Your witness.
6	DIRECT EXAMINATION
7	BY MS. HANCOCK:
8	Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Fernandes. Would you mind
9	stating and spelling your name for our record?
10	A. Name is Jared Fernandes, spelled J-A-R-E-D,
11	F-E-R-N-A-N-D-E-S.
12	Q. Thank you, Mr. Fernandes.
13	Did you prepare a written statement for testimony
14	today?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. And has that been identified as Exhibit NMPF-68?
17	A. That's correct.
18	MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, if we could mark this
19	Exhibit 123.
20	THE COURT: Yes. Exhibit previously marked top
21	right-hand corner, NMPF-68, is marked as Exhibit 123 for
22	identification.
23	(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 123 was marked
24	for identification.)
25	MS. HANCOCK: Thank you.
26	BY MS. HANCOCK:
27	Q. Mr. Fernandes, would you mind sharing your
28	statement with us?



A. Okay. Thank you.

2.

2.1

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

My name is Jared Fernandes, and I am a third-generation
dairy farmer operating just south of Tulare, California.

My family partnership consists of myself and two brothers.

Together we own and operate two dairy farms. We milk
about 5,000 cows and collectively farm approximately 1800
acres, devoted primarily to forage for feeding our cows.

My milk gets pooled on the California Federal Milk Market Order Number 51. I currently serve on the Land O'Lakes Board of Directors. I have held this position for three years. I also hold other leadership positions in the industry as a board member of the California Dairy Research Foundation and Dairy Cares, as well as my local DHIA board.

As a member-owner of Land O' Lakes, I support all five proposals put forth by National Milk Producers
Federation. Today, I am testifying in support of National Milk's proposal listed in the Notice of Hearing as
Proposal 7, Class III and Class IV Formula Factors.

I support the National Milk proposal to increase the current manufacturing cost, or Make Allowance, in butterfat, nonfat solids, protein, and other solids component formulas listed in the Notice of Hearing as Proposal Number 7.

I also support enacting the authority for the USDA to conduct mandatory, auditable plant processing cost studies, conduct such a study under that authority, and



present the resulting data to the industry, which will enable interested parties to make requests for further Make Allowance adjustments based on proper, adequate data.

As stated by Christian Edmiston, Land O'Lakes vice president of Procurement, these proposed changes do not fully correct for the increases in butter, nonfat dry milk, cheddar cheese, and dry whey manufacturing costs experienced by manufacturers since 2008 when the current Make Allowances took effect.

Instead, these Make Allowance increases strike a fair balance between the producer's margin impact of higher Make Allowance and the manufacturer's impact of Make Allowance that more closely reflects the current cost of manufacturing commodity style butter, nonfat dry milk, cheddar cheese, and dry whey.

National Milk has estimated that this

Make Allowance proposal will reduce the Class III price by

\$0.58 per hundredweight and reduce Class IV prices by

\$0.52 per hundredweight.

While these class price reductions, if implemented, will negatively impact my farm's margin, I as a member-owner of Land O'Lakes understand the importance of Federal Milk Market Orders' Make Allowances being updated to reflect current manufacturing costs more closely for commodity style products.

As you know, Land O'Lakes operates several dairy plants that manufacture butter, nonfat dry milk, cheddar cheese, and sweet dry whey. Outdated Make Allowances have



2.

2.0

2.1

negatively impacted the financial performance of our Land O'Lakes manufacturing plants.

Accordingly, patronage paid to our dairy members has been reduced in recent years as a result of these outdated Make Allowances. Additionally, compressed margins at manufacturing plants have led to delaying and underspending on routine plant maintenance that can negatively impact plant performance.

In short, outdated, undervalued, inadequate
Make Allowances compress margins at cooperatively-owned
commodity manufacturing plants and place an unfair burden
on cooperative producer members compared to producers who
are not members of milk cooperatives that own and operate
commodity manufacturing plants.

I fully realize that increasing Make Allowances will negatively impact producer milk prices and their margins will be further compressed. Make Allowance increases larger than those proposed by National Milk will have a larger negative impact on milk producer's margins and increase the likelihood of jeopardizing the milk supply going forward.

Inflationary cost has affected every producer, but in California, the decreased water supply has dramatically increased forage cost. With feed being our primary expense, I have noticed a large increase in dairy retirement and dispersals. Thankfully, we had a wet year this year, but we are feeding off old higher priced inventory, and we know that our lack of new water



2.

2.1

infrastructure will continue to inflate our forage costs.

Producer margins have become significantly compressed in the first half of 2023 and may be more compressed in the second half of 2023, into 2024.

Class III and Class IV prices have averaged \$5.47 and \$6.08 per hundredweight lower through June compared to the same six-month period in 2022. That have translated into major decreases in FMMO uniform prices.

On my farm, our milk price has decreased significantly since June. For example, Federal Order 51 blend price in June 2022 was \$25.59 compared to the blend price in June '23 of \$16.42. This represents a decrease of \$9.17 per hundredweight in 12 months and represents a decrease of over 35% over 12 months. Our current milk price is well below our break-even prices.

USDA projects the 2024 U.S. All Milk price will drop to \$19.10 per hundredweight. That represents a decrease of \$6.24 from the 2022 All Milk price of \$25.34, representing a decrease of 25%. This drastic drop in milk price, without a similar decrease in other milk production costs, has narrowed margins on many dairy farms to the point of being below their cost of production.

The larger increases in Make Allowances proposed by the International Dairy Foods Association and the Wisconsin Cheese Makers Association would narrow producer margins to levels that would significantly impact my farm's profitability and collectively could put the availability of adequate supplies of milk at risk. Simply



2.1

1	put, we cannot absorb these additional class price
2	decreases proposed by IDFA and WCMA.
3	For the reasons I have outlined in my testimony, I
4	strongly urge the USDA to accept and implement the five
5	proposals put forth by National Milk Producers Federation.
6	Thank you for the opportunity to testify today.
7	Q. Mr. Fernandes, on the first page of your statement
8	it says, "As stated by Christian Edmiston."
9	I just wanted to note for you, because you are not
10	in the room, that we've moved a little slower than
11	anticipated, so he hasn't quite gone on yet.
12	But that's what you understand Mr. Edmiston is
13	going to be testifying to; is that right?
14	A. Yeah. He told me has not been able to testify
15	today, but his testimony has been submitted.
16	Q. That's true.
17	MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, we I have no further
18	questions for him.
19	THE COURT: Did anyone have any questions for this
20	witness?
21	Ms. Taylor?
22	I'm sorry, Mr. Miltner.
23	CROSS-EXAMINATION
24	BY MR. MILTNER:
25	Q. Hi, Mr. Fernandes. My name is Ryan Miltner. I
26	represent Select Milk Producers. I just have a couple of
27	quick questions for you.
28	Are you a member of any trade associations in



California? I know there's I think at least three producer associations out there separate from cooperatives. Are you a member of any of those?

- A. Yes. I am a member of the Western United Dairymen.
- Q. Okay. Great. If you were a member of CDC, I was going to ask you your thoughts on their proposal, but since you are not, I don't have anything else.

MR. MILTNER: Thanks for testifying today.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

THE COURT: Does AMS have questions, Ms. Taylor?

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. TAYLOR:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Fernandes. This is Erin Taylor from USDA.
 - A. Good morning -- or afternoon.
 - Q. Good morning for you, yes.

Thank you for joining us virtually today to testify. I wanted just to ask a few questions on your operation. You said you milk about 5,000 cows and farm approximately 1800 acres.

I don't know if you have been able to hear questions I have asked of similar witnesses before you in regards to if your farm would meet the small business definition that I had outlined to them.

- A. No, it would not.
- Q. Okay. And can you speak -- well, there's been a



lot of discussion on the impact price changes could have on risk management tools, and so there's discussions on -- if -- if USDA did make the recommended change to the formulas, how would those be implemented.

Can you speak if your businesses use -- excuse me -- if your farm utilizes risk management tools and how that might be impacted?

- A. I used to use risk management tools as far as futures and options and puts. But currently, I'm only using DMC and DRP, and I like the simplicity of it. And it's a little -- I just try to stay consistent and do about the same amount of milk so that I have some protection out there.
 - Q. Okay. Thank you.

I think I had one more question. At the end you talk about -- you know, your testimony talked about the -- recognizing the need to increase Make Allowances because of the impact it has on manufacturers, and particularly Land O'Lakes. But you don't want them to be too high and impose the increases proposed by IDFA and WCMA. And you state that collectively those proposals could put the availability of adequate supplies of milk at risk.

And I was just wondering if you could expand on that thought for the record.

A. Well, I -- we always get nervous if the Make Allowances -- you know, we have to find -- strike a fair balance because if we get it too high, and they can make a profit just by making a product, without truly



2.

2.0

2.1

1	needing it in the marketplace, just off of a an
2	advantage of efficiency of Make Allowance, it will throw
3	things out of balance.
4	And we are already, as dairymen, operating on such
5	thin lines that we realize that there is need for
6	Make Allowance adjustment, but we think that the proposal
7	set forth by IDFA is going to be way out of line and is
8	going to cause it's going to cause either a lot more
9	consolidation or and a decrease of farms is my opinion.
10	Q. Okay. Thank you.
11	So what I think I took from that was, if
12	Make Allowances are too high, some manufacturers might
13	make more product than necessary just because it would be
14	a profit maker for them?
15	A. Exactly.
16	Q. Okay.
17	MS. TAYLOR: That's all the questions I have.
18	Thank you.
19	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
20	THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Taylor.
21	Anyone else?
22	Redirect.
23	MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, we would move to admit
24	Exhibit 123 into evidence.
25	THE COURT: Any objections?
26	Hearing none, Exhibit 123 is admitted into the
27	record.



28

(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 123 was received

1	into evidence.)
2	MS. HANCOCK: Thank you for your time,
3	Mr. Fernandes.
4	THE COURT: Yes, thank you for coming in,
5	Mr. Fernandes. You are dismissed from the stand. And we
6	much appreciate having you.
7	MR. CRINION: Thank you.
8	MS. TAYLOR: Thank you so much.
9	I think next on deck let's give us a second. I
10	have Michael Crinion. Give us a second. I think we have
11	the wrong Michael. Give us one quick second.
12	Okay. Mr. Crinion, can you and I apologize if
13	I'm saying that wrong. Can you turn your video on?
14	There we go. Let me spotlight you. There we go.
15	Okay. And, Mr. Crinion, it looks like you are
16	from Edge Dairy Farmer Cooperative; is that correct?
17	MR. CRINION: That is correct.
18	MS. TAYLOR: Okay. So I will take this one,
19	Judge, because I don't think anyone else from Edge is here
20	to introduce him.
21	I do
22	THE COURT: Okay. Let me swear the witness in.
23	Raise your right hand.
24	MICHAEL CRINION,
25	Being first duly sworn, was examined and
26	testified as follows:
27	THE COURT: Your witness, Ms. Taylor.
28	DIRECT EXAMINATION



1 BY MS. TAYLOR: 2. Thanks for joining us. I believe you do have a There aren't paper copies. For those 3 4 listening and looking online, it looks to be Edge-3, online. 5 MS. TAYLOR: Your Honor, if I could ask it be 6 7 assigned an exhibit number, and we will have paper copies 8 available on Monday so they can officially be put in the 9 record. 10 THE COURT: Yes. Let's -- let's assign -- is 11 there a --12 MS. TAYLOR: This is Edge-3. 13 THE COURT: The document statement of this witness, I take it, Edge-3, will be marked for 14 15 identification Exhibit 124. 16 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 124 was marked 17 for identification.) 18 MS. TAYLOR: 124? 19 THE COURT: Yes. 2.0 MS. TAYLOR: Okay. Thank you. 2.1 BY MS. TAYLOR: 22 Could you state and spell your name for the 23 record, please? 24 Α. Good afternoon. Michael Crinion, M-I-C-H-A-E-L, 25 C-R-I-N-I-O-N. 26 Thank you. And if you can go ahead with your Q. 27 statement. 28 Α. Thank you very much.



Good afternoon, everyone, and thanks for the opportunity to be able to testify here today. My name is Michael Crinion. I'm a partner with Ash Grove Dairy in Lake Benton, Minnesota.

Originally from Ireland, I studied Agriculture and Farm Management at Warrenstown Agricultural College in Ireland. And then to extend our farming operations, my family and I moved to Brookings, South Dakota, in 2004.

Ash Grove Dairy is a partnership between the Crinion and Gross families. We milk 2100 cows in a cross-ventilated barn. I currently serve as vice president of Edge Dairy Farmer Cooperative and have served on the Edge board since 2018. I am also an alumnus of South Dakota Ag & Rural Leadership program and currently serve as Secretary of the U.S. Farmers and Ranchers in Action Board.

And for Erin, while our dairy does not meet the USDA small business definition, approximately 66% of Edge members do.

On our farm, we utilize Dairy Revenue Protection, and our farm would lose a tool to manage risk if this were suspended for any amount of time. Like any risk management program, we have a plan and then execute that plan when the market conditions are right for our farm.

I know USDA has heard debate on how far out to delay any changes that would impact open interest on the CME Group offerings, Livestock Gross Margin for Dairy, and DRP programs. I agree with Edge Dairy Farmer



2.

2.1

Cooperative's stance that over five quarters is the best option to ensure the entire supply chain can continually manage risk and urge USDA that any potential changes to the standard milk composition, Make Allowances, or AMS service, be implemented no sooner than January of '26.

I am also supportive of Proposals 16 and 17, submitted by Edge Dairy Cooperative that further enhance dairy farmers' ability to effectively manage their price risk.

Elimination of advanced pricing is one issue that I don't believe has received enough attention before this hearing. I am glad to see that it will be discussed in Proposals 16, 17, and 18.

Advanced pricing is no longer required with the other hedging options available to milk bottlers and other manufacturers. Dairy farmers like me manage constantly changing conditions, and our milk check shows up twice monthly. We can hedge to assure ourselves of some bounds, but ultimately, we have no advanced price to tell us where prices will settle.

In conclusion, I want to thank the USDA for allowing farmers the opportunity to provide virtual testimony throughout this hearing. Farmers need their voices heard on this critical dairy policy but cannot always take time away from the farm. Thank you for the added flexibility given to accommodate the farmer's voice.

THE COURT: Questions for this witness?

28 ///

2.

2.1



1 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2. BY DR. CRYAN: Roger Cryan. Good -- trying to remember where you 3 4 are. DR. CRYAN: Where is he? 5 6 THE WITNESS: I live in South Dakota and our dairy 7 farm is --8 BY DR. CRYAN: 9 Good morning. It is still good morning. Good Ο. 10 morning, Mr. Crinion. 11 It is afternoon here. 12:06 here. Α. 12 Ο. Okay. Good afternoon. I'm sorry. 13 I appreciate your testimony support of getting rid 14 of advanced pricing. Could you talk -- that's one of the 15 things that contributes to depooling. I was hoping you 16 could talk a little bit about the impact that depooling 17 and negative PPDs has on your farm and on your neighbors. 18 All right. Well, when there was a -- the middle Α. 19 of COVID, a lot of the cheese plants in our area depooled, 2.0 and it actually was to our benefit. But I have friends 2.1 who were -- locally, and they had very significant 22 negative PPDs. So I would encourage a system where all 23 manufacturers, it's in their benefit to stay pooled so there's -- all milk can be counted. 24 25 O. Thank you very much. Have a wonderful day. Thank 26 you. 27 Α. Thank you very much for your time. 28 THE COURT: Anyone else besides AMS?



1 Seeing no one, AMS? 2. MS. TAYLOR: Well, Mr. Crinion, I appreciate that you were listening earlier to questions, and you have 3 4 already answered all my questions in your testimony. is good to know people are actually watching and 5 6 listening. 7 So I don't have any questions, your Honor. THE COURT: Very well. Thank you. 8 9 THE WITNESS: Thank you very much for your time. 10 THE COURT: I guess we have -- should I go ahead 11 and move in -- any objection to -- well, let me see, we 12 didn't actually have a document. We reserved that --13 reserved the document number. I think what I would like 14 to do is just let's -- let's have this exhibit, even 15 though we don't actually have a copy, go into the record, 16 subject to reopen when we get copies if anyone has a 17 problem. And then that way, it doesn't fall through the 18 cracks. We're so grateful to have this witness come here, 19 we want to make sure his testimony makes it into the 2.0 record. 2.1 MS. TAYLOR: Thank you, your Honor. And USDA will 22 make sure there's paper copies on Tuesday when we get 23 back. 24 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 124 was received into evidence.) 25 26 MS. TAYLOR: Our last producer here is Mr. Kris 27 Scheider. And Ms. Hancock will introduce him -- oh, he



28

needs to be sworn in first, actually.

1	THE COURT: Yes. Please raise your right hand.
2	KRISTOPHER SCHEIDER,
3	Being first duly sworn, was examined and
4	testified as follows:
5	THE COURT: Your witness, Ms. Hancock.
6	DIRECT EXAMINATION
7	BY MS. HANCOCK:
8	Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Scheider. Would you mind
9	stating and spelling your name for the record?
10	A. Kristopher Scheider, K-R-I-S-T-O-P-H-E-R,
11	S-C-H-E-I-D-E-R.
12	Q. And did you prepare a written statement on behalf
13	of your testimony today?
14	A. I have.
15	Q. And is that identified as Exhibit NMPF-69?
16	A. Yes.
17	MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, if we could mark this, I
18	believe it is Exhibit 125.
19	THE COURT: Yes. NMPF-69 is marked for
20	identification as Exhibit 125.
21	(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 125 was marked
22	for identification.)
23	MS. HANCOCK: Thank you.
24	BY MS. HANCOCK:
25	Q. Mr. Scheider, would you mind providing us with
26	your testimony?
27	A. Okay. Good afternoon. Thank you for allowing us
28	to testify via Zoom. It has been a great opportunity for



us going forward.

2.

2.0

2.1

Again, I'm Kristopher Scheider. I'm a co-owner at Zirbel Dairy Farms, LLC, located outside of Green Bay, Wisconsin. I am an active board member with Foremost Farms USA. Foremost is a large milk cooperative with 850 members, producing 6.2 billion pounds of milk annually and manufacturing 500 million pounds of cheese annually. Our members are located in Wisconsin, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Iowa, and Minnesota.

In addition to being involved with NMPF, National Milk Producers Federation, I am also diligently active in the FARM Program, FAC, the Farmers Advisory Council, as the vice-chair, and I sit on the FARM Task Force Group for Version 5, animal care.

I would like to begin my testimony speaking to the Class I mover calculation, Proposal Number 13, submitted by NMPF. As a board member of Foremost, I am requesting that the USDA revert back to the higher-of for Class III/IV calculation, replacing the average Class III/IV plus 74.

Since May 2019, when the implementation of the Class III/IV plus the 74 occurred, we have encountered dramatic shifts in milk markets which have caused significant financial losses to dairy producers. This higher-of Class III/IV calculation has exposed our dairy farm members to endless risk on the downside, while the benefits to our dairy farmers have hampered us on the upside.



Our dairy farm members would benefit greatly by reverting back to the original higher-of Class III/IV pricing method. This loss of value for our products has greatly impacted our members' profitability, especially during the volatile markets and continual increases in input costs.

Regarding the removal of the 500-pound cheddar barrel price from the protein price in the NMPF Proposal Number 3, we feel, Foremost members, this should be eliminated from the pricing altogether.

FMMO pricing was designed to provide dairy producers with a fair price for their milk based on the value of the dairy products manufactured by processors. Block and barrel prices prior to 2017 were very similar.

The average NDPSR spread between the block/barrel was \$0.01. Since 2017, we have seen the spread go from \$0.07 in 2017 to a high of \$0.27 in 2020. The NDPSR spread since 2017 between the block and the barrel has averaged \$0.11. As a result, this has undervalued the Class III pricing because the proportion of barrel volume driven the protein calculation is overstated.

To have the classes of milk undervalued is a detriment to the dairy industry, not only from a producer standpoint, but also from a manufacturing standpoint, which includes cooperatives like Foremost. Allowing the elimination of the barrels would help both dairy producers and manufacturers have the ability to capitalize on the true value of dairy products.



2.1

In 2022, barrel prices represented 9% of the natural cheese manufactured in the United States. The other 91% of the natural cheeses were mostly based off the 40-pound block market. Trying to price off the barrel versus block market would be the same as pricing one acre of farmland for commodity production versus one acre of farmland for real estate development. Neither belong in the same category, but both are tied to pricing.

Regarding the Make Allowances, I would say that out of all the proposals, NMPF Proposal Number 7 should be considered the most crucial because the Make Allowance changes have a significant impact on the prices dairy farmers receive.

Make Allowances used in the Federal Order pricing formulas have not been updated since 2008, and manufacturing costs have risen in the past 15 years. I agree that Make Allowances should be adjusted but such changes need to be done in a timely matter.

The NMPF proposal has outlined the best two-step situation for dairy farmers. Changing the Make Allowance needs to be addressed at a slower pace and the levels don't need to be severely impacted to the farmer's ability to survive. I see this as taking a portion of someone's salary or hourly rate and cutting it by a third to a quarter instantaneously. No one wants this.

I'm here to provide a solution that's best for the dairy farming industry. Let's take the current

Make Allowance and move it to the higher level as NMPF has



2.

2.0

2.1

proposed. This will allow dairy farmers to financially survive.

I understood the Wisconsin Cheese Makers
Association and the International Dairy Foods Association
would like to increase the Make Allowances to what they
consider true costs or at a much higher level in just a
matter of a few years span. Instead, let's recognize
plant costs have risen and have increased outlined in NMPF
Proposal Number 7.

But more importantly, I am much in favor of the support for NMPF's efforts to provide the USDA with authorization and funding to conduct mandatory plant cost surveys, which the industry would be able to see the USDA results, and then the industry would determine whether or not to go for -- another hearing should be taking place to consider increasing Make Allowances.

Allowing the Make Allowances to increase dramatically in a short time frame would seriously hinder the dairy farming community. NMPF's proposal is looking at a negative price impact of approximately \$0.58 a hundredweight while WCMA/IDFA proposals would negatively impact the price by approximately \$1.58 a hundredweight.

Allowing the adoption of the WCMA/IDFA proposal, some, if not many, dairy farmers would be forced into selling and others would be forced into retirement. At that end of the day, the Make Allowance needs to be continually updated and reviewed to allow for the changes in a reasonable and acceptable manner with data supporting



2.

2.1

1	pricing.
2	In summary, I'm here to support all five proposals
3	by NMPF. Using good data information, the USDA would then
4	be able to provide dairy farmers with accurate,
5	sustainable metrics for pricing. I would like to thank
6	Secretary Vilsack for allowing me this opportunity and
7	thank you for presenting it today.
8	THE COURT: Questions?
9	CROSS-EXAMINATION
10	BY DR. CRYAN:
11	Q. Roger Cryan for the American Farm Bureau
12	Federation.
13	Hello, Mr. Scheider. How are you today?
14	A. I'll great. How are you, sir?
15	Q. Very well.
16	Are you a Farm Bureau member?
17	A. I am.
18	Q. I appreciate your dues.
19	I also appreciate that you what you are saying
20	about the support for National Milk's efforts at
21	implementing you know, directing and funding a survey
22	by USDA to do manufacturing costs and yields, we're
23	working on that, along as is IDFA, and ultimately, we
24	think that's a good basis for future changes.
25	Would you would you say that you think it's
26	important that we don't go too far before we have that



increases?

27

28

kind of data, and that's why you support National Milk's

A. I think you need to spread it out over a
shorter or over a longer period of time. Because, yes,
prices have increased, and especially, okay, so let's look
at 2020, since COVID, you know, we had the war in Ukraine,
we have had higher inflation prices the last few years.
Yes, prices have risen. But we need to do this gradually.
And, you know, really, 15 years to wait to, oh, hey, I
need to bump it up, it is kind of like going to a
restaurant. You go in one day and, you know, the pricing
was from 2008, and, oh, hey, I'm going to bump it up 10
bucks a plate or 30 bucks a plate, kind of the same
difference in my opinion.

Q. Very good.

And could you -- could you talk about the impact the depooling and negative PPDs have had on you and your neighbors?

- A. So the depooling, yeah, personally. So it did affect us tremendously. I think we were fortunate that some of that was absorbed by the cooperative that we shipped to, and the majority of it was done by the farmers, I know some of it. Other farmers in the area had to take the full cost. So I think we were fortunate to share some of that. But it has significant -- significantly put us in a -- behind the eight ball in a few years.
- Q. So it -- it cost money, and it also undermined the concept of everybody getting a uniform price?
 - A. Yes, that's correct.



2.

2.0

2.1

1	DR. CRYAN: Thank you very much.
2	THE COURT: Any other questions before we get to
3	AMS?
4	Seeing none, Ms. Taylor.
5	CROSS-EXAMINATION
6	BY MS. TAYLOR:
7	Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Scheider. How are you today?
8	A. I'm great. How are you?
9	Q. Good. Thank you for joining us testifying
10	virtually today. This is Erin Taylor with AMS.
11	I was wondering if you could give us some
12	information, a little bit about your farm specifically,
13	how big your farm is. I imagine you heard my questions on
14	small businesses of other farmers. So if you could speak
15	to that as well.
16	A. So we milk 1,000 cows, and we would be greater
17	than the 3.75.
18	Questions in reference to risk management, we
19	utilize DMC and DRP. We have done futures in the past,
20	but have kind of rolled off from that a little bit.
21	Q. Okay. Thank you.
22	And in regards to Foremost, you mentioned that
23	they make 500 million pounds of cheese annually. What
24	can you describe for the record what types of cheese they
25	make? Do they make blocks or barrels or other varieties?
26	A. Mostly blocks. Mostly blocks, but it goes into
27	different types of cheeses



Q.

28

Okay. I think Mr. Cryan touched on my last

1	question, but just to make sure I'm correct. When it
2	comes to Make Allowance changes and wanting them to be at
3	a slower pace, that's in regards to National Milk's
4	efforts, which you support, of having a survey done
5	through authorized through the Farm Bill?
6	A. Yes, that's correct.
7	Q. Okay.
8	MS. TAYLOR: That is all the questions I have.
9	Thank you so much.
10	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
11	MS. HANCOCK: Thank you for your testimony.
12	Your Honor, we would offer Exhibit 125 into
13	evidence.
14	THE COURT: Seeing no objections, Exhibit 125 is
15	admitted into the record as received.
16	(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 125 was received
17	into evidence.)
18	MS. HANCOCK: Thank you Mr. Scheider.
19	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
20	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Scheider. We really
21	appreciate you talking to us, and you may step down.
22	MS. TAYLOR: Okay. Your Honor, that was our last
23	dairy farmer witness for today.
24	THE COURT: Yes.
25	MS. TAYLOR: If I might suggest maybe a 15-minute
26	break so we could reset and perhaps gather on how we might
27	want to finish the day out



28

THE COURT: Sure. But I thought we were -- we

1	were going to put up Ms. Cashman?
2	MS. TAYLOR: Yes, but I need a minute before we do
3	that.
4	THE COURT: Right. I mean, are you suggesting
5	that we may not want to put her up?
6	MS. TAYLOR: No, she can go up after the break.
7	The question is if there's anybody else that one of the
8	parties here would want to put a witness up before we end
9	at 3 o'clock or not today.
10	THE COURT: Yes. Absolutely. Let's take a
11	15-minute break. It is 1:25. So, I don't know, let's
12	just come back at a quarter to.
13	(Whereupon, a break was taken.)
14	THE COURT: Okay. Looks like we have everyone we
15	need.
16	Yes, Mr. Cryan.
17	On the record, by the way.
18	DR. CRYAN: I'm Roger Cryan with the American Farm
19	Bureau Federation. And I have discussed with the
20	advocates for the other groups that are here and with
21	Ms. Taylor to move the submission deadline for Category 4
22	from 8:00 a.m. on September 6th to 8:00 a.m. on
23	September 8th.
24	Is there any objection well, first of all, let
25	me just confirm that everyone I have talked to has no
26	objection to that. It was submitted by e-mail, and we'll
27	share it with the other advocates.
28	THE COURT: Yes, Mr. English.



MR. ENGLISH: I absolutely agree. Mr. Cryan said something very important, that after we had our conversation earlier about Issue 5, it occurred to us by submitting on midnight on Saturday, might not get it posted.

So the lawyers/parties have agreed, both for now Issue 4 that Mr. Cryan's bringing up, and Issue 5, that we will exchange by e-mails. So I thought it would be helpful for the record to know that in case there is somebody else who wants to submit.

But the bottom line is we made that agreement that -- you know, submitting it to USDA at midnight on Saturday, it doesn't accomplish the goal that some people wanted. So we have all agreed that all of these dates that are being moved would result in an e-mail to people.

THE COURT: Yes. That's a great idea. Furthers our goal of utilizing electronic help or whatever we call it. But USDA thinks it is a good idea, and I do too. Thank you. Thank you for coming forward. I haven't seen any objection to your proposal.

As I recall, we have a list on the website established by AMS for this case of those deadlines. Can we adjust that?

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, your Honor. We already made an adjustment online to the move date that we discussed this morning to September 16th for Class I and II differentials. We'll make the same change to base Class I skim milk price, which will now be due Friday,



2.1

1 September 8th by 8:00 a.m. Eastern. That change might not 2. be reflected today on the website. THE COURT: Of course. 3 MS. TAYLOR: So just so everybody knows, but we'll 4 get it done by Monday. 5 6 THE COURT: Thank you. I thought you'd be ahead 7 of me. 8 Thank you, Mr. Cryan. 9 Thanks to all the participants for the good 10 coordination on these procedural matters, which helps 11 things go so smoothly. 12 We have some preliminary business. I'd ask you, 13 Ms. Taylor, to lay out where we're going for the rest of 14 this day. MS. TAYLOR: Thank you, your Honor. I think next 15 16 we'll have Ms. Cashman up to put on the -- a few more data 17 requests that got in USDA. And then I believe after her 18 will be Christian Edmiston, on behalf of National Milk, 19 and that will probably bring us to the end of the day with 2.0 that direct testimony. 2.1 Next week on deck for Tuesday, I have Emma Downing 22 from National Milk, Roger Cryan from American Farm Bureau 23 Federation, and then Mike Brown from the International 24 Dairy Foods Association to start us off on Tuesday at 25 8:00 a.m. 26 THE COURT: Yes. And which proposal are we on 27 now?



