Exhibit 2

```
Page 1
1
              UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
             NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
    ----X
    IN RE: ROUNDUP PRODUCTS MDL No. 2741
    LIABILITY LITIGATION Case No.
6
                             16-md-02741-VC
7
    -----x
8
    This document relates to:
    ALL ACTIONS
10
11
12
      DEPOSITION OF CHRISTOPHER JUDE PORTIER, Ph.D.
13
                   New York, New York
14
                    September 5, 2017
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
    Reported by: MARY F. BOWMAN, RPR, CRR
25
     Job No: 128474
```

		T. C.
•	Page 2	Page 4
1		¹ APPEARANCES:
2		2
3		³ HOLLINGSWORTH
4	September 5, 2017	⁴ Attorneys for Defendant, Monsanto
5	9:04 a.m.	5 1350 I Street Northwest
6		6 Washington, DC 20005
7		⁷ BY: ERIC LASKER, ESQ.
8	Deposition of CHRISTOPHER JUDE	8 JOHN KALAS, ESQ.
9 10	PORTIER, Ph.D., held at the offices of	9 10
11	Weitz & Luxenberg, 700 Broadway, New York,	
12	New York, before Mary F. Bowman, a	Also I resent.
13	Registered Professional Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter, and Notary Public of the	Robyn D. Buck, Esq., Wonsumo
14	State of New Jersey.	Michael Baum, Esq. (By telephone) Pedram Esfandiary, Esq. (By telephone)
15	State of INEW Jersey.	15 Matthew Smith, Videographer
16		16 Watthew Shiftin, Videographer
17		17
18		18
19		19
20		20
21		21
22		22
23		23
24		24
25		25
	Page 3	Page 5
1	ADDEAD ANCES.	1 INDEX:
2	APPEARANCES:	
_		
3	WEITZ & LUYENBERG	² WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE:
3 4	WEITZ & LUXENBERG Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness	 WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376
	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness	 WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376
4	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness 700 Broadway	 WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376 Ms. Greenwald 366
4 5	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness 700 Broadway New York, NY 10003	 WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376 Ms. Greenwald 366
4 5 6	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness 700 Broadway	WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376 Ms. Greenwald 366 EXHIBIT INDEX:
4 5 6 7 8 9	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness 700 Broadway New York, NY 10003 BY: ROBIN GREENWALD, ESQ.	2 WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: 3 C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376 4 Ms. Greenwald 366 5 6 EXHIBIT INDEX: 7 NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE: 8 Exhibit 15-1 document entitled, "IARC 13 9 Monographs on Evaluation of
4 5 6 7 8 9	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness 700 Broadway New York, NY 10003 BY: ROBIN GREENWALD, ESQ. PEARL ROBERTSON, ESQ. MAJA LUKIC, ESQand-	2 WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: 3 C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376 4 Ms. Greenwald 366 5 EXHIBIT INDEX: 7 NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE: 8 Exhibit 15-1 document entitled, "IARC 13 9 Monographs on Evaluation of 10 Carcinogenic Risks to Humans,"
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness 700 Broadway New York, NY 10003 BY: ROBIN GREENWALD, ESQ. PEARL ROBERTSON, ESQ. MAJA LUKIC, ESQand- LUNDY LUNDY SOLEAU & SOUTH	WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376 Ms. Greenwald 366 EXHIBIT INDEX: NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE: Exhibit 15-1 document entitled, "IARC 13 Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," Exhibit 15-2 document entitled, 13
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness 700 Broadway New York, NY 10003 BY: ROBIN GREENWALD, ESQ. PEARL ROBERTSON, ESQ. MAJA LUKIC, ESQand- LUNDY LUNDY SOLEAU & SOUTH Attorneys for Plaintiffs	WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376 Ms. Greenwald 366 EXHIBIT INDEX: NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE: Exhibit 15-1 document entitled, "IARC 13 Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," Exhibit 15-2 document entitled, 13 "Discussion of Changes to
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness 700 Broadway New York, NY 10003 BY: ROBIN GREENWALD, ESQ. PEARL ROBERTSON, ESQ. MAJA LUKIC, ESQand- LUNDY LUNDY SOLEAU & SOUTH Attorneys for Plaintiffs 501 Broad Street	WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376 Ms. Greenwald 366 EXHIBIT INDEX: NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE: Exhibit 15-1 document entitled, "IARC 13 Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," Exhibit 15-2 document entitled, 13 "Discussion of Changes to Draft Preamble,"
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness 700 Broadway New York, NY 10003 BY: ROBIN GREENWALD, ESQ. PEARL ROBERTSON, ESQ. MAJA LUKIC, ESQand- LUNDY LUNDY SOLEAU & SOUTH Attorneys for Plaintiffs 501 Broad Street Lake Charles, LA 70801	WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376 Ms. Greenwald 366 EXHIBIT INDEX: NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE: Exhibit 15-1 document entitled, "IARC 13 Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," Exhibit 15-2 document entitled, 13 "Discussion of Changes to Draft Preamble," Exhibit 15-3 document entitled, "IARC 21
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness 700 Broadway New York, NY 10003 BY: ROBIN GREENWALD, ESQ. PEARL ROBERTSON, ESQ. MAJA LUKIC, ESQand- LUNDY LUNDY SOLEAU & SOUTH Attorneys for Plaintiffs 501 Broad Street	2 WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: 3 C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376 4 Ms. Greenwald 366 5 6 EXHIBIT INDEX: 7 NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE: 8 Exhibit 15-1 document entitled, "IARC 13 9 Monographs on Evaluation of 10 Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," 11 Exhibit 15-2 document entitled, 13 12 "Discussion of Changes to 13 Draft Preamble," 14 Exhibit 15-3 document entitled, "IARC 21 15 Monographs on Evaluation of
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness 700 Broadway New York, NY 10003 BY: ROBIN GREENWALD, ESQ. PEARL ROBERTSON, ESQ. MAJA LUKIC, ESQand- LUNDY LUNDY SOLEAU & SOUTH Attorneys for Plaintiffs 501 Broad Street Lake Charles, LA 70801	2 WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: 3 C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376 4 Ms. Greenwald 366 5 6 EXHIBIT INDEX: 7 NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE: 8 Exhibit 15-1 document entitled, "IARC 13 9 Monographs on Evaluation of 10 Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," 11 Exhibit 15-2 document entitled, 13 12 "Discussion of Changes to 13 Draft Preamble," 14 Exhibit 15-3 document entitled, "IARC 21 15 Monographs on Evaluation of 16 Carcinogenic Risks to Human,
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness 700 Broadway New York, NY 10003 BY: ROBIN GREENWALD, ESQ. PEARL ROBERTSON, ESQ. MAJA LUKIC, ESQand- LUNDY LUNDY SOLEAU & SOUTH Attorneys for Plaintiffs 501 Broad Street Lake Charles, LA 70801	WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376 Ms. Greenwald 366 EXHIBIT INDEX: NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE: Exhibit 15-1 document entitled, "IARC 13 Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," Exhibit 15-2 document entitled, 13 "Discussion of Changes to Draft Preamble," Exhibit 15-3 document entitled, "IARC 21 Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Human, Internal Report 6/001,"
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness 700 Broadway New York, NY 10003 BY: ROBIN GREENWALD, ESQ. PEARL ROBERTSON, ESQ. MAJA LUKIC, ESQand- LUNDY LUNDY SOLEAU & SOUTH Attorneys for Plaintiffs 501 Broad Street Lake Charles, LA 70801	WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376 Ms. Greenwald 366 EXHIBIT INDEX: NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE: Exhibit 15-1 document entitled, "IARC 13 Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," Exhibit 15-2 document entitled, 13 "Discussion of Changes to Draft Preamble," Exhibit 15-3 document entitled, "IARC 21 Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Human, Internal Report 6/001," Exhibit 15-4 e-mail chain, dated October 28
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness 700 Broadway New York, NY 10003 BY: ROBIN GREENWALD, ESQ. PEARL ROBERTSON, ESQ. MAJA LUKIC, ESQand- LUNDY LUNDY SOLEAU & SOUTH Attorneys for Plaintiffs 501 Broad Street Lake Charles, LA 70801	WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376 Ms. Greenwald 366 EXHIBIT INDEX: NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE: Exhibit 15-1 document entitled, "IARC 13 Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," Exhibit 15-2 document entitled, 13 "Discussion of Changes to Draft Preamble," Exhibit 15-3 document entitled, "IARC 21 Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Human, Internal Report 6/001," Exhibit 15-4 e-mail chain, dated October 28 21, 2015,
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness 700 Broadway New York, NY 10003 BY: ROBIN GREENWALD, ESQ. PEARL ROBERTSON, ESQ. MAJA LUKIC, ESQand- LUNDY LUNDY SOLEAU & SOUTH Attorneys for Plaintiffs 501 Broad Street Lake Charles, LA 70801	WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376 Ms. Greenwald 366 EXHIBIT INDEX: NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE: Exhibit 15-1 document entitled, "IARC 13 Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," Exhibit 15-2 document entitled, 13 "Discussion of Changes to Draft Preamble," Exhibit 15-3 document entitled, "IARC 21 Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Human, Internal Report 6/001," Exhibit 15-4 e-mail chain, dated October 28 21, 2015, Exhibit 15-5 report entitled, "Chem Daily 30
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness 700 Broadway New York, NY 10003 BY: ROBIN GREENWALD, ESQ. PEARL ROBERTSON, ESQ. MAJA LUKIC, ESQand- LUNDY LUNDY SOLEAU & SOUTH Attorneys for Plaintiffs 501 Broad Street Lake Charles, LA 70801	2 WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: 3 C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376 4 Ms. Greenwald 366 5 6 EXHIBIT INDEX: 7 NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE: 8 Exhibit 15-1 document entitled, "IARC 13 9 Monographs on Evaluation of 10 Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," 11 Exhibit 15-2 document entitled, 13 12 "Discussion of Changes to 13 Draft Preamble," 14 Exhibit 15-3 document entitled, "IARC 21 15 Monographs on Evaluation of 16 Carcinogenic Risks to Human, 17 Internal Report 6/001," 18 Exhibit 15-4 e-mail chain, dated October 28 19 21, 2015, 20 Exhibit 15-5 report entitled, "Chem Daily 30 21 Text Project: New Technology
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness 700 Broadway New York, NY 10003 BY: ROBIN GREENWALD, ESQ. PEARL ROBERTSON, ESQ. MAJA LUKIC, ESQand- LUNDY LUNDY SOLEAU & SOUTH Attorneys for Plaintiffs 501 Broad Street Lake Charles, LA 70801	WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376 Ms. Greenwald 366 EXHIBIT INDEX: NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE: Exhibit 15-1 document entitled, "IARC 13 Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," Exhibit 15-2 document entitled, 13 "Discussion of Changes to Draft Preamble," Exhibit 15-3 document entitled, "IARC 21 Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Human, Internal Report 6/001," Exhibit 15-4 e-mail chain, dated October 28 21, 2015, Exhibit 15-5 report entitled, "Chem Daily 30 Text Project: New Technology Sheds Light on Chemicals in
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness 700 Broadway New York, NY 10003 BY: ROBIN GREENWALD, ESQ. PEARL ROBERTSON, ESQ. MAJA LUKIC, ESQand- LUNDY LUNDY SOLEAU & SOUTH Attorneys for Plaintiffs 501 Broad Street Lake Charles, LA 70801	WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376 Ms. Greenwald 366 EXHIBIT INDEX: NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE: Exhibit 15-1 document entitled, "IARC 13 Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," Exhibit 15-2 document entitled, 13 "Discussion of Changes to Draft Preamble," Exhibit 15-3 document entitled, "IARC 21 Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Human, Internal Report 6/001," Exhibit 15-4 e-mail chain, dated October 28 21, 2015, Exhibit 15-5 report entitled, "Chem Daily 30 Text Project: New Technology Sheds Light on Chemicals in Our Environment,"
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs and the witness 700 Broadway New York, NY 10003 BY: ROBIN GREENWALD, ESQ. PEARL ROBERTSON, ESQ. MAJA LUKIC, ESQand- LUNDY LUNDY SOLEAU & SOUTH Attorneys for Plaintiffs 501 Broad Street Lake Charles, LA 70801	WITNESS EXAM BY: PAGE: C. Portier Mr. Lasker 6, 376 Ms. Greenwald 366 EXHIBIT INDEX: NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE: Exhibit 15-1 document entitled, "IARC 13 Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," Exhibit 15-2 document entitled, 13 "Discussion of Changes to Draft Preamble," Exhibit 15-3 document entitled, "IARC 21 Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Human, Internal Report 6/001," Exhibit 15-4 e-mail chain, dated October 28 21, 2015, Exhibit 15-5 report entitled, "Chem Daily 30 Text Project: New Technology Sheds Light on Chemicals in Our Environment,"

Case 3:16-md-02741-VC Document 546-2 Filed 10/06/17 Page 4 of 139

	Page 6		Page 8
¹ Exhi	bit 15-7 IARC announcement, dated 34	1	EXHIBIT INDEX:
2	October 7, 2014,	2	NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE:
3 Exhi	bit 15-8 document entitled, "IARC 37	3	Exhibit 15-28 document entitled, 156
4	Monographs on the Evaluation	4	"Principles for
5	of Carcinogenic Risks to	5	Exhibit 15-29 article entitled, "Mouse 164
6	Humans Preamble,	6	Exhibit 15-30 expert report of Christopher 181
	bit 15-9 e-mail dated March 3, 2015, 40	7	J. Portier
8 Exhi	bit 15-10 e-mail dated March 4, 2015, 41	8	Exhibit 15-31 Rebuttal Report of 184
9 Exhi	bit 15-11 e-mail dated March 6, 2015, 43	9	Christopher J.Portier
¹⁰ Exhi	bit 15-12 handwritten notes dated 48	10	Exhibit 15-32 Original Expert Report of 220
11	3/6/15,	11	Dr. Christopher J. Portier
	bit 15-13 e-mail dated March 11, 2015, 52	12	Exhibit 15-33 report entitled, 243
	bit 15-14 e-mail dated March 13, 2015, 57	13	"Spontaneous Neoplastic
	bit 15-15 printout from LobbyFacts, 60	14	Lesions in the Crl:CD1 Mouse"
	bit 15-16 e-mail chain dated 65	15	Exhibit 15-34 Charles River report dated 268
16	11/9/2015,	16	March of 1995,
	bit 15-17 e-mail chain dated 68	17	Exhibit 15-35 e-mail chain dated June 7, 278
18	November 11, 2005,	18	2017,
	bit 15-18 letter dated March 29, 2015, 71	19	Exhibit 15-36 report entitled "NTP 326
	bit 15-19 letter dated November 27, 73	20	historical controls, report
21	2015,	21	all routes and vehicles,
	bit 15-20 attachment to the expert 88	22	Wistar-Han rats, August 2016,
23	report,	23	Exhibit 15-37German article, 334
24		24	Exhibit 15-38 translation of German 334
25		25	article,
	Page 7		Page 9
_			
1	EXHIBIT INDEX:	1	EXHIBIT INDEX:
	MBER DESCRIPTION PAGE:	2	NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE:
3 Exhi	bit 15-21 document entitled, "Oh 89	3 4	Exhibit 15-39 article entitled, "Key 349
	Brother, CropLife Questions,	5	Characteristics of Carcinogens
5 6 Fyhi	Makeup of Glyphosate Panel,"		as a Basis for Organizing Data
Exhi	bit 15-22 e-mail chain Bates stamped 106	7	on Mechanisms of
	EPAHQ6149,		Carcinogenesis,"
e Exhi	bit 15-23 e-mail chain Bates stamped 106	9	Exhibit 15-40 article entitled, 358
	PORTIER0000055 through 61, bit 15-24 article from Horizons, dated 122	10	"Biomonitoring of genotoxic risk in agricultural workers
11 EXIII		11	<u> </u>
	March 7, 2016 with attachment,	12	from five Colombian regions," Exhibit 15-41 notice of deposition, 365
13 Exhi	bit 15-25 article entitled, "Re: 123	13	Exhibit 15-41 notice of deposition, 365 Exhibit 15-42 letter dated August 29, 366
14	Tarazona et al.: Glyphosate toxicity and carcinogenicity:	14	2017, with attachment,
15	a review of the scientific	15	Exhibit 15-43 screenshot from 373
16	basis of the European Union	16	LobbyFacts.eu,
17	assessment,"	17	Exhibit 15-44 screenshot from the EDF 375
	bit 15-26 article entitled, "The 127	18	website,
19	glyphosate saga: an example of	19	Exhibit 15-45 document entitled, "Monsanto 377
20	influence of unsound science	20	joins Environmental Defense
21	and interest groups in public	21	Fund, others, in Sustainable
	health decision	22	Agriculture Coalition,"
22			Agriculture Coantion,
22 23 Fxhi	hit 15-27 curriculum vitae 136	23	
	bit 15-27 curriculum vitae, 136	23	
²³ Exhi	bit 15-27 curriculum vitae, 136		

	Page 10		Page 12
1	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This begins	1	monograph, correct?
2	media labeled No. 1 of the	2	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.
3	video-recorded deposition of	3	A. The group that IARC brought in,
4	Dr. Christopher Portier in the matter	4	advisors, recommended a few changes to the
5	of In re: RoundUp Products Liability	5	preamble.
6	Litigation, for the United States	6	Q. For example, the science advisory
7	District Court, Northern District of	7	board that you chaired recommended that
8	California.	8	IARC place greater weight on mechanistic
9	This deposition is being held at	9	data in reaching its cancer evaluations,
10	700 Broadway in New York, New York on	10	correct?
11	September 5, 2017, at approximately	11	A. The advisory group suggested that
12	9:04 a.m.	12	the mechanism data that was now becoming
13	My name is Matthew Smith for TSG	13	available was substantially different than
14	Reporting, Incorporated. I'm the legal	14	what it was when the first preamble was
15	video specialist.	15	written and they that the preamble
16	The court reporter is Mary Bowman	16	needed to be revised to take into account
17	in association with TSG Reporting.	17	modern mechanistic understanding of cancer.
18	Will counsel please introduce	18	Q. One of the things, for example,
19	yourself for the record.	19	that your group recommended was that an
20	(Whereupon counsel placed their	20	agent might be classified as possibly
21	appearances on the audio record. All	21	carcinogenic to humans based solely on
22	attorney appearances will be on the	22	strong mechanistic data, correct?
23	final transcript).	23	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.
24	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you.	24	A. I don't know. I'd have to see
25	Will the court reporter please	25	the document to be certain that's the case,
	will the court reporter preuse		the document to be certain that's the case,
	Page 11		Page 13
1	swear in the witness.	1	and I'd have to see the previous document
2	CHRISTOPHER PORTIER,	2	to see that it wasn't in the previous
3	called as a witness by the parties,	3	preamble.
4	having been duly sworn, testified as	4	MR. LASKER: Let me actually,
5	follows:		
6		5	let me mark both of these.
	EXAMINATION BY	5 6	let me mark both of these. So we will mark as Exhibit 15-1
7	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER:		
7 8			So we will mark as Exhibit 15-1
	MR. LASKER:	6 7	So we will mark as Exhibit 15-1 the report of the Science Advisory
8	MR. LASKER: Q. Good morning, Dr. Portier.	6 7 8	So we will mark as Exhibit 15-1 the report of the Science Advisory Group from May of 2005.
8 9	MR. LASKER: Q. Good morning, Dr. Portier. Dr. Portier, you served in May of	6 7 8 9	So we will mark as Exhibit 15-1 the report of the Science Advisory Group from May of 2005. (Exhibit 15-1, document entitled,
8 9 10	MR. LASKER: Q. Good morning, Dr. Portier. Dr. Portier, you served in May of 2005 as the chair of the IARC Science	6 7 8 9 10	So we will mark as Exhibit 15-1 the report of the Science Advisory Group from May of 2005. (Exhibit 15-1, document entitled, "IARC Monographs on Evaluation of
8 9 10 11	MR. LASKER: Q. Good morning, Dr. Portier. Dr. Portier, you served in May of 2005 as the chair of the IARC Science Advisory Board that recommended amendments	6 7 8 9 10 11	So we will mark as Exhibit 15-1 the report of the Science Advisory Group from May of 2005. (Exhibit 15-1, document entitled, "IARC Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," marked
8 9 10 11 12	MR. LASKER: Q. Good morning, Dr. Portier. Dr. Portier, you served in May of 2005 as the chair of the IARC Science Advisory Board that recommended amendments to the preamble of the IARC monograph	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So we will mark as Exhibit 15-1 the report of the Science Advisory Group from May of 2005. (Exhibit 15-1, document entitled, "IARC Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," marked for identification, as of this date.)
8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. LASKER: Q. Good morning, Dr. Portier. Dr. Portier, you served in May of 2005 as the chair of the IARC Science Advisory Board that recommended amendments to the preamble of the IARC monograph series, correct?	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So we will mark as Exhibit 15-1 the report of the Science Advisory Group from May of 2005. (Exhibit 15-1, document entitled, "IARC Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," marked for identification, as of this date.) MR. LASKER: And then we will
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. LASKER: Q. Good morning, Dr. Portier. Dr. Portier, you served in May of 2005 as the chair of the IARC Science Advisory Board that recommended amendments to the preamble of the IARC monograph series, correct? A. I'm not sure of the date. But	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So we will mark as Exhibit 15-1 the report of the Science Advisory Group from May of 2005. (Exhibit 15-1, document entitled, "IARC Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," marked for identification, as of this date.) MR. LASKER: And then we will mark as 15-2 a document that is labeled
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. LASKER: Q. Good morning, Dr. Portier. Dr. Portier, you served in May of 2005 as the chair of the IARC Science Advisory Board that recommended amendments to the preamble of the IARC monograph series, correct? A. I'm not sure of the date. But the last time they did the preamble, I	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So we will mark as Exhibit 15-1 the report of the Science Advisory Group from May of 2005. (Exhibit 15-1, document entitled, "IARC Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," marked for identification, as of this date.) MR. LASKER: And then we will mark as 15-2 a document that is labeled "Discussion of Changes in the Draft
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. LASKER: Q. Good morning, Dr. Portier. Dr. Portier, you served in May of 2005 as the chair of the IARC Science Advisory Board that recommended amendments to the preamble of the IARC monograph series, correct? A. I'm not sure of the date. But the last time they did the preamble, I served as the chair. Actually, I was cochair.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So we will mark as Exhibit 15-1 the report of the Science Advisory Group from May of 2005. (Exhibit 15-1, document entitled, "IARC Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," marked for identification, as of this date.) MR. LASKER: And then we will mark as 15-2 a document that is labeled "Discussion of Changes in the Draft Preamble," which was prepared the same
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. LASKER: Q. Good morning, Dr. Portier. Dr. Portier, you served in May of 2005 as the chair of the IARC Science Advisory Board that recommended amendments to the preamble of the IARC monograph series, correct? A. I'm not sure of the date. But the last time they did the preamble, I served as the chair. Actually, I was cochair. Q. And the preamble is the document	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So we will mark as Exhibit 15-1 the report of the Science Advisory Group from May of 2005. (Exhibit 15-1, document entitled, "IARC Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," marked for identification, as of this date.) MR. LASKER: And then we will mark as 15-2 a document that is labeled "Discussion of Changes in the Draft Preamble," which was prepared the same time or following the Science
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. LASKER: Q. Good morning, Dr. Portier. Dr. Portier, you served in May of 2005 as the chair of the IARC Science Advisory Board that recommended amendments to the preamble of the IARC monograph series, correct? A. I'm not sure of the date. But the last time they did the preamble, I served as the chair. Actually, I was cochair. Q. And the preamble is the document that sets forth the methodology that IARC	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So we will mark as Exhibit 15-1 the report of the Science Advisory Group from May of 2005. (Exhibit 15-1, document entitled, "IARC Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," marked for identification, as of this date.) MR. LASKER: And then we will mark as 15-2 a document that is labeled "Discussion of Changes in the Draft Preamble," which was prepared the same time or following the Science Advisory Board meeting.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. LASKER: Q. Good morning, Dr. Portier. Dr. Portier, you served in May of 2005 as the chair of the IARC Science Advisory Board that recommended amendments to the preamble of the IARC monograph series, correct? A. I'm not sure of the date. But the last time they did the preamble, I served as the chair. Actually, I was cochair. Q. And the preamble is the document that sets forth the methodology that IARC working groups are required to follow in	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So we will mark as Exhibit 15-1 the report of the Science Advisory Group from May of 2005. (Exhibit 15-1, document entitled, "IARC Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," marked for identification, as of this date.) MR. LASKER: And then we will mark as 15-2 a document that is labeled "Discussion of Changes in the Draft Preamble," which was prepared the same time or following the Science Advisory Board meeting. (Exhibit 15-2, document entitled,
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. LASKER: Q. Good morning, Dr. Portier. Dr. Portier, you served in May of 2005 as the chair of the IARC Science Advisory Board that recommended amendments to the preamble of the IARC monograph series, correct? A. I'm not sure of the date. But the last time they did the preamble, I served as the chair. Actually, I was cochair. Q. And the preamble is the document that sets forth the methodology that IARC working groups are required to follow in reaching their carcinogenicity	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So we will mark as Exhibit 15-1 the report of the Science Advisory Group from May of 2005. (Exhibit 15-1, document entitled, "IARC Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," marked for identification, as of this date.) MR. LASKER: And then we will mark as 15-2 a document that is labeled "Discussion of Changes in the Draft Preamble," which was prepared the same time or following the Science Advisory Board meeting. (Exhibit 15-2, document entitled, "Discussion of Changes to Draft
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. LASKER: Q. Good morning, Dr. Portier. Dr. Portier, you served in May of 2005 as the chair of the IARC Science Advisory Board that recommended amendments to the preamble of the IARC monograph series, correct? A. I'm not sure of the date. But the last time they did the preamble, I served as the chair. Actually, I was cochair. Q. And the preamble is the document that sets forth the methodology that IARC working groups are required to follow in	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So we will mark as Exhibit 15-1 the report of the Science Advisory Group from May of 2005. (Exhibit 15-1, document entitled, "IARC Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," marked for identification, as of this date.) MR. LASKER: And then we will mark as 15-2 a document that is labeled "Discussion of Changes in the Draft Preamble," which was prepared the same time or following the Science Advisory Board meeting. (Exhibit 15-2, document entitled, "Discussion of Changes to Draft Preamble," marked for identification,
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. LASKER: Q. Good morning, Dr. Portier. Dr. Portier, you served in May of 2005 as the chair of the IARC Science Advisory Board that recommended amendments to the preamble of the IARC monograph series, correct? A. I'm not sure of the date. But the last time they did the preamble, I served as the chair. Actually, I was cochair. Q. And the preamble is the document that sets forth the methodology that IARC working groups are required to follow in reaching their carcinogenicity classifications, correct? A. That is correct.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So we will mark as Exhibit 15-1 the report of the Science Advisory Group from May of 2005. (Exhibit 15-1, document entitled, "IARC Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," marked for identification, as of this date.) MR. LASKER: And then we will mark as 15-2 a document that is labeled "Discussion of Changes in the Draft Preamble," which was prepared the same time or following the Science Advisory Board meeting. (Exhibit 15-2, document entitled, "Discussion of Changes to Draft Preamble," marked for identification, as of this date.)
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. LASKER: Q. Good morning, Dr. Portier. Dr. Portier, you served in May of 2005 as the chair of the IARC Science Advisory Board that recommended amendments to the preamble of the IARC monograph series, correct? A. I'm not sure of the date. But the last time they did the preamble, I served as the chair. Actually, I was cochair. Q. And the preamble is the document that sets forth the methodology that IARC working groups are required to follow in reaching their carcinogenicity classifications, correct? A. That is correct.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So we will mark as Exhibit 15-1 the report of the Science Advisory Group from May of 2005. (Exhibit 15-1, document entitled, "IARC Monographs on Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans," marked for identification, as of this date.) MR. LASKER: And then we will mark as 15-2 a document that is labeled "Discussion of Changes in the Draft Preamble," which was prepared the same time or following the Science Advisory Board meeting. (Exhibit 15-2, document entitled, "Discussion of Changes to Draft Preamble," marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. Dr. Portier, just to clarify the

Page 14 Page 16 1 1 concluded that animal cancer bioassays were correct? 2 2 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. being used less and less in looking at the 3 3 carcinogenicity of compounds and more and A. It does look like the report that 4 4 we prepared for IARC. more other types of mechanistic studies 5 5 were being used to supplant the need for a Q. And on the second page of the 6 6 report, in the listing of the participants, two-year chronic animal carcinogenicity 7 you are identified as the chair of this 7 study. 8 8 advisory group, correct? So that was the basis from which 9 A. That is correct. The cochair got 9 the discussion went on to look at the rest 10 10 ill, had to leave on the first date. 11 That's why I am listed as the only chair 11 Q. Dr. Portier, my question is a 12 12 and he is not listed. simple one. 13 Q. If we look at -- and the question 13 A. I know. I'm trying to find it in 14 14 was about the mechanistic data and some of here. 15 the recommendations of your committee. 15 "Changing the preamble to reflect If you could look at Exhibit 16 this possibility, also taking into 16 17 15-2, and particularly at page 7 -- I'm 17 account" ... 18 18 Yes, that's exactly what the sorry. 19 19 15-2 would be the changes, group said. 2.0 Dr. Portier? 20 Q. So the Science Advisory Board, 21 21 the chair recommended that the preamble be You're looking at 15-1? 22 22 A. Yes. Sorry. amended to mechanistic data alone could 23 23 Q. 15-2 is discussing some of the support a finding of possible 24 changes following your advisory group 24 carcinogenicity, correct? 2.5 25 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. recommendations. Page 15 Page 17 1 And on page 7, towards the bottom 1 There is more verbiage to it than 2 2 of the page -that. 3 A. Yes. O. But in effect, that was the 4 4 Q. -- there is a paragraph that recommendation, correct? starts, "The expert workshop recommended in 5 5 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 6 the consensus report." 6 A. No, there is more verbiage to it 7 7 Do you see that paragraph? than that. The verbiage deals with 8 A. Yes. extremely strong and strongest from other 9 relevant data could potentially be 9 Q. And then there is the sentence: 10 "Accordingly, the Advisory Group 10 classified by IARC in Group 2B. 11 recommended that an agent can be 11 Q. OK. I stand corrected. 12 characterized as possibly carcinogenic to 12 A. And to be clear, it says, 13 13 humans based solely on strong mechanistic "Similarly, an agent for which there is 14 data." 14 less than sufficient evidence from animal 15 15 studies." Correct? 16 16 A. That's what it says. That means you could have limited 17 17 evidence in animal studies, including Q. And that was one of the 18 recommendations of your advisory group? 18 inadequate evidence, and strong evidence 19 A. That's recommendation 12(d). 19 from other relevant data could potentially 20 2.0 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. be classified in Group 2B. 21 2.1 A. So the advisory group cites the So it's important that is 22 paper by McGregor, et al., which had looked 22 linked with the strong data. You can't do 23 at the presence or the ability to have data 23 it just because you have mechanistic data. Q. Understood. 24 on animal carcinogenicity studies for an 24 25 25 IARC monograph review, and McGregor Your advisory group also

Page 18 Page 20 1 recommended that the preamble be amended, your Science Advisory Board also reaffirmed 2 2 and if you want to look at pages 6 and 7 of the preamble's guidelines that IARC working the document, Exhibit 15-2, Discussion of 3 3 groups could only consider scientific 4 4 Changes in Draft Preamble, your Science studies in the published literature or 5 5 publicly available reports from national or Advisory Board also recommended that the 6 preamble be amended to allow for the 6 international agencies, correct? finding of sufficient evidence of 7 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 8 8 carcinogenicity in animals based on the A. That is correct. 9 results in a single animal study, correct? 9 O. In December of --10 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 10 A. But I believe that was in the 11 Q. And that is on the bottom of 11 previous preamble as well. We are simply 12 12 page 6, top of page 7. agreeing with the previous preamble. 13 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 13 Q. Correct. That was the question. 14 A. Actually, the only change we 14 A. That is correct. 15 changed from the previous preamble, what we 15 The previous preamble required that you have positive results from studies 16 were changing there was we could use 16 17 in two separate labs. The new preamble 17 government and international agency 18 18 documents provided they were publicly states that results in both sexes of a 19 19 single species in a GLP study can provide available. 20 sufficient evidence of carcinogenistic. 20 That was not in the previous 21 So you still have to have two 21 preamble. 22 22 positive findings of the carcinogenicity Q. Got it. 23 23 but they don't have to come from two In December of 2005, you then 24 separate laboratories. 24 served on the advisory group that reviewed 25 Q. Your Science Advisory Board also 25 and largely approved the recommendations Page 19 Page 21 1 endorsed -- page 3 on the changes, 1 that had been made by your Science Advisory 2 Exhibit 15 -- 15-2 -- also endorsed the use 2 Board, correct? 3 of metanalyses to evaluate the human MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 4 4 epidemiological data, correct? Q. And I can show you the documents 5 if that would make it easier for your call. 5 A. Can you tell me where it is on 6 6 A. I certainly don't remember that. here? 7 7 Q. Page 3, numeral 8 at the bottom. Please. 8 A. Oh, it's right there. MR. LASKER: So this will be 9 9 Yes. Exhibit 15-3. 10 10 Q. And if you look at -- let me go (Exhibit 15-3, document entitled, 11 11 back to 15-1, which is a report. "IARC Monographs on Evaluation of 12 Page 4 of 5 discusses the fact 12 Carcinogenic Risks to Human, Internal 13 Report 6/001," marked for 13 that your group also reaffirmed the 14 preamble's guidance that IARC working 14 identification, as of this date.) 15 groups could only consider scientific 15 O. You can turn to the second 16 studies in the published literature or 16 page -- third page, you will see your name 17 17 listed as part of the advisory group. publicly available reports from national 18 and international agencies, correct? 18 A. Yes, but so were many of the 19 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 19 others who helped were on the first 2.0 20 A. Do you know which issue this is? advisory group. 21 21 Q. Page 4 and 5 in Exhibit 15-1 at Q. Just so we have a clear record, 22 the bottom, it says, "Data from 22 in December of 2005, you also served on the 23 23 advisory group that reviewed and largely monographs"? 24 24 approved the recommendations made by your A. Yes. 25 25 earlier Science Advisory Board, correct? Q. And again, the question is that

Page 22 Page 24 1 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. groups. 2 2 A. There were several pieces to that On the IARC monographs, when they 3 3 question. Could you repeat it for me, came in to look at mechanistic data. I 4 4 please. didn't end up putting those points 5 5 together. That was done by IARC staff long Q. In December of 2005, you served 6 6 on the advisory group that reviewed and after I left. then approved the amendments to the 7 Q. Were you paid for your work as a 8 preamble, correct? 8 visiting scientist at IARC? 9 A. In 2005, I served on two advisory 9 A. IARC's visiting scientists are 10 groups. One made recommendations. The reimbursed for their expenses while they're 10 in Lyon during that period of time. And I 11 second one reviewed the new preamble to 11 12 make sure that it actually matched the 12 was reimbursed for those expenses; however, 13 13 they were reimbursement of expenses. It recommendations. 14 14 was not salary. Q. From 2013 to 2014, you served as 15 Q. In April of 2014, you then served 15 a visiting scientist at IARC, correct? A. From, I believe, October 2013 16 16 as the chair of the IARC advisory committee 17 'til April, March 2014, yes. 17 that designated glyphosate as a medium 18 18 Q. What work were you doing for IARC priority for review for carcinogenicity, 19 19 during this period? correct? 20 20 A. What work was I doing for IARC MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 21 during this period? 21 22 22 I did several things. There was A. In -- was it April of 2014 -- if 23 23 some joint collaborations on looking at that's the correct date, I can't be 24 genotoxicity due to a variety of chemicals 24 absolutely certain -- in April of 2014, I 2.5 using proteomics, metabolomics and 25 chaired the IARC working group that looked Page 23 Page 25 1 genomics. 1 at approximately 200 chemicals that were 2 2 I gave a seminar on genomics and nominated to the program by outside 3 genomic issues and some network modeling individuals to see what priority should be 4 that allows you to pull up our genomic data placed on evaluating those 200 compounds in 4 5 5 and gave talks on that. the next five years for the IARC. 6 We worked on a manuscript that 6 Q. And that group, among other 7 7 was recently published that looked at the decisions it made, designated glyphosate as 8 8 ten characteristics of carcinogenesis, so I a medium priority for review, correct? 9 9 worked on that. A. Yes, that group recommended 10 We were working on a review of 10 glyphosate for medium priority review. 11 the model -- of the Monographs 100. The 11 Q. Do you recall who asked you to Monographs 100 reviewed all of the known 12 12 serve as the chair of that committee? 13 human carcinogens, and we had a couple of 13 A. I don't remember which member of 14 questions we wanted to ask from the known 14 the staff was running that committee but 15 human carcinogens, such as how often do 15 probably Kurt Straif, the head of the 16 cancer seen in the animal match the cancer 16 program. 17 17 seen in humans? And other issues along Q. At the time you served as the 18 those lines. How many times do rats match 18 chair of this 2014 advisory committee, you 19 mice and how often is a mechanism tied to a 19 had been serving as well for over a year as 20 specific tumor in humans rather than any 2.0 a senior scientist for the Environmental 21 tumor in humans? 21 Defense Fund, correct? 22 22 So we were analyzing that data. A. I was working one day per week as 23 And then we were using that at the same 23 a senior contributing scientist with the 24 time to put together some guidance -- some 24 Environmental Defense Fund, yes. points for guidance for mechanistic work 25 25 O. The Environmental Defense Fund

Page 26 Page 28 1 1 was founded in the late 1960s in connection person's environment that adhered to the 2 2 with concerns about a pesticide called DDT, latex -- the special latex that's on the 3 3 wristband, and then that was in turn correct? 4 4 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. evaluated by GC mass spec to find out how 5 5 A. I've never spent time looking at much of each of these the people had 6 6 the history of the Environmental Defense encountered. 7 Fund. So I really have no idea. 7 Q. Again, the wristband project that 8 8 I've heard the same story as you. the Environmental Defense Fund conducted 9 9 Q. So your understanding is the and you advised on was measuring human 10 10 Environmental Defense Fund got started exposures to pesticides and other 11 around the issue of the pesticide DDT? 11 chemicals, correct? 12 12 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked 13 A. Someone has told me that the 13 and answered. 14 14 Environmental Defense Fund began from a A. I don't really know if they had 15 15 group of scientists on Long Island in New pesticides on the list of chemicals they 16 16 York who were trying to get DDT, a terrible measured. I can remember some of them but 17 environmental toxin, out of the -- out of 17 I can't remember exactly whether there were 18 18 their water, out of their air. pesticides on there. But certainly, there 19 19 were chemicals on that list. Q. And the Environmental Defense 20 Fund over the ensuing 50 years continued to 20 (Exhibit 15-4, e-mail chain, 21 21 be active in opposing various pesticides, dated October 21, 2015, marked for 22 22 identification, as of this date.) correct? 23 23 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Q. Dr. Portier, I have provided you 24 A. I have no knowledge of that. 24 with a copy of an e-mail exchange. It 2.5 Q. During the same time that you 25 starts off as an e-mail exchange between Page 27 Page 29 1 1 were working with IARC in reviewing you and Linda Birnbaum on October 21, 2015. 2 2 glyphosate and other pesticides, you were Correct? 3 also working with the Environmental Defense A. October 21, 2015, to Linda 4 4 Fund in promoting a wristband project which Birnbaum at -- at NIEHS, yes. 5 was seeking to measure human exposures to 5 O. For the record, who is Linda 6 pesticides and other chemicals, correct? 6 Birnbaum? 7 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Linda Birnbaum is the director of 8 8 A. I can't -- I do not know the the National Institute of Environmental 9 9 answer to that question. The time frame is Health Sciences and the director of the 10 10 National Toxicology Program, former the issue here. 11 Q. So you do recall that you worked 11 president of the Society of Toxicology, and 12 with the Environmental Defense Fund on the 12 a lot of other big, important titles. 13 wristband project, correct? 13 O. In this e-mail, you discuss two 14 A. But I can't be certain such work 14 issues with Dr. Birnbaum: One dealing with 15 15 work you're doing for the Environmental was done while I was also at IARC. 16 16 Defense Fund, and the second being work Q. I understand. I want to see if I 17 17 get a clear answer to this: You do recall that you're doing in connection with 18 working with the Environmental Defense Fund 18 glyphosate, correct? 19 on their wristband project, correct? 19 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 20 2.0 A. I do recall advising them on A. Could you ask the question again, 21 21 their wristband project, yes. please. 22 Q. And the wristband project was 22 Q. Sure. 23 measuring human exposures to pesticides and 23 In your e-mail of October 21, 24 other chemicals, correct? 24 2015, you are discussing two issues: One 25 25 A. It was measuring anything in the is the work that you are doing for the

Page 30 Page 32 Environmental Defense Fund, and the second O. Your affiliation with the 2 2 is the work that you have been doing with Environmental Defense Fund was not 3 3 respect to glyphosate and a European disclosed in that April 2014 IARC advisory 4 regulatory decision about cancer, correct? committee report, correct? 5 5 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Why is there a blacked-out 6 A. Again, could you repeat the 7 7 section in this letter? I don't understand question. 8 8 that. O. Sure. 9 9 Q. This was a document that was April 2014, you served as the 10 10 produced by the government and they blacked chair of the IARC advisory committee that 11 11 designated glyphosate as a medium priority? it out. 12 12 A. OK. A. Correct. 13 Anyway, the first paragraph deals 13 O. Your affiliation with the 14 14 with the work I'm doing in Europe on Environmental Defense Fund was not 15 15 reregistration of glyphosate, which I find disclosed in that IARC advisory committee 16 fascinating, and the second part deals with 16 report, correct? 17 the work on wristbands with EDF. 17 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 18 18 MR. LASKER: And then if we can A. The IARC advisory committee 19 19 report did not list -- well, I'd have to mark as Exhibit 15-5. 20 (Exhibit 15-5, report entitled, 20 look now. I'd have to see a copy of the 21 "Chem Daily Text Project: New 21 report. I'm sorry. 22 Technology Sheds Light on Chemicals in 22 Q. Do you recall whether IARC Our Environment," marked for 23 knew -- at the time that you served as 23 24 identification, as of this date.) 24 chair of their advisory committee, do you 25 O. And this Exhibit 15-5 is the 25 know if they knew of your work with the Page 31 Page 33 1 Environmental Defense Fund's report on its 1 Environmental Defense Fund? 2 2 wristband project, correct? A. Yes. 3 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Q. Shortly after your advisory group 4 4 A. Yes, I believe this is EDF's designated glyphosate as a medium priority, 5 IARC announced it would be convening a 5 report on their wristband testing project. 6 Q. As reflected in this report, the 6 working group to evaluate a number of 7 7 wristband project that you consulted on for pesticides for -- to determine whether they 8 8 Environmental Defense Fund reported results could be classified as carcinogens, 9 9 for detections of pesticides as -- if you correct? 10 10 look at the second page, 12 different A. I don't know. 11 11 MR. LASKER: I'm going to mark pesticides as part of its analysis and the as -- we will make this the next two in 12 12 findings of pesticides in 93 percent of the 13 13 line, Exhibit 15-6 and 15-7, two participants, correct? 14 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 14 notices from IARC announcing upcoming 15 meetings, particularly meeting 112. 15 A. This does then clarify that I 16 16 And for the record, I will couldn't remember if there were pesticides, 17 17 represent that these documents were but yes, obviously, there were pesticides 18 pulled off of IARC's website using 18 in here. And that the pesticides were seen 19 something called a Wayback Machine, 19 in -- I have to look and find that 20 which allows you to actually date when 2.0 percentage. I'm sorry. 21 it appeared on the IARC website. 2.1 Q. The first page will show you the 22 22 percentage in the blocked-out, gray area in So the first document is dated 23 23 July 16, 2014, and the second is the gray box. 24 24 October 7, 2014. A. 93 percent detected one or more 25 25 pesticides, that is correct. (Exhibit 15-6, IARC announcement,

Page 34 Page 36 1 1 dated July 16, 2014, marked for Q. But just to be clear, glyphosate 2 2 identification, as of this date.) is not an organophosphate insecticide, 3 3 (Exhibit 15-7, IARC announcement, correct? 4 dated October 7, 2014, marked for 4 A. That is correct. 5 5 identification, as of this date.) Q. The working group 112, you 6 MS. GREENWALD: Which is which? 6 ultimately were asked to serve as an 7 MR. LASKER: July 16 is the 6, invited specialist to this committee, 8 8 and October 7 is the 7. So correct? 9 9 chronological order. A. I was asked to serve as an 10 10 Q. So just so we have the timing invited specialist to this committee. I 11 correct, in April of 2014, your advisory 11 was asked -- yes. 12 12 committee designated glyphosate as medium Q. Let me ask: Did you ask to serve 13 13 priority, correct? on the committee or did somebody ask you to 14 14 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. serve on the committee? 15 15 A. In --A. I was asked in the normal way 16 16 Q. April of 2014. that IARC asks people to serve on these 17 17 committees, by an e-mail sent to me --A. -- '14, the advisory group 18 18 recommended several compounds for high first, they call you and say, "Are you 19 19 priority and some for medium priority, of interested?" And then they send you an 2.0 which glyphosate is one of the products. 20 e-mail. 21 21 Q. And in July of 2014, IARC Q. Do you recall who asked you to 22 announced meeting 112, which was going to 22 serve as an invited specialist for working 23 23 be focused on organophosphate insecticides, group 112? 24 correct? 24 A. No. I really don't recall. It 25 25 could have been any member of the staff. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Page 35 Page 37 1 A. It appears from your Wayback 1 Q. An invited specialist is someone 2 Machine review that that is the date which 2 whom IARC believes has critical knowledge 3 3 IARC put up this notice that says, "Some and experience on a matter but has real or 4 4 organophosphate insecticides, not apparent conflicts of interest, correct? 5 specifically glyphosate." MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 5 6 Q. And then October 7, 2014, that 6 A. The definition of an "invited 7 7 notice was amended and for meeting 112, specialist" is part of the preamble. And 8 they now also include glyphosate to be if what you have just said is a quote from 9 9 reviewed, correct? the preamble, then that would be correct. 10 10 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Q. Well, why don't we take a look at 11 11 A. It appears that, from your the preamble then. 12 Wayback Machine, October 7, that that is 12 A. I don't have it yet. 13 Q. You are about to get it. 13 correct, that in October, IARC appended 14 herbicides to their organophosphate 14 A. I thought you had given it to me. 15 15 (Exhibit 15-8, document entitled, insecticides review. 16 16 It is not uncommon for IARC to "IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of 17 17 Carcinogenic Risks to Humans Preamble, group chemicals when they do reviews if the 18 chemicals have similar behavior or the 18 marked for identification, as of this 19 19 datasets for the chemicals come from date.) 2.0 2.0 similar sources. Q. If you could look at page 4 of 21 21 So because many people -- many of the preamble, line 32 to 33 -- they are 22 the epidemiology studies were pesticides 22 nice enough to have line numbers for us. 23 23 and herbicides combined, it makes good A. That is the definition. 24 sense to do it here because you're 24 Q. So invited specialist is someone 25 25 reviewing the same epidemiological studies. who IARC believes has critical knowledge

Page 38 Page 40 1 and expertise on the matter but who has a 1 glyphosate for review, had you reviewed the 2 2 real or apparent conflict of interest, science on glyphosate prior to being 3 3 appointed to working group 112? correct? 4 A. That is what it says, that is 4 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 5 5 correct. form. 6 Q. Your conflict of interest arose 6 A. Prior to being appointed to 7 because of your role with the Environmental working group 112, I had not looked at any 8 8 Defense Fund, correct? of the scientific evidence on the 9 9 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. carcinogenicity of glyphosate. 10 Q. Let me show you an e-mail that we 10 A. To be clear, it's a perceived 11 11 conflict of interest, not necessarily a received from one of the other working 12 group members. 12 conflict of interest. And they're very 13 clear here on the language that it have --13 MR. LASKER: And we will mark 14 14 they talk about apparent or real. this as 15-9. In this case, it is a perception 15 15 (Exhibit 15-9, e-mail dated March that this is a conflict of interest. But 16 16 3, 2015, marked for identification, as 17 yes, that was the perceived conflict of 17 of this date.) 18 18 interest that they were concerned about. A. What is this? 19 19 Q. And you had that same conflict of Q. This is an e-mail that is dated 20 interest when you served as the chair of 20 March 3, 2015, which was the beginning of 21 the advisory committee that prioritized 21 the IARC 112 working group time period. 22 22 glyphosate for evaluation, correct? A. OK. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 23 Q. The subject line is "E-mail 23 2.4 A. The correct answer to the 24 Subgroup 4," which is the subgroup on 2.5 25 mechanisms, correct? question is no. Page 39 Page 41 1 And here is why that's the 1 A. That would usually -- yes, that 2 2 correct answer to the question as you asked would be it. 3 it: The 2014 meeting was an advisory Q. And this is creating an e-mail 4 tree of the members on this subcommittee. 4 group, not a monograph meeting. So it 5 doesn't work under the same rules as the correct? 6 6 preamble. So that's case No. 1. A. That appears to be the case, yes. 7 But IARC does give you a form Q. And you were included as one of 8 that you have to fill out for potential the individuals working on subgroup 4 at 9 9 conflicts of interest for every meeting. working group 112, correct? 10 For that meeting, because it was 10 A. That is correct. 11 an advisory group, and because I was only 11 Q. Were you assigned by IARC to work 12 12 doing work with the Environmental Defense with the mechanism subgroup? 13 13 Fund on issues related to air pollution and A. Yes, I was. 14 climate change and hydraulic fracking, in 14 Q. Were you tasked with preparing 15 15 my opinion. I did not think it was a any analyses before the actual physical 16 conflict of interest, and therefore, I did 16 meeting in Lyon? 17 17 A. No, I was not. not list it. 18 Q. And do you recall, sitting here 18 Q. We have a couple of other e-mails 19 today, whether during that period in April 19 between the mechanistic subgroup members I 20 2.0 of 2014, you had begun consulting with the would like to ask you about. 21 21 Environmental Defense Fund on the wristband (Exhibit 15-10, e-mail dated 2.2 project? 22 March 4, 2015, marked for 23 23 identification, as of this date.) A. I do not recall. 24 24 Q. Aside from your role on the Q. This March 4, 2015 e-mail, again, 25 25 advisory committee that prioritized to members of subgroup 4, and you're

	Page 42		Page 44
1	included, correct, as a recipient of this	1	group 112, correct?
2	e-mail?	2	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.
3	A. Yes, I'm included, and yes, it's	3	A. This is an e-mail. It deals with
4	an e-mail to it appears to be subgroup 4	4	the work of Section 4 during the IARC
5	with a copy to Kate Guyton.	5	monograph.
6	Q. This March 4, 2015 e-mail to you	6	Q. During the working group 112, did
7	and the other mechanism folks attached an	7	you spend all of your time when the meeting
8	early draft of Sections 4.6 and a summary	8	was not in plenary session with the
9	of 4.5 for each of the four chemicals being	9	mechanism subgroup?
10	reviewed, including glyphosate, correct?	10	A. No.
11	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	11	Q. What other subgroups did you
12	A. It seems to say that Section 4.6	12	well, let me ask this: Did you go from
13	in summary of 4.5, two- or-three sentence	13	different subgroup to different subgroup
14	summary, was attached.	14	during the meeting?
15	Q. And Dr. Martin is providing you	15	A. No. I spent a short period of
16	all with this summary to provide folks with	16	time with the animal carcinogenicity
17	something to include in their respective	17	subgroup.
18	4.6 sections, correct?	18	Q. Do you recall when that was?
19	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	19	A. No, I do not recall.
20	A. I don't know.	20	Q. Did they ask for you to help them
21	Q. The last clause	21	out or did you decide on your own to spend
22	A. Oh, I see, yes, Section 4.6 is	22	some time with them?
23	the summary of the Section 4 evaluation.	23	A. They asked for me to help them
24	Q. And were you working on one of	24	out.
25	the 4.6 sections?	25	Q. Do you recall what specifically
	Page 43		Page 45
1	Page 43 A. No, I don't write any of the	1	Page 45 they asked you to help them with?
1 2		1 2	
	A. No, I don't write any of the		they asked you to help them with?
2	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph.	2	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do.
2	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March	2 3	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that?
2 3 4	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March 6, 2015 e-mail. This will be	2 3 4 5 6	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that? A. The topic dealt with the, I believe, kidney tumors in the Knezevich and I forget the name of the authors
2 3 4 5	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March 6, 2015 e-mail. This will be Exhibit 15-11.	2 3 4 5	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that? A. The topic dealt with the, I believe, kidney tumors in the Knezevich
2 3 4 5 6	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March 6, 2015 e-mail. This will be Exhibit 15-11. (Exhibit 15-11, e-mail dated	2 3 4 5 6	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that? A. The topic dealt with the, I believe, kidney tumors in the Knezevich and I forget the name of the authors
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March 6, 2015 e-mail. This will be Exhibit 15-11. (Exhibit 15-11, e-mail dated March 6, 2015, marked for	2 3 4 5 6 7	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that? A. The topic dealt with the, I believe, kidney tumors in the Knezevich and I forget the name of the authors rat study, and the question had to deal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March 6, 2015 e-mail. This will be Exhibit 15-11. (Exhibit 15-11, e-mail dated March 6, 2015, marked for identification, as of this date.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that? A. The topic dealt with the, I believe, kidney tumors in the Knezevich and I forget the name of the authors rat study, and the question had to deal with historical controls.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March 6, 2015 e-mail. This will be Exhibit 15-11. (Exhibit 15-11, e-mail dated March 6, 2015, marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. And this is a this e-mail is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that? A. The topic dealt with the, I believe, kidney tumors in the Knezevich and I forget the name of the authors rat study, and the question had to deal with historical controls. Q. So just to be clear, is this a Knezevich rat study or a Knezevich mouse study?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March 6, 2015 e-mail. This will be Exhibit 15-11. (Exhibit 15-11, e-mail dated March 6, 2015, marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. And this is a this e-mail is from Kathryn Guyton, and she is with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that? A. The topic dealt with the, I believe, kidney tumors in the Knezevich and I forget the name of the authors rat study, and the question had to deal with historical controls. Q. So just to be clear, is this a Knezevich rat study or a Knezevich mouse
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March 6, 2015 e-mail. This will be Exhibit 15-11. (Exhibit 15-11, e-mail dated March 6, 2015, marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. And this is a this e-mail is from Kathryn Guyton, and she is with the IARC staff, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that? A. The topic dealt with the, I believe, kidney tumors in the Knezevich and I forget the name of the authors rat study, and the question had to deal with historical controls. Q. So just to be clear, is this a Knezevich rat study or a Knezevich mouse study?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March 6, 2015 e-mail. This will be Exhibit 15-11. (Exhibit 15-11, e-mail dated March 6, 2015, marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. And this is a this e-mail is from Kathryn Guyton, and she is with the IARC staff, correct? A. Uh-huh. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that? A. The topic dealt with the, I believe, kidney tumors in the Knezevich and I forget the name of the authors rat study, and the question had to deal with historical controls. Q. So just to be clear, is this a Knezevich rat study or a Knezevich mouse study? A. I guess Knezevich I'm hoping was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March 6, 2015 e-mail. This will be Exhibit 15-11. (Exhibit 15-11, e-mail dated March 6, 2015, marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. And this is a this e-mail is from Kathryn Guyton, and she is with the IARC staff, correct? A. Uh-huh. Yes. Q. And there is an e-mail to you and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that? A. The topic dealt with the, I believe, kidney tumors in the Knezevich and I forget the name of the authors rat study, and the question had to deal with historical controls. Q. So just to be clear, is this a Knezevich rat study or a Knezevich mouse study? A. I guess Knezevich I'm hoping was a mouse study and it's the mouse study. Sorry. There are so many studies, I get
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March 6, 2015 e-mail. This will be Exhibit 15-11. (Exhibit 15-11, e-mail dated March 6, 2015, marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. And this is a this e-mail is from Kathryn Guyton, and she is with the IARC staff, correct? A. Uh-huh. Yes. Q. And there is an e-mail to you and other subgroup 4 working group folks again	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that? A. The topic dealt with the, I believe, kidney tumors in the Knezevich and I forget the name of the authors rat study, and the question had to deal with historical controls. Q. So just to be clear, is this a Knezevich rat study or a Knezevich mouse study? A. I guess Knezevich I'm hoping was a mouse study and it's the mouse study. Sorry. There are so many studies, I get confused.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March 6, 2015 e-mail. This will be Exhibit 15-11. (Exhibit 15-11, e-mail dated March 6, 2015, marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. And this is a this e-mail is from Kathryn Guyton, and she is with the IARC staff, correct? A. Uh-huh. Yes. Q. And there is an e-mail to you and other subgroup 4 working group folks again talking about the work that the mechanistic	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that? A. The topic dealt with the, I believe, kidney tumors in the Knezevich and I forget the name of the authors rat study, and the question had to deal with historical controls. Q. So just to be clear, is this a Knezevich rat study or a Knezevich mouse study? A. I guess Knezevich I'm hoping was a mouse study and it's the mouse study. Sorry. There are so many studies, I get confused. Q. Do you recall specifically what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March 6, 2015 e-mail. This will be Exhibit 15-11. (Exhibit 15-11, e-mail dated March 6, 2015, marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. And this is a this e-mail is from Kathryn Guyton, and she is with the IARC staff, correct? A. Uh-huh. Yes. Q. And there is an e-mail to you and other subgroup 4 working group folks again talking about the work that the mechanistic subgroup was doing during this period,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that? A. The topic dealt with the, I believe, kidney tumors in the Knezevich and I forget the name of the authors rat study, and the question had to deal with historical controls. Q. So just to be clear, is this a Knezevich rat study or a Knezevich mouse study? A. I guess Knezevich I'm hoping was a mouse study and it's the mouse study. Sorry. There are so many studies, I get confused. Q. Do you recall specifically what their question was with respect to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March 6, 2015 e-mail. This will be Exhibit 15-11. (Exhibit 15-11, e-mail dated March 6, 2015, marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. And this is a this e-mail is from Kathryn Guyton, and she is with the IARC staff, correct? A. Uh-huh. Yes. Q. And there is an e-mail to you and other subgroup 4 working group folks again talking about the work that the mechanistic subgroup was doing during this period, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that? A. The topic dealt with the, I believe, kidney tumors in the Knezevich and I forget the name of the authors rat study, and the question had to deal with historical controls. Q. So just to be clear, is this a Knezevich rat study or a Knezevich mouse study? A. I guess Knezevich I'm hoping was a mouse study and it's the mouse study. Sorry. There are so many studies, I get confused. Q. Do you recall specifically what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March 6, 2015 e-mail. This will be Exhibit 15-11. (Exhibit 15-11, e-mail dated March 6, 2015, marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. And this is a this e-mail is from Kathryn Guyton, and she is with the IARC staff, correct? A. Uh-huh. Yes. Q. And there is an e-mail to you and other subgroup 4 working group folks again talking about the work that the mechanistic subgroup was doing during this period, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that? A. The topic dealt with the, I believe, kidney tumors in the Knezevich and I forget the name of the authors rat study, and the question had to deal with historical controls. Q. So just to be clear, is this a Knezevich rat study or a Knezevich mouse study? A. I guess Knezevich I'm hoping was a mouse study and it's the mouse study. Sorry. There are so many studies, I get confused. Q. Do you recall specifically what their question was with respect to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March 6, 2015 e-mail. This will be Exhibit 15-11. (Exhibit 15-11, e-mail dated March 6, 2015, marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. And this is a this e-mail is from Kathryn Guyton, and she is with the IARC staff, correct? A. Uh-huh. Yes. Q. And there is an e-mail to you and other subgroup 4 working group folks again talking about the work that the mechanistic subgroup was doing during this period, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's a complicated question.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that? A. The topic dealt with the, I believe, kidney tumors in the Knezevich and I forget the name of the authors rat study, and the question had to deal with historical controls. Q. So just to be clear, is this a Knezevich rat study or a Knezevich mouse study? A. I guess Knezevich I'm hoping was a mouse study and it's the mouse study. Sorry. There are so many studies, I get confused. Q. Do you recall specifically what their question was with respect to historical controls? A. The question was did this tumor appear to be significant because of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March 6, 2015 e-mail. This will be Exhibit 15-11. (Exhibit 15-11, e-mail dated March 6, 2015, marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. And this is a this e-mail is from Kathryn Guyton, and she is with the IARC staff, correct? A. Uh-huh. Yes. Q. And there is an e-mail to you and other subgroup 4 working group folks again talking about the work that the mechanistic subgroup was doing during this period, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's a complicated question. Q. OK, I'm not sure it's complicated	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that? A. The topic dealt with the, I believe, kidney tumors in the Knezevich and I forget the name of the authors rat study, and the question had to deal with historical controls. Q. So just to be clear, is this a Knezevich rat study or a Knezevich mouse study? A. I guess Knezevich I'm hoping was a mouse study and it's the mouse study. Sorry. There are so many studies, I get confused. Q. Do you recall specifically what their question was with respect to historical controls? A. The question was did this tumor appear to be significant because of the historical control population that had been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March 6, 2015 e-mail. This will be Exhibit 15-11. (Exhibit 15-11, e-mail dated March 6, 2015, marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. And this is a this e-mail is from Kathryn Guyton, and she is with the IARC staff, correct? A. Uh-huh. Yes. Q. And there is an e-mail to you and other subgroup 4 working group folks again talking about the work that the mechanistic subgroup was doing during this period, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's a complicated question. Q. OK, I'm not sure it's complicated but I'll ask it again.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that? A. The topic dealt with the, I believe, kidney tumors in the Knezevich and I forget the name of the authors rat study, and the question had to deal with historical controls. Q. So just to be clear, is this a Knezevich rat study or a Knezevich mouse study? A. I guess Knezevich I'm hoping was a mouse study and it's the mouse study. Sorry. There are so many studies, I get confused. Q. Do you recall specifically what their question was with respect to historical controls? A. The question was did this tumor appear to be significant because of the historical control population that had been identified, and then, also, where could
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March 6, 2015 e-mail. This will be Exhibit 15-11. (Exhibit 15-11, e-mail dated March 6, 2015, marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. And this is a this e-mail is from Kathryn Guyton, and she is with the IARC staff, correct? A. Uh-huh. Yes. Q. And there is an e-mail to you and other subgroup 4 working group folks again talking about the work that the mechanistic subgroup was doing during this period, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's a complicated question. Q. OK, I'm not sure it's complicated but I'll ask it again. This e-mail between you and the other individuals working on the mechanism subgroup was part of the work that was done	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that? A. The topic dealt with the, I believe, kidney tumors in the Knezevich and I forget the name of the authors rat study, and the question had to deal with historical controls. Q. So just to be clear, is this a Knezevich rat study or a Knezevich mouse study? A. I guess Knezevich I'm hoping was a mouse study and it's the mouse study. Sorry. There are so many studies, I get confused. Q. Do you recall specifically what their question was with respect to historical controls? A. The question was did this tumor appear to be significant because of the historical control population that had been identified, and then, also, where could they get code to do a trend test on that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. No, I don't write any of the sections in the IARC monograph. MR. LASKER: We also have a March 6, 2015 e-mail. This will be Exhibit 15-11. (Exhibit 15-11, e-mail dated March 6, 2015, marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. And this is a this e-mail is from Kathryn Guyton, and she is with the IARC staff, correct? A. Uh-huh. Yes. Q. And there is an e-mail to you and other subgroup 4 working group folks again talking about the work that the mechanistic subgroup was doing during this period, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's a complicated question. Q. OK, I'm not sure it's complicated but I'll ask it again. This e-mail between you and the other individuals working on the mechanism	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	they asked you to help them with? A. Yes, I do. Q. What was that? A. The topic dealt with the, I believe, kidney tumors in the Knezevich and I forget the name of the authors rat study, and the question had to deal with historical controls. Q. So just to be clear, is this a Knezevich rat study or a Knezevich mouse study? A. I guess Knezevich I'm hoping was a mouse study and it's the mouse study. Sorry. There are so many studies, I get confused. Q. Do you recall specifically what their question was with respect to historical controls? A. The question was did this tumor appear to be significant because of the historical control population that had been identified, and then, also, where could

Page 46 Page 48 1 1 Q. Did you provide them with the -assessment of the data. 2 2 did you advise them as to where they could Do you recall that? 3 3 find code to conduct a trend test on the MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 4 data? 4 A. At every IARC monograph meeting 5 5 about midweek there were presentations from A. I gave them some suggestions of 6 where to look. I was unaware of any place 6 each of the working groups as to where they 7 where it could be found, if I recall -- if 7 are and where they think the decisions are 8 8 I recall correctly. going. 9 9 Q. Did you assist in calculating Q. Let me show you copies of some 10 10 the -- the trend test that appears for that handwritten notes that we received from 11 study in the IARC monograph? 11 Dr. Matthew Ross from Mississippi State. 12 12 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. MR. LASKER: And we will mark 13 13 A. I'm not sure what you're asking this as next in line. It's 15-12. 14 14 (Exhibit 15-12, handwritten notes me. Q. The IARC --15 15 dated 3/6/15, marked for 16 16 A. The p-value was obtained from a identification, as of this date.) 17 program identified by one of the members in 17 O. Dr. Ross was a member of the 18 18 either that subgroup or the mechanism mechanism subgroup with you, correct? 19 19 subgroup, and that person ran the code. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 20 Q. Do you recall who that was? 20 A. Dr. Ross was a member of the 21 A. I think it -- I'd have to see a 21 mechanism subgroup. 22 22 list of the authors of the monograph and I Q. Now, on the last page of these 23 could probably pull -- I'm terrible with notes, Dr. Ross has written some notes 23 24 names -- I could probably pull it from the 24 about what was being said about glyphosate 25 25 at this meeting. And -list. Page 47 Page 49 Q. Did you review the statistical 1 A. Where is this? 2 analysis after it was conducted? 2 Q. This would be the last page, the 3 bottom half of the page. Do you see A. Yes, I did. 4 4 Q. While you were at the monograph group 1, group 2, group 3, group 4, with 5 meeting? listings for glyphosate? A. Yes, I did. 6 It's going to be the last page of 7 7 Q. And did you verify that that the document. 8 analysis was conducted correctly? A. Yes, I do see that. 9 9 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Q. And there are notes for 10 10 A. I verified that the approximate subgroup 1, which is for exposure data, 11 11 correct? p-value from the Armitage linear trend test 12 that was run in that analysis appeared to 12 A. Correct. 13 13 be correct. O. And there's a notation here. 14 Q. Did you understand at the time 14 "Detectable in water and food." 15 15 that that was an approximate trend test? Do you recall that discussion? 16 16 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 17 17 A. I did not know it either way. A. Not specifically. But it is 18 Q. Did you attend any of the plenary 18 normal. 19 suggestions that was conducted during that 19 Q. And then there is a note for 2.0 2.0 week for working group 112? subgroup 2 for human data, correct? 21 2.1 A. All of them. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 22 Q. And about midway through the 22 A. There appears to be a note on 23 23 week, there was a -- there was a glyphosate in human data under group 2. 24 24 Q. And Dr. Ross' notes indicate that presentation before the plenary in which 25 25 the subgroups provided their initial subgroup 2 stated that glyphosate was

Page 50 Page 52 1 1 negative NHL, and then says, "Case control conduct their analysis and then after the 2 2 glyph" with an arrow "NHL," and then a first few days of the subgroup meeting, 3 notation, "AHS negative data," correct? 3 correct? 4 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 4 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 5 5 A. That's exactly what it says. A. In a typical IARC monograph 6 6 Q. And "AHS" is referring to the meeting, midway through the week, the 7 Agricultural Health Study, correct? 7 animal group would have gone through each 8 8 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. of the papers together, discussed problems 9 9 with the paper, and were beginning to think A. I can't presume that. 10 about where they would go with the call, 10 Q. Do you recall whether there was 11 11 discussions at the Agricultural Health that is correct. 12 12 Study during this working group meeting? Q. Do you recall yourself voicing 13 A. Of course there were discussions 13 any objections to the animal group's 14 preliminary assessment of the glyphosate 14 of the Agricultural Health Study during 15 15 this meeting. data? 16 16 Q. With respect to group 3 --A. At this point? 17 subgroup 3, that is the animal subgroup, 17 I might have -- I wouldn't have 18 18 voiced concern at their calling it correct? 19 19 "limited." But I might have voiced concern A. That is correct. That's -- if 20 this note pertains to that, yes. 20 at their interpretation of one or two of 21 21 Q. And Dr. Ross wrote down that the the studies. 22 animal subgroup said that the animal 22 Q. Let me show you another e-mail we received from Dr. Ross. 23 carcinogenicity data for glyphosate was 23 24 limited to inadequate, correct? 24 (Exhibit 15-13, e-mail dated 25 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 25 March 11, 2015, marked for Page 51 Page 53 1 A. It -- he has written a note that 1 identification, as of this date.) 2 says, "Glyphosate - limited to inadequate." 2 Q. Dr. Portier, Exhibit 15-13 is an 3 Q. "Limited" and "inadequate" are e-mail from Ivan Rusyn initially to -- it 4 doesn't have a "To" line here but it is 4 both defined terms in the IARC preamble, 5 discussing convening group 4 downstairs in 5 correct? 6 6 the first coffee break on March 9, 2015. A. For the animal data, yes. 7 7 Q. Do you recall a presentation Do you recall attending a meeting 8 8 during a plenary session in working of group 4 -- March 9, just to refresh your 9 9 group 112 where the animal subgroup was recollection, will be the second-to-last 10 discussing the animal data for glyphosate 10 day of the IARC working group meeting. 11 11 as being limited to inadequate? Do you recall attending a coffee 12 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 12 break meeting of the mechanism subgroup on 13 13 A. I can't recall. March 9, 2015? 14 Q. You don't recall one way or the 14 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 15 15 A. There is no way I could recall a other? 16 A. No. This is a preliminary -- if small submeeting at an IARC monograph 17 17 meeting and whether I was in attendance or he is taking notes from the preliminary 18 meeting, it's just a preliminary meeting. 18 not. 19 And so I have no clue as to -- I mean, it's 19 Q. Do you recall discussions with 2.0 typical to have these discussions in 2.0 respect to whether or not glyphosate should 21 2.1 plenary midweek. be classified as 2B or 2A under the IARC 22 Q. And just so the record is clear, 22 classification scheme? 23 this would have been a presentation by the 23 A. Could you ask the question again? 24 animal subgroup after the period of time 24 I want to be clear I got that question 25 25 that it had taken prior to the meeting to right.

Page 54 Page 56 1 1 Q. Do you recall discussions during working group ultimately decided that the 2 2 the working group meeting with members of animal data was sufficient for glyphosate, 3 3 group 4 as to whether or not glyphosate is that correct? 4 should be classified as 2B, possible 4 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 5 carcinogen, or 2A, probable carcinogen? A. I can't be certain that's the way 5 6 6 A. I was specifically not allowed to it actually worked. 7 7 Q. You were at the meeting, do you do that. 8 8 So the answer to that question recall that's how it worked? 9 9 is: As an invited expert, I would have not A. I don't recall. I've seen cases 10 10 encouraged in one way or the other on any where the entire working group has changed 11 of the -- any of the final listings, but I 11 the recommendation in the plenary session 12 would have talked about the science and the 12 before. I can't remember. 13 13 interpretation of that science. Q. Following the working group 14 meeting, the working group's conclusions 14 Q. Would you have talked about 15 15 whether or not the -- in your opinion, the were published in an article in The Lancet, 16 16 mechanistic data was strong so as to correct? 17 17 allow -- and I recognize you wouldn't have A. Very brief summary, abstract more 18 18 continued in the next step -- but so as to than anything else, yes. 19 19 allow under the preamble glyphosate to be Q. Does IARC have an arrangement 2.0 moved from 2B to 2A? 20 with The Lancet to publish abstracts of its 21 21 meetings? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 22 2.2 A. Yes, they do. form. Q. This happens shortly after the 23 23 A. I specifically remember the 24 discussions that group had relative to the 24 meetings are concluded, correct? 2.5 strength of the evidence for mechanisms for 25 A. That is correct. Page 55 Page 57 1 glyphosate, and I clearly remember keeping 1 Q. Just so I understand the process, 2 my mouth shut. Because I was an invited 2 this is not a peer-reviewed article that 3 3 specialist and that was my job. appears in The Lancet correct? 4 Q. Do you recall that as of March MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 4 5 9 -- so this would be three days after the 5 A. I actually do not understand the 6 notes we looked at from Dr. Ross -- the 6 way in which Lancet reviews this article. 7 7 So I can't answer the question. animal subgroup had -- was classifying the 8 data -- the animal data as for glyphosate MR. LASKER: Let me mark as next 9 9 as limited? in line 15-14. 10 10 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. (Exhibit 15-14, e-mail dated 11 11 A. So IARC monographs are owned March 13, 2015, marked for 12 completely by the entire working group. 12 identification, as of this date.) 13 13 And so the animal carcinogenicity working O. Here is an e-mail March 13, 2015 14 group would make a recommendation. 14 to you and other members of the working 15 15 group from Kathryn Guyton asking for However, the entire working group has to 16 16 agree or conclude or concur with that comments on the draft article that was to 17 17 appear in Lancet about the working recommendation. Otherwise, it can change. 18 As you can see in this case, Ivan 18 group 112 meeting, correct? 19 Rusyn had concerns about limited evidence 19 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 2.0 2.0 in animals, but yes, up to March 9, it A. This is an e-mail from Kathryn 21 21 appears that the animal working group was Guyton sending a draft of the document that 22 going to recommend limited. 22 will be going into Lancet Oncology and 23 Q. Just so I understand the process, 23 asking for these members of the working 24 the animal subgroup recommended that the 24 group to review it for clarity. animal data was limited, but the full 25 25 Q. Do you recall if you reviewed the

Page 58 Page 60 1 1 draft and provided any comments? European Food Safety Authority. 2 2 A. I'm pretty certain I would have Q. You registered your company as a lobbyist in Europe so you could lobby 3 3 read it. I don't recall if I provided 4 comments. 4 against glyphosate reregistration, didn't 5 5 Q. You agree that your involvement vou? 6 in the IARC working group on glyphosate had 6 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 7 the appearance of being a conflict of A. No, I did not. 8 8 interest, correct? O. Let's take this in steps. 9 9 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Sure. 10 10 Q. You did lobby -- you did register That's not his testimony. 11 A. The fact is that IARC felt it was 11 your company as a lobbyist in Europe, 12 12 a potential or a perceived conflict of correct? 13 13 A. No, I did not. At least as far interest. That is the fact. My opinion 14 doesn't matter. as they told me I did not. Q. Well, my question though is about 15 15 Q. Who is "they"? 16 16 your opinion. A. Go ahead and put it in and I'll 17 17 You do agree that your explain. 18 18 involvement in the IARC working group on MR. LASKER: This is 19 19 glyphosate has the appearance of being a Exhibit 15-15. 2.0 conflict of interest, correct? 20 (Exhibit 15-15, printout from 21 MS. GREENWALD: Objection. 21 LobbyFacts, marked for identification, 22 22 A. I'm having a tough time with the as of this date.) 23 Q. Dr. Portier, this is a document 23 question. I've never really thought about 24 24 put out by LobbyFacts EU, which notes that 25 25 your company, C. Portier Consultations, was Do I think I had a conflict of Page 59 Page 61 1 interest? No. But would others 1 at least thought to be registered, if not 2 2 potentially see it as a conflict of registered, as a lobbyist in Europe in 3 3 interest? Of course, yes. connection with the reregistration decision 4 4 O. So you do -for glyphosate, correct? 5 A. Some others, not all others. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 5 6 6 A. I -- there are so many parts to Some others. 7 7 that, I have no idea. Q. So just to be clear, you do agree 8 that your participation in working group Would you like me to tell you 9 9 112 on glyphosate has the appearance of what this is? 10 being a conflict of interest? 10 Q. Let me first go through the 11 11 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. document. 12 A. As I said before, I agree with 12 On the second page of the 13 13 the statement that some people would document, it talks about a C. Portier 14 perceive it as a conflict of interest. 14 Consultations registration on EU 15 15 transparency register, and the issue was O. A few months after IARC reached 16 16 its causation determination, the issue of registration of the pesticide glyphosate, 17 17 whether glyphosate can cause cancer was correct? 18 considered by European regulators, correct? 18 A. It says something like that. 19 A. I am sorry, what was the first 2.0 part of that sentence? 21 O. Some months after IARC reached 22 its causation determination, the issue of 23 23 whether glyphosate can cause cancer was Q. And at least according to this 24 considered by European regulators, correct? 24 source, your company was registered in 25 25 A. Specifically considered by the Europe to consult on a reregistration of

Page 62 Page 64 1 1 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. the pesticide glyphosate, correct? 2 2 A. I don't exactly know how to MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 3 3 answer that question because I don't know A. That is not my understanding. 4 4 Q. What is your understanding? what their rules specifically are. All I 5 A. We were asked by the commissioner 5 did was respond to what the staffer told me 6 6 of health -- four of the scientists who I had to do. 7 participated in a -- who were coauthors of Q. In any event, after this 8 8 a letter sent to the commissioner discussion, you then did appear and speak 9 9 with European Parliament, European concerning the quality of the review done 10 on glyphosate by the European Food Safety regulators, about glyphosate, correct? 10 11 11 Authority. A. That's too complicated a question 12 12 The commissioners' staff told us for me to answer. 13 13 that we could not -- we would have to I met with very specific people. 14 The head of the -- the health commissioner 14 register to come in and talk to the 15 commissioner because everybody has to for European Commission and several of his 15 16 16 staff members. I think one of them was a register. They gave us a particular space 17 to fill it in on the EC website. 17 regulator but I can't be absolutely 18 18 I went to that spot, I filled certain. 19 19 this in as they asked me to fill it in, There was interaction on my part 20 since I had to come up with a title for the 20 with EU parliamentary members and there was 21 company, or -- because the thing wouldn't 21 interaction on my part with other members 22 22 take nothing in that spot, I called it C. of parliament and conferences at various Portier Consultations, for lack of a better 23 23 other national authorities. 24 24 Q. On early November of 2015, you term. 25 The day after I entered this, the 25 reached out to other members of the IARC Page 63 Page 65 1 staffer called back and said, I have this 1 working group to help you in your 2 2 discussions with the European regulators, all wrong. I'm sorry. You can come see the commissioner because all you want to 3 correct? 4 4 talk about is scientific issues. You're MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 5 A. At some point before that letter 5 not lobbying on behalf of a company. 6 You're all academics. You don't have to do 6 went out, I asked other scientists to --7 7 this, but I had already done it. who were interested to join me in writing 8 Q. Just so I understand, you were the letter. 9 MR. LASKER: Let's mark this as 9 told by the staff European -- a staffer on 10 the European Commission --10 Exhibit 15-16. 11 11 A. Yes. (Exhibit 15-16, e-mail chain 12 12 dated 11/9/2015, marked for Q. -- that you didn't have to 13 13 register because vou were not presenting identification, as of this date.) 14 your views on behalf of any private entity, 14 Q. Exhibit 15-16 at the bottom of 15 15 is that correct? the first e-mail in the chain is an e-mail 16 16 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. that you sent to a number of other 17 17 scientists dated November 9, 2015 regarding A. They -- they told us we were not 18 lobbyists and this list was for lobbyists, 18 the EFSA review of glyphosate, correct? 19 and therefore, we did not need to register. 19 A. That appears to be what it is. 20 2.0 That was the crux of the conversation. MS. GREENWALD: Eric, the Bates 21 21 Q. The reason you didn't have to is cut off the bottom. Do you know 22 register is because you were not providing 22 what it is? It doesn't appear on this 23 information -- or you were not talking to 23 document. 24 the European regulators on behalf of any 24 MR. LASKER: I don't. We will 25 25 private -- other private entity, correct? get that for you. I don't have it.