28

MS. TAYLOR: We're still on Proposal 3. Mr. Cryan

1 will discuss Proposal 4. 2. THE COURT: Very good. MS. TAYLOR: If those numbers line up. 4 and 5, 3 4 thank you. 5 And Mr. Brown will have rebuttal opposition 6 testimony to something. Some of those, I don't know. 7 haven't seen --8 MR. ENGLISH: All of them. 9 MS. TAYLOR: All of them. I haven't seen it yet. 10 THE COURT: Ms. Hancock, I recognize you. MS. HANCOCK: Thank you. I just wanted to clarify 11 12 the schedule on Tuesday. Ms. Downing Reynolds is 13 traveling back, and the first nonstop flight -- she's 14 pregnant, and the first nonstop flight that would get her 15 in doesn't get her in until 1 o'clock. So we have talked 16 with the other parties, so -- and then Mr. Cryan I believe 17 is not going to be here until 9:30. 18 So Mr. Rosenbaum is working on getting Mr. Brown 19 to put in the first couple of his rebuttals, and then we 2.0 will likely go to Mr. Cryan. Then we'll go back to 2.1 Ms. Downing Reynolds, and then finish up with Mr. Brown 22 with the rest of his rebuttals. So the same witnesses, 23 just reconfigured a little bit in another order. 24 MS. TAYLOR: And any leftover cross-examination 25 from today's witness. 26 MS. HANCOCK: Correct. 27 MS. TAYLOR: If there is any. Okay. 28 THE COURT: Okay. Great. Thank you. Thank you,



1	again, for working these things out off the record. Well
2	done.
3	Okay. We have Ms. Cashman back on the stand. I
4	think we can just say that you are still under oath from
5	the time I swore you in last time.
6	LORIE CASHMAN,
7	Having been previously sworn, was examined
8	and testified as follows:
9	THE COURT: And your witness, Mr. Hill, it
10	looks like.
11	DIRECT EXAMINATION
12	BY MR. HILL:
13	Q. Good afternoon.
14	A. Good afternoon.
15	Q. So can you, again, please state your name for the
16	record?
17	A. Yes, it's Lorie Cashman, L-O-R-I-E, C-A-S-H-M-A-N.
18	Q. And your occupation one more time, please.
19	A. Director of the economics division for AMS Dairy
20	Program.
21	Q. Okay. Now, you've had the pleasure of presenting
22	evidence before, have you not?
23	A. I have.
24	Q. So I will skip some of the preliminaries and just
25	get straight to it.
26	Do you have the document that for now is just
27	well, I guess it is marked on our document as Exhibit 59,
28	but it is actually not Exhibit 59.



- A. Well, I think it is because we asked to reserve 2 59.
 - Q. That is correct. We withheld that number. Thank you.

MR. HILL: So I would like to have that officially marked as Exhibit 59, your Honor, for identification.

THE COURT: Yes, AMS or USDA, depending on how we're marking these, it's just Exhibit 59 in the top right-hand corner, is now marked for identification as Exhibit 59.

11 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 59 was marked for identification.)

BY MR. HILL:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. So is this document something that you had a hand in preparing?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And since you testified before, it is true that in preparing this document you are not taking any sides for or against any proposals during the hearing?
 - A. I am not.
 - Q. So this was presented -- you are presenting this because of a data request; is that true?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. Okay. So if you could just walk us through the document, we would like to hear that now.
- A. Okay. So this is Package Sales of Total Fluid

 Milk Products, in Million Pounds -- well, each one's going

 to be a different Federal Order, so page 1 of 11 is



Federal Order 1, for the years 2018 through current of 2023.

Per footnote 1, "In-area sales are dispositions (deliveries) of fluid milk products in consumer type packages from milk processing (bottling plants) to outlets in Federal Order marketing areas that sell directly to consumers. These outlets include food stores, convenience stores, warehouse stores/wholesale clubs, non-food stores, schools, food service industry, and home delivery."

So the first column is years. The second column is going to be regions. And this particular instance, this is for Federal Order 1, so it's also known as the Northeast region.

And so per footnote 2, "Pounds represent disposition of packaged fluid milk from pool plants regulated by the respective order to outlets within the respective order." For example, this would be dispositions of packaged fluid milk plants regulated by Federal Order 1 to outlets within Federal Order 1.

The second one is for all other regions, so:

"Pounds represent dispositions of packaged fluid milk

products from plants not fully regulated by the respective

order to outlets within the respective order. All other

regions may include Orders 5, 6, 7, 30, 32, 33, 51, 124,

126, and 131," as well as "producer handler, exempt, and

partially regulated."

And then the total line is "pounds represent the total disposition of packaged fluid milk products within



2.

2.1

1	the respective marketing area."	
2	So then all the pounds are listed by month, and	
3	the final column is annual.	
4	And per footnote 5, the "totals may not add due to	
5	rounding."	
6	Q. Okay. So I'm looking at this. I see there are	
7	11 pages. Can you kind of just tell me	
8	A. Right.	
9	Q if there are any differences between those	
10	11 pages?	
11	A. Yes, it's all the same data, all the same	
12	footnotes. It's just the order changes. So it is for all	
13	the orders in the system, all 11.	
14	Q. So it is just for the 11 different orders?	
15	A. Correct.	
16	Q. Is there any other information you would like to	
17	add besides this?	
18	A. Not at this time.	
19	Oh, on this one in particular or all the other	
20	stuff?	
21	Q. This one.	
22	A. No.	
23	Q. Do you have any other information requests, data	
24	requests?	
25	A. Yes, I do.	
26	There was a request for unsalted and salted butter	
27	that was graded for 2005 and 2022. These requests do not	



28

have tables for because it just would have been one number

on a table.

2.0

2.1

But -- so for salted, we had 697 million pounds graded in 2005, and 816 million pounds graded in 2022. And for unsalted, it was 106 million pounds in 2005 and 355 million in 2022. And this was for all butter types that were presented for grading, so it includes retail, bulk, and etcetera.

Then there was a request for Class IV used to fortify Class I. So, first of all, I'm going to read the specific reference in the CFR to this. And it's CFR 1000.40, little (d), number (3).

And so the little (d) section is "Class IV shall be all skim milk and butterfat," and then it has several other items listed there. But in (3), it says, "in the skim milk equivalent of nonfat milk solids used to modify a fluid milk product that has not been accounted for in Class I." And for that number, it is 652 million pounds in 2022.

- Q. And just to make it clear, when you say CFR 1000.40, you mean 7 CFR 1000.40, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And then the final item was for Exhibit 88, which I think was the California Dairy Campaign Exhibit 3. There's a footnote on page 2 of 2 that states: "Due to reduced personal contacts, first-person reporting is no longer used to report mozzarella prices. The prices reported are adjusted week to week based on the CME cash futures settlement."



So to clarify some of this, some of it's correct and some of it's half correct. Market News did stop collecting these prices by phone contact about ten to 15 years ago. It is -- but it is not based on the CME cash futures settlement. It is based on the daily cash close prices for 40-pound blocks. It's a weekly average of the prices reported that week. And then we calculate a difference between the weekly average of the current week minus -- or -- and the weekly average of the prior week and subtract that and apply it to the mozzarella price for the previous week.

That's all I've got.

Q. Okay.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MR. HILL: I'll turn her over for examination at this point.

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Rosenbaum.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROSENBAUM:

Q. Steve Rosenbaum for the International Dairy Foods Association.

I want to follow up on the exhibit you were just talking about, which is Hearing Exhibit 88. So these are mozzarella cheese prices that are represented here; is that right?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And how -- how -- and does USDA report mozzarella cheese prices?
 - A. Well, we don't collect the information from the



primary source, so to speak. It is a calculated number based on the 40-pound block cheese sales on the CME.

- Q. But that's a cheddar cheese price, isn't it?
- A. Well, it was applied to some previous mozzarella price in the past.
- Q. Well, okay. How -- how is that being done now?

 Well, I mean, in -- I'm not -- I'm not understanding how you're -- you are using movement in the cheddar cheese price to say something about the mozzarella price.
- 10 A. Correct.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

2.0

2.1

- Q. So I -- so -- and so the changes that are represented here over time, those are changes that are based entirely upon changes in the cheddar cheese price?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. Well -- so what's the starting point for the mozzarella price?
- 17 A. I don't have that information.
- Q. That -- because that's before -- I mean, this is a USDA publication, right?
 - A. It is. It was prior to my time. I -- I don't have any answer for that.
- Q. And what -- what is your time? I'm sorry, you may have said that already. How long have you been doing this?
 - A. I have been with AMS 12 or 13 years.
- 26 Q. So --
- A. I mean I stated earlier that they stopped collecting this ten to 15 years ago.



Q. Okay. So are -- is the -- is it -- strike the question again.

Is it your understanding that there is a mozzarella price that was collected ten or 15 years ago by calling up somebody and asking them what the price of mozzarella cheese was at that particular point in time, and then since that phone call took place, the reported mozzarella cheese price is simply whatever that mozzarella cheese price was ten or 15 years ago adjusted by whatever changes have happened in the cheddar cheese block price since then?

- A. That's my understanding.
- Q. Okay. And -- and do you know who it is that ten or 15 years ago received the call asking them what the mozzarella price was?
 - A. I do not.
- Q. And are you the person within USDA who is most knowledgeable about these questions?
- 19 A. I would think so. Yes.
 - MR. ROSENBAUM: That's all I have. Thank you.
- 21 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 22 BY DR. CRYAN:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

2.0

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. I'm Roger Cryan with the American Farm Bureau
 Federation, and I have a very difficult question for you.
 Could you repeat all five of those numbers just to make sure everybody in the room has the same thing?
- A. Yep.
- Class IV fortification used to fortify Class I was



1	652 million pounds in 2022.
2	Q. Okay.
3	A. And then for butter graded, it was salted is
4	697 million pounds in 2005, and 816 million pounds in
5	2022. Unsalted is 106 million pounds in 2005 and
6	355 million in 2022.
7	Q. And that's graded grade AA butter grade?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. Sorry to be so hard on you. Thank you.
10	A. Terrible, Roger. Thank you.
11	Q. And thank you for the data.
12	A. You're welcome.
13	CROSS-EXAMINATION
14	BY MR. MILTNER:
15	Q. Ryan Miltner representing Select Milk Producers.
16	Ms. Warren, thank you for putting together
17	Exhibit 59, that was a request of Select Milk Producers.
18	I did want to ask about the what is comprised in the
19	in the rows where it says "all other regions." And I
20	looked back at the request that we sent in, and I think
21	they had we had requested that broken out by by
22	order.
23	Was it consolidated because of confidentiality
24	restrictions?
25	A. Yes, it was.
26	Q. Okay. And then just so I'm clear, I want to ask
27	about a partially regulated distributing plant.



28

So if we have a partially regulated plant that's

1 in Order 1, and that's where -- it's partially regulated 2. under Order 1. All of that plant's volume -- well, that plant's volume that is sold into Order 1 would be in all 3 4 other regions, correct? Α. Yes. Correct. 5 And then the volume of that plant that would be 6 Ο. 7 sold in Order 5, that would show up on the Order 5 8 spreadsheet under all other regions on Order 5, correct? 9 Α. Correct. 10 O. Okay. MR. MILTNER: I think that's all the clarification 11 12 I needed. Again, thank you very much for putting it 13 together. 14 THE WITNESS: You're welcome. 15 THE COURT: Any other questions for this witness? 16 Other than AMS? 17 AMS, it is your witness, so I guess you are 18 redirect. 19 MR. HILL: No, we have no further questions, your 2.0 Honor. 2.1 THE COURT: All right. Let's -- I'll put 22 Exhibit 59 into the record of this hearing unless there's 23 objection. 24 Seeing none, Exhibit 59 is part of the record. 25 (Thereafter, Exhibit Number 59 was received



26

27

28

MS. TAYLOR: I believe we have a National Milk

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Cashman.

into evidence.)

1	witness	next.
2		THE COURT: Yes. Thank you for making a witness
3	availab	le.
4		Raise your right hand.
5		CHRISTIAN EDMISTON,
6		Being first duly sworn, was examined and
7		testified as follows:
8		THE COURT: Your witness.
9		DIRECT EXAMINATION
10	BY MS. I	HANCOCK:
11	Q.	Good afternoon, Mr. Edmiston. Would you mind
12	stating	and spelling your name for the record?
13	Α.	Absolutely. Christian Edmiston,
14	C-H-R-I-	-S-T-I-A-N, E-D-M-I-S-T-O-N.
15	Q.	And can you provide your mailing address for the
16	record a	as well?
17	Α.	4001 Lexington Avenue North, Arden Hills,
18	Minnesot	ca, 55126.
19	Q.	Thank you.
20		And where were you employed?
21	Α.	Land O'Lakes.
22	Q.	Did you in your role with Land O'Lakes prepare a
23	written	statement in support of National Milk's proposal?
24	Α.	Yes, I did.
25	Q.	Is that identified as Exhibit NMPF-9?
26	Α.	Yes, ma'am.
27		MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, if we could have this
28	exhibit	marked as the for identification purposes.



1	THE COURT: Yes. That exhibit's marked
2	Exhibit 126 for identification.
3	(Thereafter, Exhibit Number 126 was marked
4	for identification.)
5	MS. HANCOCK: Thank you.
6	BY MS. HANCOCK:
7	Q. Mr. Edmiston, would you provide us with your
8	testimony at Exhibit 126, please?
9	A. Absolutely.
10	My name is Christian Edmiston, and I am vice
11	president of Procurement at Land O'Lakes. I have worked
12	in the dairy industry for over 20 years, including roles
13	with Informa Economics, Kraft Foods, and Land O'Lakes.
14	My primary areas of responsibility have been
15	procurement and sales of dairy products such as milk,
16	cheese, butter, whey, and cream, as well as dairy
17	commodity market analysis and risk management. I have
18	personally bought and sold bulk cheese varieties for my
19	employers, and also draw upon the experience of others
20	within Land O'Lakes that have done the same.
21	I have served on committees and represented my
22	current and former employers with groups such as the
23	International Dairy Foods Association (IDFA), National
24	Milk Producers Federation (NMPF), Chicago Mercantile
25	Exchange (CME), and American Dairy Products Institute
26	(ADPI).
27	Land O'Lakes is a dairy cooperative with over 1200



28

dairy farmer member-owners. Land O'Lakes has a national

membership base, whose members are pooled on five different Federal Orders. Land O'Lakes' members own several cheese (block, barrel, processed, and dry), butter-powder, and value-added plants in the Upper Midwest, East, and California. Land O'Lakes thanks the Department for calling this hearing to consider the modernization of Federal Milk Marketing Orders (FMMOs).

I present this testimony on behalf of Land O'Lakes, Inc. Land O'Lakes fully supports all the National Milk Producers Federation proposals, and this testimony is submitted in support of Proposal Number 3: Remove the 500-pound Barrel Cheddar Cheese Price from the Protein Price.

As others have stated in their testimony, dairy producers have been negatively impacted by the current cheese pricing structure in the Class III formula. This primarily occurs in two ways:

cheese versus NDPSR barrel cheddar cheese is not representative of cheese pricing in the United States. In my experience, most cheese in the United States is priced off of the 40-pound block cheddar cheese markets with only a very small fraction of cheese priced off of 500-pound barrel cheddar cheese. However, the Class III formula is weighted nearly equally with block and barrel cheese prices. Consequently, when block cheese prices trade well above barrel cheese prices, as has mostly been the case since 2017, the result is a Class III milk price that is



2.

2.1

artificially lower because of the overrepresentation of barrel cheese price;

(2) When the price of block cheese exceeds that of barrel cheese, barrel cheese manufacturing plants struggle to maintain profitability with a regulated milk price based on the weighted average of block cheese and barrel cheese, and with the barrel cheese sales limited to the lower value of barrel cheese price only. Producers either absorb this financial impact through direct ownership of the milk processing asset via a cooperative or through lower milk prices paid to producers by the manufacturer in areas outside FMMOs.

I'll skip the quote from USDA.

The original goal was to increase statistical volume on the survey by adding barrel cheddar cheese, while adjusting by \$0.03 per pound to reflect the difference in cost for the lower barrel cheddar cheese prices. The effect of this was to put block cheese and barrel cheese on equal price terms, which meant no major impacts to milk producers or processors of barrels.

Since that time, barrel cheese prices have become increasingly more distant from block cheddar cheese prices and the \$0.03 addition to barrels is not enough to cover the delta between the two.

The price spread between block cheese and barrel cheese was relatively stable from 1999 to 2016. Without volatility in this price spread, the flaws in the current Class III pricing formula structure were not evident. The



2.

2.0

2.1

departure of the historically stable price relationship between block cheese and barrel cheese has become evident since 2017 and has created the financial impacts detailed above.

To address several concerns that have arisen during industry association meetings:

- (1) Price discovery will not be impacted. The NDPSR survey can continue to include barrel cheese and provide visibility to changes in the market price, but it does not have to be included in the Class III Protein Price calculation;
- (2) The CME cash barrel market would not be impacted. While removal of the barrel price from the Class III Protein Price calculation may change trading interest in the CME cash barrel market, trading can still occur;
- (3) The impact on risk management and futures position limits should be negligible. As mentioned in other testimony, the percentage of total product represented by survey volume would remain above the level seen in the butter market. Single month position limits are currently the same in butter as for cheese futures and block cheese futures.

Given these considerations, Land O'Lakes supports the National Milk Producers Federation proposal to remove the 500-pound barrel cheddar cheese price from calculation of the protein price. Land O'Lakes thanks the Department for calling this hearing to consider the modernization of



2.

2.0

2.1

1 Federal Milk Marketing Orders. 2. Ο. Thank you, Mr. Edmiston. MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, we would submit Mr. 3 Edmiston for cross-examination. 4 THE COURT: Cross, Mr. Rosenbaum. 5 CROSS-EXAMINATION 6 7 BY MR. ROSENBAUM: Ο. Steve Rosenbaum for the International Dairy Foods 8 Association. 9 10 If you could please turn to the second page of 11 your testimony. MR. ROSENBAUM: I'm sorry. If I could have the 12 13 hearing -- the exhibit number again, your Honor. I'm 14 sorry. 15 THE COURT: 126. 16 MR. ROSENBAUM: 126. 17 BY MR. ROSENBAUM: 18 And you state at the end, "to address several 19 concerns that have arisen during industry association 2.0 meetings," and then you list three different points, 2.1 correct? 2.2 Α. Correct. 23 Point number one is, "Price discovery will not be 2.4 impacted. The NDPSR survey can continue to include barrel 25 cheese and provide visibility to changes in the market 26 price, but it does not have to be included in the Class III Protein Price calculation." 27 28



Do you see that?

A. Yes, I do.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. So this is a scenario under which barrel cheese prices would no longer be included in calculating the Class III protein price, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And I assume that means that barrel cheese would play no role in setting minimum milk prices, correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. Have you actually looked at the legal authority the Secretary has to gather information for purposes of the NDPSR survey?
 - A. I do not have familiarity of that legal authority.
- Q. Do you know whether, in fact, that legal authority makes it illegal for the Secretary to collect information unless that information is being used to collect -- to set minimum prices?
 - A. I do not have that knowledge.
- Q. So I will draw your attention to 7 U.S. Code
 1637b, which is the provision that provides for mandatory
 reporting for dairy products. Section (a), Establishment,
 says, quote: "The Secretary shall establish a program of
 mandatory dairy product information reporting that will:
 (1) provide timely, accurate, and reliable market
 information; (2) facilitate more informed marketing
 decisions; and (3) promote competition in the dairy
 product manufacturing industry." That is section (a).



Section (b), number (1): "In general, in

establishing the program, the Secretary shall only" --

emphasize the word only -- "(A)(i) subject to conditions described in paragraph (2), require each manufacturer to report to the Secretary information concerning the price, quantity, and moisture content of dairy products sold by the manufacturer; and" -- and then there's some other things that are irrelevant here, but say that's subject to the conditions in paragraph (2), which I'll now get to.

Paragraph (2), "Conditions: The conditions referred to in paragraph (1)(A)(i) are that, (A) the information referred to in paragraph (1)(A)(i)" -- namely the information being collected -- "is required only with respect to those package sizes actually used to establish minimum prices for Class III or Class IV milk under a Federal Milk Marketing Order; and (B) the information referred to in paragraph (1)(A)(i) is required only to extent that the information is actually used to establish minimum prices for Class III or Class IV milk under a Federal Milk Marketing Order."

Now, doesn't that suggest that, in fact, your statement is incorrect and, in fact, it would be illegal for the National -- for the survey to include barrel cheese under a circumstance where barrel cheese is no longer being used?

THE COURT: Hold up.

Ms. Hancock.

MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, I would object to this question. The witness has already said he's not familiar with the standards. And he's just read the law in. It's



2.

2.0

2.1

1	either a question of law, which we can agree, or
2	Mr. Rosenbaum is just asking for the witness to do his
3	legal research for him, either one of which is
4	MR. ROSENBAUM: I have done the legal research,
5	your Honor, and he's making a statement that I'm trying to
6	get him to to to indicate whether or not his
7	statement is is, in fact, valid.
8	THE COURT: Well, I I don't know that this
9	witness has to interpret the regulation. I mean, he can
10	certainly rely on his own counsel.
11	Would it do for your purposes if you asked the
12	witness to assume for purposes of the question that the
13	regulation that you cited and read and I do think it's
14	useful to have that text in that part of the transcript
15	precludes the Secretary from collecting that data?
16	MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, I would object on that
17	basis that it is outside the scope of this witness's
18	testimony and what he's being offered here for. He's not
19	a legal expert. He's not being he's not being offered
20	to interpret the law or even provide an opinion about what
21	the Secretary has or has not no authority to do.
22	MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, this witness it is
23	a statute, by the way, your Honor. It is not a
24	regulation.
25	THE COURT: I'm sorry.
26	MR. ROSENBAUM: Just so the record is clear. It
27	wouldn't make any difference, I don't think.



28

But in any event, this witness has said, quote,

"The NDPSR survey can continue to include barrel cheese, end quote." And do you have a basis for -- I'm trying to understand, do you have a basis for making that --

THE COURT: Yes, I overruled the objection given what the witness has said. The witness has said this -- as I understand, which is where we continue to be.

MR. ROSENBAUM: Okay.

THE COURT: And it sounds like maybe -- maybe it won't be. And I think it's appropriate to explore what the witness based that statement on and what -- really to give him the opportunity for that matter to explain.

Yes, Ms. Hancock.

MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, I have no objection to asking the witness what he bases his statement on. My objection is to the witness being asked to interpret the law. I don't think that's appropriate under any circumstances, but certainly not within the scope of what he's testifying here to.

THE COURT: Well, I think it is appropriate for this witness to ask whether he considered whether -- and you already did that -- whether the law precluded this. I mean, we're stretching this out a bit. But, I mean, I think you could -- he's not really being asked to interpret the law. It's, do you consider whether this precluded you from -- the information from being collected by the Secretary. And I think that's a fair question since he said it would continue to be collected.

BY MR. ROSENBAUM:



2.

2.0

2.1

NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING Did you consider whether the language I read, in 1 Ο. 2. fact, would preclude the Secretary from engaging in mandatory reporting of barrel cheese prices? 3 4 Mr. Rosenbaum, do you have a copy of that that I can look at? 5 I was informed -- the answer is I don't. 6 Ο. You 7 know, I got a hard time yesterday for giving -- for 8 marking as an exhibit a regulation, and so I am -- I 9 decided to skip that. 10 THE COURT: You didn't get a hard time from me. I think we can -- if the witness is putting 11 12 together his testimony -- I don't think we should ask this 13 witness to opine -- he's not -- you're not a lawyer, 14 right, sir? 15 THE WITNESS: No, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. And you -- I don't think we need to present him with something new and ask for his interpretation of it. I think your position is that it's -- the Secretary is precluded from collecting the information. He said that the Secretary would continue to collect it. If you assumed for purposes of the question that the Secretary is precluded from doing that, do you have any other reason to think the information will continue to be collected? I'm not -- I'm out of practice.

MR. ROSENBAUM: No, you -- no, actually, I think you're -- I think you are in very good practice, your Honor.

BY MR. ROSENBAUM:



16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Are you aware of any other authority than the statute that I quoted that would allow the Secretary to mandate the reporting of barrel cheese prices?
- A. So correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe the beginning of the statement that you just read said "in general."
- Q. Yes, "in general," but that -- what they mean, in general, subject to these conditions, and that was the condition I read, that the information is required only to the extent the information is actually used to establish minimum prices.
- A. So I guess I would consider that -- I would read that as to say in general but not necessarily in all cases, in all situations.
 - Q. Okay.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- A. And we haven't -- we haven't taken a look at this issue in 15 years, so I guess I would view it as a once-in-a-very-unusual situation, not necessarily subject to in general.
- Q. All right. Is there any other authority you would point to?
 - A. No, sir.
 - Q. All right. Now, I want to ask you about the language you quoted on the -- let me start that question again.
 - At the bottom, the very bottom of page 1, you're addressing what USDA had to say in 1999, as part of Federal Order Reform, regarding the question whether to



include barrels in the survey that was going to be used to set minimum Class III prices, correct?

A. Yes, sir.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. Okay. And you are quoting from that decision, so I assume you -- you have read it.
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Okay. So I would like to --

MR. ROSENBAUM: If I could approach the witness? THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ROSENBAUM: This is an excerpt from the Federal Register that is being quoted by the witness.

And, your Honor, I don't know whether -- I can -- I mean, it's easy for me -- I have given him a copy so he can look along. I don't think I need to mark this as an -- as an exhibit. I have copies for anyone who wants to be able to follow along.

THE COURT: Now, I -- it sounds like it is the type of thing that's -- well, do we have -- I don't even think we have to take official notice or judicial notice or anything of it. It's -- I'll take a copy. I'm intrigued. Mr. Rosenbaum, if you have got a copy for me, I'll read along. I'm intrigued.

And we can identify what this is in the transcript, right?

MR. ROSENBAUM: Yes. This is -- this is -- just to be clear, this is Volume 64 of the Federal Register, starting on page -- well, the cover page, which is 16026, and then I have excerpted several pages, but the very last



- Q. So as you indicate, the decision was made by the USDA to include barrels in setting the price, correct?
 - A. I'm sorry. Can you say that again?
- Q. The decision was made by USDA that it was going to include 500-pound barrels in determining the cheese price that would be used to set minimum milk prices, correct?
 - A. Correct.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

26

27

- Q. And that was over the objection of National -- of the NMPF, correct?
- A. I believe that's right, but I do not have all of the objections in the testimony committed to memory from 1999.
- Q. Okay. So the -- now -- now, you would agree with me, just on the basic very simple minded principle, that there is a difference between the cost of making cheese and the price at which a cheese is sold, correct?
- A. Difference in the definition or difference in the numerical values?
 - O. Well, definition.
 - A. Well, both, I'm sure, I mean --
- Q. But that depends on the market condition.
 - I'm juvenile saying, by definition, there's a cost to make cheese, and there's a price at which you sell cheese, and those just are two -- conceptually two



different things, right?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- A. Conceptually, yes. Numerically, not necessarily.
- Q. Exactly. And obviously, there's a relationship where you are going to hopefully sell the cheese for more than it cost you to make it, but --
 - A. Hopefully.
 - Q. -- in any event, conceptually, they are different.

So -- and what you have pointed out in your quotation is that there was \$0.03 added to the barrel cheese price, and it is generally considered to be the industry standard cost difference, cost difference, between processing barrel cheese and processing block cheese, correct?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And really my purpose of -- of providing you this document is -- and you quoted it correctly -- but if you just go up, that's -- that language appears in the middle column on page 16098, correct?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And if you go up a little further, really just like a paragraph and a half earlier on, there's a sentence that says, quote: "Other commenters suggested that if barrel prices are included, they should be increased by \$0.03 per pound to make up for the difference in packaging costs."

Do you see that?

- A. I do.
- Q. Okay. And that's the same -- the exact same \$0.03



that, in fact, USDA in 2000 adjusted barrel prices for,
correct, \$0.03?

- A. Yes. And the quote that I provided states that specifically.
- Q. Yes. And, indeed -- and that remains the adjustment today, correct?
- A. It does. However, at the time, you know, as I made that delineation between make cost and market price, at the time there was very little difference in barrels plus three and blocks on the market.
- Q. Okay.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- A. And so retroactively, trying to consider whether or not the Department would have adjusted differently, would have adjusted by \$0.03, I think is difficult because the difference between barrel cheese and block cheese really didn't -- didn't show up, didn't do different things in the market until 2017.
- Q. But -- but every statement that's made here is a statement relating to the -- by "here," I mean in the decision, the April 2nd, 1999, decision -- they are all talking about the difference in the cost to make cheese, correct?
 - A. That's right.
- Q. Okay. I mean, there's -- there's no statement that USDA was doing this in order to make the price of the two be the same --
 - A. Because at the time there was -- I'm sorry.
 - Q. -- for purposes of setting minimum milk prices,



correct?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- A. Correct. Because at the time I don't believe there was a need, given that the markets acted in relative harmony with about a \$0.03 spread.
- Q. But, I mean, you can point to nothing in this decision that says USDA was trying to equalize price or ensure that the price would be the same. All of their statements are about the effort to equalize cost; isn't that true?
- A. That is true. But what I point out in my testimony is that under those market conditions versus the market conditions in 2017 through 2023, unintended consequence of not considering that back in 1999 is some of the things that I delineated out, a couple of the unintended consequences I delineated out.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. Put differently, how could they have considered what they might need to address in 1999 when those conditions in the market hadn't surfaced yet.
- Q. Well, they had addressed the fact that block cheese was a meaningful participant in the market, and barrel cheese was too. They did talk about that, correct?
 - A. Yes. In terms of volume, correct.
- Q. Okay. And they made a determination that they were going to include both in the survey, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And they made an adjustment so that the fact that it cost less to package 500-pound barrels, presumably,



because it's one big thing --

2.

2.1

- A. It is a big thing.
- Q. -- packed into little different things than 40-pound blocks -- I'm using technical terms here -- that there was a -- there was a difference in that cost, correct?
- A. Given the best information they had at the time, correct.
 - Q. Okay. So -- well, you are certainly not here proposing to change because you think the -- there's something inaccurate about \$0.03 as a difference in the cost of packaging between the two, correct? I mean, that's not the basis --
- A. No, sir. I have provided no testimony along those lines.
 - Q. And no one from National Milk is using that as a basis for the proposal?
 - A. Not that I'm aware of.
 - Q. Okay. So let's go back to the first page and look at your example of how dairy producers have been negatively impacted. And your -- your point two, actually, I think talks mainly about the impact on processors, although there's some reference -- obviously, sometimes those processors are owned by producers.

But you say here, quote: "When the price of block cheese exceeds that of barrel cheese, barrel cheese manufacturing plants struggle to maintain profitability with a regulated milk price based on the weighted average



of block cheese and barrel cheese, and with the barrel cheese sales limited to the lower value of barrel cheese price only."

Correct?

A. Correct.

2.

2.1

Q. So I just want to focus on that. And let's just use the example of prices that I used in earlier questioning, which I think is not unrealistic, although perhaps somewhat higher than current prices, which is -- let's assume that block prices today are \$2 a pound -- sorry. Let me start that example again.

Let's assume that barrel prices are \$2 a pound and block prices are \$2.10 a pound, correct?

Now, under the current formula, those would be -- and let's assume that the surveyed price -- the survey cheese, let's just make it easy and say it is 50% block and 50% barrel. Which is not too far off from where it really is, correct?

- A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. So under that scenario, the minimum milk price is going to be set based upon an assumed selling price of cheese of \$2.05, right, halfway between the \$2 barrel price and the \$2.10 block price?
- A. Not to pick nits, but you would actually increase the barrel price by \$0.03, so you would average together 2.03 and 2.10 for an average of 2.065 doing it off the top of my head.
 - Q. Okay. All right.



- A. But, yeah, I hear you.
- Q. Well, no, I'm glad you made that correction. So I'm going to correct my example because I like my numbers.

So let's assume that the barrel -- that the barrel prices is a \$1.97.

A. Fair enough.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. And the block price is \$2.10.
- A. Now 2.05 works.
- Q. And so under that scenario, the first thing you do is add the \$0.03 -- no, I appreciate you being more accurate -- you add the \$0.03 to the barrel price to reflect the fact that it's actually cheaper to make the barrel cheese by \$0.03. And so you end up with an adjusted price for barrels of \$2 and then a price for blocks of 2.10. Okay?
- 16 A. Yes, sir.
 - O. You are with me?

And so under that scenario when it comes to setting the Class III price, USDA will look at the weighted amount of production covered by the survey, which we're going to assume here is 50/50, which is close to accurate. And that -- and then you would end up with a -- an assumed selling price of \$2.05.