Page 66 Page 68 1 MS. GREENWALD: Thank you. well. 2 2 Q. In this e-mail, you were telling Q. You state in your e-mail to these 3 these other scientists that the European 3 scientists, "I do not intend to let this happen." Correct? 4 4 Food Safety Agency was going to conclude 5 5 that glyphosate has no carcinogenic A. I do not intend to let the 6 6 potential, correct? strength of the IARC monograph program to 7 A. I believe I read that, yes. stimulate change in how these agents are 8 8 Q. And you were telling these reviewed happen, and I do not intend to let 9 individuals that this created two problems 9 it happen that people said we did our 10 10 in your view: That it might weaken the estimate wrong. 11 IARC monograph program, and suggest that 11 Q. On November 11, 2015, you sent a 12 12 the IARC working group did not adequately follow-up e-mail to a broader group of 13 review all of the data, correct? 13 recipients, again raising the same concern 14 14 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. about the EFSA's conclusion that glyphosate 15 15 A. No. does not cause cancer, correct? 16 16 Q. You stated and quoted MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 17 specifically then, that EFSA's 17 (Exhibit 15-17, e-mail chain 18 18 determination that glyphosate had no dated November 11, 2005, marked for 19 carcinogenic potential created two 19 identification, as of this date.) 20 problems: One that it weakens the strength 20 A. OK, what is your question now? 21 of the IARC monograph program to stimulate 21 Q. On November 11, you sent a 22 change in how some of these agents are 22 follow-up e-mail to a broader group of 23 2.3 reviewed and addressed. recipients, again raising concerns about 24 2.4 And the second is that it EFSA's conclusion that glyphosate did not 25 25 cause cancer, correct? suggests we did not do our assessment Page 67 Page 69 1 adequately and that had we seen all the 1 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 2 2 data they saw, they would have gotten -- we 3 would have gotten a different answer, A. That would be incorrect. 4 4 correct? I raised concerns about 5 5 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. scientific flaws in the BFR addendum. I am 6 6 That wasn't what he testified. concerned that the serious flaws of the BFR 7 7 A. No, it was not read exactly, but addendum, if not challenged, can continue 8 the point of my saying "no" before is you to be used by regulatory agencies to 9 9 said I said it would weaken the IARC dismiss critical science pertinent to 10 monograph program. 10 regulatory decisions. 11 11 That's not what this says. It Q. You are asking this broader group 12 says it weakens the strength of the IARC 12 of scientists to join you in a letter to be 13 sent to the European regulators about 13 monograph program to stimulate change. 14 That's not weakening the program. 14 glyphosate, correct? 15 15 O. And then the second concern that A. That is correct. 16 16 you had is that it would suggest that the MR. LASKER: Why don't we take a 17 work that we did -- and by "we," you are 17 break? 18 talking about working group 112, correct? 18 MS. GREENWALD: That's up to you. 19 A. Yes, I guess so. 19 Yeah, OK. 2.0 2.0 O. That if we did not do our THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 21 21 assessment adequately, and if we had seen 10:19 a.m. We're off the record. 22 all the data, we would have gotten a 22 (Recess.) 23 23 different answer, correct? THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 24 24 A. In fact, this suggestion was all 10:34 a.m. We are on the record. 25 25 over, from EFSA, from PF4, from others as

Page 70 Page 72 1 1 BY MR. LASKER: Q. You did not disclose in your 2 2 Q. Dr. Portier, before the break, we e-mail to these other scientists asking you 3 3 to join you in this letter the fact that were talking about some e-mails that you 4 4 had sent to some scientists in November of you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' 5 5 counsel in this litigation, did you? 2015 6 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 6 Do you recall that? 7 7 A. The draft document has a -- what A. Are you -- you're talking about 8 8 document 15-17? is it at the end -- the manuscript has a 9 9 O. Yes. And 15-16. thing at the end that says if anybody has 10 A. Could you read the question any conflicts of interest, and that was 10 11 already, as far as I remember, in the 11 again -- restate the question. 12 12 Q. All I asked is we were talking draft. 13 about e-mails that you had sent to 13 But the letter itself does not scientists --14 14 disclose that. 15 A. We were talking about these two 15 Q. Well, let's take this one step at 16 16 documents. a time. 17 17 O. -- in November 2015. The e-mail that you sent to these 18 18 A. We were talking about these two other scientists -- or the two e-mails you 19 19 documents, correct. sent to these other scientists asking them 20 Q. As of the time you sent these 20 to join you in this letter does not 21 e-mails, you had been signed on as an 21 disclose the fact that you had been working 22 22 expert consultant for plaintiffs' counsel as a paid consultant for plaintiffs' 23 counsel in the litigation, correct? 23 in this litigation for more than seven A. The e-mail had an attachment. 24 24 months, correct? 25 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 25 The attachment was the draft of the letter. Page 71 Page 73 1 A. I can't be certain of the exact 1 I believe the attachment had the conflict 2 2 of interest to it on the draft, but I'm not amount of time. 3 3 MR. LASKER: Let's mark as the certain. 4 4 next document in line, which is 15-18. Q. Let's look at the letter that you 5 5 (Exhibit 15-18, letter dated actually sent. 6 March 29, 2015, marked for 6 MR. LASKER: We will mark this as 7 7 identification, as of this date.) Exhibit 15-19. 8 8 Q. Dr. Portier, these are documents (Exhibit 15-19, letter dated 9 9 November 27, 2015, marked for that you produced to us in response to our 10 10 requests -- document requests for this identification, as of this date.) 11 11 Q. This is the letter that was deposition. 12 ultimately sent -- the open letter that was 12 And as set forth in this cover 13 sent by you and the individuals you had 13 letter, or this first letter, you signed an 14 14 engagement letter signing up as an expert asked to join you to 15 consultant with plaintiffs' counsel in this 15 Commissioner Andriukaitis, European 16 16 litigation on March 29, 2015, correct? Commission? 17 17 A. That is correct. A. Yes. 18 18 O. So that would be more than seven Q. This November 27, 2015 letter 19 19 also does not disclose the fact that you months before? 20 2.0 had signed on as a paid consultant with A. I just wasn't sure of the dates. 21 21 plaintiffs' counsel in this litigation, I'm sorry. 22 22 Q. So this is about seven months or correct? 23 23 so before you sent those e-mails out that A. That appears to be the case. 24 24 we were just looking at, correct? Q. So neither the e-mails that you 25 25 A. Probably, yeah. sent to these other scientists asking you

	Page 74		Page 76
1	to join you in the letter to the European	1	A. I don't know to what degree my
2	regulators or the letter you actually sent	2	discussions with them become confidential,
3	to the European regulators in November of	3	so I'm at a loss here.
4	2015, disclosed the fact that you had been	4	Q. I'm not going to ask you about
5	working with plaintiffs' counsel in this	5	the actual substance of the conversations,
6	litigation for over seven months, correct?	6	although that's a separate issue, not a
7	MS. GREENWALD: Objection to	7	privilege issue, but my question right now
8	form.	8	is dates.
9	A. That is a complicated question.	9	When did you
10	Could you simplify it for me.	10	A. So that was with Mr. Lundy, in
11	Q. We will take it in parts.	11	answer to your question.
12	The two e-mails that you sent in	12	Q. And you had been working with
13	November of 2015 to the scientists asking	13	Mr. Lundy on other matters prior to March
14	you to join you in this letter to the	14	2015, is that correct?
15	European regulators regarding glyphosate	15	A. As far as I recall, yes.
16	does not disclose the fact that you had	16	Q. Were you for those other
17	been working as a private consultant for	17	matters, have you been disclosed as a
18	plaintiffs' counsel in this litigation,	18	testifying expert in connection with those?
19	correct?	19	A. I'm not a testifying expert in
20	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	20	those.
21	A. Letter 15-17 and 15-16 do not say	21	Q. Do you know if your involvement
22	that I'm consulting with these law firms.	22	in that litigation has been publicly
23	Q. And the open letter that you sent	23	disclosed?
24	to the European Commission on November 27,	24	A. That I do not know.
25	2015, also does not disclose the fact that	25	Q. How long prior to March 2015 had
	2013, also does not disclose the fact that		110w long prior to Water 2013 had
	Page 75		Page 77
1	you had been working for over seven months	1	you been working with Mr. Lundy?
2	as a paid consultant for plaintiffs'	2	A. I don't know. Maybe two months.
3	counsel in this litigation, correct?	3	Q. When do you recall and
4	A. That is correct.	4	obviously, it's going to be sometime
5	Q. You signed on as a private	5	would it be fair to say sometime between
6	consultant for plaintiffs' counsel nine	6	March 20, when the IARC classification was
7	days within nine days of the publication	7	announced, and March 29, when you had a
8	of The Lancet article announcing IARC's 2A	8	conversation with Mr. Lundy about working
9			conversation with Mi. Lundy about working
1	classification of glyphosate, correct?	9	as an expert in the glyphosate litigation?
10	classification of glyphosate, correct? A. Where is the date of that again?	9	as an expert in the glyphosate litigation?
	A. Where is the date of that again?		,
10	A. Where is the date of that again?Q. We can show that to you.	10	as an expert in the glyphosate litigation? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to
10 11	A. Where is the date of that again?Q. We can show that to you.A. Here it is, March 29 of 2015.	10 11	as an expert in the glyphosate litigation? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. The answer is that's not correct.
10 11 12	A. Where is the date of that again?Q. We can show that to you.A. Here it is, March 29 of 2015.That appears to be the case.	10 11 12	as an expert in the glyphosate litigation? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. The answer is that's not correct. Q. When did you have your first
10 11 12 13	 A. Where is the date of that again? Q. We can show that to you. A. Here it is, March 29 of 2015. That appears to be the case. Q. When did you first speak with 	10 11 12 13	as an expert in the glyphosate litigation? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. The answer is that's not correct.
10 11 12 13 14	 A. Where is the date of that again? Q. We can show that to you. A. Here it is, March 29 of 2015. That appears to be the case. Q. When did you first speak with plaintiffs' counsel about working with them 	10 11 12 13 14	as an expert in the glyphosate litigation? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. The answer is that's not correct. Q. When did you have your first conversation with Mr. Lundy about working as an expert for plaintiffs in glyphosate
10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Where is the date of that again? Q. We can show that to you. A. Here it is, March 29 of 2015. That appears to be the case. Q. When did you first speak with plaintiffs' counsel about working with them as an expert in this litigation? 	10 11 12 13 14 15	as an expert in the glyphosate litigation? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. The answer is that's not correct. Q. When did you have your first conversation with Mr. Lundy about working as an expert for plaintiffs in glyphosate litigation?
10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Where is the date of that again? Q. We can show that to you. A. Here it is, March 29 of 2015. That appears to be the case. Q. When did you first speak with plaintiffs' counsel about working with them as an expert in this litigation? A. March 20 soon before March 	10 11 12 13 14 15	as an expert in the glyphosate litigation? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. The answer is that's not correct. Q. When did you have your first conversation with Mr. Lundy about working as an expert for plaintiffs in glyphosate litigation? A. Sometime prior to this agreement
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Where is the date of that again? Q. We can show that to you. A. Here it is, March 29 of 2015. That appears to be the case. Q. When did you first speak with plaintiffs' counsel about working with them as an expert in this litigation? A. March 20 soon before March 29. 	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	as an expert in the glyphosate litigation? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. The answer is that's not correct. Q. When did you have your first conversation with Mr. Lundy about working as an expert for plaintiffs in glyphosate litigation? A. Sometime prior to this agreement here. Maybe a few days. I have no idea.
10 11 12 13 (14 (15) (16) (17) (18)	A. Where is the date of that again? Q. We can show that to you. A. Here it is, March 29 of 2015. That appears to be the case. Q. When did you first speak with plaintiffs' counsel about working with them as an expert in this litigation? A. March 20 soon before March 29. I was already working with	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	as an expert in the glyphosate litigation? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. The answer is that's not correct. Q. When did you have your first conversation with Mr. Lundy about working as an expert for plaintiffs in glyphosate litigation? A. Sometime prior to this agreement here. Maybe a few days. I have no idea. But the IARC monograph finding
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Where is the date of that again? Q. We can show that to you. A. Here it is, March 29 of 2015. That appears to be the case. Q. When did you first speak with plaintiffs' counsel about working with them as an expert in this litigation? A. March 20 soon before March 29. I was already working with counsel	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	as an expert in the glyphosate litigation? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. The answer is that's not correct. Q. When did you have your first conversation with Mr. Lundy about working as an expert for plaintiffs in glyphosate litigation? A. Sometime prior to this agreement here. Maybe a few days. I have no idea. But the IARC monograph finding was announced the day the monograph closed.
10 11 12 13 (14 (15) (16) (17) (18) (19) (20) (21)	A. Where is the date of that again? Q. We can show that to you. A. Here it is, March 29 of 2015. That appears to be the case. Q. When did you first speak with plaintiffs' counsel about working with them as an expert in this litigation? A. March 20 soon before March 29. I was already working with counsel Q. OK, so when were you	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	as an expert in the glyphosate litigation? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. The answer is that's not correct. Q. When did you have your first conversation with Mr. Lundy about working as an expert for plaintiffs in glyphosate litigation? A. Sometime prior to this agreement here. Maybe a few days. I have no idea. But the IARC monograph finding was announced the day the monograph closed. The publication was later.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Where is the date of that again? Q. We can show that to you. A. Here it is, March 29 of 2015. That appears to be the case. Q. When did you first speak with plaintiffs' counsel about working with them as an expert in this litigation? A. March 20 soon before March 29. I was already working with counsel Q. OK, so when were you A on something different.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	as an expert in the glyphosate litigation? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. The answer is that's not correct. Q. When did you have your first conversation with Mr. Lundy about working as an expert for plaintiffs in glyphosate litigation? A. Sometime prior to this agreement here. Maybe a few days. I have no idea. But the IARC monograph finding was announced the day the monograph closed. The publication was later. Q. Do you recall whether you had
10 11 12 13 (14 (15) (16) (17) (18) (19) (20) (21)	A. Where is the date of that again? Q. We can show that to you. A. Here it is, March 29 of 2015. That appears to be the case. Q. When did you first speak with plaintiffs' counsel about working with them as an expert in this litigation? A. March 20 soon before March 29. I was already working with counsel Q. OK, so when were you A on something different. Q. So when did you let's ask	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	as an expert in the glyphosate litigation? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. The answer is that's not correct. Q. When did you have your first conversation with Mr. Lundy about working as an expert for plaintiffs in glyphosate litigation? A. Sometime prior to this agreement here. Maybe a few days. I have no idea. But the IARC monograph finding was announced the day the monograph closed. The publication was later. Q. Do you recall whether you had your first conversation with Mr. Lundy
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Where is the date of that again? Q. We can show that to you. A. Here it is, March 29 of 2015. That appears to be the case. Q. When did you first speak with plaintiffs' counsel about working with them as an expert in this litigation? A. March 20 soon before March 29. I was already working with counsel Q. OK, so when were you A on something different.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	as an expert in the glyphosate litigation? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. The answer is that's not correct. Q. When did you have your first conversation with Mr. Lundy about working as an expert for plaintiffs in glyphosate litigation? A. Sometime prior to this agreement here. Maybe a few days. I have no idea. But the IARC monograph finding was announced the day the monograph closed. The publication was later. Q. Do you recall whether you had

Page 78 Page 80 1 29, 2015, correct? A. No. 2 2 Q. It could have been before, could A. Correct. 3 3 have been after, you don't recall? Q. You agreed in March 29 -- and A. Don't recall. 4 this is on page 3 of your engagement 5 5 letter -- to work under the exclusive Q. Is the other matter that you are 6 6 working with or -- with Mr. Lundy related direction of three attorneys at the Lundy 7 to a -- and you don't have to identify the Lundy law firm, and Robin Greenwald of 8 8 substance, but a substance that has been Weitz & Luxenberg, correct? 9 9 part of an IARC review for carcinogenistic? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 10 10 A. There have been many substances O. That's No. 6. MS. GREENWALD: Objection. 11 for review by IARC for carcinogenicity, 11 this one included. 12 12 A. No. 6 says I will be working 13 13 under the exclusive direction of Hunter Q. So the other work you're doing 14 14 for Mr. Lundy also involves an Lundy, Matthew Lundy and Kristie Hightower 15 with Lundy, Lundy, Soileau & South, and 15 IARC-reviewed substance, is that correct? 16 16 Robin Greenwald with Weitz & Luxenberg. A. That is correct. 17 17 Q. You agreed on March 29, 2015 --Q. You had -- in your retention 18 18 and this is No. 7 on -- numeral 7 on page agreement on March 29, 2015, it notes that 19 19 you will be working both with Mr. Lundy and 3 -- that any and all work product created 2.0 with Ms. Greenwald for Weitz & Luxenberg, 20 by you or on your behalf in whole or in 21 21 part during the course of this engagement correct? 22 22 authorized by these attorneys shall be And her name is specifically 23 considered a work for hire and the property 23 mentioned on I think page 3 of the 24 agreement. 24 of the firms, correct? 25 25 A. That is correct. A. Yes. Page 79 Page 81 1 Q. Have you worked with 1 Q. You agreed on March 29, 2015, 2 Ms. Greenwald or her firm prior to this 2 in -- on page 3, numeral 4, that you would 3 time? not do any other work related to glyphosate 4 outside the specifics of the litigation 4 A. No. 5 5 without the written consent of the Q. Just one other question with 6 respect to the other consulting work with 6 plaintiffs' attorneys, correct? 7 7 Mr. Lundy. A. It says, "I will not accept any 8 8 RoundUp or glyphosate-related engagement The other matter, is that -- does 9 9 that involve a substance for which you had with any law firm that is party to RoundUp 10 served on the IARC working group? 10 and/or glyphosate-related litigation 11 A. Define "substance"? 11 without their written consent." 12 Q. The issue that you're consulting 12 Q. You also agreed on March 29, with them -- the other issue that you are 13 13 2015 -- and this is on page 2 -- that you 14 consulting with, does that involve 14 would not disclose your work for 15 exposures that were reviewed by IARC on a 15 plaintiffs' counsel to media organizations, 16 working group that you were part of? 16 trade journals, professional publications, 17 17 A. Yes. members of the public or other purported 18 Q. So pursuant to the terms of your 18 experts, correct? 19 agreement with your March 29, 2015 letter, 19 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 20 your engagement with plaintiffs' counsel 2.0 O. That's No. 3. began on March 29, 2015 and has continued 21 21 MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. 22 through to the present, correct? 22 A. No. 3, sorry. 23 Yes. 23 Now, your question again, please. 24 Q. You were paid a \$5,000 retainer 24 Q. You agreed on March 29, 2015, 25 by plaintiffs' counsel on or about March 25 that you would not disclose your work for

Page 82 Page 84 1 1 plaintiffs' counsel to media organizations, Q. During the entire period of time 2 2 trade journals, professional publications, in which you have had conversations with members of the public or other purported 3 3 U.S. and European regulators about experts, correct? 4 glyphosate, you have been a paid consultant 5 5 for plaintiffs' counsel in this litigation, A. Correct. 6 Q. You agreed to retain the 6 correct? 7 7 plaintiffs' lawyers to represent you if MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 8 8 anyone sought to compel you to disclose A. Yes. 9 9 this information, correct? Q. Now, you attached to your expert 10 report some submissions that you have made 10 A. I believe that's what part C 11 11 to European regulators and to the EPA in says. 12 12 the United States in opposition to the Q. And you began billing plaintiffs' 13 decisions or findings by those agencies counsel for your time as of -- and this is 13 14 14 the first invoice attached -- June 17, that glyphosate does not cause cancer, 15 15 2015, correct? correct? 16 16 A. The -- if I remember the letters A. Yes. 17 correctly, they are raising scientific 17 Q. You had a meeting on June 17, 18 concerns about the way in which these 18 2015 with Mr. Lundy, and then a second 19 particular agencies reviewed the evidence 19 meeting with Mr. Lundy and Ms. Greenwald on 20 June 19, 2015, correct? 20 for glyphosate and cancer. 21 Q. These submissions that you have 21 A. That is correct. 22 made to the regulators contain much of the 2.2 Q. On October 19, 2015, you sent 23 same scientific analyses that you have 23 plaintiffs' counsel an invoice for your 2.4 24 included in your expert report in this work on their behalf from June of 2015 to 25 litigation in support of the plaintiffs, 25 October of 2015, correct? Page 83 Page 85 1 1 A. Yes. correct? 2 Q. And you have been working as a 2 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 3 paid consultant for plaintiffs' counsel A. I -- it's not correct. 4 throughout the entire time that you have 4 O. So is it -- let me ask this: In 5 5 had discussions with regulators in the your submissions to the European regulators 6 United States and in Europe about 6 and U.S. regulators, you represented pooled 7 7 analyses of animal cancer bioassays, glyphosate, correct? 8 8 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. correct? 9 9 A. Again, I have to get that A. Yes, correct. 10 question in my head here. 10 Q. And you present those same pooled 11 11 Since March 29, 2015, I have been analyses in your expert report in this 12 12 litigation, correct? working with counsel. 13 13 Q. So during the entire period of MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 14 time in which you have had conversations 14 A. No. not correct. 15 15 O. You have revised them over the with U.S. regulators and European 16 16 regulators about glyphosate, you have been course of time, correct? 17 17 a retained expert for plaintiffs' counsel MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 18 in this litigation, correct? 18 A. I have revised the way in which I 19 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 19 do the pools analyses over time. 2.0 2.0 Q. And you have submitted different A. The e-mails, discussions and 21 2.1 everything else that I sent to the pooled analyses to the regulators over 22 regulators is not part of the work I have 22 time, correct? 23 23 done for this law firm. A. That is correct. 24 24 Q. That was not my question. Q. And you have submitted pooled 25 25 A. OK, what was your question again. analyses also in your expert report,

Page 88 Page 86 1 1 correct? answer that part of it. 2 2 Clearly in the letter you have A. That is correct. 3 3 given me, that was not in there. And some of the pooled analyses 4 in your expert report you are continuing to 4 Q. The letter I gave you was the 5 5 European regulators, correct? use in your submissions to the regulators, 6 6 A. The first letter I sent. correct? 7 7 MR. LASKER: Let's mark as MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 8 8 form. Exhibit 15-20. 9 9 (Exhibit 15-20, attachment to the A. That isn't correct. 10 10 You have not presented any of the expert report, marked for identification, as of this date.) 11 information from your -- any of your 11 12 12 analyses in the expert report to O. And this was one of the regulators? 13 13 attachments to your expert report in this 14 14 litigation and a submission that you made A. You're proposing a sequence of 15 to the EPA on October 4, 2016. 15 events that is not correct. 16 16 Q. Not my question. A. OK. 17 17 A. I know it's not your question, Q. You begin your submission to EPA 18 but the answer to the question has to do in October of 2016 with a disclaimer. 18 19 19 with the sequence of the events. correct? 20 Pooled analyses were done for my 20 A. This work was done with my own 21 21 letters to the regulators and others with research and on my own time. Yes. 22 22 Q. And you state -- you told the these data. 23 23 That was done prior to any expert EPA, and anyone else who was looking at 24 report I prepared for this litigation. 24 your submissions, that you had, quote, 25 Q. But both those pooled analyses 25 received no reimbursement for any of these Page 87 Page 89 1 were conducted after you had been retained 1 comments, correct? 2 2 as a private expert for plaintiffs' counsel A. That's correct. 3 3 in this litigation, correct? Q. And during this same time period, 4 4 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. you were publicly proclaiming that, quote, 5 nobody has paid me a cent to do what I am 5 A. What was the term you used for 6 6 doing with glyphosate. I have no conflict there? 7 7 whatsoever, correct? Q. Your pooled analyses that you 8 submitted to the U.S. and European MS. GREENWALD: Objection, that 9 9 regulators were prepared after the time is not what this says. 10 10 that you signed on as a paid expert for O. Let's look at this document. 11 MR. LASKER: We will mark this 11 plaintiffs' counsel in this litigation, 12 12 correct? 15-21. 13 13 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. (Exhibit 15-21, document 14 14 A. A paid consultant and/or expert, entitled, "Oh Brother, CropLife 15 Ouestions, Makeup of Glyphosate Panel," 15 ves. 16 marked for identification, as of this Q. The submissions that you made --17 17 strike that. date.) 18 18 Q. Dr. Portier, this is an article In your submissions to these 19 dated October 12, 2016, entitled, "Oh 19 regulators, the letters that you submitted, 20 Brother, CropLife Questions, Makeup of 2.0 you do not disclose your relationship with 21 Glyphosate Panel." 2.1 plaintiffs' counsel as an expert in private 22 Do you see that? 22 litigation against Monsanto, do you? 23 23 A. Yes, I do. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 24 Q. This is discussing the EPA's 24 A. I do not recall in my letters to 25 evaluation of glyphosate, correct? 25 EPA whether I did such a thing. I can't

Page 90 Page 92 1 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. more than 18 months, correct? 2 2 A. This is an article by Steve MS. GREENWALD: Objection, 3 3 Davies discussing CropLife questioning the assumes facts not in evidence and form. 4 makeup of the glyphosate panel. 4 O. You can answer. 5 5 Q. On the second page of this MS. GREENWALD: You can answer. 6 document, at the bottom of the page, there 6 I have my objection on the record. is an -- you have been interviewed and 7 A. Repeat the question now. 8 8 there's some various statements you have O. As of October '16 -- October 9 9 made regarding glyphosate, correct, in the 2016, when you were quoted in this article 10 10 panel? as stating that you had no conflicts 11 A. I'm sorry? 11 whatsoever, you had, in fact, been 12 12 Q. At the bottom of the second page, consulting with plaintiffs' counsel in the 13 13 glyphosate litigation against Monsanto for there is various discussions, comments that more than 18 months, correct? 14 14 you have made to the reporter in connection 15 15 with this article, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection. Same 16 16 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. objection as before. 17 A. This pertains to the work I did 17 A. At the time this quote in this 18 18 part time for the Environmental Defense article is written, I was working with 19 Fund, and it's conceivable the reporter got 19 counsel, yes. 2.0 this quote out of context. 20 Q. And had been working with them 21 So I can't -- I can't tell you 21 for more than 18 month, correct? 22 whether certainly I got it or not. I've 22 MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. 23 been misquoted many times. 2.3 A. That is correct. 2.4 Q. The quote in this article that is 24 Q. And when you were quoted in this 2.5 attributed to you in October of 2016 is, 25 article as saying nobody had paid you a Page 91 Page 93 1 "Nobody has paid me a cent to do what I am 1 cent for what you are doing with 2 doing with glyphosate," and "I have no 2 glyphosate, you had by that time sent conflict of interest whatsoever," on the 3 plaintiffs' counsel three separate invoices 4 for your glyphosate work in litigation 4 bottom of the page. 5 against Monsanto, correct? 5 Do you see that? 6 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 6 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 7 7 A. That -- those two sentences are A. The work being referred to here 8 8 on the bottom of the page. was the analyses and evaluations and 9 9 Q. Did you ever have any follow-up reading of the regulatory documents, for 10 discussion with this reporter telling him 10 which nobody paid me. 11 11 you misquoted me? Q. So it is your testimony that 12 A. I have no problem -- probably 12 plaintiffs' counsel did not pay you to 13 13 review the regulatory documents? not. I'd never do that. 14 14 A. They were paying me to provide Q. Prior to your submissions to EPA 15 15 in October of 2016, you had, of course, in them with advice and consulting. Until 16 16 fact, been paid by plaintiffs' counsel to they decided that I would be an expert 17 17 witness, there was nothing they were assist them in the glyphosate litigation 18 against Monsanto, correct? 18 requiring me to read or review except an 19 19 occasional paper they would send me. A. Prior to my submissions to EPA in 20 2.0 October of 2015 -- yes. Q. Let me ask you to look at 21 2.1 Q. And as of October 2016, when you Exhibit 15-18. It is the retention 22 were quoted in this article as telling the 22 agreement and attached exhibits. 23 23 world that you had no conflict whatsoever, Yes. 24 you, in fact, had been consulting with 24 Q. And if you look at page 7 of this 25 25 plaintiffs' counsel in this litigation for document, it's the invoice dated June 30,

Page 94 Page 96 1 2016, correct? it said happened four months, I guess, or 2 2 A. Page 7? so after my being paid by plaintiffs' 3 3 June 30, 2016, there is here June counsel to evaluate the EPA risk 4 30, 2016. 4 assessment, that is correct. 5 5 O. And this invoice is four months Q. And by that time, you had, in 6 before you submitted -- had your submission 6 fact, sent three separate invoices to 7 to the EPA, correct? plaintiffs' counsel for your work in the 8 8 A. Yes. glyphosate litigation, correct? 9 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 9 Q. And in this invoice, you are charging -- or you're billing plaintiffs' 10 10 A. By what time again? counsel for your work in reading and 11 11 Q. October of 2016? 12 evaluating the EPA's glyphosate documents, 12 A. October 2016. 13 13 correct? Yes. I had sent three invoices. 14 A. That's what it says. I stand Q. As of June 2017, which is the corrected from my previous statement. 15 15 last invoice we have, you have billed Q. So plaintiffs' counsel had paid 16 16 plaintiffs' counsel somewhere over \$160,000 17 you to evaluate EPA's glyphosate document, 17 for your work in preparing your analyses of 18 18 glyphosate, correct? 19 19 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. That's what it appears to say. 2.0 Q. And after being paid by 20 A. I -- I have no idea what the 21 plaintiffs' counsel to evaluate the EPA 21 total is, but maybe. It's a substantial 22 document, you then made submissions to EPA, 22 amount of money. 23 23 Q. And since -- the last invoice we correct? 2.4 A. But not the evaluation I made for 24 have is dated, as I said, I guess it's June 25 plaintiffs' counsel. 25 18, 2017, through the time -- through June Page 95 Page 97 1 Q. Dr. Portier, let me just ask the 1 13, 2017, and then we have a -- one invoice 2 2 question again. for an airplane ticket. 3 Four months after being paid by You have continued to do work on 4 4 plaintiffs' counsel to evaluate the EPA's this litigation subsequent to June 13, 5 glyphosate document --2017, correct? 5 6 6 You prepared your rebuttal A. I submitted --7 7 Q. -- you made submissions to EPA report? 8 8 regarding your evaluation of their A. I've done work since then, that 9 9 assessment, correct? is correct. 10 10 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Q. And I take it you have not yet 11 11 A. Four months after -- I provided billed plaintiffs' counsel for that 12 an evaluation of EPA's assessment to them, 12 additional work? 13 A. Is that privileged? 13 correct. 14 14 Q. No. Q. As of -- just to go back to the 15 A. No? 15 question that was pending, as of October of 16 16 2016, when you were quoted in this article No, I have not. 17 17 Q. Do you have an approximate amount as stating that nobody had paid you a cent 18 of time outstanding for your bill for 18 for what you were doing with glyphosate, 19 plaintiffs' counsel? 19 you had by that time submitted three 20 A. Approximate? 2.0 separate invoices to plaintiffs' counsel 21 billing them for your work on glyphosate, No. I mean, I have an exact 2.1 22 22 correct? somewhere. 23 23 Q. Have you done more than 20 hours MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 24 of work on your rebuttal report? 24 A. The quote that was in that 25 A. Yeah. 25 newspaper article that says what you said

	Page 98		Page 100
1	Q. Have you done more than 40 hours	1	experimental evidence. It required me
2	of work on your rebuttal report?	2	going back to look at the epidemiology
3	A. Maybe not.	3	experimental evidence. It takes time to
4	Q. So we have somewhere on the order	4	give a good scientific response.
5		5	Q. So in connection with this work
6	of another \$15,000 maybe, or is it more? You don't know?	6	•
7		7	and evaluating the EPA glyphosate document,
8	A. I don't know. I don't really pay	8	you spent 19 hours with doing an
9	much attention to it.	9	extensive dive into the glyphosate science,
	Q. Pursuant to the expressed terms	10	is that your testimony?
10 11	of your engagement letter with plaintiffs'	11	MS. GREENWALD: Objection to
	counsel, the work that you did and that you	12	form.
12	were paid for in evaluating the EPA		A. It's one memo. I spent 19 hours
13	assessment of glyphosate is "work for hire	13	researching it.
14	and the property of the plaintiffs' law	14	Q. And pursuant to the terms of your
15	firms," correct?	15	engagement letter, this 19 hours you spent
16	MS. GREENWALD: Objection to	16	in evaluating glyphosate and evaluating the
17	form.	17	EPA, this EPA assessment was work for hire
18	A. Let me be clear: I think there	18	and the property of plaintiffs' law firm,
19	is a mistake here and this is my	19	correct?
20	mistake, I should have pointed it out	20	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.
21	earlier this is a different EPA	21	A. I lost you on that question.
22	glyphosate document than the one that I was	22	Q. Let's go back to the engagement
23	complaining about in October. This is a	23	letter, the beginning of this document, and
24	different document.	24	on page 3, numeral 7, it says, any and all
25	This was a single, two-page	25	work product created by you or on your
	Page 99		Page 101
1	Page 99 release from the Clark subgroup of EPA	1	
1 2	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA	1 2	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by
	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in		behalf in whole or in part during the
2	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the	2	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work
2	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in	2 3	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work for hire and the property of the
2 3 4	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the comments made later that year were on EPA's draft risk assessment.	2 3 4	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work
2 3 4 5	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the comments made later that year were on EPA's draft risk assessment. Q. Let's go back to the June 30,	2 3 4 5	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work for hire and the property of the plaintiffs' law firms, correct? A. This speaks of work product. It
2 3 4 5 6	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the comments made later that year were on EPA's draft risk assessment. Q. Let's go back to the June 30, 2016 e-mail.	2 3 4 5 6	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work for hire and the property of the plaintiffs' law firms, correct? A. This speaks of work product. It doesn't speak of knowledge gained.
2 3 4 5 6 7	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the comments made later that year were on EPA's draft risk assessment. Q. Let's go back to the June 30,	2 3 4 5 6 7	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work for hire and the property of the plaintiffs' law firms, correct? A. This speaks of work product. It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the comments made later that year were on EPA's draft risk assessment. Q. Let's go back to the June 30, 2016 e-mail. You said this was reviewing a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work for hire and the property of the plaintiffs' law firms, correct? A. This speaks of work product. It doesn't speak of knowledge gained. Q. Is the work that you were paid
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the comments made later that year were on EPA's draft risk assessment. Q. Let's go back to the June 30, 2016 e-mail. You said this was reviewing a two-page document?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work for hire and the property of the plaintiffs' law firms, correct? A. This speaks of work product. It doesn't speak of knowledge gained. Q. Is the work that you were paid for in evaluating EPA assessment of the 19
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the comments made later that year were on EPA's draft risk assessment. Q. Let's go back to the June 30, 2016 e-mail. You said this was reviewing a two-page document? A. June 30 Q. 2016 invoice.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work for hire and the property of the plaintiffs' law firms, correct? A. This speaks of work product. It doesn't speak of knowledge gained. Q. Is the work that you were paid for in evaluating EPA assessment of the 19 hours
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the comments made later that year were on EPA's draft risk assessment. Q. Let's go back to the June 30, 2016 e-mail. You said this was reviewing a two-page document? A. June 30 Q. 2016 invoice. A. It's a two- or three-page	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work for hire and the property of the plaintiffs' law firms, correct? A. This speaks of work product. It doesn't speak of knowledge gained. Q. Is the work that you were paid for in evaluating EPA assessment of the 19 hours A. That wasn't the EPA assessment. It was a memo.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the comments made later that year were on EPA's draft risk assessment. Q. Let's go back to the June 30, 2016 e-mail. You said this was reviewing a two-page document? A. June 30 Q. 2016 invoice. A. It's a two- or three-page technical document, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work for hire and the property of the plaintiffs' law firms, correct? A. This speaks of work product. It doesn't speak of knowledge gained. Q. Is the work that you were paid for in evaluating EPA assessment of the 19 hours A. That wasn't the EPA assessment. It was a memo. Q. In evaluating, as you say in your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the comments made later that year were on EPA's draft risk assessment. Q. Let's go back to the June 30, 2016 e-mail. You said this was reviewing a two-page document? A. June 30 Q. 2016 invoice. A. It's a two- or three-page technical document, yes. Q. You have billed plaintiffs'	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work for hire and the property of the plaintiffs' law firms, correct? A. This speaks of work product. It doesn't speak of knowledge gained. Q. Is the work that you were paid for in evaluating EPA assessment of the 19 hours A. That wasn't the EPA assessment. It was a memo. Q. In evaluating, as you say in your invoice, the EPA glyphosate document, that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the comments made later that year were on EPA's draft risk assessment. Q. Let's go back to the June 30, 2016 e-mail. You said this was reviewing a two-page document? A. June 30 Q. 2016 invoice. A. It's a two- or three-page technical document, yes. Q. You have billed plaintiffs' counsel for 19 hours in reviewing that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work for hire and the property of the plaintiffs' law firms, correct? A. This speaks of work product. It doesn't speak of knowledge gained. Q. Is the work that you were paid for in evaluating EPA assessment of the 19 hours A. That wasn't the EPA assessment. It was a memo. Q. In evaluating, as you say in your invoice, the EPA glyphosate document, that is work for hire and intellectual property
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the comments made later that year were on EPA's draft risk assessment. Q. Let's go back to the June 30, 2016 e-mail. You said this was reviewing a two-page document? A. June 30 Q. 2016 invoice. A. It's a two- or three-page technical document, yes. Q. You have billed plaintiffs' counsel for 19 hours in reviewing that document, is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work for hire and the property of the plaintiffs' law firms, correct? A. This speaks of work product. It doesn't speak of knowledge gained. Q. Is the work that you were paid for in evaluating EPA assessment of the 19 hours A. That wasn't the EPA assessment. It was a memo. Q. In evaluating, as you say in your invoice, the EPA glyphosate document, that is work for hire and intellectual property of the plaintiff law firm, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the comments made later that year were on EPA's draft risk assessment. Q. Let's go back to the June 30, 2016 e-mail. You said this was reviewing a two-page document? A. June 30 Q. 2016 invoice. A. It's a two- or three-page technical document, yes. Q. You have billed plaintiffs' counsel for 19 hours in reviewing that document, is that correct? A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work for hire and the property of the plaintiffs' law firms, correct? A. This speaks of work product. It doesn't speak of knowledge gained. Q. Is the work that you were paid for in evaluating EPA assessment of the 19 hours A. That wasn't the EPA assessment. It was a memo. Q. In evaluating, as you say in your invoice, the EPA glyphosate document, that is work for hire and intellectual property of the plaintiff law firm, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the comments made later that year were on EPA's draft risk assessment. Q. Let's go back to the June 30, 2016 e-mail. You said this was reviewing a two-page document? A. June 30 Q. 2016 invoice. A. It's a two- or three-page technical document, yes. Q. You have billed plaintiffs' counsel for 19 hours in reviewing that document, is that correct? A. Yes. Q. So you spent 19 hours reviewing a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work for hire and the property of the plaintiffs' law firms, correct? A. This speaks of work product. It doesn't speak of knowledge gained. Q. Is the work that you were paid for in evaluating EPA assessment of the 19 hours A. That wasn't the EPA assessment. It was a memo. Q. In evaluating, as you say in your invoice, the EPA glyphosate document, that is work for hire and intellectual property of the plaintiff law firm, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the comments made later that year were on EPA's draft risk assessment. Q. Let's go back to the June 30, 2016 e-mail. You said this was reviewing a two-page document? A. June 30 Q. 2016 invoice. A. It's a two- or three-page technical document, yes. Q. You have billed plaintiffs' counsel for 19 hours in reviewing that document, is that correct? A. Yes. Q. So you spent 19 hours reviewing a two-page document?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work for hire and the property of the plaintiffs' law firms, correct? A. This speaks of work product. It doesn't speak of knowledge gained. Q. Is the work that you were paid for in evaluating EPA assessment of the 19 hours A. That wasn't the EPA assessment. It was a memo. Q. In evaluating, as you say in your invoice, the EPA glyphosate document, that is work for hire and intellectual property of the plaintiff law firm, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection. That's not his testimony. He asked and answered it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the comments made later that year were on EPA's draft risk assessment. Q. Let's go back to the June 30, 2016 e-mail. You said this was reviewing a two-page document? A. June 30 Q. 2016 invoice. A. It's a two- or three-page technical document, yes. Q. You have billed plaintiffs' counsel for 19 hours in reviewing that document, is that correct? A. Yes. Q. So you spent 19 hours reviewing a two-page document? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work for hire and the property of the plaintiffs' law firms, correct? A. This speaks of work product. It doesn't speak of knowledge gained. Q. Is the work that you were paid for in evaluating EPA assessment of the 19 hours A. That wasn't the EPA assessment. It was a memo. Q. In evaluating, as you say in your invoice, the EPA glyphosate document, that is work for hire and intellectual property of the plaintiff law firm, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection. That's not his testimony. He asked and answered it. A. No. The work product from that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the comments made later that year were on EPA's draft risk assessment. Q. Let's go back to the June 30, 2016 e-mail. You said this was reviewing a two-page document? A. June 30 Q. 2016 invoice. A. It's a two- or three-page technical document, yes. Q. You have billed plaintiffs' counsel for 19 hours in reviewing that document, is that correct? A. Yes. Q. So you spent 19 hours reviewing a two-page document? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work for hire and the property of the plaintiffs' law firms, correct? A. This speaks of work product. It doesn't speak of knowledge gained. Q. Is the work that you were paid for in evaluating EPA assessment of the 19 hours A. That wasn't the EPA assessment. It was a memo. Q. In evaluating, as you say in your invoice, the EPA glyphosate document, that is work for hire and intellectual property of the plaintiff law firm, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection. That's not his testimony. He asked and answered it. A. No. The work product from that would be the property of the law firm.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the comments made later that year were on EPA's draft risk assessment. Q. Let's go back to the June 30, 2016 e-mail. You said this was reviewing a two-page document? A. June 30 Q. 2016 invoice. A. It's a two- or three-page technical document, yes. Q. You have billed plaintiffs' counsel for 19 hours in reviewing that document, is that correct? A. Yes. Q. So you spent 19 hours reviewing a two-page document? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. If you have the document, we can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work for hire and the property of the plaintiffs' law firms, correct? A. This speaks of work product. It doesn't speak of knowledge gained. Q. Is the work that you were paid for in evaluating EPA assessment of the 19 hours A. That wasn't the EPA assessment. It was a memo. Q. In evaluating, as you say in your invoice, the EPA glyphosate document, that is work for hire and intellectual property of the plaintiff law firm, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection. That's not his testimony. He asked and answered it. A. No. The work product from that would be the property of the law firm. Q. Is it your testimony that the 19
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the comments made later that year were on EPA's draft risk assessment. Q. Let's go back to the June 30, 2016 e-mail. You said this was reviewing a two-page document? A. June 30 Q. 2016 invoice. A. It's a two- or three-page technical document, yes. Q. You have billed plaintiffs' counsel for 19 hours in reviewing that document, is that correct? A. Yes. Q. So you spent 19 hours reviewing a two-page document? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. If you have the document, we can look at that time, but it is a very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work for hire and the property of the plaintiffs' law firms, correct? A. This speaks of work product. It doesn't speak of knowledge gained. Q. Is the work that you were paid for in evaluating EPA assessment of the 19 hours A. That wasn't the EPA assessment. It was a memo. Q. In evaluating, as you say in your invoice, the EPA glyphosate document, that is work for hire and intellectual property of the plaintiff law firm, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection. That's not his testimony. He asked and answered it. A. No. The work product from that would be the property of the law firm. Q. Is it your testimony that the 19 hours that you spent in assessing the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	release from the Clark subgroup of EPA about glyphosate that appeared, I think, in March or June or April of 2016, whereas the comments made later that year were on EPA's draft risk assessment. Q. Let's go back to the June 30, 2016 e-mail. You said this was reviewing a two-page document? A. June 30 Q. 2016 invoice. A. It's a two- or three-page technical document, yes. Q. You have billed plaintiffs' counsel for 19 hours in reviewing that document, is that correct? A. Yes. Q. So you spent 19 hours reviewing a two-page document? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. If you have the document, we can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	behalf in whole or in part during the course of this engagement authorized by this committee shall be considered a work for hire and the property of the plaintiffs' law firms, correct? A. This speaks of work product. It doesn't speak of knowledge gained. Q. Is the work that you were paid for in evaluating EPA assessment of the 19 hours A. That wasn't the EPA assessment. It was a memo. Q. In evaluating, as you say in your invoice, the EPA glyphosate document, that is work for hire and intellectual property of the plaintiff law firm, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection. That's not his testimony. He asked and answered it. A. No. The work product from that would be the property of the law firm. Q. Is it your testimony that the 19

Page 102 Page 104 1 1 in the submissions or the analyses that you MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. 2 2 presented in your submissions to EPA and to A. I have spoken with the EPA 3 3 officials on the glyphosate issue. the European regulators? 4 4 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Q. And you have had private e-mail 5 5 A. Intellectual knowledge gained in communications with Jim Jones about 6 any endeavor can obviously carry over into 6 glyphosate, correct? 7 the next endeavor. I can't possibly give MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 8 8 you a "no" answer to such a question. A. I have sent to Jim Jones 9 9 The work product from that concern -- my concerns about glyphosate. 10 evaluation is the property of this firm and 10 Q. In private e-mail communications, 11 it was subsequently given to them. 11 correct? 12 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 12 Q. And the work product that your 13 evaluation, for which you were paid by 13 A. It was to his EPA e-mail address, plaintiffs' law firm in or about June 2016, 14 14 which is not a private e-mail address. 15 15 that work also folded -- was folded into Q. Well, the e-mail that you sent 16 16 the submissions that you provided to the was not disclosed publicly. You had a 17 17 private communication with Mr. Jones on EPA and to the European regulators, 18 18 correct? e-mail. correct? 19 19 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form, 2.0 A. No. 20 asked and answered, argumentative. 21 21 A. I -- she is right, I answered the Q. Is it your testimony that you did 22 not make use of any of the 19 hours of 22 question. 23 evaluation that you conducted and were paid 23 Q. So did you publicly disclose --24 for by plaintiffs' law firms in preparing 24 have you publicly disclosed your e-mail 25 your submissions to the EPA and to the 25 communications with Jim Jones at EPA about Page 105 Page 103 1 European regulators? 1 glyphosate? 2 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 2 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 3 A. I think they did. Asked and answered. 4 4 A. As I said before, intellectual Q. And is it your understanding that 5 5 every communication you have had with gains from reading documents play a role in 6 anything I ever write or do in the future. 6 Mr. Jones has been disclosed publicly? Hence, I cannot say "no" to that question. 7 7 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Q. But in your submission to the 8 A. That I don't know. But, of 9 9 EPA, when you submitted your analysis, you course, you can FOIA them and you will know 10 did not disclose the fact that you had been 10 which ones. 11 11 paid by plaintiffs' counsel to review the Q. Have you had telephone 12 scientific data on glyphosate, correct? 12 conversations with Mr. Jones about 13 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 13 glyphosate? 14 A. The document I submitted to EPA 14 A. Not that I recall. 15 15 about the scientific failures in their O. Who is Jim Jones? 16 16 evaluation of the scientific evidence for A. He was the director of the office 17 17 glyphosate did not disclose that I worked of pesticides and toxic substances, the 18 for plaintiffs' law firm. 18 assistant administrator at EPA. 19 Q. You have been -- you have had a 19 Q. How do you know Mr. Jones? 2.0 2.0 A. I've known Mr. Jones for years. number of conversations with individual EPA 21 2.1 officials behind the scenes about I was a government official. He was a 22 22 glyphosate, correct? government official. We were working on 23 23 environmental issues. That's how I knew MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 24 24 A. On what topic? him. 25 25 Q. Glyphosate. Q. In your e-mail communications

Page 106 Page 108 1 with Mr. Jones, did you disclose to him the Q. And you sent that to Mr. Jones on 2 2 June 23, 2016, correct? fact that you were a paid expert for 3 plaintiffs' counsel in this litigation? 3 A. Yes. A. I don't recall. 4 4 Q. And this is at the same time, 5 5 almost exactly the same time, that you MR. LASKER: Mark as 6 Exhibit 15-22 and 15-23 two e-mail 6 billed plaintiffs' counsel for the 19 hours 7 of work that you had conducted in communications we have between you and 8 8 Mr. Jones and others at EPA. evaluating an EPA document on glyphosate, 9 9 (Exhibit 15-22, e-mail chain correct? 10 Bates stamped EPAHQ6149, marked for MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 10 11 identification, as of this date.) 11 A. The dates are going to be close. (Exhibit 15-23, e-mail chain 12 12 Q. So in May of 2016, you spent 19 13 Bates stamped PORTIER0000055 through 13 hours for plaintiffs' counsel reviewing an 14 14 61, marked for identification, as of EPA glyphosate document and were paid by 15 plaintiffs' counsel by that, and then in 15 this date.) 16 June of 2016, you made a submission to EPA 16 Q. Dr. Portier, Exhibit 15-22 and 17 15-23 are two e-mail exchanges, one dated 17 with at least one table of an evaluation of 18 18 May of 2016, the other dated June of 2016, glyphosate, correct? 19 19 that include e-mail communications between A. I don't know. Probably. 2.0 you and Mr. Jones, correct? 20 Q. You produced this e-mail 21 A. Which document are we talking 21 communication -- at least the June 2016 22 22 about? Both of them? e-mail communication in response to our 23 Q. Yes. 23 document requests, but we did not have the assessment that you actually sent to EPA. 24 A. The first document is from 24 2.5 25 MR. LASKER: So we would request Jones -- to Jones from me it appears, and Page 107 Page 109 1 the second document is from Anna Lowit to 1 that that be produced. 2 me but there is something further down. 2 MS. GREENWALD: That was produced 3 Q. If you go to the beginning of the all PowerPoints supplied by Chris 4 conversation, there's e-mail exchanges. It Portier were supplied to you guys. 4 MR. LASKER: The PowerPoints, starts off with an e-mail exchange between 5 5 6 you and Jim Jones, and then some further 6 yes. 7 e-mail communications, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Correct. That 8 8 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. would be --9 9 A. I don't know where the start of MR. LASKER: Is this a PowerPoint 10 that conversation is. I'm sorry. 10 presentation? 11 11 Q. OK. If you look at MS. GREENWALD: PPTX is the root 12 Exhibit 15-23, I believe the first e-mail 12 of the document attached. 13 13 in the chain, and it seems like we got it MR. LASKER: Fair enough. We 14 here twice -- nope. It goes back and 14 will figure that out. 15 15 Q. Although -- so -- in any event, forth. 16 16 in these communications -- e-mail But the first chronological 17 17 communications, and particularly the e-mail that I see in this chain is an 18 e-mail at the very end of this on June 23, 18 communication in June of 2016, right after 19 2016, from you to Jim Jones correcting an 19 you had been paid by plaintiffs' counsel to 20 2.0 evaluate an EPA document, you do not error in the table that you had, I guess, 21 2.1 sent to him, correct? disclose to Mr. Jones that you are a paid 22 22 The very last page of the consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in the 23 23 litigation, correct? document --24 24 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I had an area 1 table that I had 25 25 to correct, new version attached, yes. A. In this e-mail right here, I do

	Page 110		Page 112
1	not do that. That is correct.	1	about glyphosate?
2	Q. Do you recall other e-mail	2	A. Did I have any conversations
3	communications that you had with Mr. Jones	3	yes.
4	during this period of time?	4	Q. What other EPA employees did you
5	A. I had at least one more, yes.	5	have conversations with?
6	Q. That has not been produced to us	6	A. I think his name is Steve
7	in this litigation.	7	Johnson, who is in charge of the EPA
8	Do you still have copies of that	8	science advisory panel reviews. I sent him
9	communication?	9	correspondence when I sent him my reviews.
10	A. If you didn't get it, I don't	10	Other EPA employees that I would
11	have it.	11	have spoken to?
12	Q. Do you recall the substance of	12	I speak with Vincent Cogliano.
13	this other e-mail communication with	13	Sometimes, I might have spoken with him.
14	Mr. Jones?	14	Q. Do you recall disclosing to
15	A. It had to do with errors I saw in	15	either of these EPA officials the fact that
16	the EFSA. It contains much of the stuff I	16	you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs'
17	was already sending to EFSA, along with	17	counsel in this litigation?
18	some linkage to problems with some of the	18	A. I don't know about Steve. I
19	things the EPA had done including the memo.	19	don't I don't think so.
20	Q. So in June of 2016, you were	20	Q. Have you had any conversations
21	having a series of e-mails communications	21	with Tom Burke?
22	with Mr. Jones at EPA based upon issues you	22	A. I've had lots of conversations
23	had identified through your paid work for	23	with Tom Burke.
24	plaintiffs' counsel in this litigation,	24	Q. About glyphosate?
25	correct?	25	A. I don't recall.
	Page 111		Page 113
1		1	
1 2	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	1 2	Q. Can you name for me the
	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible.		Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European
2	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.A. It's possible.Q. You do not have any recollection,	2	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government
2 3	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to	2 3	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about
2 3 4	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to Mr. Jones that you were working for	2 3 4	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about glyphosate?
2 3 4 5	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to Mr. Jones that you were working for plaintiffs' counsel during this time	2 3 4 5	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about glyphosate? A. There is no way I could remember
2 3 4 5 6	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to Mr. Jones that you were working for plaintiffs' counsel during this time period, correct?	2 3 4 5	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about glyphosate? A. There is no way I could remember them all. I'm terrible with names. No.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to Mr. Jones that you were working for plaintiffs' counsel during this time period, correct? A. I don't have a recollection of	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about glyphosate? A. There is no way I could remember them all. I'm terrible with names. No. I'm sorry.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to Mr. Jones that you were working for plaintiffs' counsel during this time period, correct? A. I don't have a recollection of disclosing or not disclosing. I don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about glyphosate? A. There is no way I could remember them all. I'm terrible with names. No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to Mr. Jones that you were working for plaintiffs' counsel during this time period, correct? A. I don't have a recollection of disclosing or not disclosing. I don't really know.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about glyphosate? A. There is no way I could remember them all. I'm terrible with names. No. I'm sorry. Q. Was it more than five people?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to Mr. Jones that you were working for plaintiffs' counsel during this time period, correct? A. I don't have a recollection of disclosing or not disclosing. I don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about glyphosate? A. There is no way I could remember them all. I'm terrible with names. No. I'm sorry. Q. Was it more than five people? A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to Mr. Jones that you were working for plaintiffs' counsel during this time period, correct? A. I don't have a recollection of disclosing or not disclosing. I don't really know. Q. You also had communications with Ann Lowit at EPA, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about glyphosate? A. There is no way I could remember them all. I'm terrible with names. No. I'm sorry. Q. Was it more than five people? A. Yes. Q. More than ten?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to Mr. Jones that you were working for plaintiffs' counsel during this time period, correct? A. I don't have a recollection of disclosing or not disclosing. I don't really know. Q. You also had communications with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about glyphosate? A. There is no way I could remember them all. I'm terrible with names. No. I'm sorry. Q. Was it more than five people? A. Yes. Q. More than ten? A. I don't know. I can't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to Mr. Jones that you were working for plaintiffs' counsel during this time period, correct? A. I don't have a recollection of disclosing or not disclosing. I don't really know. Q. You also had communications with Ann Lowit at EPA, correct? A. Yes, that is correct, briefly. Q. And that would be in this e-mail	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about glyphosate? A. There is no way I could remember them all. I'm terrible with names. No. I'm sorry. Q. Was it more than five people? A. Yes. Q. More than ten? A. I don't know. I can't distinguish between a regulator and a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to Mr. Jones that you were working for plaintiffs' counsel during this time period, correct? A. I don't have a recollection of disclosing or not disclosing. I don't really know. Q. You also had communications with Ann Lowit at EPA, correct? A. Yes, that is correct, briefly.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about glyphosate? A. There is no way I could remember them all. I'm terrible with names. No. I'm sorry. Q. Was it more than five people? A. Yes. Q. More than ten? A. I don't know. I can't distinguish between a regulator and a politician in Europe. So I have a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to Mr. Jones that you were working for plaintiffs' counsel during this time period, correct? A. I don't have a recollection of disclosing or not disclosing. I don't really know. Q. You also had communications with Ann Lowit at EPA, correct? A. Yes, that is correct, briefly. Q. And that would be in this e-mail exchange?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about glyphosate? A. There is no way I could remember them all. I'm terrible with names. No. I'm sorry. Q. Was it more than five people? A. Yes. Q. More than ten? A. I don't know. I can't distinguish between a regulator and a politician in Europe. So I have a difficult time on working out an answer to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to Mr. Jones that you were working for plaintiffs' counsel during this time period, correct? A. I don't have a recollection of disclosing or not disclosing. I don't really know. Q. You also had communications with Ann Lowit at EPA, correct? A. Yes, that is correct, briefly. Q. And that would be in this e-mail exchange? A. This e-mail exchange and then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about glyphosate? A. There is no way I could remember them all. I'm terrible with names. No. I'm sorry. Q. Was it more than five people? A. Yes. Q. More than ten? A. I don't know. I can't distinguish between a regulator and a politician in Europe. So I have a difficult time on working out an answer to that question. Q. Do you recall disclosing to any of those European officials that you were a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to Mr. Jones that you were working for plaintiffs' counsel during this time period, correct? A. I don't have a recollection of disclosing or not disclosing. I don't really know. Q. You also had communications with Ann Lowit at EPA, correct? A. Yes, that is correct, briefly. Q. And that would be in this e-mail exchange? A. This e-mail exchange and then I don't know what else is in here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about glyphosate? A. There is no way I could remember them all. I'm terrible with names. No. I'm sorry. Q. Was it more than five people? A. Yes. Q. More than ten? A. I don't know. I can't distinguish between a regulator and a politician in Europe. So I have a difficult time on working out an answer to that question. Q. Do you recall disclosing to any of those European officials that you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to Mr. Jones that you were working for plaintiffs' counsel during this time period, correct? A. I don't have a recollection of disclosing or not disclosing. I don't really know. Q. You also had communications with Ann Lowit at EPA, correct? A. Yes, that is correct, briefly. Q. And that would be in this e-mail exchange? A. This e-mail exchange and then I don't know what else is in here. Q. Do you recall ever disclosing to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about glyphosate? A. There is no way I could remember them all. I'm terrible with names. No. I'm sorry. Q. Was it more than five people? A. Yes. Q. More than ten? A. I don't know. I can't distinguish between a regulator and a politician in Europe. So I have a difficult time on working out an answer to that question. Q. Do you recall disclosing to any of those European officials that you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in litigation against Monsanto?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to Mr. Jones that you were working for plaintiffs' counsel during this time period, correct? A. I don't have a recollection of disclosing or not disclosing. I don't really know. Q. You also had communications with Ann Lowit at EPA, correct? A. Yes, that is correct, briefly. Q. And that would be in this e-mail exchange? A. This e-mail exchange and then I don't know what else is in here. Q. Do you recall ever disclosing to Ann Lowit that you were a paid consultant	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about glyphosate? A. There is no way I could remember them all. I'm terrible with names. No. I'm sorry. Q. Was it more than five people? A. Yes. Q. More than ten? A. I don't know. I can't distinguish between a regulator and a politician in Europe. So I have a difficult time on working out an answer to that question. Q. Do you recall disclosing to any of those European officials that you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in litigation against Monsanto? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to Mr. Jones that you were working for plaintiffs' counsel during this time period, correct? A. I don't have a recollection of disclosing or not disclosing. I don't really know. Q. You also had communications with Ann Lowit at EPA, correct? A. Yes, that is correct, briefly. Q. And that would be in this e-mail exchange? A. This e-mail exchange and then I don't know what else is in here. Q. Do you recall ever disclosing to Ann Lowit that you were a paid consultant with plaintiffs' counsel suing Monsanto?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about glyphosate? A. There is no way I could remember them all. I'm terrible with names. No. I'm sorry. Q. Was it more than five people? A. Yes. Q. More than ten? A. I don't know. I can't distinguish between a regulator and a politician in Europe. So I have a difficult time on working out an answer to that question. Q. Do you recall disclosing to any of those European officials that you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in litigation against Monsanto? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to Mr. Jones that you were working for plaintiffs' counsel during this time period, correct? A. I don't have a recollection of disclosing or not disclosing. I don't really know. Q. You also had communications with Ann Lowit at EPA, correct? A. Yes, that is correct, briefly. Q. And that would be in this e-mail exchange? A. This e-mail exchange and then I don't know what else is in here. Q. Do you recall ever disclosing to Ann Lowit that you were a paid consultant with plaintiffs' counsel suing Monsanto? A. No, I don't recall. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Go on.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about glyphosate? A. There is no way I could remember them all. I'm terrible with names. No. I'm sorry. Q. Was it more than five people? A. Yes. Q. More than ten? A. I don't know. I can't distinguish between a regulator and a politician in Europe. So I have a difficult time on working out an answer to that question. Q. Do you recall disclosing to any of those European officials that you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in litigation against Monsanto? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to Mr. Jones that you were working for plaintiffs' counsel during this time period, correct? A. I don't have a recollection of disclosing or not disclosing. I don't really know. Q. You also had communications with Ann Lowit at EPA, correct? A. Yes, that is correct, briefly. Q. And that would be in this e-mail exchange? A. This e-mail exchange and then I don't know what else is in here. Q. Do you recall ever disclosing to Ann Lowit that you were a paid consultant with plaintiffs' counsel suing Monsanto? A. No, I don't recall. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Go on. Q. Do you recall having any other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about glyphosate? A. There is no way I could remember them all. I'm terrible with names. No. I'm sorry. Q. Was it more than five people? A. Yes. Q. More than ten? A. I don't know. I can't distinguish between a regulator and a politician in Europe. So I have a difficult time on working out an answer to that question. Q. Do you recall disclosing to any of those European officials that you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in litigation against Monsanto? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Yes. Q. Was that in your e-mail in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. It's possible. Q. You do not have any recollection, sitting here today, of ever disclosing to Mr. Jones that you were working for plaintiffs' counsel during this time period, correct? A. I don't have a recollection of disclosing or not disclosing. I don't really know. Q. You also had communications with Ann Lowit at EPA, correct? A. Yes, that is correct, briefly. Q. And that would be in this e-mail exchange? A. This e-mail exchange and then I don't know what else is in here. Q. Do you recall ever disclosing to Ann Lowit that you were a paid consultant with plaintiffs' counsel suing Monsanto? A. No, I don't recall. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Go on.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. Can you name for me the individual individuals in the European government regulators or government officials with whom you have spoken about glyphosate? A. There is no way I could remember them all. I'm terrible with names. No. I'm sorry. Q. Was it more than five people? A. Yes. Q. More than ten? A. I don't know. I can't distinguish between a regulator and a politician in Europe. So I have a difficult time on working out an answer to that question. Q. Do you recall disclosing to any of those European officials that you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in litigation against Monsanto? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Yes.

Page 114 Page 116 1 1 your private conversations? during this time period after IARC reaches 2 2 A. I don't know if I used that in my classification, correct? 3 3 e-mail to Andriukaitis, but it is the first MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 4 thing we discussed when I walked in his 4 form. 5 5 door. A. A number of organizations have 6 6 reviewed the scientific literature on O. When was that? 7 A. When we met -- whenever the first 7 glyphosate following IARC's review of the 8 8 literature for glyphosate. time we met after I wrote that letter. I 9 9 Q. And despite Europe's submissions don't know the exact date. I'm sorry. 10 10 of various analyses, the European Food Q. In your -- you have -- remind me 11 11 Safety Agency has continued to reach a 12 12 A. Actually, I'll correct that. I'm conclusion that glyphosate does not pose a 13 13 risk for cancer, correct? sorry. 14 14 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. I told him that beforehand. I 15 15 told his staffer, when we were on the phone A. That is correct. 16 16 when she called to invite me, I said, I Q. And the European Chemical Agency, have this linkage. Is this a problem? 17 ECA, has continued to conclude that 17 18 18 And they said, no. glyphosate does not pose a risk of cancer 19 19 Q. You provided testimony in front in humans, correct? 20 of the European Commission, is that 20 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. correct, or you have been invited to? 21 A. ECA has for the first time 21 22 A. I provided testimony to the concluded that glyphosate shows no risk for 22 23 German Bundestag, but I did not provide 23 cancer in humans. 24 testimony in front of the European 24 Q. The -- obviously, the German 25 25 regulators, who you spoke with, they have Parliament. Page 115 Page 117 1 Q. In your testimony in Germany, did 1 continued to conclude that glyphosate did 2 2 you disclose that you were a paid not pose a risk for cancer, correct? 3 3 consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in this MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 4 4 litigation? A. That's not correct. 5 5 A. I can't recall. O. The BFR has now concluded that 6 Q. Have you worked with a group 6 glyphosate causes cancer, is that your 7 called the "Health and Environmental 7 testimony? 8 8 Alliance" in connection with their work on MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 9 9 glyphosate for registration in Europe? A. There are more than one German 10 A. I have advised them now and then. 10 agency dealing with glyphosate. BFR has 11 And they have advised me on issues. 11 not changed their mind. 12 Q. We talked earlier about that 12 Q. That glyphosate does not pose a 13 13 issue, about whether you should register as risk for cancer, correct? 14 a lobbyist or not register as a lobbyist. 14 A. Correct. 15 In your conversation with the 15 Q. The Canadian regulators have 16 European staffer about whether you should 16 concluded that glyphosate does not pose a 17 register, did you disclose to him the fact 17 risk for cancer, correct? 18 that you were a paid consultant for 18 A. I don't know. 19 plaintiffs' counsel in the glyphosate 19 Q. The World Health Organization, 20 litigation? 2.0 JPMR, has concluded that glyphosate through 21 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 21 food does not pose a risk for cancer, 22 form. 22 correct? 23 A. Yes. 23 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 24 O. There are a number of other 24 A. I'd have to look at their 25 25 organizations that have reviewed glyphosate conclusion. It's a little more detailed

Page 118 Page 120 1 1 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. and nuanced than that. 2 2 Q. Your general understanding though A. There are pooled analyses in 3 3 is that the JPMR in conducting its analysis these slides. 4 did not raise a concern that glyphosate 4 Q. And some of those pooled 5 5 analyses, in fact, are exactly the same as causes cancer, correct? 6 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 6 the analyses you have submitted in this 7 litigation, correct? A. Again, I would have to look at 8 8 JMPR's document and see. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 9 9 Q. The Japanese public health A. The studies that went into the 10 regulators have concluded that glyphosate pooled analyses are exactly the same as the 10 does not cause cancer, correct? 11 11 studies in this litigation. 12 12 A. I have no idea. The method by which I pooled them 13 13 and do a trend test of the overall response Q. The Australian public health regulators have concluded that glyphosate 14 14 from the pooled data is in the slides as 15 15 does not cause cancer, correct? well as in this litigation. 16 16 A. I think I might have read a news Q. Did you make a disclaimer --17 article on that, but other than that, I 17 well, first of all, none of your slide 18 18 decks themselves provide a written have no idea. 19 19 disclaimer that you are working as an Q. The New Zealand public health 20 regulators have concluded that glyphosate 20 expert for plaintiffs in glyphosate 21 does not cause cancer, correct? 21 litigation, correct? 22 22 A. I think so. I got some MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 23 23 information from one group about that. I A. If you say so. I haven't looked. 24 don't know if that's concluded or not. 24 Q. Did you make a disclaimer at the 25 Q. You actually appeared in a radio 25 beginning of each of these scientific Page 119 Page 121 1 program in New Zealand urging the 1 meetings when you presented this data that 2 regulators in New Zealand to find 2 you were a paid expert consultant for glyphosate as a carcinogenic, didn't you? 3 plaintiffs' counsel in private litigation 3 4 A. I might have. 4 against Monsanto? 5 5 Q. In response to our document A. I can't be certain for every one 6 request for this deposition, you produced a 6 of them. 7 7 series of slide decks for presentations Q. You have also given numerous 8 8 that you had given to various scientific interviews to media outlets and various 9 9 agencies, correct? bloggers commenting on glyphosate issues, 10 10 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. correct? 11 11 A. I have produced a slide deck of MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 12 any -- exactly what you asked for, any 12 A. I've done interviews with all 13 13 presentation I did on glyphosate. sorts of people on glyphosate issues. 14 Q. And at each of those scientific 14 Q. And have you disclosed to each of these media outlets your role as a paid 15 methods you presented some version of the 15 16 pooled analyses that you conducted on 16 expert consultant for plaintiffs' counsel 17 17 in this litigation? glyphosate that are the same types of 18 analyses you were proffering in this 18 A. I can't be certain. 19 litigation, correct? 19 Q. Well, for example -- strike that. 2.0 2.0 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. You have also written a number of 21 2.1 A. They're not exactly the same. commentaries about glyphosate in the Q. They are the same type of pooled 22 22 scientific press, correct? 23 23 analyses, correct? A. I've written two, I believe. 24 24 And you have been revising them O. Well, let's look at one of the 25 25 as you have gone along, correct? first of those.

Page 122 Page 124 1 1 Q. This is a reply that you MR. LASKER: This is -- we will 2 2 published in the journal "Archives of mark this as --Toxicology," correct? 3 3 MS. GREENWALD: 24. 4 MR. LASKER: So it is 15-24. I'm 4 A. This is a letter to the editor in 5 5 sorry. the journal "Archives of Toxicology." 6 6 (Exhibit 15-24, article from Q. And in this letter you are again 7 7 Horizons, dated March 7, 2016 with addressing the European Union's assessment 8 8 attachment, marked for identification. of glyphosate and its difference with IARC 9 9 as of this date.) marked regarding glyphosate, correct? 10 A. I don't know if I was talking 10 Q. Dr. Portier, this is an article 11 you wrote for the Swiss science magazine 11 about its difference with IARC. Give me a 12 Horizons, in which you debated that the 12 moment, please. 13 head of the pesticides unit at the European 13 No, I don't believe this was 14 14 Food Safety Authority about the safety of discussing the differences with IARC. I 15 15 glyphosate, correct? believe this was only discussing the 16 16 A. This article appeared in a Swiss scientific problems with the EFSA 17 magazine called Horizons, and yes, there 17 glyphosate risk assessment and pointing out 18 18 to the authors of that evaluation, that was pro and con, and Jose Tarazona did the 19 19 con and I did the pro. they missed a number of positive rodent 20 Q. This was March 2016, one year 20 findings. 21 after you had signed on as a paid 21 Q. But this is a -- again, an 22 22 consultant -- paid expert for plaintiffs' article or a letter that you had published 23 counsel in this litigation, correct? in the Archives of Toxicology presenting 23 24 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 24 your analysis of the glyphosate science, 2.5 A. This is -- yeah, about a year. 25 correct? Page 123 Page 125 1 Q. And in this article, there is 1 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 2 2 a -- you identify yourself as the former A. No. It is noting problems with director of the U.S. National Institute of 3 3 the EFSA risk assessment and some of the 4 4 Environmental Health, correct? analysis I have done for glyphosate. 5 5 A. I certainly would never have Q. And this letter was submitted in 6 6 May of 2017, correct? identified myself as that. That's 7 7 A. Probably, yes. incorrect. 8 8 O. As of this date, you had been Q. There is -- you do not have any 9 9 disclosure anywhere in this article about working as a paid expert for plaintiffs' 10 the fact that you had been for a year a 10 counsel for more than two years, correct? 11 11 paid expert for plaintiffs' counsel in MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 12 litigation against Monsanto, correct? 12 A. As of May 2017, I was working for 13 13 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. plaintiffs' counsel, correct. 14 A. There does not appear to be 14 Q. And you had billed plaintiffs' 15 15 counsel, and we can do the math, but anything on this page that suggests I am a 16 16 paid consultant for this law firm on somewhere around \$150,000 as of this date 17 17 glyphosate issues. for your work on glyphosate, correct, 18 O. And let's look at, as 15-25 --18 plaintiffs' counsel? 19 19 A. I had billed them. That is this is ... 2.0 2.0 (Exhibit 15-25, article entitled, correct. 21 2.1 "Re: Tarazona et al.: Glyphosate Q. And you do not disclose anywhere 22 toxicity and carcinogenicity: a review 22 in this letter to the editor in the journal 23 of the scientific basis of the European 23 Archives of Toxicology the fact that you 24 Union assessment," marked for 24 were a paid expert for plaintiffs' counsel identification, as of this date.) 25 25 in private litigation against Monsanto, do

	Page 126		Page 128
1	you?	1	correct?
2	MS. GREENWALD: Objection to	2	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.
3	form.	3	A. Yes, I guess.
4	A. This journal doesn't ask for	4	Q. And this presentation, you are
5	that. I don't know.	5	listed as an author along with five
6	Q. Dr. Portier	6	individuals who are identified as Ramazzini
7	A. It's not on the document.	7	fellows, correct?
8	Q. So just so the record is	8	A. One, two, three, four, five, that
9	A. To answer your question, it is	9	is correct.
10	not on the document.	10	
11	Q. In your letter to the editor that	11	Q. As of this date, you are not a Ramazzini fellow, correct?
12		12	·
13	was published in Archives of Toxicology in	13	A. As of this date, I am not I
14	2017 in June of 2017, you do not	14	was not a well, I don't know. I
15	disclose the fact that you were you are	15	honestly don't know.
16	a paid expert for plaintiffs' counsel in	16	Q. You have recently become
17	litigation against Monsanto, correct?	17	selected
18	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	18	A. I am a Ramazzini fellow
	A. In Exhibit 15-25, I do not	19	Q. OK.
19	disclose that I was a paid consultant for	20	A yes.
20	this law firm in this litigation.		I guess by this date I wasn't
21	Q. In 2016, you made a presentation	21	because I'm not listed as one.
22	about glyphosate to the Collegium	22	Q. So it was sometime in the last
23	Ramazzini.	23	year that you became a Ramazzini fellow, is
24	A. No, I didn't make a presentation.	24	that fair?
25	MR. LASKER: Let's mark this	25	A. I would think so, yes.
	Page 127		Page 129
	1490 127		Page 129
1	will be Exhibit 26.	1	
1 2	will be Exhibit 26.	1 2	Q. And one of the other scientists
	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled,		Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting
2	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of	2	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct?
2	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and	2 3	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct.
2 3 4	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and interest groups in public health	2 3 4	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to
2 3 4 5	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and interest groups in public health decision making," marked for	2 3 4 5	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form.
2 3 4 5 6	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and interest groups in public health decision making," marked for identification, as of this date.)	2 3 4 5 6	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Q. Philip Landrigan actually
2 3 4 5 6 7	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and interest groups in public health decision making," marked for identification, as of this date.) A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Q. Philip Landrigan actually assisted, helped you, in preparing that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and interest groups in public health decision making," marked for identification, as of this date.) A. Yes. Q. This is Exhibit 15-26 is a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Q. Philip Landrigan actually assisted, helped you, in preparing that open letter that you submitted to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and interest groups in public health decision making," marked for identification, as of this date.) A. Yes. Q. This is Exhibit 15-26 is a poster presentation that was presented	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Q. Philip Landrigan actually assisted, helped you, in preparing that open letter that you submitted to the European regulators in November of 2015,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and interest groups in public health decision making," marked for identification, as of this date.) A. Yes. Q. This is Exhibit 15-26 is a poster presentation that was presented it was called "Ramazzini Days."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Q. Philip Landrigan actually assisted, helped you, in preparing that open letter that you submitted to the European regulators in November of 2015, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and interest groups in public health decision making," marked for identification, as of this date.) A. Yes. Q. This is Exhibit 15-26 is a poster presentation that was presented it was called "Ramazzini Days." What is Ramazzini Days?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Q. Philip Landrigan actually assisted, helped you, in preparing that open letter that you submitted to the European regulators in November of 2015, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and interest groups in public health decision making," marked for identification, as of this date.) A. Yes. Q. This is Exhibit 15-26 is a poster presentation that was presented it was called "Ramazzini Days." What is Ramazzini Days? A. Ramazzini Days is something that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Q. Philip Landrigan actually assisted, helped you, in preparing that open letter that you submitted to the European regulators in November of 2015, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and interest groups in public health decision making," marked for identification, as of this date.) A. Yes. Q. This is Exhibit 15-26 is a poster presentation that was presented it was called "Ramazzini Days." What is Ramazzini Days? A. Ramazzini Days is something that Ramazzini Institute holds once a year	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Q. Philip Landrigan actually assisted, helped you, in preparing that open letter that you submitted to the European regulators in November of 2015, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Philip Landrigan's name is on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and interest groups in public health decision making," marked for identification, as of this date.) A. Yes. Q. This is Exhibit 15-26 is a poster presentation that was presented it was called "Ramazzini Days." What is Ramazzini Days? A. Ramazzini Days is something that Ramazzini Institute holds once a year where it is a scientific conference.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Q. Philip Landrigan actually assisted, helped you, in preparing that open letter that you submitted to the European regulators in November of 2015, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Philip Landrigan's name is on that letter, I believe. I would have to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and interest groups in public health decision making," marked for identification, as of this date.) A. Yes. Q. This is Exhibit 15-26 is a poster presentation that was presented it was called "Ramazzini Days." What is Ramazzini Days? A. Ramazzini Days is something that Ramazzini Institute holds once a year where it is a scientific conference. Q. At this scientific conference,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Q. Philip Landrigan actually assisted, helped you, in preparing that open letter that you submitted to the European regulators in November of 2015, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Philip Landrigan's name is on that letter, I believe. I would have to check to make sure.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and interest groups in public health decision making," marked for identification, as of this date.) A. Yes. Q. This is Exhibit 15-26 is a poster presentation that was presented it was called "Ramazzini Days." What is Ramazzini Days? A. Ramazzini Days is something that Ramazzini Institute holds once a year where it is a scientific conference. Q. At this scientific conference, there was a poster presentation regarding	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Q. Philip Landrigan actually assisted, helped you, in preparing that open letter that you submitted to the European regulators in November of 2015, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Philip Landrigan's name is on that letter, I believe. I would have to check to make sure. And yes, he did provide comments.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and interest groups in public health decision making," marked for identification, as of this date.) A. Yes. Q. This is Exhibit 15-26 is a poster presentation that was presented it was called "Ramazzini Days." What is Ramazzini Days? A. Ramazzini Days is something that Ramazzini Institute holds once a year where it is a scientific conference. Q. At this scientific conference, there was a poster presentation regarding glyphosate, and you are one of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Q. Philip Landrigan actually assisted, helped you, in preparing that open letter that you submitted to the European regulators in November of 2015, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Philip Landrigan's name is on that letter, I believe. I would have to check to make sure. And yes, he did provide comments. Q. What other, if any,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and interest groups in public health decision making," marked for identification, as of this date.) A. Yes. Q. This is Exhibit 15-26 is a poster presentation that was presented it was called "Ramazzini Days." What is Ramazzini Days? A. Ramazzini Days is something that Ramazzini Institute holds once a year where it is a scientific conference. Q. At this scientific conference, there was a poster presentation regarding glyphosate, and you are one of the coauthors of that poster presentation,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Q. Philip Landrigan actually assisted, helped you, in preparing that open letter that you submitted to the European regulators in November of 2015, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Philip Landrigan's name is on that letter, I believe. I would have to check to make sure. And yes, he did provide comments. Q. What other, if any, collaborations have you had with Philip
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and interest groups in public health decision making," marked for identification, as of this date.) A. Yes. Q. This is Exhibit 15-26 is a poster presentation that was presented it was called "Ramazzini Days." What is Ramazzini Days? A. Ramazzini Days is something that Ramazzini Institute holds once a year where it is a scientific conference. Q. At this scientific conference, there was a poster presentation regarding glyphosate, and you are one of the coauthors of that poster presentation, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Q. Philip Landrigan actually assisted, helped you, in preparing that open letter that you submitted to the European regulators in November of 2015, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Philip Landrigan's name is on that letter, I believe. I would have to check to make sure. And yes, he did provide comments. Q. What other, if any, collaborations have you had with Philip Landrigan relating to glyphosate?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and interest groups in public health decision making," marked for identification, as of this date.) A. Yes. Q. This is Exhibit 15-26 is a poster presentation that was presented it was called "Ramazzini Days." What is Ramazzini Days? A. Ramazzini Days is something that Ramazzini Institute holds once a year where it is a scientific conference. Q. At this scientific conference, there was a poster presentation regarding glyphosate, and you are one of the coauthors of that poster presentation, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Q. Philip Landrigan actually assisted, helped you, in preparing that open letter that you submitted to the European regulators in November of 2015, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Philip Landrigan's name is on that letter, I believe. I would have to check to make sure. And yes, he did provide comments. Q. What other, if any, collaborations have you had with Philip Landrigan relating to glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and interest groups in public health decision making," marked for identification, as of this date.) A. Yes. Q. This is Exhibit 15-26 is a poster presentation that was presented it was called "Ramazzini Days." What is Ramazzini Days? A. Ramazzini Days is something that Ramazzini Institute holds once a year where it is a scientific conference. Q. At this scientific conference, there was a poster presentation regarding glyphosate, and you are one of the coauthors of that poster presentation, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The document 15-26, I am one of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Q. Philip Landrigan actually assisted, helped you, in preparing that open letter that you submitted to the European regulators in November of 2015, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Philip Landrigan's name is on that letter, I believe. I would have to check to make sure. And yes, he did provide comments. Q. What other, if any, collaborations have you had with Philip Landrigan relating to glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and interest groups in public health decision making," marked for identification, as of this date.) A. Yes. Q. This is Exhibit 15-26 is a poster presentation that was presented it was called "Ramazzini Days." What is Ramazzini Days? A. Ramazzini Days is something that Ramazzini Institute holds once a year where it is a scientific conference. Q. At this scientific conference, there was a poster presentation regarding glyphosate, and you are one of the coauthors of that poster presentation, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The document 15-26, I am one of the coauthors.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Q. Philip Landrigan actually assisted, helped you, in preparing that open letter that you submitted to the European regulators in November of 2015, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Philip Landrigan's name is on that letter, I believe. I would have to check to make sure. And yes, he did provide comments. Q. What other, if any, collaborations have you had with Philip Landrigan relating to glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Probably a few things. I can't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	will be Exhibit 26. (Exhibit 15-26, article entitled, "The glyphosate saga: an example of influence of unsound science and interest groups in public health decision making," marked for identification, as of this date.) A. Yes. Q. This is Exhibit 15-26 is a poster presentation that was presented it was called "Ramazzini Days." What is Ramazzini Days? A. Ramazzini Days is something that Ramazzini Institute holds once a year where it is a scientific conference. Q. At this scientific conference, there was a poster presentation regarding glyphosate, and you are one of the coauthors of that poster presentation, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The document 15-26, I am one of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. And one of the other scientists that you were that you're presenting with here is Philip Landrigan, correct? A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Q. Philip Landrigan actually assisted, helped you, in preparing that open letter that you submitted to the European regulators in November of 2015, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Philip Landrigan's name is on that letter, I believe. I would have to check to make sure. And yes, he did provide comments. Q. What other, if any, collaborations have you had with Philip Landrigan relating to glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form.

Dr. Landrigan about further research relating to glyphosate? A. No. Q. Have you communicated with Mr. Landrigan about the European registration of Philip Landrigan about the Philip Landrigan of Philip Landrigan about the Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? Ms. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan about the Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate science? Ms. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate. Ms. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate cenece? Ms. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan about the Philip Landrigan philip Landrigan about the Philip Landrigan about the Philip Landrigan about the Philip Landri		Page 130		Page 132
relating to glyphosate? A. No Q. Have you communicated with Mr. Landrigan about European regulators' assessment of glyphosate beyond the open letter in November of 2015? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Say it again, please. Q. Have you consulted with Philip Landrigan about the European registration of glyphosate apart from that letter in November of 2015? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. So first, I don't consult with Philip Landrigan. Q. Communicate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. So first, I don't consult with Philip Landrigan. Q. Communicate? A. We collaborate or we communicate, so — Q. That's a better word. A. — let me make that clear. Q. So let me reask it. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate eyen (glyphosate eyen) A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate eyen (glyphosate) MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate eyen of glyphosate eyen (glyphosate) MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan about the EPA's assessment of glyphosate eyen (glyphosate) MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate eyen (glyphosate) MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate eyen collaborated with philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate eyen collaborated with philip A. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that question is yes. Q. You so lot give the period of the poster presentation - and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. No. Q. O'Now, you' gust asked me - if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation on the concern is being raised about potentia	1	Dr. Landrigan about further research	1	O. In your poster presentation at
state that you talk about economically motivated activities having influenced the glyphosate science, correct? Mr. Landrigan about European regulators' assessment of glyphosate beyond the open letter in November of 2015? Mr. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A Say it again, please. O, Have you consulted with Philip Landrigan about the European registration of glyphosate part from that letter in November of 2015? Mr. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A So first, I don't consult with Philip Landrigan. O, Communicate? O, That's a better word. A We collaborate or we communicate, and a newironmental health consultant. O, So let me reask it. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan about glyphosate registration in Europe outside of that November 2015 letter Page 131 that we have already discussed? A. Not that I recall. O, Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate. Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? Mr. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science correct? Mr. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Mr. Landrigan about assessment of the glyphosate control and the proper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? Mr. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Mr. Landrigan about assessment of the glyphosate control and the proper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? Mr. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Mr. Landrigan about assessment of the glyphosate science? Mr. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Mr. Landrigan about assessment of the glyphosate control and the proper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? Mr. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Mr. Landrigan about assessment of the glyphosate control and the proper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? Mr. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate control and the proper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correc	2		2	- • •
Q. Have you communicated with Mr. Landrigan about European registration of glyphosate spart from that letter in November of 2015? Ms. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Say it again, please. Q. Have you consulted with Philip Landrigan about the European registration of glyphosate apart from that letter in November of 2015? Ms. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. So first, I don't consult with Philip Landrigan. Q. Communicate? A. We collaborate or we communicate, so Q. That's a better word. Lardrigan about glyphosate seience, Q. So let me reask it. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan about glyphosate registration in Europe outside of that November 2015 letter Page 131 that we have already discussed? A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan about glyphosate registration in of glyphosate science? Ms. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I should pay more attention to what my coauthors write sometimes. That is what it says. Q. You don off sickose nywhere in this poster presentation your role as a paid expert for plaintiffs' counsel in private litigation against Monsanto, do you? Ms. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. Q. Again, just so the record is clear, you do not disclose the fact that you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in private litigation against Monsanto? A. That is correct. Q. Now, you're – the point you're making in this poster presentation instead Page 131 Page 133 page 133 page 134 that we have already discussed? A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about sasessments of the glyphosate. Ms. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. Q. Again, just so the record is clear, you do not disclose the fact that you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in private litigation against Monsanto? A. That is correct. A. That is correct. A. I don't — Q. Now, you're – the point you're making in this poster present	3		3	
Mr. Landrigan about European regulators' assessment of glyphosate beyon the open letter in November of 2015? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	4		4	
assessment of glyphosate beyond the open letter in November of 2015? M.S. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Say it again, please. O. Have you consulted with Philip Landrigan about the European registration of glyphosate apart from that letter in November of 2015? M.S. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. So first, I don't consult with Philip Landrigan. A. We collaborate or we communicate, So O. That's a better word. Landrigan about table treval. A. He was pour collaborated with Philip Landrigan about about a sessment of glyphosate consulted with Philip Landrigan about about assessment of glyphosate concercity. M.S. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. A. No that I recall. C. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate. M.S. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. C. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate concerc? M.S. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. C. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate concerce? M.S. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. C. Have you collaborated with plilip glyphosate. C. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. C. You asid you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate. C. You Sald you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate. C. Communicate C. A. I should pay more attention to what my councitions with with what it says. C. You do not disclose anywhere in this poster presentation your role as a paid expert for plaintiffs' counsel in private litigation against Monsanto, do you? M.S. GREENWALD: Objection form. A. Not that I recall. C. A. That is what it says. C. You do not disclose the fact that you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in private litigation against Monsanto, do you? A. That is an environmental health consultant. C. A. That is about what you	5		5	
The teller in November of 2015? Section	6		6	
MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Q. Have you consulted with Philip Landrigan about the European registration of glyphosate a part from that letter in November of 2015? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. So first, I don't consult with Philip Landrigan. A. We collaborate or we communicate, so— Q. That's a better word. Landrigan about glyphosate registration in glyphosate and sort disclose the fact that you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in private litigation against Monsanto, do you? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. Q. Again, just so the record is clear, you do not disclose the fact that you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in private litigation against Monsanto? A. — I et me make that clear. Q. So let me reask it. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan about glyphosate registration in glyphosate? A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan pabout assessments of the glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with poliply consider the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr. — with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate — A. No. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr. — with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate — A. No. What my coauthors with is says. Q. You said with eliter in this poster presentation you role as a paid expert for plaintiffs' counsel in private litigation against Monsanto, do you? MS. GREENWALD: Objection form. A. That is what it says. Q. You so don to disclose the fact that you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in mention and every mention in the pola	7		7	
A. Say it again, please. Q. Have you consulted with Philip Landrigan about the European registration of glyphosate againt from that letter in Nowember of 2015? M. S. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. So first, I don't consult with Philip Landrigan. Q. Communicate? A. We collaborate or we communicate, Bay on the reask it. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan about glyphosate registration in Europe outside of that November 2015 letter Page 131 that we have already discussed? A. Not that I recall. C. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about assessments of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. A. Not that I recall. C. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate senece? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. A. Not that I recall. C. Janing in this poster presentation your role as a paid expert for plaintiffs' counsel in private litigation against Monsanto, do you? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specifi	8		8	1 4
Q. Have you consulted with Philip Landrigan about the European registration of glyphosate apart from that letter in November of 2015? M. S. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. So first, I don't consult with Philip Landrigan. Q. Communicate? A. We collaborate or we communicate, So — Let me make that clear. Q. So let me reask it. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan about glyphosate registration in Europe outside of that November 2015 letter Page 131 that we have already discussed? A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with M. S. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with M. Landrigan about assessments of form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with M. Landrigan about assessments of fed glyphosate? M. S. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with M. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with M. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr. — with D. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate — C. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr. — with D. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate — C. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr. — with D. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate — C. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr. — with C. A. You do not disclose the nate high dayou? MS. GREENWALD: Objection form. A. Not do not disclose the act that you were a paid consultant. C. A. So the record is clear, you do not disclose the fact that you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in private litigation against Monsanto? A. That is correct. Q. Now, you've — the point you're making in this poster presentation nit his poster presentation your near the paid dexpert for plaintiffs' counsel in private	9		9	•
Landrigan about the European registration of glyphosate apart from that letter in November of 2015? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. So first, I don't consult with Bilby Landrigan. Communicate? A. We collaborate or we communicate, A. We collaborate or we communicate, By So Consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in private litigation against Monsanto, do you? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. A. That is correct. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in private litigation against Monsanto, do you'? A. That is correct. A. Not that I recall. B. A. Not that I rec	10		10	·
of glyphosate apart from that letter in November of 2015? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. So first, I don't consult with Philip Landrigan. Q. Communicate? A. We collaborate or we communicate, so — Q. That's a better word. Landrigan about glyphosate erace that we have already discussed? A. Not that I recall. A. Not that I recall. C. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. C. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. C. Again, just so the record is clear, you do not disclose the fact that you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in private litigation against Monsanto, do you? MS. GREENWALD: Objection in glaphosate or glaphosate or glaphosate or glaphosate? A. Not that I recall. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. I list myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. Ilist myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. Ilist myself as an environmental health consultant. A. Not specific. Ilist myself as an environmental health consultant. A. An An the an environmental health consultant. A. An An that so the record is clear, you do not disclose the fact that you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in private litigation against Monsanto, do you were a paid consultant. A. An An that so the record is clear, you do not disclose the fact that you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in private litigation against Monsanto, an environmental health consultant. A. That is correct. A. That is about what you characterize as an environmental health consultant. A. That is correct. A. I don't — Q. I	11		11	
November of 2015? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. So first, I don't consult with Philip Landrigan. A. We collaborate or we communicate, So	12		12	
MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. So first, I don't consult with A. So first, I don't consult with A. So first, I don't consult with Bilip Landrigan. C. Communicate? Q. Communicate? A. We collaborate or we communicate, So — Q. That's a better word. Q. So let me reask it. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan about glyphosate registration in Landrigan about glyphosate. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Not that I recall. A. Not that I recall. G. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Not that I recall. MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. MrDr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with D. Landrigan; if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate C. D. Landrigan, is I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. No. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. No. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. No. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. No. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to fee pon letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. C. Q. Now, you're the peior of the poster presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you gust so the record is clear, you do not disclose the fact that you were a paid consultant, open every and consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in private litigation against Monsanto? A. That is correct. A. That is correct. A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Idon't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. That's what theI am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear. You asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just a	13		13	
A. So first, I don't consult with Philip Landrigan. Q. Communicate? A. We collaborate or we communicate, So — Q. That's a better word. Q. That's a better word. A. We collaborated with Philip A. We collaborated with Philip Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan about glyphosate registration in Europe outside of that November 2015 letter Page 131 that we have already discussed? A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Mr. Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate of glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr. — Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr. — with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate — C. OK. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. No. A. No. A. No. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation - and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation in the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation in the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? A. No. A. No. A. That's what the — I am sorry, let's be clear. Q. In the poster presentation — and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? A. N	14		14	
16	15		15	•
17 Q. Communicate? 18 A. We collaborate or we communicate, 19 so 20 Q. That's a better word. 21 A let me make that clear. 22 Q. So let me reask it. 23 Have you collaborated with Philip 24 Landrigan about glyphosate registration in Europe outside of that November 2015 letter Page 131 1 that we have already discussed? 2 A. Not that I recall. 3 Q. Have you collaborated with Philip 4 Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? 5 of glyphosate? 6 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. 7 form. 8 A. Not that I recall. 9 Q. Have you collaborated with pilip always on the corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? 9 MS. GREENWALD: Objection. 9 Q. Have you collaborated with glyphosate science? 10 Mf. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? 11 glyphosate science? 12 MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. 13 A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. 15 So I guess the answer to that question is yes. 16 Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate 20 A. No. 21 A. No. 22 A. We collaborated with Philip and private litigation against you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in private litigation against Monsanto? 22 A. That is correct. 24 Q. Now, you're the point you're making in this poster presentation instead 25 is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? 26 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 27 A. Not that I recall. 28 I an envirommental health consultant. 29 Q. Now, you're the point you're making in this poster presentation instead 29 is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? 30 A. Not that I recall. 31 is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? 32 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 33 A. Not	16		16	
A. We collaborate or we communicate, 19 so Q. That's a better word. 20 Q. That's a better word. 21 A let me make that clear. 22 Q. So let me reask it. 23 Have you collaborated with Philip 24 Landrigan about glyphosate registration in Europe outside of that November 2015 letter Page 131 1 that we have already discussed? A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip 4 Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a conginatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate Q. OK.	17		17	
20 Q. That's a better word. 21 A let me make that clear. 22 Q. So let me reask it. 23 Have you collaborated with Philip 24 Landrigan about glyphosate registration in 25 Europe outside of that November 2015 letter Page 131 1 that we have already discussed? 2 A. Not that I recall. 3 Q. Have you collaborated with Philip 4 Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? 6 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. 8 A. Not that I recall. 9 Q. Have you collaborated with 10 Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? 11 glyphosate science? 12 MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. 13 A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. 15 Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate 2 Q. OK. 2 (Cear, you do not disclose the fact that you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' cunsel in gluant consultant for plaintiffs' you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' wonwere a paid consultant for plaintiffs' you were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' wonwere a paid consultant for plaintiffs' and monstant of plaintiffs' and the private litigation against Monsanto? A. That is correct. Page 131 Page 133 is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? A. That is vorted. A. That is orr	18		18	
Q. That's a better word. A let me make that clear. Q. So let me reask it. Have you collaborated with Philip Europe outside of that November 2015 letter Page 131 that we have already discussed? A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Mr. Landrigan bout assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate Q. OK. You were a paid consultant for plaintiffs' counsel in private litigation against Monsanto? A. That is correct. Q. Now, you're the point you're making in this poster presentation instead Page 131 Page 133 is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the conclusion? Green Wald D: Object to form. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the conclusion? A. That's what hat orrect? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the conclusion? A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something cl	19		19	
21 A. — let me make that clear. 22 Q. So let me reask it. 23 Have you collaborated with Philip 24 Landrigan about glyphosate registration in 25 Europe outside of that November 2015 letter Page 131 1 that we have already discussed? 2 A. Not that I recall. 3 Q. Have you collaborated with Philip 4 Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? 6 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. 7 form. 8 A. Not that I recall. 9 Q. Have you collaborated with 10 Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? 11 glyphosate science? 12 MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. 13 A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a counsel in private litigation against Monsanto? 1 is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? 1 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 2 A. Not that I recall. 3 Q. Have you collaborated with 4 Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? 1 MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. 2 A. Not that I recall. 3 A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a counsel in private litigation against Monsanto? 4 A. That is correct. 4 D. Now, you're the point you're making in this poster presentation instead Page 133 Fage 133 1 is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 4 I don't 4 Q. In the conclusion? 4 Clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier 4 Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. 5 Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. 4 Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with 5 Or. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate 2 A. No. 2 Q. OK. 3 Orrect. 4 Correct. 5 On the poster presentation, the conclusion? 5 On the poster presentation, the conclusion? 6 On the poster presentation, the conclusion? 7 On the poster presentation of the poster? 8 On the poster presentation of the poster? 9 On the poster presentation of conclusion? 9 On the poster presentation of				
Q. So let me reask it. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan about glyphosate registration in Europe outside of that November 2015 letter Page 131 that we have already discussed? A. Not that I recall. Q. Now, you're the point you're making in this poster presentation instead Page 133 that we have already discussed? A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with philip Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a Cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. No. Q. OK. Monsanto? A. That is correct. Q. Now, you're the point you're making in this poster presentation instead Page 133 A. Not that I recall. Page 133 Rabout what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That is correct. MS. GREENWALD: Objection form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's correct. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.				
Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan about glyphosate registration in Europe outside of that November 2015 letter Page 131 that we have already discussed? A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a Cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate Q. Now, you're the point you're making in this poster presentation instead Page 131 Page 133 is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Int's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.				
Landrigan about glyphosate registration in Europe outside of that November 2015 letter Page 131 that we have already discussed? A. Not that I recall. Q. Nave you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip allyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. Now, you're the point you're making in this poster presentation instead Page 133 I is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you're the point you're making in this poster presentation instead Page 133 is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you're the point you're making in this poster presentation instead		•		
Page 131 that we have already discussed? A. Not that I recall. Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of form. A. Not that I recall. B. A. Not that I recall. C. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of form. A. Not that I recall. C. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Not that I recall. C. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. C. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. No. Q. OK. Page 133 Page 133 is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation in the concern is being arised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.				
Page 131 that we have already discussed? A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.				
that we have already discussed? A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with MR. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. No. Q. OK.	23	Europe outside of that November 2013 letter	23	making in this poster presentation instead
A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. A. Not that I recall. BY. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. C. Have you collaborated with BY. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a Cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. No. Concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.		Page 131		Page 133
A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. A. Not that I recall. BY. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. C. Have you collaborated with BY. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a Cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. No. Concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.				_
4 Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment 5 of glyphosate? 6 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 7 form. 8 A. Not that I recall. 9 Q. Have you collaborated with 10 Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the 11 glyphosate science? 12 MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. 13 A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a 14 cosignatory of the open letter, and that 15 open letter discusses the science around 16 glyphosate. 17 So I guess the answer to that 18 question is yes. 19 Q. You said you had a number of 20 other collaborations with Mr with 21 Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, 22 regarding glyphosate 23 A. No. 24 Q. OK. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 4 A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	1	that we have already discussed?	1	
4 Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment 5 of glyphosate? 6 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 7 form. 8 A. Not that I recall. 9 Q. Have you collaborated with 10 Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the 11 glyphosate science? 12 MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. 13 A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a 14 cosignatory of the open letter, and that 15 open letter discusses the science around 16 glyphosate. 17 So I guess the answer to that 18 question is yes. 19 Q. You said you had a number of 20 other collaborations with Mr with 21 Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, 22 regarding glyphosate 23 A. No. 24 Q. OK. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 4 A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.				is about what you characterize as an
of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. No. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2	A. Not that I recall.	2	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on
6 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 7 form. 8 A. Not that I recall. 9 Q. Have you collaborated with 10 Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the 11 glyphosate science? 12 MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. 13 A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a 14 cosignatory of the open letter, and that 15 open letter discusses the science around 16 glyphosate. 17 So I guess the answer to that 18 question is yes. 19 Q. You said you had a number of 20 other collaborations with Mr with 21 Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, 22 regarding glyphosate 23 A. No. 24 Q. OK. 8 A. That's what the I am sorry, 10 MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. 4 A. That's what the I am sorry, 12 let's be clear. 13 First, I want to make something 14 clear: You asked me if I made a 15 presentation to them. Baur Xavier 18 aur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. 16 vould repeat the question. 17 Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? 18 you are a coauthor of the poster? 29 A. No. 20 In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? 20 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2	A. Not that I recall.Q. Have you collaborated with Philip	2	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct?
form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with In the second of the glyphosate science? A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. No. Q. Have you collaborated with personal sa and that improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier also presentation of them. Baur Xavier also presentation to them. Baur also presentation to them. Baur also presentation to them. Baur also	2 3 4	A. Not that I recall.Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment	2 3 4	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.
A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. No. Q. Mr. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? A. No. Q. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2 3 4 5	A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate?	2 3 4 5	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't
9 Q. Have you collaborated with 10 Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the 11 glyphosate science? 12 MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. 13 A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a 14 cosignatory of the open letter, and that 15 open letter discusses the science around 16 glyphosate. 17 So I guess the answer to that 18 question is yes. 19 Q. You said you had a number of 20 other collaborations with Mr with 21 Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, 22 regarding glyphosate 23 A. No. 24 Q. OK. 29 Iet's be clear. 10 First, I want to make something 11 clear: You asked me if I made a 12 presentation to them. Baur Xavier 13 Baur made the presentation. I did not 14 attend this meeting. 15 Now, you just asked me if you 16 could repeat the question. 17 Q. In the poster presentation and 18 you are a coauthor of the poster? 19 A. Correct. 20 Other collaborations with Mr with 21 Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, 22 regarding glyphosate 23 A. No. 24 Q. OK. 25 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2 3 4 5 6	A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to	2 3 4 5	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion?
Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. No. Q. Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? In the poster presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? Q. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form.	2 3 4 5 6 7	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection.
glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. No. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry,
MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. Ms. GREENWALD: Object to form. 12 presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? A. No. Q. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear.
A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a 13 Baur made the presentation. I did not 14 cosignatory of the open letter, and that 15 open letter discusses the science around 16 glyphosate. 17 So I guess the answer to that 18 question is yes. 19 Q. You said you had a number of 20 other collaborations with Mr with 21 Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, 22 regarding glyphosate 23 A. No. 24 Q. OK. 21 Baur made the presentation. I did not 24 attend this meeting. 25 Now, you just asked me if you 26 could repeat the question. 27 Q. In the poster presentation and 28 you are a coauthor of the poster? 29 A. Correct. 20 Q. In the poster presentation, the 21 concern is being raised about potential 22 improper influence of corporate money on 23 scientific research, correct? 24 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something
cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. No. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a
open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. No. Open letter discusses the science around 15 Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? A. No. Q. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier
glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. No. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? A. No. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not
So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. No. A. No. Other collaborations with Mr with Concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting.
question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. No. Q. Hi the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? A. No. A. No. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you
Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate 23 A. No. 24 Q. OK. 29 A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question.
other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. No. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? AS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and
Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. No. 2. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? A. No. 2. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? 2. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster?
regarding glyphosate 22 improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? Q. OK. 23 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct.
23 A. No. 24 Q. OK. 25 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the
24 Q. OK. 24 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential
W.S. OKEEN WALD. Objection, form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on
A. Sofry, none.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct?
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Philip Landrigan related to the EPA's assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. Not that I recall. Q. Have you collaborated with Mr. Landrigan about assessments of the glyphosate science? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. Mr Dr. Landrigan is a cosignatory of the open letter, and that open letter discusses the science around glyphosate. So I guess the answer to that question is yes. Q. You said you had a number of other collaborations with Mr with Dr. Landrigan, if I understood correctly, regarding glyphosate A. No. Q. OK.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	is about what you characterize as an improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. I don't Q. In the conclusion? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. That's what the I am sorry, let's be clear. First, I want to make something clear: You asked me if I made a presentation to them. Baur Xavier Baur made the presentation. I did not attend this meeting. Now, you just asked me if you could repeat the question. Q. In the poster presentation and you are a coauthor of the poster? A. Correct. Q. In the poster presentation, the concern is being raised about potential improper influence of corporate money on scientific research, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.

Page 134 Page 136 1 A. I don't recall. end, correct. 2 2 We certainly did some work with Q. And you and the other authors are 3 3 them trying to help them improve their calling upon the Collegium Ramazzini to 4 4 take a stand against corporate funding of cancer bioassays. That I do recall. 5 5 O. And in your CV -scientific research --6 6 MR. LASKER: And you can mark MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 7 7 that as 15-27. form. 8 8 (Exhibit 15-27, curriculum vitae, Q. -- as part of this presentation, 9 9 marked for identification, as of this correct? 10 10 MR. SNOO: Objection to form. date.) 11 A. Actually, no. We encouraged the 11 Q. If you look at the fifth page 12 12 Collegium Ramazzini to again support an under your U.S. Government service IARC evaluation of carcinogenicity. 13 activities, and it's about three-quarters 13 14 14 Q. In the earlier paragraph, right down the page under U.S. Government service 15 activities, you are listed as an organizer, 15 before where you are reading, you talk 16 formal collaborative agreements between NTP 16 about: 17 and Ramazzini Foundation from 2001 to 2006. 17 "Glyphosate is a one example of 18 18 inappropriate corporate influence of public correct? 19 19 health regulation by the use of unsound A. That is correct. 20 scientific reviews" --20 Q. And so for this five- or six-year 21 21 period then, the NTP and Ramazzini A. But your question said --22 22 Q. -- "and would call for increased Foundation were involved in collaborative 23 sensitivity, full transparency and 23 agreements relating to toxicological 24 24 implementation of effective rules governing studies? 25 decision-making bodies," correct? 25 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Page 135 Page 137 1 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 1 A. It was more related to pathology 2 A. But we are not calling for the 2 and the storage of data from toxicological 3 Ramazzini Institute to do that, or studies. 4 4 Collegium Ramazzini, which was your Q. During this period, you were the 5 organizer of these agreements. 5 question to me. 6 Q. So you are calling for scientists 6 Did the Ramazzini Foundation 7 7 more broadly, is that fair? conduct any research for NTP? 8 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to A. I don't believe they did. 9 9 form. Q. During this period, did the 10 Q. Or regulators? 10 Ramazzini Foundation conduct any research that was funded by the U.S. Government? 11 11 MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. 12 12 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. We are calling for an increased 13 13 sensitivity, full transparency and the A. They did get some funding from 14 implementation of effective rules governing 14 NIEHS or NTP, but, boy, I cannot for the 15 decision-making bodies. That's what we are 15 life of me remember. I think they got some 16 calling for. That's what we said. 16 funding. 17 17 Q. Am I correct in my understanding Q. Are you aware that the Collegium 18 then Collegium Ramazzini does not take 18 Ramazzini has announced that it will be conducting studies on glyphosate with 19 money from private corporations for its 19 20 2.0 scientific research? respect to genotoxicity and oxidative 21 21 A. I have no idea. stress? 22 Q. During your time in government at 22 A. Yes, I am aware of that. 23 NTP, you worked on collaborative efforts 23 Q. Are you involved in that research 24 between the NTP and the Collegium 24 effort? 25 25 Ramazzini, correct? A. No.

	Page 138		Page 140
1	Q. Have you had any conversations	1	there.
2	with the folks at Collegium Ramazzini about	2	A. 15-20? Oh, boy. I'm not good at
3	that research?	3	keeping things in order here.
4	A. Yes.	4	Q. This is your submission to EPA in
5	Q. What has been the nature of your	5	October of 2016, correct?
6	conversations?	6	A. Yeah, it looks like that.
7	A. Part of it they were asking me to	7	Q. And then on page 7, about
8	join them and analyze their data at the	8	two-thirds down the page, you're talking
9	end. I declined.	9	about whether there is an association
10	Part of it was just general	10	between glyphosate exposure and the risk of
11	questions about the science and what's	11	non-Hodgkins lymphoma.
12	already been done with glyphosate.	12	Do you see that, and that's what
13	Q. And in your conversation with	13	starts the summary?
14	Collegium Ramazzini, did you disclose the	14	A. Start with "Summary," and how far
15	fact that you were a paid consultant for	15	do you want me to read?
16	plaintiffs' counsel in litigation against	16	Q. (First of all, I'm asking if you)
17	Monsanto?	17	see that section, which you obviously do.
18	A. It is the Ramazzini Institute.	18	The end of that paragraph, you
19	They are different entities.	19	state, with regard to glyphosate in NHL,
20	But yes, I did disclose to them.	20	"So is causality plausible here? Yes,
21	Q. Is that the reason that you	21	absolutely. Is it demonstrated? No,
22	decided not to participate in their	22	clearly not."
23	scientific evaluation?	23	That was your statement, correct?
24	A. Partly. There are other reasons.	24	A. If you could wait.
25	Q. What were the other reasons?	25	This is strictly discussing the
	Q. What were the other reasons:		This is suretry discussing the
	Page 139		Page 141
1	A. I'm busy. I'm retired. They	1	epidemiology data, and the question was
2	wanted me to come down to Bologna and give	2	whether the epidemiology data, by itself,
3	a talk and other things and I just wasn't	3	demonstrates causality, and the answer to
4	interested.	4	the question is no.
5	Q. Dr. Portier, you have stated that	5	Q. And that is your opinion,
6	you do not believe that causality between	<u>6</u>	correct?
7	glyphosate formulations and NHL has been	7	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.
8	demonstrated, correct?	8	A. That is only for the epidemiology
9	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	9	data, and for the epidemiology data to
10	A. What I believe is written in the	10	exhibit clear causality, it would have had
11	expert report.	11	to be sufficient instead of limited in the
12	Q. Well, let me just ask this	12	IARC review.
13	question: It is true that you do not	13	I still believe it's limited and
14	believe that causality between glyphosate	14	not sufficient by itself to demonstrate
15	formulations and NHL have been	15	causality.
16	demonstrated, correct?	16	Q. OK, fair enough.
17	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	17	You are a proponent of a
18	A. Causality is an interesting	18	principle called the "precautionary
19	it's a spectrum, but if you're using	19	principle," correct?
20	causality to mean 100 percent, absolutely	20	MS. GREENWALD: Objection to
21	certain, then I would have concern. But my	21	form.
22	conclusion is it probably causes NHL.	22	A. I have been in debates with
23	Q. Let's take a look next in line.	23	others on the precautionary principle where
24	This is Exhibit 15-20. It is already	24	I've had to choose one side or the other.
25	marked. So it's one of the exhibits in	25	But I'm not a proponent and I
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

	Page 142		Page 144
1	don't hate it. I'm not clear on what it is	1	A. I'm calling them to conclude
2	in the way it is applied.	2	these tumors arose as a function of
3	Q. Well, let me ask you this	3	exposure to glyphosate.
4	well, first of all, you were a member of a	4	Q. Based upon the fact that EPA is
5	group called "Critical Scientists	5	a
6	Switzerland," correct?	6	A. Public health agency.
7	A. Yes, I am.	7	Q. And should therefore be applying
8	Q. And one of the goals of Critical	8	a public protective methodology, or a
9	Scientists Switzerland is promoting the	9	methodology that is protective of the
10	precautionary principle, correct?	10	public in making its assessments about
11	A. I suppose it is, yes.	11	carcinogenicity, correct?
12	Q. And in your assessment of	12	MS. GREENWALD: Objection to
13	glyphosate, you have talked about public	13	form.
14	protective decisions, correct?	14	A. It's a long question but I
15	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	15	will I think you were reading way more
16	A. I have no idea I certainly do	16	into this sentence than really is there.
17	talk about public protective science use	17	They are a public health agency.
18	of science to protect the public.	18	It's their job to protect the public. The
19	Q. And in respect specifically to	19	correct decision here, the public-protected
20	the glyphosate, and, for example, in your	20	decision, should be to conclude these
21	submissions to EPA, you have called upon	21	tumors arose as a function of exposure to
22	them to apply this public protective	22	glyphosate.
23	approach in their assessment of the	23	Q. And your understanding, when
24	glyphosate science, correct?	24	there is if there is uncertainty in the
25	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	25	data but there is data that is suggestive,
	MB. GREENWILD. Objection, form.		data but there is data that is suggestive,
	Page 143		Page 145
1	Page 143 A. I don't recall that. You would	1	Page 145 for a regulator buying making a
1 2		1 2	for a regulator buying making a
	A. I don't recall that. You would		
2	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry.	2	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should
2	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry.Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20.	2	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is
2 3 4	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry.Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20.And if we could look at page 11.	2 3 4	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is that fair to say? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form.
2 3 4 5	 A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry. Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20. And if we could look at page 11. And here you're talking about 	2 3 4 5	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is that fair to say? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to
2 3 4 5 6	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry. Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20. And if we could look at page 11. And here you're talking about your comment on the rat studies, correct?	2 3 4 5 6	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is that fair to say? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form.
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry. Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20. And if we could look at page 11. And here you're talking about your comment on the rat studies, correct? A. That's what it says, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is that fair to say? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. No, I don't I don't believe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry. Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20. And if we could look at page 11. And here you're talking about your comment on the rat studies, correct? A. That's what it says, yes. Q. And then the bottom of the page,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is that fair to say? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. No, I don't I don't believe that is a general rule I would hold.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry. Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20. And if we could look at page 11. And here you're talking about your comment on the rat studies, correct? A. That's what it says, yes. Q. And then the bottom of the page, the second paragraph on the bottom, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is that fair to say? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. No, I don't I don't believe that is a general rule I would hold. Having been a regulator myself,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry. Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20. And if we could look at page 11. And here you're talking about your comment on the rat studies, correct? A. That's what it says, yes. Q. And then the bottom of the page, the second paragraph on the bottom, the last line, you state that the public	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is that fair to say? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. No, I don't I don't believe that is a general rule I would hold. Having been a regulator myself, it's there are many facets to making a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry. Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20. And if we could look at page 11. And here you're talking about your comment on the rat studies, correct? A. That's what it says, yes. Q. And then the bottom of the page, the second paragraph on the bottom, the last line, you state that the public protective decision in this case should be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is that fair to say? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. No, I don't I don't believe that is a general rule I would hold. Having been a regulator myself, it's there are many facets to making a decision. And you worry about public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry. Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20. And if we could look at page 11. And here you're talking about your comment on the rat studies, correct? A. That's what it says, yes. Q. And then the bottom of the page, the second paragraph on the bottom, the last line, you state that the public protective decision in this case should be to conclude these tumors arose as a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is that fair to say? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. No, I don't I don't believe that is a general rule I would hold. Having been a regulator myself, it's there are many facets to making a decision. And you worry about public health but decisions are complicated.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry. Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20. And if we could look at page 11. And here you're talking about your comment on the rat studies, correct? A. That's what it says, yes. Q. And then the bottom of the page, the second paragraph on the bottom, the last line, you state that the public protective decision in this case should be to conclude these tumors arose as a function of exposure to glyphosate,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is that fair to say? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. No, I don't I don't believe that is a general rule I would hold. Having been a regulator myself, it's there are many facets to making a decision. And you worry about public health but decisions are complicated. Q. With respect to carcinogenicity,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry. Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20. And if we could look at page 11. And here you're talking about your comment on the rat studies, correct? A. That's what it says, yes. Q. And then the bottom of the page, the second paragraph on the bottom, the last line, you state that the public protective decision in this case should be to conclude these tumors arose as a function of exposure to glyphosate, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is that fair to say? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. No, I don't I don't believe that is a general rule I would hold. Having been a regulator myself, it's there are many facets to making a decision. And you worry about public health but decisions are complicated. Q. With respect to carcinogenicity, you have also stated your belief that it is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry. Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20. And if we could look at page 11. And here you're talking about your comment on the rat studies, correct? A. That's what it says, yes. Q. And then the bottom of the page, the second paragraph on the bottom, the last line, you state that the public protective decision in this case should be to conclude these tumors arose as a function of exposure to glyphosate, correct? A. It's the purpose of EPA to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is that fair to say? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. No, I don't I don't believe that is a general rule I would hold. Having been a regulator myself, it's there are many facets to making a decision. And you worry about public health but decisions are complicated. Q. With respect to carcinogenicity, you have also stated your belief that it is glyphosate and not the surfactants in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry. Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20. And if we could look at page 11. And here you're talking about your comment on the rat studies, correct? A. That's what it says, yes. Q. And then the bottom of the page, the second paragraph on the bottom, the last line, you state that the public protective decision in this case should be to conclude these tumors arose as a function of exposure to glyphosate, correct? A. It's the purpose of EPA to protect the public and they have to make	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is that fair to say? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. No, I don't I don't believe that is a general rule I would hold. Having been a regulator myself, it's there are many facets to making a decision. And you worry about public health but decisions are complicated. Q. With respect to carcinogenicity, you have also stated your belief that it is glyphosate and not the surfactants in the formulated products that are causing the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry. Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20. And if we could look at page 11. And here you're talking about your comment on the rat studies, correct? A. That's what it says, yes. Q. And then the bottom of the page, the second paragraph on the bottom, the last line, you state that the public protective decision in this case should be to conclude these tumors arose as a function of exposure to glyphosate, correct? A. It's the purpose of EPA to protect the public and they have to make that decision, and in this case, they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is that fair to say? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. No, I don't I don't believe that is a general rule I would hold. Having been a regulator myself, it's there are many facets to making a decision. And you worry about public health but decisions are complicated. Q. With respect to carcinogenicity, you have also stated your belief that it is glyphosate and not the surfactants in the formulated products that are causing the effects, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry. Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20. And if we could look at page 11. And here you're talking about your comment on the rat studies, correct? A. That's what it says, yes. Q. And then the bottom of the page, the second paragraph on the bottom, the last line, you state that the public protective decision in this case should be to conclude these tumors arose as a function of exposure to glyphosate, correct? A. It's the purpose of EPA to protect the public and they have to make that decision, and in this case, they should have included these tumors as a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is that fair to say? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. No, I don't I don't believe that is a general rule I would hold. Having been a regulator myself, it's there are many facets to making a decision. And you worry about public health but decisions are complicated. Q. With respect to carcinogenicity, you have also stated your belief that it is glyphosate and not the surfactants in the formulated products that are causing the effects, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry. Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20. And if we could look at page 11. And here you're talking about your comment on the rat studies, correct? A. That's what it says, yes. Q. And then the bottom of the page, the second paragraph on the bottom, the last line, you state that the public protective decision in this case should be to conclude these tumors arose as a function of exposure to glyphosate, correct? A. It's the purpose of EPA to protect the public and they have to make that decision, and in this case, they should have included these tumors as a function of exposure to glyphosate, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is that fair to say? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. No, I don't I don't believe that is a general rule I would hold. Having been a regulator myself, it's there are many facets to making a decision. And you worry about public health but decisions are complicated. Q. With respect to carcinogenicity, you have also stated your belief that it is glyphosate and not the surfactants in the formulated products that are causing the effects, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry. Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20. And if we could look at page 11. And here you're talking about your comment on the rat studies, correct? A. That's what it says, yes. Q. And then the bottom of the page, the second paragraph on the bottom, the last line, you state that the public protective decision in this case should be to conclude these tumors arose as a function of exposure to glyphosate, correct? A. It's the purpose of EPA to protect the public and they have to make that decision, and in this case, they should have included these tumors as a function of exposure to glyphosate, yes. Q. Again, in your discussion with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is that fair to say? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. No, I don't I don't believe that is a general rule I would hold. Having been a regulator myself, it's there are many facets to making a decision. And you worry about public health but decisions are complicated. Q. With respect to carcinogenicity, you have also stated your belief that it is glyphosate and not the surfactants in the formulated products that are causing the effects, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I can tell you what I believe.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry. Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20. And if we could look at page 11. And here you're talking about your comment on the rat studies, correct? A. That's what it says, yes. Q. And then the bottom of the page, the second paragraph on the bottom, the last line, you state that the public protective decision in this case should be to conclude these tumors arose as a function of exposure to glyphosate, correct? A. It's the purpose of EPA to protect the public and they have to make that decision, and in this case, they should have included these tumors as a function of exposure to glyphosate, yes. Q. Again, in your discussion with EPA, you're calling upon them to apply this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is that fair to say? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. No, I don't I don't believe that is a general rule I would hold. Having been a regulator myself, it's there are many facets to making a decision. And you worry about public health but decisions are complicated. Q. With respect to carcinogenicity, you have also stated your belief that it is glyphosate and not the surfactants in the formulated products that are causing the effects, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I can tell you what I believe. I believe that glyphosate has an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry. Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20. And if we could look at page 11. And here you're talking about your comment on the rat studies, correct? A. That's what it says, yes. Q. And then the bottom of the page, the second paragraph on the bottom, the last line, you state that the public protective decision in this case should be to conclude these tumors arose as a function of exposure to glyphosate, correct? A. It's the purpose of EPA to protect the public and they have to make that decision, and in this case, they should have included these tumors as a function of exposure to glyphosate, yes. Q. Again, in your discussion with EPA, you're calling upon them to apply this protective approach in their assessment of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is that fair to say? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. No, I don't I don't believe that is a general rule I would hold. Having been a regulator myself, it's there are many facets to making a decision. And you worry about public health but decisions are complicated. Q. With respect to carcinogenicity, you have also stated your belief that it is glyphosate and not the surfactants in the formulated products that are causing the effects, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I can tell you what I believe. I believe that glyphosate has an effect, and I believe the surfactants also
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. I don't recall that. You would have to show me. I'm sorry. Q. So we are still on Exhibit 20. And if we could look at page 11. And here you're talking about your comment on the rat studies, correct? A. That's what it says, yes. Q. And then the bottom of the page, the second paragraph on the bottom, the last line, you state that the public protective decision in this case should be to conclude these tumors arose as a function of exposure to glyphosate, correct? A. It's the purpose of EPA to protect the public and they have to make that decision, and in this case, they should have included these tumors as a function of exposure to glyphosate, yes. Q. Again, in your discussion with EPA, you're calling upon them to apply this protective approach in their assessment of glyphosate, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	for a regulator buying making a public-protective decision, they should lean in favor of binding an association, is that fair to say? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. No, I don't I don't believe that is a general rule I would hold. Having been a regulator myself, it's there are many facets to making a decision. And you worry about public health but decisions are complicated. Q. With respect to carcinogenicity, you have also stated your belief that it is glyphosate and not the surfactants in the formulated products that are causing the effects, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I can tell you what I believe. I believe that glyphosate has an effect, and I believe the surfactants also have an effect, but the effect seen in

Page 146 Page 148 1 1 Q. You have also stated your belief, way of explaining the set of facts before 2 2 with respect to carcinogenicity, that it is us," correct? 3 3 glyphosate and not the surfactants in the MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 4 formulated products that are causing the 4 A. It's a paraphrase probably, or 5 5 something along those lines, but yes. effects, correct? 6 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form 6 Q. You agree that this is the and asked and answered. 7 appropriate methodology to be followed in 8 8 reaching a causation opinion with respect A. There is a lot of evidence here. 9 9 to glyphosate or glyphosate formulations So you have to break it down for me by the 10 and non-Hodgkins lymphoma, correct? 10 type of evidence you want me to discuss. Q. We are going to provide you 11 11 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 12 12 with -- do you recall being interviewed form. 13 during one of the times that you went to 13 A. The Bradford Hill criteria with 14 14 Europe to talk about the European Food modifications have been accepted by many 15 15 Safety Authority's assessment of authorities as the way to approach a 16 16 glyphosate? causality argument. 17 17 Q. My question was about you though. A. I've been interviewed dozens of 18 18 Do you agree that the appropriate times. 19 19 methodology to be followed in reaching a Q. During the break we will ask you 20 to listen to one of those interviews. 20 causation opinion with respect to 21 21 glyphosate is the Bradford Hill criteria MS. GREENWALD: Counsel, it has 22 including the question is there any other 2.2 to be on the record. I'm not going to 23 23 have him look at something on a break. way of explaining the set of facts before 24 That's not the way it works in 24 us? 25 this litigation. You guys have done it 25 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form, Page 149 Page 147 1 1 asked and answered. against us --2 MR. LASKER: Well, we have had 2 A. I think that quote is in my 3 our people review things during the expert report. And the approach I took in 4 4 breaks so they could answer questions the expert report, I believe, is the 5 5 after the break. correct approach for glyphosate. 6 6 Q. You still didn't answer my MS. GREENWALD: Well, that's your 7 7 question. choice. 8 8 We have also had depositions Do you believe the correct 9 9 where we have taken a couple-minute approach, correct methodology in reaching a 10 break and then your counsel holds it 10 causation opinion with respect to 11 11 against our time. glyphosate or glyphosate formulations and 12 So if you want him to do it, we 12 NHL is to ask the question is there any 13 will do it on the record during your 13 other way of explaining the set of facts 14 14 own time. before us? 15 15 MS. GREENWALD: Same objection, MR. LASKER: We will get that 16 16 keyed up in a moment then. form, and asked and answered. 17 17 Q. In presenting your opinions in A. I believe that the approach I use 18 your expert report, you have presented them 18 is the correct approach. That's my answer. 19 in the context of the Bradford Hill 19 That question is too simple. The 20 2.0 approach is much more complicated. criteria, correct? 21 2.1 A. Yes. Bradford Hill was just using it as a means 22 Q. And the question that a scientist 22 for people to understand the concept of 23 23 must answer under the Bradford Hill what he was trying to get through, but this 24 24 criteria in deciding whether one can reach is -- the whole criteria is very 25 25 a causation opinion is "Is there any other complicated and much greater than that one

	Page 150		Page 152
1		1	
1	sentence.		MS. GREENWALD: I don't want to
2	Q. So in conducting your assessment	2	play games here either. So let's see
3	of the glyphosate science, has it been your	3	if you can hear it sufficiently, and
4	methodology to look to see whether there is	4	all of us, actually, in the room.
5	any other way of explaining the set of	5	(Videotape plays.)
6	facts before us?	6	MS. GREENWALD: I can't hear it.
7	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	7	So you have to start it over.
8	A. It's part of the Bradford Hill	8	MR. LASKER: Let's do this after
9	criteria is the philosophy of Bradford	9	the break.
10	Hill is that question.	10	MS. GREENWALD: We would also
11	I didn't ask that question	11	like some authentication that this is
12	specifically on every single piece of	12	actually an accurate if you could
13	evidence I looked at.	13	give us the link and we can look at it,
14	Q. Did you ask that question with	14	we'd just have some confirmation of
15	respect to the glyphosate science as a	15	what it is.
16	whole?	16	MR. LASKER: We can do that off
17	MS. GREENWALD: Objection to	17	the record, and then we will put it on
18	form.	18	the record, too. That's fine.
19	A. Glyphosate	19	Q. Dr. Portier, when did you first
20	Q. Science as a whole	20	reach your conclusion that glyphosate
21	MS. GREENWALD: Objection.	21	probably causes non-Hodgkins lymphoma in
22	3	22	
23	Q with respect to	23	humans?
24	carcinogenicity.	24	A. When did I first reach that
25	A. As a whole?	25	conclusion?
25	MS. GREENWALD: Same objection.	25	Well, I agreed with the IARC
	5 151		
	Page 151		Page 153
1		1	
1 2	A. Yes.	1 2	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at
2	A. Yes.Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask	2	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph.
2 3	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question	2	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you
2 3 4	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we	2 3 4	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the
2 3 4 5	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised	2 3 4 5	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you
2 3 4 5 6	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised interview that you had in Europe.	2 3 4 5 6	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you discuss in your report that were provided
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised interview that you had in Europe. MR. LASKER: And let's get this	2 3 4 5 6 7	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you discuss in your report that were provided with the Greim arbitration?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised interview that you had in Europe. MR. LASKER: And let's get this so the court reporter can hear it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you discuss in your report that were provided with the Greim arbitration? A. Not really. I can't say exactly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised interview that you had in Europe. MR. LASKER: And let's get this so the court reporter can hear it. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you discuss in your report that were provided with the Greim arbitration? A. Not really. I can't say exactly when I reviewed those supplemental tables.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised interview that you had in Europe. MR. LASKER: And let's get this so the court reporter can hear it. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript of it?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you discuss in your report that were provided with the Greim arbitration? A. Not really. I can't say exactly when I reviewed those supplemental tables. Q. Was it before or after the date
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised interview that you had in Europe. MR. LASKER: And let's get this so the court reporter can hear it. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript of it? MR. LASKER: We have a thumb	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you discuss in your report that were provided with the Greim arbitration? A. Not really. I can't say exactly when I reviewed those supplemental tables. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted the open letter to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised interview that you had in Europe. MR. LASKER: And let's get this so the court reporter can hear it. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript of it? MR. LASKER: We have a thumb drive.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you discuss in your report that were provided with the Greim arbitration? A. Not really. I can't say exactly when I reviewed those supplemental tables. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted the open letter to the European regulators in November of 2015?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised interview that you had in Europe. MR. LASKER: And let's get this so the court reporter can hear it. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript of it? MR. LASKER: We have a thumb drive. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you discuss in your report that were provided with the Greim arbitration? A. Not really. I can't say exactly when I reviewed those supplemental tables. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted the open letter to the European regulators in November of 2015? A. I think it was probably after
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised interview that you had in Europe. MR. LASKER: And let's get this so the court reporter can hear it. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript of it? MR. LASKER: We have a thumb drive. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you discuss in your report that were provided with the Greim arbitration? A. Not really. I can't say exactly when I reviewed those supplemental tables. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted the open letter to the European regulators in November of 2015? A. I think it was probably after that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised interview that you had in Europe. MR. LASKER: And let's get this so the court reporter can hear it. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript of it? MR. LASKER: We have a thumb drive. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript? MR. LASKER: We don't have a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you discuss in your report that were provided with the Greim arbitration? A. Not really. I can't say exactly when I reviewed those supplemental tables. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted the open letter to the European regulators in November of 2015? A. I think it was probably after that. Q. Was it before or after the date
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised interview that you had in Europe. MR. LASKER: And let's get this so the court reporter can hear it. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript of it? MR. LASKER: We have a thumb drive. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript? MR. LASKER: We don't have a transcript. We have a thumb drive.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you discuss in your report that were provided with the Greim arbitration? A. Not really. I can't say exactly when I reviewed those supplemental tables. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted the open letter to the European regulators in November of 2015? A. I think it was probably after that. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted your evaluations or you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised interview that you had in Europe. MR. LASKER: And let's get this so the court reporter can hear it. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript of it? MR. LASKER: We have a thumb drive. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript? MR. LASKER: We don't have a transcript. We have a thumb drive. A. My hearing is not great.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you discuss in your report that were provided with the Greim arbitration? A. Not really. I can't say exactly when I reviewed those supplemental tables. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted the open letter to the European regulators in November of 2015? A. I think it was probably after that. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted your evaluations or you submitted provided submissions to EPA in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised interview that you had in Europe. MR. LASKER: And let's get this so the court reporter can hear it. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript of it? MR. LASKER: We have a thumb drive. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript? MR. LASKER: We don't have a transcript. We have a thumb drive.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you discuss in your report that were provided with the Greim arbitration? A. Not really. I can't say exactly when I reviewed those supplemental tables. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted the open letter to the European regulators in November of 2015? A. I think it was probably after that. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted your evaluations or you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised interview that you had in Europe. MR. LASKER: And let's get this so the court reporter can hear it. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript of it? MR. LASKER: We have a thumb drive. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript? MR. LASKER: We don't have a transcript. We have a thumb drive. A. My hearing is not great.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you discuss in your report that were provided with the Greim arbitration? A. Not really. I can't say exactly when I reviewed those supplemental tables. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted the open letter to the European regulators in November of 2015? A. I think it was probably after that. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted your evaluations or you submitted provided submissions to EPA in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised interview that you had in Europe. MR. LASKER: And let's get this so the court reporter can hear it. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript of it? MR. LASKER: We have a thumb drive. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript? MR. LASKER: We don't have a transcript. We have a thumb drive. A. My hearing is not great. Q. Let's play the videotape.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you discuss in your report that were provided with the Greim arbitration? A. Not really. I can't say exactly when I reviewed those supplemental tables. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted the open letter to the European regulators in November of 2015? A. I think it was probably after that. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted your evaluations or you submitted provided submissions to EPA in October of 2016?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised interview that you had in Europe. MR. LASKER: And let's get this so the court reporter can hear it. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript of it? MR. LASKER: We have a thumb drive. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript? MR. LASKER: We don't have a transcript. We have a thumb drive. A. My hearing is not great. Q. Let's play the videotape.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you discuss in your report that were provided with the Greim arbitration? A. Not really. I can't say exactly when I reviewed those supplemental tables. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted the open letter to the European regulators in November of 2015? A. I think it was probably after that. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted your evaluations or you submitted provided submissions to EPA in October of 2016? A. I can't be certain. Q. In your expert report, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised interview that you had in Europe. MR. LASKER: And let's get this so the court reporter can hear it. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript of it? MR. LASKER: We have a thumb drive. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript? MR. LASKER: We don't have a transcript. We have a thumb drive. A. My hearing is not great. Q. Let's play the videotape. That's you on the screen, right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you discuss in your report that were provided with the Greim arbitration? A. Not really. I can't say exactly when I reviewed those supplemental tables. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted the open letter to the European regulators in November of 2015? A. I think it was probably after that. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted your evaluations or you submitted provided submissions to EPA in October of 2016? A. I can't be certain. Q. In your expert report, you address the animal cancer bioassays under
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised interview that you had in Europe. MR. LASKER: And let's get this so the court reporter can hear it. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript of it? MR. LASKER: We have a thumb drive. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript? MR. LASKER: We don't have a transcript. We have a thumb drive. A. My hearing is not great. Q. Let's play the videotape. That's you on the screen, right? A. Looks like it. MS. GREENWALD: And, Dr. Portier,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you discuss in your report that were provided with the Greim arbitration? A. Not really. I can't say exactly when I reviewed those supplemental tables. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted the open letter to the European regulators in November of 2015? A. I think it was probably after that. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted your evaluations or you submitted provided submissions to EPA in October of 2016? A. I can't be certain. Q. In your expert report, you address the animal cancer bioassays under the Bradford Hill criteria biological
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised interview that you had in Europe. MR. LASKER: And let's get this so the court reporter can hear it. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript of it? MR. LASKER: We have a thumb drive. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript? MR. LASKER: We don't have a transcript. We have a thumb drive. A. My hearing is not great. Q. Let's play the videotape. That's you on the screen, right? A. Looks like it. MS. GREENWALD: And, Dr. Portier, if you can't hear it, we should stop it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you discuss in your report that were provided with the Greim arbitration? A. Not really. I can't say exactly when I reviewed those supplemental tables. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted the open letter to the European regulators in November of 2015? A. I think it was probably after that. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted your evaluations or you submitted provided submissions to EPA in October of 2016? A. I can't be certain. Q. In your expert report, you address the animal cancer bioassays under the Bradford Hill criteria biological plausibility, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Yes. Q. Dr. Portier, I would like to ask you about let's go back to the question of the interview that you've had, and we will play for you this is a televised interview that you had in Europe. MR. LASKER: And let's get this so the court reporter can hear it. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript of it? MR. LASKER: We have a thumb drive. MS. GREENWALD: Do you have a transcript? MR. LASKER: We don't have a transcript. We have a thumb drive. A. My hearing is not great. Q. Let's play the videotape. That's you on the screen, right? A. Looks like it. MS. GREENWALD: And, Dr. Portier,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	monograph conclusion. So I guess it was at the end of the IARC monograph. Q. And then do you recall when you first reviewed the data tables for the various animal cancer bioassays that you discuss in your report that were provided with the Greim arbitration? A. Not really. I can't say exactly when I reviewed those supplemental tables. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted the open letter to the European regulators in November of 2015? A. I think it was probably after that. Q. Was it before or after the date that you submitted your evaluations or you submitted provided submissions to EPA in October of 2016? A. I can't be certain. Q. In your expert report, you address the animal cancer bioassays under the Bradford Hill criteria biological

Page 154 Page 156 1 1 A. I address it there and in two mainly used to supply evidence missing from 2 2 human studies, correct? other places, correct. 3 3 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Q. And you agree that animal cancer 4 bioassays are intended to test whether 4 5 5 glyphosate can cause cancer in mammals, (Exhibit 15-28, document 6 thus supporting the concept that 6 entitled, "Principles for modeling 7 7 chemicals -- let me strike that. dose-response for risk assessment of 8 8 chemicals." marked for identification. It is your opinion as set forth 9 9 as of this date.) in your expert report that animal cancer 10 A. I didn't think anybody ever read 10 bioassays are intended to test whether 11 11 that document. glyphosate can cause cancer in mammals, 12 12 thus supporting the concept that the O. One thing that came out of this, 13 13 chemical could cause cancer in humans. right? 14 14 A. That's amazing. correct? 15 15 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to Q. So 15-28, this is a report of a 16 committee that you chaired on principles 16 17 17 for modeling dose-response for the risk A. That is part of what I believe 18 assessment of chemicals, correct? 18 from animal cancer studies. 19 19 A. Did I chair it? There is a second part to that 20 because they can be, under certain 20 Q. Or maybe you served on this 21 21 committee. I don't remember who chaired, conditions, tumor specific for humans. 22 O. You would agree that an 2.2 frankly. 23 23 A. I don't know either. evaluation of human health risks, sound 24 24 human data, whenever available, are O. You worked on this committee. 25 25 preferred to animal data, correct? correct? Page 155 Page 157 1 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 1 A. I worked on this committee that 2 2 A. In any endeavor, looking at produced this report. That is correct. 3 mammalian health, the target population, Q. And on the beginning of this 4 doing everything you can in the target 4 report -- and I recognize it is a long 5 population that you -- things I can do in report, but on page Roman X at the 5 6 6 the target population are important and beginning, it is sort of the summary 7 7 should be considered. Things that I can't section --8 do in the target populations, I will use A. Where? 9 Q. It's Roman X. 9 other scientific models to look at. 10 10 A. Yes. As a general rule, if I have the 11 11 Q. And the final paragraph on that exact same study and one is in humans and 12 one is in rodents, I'm going to take the 12 page states: 13 13 human one as more important. "In the evaluation of human 14 14 Q. And I think it is consistent with health risks, sound human data whenever 15 available are preferred to animal data. 15 what you just said, animal and in vitro 16 16 Animal and in vitro studies provide support studies are particularly important for you 17 17 and are used mainly to supply evidence to supply evidence missing from human 18 missing from human studies." 18 studies, is that fair? 19 Do you agree with that? 19 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 20 A. No. I realize I was on the 2.0 A. In vitro? 21 21 committee but I don't agree with the Q. Well, let's go with just animal 22 22 statement. studies. 23 23 Q. There is also a statement in this MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. 24 report at page 31, which is normal 31, not 24 Q. Animal studies might provide Roman. This is the end of the second full 25 25 support for an assessment, but they are

Page 158 Page 160 1 1 paragraph under 4.6, the last sentence: A. As far as I know, there are only 2 2 "For dose response analyses based three cases of how this happens, so I --3 3 upon laboratory data using animals, there it -- in the three cases, there are 4 4 is an additional problem of extrapolating different mechanisms. 5 5 from animals to humans." O. There are differences in 6 6 Do you agree with that statement? mechanisms of action between rats and mice. 7 7 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. and between different strains of mice and 8 8 A. This has to do with calculating rats, that will impact whether or not a 9 9 chemical could cause cancer in that animal, risk --10 10 Q. And do you agree -correct? 11 11 A. -- and in the context of A. There are mechanisms which could 12 12 calculating risk, that statement is impact the degree to which the chemical 13 13 causes cancer in the animal. Metabolism correct. 14 14 Q. And page 34, Section 5.1 is a could cause differences. Many things. 15 15 statement: Q. And scientists actually use 16 "It has always been a challenge 16 different animal models to try and support 17 to extrapolate from effects observed in 17 the concept that exposure to a chemical can 18 18 experimental animal bioassays to potential be linked to a specific type of cancer in 19 effects in humans in order to protect 19 humans, correct? 20 humans from potentially harmful chemical 20 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 21 exposures." 21 22 22 Do you agree with that statement? A. Cancer -- there is numerous 23 23 A. I'm trying to find it. models that are used to assess the 24 24 Q. 5.1, the first paragraph. carcinogenic potential of chemicals in 25 25 A. OK. mammals. Page 159 Page 161 Again, this has to do with risk, 1 Q. And different animal models will 2 not hazard. And in the context of risk, 2 be used for different types of cancer, 3 not hazard, this is indeed a true correct? 4 4 statement. A. I don't really know that that Q. There are certain mechanisms of 5 statement is true. б action with respect to rodent 6 Which -- different types of 7 7 carcinogenicity that do not apply to cancer in humans? Or different types of 8 humans, correct? cancer in the animals you're going to do 9 9 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. the study in? 10 A. There have been -- the mechanisms 10 I don't know the context of your 11 apply to humans. The components of the 11 question. 12 mechanism don't exist in humans. 12 Q. Let's do it either way. 13 13 So there are cases where There are animal models that are 14 chemicals have caused cancer in rodents and 14 used to assess whether a substance can 15 15 the mechanism by which they do it does not cause a specific type of cancer in rodents, 16 16 work in humans. correct? 17 17 Q. And there are differences between A. Yes. 18 rodents and humans -- strike that. 18 O. And there are different rodent 19 19 These differences between rodents models that are used to try and make an 2.0 2.0 assessment as to whether or not an exposure and humans can vary from one type of cancer 21 2.1 to another -can cause a certain type of cancer in 22 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 22 humans, correct? 23 23 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. form. 24 24 Q. -- is that fair to say? A. Not that I'm aware of as a 25 25 MS. GREENWALD: Objection form. general screening tool.

Page 162 Page 164 1 1 Q. OK. Moving -- so moving away called "Mice models of human B lymphoid 2 2 from a general screening tool -- let me neoplasm," correct? 3 3 A. I believe I do. Yes. just back up. 4 So the cancer bioassays that we 4 (Exhibit 15-29, article entitled, 5 5 are going to be discussing and you discuss "Mouse models of human B lymphoid 6 in your report are general screening 6 neoplasms," marked for identification, 7 bioassays, correct? 7 as of this date.) 8 8 A. That is correct with the O. In this book chapter, 9 9 specifically at page 3 -- and this will be exception of one of them. 10 on the left column at the end of the 10 Q. And there are then other animal models that are used subsequent to a 11 11 column -- Dr. Morse states that 12 screening study that will focus on 12 species-specific differences in the immune 13 potentially specific types of cancer, 13 system and molecular circuitry required for 14 14 correct? transformation make it difficult to model 15 15 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. NHL in mice, correct? 16 16 A. You are talking about in rodents? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 17 17 O. Yes. A. This is the last paragraph --18 MS. GREENWALD: I can find it for 18 A. After exposure to the chemical? 19 So let me see if I am -- I am 19 you. 20 going to talk a little bit so I can get 20 Q. End of the --2.1 this straight in my head. Excuse me. 21 MS. GREENWALD: I found it. It's 22 22 So the chemical gets done in a right here. 23 23 screening and an animal in the screening A. "Could thus make it difficult to 24 gets the tumor. Why would a scientist move 24 model some human diseases in mice." 25 from the, let's say, Wistar rat I saw a 25 He is talking about genetically Page 163 Page 165 1 1 tumor in to a different animal when I'm modified mice here, yes. 2 2 already getting tumors in the Wistar rats? Q. And Dr. Morse, if you turn to 3 3 In answer to the question, I page 2 and then carry over to page 3, one 4 4 don't think there are that many cases where of the issues that Dr. Morse notes is that 5 5 they switched off for a specific reason for the murine leukemia virus can cause 6 a specific tumor. 6 lymphomas in mice through a mechanism that 7 7 Q. In your expert report, you cite has no direct parallel to NHL in humans, 8 to a number of articles regarding the 8 correct? 9 9 current state of play with respect to MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 10 identifying rodent models that could be 10 A. Everything he has written here is 11 used to analyze the possibility of NHL in 11 correct. 12 humans, correct? 12 Q. So there are -- just to be clear, 13 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 13 so I'm clear, the murine leukemia virus can 14 14 cause lymphomas in mice through a mechanism form. 15 A. I see what your question is 15 that has no direct parallels to NHL in 16 about. Now, that's the difference. OK. 16 humans, correct? 17 The rodent models for NHL are 17 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 18 developed to get therapies for NHL for 18 A. It's -- there is a parallel in 19 humans. They are not developed for the 19 humans. It just doesn't happen with that 20 purpose of identifying tumors that arise in 20 virus in humans. 21 humans from exposure to chemicals. 21 Q. So what Dr. Morse says is these 22 They induce the NHL in the animal 22 contributions to disease pathogenesis --23 and then try to fix it. 23 that's the cause of disease in the mouse --24 Q. So with respect to mice, you cite 24 have no direct parallels in human B 25 to a 2009 book chapter by Herbert Morse 25 lymphomas, correct?

Page 166 Page 168 1 1 following paragraph, starting "Finally," MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 2 2 that the genetic and epigenetic alterations form. 3 3 required for neoplastic transformation A. He is talking specifically about 4 4 the murine leukemia virus, but the sometimes differ for mouse and human, 5 5 mechanism by which the murine leukemia correct? 6 6 virus causes NHL in -- causes these B A. They do sometimes differ, yes. 7 7 lymphomas in the mice exist in humans. Q. So when we are talking about 8 8 It's just not activated by this particular alterations, we are talking about genetic 9 9 pathogen. changes that are required for cancer to 10 10 Q. Dr. Morse also notes -- and this form, correct? 11 11 is the first full paragraph on that left A. Are you talking about epigenetic 12 12 column on page 3, starting "Second," that and genetic? 13 there are significant differences between 13 Q. Right. So these are genetic and epigenetic changes that are required for 14 14 mouse and human immune systems in their 15 development, structure, phenotype and cancer to occur, correct? 15 16 16 function? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 17 17 A. Correct. form. 18 18 Q. And this is significant because A. I'm not certain what he is saying 19 NHL in humans has been associated with 19 here because neoplastic transformation can 20 immune system disorders, correct? 20 mean transformation of a carcinoma into a 21 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 21 metastatic tumor, it could mean 22 22 A. I'm not absolutely certain. transformation from an adenoma to 23 23 Q. Are you not aware of an carcinoma. 24 24 association between HIV and non-Hodgkins So I'm not exactly certain what 25 25 lymphoma? he is talking about here, but there are Page 167 Page 169 1 A. Yes, I am. 1 genetic and epigenetic alterations that are 2 O. So it is correct that HIV in 2 required for both of those processes, and 3 sometimes they differ for mice and humans. humans has been associated with immune 4 4 system disorders, correct? Q. And it is also genetic and 5 epigenetic alterations that would be 5 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 6 A. It is true that NHL in humans --6 required for a normal cell to be mutated 7 7 that would sometimes differ from mouse and 8 8 O. And there are significant human, correct? 9 9 differences between mouse and humans' MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 10 immune systems, correct? 10 11 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 11 A. Sometimes differ, yes, correct. 12 12 Q. And now Dr. Morse states in this 13 13 paper that you cite in your report that the A. There are differences between 14 mouse and human immune systems, that is 14 best-studied mouse strains -- and this is 15 15 correct. on page 2 -- for potential use as models 16 16 Q. And Dr. Morse further states, for human B-cell lymphomas are the NFS.V 17 17 congenic mice and the AX -- I'm sorry -that same paragraph, that the spleen is the 18 major secondary lymphoid organ in the 18 AKXD recombinant inbred strains, correct? 19 mouse, whereas lymph nodes fill that niche 19 MR. LASKER: On the phone, can 20 2.0 you put your phone on mute? in humans, correct? 21 21 A. That I don't know. Thank you. 22 22 You don't know one way or the Q. I will state that again. Q. 23 other? 23 On page 2, Dr. Morse states that 24 24 the best-studied mouse strains for A. No. I'm sorry. 25 25 O. And Dr. Morse also states in the potential uses --

Page 170 Page 172 1 MS. GREENWALD: Hey, guys, if humans? 2 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 2 you're not going to go on mute, we're 3 3 going to have to disconnect the line. A. No, probably not. Q. OK, we'll try that one more time. 4 I -- I'm hesitating because the 5 5 Dr. Morse states that the problem is OECD says these mice, CD1 mice, 6 best-studied mouse strains for potential 6 are good mice for studying chemicals for 7 7 use as models for human B-cell lymphomas producing cancer. Hence, that document in 8 8 are the NFS.V plus congenic mice and AKXD essence is recommending if you are going to 9 9 look for cancer, NHL is a cancer, then recombinant inbred strains, correct? 10 10 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to that's the right model. 11 11 That's why I am hesitating. form. 12 12 A. Technically, these are not That's not what he is talking about here, 13 13 strains. These are transgenic mouse but that's why I was hesitating. Sorry. models. They derive from certain strains. 14 14 Q. But specifically, can you cite to I don't know what strains they derive from. 15 15 any publication that suggests that CD1 mice 16 But he says these two mouse 16 or Swiss Albino mice are appropriate mouse 17 entities or types are the best models. He 17 models for human non-Hodgkins lymphoma? 18 18 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form would know. 19 19 Q. Now, none of the glyphosate and asked and answered. 2.0 studies that we are going to be talking 20 A. I just answered that. 21 about were conducted in either of these 21 I can point to OECD and their 22 22 guidance that this is an appropriate model mice strains? 23 23 for screening for cancer, and NHL is a A. Again, you are mistaken with what 24 this means. 24 cancer. 2.5 25 Q. Beyond the OEC document talking Q. I'm not asking what it means. Page 171 Page 173 1 1 A. No one would ever test in these about cancers generally, can you point to 2 2 any document that is talking about strains because these congenic and 3 transgenic mice all get NHL. You could non-Hodgkins lymphoma in particular --4 MS. GREENWALD: Objection --4 never detect NHL or any type of tumor like 5 that if you use these because these are O. -- with respect to CD1 mice or 5 6 not -- they have already been produced to 6 Swiss Albino mice? 7 7 induce the tumors. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 8 O. Can you cite to any -- again, form. Asked and answered. 9 9 this is a document that you cited in your A. I can't cite a single publication 10 expert report with respect to mouse models 10 for any cancer where a specific mouse model 11 11 is proposed to evaluate a chemical effect for non-Hodgkins lymphoma. 12 Can you cite to any publication 12 to cause cancer because of the mouse model. 13 13 that points to CD1 or Swiss Albino mice as So the answer to your question is 14 appropriate mouse models for human 14 I cannot cite anything specific to those non-Hodgkins lymphoma? 15 15 mouse models producing malignant lymphomas 16 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 16 and being the best model around. 17 17 Q. Dr. Morse includes a chart in his A. For the production --18 18 O. Yes. chapter on page 2 that identifies potential parallel neoplasm or cancers in human and 19 19 A. -- of lymphomas from exposure to 20 2.0 mice, correct? a chemical? 21 21 Q. No. Can you cite to any source A. Yes. 22 22 document, any published document, that Q. Dr. Morse does not suggest that 23 suggests that CD1 or Swiss Albino mice are 23 any tumors in mice other than certain 24 appropriate mouse models for assessing the 24 B-cell lymphomas would have a potential 25 25 relationship to the development of potential for a substance to cause NHL in

Page 174		Page 176
non-Hodgkins lymphoma in humans, does it?	1	at all of the known human carcinogens from
MS. GREENWALD: Objection to	2	the IARC list, 101 chemicals minus I
form.	3	think it is about 86, 85 chemicals.
A. Yeah, you've lost me. Sorry.	4	So these are chemicals that we
Q. Dr. Morse does not suggest that	5	know they cause cancer in humans and we
there are any types of tumors in mice other	6	know where they cause cancer in humans, so
than certain B-cell lymphomas that have a	7	each of them had cancer bioassays also
parallel to NHL in humans?	8	done well, some of them didn't, so we
MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	9	had to throw those out.
A. His article is about B-cell	10	But most of them had cancer
lymphomas. This table was all about B-cell	11	bioassays and so we could see what cancers
lymphomas.	12	arose in animals, what cancers arose in
Q. Dr. Morse does not suggest, for	13	humans, and we could just look at the
example, that there is any relationship	14	frequency of agreement.
between venal tumors in mice and the	15	Q. Are you aware of any published
development of NHL in humans, correct?	16	article that conducts an analysis to test
A. Renal tumors in mice? Is that	17	whether the development of renal tumors in
what you were questioning me?	18	mice is predictive of NHL in humans?
I didn't understand that at all.	19	MS. GREENWALD: Objection to
Does he suggest that kidney	20	form.
tumors would kidney tumors in the mouse	21	A. Um, no.
would predict or be directly related to	22	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm
this tumor in humans? No.	23	approaching the end of the videotape.
Q. And would you with respect to	24	MR. LASKER: We will take a
different types of tumors in different Page 175	25	break. Page 177
different types of tumors in different Page 175		break. Page 177
different types of tumors in different Page 175 organs, would you agree that evidence of	25	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i
different types of tumors in different Page 175 organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be	25	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of	25 1 2	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of non-Hodgkins lymphomas in humans, correct?	25 1 2 3	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of non-Hodgkins lymphomas in humans, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to	1 2 3 4	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of non-Hodgkins lymphomas in humans, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form.	25 1 2 3 4 5	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of non-Hodgkins lymphomas in humans, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I'm not sure.	25 1 2 3 4 5	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of non-Hodgkins lymphomas in humans, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I'm not sure. We did a paper on this, and I	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of non-Hodgkins lymphomas in humans, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I'm not sure.	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of non-Hodgkins lymphomas in humans, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I'm not sure. We did a paper on this, and I thought it came out recently, but I can't I can't tell.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of non-Hodgkins lymphomas in humans, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I'm not sure. We did a paper on this, and I thought it came out recently, but I can't I can't tell. And we looked at whether this	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of non-Hodgkins lymphomas in humans, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I'm not sure. We did a paper on this, and I thought it came out recently, but I can't I can't tell. And we looked at whether this tumor in this mouse seems to associate with	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of non-Hodgkins lymphomas in humans, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I'm not sure. We did a paper on this, and I thought it came out recently, but I can't I can't tell. And we looked at whether this tumor in this mouse seems to associate with this tumor and this human. And I don't	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of non-Hodgkins lymphomas in humans, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I'm not sure. We did a paper on this, and I thought it came out recently, but I can't I can't tell. And we looked at whether this tumor in this mouse seems to associate with this tumor and this human. And I don't remember if that particular case popped out	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of non-Hodgkins lymphomas in humans, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I'm not sure. We did a paper on this, and I thought it came out recently, but I can't I can't tell. And we looked at whether this tumor in this mouse seems to associate with this tumor and this human. And I don't remember if that particular case popped out or not.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of non-Hodgkins lymphomas in humans, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I'm not sure. We did a paper on this, and I thought it came out recently, but I can't I can't tell. And we looked at whether this tumor in this mouse seems to associate with this tumor and this human. And I don't remember if that particular case popped out or not. So I can't answer the question	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of non-Hodgkins lymphomas in humans, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I'm not sure. We did a paper on this, and I thought it came out recently, but I can't I can't tell. And we looked at whether this tumor in this mouse seems to associate with this tumor and this human. And I don't remember if that particular case popped out or not. So I can't answer the question very well. Sorry.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of non-Hodgkins lymphomas in humans, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I'm not sure. We did a paper on this, and I thought it came out recently, but I can't I can't tell. And we looked at whether this tumor in this mouse seems to associate with this tumor and this human. And I don't remember if that particular case popped out or not. So I can't answer the question very well. Sorry. Q. So if I understand correctly, you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of non-Hodgkins lymphomas in humans, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I'm not sure. We did a paper on this, and I thought it came out recently, but I can't I can't tell. And we looked at whether this tumor in this mouse seems to associate with this tumor and this human. And I don't remember if that particular case popped out or not. So I can't answer the question very well. Sorry. Q. So if I understand correctly, you have done an assessment of certain tumor	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of non-Hodgkins lymphomas in humans, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I'm not sure. We did a paper on this, and I thought it came out recently, but I can't I can't tell. And we looked at whether this tumor in this mouse seems to associate with this tumor and this human. And I don't remember if that particular case popped out or not. So I can't answer the question very well. Sorry. Q. So if I understand correctly, you have done an assessment of certain tumor types in mice to determine whether or not	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of non-Hodgkins lymphomas in humans, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I'm not sure. We did a paper on this, and I thought it came out recently, but I can't I can't tell. And we looked at whether this tumor in this mouse seems to associate with this tumor and this human. And I don't remember if that particular case popped out or not. So I can't answer the question very well. Sorry. Q. So if I understand correctly, you have done an assessment of certain tumor types in mice to determine whether or not they are predictive of certain tumor types	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of non-Hodgkins lymphomas in humans, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I'm not sure. We did a paper on this, and I thought it came out recently, but I can't I can't tell. And we looked at whether this tumor in this mouse seems to associate with this tumor and this human. And I don't remember if that particular case popped out or not. So I can't answer the question very well. Sorry. Q. So if I understand correctly, you have done an assessment of certain tumor types in mice to determine whether or not they are predictive of certain tumor types in humans?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time i 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.
organs, would you agree that evidence of renal tumors in a mouse would not be directly relevant to the development of non-Hodgkins lymphomas in humans, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. I'm not sure. We did a paper on this, and I thought it came out recently, but I can't I can't tell. And we looked at whether this tumor in this mouse seems to associate with this tumor and this human. And I don't remember if that particular case popped out or not. So I can't answer the question very well. Sorry. Q. So if I understand correctly, you have done an assessment of certain tumor types in mice to determine whether or not they are predictive of certain tumor types	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	break. Page 177 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 12:32 p.m. We are off the record.

Page 178 Page 180 AFTERNOON SESSION 1 studies, I have to pull in nonsignificant 2 2 findings from the other studies and none of 1:20 p.m. 3 3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is the regulatory agencies provide 4 4 1:20 p.m. We are on the record. nonsignificant findings. 5 5 BY MR. LASKER: So when I decided to pool the rat 6 Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Portier. 6 studies, that's when I really had to dig in 7 7 A. I hope you enjoyed your lunch. there. 8 8 O. Wonderful. O. I don't know if we have three 9 Before the break, we were 9 copies of this now. 10 10 discussing when you first looked at the MR. LASKER: Let's go off the 11 data tables for the animal cancer bioassays 11 record for a minute. 12 12 that were provided with the Greim THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 13 13 publication. 1:25 p.m. We are off the record. 14 14 Would I be correct in my (Recess) understanding that you would have reviewed 15 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 15 16 those data tables prior to your submission 16 1:27 p.m. We are on the record. 17 to EPA in which you presented a pooled 17 Q. Dr. Portier, you note in your 18 18 analysis of the data from those animal expert report that because of the large 19 19 number of evaluations that have been studies? 20 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, 20 done -- the large number of glyphosate 21 21 rodent studies that have been done, that 22 22 A. If I remember correctly, all of raises a concern that false positives could 23 the pooled analysis in the data I submitted 23 be exaggerated, correct? 24 to EPA were the mouse lymphomas and the 24 A. Let me break down your sentence 25 hemangiosarcomas and the kidney tumors and 25 for a second. Exaggerated I think is the Page 179 Page 181 1 the answer to your question is no, I'd 1 wrong term. 2 2 Q. Why don't we mark the revised probably not reviewed it before then 3 3 because all those came from EFSA review. report. This is next in line. 4 4 Q. When you, in your pooling of data (Exhibit 15-30, expert report of 5 5 Christopher J. Portier marked for with respect to -- let's actually show him 6 the October 4, 2016. It has already been 6 identification, as of this date.) 7 7 Q. Just for the record, Dr. Portier, marked. 8 8 Exhibit 15-30 is your revised expert report It is 15-20, you can look at 9 9 15-20. that was provided to us on or about 10 10 June 27, 2017, and on page 50 of your MS. GREENWALD: They are not 11 11 report, that second paragraph, midway all here. 12 through, you state, "Because of the large 12 THE WITNESS: It's the bottom one 13 13 because I reordered them just now. number of evaluations done in an individual 14 14 A. Yes, OK. Let's see what pooled animal carcinogenicity study, there is 15 analyses I did. OK, so EPA's -- I did not 15 concern that the false positive rates could be exaggerated." Correct? 16 16 pool the rat studies here. 17 17 Q. So is it your recollection then A. That's what I said. Surprised I 18 18 that you would have first reviewed or if we used exaggerated. 19 19 Q. Well, the point, in any event, were trying to get to the day where you 20 20 first reviewed the Greim supplement, it that you're making there is that if 20 21 21 would be at the time that you had pooled evaluations are done and a finding is 22 analysis for some of the rat studies? 22 deemed significant at a p-value of less 23 23 A. That's when I seriously got into than .05, then you would expect that one of 24 looking at Greim's very carefully because 24 those evaluations would report out as being 25 25 in order to do the pooling in any of these positive simply due to chance, correct?

Page 182 Page 184 1 1 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, that, by chance alone, you would expect 16 2 2 or 17 to report out with a p less than .05, form. 3 3 A. That's what I wrote and that is correct? 4 4 A. I'm -- that's correct. You know correct. 5 5 Q. So a false positive then is when this table changed --6 6 an individual test or trend meets the p Q. I do understand that. I 7 7 less than .05 standard, but it is, in fact, understand. 8 8 due to chance rather than a carcinogenicity A. Thank you. 9 effect of a tested compound, correct? 9 Q. You have further broken this 10 10 A. A false positive is when there is down, down test by sex and by strain to 11 11 no effect and you falsely declare it's look at what you would expect -- how many 12 12 positive either by statistical evaluation trends you would expect to see with ps less 13 13 than .05 by chance and then comparing them or whatever. That would be a false positive. 14 to what you actually observe in the data, 14 15 15 Q. And the point you're making here correct? 16 16 and, in particular, you state, for example, A. That is correct. 17 that there were -- on page 50, you list 329 17 Q. And let's pull out your rebuttal report. And we will mark this as 15-31. 18 18 total sites for rats and 16.5 that would be 19 19 expected. Do you see that? (Exhibit 15-31, Rebuttal Report 2.0 A. That is correct. 20 of Christopher J.Portier marked for 21 21 identification, as of this date.) Q. And that again, that is the same 22 2.2 point you're making that you would expect 1 O. And I think this statement is the 23 23 out of 20 of those tests to report with a p same in both your initial report and in 24 24 less than .05 simply due to chance, your rebuttal report, but it appears at 25 25 page 7 on your rebuttal report. correct? Page 185 Page 183 1 1 You are discussing the number of A. Correct. 2 Q. And the reason that complicates 2 trends that you see in the data or that you 3 report in the data as compared to the the analysis of the glyphosate data is 4 number of trends that you would expect 4 because there are so many evaluations that 5 5 have been conducted in the animal studies. simply by chance. Correct? 6 6 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, correct? 7 7 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 8 8 A. At the bottom of page 7, I form. 9 9 A. The problem of false positives discussed the new modified table 15 which 10 affects every study. But where you have, 10 discusses what we were discussing earlier. 11 for example, with glyphosate, hundreds of 11 Same table. 12 analyses that can be conducted, you're 12 Q. And what you state with respect 13 13 going to be expecting to have a number of to the rats -- and I want to focus on that 14 findings p less than .05 simply due to 14 now -- is with the exception of male 15 15 chance, correct. Sprague Dawley rats, the observed number of 16 16 tumors are at or near the expected number MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 17 17 for the different sex strain groups in 18 A. "Expectation" is the important 18 mice, correct? word there. You expect to see it. That 19 19 A. That's correct. 20 doesn't mean you necessarily saw it but you 20 Q. For female Sprague Dawley rats, 21 21 you observed the number of trends that do expect it. 22 Q. So you're making the point here 22 would be expected due to chance, correct? 23 on page 50 is you have 329 total sites as 23 A. I believe so, yes. 24 you set forth on table 15 that could be 24 Q. For male Wistar rats, you found 25 examined or in the rat studies, and from 25 or observed the number of trends p less

Page 186 Page 188 than .05 that you expect to see due to 1 Q. Due to chance? 2 2 chance, correct? A. Due to chance. 3 3 Q. But your opinion is, in fact, A. That is correct. 4 Q. And for the male Wistar rats, this is evidence that glyphosate caused 5 5 likewise, you observe the number of trends those tumors in those rats, correct? 6 6 of p less than .05 you would expect due to MS. GREENWALD: Objection, 7 7 chance, correct? form. 8 8 A. That is correct. A. What is "this"? What is "this is 9 9 evidence"? Q. But you nonetheless opine, based 10 10 upon your analysis, that the data shows Q. The trends that you observed of p that glyphosate causes hepatocellular 11 11 less than .0.5 for Wistar rats which are 12 12 adenomas and skin keratoacanthomas in male the same trends you would expect to see due 13 Wistar rats and it causes mammary gland 13 to chance, in your opinion, is evidence adenomas and adenocarcinomas in female 14 14 that glyphosate caused those tumors in 15 15 Wistar rats, correct? Wistar rats. Correct? 16 16 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to MS. GREENWALD: Objection, 17 17 form. form. 18 18 A. I don't know about opining, but I A. It's part of the evidence. Yes. 19 Q. You reached your rat causation 19 certainly discuss those tumors and come to 20 20 a conclusion that they are probably caused opinions through the application of a 21 by glyphosate. 21 pooling methodology, correct? 22 A. Yes, I did.
Q. And you agreed that methods for 22 Q. So your conclusion is that the 23 tumors that you identified for Wistar rats 23 24 24 that have trends less than .05, which is combining analyses of multiple animal 25 the same number you would expect due to 25 cancer bioassays are not available in the Page 187 Page 189 1 chance, is, in fact, evidence of causation, 1 scientific literature, correct? 2 2 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, correct? 3 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. 4 4 form. A. Say again. 5 A. In fact -- they are part of the Q. You agree that methods for the 6 evaluation of causation. The skin 6 combined analysis of multiple animal cancer 7 7 keratoacanthomas were also seen in the bioassays are not available to the 8 8 Sprague Dawley rats which is the reason I scientific literature? 9 9 did not decide that they were just random MS. GREENWALD: Same 10 chance and the mammary gland carcinomas and 10 objection. 11 11 A. I believe I wrote that, but it is adenomas and carcinomas, because it's the 12 same progression of tumor, there is greater 12 now incorrect. 13 13 evidence that it remains. Q. At the time that you drafted your 14 So a decision to argue for a 14 revised expert report, it was your 15 15 positive finding is not just statistical. understanding that methods for the combined 16 It's also tied to the actual biology. 16 analysis of multiple animal cancer 17 17 Q. Well, Dr. Portier, that wasn't my bioassays are not available in the 18 question. 18 scientific literature, correct? 19 19 You observed the number p less A. That is correct. 20 2.0 than .05 trends for Wistar rats that would Q. And because of that, you 21 2.1 be expected due solely to chance, correct? developed the pooling methodology that you 22 22 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, used for the purposes of your glyphosate 23 23 asked and answered. analysis, correct? 24 24 A. I observed the same number as A. Oh, I can't take credit for 25 25 expectation. developing it, no.