And that's what USDA would use to then set the Class III price, correct?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And you would deduct from that selling price the Make Allowance -- and let's just -- let's assume



- Make Allowance -- let's assume a Make Allowance of \$0.20, which is really what it is, and let's -- currently, although everyone's proposal is to increase it -- you know, everyone, most people here today are proposing to increase it, not necessarily by the same amount, but that would mean you would have -- you subtract that \$0.20 from the \$2.05, and you end up with \$1.85, which represents the minimum price that has to be paid for the class -- for the milk used to make that product; is that right?
 - A. Correct.

2.

2.0

2.1

- Q. Okay. So going back to our scenario, the price of the -- of the barrel cheese at \$1.97, you are going to subtract the same \$0.20 cost to manufacture. We've already gotten rid of the \$0.03. We're not going to get rid of it again. So that means that you would end up with -- talking about the manufacturer -- would end up with \$1.77; is that right -- I'm sorry. No, no. Sorry. Do it again.
- Okay. You take the \$1.97, and you subtract the \$1.85 that it has to pay at a minimum milk price, and you have \$0.12 left over, correct?
 - A. \$1.97 minus \$1.85 is \$0.12, correct.
- Q. Which is less than the actual cost of making the barrel cheese, correct?
- A. Yes. Although you haven't gone into the part of your scenario where you have actually gotten rid of the barrel price in the calculation of milk yet, so something went awry, I think.



Q. Okay. Well, and I'm getting there. But that's -that -- when you -- when -- I'm really at this point just
describing your sentence. Okay? That is to say, "When
the price of block cheese exceeds that of barrel cheese,
barrel cheese manufacturing plants struggle to maintain
profitability with a regulated milk price based on the
weighted average of block cheese and barrel cheese, and
with the barrel cheese sales limited to the lower value of
barrel cheese price only."

I think that's what I've just gotten through describing is that scenario. I'm going to get to your proposal in a minute. I just want to make sure we're -- the agreement -- that under my assumptions as to what the price is of -- of -- of barrel cheese and block cheese, assuming a 50/50 split in the survey, am I describing the economics to a barrel cheese manufacturer?

- A. So the cheese price used to calculate Class III, we have 2.05, right. Hold out \$0.20 in the Make Allowance, you get to \$1.85.
- Q. That's what you have to pay for your milk, correct?
 - A. Right.
 - 0. 0kay.
- A. The market for barrels is \$1.97.
- 25 Q. Right?
- 26 A. \$0.12 left over. I'm with you.
- Q. Okay. And that's -- that \$0.12 -- I mean, a barrel manufacturer under the current regulations is not



1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

covering its costs to manufacture --

A. True.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. -- because the cheese price is a 50/50 split between barrel and blocks, and in our hypothetical scenario, barrels -- blocks are higher, and so you are raising the reference price -- if that's the right way to use the term -- to a level that's in excess of the -- of the actual barrel price, correct?
- A. The barrel manufacturer's profitability is negatively impacted by the wide block-barrel spread --
 - Q. Okay.
- A. -- with the numbers that you brought in.
- Q. Okay. So now let's got to the scenario -- your scenario -- well, strike that.

So let's assume that in -- in the marketplace the pricing is exactly the same as the hypothetical we just went through. Okay? That is to say the price of barrels is \$1.97. The adjusted price is \$2 because you -- there's a \$0.03 adjustment in the formula. The price of blocks is 2.10. Okay?

Now, let's assume a scenario under which barrels are no longer used to set the Class III price. All right? Which is your proposal. Okay?

So under that scenario, you'd start with \$2.10 as the price of cheese. Let's assume a \$0.20 Make Allowance. That would mean the amount that the manufacturer has to pay for its milk as a minimum regulated price is \$1.90, right?



- A. Correct.

 Q. It is a -- the milk -- minimum milk price has gone up by a nickel as a result of the elimination of barrels from the formula, correct?

 A. Correct.
 - Q. Okay. But the -- so under that scenario, the barrel manufacturer is receiving for its finished product \$1.97, correct? And you are deducting from that \$1.90. Now he only has \$0.07 left over to cover his cost to manufacture, correct?
 - A. Assuming that the barrels are still sold based upon the barrel market, that's correct.
 - Q. So under the current regulations, he's not doing fantastic to begin with because he's already only left with \$0.12 to cover his \$0.20 of cost of manufacture, but under your proposal, he is now having only \$0.07 to cover his \$0.20 of cost to make the product, correct?
 - A. Assuming that the barrels are still sold upon the barrel market -- sold based upon the barrel market, that's correct.
- 21 MR. ROSENBAUM: That's all I have.
- 22 THE COURT: Further cross?
- 23 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 24 BY DR. CRYAN:
- Q. I'm Roger Cryan with the American Farm Bureau
 Federation.
- 27 Hello, Christian.
- 28 A. Hello, Roger.



7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

Q. Nice to see you.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

17

18

19

22

23

24

25

26

27

- A. Nice to see you as well.
- Q. You -- there was talk about the -- just now you all were talking about the prices, cost and about -- about value, demand value, if -- the cheese plants are typically running full; that's the objective?
 - A. As best you can.
 - Q. Because it's an expensive proposition to run a cheese plant, and letting it sit idle doesn't make you any money?
- 11 A. Correct.
- Q. And you can't really run blocks through a barrel line, and you can't really run barrels through a block line; is that right?
- 15 A. Processing milk into cheese, or are you talking 16 about making processed cheese for --
 - Q. I'm talking about making barrels or making blocks.

 You have separate lines and --
 - A. Correct.
- 20 Q. -- you can't just swap them out?
- 21 A. Correct.
 - Q. So that given if, in the long run, the processing capacity for blocks and barrels is balanced, there's -- plants are going to be running full all the time, and there's going to be differences in the short run in demand and -- and that there's going to be balances in the price, they are not going to -- they are not going to converge -- when those plants are all running full, the price for



- blocks and barrels isn't necessarily going to converge,
 like it might have, again, 30 -- 30 years ago when more
 cheese plants had more slack capacity?
 - A. There's limited flexibility, I think is part of what you are saying.
 - Q. Right.
 - A. There's limited open capacity --
 - Q. Right.
 - A. -- I think is part of what you are saying.
- 10 Q. Right.

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 11 A. And then obviously those markets, block and barrel 12 have different demand characteristics as well that could 13 keep them from converging.
 - Q. Okay. And -- and if the -- would you say that there's some -- to some degree the reason that the barrels are still priced separately is because they can be, because there continues to be a CME price, and there continues to be an NDPSR price, and that that's kind of maybe the biggest thing that's driving barrel users to use a separate price?
 - A. That's the structure of the industry today. And I think that that structure was put in place when conditions were such that adding \$0.03 to the barrels to calculate the Class III price didn't create any unintended consequences, negative profitability for barrel producers as an example. And so the hangover of that structure of the industry persists today, correct.
 - Q. All right. So it's changes in structure that have



made this -- have created this imbalance, this volatility of the spread?

- A. And the current structure of how we calculate our Class III protein price, correct.
 - Q. Do you sell block cheese?
 - A. Yes, sir.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

28

- Q. Do you quote customers the same price for 40s and 640s per pound?
- A. I view that as proprietary, sir. I don't want to give that.
- 11 Q. Very good.

Do you -- do you understand that there would be any difference between 40s and 640s other than packaging, other than essentially the size of the packaging? Grading standard is the same and --

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. -- and the uses are the same, aside from handling?
- A. For the most part, I agree with that. I have seen 640s that are sold specifically for processed cheese. I think there was some testimony earlier that alluded to the potential or ability to adjust the price of a 640 based upon moisture. I've seen that. It's not very common.

So I would say for the most part, your statement is direct.

- Q. Would those meet the grade standard that are applied to 640s on the CME?
 - A. They meet the grade -- so I'm talking about 640s.
 - O. I understand.



1	A. Okay.				
2	Q. You can take 640 and cut it into 40s. You can				
3	turn a 640-pound block into 40-pound blocks?				
4	A. Sure.				
5	Q. If the 640s are made for processing, would you be				
6	able to cut those into 40-pound blocks and sell them on				
7	the CME, or is that a different standard? Is that				
8	different from the grade standard?				
9	A. When I have seen that happen, they've carried a				
10	different moisture. So I don't know that that would be				
11	possible.				
12	Q. Okay. But when they meet the same grade				
13	standards, they are basically the same product?				
14	A. Yes. When they meet the grade you know, if				
15	they are the same moisture, if they meet the standards for				
16	40s, you can cut up a 640 and make 40s out of it, correct.				
17	Q. Fantastic. Thank you, Christian.				
18	DR. CRYAN: I'm done. Thank you.				
19	THE COURT: There's no questions by anyone other				
20	than AMS?				
21	Mr. Miltner?				
22	CROSS-EXAMINATION				
23	BY MR. MILTNER:				
24	Q. Ryan Miltner from Select Milk Producers.				
25	Does Land O'Lakes sell any WPI?				
26	A. No, sir.				
27	Q. Are you familiar with the wholesale prices of WPI?				
28	A. Mostly.				



- Q. Would \$7 a pound be in a range -- a reasonable range for WPI?
- A. Well, it's a market, right, and so prices change regularly. It would depend upon what time period you are -- you're quoting to -- for me to answer that.
- Q. Do you -- do you have an idea what you would consider a reasonable price for WPI in the market today?
 - A. I would put it below \$7.
 - Q. Okay. Five?
- A. Sure.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Okay. I think in the last weekly report dry whey was \$0.27 a pound or thereabouts.
- Does that sound about right?
- 14 A. Sure. Yes.
 - Q. So that's a heck of a difference between those two products with the same base ingredient, isn't it?
 - A. It is. But I think there was other testimony that spoke to the cost of processing. WPI as well as the value of the byproducts from turning the whey stream into WPI has an impact as well.
 - Q. Absolutely. I agree with that.
 - When Mr. Rosenbaum was talking with you about the various profitability calculations for a barrel manufacturer, that doesn't take into account any of the income or profit that that barrel manufacturer could obtain from the sale of its whey products, though, does it?
 - A. Correct.



	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS September 01, 2 NATIONAL FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER PRICING FORMULA HEARING					
1	Q. And if they are able to capture value from a high					
2	value whey product, wouldn't that allow them to sell their					
3	barrels at a lower price and still maintain overall					
4	profitability?					
5	A. Theoretically.					
6	MR. MILTNER: Thank you. That's all I have.					
7	THE COURT: Anything additional from anyone other					
8	than AMS?					
9	AMS?					
10	MS. TAYLOR: Your Honor, given the time and our					
11	hard stop at 3 o'clock, I did check with Ms. Hancock, and					
12	it looks like this witness will be available Tuesday					
13	morning, and we could finish his cross then. I would					
14	prefer to do it that way so we are not shortchanging our					
15	answers to our questions, if that's possible.					
16	THE COURT: Yes. We did say we would have a hard					
17	stop at 3:00, and we'll come back to Mr. Edmiston.					
18	MS. HANCOCK: Your Honor, I was just going to say,					

he has a flight to catch right now anyways, so he's going

to run while we clean up the rest.

So go ahead and go.

THE COURT: Very good, sir. Thanks for being Have a safe flight.

MS. TAYLOR: Your Honor, I did want to mention while we're still webcasting that for anyone else listening, the producer testimony opening for next Friday will be available starting on Tuesday, September 5th at 12:00 p.m. Eastern. That's different -- Monday is the