Page 190 Page 192 1 1 Q. Can you cite -- first of all, Brammer study. 2 2 have you ever published a paper in which A. Yes. 3 you used this pooling methodology that you 3 Q. And then you have on the next 4 4 use in this case? page, 28 is Brammer, 30 is Suresh, and 31 5 5 is -- I'm sorry, it bounces around a little A. I'd have to go back and look. 6 bit. 32 is Wood, correct? 6 The pooling methodology is simply taking 7 7 information from multiple laboratories or A. Yes. 8 8 multiple experiments and putting it O. Those are the three studies in 9 9 together and doing one analysis, and I Wistar rats, correct? 10 10 believe I have, using the same technology, A. Yes. taken data from multiple experiments and 11 11 Q. So in the Brammer study reported 12 12 done the analysis. on page 28, there were more mammary tumors 13 13 So I can't take credit for it. found in the female Wistar rats that were 14 14 nor can I say I never did it. not treated with glyphosate than were found 15 Q. Let me ask you again. Can you in any of the three treated groups 15 16 cite to my -- first of all, have you ever 16 individually, correct? 17 17 published a paper in which you use this A. More mammary grand adenomas and 18 18 pooling methodology? carcinomas in the control group than the 19 19 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, treated groups, yes. 2.0 asked and answered. 20 Q. And then the second Wistar study 21 21 is Suresh. That's reported in page 30 of A. I think I have. 22 your expert report, correct? 22 Q. Can you cite to which paper that 23 23 A. Yes. 24 24 A. I would have to go look at the Q. In that study, the data finds a 25 25 statistically significant inverse trend or papers. Page 191 Page 193 1 Q. Can you cite, sitting here today, 1 negative trend for mammary tumors with 2 2 to any published paper by any scientist increased doses of glyphosate, correct? 3 using this pooling methodology in analyzing MS. GREENWALD: Objection, animal cancer bioassay data? 4 form. A. Yes. 5 A. I don't actually know. I just 6 6 see the p trend. I don't know what the Q. Which article? 7 A. The someone asked me to look -slope was. 8 so Mike Dourson is going to be the new Q. But the p-value, if you have a 9 p-value of .970 for a positive trend, that 9 assistant administrator for EPA and I was 10 translates also to a trend of .03 for a 10 asked to look at some of his papers and he 11 11 negative trend. That's the way the math does it in two of his papers. 12 12 Q. Can you say the name again? works, right? 13 13 A. Mike Dourson, D-O-U-R-S-O-N. A. Probably. I would want to look 14 14 Q. Let's take a look at how you at the statistic to be sure, but probably, 15 15 applied the pooling methodology in this yes. 16 Q. So with that understanding, the case. 17 17 Suresh study found an inverse trend, a Now, we already talked about the 18 18 fact that you opine, based upon your negative trend for mammary glands that 19 19 pooling analysis, that glyphosate causes would be significant to p equals .03, 20 2.0 correct? mammary gland tumors in female Wistar rats, 21 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, 21 correct? 22 2.2 A. Wistar rats, I think so, yes. form. 23 23 Q. We can look at your expert report A. I am not sure. 24 Q. The Suresh study found more 24 at page 28. And this is 15-30. Starting 25 mammary gland tumors in the controls than 25 at page -- 15-30, you're talking about the

Page 194 Page 196 1 1 in the highest dose group, correct? A. OK, say the question again. 2 2 A. That is correct. Q. When you pooled the three Wistar 3 rat studies together, you did not find any 3 Q. And if the p trend for mammary 4 4 gland adenomas and carcinomas in Suresh is increased risk of mammary tumors in female 5 Wistar rats with treatment for glyphosate, 5 an inverse trend, p equals .03, that would 6 mean that the incidence of mammary gland correct? 7 tumors in female Wistar rats decreased as A. Yes, I got a p-value well above 8 8 the dose increased by a statistical .05. 9 9 measure, correct? Q. To reach your causation 10 10 opinion -- and you did reach an opinion MS. GREENWALD: Objection, 11 11 that glyphosate causes mammary tumors in 12 12 A. Because of the high response in Wistar female rats. We just talked about 13 the control, yes, that's probably the case. 13 that. To reach that opinion, you removed Q. The third study you have for 14 Suresh from your pooling analysis, correct? 15 Wistar rats is the Wood study and that is a MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 15 16 study that found a -- you report a 16 17 statistically positive trend increasing 17 A. First, I want to check the 18 18 tumors for mammary gland tumors, correct? conclusion. So I'm very clear on what I 19 A. For mammary gland adenocarcinomas 19 said. 2.0 and mammary gland adenocarcinomas and 20 Q. On page 52, you state that 21 adenomas combined. Yes. 21 glyphosate causes mammary gland adenomas 22 22 O. So for the three Wistar rat and adenocarcinomas in female Wistar rats, right? That's your opinion in your expert 23 23 studies for mammary tumors, we have one 2.4 study, the first one study we looked at, by 24 report, correct, Dr. Portier? 25 Brammer, where there were more tumors found 25 A. Yes, yes. It should have said Page 195 Page 197 1 in the controls than in any of the treated 1 limited. I'm sorry, that was a -- that was 2 2 a mistake. That's in this paragraph on groups. 3 page 33. We have a second study by Suresh 4 4 that reported what appears to be a Q. To reach your opinion to support 5 the idea that there is a causation with 5 statistically significant negative trend, 6 meaning less tumors, less mammary gland 6 mammary tumors in Wistar rats, you dropped 7 7 tumors as the dose increases. And we have the Suresh study from your pooling analysis 8 a third study that shows an increased trend completely, correct? 9 9 of more tumors with more dose. Correct? A. I did a sensitivity analysis in 10 MS. GREENWALD: Object to the 10 which I removed the one study that might 11 11 form. have not matched the other two. And I did 12 12 a separate pooling. That is correct. A. We have the Brammer study which 13 13 O. So by removing the statistically is negative; the Suresh study which is 14 negative; and the Wood study which is 14 significant negative trend, decreasing 15 15 tumors with increasing glyphosate use, in positive. 16 Q. Just to be clear again, the 16 Suresh, you were able to pool the two other 17 Suresh study appears to be statistically 17 studies to opine that there was a positive 18 significant negative, correct? 18 trend for mammary tumors in Wistar rats 19 A. Correct. 19 with glyphosate, correct? 20 20 Q. Now, when you pooled these MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 2.1 studies together, and you report that -- I 21 22 think on page 33 -- when you pooled the 22 A. When, with justification, I 23 three studies together, you did not find 23 removed the Suresh study. I could see a 24 any increased risk of mammary tumors in 24 significant finding; and, hence, I said 25 female Wistar rats, correct? 25 there was limited support for that tumor.

Page 200 Page 198 1 Q. Well, you're stating that now. 1 the control population, substantially, than 2 2 A. No, it's right there. either of the other two studies. That 3 3 O. In your expert report? raises a flag that suggests that those 4 4 A. Page 33. studies are not replicates of each other 5 5 Q. Page 52. and one should be careful when combining 6 6 A. Page 33, "Given the mixed results 7 7 for the pooling from this tumor, I conclude Q. In the mammary gland tumors, you 8 8 there is limited support for the notion had, in the Wood study, eight out of 51 9 9 that glyphosate can cause mammary gland with tumors in the high dose group and that 10 10 adenomas and adenocarcinomas in Wistar is significantly different than what you 11 rats." 11 found in the other two studies, in Suresh 12 12 I've already conceded that in the and Brammer, correct? 13 13 final conclusion I should have used the MS. GREENWALD: Objection, 14 14 word "limited" for that tumor. form. 15 Q. If you had instead removed the 15 A. There were different doses. 16 16 Wood study from your analysis and pooled That's -- they are not equivalent instead the Suresh study and the Brammer 17 17 connections and I don't know if they were 18 18 statistically significant or not. They study, you would have reported a 19 19 statistically significant protective effect were different. There is no doubt about 20 of glyphosate against mammary tumors, 20 it. 21 21 wouldn't you have? Q. You used a similar pooling 22 22 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, methodology to reach your opinion that 23 23 glyphosate causes hepatocellular adenomas form. 24 24 in male Wistar rats, correct? A. That, I do not know. 25 25 A. I believe I did. Q. You didn't conduct that Page 199 Page 201 1 sensitivity analysis? 1 Q. Neither the Suresh study or Wood 2 2 A. I had no reason to believe the study found any increased incidence of 3 Wood study was different from the Animoto hepatocellular adenomas in male Wistar 4 4 study, or whatever we are talking about. rats, correct? 5 5 Wood and -- Wood and Animoto was the two I A. OK, let's see here. I was 6 pooled, correct? Wood and Brammer, Wood 6 looking at the wrong ones. The first 7 7 and Brammer. paragraph under joint analysis. 8 Q. It might be easier to look at the 8 I had no reason to believe that 9 tables, 28, 30 and 32. Neither the Suresh 9 Wood was different than Brammer. But I had 10 10 reason to believe that Suresh was different study nor the Wood study found any 11 11 increased incidence in hepatocellular than the other two. 12 12 adenomas in male Wistar rats, correct? Q. With respect to mammary tumors, 13 A. No statistically significant 13 what was your basis for concluding that 14 14 Suresh was different than Wood and Brammer? increased incidence, that is correct. 15 O. And when you pooled the results 15 A. When a -- when a strain of 16 16 of the three Wistar rat studies, you animals shows any tumor, whether it's the 17 17 likewise did not find a positive trend for adenocarcinomas or the liver tumors, at a 18 18 rate which is incredibly different than the hepatocellular adenomas, correct? 19 A. I'm trying to find where I did 19 others, it suggests that the strains are 20 the pooling and talked about whether it is 2.0 not -- they are not exactly operating the 21 significant or not. 21 same. 22 I didn't pool all three studies. 22 The hepatocellular adenomas 23 23 I'm sorry, I didn't pool them here. I and carcinomas in the Suresh data set -- I 24 don't see an analysis of the pooled three 24 believe it was the hepatocellular adenomas 25 studies because the hepatocellular adenomas 25 and carcinomas were substantially larger in

	Page 202		Page 204
1	seen in the Suresh study were 48 percent in	1	about is rejecting a coin being fair,
2	controls; whereas the other two studies,	2	correct?
3	the hepatocellular adenomas were down in	3	MS. GREENWALD: Objection to
4	the 0 to 1 percent to 2 percent range.	4	the form.
5	Hence, pooling all three of them would be a	5	A. No, the rejection of a coin being
6	mistake from the start. So I never even	6	fair here is that it's impossible to do it
7	bothered.	7	with only three flips.
8	Q. You reach your causation opinion	8	Q. Right.
9	based on a pooling that dropped the Suresh	9	A. It's not that I can't reject a
10	study out of the analysis, correct?	10	coin being fair. Of course I can if I do a
11	MS. GREENWALD: Objection,	11	large enough sample size.
12	form and asked and answered.	12	So it's the concept that you
13	A. I didn't drop the Suresh I	13	can't do this that is being brought up
14	didn't drop the Suresh out of the analysis,	14	there.
15	I never put it in.	15	Q. In scientific analyses, you start
16	Q. And in your discussion of that	16	off with a null hypothesis and then you try
17	analysis, or your reasoning there for not	17	to reject that hypothesis, correct? That's
18	including or in your evaluation, the	18	the scientific methodology?
19	hepatocellular adenomas, you state that, to	19	A. Correct. Well, you don't try to
20	reject a finding based upon only one in	20	reject the hypothesis. If the data pops
21	three being positive is the same as	21	that way, it rejects the hypothesis.
22	rejecting a coin being fair if, in three	22	Q. So for a coin toss, is the null
23	flips of the coin, the result is one head	23	hypothesis that the coin is fair and you
24	and two tails, correct?	24	are trying to reject that, correct?
25	MS. GREENWALD: Objection,	25	MS. GREENWALD: Objection,
	•		
	Page 203		Page 205
1	form.	1	form.
2	A. I do write that in here.	2	A. If that's your hypothesis, yes.
3	Q. And you so you state that to	3	Q. For glyphosate and the animal
4	reject causation based upon the findings of	4	studies, the null hypothesis is that
5			
	one positive trend and two null findings	5	
6	one positive trend and two null findings for hepatocellular adenomas, then it is the	5 6	glyphosate does not cause tumors, correct?
6 7	for hepatocellular adenomas, then it is the		glyphosate does not cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Some
	for hepatocellular adenomas, then it is the same as rejecting a coin as being fair if	6	glyphosate does not cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Some objection, form.
7	for hepatocellular adenomas, then it is the same as rejecting a coin as being fair if in three flips of the coin, the result is	6 7	glyphosate does not cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Some objection, form. A. The null hypothesis is that it
7 8	for hepatocellular adenomas, then it is the same as rejecting a coin as being fair if in three flips of the coin, the result is one head and two tails, correct?	6 7 8	glyphosate does not cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Some objection, form. A. The null hypothesis is that it does not cause an increase in tumors, that
7 8 9	for hepatocellular adenomas, then it is the same as rejecting a coin as being fair if in three flips of the coin, the result is one head and two tails, correct? A. Yes. The rest of it says you	6 7 8 9	glyphosate does not cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Some objection, form. A. The null hypothesis is that it does not cause an increase in tumors, that is correct.
7 8 9 10	for hepatocellular adenomas, then it is the same as rejecting a coin as being fair if in three flips of the coin, the result is one head and two tails, correct? A. Yes. The rest of it says you can't it simply is not possible and	6 7 8 9 10	glyphosate does not cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Some objection, form. A. The null hypothesis is that it does not cause an increase in tumors, that is correct. Q. And your assessment, though, is
7 8 9 10 11	for hepatocellular adenomas, then it is the same as rejecting a coin as being fair if in three flips of the coin, the result is one head and two tails, correct? A. Yes. The rest of it says you can't it simply is not possible and there is a better way to address these	6 7 8 9 10 11	glyphosate does not cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Some objection, form. A. The null hypothesis is that it does not cause an increase in tumors, that is correct. Q. And your assessment, though, is looking to see whether the data is
7 8 9 10 11	for hepatocellular adenomas, then it is the same as rejecting a coin as being fair if in three flips of the coin, the result is one head and two tails, correct? A. Yes. The rest of it says you can't it simply is not possible and there is a better way to address these findings.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	glyphosate does not cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Some objection, form. A. The null hypothesis is that it does not cause an increase in tumors, that is correct. Q. And your assessment, though, is
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	for hepatocellular adenomas, then it is the same as rejecting a coin as being fair if in three flips of the coin, the result is one head and two tails, correct? A. Yes. The rest of it says you can't it simply is not possible and there is a better way to address these findings. Q. And your pooling methodology for	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	glyphosate does not cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Some objection, form. A. The null hypothesis is that it does not cause an increase in tumors, that is correct. Q. And your assessment, though, is looking to see whether the data is sufficient to reject the possibility that glyphosate does cause tumors, correct?
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	for hepatocellular adenomas, then it is the same as rejecting a coin as being fair if in three flips of the coin, the result is one head and two tails, correct? A. Yes. The rest of it says you can't it simply is not possible and there is a better way to address these findings.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	glyphosate does not cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Some objection, form. A. The null hypothesis is that it does not cause an increase in tumors, that is correct. Q. And your assessment, though, is looking to see whether the data is sufficient to reject the possibility that
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	for hepatocellular adenomas, then it is the same as rejecting a coin as being fair if in three flips of the coin, the result is one head and two tails, correct? A. Yes. The rest of it says you can't it simply is not possible and there is a better way to address these findings. Q. And your pooling methodology for the glyphosate animal studies then seeks to determine whether the data is sufficient to	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	glyphosate does not cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Some objection, form. A. The null hypothesis is that it does not cause an increase in tumors, that is correct. Q. And your assessment, though, is looking to see whether the data is sufficient to reject the possibility that glyphosate does cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	for hepatocellular adenomas, then it is the same as rejecting a coin as being fair if in three flips of the coin, the result is one head and two tails, correct? A. Yes. The rest of it says you can't it simply is not possible and there is a better way to address these findings. Q. And your pooling methodology for the glyphosate animal studies then seeks to determine whether the data is sufficient to reject a finding of causation for	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	glyphosate does not cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Some objection, form. A. The null hypothesis is that it does not cause an increase in tumors, that is correct. Q. And your assessment, though, is looking to see whether the data is sufficient to reject the possibility that glyphosate does cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. No, the test is to see whether
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	for hepatocellular adenomas, then it is the same as rejecting a coin as being fair if in three flips of the coin, the result is one head and two tails, correct? A. Yes. The rest of it says you can't it simply is not possible and there is a better way to address these findings. Q. And your pooling methodology for the glyphosate animal studies then seeks to determine whether the data is sufficient to reject a finding of causation for glyphosate and cancer in rodents, correct?	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	glyphosate does not cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Some objection, form. A. The null hypothesis is that it does not cause an increase in tumors, that is correct. Q. And your assessment, though, is looking to see whether the data is sufficient to reject the possibility that glyphosate does cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. No, the test is to see whether the rejection of the null hypothesis from
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	for hepatocellular adenomas, then it is the same as rejecting a coin as being fair if in three flips of the coin, the result is one head and two tails, correct? A. Yes. The rest of it says you can't it simply is not possible and there is a better way to address these findings. Q. And your pooling methodology for the glyphosate animal studies then seeks to determine whether the data is sufficient to reject a finding of causation for glyphosate and cancer in rodents, correct? A. No. The pooling is there to	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	glyphosate does not cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Some objection, form. A. The null hypothesis is that it does not cause an increase in tumors, that is correct. Q. And your assessment, though, is looking to see whether the data is sufficient to reject the possibility that glyphosate does cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. No, the test is to see whether the rejection of the null hypothesis from the one study is remains or is goes
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	for hepatocellular adenomas, then it is the same as rejecting a coin as being fair if in three flips of the coin, the result is one head and two tails, correct? A. Yes. The rest of it says you can't it simply is not possible and there is a better way to address these findings. Q. And your pooling methodology for the glyphosate animal studies then seeks to determine whether the data is sufficient to reject a finding of causation for glyphosate and cancer in rodents, correct? A. No. The pooling is there to evaluate whether, for this tumor, having	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	glyphosate does not cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Some objection, form. A. The null hypothesis is that it does not cause an increase in tumors, that is correct. Q. And your assessment, though, is looking to see whether the data is sufficient to reject the possibility that glyphosate does cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. No, the test is to see whether the rejection of the null hypothesis from the one study is remains or is goes away when I pool the data.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	for hepatocellular adenomas, then it is the same as rejecting a coin as being fair if in three flips of the coin, the result is one head and two tails, correct? A. Yes. The rest of it says you can't it simply is not possible and there is a better way to address these findings. Q. And your pooling methodology for the glyphosate animal studies then seeks to determine whether the data is sufficient to reject a finding of causation for glyphosate and cancer in rodents, correct? A. No. The pooling is there to evaluate whether, for this tumor, having seen a positive in one or two studies, does	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	glyphosate does not cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Some objection, form. A. The null hypothesis is that it does not cause an increase in tumors, that is correct. Q. And your assessment, though, is looking to see whether the data is sufficient to reject the possibility that glyphosate does cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. No, the test is to see whether the rejection of the null hypothesis from the one study is remains or is goes away when I pool the data. Q. So you are pooling the data to
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	for hepatocellular adenomas, then it is the same as rejecting a coin as being fair if in three flips of the coin, the result is one head and two tails, correct? A. Yes. The rest of it says you can't it simply is not possible and there is a better way to address these findings. Q. And your pooling methodology for the glyphosate animal studies then seeks to determine whether the data is sufficient to reject a finding of causation for glyphosate and cancer in rodents, correct? A. No. The pooling is there to evaluate whether, for this tumor, having	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	glyphosate does not cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Some objection, form. A. The null hypothesis is that it does not cause an increase in tumors, that is correct. Q. And your assessment, though, is looking to see whether the data is sufficient to reject the possibility that glyphosate does cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. No, the test is to see whether the rejection of the null hypothesis from the one study is remains or is goes away when I pool the data. Q. So you are pooling the data to see if you can support strike that.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	for hepatocellular adenomas, then it is the same as rejecting a coin as being fair if in three flips of the coin, the result is one head and two tails, correct? A. Yes. The rest of it says you can't it simply is not possible and there is a better way to address these findings. Q. And your pooling methodology for the glyphosate animal studies then seeks to determine whether the data is sufficient to reject a finding of causation for glyphosate and cancer in rodents, correct? A. No. The pooling is there to evaluate whether, for this tumor, having seen a positive in one or two studies, does that positive stay when you group it with all the rest of the studies that it should	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	glyphosate does not cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Some objection, form. A. The null hypothesis is that it does not cause an increase in tumors, that is correct. Q. And your assessment, though, is looking to see whether the data is sufficient to reject the possibility that glyphosate does cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. No, the test is to see whether the rejection of the null hypothesis from the one study is remains or is goes away when I pool the data. Q. So you are pooling the data to see if you can support strike that. So you are pooling the data of
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	for hepatocellular adenomas, then it is the same as rejecting a coin as being fair if in three flips of the coin, the result is one head and two tails, correct? A. Yes. The rest of it says you can't it simply is not possible and there is a better way to address these findings. Q. And your pooling methodology for the glyphosate animal studies then seeks to determine whether the data is sufficient to reject a finding of causation for glyphosate and cancer in rodents, correct? A. No. The pooling is there to evaluate whether, for this tumor, having seen a positive in one or two studies, does that positive stay when you group it with	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	glyphosate does not cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Some objection, form. A. The null hypothesis is that it does not cause an increase in tumors, that is correct. Q. And your assessment, though, is looking to see whether the data is sufficient to reject the possibility that glyphosate does cause tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. No, the test is to see whether the rejection of the null hypothesis from the one study is remains or is goes away when I pool the data. Q. So you are pooling the data to see if you can support strike that.

Page 208 Page 206 1 1 in the third study, is that correct? just checking my -- yes. That must be what 2 2 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, I used in my table 8. 3 3 form, asked and answered. Q. So you dropped or did not include 4 4 Suresh for your pooling methodology when it A. No. 5 resulted in a finding of no increased trend 5 Q. You also exclude the Suresh study 6 from your pooling analysis to support your 6 for mammary glad or hepatocellular tumors, 7 but then included Suresh in your pooling 7 opinion in your rebuttal report that there 8 8 is a suggestion that glyphosate causes analysis to calculate a positive trend for 9 skin keratoacanthomas, correct? 9 pituitary tumors in -- strike that. 10 10 I want to get that right. Yes. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 11 At page 6 of your rebuttal report, you also 11 form. 12 12 exclude the Suresh study from your pooling A. No. analysis to support your opinion that there 13 13 Q. Did you not include Suresh in 14 14 is a suggestion that glyphosate causes your analysis for skin keratoacanthomas? 15 A. In all of them, maybe all of them 15 pituitary tumors in female Sprague Dawley 16 except hepatocellular adenomas, I did 16 rats, correct? 17 17 analyses with Suresh included and without MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 18 18 Suresh included. All of those analyses form. 19 19 A. I did not include -- I don't know play a role in my decision about whether 20 if I did the three. I don't think I --20 this is a real tumor finding or a chance 21 tumor finding and how much support there 21 I'm -- yes, that is -- I believe that's 22 22 correct. is. 23 Q. And in your finding of a positive 23 Q. Now, you used that same pooling 24 methodology to conclude that there was a 24 trend, as you reported in your final 25 statistically significant positive trend 25 opinion, to find a positive trend for Page 207 Page 209 1 for skin keratoacanthomas in male Wistar 1 mammary gland tumors and hepatocellular 2 rats, correct? And that's initially your 2 adenomas, you used a pooling only of the 3 Wood and Brammer study, and to reach your revised report at page 32. 4 4 A. Page 32? opinion with respect to keratoacanthomas, O. I'm sorry. Page 31. 5 you used a pooling of all three studies, 6 That is correct. 6 correct? Α. 7 Q. So for skin keratoacanthomas, MS. GREENWALD: Objection, 8 pooling the Wood and Brammer studies alone form. 9 9 did not result in a statistically A. I used all of the analyses that 10 significant positive trend for male Wistar 10 it had done to that time. 11 11 rats, correct? Q. For mammary gland tumors and the 12 12 hepatocellular adenomas, to find a A. It resulted in a p-value for 13 13 trend of 0.053 which was barely not statistically significant positive trend. 14 statistically significant. 14 you found that only when you pooled just 15 the two studies, Brammer and Wood, correct? 15 Q. So for your skin keratoacanthoma 16 causation opinion, you did pool, include 16 A. As I mentioned before, I saw an 17 the Suresh study in your pooling analysis 17 almost statistically significant p equals 18 to come up with a statistically significant 18 p.053 in the combined analysis. 19 19 finding, correct? I do not characterize it as 20 2.0 negative. I characterize that as almost MS. GREENWALD: Objection, 21 21 significant. 22 22 A. I believe I wasn't that marginal. Q. Just to be clear, we are talking 23 23 about mammary gland tumors and Let me look at my summary. 24 Q. Page 35. 24 hepatocellular adenomas. Is it your 25 25 A. I've got you. I'm sorry, I'm testimony now that you found an almost

Page 212 Page 210 1 1 significant trend with those two tumors Q. All three of the studies were 2 2 when you combined the three studies? I pooled to get that statistically 3 3 think you are confusing it now for skin -significant trend, correct? 4 4 A. I am sorry, for skin A. No. The statistically 5 5 keratoacanthomas. significant -- you're confusing my decision 6 6 Q. No, let me -- for mammary gland to say this is glyphosate-related with any 7 8 7 adenomas and hepatocellular adenomas -- I given one test or not. If you look through 8 am sorry, for mammary gland tumors and for here, you will see is that there are 9 9 hepatocellular adenomas, you opined to a subtleties involved in this. 10 10 statistically significant increased trend In this case, when pooled with 11 11 by pooling just Wood and Brammer, correct? the Suresh study, it was highly -- it was 12 12 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, highly -- no, it was statistically 13 13 significant for the keratoacanthomas, and form. 14 14 A. For mammary gland adenomas and when it was not pooled, it was almost 15 15 statistically significant for the adenocarcinomas combined. 16 16 keratoacanthomas. Therefore, I decided Q. And hepatocellular adenomas for 17 17 those two tumors, you reported a -- or you that there is a -- there is fire here and 18 18 opined to a statistically significant there is probably something going on. And 19 19 increased trend by pooling Brammer and Wood that's why I made the decision to say that 20 20 and not including Suresh, correct? it was causal. 21 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, 21 Q. And you reported that trend as 22 22 form. statistically significant in your tables, 23 23 A. For those two tumors, I saw -correct? 24 24 not for -- for hepatocellular adenomas, I A. In the table 8, I put three dots 25 did not pool the three. So I do not know 25 for the triple. I should have put one. Page 211 Page 213 what the result of that pooling would be. 1 Q. Let's look at your pooling 2 2 When I pooled the two, yes, I saw methodology for Sprague Dawley rats in your 3 3 significant p-value. For that tumor. rebuttal report and this is page 6. 4 4 Q. And for mammary gland tumors, You opine that the Sprague Dawley 5 5 when you pooled the three, you didn't see a rat study suggests a potential for б statistically significant trend, but when 6 glyphosate to cause adrenal cortical tumors 7 7 you pooled the two, you did? in female rats, correct? That's page 6. 8 A. That is correct. 8 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 9 9 Q. And that was the basis for your Q. Second paragraph, first full 10 opinion with respect to mammary gland 10 paragraph on page 6, returning to table 2. 11 11 tumors, correct? A. So ask your question again, 12 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, 12 please. 13 13 form. Q. Through -- in your rebuttal 14 A. That's the basis for my opinion 14 report, you opine that the Sprague Dawley 15 that there is limited support for the 15 rat studies suggest a potential for 16 notion that glyphosate can cause mammary 16 glyphosate to cause adrenal cortical tumors 17 gland adenomas and adenocarcinomas in 17 in female rats, correct? 18 Wistar rats. 18 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, 19 O. And for skin keratoacanthomas, 19 form. 20 where you report a statistically 2.0 A. That is correct. 21 significant trend on your table, that is 21 Q. When you pooled the results for 22 based upon the pooling all three of the 22 the four Sprague Dawley studies, your 23 studies, correct, including Suresh? 23 pooling methodology reported a 24 A. As I said before, it's based upon 24 statistically significant negative trend 25 everything that went on in that evaluation. 25 for glyphosate and adrenal cortical tumors,

Page 214	Page 216
1 correct?	respect to kidney adenomas in male rats.
A. That is, I believe, correct.	Correct?
Q. So in other words, you found, by	MS. GREENWALD: Objection,
pooling the studies, that there was a	form.
decrease in the incidence of adrenal cortical tumors with an increased dose of glyphosate and that was statistically significant, correct?	A. (Again, the Lankas study was 26 months and the rest were 24. That is reason to exclude it.) Q. (And, in fact, though, if you looked at the four Sprague Dawley rat
cortical tumors with an increased dose of	months and the rest were 24. That is
glyphosate and that was statistically	reason to exclude it.
	Q. And, in fact, though, if you
A. No. What I found was that the	
because of the hypothesis rates of this	studies and that would be on pages 26 to 27
tumor in Lankas, et al., 1981 and the lower	of your expert report I am sorry.
rates in the others, you end up with a	A. Wistar rats. It starts on 24
negative trend because of that high rate of tumors. And that's why you have the	
tallions. Time that's willy you have the	
negative trend. I would hever have caned	
that pooled analysis a negative tiend	
because it was clear to life that that pooled	with increased dose of glyphosate, correct? A. That is correct.
analysis was flawed. Q. OK. But just to be clear, page	A. That is correct. Q. And then if we look at the Stout
10 of your rebuttal expert report, you	and Reucker study, the second Sprague
present the data the your pooled	Dawley study, it's a 24-month study you do
analyses for adrenal cortical carcinomas in	not find an increased incidence of kidney
female Sprague Dawley rats correct?	adenomas with increased dose of glyphosate,
Adrenal cortical carcinomas?	correct?
(25) A. (I'm sorry, I'm kind of slow, yes,	A. That is correct.
Page 215	Page 217
I present that, yes.	Q. If you look at the Atkinson study
Q. In your original pooled analysis,	which is the third study for kidney
you have a p of 0.997 which translates	adenomas in male Sprague Dawley rats, you
to an inverse trend with a p of .003.	did not find an increased incidence of
That's statistically significant, correct?	kidney adenomas with increased exposure to
A. For negative, it has a negative	glyphosate, correct?
trend. That is correct.	7 A. That is correct.
Q. And despite the fact that your	Q. So three of the four. And in
pooling analysis finds this statistically	fact, three of the four Sprague Dawley
significant inverse trend with p equal to	studies did not find any kidney adenomas
.003, your ultimate opinion is that these	whatsoever in either the middle or highest
studies suggest a potential for glyphosate	glyphosate dose groups tested, correct?
to cause adrenal cortical tumors, correct?	(A.) (I'm looking for the fourth study.)
MS. GREENWALD: Objection,	14 I'm sorry.
form.	Q. The fourth study would be
A. I concluded that because the	table
Edinas stady is 20 months instead of 2 i and	(Table 6, and I wanted to look at that.)
	that. That would be correct. Three of
belong in that pooled analysis and I made my conclusion based upon pooling the other	the four did not have, by themselves, a positive finding for this tumor.
three studies.	Q. (Well, my question was a little
Q. Well you talk about dropping the	bit different. Three of the four Sprague
Lankas Sprague Dawley study. You used that	Dawley studies did not find any kidney
same approach to reach an opinion with	adenomas whatsoever in either the high dose
	and the second s

Page 218		Page 220
or middle dose glyphosate group, correct?	1	32.
A. I believe that is correct. This	2	(Exhibit 15-32, Original Expert
is a very rare tumor.	3	Report of Dr. Christopher J. Portier
Q. But using your methodology, you	4	marked for identification, as of this
opined that that data proves that	5	date.)
glyphosate caused kidney adenomas in male	6	Q. So Exhibit 32 is the expert
Sprague Dawley rats, correct?	7	report you submitted in this case in May of
A. I believe that's what I said and	8	2017, correct?
I believe that is the case, yes.	9	I'll represent to you it was
Q. So now you dropped Lankas from	10	May 1, unless there is some disagreement
your analysis for adrenal cortical tumors	11	there.
and kidney adenomas, but you highlight the	12	You revised this expert report in
findings of Lankas with respect to other	13	your July report, correct?
tumors that were seen in that study?	14	A. That is correct.
A. In the Lankas study. Other	15	Q. Now, at page 53 of your May
tumors that were seen in the Lankas study.	16	your first expert report. I'm sorry, not
Q. Yes.	17	53. 34, of your May 2017 expert report,
A. That is correct.	18	you're talking about the findings for
Q. So for example, with thyroid	19	thyroid C-cell tumors, correct?
C-cell tumors in female rats and in testes	20	A. That is correct.
interstitial tumors in male rats, those	21	Q. And at that point in time, you
tumors were found in the Lankas study but	22	didn't have data from the Lankas study,
not found in the other three studies,	23	correct?
correct?	24	A. That is correct.
A. That is correct.	25	Q. And you concluded, based upon
		Page 221
	1	Page 221
Q. And in your expert report, you	1 2	your analysis of the three other studies,
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on	2	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types		your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while	2 3	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct?
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while the other three studies were for 24 months,	2 3 4	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct? A. That is correct.
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while the other three studies were for 24 months, correct?	2 3 4 5	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And if we go now to your revised
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while the other three studies were for 24 months, correct? A. That is correct.	2 3 4 5	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And if we go now to your revised expert report, that same page on Exhibit
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while the other three studies were for 24 months, correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also opine, in your expert	2 3 4 5 6 7	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And if we go now to your revised expert report, that same page on Exhibit page 34 on your revised expert report, here
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while the other three studies were for 24 months, correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also opine, in your expert report, that glyphosate causes thyroid	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And if we go now to your revised expert report, that same page on Exhibit page 34 on your revised expert report, here you now have data from the Lankas study and
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while the other three studies were for 24 months, correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also opine, in your expert report, that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And if we go now to your revised expert report, that same page on Exhibit page 34 on your revised expert report, here you now have data from the Lankas study and you note that pooling all four studies
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while the other three studies were for 24 months, correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also opine, in your expert report, that glyphosate causes thyroid	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And if we go now to your revised expert report, that same page on Exhibit page 34 on your revised expert report, here you now have data from the Lankas study and
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while the other three studies were for 24 months, correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also opine, in your expert report, that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats, correct? You can look at page 52 if you want.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And if we go now to your revised expert report, that same page on Exhibit page 34 on your revised expert report, here you now have data from the Lankas study and you note that pooling all four studies yields a significant trend of p equals .041. Correct?
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while the other three studies were for 24 months, correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also opine, in your expert report, that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats, correct? You can look at page 52 if you want.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And if we go now to your revised expert report, that same page on Exhibit page 34 on your revised expert report, here you now have data from the Lankas study and you note that pooling all four studies yields a significant trend of p equals .041. Correct? A. I have to find it. I'm sorry.
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while the other three studies were for 24 months, correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also opine, in your expert report, that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats, correct? You can look at page 52 if you want. A. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And if we go now to your revised expert report, that same page on Exhibit page 34 on your revised expert report, here you now have data from the Lankas study and you note that pooling all four studies yields a significant trend of p equals .041. Correct?
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while the other three studies were for 24 months, correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also opine, in your expert report, that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats, correct? You can look at page 52 if you want. A. Thank you. Thyroid C-cell adenomas and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And if we go now to your revised expert report, that same page on Exhibit page 34 on your revised expert report, here you now have data from the Lankas study and you note that pooling all four studies yields a significant trend of p equals .041. Correct? A. I have to find it. I'm sorry. That appears to be correct.
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while the other three studies were for 24 months, correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also opine, in your expert report, that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats, correct? You can look at page 52 if you want. A. Thank you. Thyroid C-cell adenomas and carcinomas combined in male Sprague Dawley	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And if we go now to your revised expert report, that same page on Exhibit page 34 on your revised expert report, here you now have data from the Lankas study and you note that pooling all four studies yields a significant trend of p equals .041. Correct? A. I have to find it. I'm sorry. That appears to be correct. Q. So you're no longer saying that
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while the other three studies were for 24 months, correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also opine, in your expert report, that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats, correct? You can look at page 52 if you want. A. Thank you. Thyroid C-cell adenomas and carcinomas combined in male Sprague Dawley rats.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And if we go now to your revised expert report, that same page on Exhibit page 34 on your revised expert report, here you now have data from the Lankas study and you note that pooling all four studies yields a significant trend of p equals .041. Correct? A. I have to find it. I'm sorry. That appears to be correct. Q. So you're no longer saying that the evidence is weak, correct?
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while the other three studies were for 24 months, correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also opine, in your expert report, that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats, correct? You can look at page 52 if you want. A. Thank you. Thyroid C-cell adenomas and carcinomas combined in male Sprague Dawley rats. Q. So the answer is yes, you do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And if we go now to your revised expert report, that same page on Exhibit page 34 on your revised expert report, here you now have data from the Lankas study and you note that pooling all four studies yields a significant trend of p equals .041. Correct? A. I have to find it. I'm sorry. That appears to be correct. Q. So you're no longer saying that the evidence is weak, correct? A. That is correct. But
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while the other three studies were for 24 months, correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also opine, in your expert report, that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats, correct? You can look at page 52 if you want. A. Thank you. Thyroid C-cell adenomas and carcinomas combined in male Sprague Dawley rats. Q. So the answer is yes, you do opine that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And if we go now to your revised expert report, that same page on Exhibit page 34 on your revised expert report, here you now have data from the Lankas study and you note that pooling all four studies yields a significant trend of p equals .041. Correct? A. I have to find it. I'm sorry. That appears to be correct. Q. So you're no longer saying that the evidence is weak, correct? A. That is correct. But Q. And that is because you're now
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while the other three studies were for 24 months, correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also opine, in your expert report, that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats, correct? You can look at page 52 if you want. A. Thank you. Thyroid C-cell adenomas and carcinomas combined in male Sprague Dawley rats. Q. So the answer is yes, you do opine that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And if we go now to your revised expert report, that same page on Exhibit page 34 on your revised expert report, here you now have data from the Lankas study and you note that pooling all four studies yields a significant trend of p equals .041. Correct? A. I have to find it. I'm sorry. That appears to be correct. Q. So you're no longer saying that the evidence is weak, correct? A. That is correct. But Q. And that is because you're now including the Lankas study
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while the other three studies were for 24 months, correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also opine, in your expert report, that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats, correct? You can look at page 52 if you want. A. Thank you. Thyroid C-cell adenomas and carcinomas combined in male Sprague Dawley rats. Q. So the answer is yes, you do opine that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And if we go now to your revised expert report, that same page on Exhibit page 34 on your revised expert report, here you now have data from the Lankas study and you note that pooling all four studies yields a significant trend of p equals .041. Correct? A. I have to find it. I'm sorry. That appears to be correct. Q. So you're no longer saying that the evidence is weak, correct? A. That is correct. But Q. And that is because you're now including the Lankas study MS. GREENWALD: He was
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while the other three studies were for 24 months, correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also opine, in your expert report, that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats, correct? You can look at page 52 if you want. A. Thank you. Thyroid C-cell adenomas and carcinomas combined in male Sprague Dawley rats. Q. So the answer is yes, you do opine that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And if we go now to your revised expert report, that same page on Exhibit page 34 on your revised expert report, here you now have data from the Lankas study and you note that pooling all four studies yields a significant trend of p equals .041. Correct? A. I have to find it. I'm sorry. That appears to be correct. Q. So you're no longer saying that the evidence is weak, correct? A. That is correct. But Q. And that is because you're now including the Lankas study MS. GREENWALD: He was finishing a sentence.
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while the other three studies were for 24 months, correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also opine, in your expert report, that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats, correct? You can look at page 52 if you want. A. Thank you. Thyroid C-cell adenomas and carcinomas combined in male Sprague Dawley rats. Q. So the answer is yes, you do opine that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And if we go now to your revised expert report, that same page on Exhibit page 34 on your revised expert report, here you now have data from the Lankas study and you note that pooling all four studies yields a significant trend of p equals .041. Correct? A. I have to find it. I'm sorry. That appears to be correct. Q. So you're no longer saying that the evidence is weak, correct? A. That is correct. But Q. And that is because you're now including the Lankas study MS. GREENWALD: He was finishing a sentence. A. That is correct. But you are
Q. And in your expert report, you state that Lankas might be informative on causation with respect to these tumor types because there was a 26-month study while the other three studies were for 24 months, correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also opine, in your expert report, that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats, correct? You can look at page 52 if you want. A. Thank you. Thyroid C-cell adenomas and carcinomas combined in male Sprague Dawley rats. Q. So the answer is yes, you do opine that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form. A. That's what it says, correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	your analysis of the three other studies, that there was the evidence is weak that glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors in male Sprague Dawley rats. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And if we go now to your revised expert report, that same page on Exhibit page 34 on your revised expert report, here you now have data from the Lankas study and you note that pooling all four studies yields a significant trend of p equals .041. Correct? A. I have to find it. I'm sorry. That appears to be correct. Q. So you're no longer saying that the evidence is weak, correct? A. That is correct. But Q. And that is because you're now including the Lankas study MS. GREENWALD: He was finishing a sentence. A. That is correct. But you are right, that is an error. This should

Page 222	Page 224
1 correct.	bottom, pooling the remaining new findings
Q. So you are now opining that you	in Sprague Dawley rats. Do you see that?
should not have included the Lankas study	A. It seems that's what I did,
in this pooling analysis?	that's correct.
5 A. No, I should not have concluded	5 Q. Which of the four Sprague Dawley
6 that this was evidence that it should	6 rat studies did you pool for your
7 have been weak or limited evidence that	7 positive reported positive reports in
glyphosate causes thyroid C-cell tumors. I	8 skin keratoacanthomas?
should have put that in there.	9 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to
Q. In your revised report, to reach	10 form.
a statistically significant finding for	11 A. It does not say.
thyroid C-cell adenomas, you included the	Q. I know it does not say. That's
Lankas study in your pooling methodology,	why I am asking you.
didn't you?	A. I would have to go back.
MS. GREENWALD: Objection to	Q. Basel cell tumors, you also
¹⁶ form.	report a pooled finding. Which of the four
A. I had done both since I did it in	Sprague Dawley rat studies did you include
my previous one. But here, it seems I	in your pooling analysis for basal cell
pooled all four. That is correct.	19 tumors?
Q. You had pooled all three in your	A. Again, I don't know. I would
May report and, then to reach a	have to go back and look.
statistically significant finding in your	Q. Basal cell tumors, those in mice
July report, you pool all four, correct?	are the sames basal cell tumors in humans?
MS. GREENWALD: Objection,	Is that a similar tumor?
²⁵ form.	A. It's it arises from the same
Page 223	Page 225
¹ A. No, no.	¹ place.
 Q. You didn't pool all four studies 	Q. And basal cell tumors, as I know
in your July expert report?	all too well, in humans are generally
⁴ A. I did, but I didn't do it to	4 caused by exposure to sunlight, correct?
⁵ achieve statistical significance.	⁵ MS. GREENWALD: Objection to
⁶ Q. In your rebuttal report, you also	⁶ form.
discuss pooled analysis in Sprague Dawley	A. Can I go back to your previous
8 rats for skin keratoacanthomas and basal	question about what was pooled and correct
⁹ cell tumors. I think this is based on page	9 that?
6 of your report.	Q. Sure.
A. Which one are we looking at?	A. Thank you. All four studies were
Q. I am sorry, your rebuttal expert	pooled for that evaluation.
report. So this is 15-31.	Q. Is that for both the evaluations?
14 A. Page 6?	A. What was the skin
Q. Yes.	keratoacanthomas and what was the other
A. I OK, what are we looking at	one.
here.	Q. Basar cen.
Q. So you report that for skin	71. Retuarry I did both poolings.
keratoacanthomas, you are reporting a	or, fixe I did before, three and four.
pooled finding of all increased trend for	Q. Where is your
mereased skin keratoaeanthomas for Sprague	71. Table 2, page 10.
Dawley rais, correct. On page 6 or your	Q. OK. What is 3 and what's 4? A. So Lankas, Ekemoto, Atkinson and
	A. SU Laiikas, Ekciliulu, Alkilisuli aliu
reductal report, on the bottom, the second	
paragraph from the end. Page 6, second paragraph from the	

	Page 226		Page 228
1	four. Oh, no, I didn't show the pooled	1	gavage.
2	three here, I'm sorry.	2	Q. That would be a liquid ingestion
3	Q. You are looking Wistar rats I	3	as opposed to a solid ingestion of the
4	think?	4	chemical?
5	A. I was looking at Wistar rats.	5	A. Yes, and forced into the stomach
6	Q. Just so the record is clear	6	of the animal so it would not be licking
7	A. I don't have anything here that	7	itself and putting it on the skin.
8	says when I pooled just one minute.	8	Q. With respect to this potential
9	I don't say here when I pooled	9	licking of the skin, you would not be able
10	only three instead of the four, so I can't	10	to actually determine what the dose was for
11	answer the question.	11	any of the animals in these studies,
12	Q. At least as reported in table 2,	12	correct?
13	you are relying upon a pooling analysis of	13	MS. GREENWALD: Objection,
14	all four of the Sprague Dawley rat studies	14	form.
15	including Lankas for those two tumor types?	15	A. You could figure out with some
16	A. I can't answer the question.	16	degree of accuracy an estimate of how much
17	Q. Fair enough.	17	was going on the skin from studies people
18	A. I thought I could. Sorry.	18	have done in looking at the issue. Nobody
19	Q. Basal cell tumors, those are	19	has done that, but you probably could.
20	caused primarily by exposure to the sun,	20	Q. But as of today, nobody has
21	correct?	21	conducted the study that would allow you to
22	MS. GREENWALD: Object to	22	determine what dose of glyphosate might
23	form.	23	have been licked on to the skin of these
24	A. I don't know. Skin cancers	24	mice in the various treatment groups,
25	are certain skin cancers are caused	25	correct?
	Page 227		Page 229
1		1	
1 2	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if	1 2	A. That is correct.
	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing.		A. That is correct.Q. So you would not be able to come
2	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or	2	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of
2	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states	2 3	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these
2 3 4	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states that an oral ingestion, eating study, of	2 3 4	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these studies, correct?
2 3 4 5	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states that an oral ingestion, eating study, of any substance can result in a basal cell	2 3 4 5	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these studies, correct? A. No, that's not true. Almost
2 3 4 5 6	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states that an oral ingestion, eating study, of any substance can result in a basal cell tumor? Can cause a basal cell tumor?	2 3 4 5	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these studies, correct? A. No, that's not true. Almost certainly the dose to the skin is going to
2 3 4 5 6 7	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states that an oral ingestion, eating study, of any substance can result in a basal cell	2 3 4 5 6 7	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these studies, correct? A. No, that's not true. Almost
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states that an oral ingestion, eating study, of any substance can result in a basal cell tumor? Can cause a basal cell tumor? A. Probably. It's well known that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these studies, correct? A. No, that's not true. Almost certainly the dose to the skin is going to be concentration dependent because the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states that an oral ingestion, eating study, of any substance can result in a basal cell tumor? Can cause a basal cell tumor? A. Probably. It's well known that rats and mice, after they eat, lick their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these studies, correct? A. No, that's not true. Almost certainly the dose to the skin is going to be concentration dependent because the animals will, on average, all do the same
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states that an oral ingestion, eating study, of any substance can result in a basal cell tumor? Can cause a basal cell tumor? A. Probably. It's well known that rats and mice, after they eat, lick their skin, and so it's well known that you get	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these studies, correct? A. No, that's not true. Almost certainly the dose to the skin is going to be concentration dependent because the animals will, on average, all do the same amount of grooming. And so as you double
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states that an oral ingestion, eating study, of any substance can result in a basal cell tumor? Can cause a basal cell tumor? A. Probably. It's well known that rats and mice, after they eat, lick their skin, and so it's well known that you get some degree of absorption on the skin in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these studies, correct? A. No, that's not true. Almost certainly the dose to the skin is going to be concentration dependent because the animals will, on average, all do the same amount of grooming. And so as you double the dose, you're going to probably double
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states that an oral ingestion, eating study, of any substance can result in a basal cell tumor? Can cause a basal cell tumor? A. Probably. It's well known that rats and mice, after they eat, lick their skin, and so it's well known that you get some degree of absorption on the skin in these types of studies.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these studies, correct? A. No, that's not true. Almost certainly the dose to the skin is going to be concentration dependent because the animals will, on average, all do the same amount of grooming. And so as you double the dose, you're going to probably double the amount that gets on the skin. So I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states that an oral ingestion, eating study, of any substance can result in a basal cell tumor? Can cause a basal cell tumor? A. Probably. It's well known that rats and mice, after they eat, lick their skin, and so it's well known that you get some degree of absorption on the skin in these types of studies. Q. So your sense then would be to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these studies, correct? A. No, that's not true. Almost certainly the dose to the skin is going to be concentration dependent because the animals will, on average, all do the same amount of grooming. And so as you double the dose, you're going to probably double the amount that gets on the skin. So I could do a trend test for that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states that an oral ingestion, eating study, of any substance can result in a basal cell tumor? Can cause a basal cell tumor? A. Probably. It's well known that rats and mice, after they eat, lick their skin, and so it's well known that you get some degree of absorption on the skin in these types of studies. Q. So your sense then would be to the extent that there are skin tumors	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these studies, correct? A. No, that's not true. Almost certainly the dose to the skin is going to be concentration dependent because the animals will, on average, all do the same amount of grooming. And so as you double the dose, you're going to probably double the amount that gets on the skin. So I could do a trend test for that. Q. Do you have any evidence of your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states that an oral ingestion, eating study, of any substance can result in a basal cell tumor? Can cause a basal cell tumor? A. Probably. It's well known that rats and mice, after they eat, lick their skin, and so it's well known that you get some degree of absorption on the skin in these types of studies. Q. So your sense then would be to the extent that there are skin tumors reported in these studies that might be attributed to the glyphosate, it would be because of rats licking their skin?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these studies, correct? A. No, that's not true. Almost certainly the dose to the skin is going to be concentration dependent because the animals will, on average, all do the same amount of grooming. And so as you double the dose, you're going to probably double the amount that gets on the skin. So I could do a trend test for that. Q. Do you have any evidence of your review of the studies that looked at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states that an oral ingestion, eating study, of any substance can result in a basal cell tumor? Can cause a basal cell tumor? A. Probably. It's well known that rats and mice, after they eat, lick their skin, and so it's well known that you get some degree of absorption on the skin in these types of studies. Q. So your sense then would be to the extent that there are skin tumors reported in these studies that might be attributed to the glyphosate, it would be because of rats licking their skin? A. You couldn't rule it out. It	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these studies, correct? A. No, that's not true. Almost certainly the dose to the skin is going to be concentration dependent because the animals will, on average, all do the same amount of grooming. And so as you double the dose, you're going to probably double the amount that gets on the skin. So I could do a trend test for that. Q. Do you have any evidence of your review of the studies that looked at the grooming habits of these rats with respect to whether the grooming habits were the same across treatment groups?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states that an oral ingestion, eating study, of any substance can result in a basal cell tumor? Can cause a basal cell tumor? A. Probably. It's well known that rats and mice, after they eat, lick their skin, and so it's well known that you get some degree of absorption on the skin in these types of studies. Q. So your sense then would be to the extent that there are skin tumors reported in these studies that might be attributed to the glyphosate, it would be because of rats licking their skin?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these studies, correct? A. No, that's not true. Almost certainly the dose to the skin is going to be concentration dependent because the animals will, on average, all do the same amount of grooming. And so as you double the dose, you're going to probably double the amount that gets on the skin. So I could do a trend test for that. Q. Do you have any evidence of your review of the studies that looked at the grooming habits of these rats with respect to whether the grooming habits were the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states that an oral ingestion, eating study, of any substance can result in a basal cell tumor? Can cause a basal cell tumor? A. Probably. It's well known that rats and mice, after they eat, lick their skin, and so it's well known that you get some degree of absorption on the skin in these types of studies. Q. So your sense then would be to the extent that there are skin tumors reported in these studies that might be attributed to the glyphosate, it would be because of rats licking their skin? A. You couldn't rule it out. It	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these studies, correct? A. No, that's not true. Almost certainly the dose to the skin is going to be concentration dependent because the animals will, on average, all do the same amount of grooming. And so as you double the dose, you're going to probably double the amount that gets on the skin. So I could do a trend test for that. Q. Do you have any evidence of your review of the studies that looked at the grooming habits of these rats with respect to whether the grooming habits were the same across treatment groups?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states that an oral ingestion, eating study, of any substance can result in a basal cell tumor? Can cause a basal cell tumor? A. Probably. It's well known that rats and mice, after they eat, lick their skin, and so it's well known that you get some degree of absorption on the skin in these types of studies. Q. So your sense then would be to the extent that there are skin tumors reported in these studies that might be attributed to the glyphosate, it would be because of rats licking their skin? A. You couldn't rule it out. It could be either one and to give you an example, we saw an increase in skin tumors from oral ingestion of dioxin.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these studies, correct? A. No, that's not true. Almost certainly the dose to the skin is going to be concentration dependent because the animals will, on average, all do the same amount of grooming. And so as you double the dose, you're going to probably double the amount that gets on the skin. So I could do a trend test for that. Q. Do you have any evidence of your review of the studies that looked at the grooming habits of these rats with respect to whether the grooming habits were the same across treatment groups? A. There is no evidence either way in almost any study about grooming habits, it's not recorded.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states that an oral ingestion, eating study, of any substance can result in a basal cell tumor? Can cause a basal cell tumor? A. Probably. It's well known that rats and mice, after they eat, lick their skin, and so it's well known that you get some degree of absorption on the skin in these types of studies. Q. So your sense then would be to the extent that there are skin tumors reported in these studies that might be attributed to the glyphosate, it would be because of rats licking their skin? A. You couldn't rule it out. It could be either one and to give you an example, we saw an increase in skin tumors from oral ingestion of dioxin. Q. And was that an oral gavage or a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these studies, correct? A. No, that's not true. Almost certainly the dose to the skin is going to be concentration dependent because the animals will, on average, all do the same amount of grooming. And so as you double the dose, you're going to probably double the amount that gets on the skin. So I could do a trend test for that. Q. Do you have any evidence of your review of the studies that looked at the grooming habits of these rats with respect to whether the grooming habits were the same across treatment groups? A. There is no evidence either way in almost any study about grooming habits, it's not recorded. Q. Let's turn to the mice, mouse
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states that an oral ingestion, eating study, of any substance can result in a basal cell tumor? Can cause a basal cell tumor? A. Probably. It's well known that rats and mice, after they eat, lick their skin, and so it's well known that you get some degree of absorption on the skin in these types of studies. Q. So your sense then would be to the extent that there are skin tumors reported in these studies that might be attributed to the glyphosate, it would be because of rats licking their skin? A. You couldn't rule it out. It could be either one and to give you an example, we saw an increase in skin tumors from oral ingestion of dioxin. Q. And was that an oral gavage or a feeding study?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these studies, correct? A. No, that's not true. Almost certainly the dose to the skin is going to be concentration dependent because the animals will, on average, all do the same amount of grooming. And so as you double the dose, you're going to probably double the amount that gets on the skin. So I could do a trend test for that. Q. Do you have any evidence of your review of the studies that looked at the grooming habits of these rats with respect to whether the grooming habits were the same across treatment groups? A. There is no evidence either way in almost any study about grooming habits, it's not recorded. Q. Let's turn to the mice, mouse studies, mice studies, mouse studies.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states that an oral ingestion, eating study, of any substance can result in a basal cell tumor? Can cause a basal cell tumor? A. Probably. It's well known that rats and mice, after they eat, lick their skin, and so it's well known that you get some degree of absorption on the skin in these types of studies. Q. So your sense then would be to the extent that there are skin tumors reported in these studies that might be attributed to the glyphosate, it would be because of rats licking their skin? A. You couldn't rule it out. It could be either one and to give you an example, we saw an increase in skin tumors from oral ingestion of dioxin. Q. And was that an oral gavage or a feeding study? A. It was an unusual study. I just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these studies, correct? A. No, that's not true. Almost certainly the dose to the skin is going to be concentration dependent because the animals will, on average, all do the same amount of grooming. And so as you double the dose, you're going to probably double the amount that gets on the skin. So I could do a trend test for that. Q. Do you have any evidence of your review of the studies that looked at the grooming habits of these rats with respect to whether the grooming habits were the same across treatment groups? A. There is no evidence either way in almost any study about grooming habits, it's not recorded. Q. Let's turn to the mice, mouse studies, mice studies, mouse studies. You used the same pooling
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	primarily by the sun, but I don't know if that is a basal cell is the same thing. Q. Do you know of any evidence or can you cite to any publication that states that an oral ingestion, eating study, of any substance can result in a basal cell tumor? Can cause a basal cell tumor? A. Probably. It's well known that rats and mice, after they eat, lick their skin, and so it's well known that you get some degree of absorption on the skin in these types of studies. Q. So your sense then would be to the extent that there are skin tumors reported in these studies that might be attributed to the glyphosate, it would be because of rats licking their skin? A. You couldn't rule it out. It could be either one and to give you an example, we saw an increase in skin tumors from oral ingestion of dioxin. Q. And was that an oral gavage or a feeding study?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. That is correct. Q. So you would not be able to come up with any trend based upon dose of glyphosate applied to the skin using these studies, correct? A. No, that's not true. Almost certainly the dose to the skin is going to be concentration dependent because the animals will, on average, all do the same amount of grooming. And so as you double the dose, you're going to probably double the amount that gets on the skin. So I could do a trend test for that. Q. Do you have any evidence of your review of the studies that looked at the grooming habits of these rats with respect to whether the grooming habits were the same across treatment groups? A. There is no evidence either way in almost any study about grooming habits, it's not recorded. Q. Let's turn to the mice, mouse studies, mice studies, mouse studies.

Page 230 Page 232 1 1 studies in reaching your causation opinions Q. Is that correct? 2 2 in mice, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, 3 3 same two objections. A. Yes. Q. In your rebuttal report -- again, 4 A. I answered the question already. 5 5 if you look at page 7, you state that the Q. I am going to ask it again 6 observed findings of p less than .05 in 6 because I don't believe you did. 7 Swiss Albino mice, both male and female, 7 In female CD-1 mice and Swiss 8 8 and female CD-1 mice would be consistent Albino mice, the number of trends you would 9 9 with what would be expected due solely to expect to see due to chance and the number 10 10 chance, correct? of trends you, in fact, did see are 11 A. I'm not sure where you are 11 approximately equal, correct? 12 12 reading at. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, 13 13 Q. At the bottom of page 7 in your form. rebuttal report. Yeah. 14 14 A. That is correct. 15 15 A. Now, what's the question? Q. Now, based upon your pooling 16 16 Q. So you state in your rebuttal methodology, you opine that glyphosate 17 expert report that the observed findings of 17 causes a number of tumors in CD-1 mice, 18 18 p less than 0.05 trends in Swiss Albino correct? 19 19 mice, both male and female, and female CD-1 A. Due to the data I'm looking at, 2.0 mice are consistent with what would be 20 which includes the pooling analysis and the 21 21 individual analysis and other things, I am expected due solely to chance, correct? 22 22 convinced that a number of tumors in the MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 23 23 form. CD-1 mouse are positive. 24 A. That's not what I said. 24 Q. So your causation opinion with 25 25 respect to CD-1 mice is looking at four O. You state that in female CD-1 Page 231 Page 233 1 mice and Swiss Albino mice, the expected 1 studies, correct? 2 2 and observed numbers are approximately MS. GREENWALD: Objection, 3 3 equal, correct? form. 4 4 A. That is for the expected and The four mouse studies? 5 observed number of p values less than 0.05, 5 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, 6 6 that is correct. form. 7 Q. Right. Just to be clear then, A. There are four mouse studies that 8 8 you state in your rebuttal expert report were acceptable for use in the causation 9 9 that the observed findings of p less than evaluation, that is correct. 0.05 trends in Swiss Albino mice and female 10 10 O. And two of the studies were 18 11 11 CD-1 mice are consistent with what would be months in duration and two of them were 24 12 12 expected due solely to chance, correct? months in duration, correct? 13 13 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to A. That is correct. 14 14 Q. In your pooling analysis, you form. 15 15 conduct pooling of the two 18-month studies A. No. that's not what I wrote. I 16 16 wrote what I wrote. It says they are and then you conduct pooling of the two 17 17 approximately equal. That is all it says. 24-month studies and you also conduct 18 Q. So the number of observed trends 18 pooling of all four studies combined? that you saw in female CD-1 mice and in 19 19 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 2.0 2.0 Swiss Albino mice are approximately equal form. 21 2.1 to what you would expect to see due to A. I don't know that I did all four 22 chance, correct? 22 studies combined all the time, but I 23 23 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, probably pooled them all the time in all 24 24 form, asked and answered. four as well. 25 25 A. I answered it. Q. If your pooling methodology

	Page 234		Page 236
1	reported a positive trend for tumor type in	1	the two 24-month studies are pooled,
2	any one of those three pooled analyses, you	2	correct?
3	ultimately opined that the glyphosate	3	A. That is correct.
4	causes that type of tumor in CD-1 mice,	4	Q. And there is no positive trend
5	correct?	5	when all four studies are pooled, correct?
6	MS. GREENWALD: Object to	6	A. It's a marginal trend, but it's
7	form.	7	not statistically significant at the .05
8	A. No.	8	level.
9	Q. Are there any tumor types that	9	Q. And you opine through this
10	resulted in a positive trend in either the	10	analysis that the data establishes that
11	18-month studies or 24-month study or the	11	glyphosate causes malignant lymphoma in
12	four studies combined that you do not opine	12	male CD-1 mice, correct?
13	was caused by glyphosate?	13	MS. GREENWALD: Objection to
14	MS. GREENWALD: Objection,	14	form.
15	form.	15	A. My opinion is glyphosate causes
16	A. You've lost me a little bit	16	malignant lymphoma in male CD-1 mice.
17	there. I would have to look. I'm sorry.	17	Q. When you applied your pooling
18	I'd have to look carefully.	18	methodology so the data on hemangiosarcomas
19	My guess would be, looking at	19	in male CD-1 mice from the two 24-month
20	it no, I'd have to look. I'm sorry, I	20	studies, you likewise do not find an
21 22	can't guess.	_	increased trend, correct?
23	Q. Now, in connection with strike	22	A. It doesn't reach the level of
24	that.	24	statistical significance, that is correct.
25	When you look at the 24-month	25	Q. Now, in your expert report and
23	study through your pooling methodology, you	25	this is at page, your initial expert
	Page 235		Page 237
1	did not find an increased trend for any	<u>(1)</u>	report, the revised one, 15-30, at page 48,
2	type of tumor in CD-1 mice, correct?	(2)	you suggest another approach in analyzing
3	A. I would have to look at it and	3	those two studies for hemangiosarcomas and
4	make sure of that.	4	first I want to make sure that you are on
5	Q. So why don't we look at page 11	<u>(5)</u>	page 48?
6	of your revised expert report.	<u>(6)</u>	A. Yes, I am.
7	A. OK.	7	Q. The top for hemangiosarcomas in
8	Q. I am sorry, not your revised.	8	male and pooling the two 18-month studies
9	Your rebuttal.	9	and then pooling the two 24-month studies,
10	A. Rebuttal.	10	correct?
11	Q. We were on the same page	11	A. That's correct.
12	physically and mentally.	12	Q. And you note, again, pooling the
13 14	A. So looking at the mouse studies	13	two 24-month studies did not result in a
15	here, none of them reached a level of	14 15	statistically significant increased trend
16	statistical significance. That is correct.	16	for hemangiosarcomas, correct?
17	They one of them is marginally, two of	17	A. That is correct.
18	them are marginally no. One, one is marginally significant.	18	Q. Then you state if you were to remove the findings in the high dose group
19	Q. For example, for malignant	19	in one of the 24-month studies and then
20	lymphoma in male CD-1 mice, your pooling	20	pool the two 24-month studies without the
21	methodology reports a positive trend when	21	high dose group, then your pooling of the
22	the two 18-month studies were pooled,	22	24-month studies would be a statistically
23	correct?	23	significant increased trend, correct?
24	A. That is correct.	24	A. I note that there is an aberrant
25	Q. There is no positive trend when	25	result in the highest dose of the Knezevich
	•		

Page 240 Page 238 1 and Hogan study and I looked at the sensitive to that high dose point. 2 2 sensitivity of the pooled analysis to Q. You conducted a historical trend 3 removal of that aberrant result. 3 analysis for hemangiosarcomas in male mice 4 4 Q. And now if you followed the same in the Sugimoto study, correct? That's 5 5 page 42 of your initial or July 2017 methodology and ignored the findings of 6 hemangiosarcoma in the highest dose group report, 15-30. 7 7 of the highest dose group of the Atkinson A. Yes, it starts on page 41. OK. 8 8 study or the Wood study your pooling Q. So you calculated that while the 9 9 concurrent control trend -- you calculated methodology would not have resulted in any 10 trend for hemangiosarcomas in the 18-month 10 that while the concurrent control trend 11 analysis for hemangiosarcomas in male mice study, correct? 11 12 12 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to in Sugimoto is not statistically 13 13 significantly increased, you did find a form. 14 14 A. That's possibly true, yes. significant increase in your historical 15 trend analysis, correct? Q. You also conducted -- you don't 15 16 16 present that data though in your expert A. For hemangiosarcomas, the trend 17 17 test was marginally significant and report? 18 18 A. This is a -- this is the pooling historical control evaluation was 19 evaluation here. There is reason -- that's 19 significant. 20 just simply an observation on my part. 20 Q. That p trend, that p hist. trend 21 That is all it is. This is not used as 21 is listed as one of your statistically 22 part of my overall evaluation. 22 significant trends in your table 15, 23 23 Q. It was important enough for you correct? 24 to put it in your expert report? 24 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, 25 A. Because I did it. 25 form. Page 239 Page 241 1 Q. But you didn't do the same 1 A. Yes, that is correct. 2 2 Q. Now, hemangiosarcomas are one of analysis removing the high dose group from 3 either Atkinson or Wood studies, correct? those types of tumors that you have stated 4 4 must be combined as systemic tumors, A. I saw no reason to do it. 5 5 Q. That would not have resulted in a correct? 6 positive trend, would it have? 6 A. Yes, that is correct. 7 7 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, Q. So whether hemangiosarcomas in 8 form, asked and answered. 8 the liver or kidney or in the spleen, for 9 A. I do not know, but I saw no 9 the purposes of the trend analysis, they 10 reason to do it. 10 are all grouped together, correct? 11 Q. In fact, it would have removed a 11 A. No, they -- from what I 12 trend that you wanted to rely upon, 12 understand, they group it slightly 13 13 wouldn't it? differently than that. I'm sorry. I have 14 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, 14 to go and try to figure it out myself, but 15 asked and answered, form. 15 I don't know exactly. 16 Q. You don't know? 16 But they tend not to pool liver 17 17 A. I -- first, I don't know if it and kidney hemangiosarcomas with the other 18 would remove the trend. Probably it would. 18 hemangiosarcomas, I think it has something 19 But that's not the point here. The reason 19 to do with the origin of the cells for the 20 for pooling -- for looking at it here is 20 hemangiosarcoma. 21 the classic things you do. It's a 21 Q. So is it your understanding then, 22 sensitivity analysis to see how sensitive 22 in reporting hemangiosarcomas, you would 23 the findings are to what appears to be an 23 separately analyze, for trend analysis, 24 aberrant result. That was all that was 24 liver and kidney -- I am sorry, which one 25 done here. And it seemed to be very 25 did you say it was?

Page 244 Page 242 1 A. I think it is liver and kidney, 1 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 2 2 but I would ask my pathologist first. I 3 would trust him to tell me how to combine 3 A. This is the Giknis and Clifford these things. paper that I referenced, yes. 5 5 Q. For the Sugimoto study then, is Q. Let's take a look at table 5 on 6 it your understanding that the 6 page 21 and 22. Actually, first of all, 7 7 hemangiosarcomas that you found were not in just to set the stage, on page 5 of this 8 8 the liver or kidney? report they have a summary of the 9 9 A. I don't honestly know. I -- I individual studies and information, 10 10 can't be absolutely certain. You asked me correct? So this identifies the 18-month 11 about systemic tumors and combining them. 11 study and 24-month studies, correct? 12 But in this case, I have no clue. 12 A. That is correct. Q. So studies 1 through 26, those 13 O. So for the purposes of the 13 14 14 historical trend analysis then for the are the 18-month studies, correct? Sugimoto study for hemangiosarcomas to find 15 15 A. That -- yes, that is correct. Q. And those are the -- that's the 16 a historical incidence of hemangiosarcomas 16 17 then, you would look at all the 17 data set we would be looking at for this 18 hemangiosarcomas in controlled animals in 18 historical control? 19 the historical database? 19 A. I believe so, yes. 20 A. That you -- yes, you look at all 20 Q. If we looked at pages 21 and 22, 21 the historical hemangiosarcomas in the 21 this has the instance of neoplasm by study historical controlled database, that is 22 22 for selected organs in males, correct? So 23 23 these are the male historical database? 24 24 Q. Now, you note in your report that Historical controls? 25 the historical control rate for 25 A. That is correct. Page 243 Page 245 1 hemangiosarcomas based on Giknis and Q. And you, in coming up with your 2 2 Clifford is zero out of 1424, correct? statement that there were no 3 Actually, you have two different hemangiosarcomas in these historical 4 4 numbers. Zero, 1424 on your footnote, and controls, you were looking at the whole I think you have zero out of 1149 in your 5 body, multiple organ line, third from the б text. One of those two, right? 6 bottom, correct? 7 7 A. Yeah, it's one of those two. I'm A. That is correct. 8 8 O. There is another line item for sorry. 9 9 Q. The key point that you're making hemangiosarcomas in the liver, correct? 10 here is the fact that hemangiosarcomas was 10 A. That is correct. 11 never seen in historical controls should 11 O. And there were, in fact, 12 strongly support any positive finding as in 12 12 historical control animals in the 18-month 13 the Sugimoto study as being significant 13 studies with hemangiosarcomas in the liver, 14 correct? 14 correct? 15 A. Biologically significant, that is 15 A. That is correct. 16 16 correct. Q. And again, you don't know with 17 17 Sugimoto whether the hemangiosarcomas were Q. Let's take a look at the Giknis 18 and Clifford report. 18 in the liver or other organs, correct? 19 (Exhibit 15-33, report entitled, 19 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, "Spontaneous Neoplastic Lesions in the 20 20 form. Crl:CD1 Mouse" marked for 21 21 A. Typically it's whole body 22 identification, as of this date.) 22 hemangiosarcomas, but I can't be certain 23 Q. This is the source of your 23 exactly what they did. 24 information on historical control for Q. So for determining what the 24 25 hemangiosarcomas, correct? 25 historical control instances of

Page 246		Page 248
hemangiosarcomas, we should be looking	1	were in the 12-month study I'm sorry,
including these 12 hemangiosarcomas in the	2	the 18-month study and how many were in the
liver, correct?	3	24-month study, correct?
MS. GREENWALD: Objection,	4	A. That is correct.
form.	5	Q. Is it your to the extent that
A. No. I would not recommend that.	6	there were spleen hemangiosarcomas in
The typical pathological approach is whole	7	18-month historical controls, should
body hemangiosarcomas, and from my	8	that those hemangiosarcomas be included
understanding, that is what we were	9	in your historical control incidence for
analyzing.	10	Sugimoto?
Q. And you would not include liver	11	MS. GREENWALD: Objection to
	12	form.
hemangiosarcomas. Is that your	13	
understanding?	14	A. You would really have to ask a
MS. GREENWALD: Objection,		pathologist.
asked and answered.	15	Q. So you don't know one way or the
A. That is my understanding, but the	16	other?
only way to verify that is if I have the	17	A. I don't know one way or the other
individual animal pathology data.	18	what Sugimoto did. All I know, he
Q. You don't have that for Sugimoto?	19	characterized it the way he characterized
A. Is that a Monsanto study? No, I	20	it.
don't have it.	21	Q. In the Giknis paper, Giknis and
Q. Are there any other organs where	22	Clifford paper also reports on
hemangiosarcomas would not be included in	23	hemangiosarcomas in other tissues. It
the historical control rate?	24	reports hemangiosarcomas in the testes, in
the historical control rate?		
A. You really have to ask that Page 247	25	the skin, in the pancreas, and in the lymph Page 249
A. You really have to ask that Page 247	25	the skin, in the pancreas, and in the lymph Page 249
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist.		the skin, in the pancreas, and in the lymph Page 249 nodes. And if you want you can go through
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the	1	the skin, in the pancreas, and in the lymph Page 249 nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And	1 2	the skin, in the pancreas, and in the lymph Page 249 nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas.
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12.	1 2 3	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12. Now, this has data for all 46 of	1 2 3 4	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those hemangiosarcomas appeared in the 18-month.
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12. Now, this has data for all 46 of the studies, it doesn't break it out, but	1 2 3 4 5	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those hemangiosarcomas appeared in the 18-month studies, do you know if those should be
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12. Now, this has data for all 46 of the studies, it doesn't break it out, but for the spleen, there are 28	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those hemangiosarcomas appeared in the 18-month studies, do you know if those should be included in your historical control rate
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12. Now, this has data for all 46 of the studies, it doesn't break it out, but for the spleen, there are 28 hemangiosarcomas in these studies, correct?	1 2 3 4 5	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those hemangiosarcomas appeared in the 18-month studies, do you know if those should be included in your historical control rate for Sugimoto?
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12. Now, this has data for all 46 of the studies, it doesn't break it out, but for the spleen, there are 28 hemangiosarcomas in these studies, correct? A. That's what it says.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those hemangiosarcomas appeared in the 18-month studies, do you know if those should be included in your historical control rate for Sugimoto? A. I can't know how many of those
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12. Now, this has data for all 46 of the studies, it doesn't break it out, but for the spleen, there are 28 hemangiosarcomas in these studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. Just to put this in context, page	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those hemangiosarcomas appeared in the 18-month studies, do you know if those should be included in your historical control rate for Sugimoto? A. I can't know how many of those appeared in the 18-month studies from this
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12. Now, this has data for all 46 of the studies, it doesn't break it out, but for the spleen, there are 28 hemangiosarcomas in these studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. Just to put this in context, page 9, they report the data for liver	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those hemangiosarcomas appeared in the 18-month studies, do you know if those should be included in your historical control rate for Sugimoto? A. I can't know how many of those appeared in the 18-month studies from this document. So I can't I can't answer the
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12. Now, this has data for all 46 of the studies, it doesn't break it out, but for the spleen, there are 28 hemangiosarcomas in these studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. Just to put this in context, page 9, they report the data for liver hemangiosarcomas, correct?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those hemangiosarcomas appeared in the 18-month studies, do you know if those should be included in your historical control rate for Sugimoto? A. I can't know how many of those appeared in the 18-month studies from this document. So I can't I can't answer the question in reality.
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12. Now, this has data for all 46 of the studies, it doesn't break it out, but for the spleen, there are 28 hemangiosarcomas in these studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. Just to put this in context, page 9, they report the data for liver hemangiosarcomas, correct? A. Yes, they do.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those hemangiosarcomas appeared in the 18-month studies, do you know if those should be included in your historical control rate for Sugimoto? A. I can't know how many of those appeared in the 18-month studies from this document. So I can't I can't answer the question in reality. Q. And so then would it be fair to
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12. Now, this has data for all 46 of the studies, it doesn't break it out, but for the spleen, there are 28 hemangiosarcomas in these studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. Just to put this in context, page 9, they report the data for liver hemangiosarcomas, correct? A. Yes, they do. Q. So there were 29 hemangiosarcomas	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those hemangiosarcomas appeared in the 18-month studies, do you know if those should be included in your historical control rate for Sugimoto? A. I can't know how many of those appeared in the 18-month studies from this document. So I can't I can't answer the question in reality. Q. And so then would it be fair to say that you, without additional
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12. Now, this has data for all 46 of the studies, it doesn't break it out, but for the spleen, there are 28 hemangiosarcomas in these studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. Just to put this in context, page 9, they report the data for liver hemangiosarcomas, correct? A. Yes, they do. Q. So there were 29 hemangiosarcomas in the liver in the control animals in the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those hemangiosarcomas appeared in the 18-month studies, do you know if those should be included in your historical control rate for Sugimoto? A. I can't know how many of those appeared in the 18-month studies from this document. So I can't I can't answer the question in reality. Q. And so then would it be fair to say that you, without additional information that you do not have, cannot
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12. Now, this has data for all 46 of the studies, it doesn't break it out, but for the spleen, there are 28 hemangiosarcomas in these studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. Just to put this in context, page 9, they report the data for liver hemangiosarcomas, correct? A. Yes, they do. Q. So there were 29 hemangiosarcomas in the liver in the control animals in the 46 studies, correct?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those hemangiosarcomas appeared in the 18-month studies, do you know if those should be included in your historical control rate for Sugimoto? A. I can't know how many of those appeared in the 18-month studies from this document. So I can't I can't answer the question in reality. Q. And so then would it be fair to say that you, without additional information that you do not have, cannot state what the appropriate historical
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12. Now, this has data for all 46 of the studies, it doesn't break it out, but for the spleen, there are 28 hemangiosarcomas in these studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. Just to put this in context, page 9, they report the data for liver hemangiosarcomas, correct? A. Yes, they do. Q. So there were 29 hemangiosarcomas in the liver in the control animals in the 46 studies, correct? A. That's what it says.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those hemangiosarcomas appeared in the 18-month studies, do you know if those should be included in your historical control rate for Sugimoto? A. I can't know how many of those appeared in the 18-month studies from this document. So I can't I can't answer the question in reality. Q. And so then would it be fair to say that you, without additional information that you do not have, cannot state what the appropriate historical control rate for hemangiosarcomas should be
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12. Now, this has data for all 46 of the studies, it doesn't break it out, but for the spleen, there are 28 hemangiosarcomas in these studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. Just to put this in context, page 9, they report the data for liver hemangiosarcomas, correct? A. Yes, they do. Q. So there were 29 hemangiosarcomas in the liver in the control animals in the 46 studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. And we know from table 5 that 12	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those hemangiosarcomas appeared in the 18-month studies, do you know if those should be included in your historical control rate for Sugimoto? A. I can't know how many of those appeared in the 18-month studies from this document. So I can't I can't answer the question in reality. Q. And so then would it be fair to say that you, without additional information that you do not have, cannot state what the appropriate historical control rate for hemangiosarcomas should be for the Sugimoto study?
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12. Now, this has data for all 46 of the studies, it doesn't break it out, but for the spleen, there are 28 hemangiosarcomas in these studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. Just to put this in context, page 9, they report the data for liver hemangiosarcomas, correct? A. Yes, they do. Q. So there were 29 hemangiosarcomas in the liver in the control animals in the 46 studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. And we know from table 5 that 12 of those were in the 18-month studies,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those hemangiosarcomas appeared in the 18-month studies, do you know if those should be included in your historical control rate for Sugimoto? A. I can't know how many of those appeared in the 18-month studies from this document. So I can't I can't answer the question in reality. Q. And so then would it be fair to say that you, without additional information that you do not have, cannot state what the appropriate historical control rate for hemangiosarcomas should be for the Sugimoto study? MS. GREENWALD: Objection,
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12. Now, this has data for all 46 of the studies, it doesn't break it out, but for the spleen, there are 28 hemangiosarcomas in these studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. Just to put this in context, page 9, they report the data for liver hemangiosarcomas, correct? A. Yes, they do. Q. So there were 29 hemangiosarcomas in the liver in the control animals in the 46 studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. And we know from table 5 that 12 of those were in the 18-month studies, correct?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those hemangiosarcomas appeared in the 18-month studies, do you know if those should be included in your historical control rate for Sugimoto? A. I can't know how many of those appeared in the 18-month studies from this document. So I can't I can't answer the question in reality. Q. And so then would it be fair to say that you, without additional information that you do not have, cannot state what the appropriate historical control rate for hemangiosarcomas should be for the Sugimoto study? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12. Now, this has data for all 46 of the studies, it doesn't break it out, but for the spleen, there are 28 hemangiosarcomas in these studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. Just to put this in context, page 9, they report the data for liver hemangiosarcomas, correct? A. Yes, they do. Q. So there were 29 hemangiosarcomas in the liver in the control animals in the 46 studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. And we know from table 5 that 12 of those were in the 18-month studies, correct? A. Twelve of the 29 were in the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those hemangiosarcomas appeared in the 18-month studies, do you know if those should be included in your historical control rate for Sugimoto? A. I can't know how many of those appeared in the 18-month studies from this document. So I can't I can't answer the question in reality. Q. And so then would it be fair to say that you, without additional information that you do not have, cannot state what the appropriate historical control rate for hemangiosarcomas should be for the Sugimoto study? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. No, I can tell you what is
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12. Now, this has data for all 46 of the studies, it doesn't break it out, but for the spleen, there are 28 hemangiosarcomas in these studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. Just to put this in context, page 9, they report the data for liver hemangiosarcomas, correct? A. Yes, they do. Q. So there were 29 hemangiosarcomas in the liver in the control animals in the 46 studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. And we know from table 5 that 12 of those were in the 18-month studies, correct? A. Twelve of the 29 were in the 18-month studies, that is correct.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those hemangiosarcomas appeared in the 18-month studies, do you know if those should be included in your historical control rate for Sugimoto? A. I can't know how many of those appeared in the 18-month studies from this document. So I can't I can't answer the question in reality. Q. And so then would it be fair to say that you, without additional information that you do not have, cannot state what the appropriate historical control rate for hemangiosarcomas should be for the Sugimoto study? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. No, I can tell you what is characterized we can look up what OECD
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12. Now, this has data for all 46 of the studies, it doesn't break it out, but for the spleen, there are 28 hemangiosarcomas in these studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. Just to put this in context, page 9, they report the data for liver hemangiosarcomas, correct? A. Yes, they do. Q. So there were 29 hemangiosarcomas in the liver in the control animals in the 46 studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. And we know from table 5 that 12 of those were in the 18-month studies, correct? A. Twelve of the 29 were in the 18-month studies, that is correct. Q. And with the spleen, we know we	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those hemangiosarcomas appeared in the 18-month studies, do you know if those should be included in your historical control rate for Sugimoto? A. I can't know how many of those appeared in the 18-month studies from this document. So I can't I can't answer the question in reality. Q. And so then would it be fair to say that you, without additional information that you do not have, cannot state what the appropriate historical control rate for hemangiosarcomas should be for the Sugimoto study? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. No, I can tell you what is characterized we can look up what OECD requires for this tumor, for this
A. You really have to ask that Page 247 question of the pathologist. Q. Let's look at table 3 in the Giknis and Clifford report. And specifically at page 12. Now, this has data for all 46 of the studies, it doesn't break it out, but for the spleen, there are 28 hemangiosarcomas in these studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. Just to put this in context, page 9, they report the data for liver hemangiosarcomas, correct? A. Yes, they do. Q. So there were 29 hemangiosarcomas in the liver in the control animals in the 46 studies, correct? A. That's what it says. Q. And we know from table 5 that 12 of those were in the 18-month studies, correct? A. Twelve of the 29 were in the 18-month studies, that is correct.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	nodes. And if you want you can go through the page 11, 12, and 13, you will see listings of the other hemangiosarcomas. To the extent that those hemangiosarcomas appeared in the 18-month studies, do you know if those should be included in your historical control rate for Sugimoto? A. I can't know how many of those appeared in the 18-month studies from this document. So I can't I can't answer the question in reality. Q. And so then would it be fair to say that you, without additional information that you do not have, cannot state what the appropriate historical control rate for hemangiosarcomas should be for the Sugimoto study? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. No, I can tell you what is characterized we can look up what OECD

Page 250 Page 252 1 1 at here assuming that Sugimoto followed page 38 of your report. 2 2 OECD guidelines. A. Page 38. Knezevich and Hogan. 3 3 I don't -- I know he followed the Q. So now we are talking about 4 OECD guidelines. I just haven't looked at 4 hemangiomas in female CD-1 mice and the 5 5 first question is for the Knezevich study, the issue. 6 Q. Do you know if the 6 there was no finding of an increased trend 7 7 hemangiosarcomas in Sugimoto were in the in hemangiomas in female CD-1 mice, 8 8 liver or spleen or testes or the pancreas correct? 9 or any other tissues where hemangiosarcomas 9 A. That's correct. 10 10 Q. In fact, the trend is above .5 so were found in the control animals? 11 11 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, it actually leans in the negative 12 12 asked and answered. direction, correct? 13 13 A. The hemangiosarcomas were MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 14 characterized as whole body 14 form. hemangiosarcomas which is the same 15 15 A. Hard to say. 16 characterization in this document for a 16 Q. The Atkinson study, and this is 17 17 reported on page 39, likewise does not find specific class of tumors. 18 18 evidence of an increased risk of hemangioma Q. I asked a different question. 19 19 in female CD-1 mice, correct? Do you know if the 2.0 hemangiosarcomas in the Sugimoto study, the 20 A. That is correct. 21 two hemangiosarcomas, do you know in what 21 Q. The Wood study on page 41, 22 22 tissue of the animal they occurred? likewise, does not find evidence of an 23 23 MS. GREENWALD: Objection. increased trend in hemangiomas in female 24 form, asked and answered. 24 CD-1 mice, correct? 25 25 A. The Wood study, given the A. Again, they were characterized as Page 251 Page 253 1 1 whole body hemangiosarcomas. I do not know historical controls, I would say it does 2 what tissue they came in, but they fell in 2 show -that general category. 3 Q. On page 41? 4 Q. If they were in the liver --A. I don't have -- you're right, 4 5 5 A. They wouldn't be a whole body you're right, my mistake. There is no hemangiosarcoma. 6 significant trend here, positive trend. 6 7 Q. That's your understanding? That is correct. A. That's my understanding. Since 8 8 O. So the one study in CD-1 mice 9 Giknis and Clifford come from a contract 9 that you find with an increased trend and 10 lab that does these types of things all the 10 what forms the basis of your pooled 11 time, I'm assuming that is a common 11 analysis finding is the Sugimoto study 12 classification for a category of tumors, 12 which you report on page 42, correct? 13 13 multiorgan -- multiorgan hemangiosarcoma. A. The Fujimoto study when --14 Q. You separately opine that 14 Q. Sugimoto. glyphosate causes these hemangiomas in 15 15 A. Sugimoto, when combined with the 16 16 Wood, et al., study has a significant female CD-1 mice, correct? 17 17 increase in hemangiomas combined. And then MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 18 18 A. The data supports a finding of me the Wood study itself is also significant 19 hemangiomas in female whatever it was. 19 for hemangiomas. 20 2.0 Q. CD-1 mice? Q. You mean the Sugimoto? 21 A. Sugimoto, God. Sorry, long day. 21 A. CD-1 mice. I'm sorry there is so 22 Q. Three of the four CD-1 mice 22 many things here. 23 23 studies do not find any evidence of an Q. Let's walk through the findings 24 for this tumor type for the four CD-1 mouse 24 increased risk of hemangiomas in CD-1 25 25 studies. The first is Knezevich study, female mice, correct?

Page 254 Page 256 1 A. The 24-month studies have to be 1 used for hemangiosarcomas, you could look 2 2 at the hemangiomas and conclude there was handled differently than the 18-month 3 3 no increased trend for hemangiomas, studies. So in the 18-month studies, you 4 4 have one positive study and one study correct? 5 5 without a positive trend. MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 6 6 The study without the positive form. trend has a lower exposure and the highest 7 7 A. That is not true. 8 8 exposure group. The study with the Q. Did you do a sensitivity analysis positive trend has higher doses. 9 knocking off the high dose group in 9 10 10 When you combine them together Sugimoto the way that you knocked out the 11 high group in Knezevich for 11 with the doses and the responses, you 12 12 maintain a significant response. That's hemangiosarcomas? what the data tells you. 13 13 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 14 14 Q. Dr. Portier, that was not my form. 15 15 question. A. I have done that analysis. For 16 16 There are four CD-1 mouse some of the presentations I had where the 17 17 regulatory agencies were saying that the studies, correct? 18 18 There are four CD-1 mouse doses were too high. And I believe I have Α. 19 19 an example in there where there is -- well, studies. 2.0 Q. The two 24-month studies do not 20 this is hemangiomas, they didn't have them 21 report any positive trend with hemangiomas 21 at the time. I haven't done the analysis, in female mice, correct? 22 22 no. 23 23 A. That is correct. Q. You opine that glyphosate causes 24 The Wood 18-month does not find 24 kidney tumors in male CD-1 mice, correct? 25 25 A. I believe, yes. That is correct. any increased trend in hemangiomas in Page 255 Page 257 1 female CD-1 mice, correct? 1 Q. Now, neither of the 24-month CD-1 2 2 mouse studies reports a statistically A. It -- it found some, but not an 3 significant increased trend for kidney increase, that is correct. 4 4 Q. So the only CD-1 mouse study that tumors in male CD-1 mice, correct? found any increased trend of hemangiomas in 5 A. OK, let's see. That would be 5 6 female CD-1 mice was the Sugimoto study, 6 tables 9 and 10. Kidney hemangiomas, 7 7 kidney sarcomas, the 24-month studies? right? 8 8 O. Yes, that would be Knezevich and A. That is correct. 9 9 Q. And using -- if you had followed Atkinson. 10 10 that same methodology that you followed in A. Knezevich using historical 11 doing your sensitivity analysis for 11 control test is significant. 12 12 hemangiosarcomas and you knocked off the Q. We are going to go to concurrent 13 control. We will get to historical control 13 aberrant finding in that high dose group in 14 14 one of the studies, you would not have in a second. found any increased trend for hemangiomas 15 15 My question is with respect to 16 16 in any of the CD-1 mice studies, correct? statistically significant trends which 17 17 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, would be p less than .05, neither of the 18 24-month CD-1 studies report a 18 form. 19 statistically significant increased trend 19 A. If, individually, one study at a 20 for kidney tumors in male CD-1 mice, 2.0 time, I had knocked this off, then this 21 2.1 significant finding might go away probably. correct? 22 A. If significance is defined as 22 No, it would go away, it would not be 23 23 0.05, that is correct. there. 24 Q. In its monograph for working 24 Q. So if you followed the same 25 group 112, the IARC working group stated 25 sensitivity analysis methodology that you

	Page 258		Page 260
1	that the finding for Knezevich was	1	A. That's not true.
2	statistically significant to the p equals	2	Q. I'm sorry. Top of page 37, I am
3	.05 level, correct?	3	reading, "I will use the study by Giknis
4	A. I'd have to look. I'm sorry.	4	and Clifford 2000 since it best covers the
5	Q. Do you recall that there was a	5	range of studies we have for CD-1 mice,
6	calculation that was conducted using the	6	correct?
7	approximate trend test?	7	A. It says that. But before that,
8	A. That, I do recall. The decision	8	it says, "These studies have virtually
9	was twofold, but yes.	9	identical rates for the important tumor
10	Q. And the IARC monograph, the IARC	10	seen in CD-1 mice," which refers to not one
11	working group, using the approximate trend	11	historical control but three.
12	test, reported that the findings for kidney	12	Q. OK, but for the purposes of your
13	tumors in Knezevich was statistically	13	historical trend analysis, for the
14	significant at p equals .05, correct?	14	Knezevich and Hogan study, for kidney
15	A. For the trend test, yes, that is	15	adenomas and carcinomas, you used a
16	correct.	16	historical rate from Giknis and Clifford,
17	Q. Your analysis now is that the	17	correct?
18	Knezevich study does not have a p less than	18	A. That is for kidneys?
19	0.05 trend for kidney tumors, correct?	19	Yes, that is correct.
20	MS. GREENWALD: Objection,	20	Q. And you agree that in any
21	form. That's not his testimony.	21	analysis using historical controls, the
22	A. It could you say it again? I	22	data should be from studies in the same
23	don't know	23	time frame, for the same animal strain,
24	Q. Your expert analysis now is that	24	preferably from the same laboratory or same
25	the Knezevich study for renal tumors does	25	supplier, and preferably reviewed by the
	the Knezevien study for renar tumors does		supplier, and preferably reviewed by the
	Page 259		Page 261
1		1	Page 261 same pathologist, correct?
1 2	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct?	1 2	
	not report a p less than .05 finding,		same pathologist, correct?
2	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct?	2	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection,
2	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same	2 3	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.
2 3 4	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection.	2 3 4	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. If possible. And when possible,
2 3 4 5	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. The p-value is reported in that	2 3 4 5	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. If possible. And when possible, that would be assuming that the historical
2 3 4 5 6	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. The p-value is reported in that study from the exact test and that p-value	2 3 4 5 6	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. If possible. And when possible, that would be assuming that the historical control data set is a valid and useful data
2 3 4 5 6 7	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. The p-value is reported in that study from the exact test and that p-value is not less than 0.05. But I do report the	2 3 4 5 6 7	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. If possible. And when possible, that would be assuming that the historical control data set is a valid and useful data set, that would probably be the best
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. The p-value is reported in that study from the exact test and that p-value is not less than 0.05. But I do report the p-value.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. If possible. And when possible, that would be assuming that the historical control data set is a valid and useful data set, that would probably be the best approach.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. The p-value is reported in that study from the exact test and that p-value is not less than 0.05. But I do report the p-value. Q. Yes, I understand.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. If possible. And when possible, that would be assuming that the historical control data set is a valid and useful data set, that would probably be the best approach. Q. You also agree that historical
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. The p-value is reported in that study from the exact test and that p-value is not less than 0.05. But I do report the p-value. Q. Yes, I understand. the you've been talking about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. If possible. And when possible, that would be assuming that the historical control data set is a valid and useful data set, that would probably be the best approach. Q. You also agree that historical control data should be taken from studies
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. The p-value is reported in that study from the exact test and that p-value is not less than 0.05. But I do report the p-value. Q. Yes, I understand. the you've been talking about the historical trend analysis for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. If possible. And when possible, that would be assuming that the historical control data set is a valid and useful data set, that would probably be the best approach. Q. You also agree that historical control data should be taken from studies that are of the same duration as the study
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. The p-value is reported in that study from the exact test and that p-value is not less than 0.05. But I do report the p-value. Q. Yes, I understand. the you've been talking about the historical trend analysis for Knezevich, for renal tumors. Just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. If possible. And when possible, that would be assuming that the historical control data set is a valid and useful data set, that would probably be the best approach. Q. You also agree that historical control data should be taken from studies that are of the same duration as the study in interest, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. The p-value is reported in that study from the exact test and that p-value is not less than 0.05. But I do report the p-value. Q. Yes, I understand. the you've been talking about the historical trend analysis for Knezevich, for renal tumors. Just mentioned that, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. If possible. And when possible, that would be assuming that the historical control data set is a valid and useful data set, that would probably be the best approach. Q. You also agree that historical control data should be taken from studies that are of the same duration as the study in interest, correct? A. Where possible, absolutely.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. The p-value is reported in that study from the exact test and that p-value is not less than 0.05. But I do report the p-value. Q. Yes, I understand. the you've been talking about the historical trend analysis for Knezevich, for renal tumors. Just mentioned that, correct? A. Correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. If possible. And when possible, that would be assuming that the historical control data set is a valid and useful data set, that would probably be the best approach. Q. You also agree that historical control data should be taken from studies that are of the same duration as the study in interest, correct? A. Where possible, absolutely. Q. And as a general matter, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. The p-value is reported in that study from the exact test and that p-value is not less than 0.05. But I do report the p-value. Q. Yes, I understand. the you've been talking about the historical trend analysis for Knezevich, for renal tumors. Just mentioned that, correct? A. Correct. Q. And in your p hist. analysis for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. If possible. And when possible, that would be assuming that the historical control data set is a valid and useful data set, that would probably be the best approach. Q. You also agree that historical control data should be taken from studies that are of the same duration as the study in interest, correct? A. Where possible, absolutely. Q. And as a general matter, you would expect a higher incidence of tumors
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. The p-value is reported in that study from the exact test and that p-value is not less than 0.05. But I do report the p-value. Q. Yes, I understand. the you've been talking about the historical trend analysis for Knezevich, for renal tumors. Just mentioned that, correct? A. Correct. Q. And in your p hist. analysis for the Knezevich study, you again rely upon	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. If possible. And when possible, that would be assuming that the historical control data set is a valid and useful data set, that would probably be the best approach. Q. You also agree that historical control data should be taken from studies that are of the same duration as the study in interest, correct? A. Where possible, absolutely. Q. And as a general matter, you would expect a higher incidence of tumors in historical controls as the duration of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. The p-value is reported in that study from the exact test and that p-value is not less than 0.05. But I do report the p-value. Q. Yes, I understand. the you've been talking about the historical trend analysis for Knezevich, for renal tumors. Just mentioned that, correct? A. Correct. Q. And in your p hist. analysis for the Knezevich study, you again rely upon the data from that 2000 report by Giknis	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. If possible. And when possible, that would be assuming that the historical control data set is a valid and useful data set, that would probably be the best approach. Q. You also agree that historical control data should be taken from studies that are of the same duration as the study in interest, correct? A. Where possible, absolutely. Q. And as a general matter, you would expect a higher incidence of tumors in historical controls as the duration of the study increases, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. The p-value is reported in that study from the exact test and that p-value is not less than 0.05. But I do report the p-value. Q. Yes, I understand. the you've been talking about the historical trend analysis for Knezevich, for renal tumors. Just mentioned that, correct? A. Correct. Q. And in your p hist. analysis for the Knezevich study, you again rely upon the data from that 2000 report by Giknis and Clifford, correct? A. I would have to look.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. If possible. And when possible, that would be assuming that the historical control data set is a valid and useful data set, that would probably be the best approach. Q. You also agree that historical control data should be taken from studies that are of the same duration as the study in interest, correct? A. Where possible, absolutely. Q. And as a general matter, you would expect a higher incidence of tumors in historical controls as the duration of the study increases, correct? A. On average, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. The p-value is reported in that study from the exact test and that p-value is not less than 0.05. But I do report the p-value. Q. Yes, I understand. the you've been talking about the historical trend analysis for Knezevich, for renal tumors. Just mentioned that, correct? A. Correct. Q. And in your p hist. analysis for the Knezevich study, you again rely upon the data from that 2000 report by Giknis and Clifford, correct? A. I would have to look.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. If possible. And when possible, that would be assuming that the historical control data set is a valid and useful data set, that would probably be the best approach. Q. You also agree that historical control data should be taken from studies that are of the same duration as the study in interest, correct? A. Where possible, absolutely. Q. And as a general matter, you would expect a higher incidence of tumors in historical controls as the duration of the study increases, correct? A. On average, yes. Q. So all things being equal, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. The p-value is reported in that study from the exact test and that p-value is not less than 0.05. But I do report the p-value. Q. Yes, I understand. the you've been talking about the historical trend analysis for Knezevich, for renal tumors. Just mentioned that, correct? A. Correct. Q. And in your p hist. analysis for the Knezevich study, you again rely upon the data from that 2000 report by Giknis and Clifford, correct? A. I would have to look. Q. It's page 37 of your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. If possible. And when possible, that would be assuming that the historical control data set is a valid and useful data set, that would probably be the best approach. Q. You also agree that historical control data should be taken from studies that are of the same duration as the study in interest, correct? A. Where possible, absolutely. Q. And as a general matter, you would expect a higher incidence of tumors in historical controls as the duration of the study increases, correct? A. On average, yes. Q. So all things being equal, you would want to use 24-month study,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. The p-value is reported in that study from the exact test and that p-value is not less than 0.05. But I do report the p-value. Q. Yes, I understand. the you've been talking about the historical trend analysis for Knezevich, for renal tumors. Just mentioned that, correct? A. Correct. Q. And in your p hist. analysis for the Knezevich study, you again rely upon the data from that 2000 report by Giknis and Clifford, correct? A. I would have to look. Q. It's page 37 of your A. Give me a moment, please.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. If possible. And when possible, that would be assuming that the historical control data set is a valid and useful data set, that would probably be the best approach. Q. You also agree that historical control data should be taken from studies that are of the same duration as the study in interest, correct? A. Where possible, absolutely. Q. And as a general matter, you would expect a higher incidence of tumors in historical controls as the duration of the study increases, correct? A. On average, yes. Q. So all things being equal, you would want to use 24-month study, historical control data, to compare to a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. The p-value is reported in that study from the exact test and that p-value is not less than 0.05. But I do report the p-value. Q. Yes, I understand. the you've been talking about the historical trend analysis for Knezevich, for renal tumors. Just mentioned that, correct? A. Correct. Q. And in your p hist. analysis for the Knezevich study, you again rely upon the data from that 2000 report by Giknis and Clifford, correct? A. I would have to look. Q. It's page 37 of your A. Give me a moment, please. So 36 onward on to 37?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. If possible. And when possible, that would be assuming that the historical control data set is a valid and useful data set, that would probably be the best approach. Q. You also agree that historical control data should be taken from studies that are of the same duration as the study in interest, correct? A. Where possible, absolutely. Q. And as a general matter, you would expect a higher incidence of tumors in historical controls as the duration of the study increases, correct? A. On average, yes. Q. So all things being equal, you would want to use 24-month study, historical control data, to compare to a 24-month study, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	not report a p less than .05 finding, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. A. The p-value is reported in that study from the exact test and that p-value is not less than 0.05. But I do report the p-value. Q. Yes, I understand. the you've been talking about the historical trend analysis for Knezevich, for renal tumors. Just mentioned that, correct? A. Correct. Q. And in your p hist. analysis for the Knezevich study, you again rely upon the data from that 2000 report by Giknis and Clifford, correct? A. I would have to look. Q. It's page 37 of your A. Give me a moment, please. So 36 onward on to 37? Q. Yes. We were talking about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	same pathologist, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. If possible. And when possible, that would be assuming that the historical control data set is a valid and useful data set, that would probably be the best approach. Q. You also agree that historical control data should be taken from studies that are of the same duration as the study in interest, correct? A. Where possible, absolutely. Q. And as a general matter, you would expect a higher incidence of tumors in historical controls as the duration of the study increases, correct? A. On average, yes. Q. So all things being equal, you would want to use 24-month study, historical control data, to compare to a 24-month study, correct? A. All things being equal, yes, if

	Page 262		Page 264
1	a natural breaking point, I need a	1	1987 and December of 1996, correct?
2	comfort break.	2	That's by a common study
3		3	•
4	MR. LASKER: This would be right	4	parameters on the top on page 1?
5	now is fine.	5	Page 1, common study parameters,
6	MS. GREENWALD: I don't want	6	the 51 studies included?
7	to is now OK?	7	A. Oh, yes, there it is. Thank you.
8	MR. LASKER: Now is perfectly	8	Q. Were initiated between January
9	fine.	9	1987 and December of 1996, correct?
	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is	10	A. That is correct.
10	3:03 p.m.		Q. So this is the Knezevich study
11	(Recess)	11	was a two-year study, completed report in
12	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is	12	1983, so these studies in this 2000 report
13	3:18 p.m. We are on the record.	13	for the historical control data were all
14	BY MR. LASKER:	14	initiated maybe 6 to 16 years after the
15	Q. Dr. Portier, let's go back to	15	Knezevich study, correct?
16	that Giknis and Clifford 2000 report. It's	16	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.
17	right on the top of your pile there. Left	17	A. They were after the Knezevich and
18	hand. There it is.	18	Hogan study, that is correct.
19	And this, again, is the source of	19	Q. Between 6 and 16 years after,
20	the historical control data that you used	20	correct?
21	for your p-hist. analysis of the Knezevich	21	A. Probably, yes.
22	kidney tumor findings, correct?	22	Q. And if it was available, you
23	A. This is the source of the mean	23	agree that it would be more reliable to use
24	historical control response that was	24	historical control data for studies
25	applied in the analysis that appears in the	25	conducted closer in time to Knezevich,
	Page 263		Page 265
1		1	
1 2	paper.	1 2	correct?
3	It's not the only historical	3	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.
4	controls group I looked at.	4	A. Not necessarily correct.
5	Q. But just to be clear, this is the	5	Q. If you had a choice between
	source of the data that you used for your	6	historical control data in CD-1 mice for
6 7	p-hist. analysis of the kidney tumors in	7	Charles River, for example, that was closer
	Knezevich, correct?		in time to the Knezevich study, you would
8	A. That in the published	8	like to look at that historical control
9	document, yes, that is correct.	9	data, correct?
10 11	Q. Where did you get, by the way	10	A. I would look at it, but I would
	strike that.	12	have to evaluate whether I thought it was
	The Charles Dissess 4 14		
12	The Charles River posts its		better or worse than this particular
13	historical trend data on its website,	13	dataset.
13 14	historical trend data on its website, correct? That's where you got this?	13 14	dataset. Q. Have you looked at any Charles
13 14 15	historical trend data on its website, correct? That's where you got this? For example, this 2000 report is	13 14 15	dataset. Q. Have you looked at any Charles River data to determine whether they have
13 14 15 16	historical trend data on its website, correct? That's where you got this? For example, this 2000 report is right on their website, correct?	13 14 15 16	dataset. Q. Have you looked at any Charles River data to determine whether they have data on historical controls for a time
13 14 15 16 17	historical trend data on its website, correct? That's where you got this? For example, this 2000 report is right on their website, correct? A. Whatever it says in my references	13 14 15 16 17	dataset. Q. Have you looked at any Charles River data to determine whether they have data on historical controls for a time period closer to Knezevich?
13 14 15 16 17	historical trend data on its website, correct? That's where you got this? For example, this 2000 report is right on their website, correct? A. Whatever it says in my references is where I got this from. It is a website.	13 14 15 16 17 18	dataset. Q. Have you looked at any Charles River data to determine whether they have data on historical controls for a time period closer to Knezevich? A. I didn't find them.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	historical trend data on its website, correct? That's where you got this? For example, this 2000 report is right on their website, correct? A. Whatever it says in my references is where I got this from. It is a website. Or does it even say? Let's see.	13 14 15 16 17 18	dataset. Q. Have you looked at any Charles River data to determine whether they have data on historical controls for a time period closer to Knezevich? A. I didn't find them. If I had, I would have used them
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	historical trend data on its website, correct? That's where you got this? For example, this 2000 report is right on their website, correct? A. Whatever it says in my references is where I got this from. It is a website. Or does it even say? Let's see. Giknis and Clifford, which one is that?	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	dataset. Q. Have you looked at any Charles River data to determine whether they have data on historical controls for a time period closer to Knezevich? A. I didn't find them. If I had, I would have used them probably.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	historical trend data on its website, correct? That's where you got this? For example, this 2000 report is right on their website, correct? A. Whatever it says in my references is where I got this from. It is a website. Or does it even say? Let's see. Giknis and Clifford, which one is that? But anyway, I believe it is their	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	dataset. Q. Have you looked at any Charles River data to determine whether they have data on historical controls for a time period closer to Knezevich? A. I didn't find them. If I had, I would have used them probably. Q. In fact, in your submission to
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	historical trend data on its website, correct? That's where you got this? For example, this 2000 report is right on their website, correct? A. Whatever it says in my references is where I got this from. It is a website. Or does it even say? Let's see. Giknis and Clifford, which one is that? But anyway, I believe it is their website, that is correct.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	dataset. Q. Have you looked at any Charles River data to determine whether they have data on historical controls for a time period closer to Knezevich? A. I didn't find them. If I had, I would have used them probably. Q. In fact, in your submission to regulators
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	historical trend data on its website, correct? That's where you got this? For example, this 2000 report is right on their website, correct? A. Whatever it says in my references is where I got this from. It is a website. Or does it even say? Let's see. Giknis and Clifford, which one is that? But anyway, I believe it is their website, that is correct. Q. So this report provides	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	dataset. Q. Have you looked at any Charles River data to determine whether they have data on historical controls for a time period closer to Knezevich? A. I didn't find them. If I had, I would have used them probably. Q. In fact, in your submission to regulators A. I will point out that the
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	historical trend data on its website, correct? That's where you got this? For example, this 2000 report is right on their website, correct? A. Whatever it says in my references is where I got this from. It is a website. Or does it even say? Let's see. Giknis and Clifford, which one is that? But anyway, I believe it is their website, that is correct. Q. So this report provides historical control data, and it's on page 1	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	dataset. Q. Have you looked at any Charles River data to determine whether they have data on historical controls for a time period closer to Knezevich? A. I didn't find them. If I had, I would have used them probably. Q. In fact, in your submission to regulators A. I will point out that the regulators use this as well, as well as
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	historical trend data on its website, correct? That's where you got this? For example, this 2000 report is right on their website, correct? A. Whatever it says in my references is where I got this from. It is a website. Or does it even say? Let's see. Giknis and Clifford, which one is that? But anyway, I believe it is their website, that is correct. Q. So this report provides	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	dataset. Q. Have you looked at any Charles River data to determine whether they have data on historical controls for a time period closer to Knezevich? A. I didn't find them. If I had, I would have used them probably. Q. In fact, in your submission to regulators A. I will point out that the

Page 266 Page 268 1 1 Q. Now, the Charles River website, Q. In your submission to regulators, 2 2 you have stated that attempting to compare I've gone to that website and it does have 3 3 an earlier report. animals ranging over 16 years for 4 4 historical control data is inappropriate MR. LASKER: So let's mark that 5 because of the known drift in strains over 5 as the next in line. 6 time, correct? 6 (Exhibit 15-34, Charles River 7 7 A. I probably said something like report dated March of 1995, marked for 8 8 that, that is correct. identification, as of this date.) 9 9 spontaneous neoplastic lesions in the Q. Now, the historical control data 10 CD-1BR mouse marked for identification, 10 that you use in your analysis, your p-hist. 11 analysis in your expert report is listed on 11 as of this date.) Q. This is a report dated March 1995 12 page 10 of the Giknis and Clifford paper, 12 13 prepared for Charles River Laboratory by 13 1533, correct? 14 14 Dr. Lang, correct? A. What are we looking at here? 15 A. That seems to be what it says. 15 Q. This is the kidney historical 16 16 control data. It's the third tumor typed Q. If you look at page 4, it has a 17 listing of the different studies -- CD-1 17 down on page 10, kidney. 18 18 A. I'm sorry, I have to make sure mouse studies used to obtain historical 19 19 that kidney is not one of the one where control data, correct? 20 they give the individual tumor incidence? 20 A. That is correct. 21 21 They do not. O. And there are ten 24-month Yes, that is it. 22 22 studies in CD-1 mice that were used in 23 23 Q. And if you look at this data, you generating historical control data, 24 have .37 for kidney adenomas and .16 for 24 correct? 25 adenocarcinomas, total is .43. And that 25 A. That is correct. Page 267 Page 269 1 is, I believe, the historical control data 1 Q. The ten studies were initiated 2 that you used for your p-hist. analysis or 2 between 1981 and 1990, correct? 3 3 the number that you use for your historical A. No. 1983 --4 Q. Look at --4 controls, correct? 5 5 A. I use .27 for the kidney A. I am sorry. Yes, 1981 and 1990, 6 adenomas, .15 is what it says here for the 6 correct. 7 7 kidney carcinomas --Q. So these studies were initiated 8 8 O. We will give you that one. between 1981 and 1990, correct? 9 A. -- and then the joint historical 9 A. That is correct. 10 rate is .44 percent. 10 Q. So this covers the time period of 11 Q. Now, for this historical control 11 Knezevich and then forward a period of 12 data, that would be a mix of 24-month and 12 years, correct? 13 13 18-month studies --A. That is correct. 14 A. That is correct. 14 Q. And on page 23 of this report, we 15 Q. -- from the Giknis paper? 15 have data broken down just for the 24-month So to the extent it includes the 16 16 CD-1 mice studies, correct? 17 18-month study -- well, you would agree if 17 A. This might not cover Knezevich. you had the data broken down, it would be 18 18 I'm sorry, I want to correct my previous 19 more reliable to use historical control 19 answer. 20 data drawn solely from 24-month studies, 2.0 It partially covers Knezevich, 21 21 correct? but because of the length of time it takes 22 MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. 22 to run a study, Knezevich probably started 23 A. If the -- this is a 24-month 23 in 1979 or so. 24 study, I would prefer to have 24 month only 24 Q. These studies are closer in time 25 historical controls. 25 to Knezevich certainly than the studies in

Page 272 Page 270 1 1 the Giknis and Clifford 2000 report, closer to time to Knezevich is more than 2 2 five times greater than the historical correct? 3 3 control rate that you used for your p-hist. A. Correct. 4 Q. And on page 23, the Lang report 4 trend analysis, correct? sets forth historical control data 5 5 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. specifically for the 24-month CD-1 mouse 6 6 A. That were used by me and the EPA 7 studies, correct? 7 and EFSA, and that is correct. 8 A. That's what table C1 says. 8 O. And to be fair, EPA and EFSA did 9 Q. And on page 24, they report the 9 not conduct a p-hist. trend analysis, 10 historical control data for kidney tumors, 10 correct? 11 correct? 11 A. That is correct. 12 12 A. Renal adenomas and renal cell O. You are the only one who has 13 13 carcinomas are reported, that is correct. conducted a p-hist. trend analysis, Q. And the historical control data 14 14 correct? reported in these studies, 24-month 15 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 15 studies, closer to time to the Knezevich 16 16 form. 17 study, report a mean historical control 17 A. For these data, that is correct. 18 18 rate for kidney tumors, adenomas and O. And the historical control rate 19 19 carcinomas combined, of 2.3 percent, that you used to conduct that p-hist. 20 correct? 20 analysis is five times lower than the 21 21 historical control rate reported in this MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 22 22 A. Maybe. When you combine them, Lang 1995 study that covers CD-1 mouse you could have multiple adenomas and 23 23 studies of the same duration and closer in 24 24 carcinomas in the same animal, so you would time to the Knezevich study, correct? 25 have -- the highest it would be would be 25 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Page 271 Page 273 1 2.3 percent. It could be as low as 1.34 1 A. Yes, that's correct. 2 percent for the combined. 2 Q. You also agree that the 3 Q. The data that you used from the historical control rates for kidney tumors 4 4 in CD-1 mice may not even apply to the 2000 Giknis report to get your combined 5 5 data, you added the incidence from the Knezevich study because additional sections 6 6 adenomas and the carcinomas in the 2000 were taken of the kidney tumors in that 7 7 Giknis and Clifford report. study, correct? 8 8 We just went through that, A. I retract that statement 9 9 correct? actually. I thought about that when I was 10 10 rereading it. A. Yes, I did it -- correct. 11 11 The thing is the extra sections Q. For this data, using the same 12 produced nothing. There were no new 12 methodology that you used to come up with a 13 tumors. There were no new findings at all. 13 historical control rate for your Knezevich 14 And so since it's still based upon the 14 paper, the historical control rate is 15 original findings, I would say this 15 actually about five times greater than the 16 16 control rate that you used for your p-hist. historical control set is applicable. 17 17 trend analysis, correct? Q. If there had been additional 18 sectioning of the -- first of all, when you 18 A. It is 2.3 percent. 19 say you retract that statement, you are 19 Q. Compared to .42 or .44 percent, 20 retracting a statement that appears in your 2.0 correct? 21 expert report, correct? 2.1 A. Right. Yeah. 22 A. Whatever I'm doing, the statement 2.2 Q. So the actual -- or I am sorry, 23 23 the historical control incidence of kidney that says because of the taking of three 24 liver slices, these historical controls may 24 tumors -- the mean historical control 25 not be appropriate, I'm now saying I 25 incidence from these 24-month studies

Page 276 Page 274 1 believe these historical controls are 1 Q. If it was the case that multiple 2 2 sections of historical control animals appropriate because the three extra 3 3 found additional kidney tumors, is it your sections did not change anything. 4 4 Q. So just so we are clear, in your testimony that those additional tumors 5 5 should not be considered as relevant expert report, which is 1530 on page 37 --6 historical controls to the Knezevich study? 6 so this is your expert report. 7 7 A. Um-hm. A. You have lost me a little bit. 8 8 Q. You state, with respect to your P I'm sorry. 9 trend analysis for Knezevich for kidney 9 Q. I'll say it again. 10 tumors, and it's about one-third down the 10 If the historical control 11 11 animals -- those studies where you got the page: 12 12 "These historical control rates historical control data -- had undergone 13 13 additional sectioning and found additional may not apply to this analysis because a 14 14 reevaluation of the kidney tumors tumors -- you got that part? considered additional sections and no 15 15 A. Um-hm. 16 Q. In trying to identify what the 16 information is available on how additional 17 17 historical control rate was as compared to sections affect historical control rates in 18 the Knezevich study, would you have 18 this strain of mice. Differences have been 19 considered those additional tumors found in 19 seen in other settings." 2.0 Correct? 20 the historical control animals? 21 21 A. I certainly would have looked at A. That is correct. 22 22 Q. And that is a statement that you it. 23 23 are now retracting today, correct? Q. And that was the basis of your 24 A. I'm certainly not retracting the 24 original statement that you have in your 25 statement that says this has been seen in 25 expert report as to why the historical Page 275 Page 277 1 other settings. These historical -- what I 1 control rates that you have from Charles 2 am retracting is "may not apply." 2 River might not apply, because you don't Q. And for -- just so I understand, 3 know that there was additional sectioning 4 the point that you were making in your 4 of those animals, correct? 5 expert report is that if the historical MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 5 6 6 control animals had been -- there had been form. 7 7 additional sections taken of those animals, A. I assume -- in fact, I'm certain 8 there might have been additional tumors that under OECD guidelines, there is 9 guidance on how to section kidney tumors. 9 found in those animals, correct? 10 10 And the kidney tumors that were done in A. Correct. 11 11 Giknis and Clifford were certainly done Q. And if you were then doing an 12 12 apples-to-apples comparison of studies with under OEC guidelines because of the nature 13 of that laboratory. 13 similar numbers of sectioning, you would 14 14 want to compare the findings in Knezevich The previous ones I don't know after those multiple sections with 15 about because it was earlier. But they are 15 16 16 control -- historical controls after the all done the same way. Q. And they are just -- there 17 17 multiple sections, correct? 18 wouldn't be additional sectioning? 18 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 19 A. There wouldn't be additional 19 A. If the multiple sections had 20 sectioning because they would be doing 2.0 altered the numbers, I would want to do 21 whatever the guidelines say. 2.1 that. Failing to alter the numbers then 22 Q. The 24-month Atkinson study --22 means that they are appropriate against the 23 23 original pathology, which is the final and this is in your report at page 39 -- it 24 reports -- and you report in your expert 24 pathology. Therefore, they are 25 report -- a statistically significant 25 appropriate.

	Page 278		Page 280
1	negative trend for kidney tumors in CD-1	1	A. Yeah, that seems to be the case,
2	mice with increased dose of glyphosate,	2	yes. That's correct.
3	correct?	3	Q. But that was a mistake, correct?
4	A. Yes, I would guess that's the	4	A. That when they are combined, they
5	case.	5	are marginally statistically significant,
6	Q. And the you recently told a	6	not without the term "marginally," they
7	blogger by the name of Carey Gillam that	7	are just marginally statistically
8	when the findings for renal tumors in these	8	significant.
9	two 24-month mouse studies, Knezevich and	9	Q. They are not statistically
10	Atkinson, are combined, there is a	10	significant, correct?
11	statistically significant increased trend,	11	A. They are marginally statistically
12	correct?	12	significant.
13	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	13	Q. Your statement to Ms. Gillam was
14	A. I don't know. I would have to	14	incorrect?
15	see.	15	A. It seems it's not as correct as I
16	(Exhibit 15-35, e-mail chain	16	would like it to be.
17	dated June 7, 2017, marked for	17	Q. Now, with respect to the 18-month
18	identification, as of this date.)	18	studies, neither of the two 18-month CD-1
19	Q. For the record, Exhibit 15-35 is	19	mouse studies are reported a statistically
20	an e-mail exchange that you provided to us	20	significant increased trend for kidney
21	between you and Carey Gillam, correct?	21	tumors against concurrent controls,
22	A. What's the question again? I	22	correct?
23	finally got to read it.	23	A. That was a marginal statistical
24	Q. You told Ms. Gillam in June of	24	increase in the Sugimoto study.
25	2017 that when the results of these two	25	Q. Correct, not statistically
	Page 279		Page 281
1	24-month mouse studies are combined, there	1	significant at P equals .05, correct?
2	is a statistically significant increased	2	A. That is correct.
3	trend, correct?	3	Q. The Wood study did not find
4	A. Correct, but I think that is	4	kidney tumors at any dose group, correct?
5	wrong. I think I probably intended the two	5	A. That is correct.
6	18-month studies.	6	Q. And the Sugimoto study did not
7	Q. OK.	7	find any kidney carcinomas at any dose
8	A. Or she might have	8	group, correct?
9			group, correct:
	Q. In looking at your revised	9	A. It found kidney adenomas, that is
10	Q. In looking at your revised report and this is in connection just	10	A. It found kidney adenomas, that is correct.
10 11	Q. In looking at your revised report and this is in connection just to be clear, you're talking about the 1983	10 11	A. It found kidney adenomas, that is correct.Q. So just so we are clear, the
10 11 12	Q. In looking at your revised report and this is in connection just to be clear, you're talking about the 1983 study, which is the Monsanto study,	10 11 12	A. It found kidney adenomas, that is correct. Q. So just so we are clear, the Sugimoto did not find any kidney carcinomas
10 11 12 13	Q. In looking at your revised report and this is in connection just to be clear, you're talking about the 1983 study, which is the Monsanto study, correct?	10 11 12 13	A. It found kidney adenomas, that is correct. Q. So just so we are clear, the Sugimoto did not find any kidney carcinomas at any dose group, correct?
10 11 12 13 14	Q. In looking at your revised report and this is in connection just to be clear, you're talking about the 1983 study, which is the Monsanto study, correct? A. The first sentence is definitely	10 11 12 13 14	A. It found kidney adenomas, that is correct. Q. So just so we are clear, the Sugimoto did not find any kidney carcinomas at any dose group, correct? A. That is correct well, I don't
10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. In looking at your revised report and this is in connection just to be clear, you're talking about the 1983 study, which is the Monsanto study, correct?	10 11 12 13 14 15	A. It found kidney adenomas, that is correct. Q. So just so we are clear, the Sugimoto did not find any kidney carcinomas at any dose group, correct? A. That is correct well, I don't have kidney carcinomas here. So I would
10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. In looking at your revised report and this is in connection just to be clear, you're talking about the 1983 study, which is the Monsanto study, correct? A. The first sentence is definitely talking about the 1983 Knezevich and Hogan study.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. It found kidney adenomas, that is correct. Q. So just so we are clear, the Sugimoto did not find any kidney carcinomas at any dose group, correct? A. That is correct well, I don't have kidney carcinomas here. So I would have to look back at the original study to
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. In looking at your revised report and this is in connection just to be clear, you're talking about the 1983 study, which is the Monsanto study, correct? A. The first sentence is definitely talking about the 1983 Knezevich and Hogan study. Q. That is a 24-month study,	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. It found kidney adenomas, that is correct. Q. So just so we are clear, the Sugimoto did not find any kidney carcinomas at any dose group, correct? A. That is correct well, I don't have kidney carcinomas here. So I would have to look back at the original study to make sure there were none because I don't
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. In looking at your revised report and this is in connection just to be clear, you're talking about the 1983 study, which is the Monsanto study, correct? A. The first sentence is definitely talking about the 1983 Knezevich and Hogan study. Q. That is a 24-month study, correct?	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. It found kidney adenomas, that is correct. Q. So just so we are clear, the Sugimoto did not find any kidney carcinomas at any dose group, correct? A. That is correct well, I don't have kidney carcinomas here. So I would have to look back at the original study to make sure there were none because I don't have them here.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. In looking at your revised report and this is in connection just to be clear, you're talking about the 1983 study, which is the Monsanto study, correct? A. The first sentence is definitely talking about the 1983 Knezevich and Hogan study. Q. That is a 24-month study, correct? A. That is a 24-month study.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. It found kidney adenomas, that is correct. Q. So just so we are clear, the Sugimoto did not find any kidney carcinomas at any dose group, correct? A. That is correct well, I don't have kidney carcinomas here. So I would have to look back at the original study to make sure there were none because I don't have them here. Q. In your methodology, your goal at
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. In looking at your revised report and this is in connection just to be clear, you're talking about the 1983 study, which is the Monsanto study, correct? A. The first sentence is definitely talking about the 1983 Knezevich and Hogan study. Q. That is a 24-month study, correct? A. That is a 24-month study. Q. That is the context in which you	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. It found kidney adenomas, that is correct. Q. So just so we are clear, the Sugimoto did not find any kidney carcinomas at any dose group, correct? A. That is correct well, I don't have kidney carcinomas here. So I would have to look back at the original study to make sure there were none because I don't have them here. Q. In your methodology, your goal at least was to list kidney carcinomas
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. In looking at your revised report and this is in connection just to be clear, you're talking about the 1983 study, which is the Monsanto study, correct? A. The first sentence is definitely talking about the 1983 Knezevich and Hogan study. Q. That is a 24-month study, correct? A. That is a 24-month study. Q. That is the context in which you are telling Carey Gillam that when the two	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. It found kidney adenomas, that is correct. Q. So just so we are clear, the Sugimoto did not find any kidney carcinomas at any dose group, correct? A. That is correct well, I don't have kidney carcinomas here. So I would have to look back at the original study to make sure there were none because I don't have them here. Q. In your methodology, your goal at least was to list kidney carcinomas findings in all these studies, correct?
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. In looking at your revised report and this is in connection just to be clear, you're talking about the 1983 study, which is the Monsanto study, correct? A. The first sentence is definitely talking about the 1983 Knezevich and Hogan study. Q. That is a 24-month study, correct? A. That is a 24-month study. Q. That is the context in which you are telling Carey Gillam that when the two 24-month studies are combined, meaning the	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. It found kidney adenomas, that is correct. Q. So just so we are clear, the Sugimoto did not find any kidney carcinomas at any dose group, correct? A. That is correct well, I don't have kidney carcinomas here. So I would have to look back at the original study to make sure there were none because I don't have them here. Q. In your methodology, your goal at least was to list kidney carcinomas findings in all these studies, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. In looking at your revised report and this is in connection just to be clear, you're talking about the 1983 study, which is the Monsanto study, correct? A. The first sentence is definitely talking about the 1983 Knezevich and Hogan study. Q. That is a 24-month study, correct? A. That is a 24-month study. Q. That is the context in which you are telling Carey Gillam that when the two 24-month study and the Atkinson study, the	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. It found kidney adenomas, that is correct. Q. So just so we are clear, the Sugimoto did not find any kidney carcinomas at any dose group, correct? A. That is correct well, I don't have kidney carcinomas here. So I would have to look back at the original study to make sure there were none because I don't have them here. Q. In your methodology, your goal at least was to list kidney carcinomas findings in all these studies, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. I missed that. Sorry.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. In looking at your revised report and this is in connection just to be clear, you're talking about the 1983 study, which is the Monsanto study, correct? A. The first sentence is definitely talking about the 1983 Knezevich and Hogan study. Q. That is a 24-month study, correct? A. That is a 24-month study. Q. That is the context in which you are telling Carey Gillam that when the two 24-month study and the Atkinson study, the kidney tumors are statistically	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. It found kidney adenomas, that is correct. Q. So just so we are clear, the Sugimoto did not find any kidney carcinomas at any dose group, correct? A. That is correct well, I don't have kidney carcinomas here. So I would have to look back at the original study to make sure there were none because I don't have them here. Q. In your methodology, your goal at least was to list kidney carcinomas findings in all these studies, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. I missed that. Sorry. A. Say the question again, please.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. In looking at your revised report and this is in connection just to be clear, you're talking about the 1983 study, which is the Monsanto study, correct? A. The first sentence is definitely talking about the 1983 Knezevich and Hogan study. Q. That is a 24-month study, correct? A. That is a 24-month study. Q. That is the context in which you are telling Carey Gillam that when the two 24-month study and the Atkinson study, the	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. It found kidney adenomas, that is correct. Q. So just so we are clear, the Sugimoto did not find any kidney carcinomas at any dose group, correct? A. That is correct well, I don't have kidney carcinomas here. So I would have to look back at the original study to make sure there were none because I don't have them here. Q. In your methodology, your goal at least was to list kidney carcinomas findings in all these studies, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. I missed that. Sorry.

Page 282 Page 284 1 1 data for these studies -- these animal with increased dosing of glyphosate. 2 2 That's the Atkinson study, correct? studies, you reported that in these tables, 3 3 A. Let me look at it again. didn't you? 4 A. When I had them, yes. 4 Yup, that is probably significant 5 5 at the 05 level. O. But now --6 A. In some of them, I'm not 6 Q. In your pooled analysis though, 7 7 you conclude that glyphosate causes kidney absolutely certain. The Atkinson, et al., 8 8 study, I don't think they separated them at tumors, correct? all. I don't think I had a chance to see 9 9 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 10 10 the difference. So I can't answer the A. Kidney tumors? 11 11 So pooling the 18-month studies question. 12 12 The intent for kidney tumors was is significant. Pooling the 24-month 13 studies is marginally significant. Pooling 13 to talk about the combined -- if the 14 all four is significant. That is what I --14 combined could be made. 15 15 Q. But you actually report on kidney that is what it says. 16 adenomas and then you separately report on 16 Q. What data did you use in this 17 kidney carcinomas and then you separately 17 pooled analysis? Did you use data for 18 18 report on kidney adenomas and carcinomas kidney adenomas, kidney carcinomas or for 19 both kidney adenomas and carcinomas 19 combined? 2.0 A. Because I had that from Knezevich 20 combined? 21 21 A. It's for kidney tumors, which is and Hogan. 22 22 Q. So for the four CD-1 mouse adenomas and/or carcinomas. 23 23 Q. So for the Sugimoto study then, studies that you have one study finding a 24 statistically significant negative trend 24 where you had only data for adenomas, what 25 for kidney tumors and no studies finding a 25 data did you use for the carcinomas to pool Page 283 Page 285 1 statistically significant positive trend, 1 for combined total? 2 2 correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 3 A. I'd have to go back to the A. Marginally significant positive 4 original Sugimoto study to be able to 4 trend. 5 address that, the Greim study. 5 Q. I'll ask the question again. 6 From the four CD-1 mouse studies, 6 Q. But am I correct for the pooling, 7 7 you would want to put in -- assuming that the P equals .05 is the statistical 8 8 significance. You had one study finding a there were no kidney carcinomas in that 9 9 statistically significant negative trend, Sugimoto, you would want to include 0000 10 meaning less tumors with more glyphosate 10 for the kidney carcinomas in your pooled 11 for kidney tumors, and no studies finding a 11 analysis for Sugimoto, correct? 12 12 statistically significant positive trend, MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 13 13 A. I didn't do a pooled analysis of correct? 14 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form, 14 kidney carcinomas alone. So I can't answer the question because you -- I didn't do 15 15 asked and answered. 16 16 A. The overall evaluation included such an analysis. 17 17 both the trend test and the historical Q. No, I'm talking about for 18 controls, but yes, when just looking at the 18 combined, when you do a combined analysis. 19 trend test and not using anything to do 19 would you include the data for the kidney 20 2.0 with the historical controls, there are two carcinomas in that pooled analysis? 21 21 marginal statistically significant findings A. Yes, I would. 22 that are not at the .05 level. 22 Q. Now, your pooling methodology for 23 Q. And there is one finding at the 23 renal tumors did result in what you have 24 05 level, statistically significant, 24 described here today as marginally showing a lower incidence of kidney tumors 25 25 significant -- a marginally significant

Page 286 Page 288 1 increased trend for renal tumors in the two 1 Q. And for the Atkinson study, which 2 2 is the next page, on 39, you have 2 out of 24-month studies, correct? 3 3 50 kidney adenomas and carcinomas in the And if you look at page 11 of 4 4 your rebuttal report, where you have your control animals, correct? pooled analysis -- if you go in your 5 5 A. That is correct. rebuttal report, you have the table. It is 6 6 O. You have 2 out of 50 in the low 7 just a little bit easier to find. 7 dose, correct? 8 Table 3 on page 11 of your 8 A. That is correct. rebuttal report has all your pooled 9 9 Q. You have 0 out of 50 in the mid 10 10 analysis. dose and 0 out of 50 in the high dose, A. OK. Got it. 11 11 correct? 12 12 O. So for the two 24-month studies. A. That is correct. 13 13 when you pooled them for kidney adenoma and Q. And so if you look at these two 14 carcinoma, you report what you have been studies combined, you have 3 renal tumors describing as a marginally significant 15 out of 99 control mice in the control 15 16 increased trend, correct? 16 animals, correct? 17 A. For the 18-month studies? 17 A. That's correct. 18 18 O. No. the 24-month studies. Q. You have 2 renal tumors out of 99 19 A. 24-month studies. 19 in the low-dose groups, correct? 2.0 That is correct. 20 A. Correct. 21 21 Q. So based upon your pooling Q. You have 1 renal tumor out of 100 22 methodology then, your opinion that the 22 in the mid-dose group, correct? renal tumors and the combined data for A. These are terribly different 23 23 24 Knezevich and Atkinson show an increased 24 doses. You can't just combine them that 25 25 way. That's not how it's done. I'm sorry. trend of tumors, that's almost significant, Page 287 Page 289 1 1 Each individual group and its dose is fed correct? 2 2 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. into the pooled analysis exactly like it is 3 A. The combined pooled analysis of in the study. 4 So the pooled analysis would have 4 Atkinson and Knezevich, that shows a 5 1 out of 49 in control and 2 out of 50 in 5 marginally significant P value which is 6 almost significant, correct. 6 control. Then at a dose of 190 mgs per 7 7 O. For an increased trend in tumors kilo per day, it would be 0 out of 49. At 8 102, it would be 2 out of 50. At 298, it 8 with increased --9 9 A. For an increased trend in tumors. would be 0 out of 50. At 955, it would be 10 10 Q. If you can go to your report --1 out of 50. At 1.000, it would be 0 out 11 11 your initial report at page 38, so we can of 50. And at 5,874, it would be 3 out of 12 look at the data. 12 13 13 For the Knezevich study, you have Q. So the trend analysis then, if I 14 1 tumor in the control animal, 0 in the 14 understand your testimony correctly, that 15 15 you conducted for the purposes of your low-dose group, 1 out of 50 in the 16 high-dose group, and 3 out of 50 in the --16 expert report here did a trend analysis 17 17 using each of the different dose levels as I'm sorry, let me state that again. 18 For Knezevich, for kidney adenoma 18 a different point in the trend analysis 19 and carcinoma combined, you report 1 out of 19 over the combined studies, is that correct? 20 2.0 49 tumors in the control animals, 0 out of MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 21 2.1 49 in the low-dose group, 1 out of 50 in A. The individual doses are attached 22 the mid-dose group, and 3 out of 50 in the 22 to the chemical. You don't just 23 23 high-dose group, correct? haphazardly pool high and low dose. 24 A. That's what EPA reported, that's 24 If that's what you just said, 25 25 correct. then that's correct.

Page 292 Page 290 1 1 Q. Let me just be clear, in your significant trend. 2 2 earlier submissions to EPA and to the The reason it's statistically 3 European regulators, you did combine doses 3 significant is because the three out of 4 4 into a control, a low dose, a mid dose and control are at low doses, which also have 5 5 high dose for your trend analysis, correct? very low response as well, and remember, MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 6 it's not 3 out of 50, 49 in control, or 99, 7 A. No, I didn't. I combined them it's 1 and 2. But they are matched with 8 8 other dose groups that are 0, 0, 2, 0, 0, into that form for an illustration of what 9 9 0, 0. That pushes that down in the low the dose response trend looked like, 10 exposure range and the upper exposure range 10 because when you put the individual dose response points up there, it's very 11 11 picks up the trend. 12 12 difficult to see a trend just simply That is why you see a 13 because of the nature of that type of data, 13 statistically significant trend. but by grouping doses that were close 14 Q. And just so we are clear, if you 14 15 together, you got a better chance. look at the different tumor levels in these 15 16 16 The pictures also included a two studies, there were five renal tumors 17 confidence interval side to side and up and 17 found in the controls and the lowest dose 18 18 down. group studied, and that there were four 19 19 tumors found in the three highest dose Q. Let me make sure I'm clear on 20 your methodology. 20 groups studies, correct? 21 A. That's not what's here. 21 A. Again, over a very broad range, 22 22 that is a statement of fact. O. I understand that. 23 23 In your methodology, when you Q. So through your pooling 24 submitted a pooled analysis to the EPA, did 24 methodology with two studies where you have 25 you conduct your P analysis based upon 4 25 5 tumors out of 200 in the lowest -- in the Page 291 Page 293 1 different combined dose groups or did you 1 controls at the lowest dose studied and 4 2 conduct your pooled analysis based upon 8 2 tumors out of 200, if you will, in the or 16 or 12 different dose levels as the 3 highest doses studied, you have an almost 4 4 case may be? statistically significant increased trend, 5 is that correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 6 A. The analyses submitted to EPA 6 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 7 included both simply for completeness. The A. I'm sorry, you have -- you have 8 individual dose group studies are the one lost me. What am I doing? 9 9 which are the clearest and correct way to You're trying to make me pool 10 10 something new? do this. 11 11 Q. And just so I understand then, Q. I'm not making you pool anything. 12 for your pooled methodology, while you have 12 You have done the pool. 13 13 three tumors -- real tumors in control mice In pooling these two studies, you 14 in Knezevich and Atkinson and three tumors 14 have -- the data shows that you have 5 15 kidney tumors in the 150 animals where you 15 in the high-dose group in Knezevich and 16 Atkinson, that data under your pooled 16 have control animals and the lowest dose 17 17 methodology results in an almost studied, correct? 18 statistically significant increased trend 18 A. I have what appeared in the lower 19 19 in tumors with increased dose, correct? dose groups, that is correct. 20 2.0 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Q. And so you have -- and you have 4 21 21 tumors out of 150 in the highest doses A. There are other doses in that 22 22 dose response range which all play a role studied? 23 in the statistical significance of that 23 There are doses with 0, 0, 1 and 24 trend. And all of those doses combined in 24 3. 25 25 the pooled analysis gave a statistically Q. I understand that. But if you

	Page 294		Page 296
1	look at the data combined and you're	1	are three ways you can calculate P values
2	pooling this data	2	in the Armitage linear trend test.
3	A. I'm not going to look at the data	3	So the choice of which datasets
4	combined. The data is what it is. The	4	to pool has not changed. So the pooling
5	data is 0, 0, 1, 3.	5	has not changed. The analysis by the
6	Q. It's actually 1, 0, 1, 3	6	Armitage linear trend test in proportions
7	A. 1, 0, 1, 3, whatever.	7	has not changed. The only thing that has
8	Q and 2, 2, 0, 0, correct?	8	changed has been the way in which I
9	A. It is whatever it really is. So	9	calculate the P values for those tests.
10	it is 1, 2, 2, 0, 1, 0, and 3.	10	Q. Understood.
11	Q. And that distribution under your	11	The let's talk about the
12	pooling analysis results in an almost	12	modified table 15 in your rebuttal report.
13	statistically significant increased trend,	13	A. OK.
14	correct?	14	Q. So your table 15 in your listing
15	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	15	of total sites, that is, as I understand
16	A. That distribution under the use	16	it, a calculation of the total sites for
17	of the scientifically verifiable and	17	which three or four tumors were found in
18	methodologically sound Armitage linear	18	the glyphosate data, correct?
19	trend testing proportions shows a P value	19	A. With exception. The rare tumors
20	which is statistically significant.	20	in kidney and hemangiosarcomas are also
21	So does the analysis using the	21	included in this table.
22	logistic regression approach suggested by	22	Q. That wasn't my question. My
23	your expert.	23	question is the total sites column.
24	Q. We can talk about that later	24	A. The hemangiosarcomas only have
25	because our expert wouldn't agree to that.	25	two tumors.
	because our expert wouldn't agree to that.		two tumors.
	Page 295		Page 297
1	Page 295 Let's talk about I take it	1	Page 297 Q. I understand that.
1 2	Let's talk about I take it	1 2	
	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling		Q. I understand that.
2	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that	2	Q. I understand that.A. I am sorry.Q. My question is, if you look at
2 3	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct?	2 3	Q. I understand that. A. I am sorry.
2 3 4	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct? A. Let me correct something here.	2 3 4	Q. I understand that.A. I am sorry.Q. My question is, if you look at modified table 15, you have a calculation
2 3 4 5	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct? A. Let me correct something here. You keep calling it "my pooling analysis."	2 3 4 5	 Q. I understand that. A. I am sorry. Q. My question is, if you look at modified table 15, you have a calculation of total sites. Do you see that?
2 3 4 5 6	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct? A. Let me correct something here. You keep calling it "my pooling analysis." The pooling analysis I did is the more	2 3 4 5 6	 Q. I understand that. A. I am sorry. Q. My question is, if you look at modified table 15, you have a calculation of total sites.
2 3 4 5 6 7	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct? A. Let me correct something here. You keep calling it "my pooling analysis." The pooling analysis I did is the more accurate statement. Again, because I told	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. I understand that. A. I am sorry. Q. My question is, if you look at modified table 15, you have a calculation of total sites. Do you see that? And it's a column the fourth column on modified table 15.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct? A. Let me correct something here. You keep calling it "my pooling analysis." The pooling analysis I did is the more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. I understand that. A. I am sorry. Q. My question is, if you look at modified table 15, you have a calculation of total sites. Do you see that? And it's a column the fourth
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct? A. Let me correct something here. You keep calling it "my pooling analysis." The pooling analysis I did is the more accurate statement. Again, because I told you Dourson has already done it, by all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. I understand that. A. I am sorry. Q. My question is, if you look at modified table 15, you have a calculation of total sites. Do you see that? And it's a column the fourth column on modified table 15. A. Yes, I see it. Q. It has a footnote, footnote 1,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct? A. Let me correct something here. You keep calling it "my pooling analysis." The pooling analysis I did is the more accurate statement. Again, because I told you Dourson has already done it, by all technical reasons, I would have to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. I understand that. A. I am sorry. Q. My question is, if you look at modified table 15, you have a calculation of total sites. Do you see that? And it's a column the fourth column on modified table 15. A. Yes, I see it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct? A. Let me correct something here. You keep calling it "my pooling analysis." The pooling analysis I did is the more accurate statement. Again, because I told you Dourson has already done it, by all technical reasons, I would have to reference him now that I know it's there,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. I understand that. A. I am sorry. Q. My question is, if you look at modified table 15, you have a calculation of total sites. Do you see that? And it's a column the fourth column on modified table 15. A. Yes, I see it. Q. It has a footnote, footnote 1, correct? A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct? A. Let me correct something here. You keep calling it "my pooling analysis." The pooling analysis I did is the more accurate statement. Again, because I told you Dourson has already done it, by all technical reasons, I would have to reference him now that I know it's there, and so it should be his pooling algorithm, not mine.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. I understand that. A. I am sorry. Q. My question is, if you look at modified table 15, you have a calculation of total sites. Do you see that? And it's a column the fourth column on modified table 15. A. Yes, I see it. Q. It has a footnote, footnote 1, correct? A. Yes. Q. And total sites is based upon the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct? A. Let me correct something here. You keep calling it "my pooling analysis." The pooling analysis I did is the more accurate statement. Again, because I told you Dourson has already done it, by all technical reasons, I would have to reference him now that I know it's there, and so it should be his pooling algorithm,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. I understand that. A. I am sorry. Q. My question is, if you look at modified table 15, you have a calculation of total sites. Do you see that? And it's a column the fourth column on modified table 15. A. Yes, I see it. Q. It has a footnote, footnote 1, correct? A. Yes. Q. And total sites is based upon the sites with three or more tumors, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct? A. Let me correct something here. You keep calling it "my pooling analysis." The pooling analysis I did is the more accurate statement. Again, because I told you Dourson has already done it, by all technical reasons, I would have to reference him now that I know it's there, and so it should be his pooling algorithm, not mine. But the point is it is just the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. I understand that. A. I am sorry. Q. My question is, if you look at modified table 15, you have a calculation of total sites. Do you see that? And it's a column the fourth column on modified table 15. A. Yes, I see it. Q. It has a footnote, footnote 1, correct? A. Yes. Q. And total sites is based upon the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct? A. Let me correct something here. You keep calling it "my pooling analysis." The pooling analysis I did is the more accurate statement. Again, because I told you Dourson has already done it, by all technical reasons, I would have to reference him now that I know it's there, and so it should be his pooling algorithm, not mine. But the point is it is just the pooling algorithm I used.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. I understand that. A. I am sorry. Q. My question is, if you look at modified table 15, you have a calculation of total sites. Do you see that? And it's a column the fourth column on modified table 15. A. Yes, I see it. Q. It has a footnote, footnote 1, correct? A. Yes. Q. And total sites is based upon the sites with three or more tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Actually, it's described directly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct? A. Let me correct something here. You keep calling it "my pooling analysis." The pooling analysis I did is the more accurate statement. Again, because I told you Dourson has already done it, by all technical reasons, I would have to reference him now that I know it's there, and so it should be his pooling algorithm, not mine. But the point is it is just the pooling algorithm I used. Q. The pooling algorithm you used,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. I understand that. A. I am sorry. Q. My question is, if you look at modified table 15, you have a calculation of total sites. Do you see that? And it's a column the fourth column on modified table 15. A. Yes, I see it. Q. It has a footnote, footnote 1, correct? A. Yes. Q. And total sites is based upon the sites with three or more tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Actually, it's described directly in the text of the document. On page 4
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct? A. Let me correct something here. You keep calling it "my pooling analysis." The pooling analysis I did is the more accurate statement. Again, because I told you Dourson has already done it, by all technical reasons, I would have to reference him now that I know it's there, and so it should be his pooling algorithm, not mine. But the point is it is just the pooling algorithm I used. Q. The pooling algorithm you used, you still maintain that? A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. I understand that. A. I am sorry. Q. My question is, if you look at modified table 15, you have a calculation of total sites. Do you see that? And it's a column the fourth column on modified table 15. A. Yes, I see it. Q. It has a footnote, footnote 1, correct? A. Yes. Q. And total sites is based upon the sites with three or more tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Actually, it's described directly in the text of the document. On page 4 first full paragraph, this also includes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct? A. Let me correct something here. You keep calling it "my pooling analysis." The pooling analysis I did is the more accurate statement. Again, because I told you Dourson has already done it, by all technical reasons, I would have to reference him now that I know it's there, and so it should be his pooling algorithm, not mine. But the point is it is just the pooling algorithm I used. Q. The pooling algorithm you used, you still maintain that? A. Yes. Q. And has that pooling algorithm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. I understand that. A. I am sorry. Q. My question is, if you look at modified table 15, you have a calculation of total sites. Do you see that? And it's a column the fourth column on modified table 15. A. Yes, I see it. Q. It has a footnote, footnote 1, correct? A. Yes. Q. And total sites is based upon the sites with three or more tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Actually, it's described directly in the text of the document. On page 4 first full paragraph, this also includes joint analyses and some room for joint
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct? A. Let me correct something here. You keep calling it "my pooling analysis." The pooling analysis I did is the more accurate statement. Again, because I told you Dourson has already done it, by all technical reasons, I would have to reference him now that I know it's there, and so it should be his pooling algorithm, not mine. But the point is it is just the pooling algorithm I used. Q. The pooling algorithm you used, you still maintain that? A. Yes. Q. And has that pooling algorithm changed over time for glyphosate?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. I understand that. A. I am sorry. Q. My question is, if you look at modified table 15, you have a calculation of total sites. Do you see that? And it's a column the fourth column on modified table 15. A. Yes, I see it. Q. It has a footnote, footnote 1, correct? A. Yes. Q. And total sites is based upon the sites with three or more tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Actually, it's described directly in the text of the document. On page 4 first full paragraph, this also includes joint analyses and some room for joint analyses and other things.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct? A. Let me correct something here. You keep calling it "my pooling analysis." The pooling analysis I did is the more accurate statement. Again, because I told you Dourson has already done it, by all technical reasons, I would have to reference him now that I know it's there, and so it should be his pooling algorithm, not mine. But the point is it is just the pooling algorithm I used. Q. The pooling algorithm you used, you still maintain that? A. Yes. Q. And has that pooling algorithm changed over time for glyphosate? A. I'm going to try to break it down	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. I understand that. A. I am sorry. Q. My question is, if you look at modified table 15, you have a calculation of total sites. Do you see that? And it's a column the fourth column on modified table 15. A. Yes, I see it. Q. It has a footnote, footnote 1, correct? A. Yes. Q. And total sites is based upon the sites with three or more tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Actually, it's described directly in the text of the document. On page 4 first full paragraph, this also includes joint analyses and some room for joint analyses and other things. Q. I understand that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct? A. Let me correct something here. You keep calling it "my pooling analysis." The pooling analysis I did is the more accurate statement. Again, because I told you Dourson has already done it, by all technical reasons, I would have to reference him now that I know it's there, and so it should be his pooling algorithm, not mine. But the point is it is just the pooling algorithm I used. Q. The pooling algorithm you used, you still maintain that? A. Yes. Q. And has that pooling algorithm changed over time for glyphosate? A. I'm going to try to break it down to make it clear.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. I understand that. A. I am sorry. Q. My question is, if you look at modified table 15, you have a calculation of total sites. Do you see that? And it's a column the fourth column on modified table 15. A. Yes, I see it. Q. It has a footnote, footnote 1, correct? A. Yes. Q. And total sites is based upon the sites with three or more tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Actually, it's described directly in the text of the document. On page 4 first full paragraph, this also includes joint analyses and other things. Q. I understand that. I'm looking again just at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct? A. Let me correct something here. You keep calling it "my pooling analysis." The pooling analysis I did is the more accurate statement. Again, because I told you Dourson has already done it, by all technical reasons, I would have to reference him now that I know it's there, and so it should be his pooling algorithm, not mine. But the point is it is just the pooling algorithm I used. Q. The pooling algorithm you used, you still maintain that? A. Yes. Q. And has that pooling algorithm changed over time for glyphosate? A. I'm going to try to break it down to make it clear. There is pooling of the data, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. I understand that. A. I am sorry. Q. My question is, if you look at modified table 15, you have a calculation of total sites. Do you see that? And it's a column the fourth column on modified table 15. A. Yes, I see it. Q. It has a footnote, footnote 1, correct? A. Yes. Q. And total sites is based upon the sites with three or more tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Actually, it's described directly in the text of the document. On page 4 first full paragraph, this also includes joint analyses and other things. Q. I understand that. I'm looking again just at the total sites column.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Let's talk about I take it that you have your code for your pooling analysis various pooling analyses that you conducted over time, correct? A. Let me correct something here. You keep calling it "my pooling analysis." The pooling analysis I did is the more accurate statement. Again, because I told you Dourson has already done it, by all technical reasons, I would have to reference him now that I know it's there, and so it should be his pooling algorithm, not mine. But the point is it is just the pooling algorithm I used. Q. The pooling algorithm you used, you still maintain that? A. Yes. Q. And has that pooling algorithm changed over time for glyphosate? A. I'm going to try to break it down to make it clear.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. I understand that. A. I am sorry. Q. My question is, if you look at modified table 15, you have a calculation of total sites. Do you see that? And it's a column the fourth column on modified table 15. A. Yes, I see it. Q. It has a footnote, footnote 1, correct? A. Yes. Q. And total sites is based upon the sites with three or more tumors, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Actually, it's described directly in the text of the document. On page 4 first full paragraph, this also includes joint analyses and other things. Q. I understand that. I'm looking again just at the

Page 298 Page 300 1 1 And female rats, 26." describes that the total sites are taken 2 2 Correct? from an analysis done by a Dr. Haseman, 3 A. That's what the footnote says. 3 correct? 4 4 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Q. In Dr. Haseman's analysis, these 5 5 A. It's a suggestion from Dr. Joseph numbers, at least 10.5, 15 and 21.5, are б 6 Haseman in his EPA testimony. the numbers he calculated for tumors 7 with -- for sites with three or more Q. And Dr. Haseman in his EPA 8 8 testimony is quantifying the number of tumors, correct? 9 9 sites in the glyphosate data for which A. That's not what he says as far as 10 I know. He was just looking for sites that 10 three or more tumors were found, correct? 11 11 A. He is quantifying the number of would be likely. 12 12 sites which he felt would be relevant in a But I'd have to see his EPA 13 13 testimony again to make sure that that is statistical evaluation of how many sites 14 14 were actually evaluated in the study. the case. 15 15 Q. Well, for this column though he Q. OK. So -is actually just doing an addition. He's 16 A. That is -- that is probably what 16 17 17 adding up the number of sites for which he did. That's probably the case. I don't 18 18 three or more tumors were found in this know if he said it. 19 Q. OK. But you now testify that you 19 column? 20 20 A. No, in this column is me adding think it probably is the case that the 2.1 up three or more tumors --21 numbers in this table for total sites are 22 22 Q. OK. the number of sites for which three or more 23 A. -- and adding, like Dr. Haseman tumors were found? 23 24 24 did, some room for joint analyses of tumor MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 2.5 25 A. The numbers in this table -findings. Page 299 Page 301 1 1 Q. Is it your testimony that the For total sites. 2 2 A. -- are consistent with what I total sites calculation that you use in 3 3 your report includes sites where less than found in evaluating the numbers of sites 4 4 three tumors were found? with three or more from the data in these 5 5 A. Yes. studies. 6 6 Q. So that is your understanding of Q. OK, fair enough. 7 7 table 15 for the total sites column? The total sites then is used as 8 8 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to your -- as one of the -- well, total sites 9 9 form. is then used to calculate the expected 10 10 number of sites you would see at P less Table 15 includes enough room to 11 cover all of the analyses that were done. 11 than .05, correct? 12 Q. Well, that's -- I don't know what 12 If you take the total sites and 13 13 "enough room" means. multiply it by .05, correct? 14 A. Enough numbers of tumors to 14 A. Correct. 15 incorporate all of the analyses that are 15 Q. That's your expected number of 16 relevant for these data. 16 less than .05, which is the column on 17 Q. To get these numbers that you 17 table 15 right next to the total sites 18 have listed here, you have a footnote that 18 column, correct? 19 states: 19 A. That is correct. 20 "Numbers of sites is based upon 2.0 Q. And you also use that total site 21 suggestions by Dr. Haseman in his written 21 column -- total site number to calculate 22 testimony to the EPA with female rats 22 the expected sites P less than .01, 23 modified for fewer sites with three or more 23 correct? 24 tumors. Male mice, 10.5 sites. Female 24 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 25 mice, 15 sites. Male rats, 21.5 sites. 25 A. I used the total sites,

Page 302 Page 304 1 1 multiplied it by .01 to get the expected very rare tumors, which are the two mouse 2 2 less than .01 in that last column -- third tumors we were talking about earlier, and 3 3 those P values are put in here from the column -- third-from-last column. 4 4 historical trend test, not from the typical I should note just for the record 5 5 while we are here, I have an addition trend test. 6 error. I put 19 on both sexes for rats 6 Q. So let me make sure I understand 7 7 when it is really 18. correctly. 8 8 Q. And the --In your table 15, for your 9 9 A. The sum is the same. expected, you have the number of tumors you 10 would expect based upon total sites with 10 O. 30 should be 29? three tumors or more, and then you have 11 11 A. No, the 30 is 30. That 19 is 12 12 your expected and then you have your just wrong. 13 observed column, and your observed column 13 Q. That should be 18? 14 14 also includes tumors that you observed --A. 18. or trends that you observed based upon your 15 15 Q. So 11 and 6 equal 18? 16 16 A. Let's see here. historical trend analysis, correct? 17 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 17 O. If you have 11 male and 6 female, 18 A. I -- I'm -- I'm not understanding 18 you add up to 18? 19 19 the question. It's --A. The 12 -- the first one is 12. Q. OK. Your -- through your 20 If I count the tumors themselves, 1, 2, 3, 20 21 21 historical trend analysis --4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 1, 2, 3, 22 A. Let me try -- let me try 22 4 5, 6, it should be 18. 23 23 something --I don't know why the counts in Q. Let me just ask the question this 24 the tumors are incorrect for the rats. 24 25 25 way: For your historical trend analysis, Q. OK. So now for your observed Page 303 Page 305 1 tumors, which you have next to your 1 for example, you calculated statistically 2 2 expected, you also include trends that you significant trends at two sites where there 3 3 calculate based upon your p-hist. analysis, are only two tumors, correct? 4 4 A. Rare tumors at rare sites. correct? 5 5 A. I'm sorry, say that again. O. Right. And those sites would not 6 Q. For your observed trends of less 6 be part of the total sites that you have 7 7 than .05, and for less than .01, you use -listed in your column on total sites 8 8 you report the numbers that you find for a because there is only two tumors there, 9 9 concurrent control trend test and also add correct? 10 to that the numbers of -- that you observed 10 A. No. This is not -- as I pointed 11 through your p-hist. analysis -- historical 11 out before, this is for the typical types 12 trend analysis? 12 of analyses that would be done. Enough 13 13 A. No, of course not. That would be extra counts were put in there to cover the 14 terribly methodologically flawed. 14 counts for the two rare tumors that we 15 15 Q. So is it your testimony then that looked at. 16 you do not include in your observed count 16 Q. OK, let me go back to that, 17 in table 15 findings that are only 17 because I'm misunderstanding. I thought we 18 significant based upon the historical trend 18 had established this. 19 analysis? 19 In your total sites, footnote 1 20 20 A. No, the -- this -- I should be shows how those total sites were calculated 21 21 clear in the text, but I'll make it clear based upon what Dr. Haseman had calculated. 22 now, what I'm putting in here is the P 22 Those were the sites for which three or 23 value observed for the trend test, because 23 more tumors were found, correct? 24 the correct control to use is the control 24 A. No --25 25 for the trend test, except in the cases of MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.

Page 306 Page 308 1 1 -- I'm sorry, that's not the with three or more tumors? 2 2 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form, case. 3 3 If you look at table 1 in the asked and answered. 4 report -- in my rebuttal report, table 1 4 A. I would have to see Dr. Haseman's 5 tells you how many tumors of each type were 5 comments to be able to answer that question 6 in each -- were in each of the studies. 6 for you. 7 Q. Right. And you have each Q. Well, would you agree if those 8 8 individual site, and then for you total numbers for total sites only include sites 9 9 sites, you also include combined tumors, with three or more tumors, for your 10 correct, where you had three or more tumors 10 analysis, since you also looked at 11 historical trends and rare tumors, you 11 in the combined data, correct? 12 12 A. If they are even done or not would have to provide some additional bump 13 13 up for the total sites to account for the done. 14 14 possibility of trends, the sites with fewer But I have -- in this table, I 15 15 have more than -- I have somewhere around. than three tumors, correct? 16 16 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. I believe, 100 more observe -- more -- I 17 17 have the possibility of 100 more A. That bump up, as you put it, is 18 18 evaluations being done than the total already incorporated in these sets of 19 numbers such that there are sufficient 19 number of eval -- of sites with three or 20 20 more tumors. numbers in each of the sex species groups 21 21 that I feel I've probably put a number in So I've left 100 open spots for 22 22 here which is more than the number of analyses that might have been done rather 23 23 than just the three or more tumors. evaluations which were actually done. O. Dr. Portier, the numbers that you 24 24 Q. OK. And in your calculation of 25 have in your report for total sites are 25 your adjustment for p-hist. -- first of Page 307 Page 309 1 1 numbers that Dr. Haseman reported, correct, all, in deciding which studies or tumor 2 2 sites to conduct historical analyses for, that's where you got those numbers? 3 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. you did not do historical analyses for all 3 4 4 A. With a modification, and those rare tumors in these studies, correct? 5 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 5 numbers are very conservative. 6 6 Q. The modification you made was to A. Yeah, I -- I don't -- I don't 7 7 reduce the number of sites for female rats understand the question. I am sorry. 8 Q. In deciding which tumor sites to as -- from what Dr. Haseman had reported 9 9 and you made it lower, correct? conduct a p-hist. analysis, you base that 10 10 A. Yes. on your review of where there were sites 11 that were -- where there had been one 11 O. And Dr. Haseman --12 12 finding of a statistically significant And I explained why I did that. 13 13 O. And Dr. Haseman, in adding up trend in a concurrent control, correct? 14 14 those sites that you use, he added the MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 15 15 number of sites, either with individual or A. Yeah, I'm -- again, you have lost 16 16 combined analyses, that had three or more me in the question. I am sorry. 17 17 Q. Let me ask this: Through your tumors, correct? 18 18 A. No, he was -- he was just roughly p-hist, analysis, you can calculate 19 19 looking at two of the -- three of the statistically significant trends at sites 20 2.0 studies, I believe -- I'd have to see his with one or two tumors, correct, for rare 21 21 writeup, if you have it. tumors? 22 22 Q. Sitting here today, you don't A. An analysis using that approach 23 recall one way or the other whether those 23 could potentially find a positive finding 24 total site numbers from Dr. Haseman that 24 for just two tumors, that is correct. 25 25 you use in your table 15 were for sites But the two I chose -- the

Page 310 Page 312 1 tumors -- let -- the tumors I chose to historical trend analysis, where you could 2 2 evaluate were identified by regulatory calculate a p-hist., the rare tumor, and 3 agencies as a concern because those tumors 3 you have two tumors, so there's enough with 4 were different than the historical rare tumors, two tumors with a historical 5 trend analysis is enough to find a controls. I didn't go back and look at 6 historical -- to find a trend, correct? 7 7 every single site and get historical A. With the right historical control 8 8 controls for every single site because I dataset, ves. 9 didn't analyze every single site with two 9 Q. And if you were to look at 20 10 rare tumors where you have historical 10 tumors in it. So that just -- it would 11 never have occurred except that this was 11 control data and run a p-hist. analysis, 12 12 flagged already by the regulatory you would expect by chance that one of them 13 13 would report a P less than .05, correct? community. 14 14 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. Q. So in your --15 A. And I will add, because I still 15 A. No, I can't say that. You're in 16 don't understand -- I guess I don't have to 16 a realm of behavior of the statistical 17 understand the relevance of your questions. 17 methods that are dependent upon both the 18 18 Q. So for your historical trend historical control dataset and the 19 analysis, you didn't conduct -- you only 19 concurrent dataset, and to be quite honest, 20 did historical trend analysis for tumors 20 I'd have to sit down and do some analyses 21 that had been flagged as potential issues, 21 to figure out what this type of analysis 22 22 you are suggesting would be done. correct? 23 23 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. But I don't understand why you're 24 A. I did -- for every tumor where 24 suggesting the analysis because typically 25 EPA or some other authority flagged it as 25 you flag something as a rare tumor based Page 311 Page 313 falling outside of the range of historical 1 upon the advice of the pathologist 2 controls, and arguing that it could go 2 involved. away, I did the historical control analysis 3 Q. I understand. But in your 4 4 table 15, you're comparing what you observe to illustrate the importance of doing 5 something correct with historical controls. to what would be expected by chance. б However, as I say at the 6 And what I'm trying to understand 7 7 beginning, the best control to use for any is what you -- what number of sites you 8 8 of these studies is the concurrent control, would expect to see by chance for rare 9 9 except in the case where there are rare tumors or through historical trend analysis 10 tumors. So in those cases, I used the P 10 versus the number of trends you found with 11 value from historical control for this 11 a historical trend analysis? 12 table that you're looking at. 12 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 13 13 Q. If you were to determine the A. But this table, 15, is only for 14 number of P trends that you might find by 14 the number of analyses done. It's not --15 chance in a historical trend analysis of 15 not a theoretical number of analyses. It 16 rare tumors -- so you would have -- as you 16 is for analyses done. 17 17 Q. That may be why I misunderstood. have already testified, if you conduct 20 18 tests, you would find one by chance, 18 So your table 15 is comparing 19 19 only the analyses you did as total sites, correct? 2.0 20 and then calculating an expected number of MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 21 21 A. You would not find any by trend sites and an observed number of sites, is 22 22 analysis. I'm sorry, two -- two tumors -that correct? 23 I must have missed your question. 23 A. No. It's calculating the number 24 Q. I'll ask it again. 24 of potential sites. 25 25 For tumors where you can do I didn't calculate exactly how

Page 314

many analyses I did. I guess I can go and do that but I haven't, because what you're looking at is -- I looked at all the EFSA studies and EPAs.

2.3

2.0

So it wouldn't be correct for me to put in here the total sites that I personally evaluated, because those other documents guided me to sites, and those other documents had evaluated sites in a standard statistical way. But they didn't tell me how many they did.

So I technically can't give you an exact number for the total sites. This is the way it is sometimes with practical science. What I can do is create a logical, reasonable estimate for the total sites that had been reviewed, had been analyzed. And that's what this is.

Q. Just so I'm clear, if your total sites number did not include the numbers that would account for both individual tumor types with three or more tumors for adenomas and carcinomas and combined total sites with three or more tumors and the rare tumors for which you might find a

kidney carcinomas, kidney adenomas and carcinomas combined?

MS. GREENWALD: Objection to the

Page 316

- A. I've allowed sufficient numbers in the total sites to cover those.
- Q. Have you added up all the sites in the studies with adenomas more than three, carcinomas more than three, and adenomas and carcinomas combined more than three?

MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form.

A. You wouldn't always do the combined analysis. That's not standard methodological practice in toxicology. You do the combined analysis only sometimes.

So adding up that number, creating that number that you just made up -- you just suggested would not reflect the number of sites that would actually be done.

Q. Have you gone through the exercise of adding up the sites that you think should be combined so you actually

Page 315

statistically significant finding --

- A. The two rare tumors.
- Q. OK, so all of those possibilities, for your modified table 15 to make sense, would have to add up to the total sites that you have listed in your total tumor sites?

MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form.

- A. Or in this case, I've been conservative enough that I'm pretty certain that total sites is larger than that number of the sites that you have evaluated, which makes it somewhat conservative.
- Q. And you can, in fact, just add up the number of sites in these studies with three or more tumors, correct, you have got all the data?
 - A. I've done that.
- Q. Have you looked at all the sites combined and separately?

Because you report both of those in your table.

MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.

Q. So you have kidney adenomas,

Page 317

have the total number of sites with adenomas, with carcinomas, and adenomas and

carcinomas combined where you believe that's appropriate?

MS. GREENWALD: Objection to

form.

A. You can't do that evaluation sort of in isolation. So no. I have not done

of in isolation. So no, I have not done that.

Q. So sitting here today, do you

know the total sites -- total number of sites for which you could have done a trend analysis for -- I'm sorry, for adenomas, for carcinomas, and as you think it appropriate, adenomas and carcinomas combined in this dataset?

MS. GREENWALD: Objection to form.