19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

```
holiday, so it will open up Tuesday at noon, and I just
 1
 2
     wanted to make sure everyone was clear about that.
 3
             THE COURT: Thank you.
             Let's go off the record.
 4
                          (Off-the-record.)
 5
             THE COURT: Back on the record.
 6
 7
             Off the record it appeared that no one had
 8
     anything further that needed to be raised today on the
 9
     record or off, and so we adjourn to reconvene Tuesday,
10
     September 5th at 8:00 a.m. Thank you.
11
            (Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded.)
12
                              ---000---
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
2.1
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```



	MATIONAL I BERGAL MILK MARKETING ORDER I RICING I ORDER I BERKING			
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: September 20, 2023			
11	FRESNO, CALIFORNIA			
12				
13	1 Ma Pan			
14	Mya Zan			
15				
16	MYRA A. PISH, RPR CSR Certificate No. 11613			
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				



	\$1.77 1952:17	1939:2,7,8	11:00 1864:1
#	\$1.80 1782:19 1822:27 1823:4,11 1824:20	(3) 1926:11,14 1936:17 1938:25	11:30 1812:2
#2 1777:8 1778:8 1811:25			12 1898:13,14 1928:25
\$	\$1.84 1857:12	(a) 1938:20,26 1939:9	120 1865:28 1866:2 1875:27,
—	\$1.85 1822:18 1825:15,23 1952:7,20,22 1953:19	(a)(i) 1939:1	28 1876:2
\$0.01 1911:16	\$1.86 1846:12 1857:9,12	(b) 1938:27 1939:14	1200 1933:27
\$0.02 1846:24 1857:16	\$1.88 1804:10 1845:5	(d) 1926:11,12	121 1866:5,6 1875:27,28 1876:2 1878:26
\$0.03 1788:3 1789:2 1796:16 1829:8,11 1838:28 1935:16, 23 1946:9,24,28 1947:2,14	1846:14 1852:28 1853:3 \$1.90 1954:27 1955:8	-	122 1878:27,28 1879:1,5 1884:28 1885:2,4
1948:4 1949:11 1950:25 1951:10,11,13 1952:14	\$1.95 1782:19 1804:10 1845:11,20 1856:2 1857:1	00o 1864:3 1962:12	123 1894:19,21,23 1902:24, 26,28
1954:19 1957:23		0	
\$0.07 1911:17 1955:9,16	\$1.97 1951:5 1952:12,19,22 1953:24 1954:18 1955:8	0.17 1855:22	124 1904:15,16,18 1908:24 1924:24
\$0.08 1788:9,12	\$16.42 1898:12	0.75 1852:7	125 1909:18,20,21 1917:12,
\$0.11 1911:19	\$19.10 1898:17	0.83 1855:23	14,16
\$0.12 1952:21,22 1953:26,27 1955:15	\$2 1785:15 1792:26 1793:4, 15 1805:24 1820:5,9,26		126 1924:25 1933:2,3,8 1937:15,16
\$0.15 1825:24	1822:6,22 1824:17,27	1	12:00 1961:28
\$0.20 1952:1,6,13 1953:18	1827:3,14 1843:23 1845:10, 23 1849:9 1852:24 1853:27	1 1767:1 1787:28 1837:28 1838:5 1843:21,25,26	12:06 1907:11
1954:25 1955:15,17 \$0.25 1820:12,17,27 1821:28	1854:15 1950:10,12,22 1951:14 1954:18	1862:25,27 1863:12 1865:1 1880:10 1881:13 1921:15	13 1782:9 1842:19 1910:16 1928:25
1822:26 1824:19 1825:14,26 1826:2	\$2.05 1822:24 1823:10 1824:19 1950:22 1951:23	1923:28 1924:1,3,12,19 1931:1,2,3 1943:26	130 1777:13
\$0.27 1911:17 1960:12	1952:7	1,000 1867:10 1916:16	131 1924:25
\$0.28 1852:25 1854:3	\$2.10 1822:7 1825:10,13	1.1 1786:16	13th 1767:10,15
\$0.29 1844:5,18,24 1856:1,	1950:13,23 1951:7 1954:24	1.2 1770:9,11,15 1786:15	140 1868:20
26	\$209,000 1887:28	1827:22	1400 1868:9 1873:25
\$0.43 1788:16	\$25.34 1898:18	1.72 1843:22 1853:19 1854:14	15 1834:11 1847:12,16
\$0.52 1896:19	\$25.59 1898:11	1.75 1824:5	1880:18 1887:5 1912:16 1915:7 1927:3 1928:28
\$0.58 1896:18 1913:20	\$250,000 1826:9		1929:4,9,14 1943:17
\$0.75 1844:9,17 1852:10	\$3 1788:14 1839:4	1.84 1855:12	15-minute 1917:25 1918:11
1854:21	\$3.75 1873:13 1884:7 1891:14	1.8432 1855:10	16 1906:6,13
\$0.80 1783:5	\$5.47 1898:5	1.88 1855:12	16026 1944:27
\$0.84 1779:14 1780:11,17 1788:25 1799:8 1802:20,28		1.95 1844:25,27	16098 1945:1 1946:18
1803:1,4 1839:13 1841:11	\$6.08 1898:6 \$6.24 1808:18	10 1834:11 1867:18 1915:10	1637b 1938:19
\$0.90 1781:28 1843:19	\$6.24 1898:18 \$7 1960:1,8	10.1 1821:17	165.1 1781:16 1843:6
\$1 1801:24		100% 1771:4	16th 1767:16,17 1768:8
\$1,100,000 1801:27	\$750,000 1826:10	1000.40 1926:11,20	1919:26
\$1.12 1852:11	\$9.17 1898:13	106 1926:4 1930:5	17 1782:10 1854:5 1906:6,13
\$1.58 1913:22	(11 1870:1 1923:28 1925:7, 10,13,14	17% 1782:14,28 1804:12 1844:12,17
\$1.66 1844:24 1856:1,27	(1) 1934:18 1936:7 1938:23,	117 1769:9	17.81 1782:27
\$1.72 1852:25 1853:19,23 1854:20	27	118 1772:22	17.8139 1846:6
	(1)(a)(i) 1939:9,10,15	119 1776:13,14 1828:6	174 1869:28
\$1.75 1820:26,27 1821:12,16 1824:21,22,27 1826:1,2	(2) 1935:3 1936:12 1938:24	1830:3 1863:21,23,24	



18 1880:4 1906:13

18.71 1783:1

18.7168 1846:9

1800 1895:7 1900:22

19 1768:5

1910 1776:26

1933 1779:17

1937 1779:18

1958 1879:20

1983 1879:24

1991 1880:5

1997 1828:20

1998 1828:18

1999 1828:24,25 1935:26 1943:27 1945:16 1947:20 1948:13,18

1:25 1918:11

1st 1831:5 1870:5

2

2 1771:27 1772:5 1779:18 1782:2 1783:28 1792:24 1798:24 1828:25 1830:2 1833:27 1834:13 1843:28 1844:13 1851:16,28 1862:18,24 1874:17 1924:14 1926:24

2% 1874:21

2.03 1950:26

2.05 1951:8 1953:18

2.065 1950:26

2.10 1822:22 1824:17 1950:26 1951:15 1954:20

2.234 1781:17

2.3 1786:14

2.39 1842:16

2.399 1781:11 1842:5

2.4 1842:17,20

2.5 1777:12

20 1768:5,6 1867:1,16,17 1871:17 1875:9 1880:27 1882:3 1933:12

200 1850:1

2000 1828:15 1882:19 1947:1

2001 1882:4

2004 1905:8

2005 1882:5 1925:27 1926:3, 4 1930:4.5

2008 1776:20 1896:8 1912:15 1915:10

2016 1935:26

2017 1779:6 1780:11 1785:15 1788:16,25 1789:1, 6,11 1792:23 1793:4 1803:26 1804:2 1834:14 1839:14,17 1840:9 1911:14, 16,17,18 1934:28 1936:3 1947:17 1948:12

2018 1880:22 1883:20,23 1905:13 1924:1

2019 1910:21

2020 1781:11,16,27 1782:3 1791:11 1806:8,13,15,17 1842:5 1843:6 1845:5 1859:13 1862:24,27 1863:16 1867:22 1911:17 1915:4

2022 1863:6,11 1882:11 1898:7,11,18 1912:1 1925:27 1926:3,5,18 1930:1, 5.6

2023 1767:1 1779:15 1788:21,22 1839:17 1863:14,15 1865:1 1882:19 1898:3,4 1924:2 1948:12

2024 1786:25 1787:6 1898:4, 16

21 1768:5,6 1833:2

2100 1905:10

216 1849:26

220 1776:26 1849:18,25

23 1898:12

232 1775:21

25 1824:27 1834:11 1849:11

25% 1823:10 1898:19

2500 1867:9

26 1906:5

29 1844:15

2nd 1947:20

3

3 1787:27 1798:19 1806:6,8, 11 1813:15 1823:24 1837:27,28 1838:4,5 1839:25 1843:17,21,24

1851:25 1852:6 1853:9,17, 21 1862:18 1863:5 1911:9 1918:9 1920:28 1926:23 1934:11 1961:11

3.31 1882:13

3.67 1882:6

3.68% 1882:7

3.75 1916:17

30 1773:1,7,10,24 1774:18, 19 1776:23 1790:16,23 1837:3 1849:2 1859:17 1915:11 1924:24 1957:2

30% 1782:3

30-day 1774:11

31% 1782:9

32 1868:10 1924:24

33 1924:24

34 1808:24

35% 1898:14

355 1926:5 1930:6

37.5 1846:1

380 1776:28 1847:17

3:00 1961:17

4

4 1769:14 1782:25 1798:19 1799:5 1806:6,10 1828:24 1843:17 1845:26 1857:5,8 1858:5,8 1863:5 1918:21 1919:7 1921:1,3

4% 1782:4

4,000 1880:1 1884:5

4.04% 1882:12

40 1879:25

40-pound 1777:7,24 1778:7, 19 1780:8 1781:2,23 1783:18 1791:17 1794:26 1796:16,18 1811:2 1812:20 1816:11 1824:10 1828:8 1829:3 1912:4 1927:6 1928:2 1934:22 1949:4 1959:3,6

4001 1932:17

40s 1958:7,13 1959:2,16

42-pound 1777:12

44% 1851:18 1853:9,27 1854:15 1856:16,17

5

5 1767:9,14 1768:4 1770:3, 21,23 1771:27,28 1772:2 1782:1 1803:8 1810:16 1831:26 1841:10,12 1843:17,18 1910:14 1919:3, 7 1921:3 1924:24 1925:4 1931:7.8

5% 1782:5 1810:16,20

5,000 1895:7 1900:21

5.75% 1882:13

50% 1950:16,17

50/50 1822:23 1823:9 1951:21 1953:15 1954:3

500 1886:11 1891:11,12 1910:7 1916:23

500-pound 1777:14,19,23, 26 1778:20 1780:8,26 1781:2,22 1783:8 1785:5 1794:25 1795:24,28 1796:7 1812:21 1814:20,22,23 1815:7,14,21 1816:4,12,18, 19,23 1817:23 1828:1,6 1829:2 1830:5,11 1831:17, 22 1832:1 1833:11,19 1911:7 1934:12,23 1936:26 1945:9 1948:28

51 1895:10 1898:10 1924:24

53 1854:14,15

54011 1775:24

5441 1775:22

55126 1932:18

56% 1810:21 1851:22 1853:9,23 1854:14,20 1856:16,17

59 1922:27,28 1923:2,6,8,10, 11 1930:17 1931:22,24,25

5th 1961:27 1962:10

6

6 1783:25 1804:7 1851:14 1865:22,28 1869:25 1924:24

6.2 1910:6

60% 1786:10

600 1867:10

608c(15) 1799:3

64 1944:26

640 1798:6 1958:21 1959:2, 16

Index: 18..640



640-pound 1813:28 1959:3

640s 1790:26 1834:4 1958:8, 13,19,26,27 1959:5

65 1788:10

652 1926:17 1930:1

66% 1905:18

697 1926:2 1930:4

6th 1918:22

7

7 1769:15 1865:23 1866:4 1895:20,25 1912:10 1913:9 1924:24 1926:20 1938:18

70 1873:8

74 1910:20,22

75 1844:8

750 1826:12

777 1776:27

78 1868:23 1873:9,24

8

8 1767:14 1770:3

8.71 1882:8

8.8% 1882:8

816 1926:3 1930:4

83 1784:9

83% 1784:1,13,14,17

850 1910:5

88 1854:15 1855:5 1926:22 1927:22

8800 1855:5

8:00 1918:22 1920:1,25 1962:10

8th 1918:23 1920:1

9

9% 1769:26 1770:8,16,28 1771:5,10,11 1782:6 1784:18,27 1810:23 1912:1

9.06% 1882:13

91% 1912:3

93% 1782:10,14 1784:5

93.1% 1781:18

96 1855:1

96.32 1855:1

9632 1854:22,24,28

98% 1869:5 1874:19.24

9:30 1921:17

Α

a.m. 1767:14 1918:22 1920:1,25 1962:10

AA 1930:7

abilities 1847:27

ability 1785:24 1789:14 1807:16 1830:26 1831:1,7,9, 14,16 1837:9,21 1848:12 1851:1 1869:4 1881:7 1884:15 1891:26 1906:8 1911:27 1912:22 1958:21

absolutely 1786:24 1811:3 1824:23 1826:21 1918:10 1919:1 1932:13 1933:9 1960:21

absorb 1899:1 1935:9

absorbed 1915:19

accent 1848:27

accept 1823:5 1869:24 1899:4

acceptable 1870:8 1913:28

accepted 1781:8

access 1817:17

accidentally 1853:8

accommodate 1906:26

accomplish 1919:13

account 1805:17 1960:24

accounted 1926:16

accounting 1799:19,20

accumulate 1811:9

accurate 1777:22 1778:25 1789:26 1792:16 1796:2 1800:3 1856:28 1914:4 1938:23 1951:11,22

accurately 1771:12 1780:16

achieved 1792:5

acknowledged 1816:21,25

acre 1912:5,6

acres 1867:9 1895:8 1900:22

Act 1779:17,18 1798:20

acted 1948:3

Action 1870:5,10 1905:16

active 1910:4,11

actively 1868:19

actual 1778:1,25 1785:9 1835:19 1846:13 1869:21 1882:17 1952:23 1954:8

add 1787:1 1809:22 1812:15 1834:10,11 1841:5 1877:7 1925:4,17 1951:10,11

added 1778:14 1787:3 1834:4 1844:24 1906:26 1946:9

adding 1834:6,9 1841:5 1852:15 1855:16 1935:15 1957:23

addition 1789:20 1790:3 1860:25 1871:15 1910:10 1935:23

additional 1781:28 1787:10 1793:9 1811:19 1834:7 1861:13 1870:7 1899:1 1961:7

Additionally 1866:25 1868:5 1897:5

address 1769:13 1775:19,20 1781:19 1819:10 1881:12 1932:15 1936:5 1937:18 1948:18

addressed 1871:7 1877:12 1912:21 1948:20

addressing 1769:14 1943:27

adds 1836:11 1876:18

adequate 1850:10 1896:3 1898:28 1901:22

adjourn 1962:9

adjust 1845:6 1919:23 1958:21

adjusted 1778:7 1780:1 1840:3 1888:18,19 1892:25 1912:17 1926:27 1929:9 1947:1,13,14 1951:14 1954:18

adjusting 1892:20,23 1935:16

adjustment 1779:16 1829:8 1880:15,18 1882:22,23,27 1902:6 1919:25 1947:6 1948:27 1954:19

adjustments 1777:24 1828:7 1869:10 1881:8,10 1893:2 1896:3

Administration 1873:12 1884:6 1891:13

administrative 1768:20

Administrator 1800:21 1876:9

admission 1875:26

admit 1884:28 1902:23

admitted 1769:9 1772:22 1875:28 1885:2 1902:26 1917:15

adopt 1803:13

adopted 1813:15 1828:15

adopting 1828:23

adoption 1805:12 1913:23

ADPI 1933:26

advanced 1906:10,14,19 1907:14

advancement 1834:26

advantage 1805:10,13 1835:23 1902:2

advantageous 1819:21

Advisory 1910:12

advocates 1918:20.27

advocating 1845:13,22

affect 1810:5 1855:26 1856:7 1857:5,15 1859:26 1915:18

affected 1794:24 1857:28 1858:9 1859:16 1897:22

affecting 1780:9

afraid 1878:6

afternoon 1865:1,19 1866:22 1873:4 1883:13,14 1889:9,10 1893:25 1894:8 1900:15,17 1904:24 1905:1 1907:11,12 1909:8,27 1916:7 1922:13,14 1932:11

Ag 1905:14

age 1773:10 1774:2 1790:16

Agency 1867:23

aggregate 1869:18

aggregated 1769:23

aging 1773:11,17,27 1774:7

agree 1768:18 1800:4,10,13 1803:10 1805:13 1810:25,28 1812:25 1818:2 1827:19



1842:28 1877:11,21 1878:11 1885:20 1905:28 1912:17 1919:1 1940:1 1945:17 1958:18 1960:21

agreed 1792:19 1793:3 1824:13 1919:6,14

agreed-upon 1869:9

agreeing 1767:13

agreement 1779:18 1798:20 1919:11 1953:13

agreements 1817:13,17

agricultural 1779:16,17 1780:15 1798:20 1867:26 1905:6

Agriculture 1867:28 1882:4 1905:5

Agropur 1830:28

ahead 1840:28 1854:12 1886:7 1904:26 1908:10 1920:6 1961:21

alike 1783:14 1850:16

all-u.s. 1843:13

allegedly 1805:10

allocated 1816:18 1838:25

allowance 1789:22 1796:15 1807:20,21 1820:12,16 1822:1,26 1823:10 1824:19 1825:14 1826:3,9 1835:7 1846:5 1862:6,10 1887:6 1888:11,18 1890:12 1892:25 1895:22 1896:3,10,12,13,17 1897:17 1902:2,6 1912:11, 20,28 1913:26 1917:2 1951:28 1952:1 1953:19 1954:25

allowances 1804:4 1835:15 1861:26 1862:1,13 1880:15 1892:21,23 1896:9,23,28 1897:5,10,15 1898:23 1901:17,26 1902:12 1906:4 1912:9,14,17 1913:5,16,17

allowed 1778:15 1818:17 1834:27

allowing 1866:28 1906:22 1909:27 1911:25 1913:17,23 1914:6

alluded 1958:20

altogether 1911:10

alumnus 1905:13

amalgamation 1817:3

amended 1783:21

amending 1783:10

amendments 1779:17 1870:8,11 1880:8 1883:2

America 1867:15

American 1768:7 1777:11 1813:24 1858:18 1889:7 1914:11 1918:18 1920:22 1929:23 1933:25 1955:25

amount 1771:3 1800:5 1807:18 1822:12,14 1823:27 1827:8 1845:6,7 1862:17 1880:21 1883:19 1901:12 1905:22 1951:20 1952:5 1954:26

AMPI 1830:16

amplified 1871:2

AMS 1813:20 1832:13,14 1851:6 1860:5,25 1861:11 1865:8 1872:23,25 1877:7 1890:28 1891:6 1900:11 1906:4 1907:28 1908:1 1916:3,10 1919:22 1922:19 1923:7 1928:25 1931:16,17 1959:20 1961:8,9

AMS's 1851:13 1875:22

analysis 1933:17

analyst 1769:19

anecdotally 1789:24

animal 1871:11 1881:25 1910:14

animals 1881:25

announce 1785:21

announced 1807:9 1870:13

announcement 1812:22

annual 1869:15 1873:13 1884:7 1925:3

annually 1770:16 1776:27 1869:1 1891:15 1910:6,7 1916:23

answers 1858:22 1961:15

anticipate 1790:10

anticipated 1899:11

anymore 1817:6 1833:25

apologies 1885:11

apologize 1784:10 1852:5 1903:12

appeared 1962:7

appears 1854:25 1857:8 1946:17

applied 1928:4 1958:26

apply 1927:10

appointed 1867:22

approach 1857:13 1881:1,4 1883:4 1944:8

appropriately 1882:17

approximate 1803:25 1853:5

approximately 1781:15 1785:15 1786:10 1792:24 1793:4 1822:23 1828:28 1847:16 1849:28 1857:18 1880:1 1884:5 1891:10 1895:7 1900:22 1905:18 1913:20,22

April 1779:15 1788:22 1828:24,25 1839:15,17 1863:15 1947:20

arbitrage 1790:4

arbitrary 1870:14

Arden 1932:17

area 1867:21 1907:19 1915:21 1925:1

areas 1779:8 1793:6 1794:15 1836:25 1837:1,5 1875:2 1924:6 1933:14 1935:12

argued 1822:9

argument 1805:16 1876:16 1877:13

arguments 1877:4

arise 1891:25

arisen 1936:5 1937:19

arrive 1770:18

articles 1810:1

artificially 1777:28 1785:8 1935:1

Ash 1905:3,9

aspect 1786:20 1790:15 1791:22 1832:8 1850:20

assert 1870:18

assertion 1870:12

asset 1780:21 1935:10

assets 1780:15,20 1803:5

assign 1904:10

assigned 1904:7

Assist 1878:7

association 1771:25 1814:7 1830:20 1851:12 1898:24,25 1913:4 1920:24 1927:20 1933:23 1936:6 1937:9,19

associations 1899:28

1900:2

assortment 1870:15

assume 1801:23,26 1802:25 1805:13 1807:6,8 1818:20 1820:4,12 1822:4,6 1826:8 1893:3 1938:6 1940:12 1944:5 1950:10,12,15 1951:4,21,28 1952:1 1954:15,21,25

assumed 1782:13 1942:21 1950:21 1951:23

assumes 1808:3

assuming 1821:15 1826:2 1845:18 1953:15 1955:11,18

assumption 1807:28

assumptions 1808:6 1881:19 1953:13

assure 1820:23 1906:18

attached 1882:11

attachment 1865:24 1882:3

attempt 1794:11,13 1815:27 1878:7

attention 1906:11 1938:18

attributed 1829:4 1838:17

audience 1878:8

auditable 1895:27

audited 1890:13

authority 1895:26,28 1938:9,12,13 1940:21 1943:1,20

authorization 1913:12

authorized 1917:5

availability 1891:24 1898:28 1901:22

Avenue 1932:17

average 1769:20 1778:9 1779:5 1788:7,8,9 1822:24 1838:8,9 1839:14,17 1843:22 1844:2,12,28 1846:13 1855:22,28 1856:22,23 1868:23 1873:7, 24 1881:19,21 1882:2,5,6,7, 9,12 1910:19 1911:15 1927:6,8,9 1935:6 1949:28 1950:25,26 1953:7



averaged 1778:11 1898:5 1911:19

averages 1824:18

aware 1805:1,6,7 1809:26 1833:24 1889:13,15 1943:1 1949:18

awry 1952:28

R

B-A-U-E-R 1775:18

back 1767:11 1768:27 1786:6 1789:28 1795:20 1797:1 1804:6 1812:4 1822:27 1828:18,22 1829:21,24,27 1834:23 1842:22 1843:2 1846:14,21 1860:2 1865:2 1872:15 1875:23 1882:1 1887:9,10 1888:21 1892:2 1908:23 1910:18 1911:2 1918:12 1921:13,20 1922:3 1930:20 1945:1 1948:13 1949:19 1952:11 1961:17 1962:6

bad 1792:8 1893:26

bailing 1867:20

balance 1896:11 1901:27 1902:3

balanced 1883:3 1956:23

balances 1956:26

ball 1915:24

barn 1867:2 1905:11

barrel 1769:21 1770:9,12,14, 17,19,21,22,26 1771:4,11 1772:1,7,27 1773:9,18,19 1774:2 1776:5 1777:1,15,20, 23,26 1778:7,20,23 1779:8, 11,13 1780:1,3,8,10,13,20, 22,24 1781:21,22,25,27,28 1782:13,17,22,28 1783:3,4, 5,15 1785:5,23,24 1786:9,15 1788:10 1790:5,19 1791:10, 16 1794:16 1795:28 1796:7 1797:21,25 1798:4,7 1799:15,20,28 1800:1,2 1803:15,20 1804:11,16,19, 22,25 1805:4,6,7 1806:1,3 1807:1,6 1808:9,13 1810:3, 5,16 1811:1,26,27 1812:9, 22,26 1813:3,8,9,12 1814:17 1815:16,21 1816:2,14,23 1817:9 1819:11 1820:5 1822:22 1823:8,11,17,21,24 1824:9 1825:7,17,28 1826:7, 16,18 1827:11,17 1828:7 1830:5 1833:11 1836:7,25 1837:2,15 1838:8,17

1839:27 1840:3,13 1841:13, 26,28 1843:22 1847:24,27 1848:4,21 1849:2 1850:26 1860:18 1861:19 1888:4 1911:8,14,18,20 1912:1,4 1934:3,12,19,24,25,27 1935:2,4,7,8,15,17,19,21,25 1936:2,8,12,13,15,26 1937:24 1938:2,6 1939:21, 22 1941:1 1942:3 1943:3 1946:9,12,23 1947:1,15 1948:22 1949:26 1950:1,2, 12,17,23,25 1951:4,11,13 1952:12,24,27 1953:4,5,7,8, 9,14,16,28 1954:4,8,9 1955:7,12,19 1956:12 1957:11,19,25 1960:23,25

barrels 1769:27 1770:6 1772:16 1773:4 1778:12 1779:2,5,7,25 1780:26 1781:2 1782:5,10,12,15 1783:9 1784:2,18,27 1785:12 1786:22 1787:7,10 1788:1,3,8 1790:11,25 1791:3,23 1792:12 1794:25 1795:24 1797:1,18,24 1798:8 1801:12,16,26 1804:21 1805:1,26 1807:12, 27 1809:12 1812:11 1814:22,23 1815:8,14 1816:1,4,12,15,18,19,27 1817:2,3,23,27 1822:6 1824:15 1825:5.10 1828:1 1829:2 1830:12 1831:17,22, 23 1832:1 1833:12,20,25 1834:25 1836:10 1839:21 1840:12,22 1841:6 1844:28 1845:7 1846:26 1847:5,13 1848:17 1849:4 1850:7,12 1851:3,22,26 1852:16 1853:15,17,21 1854:17,26 1855:15,23 1856:1,16,26 1862:2,7,15 1880:12 1911:26 1916:25 1935:20,23 1944:1 1945:6.9 1947:9 1948:28 1951:14 1953:24 1954:5,17,21 1955:3,11,18 1956:13,17,23 1957:1,15,23 1961:3

barrier 1791:18

base 1783:17 1786:28 1790:16 1845:5 1869:14 1919:27 1934:1 1960:16

based 1770:10,27 1779:1 1783:11 1799:27 1806:11 1810:19 1816:11 1817:7 1819:14 1821:17 1822:16 1829:12 1837:21 1843:2 1844:3 1858:5,8,21 1862:23 1882:17 1890:12 1896:3 1911:12 1912:3 1926:27 1927:4,5 1928:2,13 1935:6 1941:10 1949:28 1950:21 1953:6 1955:11.19 1958:21

bases 1941:14

basic 1796:23 1797:4 1945:18

basically 1767:16 1790:7 1804:11 1820:24 1838:27 1959:13

basics 1818:1 1827:10

basis 1807:27 1808:17 1836:12 1850:6,9,12 1859:10 1861:22 1869:9,15 1914:24 1940:17 1941:2,3 1949:13,17

batch 1787:3

Bauer 1775:5,8,15,18 1776:18,20 1783:23 1793:28 1794:3 1806:26 1813:26 1860:11 1863:18

Bay 1835:24 1886:11 1910:3

beef 1867:12

begin 1879:9 1910:15 1955:14

beginning 1849:17 1877:17 1892:2 1943:5

behalf 1909:12 1920:18 1934:8

bell 1836:16

belong 1912:7

benefit 1818:28 1870:21 1871:22 1907:20,23 1911:1

benefits 1910:27

benefitting 1793:15

Benton 1905:4

BFP 1796:26 1797:3

bids 1812:23

big 1849:13 1874:22 1887:19 1916:13 1949:1,2

biggest 1957:19

Bill 1880:23 1881:6 1883:20, 24 1917:5

billion 1770:9,11,15 1781:11,17 1785:15 1786:14,15,16 1792:24,26 1793:4,15 1805:24 1816:22 1827:3,14,22 1842:5,16,17, 19,20 1849:9 1910:6

bills 1826:6

bit 1791:6 1795:22 1808:15 1831:27 1835:9 1840:25

1850:2 1866:26 1873:28 1874:20 1891:21 1907:16 1916:12,20 1921:23 1941:22

blame 1862:6

bleeding 1841:16

blend 1781:25 1898:11

blended 1782:13

blending 1823:8 1824:3

block 1769:21 1770:19 1772:15,28 1773:5,6,9,15,26 1774:6 1777:8,25 1778:7,19 1779:1 1780:2,8,24 1781:3,4 1782:14 1783:18 1790:7 1791:17 1793:18 1794:26 1796:16,18 1797:17 1803:22 1808:14 1811:2,12 1814:12, 16 1815:19 1816:11 1822:7. 16,21 1823:9,14,16,20,25,28 1824:10 1825:15.17 1827:5. 7,13,15,17 1828:8 1834:3 1836:9 1837:20 1838:13 1840:4,18 1841:4,6,8 1843:23 1861:20 1862:15 1911:14,18 1912:4,5 1928:2 1929:10 1934:3,18,22,25,26 1935:3,6,18,22,25 1936:2,23 1946:12 1947:15 1948:20 1949:25 1950:1,10,13,16,23 1951:7 1953:4,7,14 1956:13 1957:11 1958:5 1959:3

block-barrel 1954:10

block/barrel 1911:15

blocks 1772:9 1773:10 1777:12 1778:12 1779:2,5,7 1781:23 1782:4,9 1788:1,3,9 1790:26 1797:18 1805:26 1807:27 1812:20 1813:28 1814:20 1816:15 1817:2,3 1824:17 1827:19,24,25 1829:3 1840:12,26 1845:8, 23 1846:27 1847:5,7,25 1848:18 1849:3 1850:7,11 1851:3,17,26 1852:11,16 1853:25 1855:3,16,23 1856:2,17,27 1862:2,7 1880:13 1916:25,26 1927:6 1947:10 1949:4 1951:15 1954:4,5,19 1956:12,17,23 1957:1 1959:3,6

board 1868:2,3,6 1869:1 1880:2,4,6 1895:11,13,15 1905:13,16 1910:4,17

body 1790:17,23

bottle 1868:17 **bottlers** 1906:15

bottling 1924:5



bottom 1799:5 1834:13 1839:25 1919:11 1943:26

bought 1933:18

bounds 1906:18

Box 1806:17

brand 1847:6 1868:8

branded 1833:25 1868:12

break 1807:23 1829:21,26 1864:2 1917:26 1918:6,11, 13

break-even 1898:15

briefing 1876:17 1877:13

briefly 1768:23

brined 1777:9

bring 1868:19 1920:19

bringing 1846:1 1859:5 1919:7

broad-based 1883:2

broken 1930:21

broker 1811:14

Brookings 1905:8

brothers 1895:5

brought 1791:25 1848:3 1859:10 1889:28 1954:12

Brown 1920:23 1921:5,18,

bucks 1915:11

built 1804:28 1805:6,7,8 1847:6

bulk 1777:3 1832:5 1840:17 1868:12 1926:7 1933:18

bump 1915:8,10

bunch 1849:14

burden 1868:26 1871:20 1897:11

Bureau 1768:7 1813:25 1858:18 1889:7,11 1914:11, 16 1918:19 1920:22 1929:23 1955:25

business 1775:20 1776:26 1804:24,25 1805:8,9 1841:16 1842:2 1868:15 1869:21 1870:25 1873:11, 12,15,17 1879:18,23,26 1884:5 1891:13,14 1892:9 1900:25 1905:18 1920:12

businesses 1777:3 1873:26 1901:5 1916:14

butter 1831:5 1836:10 1846:2 1857:28 1880:15 1896:6,14,27 1925:26 1926:5 1930:3,7 1933:16 1936:21,22

butter-powder 1934:4

butterfat 1821:14,20 1882:6, 12 1895:23 1926:13

buy 1787:10 1815:7 1835:23 1837:22

buyer 1817:4

buyers 1781:10 1817:14 1868:14

buying 1793:25 1807:7 1815:14 1834:20

byproducts 1809:20,23 1960:19

С

C-A-S-H-M-A-N 1922:17

C-H-R-I-S-T-I-A-N 1932:14

C-R-I-N-I-O-N 1904:25

calculate 1778:10 1780:4 1782:26 1793:11,21 1815:28 1816:7 1846:2 1853:6 1927:7 1953:17 1957:23 1958:3

calculated 1783:9 1794:24 1810:26 1839:12 1841:5 1845:1 1849:27 1854:13 1856:12 1928:1

calculating 1801:20 1938:3

calculation 1769:26 1770:8 1777:16,21 1778:17 1781:21 1782:18,20,27 1783:9 1785:17 1788:5 1791:20 1792:19 1796:1 1798:13 1799:28 1801:19 1804:9 1806:8,10 1810:5 1816:6 1817:20 1821:15 1824:2 1845:4 1846:15 1849:10 1856:13 1862:19 1863:3 1880:13,20 1883:18 1910:16,19,25 1911:21 1936:11,14,26 1937:27

calculations 1769:18 1791:4 1823:2 1860:12 1960:23

calculator 1844:16

California 1837:6 1879:18, 20,25 1880:2 1882:3,4,10,15 1895:4,9,13 1897:23 1900:1 1926:23 1934:5 call 1775:5 1824:10 1919:17 1929:7.14

called 1833:4 1851:17,26 1852:6,13,28 1853:17 1854:1 1855:22 1857:8,9,16 1872:4

calling 1929:5 1934:6 1936:28

Campaign 1926:23

capabilities 1809:1

capacity 1770:12,17,22,27 1771:1,4,8 1786:16 1787:7 1804:28 1859:1 1956:23 1957:3,7

capital 1807:18

capitalize 1911:27

capture 1861:12 1880:18 1961:1

captured 1778:23

care 1775:3 1910:14

Cares 1895:14

carried 1959:9

carries 1806:10

case 1798:7 1808:18 1919:9, 22 1934:27

cases 1875:4 1943:14

cash 1869:16 1926:27 1927:4,5 1936:12,15

Cashman 1918:1 1920:16 1922:3,6,17 1931:27

catch 1854:23 1961:19

category 1842:27 1849:28 1912:8 1918:21

cattle 1867:2,13

caught 1834:17 1838:1

caused 1780:6 1848:11 1862:9 1910:23

caveat 1892:26

CDC 1900:6

CDI 1880:3,5

Central 1812:2

cents 1846:1 1855:1

CEO 1776:21

certainty 1830:26 1851:4

CFR 1926:10,11,20

chain 1906:2

chair 1867:24

chairs 1867:28

change 1778:12 1779:3 1781:5 1787:15 1789:12 1790:9 1797:19 1803:16 1804:10,11,18 1805:16 1812:15 1824:6,7 1826:11, 12,14 1827:5 1834:16,18 1835:14 1857:19,23 1880:22 1882:24,25 1883:20 1888:2 1901:3 1919:27 1920:1 1936:14 1949:10 1960:3

changed 1777:18 1780:1 1794:25 1835:15 1840:3,5 1862:12 1887:5

changing 1789:6 1906:17 1912:20

chaos 1859:13

characteristics 1957:12

chat 1860:14

cheaper 1951:12

check 1799:11 1802:10,21 1889:20 1890:2 1906:17 1961:11

checking 1854:8

checkoff 1781:14

checks 1802:18

cheddar 1770:5,17,21,26 1772:1 1777:9,20,25 1778:8, 19 1780:25 1781:2 1782:3,8, 10 1784:1,17 1790:7 1795:28 1796:18 1811:25 1828:8 1830:5 1833:11 1841:8 1880:13,16 1888:5 1896:7,15,27 1911:7 1928:3, 8,13 1929:10 1934:12,18,19, 22,24 1935:15,17,22 1936:26

cheese 1769:27 1770:15,17, 27 1771:11,12 1772:7,27,28 1773:5,6,8,16,22,23 1774:2, 3,6,12,14,17,21 1776:24 1777:2,5,8,9,10,12,13,15,20, 22,23,25,26 1778:7,8,10,11, 16,19,20,21,23,25,27 1779:8,9,11,13 1780:3,4,8, 10,20,22,24,27 1781:1,3,4,7, 9,10,12,15,16,17,21,22 1782:3,4,5,6,8,10,14,17,18, 20,22 1783:16,17,18 1784:1, 17,28 1785:5 1786:8,9,11, 14,15,17,19,21,27,28 1787:1,3,4,13,14,16,18,21 1788:10,13 1789:12,14,15, 17,18,21,26,27 1790:6,7,15, 16,19,20,21,28 1791:5,11, 16,17 1792:4,6,12,24



1793:18,20 1794:16 1795:22,28 1796:3,7,8,18 1799:15,21,28 1800:1,2 1803:16,21 1804:9,12 1807:1,3,12 1808:4 1809:28 1810:4,6,10,16,20 1811:11, 12,25,26 1813:4,10 1814:9, 11,16,20,21,23 1815:5,7,9, 10,14,15,17,28 1816:2,3,4,5, 14,15,17,22,23,26 1817:5,7, 9,13,14,24 1818:6,8,12 1820:5 1821:10 1822:7 1823:28 1824:5,12,14 1826:7 1827:12 1828:7,8 1830:5,6 1831:6,28 1832:9, 27,28 1833:11 1834:9,19,20, 24,27 1835:5,13,19,20 1836:10,18,24,25 1838:16, 19,21,24,25,28 1839:27 1840:4,13,14,15 1841:8,13, 26 1842:5,11,12,15,18,19, 20,25 1843:5,9,10 1845:6,28 1846:7,10 1847:11 1848:21 1850:23,27,28 1853:6 1857:9,11,17,20 1858:9,25 1859:1,5 1860:16,18,21,24, 27 1861:13 1880:16 1886:28 1888:5.6.13 1896:7.15.28 1898:25 1907:19 1910:7 1912:2 1913:3 1916:23,24 1927:23,27 1928:2,3,8,13 1929:6,8,9,10 1933:16,18 1934:3,12,16,19,20,21,22, 23,24,25,26,27 1935:2,3,4,6, 7.8,15,17,18,19,21,22,25,26 1936:2,8,22,23,26 1937:25 1938:2,6 1939:22 1941:1 1942:3 1943:3 1945:9,19,20, 27,28 1946:4,10,12,13 1947:15,21 1948:21,22 1949:26 1950:1,2,16,22 1951:13 1952:12,24 1953:4, 5,7,8,9,14,16,17 1954:3,25 1956:5,9,15,16 1957:3 1958:5.19

cheese's 1780:27 1803:8

cheese-making 1834:26

cheeses 1774:6 1786:12 1835:4 1840:16 1858:24 1860:15,18,19 1912:3 1916:27

Chicago 1797:20,24 1798:3 1933:24

chick 1797:20 **chide** 1820:7

children 1867:5 1879:21

Chip 1767:4 1794:7 1865:19 1872:1

choose 1818:24 1825:18,21,

chosen 1818:16

Christian 1896:4 1899:8 1920:18 1932:5,13 1933:10 1955:27 1959:17

chunk 1810:22

circumstance 1939:22

circumstances 1941:17

citation 1768:22,24 1770:6 1796:4

cited 1940:13

citing 1945:2

City 1867:6 1890:24

clarification 1771:16 1845:15 1931:11

clarify 1811:24 1872:18 1877:10 1921:11 1927:1

class 1777:20 1778:2,17 1779:26 1782:7,20,26 1783:10.18 1785:9.21.25 1786:4 1793:21,22,26 1795:9,13 1796:1,20,27 1797:4 1798:13 1800:2 1801:16,23,28 1804:15,18 1805:15 1807:7 1810:13 1816:8,10 1817:8 1818:24 1819:1,2,4,11,14,18,21,26, 27 1821:5,6 1834:9 1837:12 1838:21 1839:27 1841:4.18. 19.28 1842:1 1845:1.5.13.28 1846:3,11 1847:25,28 1848:5 1853:6 1859:17,18 1868:16 1869:26 1870:16, 17,18,25 1871:18,20 1875:6, 10,12 1880:12,20,24 1882:16,18,22,23 1888:20 1893:2,3 1895:20 1896:17, 18,20 1898:5 1899:1 1910:16,19,20,22,25 1911:2, 20 1919:26,27 1926:8,9,12, 17 1929:28 1934:16,24,28 1935:28 1936:10.14 1937:27

1954:22 1957:24 1958:4 classes 1868:12 1911:22

classified 1800:28 1869:13

1938:4 1939:13.17 1944:2

1951:19,25 1952:8 1953:17

clean 1961:20

clear 1768:24 1770:20 1775:4 1828:3 1838:7 1926:19 1930:26 1940:26 1944:26 1962:2

clock 1812:6

close 1772:12 1796:25 1820:17 1891:17 1927:5 1951:21 closely 1827:27 1896:13,25

closing 1888:17

clubs 1924:8

CME 1789:10,11,21 1797:25, 27 1811:11,12,15,18,25,28 1812:9,12,14,22 1834:19,21 1835:2,7,15,24 1836:15 1838:11 1840:19 1905:27 1926:27 1927:4 1928:2 1933:25 1936:12,15 1957:17 1958:26 1959:7

co-manufacturers 1868:17

co-op 1805:20 1821:9 1859:9,12,15,19 1860:1 1869:7 1875:13,15

co-op's 1869:16

Co-ops 1805:27

co-owner 1910:2

Code 1938:18

collect 1770:11 1881:7 1927:28 1938:14,15 1942:21

collected 1929:4 1939:11 1941:25,27 1942:24

collecting 1927:3 1928:28 1940:15 1942:19

collectively 1881:2 1895:7 1898:27 1901:21

College 1905:6

color 1781:4

colored 1808:16,20

column 1788:7 1838:7 1851:26 1852:6,27 1853:11, 18,22,26 1854:2,12,14 1855:4,21 1856:1,20,22,23 1857:28 1924:10 1925:3 1946:18

combination 1836:20

comfort 1881:25

commenters 1946:22

commercial 1832:8 1868:13

committed 1945:15

committee 1867:23.24.28

committees 1868:4 1933:21

commodities 1792:5 1797:7

1834:7

commodity 1779:19 1808:26 1840:14,15,16,17, 18 1848:10 1896:14,25 1897:11,14 1912:6 1933:17 **common** 1773:6,15 1852:17 1958:22

commonly 1832:1 1868:7

communities 1780:19

community 1867:26 1913:19

companies 1776:24 1815:13 1830:10 1831:20,22

company 1824:12,14 1868:3

compare 1771:27 1837:19 1843:11 1882:9

compared 1772:8 1875:5 1897:12 1898:6,11

comparison 1837:15

comparisons 1806:16

compete 1841:22

competing 1871:12

competition 1938:25

complaint 1823:13

complete 1781:7

complicated 1821:19 1845:3

component 1774:7 1778:4, 18 1791:20,21 1797:7 1798:11 1821:19 1836:5,6 1850:24 1881:21 1895:24

components 1783:12 1801:2,3 1808:26 1869:12 1882:2,5,17,20

composition 1880:10 1881:13,19 1906:4

comprehensive 1880:28 1883:2

compress 1897:10

compressed 1897:5,17 1898:3,4

comprised 1930:18

compromise 1767:21

conceded 1862:11

concentrated 1809:2

concentrates 1782:15

concept 1777:19 1795:27 1821:27 1848:1,4 1915:27

conceptually 1945:28 1946:2.7

concern 1887:1

concerned 1792:11 1826:28 1827:1 1849:9 1877:18



concerns 1936:5 1937:19

concluded 1962:11

conclusion 1791:8 1862:9

1906:21

condensed 1777:4 1808:11,

27

condition 1791:26 1834:2

1943:9 1945:25

conditions 1905:24 1906:17 1939:1,7,8 1943:8 1948:11,

12,19 1957:22

conduct 1895:27,28 1913:12

confidentiality 1930:23

confirm 1828:16 1858:25

1918:25

conform 1787:2

confusion 1834:10,11

conjunction 1867:6

connect 1806:7

connected 1887:21

consecutive 1880:3

consensus 1798:17

consequence 1861:25

1948:13

consequences 1948:15

1957:25

considerably 1835:17 1863:7.15

1003.7,13

consideration 1798:28

considerations 1936:24

considered 1850:1 1912:11

1941:20 1946:10 1948:17

considers 1834:1 1883:4

consistent 1789:16 1901:11

consistently 1823:20

consists 1895:5

consolidated 1930:23

consolidation 1902:9

constant 1870:26

constantly 1906:16

constitute 1876:17

consulted 1767:10 1768:12

consume 1883:7

consumer 1883:6 1887:3,8,

20,21,22 1924:4

consumers 1887:11 1924:7

contact 1927:3

contacts 1926:25

contend 1792:14

content 1939:4

contention 1841:3

contentions 1876:10

context 1852:22 1853:3 1855:14 1856:4

continual 1911:5

continually 1881:27 1906:2

1913:27

continue 1781:23 1791:18 1792:10 1798:4 1803:21 1868:19 1879:26 1898:1

1936:8 1937:24 1941:1,6,27 1942:20.24

continued 1780:6 1880:25

continues 1826:16 1957:17,

continuing 1779:1 1787:17

1797:17

1881:22

continuously 1826:17

contract 1861:22

contracted 1811:22

contracting 1892:2

contradistinction 1772:5

1774:5

contributes 1907:15

contributing 1789:6 1811:7

contributor 1827:22

control 1812:14

convenience 1924:7

conventional 1875:1

conventional-fed 1867:13

converge 1956:27 1957:1

converging 1957:13

conversation 1843:3

1889:28 1919:3

conversations 1767:6

conversion 1796:17 1809:9

convert 1841:25

1842:2

0111011 10-11.20

converted 1831:4 1841:27

cooperative 1776:1,21,25 1780:9,19 1799:19 1800:12, 15 1813:14 1824:4 1830:14 1847:3,9 1867:17 1868:7,9, 11,16,21,22 1869:2,11,18 1870:19 1872:5,8,9,12 1873:23 1874:23 1897:12 1903:16 1905:12 1906:7 1910:5 1915:19 1933:27

Cooperative's 1906:1

cooperatively-owned 1897:10

cooperatives 1776:24 1780:10,12 1868:27 1881:3 1883:5 1897:13 1900:3

1911:25

Cooperative's 1868:4

coordination 1920:10

copies 1865:21 1904:3,7 1908:16,22 1944:15

copy 1769:10 1908:15 1942:4 1944:13,20,21

corner 1894:21 1923:9

correct 1767:26 1769:16 1770:1,4,25 1771:2,6,15 1772:4,9,10,14,16,23,24 1773:3,18,19,25,26 1774:8 1784:8,13,21 1785:1 1787:12,24 1788:18,23,27 1793:10,27 1794:10,28 1795:4,5,7 1796:6,24,27,28 1797:8,21,22 1798:4,21,22 1799:9,10,12,16,17,21 1800:2,17,18,21,22,24,26 1801:1,2,5,9,10,13,28 1802:11.18.19.22.27 1803:6. 7,11,12 1804:12,13,17,28 1805:27,28 1806:8,9,12,13, 14 1807:4,5 1808:6 1810:2, 27 1811:23 1812:28 1813:9, 16 1814:1,17,18,21 1815:5, 6,8,22,25 1816:15,19,20,23, 24,27 1817:15,16,18,19 1818:3,7,14,21,25,26 1819:5,6,8,9,18,22,23 1820:1,2,13,14,28 1822:2,3, 7,8,10,11,18 1823:11,12,18 1824:1 1825:3,6,11,12,16 1827:21,23 1829:9,10 1830:18,19 1831:21,24,25 1832:1,2,5,6 1833:17 1834:23 1837:26 1839:8,16, 20 1840:10 1844:19,23,26 1845:21,24 1849:15,19 1852:11,12 1853:2,12,23,24, 27,28 1854:4,22 1855:2,12,

13,17 1875:15,16 1883:28 1894:17 1896:6 1903:16,17 1915:28 1917:1,6 1921:26 1923:3,23 1925:15 1926:20 1927:1,2 1928:10,14 1931:4, 5,8,9 1937:21,22 1938:4,5,7, 8 1943:4 1944:2 1945:6,10, 11,13,20 1946:13,18 1947:2, 6,22 1948:1,2,22,23,25,26 1949:6,8,12 1950:4,5,13,18, 19 1951:3,25 1952:10,21,22, 24 1953:21 1954:8 1955:1,4, 5,8,10,12,17,20 1956:11,19, 21 1957:27 1958:4 1959:16

corrected 1827:25 1854:11 1856:7,21

correcting 1856:6,19

correction 1783:25 1814:26 1951:2

corrections 1855:25 1858:1,

correctly 1767:20 1772:1 1787:5 1793:24 1810:18 1845:17 1846:28 1861:2,24 1946:16

correlate 1778:1 1785:8

correlation 1803:27

cost 1774:13 1789:20,28 1809:10 1823:26 1825:25 1829:4 1835:12,13,27 1880:25 1881:8 1895:22,27 1896:13 1897:22,24 1898:22 1913:12 1915:22,26 1935:17 1945:19,26 1946:5,11 1947:8,21 1948:8,28 1949:5, 12 1952:13,23 1955:9,15,17 1956:4 1960:18

costs 1827:9 1829:5,12 1846:4 1860:2 1882:21 1890:13 1896:7,24 1898:1, 21 1911:6 1912:16 1913:6,8 1914:22 1946:25 1954:1

Council 1910:12

counsel 1775:3 1940:10

counted 1907:24

counterability 1836:7

counterpart 1780:12

counting 1831:20,22

country 1804:27 1809:12 1818:17,22 1859:5

County 1867:5 1868:2

county-by-county 1880:26



13,16,17,19,20 1856:3,5,9

1857:2,14,22,24,26 1858:27

1861:7,15 1862:26 1863:2,

couple 1783:24 1787:25 1860:13 1883:16 1884:2,13 1899:26 1921:19 1948:14

court 1767:2,27 1768:9,14, 26 1771:20 1774:25 1775:2, 7,11,26 1776:13 1794:4 1806:20 1813:20 1829:23,27 1832:13 1845:15 1851:8 1858:13 1860:4 1863:22,26 1865:2,6,15,26 1866:4,10,14 1871:26 1872:19,28 1875:20,28 1876:5,21 1877:6,17,22 1878:9,18,26 1879:9,13 1883:8 1884:26 1885:2,6,12,17,21 1889:3 1890:27 1893:9,17,26 1894:5,20 1899:19 1900:11 1902:20,25 1903:4,22,27 1904:10,13,19 1906:27 1907:28 1908:8,10 1909:1,5, 19 1914:8 1916:2 1917:14, 20,24,28 1918:4,10,14,28 1919:16 1920:3,6,26 1921:2, 10,28 1922:9 1923:7 1927:16 1931:15,21,27 1932:2.8 1933:1 1937:5.15 1939:24 1940:8,25 1941:4,8, 19 1942:10,16 1944:9,17 1955:22 1959:19 1961:7,16, 22 1962:3,6

cousins 1867:4

cover 1823:26 1825:25 1827:9 1935:23 1944:27 1955:9.15.16

covered 1951:20

covering 1954:1

COVID 1892:2 1907:19 1915:4

cows 1867:10 1868:23 1873:21,24 1880:1 1881:23 1884:5 1886:11,14 1888:28 1891:9 1895:7,8 1900:21 1905:10 1916:16

cracks 1908:18

cream 1933:16

Creamery 1776:1,22,25 1780:9 1830:14 1847:9

create 1779:22,23 1837:10 1887:11 1957:24

created 1790:4 1794:18 1880:5 1887:10 1936:3 1958:1

creates 1783:3 1790:5 1835:18

creating 1775:4 1777:28 1785:6

creative 1809:22 1835:1

Crinion 1903:7,10,12,15,17, 24 1904:24 1905:3,10 1907:10 1908:2

criteria 1772:22,25

critical 1881:1,9 1906:24

crop 1873:7 1874:14

CROPP 1867:17 1868:3,7 1869:11 1874:18,27 1875:13

cropping 1874:14

cross 1806:20 1813:20 1832:13 1872:19,22 1880:16 1937:5 1955:22 1961:13

cross-examination 1771:21 1774:25 1794:3,4,5 1806:21 1813:22 1814:4 1832:15 1851:9 1858:14 1873:2 1883:11 1889:5 1891:3 1899:23 1900:13 1907:1 1914:9 1916:5 1921:24 1927:17 1929:21 1930:13 1937:4,6 1955:23 1959:22

cross-ventilated 1905:11

crossbred 1867:11

crucial 1912:11

Cryan 1813:23,24 1814:3 1858:13,15,18 1860:3 1889:6,7 1890:26 1907:2,3, 5,8 1914:10,11 1916:1,28 1918:16,18 1919:1 1920:8, 22,28 1921:16,20 1929:22, 23 1955:24,25 1959:18

Cryan's 1919:7

Cuba 1867:6

curds 1777:2,6 1850:27,28 1859:5

curious 1860:17 1884:17

current 1781:1 1788:24 1790:12 1801:22 1823:7,8 1826:20 1829:9 1870:8 1871:18 1881:14,15,18,21 1895:22 1896:8,13,24 1898:14 1912:27 1924:1 1927:8 1933:22 1934:15 1935:27 1950:9,14 1953:28 1955:13 1958:3

custom 1867:8,20

customers 1778:9 1780:28 1803:9 1808:21 1850:20 1958:7

cut 1959:2,6,16

cut-and-wrap 1777:10

cutting 1912:24

D

D-I-E-D-E-R-I-C-H 1886:2

daily 1927:5

dairies 1871:6 1879:28 1880:2,3

dairy 1771:24 1776:28 1778:3 1781:13,14 1785:10, 16 1792:6,22 1793:3,14 1802:8,17,18 1805:25 1811:9 1812:17 1814:6 1834:28 1843:4 1851:11 1865:9 1866:22,24 1867:4,7, 12,14,16,18 1868:10,11,13 1869:11 1870:1,21 1871:9, 20 1873:11,12,18 1874:10, 13 1879:18,19,20,22,23,27 1880:21 1881:22,27 1883:7, 18 1884:6,15 1886:18,19 1888:1 1889:4 1891:14,24 1895:4,6,13,14 1896:26 1897:3,25 1898:21,24 1903:16 1905:3,9,12,17,20, 27,28 1906:7,8,16,24 1907:6 1910:3,24,25,27 1911:1,11, 13,23,26,28 1912:12,20,27 1913:1.4.19.24 1914:4 1917:23 1920:24 1922:19 1926:23 1927:19 1933:12, 15,16,23,25,27,28 1934:14 1937:8 1938:20,22,25 1939:4 1949:20

dairy-owned 1883:5

dairying 1879:24

dairyman 1888:27

dairymen 1881:2 1889:27 1900:5 1902:4

Dakota 1905:8,14 1907:6

Darin 1768:21

data 1769:20 1770:11 1787:26 1789:25 1842:22 1843:8 1881:8 1896:1,3 1913:28 1914:3,27 1920:16 1923:22 1925:11,23 1930:11 1940:15

date 1773:2 1788:21 1828:27 1887:28 1919:25

dates 1919:14

day 1792:2,3 1807:2 1812:2, 21 1847:16 1860:1 1883:7 1888:28 1892:9 1907:25 1913:26 1915:9 1917:27 1920:14,19

days 1773:1,7,10,24

1774:18,19 1790:16,23

deadline 1767:8,13,24

1918:21

deadlines 1768:7 1919:22

deal 1848:2

debate 1905:25

decade 1868:25

decide 1812:19

decided 1942:9 **decimals** 1846:8

decision 1828:23,25 1829:2 1869:23 1870:4 1944:4 1945:5,8 1947:20 1948:6

decision-making 1849:13

decisions 1869:15 1874:5 1938:25

deck 1885:10 1903:9 1920:21

declaration 1798:23 1799:1

decrease 1898:12,14,18,19, 20 1902:9

decreased 1897:23 1898:9

decreases 1898:8 1899:2

dedicated 1868:16

deduct 1951:27

deducting 1955:8

defined 1870:23

defines 1873:12 1884:6 1891:13

definition 1800:14 1808:26 1873:17,22 1884:9 1891:16, 17 1900:26 1905:18 1945:21,23,26

degree 1851:3 1859:13 1957:15

delay 1905:26

delaying 1897:6

delineated 1948:14,15

delineation 1947:8

delis 1833:1

deliveries 1924:4

delivery 1835:24 1924:9

delta 1935:24

demand 1774:17,20,21,22 1810:5 1956:5,25 1957:12



demanding 1871:21

demands 1779:20

demographics 1787:15

demonstrates 1871:17

department 1843:8 1882:4 1934:6 1936:27 1947:13

departure 1936:1

depend 1960:4

depending 1786:10 1790:22 1818:15 1819:1 1861:20 1923:7

depends 1800:14 1807:25 1815:20 1821:20 1945:25

depool 1800:26 1805:19,28 1806:2 1818:14 1819:25 1824:7 1837:13

depooled 1907:19

depooling 1818:19 1859:10, 12,18 1887:15,17 1889:17, 18,20 1907:15,16 1915:15, 17

describe 1814:28 1868:27 1916:24

describing 1817:12 1953:3, 11,15

designed 1911:11

destroys 1780:14

detached 1869:20

detailed 1936:3

determination 1948:24

determine 1774:12 1849:6 1913:14

determined 1869:1

determining 1849:8 1945:9

detriment 1911:23

detrimental 1859:21

developed 1836:5

development 1912:7

devoted 1895:8

DHIA 1895:15

diameter 1833:2

Diederich 1885:10,14,26 1886:1,3,5,10 1889:9 1891:5 1893:13

difference 1779:4 1780:13 1781:5 1786:16 1788:12 1796:17 1829:3 1836:23

1850:7 1852:18,24 1855:15 1915:12 1927:8 1935:17 1940:27 1945:19,21 1946:11,24 1947:9,15,21 1949:5,11 1958:13 1960:15

differences 1779:6 1829:12, 13 1925:9 1956:25

differential 1888:20

differentials 1870:16 1871:18,20 1880:24 1893:2, 4 1919:27

differently 1834:27 1947:13 1948:17

differs 1807:27

difficult 1850:10 1929:24 1947:14

difficulties 1790:3

diligence 1775:3

diligently 1910:11

direct 1775:13 1793:18 1811:20 1871:27 1878:20 1894:6 1903:28 1909:6 1920:20 1922:11 1932:9 1935:9 1958:24

directing 1914:21

direction 1829:6

directly 1811:13,18 1870:11 1871:12,13 1924:6

Director 1922:19

Directors 1868:3 1869:2 1880:2 1895:11

disadvantage 1837:8

disadvantaged 1794:17

disagree 1796:10 1800:7 1840:28 1869:23

disconnect 1774:16 1887:8, 19 1888:24

disconnected 1778:26

discontinue 1797:25

discount 1808:22

discounted 1832:9

discouraged 1892:5

discovery 1778:14 1789:23 1880:14 1888:4,15,16 1890:7,9,16 1892:15,17,27 1936:7 1937:23

discrepancy 1837:23

discuss 1795:22 1796:13 1798:19 1841:11 1921:1

discussed 1836:23 1840:7 1841:27 1906:12 1918:19 1919:25

discussing 1855:25

discussion 1767:8 1820:15 1823:3 1850:19 1861:27 1874:2 1884:12 1901:1

discussions 1809:16,25 1835:18 1891:23 1901:2

dismissed 1863:26 1877:28 1885:6 1903:5

disorderly 1777:28 1779:7 1782:23 1783:3 1785:6,18 1834:2 1836:24 1837:25

disparity 1799:18

dispersals 1897:26

disposition 1924:15,28

dispositions 1924:3,18,21

disproportionately 1862:2

disrupted 1887:12

disruption 1780:6 1848:11

disruptive 1889:22

distant 1935:22

distinct 1814:28 1837:7 1850:5

distinction 1800:13

distinguish 1849:23

distributed 1849:10

distributing 1930:27

District 1830:20

divergence 1811:5

diversified 1847:9.11

divide 1821:17 1873:20

divided 1788:14 1839:2.4

arriaca 1700.14 1000.

dividends 1870:28

division 1922:19

DMC 1887:25 1892:1 1901:10 1916:19

document 1904:13 1908:12, 13 1922:26,27 1923:14,18, 25 1945:1 1946:16

documents 1893:11

dollar 1825:8 1826:6 1869:19 1870:26 1892:11

dollars 1792:26 1801:17 1826:8,9 1837:8 1839:2

1852:8 1883:25

dots 1806:7

double 1854:8

Downing 1920:21 1921:12, 21

downside 1910:26

dramatic 1789:11 1841:26 1910:23

dramatically 1897:23 1913:18

drastic 1898:19

draw 1799:27 1800:4,5 1801:8,11 1802:6 1819:14, 20 1849:12 1862:8 1869:19 1870:26 1872:4,7,13 1933:19 1938:18

dried 1808:25 1847:13

driven 1778:21 1830:6 1911:21

driving 1787:22 1789:7 1957:19

drop 1797:24 1898:17,19

dropped 1801:27

DRP 1901:10 1905:28 1916:19

dry 1797:9 1808:19,23,28 1809:8 1836:8 1880:16 1896:6,7,14,15,27,28 1934:3 1960:11

drying 1777:4 1808:10

due 1847:5 1919:28 1925:4 1926:24

dues 1914:18

duly 1775:9 1878:16 1885:15 1894:3 1903:25 1909:3 1932:6

Е

E-D-M-I-S-T-O-N 1932:14

e-mail 1767:6 1918:26 1919:15

e-mailed 1843:8

e-mails 1919:8

earlier 1789:13 1805:2 1809:11 1816:25 1834:23 1836:21 1840:26 1841:27 1908:3 1919:3 1928:27 1946:21 1950:7 1958:20

early 1767:7



easily 1781:3

East 1934:5

Eastern 1767:17,18 1768:8 1920:1 1961:28

easy 1820:20,22 1832:24 1833:6 1944:13 1950:16

eat 1787:17

economic 1871:18

economically 1780:23 1819:21,28 1841:14

economics 1819:13 1922:19 1933:13 1953:16

Edge 1903:16,19 1905:12, 13,18,28 1906:7

Edge-3 1904:4,12,14

Edmiston 1896:4 1899:8,12 1920:18 1932:5,11,13 1933:7,10 1937:2,4 1961:17

effect 1791:24 1849:11 1861:17 1896:9 1935:18

effective 1774:22

effectively 1779:28 1840:2 1906:8

effects 1810:9

efficiencies 1807:17

efficiency 1902:2

effort 1774:11 1828:18 1877:26 1948:8

efforts 1791:2 1881:7 1913:11 1914:20 1917:4

elected 1868:6

electronic 1919:17

eliminate 1798:8

eliminated 1911:10

eliminating 1785:12

elimination 1776:6 1880:12 1906:10 1911:26 1955:3

Ellsworth 1775:21 1776:1,3, 21,22,25,27 1777:1 1779:4, 13 1780:9,18 1795:24 1799:7,9 1800:16,19 1808:8 1811:11,17 1830:14 1834:1 1835:3 1838:23,24 1846:26 1847:3,8,19,21

Ellsworth's 1808:12

Emma 1920:21

emphasize 1939:1

employ 1867:17

employed 1775:23,28 1932:20

employees 1776:28

employers 1933:19,22

enable 1896:2

enacting 1895:26

encountered 1910:22

encourage 1907:22

end 1782:10 1784:1 1789:18 1792:2,3 1807:2 1841:12 1845:19,23 1860:1 1892:8 1901:15 1913:26 1918:8 1920:19 1937:18 1941:2 1951:13,22 1952:7,15,16

end-of-year 1870:27

ended 1794:8

endless 1910:26

ends 1892:10

engage 1874:8

engaged 1881:6

engaging 1942:2

English 1767:3,4,5 1768:2,4, 10 1794:6,7 1806:19,28 1812:9 1831:26 1860:19 1865:17,19,20 1866:8 1871:26,28 1872:1,17 1875:23,24 1876:4,14,24 1877:12,21 1918:28 1919:1 1921:8

enhance 1871:1 1906:7

enhancements 1870:28

enhancing 1881:25

ensure 1881:14 1906:2 1948:7

entered 1863:23

entire 1777:17 1906:2

entitled 1821:28

entry 1852:16

equal 1780:25 1803:25 1804:17 1835:4 1844:5,15, 17 1935:19

equalize 1948:6,8

equally 1786:5 1934:25

equals 1854:15

equate 1835:2

equation 1888:7,8,14

equipment 1809:3,5 1877:27

equity 1871:1

equivalency 1821:16 1824:27

equivalent 1778:8 1926:15

Erin 1865:8 1891:6 1900:15 1905:17 1916:10

erroneous 1792:15

error 1852:1,2,4,20 1856:18, 19 1870:3

errors 1855:25 1856:6

escalate 1880:26

essence 1781:25

essential 1871:6

essentially 1818:18 1821:11 1958:14

establish 1778:6,9 1783:9 1792:8 1794:9 1796:22

1811:1 1938:21 1939:12,16 1943:10

established 1835:16 1919:22

establishes 1801:4

establishing 1794:14 1810:21 1938:28

Establishment 1938:20

estate 1912:7

estimate 1770:10,21,26 1772:2 1784:27 1786:15 1843:5,7,14,15 1849:6

estimated 1770:15 1844:2, 12 1845:7 1850:11 1855:22 1896:16

estimates 1814:15

estimating 1777:22 1796:2

etcetera 1809:21 1821:21 1926:7

evaluation 1791:7

event 1940:28 1946:7

eventually 1848:16,20

everyone's 1952:3

evidence 1863:21,25 1876:3 1885:5 1902:24 1903:1 1908:25 1917:13,17 1922:22

1931:26

evident 1935:28 1936:2

evolve 1848:17

exact 1780:4 1946:28

examination 1769:5 1775:13 1860:9 1871:27 1878:19 1894:6 1903:28 1909:6 1922:11 1927:14 1932:9

examined 1775:9 1866:20 1878:16 1885:15 1894:3 1903:25 1909:3 1922:7 1932:6

exceed 1849:27

exceeds 1823:25 1827:8 1935:3 1949:26 1953:4

excellent 1890:20.25

exception 1836:7

excerpt 1944:10

excerpted 1944:28

excess 1954:7

exchange 1780:25 1789:17, 21,27 1797:21,24 1798:3 1810:11 1835:5 1919:8 1933:25

exchanged 1826:2

excluded 1797:1

exclusively 1780:26

excuse 1775:24 1783:7 1784:9 1792:2 1837:28 1838:5 1863:10 1901:5

execute 1905:23

executive 1867:23

exempt 1869:25 1924:25

exemption 1870:2 1871:15

exhibit 1769:9 1772:22 1776:8,12,14 1828:6 1830:3 1834:24 1863:20,23,24 1865:22,23,27,28 1866:2,4, 5,6 1876:2 1878:24,27 1879:1,5 1884:28 1885:2,4 1894:16,19,20,21,23 1902:24,26,28 1904:7,15,16 1908:14,24 1909:15,18,20, 21 1917:12,14,16 1922:27, 28 1923:6,8,10,11 1926:22, 23 1927:21,22 1930:17 1931:22,24,25 1932:25,28 1933:2,3,8 1937:13 1942:8 1944:15

exhibit's 1933:1

exhibits 1865:16,27 1875:27,28 1877:19

Index: easily..exist

exist 1849:2



existing 1846:3 1868:25

expand 1787:25 1808:15 1836:27 1850:17 1871:19 1901:23

expect 1798:3 1846:9 1848:21 1892:21

expected 1786:5 1868:20 1869:3

expense 1897:25

expensive 1858:28 1859:1 1956:8

experience 1770:10 1787:20 1807:15 1808:12 1810:8 1933:19 1934:21

experienced 1896:8

expert 1818:20 1940:19

explain 1799:22 1811:4 1841:15 1852:3,21 1874:28 1941:11

explained 1772:1 1856:19

explanation 1771:26 1814:14 1825:27

explore 1791:2 1799:5 1941:9

exposed 1910:25

express 1767:21 1866:27

extend 1905:7

extended 1867:19

extension 1836:12,13 1859:24 1868:2

extensive 1868:17

extensively 1867:25

extent 1768:18 1800:4,27 1818:11 1819:1 1861:3 1939:16 1943:10

external 1778:8

extra 1816:22,26 1820:26 1833:14,20 1834:25 1836:11

extreme 1823:19 1869:19

F

F-E-R-N-A-N-D-E-S 1894:11

FAC 1910:12 face 1872:12 faces 1869:18

facilitate 1938:24

facility 1808:28

fact 1767:22 1799:2 1802:10 1804:3,8 1809:27 1816:21 1818:22 1821:9 1822:9 1823:28 1828:15 1829:1 1830:11 1831:16 1853:8 1856:15 1862:18 1871:2 1938:13 1939:19,20 1940:7 1942:2 1947:1 1948:20,27

factor 1789:9 1790:9 1811:7 1821:18 1862:12

factored 1788:5

factors 1785:28 1789:8,22 1790:9 1804:5 1811:8 1849:4,7,14,15 1895:20

failed 1798:16

fair 1774:3 1780:3 1788:26 1795:15 1816:5 1821:12 1869:8 1896:11 1901:27 1911:12 1941:26 1951:6

fairly 1772:12 1783:22

fall 1890:24 1908:17

falls 1882:16 false 1792:15

familiar 1939:27 1959:27

familiarity 1938:12

families 1780:18 1879:26 1905:10

family 1867:7,9,14,15,19,24, 25,27 1868:1,22 1873:16 1879:20,27 1895:5 1905:8

fantastic 1955:14 1959:17

farm 1768:7 1779:19
1802:28 1803:1 1813:24
1849:28 1858:18 1867:4,22
1869:12 1873:7,10,14,19,28
1880:22 1881:6 1883:20,23
1884:6 1886:3 1889:7,11
1891:9,14,16 1895:7 1898:9
1900:21,25 1901:6 1905:6,
20,21,24 1906:25 1907:7,17
1910:12,13,26 1911:1
1914:11,16 1916:12,13
1917:5 1918:18 1920:22
1929:23 1955:25

farm's 1896:21

farmer 1822:28 1865:9 1871:3,24 1883:5 1889:4 1895:4 1903:16 1905:12,28 1917:23 1933:28

farmer's 1906:26 1912:22 farmer-owned 1868:10 1881:3 1883:5

farmer-owners' 1871:1