A. You can't -- again, you can't look at it that way. If carcinomas are zero, for example, you would only do the adenoma evaluation. If adenomas are zero and you have carcinomas, you would only do the carcinoma evaluation. There are other similar situations where you do those site

	Page 318		Page 320
1	types of evaluations.	1	MS. GREENWALD: Objection to
2	Unless I sat with EPA and they	2	form.
3	gave me every test they did, or I sat with	3	A. They're not they're not I'm
4	EFSA and they told me every test they did,	4	sorry, give me a minute to look this up,
5	I cannot figure that number out. All I can	5	please.
6	do is give you an approximation.	6	Splenic lymphosarcomas. They are
7	Q. OK, I'm not asking about the	7	not lymphomas. They are lymphosarcomas.
8	number of analyses that were done. I'm	8	Q. So in your testimony,
9	asking you about the number of analyses	9	lymphosarcomas do not need to be listed
10	that could be done, because that's what	10	with lymphomas?
11	your total sites column is, correct?	11	I'm trying to understand.
12	MS. GREENWALD: Objection to	12	A. That's correct, you wouldn't
13	form.	13	combine sarcomas with lymphomas.
14	A. No, the total sites column should	14	Q. Do you know how many
15	be an estimate of the number of sites that	15	lymphosarcomas were analyzed in Knezevich,
16	were done. That is what it's attempting to	16	given tissue types?
17	give you.	17	A. By whom.
18	Q. I understand.	18	Q. By the investigators in
19	MR. LASKER: Let's take a break.	19	Knezevich?
20	THE WITNESS: I'm happy to go on.	20	A. I'm not able to see the full
21	Q. In your report for female CD-1	21	report from them, so I wouldn't know that.
22	mice, you have listed an observed trend	22	Q. And you have the data table
23	that you identify as "SL."	23	from
24	Do you see that?	24	A. But I don't have the report of
25	It's on mice tumors P less than	25	what analyses they did, therefore, I can't
	Dama 210		Dawa 221
	Page 319		Page 321
		_	
1	05.	1	answer the questions.
2	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL.	2	Q. You have data presented for a
2	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL. Yes.	2	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type
2 3 4	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL.Yes.Q. And you have SL listed as skin	2 3 4	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study,
2 3 4 5	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL.Yes.Q. And you have SL listed as skin lymphoma?	2 3 4 5	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study, correct?
2 3 4 5 6	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL.Yes.Q. And you have SL listed as skin lymphoma?A. Yes, it is.	2 3 4 5 6	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study, correct? A. I have yes, I have data tables
2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL. Yes. Q. And you have SL listed as skin lymphoma? A. Yes, it is. Q. Now, I don't find any skin 	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study, correct? A. I have yes, I have data tables that show lymphosarcomas in several
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL. Yes. Q. And you have SL listed as skin lymphoma? A. Yes, it is. Q. Now, I don't find any skin lymphoma in any of the studies. There was 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study, correct? A. I have yes, I have data tables that show lymphosarcomas in several different tissues.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL. Yes. Q. And you have SL listed as skin lymphoma? A. Yes, it is. Q. Now, I don't find any skin lymphoma in any of the studies. There was a SL trend in the Knezevich study that you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study, correct? A. I have yes, I have data tables that show lymphosarcomas in several different tissues. Q. And in your response to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL. Yes. Q. And you have SL listed as skin lymphoma? A. Yes, it is. Q. Now, I don't find any skin lymphoma in any of the studies. There was a SL trend in the Knezevich study that you report for spleen lymphomas.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study, correct? A. I have yes, I have data tables that show lymphosarcomas in several different tissues. Q. And in your response to Dr. Corcoran, you testify that Dr. Corcoran
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL. Yes. Q. And you have SL listed as skin lymphoma? A. Yes, it is. Q. Now, I don't find any skin lymphoma in any of the studies. There was a SL trend in the Knezevich study that you report for spleen lymphomas. A. Oh, that's correct, that's the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study, correct? A. I have yes, I have data tables that show lymphosarcomas in several different tissues. Q. And in your response to Dr. Corcoran, you testify that Dr. Corcoran improperly calculated trend analyses
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL. Yes. Q. And you have SL listed as skin lymphoma? A. Yes, it is. Q. Now, I don't find any skin lymphoma in any of the studies. There was a SL trend in the Knezevich study that you report for spleen lymphomas. A. Oh, that's correct, that's the splenic lymphomas. Thank you. Yes, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study, correct? A. I have yes, I have data tables that show lymphosarcomas in several different tissues. Q. And in your response to Dr. Corcoran, you testify that Dr. Corcoran improperly calculated trend analyses reporting out all of those different
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL. Yes. Q. And you have SL listed as skin lymphoma? A. Yes, it is. Q. Now, I don't find any skin lymphoma in any of the studies. There was a SL trend in the Knezevich study that you report for spleen lymphomas. A. Oh, that's correct, that's the splenic lymphomas. Thank you. Yes, that is the splenic lymphomas.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study, correct? A. I have yes, I have data tables that show lymphosarcomas in several different tissues. Q. And in your response to Dr. Corcoran, you testify that Dr. Corcoran improperly calculated trend analyses reporting out all of those different lymphosarcoma sites and that they should be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL. Yes. Q. And you have SL listed as skin lymphoma? A. Yes, it is. Q. Now, I don't find any skin lymphoma in any of the studies. There was a SL trend in the Knezevich study that you report for spleen lymphomas. A. Oh, that's correct, that's the splenic lymphomas. Thank you. Yes, that is the splenic lymphomas. Q. You include spleen lymphomas as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study, correct? A. I have yes, I have data tables that show lymphosarcomas in several different tissues. Q. And in your response to Dr. Corcoran, you testify that Dr. Corcoran improperly calculated trend analyses reporting out all of those different lymphosarcoma sites and that they should be combined in your opinion, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL. Yes. Q. And you have SL listed as skin lymphoma? A. Yes, it is. Q. Now, I don't find any skin lymphoma in any of the studies. There was a SL trend in the Knezevich study that you report for spleen lymphomas. A. Oh, that's correct, that's the splenic lymphomas. Thank you. Yes, that is the splenic lymphomas. Q. You include spleen lymphomas as one of your observed trends in your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study, correct? A. I have yes, I have data tables that show lymphosarcomas in several different tissues. Q. And in your response to Dr. Corcoran, you testify that Dr. Corcoran improperly calculated trend analyses reporting out all of those different lymphosarcoma sites and that they should be combined in your opinion, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL. Yes. Q. And you have SL listed as skin lymphoma? A. Yes, it is. Q. Now, I don't find any skin lymphoma in any of the studies. There was a SL trend in the Knezevich study that you report for spleen lymphomas. A. Oh, that's correct, that's the splenic lymphomas. Thank you. Yes, that is the splenic lymphomas. Q. You include spleen lymphomas as one of your observed trends in your table 15?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study, correct? A. I have yes, I have data tables that show lymphosarcomas in several different tissues. Q. And in your response to Dr. Corcoran, you testify that Dr. Corcoran improperly calculated trend analyses reporting out all of those different lymphosarcoma sites and that they should be combined in your opinion, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. I noted that he had done multiple
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL. Yes. Q. And you have SL listed as skin lymphoma? A. Yes, it is. Q. Now, I don't find any skin lymphoma in any of the studies. There was a SL trend in the Knezevich study that you report for spleen lymphomas. A. Oh, that's correct, that's the splenic lymphomas. Thank you. Yes, that is the splenic lymphomas. Q. You include spleen lymphomas as one of your observed trends in your table 15? A. It is an observed trend, that is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study, correct? A. I have yes, I have data tables that show lymphosarcomas in several different tissues. Q. And in your response to Dr. Corcoran, you testify that Dr. Corcoran improperly calculated trend analyses reporting out all of those different lymphosarcoma sites and that they should be combined in your opinion, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. I noted that he had done multiple analyses about lymphosarcomas and there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL. Yes. Q. And you have SL listed as skin lymphoma? A. Yes, it is. Q. Now, I don't find any skin lymphoma in any of the studies. There was a SL trend in the Knezevich study that you report for spleen lymphomas. A. Oh, that's correct, that's the splenic lymphomas. Thank you. Yes, that is the splenic lymphomas. Q. You include spleen lymphomas as one of your observed trends in your table 15? A. It is an observed trend, that is correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study, correct? A. I have yes, I have data tables that show lymphosarcomas in several different tissues. Q. And in your response to Dr. Corcoran, you testify that Dr. Corcoran improperly calculated trend analyses reporting out all of those different lymphosarcoma sites and that they should be combined in your opinion, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. I noted that he had done multiple analyses about lymphosarcomas and there only should be one lymphosarcoma analysis.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL. Yes. Q. And you have SL listed as skin lymphoma? A. Yes, it is. Q. Now, I don't find any skin lymphoma in any of the studies. There was a SL trend in the Knezevich study that you report for spleen lymphomas. A. Oh, that's correct, that's the splenic lymphomas. Thank you. Yes, that is the splenic lymphomas. Q. You include spleen lymphomas as one of your observed trends in your table 15? A. It is an observed trend, that is correct. Q. OK.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study, correct? A. I have yes, I have data tables that show lymphosarcomas in several different tissues. Q. And in your response to Dr. Corcoran, you testify that Dr. Corcoran improperly calculated trend analyses reporting out all of those different lymphosarcoma sites and that they should be combined in your opinion, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. I noted that he had done multiple analyses about lymphosarcomas and there only should be one lymphosarcoma analysis. However, I can't do that myself but I did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL. Yes. Q. And you have SL listed as skin lymphoma? A. Yes, it is. Q. Now, I don't find any skin lymphoma in any of the studies. There was a SL trend in the Knezevich study that you report for spleen lymphomas. A. Oh, that's correct, that's the splenic lymphomas. Thank you. Yes, that is the splenic lymphomas. Q. You include spleen lymphomas as one of your observed trends in your table 15? A. It is an observed trend, that is correct. Q. OK. A. That is correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study, correct? A. I have yes, I have data tables that show lymphosarcomas in several different tissues. Q. And in your response to Dr. Corcoran, you testify that Dr. Corcoran improperly calculated trend analyses reporting out all of those different lymphosarcoma sites and that they should be combined in your opinion, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. I noted that he had done multiple analyses about lymphosarcomas and there only should be one lymphosarcoma analysis. However, I can't do that myself but I did report the one.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL. Yes. Q. And you have SL listed as skin lymphoma? A. Yes, it is. Q. Now, I don't find any skin lymphoma in any of the studies. There was a SL trend in the Knezevich study that you report for spleen lymphomas. A. Oh, that's correct, that's the splenic lymphomas. Thank you. Yes, that is the splenic lymphomas. Q. You include spleen lymphomas as one of your observed trends in your table 15? A. It is an observed trend, that is correct. Q. OK. A. That is correct. Q. Now, the spleen lymphomas, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study, correct? A. I have yes, I have data tables that show lymphosarcomas in several different tissues. Q. And in your response to Dr. Corcoran, you testify that Dr. Corcoran improperly calculated trend analyses reporting out all of those different lymphosarcoma sites and that they should be combined in your opinion, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. I noted that he had done multiple analyses about lymphosarcomas and there only should be one lymphosarcoma analysis. However, I can't do that myself but I did report the one. Q. But the multiple lymphosarcoma
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL. Yes. Q. And you have SL listed as skin lymphoma? A. Yes, it is. Q. Now, I don't find any skin lymphoma in any of the studies. There was a SL trend in the Knezevich study that you report for spleen lymphomas. A. Oh, that's correct, that's the splenic lymphomas. Thank you. Yes, that is the splenic lymphomas. Q. You include spleen lymphomas as one of your observed trends in your table 15? A. It is an observed trend, that is correct. Q. OK. A. That is correct. Q. Now, the spleen lymphomas, I think in your rebuttal report, you state	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study, correct? A. I have yes, I have data tables that show lymphosarcomas in several different tissues. Q. And in your response to Dr. Corcoran, you testify that Dr. Corcoran improperly calculated trend analyses reporting out all of those different lymphosarcoma sites and that they should be combined in your opinion, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. I noted that he had done multiple analyses about lymphosarcomas and there only should be one lymphosarcoma analysis. However, I can't do that myself but I did report the one. Q. But the multiple lymphosarcoma sites that are separately calculated, those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL. Yes. Q. And you have SL listed as skin lymphoma? A. Yes, it is. Q. Now, I don't find any skin lymphoma in any of the studies. There was a SL trend in the Knezevich study that you report for spleen lymphomas. A. Oh, that's correct, that's the splenic lymphomas. Thank you. Yes, that is the splenic lymphomas. Q. You include spleen lymphomas as one of your observed trends in your table 15? A. It is an observed trend, that is correct. Q. OK. A. That is correct. Q. Now, the spleen lymphomas, I think in your rebuttal report, you state should be combined with all the lymphomas	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study, correct? A. I have yes, I have data tables that show lymphosarcomas in several different tissues. Q. And in your response to Dr. Corcoran, you testify that Dr. Corcoran improperly calculated trend analyses reporting out all of those different lymphosarcoma sites and that they should be combined in your opinion, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. I noted that he had done multiple analyses about lymphosarcomas and there only should be one lymphosarcoma analysis. However, I can't do that myself but I did report the one. Q. But the multiple lymphosarcoma sites that are separately calculated, those would not be separately listed as total
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Mice tumors P less than 05 SL. Yes. Q. And you have SL listed as skin lymphoma? A. Yes, it is. Q. Now, I don't find any skin lymphoma in any of the studies. There was a SL trend in the Knezevich study that you report for spleen lymphomas. A. Oh, that's correct, that's the splenic lymphomas. Thank you. Yes, that is the splenic lymphomas. Q. You include spleen lymphomas as one of your observed trends in your table 15? A. It is an observed trend, that is correct. Q. OK. A. That is correct. Q. Now, the spleen lymphomas, I think in your rebuttal report, you state	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. You have data presented for a number of different tissue type lymphosarcomas in the Knezevich study, correct? A. I have yes, I have data tables that show lymphosarcomas in several different tissues. Q. And in your response to Dr. Corcoran, you testify that Dr. Corcoran improperly calculated trend analyses reporting out all of those different lymphosarcoma sites and that they should be combined in your opinion, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. A. I noted that he had done multiple analyses about lymphosarcomas and there only should be one lymphosarcoma analysis. However, I can't do that myself but I did report the one. Q. But the multiple lymphosarcoma sites that are separately calculated, those

Page 322 Page 324 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. study is the Monsanto 1983 mouse study, 2 2 A. They were listed in the total correct? 3 site that Dr. Corcoran had done --3 A. The splenic lymphosarcomas? Q. Not Dr. Corcoran's, I'm talking 4 The rows are the Knezevich and 5 5 about yours. Hogan study, that is correct. A. Let me finish -- and the table 15 6 Q. So you have that full report --7 7 has one site for lymphosarcomas. One, it study report, correct? 8 8 takes up one site and it was evaluated, so A. I have that study report, but the 9 it is put into this table. And it had a P 9 study report is presented with groups of --10 10 value associated with it, which also goes the part I have is presented with groups of 11 into this table. 11 animals by organ. So I -- it gives me the 12 12 This is a table of what numbers for spleen and gives me the numbers 13 13 evaluations were done. for wherever, say, kidney. 14 14 Q. So the total sites column then But because this tumor can appear 15 15 quite often in multiple organs in the same does not -- in table -- modified table 15 16 16 animal, and I'm interested in incidents, I does not include the other lymphosarcomas 17 sites that were analyzed in the Knezevich 17 cannot back those numbers out and make the 18 18 study, just the splenic lymphosarcoma, correct -- what I would consider the 19 19 correct? correct classification. 20 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 20 Q. In your modified table 15, you 21 21 also include listing of four observed sites A. In my table 1 on page 9 of the 22 22 rebuttal reports, the three-or-more-tumors for -- and these are actually as opposed to 23 23 column only allows one spot for the skin and bone. 24 lymphosarcomas. So when lymphosarcomas 24 You have four sites for skin 25 were found, whether it was five organs or 25 tumors. You have three, I think, skin Page 323 Page 325 one organ, I collapsed it down into a 1 keratoacanthomas and one basal cell 2 2 single entry into this table. carcinoma in your table for the rat 3 Q. So in the Knezevich study then, studies, correct? 4 4 for the purposes of your analysis, you have A. I have skin keratoacanthoma for 5 5 one total site where there could be a the rat studies. I have three, and one б calculation conducted and one tumor site 6 basal cell, that is correct. 7 7 Q. Now, let me show you -- you being splenic lymphosarcoma where you 8 8 talked about the NTP is sort of the gold observed a trend, is that correct? 9 9 A. That is -- for each study, there standard for these cancer bioassays, 10 10 correct? is sufficient room for that type of 11 11 evaluation to be done, and in this case, A. For the way they are done and the 12 there was one evaluation of that type, and 12 way they are presented and the way they are 13 13 analyzed, that is correct. that is included. 14 14 Q. And the other however many other Q. And the NTP combines different 15 15 skin tumors into one category, correct? sites that were evaluated are not included 16 16 A. That I don't know for certain. in the total sites column? 17 17 MR. LASKER: Let's mark this. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 18 18 Q. For lymphosarcoma. I'm sorry. A. Of course, NTP uses a different 19 19 MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. strain of animals. 20 20 Q. They use many different strains A. I can't know that. I don't know 21 21 of animals, but I'm talking about -- let me how many other sites were evaluated. As I 22 22 ask you this: When NTP combines tumor pointed out before, that information is not 23 23 types, does it combine different tumor available to me, so I can't answer the 24 24 types for different strains of animals? question. 25 25 So, for example, you --Q. Just to be clear, the Knezevich

Page 326 Page 328 A. Oh, they might, yes, they might. 1 different sites for the skin or was skin 2 Q. For skin tumors, do you know one 2 just one site for your total site way or the other whether NTP combines tumor 3 3 calculation? 4 types for any different type of rodent? 4 A. I'm sorry, when I counted up all 5 5 A. No, I don't. the numbers of tumors greater than three 6 (Exhibit 15-36, report entitled tumors, it could easily have two skin sites 7 "NTP historical controls, report all or three. 8 8 routes and vehicles. Wistar-Han rats. Q. Do you recall right now whether 9 9 August 2016, marked for identification, you had more than one skin site for your 10 10 as of this date.) total sites or not? 11 Q. This is Wistar rats, and I'll 11 A. I would have to go back to the 12 12 refer you to page 32 of this report. original tables and read through and see MS. GREENWALD: I am sorry, what 13 13 how many of them were greater than three 14 and/or skin. page? 15 15 MR. LASKER: Page 32. I don't have that recollection. 16 16 Q. As reflected at least for this I can't remember that much detail on --17 rodent, the NTP combines I think it is 17 with so many numbers around. 18 18 MR. LASKER: Now I would like to something like 12 different types of skin 19 19 tumors to report an overall combined take a break. Thanks. 2.0 instance for skin tumors, correct? 20 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 21 A. On the previous -- 12? 21 4:36. Off the record. 22 22 On the previous page, it gives (Recess.) the individual historical control data for 23 23 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 24 basal cell adenoma or basal squamous tumor 24 4:48 p.m. We are on the record. 25 benign, basal cell adenoma, basal squamous 25 Page 327 Page 329 1 benign or trichoepithelioma, basal cell 1 BY MR. LASKER: 2 2 carcinoma, basal cell carcinoma with basal Q. Dr. Portier --3 3 squamous tumor, malignant or not otherwise A. Before you ask me a question, 4 4 during the break, I took the time to look specified, and then it provides a category 5 5 over this Charles River Laboratory document for all of these things combined in one 6 table, yes --6 you gave me. And I would like to correct 7 7 Q. For purposes of -my reaction to it a little bit on the 8 8 A. -- and there is no skin record. 9 9 Q. Which document is that? keratoacanthoma in this listing. 10 Q. Actually, page 32, just so we are 10 A. 15-34. clear, the listing -- the second listing 11 11 MR. LASKER: Let's go off the includes keratoacanthoma, correct? 12 12 record for a second, just because I 13 A. Yes, there it is, correct. 13 want to find out if you are going to be 14 Q. And that is grouped together with 14 asking questions, but if you will, we 15 basal cell or squamous cell carcinoma, 15 will save it. 16 carcinoma, basal squamous tumors M or B, 16 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Did you say go 17 basal cell adenomas, adenomas, papillomas, 17 off the record? 18 squamous papillomas, keratoacanthoma and 18 MR. LASKER: Yes. 19 trichoepithelioma, correct? 19 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 20 A. That's correct. It doesn't mean 2.0 4:49 p.m. We are off the record. 21 they would analyze it that way, but that is 21 (Recess.) 22 what's on this paper. 22 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 23 Q. For the purposes of your total 23 4:50 p.m. We are on the record. 24 site analysis -- or total site numbers in 24 MS. GREENWALD: I would like the 25 modified table 15, did you have counts for 25 record to reflect Dr. Portier asked

	Page 330		Page 332
1	Mr. Lasker if he could have a minute or	1	limited and not doesn't warrant a full
2	two to clarify his answer to the	2	review.
3	document 15-34, which he admitted	3	Q. OK, that's fine.
4	during his testimony before he had	4	Now, you have stated that we
5	never seen before, and during the	5	don't know for sure if glyphosate is
6	ten-minute break, Dr. Portier used that	6	genotoxic, correct?
7	to familiarize himself very briefly	7	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.
8	with it.	8	A. Where would you where is this
9	He did not use that time at all	9	in here?
10	during the time Mr. Lasker was asking	10	Q. First of all, that's a general
11	him questions. He asked for one or two	11	question and then I can do a follow-up.
12	minutes to clarify and correct his	12	But I want to know if you recall
13	answer, and Mr. Lasker right now is not	13	having made the statement that we don't
14	letting him do that.	14	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic?
15	MR. LASKER: Just so the record	15	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form,
16	is clear, Dr. Portier will have the	16	and the witness asked you to please
17	opportunity to clarify that before the	17	identify where you think he made that
18	end of the deposition here today.	18	statement.
19	MS. GREENWALD: I have made my	19	A. I can't I my expert
20	peace. He can do it on your time.	20	statement is right here and I believe my
21	Q. Dr. Portier, let's turn to your	21	conclusions on genotoxicity are quite
22	opinions regarding mechanism of	22	clear. So if you want to ask me about
23	carcinogenicity in your report.	23	that, please ask me about it.
24	You mentioned ten key	24	Q. Well, I'm asking you whether or
25	characteristics of carcinogens, and I think	25	not you have made the statement "we don't
	endianteristics of caronic gens, and a unital		
	Page 331		Page 333
1		1	Page 333 know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic."
1 2	it is part of the Smith publication, correct?	1 2	
	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct.		know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic."
2	it is part of the Smith publication, correct?	2	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is
2 3 4 5	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct.	2	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine.
2 3 4	it is part of the Smith publication,correct?A. That is correct.Q. And is it your opinion that there	2 3 4	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked
2 3 4 5	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct. Q. And is it your opinion that there is only sufficient evidence for glyphosate	2 3 4 5	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered. My objection stays the
2 3 4 5 6	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct. Q. And is it your opinion that there is only sufficient evidence for glyphosate with respect to two of those	2 3 4 5 6	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered. My objection stays the same.
2 3 4 5 6 7	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct. Q. And is it your opinion that there is only sufficient evidence for glyphosate with respect to two of those characteristics, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered. My objection stays the same. A. I seriously don't recall.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct. Q. And is it your opinion that there is only sufficient evidence for glyphosate with respect to two of those characteristics, correct? A. I do not believe that is what I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered. My objection stays the same. A. I seriously don't recall. Q. OK. Can you state here today
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct. Q. And is it your opinion that there is only sufficient evidence for glyphosate with respect to two of those characteristics, correct? A. I do not believe that is what I said. Q. Let me look at your report on page 53.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered. My objection stays the same. A. I seriously don't recall. Q. OK. Can you state here today that you have not made the statement that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct. Q. And is it your opinion that there is only sufficient evidence for glyphosate with respect to two of those characteristics, correct? A. I do not believe that is what I said. Q. Let me look at your report on page 53. And on page 53 you're talking	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered. My objection stays the same. A. I seriously don't recall. Q. OK. Can you state here today that you have not made the statement that we do not know for sure if glyphosate is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct. Q. And is it your opinion that there is only sufficient evidence for glyphosate with respect to two of those characteristics, correct? A. I do not believe that is what I said. Q. Let me look at your report on page 53. And on page 53 you're talking about the ten characteristics of mechanisms	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered. My objection stays the same. A. I seriously don't recall. Q. OK. Can you state here today that you have not made the statement that we do not know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered, argumentative.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct. Q. And is it your opinion that there is only sufficient evidence for glyphosate with respect to two of those characteristics, correct? A. I do not believe that is what I said. Q. Let me look at your report on page 53. And on page 53 you're talking about the ten characteristics of mechanisms for carcinogenicity, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered. My objection stays the same. A. I seriously don't recall. Q. OK. Can you state here today that you have not made the statement that we do not know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct. Q. And is it your opinion that there is only sufficient evidence for glyphosate with respect to two of those characteristics, correct? A. I do not believe that is what I said. Q. Let me look at your report on page 53. And on page 53 you're talking about the ten characteristics of mechanisms for carcinogenicity, correct? And it's the top of the page	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered. My objection stays the same. A. I seriously don't recall. Q. OK. Can you state here today that you have not made the statement that we do not know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered, argumentative.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct. Q. And is it your opinion that there is only sufficient evidence for glyphosate with respect to two of those characteristics, correct? A. I do not believe that is what I said. Q. Let me look at your report on page 53. And on page 53 you're talking about the ten characteristics of mechanisms for carcinogenicity, correct? And it's the top of the page where you cite to Smith.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered. My objection stays the same. A. I seriously don't recall. Q. OK. Can you state here today that you have not made the statement that we do not know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered, argumentative. A. I don't recall. It's still the answer. Q. Let's mark as I will have to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct. Q. And is it your opinion that there is only sufficient evidence for glyphosate with respect to two of those characteristics, correct? A. I do not believe that is what I said. Q. Let me look at your report on page 53. And on page 53 you're talking about the ten characteristics of mechanisms for carcinogenicity, correct? And it's the top of the page where you cite to Smith. A. That is correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered. My objection stays the same. A. I seriously don't recall. Q. OK. Can you state here today that you have not made the statement that we do not know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered, argumentative. A. I don't recall. It's still the answer. Q. Let's mark as I will have to make this as two documents. This is an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct. Q. And is it your opinion that there is only sufficient evidence for glyphosate with respect to two of those characteristics, correct? A. I do not believe that is what I said. Q. Let me look at your report on page 53. And on page 53 you're talking about the ten characteristics of mechanisms for carcinogenicity, correct? And it's the top of the page where you cite to Smith. A. That is correct. Q. And you say, "There is limited	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered. My objection stays the same. A. I seriously don't recall. Q. OK. Can you state here today that you have not made the statement that we do not know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered, argumentative. A. I don't recall. It's still the answer. Q. Let's mark as I will have to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct. Q. And is it your opinion that there is only sufficient evidence for glyphosate with respect to two of those characteristics, correct? A. I do not believe that is what I said. Q. Let me look at your report on page 53. And on page 53 you're talking about the ten characteristics of mechanisms for carcinogenicity, correct? And it's the top of the page where you cite to Smith. A. That is correct. Q. And you say, "There is limited evidence on glyphosate for most of the key	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered. My objection stays the same. A. I seriously don't recall. Q. OK. Can you state here today that you have not made the statement that we do not know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered, argumentative. A. I don't recall. It's still the answer. Q. Let's mark as I will have to make this as two documents. This is an article that appeared in a German news site, so we have had it translated.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct. Q. And is it your opinion that there is only sufficient evidence for glyphosate with respect to two of those characteristics, correct? A. I do not believe that is what I said. Q. Let me look at your report on page 53. And on page 53 you're talking about the ten characteristics of mechanisms for carcinogenicity, correct? And it's the top of the page where you cite to Smith. A. That is correct. Q. And you say, "There is limited evidence on glyphosate for most of the key characteristics," but then you identify two	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered. My objection stays the same. A. I seriously don't recall. Q. OK. Can you state here today that you have not made the statement that we do not know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered, argumentative. A. I don't recall. It's still the answer. Q. Let's mark as I will have to make this as two documents. This is an article that appeared in a German news
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct. Q. And is it your opinion that there is only sufficient evidence for glyphosate with respect to two of those characteristics, correct? A. I do not believe that is what I said. Q. Let me look at your report on page 53. And on page 53 you're talking about the ten characteristics of mechanisms for carcinogenicity, correct? And it's the top of the page where you cite to Smith. A. That is correct. Q. And you say, "There is limited evidence on glyphosate for most of the key characteristics," but then you identify two characteristics, genotoxicity and oxidative	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered. My objection stays the same. A. I seriously don't recall. Q. OK. Can you state here today that you have not made the statement that we do not know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered, argumentative. A. I don't recall. It's still the answer. Q. Let's mark as I will have to make this as two documents. This is an article that appeared in a German news site, so we have had it translated.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct. Q. And is it your opinion that there is only sufficient evidence for glyphosate with respect to two of those characteristics, correct? A. I do not believe that is what I said. Q. Let me look at your report on page 53. And on page 53 you're talking about the ten characteristics of mechanisms for carcinogenicity, correct? And it's the top of the page where you cite to Smith. A. That is correct. Q. And you say, "There is limited evidence on glyphosate for most of the key characteristics," but then you identify two characteristics, genotoxicity and oxidative stress, which you believe have sufficient	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered. My objection stays the same. A. I seriously don't recall. Q. OK. Can you state here today that you have not made the statement that we do not know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered, argumentative. A. I don't recall. It's still the answer. Q. Let's mark as I will have to make this as two documents. This is an article that appeared in a German news site, so we have had it translated. So we will have the German
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct. Q. And is it your opinion that there is only sufficient evidence for glyphosate with respect to two of those characteristics, correct? A. I do not believe that is what I said. Q. Let me look at your report on page 53. And on page 53 you're talking about the ten characteristics of mechanisms for carcinogenicity, correct? And it's the top of the page where you cite to Smith. A. That is correct. Q. And you say, "There is limited evidence on glyphosate for most of the key characteristics," but then you identify two characteristics, genotoxicity and oxidative stress, which you believe have sufficient evidence, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered. My objection stays the same. A. I seriously don't recall. Q. OK. Can you state here today that you have not made the statement that we do not know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered, argumentative. A. I don't recall. It's still the answer. Q. Let's mark as I will have to make this as two documents. This is an article that appeared in a German news site, so we have had it translated. So we will have the German document as the next in line, and then the English translation as 38? MS. GREENWALD: Can you please
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct. Q. And is it your opinion that there is only sufficient evidence for glyphosate with respect to two of those characteristics, correct? A. I do not believe that is what I said. Q. Let me look at your report on page 53. And on page 53 you're talking about the ten characteristics of mechanisms for carcinogenicity, correct? And it's the top of the page where you cite to Smith. A. That is correct. Q. And you say, "There is limited evidence on glyphosate for most of the key characteristics," but then you identify two characteristics, genotoxicity and oxidative stress, which you believe have sufficient evidence, correct? A. To warrant a full review. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered. My objection stays the same. A. I seriously don't recall. Q. OK. Can you state here today that you have not made the statement that we do not know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered, argumentative. A. I don't recall. It's still the answer. Q. Let's mark as I will have to make this as two documents. This is an article that appeared in a German news site, so we have had it translated. So we will have the German document as the next in line, and then the English translation as 38? MS. GREENWALD: Can you please tell us who translated it?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it is part of the Smith publication, correct? A. That is correct. Q. And is it your opinion that there is only sufficient evidence for glyphosate with respect to two of those characteristics, correct? A. I do not believe that is what I said. Q. Let me look at your report on page 53. And on page 53 you're talking about the ten characteristics of mechanisms for carcinogenicity, correct? And it's the top of the page where you cite to Smith. A. That is correct. Q. And you say, "There is limited evidence on glyphosate for most of the key characteristics," but then you identify two characteristics, genotoxicity and oxidative stress, which you believe have sufficient evidence, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic." If you don't recall, that is fine. MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered. My objection stays the same. A. I seriously don't recall. Q. OK. Can you state here today that you have not made the statement that we do not know for sure if glyphosate is genotoxic? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked and answered, argumentative. A. I don't recall. It's still the answer. Q. Let's mark as I will have to make this as two documents. This is an article that appeared in a German news site, so we have had it translated. So we will have the German document as the next in line, and then the English translation as 38? MS. GREENWALD: Can you please

	Page 334		Page 336
1	the document.	1	page 4 on the English translation, this
2	MS. GREENWALD: Was it a	2	is just so the record is clear, and you
3	certified translator?	3	can look through this this document sets
4	MR. LASKER: It is. You will see	4	forth a series of questions to you and your
5	it in a second.	5	answers on various issues with regard to
6	(Exhibit 15-37, German article,	6	the EFSA and ACA review of glyphosate,
7	marked for identification, as of this	7	correct?
8	date.)	8	MS. GREENWALD: You have to give
9	(Exhibit 15-38, translation of	9	him a chance to look at this,
10	German article, marked for	10	Mr. Lasker.
11	identification, as of this date.)	11	A. Now, what is your question.
12	Q. So, Dr. Portier, 15-38, which	12	Q. This in your interview with
13	will be more useful for us to look at since	13	Mr. Forter and Ms. Fuchs, they asked you a
14	it is the translation to English first	14	series of questions, and you provided
15	of all, the record can reflect that it is a	15	answers. That's normal interview format,
16	certified English translation as set forth	16	correct?
17		17	
18	on the bottom of page 1. MS. GREENWALD: So, Mr. Lasker,	18	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. In this case, they asked
19	if I can just ask for the record	19	questions, we had a discussion, that is
20	whether this was a certified	20	correct.
21	translator. I'm not seeing that	21	Q. And one of the questions they
22	reference here, that she is a certified	22	asked you, as reflected on page 4 of the
23	translator.	23	English translation, was is glyphosate
24	She is certifying that she	24	genotoxic, correct?
25	translated it. Is she a certified	25	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.
	translated it. Is she a certified		W.S. GREEN WALD. Objection, form.
	Page 335		Page 337
1	translator?	1	A. That is what they give your
2	MR. LASKER: We will get that	2	translator has said what they say, and that
3	information for you if it is not on the	3	is what they say.
4	document. I apologize right now.	4	I can't tell you if they asked me
5	MS. GREENWALD: It's not.	5	4 4 4 4 4 6 4 4
6	O Du Doution in do 11		that question in this frame in the
	Q. Dr. Portier, in do you recall	6	that question in this frame in the interview.
7	being interviewed in July, which would be	6 7	interview. Q. And if you look at the well,
8	being interviewed in July, which would be about a month and a half ago, about the	6 7 8	interview. Q. And if you look at the well, do you speak German?
8	being interviewed in July, which would be about a month and a half ago, about the European Union assessment of glyphosate?	6 7 8 9	interview. Q. And if you look at the well, do you speak German? A. That still wouldn't solve the
8 9 10	being interviewed in July, which would be about a month and a half ago, about the European Union assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: I just want to	6 7 8 9 10	interview. Q. And if you look at the well, do you speak German? A. That still wouldn't solve the problem because I don't know if they asked
8 9 10 11	being interviewed in July, which would be about a month and a half ago, about the European Union assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: I just want to I'm objecting to all these questions.	6 7 8 9 10 11	interview. Q. And if you look at the well, do you speak German? A. That still wouldn't solve the problem because I don't know if they asked me that question verbatim as they put it
8 9 10 11 12	being interviewed in July, which would be about a month and a half ago, about the European Union assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: I just want to I'm objecting to all these questions. You can answer them, but I'm	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	interview. Q. And if you look at the well, do you speak German? A. That still wouldn't solve the problem because I don't know if they asked me that question verbatim as they put it here.
8 9 10 11 12 13	being interviewed in July, which would be about a month and a half ago, about the European Union assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: I just want to I'm objecting to all these questions. You can answer them, but I'm objecting to all the questions on the	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	interview. Q. And if you look at the well, do you speak German? A. That still wouldn't solve the problem because I don't know if they asked me that question verbatim as they put it here. Q. That's not my question. My
8 9 10 11 12 13	being interviewed in July, which would be about a month and a half ago, about the European Union assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: I just want to I'm objecting to all these questions. You can answer them, but I'm objecting to all the questions on the grounds that we have no idea if this is	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	interview. Q. And if you look at the well, do you speak German? A. That still wouldn't solve the problem because I don't know if they asked me that question verbatim as they put it here. Q. That's not my question. My question is: Do you speak German?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	being interviewed in July, which would be about a month and a half ago, about the European Union assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: I just want to I'm objecting to all these questions. You can answer them, but I'm objecting to all the questions on the grounds that we have no idea if this is an accurate translation.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	interview. Q. And if you look at the well, do you speak German? A. That still wouldn't solve the problem because I don't know if they asked me that question verbatim as they put it here. Q. That's not my question. My question is: Do you speak German? A. I speak some.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	being interviewed in July, which would be about a month and a half ago, about the European Union assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: I just want to I'm objecting to all these questions. You can answer them, but I'm objecting to all the questions on the grounds that we have no idea if this is an accurate translation. MR. LASKER: That's fine.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	interview. Q. And if you look at the well, do you speak German? A. That still wouldn't solve the problem because I don't know if they asked me that question verbatim as they put it here. Q. That's not my question. My question is: Do you speak German? A. I speak some. (German phrase.)
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	being interviewed in July, which would be about a month and a half ago, about the European Union assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: I just want to I'm objecting to all these questions. You can answer them, but I'm objecting to all the questions on the grounds that we have no idea if this is an accurate translation. MR. LASKER: That's fine. A. I was interviewed by Martin	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	interview. Q. And if you look at the well, do you speak German? A. That still wouldn't solve the problem because I don't know if they asked me that question verbatim as they put it here. Q. That's not my question. My question is: Do you speak German? A. I speak some. (German phrase.) Q. If you can also look at
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	being interviewed in July, which would be about a month and a half ago, about the European Union assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: I just want to I'm objecting to all these questions. You can answer them, but I'm objecting to all the questions on the grounds that we have no idea if this is an accurate translation. MR. LASKER: That's fine. A. I was interviewed by Martin Forter and Stephanie Fuchs.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	interview. Q. And if you look at the well, do you speak German? A. That still wouldn't solve the problem because I don't know if they asked me that question verbatim as they put it here. Q. That's not my question. My question is: Do you speak German? A. I speak some. (German phrase.) Q. If you can also look at Exhibit 15-37, the German article on the
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	being interviewed in July, which would be about a month and a half ago, about the European Union assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: I just want to I'm objecting to all these questions. You can answer them, but I'm objecting to all the questions on the grounds that we have no idea if this is an accurate translation. MR. LASKER: That's fine. A. I was interviewed by Martin Forter and Stephanie Fuchs. I don't believe it was July 18.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	interview. Q. And if you look at the well, do you speak German? A. That still wouldn't solve the problem because I don't know if they asked me that question verbatim as they put it here. Q. That's not my question. My question is: Do you speak German? A. I speak some. (German phrase.) Q. If you can also look at Exhibit 15-37, the German article on the bottom of page 3, there is a question that
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	being interviewed in July, which would be about a month and a half ago, about the European Union assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: I just want to I'm objecting to all these questions. You can answer them, but I'm objecting to all the questions on the grounds that we have no idea if this is an accurate translation. MR. LASKER: That's fine. A. I was interviewed by Martin Forter and Stephanie Fuchs. I don't believe it was July 18. I think it was before that.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	interview. Q. And if you look at the well, do you speak German? A. That still wouldn't solve the problem because I don't know if they asked me that question verbatim as they put it here. Q. That's not my question. My question is: Do you speak German? A. I speak some. (German phrase.) Q. If you can also look at Exhibit 15-37, the German article on the bottom of page 3, there is a question that I'm going to butcher in German, but it "Ist
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	being interviewed in July, which would be about a month and a half ago, about the European Union assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: I just want to I'm objecting to all these questions. You can answer them, but I'm objecting to all the questions on the grounds that we have no idea if this is an accurate translation. MR. LASKER: That's fine. A. I was interviewed by Martin Forter and Stephanie Fuchs. I don't believe it was July 18. I think it was before that. Q. OK, but then it would appear in	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	interview. Q. And if you look at the well, do you speak German? A. That still wouldn't solve the problem because I don't know if they asked me that question verbatim as they put it here. Q. That's not my question. My question is: Do you speak German? A. I speak some. (German phrase.) Q. If you can also look at Exhibit 15-37, the German article on the bottom of page 3, there is a question that I'm going to butcher in German, but it "Ist Glyphosat genotoxisch?" is the question.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	being interviewed in July, which would be about a month and a half ago, about the European Union assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: I just want to I'm objecting to all these questions. You can answer them, but I'm objecting to all the questions on the grounds that we have no idea if this is an accurate translation. MR. LASKER: That's fine. A. I was interviewed by Martin Forter and Stephanie Fuchs. I don't believe it was July 18. I think it was before that. Q. OK, but then it would appear in an article after you were interviewed, that	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	interview. Q. And if you look at the well, do you speak German? A. That still wouldn't solve the problem because I don't know if they asked me that question verbatim as they put it here. Q. That's not my question. My question is: Do you speak German? A. I speak some. (German phrase.) Q. If you can also look at Exhibit 15-37, the German article on the bottom of page 3, there is a question that I'm going to butcher in German, but it "Ist Glyphosat genotoxisch?" is the question. MS. GREENWALD: Hold on.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	being interviewed in July, which would be about a month and a half ago, about the European Union assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: I just want to I'm objecting to all these questions. You can answer them, but I'm objecting to all the questions on the grounds that we have no idea if this is an accurate translation. MR. LASKER: That's fine. A. I was interviewed by Martin Forter and Stephanie Fuchs. I don't believe it was July 18. I think it was before that. Q. OK, but then it would appear in an article after you were interviewed, that makes sense?	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	interview. Q. And if you look at the well, do you speak German? A. That still wouldn't solve the problem because I don't know if they asked me that question verbatim as they put it here. Q. That's not my question. My question is: Do you speak German? A. I speak some. (German phrase.) Q. If you can also look at Exhibit 15-37, the German article on the bottom of page 3, there is a question that I'm going to butcher in German, but it "Ist Glyphosat genotoxisch?" is the question. MS. GREENWALD: Hold on. Don't guess. I said don't guess.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	being interviewed in July, which would be about a month and a half ago, about the European Union assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: I just want to I'm objecting to all these questions. You can answer them, but I'm objecting to all the questions on the grounds that we have no idea if this is an accurate translation. MR. LASKER: That's fine. A. I was interviewed by Martin Forter and Stephanie Fuchs. I don't believe it was July 18. I think it was before that. Q. OK, but then it would appear in an article after you were interviewed, that makes sense? A. Of course.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	interview. Q. And if you look at the well, do you speak German? A. That still wouldn't solve the problem because I don't know if they asked me that question verbatim as they put it here. Q. That's not my question. My question is: Do you speak German? A. I speak some. (German phrase.) Q. If you can also look at Exhibit 15-37, the German article on the bottom of page 3, there is a question that I'm going to butcher in German, but it "Ist Glyphosat genotoxisch?" is the question. MS. GREENWALD: Hold on. Don't guess. I said don't guess. If he is not fluent in German, he
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	being interviewed in July, which would be about a month and a half ago, about the European Union assessment of glyphosate? MS. GREENWALD: I just want to I'm objecting to all these questions. You can answer them, but I'm objecting to all the questions on the grounds that we have no idea if this is an accurate translation. MR. LASKER: That's fine. A. I was interviewed by Martin Forter and Stephanie Fuchs. I don't believe it was July 18. I think it was before that. Q. OK, but then it would appear in an article after you were interviewed, that makes sense?	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	interview. Q. And if you look at the well, do you speak German? A. That still wouldn't solve the problem because I don't know if they asked me that question verbatim as they put it here. Q. That's not my question. My question is: Do you speak German? A. I speak some. (German phrase.) Q. If you can also look at Exhibit 15-37, the German article on the bottom of page 3, there is a question that I'm going to butcher in German, but it "Ist Glyphosat genotoxisch?" is the question. MS. GREENWALD: Hold on. Don't guess. I said don't guess.

Page 338 Page 340 1 1 MR. LASKER: OK. in the expert report. 2 2 Q. I understand that. A. Again, the -- there is a 3 3 Are you saying that you did not two-stage process here. The first is did 4 they ask me the question? And the second 4 say this in the interview or are you saying 5 is did your translator get it right from you can't recall whether you said it? 5 6 what they wrote? 6 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked 7 7 I can't tell you if they asked me and answered. 8 8 this question verbatim. But I can tell you A. It was answered. I'm sorry, yes. 9 9 that "Ist Glyphosate toxicisch" is the She is right. 10 10 question that they have -- you have Q. Do you recall whether you said to 11 converted to English. 11 these reporters, we don't know for sure 12 Q. And the conversion "Is glyphosate 12 whether glyphosate is genotoxic? genotoxic" is an accurate translation of 13 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, asked 13 14 14 that question, correct? and answered now several times. 15 15 A. That is correct. A. I do not recall. 16 16 Q. The answer that they have -- you Q. Do you recall whether you said, 17 can read it in German as well as in English 17 in the interest of public health, we should 18 therefore classify glyphosate as genotoxic, 18 from you -- is, "We don't know for sure. The data of 50 percent of the studies 19 19 in my opinion? 20 argues for genotoxicity, 50 percent against 20 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 21 21 A. I cannot possibly answer the 22 22 First of all, do you see that question. No. 23 Q. You don't recall? 23 statement in the article? 24 MS. GREENWALD: Object to form. 24 A. Don't know. 25 25 A. I see it in the translation, Q. You don't recall one way or the Page 339 Page 341 1 that's clear. I have --1 other? 2 O. You have to turn the page for the 2 A. No. It was a long interview. It 3 German. was over an hour. 4 4 A. No, it's right here. But I'm not Q. The -- you do -- you agree that 5 good enough in German to look at this. 5 just because a chemical can damage DNA, 6 Q. Can you state, sitting here 6 that does not mean it will cause mutations, 7 7 today, that you did not state to this correct? 8 reporter, in answer to the question "Is MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 9 9 glyphosate genotoxic," "We do not know for A. Say it again, please. 10 sure"? 10 Q. Just because a chemical can 11 11 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to damage DNA, that does not mean it will 12 12 cause mutations, you agree with that form. 13 13 A. I can't tell you. They could statement, correct? 14 have easily taken it out of context or 14 MS. GREENWALD: Same objection. 15 15 something along those lines. I have no A. In general, that is correct. I idea. What I -- I can't answer "yes" or 16 would state it slightly different, but as a 17 17 general, broad sweep, that's good enough. "no" to that question. Q. OK, so sitting here today, you 18 18 O. And just to be clear, if you can 19 can't state that you didn't make this 19 look at your expert report on page 53, I 2.0 2.0 statement, and you can't say that you did, thought I quoted you, but maybe I did not. 21 2.1 you just don't recall, correct? Page 53 in your expert report on 2.2 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 22 genotoxicity, the second full paragraph 23 23 starting "Just because a chemical can A. My current opinion on the 24 genotoxic data for glyphosate is in the 24 damage DNA does not mean it will cause 25 25 mutations," correct? expert report. This does not match what's

Page 342 Page 344 1 1 matter of fact, then it cannot cause cancer A. Yeah. 2 2 through a genotoxic mechanism, correct? Q. That's your statement? 3 3 That's my statement. A. It can do it through a side -- to Α. 4 Q. You agree with that, correct? 4 really think it through -- through side 5 5 A. I would have liked to have activities. 6 6 written it slightly differently and more Genotoxic compounds are very 7 7 nuanced, but that's good enough. reactive. They can damage other parts that 8 8 Q. You agree that not all chemicals could lead to oxidative stress or other 9 9 are mutagens, correct? things that will cause the mutations and 10 10 A. Who defines what the geno -- it's the cancers. 11 going to depend on a lot of different 11 So it's complicated. 12 12 things. Who's making the call, who's doing Q. OK. And again, I didn't word 13 13 the evaluations, et cetera. this correctly, so I apologize, but for a 14 14 But in looking at NTP studies chemical to cause cancer through a with NTP evaluations, not all genotoxic 15 genotoxic mechanism, cause of action, it 15 substances cause tumors in male and female 16 16 would have to progress to a mutagen -- a 17 17 mutation -- I'm sorry -- correct? rats and mice. 18 18 A. The -- in a theoretical sense, if Q. And just to be clear also, not 19 19 all chemicals that are reported to be such a compound were not interacting with 20 genotoxic are found to be mutagenic, 20 anything else, then in a theoretical sense, 21 21 correct? in a multi-stage model, you would expect a 22 22 A. Not all chemicals that are mutation to occur. If you could find it, 23 23 that may not be possible. But you would reportedly genotoxic are found to be 24 mutagenic? 24 expect a mutation to occur. 25 25 Q. And all of us sitting in this I can't answer that question. Page 343 Page 345 1 1 It's too broad. I'm sorry. room, we constantly have DNA damage to our 2 2 cells in the ordinary course, correct? O. OK. I am correct that if a 3 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 3 genotoxic chemical does not cause 4 4 mutations, then it cannot cause cancer A. All living organisms have repair capacity and -- because they always have 5 5 through a genotoxic mechanism, correct? 6 6 A. The assays -- this is all problems with their DNA during replication. 7 7 dependent upon what you look at. Q. And in the ordinary course, we 8 8 The assays that are done for are having DNA damage in our cells probably 9 9 millions of times each day, correct? mutations are very limited assays looking 10 at a very small number of genes and a very 10 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 11 11 A. I couldn't give you an exact small number of mutations. 12 12 So to answer your question, I can number. 13 13 answer it this way: There are some Certainly not millions of times 14 chemicals that are genotoxic that do not 14 each day in each cell, because the DNA 15 appear to be positive in the toxicological 15 damage only really has any value during the 16 assays that have been done to evaluate 16 time the cell replicates, and many of the 17 17 cells in humans simply don't replicate that them. 18 Q. I appreciate that. I was trying 18 often. 19 to ask a different question. I didn't word 19 Q. Every time there is a replication 20 20 it correctly. though, in the ordinary course, it is not 2.1 This is not in an individual 21 uncommon for there to be DNA damage, 22 study that tests one way or another. This 22 correct? 23 is a broader, mechanistic question. 23 A. That is correct. 24 If a substance is genotoxic but 24 Q. As you said, the human body has 25 it does not cause mutations, just as a 25 repair mechanisms that respond to DNA

	Page 346		Page 348
1	damage so that it doesn't cause further	1	tests looking at effects of chemical on the
2	damage, correct?	2	gene, yes.
3	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	3	Q. And you state in your report,
4	A. The body has DNA repair capacity	4	"Genotoxicity is a complicated area from
5	through several processes for different	5	which to draw a conclusion due to the
6	types of DNA damage, yes.	6	diversity of studies available," correct?
7	Q. And you would also agree that not	7	A. It is, yes.
8	all chemicals that test positive for	8	Q. And that is the case certainly
9	mutagenicity cause cancer in humans,	9	with glyphosate in your opinion, correct?
10	correct?	10	MS. GREENWALD: Objection to
11	A. Not all chemicals that have been	11	form.
12	tested for genotoxicity	12	A. If I said it in here, you would
13	Q. For mutagenicity.	13	have to tell me where it is again.
14	A for mutagenicity, and the	14	Q. I'm just asking you, would you
15	evaluation is done by reputable groups,	15	agree that for glyphosate, genotoxicity is
16	like the NTP, then I wouldn't be surprised	16	a complicated area from which to draw a
17	if some of those that were mutagenic were	17	conclusion due to the diversity of studies
18	not also carcinogenic, but I couldn't give	18	available?
19	you one right now.	19	MS. GREENWALD: Objection to
20	Q. Now, in your expert report, you	20	form.
21	opine that the evidence is sufficient to	21	A. In general, genotoxicity is
22	classify glyphosate as genotoxic, correct?	22	complicated to make decisions because there
23	A. Yes.	23	are so many different possibilities of how
24	Q. In your expert report, you do not	24	people do it. They use different animals.
25	opine that the evidence is sufficient to	25	They use different cell lines. They use
	Page 347		Page 349
1	Page 347 classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct?	1	Page 349 different links of time for the exposure,
1 2		1 2	
	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct?		different links of time for the exposure,
2	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera.
2	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence	2	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think
2 3 4	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence is insufficient to classify the mutagen	2 3 4	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think I said that here but I'm not certain so I
2 3 4 5	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence is insufficient to classify the mutagen because of the reasons I gave earlier.	2 3 4 5	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think I said that here but I'm not certain so I can't own up to that for this compound.
2 3 4 5 6	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence is insufficient to classify the mutagen because of the reasons I gave earlier. There aren't that many tests, and	2 3 4 5	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think I said that here but I'm not certain so I can't own up to that for this compound. Q. But whether or not you said it in
2 3 4 5 6 7	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence is insufficient to classify the mutagen because of the reasons I gave earlier. There aren't that many tests, and they are very specific to very genes	2 3 4 5 6 7	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think I said that here but I'm not certain so I can't own up to that for this compound. Q. But whether or not you said it in your expert report, you agree that that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence is insufficient to classify the mutagen because of the reasons I gave earlier. There aren't that many tests, and they are very specific to very genes very few genes, not the entire human	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think I said that here but I'm not certain so I can't own up to that for this compound. Q. But whether or not you said it in your expert report, you agree that that applies to glyphosate, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence is insufficient to classify the mutagen because of the reasons I gave earlier. There aren't that many tests, and they are very specific to very genes very few genes, not the entire human genome.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think I said that here but I'm not certain so I can't own up to that for this compound. Q. But whether or not you said it in your expert report, you agree that that applies to glyphosate, correct? A. Yes, when compared to something
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence is insufficient to classify the mutagen because of the reasons I gave earlier. There aren't that many tests, and they are very specific to very genes very few genes, not the entire human genome. Q. And you do agree though that both	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think I said that here but I'm not certain so I can't own up to that for this compound. Q. But whether or not you said it in your expert report, you agree that that applies to glyphosate, correct? A. Yes, when compared to something like the animal cancer studies where you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence is insufficient to classify the mutagen because of the reasons I gave earlier. There aren't that many tests, and they are very specific to very genes very few genes, not the entire human genome. Q. And you do agree though that both glyphosate and glyphosate formulations have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think I said that here but I'm not certain so I can't own up to that for this compound. Q. But whether or not you said it in your expert report, you agree that that applies to glyphosate, correct? A. Yes, when compared to something like the animal cancer studies where you have pretty much standardized designs on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence is insufficient to classify the mutagen because of the reasons I gave earlier. There aren't that many tests, and they are very specific to very genes very few genes, not the entire human genome. Q. And you do agree though that both glyphosate and glyphosate formulations have consistently tested negative in the Ames	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think I said that here but I'm not certain so I can't own up to that for this compound. Q. But whether or not you said it in your expert report, you agree that that applies to glyphosate, correct? A. Yes, when compared to something like the animal cancer studies where you have pretty much standardized designs on everything.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence is insufficient to classify the mutagen because of the reasons I gave earlier. There aren't that many tests, and they are very specific to very genes very few genes, not the entire human genome. Q. And you do agree though that both glyphosate and glyphosate formulations have consistently tested negative in the Ames mutagenistic test, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think I said that here but I'm not certain so I can't own up to that for this compound. Q. But whether or not you said it in your expert report, you agree that that applies to glyphosate, correct? A. Yes, when compared to something like the animal cancer studies where you have pretty much standardized designs on everything. Q. Let me ask you about your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence is insufficient to classify the mutagen because of the reasons I gave earlier. There aren't that many tests, and they are very specific to very genes very few genes, not the entire human genome. Q. And you do agree though that both glyphosate and glyphosate formulations have consistently tested negative in the Ames mutagenistic test, correct? A. They have consistently with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think I said that here but I'm not certain so I can't own up to that for this compound. Q. But whether or not you said it in your expert report, you agree that that applies to glyphosate, correct? A. Yes, when compared to something like the animal cancer studies where you have pretty much standardized designs on everything. Q. Let me ask you about your opinions with regard to oxidative stress.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence is insufficient to classify the mutagen because of the reasons I gave earlier. There aren't that many tests, and they are very specific to very genes very few genes, not the entire human genome. Q. And you do agree though that both glyphosate and glyphosate formulations have consistently tested negative in the Ames mutagenistic test, correct? A. They have consistently with the exception, I believe, of four studies	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think I said that here but I'm not certain so I can't own up to that for this compound. Q. But whether or not you said it in your expert report, you agree that that applies to glyphosate, correct? A. Yes, when compared to something like the animal cancer studies where you have pretty much standardized designs on everything. Q. Let me ask you about your opinions with regard to oxidative stress. A. OK.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence is insufficient to classify the mutagen because of the reasons I gave earlier. There aren't that many tests, and they are very specific to very genes very few genes, not the entire human genome. Q. And you do agree though that both glyphosate and glyphosate formulations have consistently tested negative in the Ames mutagenistic test, correct? A. They have consistently with the exception, I believe, of four studies but there were a lot of studies	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think I said that here but I'm not certain so I can't own up to that for this compound. Q. But whether or not you said it in your expert report, you agree that that applies to glyphosate, correct? A. Yes, when compared to something like the animal cancer studies where you have pretty much standardized designs on everything. Q. Let me ask you about your opinions with regard to oxidative stress. A. OK. Q. You agree that oxidative stress
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence is insufficient to classify the mutagen because of the reasons I gave earlier. There aren't that many tests, and they are very specific to very genes very few genes, not the entire human genome. Q. And you do agree though that both glyphosate and glyphosate formulations have consistently tested negative in the Ames mutagenistic test, correct? A. They have consistently with the exception, I believe, of four studies but there were a lot of studies consistently tested negative for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think I said that here but I'm not certain so I can't own up to that for this compound. Q. But whether or not you said it in your expert report, you agree that that applies to glyphosate, correct? A. Yes, when compared to something like the animal cancer studies where you have pretty much standardized designs on everything. Q. Let me ask you about your opinions with regard to oxidative stress. A. OK. Q. You agree that oxidative stress is not unique to cancer induction, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence is insufficient to classify the mutagen because of the reasons I gave earlier. There aren't that many tests, and they are very specific to very genes very few genes, not the entire human genome. Q. And you do agree though that both glyphosate and glyphosate formulations have consistently tested negative in the Ames mutagenistic test, correct? A. They have consistently with the exception, I believe, of four studies but there were a lot of studies consistently tested negative for the reverse mutation assay of a specific gene	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think I said that here but I'm not certain so I can't own up to that for this compound. Q. But whether or not you said it in your expert report, you agree that that applies to glyphosate, correct? A. Yes, when compared to something like the animal cancer studies where you have pretty much standardized designs on everything. Q. Let me ask you about your opinions with regard to oxidative stress. A. OK. Q. You agree that oxidative stress is not unique to cancer induction, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence is insufficient to classify the mutagen because of the reasons I gave earlier. There aren't that many tests, and they are very specific to very genes very few genes, not the entire human genome. Q. And you do agree though that both glyphosate and glyphosate formulations have consistently tested negative in the Ames mutagenistic test, correct? A. They have consistently with the exception, I believe, of four studies but there were a lot of studies consistently tested negative for the reverse mutation assay of a specific gene in salmonella typhimurium. So yes, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think I said that here but I'm not certain so I can't own up to that for this compound. Q. But whether or not you said it in your expert report, you agree that that applies to glyphosate, correct? A. Yes, when compared to something like the animal cancer studies where you have pretty much standardized designs on everything. Q. Let me ask you about your opinions with regard to oxidative stress. A. OK. Q. You agree that oxidative stress is not unique to cancer induction, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Not unique to cancer induction.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence is insufficient to classify the mutagen because of the reasons I gave earlier. There aren't that many tests, and they are very specific to very genes very few genes, not the entire human genome. Q. And you do agree though that both glyphosate and glyphosate formulations have consistently tested negative in the Ames mutagenistic test, correct? A. They have consistently with the exception, I believe, of four studies but there were a lot of studies consistently tested negative for the reverse mutation assay of a specific gene in salmonella typhimurium. So yes, the Ames test.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think I said that here but I'm not certain so I can't own up to that for this compound. Q. But whether or not you said it in your expert report, you agree that that applies to glyphosate, correct? A. Yes, when compared to something like the animal cancer studies where you have pretty much standardized designs on everything. Q. Let me ask you about your opinions with regard to oxidative stress. A. OK. Q. You agree that oxidative stress is not unique to cancer induction, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Not unique to cancer induction. I'm not sure what you mean.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence is insufficient to classify the mutagen because of the reasons I gave earlier. There aren't that many tests, and they are very specific to very genes very few genes, not the entire human genome. Q. And you do agree though that both glyphosate and glyphosate formulations have consistently tested negative in the Ames mutagenistic test, correct? A. They have consistently with the exception, I believe, of four studies but there were a lot of studies consistently tested negative for the reverse mutation assay of a specific gene in salmonella typhimurium. So yes, the Ames test. Q. And as you note in your expert	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think I said that here but I'm not certain so I can't own up to that for this compound. Q. But whether or not you said it in your expert report, you agree that that applies to glyphosate, correct? A. Yes, when compared to something like the animal cancer studies where you have pretty much standardized designs on everything. Q. Let me ask you about your opinions with regard to oxidative stress. A. OK. Q. You agree that oxidative stress is not unique to cancer induction, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Not unique to cancer induction. I'm not sure what you mean. MR. LASKER: Let's mark the Smith
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence is insufficient to classify the mutagen because of the reasons I gave earlier. There aren't that many tests, and they are very specific to very genes very few genes, not the entire human genome. Q. And you do agree though that both glyphosate and glyphosate formulations have consistently tested negative in the Ames mutagenistic test, correct? A. They have consistently with the exception, I believe, of four studies but there were a lot of studies consistently tested negative for the reverse mutation assay of a specific gene in salmonella typhimurium. So yes, the Ames test. Q. And as you note in your expert report, there is a wide diversity of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think I said that here but I'm not certain so I can't own up to that for this compound. Q. But whether or not you said it in your expert report, you agree that that applies to glyphosate, correct? A. Yes, when compared to something like the animal cancer studies where you have pretty much standardized designs on everything. Q. Let me ask you about your opinions with regard to oxidative stress. A. OK. Q. You agree that oxidative stress is not unique to cancer induction, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Not unique to cancer induction. I'm not sure what you mean. MR. LASKER: Let's mark the Smith publication.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	classify glyphosate as a mutagen, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The there is the evidence is insufficient to classify the mutagen because of the reasons I gave earlier. There aren't that many tests, and they are very specific to very genes very few genes, not the entire human genome. Q. And you do agree though that both glyphosate and glyphosate formulations have consistently tested negative in the Ames mutagenistic test, correct? A. They have consistently with the exception, I believe, of four studies but there were a lot of studies consistently tested negative for the reverse mutation assay of a specific gene in salmonella typhimurium. So yes, the Ames test. Q. And as you note in your expert report, there is a wide diversity of different types of genotoxicity tests,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	different links of time for the exposure, et cetera. So that is a usual case. I think I said that here but I'm not certain so I can't own up to that for this compound. Q. But whether or not you said it in your expert report, you agree that that applies to glyphosate, correct? A. Yes, when compared to something like the animal cancer studies where you have pretty much standardized designs on everything. Q. Let me ask you about your opinions with regard to oxidative stress. A. OK. Q. You agree that oxidative stress is not unique to cancer induction, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Not unique to cancer induction. I'm not sure what you mean. MR. LASKER: Let's mark the Smith publication. (Exhibit 15-39, article entitled,

Page 350 Page 352 1 Mechanisms of Carcinogenesis," marked noncarcinogens and look to see whether they 2 2 for identification, as of this date.) are reported to cause oxidative stress? 3 3 A. Noncarcinogens. A. Yes. 4 4 Q. And that paper -- this is a paper O. Noncarcinogens. you were coauthor on, correct? 5 A. This was known human carcinogens. 5 6 6 A. Correct. The entire analysis was known human 7 7 Q. And page 715, talking about carcinogens. 8 characteristic five induces oxidative 8 And I'm not certain because it is 9 9 stress, correct? a separate analysis from the one I was 10 10 thinking of. I can't be certain it's only A. Characteristic five induces 11 11 the known human carcinogens. oxidative stress, that is correct. 12 12 Q. And you and your coauthor state, O. Are you aware of the fact that about halfway through that first paragraph, 13 there are medicines that are used to treat 13 14 "Oxidative stress is not unique to cancer 14 cancer that cause oxidative stress? 15 A. Yes. I am. 15 induction," correct? A. "And is associated with a number 16 16 Q. And oxidative stress has also of chronic diseases and pathological 17 been recognized as potentially acting to 17 18 18 conditions " block carcinogenicity by inducing a -- I Yes. That is correct. 19 19 say this apoptosis or cell death, correct? 2.0 Q. And so -- and you agree with 20 MS. GREENWALD: Objection to 21 21 that, correct? 22 22 A. At high enough levels, oxidative That is correct. Α. O. And the fact that a substance 23 23 stress in some cells will kill them through 24 causes oxidative stressor is bound to cause 24 an apoptotic or necrotic mechanism, but 25 oxidative stress in human cells in vitro, 25 different cells get different exposures so Page 351 Page 353 or mammals in vitro, does not establish 1 it depends on the level of exposure as to 2 2 that that substance can cause cancer, whether they get to that point. 3 correct? Q. Oxidative stress is happening in 4 4 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. our body all the time, correct? A. For any of the key 5 A. It's part of the energy system 6 characteristics, seeing a key 6 that drives our ability to move. 7 7 Q. So exercise causes oxidative characteristic does not establish that 8 that -- by itself does not establish that 8 stress, correct? 9 9 that compound can cause cancer. A. Of course. 10 10 Q. So that would apply to oxidative Q. And having a cold would cause 11 stress and to genotoxicity, correct? 11 oxidative stress, correct? 12 A. That is correct. 12 A. That's correct. 13 13 Q. Can you cite to any scientific Q. Oxidative stress is happening all 14 14 publication or analysis that looks at the the time in every cell in the human body percentage of substances that have been 15 15 just through normal cell operations, 16 16 shown to cause oxidative stress to see what correct? 17 17 percentage of them have been shown to cause A. What you're measuring in these 18 18 cancer? studies is increased oxidative stress. 19 19 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. It's not yes, no. It's increased oxidative 20 2.0 A. Yes. We looked at it in the stress. 21 Q. Well, just to be clear, exercise 2.1 paper that we just did on monograph 100, 22 causes an increase in oxidative stress, 2.2 but I have no idea if it is published yet 23 23 correct? or not. 24 A. Very marginally. 24 Q. In that same paper did you look 25 at scientific data that sets forth And being sick can cause an 25

	Page 354		Page 356
1	increase in oxidative stress, correct?	1	studies that you cite to have compared the
2	A. Very marginal for a very short	2	doses they use with the dose levels that
3	period of time.	3	would occur in human cells from the use of
4	Q. And sunlight can cause an	4	glyphosate-based herbicides?
5	increase in oxidative stress, correct?	5	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.
6	A. That I'm not so certain of but it	6	A. As I said, some of them I believe
7	wouldn't surprise me.	7	might have done that.
8	*	8	The these are in vitro studies
9	Q. What other non-exposure type activities have caused an increase in	9	
10		10	we are talking about, right?
11	oxidative stress?	11	Q. These are the studies you relied
12	A. II don't quite recall. I'd	12	upon.
13	have to consult a couple of good textbooks	13	A. But you're asking me questions
	or articles.	14	about in vitro studies or are you asking me
14	Q. And the body has repair		questions about in vivo studies?
15	mechanisms that are constantly responding	15	Because it actually makes a
16	to cellular damage caused by oxidative	16	difference. They are both they are both
17	stress, correct?	17	in there.
18	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	18	Q. In your expert report let me
19	A. Not correct. They are responding	19	ask you this: Whether in vitro or in vivo,
20	to cellular damage regardless of the	20	is it your recollection any of those
21	source.	21	studies conducted an analysis to determine
22	Q. OK. But they would in	22	whether the dose that they use is at a
23	responding to cellular damage, they would	23	level that is possible for the human cell
24	respond to cellular damage caused by	24	to have as a result of the use of a
25	oxidative stress, correct?	25	glyphosate-based herbicide?
	Page 355		Page 357
1	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	1	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.
2	A. If that damage was aimed at DNA,	2	A. I already answered that. I said
3	that is correct.	3	I thought some of them might have done that
4	Q. And you cite a number of studies	4	and talked about how large it was compared
5	in your expert report that you cite as	5	to humans.
6	support for your opinion that glyphosate	6	But I can't be absolutely
7	can cause oxidative stress, correct?	7	certain.
8	A. I'm sorry.	8	Q. In your assessment of
9	Q. You cite to a number of studies	9	genotoxicity, you state in your expert
10	in your expert report that you believe	10	report that you give the heaviest weight to
11	support your opinion that glyphosate can	11	the in vivo studies in humans, correct?
12	cause oxidative stress, correct?	12	So there's three studies you talk
13	A. That's correct.	13	about, two by Paz-y-Mino and one by
14	Q. Have you conducted any analysis	14	Bolognesi, correct?
15	to determine whether the concentrations of	15	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.
16	glyphosate in those studies could ever	16	A. The evaluation has different
17	occur in human cells from the use of a	17	language than that. Because in the context
18		18	0 0
19	glyphosate-based herbicide?	19	of just talking about the human studies,
20	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	20	the Bolognesi is the strongest, I think is
21	A. Me personally? No.	21	what I said, but I don't know if I said I
22	Some of the studies did that.	22	give the most weight.
23	But not me personally.	23	I am sorry, you would have to
24	Q. And is it your opinion that you	24	point it out in here.
25	rely upon studies strike that. Do you believe that some of the	25	Q. In your revised report on page 54, you state that seeing genotoxicity
1	Do you delieve that some of the		page 54, you state that seeing genotoxicity

	Page 358		Page 360
1	in humans is more important than seeing	1	Q. The Bolognesi study on page 995,
2	genotoxicity in other mammals, which is	2	the first column, about half the way down
3	more important than seeing genotoxicity in	3	that first paragraph, there is a sentence
4	non-mammalian systems, correct?	4	that starts "Evidence indicates that the
5	A. All else being equal, that is	5	genotoxic risk."
6	correct.	6	Do you see that?
7	Q. As you said, the study in humans	7	A. Um-hm.
8	that you believed to be the strongest study	8	Q. The Bolognesi investigators
9	is the Bolognesi study, correct?	9	conclude from their study that evidence
10	A. Correct, but that does not make	10	indicates that the genotoxic risk
11	it the major weight of my determination.	11	potentially associated with exposure to
12	Q. I understand.	12	glyphosate in the area where the herbicide
13	A. OK.	13	is applied for eradication of cocoa and
14	Q. And let's take a look at the	14	poppy is of low biological relevance.
15	Bolognesi study.	15	Do you see that?
16	MR. LASKER: We will mark that	16	A. I see it.
17	as	17	Q. Do you agree with the Bolognesi
18	(Exhibit 15-40, article entitled,	18	investigators' assessment, this assessment
19	"Biomonitoring of genotoxic risk in	19	of their study findings?
20	agricultural workers from five	20	A. I don't know how they could
21	Colombian regions," marked for	21	possibly come to that conclusion. So I
22	identification, as of this date.)	22	don't disagree or agree. I can't imagine
23	Q. And just for the record, this is	23	where they got that from this data.
24	the study you were talking about we were	24	Q. The Bolognesi investigators found
25	just talking about just previously,	25	that there was no association between
	Page 359		Page 361
1		1	
1 2	correct?	1 2	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and
	correct? A. Yes, I believe it was.		
2	correct? A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at	2	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct.
2	correct? A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second	2 3	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994.
2 3 4	correct? A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second column, state that, overall, these data	2 3 4	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994. A. They they ask specific
2 3 4 5	correct? A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second column, state that, overall, these data suggest that genotoxic damage associated	2 3 4 5	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994. A. They they ask specific questions about where you were when the
2 3 4 5 6	correct? A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second column, state that, overall, these data suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by	2 3 4 5	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994. A. They they ask specific
2 3 4 5 6 7	correct? A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second column, state that, overall, these data suggest that genotoxic damage associated	2 3 4 5 6 7	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994. A. They they ask specific questions about where you were when the spraying occurred. And so that's not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	correct? A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second column, state that, overall, these data suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the NM test is small and appears to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994. A. They they ask specific questions about where you were when the spraying occurred. And so that's not self-chosen exposure. That's self-chosen
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second column, state that, overall, these data suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the NM test is small and appears to be transient, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994. A. They they ask specific questions about where you were when the spraying occurred. And so that's not self-chosen exposure. That's self-chosen where were you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second column, state that, overall, these data suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the NM test is small and appears to be transient, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994. A. They they ask specific questions about where you were when the spraying occurred. And so that's not self-chosen exposure. That's self-chosen where were you. Q. Well, let's look actually at page
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second column, state that, overall, these data suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the NM test is small and appears to be transient, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. That wasn't read right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994. A. They they ask specific questions about where you were when the spraying occurred. And so that's not self-chosen exposure. That's self-chosen where were you. Q. Well, let's look actually at page 994 again. The second column on the right,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second column, state that, overall, these data suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the NM test is small and appears to be transient, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. That wasn't read right. A. Overall, these results suggest	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994. A. They they ask specific questions about where you were when the spraying occurred. And so that's not self-chosen exposure. That's self-chosen where were you. Q. Well, let's look actually at page 994 again. The second column on the right, the second paragraph from the bottom, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second column, state that, overall, these data suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the NM test is small and appears to be transient, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. That wasn't read right. A. Overall, these results suggest that genotoxic I am sorry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994. A. They they ask specific questions about where you were when the spraying occurred. And so that's not self-chosen exposure. That's self-chosen where were you. Q. Well, let's look actually at page 994 again. The second column on the right, the second paragraph from the bottom, the sentence starts, "There was no significant
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second column, state that, overall, these data suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the NM test is small and appears to be transient, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. That wasn't read right. A. Overall, these results suggest that genotoxic I am sorry. "Overall, these results suggest	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994. A. They they ask specific questions about where you were when the spraying occurred. And so that's not self-chosen exposure. That's self-chosen where were you. Q. Well, let's look actually at page 994 again. The second column on the right, the second paragraph from the bottom, the sentence starts, "There was no significant association between self-reported direct
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second column, state that, overall, these data suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the NM test is small and appears to be transient, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. That wasn't read right. A. Overall, these results suggest that genotoxic I am sorry. "Overall, these results suggest that genotoxic damage associated with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994. A. They they ask specific questions about where you were when the spraying occurred. And so that's not self-chosen exposure. That's self-chosen where were you. Q. Well, let's look actually at page 994 again. The second column on the right, the second paragraph from the bottom, the sentence starts, "There was no significant association between self-reported direct contact with eradication sprays"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second column, state that, overall, these data suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the NM test is small and appears to be transient, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. That wasn't read right. A. Overall, these results suggest that genotoxic I am sorry. "Overall, these results suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994. A. They they ask specific questions about where you were when the spraying occurred. And so that's not self-chosen exposure. That's self-chosen where were you. Q. Well, let's look actually at page 994 again. The second column on the right, the second paragraph from the bottom, the sentence starts, "There was no significant association between self-reported direct contact with eradication sprays" A. Which page are we on?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second column, state that, overall, these data suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the NM test is small and appears to be transient, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. That wasn't read right. A. Overall, these results suggest that genotoxic I am sorry. "Overall, these results suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the micronucleus test is small and appears to be transient" is what it says.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994. A. They they ask specific questions about where you were when the spraying occurred. And so that's not self-chosen exposure. That's self-chosen where were you. Q. Well, let's look actually at page 994 again. The second column on the right, the second paragraph from the bottom, the sentence starts, "There was no significant association between self-reported direct contact with eradication sprays" A. Which page are we on? Q. I'm sorry. Page 994.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second column, state that, overall, these data suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the NM test is small and appears to be transient, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. That wasn't read right. A. Overall, these results suggest that genotoxic I am sorry. "Overall, these results suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the micronucleus test is small and appears to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994. A. They they ask specific questions about where you were when the spraying occurred. And so that's not self-chosen exposure. That's self-chosen where were you. Q. Well, let's look actually at page 994 again. The second column on the right, the second paragraph from the bottom, the sentence starts, "There was no significant association between self-reported direct contact with eradication sprays" A. Which page are we on? Q. I'm sorry. Page 994. A. Right hand
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second column, state that, overall, these data suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the NM test is small and appears to be transient, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. That wasn't read right. A. Overall, these results suggest that genotoxic I am sorry. "Overall, these results suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the micronucleus test is small and appears to be transient" is what it says. Q. Do you agree with the Bolognesi	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994. A. They they ask specific questions about where you were when the spraying occurred. And so that's not self-chosen exposure. That's self-chosen where were you. Q. Well, let's look actually at page 994 again. The second column on the right, the second paragraph from the bottom, the sentence starts, "There was no significant association between self-reported direct contact with eradication sprays" A. Which page are we on? Q. I'm sorry. Page 994. A. Right hand Q. Second column, second paragraph
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second column, state that, overall, these data suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the NM test is small and appears to be transient, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. That wasn't read right. A. Overall, these results suggest that genotoxic I am sorry. "Overall, these results suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the micronucleus test is small and appears to be transient" is what it says. Q. Do you agree with the Bolognesi investigators' assessment of their study	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994. A. They they ask specific questions about where you were when the spraying occurred. And so that's not self-chosen exposure. That's self-chosen where were you. Q. Well, let's look actually at page 994 again. The second column on the right, the second paragraph from the bottom, the sentence starts, "There was no significant association between self-reported direct contact with eradication sprays" A. Which page are we on? Q. I'm sorry. Page 994. A. Right hand Q. Second column, second paragraph from the bottom, it starts, "There was"?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second column, state that, overall, these data suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the NM test is small and appears to be transient, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. That wasn't read right. A. Overall, these results suggest that genotoxic I am sorry. "Overall, these results suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the micronucleus test is small and appears to be transient" is what it says. Q. Do you agree with the Bolognesi investigators' assessment of their study and findings? A. I have to look to see the context	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994. A. They they ask specific questions about where you were when the spraying occurred. And so that's not self-chosen exposure. That's self-chosen where were you. Q. Well, let's look actually at page 994 again. The second column on the right, the second paragraph from the bottom, the sentence starts, "There was no significant association between self-reported direct contact with eradication sprays" A. Which page are we on? Q. I'm sorry. Page 994. A. Right hand Q. Second column, second paragraph from the bottom, it starts, "There was"? A. Yes, now I see it. Sorry. I was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second column, state that, overall, these data suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the NM test is small and appears to be transient, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. That wasn't read right. A. Overall, these results suggest that genotoxic I am sorry. "Overall, these results suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the micronucleus test is small and appears to be transient" is what it says. Q. Do you agree with the Bolognesi investigators' assessment of their study and findings?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994. A. They they ask specific questions about where you were when the spraying occurred. And so that's not self-chosen exposure. That's self-chosen where were you. Q. Well, let's look actually at page 994 again. The second column on the right, the second paragraph from the bottom, the sentence starts, "There was no significant association between self-reported direct contact with eradication sprays" A. Which page are we on? Q. I'm sorry. Page 994. A. Right hand Q. Second column, second paragraph from the bottom, it starts, "There was"? A. Yes, now I see it. Sorry. I was second from the top.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Yes, I believe it was. Q. The investigators in Bolognesi at page 994, at the bottom of the second column, state that, overall, these data suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the NM test is small and appears to be transient, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. That wasn't read right. A. Overall, these results suggest that genotoxic I am sorry. "Overall, these results suggest that genotoxic damage associated with glyphosate spraying as evidenced by the micronucleus test is small and appears to be transient" is what it says. Q. Do you agree with the Bolognesi investigators' assessment of their study and findings? A. I have to look to see the context in which they're making the statement.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	self-reported exposure to glyphosate and in-transit genotoxic impacts, correct? A. Not correct. Q. Let's look at page 994. A. They they ask specific questions about where you were when the spraying occurred. And so that's not self-chosen exposure. That's self-chosen where were you. Q. Well, let's look actually at page 994 again. The second column on the right, the second paragraph from the bottom, the sentence starts, "There was no significant association between self-reported direct contact with eradication sprays" A. Which page are we on? Q. I'm sorry. Page 994. A. Right hand Q. Second column, second paragraph from the bottom, it starts, "There was"? A. Yes, now I see it. Sorry. I was second from the top. Q. The Bolognesi investigators

Page 362 Page 364 1 1 contact with eradication sprays and A. That would not be correct. 2 2 frequency of BNMN, correct? O. In the Narino Province, where 3 3 A. That's what they write, but there was the highest spraying of 4 self-reported is an incorrect description 4 glyphosate, the findings four months after 5 5 the spraying was unchanged from before the of what that was. Q. There was a -- on the preceding 6 6 spraying, correct? 7 page, 993, there is a table that -- table 4 A. In the Narino Province, that is 8 8 presents their analysis for self-reported correct. 9 9 exposure to the glyphosate sprays. Q. If a genotoxic effect does not 10 Do you see that? 10 persist or is not present four months after 11 A. That's what it says in the title, 11 exposure, it's fair to say that cannot be a 12 12 but what it is is a report of where you cause of cancer, correct? 13 sort of -- whether you had it in the air, 13 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 14 14 on your skin, or you entered the spraying A. Not correct. 15 15 field. Q. So is it your testimony that if 16 there is a genotoxic impact that does not 16 That's not asking someone did you 17 think you were exposed to this, which would 17 result in genotoxic damage four months 18 18 be a self-reported exposure. So not after exposure, they can still lead to that 19 19 exactly that. can cause cancer? 2.0 Q. In your understanding, 20 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 21 Bolognesi -- the Bolognesi study did not 21 MR. LASKER: I agree with that. conduct an analysis that asked individuals 22 2.2 Actually, I'm going to state that 23 if they were exposed to the glyphosate 23 24 spray? 24 Q. If a chemical exposure does not 25 A. It's not here. That's clear to 25 cause a genotoxic effect that persists for Page 363 Page 365 1 1 four months, can that effect be a cause of me. 2 2 And my understanding of this cancer? 3 study is these are the three things they A. Yes. 4 used, but had they asked the question, do 4 And there is a chemical that's a 5 you think you were exposed? People who ate classic example of that in humans, but I 6 things from the field might have answered 6 don't know it off the top of my tongue. 7 7 It's banned. It was a drug. yes. 8 MR. LASKER: I am maybe done. I So it's hard from this to jump to 9 9 may have a chance to have him answer self-exposure arguments. But they -- they 10 10 do point out that it does not seem to be that one question and a few more 11 11 things, but let's take a break and talk correlated with these things. 12 12 Q. And with respect to the analysis to this guy. 13 13 of where they were located -- where the THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 14 14 individuals in this study were located, the 5:29 p.m. We are off the record. 15 15 Bolognesi investigators looked at impacts (Recess.) 16 16 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is five days later after the alleged 17 17 spraying -- glyphosate spraying, and then 5:33 p.m. We are on the record. 18 18 again four months later, correct? MR. LASKER: I am going to mark 19 as 15-41 the notice of deposition for 19 A. That is correct. In certain 20 Dr. Portier's deposition in this case. 2.0 cities, not in all of them. 21 21 (Exhibit 15-41, notice of Q. And the findings with respect to 22 deposition, marked for identification, 22 genotoxic impacts do not continue or are 23 23 as of this date.) not present four months after the exposure, 24 24 BY MR. LASKER: correct? 25 25 Q. And, Dr. Portier, there is MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.