farmers 1778:3 1780:14 1781:13,14 1783:21 1785:10,13,16 1786:5 1792:22 1793:4,14 1802:9, 17.18 1805:25 1812:17 1822:2,15,18 1837:19 1843:4 1859:23,24 1866:24 1867:21 1868:10,22 1869:7, 12,14 1870:1,19,21,27,28 1871:13,21 1872:13,15 1873:11,25 1874:4 1875:14 1880:21 1881:23 1883:18 1886:18,19 1887:7 1891:24 1905:15 1906:16,22,23 1910:12,27 1912:13,20 1913:1,24 1914:4 1915:21 1916:14

farmers' 1884:15 1906:8

farming 1867:14 1871:9,14 1905:7 1912:27 1913:19

farmland 1912:6,7

farms 1780:18 1849:27 1850:1 1867:25 1868:19,20 1873:12,16 1895:6 1898:21 1902:9 1910:3,5

farm's 1898:27

fast-food 1780:28 1803:9,15

faster 1793:1 fat 1882:13 father 1879:19

favor 1913:10

federal 1777:16 1779:12 1780:23 1782:23 1785:7,20 1786:3 1791:28 1793:6 1794:9,15 1795:3,12,21 1796:10,21 1797:2,23 1798:13 1799:20,24 1800:1, 12 1804:19,26,27 1807:10, 22 1808:3 1818:1,2,9,12 1820:25 1821:24 1824:26 1826:13 1827:10,14 1835:10 1836:25,28 1840:2 1841:14 1849:5 1861:4,10 1870:22, 23 1874:26 1880:8 1882:10 1887:10 1888:9 1891:26 1895:9 1896:23 1898:10 1912:14 1923:28 1924:1,6, 12,19 1934:2,7 1937:1 1939:14,18 1943:28 1944:11,26

Federation 1783:8 1813:25 1858:19 1880:6 1883:3 1889:8 1895:18 1899:5 1910:11 1914:12 1918:19 1920:23 1929:24 1933:24 1934:10 1936:25 1955:26

feed 1881:26 1897:24

feeding 1867:2 1895:8 1897:27

feel 1874:23,25 1911:9

felt 1889:25

Fernandes 1893:21,25,28 1894:2,8,10,12,27 1895:3 1899:7,25 1900:15 1903:3,5

field 1892:8

fifty- 1810:22

figure 1772:2 1842:23 1848:20 1853:22,26 1854:2 1856:18

figured 1865:12

figures 1772:6

file 1800:20

final 1925:3 1926:22

financial 1791:14 1836:4 1897:1 1910:24 1935:9 1936:3

financially 1847:4 1913:1

find 1770:2 1783:16 1786:28 1809:19,22 1841:3,21 1843:1 1873:8 1875:2,20 1901:26

finding 1848:28

fine 1767:25 1876:24

finish 1917:27 1921:21 1961:13

finished 1773:28 1806:28 1955:7

firm 1790:23

first-person 1926:25

firsthand 1809:15

fit 1871:7

five- 1833:1

fix 1778:28 1797:16 1798:18 1833:28 1848:14

fixed 1815:18 1850:26

flagship 1868:8

flat 1860:25 1861:18

flaw 1791:27 flaws 1935:27

flexibility 1906:26 1957:4



flight 1921:13,14 1961:19,23

flipped 1853:9 1856:16

floor 1866:17 1879:13

flow 1869:17

fluctuate 1869:8

fluid 1868:16 1869:22 1923:26 1924:4,15,18,21,28 1926:16

FMMO 1777:16 1778:4 1868:12,25 1869:13 1871:7, 12 1898:8 1911:11

FMMOS 1777:28 1778:15 1779:8,22,28 1870:9 1934:7 1935:12

focus 1950:6

focused 1778:21 1829:3 1830:5

fold 1876:14,17

follow 1811:27 1814:8 1851:13 1888:23 1927:21 1944:16

follow-up 1858:21 1860:13 1875:22

food 1781:18 1787:18,22 1806:17 1832:5 1842:12 1882:4 1924:7,9

Foods 1771:24 1814:6 1830:22 1851:11 1898:24 1913:4 1920:24 1927:19 1933:13,23 1937:8

footnote 1924:3,14 1925:4 1926:24

footnotes 1925:12

forage 1895:8 1897:24 1898:1

force 1796:13 1835:17 1910:13

forced 1803:22 1913:24,25

forces 1848:3

foremost 1847:6 1910:4,5, 17 1911:9.25 1916:22

forgot 1850:27

form 1860:28

formula 1779:26 1781:23 1790:12 1791:3 1794:17,18 1795:11 1796:23 1797:4 1807:22 1822:16 1824:18 1839:28 1846:4,7 1848:5 1881:8,14 1882:18,22,23 1883:26 1895:20 1934:16,24 1935:28 1950:14 1954:19 1955:4

formulas 1812:11 1839:21 1846:5 1870:11 1880:18 1881:11,18 1884:15 1895:24 1901:4 1912:15

fortification 1929:28

fortify 1926:9 1929:28

fortunate 1915:18.22

forum 1890:24

forward 1790:13 1843:24 1846:1 1881:6,17 1884:22 1892:1,6 1897:21 1910:1 1919:19

found 1786:17

Foundation 1895:14

four- 1833:1

fraction 1934:23

frame 1913:18

frankly 1888:21 1892:9

freestanding 1821:10

fresh 1790:20

Friday 1767:1 1865:1 1919:28 1961:26

friends 1907:20

front 1769:10 1826:7

frustration 1871:2

fuel 1874:13

full 1783:27 1858:26 1859:2 1880:7 1915:22 1956:6,24, 28

full-time 1867:18

fully 1783:15 1798:3 1848:8 1881:6 1883:1 1896:6 1897:15 1924:22 1934:9

function 1789:15,16 1827:20 1828:2 1834:21

functionality 1834:20

fund 1871:13

fundamental 1791:15

funding 1913:12 1914:21

funny 1848:28

Furthers 1919:16

future 1790:11,13,15 1881:1,8,9 1914:24

futures 1836:8,11 1850:22 1874:10 1901:9 1916:19

1926:28 1927:5 1936:17,22, 23

G

G-E-R-B-E-N 1879:11

gain 1826:16,17

gained 1793:19

gap 1782:15 1789:9

gate 1779:20 1802:28 1803:2 1869:12

gather 1892:14 1917:26 1938:10

gave 1843:10

general 1774:20 1776:21 1798:26 1809:15 1938:27 1943:6,7,8,13,19

generally 1774:1,4 1833:2 1859:8 1860:26 1892:23 1946:10

genetics 1881:27

gentleman 1886:22

Gerben 1878:6,15 1879:11,

give 1799:1 1822:23,26 1850:25 1856:9 1865:6 1866:24,28 1872:15 1876:22 1878:5 1892:8 1893:22 1903:9,10,11 1916:11 1941:11 1958:10

giving 1942:7

glad 1906:12 1951:2

Glanbia 1830:22

goal 1919:13,17 1935:14

God 1846:24

good 1767:2,4 1768:9,14,16, 17 1769:7 1775:15 1780:2 1792:8 1803:27 1806:23,25, 26 1812:3,7 1813:24 1820:20,22 1832:17,18 1833:6 1840:4 1846:19 1858:16,17 1860:3,7 1862:17 1865:19 1866:22 1873:4 1883:13,14 1887:11, 15,24 1888:23 1889:9,10,16 1890:22 1893:17,25 1894:8 1900:15,17,18 1904:24 1905:1 1907:3,9,12 1908:5 1909:8,27 1914:3,24 1915:13 1916:7,9 1919:18 1920:9 1921:2 1922:13,14 1932:11 1942:26 1958:11 1961:22

government 1887:23,24

governs 1798:26

grade 1833:14,21 1834:25 1930:7 1958:25,27 1959:8, 12,14

graded 1777:8 1833:13,16 1925:27 1926:3 1930:3,7

grading 1926:6 1958:14

gradually 1915:6

grant 1867:5 1868:2 1881:7

grateful 1768:13 1885:21 1908:18

gratefulness 1767:21

gratitude 1866:28

gray 1886:15

grazing 1886:23

great 1767:27 1820:10 1879:9 1887:26 1889:23 1900:6 1909:28 1914:14 1916:8 1919:16 1921:28

greater 1783:19 1805:18 1821:25 1838:21 1916:16

greatly 1849:4 1911:1,4

Green 1835:24 1886:11

Greenwood 1831:3 1841:27

gross 1873:13 1884:7 1887:28 1891:15,18 1905:10,27

group 1767:5 1768:6 1781:14 1794:7 1797:28 1835:18 1865:20 1872:2 1905:27 1910:13

groups 1918:20 1933:22

Grove 1905:3,9

grow 1787:18

grown 1868:24

guarantee 1767:18

guess 1802:8 1843:17 1853:10 1859:4 1865:6 1872:21 1889:25 1891:18 1908:10 1922:27 1931:17 1943:12.17

guinea 1865:10 1866:27

guys 1842:14

gyrations 1869:13



н

hair 1886:15

half 1863:9 1891:18 1898:3, 4 1927:2 1946:21

halfway 1950:22

hampered 1910:27

Hancock 1768:15,16,17
1769:3,6 1771:18 1774:27
1775:5,11,12,14 1776:11,16,
17 1794:2 1834:15 1860:7,8,
10 1863:20 1866:10,12
1877:10 1878:22 1879:3
1884:27,28 1885:18,20,23
1886:4,7 1893:24,25 1894:7,
18,25,26 1899:17 1902:23
1903:2 1908:27 1909:5,7,17,
23,24 1917:11,18 1921:10,
11,26 1932:10,27 1933:5,6
1937:3 1939:25,26 1940:16
1941:12,13 1961:11,18

hand 1775:7 1878:14 1885:13 1894:1 1903:23 1909:1 1923:14 1932:4

handle 1885:18

handler 1800:6,8,17,20,24 1801:4,19 1847:20 1924:25

handling 1958:17

hands 1826:2

Hang 1769:3

hangover 1957:26

Hanson 1768:21 1769:7 1774:28 1775:2 1784:19,23 1792:20 1793:3

happen 1819:25 1959:9

happened 1806:16 1929:10

hard 1847:22 1862:8 1872:3 1882:20 1930:9 1942:7,10 1961:11,16

harder 1782:21 1804:15,21

harmony 1948:4

harvesting 1867:20

hat 1847:19,20 1859:9

haywire 1803:28 1804:2

head 1793:1 1854:21 1950:27

heading 1851:16 1857:9 1858:5,8

headquartered 1776:22

health 1871:10,11

healthier 1824:8

hear 1805:2 1846:27,28 1848:27 1900:23 1923:25 1951:1

heard 1784:19 1785:14 1792:20 1834:18 1872:11 1875:11 1892:15 1905:25 1906:24 1916:13

hearing 1772:22 1776:5 1848:16 1869:25 1870:2,12 1871:8 1882:26 1895:19,24 1902:26 1906:12,23 1913:15 1923:19 1927:22 1931:22 1934:6 1936:28 1937:13

heavily 1868:1

heck 1960:15

hedge 1906:18

hedged 1850:8

hedging 1906:15

heifer 1867:8

heifers 1886:22

held 1895:11

helpful 1919:9

helping 1865:11

helps 1811:4 1828:3 1920:10

herd 1868:23 1873:8 1881:28

herds 1867:12

hey 1850:25 1915:7,10

hidden 1872:27

high 1789:28 1859:17 1886:12 1901:19,27 1902:12 1911:17 1961:1

higher 1771:7 1789:3 1790:19 1801:12 1805:17 1809:8,9 1819:1,14,26 1823:17,21 1841:19 1845:9, 13 1846:10,11 1847:26 1854:17,19,20 1862:27 1880:17 1896:12 1897:27 1912:28 1913:6 1915:5 1950:9 1954:5

higher-of 1880:20 1883:18, 23 1910:18,25 1911:2

highest 1841:21

highly 1807:28

Hill 1767:26 1922:9,12 1923:5,13 1927:14 1931:19

Hills 1932:17

Hilmar 1831:6

hinder 1913:18

historical 1823:21

historically 1789:2,24 1871:3 1936:1

hold 1773:6,15,19 1821:28 1846:15 1895:12 1939:24 1953:18

holiday 1962:1

Holland 1879:19

Holstein 1867:11

home 1786:17 1787:17 1833:8 1875:2 1882:2 1924:9

honest 1832:20

honor 1767:4 1768:17 1771:18 1774:27 1775:5,12 1776:11 1794:2 1829:17,18, 25 1860:8 1863:20 1866:8, 26 1872:26 1875:26 1878:22,24 1885:1 1894:18 1899:17 1900:12 1902:23 1904:6 1908:7,21 1909:17 1917:12,22 1919:24 1920:15 1923:6 1931:20 1932:27 1937:3,13 1939:26 1940:5, 16,22,23 1941:13 1942:27 1944:12 1961:10,18,24

hope 1783:20

hopes 1876:11

hoping 1907:15

horn 1832:28 1833:5

horns 1777:9 1832:27 1833:4

hourly 1912:24

housekeeping 1866:15 1877:18

huge 1789:22 1791:14 1850:12 1875:5 1883:19

hundred 1883:24

hundredweight 1779:14 1780:12,17 1782:28 1783:1, 5 1788:17,26 1799:8 1839:14 1846:6 1857:23 1862:28 1896:18,19 1898:6, 13,17 1913:21,22

hypothetical 1821:26 1954:4,16

i.e. 1835:12 1841:27

Idaho 1835:12

idea 1797:12,15 1846:22 1919:16.18 1960:6

identification 1776:12,15 1866:1,3,7 1878:25,28 1879:2 1894:22,24 1904:15, 17 1909:20,22 1923:6,9,12 1932:28 1933:2.4

identified 1776:8 1879:5 1894:16 1909:15 1932:25

identify 1944:23

identity 1787:2 1797:10

IDFA 1768:12 1899:2 1901:20 1902:7 1914:23 1933:23

idle 1858:28 1956:9

II 1919:26

III 1777:20 1778:2,17 1779:26 1782:7,20,26 1783:10,18 1785:9,21,25 1786:4 1793:21,26 1796:1, 20,27 1797:4 1798:13 1800:2 1801:16,23,28 1804:15,18 1805:15 1807:7 1810:13 1816:8,10 1817:8 1818:24 1819:11,18,26 1821:5 1834:9 1837:12 1838:21 1839:27 1841:4,19 1845:1,5,13,28 1846:3,11 1847:25,28 1848:5 1853:6 1870:18 1880:12 1882:16 1895:20 1896:17 1898:5 1911:20 1934:16,24,28 1935:28 1936:10,14 1937:27 1938:4 1939:13,17 1944:2 1951:19,25 1953:17 1954:22 1957:24 1958:4

III/IV 1910:19,20,22,25 1911:2

illegal 1938:14 1939:20

imagine 1916:13

imbalance 1835:19 1958:1

immigrated 1879:19

impact 1779:4 1787:28 1789:4 1791:14 1810:21 1811:10 1826:24 1838:21 1839:19,22 1846:2 1858:9 1859:22 1862:2,28 1863:11 1868:28 1869:13,15 1870:18 1875:10,13 1884:14 1889:23 1896:11,12,21 1897:8,16,19 1898:26 1901:1,18 1905:26

Index: hair..impact



1907:16 1912:12 1913:20,22 1915:14 1935:9 1936:17 1949:22 1960:20

impacted 1897:1 1901:7 1911:4 1912:22 1934:15 1936:7,13 1937:24 1949:21 1954:10

impacting 1870:11

impacts 1799:6 1859:11 1869:16 1875:14 1889:18,19 1935:20 1936:3

impairs 1780:14

implement 1899:4

implementation 1910:21

implemented 1881:17 1896:21 1901:4 1906:5

implementing 1914:21

implication 1835:11

importance 1896:22

important 1774:7 1866:25 1877:1 1881:13,16 1889:26 1890:14,24 1914:26 1919:2

importantly 1807:18 1913:10

impose 1901:20

imposition 1870:25

impossible 1781:5 1792:9

improve 1847:27 1871:10 1881:26

improved 1881:23

improvements 1882:21

improving 1881:27

In-area 1924:3

inaccurate 1949:11

inadequate 1804:3 1861:26 1862:1,6,10 1897:9

inappropriately 1825:5

incentive 1810:3 1819:7 1848:24

inches 1833:2

include 1774:14 1777:19 1781:21 1789:13 1795:28 1803:4,5 1817:9 1819:27 1924:7,24 1936:8 1937:24 1939:21 1941:1 1944:1 1945:6,9 1948:25

included 1772:7,9 1773:11, 21,25 1777:18 1794:16 1797:11,14 1798:12 1801:13 1805:11 1816:1 1824:9 1827:12 1842:17 1848:6 1888:12 1936:10 1937:26 1938:3 1946:23

includes 1777:17 1799:28 1800:2 1842:11 1911:25 1926:6

including 1777:8,26 1778:23 1785:4 1796:7 1799:1 1806:17 1813:14 1892:16 1933:12

inclusion 1772:23 1779:25 1839:27 1870:1

income 1791:19 1802:9 1850:9 1859:25 1873:21 1960:25

incorporated 1777:24 1828:7

incorrect 1794:21 1797:26 1801:14,15 1802:7,12,15 1817:25 1824:2 1853:11 1939:20

increase 1785:13 1789:11 1870:16 1882:20 1890:12 1893:3 1895:21 1897:20,25 1901:17 1913:5,17 1935:14 1950:24 1952:3,5

increased 1780:7 1797:3 1882:21 1897:24 1913:8 1915:3 1946:23

increases 1880:19 1896:6, 10 1897:18 1898:23 1901:20 1911:5 1914:28

increasing 1897:15 1913:16

increasingly 1935:22

independent 1797:28 1798:2

Indiana 1910:8

indirectly 1872:13

individual 1861:22

indulgement 1829:18

industries 1824:8

industry 1770:11 1773:14, 15 1777:17 1779:2 1780:1 1781:9,24 1786:12,17 1787:23 1792:2,3,18,21 1794:24 1797:18 1798:16,17 1803:28 1804:18 1809:15, 21,24 1811:9,13 1812:17 1826:14 1835:1 1840:3,5 1841:7 1848:1,2,15,17 1850:23 1867:26 1869:11 1871:3,22 1874:11 1881:1,9, 15 1883:6 1895:13 1896:1 1911:23 1912:27 1913:13,14 1924:9 1933:12 1936:6 1937:19 1938:26 1946:11 1957:21,27

inequitable 1868:26

infer 1811:21

inflate 1898:1

inflation 1915:5

Inflationary 1897:22

influence 1797:23,27

influenced 1800:5

Informa 1933:13

information 1778:23 1781:13 1782:2 1788:23,24 1829:7,19 1851:16 1858:4 1881:4,9,24,26 1882:26 1914:3 1916:12 1925:16,23 1927:28 1928:17 1938:10, 14,15,22,24 1939:3,10,11, 14,16 1941:25 1942:20,23 1943:9,10 1949:7

informed 1938:24 1942:6

infrastructure 1898:1

ingredient 1781:6 1868:13 1960:16

initial 1855:24

ink 1841:17

Innovation 1767:5 1768:6 1794:7 1865:20 1872:2

innovative 1871:10

input 1777:21 1796:1 1874:13 1911:6

installed 1836:6

instance 1924:11

instantaneously 1912:25

Institute 1933:25

insufficient 1870:2

insurance 1874:14

intend 1795:6

intended 1777:27 1785:6 1796:18.19 1834:10

intent 1779:28 1780:5 1795:8 1818:2 1840:2 1858:25

intention 1840:21

intents 1779:16

interest 1905:26 1936:15

interested 1896:2

interesting 1836:4 1842:16, 24 1859:15

Internal 1812:6

International 1771:24 1814:6 1851:11 1898:24 1913:4 1920:23 1927:19 1933:23 1937:8

interpret 1810:1,17 1940:9, 20 1941:15,24

interpretation 1942:18

interpreted 1802:25,26

interrupt 1879:7

intrigued 1944:21,22

introduce 1865:14,17 1903:20 1908:27

introduction 1779:22 1865:6

inventories 1869:4

inventory 1897:28

invested 1807:18 1867:25 1870:6

investment 1847:8

investments 1871:10,11

involved 1828:17 1868:1 1889:27 1890:8 1892:7 1910:10

lowa 1868:1 1910:9

Ireland 1905:5,7

irrelevant 1939:6

irrespective 1824:25

issue 1767:9,14 1768:4,21, 24 1781:19 1866:25 1906:10 1919:3,7 1943:17

issued 1870:5

issues 1891:25

item 1926:22

items 1770:23 1790:10 1816:11 1926:14

IV 1796:27 1841:28 1842:1 1882:16 1895:20 1896:18 1898:5 1926:8,12 1929:28 1939:13,17

J

J-A-R-E-D 1894:10

January 1906:5



Jared 1893:21 1894:2,10 1895:3

jeopardizing 1897:20

Jersey 1867:12

job 1811:28 1859:24

join 1868:20

joining 1883:15 1891:5 1900:19 1904:2 1916:9

Josh 1865:10,23 1866:19 1867:3

journals 1809:24,25

Judge 1865:5 1870:3 1871:24 1878:3 1883:10 1891:2 1903:19

judicial 1944:19

June 1870:5 1898:6,10,11,

justification 1871:18

juvenile 1945:26

Κ

K-R-I-S-T-O-P-H-E-R

1909:10

Kalyn 1867:4

Kansas 1890:24

keeping 1847:17

Kevin 1889:13

kind 1789:18 1859:13 1874:9 1890:21 1892:10 1914:27 1915:8,11 1916:20 1925:7 1957:18

kinds 1850:4

knew 1833:4

knowledge 1793:13 1797:5 1809:13,15 1812:28 1815:24 1817:7 1829:15 1938:17

knowledgeable 1929:18

Kraft 1933:13

Krentz 1889:13

Kris 1908:26

Kristopher 1909:2,10 1910:2

1

L-E-Y-E-N-D-E-K-K-E-R

1879:12

L-O-R-I-E 1922:17

label 1787:2

labeled 1865:22

labeling 1866:12

lack 1780:22 1799:13,14 1841:13 1871:17 1897:28

Lactalis 1831:8

laid 1807:23

Lake 1905:4

Lakes 1895:16

Land 1831:10 1895:10,16 1896:4,22,26 1897:1 1901:19 1932:21,22 1933:11,13,20,27,28 1934:2, 5,8,9 1936:24,27 1959:25

language 1942:1 1943:24 1946:17

large 1787:21 1849:28 1850:11 1880:21 1897:25 1910:5

larger 1779:21 1863:15 1873:17 1897:18,19 1898:23

late 1767:19

law 1870:23 1939:28 1940:1, 20 1941:16,21,24

lawyer 1768:12 1798:21 1877:2 1942:13

lawyers 1767:7 1813:5

lawyers/parties 1919:6

lay 1836:7 1920:13

laying 1890:4

lead 1782:23 1783:19 1796:17

leadership 1776:23 1869:2 1895:12 1905:14

leading 1789:9 1790:8

leave 1841:23 1877:3

led 1779:7 1836:24 1897:6

left 1768:21 1769:13 1825:24 1833:26 1880:21 1883:19,24 1952:21 1953:26 1955:9,14

leftover 1921:24

legal 1876:16 1877:4 1938:9,12,13 1940:3,4,19

Legislature 1867:28

legitimate 1832:8

legitimize 1791:27

legitimizes 1791:19

legitimizing 1791:16

length 1796:13

lesser 1859:13

letter 1871:24

letting 1885:27 1956:9

let's 1912:27 1913:7

level 1797:3 1801:11 1802:5 1821:20 1882:13 1912:28 1913:6 1936:20 1954:7

levels 1841:9 1881:21 1882:6,7,12 1892:7 1898:26 1912:21

Lexington 1932:17

Leyendekker 1878:7,12,15 1879:4,11,13,17 1885:7

lies 1887:1

life 1879:18 1886:14

likelihood 1897:20

Likewise 1838:13

limit 1774:11

limited 1935:7 1945:3 1950:2 1953:8 1957:4,7

limits 1936:18.21

lines 1807:9,22 1902:5 1949:15 1956:18

list 1830:10 1831:21 1837:2, 4 1842:10 1865:26 1919:21 1937:20

listed 1770:24 1788:20 1895:19,24 1925:2 1926:14

listened 1813:26

listening 1827:27 1874:2 1888:27 1904:4 1908:3,6 1961:26

live 1907:6

Livestock 1905:27

LLC 1886:3 1910:3

loafs 1777:12

loaves 1840:17

local 1867:21 1895:14

locally 1907:21

located 1776:2 1790:1

1910:3,8

location 1777:3

locked 1848:1

logic 1871:17

logically 1832:23

London 1777:11

long 1835:17 1841:13 1887:27 1928:23 1956:22

long-term 1778:28 1780:21 1797:16 1833:28

longer 1773:19 1780:2 1794:25 1833:3 1840:4,13, 22 1841:6 1906:14 1915:2 1926:26 1938:3 1939:23 1954:22

looked 1775:26 1930:20 1938:9

loose 1833:21

Lorie 1922:6,17

lose 1887:7 1889:24,28 1905:21

losing 1779:14

loss 1793:16 1803:1 1837:10 1875:5 1887:17 1911:3

losses 1793:9 1803:5 1805:18 1910:24

lost 1792:23 1793:4,14 1839:1,3 1849:26 1887:6 1888:1,21,22

lot 1807:16 1811:8 1820:15 1821:18 1850:28 1885:19 1887:6,7 1888:28 1890:1 1892:4,12 1901:1 1902:8 1907:19

love 1820:9

low 1779:13 1791:18 1859:18

lower 1789:4 1799:20 1801:16 1808:4 1823:14 1827:17 1854:18 1855:11,12 1898:6 1935:1,8,11,17 1950:2 1953:8 1961:3

lowering 1801:17 1805:15

lunch 1812:3 1863:28 1865:3

luncheon 1864:2

М

M-I-C-H-A-E-L 1904:24



made 1774:6 1788:10 1832:1 1838:16 1852:4 1858:10 1868:9 1870:12 1882:18 1919:11,24 1945:5, 8 1947:8,18 1948:24,27 1951:2 1958:1 1959:5

mailing 1775:19,20 1932:15

main 1780:27 1803:8

maintain 1808:5 1858:28 1935:5 1949:27 1953:5 1961:3

maintenance 1897:7

major 1898:8 1935:19

majority 1781:9 1789:26 1813:7,12 1837:4 1860:22 1868:15 1873:25 1890:17 1915:20

make 1769:27 1770:20 1774:18 1780:22 1781:4,26, 27 1782:21 1784:6 1786:7, 12,28 1787:4,9 1788:13 1790:11,12,22 1791:7 1796:15 1804:4,10,11,15,21 1805:12 1807:20,21,28 1808:1 1812:12 1813:27,28 1815:4,7,15 1817:14 1818:6 1819:13 1820:12,16,25 1822:1.26 1823:10 1824:19 1825:14 1826:3,8,9 1827:1 1831:16,22 1835:3 1838:7 1841:13 1844:5 1846:5 1847:7 1849:3 1850:10 1859:25 1861:26 1862:1,6, 10,13 1865:11,12 1880:15 1881:10 1887:4,6 1888:11, 18 1890:12 1892:10,21,23, 25 1895:22 1896:2,3,9,10, 12.13.17.23.28 1897:5.10. 15,17 1898:23 1901:3,17,26, 28 1902:2,6,12,13 1906:4 1908:19,22 1912:9,11,14,17, 20,28 1913:5,16,17,26 1916:23,25 1917:1,2 1919:27 1926:19 1929:25 1940:27 1945:27 1946:5.24 1947:8,21,25 1950:16 1951:12,28 1952:1,9 1953:12.19 1954:25 1955:17 1956:9 1959:16 1962:2

maker 1902:14

makers 1858:25 1898:25 1913:3

makes 1777:7,11 1783:2 1792:9 1807:13 1819:21 1849:13 1868:11 1908:19 1938:14

making 1778:24 1784:16 1786:27 1790:15,21 1795:23,24 1815:13 1816:3 1818:12 1820:7 1866:24 1874:5 1886:27 1888:5,13 1891:14 1901:28 1932:2 1940:5 1941:3 1945:19 1952:23 1956:16,17

manage 1867:9 1869:4 1884:19 1891:25 1905:21 1906:3,8,16

management 1850:3,4,5 1874:1,4,6,9,12 1884:14,16, 18 1889:21 1891:23,28 1901:2,6,8 1905:6,23 1916:18 1933:17 1936:17

manager 1776:21

managing 1867:10 1878:21

mandate 1943:3

mandated 1871:5

mandatory 1890:13 1895:27 1913:12 1938:19,22 1942:3

manner 1881:11 1913:28

manufacture 1777:13 1810:23 1823:26 1825:25,26 1829:4 1896:27 1952:13 1954:1 1955:10.15

manufactured 1814:11 1911:13 1912:2

manufacturer 1807:6 1820:25 1821:9 1822:15,17 1823:25 1825:8 1826:1,16, 27 1861:21 1935:12 1939:2, 5 1952:16 1953:16,28 1954:26 1955:7 1960:24,25

manufacturer's 1896:12 1954:9

manufacturers 1781:10 1803:20 1813:3,8 1814:19, 23 1817:13 1826:18 1827:5, 7,11 1837:16 1841:22 1896:8 1901:18 1902:12 1906:16 1907:23 1911:27

manufacturing 1779:9 1807:1 1831:5 1836:26 1847:20 1859:15 1895:22 1896:7,14,24 1897:2,6,11,14 1910:7 1911:24 1912:16 1914:22 1935:4 1938:26 1949:27 1953:5

map 1880:27

margin 1896:11,21 1905:27

margins 1897:6,10,17,19 1898:2,21,26

mark 1776:11 1865:28 1894:18 1909:17 1944:14 marked 1772:21 1776:14 1865:24 1866:2,6 1878:25, 27 1879:1 1894:20,21,23 1904:14,16 1909:19,21 1922:27 1923:6,9,11 1932:28 1933:1,3

market 1769:28 1777:23 1778:2,20,21,24,25,26,27 1779:1,3,24 1780:6,16 1781:15,20 1783:12,13,18 1785:9 1786:20 1788:11 1789:6 1790:4,19,24 1791:17,26 1792:7,16 1795:6,10,13,17 1796:3 1797:17,19 1798:4,5,6,7 1800:20 1803:10,12,16,21 1804:12 1808:16,17,19 1809:10 1810:9 1811:28 1812:10,12,15,26 1813:9 1817:27 1820:5 1822:5,6,22 1824:5,9,15,17,18 1827:13 1828:3 1830:6,27 1831:19, 27 1832:4,8 1834:3 1835:19, 21 1836:8,9,10,11 1837:20 1838:17 1840:19 1841:20 1847:26 1850:15,21,22 1861:14,16,18 1867:13 1868:24 1871:21 1873:23 1874:8,10 1875:1 1886:28 1887:11 1895:10 1896:23 1905:24 1912:4,5 1927:2 1933:17 1936:9,12,15,21 1937:25 1938:23 1945:25 1947:8,10,17 1948:11,12,19, 21 1953:24 1955:12,19 1960:3,7

market-clearing 1785:22 1786:1,12,18,20,22,26 1787:8 1796:8 1827:19 1828:1 1840:23,27 1841:2 1860:17

marketed 1867:16

marketing 1777:16,28 1779:7,18,19 1780:23 1781:14 1782:23,24 1783:3, 21 1785:7,18,20 1786:3 1791:28 1793:6 1795:12 1798:13,20 1834:2 1835:10 1836:24 1849:5 1870:22 1880:8 1882:10 1924:6 1925:1 1934:7 1937:1 1938:24 1939:14,18

marketplace 1793:23 1817:2 1837:11 1869:3 1874:25 1875:6 1902:1 1954:15

markets 1779:2 1781:24 1789:27 1797:18 1798:9 1888:23 1910:23 1911:5 1934:22 1948:3 1957:11

marking 1923:8 1942:8

Maryland 1848:26

material 1803:25

math 1820:20,22 1822:19 1838:14,27 1843:20 1846:21 1852:14 1854:7,10,21

matter 1768:20 1794:23 1819:19 1824:3 1912:18 1913:7 1941:11

matters 1920:10

maximize 1867:12

maximum 1771:1,9 1786:16 1787:7

meaning 1790:23 1825:24 1836:27

meaningful 1948:21

means 1780:17,19 1782:6 1785:19,23 1861:3 1887:17 1938:6 1952:15

meant 1779:22 1935:19

measured 1881:4

measures 1847:2

Meat 1868:3

mechanical 1829:19

mechanism 1795:4 1796:19 1803:17 1812:16 1813:12 1881:16

meet 1833:13 1860:27 1873:22 1884:9 1891:16 1892:10 1900:25 1905:17 1958:25,27 1959:12,14,15

meetings 1936:6 1937:20

meets 1773:23 1808:25 1833:24

member 1867:27 1868:1 1889:11 1895:13 1899:28 1900:3,4,6 1910:4,17 1914:16

member-owner 1895:16

member-owners 1776:26 1849:18 1933:28

members 1780:9,11 1847:15 1849:25,26 1850:3 1859:11 1867:7,19,24 1868:6,27 1897:3,12,13 1905:19 1910:6,8,26 1911:1,9 1934:1,2

members' 1911:4

membership 1849:20 1934:1



memory 1945:15

Menomonie 1777:7

mention 1850:14,27 1859:4 1961:24

mentioned 1836:2 1883:18 1884:4 1886:22 1916:22 1936:18

Mercantile 1797:20,24 1798:3 1933:24

messed 1853:20

method 1779:23 1783:16 1911:3

methods 1871:10

metrics 1914:5

Michael 1903:10,11,24 1904:24 1905:3

Michigan 1910:8

middle 1798:24 1839:25,26 1842:4 1874:17 1907:18 1946:17

midnight 1767:16 1768:8 1919:4.12

Midwest 1790:2 1835:4 1934:5

MIG 1865:22,23,28 1866:4 1876:10

Mike 1920:23

milk 1767:5 1768:6,11 1776:27 1777:16 1779:8,12, 23 1780:21.23 1782:21.24 1783:8,10,18,20 1785:7,20 1786:3,4 1789:14 1791:28 1793:6,7,8 1794:7,15 1795:1,12 1797:10 1798:13 1799:3,11 1800:23 1801:23 1802:9,18,21,22,24,27 1803:11,26 1804:16,22 1805:22 1806:24 1807:7 1810:12,13 1818:4,6,8,9,15 1820:17 1821:5.12 1822:2. 13 1823:27 1824:8,28 1825:24 1826:10 1830:18 1831:3 1834:1 1835:10 1836:24 1838:22 1839:5 1840:23 1841:21,23 1846:4 1849:1,5,8,14 1865:20 1867:9,17 1869:5,12,22,25 1870:22,23,24 1872:1 1873:24 1874:7.19.24 1875:1,3 1877:8 1879:28 1880:6,8,10,16,25 1881:8, 10,13,19,22 1882:1,2,10,15, 17 1883:3,7 1884:4 1886:10, 12,26 1889:20 1890:2 1891:10 1895:6,9,17,21 1896:7,14,16,23,27 1897:13, 16,18,19,20 1898:9,14,16, 18,19,20,28 1899:5,26 1900:21 1901:12,22 1905:10 1906:4,15,17 1907:24 1910:5,6,11,23 1911:12,22 1916:16 1919:28 1920:18,22 1923:27 1924:4,5,15,18,21, 28 1926:13,15,16 1930:15, 17 1931:28 1933:15,24 1934:7,10,28 1935:5,10,11, 20 1936:25 1937:1 1938:7 1939:13,14,17,18 1945:10 1947:28 1949:16,28 1950:20 1952:9,20,27 1953:6,20 1954:27 1955:2 1956:15 1959:24

Milk's 1776:5 1785:11 1803:14 1880:7,28 1895:19 1914:20,27 1917:3 1932:23

milkers 1886:12

milking 1886:14 1888:28

milks 1881:14