Page 366 Page 368 1 1 attached to this notice a list of document Q. Do you have those spreadsheets in 2 2 your computer? requests, request for production of 3 3 A. Yes, I do. documents, and you have produced some 4 documents here today. 4 Q. And do you have the calculations MR. LASKER: I'm going to mark 5 that you conducted on the data in your 5 6 that. That's what this is, 15-42, as 6 computer? 7 7 A. Probably some of them. The the documents that we received from 8 8 your counsel, Robin Greenwald, in programs I use spit out an answer, I'd 9 9 write it down, but they weren't always response to the notice of deposition. 10 (Exhibit 15-42, letter dated 10 kept. 11 August 29, 2017, with attachment, 11 Q. So you have some data and some 12 marked for identification, as of this 12 you have and others you don't have and you 13 13 don't know sitting here today? date.) 14 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 14 MS. GREENWALD: You didn't give 15 A. I have all of the data. I can't 15 me a copy of that, did you? 16 guarantee I have all the results of the 16 No, I don't want them. That 17 17 would kill too many trees. No, no, no. runs on the computer. 18 18 Q. First question, and you can take O. OK. 19 19 a moment to leaf through them if you need And which programs did you use in 20 to, but am I correct in my understanding 20 conducting your analysis? 21 21 A. MATLAB. what we marked as Exhibit 15-42 are the 22 Q. That was for all of your 2.2 documents that you have that you believe 23 23 were responsive to the document requests analyses? 24 which have been marked as 15-41? 24 A. No. I used a program by the 2.5 25 German Cancer Research Center on animal A. If these are documents, they Page 367 Page 369 1 1 are -- that were passed on to you, then bioassays, the exact test, to check it 2 they are responsive. 2 against the MATLAB program for the exact 3 Q. And am I correct in my test. I wanted to make sure they were both understanding that, at least as far as you 4 4 working right. And did I use any other programs? believe, you do not have any other 5 5 6 documents that are responsive to our 6 I -- I might have programmed one 7 7 document requests? or two things in the spreadsheet itself. 8 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 9 A. As -- I don't know what's in 10 here, what they gave you. So I can't 11 answer that question. 12 Q. We have not received any 13 electronic data reflecting any of your work 14 product in preparing your various analyses 14 Q. Is that a residence that you 15 of glyphosate. 15 maintain in the United States? 16 16 I take it you do have that data A. Yes, it is. 17 17 somewhere, correct? Q. Dr. Portier, you had wanted to 18 MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. 18 make a comment about the 1995 Charles River 19 19 A. By -- I'm not sure what you report. 20 2.0 mean --A. That's correct. 21 2.1 Q. You have files on your O. Just for the record, what is the 22 22 computer -exhibit number? Because I don't remember 23 23 A. The data that I used is in this 24 24 expert report and the data was in A. 15-34. 25 spreadsheets. 25 So I have some concerns with this

Page 372 Page 370 1 one being the correct historical controls. tumors seen in these studies listed in his 2 First, I don't know what a CRL CD-1 13R 2 report. 3 3 mouse is and I can't find it. So I'd have And what I mean by seen in these 4 4 to find out if that strain is relevant. studies is they had a positive Armitage 5 5 linear trend testing proportions, which is The 13R could indicate some sort 6 6 of genetic transformation or something, I the standard for how people analyze these 7 7 just don't know what it is. data. 8 The other problem in looking at 8 Q. OK. Thank you. these, I realize these are fairly small 9 9 In biomedical research, is it 10 10 numbers of studies groups, and when you go generally accepted to perform sensitivity 11 back to the beginning, it turns out this is 11 analyses? 12 12 a companion paper to go with a different A. Oh, definitely. It's a -- it's a 13 paper that provides the historical control 13 common tool. The tool is used to judge how 14 14 sensitive your finding is to slight database. 15 15 So I wouldn't use just this, I'd modifications. 16 need the companion paper that goes with it. 16 We saw a good example of that 17 MR. LASKER: I pass the witness 17 with the meta analysis -- meta analyses 18 and reserve the remaining time. 18 that were done for this where certain 19 19 MS. GREENWALD: We are going to studies were added in, certain studies were 2.0 go to your room. And just we need one 20 taken out, and you look at the overall 21 21 effect on that and then it gives you a minute. 22 22 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record better chance for making the correct 23 23 judgment about whether you believe the at 5:38 p.m. We are off the record. 24 2.4 (Recess.) finding you're looking at is positive or 25 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 25 negative. Page 371 Page 373 1 1 5:53 p.m. We are on the record. Sometimes it can make you more 2 **EXAMINATION BY** 2 confused but sometimes it can clarify 3 3 MS. GREENWALD: things for you. 4 4 Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Portier. It In addition, any time you have 5 5 got something that you feel not only is now my turn to ask you a couple of 6 6 questions and we will call it a day. doesn't -- not that it drives the result, 7 7 I want to ask you one question -but that maybe shouldn't be included in the 8 just a couple of questions, the first one 8 evaluation, then you would do a sensitivity 9 9 being: IARC does not use expert summary analysis to exclude and -- you do both to 10 look and see how important that concept is, 10 articles, is that correct? 11 11 A. That is correct. and then if you find it's very important, 12 12 Q. Can you tell us why? you have to decide which way was the most 13 13 important way to go. A. Yes. Expert summary reports 14 sometimes cannot cover the topic 14 So that's a normal technique in 15 completely. It is always much better to go 15 biomedical research. 16 16 to the source material and work with the MS. GREENWALD: Can I have an 17 17 source material or the source report. exhibit. I think we are on. 18 18 A good example of that is the (Exhibit 15-43, screen shot from 19 19 Greim study. If all we had used was to LobbyFacts.eu, marked for 20 20 read the Greim study to talk about the identification, as of this date.) 21 carcinogenicity of the 12 studies that were 21 Q. I'm going to show you, included in the appendix of the Greim 22 22 Dr. Portier, what I am marking as 23 23 report, we would have missed a lot of Exhibit 15-43. 24 24 tumors because Greim only had roughly half This is a two-page document that 25 25 or even maybe less than half of the total we took off the internet today called

	Page 374		Page 376
1	"LobbyFacts.eu."	1	the EDF website, marked for
2	And if you recall earlier today,	2	identification, as of this date.)
3	Mr. Lasker asked you questions about C.	3	Q. And this is a from a blog that
4	Portier Consultation being a registered	4	was taken off of actually, Reuters. Oh,
5		5	yeah, I'm so sorry, my eyesight is so bad,
6	lobbyist in the European Union.	6	
7	Do you remember those questions?	7	forgive me. It says, "Off the EDF
8	A. Yes, I do.	8	website." It is a three-page printout from
	Q. And I believe you testified	9	the EDF website, and it is titled, "Growing
9	and I'm going to ask you to explain it	10	returns, a coalition of uncommon bedfellows
10	again why you ever why you ever		is bringing sustainable agriculture to
11	registered in the first place with the EU?	11	scale."
12	A. Because the staffer for the	12	Do you see that?
13	commissioner of health at first thought in	13	A. Yes, I do.
14	order for us to talk to the commissioner of	14	Q. What is this article about?
15	health, we had to register as lobbyists,	15	A. I'll have to take a look at it
16	but then after I think two days it	16	real quick here. Sorry.
17	wasn't very long, a couple of days came	17	Q. Is this a description let me
18	back and said, no, I got that wrong, you're	18	ask a different question: Is this a
19	not representing anybody, you're	19	description of work that Monsanto is
20	representing your academic background and	20	currently doing with the Environmental
21	standards, and as such, it would be	21	Defense Fund?
22	inappropriate for you to do this. So you	22	A. Yes, it appears to be. It says,
23	don't have to do it.	23	"Founding members of the MRCC include
24	Q. And what does 15-43 show?	24	cargo, environmental potential, and General
25	A. Under the little red triangle in	25	Mills, Kellogg Company, Monsanto, PepsiCo,
	D 275		
	Page 375		Page 377
1	the top half of the page, it says,	1	Page 377 and others.
1 2	the top half of the page, it says,	1 2	and others.
	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the		and others. Q. And it actually talks about
2	the top half of the page, it says,	2	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the
2	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015.	2 3	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on
2 3 4	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21	2 3 4	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the
2 3 4 5	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015. Q. And what do you understand that to mean?	2 3 4 5	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on page 2? A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015. Q. And what do you understand that to mean? A. They have taken the registration	2 3 4 5 6	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on page 2? A. Yes. Q. And the date of this article is
2 3 4 5 6 7	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015. Q. And what do you understand that to mean?	2 3 4 5 6 7	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on page 2? A. Yes. Q. And the date of this article is August 31, 2016, is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015. Q. And what do you understand that to mean? A. They have taken the registration off the register, which they told me they would do.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on page 2? A. Yes. Q. And the date of this article is August 31, 2016, is that correct? A. Yes, it is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015. Q. And what do you understand that to mean? A. They have taken the registration off the register, which they told me they would do. Q. That was as of the 21st of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on page 2? A. Yes. Q. And the date of this article is August 31, 2016, is that correct? A. Yes, it is. Q. And I'm going to show you one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015. Q. And what do you understand that to mean? A. They have taken the registration off the register, which they told me they would do. Q. That was as of the 21st of December 2015, right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on page 2? A. Yes. Q. And the date of this article is August 31, 2016, is that correct? A. Yes, it is. Q. And I'm going to show you one more document.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015. Q. And what do you understand that to mean? A. They have taken the registration off the register, which they told me they would do. Q. That was as of the 21st of December 2015, right? A. That's what it looks like, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on page 2? A. Yes. Q. And the date of this article is August 31, 2016, is that correct? A. Yes, it is. Q. And I'm going to show you one more document. MS. GREENWALD: I'm marking it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015. Q. And what do you understand that to mean? A. They have taken the registration off the register, which they told me they would do. Q. That was as of the 21st of December 2015, right? A. That's what it looks like, yes. Q. Now, Mr. Lasker also asked you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on page 2? A. Yes. Q. And the date of this article is August 31, 2016, is that correct? A. Yes, it is. Q. And I'm going to show you one more document. MS. GREENWALD: I'm marking it 15-45.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015. Q. And what do you understand that to mean? A. They have taken the registration off the register, which they told me they would do. Q. That was as of the 21st of December 2015, right? A. That's what it looks like, yes. Q. Now, Mr. Lasker also asked you questions earlier about your consultation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on page 2? A. Yes. Q. And the date of this article is August 31, 2016, is that correct? A. Yes, it is. Q. And I'm going to show you one more document. MS. GREENWALD: I'm marking it 15-45. (Exhibit 15-45, document
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015. Q. And what do you understand that to mean? A. They have taken the registration off the register, which they told me they would do. Q. That was as of the 21st of December 2015, right? A. That's what it looks like, yes. Q. Now, Mr. Lasker also asked you questions earlier about your consultation with the Environmental Defense Fund,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on page 2? A. Yes. Q. And the date of this article is August 31, 2016, is that correct? A. Yes, it is. Q. And I'm going to show you one more document. MS. GREENWALD: I'm marking it 15-45. (Exhibit 15-45, document entitled, "Monsanto joins Environmental"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015. Q. And what do you understand that to mean? A. They have taken the registration off the register, which they told me they would do. Q. That was as of the 21st of December 2015, right? A. That's what it looks like, yes. Q. Now, Mr. Lasker also asked you questions earlier about your consultation with the Environmental Defense Fund, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on page 2? A. Yes. Q. And the date of this article is August 31, 2016, is that correct? A. Yes, it is. Q. And I'm going to show you one more document. MS. GREENWALD: I'm marking it 15-45. (Exhibit 15-45, document entitled, "Monsanto joins Environmental Defense Fund, others, in Sustainable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015. Q. And what do you understand that to mean? A. They have taken the registration off the register, which they told me they would do. Q. That was as of the 21st of December 2015, right? A. That's what it looks like, yes. Q. Now, Mr. Lasker also asked you questions earlier about your consultation with the Environmental Defense Fund, correct? A. That's correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on page 2? A. Yes. Q. And the date of this article is August 31, 2016, is that correct? A. Yes, it is. Q. And I'm going to show you one more document. MS. GREENWALD: I'm marking it 15-45. (Exhibit 15-45, document entitled, "Monsanto joins Environmental Defense Fund, others, in Sustainable Agriculture Coalition," marked for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015. Q. And what do you understand that to mean? A. They have taken the registration off the register, which they told me they would do. Q. That was as of the 21st of December 2015, right? A. That's what it looks like, yes. Q. Now, Mr. Lasker also asked you questions earlier about your consultation with the Environmental Defense Fund, correct? A. That's correct. Q. In fact, that was quite a bit of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on page 2? A. Yes. Q. And the date of this article is August 31, 2016, is that correct? A. Yes, it is. Q. And I'm going to show you one more document. MS. GREENWALD: I'm marking it 15-45. (Exhibit 15-45, document entitled, "Monsanto joins Environmental Defense Fund, others, in Sustainable Agriculture Coalition," marked for identification, as of this date.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015. Q. And what do you understand that to mean? A. They have taken the registration off the register, which they told me they would do. Q. That was as of the 21st of December 2015, right? A. That's what it looks like, yes. Q. Now, Mr. Lasker also asked you questions earlier about your consultation with the Environmental Defense Fund, correct? A. That's correct. Q. In fact, that was quite a bit of the questions this morning, wasn't it?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on page 2? A. Yes. Q. And the date of this article is August 31, 2016, is that correct? A. Yes, it is. Q. And I'm going to show you one more document. MS. GREENWALD: I'm marking it 15-45. (Exhibit 15-45, document entitled, "Monsanto joins Environmental Defense Fund, others, in Sustainable Agriculture Coalition," marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. It is a one page document, and it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015. Q. And what do you understand that to mean? A. They have taken the registration off the register, which they told me they would do. Q. That was as of the 21st of December 2015, right? A. That's what it looks like, yes. Q. Now, Mr. Lasker also asked you questions earlier about your consultation with the Environmental Defense Fund, correct? A. That's correct. Q. In fact, that was quite a bit of the questions this morning, wasn't it? A. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on page 2? A. Yes. Q. And the date of this article is August 31, 2016, is that correct? A. Yes, it is. Q. And I'm going to show you one more document. MS. GREENWALD: I'm marking it 15-45. (Exhibit 15-45, document entitled, "Monsanto joins Environmental Defense Fund, others, in Sustainable Agriculture Coalition," marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. It is a one page document, and it is taken from the Genetic Literacy Project.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015. Q. And what do you understand that to mean? A. They have taken the registration off the register, which they told me they would do. Q. That was as of the 21st of December 2015, right? A. That's what it looks like, yes. Q. Now, Mr. Lasker also asked you questions earlier about your consultation with the Environmental Defense Fund, correct? A. That's correct. Q. In fact, that was quite a bit of the questions this morning, wasn't it? A. The Q. Early in the morning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on page 2? A. Yes. Q. And the date of this article is August 31, 2016, is that correct? A. Yes, it is. Q. And I'm going to show you one more document. MS. GREENWALD: I'm marking it 15-45. (Exhibit 15-45, document entitled, "Monsanto joins Environmental Defense Fund, others, in Sustainable Agriculture Coalition," marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. It is a one page document, and it is taken from the Genetic Literacy Project. And it is entitled, "Monsanto joins
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015. Q. And what do you understand that to mean? A. They have taken the registration off the register, which they told me they would do. Q. That was as of the 21st of December 2015, right? A. That's what it looks like, yes. Q. Now, Mr. Lasker also asked you questions earlier about your consultation with the Environmental Defense Fund, correct? A. That's correct. Q. In fact, that was quite a bit of the questions this morning, wasn't it? A. The Q. Early in the morning. A. A lot of them, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on page 2? A. Yes. Q. And the date of this article is August 31, 2016, is that correct? A. Yes, it is. Q. And I'm going to show you one more document. MS. GREENWALD: I'm marking it 15-45. (Exhibit 15-45, document entitled, "Monsanto joins Environmental Defense Fund, others, in Sustainable Agriculture Coalition," marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. It is a one page document, and it is taken from the Genetic Literacy Project. And it is entitled, "Monsanto joins Environmental Defense Fund, others, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015. Q. And what do you understand that to mean? A. They have taken the registration off the register, which they told me they would do. Q. That was as of the 21st of December 2015, right? A. That's what it looks like, yes. Q. Now, Mr. Lasker also asked you questions earlier about your consultation with the Environmental Defense Fund, correct? A. That's correct. Q. In fact, that was quite a bit of the questions this morning, wasn't it? A. The Q. Early in the morning. A. A lot of them, yes. MS. GREENWALD: I'm going to mark	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on page 2? A. Yes. Q. And the date of this article is August 31, 2016, is that correct? A. Yes, it is. Q. And I'm going to show you one more document. MS. GREENWALD: I'm marking it 15-45. (Exhibit 15-45, document entitled, "Monsanto joins Environmental Defense Fund, others, in Sustainable Agriculture Coalition," marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. It is a one page document, and it is taken from the Genetic Literacy Project. And it is entitled, "Monsanto joins Environmental Defense Fund, others, in sustainable agriculture coalition."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015. Q. And what do you understand that to mean? A. They have taken the registration off the register, which they told me they would do. Q. That was as of the 21st of December 2015, right? A. That's what it looks like, yes. Q. Now, Mr. Lasker also asked you questions earlier about your consultation with the Environmental Defense Fund, correct? A. That's correct. Q. In fact, that was quite a bit of the questions this morning, wasn't it? A. The Q. Early in the morning. A. A lot of them, yes. MS. GREENWALD: I'm going to mark 15-44.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on page 2? A. Yes. Q. And the date of this article is August 31, 2016, is that correct? A. Yes, it is. Q. And I'm going to show you one more document. MS. GREENWALD: I'm marking it 15-45. (Exhibit 15-45, document entitled, "Monsanto joins Environmental Defense Fund, others, in Sustainable Agriculture Coalition," marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. It is a one page document, and it is taken from the Genetic Literacy Project. And it is entitled, "Monsanto joins Environmental Defense Fund, others, in sustainable agriculture coalition." Do you see that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the top half of the page, it says, organization not currently on the register registration as it was on 21 December 2015. Q. And what do you understand that to mean? A. They have taken the registration off the register, which they told me they would do. Q. That was as of the 21st of December 2015, right? A. That's what it looks like, yes. Q. Now, Mr. Lasker also asked you questions earlier about your consultation with the Environmental Defense Fund, correct? A. That's correct. Q. In fact, that was quite a bit of the questions this morning, wasn't it? A. The Q. Early in the morning. A. A lot of them, yes. MS. GREENWALD: I'm going to mark	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and others. Q. And it actually talks about partnership between Monsanto and the Environmental Defense Fund, correct, on page 2? A. Yes. Q. And the date of this article is August 31, 2016, is that correct? A. Yes, it is. Q. And I'm going to show you one more document. MS. GREENWALD: I'm marking it 15-45. (Exhibit 15-45, document entitled, "Monsanto joins Environmental Defense Fund, others, in Sustainable Agriculture Coalition," marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. It is a one page document, and it is taken from the Genetic Literacy Project. And it is entitled, "Monsanto joins Environmental Defense Fund, others, in sustainable agriculture coalition."

			i
	Page 378		Page 380
1	Q. Dated September 1, 2016?	1	information that you were providing advice
2	A. Yes, I do yes, it does.	2	to a U.S. law firm involved in glyphosate
3	Q. What is this?	3	litigation?
4	A. It looks like a news article	4	"CJP also works part time for the
5	about the same Midwest Row Crop	5	Environmental Defense Fund on issues not
6	Collaborative that the other one was on but	6	related to pesticides."
7	this is a news item on it.	7	Do you see that?
8	Q. It is also, again, talking about	8	A. Yes, that is correct.
9	Monsanto	9	Q. Who is "CJP"?
10	A. Whatever Genetic Literacy Project	10	A. That is me, Christopher Jude
11	does.	11	Portier.
12	Q. Again, it's talking about	12	And it refers to the initials
13	Monsanto's work with the Environmental	13	used in the author's list at the beginning
14	Defense Fund, is that correct?	14	of the document, wherever that is.
15	A. Yes, it is.	15	But if you look at the authors
16	MS. GREENWALD: OK, thank you.	16	list in the beginning of the document, I'm
17	Q. Dr. Portier, can you pull out	17	listed as Christopher J. Portier and I'm
18	15-32?	18	the only CJP.
19	MR. LASKER: That's the original	19	MS. GREENWALD: Thank you,
20	expert report with attachments?	20	Dr. Portier. I don't have any other
21	MS. GREENWALD: Yes.	21	questions. I appreciate your patience
22	Q. If you can look at the	22	today.
23	appendices, the first appendices, it is	23	MR. LASKER: I have a couple of
24	entitled "Document 1." It is sort of	24	follow-ups, but just a couple.
25	towards the back?	25	
	Page 379		Page 381
1		1	
1 2	A. Yes, I see it.	1 2	EXAMINATION BY
	A. Yes, I see it.Q. It says, "Difference in the		EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER:
2	A. Yes, I see it.Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate	2	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included
2	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for	2 3	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all
2 3 4	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for research on cancer (IARC) and the European	2 3 4	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all of the tumors that were analyzed in each of
2 3 4 5	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for research on cancer (IARC) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA.)" Do you see	2 3 4 5	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all of the tumors that were analyzed in each of the animal studies or glyphosate cancer
2 3 4 5 6	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for research on cancer (IARC) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA.)" Do you see that?	2 3 4 5	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all of the tumors that were analyzed in each of the animal studies or glyphosate cancer bioassays, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for research on cancer (IARC) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA.)" Do you see that? A. Yes, I do.	2 3 4 5 6 7	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all of the tumors that were analyzed in each of the animal studies or glyphosate cancer
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for research on cancer (IARC) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA.)" Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. What is the date of this article?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all of the tumors that were analyzed in each of the animal studies or glyphosate cancer bioassays, correct? A. No, not correct. It contained summarized data.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for research on cancer (IARC) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA.)" Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. What is the date of this article? A. August 2016, Volume 7, No. 8 in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all of the tumors that were analyzed in each of the animal studies or glyphosate cancer bioassays, correct? A. No, not correct. It contained summarized data. Q. The supplemental materials
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for research on cancer (IARC) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA.)" Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. What is the date of this article?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all of the tumors that were analyzed in each of the animal studies or glyphosate cancer bioassays, correct? A. No, not correct. It contained summarized data. Q. The supplemental materials provided the data on tumor types and tumor
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for research on cancer (IARC) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA.)" Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. What is the date of this article? A. August 2016, Volume 7, No. 8 in the Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all of the tumors that were analyzed in each of the animal studies or glyphosate cancer bioassays, correct? A. No, not correct. It contained summarized data. Q. The supplemental materials provided the data on tumor types and tumor counts that you have used in your analyses
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for research on cancer (IARC) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA.)" Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. What is the date of this article? A. August 2016, Volume 7, No. 8 in the Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health. Q. If you go to page 744 of that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all of the tumors that were analyzed in each of the animal studies or glyphosate cancer bioassays, correct? A. No, not correct. It contained summarized data. Q. The supplemental materials provided the data on tumor types and tumor counts that you have used in your analyses in this case, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for research on cancer (IARC) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA.)" Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. What is the date of this article? A. August 2016, Volume 7, No. 8 in the Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health. Q. If you go to page 744 of that article, please.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all of the tumors that were analyzed in each of the animal studies or glyphosate cancer bioassays, correct? A. No, not correct. It contained summarized data. Q. The supplemental materials provided the data on tumor types and tumor counts that you have used in your analyses in this case, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for research on cancer (IARC) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA.)" Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. What is the date of this article? A. August 2016, Volume 7, No. 8 in the Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health. Q. If you go to page 744 of that article, please. And if you look at there is a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all of the tumors that were analyzed in each of the animal studies or glyphosate cancer bioassays, correct? A. No, not correct. It contained summarized data. Q. The supplemental materials provided the data on tumor types and tumor counts that you have used in your analyses in this case, correct? A. For most of the analyses, that is correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for research on cancer (IARC) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA.)" Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. What is the date of this article? A. August 2016, Volume 7, No. 8 in the Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health. Q. If you go to page 744 of that article, please. And if you look at there is a loke a lock with an open key, and it says,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all of the tumors that were analyzed in each of the animal studies or glyphosate cancer bioassays, correct? A. No, not correct. It contained summarized data. Q. The supplemental materials provided the data on tumor types and tumor counts that you have used in your analyses in this case, correct? A. For most of the analyses, that is correct. Q. And every finding that you report
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for research on cancer (IARC) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA.)" Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. What is the date of this article? A. August 2016, Volume 7, No. 8 in the Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health. Q. If you go to page 744 of that article, please. And if you look at there is a loke a lock with an open key, and it says, "Open access."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all of the tumors that were analyzed in each of the animal studies or glyphosate cancer bioassays, correct? A. No, not correct. It contained summarized data. Q. The supplemental materials provided the data on tumor types and tumor counts that you have used in your analyses in this case, correct? A. For most of the analyses, that is correct. Q. And every finding that you report as showing significance can be obtained
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for research on cancer (IARC) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA.)" Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. What is the date of this article? A. August 2016, Volume 7, No. 8 in the Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health. Q. If you go to page 744 of that article, please. And if you look at there is a loke a lock with an open key, and it says, "Open access." Do you see that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all of the tumors that were analyzed in each of the animal studies or glyphosate cancer bioassays, correct? A. No, not correct. It contained summarized data. Q. The supplemental materials provided the data on tumor types and tumor counts that you have used in your analyses in this case, correct? A. For most of the analyses, that is correct. Q. And every finding that you report as showing significance can be obtained from the supplemental data tables that were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for research on cancer (IARC) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA.)" Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. What is the date of this article? A. August 2016, Volume 7, No. 8 in the Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health. Q. If you go to page 744 of that article, please. And if you look at there is a loke a lock with an open key, and it says, "Open access." Do you see that? A. Yes, I do.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all of the tumors that were analyzed in each of the animal studies or glyphosate cancer bioassays, correct? A. No, not correct. It contained summarized data. Q. The supplemental materials provided the data on tumor types and tumor counts that you have used in your analyses in this case, correct? A. For most of the analyses, that is correct. Q. And every finding that you report as showing significance can be obtained from the supplemental data tables that were provided with the Greim publication,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for research on cancer (IARC) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA.)" Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. What is the date of this article? A. August 2016, Volume 7, No. 8 in the Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health. Q. If you go to page 744 of that article, please. And if you look at there is a loke a lock with an open key, and it says, "Open access." Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. If you go right above that, it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all of the tumors that were analyzed in each of the animal studies or glyphosate cancer bioassays, correct? A. No, not correct. It contained summarized data. Q. The supplemental materials provided the data on tumor types and tumor counts that you have used in your analyses in this case, correct? A. For most of the analyses, that is correct. Q. And every finding that you report as showing significance can be obtained from the supplemental data tables that were provided with the Greim publication, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for research on cancer (IARC) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA.)" Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. What is the date of this article? A. August 2016, Volume 7, No. 8 in the Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health. Q. If you go to page 744 of that article, please. And if you look at there is a loke a lock with an open key, and it says, "Open access." Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. If you go right above that, it says, "Competing interest."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all of the tumors that were analyzed in each of the animal studies or glyphosate cancer bioassays, correct? A. No, not correct. It contained summarized data. Q. The supplemental materials provided the data on tumor types and tumor counts that you have used in your analyses in this case, correct? A. For most of the analyses, that is correct. Q. And every finding that you report as showing significance can be obtained from the supplemental data tables that were provided with the Greim publication, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for research on cancer (IARC) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA.)" Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. What is the date of this article? A. August 2016, Volume 7, No. 8 in the Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health. Q. If you go to page 744 of that article, please. And if you look at there is a loke a lock with an open key, and it says, "Open access." Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. If you go right above that, it says, "Competing interest." Do you see that box?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all of the tumors that were analyzed in each of the animal studies or glyphosate cancer bioassays, correct? A. No, not correct. It contained summarized data. Q. The supplemental materials provided the data on tumor types and tumor counts that you have used in your analyses in this case, correct? A. For most of the analyses, that is correct. Q. And every finding that you report as showing significance can be obtained from the supplemental data tables that were provided with the Greim publication, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The question I was asked by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for research on cancer (IARC) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA.)" Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. What is the date of this article? A. August 2016, Volume 7, No. 8 in the Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health. Q. If you go to page 744 of that article, please. And if you look at there is a loke a lock with an open key, and it says, "Open access." Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. If you go right above that, it says, "Competing interest." Do you see that box? A. Yes, I do.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all of the tumors that were analyzed in each of the animal studies or glyphosate cancer bioassays, correct? A. No, not correct. It contained summarized data. Q. The supplemental materials provided the data on tumor types and tumor counts that you have used in your analyses in this case, correct? A. For most of the analyses, that is correct. Q. And every finding that you report as showing significance can be obtained from the supplemental data tables that were provided with the Greim publication, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The question I was asked by counsel had to do with the use of expert
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Yes, I see it. Q. It says, "Difference in the carcinogenic evaluation is glyphosate between the international agency for research on cancer (IARC) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA.)" Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. What is the date of this article? A. August 2016, Volume 7, No. 8 in the Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health. Q. If you go to page 744 of that article, please. And if you look at there is a loke a lock with an open key, and it says, "Open access." Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. If you go right above that, it says, "Competing interest." Do you see that box?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	EXAMINATION BY MR. LASKER: Q. The Greim publication included supplemental tables with the data for all of the tumors that were analyzed in each of the animal studies or glyphosate cancer bioassays, correct? A. No, not correct. It contained summarized data. Q. The supplemental materials provided the data on tumor types and tumor counts that you have used in your analyses in this case, correct? A. For most of the analyses, that is correct. Q. And every finding that you report as showing significance can be obtained from the supplemental data tables that were provided with the Greim publication, correct? MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. The question I was asked by

	Page 382		Page 384
1	the written words of Greim.	1	_
2			CERTIFICATE
3	Q. That's not my question. The data tables that were	2	STATE OF NEW JERSEY)
4)ss:
5	provided with the Greim publication in the	3	COUNTY OF UNION)
6	supplemental materials that were publicly	4	I, MARY F. BOWMAN, a Registered
7	available contains all the data that you	5	Professional Reporter, Certified
8	would need to generate every one of the	6 7	Realtime Reporter, and Notary Public
9	calculations in your report MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	8	within and for the State of New Jersey,
10	Q except for historical	9	do hereby certify: That CHRISTOPHER JUDE PORTIER,
11	controls?	10	Ph.D., the witness whose deposition is
12		11	hereinbefore set forth, was duly sworn
13	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form. A. Given six months and I'm going	12	by me and that such deposition is a
14	to have to take some minor reservations,	13	true record of the testimony given by
15	because I can't be absolutely certain, but	14	such witness.
16	given six months and that data, I could	15	I further certify that I am not
17	have done what I wanted what I did here.	16 17	related to any of the parties to this
18	Q. And that data became publicly	18	action by blood or marriage and that I am in no way interested in the outcome
19	available because an author, a scientist at	19	of this matter.
20	Monsanto, who is a coauthor on the Greim	20	In witness whereof, I have
21	publication, and the other coauthors	21	hereunto set my hand this 6th day of
22	published the Greim publication and made	22	September, 2017.
23	those data tables available on the	23	-
24	internet, correct?	24	
25	MS. GREENWALD: Objection, form.	25	MARY F. BOWMAN, RPR, CRR
	Wis. GREEN WILD. Objection, form.	23	
	Page 383		Page 385
1	A. 30 days before the IARC meeting,	1	NAME OF CASE:
2	that is correct.	2	DATE OF DEPOSITION:
3	MR. LASKER: I have no further	3	NAME OF WITNESS:
4	questions.	4	Reason Codes:
5	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This concludes	5	1. To clarify the record.
6	today's deposition. The time is 6:06	6	2. To conform to the facts.
7	p.m. We are off the record.	7	3. To correct transcription errors.
8	p.m. We are off the record.	8	Page Line Reason
9		9	From to
10	CHRISTOPHER JUDE PORTIER, Ph.D.	10	Page Line Reason
11		11	From to
12	Subscribed and sworn to	12	Page Line Reason
13	before me this day	13	From to Page Line Reason
14	octore me uns day	14	Page Line Reason
	•		-
15	of MO , 2017.	15	From to
15 16	•	15 16	From to Page Line Reason
	•	15 16 17	From to Page Line Reason From to
16	•	15 16 17 18	From
16 17	•	15 16 17	From
16 17 18	•	15 16 17 18 19	From
16 17 18 19	•	15 16 17 18 19 20	From
16 17 18 19 20	•	15 16 17 18 19 20 21	From to Page Line Reason From to Page Line Reason From to Page Line Reason From to Page Line Reason
16 17 18 19 20 21	•	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	From
16 17 18 19 20 21	•	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	From to Page Line Reason From to Page Line Reason From to Page Line Reason From to Page Line Reason
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	•	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	From to Page Line Reason From to Page Line Reason From to Page Line Reason From to Page Line Reason

	132:4 136:13,15	271:6 281:9 282:16	agent (3)	295:12,15,16,19
	344:5 354:9	282:18 284:18,19	12:20 15:11 17:13	alleged (1)
aberrant (4)	actual (4)	284:22,24 288:3	agents (2)	363:16
237:24 238:3 239:24	41:15 76:5 187:16	314:23 315:25	66:22 68:7	alliance (1)
255:13	271:22	316:1,8,10 317:2,2	ago (1)	115:8
ability (2)	add (5)	317:13,15,22	335:8	allow (4)
15:23 353:6	302:18 303:9 310:15	327:17,17	agree (38)	18:6 54:17,19 228:21
able (6)	315:5,15	adequately (3)	55:16 58:5,17 59:7,12	allowed (2)
197:16 228:9 229:2	added (4)	66:12 67:1,21	148:6,18 154:3,22	54:6 316:5
285:4 308:5 320:20	271:5 307:14 316:7	adhered (1)	157:19,21 158:6,10	
absolutely (10)	372:19	28:1		allows (3) 23:4 33:20 322:23
24:24 64:17 139:20	addendum (2)	adjustment (1)	158:22 175:1 189:5	
140:21 166:22		308:25	260:20 261:9	alter (1)
242:10 261:13	69:5,7		264:23 267:17	275:21
282:7 357:6 382:15	adding (6)	administrator (2)	273:2 294:25 308:7	alterations (4)
absorption (1)	298:17,20,23 307:13	105:18 191:9	341:4,12 342:4,8	168:2,8 169:1,5
227:11	316:18,24	admitted (1)	346:7 347:10	altered (1)
abstract (1)	addition (3)	330:3	348:15 349:7,16	275:20
56:17	298:16 302:5 373:4	adrenal (8)	350:20 359:19,24	amazing (1)
abstracts (1)	additional (18)	213:6,16,25 214:5,22	360:17,22 364:21	156:14
56:20	97:12 158:4 249:14	214:24 215:13	agreed (8)	amended (4)
aca (1)	273:5,17 274:15,16	218:11	80:3,17 81:1,12,24	16:22 18:1,6 35:7
336:6	275:7,8 276:3,4,13	advice (3)	82:6 152:25 188:23	amendments (2)
academic (1)	276:13,19 277:3,18	93:15 313:1 380:1	agreeing (1)	11:11 22:7
374:20	277:19 308:12	advise (1)	20:12	ames (2)
academics (1)	address (8)	46:2	agreement (6)	347:12,20
63:6	61:22 104:13,14	advised (3)	77:17 78:18,24 79:19	amount (5)
accept (1)	153:21 154:1	28:9 115:10,11	93:22 176:14	71:2 96:22 97:17
81:7	203:12 285:5	advising (1)	agreements (3)	229:10,12
acceptable (1)	369:10	27:20	136:16,23 137:5	analogy (1)
233:8	addressed (1)	advisors (1)	agricultural (5)	203:25
accepted (2)	66:23	12:4	9:10 50:7,11,14	analyses (62)
148:14 372:10	addressing (1)	advisory (39)	358:20	41:15 84:23 85:7,11
access (1)	124:7	11:11 12:6,11 13:7,18	agriculture (4)	85:19,21,25 86:3,12
379:17	adenocarcinomas (9)	13:25 14:8,24 15:10	9:22 376:10 377:17	86:20,25 87:7 93:8
account (4)	186:14 194:19,20	15:18,21 16:20	377:23	96:17 102:1 116:10
12:16 16:17 308:13	196:22 198:10	17:25 18:5,25 20:1	ahead (1)	119:16,18,23 120:2
314:21	199:17 210:15	20:24 21:1,17,20,23	60:16	120:5,6,10 158:2
accuracy (1)	211:17 266:25	21:25 22:6,9 24:16	ahs (2)	179:15 183:12
228:16	adenoma (6)	25:18 32:3,10,15,18	50:3,6	188:24 204:15
accurate (4)	168:22 286:13 287:18	32:24 33:3 34:11,17	aimed (1)	208:17,18 209:9
152:12 295:8 335:15	317:22 326:24,25	38:21 39:3,11,25	355:2	214:22 234:2 291:6
338:13	adenomas (68)	112:8	air (3)	295:3 297:19,20
achieve (1)	186:12,14 187:11	affect (1)	26:18 39:13 362:13	298:24 299:11,15
223:5	192:17 194:4,21	274:17	airplane (1)	305:12 306:22
acting (1)	196:21 198:10	affiliation (2)	97:2	307:16 309:2,3
352:17	199:22,24 200:23	32:1,13	akxd (2)	312:20 313:14,15
action (4)	201:3,12,18,25	afternoon (3)	169:18 170:8	313:16,19 314:1
159:6 160:6 344:15	202:3,19 203:6	178:1,6 371:4	al (6)	318:8,9 320:25
384:17	208:16 209:2,12,24	agencies (9)	7:13 15:22 123:21	321:11,17 367:14
actions (1)	210:7,7,9,14,16,24	19:18 20:6 69:8 84:13	214:11 253:16	368:23 372:11,17
1:9	211:17 216:1,15,16 216:23 217:3,5,10	84:19 119:9 180:3	282:7	381:12,14
activated (1)	217:25 218:6,12	256:17 310:3	albino (10)	analysis (156) 31:11 47:2,8,12 52:1
166:8	217:23 218:0,12 219:14 222:12	agency (8) 20:17 66:4 116:11,16	171:13,23 172:16	103:9 118:3 124:24
active (1)	260:15 266:24	117:10 144:6,17	173:6 230:7,18 231:1,10,20 232:8	103:9 118:3 124:24
26:21	267:6 270:12,18,23	379:4	algorithm (4)	178:18,23 179:22
activities (5)	201.0 210.12,10,23	J17. 1	argoriumi (4)	170.10,43 177.44
	1	1	1	1

				1
192.2 196.10 190.6	73:15 114:3	162.2 172.12	57:3 65:19 73:23	10.11 25.1 221.2 17
183:3 186:10 189:6		163:3 173:13		10:11 25:1 231:2,17
189:16,23 190:9,12	animal (68)	175:16 179:1	75:13 94:19 106:25	231:20 232:11
191:19 196:14	15:24 16:1,6 17:14,17	219:17 226:11,16	184:24 195:4,17	approximation (1)
197:7,9 198:16	18:9 23:16 44:16	249:11 269:19	221:14 239:23	318:6
199:1 201:7,24	50:17,22,22 51:6,9	282:10 285:14	262:25 273:20	april (10)
202:10,14,17 206:6	51:10,24 52:7,13	308:5 321:1 323:23	359:8,17 376:22	22:17 24:15,22,24
206:13 207:17	55:7,8,13,21,24,25	330:2,13 333:15	appended (1)	32:3,9 34:11,16
208:8,14 209:18	56:2 85:7 99:25	335:12 338:16	35:13	39:19 99:3
214:16,18 215:2,9	153:5,21 154:3,9,18	339:8,16 340:21	appendices (2)	arbitration (1)
215:20 218:11	154:25 155:15,21	342:25 343:12,13	378:23,23	153:7
221:1 222:4 223:7	155:24 157:15,16	365:9 367:11 368:8	appendix (1)	archives (5)
224:18 226:13	158:18 160:9,13,16	answered (32)	371:22	124:2,5,23 125:23
232:20,21 233:14	161:1,13 162:10,23	28:13 101:19 103:3	applestoapples (1)	126:12
236:10 238:2 239:2	163:1,22 178:11,18	104:20,21 146:7	275:12	area (5)
239:22 240:3,11,15	181:14 183:5	149:1,16 172:19,20	applicable (1)	31:22 107:24 348:4
241:9,23 242:14	188:24 189:6,16	173:8 187:23	273:16	348:16 360:12
253:11 255:11,25	191:4 203:15 205:3	190:20 202:12	application (1)	arent (1)
256:8,15,21 258:17	228:6 246:18	206:3 231:24,25	188:20	347:6
258:24 259:11,15	250:22 260:23	232:4 239:8,15	applied (7)	argue (1)
260:13,21 262:21	270:24 282:1	246:15 250:12,24	142:2 191:15 229:4	187:14
262:25 263:6	287:14 324:16	283:15 308:3 333:5	229:25 236:17	
266:10,11 267:2	349:10 368:25	333:13 340:7,8,14	262:25 360:17	argues (1) 338:20
271:17 272:4,9,13	381:6	357:2 363:6		
		answers (2)	applies (1)	arguing (1)
272:20 274:9,13	animals (31)	` /	349:8	311:2
284:6,17 285:11,13	18:8 55:20 158:3,5	336:5,15	apply (9)	argument (1)
285:16,18,20 286:5	161:8 176:12	anybody (3)	142:22 143:21 159:7	148:16
286:10 287:3 289:2	199:16 228:11	72:9 156:10 374:19	159:11 273:4	argumentative (2)
289:4,13,16,18	229:9 242:18	anyway (3)	274:13 275:2 277:2	104:20 333:13
290:5,24,25 291:2	245:12 247:15	30:13 216:13 263:21	351:10	arguments (1)
291:25 294:12,21	250:10 266:3 275:6	apart (1)	applying (1)	363:9
295:3,6,7,24 296:5	275:7,9 276:2,11,20	130:12	144:7	arises (1)
298:2 300:4 303:3	277:4 287:20 288:4	apologize (2)	appointed (2)	224:25
303:11,12,19	288:16 293:15,16	335:4 344:13	40:3,6	armitage (6)
304:16,21,25	324:11 325:19,21	apoptosis (1)	appreciate (2)	47:11 294:18 295:25
308:10 309:9,18,22	325:24 348:24	352:19	343:18 380:21	296:2,6 372:4
310:19,20 311:3,15	animoto (2)	apoptotic (1)	approach (15)	arose (6)
311:22 312:1,5,11	199:3,5	352:24	142:23 143:22 148:15	38:6 143:12 144:2,21
312:21,24 313:9,11	ann (2)	apparent (3)	149:3,5,9,17,18,20	176:12,12
316:15,17 317:13	111:12,19	37:4 38:2,14	215:25 237:2 246:7	arrangement (1)
319:25 321:18	anna (1)	appear (8)	261:8 294:22	56:19
323:4 327:24	107:1	45:21 57:17 64:8	309:22	arrow (1)
351:14 352:6,9	announced (5)	65:22 123:14	approaching (1)	50:2
355:14 356:21	33:5 34:22 77:7,20	324:14 335:21	176:23	article (51)
362:8,22 363:12	137:18	343:15	appropriate (13)	7:10,12,18 8:5,23,25
368:20 372:17	announcement (4)	appearance (3)	148:7,18 171:14,24	9:3,8 56:15 57:2,6
373:9	5:24 6:1 33:25 34:3	58:7,19 59:9	172:16,22 249:16	
analyze (6)	announcing (2)	appearances (4)	273:25 274:2	57:16 75:8 77:24
138:8 163:11 241:23	33:14 75:8	3:1 4:1 10:21,22		89:18 90:2,15,24
310:9 327:21 372:6	answer (53)	appeared (9)	275:22,25 317:4,15	91:22 92:9,18,25
analyzed (5)	27:9,17 38:24 39:2	33:21 47:12 99:2	appropriately (1)	95:16,25 118:17
314:18 320:15 322:17	54:8 57:7 64:3,12		203:24	122:6,10,16 123:1,9
		118:25 122:16	approved (3)	123:20 124:22
325:13 381:5	67:3,23 76:11 77:12	249:5,10 293:18	20:25 21:24 22:7	127:2 164:4 174:10
analyzing (4)	86:18 88:1 92:4,5	333:18	approximate (6)	176:16 191:6
23:22 191:3 237:2	102:8 113:15 126:9	appears (23)	47:10,15 97:17,20	333:18 334:6,10
246:10	131:17 141:3 147:4	35:1,11 41:6 42:4	258:7,11	335:22 337:18
andriukaitis (2)	147:23 149:6,18	46:10 49:22 55:21	approximately (6)	338:23 349:23
	l	l	l	I

				rage 3
250.10 277.14	146.15 150.2	attandanas (1)	h (5)	haell (6)
358:18 376:14	146:15 150:2	attendance (1)	b (5)	bcell (6)
377:7 378:4 379:9	155:25 156:7,18	53:17	164:1,5 165:24 166:6	169:16 170:7 173:24
379:14,25	161:20 175:19	attending (2)	327:16	174:7,10,11
articles (3)	205:11 335:9 357:8	53:7,11	back (24)	becoming (1)
163:8 354:13 371:10	359:20 360:18,18	attention (2)	19:11 63:1 95:14 99:6	12:12
aside (1)	assessments (2)	98:8 132:7	99:25 100:2,22	bedfellows (1)
39:24	131:10 144:10	attorney (1)	107:14 151:3 162:3	376:9
asked (60)	assigned (1)	10:22	190:5 224:14,21	began (3)
25:11 28:12 36:6,9,11	41:11	attorneys (6)	225:7 262:15	26:14 79:21 82:12
36:15,21 39:2 44:23	assist (2)	3:4,12 4:4 80:6,22	281:16 285:3	beginning (11)
45:1 62:5,19 65:6	46:9 91:17	81:6	305:16 310:6	40:20 52:9 100:23
70:12 73:14 101:19	assistant (2)	attributed (2)	324:17 328:11	107:3 120:25 157:3
103:3 104:20	105:18 191:9	90:25 227:16	370:11 374:18	157:6 311:7 370:11
119:12 133:11,15	assisted (1)	audio (1)	378:25	380:13,16
146:7 149:1,16	129:8	10:21	background (1)	begins (1)
172:19 173:8	associate (1)	august (6)	374:20	10:1
187:23 190:20	175:12	8:22 9:13 326:9	bad (1)	begun (1)
191:7,10 202:12	associated (7)	366:11 377:8	376:5	39:20
206:3 231:24 239:8	166:19 167:3 322:10	379:10	banned (1)	behalf (6)
239:15 242:10	350:16 359:6,15	australian (1)	365:7	63:5,14,24 80:20
246:15 250:12,18	360:11	118:13	barely (1)	82:24 101:1
250:24 283:15	association (7)	authentication (1)	207:13	behavior (2)
308:3 329:25	10:17 140:9 145:3	152:11	basal (22)	35:18 312:16
330:11 332:16	166:24 360:25	author (2)	223:8 224:18,22,23	belief (2)
333:4,12 336:13,18	361:14,25	128:5 382:19	225:2,17 226:19	145:14 146:1
336:22 337:4,10	assume (1)	authorities (2)	227:2,6,7 325:1,6	believe (63)
338:7 340:6,13	277:7	64:23 148:15	326:24,24,25,25	20:10 22:16 31:4 45:5
362:22 363:4 374:3	assumes (1)	authority (5)	327:1,2,2,15,16,17	66:7 73:1 82:10
375:13 381:22	92:3	60:1 62:11 122:14	base (1)	107:12 121:23
asking (21)	assuming (4)	310:25 379:6	309:9	124:13,15 129:15
46:13 57:15,23 69:11	250:1 251:11 261:5	authoritys (1)	based (31)	137:8 139:6,10,14
72:2,19 73:25 74:13	285:7	146:15	12:21 15:13 18:8	141:13 145:7,20,21
138:7 140:16	ate (1)	authorized (2)	110:22 144:4 158:2	145:22 149:4,8,17
170:25 224:13	363:5	80:22 101:2	186:9 191:18 202:9	154:17 164:3
318:7,9 329:14	atkinson (16)	authors (6)	202:20 203:4	185:23 189:11
330:10 332:24	217:1 225:23 238:7	45:6 46:22 124:18	211:22,24 215:21	190:10 199:2,8,10
348:14 356:12,13	239:3 252:16 257:9	134:2 380:13,15	220:25 223:9 229:3	199:24 200:25
362:16	277:22 278:10	available (17)	232:15 243:1	206:21 207:22
asks (1)	279:23 282:7 284:2	12:13 19:17 20:5,19	273:14 286:21	214:2 218:2,8,9
36:16	286:24 287:4 288:1	154:24 157:15	290:25 291:2	232:6 244:19
assay (1)	291:14,16	188:25 189:7,17	297:13 299:20	256:18,25 263:21
347:18	attached (9)	264:22 274:16	303:3,18 304:10,15	267:1 274:1 306:16
assays (4)	42:7,14 82:14 84:9	323:23 348:6,18	305:21 312:25	307:20 317:3 331:8
343:6,8,9,16	93:22 107:25	382:6,19,23	basel (1)	331:22 332:20
assess (2)	109:12 289:21	avenue (2)	224:15	335:19 347:15
160:23 161:14	366:1	369:10,11	basis (10)	355:10,25 356:6
assessing (2)	attachment (9)	average (2)	7:16 9:5 16:8 123:23	359:2 366:22 367:5
101:23 171:24	6:22 7:11 9:14 72:24	229:9 261:18	199:13 211:9,14	372:23 374:8
assessment (36)	72:25 73:1 88:9	aware (6)	253:10 276:23	believed (1)
7:17 48:1 52:14 66:25	122:8 366:11	137:17,22 161:24	349:25	358:8
67:21 95:9,12 96:4	attachments (2)	166:23 176:15	bates (5)	believes (2)
98:13 99:5 100:17	88:13 378:20	352:12	7:6,8 65:20 106:10,13	37:2,25
101:9,11 108:24	attempting (2)	ax (1)	baum (1)	belong (1)
123:24 124:7,17	266:2 318:16	169:17	4:13	215:20
125:3 130:6 131:4	attend (2)	107.17	baur (2)	benign (2)
142:12,23 143:22	47:18 133:14	B	133:12,13	326:25 327:1
112.12,23 113.22	77.10 133.14		133.12,13	520.25 527.1
	•	•	1	•

	I	İ	l	1
best (5)	blockedout (1)	bradford (8)	337:20	159:14,20 160:9,13
170:17 173:16 260:4	31:22	147:19,23 148:13,21	buying (1)	160:18,22 161:2,7,8
261:7 311:7	blog (1)	149:21 150:8,9	145:1	161:15,21 162:4,13
beststudied (3)	376:3	153:22		168:9,15 172:7,9,9
169:14,24 170:6	blogger (1)	brammer (16)	C	172:23,24 173:10
better (7)	278:7	192:1,4,11 194:25	c (7)	173:12 176:5,6,7,10
62:23 130:20 203:12	bloggers (1)	195:12 198:17	5:3 60:25 61:13,20	178:11 188:25
265:12 290:15	121:9	199:6,7,9,14 200:12	62:22 82:10 374:3	189:6,16 191:4
371:15 372:22	blood (1)	207:8 209:3,15	c1 (1)	203:18 325:9 343:4
beyond (2)	384:17	210:11,19	270:8	344:1,14 346:9
130:6 172:25	bnmn (1)	break (21)	calculate (9)	349:10,17,19
bfr (4)	362:2	53:6,12 69:17 70:2	208:8 296:1,9 301:9	350:14 351:2,9,18
69:5,6 117:5,10	board (9)	146:9,19,23 147:5	301:21 303:3	352:14 364:12,19
big (2)	11:11 12:7 13:18	147:10 152:9	309:18 312:2	365:2 368:25 379:5
29:12 225:25	16:20 18:5,25 20:1	176:25 178:9	313:25	381:6
bill (1)	21:2,25	180:24 247:6 262:2	calculated (8)	cancers (7)
97:18	bodies (2)	295:21 318:19	240:8,9 300:6 305:1	173:1,19 176:11,12
billed (6)	134:25 135:15	328:19 329:4 330:6	305:20,21 321:11	226:24,25 344:10
96:15 97:11 99:14	body (11)	365:11	321:22	cant (74)
108:6 125:14,19	245:5,21 246:8	breaking (1)	calculating (5)	17:22 24:23 27:8,14
billing (3)	250:14 251:1,5	262:1	46:9 158:8,12 313:20	28:17 50:9 51:13
82:12 94:10 95:21	345:24 346:4 353:4	breaks (1)	313:23	56:5,12 57:7 64:17
binding (1)	353:14 354:14	147:4	calculation (7)	71:1 87:25 90:21,21
145:3	bologna (1)	brief (1)	258:6 296:16 297:4	102:7 113:12 115:5
bioassay (1)	139:2	56:17	299:2 308:24 323:6	121:5,18 129:23
191:4	bolognesi (14)	briefly (2)	328:3	151:23 152:6 153:8
bioassays (19)	357:14,19 358:9,15	111:13 330:7	calculations (2)	153:19 155:7 173:9
16:1 85:7 136:4 153:5	359:3,19 360:1,8,17	bringing (1)	368:4 382:8	175:10,10,16
153:21 154:4,10	360:24 361:23	376:10	california (2)	189:24 190:13
158:18 162:4,7	362:21,21 363:15	broad (4)	1:2 10:8	203:11 204:9,13
176:7,11 178:11	bone (1)	3:13 292:21 341:17	call (6)	226:10,16 234:21
188:25 189:7,17	324:23	343:1	21:5 36:18 52:10	242:10 245:22
325:9 369:1 381:7	book (2)	broader (4)	134:22 342:12	249:9,11,11 282:10
biological (2)	163:25 164:8	68:12,22 69:11	371:6	285:14 288:24
153:22 360:14	bothered (1)	343:23	called (15)	312:15 314:12
biologically (1)	202:7	broadly (1)	11:3 26:2 33:19 62:22	317:7,19,19 320:25
243:15	bottom (24)	135:7	63:1 114:16 115:7	321:19 323:20,23
biology (1)	15:1 18:11 19:7,22	broadway (3)	122:17 127:11	328:16 332:19
187:16	49:3 65:14,21 90:6	2:10 3:5 10:10	141:18 142:5,21	337:4,25 338:7
biomedical (2)	90:12 91:4,8 143:8	broken (3)	164:1 214:15	339:13,16,19,20
372:9 373:15	143:9 179:12 185:8	184:9 267:18 269:15	373:25	340:5 342:25 349:5
biomonitoring (2)	223:23 224:1	brother (3)	calling (9)	352:10 357:6
9:9 358:19	230:13 245:6	7:4 89:14,20	52:18 134:3 135:2,6	360:22 367:10
birnbaum (5)	334:17 337:19	brought (2)	135:12,16 143:21	368:15 370:3
29:1,4,6,7,14	359:4 361:12,20	12:3 204:13	144:1 295:6	382:15
bit (9)	bounces (1)	buck (1)	canadian (1)	capacity (2) 345:5 346:4
133:25 162:20 192:6	192:5	4:12	117:15	carcinogen (2)
217:23 234:16	bound (1)	bump (2)	cancer (85)	54:5,5
276:7 286:7 329:7	350:24	308:12,17	12:9,17 16:1 23:16,16	carcinogenesis (3)
375:18	bowman (5)	bundestag (1)	30:4 59:17,23 68:15	9:7 23:8 350:1
blacked (1)	1:24 2:11 10:16 384:4	114:23	68:25 84:14,20 85:7	carcinogenic (14)
30:10	384:24	burke (2)	116:13,18,23 117:2	5:10,16 6:5 12:21
blackedout (1)	box (2)	112:21,23	117:6,13,17,21	13:11 15:12 21:12
30:6	31:23 379:22	busy (1)	118:5,11,15,21	37:17 66:5,19 119:3
block (2)	boy (2)	139:1	136:4 153:5,21	160:24 346:18
225:25 352:18	137:14 140:2	butcher (1)	154:3,5,9,11,13,18	100.24 340.10
	1	<u> </u>	I	ı

				. 1
379:3	348:8 349:3 365:20	256:23 284:7	168:18,24 170:14	20:14 39:14 55:17
carcinogenicity (27)	379:24 381:13	350:24 353:7,22	173:23 174:7	66:22 67:13 68:7
7:14 11:21 15:24 16:3	385:1	causing (2)	175:19,21 226:25	274:3
16:6,24 18:8,22	cases (7)	145:16 146:4	242:10 245:22	changed (9)
24:18 40:9 44:16	56:9 159:13 160:2,3	ccell (8)	277:7 282:7 315:11	20:15 56:10 117:11
	163:4 303:25	` '	325:16 349:4 352:8	184:5 295:20 296:4
50:23 55:13 78:11		218:20 219:10,14,18		
123:22 134:13	311:10	220:19 221:3 222:8	352:10 354:6 357:7	296:5,7,8
144:11 145:13	category (4)	222:12	363:19 372:18,19	changes (10)
146:2 150:23 159:7	251:3,12 325:15	cd1 (59)	382:15	5:12 12:4 13:15,20
181:14 182:8	327:4	8:14 171:13,23 172:5	certainly (14)	14:19,24 18:4 19:1
330:23 331:14	causal (1)	172:15 173:5 230:8	21:6 28:18 90:22	168:9,14
352:18 371:21	212:20	230:19,25 231:11	123:5 136:2 142:16	changing (2)
carcinogenistic (2)	causality (9)	231:19 232:7,17,23	186:19 229:7	16:15 20:16
18:20 78:9	139:6,14,18,20	232:25 234:4 235:2	269:25 274:24	chapter (3)
carcinogens (10)	140:20 141:3,10,15	235:20 236:12,16	276:21 277:11	163:25 164:8 173:18
9:4 23:13,15 33:8	148:16	236:19 243:21	345:13 348:8	characteristic (3)
176:1 330:25	causation (19)	251:16,20,21,24	certificate (1)	350:8,10 351:7
349:24 352:5,7,11	59:16,22 147:25	252:4,7,19,24 253:8	384:1	characteristics (9)
carcinoma (10)	148:8,20 149:10	253:22,24 254:16	certified (7)	9:4 23:8 330:25 331:7
168:20,23 286:14	187:1,6 188:19	254:18 255:1,4,6,16	2:12 334:3,16,20,22	331:13,20,21
287:19 317:24	196:9 197:5 202:8	256:24 257:1,4,18	334:25 384:5	349:24 351:6
325:2 327:2,2,15,16	203:4,17 207:16	257:20 260:5,10	certify (2)	characterization (1)
carcinomas (42)	219:3 230:1 232:24	265:5 268:17,22	384:8,15	250:16
187:10,11 192:18	233:8	269:16 270:6	certifying (1)	characterize (3)
194:4 199:23,25	cause (60)	272:22 273:4 278:1	334:24	133:1 209:19,20
214:22,24 219:15	59:17,23 68:15,25	280:18 282:22	cetera (2)	characterized (6)
260:15 267:7	84:14 118:11,15,21	283:6 318:21 370:2	342:13 349:2	15:12 248:19,19
270:13,19,24 271:6	154:5,11,13 160:9	cd1br (1)	chain (15)	249:22 250:14,25
281:7,12,15,20,25	160:14 161:15,21	268:10	5:18 6:15,17 7:6,8	charge (1)
282:17,18 284:18	165:5,14,23 171:25	cell (29)	8:17 28:20 65:11,15	112:7
284:19,22,25 285:8	173:12 176:5,6	169:6 223:9 224:15	68:17 106:9,12	charging (1)
285:10,14,20 288:3	198:9 205:5,9,14	224:18,22,23 225:2	107:13,17 278:16	94:10
314:23 316:1,2,9,10	211:16 213:6,16	225:17 226:19	chair (12)	charles (11)
317:2,3,14,15,20,23	215:13 227:7 341:6	227:2,6,7 270:12	11:10,16 14:7,11	3:14 8:15 263:12
careful (1)	341:12,24 342:16	325:1,6 326:24,25	16:21 24:16 25:12	265:6,14 268:1,6,13
200:5	343:3,4,25 344:1,9	327:1,2,15,15,17	25:18 32:10,24	277:1 329:5 369:18
carefully (2)	344:14,15 346:1,9	345:14,16 348:25	38:20 156:19	chart (1)
179:24 234:18	350:24 351:2,9,16	352:19 353:14,15	chaired (5)	173:17
carey (3)	351:17 352:2,14	356:23	11:24 12:7 24:25	check (3)
278:7,21 279:21	353:10,25 354:4	cells (9)	156:16,21	129:16 196:17 369:1
cargo (1)	355:7,12 364:12,19	241:19 345:2,8,17	challenge (1)	checking (1)
376:24	364:25 365:1	350:25 352:23,25	158:16	208:1
carry (2)	caused (12)	355:17 356:3	challenged (1)	chem (2)
102:6 165:3	159:14 186:20 188:4	cellular (4)	69:7	5:20 30:21
case (37)	188:14 218:6 225:4	354:16,20,23,24	chance (32)	chemical (20)
1:5 12:25 38:15 39:6	226:20,25 234:13	cent (4)	181:25 182:8,24	116:16 154:13 158:20
41:6 50:1 55:18	354:9,16,24	89:5 91:1 93:1 95:17	183:15 184:1,13	160:9,12,17 162:18
73:23 75:13 143:11	causes (29)	center (1)	185:5,22 186:2,7	162:22 171:20
143:17 175:14	117:6 118:5 139:22	368:25	187:1,10,21 188:1,2	173:11 228:4
190:4 191:16	152:21 160:13	certain (39)	188:13 208:20	289:22 341:5,10,23
194:13 212:10	166:6,6 186:11,13	12:25 24:24 27:14	230:10,21 231:12	343:3 344:14 348:1
218:9 220:7 242:12	191:19 196:11,21	56:5 58:2 64:18	231:22 232:9 282:9	364:24 365:4
276:1 278:5 280:1	200:23 206:8,14	71:1 73:3 121:5,18	290:15 311:15,18	chemicals (29)
291:4 300:14,17,20	219:9,18 221:3	139:21 153:19	312:12 313:5,8	5:22 22:24 25:1 27:6
306:2 311:9 315:10	222:8 232:17 234:4	154:20 159:5	336:9 365:9 372:22	27:24 28:11,15,19
323:11 336:18	236:11,15 251:15	161:21 166:22	change (7)	30:22 35:17,18,19

42:9 154:7 156:8,18	12:20 17:10,20 33:8	382:20	194:21 209:18	committees (1)
159:14 160:24	53:21 54:4	coauthors (5)	210:2,15 219:15	36:17
163:21 172:6 176:2	classify (4)	62:7 127:19,23 132:8	233:18,22 234:12	common (4)
176:3,4 342:8,19,22	340:18 346:22 347:1	382:21	241:4 253:15,17	251:11 264:2,4
343:14 346:8,11	347:4	cochair (2)	270:19 271:2,4	372:13
		` /	278:10 279:1,22	
choice (3)	classifying (1)	11:17 14:9		communicate (2)
147:7 265:4 296:3	55:7	cocoa (1)	280:4 282:13,14,19	130:17,18
choose (1)	clause (1)	360:13	284:20 285:1,18,18	communicated (1)
141:24	42:21	code (4)	286:23 287:3,19	130:4
chose (2)	clear (47)	45:24 46:3,19 295:2	288:14 289:19	communication (7)
309:25 310:1	17:12 21:21 27:17	codes (1)	290:7 291:1,24	104:17 105:5 108:21
chris (1)	36:1 38:10,13 45:9	385:4	294:1,4 306:9,11	108:22 109:18
109:3	51:22 53:24 59:7	coffee (2)	307:16 314:23	110:9,13
christopher (14)	98:18 130:21	53:6,11	315:21 316:2,10,15	communications (13)
1:12 2:8 8:6,9,11 10:4	132:19 133:9,11	cogliano (1)	316:17,25 317:3,16	104:5,10,25 105:25
11:2 181:5 184:20	141:10 142:1	112:12	319:23,24 321:14	106:7,19 107:7
220:3 380:10,17	165:12,13 195:16	coin (9)	326:19 327:5	109:16,17 110:3,21
383:10 384:9	196:18 209:22	202:22,23 203:7,8	combines (5)	111:11 113:25
chronic (2)	214:17,19 226:6	204:1,5,10,22,23	321:25 325:14,22	community (2)
16:6 350:17	231:7 263:4 274:4	cold (1)	326:3,17	310:13 379:11
chronological (2)	279:11 281:11	353:10	combining (3)	companion (2)
34:9 107:16	290:1,19 292:14	collaborate (1)	188:24 200:5 242:11	370:12,16
circuitry (1)	295:22 303:21,21	130:18	come (12)	company (7)
164:13	314:19 323:25	collaborated (3)	18:23 35:19 62:14,20	60:2,11,25 61:24
cite (20)	327:11 330:16	130:23 131:3,9	63:2 139:2 186:19	62:21 63:5 376:25
163:7,24 169:13	332:22 336:2 339:1	collaborations (3)	207:18 229:2 251:9	compare (3)
171:8,12,21 172:14	341:18 342:18	22:23 129:19 131:20	271:12 360:21	261:21 266:2 275:14
173:9,14 190:1,16	353:21 362:25	collaborative (4)	comfort (1)	compared (6)
190:22 191:1 227:4	clearest (1)	135:23 136:16,22	262:2	185:3 271:19 276:17
331:16 351:13	291:9	378:6	coming (1)	349:9 356:1 357:4
355:4,5,9 356:1	clearly (4)	collapsed (1)	245:1	comparing (3)
cited (1)	55:1 88:2 140:22	323:1	comment (2)	184:13 313:4,18
171:9	145:24	collegium (9)	143:6 369:18	comparison (1)
cites (1)	clifford (16)	126:22 134:3,12	commentaries (1)	275:12
15:21	243:2,18 244:3 247:3	135:4,18,24 137:17	121:21	compel (1)
cities (1)	248:22 251:9	138:2,14	commenting (1)	82:8
363:20	259:18,25 260:4,16	colombian (2)	121:9	competing (1)
cjp (3)	262:16 263:20	9:11 358:21	comments (8)	379:21
380:4,9,18	266:12 270:1 271:7	column (29)	57:16 58:1,4 89:1	complaining (1)
clarify (7)	277:11	164:10,11 166:12	90:13 99:4 129:17	98:23
13:23 31:15 330:2,12	climate (1)	296:23 297:7,8,23	308:5	completed (1)
330:17 373:2 385:5	39:14	298:15,19,20 299:7	commission (5)	264:11
clarity (1)	close (2)	301:16,18,21 302:2	63:10 64:15 73:16	completely (3)
57:24	108:11 290:14	302:3,3 304:13,13	74:24 114:20	55:12 197:8 371:15
clark (1)	closed (1)	305:7 318:11,14	commissioner (8)	completeness (1)
99:1	77:20	322:14,23 323:16	62:5,8,15 63:3 64:14	291:7
class (1)	closer (7)	359:5 360:2 361:11	73:15 374:13,14	complicated (11)
250:17	264:25 265:6,17	361:19	commissioners (1)	43:19,20 64:11 74:9
classic (2)	269:24 270:16	combination (2)	62:12	145:12 149:20,25
239:21 365:5	272:1,23	249:24,25	committee (23)	344:11 348:4,16,22
classification (6)	clue (2)	combine (7)	14:15 24:16 25:12,14	complicates (1)
53:22 75:9 77:6 116:2	51:19 242:12	242:3 254:10 270:22	25:18 32:4,10,15,18	183:2
251:12 324:19	coalition (4)	288:24 290:3	32:24 34:12 36:7,10	components (1)
classifications (1)	9:22 376:9 377:17,23	320:13 325:23	36:13,14 38:21	159:11
11:22	coauthor (4)	combined (55)	39:25 101:3 156:16	compound (4)
classified (6)	133:18 350:5,12	35:23 189:6,15	156:21,24 157:1,21	182:9 344:19 349:5

351:9	56:14 332:21	169:17 170:8 171:2	110:16 382:6	253:1 260:21
compounds (4)	concur (1)	connection (10)	context (10)	261:16 263:3
16:3 25:4 34:18 344:6	55:16	26:1 29:17 61:3 76:18	90:20 147:19 158:11	265:16 267:4,25
computer (4)	concurrent (8)	90:14 100:5 101:24	159:2 161:10	273:24 274:1
				275:16 276:6
367:22 368:2,6,17	240:9,10 257:12	115:8 234:22	247:10 279:20	
con (2)	280:21 303:9	279:10	339:14 357:17	280:21 283:18,20
122:18,19	309:13 311:8	connections (1)	359:22	292:17 293:1 310:5
conceded (1)	312:19	200:17	continue (2)	310:8 311:2,5 326:7
198:12	conditions (2)	consensus (1)	69:7 363:22	370:1 382:11
conceivable (1)	154:21 350:18	15:6	continued (7)	convening (2)
90:19	conduct (17)	consent (2)	26:20 54:18 79:21	33:5 53:5
concentration (1)	46:3 52:1 137:7,10	81:5,11	97:3 116:11,17	conversation (8)
229:8	198:25 233:15,16	conservative (3)	117:1	63:20 77:8,14,23
concentrations (1)	233:17 272:9,19	307:5 315:11,14	continuing (1)	107:4,10 115:15
355:15	290:25 291:2 309:2	consider (3)	86:4	138:13
concept (6)	309:9 310:19	19:15 20:3 324:18	contract (1)	conversations (13)
149:22 154:6,12	311:17 362:22	considered (9)	251:9	76:5 83:14 84:2
160:17 204:12	conducted (23)	59:18,24,25 80:23	contributing (1)	103:20 105:12
373:10	28:8 47:2,8,19 87:1	101:3 155:7 274:15	25:23	111:25 112:2,5,20
concern (11)	102:23 108:7	276:5,19	contributions (1)	112:22 114:1 138:1
52:18,19 67:15 68:13	119:16 170:21	consistent (5)	165:22	138:6
104:9 118:4 133:21	183:5,12 228:21	155:14 230:8,20	control (91)	conversion (1)
139:21 180:22	238:15 240:2 258:6	231:11 301:2	45:22 50:1 192:18	338:12
181:15 310:3	264:25 272:13	consistently (3)	194:13 200:1 240:9	converted (1)
concerned (2)	289:15 295:4 323:6	347:12,14,17	240:10,18 242:25	338:11
38:18 69:6	355:14 356:21	constantly (2)	243:24 244:18	convinced (1)
concerning (1)	368:5	345:1 354:15	245:12,25 246:24	232:22
62:9	conducting (4)	consult (3)	247:15 248:9 249:7	copies (3)
concerns (7)	118:3 137:19 150:2	61:25 130:15 354:12	249:17 250:10	48:9 110:8 180:9
26:2 55:19 68:23 69:4	368:20	consultant (25)	257:11,13,13	copy (4)
84:18 104:9 369:25	conducts (1)	70:22 71:15 72:4,22	259:24 260:11	28:24 32:20 42:5
conclude (12)	176:16	73:20 74:17 75:2,6	261:6,10,21 262:20	366:15
55:16 66:4 116:17	conference (2)	83:3 84:4 87:14	262:24 263:24	corcoran (3)
117:1 143:12 144:1	127:15,16	109:22 111:19	264:13,24 265:5,8	321:10,10 322:3
	conferences (1)		266:4,9,16 267:1,11	corcorans (1)
144:20 198:7 206:24 256:2 284:7	64:22	112:16 113:19	267:19 268:19,23	322:4
		115:3,18 121:2,16		
360:9	confidence (1) 290:17	122:22 123:16	270:5,10,14,17	corporate (4)
concluded (13)		126:19 132:17,20	271:13,14,16,23,24	133:2,22 134:4,18
16:1 56:24 116:22	confidential (1)	138:15	272:3,18,21 273:3	corporations (1)
117:5,16,20 118:10	76:2	consultation (2)	273:16 274:12,17	135:19
118:14,20,24	confirmation (1)	374:4 375:14	275:6,16 276:2,10	correct (884)
215:16 220:25	152:14	consultations (4)	276:12,17,20 277:1	11:13,22,23 12:1,10
222:5	conflict (19)	60:25 61:14,20 62:23	287:14,20 288:4,15	12:22 14:1,8,9
concludes (1)	38:2,6,11,12,16,17,19	consulted (3)	288:15 289:5,6	15:15 16:24 17:4
383:5	39:16 58:7,12,20,25	31:7 129:25 130:10	290:4 291:13 292:4	18:9,14 19:4,18
concluding (1)	59:2,10,14 73:1	consulting (8)	292:6 293:16 303:9	20:6,8,13 21:2,25
199:13	89:6 91:3,23	39:20 74:22 79:6,12	303:24,24 309:13	22:8,15 24:19,23
conclusion (18)	conflicts (4)	79:14 91:24 92:12	311:3,7,8,11 312:7	25:8,21 26:3,22
68:14,24 116:12	37:4 39:9 72:10 92:10	93:15	312:11,18 326:23	27:6,13,19,24 28:11
117:25 132:2 133:6	conform (1)	contact (2)	370:13	29:2,18 30:4 31:2
139:22 152:20,24	385:6	361:15 362:1	controlled (2)	31:13,25 32:4,12,16
153:1 186:20,22	confused (2)	contain (1)	242:18,22	33:9 34:11,13,24
196:18 198:13	45:16 373:2	84:22	controls (33)	35:9,13 36:3,4,8
215:21 348:5,17	confusing (2)	contained (1)	8:20 45:8,19 193:25	37:4,9 38:3,5,8,22
360:21	210:3 212:5	381:8	195:1 202:2 243:11	38:24 39:2 40:25
conclusions (2)	congenic (3)	contains (2)	244:24 245:4 248:7	41:5,9,10 42:1,10

42:18 43:11,17 44:1	153:23 154:2,14,25	238:11 239:3 240:4	313:22 314:5	couldnt (4)
47:13 48:18 49:11	156:2,18,25 157:2	240:15,23 241:1,5,6	315:17 318:11	31:16 227:18 345:11
49:12,20 50:3,7,18	158:13 159:8	241:10 242:23	319:11,18,20	346:18
50:19,24 51:5 52:3	160:10,19 161:3,16	243:2,14,16,25	320:12 321:5,14,25	counsel (77)
52:11 56:3,16,24,25	161:22 162:7,8,14	244:10,11,12,14,15	322:19 323:8 324:2	10:18,20 70:22 71:15
57:3,18 58:8,20	163:12 164:2,15	244:22,25 245:6,7,9	324:5,7,18,19 325:3	72:5,23 73:21 74:5
59:18,24 60:12 61:4	165:8,11,16,25	245:10,14,15,18	325:6,10,13,15	74:18 75:3,6,15,20
61:17,21 62:1 63:15	166:17,20 167:2,4,7	246:3 247:8,12,16	326:20 327:12,13	79:20,25 81:15 82:1
63:25 64:10 65:3,18	167:10,15,20 168:5	247:20,22 248:3,4	327:19,20 329:6	82:13,23 83:3,12,17
66:6,13 67:4,18,23	168:10,15 169:8,11	251:16 252:8,9,12	330:12 331:2,3,7,14	84:5 87:2,11,21
68:4,15,25 69:14,15	169:18 170:9	252:19,20,24 253:7	331:17,23 332:6	91:16,25 92:12,19
70:19,24 71:16,17	173:20 174:16	253:12,25 254:17	336:7,16,20,24	93:3,12 94:11,16,21
71:24 72:23 73:22	175:4 178:14	254:22,23 255:1,3,8	338:14,15 339:21	94:25 95:4,20 96:3
			341:7,13,15,25	· ·
74:6,19 75:3,4,9	180:23 181:16,25	255:16 256:4,24,25	342:4,9,21 343:2,5	96:7,16 97:11,19 98:11 99:15 103:11
76:14 77:12 78:15	182:4,9,20,25 183:1	257:4,21,23 258:3		
78:16,21 79:22 80:1	183:6,15 184:3,4,15	258:14,16,19 259:2	344:2,17 345:2,9,22	106:3 108:6,13,15
80:2,8,24,25 81:6	184:16 185:5,18,19	259:13,14,18 260:6	345:23 346:2,10,22	109:19,22 110:24
81:18 82:4,5,9,15	185:22 186:2,3,7,8	260:17,19 261:1,12	347:1,13,24 348:6,9	111:6,20 112:17
82:20,21,25 83:7,18	186:15 187:2,21	261:17,22 262:22	349:8,17 350:5,6,9	113:19 115:3,19
84:6,15 85:1,3,8,9	188:5,15,21 189:1	263:7,9,14,16,22	350:11,15,19,21,22	121:3,16 122:23
85:12,14,16,22,23	189:18,19,23	264:1,8,9,15,18,20	351:3,11,12 352:19	123:11 125:10,13
86:1,2,6,9,15 87:3	191:21 192:6,9,16	265:1,3,9 266:6,8	353:4,8,11,12,16,23	125:15,18,24
87:12 88:5,19 89:1	192:22 193:2,20	266:13 267:4,14,21	354:1,5,17,19,25	126:15 132:12,21
89:2,7,25 90:9,15	194:1,2,9,18 195:9	268:14,19,20,24,25	355:3,7,12,13	138:16 146:21
91:18 92:1,14,21,23	195:18,19,25 196:6	269:2,6,8,9,12,13	357:11,14 358:4,6,9	147:10 366:8 369:9
93:5 94:1,7,13,18	196:14,24 197:8,12	269:16,18 270:2,3,7	358:10 359:1,9	381:23
94:23 95:9,13,22	197:19 199:6	270:11,13,20 271:9	361:2,3 362:2	count (2)
96:4,8,18 97:5,9	200:12,24 201:4,12	271:10,17,20 272:4	363:18,19,24 364:1	302:20 303:16
98:15 99:16 100:19	201:14,18 202:10	272:7,10,11,14,17	364:6,8,12,14	counted (1)
101:5,16 102:18	202:24 203:9,18	272:24 273:1,7,21	366:20 367:3,17	328:4
103:12,22 104:6,11	204:2,17,19,24	274:20,21,23 275:9	369:20 370:1	counts (5)
104:18 106:20	205:5,10,14 206:1	275:10,17 277:4	371:10,11 372:22	302:23 305:13,14
107:7,21,25 108:2,9	206:16,22 207:2,6	278:3,12,21 279:3,4	375:16,17 377:4,8	327:25 381:12
108:18 109:7,23	207:11,19 208:9	279:13,18,25 280:2	378:14 380:8 381:7	county (1)
110:1,25 111:7,12	209:6,15 210:11,20	280:3,10,15,22,25	381:8,13,15,20	384:3
111:13 114:12,21	211:8,11,23 212:3	281:1,2,4,5,8,10,13	382:24 383:2 385:7	couple (8)
116:2,13,15,19	212:23 213:7,17,20	281:14,21 283:2,13	corrected (2)	23:13 41:18 354:12
117:2,4,13,14,17,22	214:1,2,8,23 215:5	284:2,8 285:6,11	17:11 94:15	371:5,8 374:17
118:5,11,15,21	215:7,13 216:2,17	286:2,16,20 287:1,6	correcting (1)	380:23,24
119:9,19,23,25	216:18,24,25 217:6	287:23,25 288:4,5,7	107:19	coupleminute (1)
120:7,21 121:10,22	217:7,12,19 218:1,2	288:8,11,12,16,17	correctly (10)	147:9
122:15,23 123:4,12	218:7,18,24,25	288:19,20,22	46:8 47:8 84:17	course (15)
124:3,9,25 125:6,10	219:6,7,11,20,23	289:19,25 290:5	131:21 175:18	50:13 59:3 80:21
124.3,9,23 123.0,10	220:8,13,14,19,20	291:9,19 292:20	178:22 289:14	85:16 91:15 101:2
126:16 127:20	220:23,24 221:4,5	293:5,17,19 294:8	304:7 343:20	105:9 204:10
128:1,7,9,11 129:3	221:12,14,16,17,22	294:14 295:4,5	344:13	303:13 325:18
129:4,11 132:5,23	222:1,19,23 223:22	296:18 297:11,14	correlated (1)	335:24 345:2,7,20
133:3,19,23 134:1,9	224:4 225:4,8	297:24 298:3,10	363:11	353:24 345:2,7,20
133:3,19,23 134:1,9	226:21 228:12,25	300:2,8 301:11,13	correspondence (1)	
,	229:1,5 230:2,10,21			court (5)
136:18,19 139:8,16		301:14,18,19,23	112:9	1:1 10:7,16,25 151:8
140:5,23 141:6,19	231:3,6,12,22 232:1	303:4,24 304:16	cortical (8)	cover (6)
142:6,10,14,24	232:11,14,18 233:1	305:3,9,23 306:10	213:6,16,25 214:6,22	71:12 269:17 299:11
143:6,14,23 144:11	233:9,12,13 234:5	306:11 307:1,9,17	214:24 215:13	305:13 316:6
144:19 145:17	235:2,15,23,24	308:15 309:4,13,20	218:11	371:14
146:5 147:20 148:2	236:2,3,5,12,21,23	309:24 310:22	cosignatory (1)	covers (4)
148:10 149:5,8,9,18	237:10,11,15,16,23	311:5,19 312:6,13	131:14	260:4 269:10,20

272:22	55:8,8,25 56:2	35:19 296:3	days (14)	decreased (1)
create (1)	66:13 67:2,22 86:22	date (63)	52:2 55:5 75:7,7	194:7
314:15	101:24 103:12	11:14 13:12,22 14:10	77:18 127:11,12,13	decreasing (1)
created (4)	120:14 121:1 137:2	21:14 24:23 28:22	127:25 132:2	197:14
66:9,19 80:19 100:25	138:8 141:1,2,9,9	30:24 33:20 34:2,5	363:16 374:16,17	deemed (1)
	144:25,25 153:4	35:2 37:19 40:17	383:1	181:22
creating (2)				
41:3 316:19	154:24,25 157:14	41:23 43:8 48:16	dc (1)	defendant (1)
credit (2)	157:15 158:3	53:1 57:12 60:22	4:6	4:4
189:24 190:13	178:11,16,18,23	65:13 68:19 71:7	ddt (3)	defense (30)
criteria (7)	179:4 183:3 184:14	73:10 75:10 88:11	26:2,11,16	9:20 25:21,24,25 26:6
147:20,24 148:13,21	185:2,3 186:10	89:17 106:11,15	deal (1)	26:10,14,19 27:3,12
149:24 150:9	190:11 191:4	114:9 122:9 123:25	45:7	27:18 28:8 29:16
153:22	192:24 199:23	125:8,16 127:7	dealing (2)	30:1 31:1,8 32:2,14
critical (5)	203:16 204:20	128:10,12,20	29:14 117:10	33:1 38:8 39:12,21
37:2,25 69:9 142:5,8	205:12,20,21,23	136:10 153:10,15	deals (4)	90:18 375:15
crl (3)	214:21 218:5	156:9 164:7 181:6	17:7 30:13,16 44:3	376:21 377:4,16,22
8:14 243:21 370:2	220:22 221:9	184:21 220:5	dealt (1)	378:14 380:5
crop (1)	232:19 236:10,18	243:22 268:8,11	45:4	define (1)
378:5	238:16 244:17	278:18 326:10	death (1)	79:11
croplife (4)	246:18 247:5,11	334:8,11 350:2	352:19	defined (2)
7:4 89:14,20 90:3	251:18 254:13	358:22 365:23	debated (1)	51:4 257:22
crr (2)	259:17,24 260:22	366:13 373:20	122:12	defines (1)
1:24 384:24	261:6,6,10,21	376:2 377:7,18	debates (1)	342:10
crux (1)	262:20 263:5,13,24	379:9 385:2	141:22	definitely (2)
63:20	264:13,24 265:5,9	dated (44)	december (8)	279:14 372:12
current (2)	265:15,16 266:4,9	5:18,24 6:1,7,8,9,10	20:9,23 21:22 22:5	definition (2)
163:9 339:23	266:16,23 267:1,12	6:12,13,15,17,19,20	264:1,8 375:4,11	37:6,23
currently (2)	267:18,20 268:19	7:10 8:15,17 9:13	decide (3)	degree (4)
375:2 376:20	268:23 269:15	28:21 33:22 34:1,4	44:21 187:9 373:12	76:1 160:12 227:11
curriculum (2)	270:5,10,14 271:3,5	40:15,19 41:21 43:6	decided (5)	228:16
7:23 136:8	271:11 272:17	48:15 52:24 57:10	56:1 93:16 138:22	demonstrate (1)
	276:12 282:1	65:12,17 68:18 71:5	180:5 212:16	141:14
cut (1)	284:16,17,24,25	73:8 89:19 93:25		demonstrated (3)
65:21	285:19 286:23	96:24 106:17,18	deciding (3) 147:24 309:1,8	139:8,16 140:21
ev (1)	287:12 290:13	122:7 268:7,12		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
136:5	291:16 293:14	278:17 366:10	decision (15)	demonstrates (1)
D	294:1,2,3,4,5	378:1	7:22 30:4 61:3 127:6	141:3
	295:23,24 296:18	dates (3)	143:11,17 144:19	depend (1)
d (6)	*	` /	144:20 145:2,11	342:11
1:12 2:9 4:12 15:19	298:9 299:16 301:4	71:20 76:8 108:11	187:14 208:19	dependent (3)
383:10 384:10	306:11 312:11	davies (1)	212:5,19 258:8	229:8 312:17 343:7
daily (2)	315:18 320:22	90:3	decisionmaking (2)	depends (1)
5:20 30:21	321:2,6 326:23	dawley (27)	134:25 135:15	353:1
damage (19)	338:19 339:24	185:15,20 187:8	decisions (7)	deposition (16)
341:5,11,24 344:7	349:25 351:25	206:15 213:2,4,14	25:7 48:7 69:10 84:13	1:12 2:8 9:12 10:3,9
345:1,8,15,21 346:1	359:5 360:23	213:22 214:23	142:14 145:12	71:11 119:6 330:18
346:2,6 354:16,20	367:13,16,23,24	215:24 216:9,21	348:22	365:19,20,22 366:9
354:23,24 355:2	368:5,11,15 372:7	217:3,9,24 218:7	deck (1)	383:6 384:10,12
359:6,15 364:17	381:4,9,11,18,25	219:10,15,19 221:4	119:11	385:2
data (178)	382:3,6,16,18,23	223:7,22 224:2,5,17	decks (2)	depositions (1)
9:5 12:9,12,22 14:14	database (4)	225:24 226:14	119:7 120:18	147:8
15:14,23 16:22 17:9	242:19,22 244:23	day (12)	declare (1)	derive (2)
17:19,22,23 19:4,22	370:14	25:22 53:10 62:25	182:11	170:14,15
23:4,22 24:3 45:25	dataset (5)	77:20 179:19	declined (1)	described (2)
46:4 48:1 49:10,20	265:13 312:8,18,19	253:21 289:7 345:9	138:9	285:24 297:16
49:23 50:3,23 51:6	317:16	345:14 371:6	decrease (1)	describes (1)
51:10 52:15 54:16	datasets (2)	383:13 384:21	214:5	298:1