million 1776:27 1777:13 1781:16 1788:10,14 1801:24 1826:8,9 1839:1,4 1843:6 1873:13 1884:7 1891:14 1910:7 1916:23 1923:27 1926:2,3,4,5,17 1930:1,4,5,6

millions 1839:6 1883:24

Miltner 1806:22,23 1813:18 1899:22,24,25 1900:9 1930:14,15 1931:11 1959:21,23,24 1961:6

mind 1775:16 1776:18 1885:26 1894:8,27 1909:8, 25 1932:11

minded 1945:18

mine 1814:25

minimum 1772:8 1786:3 1794:9,14,19,28 1795:1,7,17 1796:19 1801:4 1802:2,4 1810:13 1818:3,13 1824:11 1826:22 1837:13 1938:7,16 1939:13,17 1943:11 1944:2 1945:10 1947:28 1950:20 1952:8,20 1954:27 1955:2

minimums 1779:12 1871:4 1874:26

Minnesota 1905:4 1910:9 1932:18

minus 1820:26 1848:18 1927:9 1952:22

minute 1829:16 1875:4 1876:5 1880:11 1918:2 1953:12 minutes 1829:24 1855:26 1867:1

misheard 1836:16

misleading 1787:16

missed 1836:14 1846:24

mistake 1814:25 1827:26

mitigate 1790:6

mix 1789:19 1790:26

MMOS 1783:19

mode 1868:20

model 1782:26 1783:1,2

modernization 1934:7 1936:28

modernize 1812:16

modify 1870:16 1926:15

moisture 1781:5 1939:4 1958:22 1959:10,15

moment 1806:1

momentarily 1878:4

Monday 1904:8 1920:5 1961:28

money 1780:17,19 1783:11 1799:9 1801:9 1805:20,21 1807:13 1808:1 1819:4 1826:1,4 1837:10 1859:28 1860:1 1880:21 1883:19 1887:22 1890:1 1892:4,8 1915:26 1956:10

month 1788:8 1822:4,6 1823:24 1839:15,16 1869:20 1925:2 1936:21

monthly 1769:18,23 1788:7 1838:8,9 1869:9,13,14 1880:13 1881:14 1906:18

months 1799:25,26 1800:16, 19 1817:8 1898:13.14

morning 1767:1,2,4,7,15 1768:16,17 1769:7 1775:15 1806:23,25,26 1813:24 1832:17,18 1858:16,17 1865:21 1886:23 1900:17,18 1907:9.10 1919:26 1961:13

mother 1879:21

mouth 1793:1

move 1768:24 1790:25 1837:27 1848:4,11 1875:26 1878:23 1884:28 1902:23 1908:11 1912:28 1918:21 1919:25

moved 1768:8 1824:6

1847:12 1899:10 1905:8 1919:15

movement 1928:8

mover 1870:17 1910:16

moves 1793:1

moving 1767:24 1850:23 1886:22

mozzarella 1790:27 1798:5 1840:18 1888:6 1892:16 1926:26 1927:10,23,26 1928:4,9,16 1929:4,6,8,15

Muenster 1777:9

multi-million 1869:19 1870:26

multiple 1847:13

multiplied 1800:28 1844:1

multiply 1853:23,27

multiplying 1854:17

mute 1872:10

Ν

NAJ 1876:10

narrow 1898:25

narrowed 1863:7 1898:21

narrowing 1870:14

national 1767:11 1768:5,11 1776:5 1783:7 1785:11 1803:13 1820:17 1834:1 1877:8 1880:6,7,28 1883:3 1895:17,18,21 1896:16 1897:18 1899:5 1910:10 1914:20,27 1917:3 1920:18, 22 1931:28 1932:23 1933:23,28 1934:10 1936:25 1939:21 1945:12 1949:16

nation's 1782:6

natural 1842:15,25 1912:2,3

nature 1774:14 1875:21

NDPSR 1782:4 1795:25 1807:13 1812:21 1833:12 1838:10 1851:17,18,21,27 1852:7 1853:11,18,22,26 1854:12,26 1855:4 1856:20 1911:15,17 1934:18,19 1936:8 1937:24 1938:11 1941:1 1957:18

necessarily 1834:21 1835:2 1840:24 1847:20 1859:6 1943:13,18 1946:2 1952:5 1957:1



needed 1783:13 1850:16,17 1931:12 1962:8

needing 1902:1

negate 1779:28 1840:2

negative 1788:16,26 1808:17 1839:1 1859:12,26 1889:20 1890:1 1892:3 1897:19 1907:17,22 1913:20 1915:15 1957:25

negatively 1896:21 1897:1, 8,16 1913:21 1934:15 1949:21 1954:10

negligible 1936:18

neighbors 1889:19 1907:17 1915:16

nerve-racking 1846:23

nervous 1832:20 1863:27 1901:25

net 1857:15,16,24

network 1868:17

neutral 1796:26

News 1927:2

nice 1859:7 1886:23 1956:1,

nickel 1826:19,23 1955:3

nieces 1848:27

night 1767:15,16

ninety- 1784:9

ninth 1880:3

nits 1950:24

NMPF 1781:20 1881:6 1910:10,17 1911:8 1912:10, 19,28 1913:8 1914:3 1933:24 1945:13

NMPF's 1913:11

NMPF-64 1878:25,27

NMPF-68 1894:16,21

NMPF-69 1909:15,19

NMPF-8 1776:9

NMPF-9 1932:25

NMPF'S 1913:19

non-500-pound 1816:2

non-barrel 1782:1

non-food 1924:8

non-organic 1870:24

nonfat 1797:9 1880:15 1882:7 1895:23 1896:6,14, 27 1926:15

nonstop 1921:13,14

noon 1962:1

norm 1823:21

normal 1782:27

normalcy 1790:19

norms 1881:15

North 1775:21 1932:17

Northeast 1924:13

note 1871:19 1873:23 1893:1 1899:9

noted 1770:23

notice 1895:19,24 1944:19

noticed 1897:25

number 1770:2,9 1771:5,8 1772:3 1775:25 1776:14 1778:6,12 1788:11,13,14,26 1817:20,25 1820:7,19 1823:4 1838:16 1841:26 1842:7,8 1843:1 1844:5 1845:2,9 1846:1 1853:14,22 1854:5,18,19,25 1855:3 1856:20 1857:10,21 1863:12,21,24 1866:2,6 1873:20,21 1879:1 1885:4 1889:26 1894:23 1895:10,25 1902:28 1904:7,16 1908:13, 24 1909:21 1910:16 1911:9 1912:10 1913:9 1917:16 1923:3,11 1925:28 1926:11, 17 1928:1 1931:25 1933:3 1934:11 1937:13.23 1938:27

numbers 1784:24,26 1788:28 1791:9,12 1792:15, 17 1793:12 1794:23 1808:11 1810:19 1816:7 1817:20 1842:14,18 1843:23,28 1851:27,28 1853:9,10 1854:11 1855:26 1856:7,9, 12,21 1858:9 1862:24 1863:4 1876:2 1889:25 1890:4 1892:22,24 1921:3 1929:25 1951:3 1954:12

numerical 1945:22 Numerically 1946:2

nutritional 1881:26

nutritious 1883:6

0

O' 1895:16

O'LAKES 1831:10 1895:11 1896:4,22,26 1897:2 1901:19 1932:21,22 1933:11,13,20,27,28 1934:5, 9 1936:24,27 1959:25

O'LAKES' 1934:2

oath 1768:28 1922:4

object 1939:26 1940:16

objection 1908:11 1918:24, 26 1919:20 1931:23 1941:4, 13,15 1945:12

objections 1863:22 1902:25 1917:14 1945:15

objective 1956:6

obligation 1800:6,8 1801:5, 27 1802:1,2,4 1823:11 1824:12,13,20 1825:15 1826:23 1827:7 1872:6,7,9, 12 1875:13

obligations 1869:26

observed 1810:8

obsolete 1780:23 1841:14

obtain 1960:26

occasion 1831:18 1875:2

occupation 1922:18

occur 1881:17 1936:16

occurred 1811:5 1910:22 1919:3

occurs 1934:17

Off-the-record 1962:5

offense 1840:25

offer 1863:20 1867:18,20 1870:19 1886:7 1917:12

offered 1869:14 1871:3 1874:15 1940:18,19

offerings 1868:13 1905:27

offers 1812:23

official 1944:19

officially 1904:8 1923:5

Ohio 1910:8

on-the-fly 1860:12

once-in-a-very-unusual 1943:18

one's 1923:27

ongoing 1871:9 1882:25

online 1904:4,5 1919:25

open 1865:26 1905:26 1957:7 1962:1

opening 1961:26

operate 1777:3 1782:16 1795:7 1867:3,6 1868:28 1895:6 1897:13

operates 1896:26

operating 1867:7 1895:4 1902:4

operation 1777:5,10 1780:13 1783:3 1785:24 1807:17 1886:13 1889:23 1900:21

operational 1870:28

operations 1776:28 1807:15 1867:8 1869:16 1871:14 1889:22 1905:7

operators 1891:18

opine 1942:13

opinion 1791:23 1815:9 1840:22 1841:7 1862:13 1887:7,15 1902:9 1915:12 1940:20

opportunities 1787:1 1867:19 1870:27

opportunity 1790:5 1810:12 1846:20 1867:13 1868:5 1870:6 1871:23 1872:21 1876:22 1878:2 1879:16 1882:25,28 1886:20 1890:22 1893:16 1895:2 1899:6 1905:2 1906:22 1909:28 1914:6 1941:11

opposed 1772:3

opposite 1777:27 1780:4 1785:6 1804:20

opposition 1875:9,12

option 1783:6 1790:13 1806:2 1906:2

options 1874:7 1901:9 1906:15

order 1777:16 1779:12 1785:20,22,23 1786:3,12 1787:3,8,9 1791:28 1793:7 1795:12 1796:11,21 1797:2 1798:13 1799:20,24 1800:1, 12,17 1804:19,26,27 1807:19 1808:3 1816:7 1818:1,2,9,12,15 1820:25 1821:24 1824:26 1826:13 1827:10,14 1828:15,18 1829:9,27 1835:10 1837:1,3 1849:2,5 1853:25 1859:17,

Index: needed..order



19 1861:4,10,11 1878:26 1880:8 1882:11 1891:26 1895:10 1898:10 1912:14 1921:23 1923:28 1924:1,6, 12,16,17,19,23 1925:12 1930:22 1931:1,2,3,7,8 1939:14,18 1943:28 1947:25

orderly 1779:19 1791:26

orders 1780:5,23 1782:24 1783:4,21 1785:7 1794:9 1795:3 1797:23 1836:25 1840:2 1841:14 1870:22 1871:5 1887:10 1888:9 1924:24 1925:13,14 1934:2, 7 1937:1

Orders' 1896:23

organic 1867:3,9,15 1868:2, 8,9,11,13,24 1869:5,22,25 1870:1,21,23 1871:3,6,9,15, 20 1874:8,10,18,24 1875:5

organically 1875:3

organization 1886:17

organizations 1889:1

orient 1820:3

original 1777:19 1795:27 1911:2 1935:14

Originally 1905:5

outdated 1881:18 1896:28 1897:5.9

outlets 1780:28 1803:9,15 1924:5,7,16,19,23

outlined 1770:13 1789:13 1899:3 1900:26 1912:19 1913:8

output 1809:28

outstanding 1768:22 1769:13

overnight 1767:5 1848:14

overrepresentation 1935:1

overruled 1941:4

overstated 1911:21

overvalue 1804:21

owned 1949:24

owners 1802:10,13 1873:20, 21

ownership 1935:10

Ρ

P-A-U-L 1775:18

p.m. 1961:28

pace 1912:21 1917:3

package 1860:28 1880:7 1883:2 1923:26 1939:12 1948:28

packaged 1780:25 1924:15, 18,21,28

packages 1924:5

packaging 1777:5 1829:5,12 1946:24 1949:12 1958:13,14

packed 1949:3

Packers 1886:11

pages 1799:6 1925:7,10 1944:28

paid 1779:11 1782:16,22 1800:11 1804:16,17,22 1821:2,4,7 1822:1 1827:6 1837:24 1869:12,26 1892:4 1897:3 1935:11 1952:8

paper 1904:3,7 1908:22

par 1808:16

paragraph 1770:14 1783:27 1784:13 1795:21 1830:3 1839:26 1841:12 1939:2,7,8, 9,10,15 1946:21

parity 1808:19

part 1802:14,17 1804:2 1809:12 1811:28 1818:28 1828:2,3 1830:4 1842:25 1848:23 1849:13 1865:13 1886:25 1887:1,2 1888:6,8, 14,15,28 1892:6 1931:24 1940:14 1943:27 1952:25 1957:4,9 1958:18,23

part-time 1867:19

partially 1818:15 1924:26 1930:27,28 1931:1

participant 1948:21

participants 1865:22 1876:22 1920:9

participate 1818:16,18 1819:18,22

participating 1813:9 1818:11 1819:3,12 1892:6

participation 1890:23

parties 1767:22,28 1870:7 1876:13 1896:2 1918:8 1921:16

partner 1905:3

partnership 1895:5 1905:9

parts 1818:17,22 1852:23

past 1774:19 1884:3 1891:22 1912:16 1916:19 1928:5

pasture 1886:23

patronage 1897:3

Paul 1775:5,8,18 1776:20

Pauline 1879:24

pay 1779:12 1785:23,25 1786:5 1799:11,13,14 1803:15,18 1805:21 1815:16 1817:4 1820:27 1822:15,17 1823:11,27 1824:11,20,24, 25,28 1825:8,14 1826:10,27 1827:8,9 1837:9,13,18 1841:23 1847:25,27 1848:12 1850:22 1869:1,8,15 1871:4 1874:25 1875:14 1952:20 1953:20 1954:27

paycheck 1799:13,14

paying 1816:4 1818:13 1825:23 1826:4 1841:18,19

payment 1781:27 1872:13

payments 1871:12

pays 1821:11

people 1774:18 1813:5,7,9 1815:4,7 1816:3 1834:20 1837:20 1842:22 1848:20 1867:18 1874:27 1877:3 1908:5 1919:13,15 1952:4

percent 1851:27

percentage 1769:27 1815:28 1816:14 1817:23,26 1832:3 1844:3,4 1854:18 1858:8 1936:19

percentages 1810:26 1844:1 1845:4

perfectly 1850:8 1854:13

performance 1869:3 1897:1,

performed 1863:5

period 1805:21 1811:22 1819:26 1824:27 1848:9 1898:7 1915:2 1960:4

persists 1957:27

person 1929:17

personal 1876:18 1926:25

personally 1773:14 1828:17 1915:17 1933:18

perspective 1876:19

Peter 1829:7

phone 1927:3 1929:7

phrase 1833:11

pick 1950:24

picture 1890:20

piece 1834:16 1874:22

pig 1865:10 1866:27

place 1883:27 1897:11 1913:15 1929:7 1957:22

plan 1768:19 1870:5,10 1905:23,24

plant 1777:1,4,7,10,11 1785:23 1786:24 1795:22 1799:15 1802:11,13 1807:12,13,19,23 1808:2,4, 10,13,14 1809:6 1818:11,24 1819:11,18 1821:5,10,11,27 1823:11 1825:15,17 1831:4, 5 1841:28 1847:7,11,24 1881:7 1886:26 1895:27 1897:7,8 1913:8,12 1930:27, 28 1931:6 1956:9

plant's 1807:21 1931:2,3

plants 1779:10 1781:27,28 1782:17,22 1783:4 1789:15 1790:1 1804:16,19,22,25 1805:6,7,8 1806:1,4 1809:11,13,19,27 1810:11 1819:4,5 1831:15 1833:24 1837:3,6 1841:25,26 1842:2 1848:11 1849:2 1858:26 1896:27 1897:2,6,11,14 1907:19 1924:5,15,18,22 1934:4 1935:4 1949:27 1953:5 1956:5,24,28 1957:3

plate 1915:11

play 1938:7

playing 1892:7

pleasure 1868:6 1922:21

point 1774:1 1784:16 1785:11 1791:11 1798:1,2 1811:9 1814:12 1824:7 1835:24 1857:25 1888:3 1898:22 1927:15 1928:15 1929:6 1937:23 1943:21 1948:5,10 1949:21 1953:2

pointed 1946:8

points 1787:26 1937:20

policy 1906:24

pool 1786:4 1792:13 1795:1 1799:27 1800:5,17,20,21,23, 26 1801:5,6,8,9,11,20,24 1802:1,3,6,27 1805:17,21,22

Index: orderly..pool



1806:4 1810:13 1819:3,5,7, 14,28 1820:28 1821:2,7 1824:7 1825:18,21,23 1826:13 1848:24,25,26 1849:1,6,7,12,14 1872:6,7,9, 12 1924:15

pooled 1793:8 1799:24 1800:25,27 1801:17,18 1839:9 1848:22 1849:8 1895:9 1907:23 1934:1

pooling 1793:7 1810:12 1818:23,28 1819:19 1869:26

portion 1787:21 1808:28 1871:21 1912:23

position 1767:22 1834:8 1870:25 1895:11 1936:18,21 1942:18

positions 1869:17 1895:12

positive 1863:12

posted 1919:5

potential 1870:7 1906:3 1958:21

potentially 1771:5 1774:16

pound 1770:9 1772:16 1777:12 1782:19 1788:4 1816:1 1820:5,13 1827:22 1844:22 1935:16 1946:24 1950:10,12,13 1958:8 1960:1.12

pounds 1770:16 1772:6,8,15 1776:27 1777:13 1778:6 1781:12,16,17 1786:14,15, 16 1788:10,13,14 1792:24, 27 1800:23,25,27,28 1815:28 1816:22 1838:16, 18,20,24,25,28 1839:2,6,9, 10,11 1842:5,19,20 1843:6 1910:6,7 1916:23 1923:27 1924:14,21,27 1925:2 1926:2,3,4,17 1930:1,4,5

power 1779:24 1780:14

PPD 1890:1

PPDS 1859:12,26 1889:20 1892:3 1907:17,22 1915:15

practical 1819:19

practice 1867:12 1942:24,26

pre-arranged 1860:26

precision 1821:25

preclude 1877:6 1942:2

precluded 1941:21,25 1942:19,22

precludes 1940:15

predictable 1869:8

predominantly 1786:9

prefer 1961:14

pregnant 1921:14

preliminaries 1922:24

preliminary 1920:12

premise 1805:14 1810:27,28

premiums 1869:10,27

preparation 1776:4

prepare 1776:4 1886:4 1894:13 1909:12 1932:22

prepared 1776:19

preparing 1798:28 1923:15,

present 1896:1 1934:8 1942:17

presentation 1847:15

presented 1834:24 1923:21 1926:6

presenting 1914:7 1922:21 1923:21

presently 1767:9

president 1896:5 1905:12 1933:11

press 1809:21

presubmitted 1865:21

presume 1857:19

presumptions 1807:22

pretty 1803:27 1807:13 1820:17 1847:8 1874:22 1891:17

preventing 1779:24

previous 1817:8 1837:2 1880:22 1883:19 1927:11 1928:4

previously 1894:20 1922:7

price 1769:23 1772:8 1774:12 1777:15,20,22,23, 25 1778:1,5,9,10,14,16,17, 25,28 1779:6,12,13,20,23,27 1780:2,4 1781:19,25 1782:7, 13,20,26 1783:10,11,17 1785:5,9,21,22,25 1786:2,4, 5,18,26 1788:8 1789:23 1791:21 1792:3,7,8 1793:18 1794:9,15,20,28 1795:1,3,7, 10,13,28 1796:1,16,19,23,27 1797:4,17,19,21,25 1799:11, 18 1800:2 1801:13,16,23,28 1802:2,5,10,28 1803:21,22, 28 1804:1,15 1805:11,15,17 1807:7,9,10,13,16 1808:4,19 1810:22 1811:5 1812:11,22, 27 1813:8 1814:12,16,17 1815:16,19,22 1816:3,8,10 1817:4 1818:3,13 1819:1,15, 26,27 1820:5 1822:5,7,15,17 1823:8,9,14,16,18,24,25,28 1824:15,17,18 1825:9,11,13 1826:15,22,25,26 1827:6,15, 17,18 1828:7,8 1834:2 1837:13 1838:10 1839:21 1840:1,3 1841:4,5,6,8,19 1843:22,23 1845:1,10,13,28 1846:8,10,11 1847:25 1848:5,6,10 1850:21,26 1857:7,8,10 1858:6 1861:4, 5,19,20 1869:1,8,14,15 1870:20 1874:25 1875:12,14 1880:14,21 1881:8,10 1887:21 1888:4,16,19,20 1890:7,8,16 1891:26 1892:15,17,27 1896:17,20 1898:9,11,12,15,16,18,20 1899:1 1901:1 1906:8,19 1911:8,12 1912:4 1913:20, 22 1915:27 1919:28 1927:10 1928:3.5.9.13.16 1929:4.5.8. 9,10,15 1934:12,13,28 1935:2,3,6,8,19,25,27 1936:1,7,9,11,13,14,26,27 1937:23,26,27 1938:4 1939:3 1945:6,9,20,27 1946:10 1947:8,25 1948:6,7 1949:25,28 1950:3,15,21,22, 23,25 1951:7,11,14,19,23, 25.27 1952:8.11.20.27 1953:4,6,9,14,17 1954:3,6,8, 17,18,19,22,25,27 1955:2 1956:26,28 1957:17,18,20, 24 1958:4,7,21 1960:7 1961:3

priced 1782:11 1784:2 1788:10 1814:16 1816:1,15, 18,27 1827:13 1845:8 1848:17 1850:24 1897:27 1934:21,23 1957:16

prices 1769:21 1771:13 1777:27 1778:2 1780:7 1784:28 1785:5,8 1791:5,18, 21 1792:24 1795:17,18 1799:3 1800:28 1823:20.21 1829:13 1834:9,14 1835:8 1836:23 1837:19 1861:17 1871:4 1875:6,10 1896:18 1897:16 1898:5,8,15 1906:20 1911:14 1912:1,12 1915:3,5,6 1926:26 1927:3, 6,7,23,27 1934:26,27 1935:11,18,21,22 1938:3,7, 16 1939:13,17 1942:3 1943:3,11 1944:2 1945:10 1946:23 1947:1,28 1950:7,9, 10,12,13 1951:5 1956:4 1959:27 1960:3

pricing 1780:2,15,16
1783:18 1790:12 1792:12
1796:2,19 1803:16 1808:26
1810:14 1813:12 1817:1,8,
10,24 1818:1 1821:19
1835:11 1836:5 1837:20
1839:28 1840:4 1861:10
1868:26 1869:13 1870:8,11,
19,27 1884:14 1906:10,14
1907:14 1911:3,10,11,20
1912:5,8,14 1914:1,5 1915:9
1934:16,20 1935:28 1954:16

primarily 1789:17 1790:1 1810:23 1813:11 1815:9 1895:8 1934:17

primary 1809:28 1897:24 1928:1 1933:14

principal 1819:7 1873:20

principle 1890:4 1945:18

prior 1779:6 1788:28 1817:7 1860:20 1911:14 1927:9 1928:20

private 1776:24 1817:12,17 1824:4 1886:26

problem 1781:26 1791:15 1794:16 1805:24 1825:1 1826:6 1829:19 1846:25 1908:17

problems 1850:5

procedural 1876:6 1920:10

proceed 1866:17 1879:4,14

proceedings 1870:2 1871:16 1962:11

proceeds 1819:21

process 1774:7 1778:15 1780:21 1786:13 1789:19 1791:7 1807:17 1812:16 1815:11 1830:6 1848:6,11 1866:27 1888:10,15

processed 1774:3 1777:11 1778:21 1780:27 1781:1,7,9, 10,12,15,17 1783:16 1786:8, 14,19,27 1787:1,3,9,13,14, 16,18,21 1790:15,21,27 1800:24 1803:8 1813:4,10 1814:20,23 1815:4,7,13,15 1816:3,5,22 1817:14 1831:28 1834:27 1842:5,11, 20 1843:5,10 1847:11 1850:23 1860:16,21 1934:3 1956:16 1958:19

processes 1815:1

processing 1776:28 1779:8



1790:1 1808:21 1835:13 1836:25 1837:1 1869:21 1880:17 1890:13 1895:27 1924:5 1935:10 1946:12 1956:15,22 1959:5 1960:18

processor 1824:22,24,25,26 1826:28 1875:3 1888:12,14

processors 1778:22 1779:21,24 1782:1 1783:13, 15 1790:6 1813:10,11 1814:9,11 1827:3 1830:6,11 1836:12 1838:22 1850:16 1881:3 1883:4 1887:2,4,6,14 1888:18 1890:17 1892:27 1911:13 1935:20 1949:23,24

procurement 1868:20 1896:5 1933:11,15

produce 1780:10,20 1807:19 1808:23 1809:1 1810:3 1831:1 1841:24 1842:19 1846:27 1881:23 1883:6

produced 1781:12 1782:4 1784:18 1810:17,21,23 1838:28 1842:6 1845:7 1882:15

producer 1788:14 1800:11 1801:6,7 1803:10 1821:4 1826:25,26 1836:13 1838:18,20,24,25 1839:2,5,6 1847:19 1860:2 1876:25 1882:9 1897:12,16,22 1898:2,25 1900:2 1908:26 1911:23 1924:25 1961:26

producer's 1896:11 1897:19

producers 1779:4,10,14,25 1780:18 1781:26,28 1782:16,21 1783:2,4,8,14,16 1787:28 1788:11 1790:5 1791:14,19 1792:22 1799:9 1804:15,21 1806:24 1824:6 1826:17 1827:1,4 1830:18 1836:12 1837:7,9,14,24 1839:4 1848:12 1849:10,17 1850:12,16 1859:27 1869:26 1880:6 1883:3,4 1884:3 1895:17 1897:12 1899:5,26 1910:11,24 1911:12,26 1930:15,17 1933:24 1934:10,15 1935:8,11,20 1936:25 1949:20,24 1957:25 1959:24

produces 1799:15 1846:26

producing 1776:26 1779:10 1809:12 1880:25 1910:6

product 1774:1 1786:23 1789:10 1791:20 1792:6,7 1793:19 1797:9,13 1809:2 1810:15,20,24 1811:14,15, 19,24 1831:28 1834:8 1835:3 1836:15 1837:20,22 1840:18,23,27 1841:24 1869:5 1874:19 1886:27 1887:11 1901:28 1902:13 1926:16 1936:19 1938:22,26 1952:9 1955:7,17 1959:13 1961:2

production 1770:12,15,17, 18,19,22,27 1771:4,12 1774:13 1780:22,27 1782:6, 11 1784:1,17 1786:24 1789:15 1808:9 1816:14 1840:28 1841:14 1842:18,25 1867:16 1881:20,22 1898:20,22 1912:6 1951:20

products 1777:8 1778:5,16 1779:27 1781:8 1786:7 1787:8,9 1790:4,26 1796:8 1802:23 1807:2 1808:24 1809:7,8,27 1827:21 1828:4 1829:14 1831:3,12 1836:5 1840:1 1847:14 1848:7 1868:11,12 1883:7 1896:25 1911:3,13,28 1923:27 1924:4,22,28 1933:15,25 1938:20 1939:4 1960:16,26

profit 1887:16 1901:28 1902:14 1960:25

profitability 1803:5 1808:5 1898:27 1911:4 1935:5 1949:27 1953:6 1954:9 1957:25 1960:23 1961:4

program 1806:17 1828:23 1887:25 1892:4 1905:14,23 1910:12 1922:20 1938:21,28

programs 1866:22 1874:15 1892:7 1905:28

projected 1816:13

projects 1898:16

promote 1938:25

proper 1790:17 1896:3

proponents 1796:14

proportion 1781:22 1816:26 1817:9 1911:20

proposal 1776:6 1781:20 1783:8 1785:11 1803:14 1805:12 1806:3 1813:15 1823:24 1861:25 1869:25 1871:16,17 1875:9 1880:28 1881:4,13 1892:17 1895:19, 20,21,25 1896:17 1900:7 1902:6 1910:16 1911:8 1912:10,19 1913:9,19,23 1919:20 1920:26,28 1921:1 1932:23 1934:11 1936:25 1949:17 1952:3 1953:12 1954:23 1955:16

proposals 1768:5 1834:6 1870:7,15 1871:19 1875:10 1876:9,26 1880:10 1895:17 1899:5 1901:21 1906:6,13 1912:10 1913:21 1914:2 1923:19 1934:10

propose 1797:25

proposed 1767:12 1883:2 1896:5 1897:18 1898:23 1899:2 1901:20 1913:1

proposing 1820:18 1823:23 1949:10 1952:4

proposition 1956:8

proprietary 1958:9

protect 1850:6 1851:1,2 1887:2

protection 1901:13 1905:20

protein 1777:15 1778:4,10, 17,28 1779:27 1780:4 1781:20,21 1782:7 1783:10, 11 1792:4 1793:21 1796:20 1798:14 1803:28 1810:22 1816:8,10 1821:20 1826:15 1831:13 1834:2,9 1840:1 1841:4,9 1845:1,5 1850:21, 24 1853:7 1882:13 1895:23 1911:8,21 1934:13 1936:10, 14,27 1937:27 1938:4 1958:4

provide 1775:19 1779:19 1821:26 1827:19 1828:1 1854:11 1856:21 1869:7 1874:28 1881:16 1906:22 1911:11 1912:26 1913:11 1914:4 1932:15 1933:7 1936:9 1937:25 1938:23 1940:20

provided 1814:15 1829:7 1865:21 1947:3 1949:14

providers 1787:11

providing 1776:18 1860:11 1870:6 1909:25 1946:15

provision 1799:2 1938:19

provisions 1870:8

publication 1928:19

pull 1848:25 1872:14

pulled 1791:12

pulling 1778:1 1785:8 1872:15

purchase 1861:21

purchased 1847:10

purchaser 1789:18

purchasers 1778:22 1830:7

purchasing 1780:14

pure 1804:26

purpose 1773:16,17,20 1796:6 1806:3 1946:15

purposes 1776:12 1799:19 1817:3 1822:16,24 1823:3 1878:25 1932:28 1938:10 1940:11,12 1942:21 1947:28

put 1768:23 1769:19 1788:23 1791:10 1809:3 1833:15 1877:14,18 1893:11 1895:17 1898:27 1899:1,5 1901:21 1904:8 1915:24 1918:1,5,8 1920:16 1921:19 1931:21 1935:18 1948:17 1957:22 1960:8

puts 1837:7 1901:9

putting 1849:5 1886:28 1930:16 1931:12 1942:11

Q

qualify 1873:15,25

quality 1869:10 1886:28

quantity 1804:26 1817:5 1939:4

quarter 1912:25 1918:12

quarters 1906:1

question 1769:17,25 1770:5 1772:26 1799:22 1802:14,25 1805:14,23 1808:15 1812:8 1814:10,14,27 1823:15 1826:11 1827:28 1829:20 1832:24 1833:6 1834:15 1847:24 1848:28 1849:1,16, 22 1850:13 1852:1 1853:10, 15 1854:6,9 1855:24 1856:14 1862:22 1871:6 1873:6 1876:6,21 1884:11 1893:8 1901:15 1917:1 1918:7 1929:2,24 1939:27 1940:1,12 1941:26 1942:21 1943:24,28

questioning 1816:26 1950:8

questions 1769:12 1771:19 1783:24 1806:19,27 1817:28 1820:23 1846:17,21 1851:13 1858:4,20,21 1860:13 1871:25 1872:23,25 1873:11 1875:18,22 1883:8,16 1884:2,25,26 1889:3 1890:27 1891:8 1899:18,19, 27 1900:11,20,24 1902:17 1906:27 1908:3,4,7 1914:8



1916:2,13,18 1917:8 1929:18 1931:15,19 1945:3 1959:19 1961:15

quick 1783:25 1879:7 1883:16 1884:2 1891:8 1893:22 1899:27 1903:11

quicker 1834:27 1881:24 1893:27

quotation 1946:9

quote 1796:25 1828:27 1830:4 1839:26 1935:13 1938:21 1940:28 1941:2 1946:22 1947:3 1949:25 1958:7

quoted 1798:23 1943:2,24 1944:11 1946:16

quoting 1944:4 1960:5

R

R-A-Y-M-O-N-D 1886:2

raise 1775:7 1782:20 1804:14 1875:12 1878:14 1885:13 1894:1 1903:23 1909:1 1932:4

raised 1879:21 1962:8

raising 1954:6

Ranchers 1905:15

range 1789:2 1851:2 1960:1,

ranged 1882:6,7

rate 1912:24

ratio 1934:18

rations 1881:26

raw 1803:25

Raymond 1885:10,14 1886:1,10

re-cross 1860:6

read 1784:9 1809:24 1810:1 1828:22 1926:9 1939:28 1940:13 1942:1 1943:5,9,12 1944:5,22

readily 1831:18

reading 1784:5 1792:16,18

reads 1850:15

real 1818:27 1823:9 1912:7

realistic 1822:10 realities 1881:21

reality 1786:19 1805:19

1810:15,24 1824:21

realize 1847:18 1897:15 1902:5

realm 1835:9

reason 1773:4 1774:2,10 1779:3 1796:12 1797:19 1811:17 1813:13 1832:10 1835:6 1836:14 1862:5 1942:23 1957:15

reasonable 1851:2 1890:11 1913:28 1960:1,7

reasons 1834:16 1899:3

reblend 1805:27

rebuttal 1877:14 1921:5

rebuttals 1921:19,22

recalculate 1853:12

recall 1772:20,25,27 1919:21

receipts 1882:10 1888:1

receive 1783:5 1785:27 1862:22 1883:25 1912:13

received 1780:11 1785:16 1824:26 1861:5 1863:24 1869:6 1874:19 1876:3,20 1883:25,26 1885:4 1902:28 1906:11 1908:24 1917:15,16 1929:14 1931:25

receives 1808:3 1871:22 1873:13

receiving 1805:25 1821:12 1823:28 1824:1 1839:13 1884:6 1955:7

recent 1823:17 1897:4

recipe 1781:6 1786:10

recognize 1783:15 1798:16 1821:1 1848:8 1913:7 1921:10

recognizing 1804:11 1901:17

recommended 1901:3

reconciling 1829:2

reconfigured 1921:23

reconsider 1870:4

reconvene 1962:9

record 1767:2 1768:18 1775:4,17 1829:28 1863:23 1864:1 1865:2,17 1866:1 1876:1 1877:22 1884:8 1885:3,27 1893:12 1894:9 1901:24 1902:27 1904:9,23 1908:15,20 1909:9 1916:24 1917:15 1918:17 1919:9 1922:1,16 1931:22,24 1932:12,16 1940:26 1962:4, 6,7,9

RECROSS-EXAMINATION 1771:22

red 1841:17

redirect 1769:5 1774:26 1860:5,9 1893:10 1902:22 1931:18

reduce 1801:19 1896:17,18

reduced 1785:9 1897:4 1926:25

reduction 1778:2 1841:26

reductions 1896:20

reenacted 1779:17

reference 1779:18 1798:24 1804:8 1812:27 1813:8 1814:12 1825:11,13 1840:20 1843:12,21 1916:18 1926:10 1949:23 1954:6

referenced 1815:19,21 1844:13

referred 1809:11 1872:4 1939:9,10,15

referring 1792:22 1802:20 1803:1

reflect 1881:15,20 1892:24 1896:24 1935:16 1951:12

reflected 1771:11,12 1780:16 1791:4 1920:2

reflects 1800:23 1857:10 1880:28 1896:13

reform 1796:11,22 1797:2 1828:15,18 1943:28

reformed 1828:23

regard 1834:6

region 1924:13

regions 1924:11,20,24 1930:19 1931:4,8

Register 1944:11,26

regular 1811:28

regularly 1960:4

regulated 1794:9,15 1800:17,20 1818:4,9,10,13 1837:17,18 1871:4 1924:16, 18,22,26 1930:27,28 1931:1 1935:5 1949:28 1953:6 1954:27 regulation 1772:21 1940:9, 13,24 1942:8

regulations 1823:8 1868:26 1953:28 1955:13

reinserting 1871:15

reinvest 1780:20

rejected 1876:9

related 1806:28 1849:2,3

relating 1858:4 1947:19

relationship 1774:12 1936:1

relative 1797:4 1861:19,20 1948:3

relevance 1785:21

reliable 1938:23

relies 1868:16

rely 1829:7 1883:6 1940:10

relying 1880:13

remain 1847:4 1854:3 1936:20

remainder 1832:4

remaining 1781:16

remains 1947:5

remarks 1871:24

remedy 1862:13

remember 1861:27 1907:3

reminder 1812:5,6

removal 1911:7 1936:13

remove 1783:8 1934:12 1936:25

removes 1791:17

removing 1777:14 1792:11 1847:27

reopen 1908:16

repeat 1856:14 1929:25

repeated 1784:12

rephrase 1813:6

replacement 1796:22

replacing 1910:19

report 1771:28 1778:26 1800:21,23 1882:4 1926:26 1927:26 1939:3 1960:11

reportable 1833:12

reported 1770:6 1772:3



1778:9,11 1782:2,4,6,9 1795:24 1860:25 1861:11 1882:10 1926:27 1927:7 1929:7

reporter 1775:26 1845:15 1879:9

reporting 1926:25 1938:20, 22 1942:3 1943:3

reports 1808:10

represent 1778:7 1780:3 1794:26 1806:24 1844:27 1853:3 1885:28 1886:2 1899:26 1924:14,21,27

representation 1794:27

representative 1934:20

represented 1782:5 1784:27 1912:1 1927:23 1928:12 1933:21 1936:20

representing 1853:5 1886:17,18 1889:1 1898:19 1930:15

represents 1821:28 1838:7 1898:12,13,17 1952:7

request 1767:11 1877:19 1923:22 1925:26 1926:8 1930:17,20

requested 1930:21

requesting 1910:17

requests 1877:24 1896:2 1920:17 1925:23,24,27

require 1939:2

required 1810:12 1822:1 1823:27 1906:14 1939:11,15 1943:9

requirement 1772:28 1773:10 1790:22

requirements 1818:23 1819:20

requires 1871:9

requiring 1825:7

resale 1861:14

research 1895:14 1940:3.4

reserve 1923:1

reserved 1908:12,13

reset 1803:28 1917:26

residual 1837:21

resolution 1767:12

resort 1840:24 1858:24

respect 1769:17,25 1799:3 1858:7 1939:12

respective 1924:16,17,22,23 1925:1

respond 1876:23 1877:3,4

responded 1890:17

response 1767:12 1858:23 1869:28

responsibilities 1812:1

responsibility 1933:14

rest 1778:27 1786:13 1822:1 1920:13 1921:22 1961:20

restaurant 1915:9

restaurants 1780:28 1803:9,

restrictions 1818:19 1930:24

result 1792:23 1799:18 1853:18 1897:4 1911:19 1919:15 1934:28 1955:3

resulted 1788:16 1839:13

resulting 1778:2 1785:9 1896:1

results 1778:24 1779:26 1839:28 1913:14

retail 1777:2,5 1781:15 1787:16 1831:27 1832:4 1843:5,9 1926:6

retirement 1897:26 1913:25

retroactively 1947:12

return 1780:22 1841:13 1880:20

returning 1883:17

revenue 1796:26 1850:11 1873:14 1884:7 1888:1 1889:24 1891:15 1905:20

reverse 1851:27

reversed 1852:4

revert 1910:18

reverting 1911:2

review 1791:12 1838:2

reviewed 1913:27

reviewing 1791:13

reweighted 1791:3,24 1845:18

Reynolds 1921:12,21

rid 1907:13 1952:14,15,26

right-hand 1894:21 1923:9

ring 1836:16

rise 1790:18 1881:22

risen 1866:11 1912:16 1913:8 1915:6

rises 1768:15

risk 1790:6 1836:2,8,12 1850:3,4,5 1874:1,3,6,9,12 1884:13,16,18,19 1889:21 1891:23,25,28 1898:28 1901:2,6,8,22 1905:21,22 1906:3,9 1910:26 1916:18 1933:17 1936:17

robust 1778:20 1787:19 1834:28 1886:12

Roger 1813:24 1858:18 1889:7 1907:3 1914:11 1918:18 1920:22 1929:23 1930:10 1955:25,28

role 1932:22 1938:7

roles 1776:23 1933:12

roll 1877:23

rolled 1916:20

room 1865:12 1875:19 1893:8 1899:10 1929:26

root 1798:11

Rosenbaum 1771:21,23,24 1774:24 1814:5,6 1829:16, 25 1830:1 1832:12 1851:8, 10,11 1858:12 1862:20 1921:18 1927:16,18,19 1929:20 1937:5,7,8,12,16,17 1940:2,4,22,26 1941:7,28 1942:4,25,28 1944:8,10,21, 25 1945:4 1955:21 1960:22

roughly 1772:11

round 1820:19 1842:17

rounding 1852:15 1925:5

routine 1897:7

row 1851:17,21,25,26 1852:13 1853:17,21,25 1854:1,25 1857:8,16

rows 1930:19

rule 1798:25

rules 1779:23

run 1782:28 1846:5,7 1858:26 1890:18 1956:8,12, 13,22,25 1961:20

running 1956:6,24,28

Rural 1905:14

Ryan 1806:23 1899:25 1930:15 1959:24

S

S-C-H-E-I-D-E-R 1909:11

safe 1961:23

sake 1820:11

sakes 1821:17

salary 1912:24

sale 1773:2,7 1805:20 1811:19,20 1817:12 1835:19 1857:10 1860:23,25 1861:8 1872:8 1960:26

sales 1777:22 1787:13,14, 18,21 1796:3 1811:22 1843:5,9 1861:11 1874:7,19 1923:26 1924:3 1928:2 1933:15 1935:7 1950:2 1953:8

salted 1925:26 1926:2 1930:3

sample 1792:14

sampling 1792:13

Saturday 1767:15,16 1768:8 1919:4,13

SBA 1873:22

SBA's 1873:17

scenario 1820:4,24 1821:8, 11,27 1822:12,14 1823:7,23 1824:14,20 1825:8,9,15 1826:20 1938:2 1950:20 1951:9,18 1952:11,26 1953:11 1954:5,13,14,21,24 1955:6

scenarios 1819:17

schedule 1767:6 1921:12

Scheider 1908:27 1909:2,8, 10,25 1910:2 1914:13 1916:7 1917:18,20

schools 1924:9

scope 1869:24 1870:12,14 1876:7 1940:17 1941:17

screen 1893:23

seasonal 1869:9

secondary 1809:28 1861:8, 14

Secretary 1905:15 1914:6 1938:10,14,21,28 1939:3 1940:15,21 1941:26 1942:2, 19,20,22 1943:2



section 1799:3 1841:11 1846:3 1926:12 1938:20,26,

secure 1850:9,10

security 1871:1

seek 1871:19

seeks 1869:7 1881:10

segments 1847:10

Select 1768:12 1806:24 1899:26 1930:15,17 1959:24

sell 1777:2,4 1803:21 1807:2 1808:2,4,11,18,24 1811:11, 13,14,15,17 1835:21 1838:22 1840:28 1875:1 1924:6 1945:27 1946:4 1958:5 1959:6,25 1961:2

selling 1802:18 1807:8 1826:7 1829:13 1858:6 1869:21 1875:5 1913:25 1950:21 1951:23,27

sells 1807:12

senior 1776:23

sense 1819:13 1844:6 1882:19

sentence 1783:28 1784:12 1785:4 1830:4 1850:15 1946:21 1953:3

separate 1777:5 1779:26 1839:28 1842:21 1848:10 1900:2 1956:18 1957:20

separately 1957:16

September 1767:1,10,17 1831:5 1865:1 1918:22,23 1919:26 1920:1 1961:27 1962:10

series 1777:20 1778:5 1795:28 1892:17

serve 1868:6 1895:10 1905:11,15

served 1905:12 1933:21

serves 1867:27

service 1781:18 1787:18,22 1832:5 1867:23 1880:4 1887:24 1906:5 1924:9

services 1867:20

serving 1880:1,5

SESSION 1767:1 1865:1

set 1767:9 1772:8 1778:16, 18 1799:3 1803:24 1809:4 1812:4 1817:23 1818:3 1821:28 1822:16 1869:2 1874:8 1902:7 1938:15 1944:2 1945:10 1950:21 1951:24 1954:22

sets 1786:3 1837:24

setting 1817:4 1938:7 1945:6 1947:28 1951:19

settings 1834:28

settle 1790:11 1906:20

settled 1767:12

settlement 1926:28 1927:5

setup 1797:7

severe 1818:19

severely 1912:22

shape 1832:28

share 1819:3,4 1847:2 1871:23 1887:16 1889:25 1915:23 1918:27

sharing 1887:18 1894:27

shifts 1910:23

ship 1779:10 1781:26 1835:26 1886:26

shipped 1915:20

shipping 1783:4

short 1775:25 1790:20,24 1897:9 1913:18 1956:25

shortchanging 1961:14

shorter 1915:2

show 1845:26 1851:18,22 1931:7 1947:16

showed 1772:20

showing 1769:26

shows 1782:25,27 1783:1 1862:27 1882:11 1906:17

side 1874:13

sides 1923:18

significant 1779:24 1789:4 1790:8 1817:5,6 1847:8 1871:9 1907:21 1910:24 1912:12 1915:23

significantly 1779:11 1793:19 1794:17 1898:2,10, 26 1915:24

silo 1821:6

similar 1772:19 1785:3 1876:10 1898:20 1900:24 1911:14

similarly 1853:25

simple 1783:17 1788:8 1801:22 1809:8 1821:17 1825:27 1845:4,19,27 1846:3,15 1852:14 1945:18

simplest 1793:17

simplicity 1820:11 1901:10

simplified 1821:26

simplistic 1821:13,26 1822:24 1845:2

simply 1841:21 1898:28 1929:8

single 1779:1 1783:13 1789:8 1797:17 1812:2 1834:3 1836:6 1850:15,21, 24 1936:21

singularly 1778:21 1830:5

sir 1768:9,14 1798:21 1872:1,17 1876:4 1877:25 1893:17 1914:14 1942:14,15 1943:22 1944:3,6 1946:14, 19 1949:14 1951:16,26 1958:6,9,16 1959:26 1961:22

sit 1866:8 1910:13 1956:9

situation 1815:20 1819:10 1912:20 1943:18

situations 1943:14

six-inch 1833:2

six-month 1898:7

size 1849:20,23 1868:23 1873:8 1958:14

sizes 1939:12

skewing 1778:24

skim 1880:21 1881:14 1919:28 1926:13,15

skip 1922:24 1935:13 1942:9

SKUS 1847:17

slack 1957:3

slight 1791:27 1852:15

slightly 1789:3,4 1856:8 1857:6 1873:16

slower 1899:10 1912:21 1917:3

small 1778:26 1792:13 1817:9 1850:1 1868:22 1873:11,12,15,17,25 1884:5, 6 1891:13,14 1900:25 1905:18 1916:14 1934:23

smaller 1778:22 1792:17

smidge 1786:6

smoothly 1920:11

soil 1871:10

sold 1773:9 1774:13 1778:8 1786:24 1787:6 1789:10,12, 16,17,26 1808:22,23 1811:12,25 1834:19,24 1835:4 1836:15 1860:20 1861:3,6,16 1931:3,7 1933:18 1939:4 1945:20 1955:11,18,19 1958:19

solely 1822:16 1825:11 1849:3 1862:9

solids 1821:14 1882:7,12,14 1895:23 1926:15

solution 1912:26

someone's 1912:23

sons 1879:25

sooner 1906:5

sort 1777:2 1818:1 1820:18 1860:26 1889:19

sound 1960:13

sounds 1941:8 1944:17

source 1770:24 1792:4 1928:1

sourcing 1869:21

south 1895:4 1905:8,14 1907:6

span 1913:7

speak 1829:6 1882:28 1891:21 1900:28 1901:5 1916:14 1928:1

speaking 1773:5 1774:1,15 1859:9 1910:15

Specialties 1831:13

specialty 1870:22

specific 1798:26 1799:2 1836:28 1853:15 1892:22 1926:10

specifically 1873:10 1880:9 1881:12 1886:19 1889:18 1916:12 1947:4 1958:19

specifications 1773:23 1789:13

spell 1879:8 1904:22

spelled 1894:10

spelling 1775:16 1885:27 1894:9 1909:9 1932:12



spent 1862:17

split 1805:25 1891:18 1953:15 1954:3

spoke 1769:19 1960:18

spotlight 1903:14

spotlighted 1893:23

spread 1780:7 1788:1,3,9 1798:12 1822:9,10 1838:14, 27 1839:13,22,23 1842:12 1847:5 1852:13,15,17,18,22 1853:1 1854:1 1855:8,14,19 1856:2,4,28 1862:6,9,14,15 1863:4,6,15 1870:17 1911:15,16,18 1915:1 1935:25,27 1948:4 1954:10

spreadsheet 1931:8

squeak 1859:6

stability 1783:19 1874:23

stable 1779:5,23 1874:25 1887:11 1935:26 1936:1

stance 1906:1

stand 1820:21 1885:7 1893:18 1903:5 1922:3

standard 1781:1 1787:2 1797:10 1808:25 1834:25 1836:17 1841:7 1847:17 1906:4 1946:11 1958:15,25 1959:7.8

standards 1812:15 1833:14, 19,21 1835:2 1860:28 1939:28 1959:13,15

standpoint 1911:24

start 1772:26 1774:19 1794:8 1806:27 1814:9 1815:2,11 1823:10,14 1832:24 1850:23 1853:15,19 1865:9 1885:25 1920:24 1943:24 1950:11 1954:24

started 1769:2 1828:20 1850:19 1879:20,23

starting 1863:28 1928:15 1944:27 1961:27

starts 1783:27

state 1795:27 1830:3 1833:13 1867:27 1868:1 1882:2 1901:21 1904:22 1922:15 1937:18

stated 1814:19 1870:5 1888:4 1896:4 1899:8 1928:27 1934:14

statement 1795:16,20

1796:4 1797:16,26 1799:1 1800:3,7 1804:8,23 1810:17 1830:2 1834:23 1849:18 1866:18 1872:6 1876:25 1884:4 1885:22,23 1886:5 1894:13,28 1899:7 1904:3, 13,27 1909:12 1932:23 1939:20 1940:5,7 1941:10, 14 1943:5 1947:18,19,24 1958:23

statements 1781:6 1876:26 1948:8

states 1770:28 1868:10 1912:2 1926:24 1934:20,21 1947:3

statewide 1882:5

stating 1767:20 1775:16 1885:26 1894:9 1909:9 1932:12

statistical 1778:22 1792:13, 14 1935:14

statute 1940:23 1943:2

stay 1767:19 1785:22 1901:11 1907:23

steadily 1835:14

step 1893:17 1917:21

Steve 1771:24 1814:6 1851:11 1927:19 1937:8

stock 1847:17 1867:10

stop 1927:2 1961:11,17

stopped 1928:27

stored 1790:20

stores 1924:7,8

stores/wholesale 1924:8

straight 1922:25

stream 1807:9 1960:19

streams 1802:9

Street 1775:21

stretching 1941:22

strict 1818:23

strictly 1847:13

strike 1772:26 1815:11 1822:13 1827:6,16,18 1896:10 1901:26 1929:1 1954:14

strive 1869:4 1874:18

strong 1787:19

strongly 1869:23 1899:4

Strother 1870:3 1871:25

structure 1934:16 1935:28 1957:21,22,26,28 1958:3

structured 1882:18

struggle 1935:5 1949:27 1953:5

struggling 1892:10

studied 1905:5

studies 1895:28

study 1895:28

stuff 1925:20

style 1787:4 1896:14,25

sub- 1876:28

subject 1810:13 1861:4 1908:16 1939:1,6 1943:8,18

subjected 1861:9

submission 1767:8 1918:21

submissions 1767:14

submit 1771:18 1794:2 1870:7 1919:10 1937:3

submitted 1768:5 1899:15 1906:7 1910:16 1918:26 1934:11

submitting 1919:4,12

subsidizing 1827:12

substitutable 1870:24

substitute 1780:2 1791:16 1811:2 1840:4

substituted 1780:25 1781:3

substitutes 1840:12

substitution 1781:7

substitutions 1781:4

subtract 1927:10 1952:6,13,

subtracting 1823:10

Jubilading 1020.10

subtracts 1824:19

succeed 1794:12

suffer 1791:18

sufficiently 1785:25

suggest 1917:25 1939:19

suggested 1946:22

suggesting 1832:7 1918:4

suggestions 1809:26

summarize 1875:8,11

summary 1839:12 1914:2

Sunday 1767:15

super 1859:2

supplement 1787:9

supplies 1898:28 1901:22

supply 1774:22 1779:20 1810:5 1841:23 1869:4 1897:21,23 1906:2

support 1776:5 1777:14 1781:20,24 1783:7 1795:3 1803:14 1871:14,16 1880:7, 9 1882:24 1883:1 1892:15, 16,20,23 1893:2 1895:16,18, 21,26 1907:13 1913:11 1914:2,20,27 1917:4 1932:23 1934:11

supporting 1875:9 1880:26 1913:28

supportive 1906:6

supports 1882:26 1934:9 1936:24

supposed 1843:13 1844:27 1887:16

supposedly 1796:15

surfaced 1948:19

1822:27

survey 1772:7,17,23 1773:6, 12,21,25 1801:13 1805:11 1812:20 1834:5 1847:27 1890:13 1914:21 1917:4 1935:15 1936:8,20 1937:24 1938:11 1939:21 1941:1 1944:1 1948:25 1950:15 1951:20 1953:15

surveyed 1950:15

surveys 1913:13

survival 1859:19

survive 1912:23 1913:2

suspended 1905:22

sustainable 1914:5

swap 1956:20

swear 1768:27 1878:9,12 1885:12 1893:26,28 1903:22

swearing 1878:11

sweet 1777:4 1808:10,18,23 1847:13 1896:28

Index: spent..switch

swing 1850:11

swiss 1817:7 1840:17

switch 1830:26



swore 1922:5

sworn 1775:9 1878:16 1885:15 1894:3 1903:25 1908:28 1909:3 1922:7 1932:6

synthetic 1777:24 1791:16 1794:26 1796:16 1811:2 1824:10 1828:8,11

system 1791:28 1803:24 1804:26,27 1807:10 1818:3, 12 1820:25 1821:24 1825:27 1826:14 1827:10,14 1871:7, 12,13 1872:16 1907:22 1925:13

systems 1804:19

Т

table 1769:14,20,25 1770:3, 21,23 1771:27 1772:2,5 1782:1,2,25 1783:28 1787:28 1806:6,8,10,11 1837:27,28 1838:4,5 1839:12 1843:18,21,24,25, 26,28 1844:13 1845:3,26 1851:14,16,25,28 1852:2,6 1853:9,17,21 1857:5,8 1858:5,8 1862:24,25,27 1863:12 1880:22 1883:19 1926:1

tables 1787:26 1843:17,18 1862:18 1863:5 1925:28

takes 1859:28 1881:4 1887:4

taking 1875:25 1877:26 1886:27 1888:4 1912:23 1913:15 1923:18

talk 1799:6,8 1833:27 1834:13 1836:22 1840:5 1843:4 1849:20 1850:14 1859:8,11 1865:4 1873:7,28 1874:20 1883:17 1889:18 1901:16 1907:14,16 1915:14 1948:22 1956:3

talked 1771:14 1834:19 1835:6 1836:21 1840:11 1860:16 1889:17 1890:7,8 1901:16 1918:25 1921:15

talking 1771:10 1794:27,28 1799:19 1800:8,10,11 1815:4 1822:20 1824:11 1828:12 1833:28 1840:6 1850:18 1858:23 1860:19 1862:18 1874:17 1880:11 1886:19 1888:9 1893:14 1917:21 1927:22 1947:21 1952:16 1956:4,15,17 1958:27 1960:22 talks 1949:22

task 1796:13 1835:17 1848:3 1910:13

Taylor 1767:25 1832:16 1845:16 1851:6 1858:20 1865:5,7,8,16 1872:26,28 1873:1,3 1875:18 1878:3 1879:7 1883:9,10,12 1884:25 1885:9 1891:1,2,4,6 1893:7,20 1899:21 1900:11, 12,14,16 1902:17,20 1903:8, 18,27 1904:1,6,12,18,20,21 1908:2,21,26 1916:4,6,10 1917:8,22,25 1918:2,6,21 1919:24 1920:4,13,15,28 1921:3,9,24,27 1931:28 1961:10,24

team 1769:19

technical 1886:12 1949:4

technically 1809:3 1873:16

technologies 1887:13

technology 1834:26 1881:24

ten 1829:24 1831:20 1887:5 1927:3 1928:28 1929:4,9,13

tend 1781:25 1782:23

term 1828:13,14 1832:25 1841:13 1855:18 1856:3 1872:6 1954:7

terms 1772:15 1814:28 1817:12 1821:13 1824:24 1829:2 1889:19,20 1935:19 1948:23 1949:4

Terrible 1930:10

test 1789:14 1882:9

testified 1775:10 1797:6 1866:20 1878:17 1884:3 1885:16 1894:4 1903:26 1909:4 1922:8 1923:17 1932:7

testify 1768:21 1873:5 1877:20,27 1879:17 1883:15 1889:14 1895:2 1899:6,14 1900:20 1905:2 1909:28

testifying 1832:21 1834:5 1877:1 1885:7 1891:6 1895:18 1899:13 1900:9 1916:9 1941:18

testimony 1769:8,9,15 1770:3 1771:14 1776:4,19 1783:26 1784:6,7 1785:2,14 1787:27 1791:1 1805:2 1813:26 1814:15 1828:6 1833:10,28 1840:11,26 1847:18 1848:8 1865:9,23 1866:18,25 1877:13,14 1879:5 1886:8 1888:27 1892:14 1894:13 1899:3,15 1901:16 1906:23 1907:13 1908:4,19 1909:13,26 1910:15 1917:11 1920:20 1921:6 1933:8 1934:8,11,14 1936:19 1937:11 1940:18 1942:12 1945:15 1948:11 1949:14 1958:20 1960:17 1961:26

text 1940:14

Thankfully 1897:26

theoretical 1824:3

Theoretically 1961:5

theory 1824:3 1892:23

thereabouts 1960:12

thin 1902:5

thing 1848:14 1872:8 1878:9 1887:3 1929:26 1944:18 1949:1,2 1951:9 1957:19

things 1774:13 1806:16 1815:27 1818:7 1852:19 1857:5 1869:16 1889:21 1902:3 1907:15 1920:11 1922:1 1939:6 1946:1 1947:17 1948:14 1949:3

thinks 1919:18

third-generation 1895:3

thought 1775:25,27 1824:12 1901:24 1917:28 1919:8 1920:6

thoughts 1859:22 1900:7

three-legged 1887:3

threshold 1784:19

throw 1813:5 1902:2

tied 1912:8

time 1767:17,19 1774:28 1778:12 1783:20 1791:11 1794:25 1811:22 1812:2 1819:26 1823:14.16 1828:2 1831:23 1835:17 1838:3,6, 22 1841:1 1854:27 1859:6 1861:5.17 1862:18 1863:19 1866:23.24 1872:4.5 1875:25 1877:26 1878:13 1887:27 1888:26 1889:2 1890:23 1903:2 1905:22 1906:25 1907:27 1908:9 1913:18 1915:2 1922:5,18 1925:18 1928:12,20,22 1929:6 1935:21 1942:7,10 1947:7,9,27 1948:2 1949:7 1956:24 1960:4 1961:10

timely 1881:11 1912:18 1938:23

times 1788:12 1833:10 1838:28 1844:15,17 1853:23,27 1854:5,14,15,20

title 1788:2

today 1777:26 1785:4 1809:5 1827:20 1832:19,21 1834:12 1847:24 1850:6 1864:1 1873:5 1877:27 1882:28 1883:15 1885:7 1886:20 1887:12 1888:6 1889:1 1890:15 1891:5 1892:9 1894:14 1895:2,18 1899:6,15 1900:9,19 1905:2 1909:13 1914:7,13 1916:7, 10 1917:23 1918:9 1920:2 1947:6 1950:10 1952:4 1957:21,27 1960:7 1962:8

today's 1921:25

told 1899:14

tomorrow 1812:19

tonnage 1777:21 1796:2

tool 1859:19 1874:8,9 1905:21

tools 1783:13 1850:3,4,6,16, 17,21 1874:1,4,6,12 1884:16,19,20,21 1891:24, 27,28 1901:2,6,8

top 1841:10,12 1843:17 1846:3 1894:20 1923:8 1950:26

total 1770:12,14,21,27 1772:15 1782:3,8 1787:14 1788:14 1815:28 1816:14 1842:17 1852:27,28 1855:10,19 1856:3,27 1873:20,21 1923:26 1924:27,28 1936:19

totaled 1842:21

totally 1797:28 1810:25 1847:11

totals 1925:4

touched 1916:28

Township 1868:2

track 1811:27

trade 1809:24 1874:9 1899:28 1934:26

trades 1812:23

trading 1936:14,15

traditional 1777:9

Tranel 1866:10,16,19

Index: swore..Tranel



1867:3,25 1872:24,25 1873:16 1875:25 1877:25 1878:2

transaction 1774:19

transcript 1876:20 1940:14 1944:24

transfer 1848:9

transitioned 1867:15

translate 1821:16

translated 1821:1 1898:7

transportation 1789:20,22, 28 1812:15 1835:7,14

transporting 1880:25

traps 1813:5

travel 1886:24

traveling 1921:13

treat 1783:21

treated 1783:12

treats 1824:18

tremendously 1915:18

trend 1787:17

trucking 1835:11

true 1774:4 1808:6 1899:16 1911:28 1913:6 1923:17,22 1948:9,10 1954:2

Tuesday 1908:22 1920:21, 24 1921:12 1961:12,27 1962:1,9

Tulare 1895:4

tune 1827:14 1884:13 1891:22

turn 1783:25 1787:27 1791:1 1804:7 1806:6 1820:26 1865:13 1903:13 1927:14 1937:10 1959:3

turned 1774:2

turning 1960:19

two-part 1802:14

two-step 1912:19

type 1778:11 1786:11 1834:18 1860:24 1924:4 1944:18

types 1790:7 1810:8 1814:24 1916:24,27 1926:5

typical 1869:10

typically 1819:25 1875:3 1956:5

U

U.S. 1770:15,22 1843:13 1881:19,22,27 1898:16 1905:15 1938:18

Uh-huh 1770:4 1838:15

Ukraine 1915:4

ultimately 1791:8 1835:22 1870:17 1906:19 1914:23

unable 1842:7

unacceptable 1808:21

unclear 1812:8

undercuts 1870:26

undermined 1915:26

underpaying 1793:20

underreported 1793:22 1795:11

undersold 1793:22

underspending 1897:7

understand 1771:28 1796:21 1821:24 1833:14 1866:26 1876:9 1896:22 1899:12 1941:3,6 1958:12, 28

understanding 1767:23 1774:10 1787:5 1793:24 1809:17 1845:17 1852:17 1861:2,9 1890:15 1928:7 1929:3.12

understood 1813:27 1861:24 1913:3

undertook 1791:2

undervalued 1795:14 1897:9 1911:19,22

undervaluing 1825:5

unfair 1897:11

ungraded 1777:15 1781:2 1833:11,15

uniform 1870:11 1871:4 1898:8 1915:27

unintended 1948:12,15 1957:24

unique 1809:22 1833:20 1842:10 1850:20

United 1770:28 1900:4 1912:2 1934:20,21

units 1847:17 1848:10

University 1868:1

unknown 1789:18 1830:23

unpredictable 1780:7

unrealistic 1820:8 1950:8

unregulated 1789:27 1809:11 1837:5,16

unsalted 1925:26 1926:4 1930:5

update 1880:26 1881:13

updated 1881:20 1882:25 1896:24 1912:15 1913:27

updates 1880:10,24 1881:16

Upper 1835:3 1837:3 1849:1 1934:4

upside 1910:28

urge 1870:3 1899:4 1906:3

urging 1870:1

USA 1910:5

USDA 1767:10,23 1768:11, 22 1769:12 1770:18 1772:3, 6 1777:8,15 1781:11 1782:3 1784:24 1791:9 1796:10 1806:17 1810:19 1812:19 1816:7 1817:21 1828:15,23 1829:12 1832:9 1833:11,13, 20,24 1842:5,9 1849:5 1865:21 1866:22 1868:25 1870:3,5,6,15 1871:24 1874:15 1881:7 1891:6 1895:26 1898:16 1899:4 1900:16 1901:3 1905:18.25 1906:3,21 1908:21 1910:18 1913:11,13 1914:3,22 1919:12,18 1920:17 1923:7 1927:26 1928:19 1929:17 1935:13 1943:27 1945:6,8 1947:1,25 1948:6 1951:19,

USDA's 1794:23 1869:23,28

users 1957:19

utilization 1819:2 1859:17, 18 1869:5 1874:19

utilize 1850:3 1874:4,24 1884:15 1887:13,25 1891:26 1905:20 1916:19

utilizes 1901:6

utilizing 1881:23 1919:17

٧

valid 1795:10 1940:7

Valley 1868:8

valuable 1808:13

value-added 1847:10 1934:4

values 1782:25 1945:22

vanish 1812:13

variability 1778:14 1809:10 1823:19 1869:20

variations 1779:20

varies 1778:13 1791:10 1839:15

varieties 1916:25 1933:18

vast 1789:26 1813:7,12 1837:4 1860:22 1873:24

verbal 1784:7

verify 1842:7,18

Version 1910:14

versus 1772:15 1790:6 1814:16 1816:15 1852:25 1862:2 1912:5,6 1934:19 1948:11

viable 1780:21 1790:13 1847:5

vice 1896:4 1905:11 1933:10

vice-chair 1910:13

video 1903:13

view 1774:1 1798:19 1803:23 1809:27 1823:16 1872:7 1876:28 1877:2 1943:17 1958:9

Village 1777:1

Vilsack 1914:6

virtual 1865:3,9 1872:20,22 1877:27 1893:18 1906:22

virtually 1866:28 1874:3 1886:21 1900:19 1916:10

Visalia 1879:24

visibility 1936:9 1937:25

Vitaliano 1829:7

voice 1871:16 1906:26

voices 1906:24

volatile 1790:12.14 1911:5

volatility 1778:14 1789:7 1792:9,23 1862:14,15 1935:27 1958:1

volume 1778:11,13 1781:17, 18 1782:9 1789:11 1792:11 1799:28 1875:4 1911:20 1931:2,3,6 1934:18 1935:15 1936:20 1944:26 1948:23



volumes 1772:17 1773:21

W

wait 1876:5 1915:7

waiting 1849:22

waive 1878:11

walk 1768:3 1843:16,19

1923:24

walking 1788:15

Wallace 1775:21

wanted 1770:20 1843:11,16, 19 1872:17 1873:6 1875:8 1899:9 1900:20 1919:14

1921:11 1962:2 **wanting** 1917:2

war 1915:4

warehouse 1924:8

Warren 1930:16

Warrenstown 1905:6

Washington 1859:7

watch 1892:11

watching 1908:5

water 1897:23,28

ways 1809:22 1872:14

1934:17

WCMA 1899:2 1901:20

WCMA/IDFA 1913:21,23

wear 1847:22

wearing 1847:19

webcasting 1961:25

website 1782:3 1784:25 1842:9 1919:21 1920:2

Wednesday 1767:9,15

weedy 1846:17

week 1778:13 1805:2 1874:3 1920:21 1926:27 1927:7,8,9,

11

weekend 1833:9

weekly 1769:18,20,21 1927:6,8,9 1960:11

weeks 1884:4,13 1891:23

weight 1791:10 1822:23

1845:18

weighted 1769:20 1783:2,5 1844:28 1845:12 1934:25

1935:6 1949:28 1951:20 1953:7

weighting 1845:10,11,14,22

west 1809:19 1835:12

Western 1789:27 1809:12 1810:11 1900:4

wet 1897:26

whatsoever 1827:28

whey 1777:4 1797:13 1807:3,8,9 1808:2,8,10,11, 12,13,19,20,23,24,25,27,28 1809:2,8,14,18,20,27 1810:4 1831:12,13 1836:8 1846:1 1847:13 1857:27 1880:16 1896:7,15,28 1933:16 1960:11,19,26 1961:2

white 1780:25 1781:2

who've 1884:3

wholesale 1959:27

wide 1834:26 1954:10

widening 1780:7 1789:9

widens 1855:8

wider 1782:15

wife 1867:4 1879:23,28

window 1774:22

Wisconsin 1775:21 1776:3 1777:1,7,11 1781:13,14 1831:12,13 1833:13,25 1835:13,25 1836:28 1843:5 1867:6,22,27 1886:11,18 1891:9 1898:25 1910:4,8 1913:3

withheld 1923:3

witness's 1940:17

witnesses 1872:20,22 1877:15 1900:24 1921:22

wives 1867:5

wonderful 1858:20 1907:25

wondering 1770:7 1785:19 1788:4 1901:23 1916:11

word 1828:11 1833:20 1852:21 1939:1

words 1876:8

work 1767:28 1832:23 1843:20 1865:11,13 1879:21 1885:19 1887:4

worked 1776:23 1882:20

1933:11

working 1914:23 1921:18 1922:1

works 1768:1 1782:26 1825:27 1951:8

world 1818:28 1823:9 1865:3

worse 1771:13 1781:26 1783:2 1805:12

WPC80 1809:2,7

WPI 1809:2,7 1959:25,27 1960:2,7,18,19

written 1784:7 1830:2 1872:5 1886:5 1894:13 1909:12 1932:23

wrong 1784:10 1802:16 1825:28 1854:16 1903:11,13 1943:4

wrote 1849:25 1893:1

Υ

year 1777:13 1788:21 1790:18 1791:10 1806:15 1843:12 1845:5 1863:9 1867:11 1869:19 1880:3 1887:26,28 1897:26,27

years 1776:23 1785:28 1788:19 1789:3,4 1791:13 1793:20 1795:15 1811:5 1823:17,22 1827:4 1834:11 1836:9 1843:10 1847:12 1848:3 1849:11 1859:14 1862:28 1863:6 1867:16,17 1868:21 1879:25 1880:4,18, 27 1882:3 1887:5,10 1895:12 1897:4 1912:16 1913:7 1915:5,7,25 1924:1, 10 1927:4 1928:25,28 1929:4,9,14 1933:12 1943:17 1957:2

yellow 1777:8 1778:8 1781:3 1811:25

yesterday 1768:21 1769:8 1772:20 1889:13 1942:7

yesterday's 1785:14

yield 1821:17,23 1857:19,20

yields 1890:13 1914:22

young 1867:10

Ζ

Index: volumes..Zoom

Zirbel 1910:3

Zoom 1865:9 1909:28