	İ	Ī	İ	ı
describing (1)	344:12 366:14	disclaimer (4)	294:11,16	30:2,14 39:12 43:16
286:15	differ (5)	88:18 120:16,19,24	district (4)	78:13 89:6 91:2
description (7)	168:4,6 169:3,7,11	disclose (24)	1:1,2 10:7,7	93:1 95:18 100:7
5:7 7:2 8:2 9:2 362:4	difference (6)	72:1,14,21 73:19	dive (1)	155:4 190:9 255:11
376:17,19	124:8,11 163:16	74:16,25 81:14,25	100:8	273:22 275:11
designated (5)	282:10 356:16	82:8 87:20 103:10	diversity (4)	277:20 293:8
24:17 25:7 32:11 33:4	379:2	103:17 104:23	347:22,25 348:6,17	298:16 311:4
34:12	differences (10)	106:1 109:21 115:2	dna (12)	319:24 342:12
designs (1)	124:14 159:17,19	115:17 125:21	341:5,11,24 345:1,6,8	376:20
349:11	160:5,14 164:12	126:14,19 132:10	345:14,21,25 346:4	dont (161)
despite (2)	166:13 167:9,13	132:19 138:14,20	346:6 355:2	12:24 18:23 21:6
116:9 215:8	274:18	disclosed (9)	document (92)	25:13 28:14 30:7
detail (1)	different (67)	32:3,15 74:4 76:17,23	1:8 5:8,11,14 6:3 7:3	33:10 36:24 37:10
328:16	12:13 31:10 44:13,13	104:16,24 105:6	8:3 9:19 11:18	37:12 42:20 43:1
detailed (1)	67:3,23 75:22 85:20	121:14	12:25 13:1,9,14,19	51:14 56:9 58:3
117:25	98:21,24 138:19	disclosing (6)	18:3 21:10 30:9	63:6 64:2,3 65:24
detect (1)	160:4,7,16 161:1,2	111:4,9,9,18 112:14	33:22 37:15 49:7	65:25 69:16 76:1
171:4	161:6,7,18 163:1	113:17	57:21 60:23 61:11	77:2 78:3,4,7 98:6,7
detectable (1)	174:25,25 185:17	disclosure (1)	61:13 65:23 70:8	98:7 105:8 106:4
49:14	199:3,9,10,14,18	123:9	71:4,10 72:7 89:10	107:9 108:19
detected (1)	200:10,15,19	disconnect (1)	89:13 90:6 93:25	110:10 111:8,9,17
31:24	217:23 243:3	170:3	94:17,22 95:5 98:22	111:21 112:18,19
detections (1)	250:18 268:17	discuss (6)	98:24 99:9,13,16,19	112:19,25 113:12
31:9	288:23 289:17,18	29:13 146:10 153:6	99:22,24 100:6,23	114:2,9 117:18
determination (4)	291:1,3 292:15	162:5 186:19 223:7	101:14,25 103:14	118:24 124:10,13
59:16,22 66:18	310:4 321:3,8,12	discussed (4)	106:21,24 107:1,23	126:5 128:13,14
358:11	325:14,18,20,23,24	52:8 114:4 131:1	108:8,14,23 109:12	130:15 133:5 136:1
determine (9)	326:4,18 328:1	185:9	109:20 118:8 119:5	137:8 142:1 143:1
33:7 175:20 203:16	341:16 342:11	discusses (3)	126:7,10 127:22	145:7,7 151:15
228:10,22 265:15	343:19 346:5	19:12 131:15 185:10	156:5,11 171:9,22	152:1 156:21,23
311:13 355:15	347:23 348:23,24	discussing (13)	171:22 172:7,25	157:21 159:12
356:21	348:25 349:1	14:23 29:24 51:10	173:2 249:11	161:4,10 163:4
determining (1)	352:25,25 357:16	53:5 89:24 90:3	250:16 263:9	167:21,22 170:15
245:24	370:12 376:18	124:14,15 140:25	297:17 329:5,9 330:3 333:21 334:1	175:13 180:8 181:2 186:18 193:5,6
developed (3)	differently (3)	162:5 178:10 185:1		200:17 201:24
163:18,19 189:21	241:13 254:2 342:6 difficult (4)	185:10	335:4 336:3 366:1 366:23 367:7	204:19 206:19,20
developing (1)	113:15 164:14,23	discussion (11)	373:24 377:11,14	224:20 226:7,9,24
189:25	290:12	5:12 13:15,20 16:9		227:1,25 232:6
development (5)	dig (1)	18:3 49:15 64:8	377:19 378:24 380:14,16	233:21 235:5
166:15 173:25 174:16	180:6	91:10 143:20 202:16 336:19	documents (19)	238:15 239:16,17
175:3 176:17	dioxin (1)	discussions (11)	20:18 21:4 33:17	241:15 242:9
didnt (39) 24:4 60:4 63:12,21	227:21	50:11,13 51:20 53:19	70:16,19 71:8 93:9	245:16 246:19,21
110:10 119:3	direct (5)	54:1,24 65:2 76:2	93:13 94:12 103:5	247:25 248:15,17
126:24 149:6	165:7,15,24 361:14	83:5,20 90:13	314:8,9 333:17	250:3 253:4 258:23
150:11 156:10	361:25	disease (2)	366:3,4,7,22,25	262:5 277:2,14
174:19 176:8	direction (3)	165:22,23	367:6	278:14 281:14,17
198:25 201:22,23	80:6,13 252:12	diseases (2)	doesnt (15)	282:8,9 289:22
202:13,14 211:5	directly (3)	164:24 350:17	39:5 53:4 58:14 65:22	299:12 300:17
220:22 222:14	174:22 175:3 297:16	dismiss (1)	101:7 126:4 165:19	302:23 307:22
223:2,4 226:1 239:1	director (4)	69:9	183:20 215:19	309:6,6 310:16,16
256:20 265:18	29:7,9 105:16 123:3	disorders (2)	236:22 247:6	312:23 319:7
282:3 285:13,15	disagree (1)	166:20 167:4	327:20 332:1 346:1	320:24 323:20
290:7 310:6,9,19	360:22	distinguish (1)	373:6	325:16 326:5
313:25 314:10	disagreement (1)	113:13	doing (27)	328:15 332:5,13,25
339:19 343:19	220:10	distribution (2)	22:18,20 29:15,17,25	333:2,7,14 335:19

				Page II
				1 04 0 00 40 400 45
337:10,23,23	70:2 71:8 89:18	232:9,19 348:5,17	efsas (3)	81:8 98:10 100:15
338:18 339:21	95:1 106:16 122:10	duly (2)	66:17 68:14,24	100:22 101:2
340:11,23,24,25	126:6 130:1 131:13	11:4 384:11	eight (1)	english (7)
345:17 354:11	131:21 139:5 151:2	duration (5)	200:8	333:22 334:14,16
357:20 360:20,22	151:22 152:19	233:11,12 261:11,16	either (16)	336:1,23 338:11,17
365:6 366:16 367:9	164:11 165:2,4,21	272:23	46:18 47:17 112:15	enjoyed (1)
368:12,13 369:22	166:10 167:16,25		152:2 156:23	178:7
370:2,7 374:23	169:12,23 170:5	E	161:12 170:21	ensuing (1)
380:20	173:17,22 174:5,13	earlier (12)	182:12 200:2	26:20
door (1)	178:6 180:17 181:7	21:25 98:21 115:12	217:11,25 227:19	entered (2)
114:5	187:17 196:24	134:14 185:10	229:19 234:10	62:25 362:14
dose (55)	220:3 254:14	268:3 277:15 290:2	239:3 307:15	entire (8)
158:2 194:1,8 195:7,9	262:15 268:14	304:2 347:5 374:2	ekemoto (1)	55:12,15 56:10 83:4
200:9 214:6 216:17	298:2,5,7,23 299:21	375:14	225:23	83:13 84:1 347:8
216:23 217:12,25	300:4 305:21	early (3)	electronic (1)	352:6
218:1 228:10,22	306:24 307:1,8,11	42:8 64:24 375:21	367:13	entities (2)
229:3,7,11 237:18	307:13,24 308:4	easier (3)	email (84)	138:19 170:17
237:21,25 238:6,7	321:10,10 322:3,4	21:5 201:8 286:7	5:18 6:7,8,9,12,13,15	entitled (33)
239:2 240:1 255:13	329:2,25 330:6,16	easily (2)	6:17 7:6,8 8:17	5:8,11,14,20 6:3 7:3
256:9 278:2 281:4,7	330:21 334:12	328:6 339:14	28:20,24,25 29:13	7:12,18 8:3,5,12,19
281:13 288:7,10,10	335:6 365:20,25	eat (1)	29:23 36:17,20	9:3,8,19 13:9,19
289:1,6,17,23 290:4	369:17 371:4	227:9	40:10,15,19,23 41:3	21:10 30:20 37:15
290:4,5,9,10 291:1	373:22 378:17	eating (1)	41:21,24 42:2,4,6	89:14,19 123:20
291:3,8,19,22 292:8	380:20	227:5	43:4,6,9,13,22 44:3	127:2 156:6 164:4
292:17,19 293:1,16	draft (13)	ec (1)	52:22,24 53:3 57:10	243:19 326:6
293:19 356:2,22	5:13 13:15,20 18:4	62:17	57:13,20 65:11,15	349:23 358:18
doseresponse (2)	42:8 57:16,21 58:1	eca (2)	65:15 66:2 68:2,12	377:15,21 378:24
156:7,17	72:7,12,25 73:2	116:17,21	68:17,22 72:2,17,24	entity (2)
doses (16)	99:5	economically (1)	99:7 104:4,10,13,14	63:14,25
193:2 200:15 254:9	drafted (1)	132:3	104:15,18,24	entry (1)
254:11 256:18	189:13	edf (5)	105:25 106:6,9,12	323:2
288:24 289:21	draw (2)	9:17 30:17 376:1,6,8	106:17,19 107:4,5,7	environment (3)
290:3,14 291:21,24	348:5,16	edfs (1)	107:12,17,18	5:23 28:1 30:23
292:4 293:3,21,23	drawn (1)	31:4	108:20,22 109:16	environmental (37)
356:2	267:20	editor (3)	109:25 110:2,13	9:20 25:20,24,25 26:6
dosing (1)	drift (1)	124:4 125:22 126:11	111:14,16 113:24	26:10,14,17,19 27:3
284:1	266:5	effect (12)	113:25 114:3	27:12,18 28:8 29:8
dots (1)	drive (2)	17:3 145:22,23,23	278:16,20	29:15 30:1 31:1,8
212:24	151:12,16	173:11 182:9,11	emails (10)	32:2,14 33:1 38:7
double (2)	drives (2)	198:19 364:9,25	41:18 70:3,13,21	39:12,21 90:18
229:10,11	353:6 373:6	365:1 372:21	71:23 72:18 73:24	105:23 115:7 123:4
doubt (1)	drop (2)	effective (2)	74:12 83:20 110:21	132:17 375:15
200:19	202:13,14	134:24 135:14	employees (3)	376:20,24 377:4,15
dourson (4)	dropped (4)	effects (5)	111:25 112:4,10	377:22 378:13
191:8,13,13 295:9	197:6 202:9 208:3	145:17 146:5 158:17	encountered (1)	380:5
downstairs (1)	218:10	158:19 348:1	28:6	epa (67)
53:5	dropping (1)	effort (1)	encouraged (2)	84:11 87:25 88:15,17
dozens (1)	215:23	137:24	54:10 134:11	88:23 91:14,19 94:7
146:17	drug (1)	efforts (1)	endeavor (3)	94:21,22 95:7 96:3
dr (89)	365:7	135:23	102:6,7 155:2	98:12,21 99:1 100:6
8:11 10:4 11:8,9	due (22)	efsa (13)	endorsed (2)	100:17,17 101:9,11
13:23 14:20 16:11	22:24 145:24 181:25	65:18 67:25 110:16	19:1,2	101:14,24 102:2,17
28:23 29:14 42:15	182:8,24 183:14	110:17 124:16	energy (1)	102:25 103:9,14,20
48:11,17,20,23	185:22 186:1,6,25	125:3 179:3 272:7,8	353:5	104:2,13,25 105:18
49:24 50:21 52:23	187:21 188:1,2,12	314:3 318:4 336:6	engagement (9)	106:8 108:8,14,16
53:2 55:6 60:23	230:9,21 231:12,21	379:6	71:14 79:20 80:4,21	108:24 109:20
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				1490 12
110 10 22 111 12		100 17 104 10	100.00.00.101.1510	100 00 106 10
110:19,22 111:12	estimate (4)	108:17 124:18	180:23,25 181:16,18	123:20 126:18
111:25 112:4,7,10	68:10 228:16 314:16	134:13 138:23	exam (1)	127:1,2,9 136:8
112:15 140:4	318:15	154:23 157:13	5:2	139:24 141:10
142:21 143:15,21	et (8)	182:12 187:6	examination (3)	143:3 156:5 164:4
144:4 153:17	7:13 15:22 123:21	202:18 211:25	11:6 371:2 381:1	181:4,8 184:19
178:17,24 191:9	214:11 253:16	225:12 233:9	examined (1)	220:2,6 221:7
272:6,8 287:24	282:7 342:13 349:2	238:19,22 240:18	183:25	243:19 268:6
290:2,24 291:6	eu (7)	283:16 298:13	example (22)	278:16,19 326:6
298:6,7 299:22	9:16 60:24 61:14	317:7,22,24 323:11	7:19 12:6,18 121:19	334:6,9 337:18
300:12 310:25	64:20 373:19 374:1	323:12 346:15	127:3 134:17	349:23 358:18
318:2	374:11	357:16 373:8 379:3	142:20 174:14	365:21 366:10,21
epahq6149 (2)	europe (11)	evaluations (15)	182:16 183:11	369:22 373:17,18
7:7 106:10	30:14 60:3,11 61:2,25	12:9 93:8 153:16	218:19 227:20	373:23 375:25
epas (9)	83:6 113:14 115:9	180:19 181:13,21	235:19 256:19	377:14
89:24 94:12,17 95:4	130:25 146:14	181:24 183:4	263:15 265:6 305:1	exhibits (2)
95:12 99:4 131:4	151:6	225:13 306:18	317:21 325:25	93:22 139:25
179:15 314:4	european (48)	308:23 318:1	365:5 371:18	exist (2)
epidemiological (2)	7:16 30:3 59:18,24	322:13 342:13,15	372:16	159:12 166:7
19:4 35:25	60:1 62:10 63:9,10	event (3)	exceed (1)	expect (20)
epidemiology (8)	63:24 64:9,9,15	64:7 109:15 181:19	215:19	181:23 182:22 183:19
35:22 100:2 141:1,2,8	65:2 66:3 69:13	events (2)	exception (4)	183:21 184:1,11,12
141:9 145:24	73:15 74:1,3,15,24	86:15,19	162:9 185:14 296:19	185:4 186:1,6,25
379:11	83:15 84:3,11 85:5	everybody (1)	347:15	188:12 231:21
epigenetic (5)	87:8 88:5 102:3,17	62:15	exchange (6)	232:9 261:15
168:2,11,14 169:1,5	103:1 113:2,18	evidence (46)	28:24,25 107:5	304:10 312:12
equal (9)	114:20,24 115:16	17:14,17,18,18 18:7	111:15,16 278:20	313:8 344:21,24
215:10 231:3,17,20	116:10,16 122:13	18:20 40:8 54:25	exchanges (2)	expectation (2)
232:11 261:19,23	123:23 124:7	55:19 84:19 92:3	106:17 107:4	183:18 187:25
302:15 358:5	129:10 130:5,11	100:1,3 103:16	exclude (4)	expected (18)
equals (8)	146:14 153:12	146:8,10 150:13	206:5,12 216:7 373:9	182:19 185:16,22
193:19 194:5 209:17	290:3 335:9 374:5	155:17 156:1	exclusive (2)	187:21 230:9,21
221:11 258:2,14	379:5	157:17 175:1 187:1	80:5,13	231:1,4,12 301:9,15
281:1 283:7	europes (1)	187:13 188:4,9,13	excuse (1)	301:22 302:1 303:2
equivalent (1)	116:9	188:18 221:2,16	162:21	304:9,12 313:5,20
200:16	eval (1)	222:6,7 227:3		expecting (1)
eradication (3)	306:19	229:14,19 252:18	exercise (3) 316:24 353:7,21	183:13
360:13 361:15 362:1	evaluate (12)	252:22 253:23		expenses (3)
			exhibit (130)	_
eric (2)	19:3 33:6 94:17,21	331:5,19,23,25 346:21,25 347:3	5:6,8,11,14,18,20,24	24:10,12,13 experience (1)
4:7 65:20	95:4 96:3 109:20	360:4,9	6:1,3,7,8,9,10,12,13	37:3
error (3)	173:11 203:20	evidenced (2)	6:14,15,17,19,20,22	
107:20 221:23 302:6	265:11 310:2	359:7,16	7:1,3,6,8,10,12,18	experiment (1)
errors (2)	343:16	exact (9)	7:23 8:1,3,5,6,8,10	99:25
110:15 385:7	evaluated (8)	` /	8:12,15,17,19,23,24	experimental (3)
esfandiary (1)	28:4 298:14 314:7,9	71:1 97:21 114:9	9:1,3,8,12,13,15,17	100:1,3 158:18
4:14	315:13 322:8	155:11 259:6	9:19 13:6,9,19,24	experiments (2)
esq (9)	323:15,21	314:13 345:11	14:16 18:3 19:2,21	190:8,11
3:7,8,9,15 4:7,8,12,13	evaluating (10)	369:1,2	21:9,10 28:20 30:19	expert (106)
4:14	25:4 94:12 98:12	exactly (18)	30:20,25 33:13,25	6:22 8:6,10 15:5 54:9
essence (1)	100:6,16,16 101:9	16:18 28:17 50:5 64:2	34:3 37:15 40:15	70:22 71:14 75:16
172:8	101:13 108:8 301:3	67:7 108:5 119:12	41:21 43:5,6 48:14	76:18,19 77:9,15
establish (3)	evaluation (42)	119:21 120:5,10	52:24 53:2 57:10	83:17 84:9,24 85:11
351:1,7,8	5:9,15 6:4 13:10	153:8 168:24	60:19,20 65:10,11	85:25 86:4,12,23
established (1)	21:11 37:16 38:22	199:20 241:15	65:14 68:17 71:5	87:2,10,14,21 88:10
305:18	42:23 89:25 94:24	245:23 289:2	73:7,8 88:8,9 89:13	88:13 93:16 106:2
establishes (1)	95:8,12 102:10,13	313:25 362:19	93:21 106:6,9,12,16	120:20 121:2,16
236:10	102:23 103:16	exaggerated (4)	107:12 122:6	122:22 123:11
	Į.			Į

				Page 13
	1	1	l	l
125:9,24 126:15	expressed (1)	364:11	312:21 318:5	278:8 281:21
132:12 139:11	98:9	fairly (1)	files (1)	283:21 298:25
147:18 149:3,4	extensive (1)	370:9	367:21	303:17 359:21
153:20 154:9 163:7	100:8	falling (1)	fill (4)	360:19 363:21
171:10 180:18	extent (4)	311:1	39:8 62:17,19 167:19	364:4
181:4,8 189:14	227:14 248:5 249:4	false (6)	filled (1)	finds (2)
191:23 192:22	267:16	180:22 181:15 182:5	62:18	192:24 215:9
196:23 198:3	extra (3)	182:10,13 183:9	final (6)	fine (6)
214:20 216:11	273:11 274:2 305:13	falsely (1)	10:23 54:11 157:11	152:18 262:4,8 332:3
219:1,8,25 220:2,6	extrapolate (1)	182:11	198:13 208:24	333:3 335:16
220:12,16,17 221:7	158:17	familiarize (1)	275:23	finish (1)
221:8 223:3,12	extrapolating (1)	330:7	finally (2)	322:6
230:17 231:8 235:6	158:4	far (8)	168:1 278:23	finishing (1)
236:24,25 238:16	extremely (1)	60:13 72:11 76:15	find (48)	221:21
238:24 258:24	17:8	140:14 160:1	16:13 28:4 30:15	fire (1)
265:25 266:11	eyesight (1)	215:19 300:9 367:4	31:19 46:3 119:2	212:17
273:21 274:5,6	376:5	fascinating (1)	158:23 164:18	firm (13)
275:5 276:25		30:16	195:23 196:3	79:2 80:7 81:9 83:23
277:24 289:16	F	favor (1)	201:17,19 208:25	100:18 101:16,21
294:23,25 332:19	f (4)	145:3	209:12 216:16,22	102:10,14 103:18
339:25 340:1	1:24 2:11 384:4,24	fed (1)	217:4,10,24 221:13	123:16 126:20
341:19,21 346:20	facets (1)	289:1	235:1 236:20	380:2
346:24 347:21	145:10	feeding (1)	240:13 242:15	firms (5)
349:7 355:5,10	fact (46)	227:23	252:17,22 253:9,23	74:22 80:24 98:15
356:18 357:9	19:12 58:11,13 67:24	feel (2)	254:24 265:18	101:5 102:24
367:24 371:9,13	72:3,21 73:19 74:4	308:21 373:5	281:3,7,12 286:7	first (70)
378:20 381:23,24	74:16,25 91:16,24	fell (1)	303:8 309:23	12:14 14:10 21:19
381:25	92:11 96:6 103:10	251:2	311:14,18,21 312:5	30:13 31:21 33:22
expertise (1)	106:2 112:15	fellow (3)	312:6 314:25 319:7	36:18 52:2 53:6
38:1	115:17 120:5	128:11,17,23	329:13 344:22	59:19 61:10 65:15
experts (2)	123:10 125:23	fellows (1)	370:3,4 373:11	71:13 75:14 77:13
81:18 82:4	126:14 132:19	128:7	finding (38)	77:23 82:14 88:6
explain (2)	138:15 144:4 182:7	felt (2)	16:23 18:7 77:19	106:24 107:12,16
60:17 374:9	187:1,5 188:3	58:11 298:12	181:21 187:15	114:3,7 116:21
explained (1)	191:18 215:8 216:8	female (39)	197:24 202:20	120:17 121:25
307:12	217:9 232:10	185:20 186:14 191:20	203:17 205:25	130:15 133:10
explaining (4)	239:11 243:10	192:13 194:7	207:19 208:5,20,21	140:16 142:4
148:1,23 149:13	245:11 252:10	195:25 196:4,12,22	208:23 217:21	152:19,23 153:4
150:5	265:21 277:7	206:15 213:7,17	222:11,22 223:20	158:24 166:11
exposed (3)	292:22 315:15	214:23 218:20	224:16 243:12	178:10 179:18,20
362:17,23 363:5	344:1 350:23	230:7,8,19,19,25	251:18 252:6	190:1,16 194:24
exposure (29)	352:12 375:18	231:10,19 232:7	253:11 255:13,21	196:17 201:6 213:9
49:10 140:10 143:13	facts (6)	251:16,19 252:4,7	258:1 259:1 282:23	220:16 225:25
143:19 144:3,21	92:3 148:1,23 149:13	252:19,23 253:25	282:25 283:8,11,23	237:4 239:17 242:2
160:17 161:20	150:6 385:6	254:22 255:1,6	309:12,23 315:1	244:6 251:25 252:5
162:18 163:21	failing (1)	299:22,24 300:1	372:14,24 381:16	273:18 279:14
171:19 217:5 225:4	275:21	302:17 307:7	findings (34)	297:18 302:19
226:20 254:7,8	failures (1)	318:21 342:16	18:22 31:12 84:13	308:25 332:10
292:10,10 349:1	103:15	fewer (2)	124:20 180:2,4	334:14 338:3,22
353:1 360:11 361:1	fair (19)	299:23 308:14	183:14 203:4,5,13	350:13 360:2,3
361:8 362:9,18	77:5 109:13 128:24	field (2)	218:13 220:18	366:18 370:2 371:8
363:23 364:11,18	135:7 141:16 145:4	362:15 363:6	224:1 230:6,17	374:11,13 378:23
364:24	155:18 159:24	fifth (1)	231:9 237:18 238:5	five (15)
exposures (6)	202:22 203:7 204:1	136:11	239:23 251:23	9:11 25:5 113:9 128:5
27:5,23 28:10 79:15	204:6,10,23 226:17	figure (5)	258:12 262:22	128:8 136:20
158:21 352:25	249:13 272:8 301:6	109:14 228:15 241:14	273:13,15 275:14	271:15 272:2,20

				1490 11
292:16 322:25	form (357)	167:5,12 168:10,17	348:20 349:18	217:9,20,23 221:10
			351:4,19 352:21	222:19,23 223:2
350:8,10 358:20	12:2,23 14:2 15:20	169:10 170:11 171:16 172:2,18	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	222:19,23 223:2 224:5,16 225:11,19
363:16	16:25 17:5 18:10,13		354:18 355:1,19	224:5,16 225:11,19 226:1,10,14 232:25
fix (1)	19:19 20:7 21:3	173:8 174:3,9 175:6	356:5 357:1,15	
163:23	22:1 24:21 26:4,12	175:24 176:20	359:10 363:25	233:4,7,18,21,24
flag (2)	26:23 27:7 29:19	178:21 182:2 183:8	364:13,20 367:8,18	234:12 236:5
200:3 312:25	30:5 31:3,14 32:5	183:17 185:7	368:14 381:21	251:24 253:22
flagged (3)	32:17 34:14,25	186:17 187:4 188:7	382:9,12,25	254:16,18 282:22
310:12,21,25	35:10 37:5 38:9,23	188:17 189:3 193:4	formal (1)	283:6 284:14
flawed (2)	39:7 40:5 42:11,19	193:22 194:11	136:16	292:18 296:17
214:18 303:14	43:18 44:2 46:12	195:11 196:16	format (1)	324:21,24 347:15
flaws (2)	47:9,16 48:3,19	197:21 198:23	336:15	363:18,23 364:4,10
69:5,6	49:16,21 50:4,8,25	200:14 202:12	former (2)	364:17 365:1
flips (3)	51:12 52:4 53:14	203:1 204:4 205:1,7	29:10 123:2	fourth (3)
202:23 203:8 204:7	54:22 55:10 56:4	205:16 206:3,18	forms (1)	217:13,15 297:7
fluent (1)	57:4,19 58:9 59:11	207:21 208:11	253:10	fracking (1)
337:24	60:6 61:5 62:2	209:8 210:13,22	formulated (2)	39:14
focus (2)	63:16 64:1 65:4	211:13 213:8,19	145:16 146:4	frame (3)
162:12 185:13	66:14 67:5 68:16	215:15 216:4	formulations (5)	27:9 260:23 337:5
focused (1)	69:2 70:25 72:6	219:22 222:16,25	139:7,15 148:9	frankly (1)
34:23	74:8,20 77:11 80:9	224:10 225:6	149:11 347:11	156:22
foia (1)	81:19 83:8,19 84:7	226:23 228:14	forter (2)	frequency (2)
105:9	85:2,13,17 86:8	230:23 231:14,24	335:18 336:13	176:14 362:2
folded (2)	87:4,13,23 90:1,16	232:13 233:3,6,20	forth (11)	front (2)
102:15,15	91:6 92:3 93:6	234:7,15 236:14	11:19 71:12 107:15	114:19,24
folks (4)	95:10,23 96:9,19	238:13 239:8,15	154:8 183:24 270:5	fuchs (2)
42:7,16 43:14 138:2	98:17 99:21 100:11	240:25 244:2	333:25 334:16	335:18 336:13
follow (1)	100:20 102:4,19	245:20 246:5	336:4 351:25	fujimoto (1)
11:20	103:2,13,23 104:7	248:12 249:20	384:11	253:13
followed (8)	104:12,19 105:2,7	250:24 251:17	forward (1)	full (12)
148:7,19 238:4 250:1	107:8 108:10	252:14 255:18	269:11	55:25 134:23 135:13
250:3 255:9,10,24	109:24 111:1,22	256:6,14 258:21	found (42)	157:25 166:11
following (5)	113:22 115:22	261:3 264:16 265:2	46:7 164:21 185:24	213:9 297:18
13:17 14:24 56:13	116:4,14,20 117:3,8	267:22 270:21	192:13,14 193:17	320:20 324:6
116:7 168:1	117:23 118:6	272:5,16,25 275:18	193:24 194:16,25	331:24 332:1
follows (1)	119:10,20 120:1,8	277:6 278:13	200:11 201:2,10	341:22
11:5	120:22 121:11	281:22 283:14	209:14,25 214:3,9	function (5)
followup (4)	122:24 123:13	284:9 285:2,12	218:22,23 242:7	143:13,19 144:2,21
68:12,22 91:9 332:11	125:1,11 126:3,17	287:2 289:20 290:6	250:10 255:2,5,15	166:16
followups (1)	127:21 128:2 129:6	290:8 291:5,20	275:9 276:3,13,19	fund (29)
380:24	129:13,22 130:8,14	293:6 294:15	281:9 292:17,19	9:21 25:21,24,25 26:7
food (9)	131:7,12 132:6,15	297:15 298:4 299:9	296:17 298:10,18	26:10,14,20 27:4,12
49:14 60:1 62:10 66:4	133:4,24 134:7,10	300:24 301:24	299:4 300:23 301:3	27:18 28:8 29:16
116:10 117:21	135:1,9 136:25	304:17 305:25	305:23 313:10	30:1 31:8 32:2,14
122:14 146:14	137:12 139:9,17	307:3 308:2,16	322:25 342:20,23	33:1 38:8 39:13,21
379:6	141:7,21 142:15,25	309:5,14 310:23	360:24	90:19 375:15
footnote (7)	143:25 144:13	311:20 312:14	foundation (4)	376:21 377:4,16,22
243:4 297:10,10,25	145:6,19 146:6	313:12 315:9,24	136:17,22 137:6,10	378:14 380:5
299:18 300:3	148:3,12,25 149:16	316:4,13 317:6,18	founded (1)	funded (1)
305:19	150:7,18 153:25	318:13 320:2	26:1	137:11
forced (1)	154:16 155:1,19	321:15 322:1,20	founding (1)	funding (3)
228:5	156:3 158:7 159:9	323:17 332:7,15	376:23	134:4 137:13,16
forget (1)	159:23,25 160:21	336:17,25 338:24	four (50)	funds (1)
45:6	161:23 162:15	339:12,22 340:20	42:9 62:6 94:5 95:3	31:1
forgive (1)	163:14 164:16	341:8 345:3,10	95:11 96:1 128:8	further (8)
376:6	165:9,17 166:2,21	346:3 347:2 348:11	213:22 216:9 217:8	107:2,6 130:1 167:16

	ı	Ī	1	
184:9 346:1 383:3	363:22 364:9,16,17	193:25 194:4,6,18	145:15,21,25 146:3	373:13 379:13,20
384:15	364:25	194:19,20 195:6	146:16 148:9,9,21	goal (1)
future (1)	genotoxicity (16)	196:21 198:9 200:7	149:5,11,11 150:3	281:19
103:6	22:24 137:20 331:21	209:1,11,23 210:6,8	150:15,19 152:20	
105:0				goals (1)
G	332:21 338:20	210:14 211:4,10,17	154:5,11 170:19	142:8
	341:22 346:12	glands (1)	180:20 183:3,11	god (1)
gained (2)	347:23 348:4,15,21	193:18	186:11,21 188:4,14	253:21
101:7 102:5	351:11 357:9,25	glp (1)	189:22 191:19	goes (4)
gains (1)	358:2,3	18:19	192:14 193:2 196:5	107:14 205:19 322:10
103:5	genotoxisch (1)	glyph (1)	196:11,21 197:15	370:16
games (1)	337:21	50:2	197:19 198:9,20	going (44)
152:2	german (18)	glyphosat (1)	200:23 203:15,18	33:11 34:22 48:8 49:6
gavage (2)	8:24 114:23 116:24	337:21	205:3,5,14 206:8,14	55:22 57:22 66:4
227:22 228:1	117:9 333:18,20	glyphosate (279)	211:16 213:6,16,25	76:4 77:4 100:2
gc (1)	334:6,10 337:8,14	7:5,13,19 24:17 25:7	214:7 215:12	108:11 146:11,22
28:4	337:16,18,20,24	25:10 27:2 29:18	216:17,23 217:6,12	155:12 161:8 162:5
gene (2)	338:17 339:3,5	30:3,15 32:11 33:4	218:1,6 219:9,18	162:20 170:2,3,20
347:18 348:2	368:25	34:12,20 35:5,8	221:3 222:8 227:16	172:8 183:13 191:8
general (14)	germany (1)	36:1 38:22 40:1,2,9	228:22 229:4	212:18 216:14
118:2 138:10 145:8	115:1	42:10 48:24 49:5,23	232:16 234:3,13	228:17 229:7,11
155:10 161:25	getting (1)	49:25 50:23 51:2,10	236:11,15 251:15	232:5 257:12 294:3
162:2,6 251:3	163:2	52:14 53:20 54:3,19	256:23 278:2	295:21 329:13
261:14 332:10	giknis (19)	55:1,8 56:2 58:6,19	283:10 284:1,7	337:20 342:11
341:15,17 348:21	243:1,17 244:3 247:3	59:9,17,23 60:4	295:20 296:18	364:22 365:18
376:24	248:21,21 251:9	61:4,16 62:1,10	298:9 331:5,19	366:5 370:19
	259:17,24 260:3,16	64:10 65:18 66:5,18	332:5,14 333:1,10	373:21 374:9
generally (3)			335:9 336:6,23	375:23 377:10
173:1 225:3 372:10	262:16 263:20	68:14,24 69:14	338:9,12 339:9,24	
generate (1)	266:12 267:15	74:15 75:9 77:9,15	340:12,18 346:22	382:13
382:7	270:1 271:4,7	81:3 83:7,16 84:4	· ·	gold (1)
generating (1)	277:11	84:14,20 89:6,15,21	347:1,11,11 348:9	325:8
268:23	gillam (5)	89:25 90:4,9 91:2	348:15 349:8 355:6	good (13)
genes (3)	278:7,21,24 279:21	91:17 92:13 93:2,4	355:11,16 359:7,16	11:8 35:23 100:4
343:10 347:7,8	280:13	94:12,17 95:5,18,21	360:12 361:1 362:9	140:2 172:6 178:6
genetic (9)	give (21)	96:8,18 98:13,22	362:23 363:17	339:5 341:17 342:7
168:2,8,12,13 169:1,4	39:7 100:4 102:7	99:2 100:6,8,16	364:4 367:15 379:3	354:12 371:4,18
370:6 377:20	124:11 139:2	101:14 103:12,17	380:2 381:6	372:16
378:10	152:13 227:19	103:22,25 104:3,6,9	glyphosatebased (3)	gotten (3)
genetically (1)	259:21 266:20	105:1,13 108:8,14	355:18 356:4,25	67:2,3,22
164:25	267:8 314:12 318:6	108:18 112:1,24	glyphosaterelated (3)	governing (2)
geno (1)	318:17 320:4 336:8	113:5 115:9,19,25	81:8,10 212:6	134:24 135:14
342:10	337:1 345:11	116:7,8,12,18,22	go (45)	government (10)
genome (1)	346:18 357:10,21	117:1,6,10,12,16,20	19:10 44:12 52:10	20:17 30:10 105:21
347:9	366:14	118:4,10,14,20	60:16 61:10 95:14	105:22 113:3,3
genomic (2)	given (12)	119:3,13,17 120:20	99:6,25 100:22	135:22 136:12,14
23:3,4	37:14 88:3 102:11	121:9,13,21 122:15	107:3 111:23 151:3	137:11
genomics (2)	119:8 121:7 198:6	123:17,21 124:8,9	155:21 170:2	grand (1)
23:1,2	212:7 252:25	124:17,24 125:4,17	180:10 190:5,24	192:17
genotoxic (34)	320:16 382:13,16	126:22 127:3,18	221:6 224:14,21	gray (2)
	384:13	129:20 130:2,6,12	225:7 241:14 249:1	31:22,23
9:9 332:6,14 333:1,11	gives (4)	130:24 131:5,11,16	255:21,22 257:12	great (1)
336:24 338:13	324:11,12 326:22	131:22 132:5	262:15 285:3 286:5	151:17
339:9,24 340:12,18	· ·	131.22 132.3	287:10 305:16	
342:15,20,23 343:3	372:21			greater (7)
343:5,14,24 344:2,6	glad (1)	138:12 139:7,14	310:6 311:2 314:1	12:8 149:25 187:12
344:15 346:22	208:6	140:10,19 142:13	318:20 328:11	271:15 272:2 328:5
358:19 359:6,13,15	gland (22)	142:20,24 143:13	329:11,16 370:10	328:13
360:5,10 361:2	186:13 187:10 191:20	143:19,23 144:3,22	370:12,20 371:15	greenwald (432)
	I			I

				1 490 10
2.7.5.4.10.2.22.14.2	156:3 158:7 159:9	317:5,17 318:12	192:18 194:1 200:9	271.24.25.275.1
3:7 5:4 12:2,23 14:2		320:1 321:15 322:1	203:22 218:1	371:24,25 375:1
15:20 16:25 17:5	159:22,25 160:20			halfway (1)
18:10,13 19:19 20:7	161:23 162:15	322:20 323:17,19	237:18,21 238:6,7	350:13
21:3 22:1 24:20	163:13 164:16,18	326:13 329:24	239:2 241:12 254:8	hand (3)
26:4,12,23 27:7	164:21 165:9,17	330:19 332:7,15	255:13 256:9,11	262:18 361:18 384:21
28:12 29:19 30:5	166:1,21 167:5,11	333:4,12,23 334:2	257:25,25 258:11	handled (1)
31:3,14 32:5,17	168:16 169:9 170:1	334:18 335:5,10	263:3 281:4,8,13	254:2
34:6,14,25 35:10	170:10 171:16	336:8,17,25 337:22	287:15,16,21,22,23	handwritten (3)
37:5 38:9,23 40:4	172:2,18 173:4,7	338:24 339:11,22	288:22 289:1 291:8	6:10 48:10,14
42:11,19 43:18 44:2	174:2,9 175:5,23	340:6,13,20 341:8	291:15 292:18	haphazardly (1)
46:12 47:9,16 48:3	176:19 178:20	341:14 345:3,10	grouped (3)	289:23
48:19 49:16,21 50:4	179:10 182:1 183:7	346:3 347:2 348:10	203:24 241:10 327:14	happen (4)
50:8,25 51:12 52:4	183:16 185:6	348:19 349:18	grouping (1)	68:4,8,9 165:19
53:14 54:21 55:10	186:16 187:3,22	351:4,19 352:20	290:14	happened (1)
56:4 57:4,19 58:9	188:6,16 189:2,9	354:18 355:1,19	groups (27)	96:1
58:21 59:11 60:6	190:19 193:3,21	356:5 357:1,15	7:21 11:20 19:15 20:3	happening (2)
61:5 62:2 63:16	194:10 195:10	359:10 363:25	22:10 24:1 48:6	353:3,13
64:1 65:4,20 66:1	196:15 197:20	364:13,20 366:8,14	52:13 56:14 127:5	happens (2)
66:14 67:5 68:16	198:22 200:13	367:8,18 368:14	185:17 192:15,19	56:23 160:2
69:1,18 70:25 72:6	202:11,25 204:3,25	370:19 371:3	195:2 217:12	happy (1)
74:7,20 77:10 78:20	205:6,15 206:2,17	373:16 375:23	228:24 229:18	318:20
79:2 80:7,9,11,16	207:20 208:10	377:12 378:16,21	288:19 291:1 292:8	hard (2)
81:19,21 82:19 83:8	209:7 210:12,21	380:19 381:21	292:20 293:19	252:15 363:8
83:19 84:7 85:2,13	211:12 213:8,18	382:9,12,25	308:20 324:9,10	harmful (1)
85:17 86:7 87:4,13	215:14 216:3	greim (14)	346:15 370:10	158:20
87:23 89:8 90:1,16	219:21 221:20	153:7 178:12 179:20	growing (1)	haseman (11)
91:6 92:2,5,15,22	222:15,24 224:9	285:5 371:19,20,22	376:8	298:2,6,7,23 299:21
93:6 95:10,23 96:9	225:5 226:22	371:24 381:3,19	guarantee (1)	305:21 307:1,8,11
96:19 98:16 99:20	228:13 230:22	382:1,4,20,22	368:16	307:13,24
100:10,20 101:17	231:13,23 232:2,12	greims (1)	guess (17)	hasemans (2)
102:4,19 103:2,13	233:2,5,19 234:6,14	179:24	45:12 67:19 96:1,24	300:4 308:4
103:23 104:1,7,12	236:13 238:12	grooming (4)	107:20 128:3,20	hate (1)
104:19 105:2,7	239:7,14 240:24	229:10,16,17,20	131:17 153:1	142:1
107:8 108:10 109:2	244:1 245:19 246:4	grounds (1)	234:19,21 278:4	havent (4)
109:7,11,24 111:1	246:14 248:11	335:14	310:16 314:1	120:23 250:4 256:21
111:22 113:21	249:19 250:11,23	group (113)	337:23,23,25	314:2
115:21 116:3,14,20	251:17 252:13	11:24 12:3,11,19 13:8	guidance (5)	hazard (2)
117:3,8,23 118:6	255:17 256:5,13	13:25 14:8,24 15:10	19:14 23:24,25	, ,
119:10,20 120:1,8	258:20 259:3 261:2	15:18,21 16:19	172:22 277:9	159:2,3
120:22 121:11	261:25 262:5	17:10,20,25 19:13	guided (1)	head (7)
120:22 121:11	264:16 265:2	20:24 21:17,20,23	314:8	25:15 64:14 83:10
125:1,11 126:2,17	267:22 270:21	22:6 24:25 25:6,9	guidelines (6)	122:13 162:21
127:21 128:2 129:5	272:5,15,25 275:18	26:15 33:3,6 34:17	20:2 250:2,4 277:8,12	202:23 203:9
127.21 128.2 129.3	277:5 278:13	35:17 36:5,23 39:4	277:21	health (26)
131:6,12 132:6,15	281:22 283:14	39:11 40:3,7,12,21		7:22 29:9 50:7,11,14
133:4,7,24 134:6	284:9 285:2,12	41:9 43:14 44:1,6	guy (1)	62:6 64:14 115:7
135:1,8,11 136:25	287:2 289:20 290:6	-	365:12	117:19 118:9,13,19
	291:5,20 293:6	47:20 49:4,4,4,4,23	guys (3)	123:4 127:5 132:17
137:12 139:9,17		50:12,16 51:9 52:7	109:4 146:25 170:1	134:19 144:6,17
141:7,20 142:15,25	294:15 297:15	53:5,8,10 54:2,3,24	guyton (4)	145:12 154:23
143:24 144:12	298:4 299:8 300:24	55:12,14,15,21 56:1	42:5 43:10 57:15,21	155:3 157:14
145:5,18 146:6,21	301:24 304:17	56:10,13 57:15,18		340:17 374:13,15
147:6 148:3,11,25	305:25 307:3 308:2	57:24 58:6,18 59:8	<u>H</u>	379:12
149:15 150:7,17,21	308:16 309:5,14	65:1 66:12 67:18	habits (3)	hear (4)
150:25 151:9,13,22	310:23 311:20	68:12,22 69:11	229:16,17,20	151:8,23 152:3,6
152:1,6,10 153:24	312:14 313:12	79:10,16 115:6	half (6)	heard (1)
154:15 155:1,19,23	315:8,24 316:3,12	118:23 142:5	49:3 335:8 360:2	26:8
		I		I

26:8	hogitating (2)	273:24 274:1,12,17	172:17 173:19	124.11 14 124.12
	hesitating (3)			124:11,14 134:13 141:12 152:25
hearing (1)	172:4,11,13	275:1,5,16 276:2,6	175:13 176:1	
151:17	hey (1)	276:10,12,17,20,25	345:24 347:8	153:2 176:2 257:25
heaviest (1)	170:1	283:17,20 303:11	350:25 352:5,6,11	258:10,10 371:9
357:10	high (17)	303:18 304:4,16,21	353:14 355:17	379:5 383:1
held (2)	34:18 194:12 200:9	304:25 308:11	356:3,23 357:18	iarcreviewed (1)
2:9 10:9	214:13 217:25	309:2,3 310:4,7,18	humans (61)	78:15
help (5)	237:18,21 239:2	310:20 311:1,3,5,11	5:10 6:6 12:21 13:11	iarcs (4)
44:20,23 45:1 65:1	240:1 255:13 256:9	311:15 312:1,4,6,7	15:13 23:17,20,21	24:9 33:18 75:8 116:7
136:3	256:11,18 288:10	312:10,18 313:9,11	37:17 116:19,23	id (20)
helped (2)	289:23 290:5	326:7,23 370:1,13	152:22 154:13,21	12:24 13:1 32:19,20
21:19 129:8	352:22	382:10	155:11 158:5,19,20	46:21 91:13 117:24
hemangioma (1)	highdose (3)	history (1)	159:8,11,12,16,18	179:1 190:5 234:18
252:18	287:16,23 291:15	26:6	159:20 160:19	234:20 258:4 285:3
hemangiomas (16)	higher (2)	hiv (2)	161:7,22 163:12,19	300:12 307:20
251:15,19 252:4,7,23	254:9 261:15	166:24 167:2	163:21 165:7,16,19	312:20 354:11
253:17,19,24	highest (11)	hogan (7)	165:20 166:7,19	368:8 370:3,15
254:21,25 255:5,15	194:1 217:11 237:25	238:1 252:2 260:14	167:3,6,9,20 169:3	idea (12)
254:21,23 253:5,13	238:6,7 254:7	264:18 279:15	172:1 174:1,8,16,23	26:7 61:7 77:18 96:20
hemangiosarcoma (270:25 292:19	282:21 324:5	175:4,22 176:5,6,13	118:12,18 135:21
238:6 241:20 251:6	293:3,21 364:3	hold (2)	176:18 224:23	142:16 197:5
251:13	highlight (1)	145:8 337:22	225:3 345:17 346:9	335:14 339:16
	218:12	holds (2)	357:5,11 358:1,7	351:22
hemangiosarcomas		127:14 147:10	365:5	
178:25 236:18 237:3	highly (2)		hundreds (1)	identical (1)
237:7,15 238:10	212:11,12	hollingsworth (1)	` /	260:9
240:3,11,16 241:2,7	hightower (1)	4:3	183:11	identification (46)
241:17,18,22 242:7	80:14	home (1)	hunter (2)	13:12,21 21:14 28:22
242:15,16,18,21	hill (8)	61:22	3:15 80:13	30:24 34:2,5 37:18
243:1,10,25 245:3,9	147:19,23 148:13,21	honest (1)	hydraulic (1)	40:16 41:23 43:8
245:13,17,22 246:1	149:21 150:8,10	312:19	39:14	48:16 53:1 57:12
246:2,8,12,23 247:8	153:22	honestly (2)	hypothesis (10)	60:21 65:13 68:19
247:12,14,24 248:6	hire (5)	128:14 242:9	204:16,17,20,21,23	71:7 73:10 88:11
248:8,23,24 249:3,5	80:23 98:13 100:17	hope (1)	205:2,4,8,18 214:10	89:16 106:11,14
249:17 250:7,9,13	101:4,15	178:7		122:8 123:25 127:7
250:15,20,21 251:1	hist (2)	hoping (1)	I	136:9 156:8 164:6
255:12 256:1,12	240:20 259:15	45:12	iarc (96)	181:6 184:21 220:4
296:20,24	historical (120)	horizons (4)	5:8,14,24 6:1,3 11:10	243:22 268:8,10
hepatocellular (20)	8:20 45:8,19,22 240:2	7:10 122:7,12,17	11:12,19 12:3,8	278:18 326:9 334:7
186:11 199:22,24	240:14,18 242:14	hour (1)	13:10,25 14:4 15:25	334:11 350:2
200:23 201:3,11,18	242:16,19,21,22,25	341:3	17:10 19:14 20:2	358:22 365:22
201:25 202:3,19	243:11,24 244:18	hours (12)	21:11 22:15,18,20	366:12 373:20
203:6 208:6,16	244:23,24 245:3,12	97:23 98:1 99:15,18	24:2,5,8,16,25 25:5	376:2 377:18
209:1,12,24 210:7,9	245:25 246:24	100:7,12,15 101:10	27:1,15 32:3,10,15	identified (8)
210:16,24	248:7,9 249:7,16	101:23 102:22	32:18,22 33:5,14,21	14:7 45:23 46:17
herbert (1)	253:1 257:10,13	108:6,13	33:25 34:3,21 35:3	110:23 123:6 128:6
163:25	259:11,24 260:11	human (45)	35:13,16 36:16 37:2	186:23 310:2
herbicide (3)	260:13,16,21 261:5	5:16 19:3 21:12 23:13	37:16,25 39:7 40:21	identifies (2)
355:18 356:25 360:12	261:9,16,21 262:20	23:15 27:5,23 28:9	41:11 43:2,11 44:4	173:18 244:10
herbicides (3)	262:24 263:2,13,24	49:20,23 145:24	46:11,15 48:4 51:4	identify (6)
35:14,23 356:4	264:13,24 265:5,8	*	52:5 53:10,16,21	78:7 123:2 276:16
*		154:23,24 155:13	55:11 56:19 58:6,11	
hereinbefore (1)	265:16 266:4,9,15	155:17 156:2		318:23 331:20
384:11	267:1,3,9,11,19,25	157:13,14,18 164:1	58:18 59:15,21	332:17
hereunto (1)	268:18,23 270:5,10	164:5,24 165:24	64:25 66:11,12,21	identifying (2)
384:21	270:14,17 271:13	166:14 167:14	67:9,12 68:6 77:6	163:10,20
hes (1)	271:14,23,24 272:2	168:4 169:8,16	77:19 78:9,11 79:10	ignored (1)
298:16	272:18,21 273:3,16	170:7 171:14	79:15 116:1 124:8	238:5
	I	I		I

				ı
ill (11)	335:11,12 337:20	303:2,16 306:9	increasing (2)	263:25 264:7,14
14:10 43:21 60:16	339:4 340:8 343:1	308:8 314:20	194:17 197:15	269:1,7
114:12 220:9 276:9	344:17 348:14	319:14 322:16	incredibly (1)	insecticide (1)
283:5 303:21	349:4,20 352:8	324:21 376:23	199:18	36:2
311:24 326:11	354:6 355:8 359:24	included (24)	index (5)	insecticides (3)
376:15	361:17 364:22	41:7 42:1,3 78:12	5:1,6 7:1 8:1 9:1	34:23 35:4,15
illustrate (1)	366:5 367:19	84:24 143:18 208:7	indicate (2)	instance (3)
311:4	373:21 374:9	208:17,18 222:3,12	49:24 370:5	216:16 244:21 326:20
illustration (1)	375:23 376:5	246:23 248:8 249:7	indicates (2)	instances (1)
290:8	377:10,12 380:16	264:5 283:16	360:4,10	245:25
im (151)	380:17 382:13	290:16 291:7	individual (17)	institute (5)
10:14 11:14 14:17	imagine (1)	296:21 323:13,15	103:20 113:2 181:13	29:8 123:3 127:14
16:13 30:14 31:20	360:22	371:22 373:7 381:3	182:6 232:21 244:9	135:3 138:18
32:21 33:11 42:3	immune (6)	includes (8)	246:18 266:20	insufficient (1)
43:20 45:12 46:13	164:12 166:14,20	173:17 232:20 267:16	289:1,21 290:10	347:4
46:23 58:2,22 63:2	167:3,10,14	297:18 299:3,10	291:8 306:8 307:15	intellectual (3)
71:21 73:2 74:22	impact (3)	304:14 327:12	314:21 326:23	101:15 102:5 103:4
76:3,4,19 90:11	160:8,12 364:16	including (10)	343:21	intend (3)
107:10 113:7,8	impacts (3)	17:17 42:10 110:19	individually (2)	68:3,5,8
114:9,12 122:4	361:2 363:15,22	148:22 202:18	192:16 255:19	intended (3)
128:21 139:1,1 140:2,16 141:25	implementation (2) 134:24 135:14	210:20 211:23 221:19 226:15	individuals (9)	154:4,10 279:5
*		246:2	25:3 41:8 43:23 66:9	intent (1)
142:1 143:2 144:1	importance (1)	incorporate (1)	73:13 113:2 128:6	282:12
146:22 155:12 158:23 161:24	311:4 important (13)	299:15	362:22 363:14	intention (1)
163:1 165:13	17:21 29:12 155:6,13	incorporated (2)	induce (2)	221:25
166:22 167:24	155:16 183:18	10:14 308:18	163:22 171:7	interacting (1)
168:18,24 169:17	238:23 260:9 358:1	incorrect (6)	induces (2) 350:8,10	344:19
170:25 172:4 175:7	358:3 373:10,11,13	69:3 123:7 189:12	inducing (1)	interaction (2) 64:19,21
176:22 184:4 192:5	impossible (1)	280:14 302:24	352:18	interest (25)
196:18 197:1	204:6	362:4	induction (3)	7:21 37:4 38:2,6,11
201:19,23 206:21	improper (2)	increase (10)	349:17,19 350:15	38:12,16,18,20 39:9
207:5,25,25 214:25	133:2,22	205:9 227:20 240:14	influence (5)	39:16 58:8,13,20
214:25 217:13,14	improperly (1)	253:17 255:3	7:20 127:4 133:2,22	59:1,3,10,14 72:10
220:16 221:13,25	321:11	280:24 353:22	134:18	73:2 91:3 127:5
226:2 230:11	improve (1)	354:1,5,9	influenced (1)	261:12 340:17
232:19 234:17,20	136:3	increased (55)	132:4	379:21
241:13 243:7 248:1	inadequate (5)	134:22 135:12 193:2	information (12)	interested (5)
251:11,21 258:4	17:18 50:24 51:2,3,11	194:8 195:8,24	63:23 82:9 86:11	36:19 65:7 139:4
260:2 266:18	inappropriate (3)	196:4 201:2,11,14	118:23 190:7	324:16 384:18
269:18 273:22,25	134:18 266:4 374:22	208:5 210:10,19	243:24 244:9	interesting (1)
274:24 276:8 277:7	inbred (2)	214:6 216:16,17,22	249:15 274:16	139:18
282:6 285:17	169:18 170:9	216:23 217:4,5	323:22 335:3 380:1	internal (2)
287:17 288:25	incidence (15)	223:20,21 235:1	informative (1)	5:17 21:12
290:19 293:7,11	194:6 201:2,11,14	236:21 237:14,23	219:2	international (4)
294:3 295:21	214:5 216:22 217:4	240:13 252:6,18,23	ingestion (4)	19:18 20:6,17 379:4
297:22 303:5,22	242:16 248:9	253:9,24 254:25	227:5,21 228:2,3	internet (2)
304:18,18 305:17	261:15 266:20	255:5,15 256:3	initial (6)	373:25 382:24
306:1 309:15	271:5,23,25 283:25	257:3,19 278:2,11	47:25 184:23 219:25	interpretation (2)
311:22 313:6	incidents (1)	279:2 280:20 284:1	236:25 240:5	52:20 54:13
314:19 315:11	324:16	286:1,16,24 287:7,8	287:11	interstitial (1)
317:13 318:7,8,20	include (20)	287:9 291:18,19	initially (2)	218:21
320:3,11,20 322:4	35:8 42:17 106:19	293:4 294:13	53:3 207:2	interval (1)
323:18 324:16	206:19 207:16	353:18,19	initials (1)	290:17
325:21 328:4	208:3,13 224:17	increases (2)	380:12	interview (7)
332:24 334:21	246:11 285:9,19	195:7 261:17	initiated (5)	151:4,6 336:12,15

				1496 17
227.6 240.4 241.2	200.5	200.5	212.12.16.222.9.10	274:9 275:14 276:6
337:6 340:4 341:2	380:5	298:5	212:13,16 223:8,19	
interviewed (6)	ist (2)	journal (5)	223:21 224:8	276:18 278:9
90:7 146:12,17 335:7	337:20 338:9	124:2,5 125:22 126:4	225:15 325:1	279:15 282:20
335:17,22	item (2)	379:11	key (8)	286:24 287:4,13,18
interviews (3)	245:8 378:7	journals (2)	9:3 243:9 330:24	291:14,15 319:9
121:8,12 146:20	ivan (2)	81:16 82:2	331:19 349:24	320:15,19 321:4
intransit (1)	53:3 55:18	jpmr (2)	351:5,6 379:16	322:17 323:3,25
361:2	ive (20)	117:20 118:3	keyed (1)	324:4
introduce (1)	26:5,8 56:9 58:23	jude (5)	147:16	knocked (3)
10:18	90:22 97:8 105:20	1:12 2:8 380:10	kidney (81)	255:12,20 256:10
inverse (5)	112:22 121:12,23	383:10 384:9	45:5 174:20,21	knocking (1)
192:25 193:17 194:5	141:24 146:17	judge (1)	178:25 216:1,15,16	256:9
215:4,10	198:12 207:25	372:13	216:22 217:2,5,10	know (114)
investigators (8)	268:2 306:21	judgment (1)	217:24 218:6,12	12:24 16:13 19:20
320:18 359:3,20	308:21 315:10,19	372:23	241:8,17,24 242:1,8	27:8 28:14 32:25
360:8,18,24 361:23	316:5	july (11)	256:24 257:3,6,7,20	33:10 42:20 47:17
363:15		5:25 33:23 34:1,7,21	258:12,19 260:14	64:2,3 65:21 76:1
invite (1)	J	220:13 222:23	262:22 263:6	76:21,24 77:2 86:17
114:16	j (7)	223:3 240:5 335:7	266:15,17,19,24	98:6,7 105:8,9,19
invited (9)	8:7,9,11 181:5 184:20	335:19	267:5,7 270:10,18	107:9 108:19
36:7,10,22 37:1,6,24	220:3 380:17	jump (1)	271:23 273:3,6	111:10,17 112:18
54:9 55:2 114:21	january (2)	363:8	274:9,14 276:3	113:12 114:2,9
invoice (10)	263:25 264:7	june (27)	277:9,10 278:1	117:18 118:24
82:14,23 93:25 94:5,9		. ,	279:24 280:20	124:10 126:5
	japanese (1)	8:17 82:14,17,20,24	281:4,7,9,12,15,20	128:13,14 156:23
96:15,23 97:1 99:11	118:9	93:25 94:3,3 96:14	281:25 282:12,15	160:1 161:4,10
101:14	jersey (3)	96:24,25 97:4 99:3	281:23 282:12,13	167:21,22 170:15
invoices (6)	2:14 384:2,7	99:6,10 102:14		-
93:3 95:20 96:6,13	jim (6)	106:18 107:18	283:11,25 284:7,10	170:18 176:5,6
369:8,9	104:5,8,25 105:15	108:2,16,21 109:18	284:18,18,19,21	180:8 184:4 186:18
involve (2)	107:6,19	110:20 126:13	285:8,10,14,19	193:5,6 198:24
79:9,14	jmprs (1)	181:10 278:17,24	286:13 287:18	200:17 206:19
involved (5)	118:8	justification (1)	288:3 293:15	210:25 224:12,20
136:22 137:23 212:9	job (3)	197:22	296:20 315:25	225:2 226:24 227:1
313:2 380:2	1:25 55:3 144:18		316:1,1 324:13	227:3 233:21 239:9
involvement (3)	john (1)	<u>K</u>	kidneys (1)	239:16,17 241:15
58:5,18 76:21	4:8	kalas (1)	260:18	242:9 245:16
involves (1)	johnson (1)	4:8	kill (2)	247:18,23,25
78:14	112:7	kate (1)	352:23 366:17	248:15,17,18 249:6
island (1)	join (8)	42:5	kilo (1)	249:9 250:3,6,19,21
26:15	65:7 69:12 72:3,20	kathryn (3)	289:7	251:1 258:23 277:3
isnt (2)	73:14 74:1,14 138:8	43:10 57:15,20	kind (1)	277:14 278:14
86:9 379:24	joins (3)	keep (1)	214:25	295:11 299:12
isolation (1)	9:20 377:15,21	295:6	knew (3)	300:10,18 302:23
317:8	joint (6)	keeping (2)	32:23,25 105:23	317:11 320:14,21
issue (14)	22:23 201:7 267:9	55:1 140:3	knezevich (57)	323:20,20 325:16
19:20 26:11 27:10	297:19,19 298:24	kellogg (1)	45:5,10,10,12 237:25	326:2 332:5,12,14
59:16,22 61:15 76:6	jones (22)	376:25	251:25 252:2,5	333:1,10 337:10
76:7 79:12,13 104:3	104:5,8,17,25 105:6	kept (1)	256:11 257:8,10	338:18 339:9
115:13 228:18	105:12,15,19,20	368:10	258:1,13,18,25	340:11,24 357:20
250:5	106:1,8,20,25,25	keratoacanthoma (5)	259:12,16 260:14	360:20 365:6 367:9
issues (16)	107:6,19 108:1	207:15 325:4 327:9	262:21 263:7	368:13 370:2,7
23:3,17 29:14,24	109:21 110:3,14,22	327:12,18	264:10,15,17,25	knowledge (5)
39:13 63:4 105:23	111:5	keratoacanthomas	265:7,17 269:11,17	26:24 37:2,25 101:7
110:22 115:11	jose (1)	186:12 187:7 207:1,7	269:20,22,25	102:5
121:9,13 123:17	122:18	208:9,14 209:4	270:16 271:13	known (10)
165:4 310:21 336:5	joseph (1)	210:5 211:19	272:1,24 273:5	23:12,14 105:20
	g ·r \/			

176:1 227:8,10 266:5 38:25,6,11 Kristie (I) 713:746:88.7 68:94 69:16 70:1 713:746:88.7 715:313:14 126:25 136:6 147:2 74:14,21,23 79:19 126:25 136:6 147:2 74:14,21,23 79:19 15:125 152:8,16 169:176:24 178:5 180:10 26:23 180:10 169:176:24 178:5 180:10 26:23 180:14 180:19 132:11 18					
2665 382:56.11	176 1 227 0 10	40 10 57 0 60 10	6 10 20 0 12 20 7	170 2 101 2 245 5 0	07.4.106.2.100.22
89.14 89.11 106.5 108.25 73.13.20.25 73.48 385.20.22 119.19 1207.11,15 125.15 125.15 126.25 136.6 147.2 74.14.21.23.79.19 92.62.3 73.25 122.23 123.12 122.23 123.12 125.10 151.25 152.81.6 169.19 176.24 138.15 152.15 126.16.20 138.19 325.17 138.15 139.25 130.10 1.31.5 135.25 134.4 138.24 190.7 332.55 334.48 335.20.23 138.25 134.25 139.25 134.14 138.24 190.7 332.55 334.48 335.21.6 336.10 335.14 138.13 139.21 138.13		-			
109.59.13 122:1.4 25:15 26:25 1366 147:22 73:14.21.23 79:19 47:11 29:418 295:25 296.26 372:5 118:25 132:81.6 169:19 176:24 178:5 180:10 26:23 126:11 129:9.15 138:19 325:17 138:19 325:14 136:10 152:13 118:18; 138:24 168:62 187:19.24 188:17 338:1 349:21 358:16 364:21 138:13 358:16 364:21 138:14 13					
25:15					
L					
L	25:15	126:25 136:6 147:2	74:14,21,23 79:19	47:11 294:18 295:25	
160 19 176		147:15 151:7,11,15	80:5 88:2,4,6 98:10	296:2,6 372:5	125:25 126:16,20
178.5 180-10 262:3 126:11 129-9.15 138:14 262:7.14 268:14 262:7.14 268:14 262:7.14 268:14 262:7.14 268:14 262:7.14 268:14 262:7.14 268:14 262:7.14 268:14 262:7.14 268:14 262:17 262:14 262:14 262:17 262:14 262	L	151:25 152:8,16	100:15,23 114:8	lines (4)	132:13,21 138:16
178.5 180:10 262:3 126:11 129-9.15 348:25 18title (10) 252:7.14 268:17 336:19 325:17 336:19 325:17 336:19 325:17 336:19 325:17 336:19 17:25 133:25 134:21 10:21 13:14 329:1,11,18 330:1 13:15 153:11 13:15 153:11 18:24 190:7 330:10,13,15 333:25 334:4,18 18:24 190:7 133:25 334:4,18 18:24 190:7 133:25 334:4,18 18:24 190:7 133:25 334:4,18 18:24 190:7 133:25 134:4,18 158:3 260:24 268:13 338:1 349:21 133:25 134:4,18 18:24 190:7 133:13 399:1 138:13 349:21 138:13 349:21 138:14 10:24 138:14 10:24 138:14 10:24 138:14 10:24 10:18 10:5 138:14 10:224 10:18 10:5 138:14 10:224 10:18 10:18 10:5 138:14 10:224 10:18 10:18 10:5 138:14 10:224 10:18 10:18 10:5 13:16 12:20 13:16 12	la (1)	169:19 176:24	124:4,6,22 125:5,22	23:18 148:5 339:15	146:25 380:3
Lab (1) 262-71, 14 268:4 130.7, 12, 25 13:1.14 1		178:5 180:10 262:3	126:11 129:9,15	348:25	little (10)
251:10 labeled (2) labeled (2) labeled (2) labeled (2) labeled (2) labeled (2) labeled (2) labeled (2) labeled (2) labeled (2) labeled (2) labeled (2) labeled (2) labeled (2) labeled (2) labeled (3) 39:1,11,18 330:1 39:1,11,18 330:1 330:10,13,15 330:10,13,15 330:25 3344.18 labeled (3) 335:2,16 336:10 335:2,16 336:10 335:2,16 336:10 335:2,16 336:10 335:2,16 336:10 335:2,16 336:10 335:2,16 336:10 335:2,16 336:10 335:2,16 336:10 335:2,16 336:10 335:2,16 336:10 335:2,16 336:10 1,72 21 60:18 linkage (2) 110:18 114:17 linkage (2) 117:22 l60:18 linkage (2) 117:22 l60:18 linkage (2) 117:22 l60:18 linkage (2) 117:22 l60:18 linkage (2) 117:22 l60:18 linkage (2) 117:22 l60:18 linkage (2) 117:22 l60:18 linkage (2) 117:22 l60:18 linkage (2) 117:22 l60:18 linkage (2) 117:22 l60:18 linkage (2) 117:22 l60:18 linkage (2) 117:22 l60:18 linkage (2) 117:22 l60:18 linkage (2) 117:22 l60:18 linkage (2) 117:22 l60:18 linkage (2) 117:22 l60:18 linkage (2) 117:22 l60:18 linkage (2) 117:22 l		262:7,14 268:4	130:7,12,25 131:14	link (1)	117:25 133:25 162:20
labeled (2) 326:15 328:18 366:10 letters (4) 10:18 114:17 329:11,11,18 330:1 laboratories (2) 330:10,15,15 84:16 86:21 87:19,24 laboratory (5) 333:25 334:4,18 335:2,16 336:10 338:1 349:21 277:13 329:5 358:16 364:21 338:1 349:21 leukemia (4) leukemia (4) 228:2 labis (1) 375:13 378:19 375:13 378:19 380:23 381:2 383:3 late (1) 375:13 378:19 238:3 283:2,24 288:5 383:1,22 4 288:5,13 36:23 lake (1) 289:17 291:3 292:15 labis (7) lates (2) lates (3) late (1) lates (2) lates (3) late (1) lates (2) lates (3) lates (1) lates (2) lates (3) lates (1) lates (2) lates (2) lates (3) lates (1) lates (2) lates (3) lates (1) lates (2) lates (3) lates (1) lates (2) lates (3) lates (3) lates (3) lates (4) lates (3) lates (3) lates (3) lates (4) lates (3) lates (4) lates (3) lates (3) lates (3) lates (3) lates (3) lates (4) lates (3) lates (3) lates (3) lates (3) lates (4) lates (3) lates (4) lates (3) lates (4) lates (3) lates (4) lates (4) lates (4) lates (4)				` /	192:5 217:22
10:2 3:14 330:10,13,15 339:14,18 330:1 10:18;114:17 329:7,374:25 linked (2) 17:22 160:18 199:17 241:8,16,24 189:17 241:11,15 199:17 241:					234:16 276:7 286:7
laboratories (2) 330:10,13,15 34:16 86:21 87:19,24 linked (2) 19:72 16:18					
18:24 190:7 18iboratory (5) 333:25 334:4,18 330:14 18:8 3 260:24 268:13 338:1 349:21 18:8 3 260:24 268:13 338:1 349:21 18:5 3 277:13 329:5 18is 17 358:16 364:21 18is (1) 358:18 368:8,18 34 366:5 18it 17 370:17 374:3 378:19 380:23 381:2 383:3 1ake (1) 26:1 1atex (2) 352:22 356:2 18it (14) 26:1 1atex (2) 28:2.2 18ibility (2) 18:16 (2) 18:16 (2) 18:17 28:17 281:20 18ibility (2) 18:18 21 130:16,24 18:14 100:18 01:0 101:16,21 102:14 101:16,21 102:14 101:16,21 102:14 101:16,21 102:14 102:24 103:18 129:14 101:24 101:18 129:14 102:24 103:18 129:14 101:25 (2) 18ibility (2) 18ibility (2) 18ibility (2) 18ibility (3) 137:15 18ibility (7) 18ibility					
laboratory (5) 335:2,16 336:10 330:14 leukemia (4) 349:1 246:3,11 247:11,15 250:8 251:4 273:24 links (1) 370:17 374:3 370:17 374:3 370:17 374:3 370:17 374:3 380:23 381:2 383:3 lake (1) 370:17 374:3 380:23 381:2 383:3 lake (1) 314 (1) 26:1 26:1 26:1 28:2 lainte (8) 26:1 28:2 lainte (1) 26:1 28:2 lainte (1) 28:2 27:5 8 77:24 landrigan (12) 74:22 80:7 81:9 83:23 98:14 100:18 101:5 131:13,21 100:224 103:18 123:16 126:20 landrigans (1) 129:3,720 130:15,111 130:16.24 131:4,10 131:13,21 102:24 103:18 133:16 126:20 larke (1) 128:5,21 136:15 299:18 305:7 315:6 133:16 126:20 larke (1) 128:5,21 136:15 299:18 305:7 315:6 133:16 126:20 larke (1) 380:2 227:17 228:6,9 240:21 266:11 60:31,10 lobbyst (6) 60:3,10 lobbyst (5) lobbyst (5) lobbyst (6) 14:11,12 21:17 61:19 lobbyst (5) lobbyst (6) lobbyst (6		The state of the s			
1583 250-24 268:13 3381 349:21 3381 349:21 1655;13 166:4,5 liquid (1) 250:8 251:4 273:24 living (1) 355:8,18,24 366:5 370:17 374:3 375:13 378:19 375:13 378:19 380:23 381:2 383:3 lake (1) 380:23 381:2 383:3 lake (1) 266:1 289:17 291:3 292:15 late (1) 375:13 378:19 375:13 378:19 375:13 378:19 375:13 378:19 375:13 378:19 375:13 378:19 375:13 378:19 375:13 378:19 375:13 378:19 375:13 378:19 375:13 378:19 375:13 378:19 375:13 378:19 375:13 378:19 375:13 378:19 375:13 378:19 378:11 lobbyfacts (6) 60:31,0 lobbyfacts (6) 614 91:6 60:21,24 lobbyfacts (6) 614 91:6 60:21,24 lobbyfacts (6) 614 91:6 60:21,24 lobbyfacts (7) lobbyfacts (7) lobbyfacts (7) lobbyfacts (7) lobbyfacts (8) l					
277:13 329:5 labs (1) 358:16 364:21 370:17 374:3 375:13 378:19 62:23 380:23 381:2 383:3 late (1) 3:14 lancet (8) 56:15,20 57:3,6,17,22 75:8 77:24 landrigan (12) 129:3,7,20 130:1,5,11 130:16,24 131:4,10 131:1321 landrigans (1) 129:14 lang (3) 268:14 270:4 272:22 language (2) 129:3,717 28:6,9 129:14 lang (3) 268:14 270:4 272:22 language (2) 129:14 lanka (18) 121:15 10:16,21 102:14 lang (3) 268:14 270:4 272:22 language (2) 129:14 lanka (18) 129:14 lang (3) 268:14 270:4 272:22 language (2) 129:14 lang (3) 268:14 270:4 272:22 language (2) 129:13,57 lanka (18) 121:15 10:16,21 102:14 lanka (18) 121:15 10:15 121:15 10:16,21 102:14 lang (3) 268:14 270:4 272:22 language (2) 120:22 221:9,19 222:3,13 225:23 120:15 120:23 13:3 37:17 lanka (18) 121:15 10:16 121:15 10:16 121:15 10:16 121:15 10:16 121:15 10:16 121:15 10:16 121:15 10:16 121:15 10:16 121:15 10:16 121:15 10:16 121:15 10:16 121:15 10:16 121:15 10:16 121:15 10:16 121:15 10:16 122:17 10:19 122:23 13 12 25:23 122:11 large (5) 120:12 21:23 120:25 21:23 120:25 21:23 120:25 21:23 120:25 21:23 120:25 21:23 120:25 21:23 120:25 21:23 120:25 21:23 120:25 21:23 120:25 21:23 120:21 20:21 120:21 20:21 120:21 20:21 120:22 20:21 120:22 20:22 120:22 21:23 120:22 21:23 120:23 15:12 120:24 13:13:13 120:24 13:13:13 120:25 11:24 120:24 13:13:13 120:25 11:24 120:25 11:25 120:25 21:23 120:25 21:25 21 120:25 21:25 21 120:25 21:25 21 120:25 21:25 21 120:25 21:25 21 120:25 21:25 21 120:25					
labs (1)					
18:17					
lack (1)					
62:23 lake (1) 3:14 26:1 28:17 291:3 292:15 35:22 356:2 liability (2) 136:13 20:13 16:19 175:8 77:24 180rd(3) 1814 100:18 101:5 130:16,24 131:4,10 131:13,21 130:16,24 131:4,10 131:13,21 129:3 7,20 130:1,5,11 130:16,24 131:4,10 131:13,21 129:3 7,20 130:1,5,11 130:16,24 131:4,10 131:13,21 129:14 130:16,24 103:18 129:14 131:13,21 129:14 138:10 129:14 138:13 132:16 176:2 138:13 35:15 138:13 35:7:17 138:13 35:17 138:13 35:17 138:13 35:17 138:13 35:17 138:13 35:17 138:13 35:17 138:13 35:17 138:13 15:15 14:11 215:17,24 216:5,14 218:10,13 218:15,16,22 219:2 220:22 221:9,19 222:3,13 225:23 220:22 221:9,19 222:3,13 225:23 220:11 129:16 (1) 136:19 222:3,13 225:23 220:11 129:10 14:10 129:18 26:1 13:13 16 16:20 16:14 (1) 18ce (1) 136:19 14:10 14:6 268:17 296:14 1379:16 10ck (1) 1379:16 10ck (1) 1379:16 10ck (1) 1379:16 10ck (1) 1379:16 10ck (1) 1379:16 10ck (1) 1379:16 10ck (1) 1379:16 10ck (1) 1379:16 10ck (1) 1379:16 10ck (1) 1379:16 10ck (1) 1379:16 10ck (1) 1379:16 10ck (1) 1379:16 10ck (1) 1379:16 10ck (1) 14:10 120:21:3 32:2 10ck (1) 14:10 120:21:3 32:2 10ck (1) 14:11 1357:4 120:21:13 120:13 1:4 120:22:17 306:21 120:13 1:4 120:22:17 306:21 120:22:17 306:21 120:13 1:7 13:4,13 120:14 10:12 120:14 10:14 120:15 10:15 120:15 10:14 11:15 10:19 120:13 13:14 100:11:12 10:19 120:13 13:14 100:11:12 10:19 120:13 13:14 100:13 13:14 100:13 13:15 100:14 10:15 100:14 10:14 100:14 10:14 100:14 10:14 100:14 10:14 100:14 10:14 100:14 10:14 100:14 10:14 100:14 10:14 100:14 10:14 100:14 10:14 100:14 10:14 100:14 10:14 100:14 10:14 100:14 10					
lake (1) 3:14 26:1 26:					
3:14 26:1 289:17 291:3 292:15 352:22 356:2 366:1 380:13,16 373:19 374:1 10bbying (1) 63:5 129:3,7,20 130:1,5,11 130:16,24 131:4,10 131:13,21 102:24 103:18 122:16 126:20 138:13 375:17 138:13 371:1 138:13 38:13 375:17 138:13 371:1					
lancet (8) 56:15,20 57:3,6,17,22 28:2,2 law (15) 75:8 77:24 75:8 77:24 130:15,20 57:3,6,17,22 140:15 129:3,7,20 130:1,5,11 130:16,24 131:4,10 131:13,21 101:16,21 102:14 101:16,2					
56:15,20 57:3,6,17,22 75:8 77:24 law (15) 74:22 80:7 81:9 83:23 lisbility (2) 14:11,12 21:17 61:19 63:5 lobbying (1) 63:5 129:3,7,20 130:1,5,11 130:16,24 131:4,10 131:13,21 98:14 100:18 101:5 10:227:9 128:5,21 136:15 240:21 266:11 299:18 305:7 315:6 10bying (1) 63:5 lobbyist (6) 60:3,11 61:2 115:14 15:14 299:18 305:7 315:6 115:14 374:5 lobbyist (3) 60:3,11 61:2 115:14 15:14 374:5 lobbyist (3) 115:14 374:5 lobbyist (3) 318:22 319:4 320:9 380:2 227:17 228:6,9 369:10 372:1 380:17					,
T5:8 77:24 landrigan (12)	, ,				
landrigan (12)					
129:3,7,20 130:1,5,11 130:16,24 131:4,10 101:16,21 102:14 101:16,24 103:18 102:24 103:18 102:24 103:18 102:24 103:18 123:16 126:20 licking (3) 321:23 322:2 63:18,18 374:15 located (2) 380:2 227:17 228:6,9 369:10 372:1 363:13,14 lock (1) 380:17 363:13,14 lock (1) language (2) 344:8 364:18 5:22 30:22 liked (1) 146:20 379:16 logical (1) 379:16 logical (1) 379:16 logical (1) 379:16 logical (1) 314:16 222:23 32:22 liked (1) 344:8 364:18 5:22 30:22 liked (1) 146:20 379:16 logical (1) logical (1) 379:16 logical (1) 379:16 logical (1) logical (1) logical (1) logical (1) logical (1) lo					
130:16,24 131:4,10					
131:13,21	129:3,7,20 130:1,5,11				The state of the s
landrigans (1) 123:16 126:20 380:2 227:17 228:6,9 369:10 372:1 363:13,14 363:13,14 380:2 82:7 137:15 1380:17 363:13,14 146:20 379:16 146:20 379:16 146:20 379:16 146:20 14	130:16,24 131:4,10			299:18 305:7 315:6	
129:14	131:13,21			318:22 319:4 320:9	lobbyists (3)
lang (3) lawyers (1) life (1) 380:17 363:13,14 268:14 270:4 272:22 lead (2) 137:15 listen (1) 146:20 379:16 38:13 357:17 344:8 364:18 5:22 30:22 listing (7) logical (1) lankas (18) leaf (1) liked (1) 14:6:268:17 296:14 314:16 214:11 215:17,24 366:19 342:5 324:5 324:21 327:9,11,11 218:15,16,22 219:2 145:3 186:5 201:17 236:20 49:5 54:11 249:3 logistic (1) 220:22 221:9,19 252:11 limited (21) 377:20 378:10 long (8) 226:15 leans (1) 17:16 50:24 51:2,3,11 literacy (2) 379:16 180:18,20 181:12 left (5) 14:10 52:19 55:9,19,22,25 literature (7) 24:5 26:15 76:25 1argely (2) 262:17 306:21 222:7 331:18 332:1 15:10:6 70:23 71:16 234:12 20:25 21:23 legal (1) 343:9 15:50:6 70:23 71:16 10oger (1) 29:25 315:12 length (1) 29:1,3,5,7 17:6 81:410 16:64) <t< td=""><td>landrigans (1)</td><td></td><td>licking (3)</td><td>321:23 322:2</td><td>63:18,18 374:15</td></t<>	landrigans (1)		licking (3)	321:23 322:2	63:18,18 374:15
268:14 270:4 272:22 82:7 lead (2) light (2) listen (1) lock (1) 379:16 38:13 357:17 lead (2) 344:8 364:18 leaf (1) liked (1) 146:20 listing (7) logical (1) 214:11 215:17,24 366:19 lean (1) 342:5 listing (3) 24:21 327:9,11,11 logistic (1) 218:15,16,22 219:2 lean (1) likewise (5) listings (3) 294:22 loke (1) 220:22 221:9,19 leans (1) 252:17,22 limited (21) 377:20 378:10 long (8) 226:15 leave (1) 17:16 50:24 51:2,3,11 literature (7) 24:5 26:15 76:25 180:18,20 181:12 left (5) 14:10 52:19 55:9,19,22,25 19:16 20:4 116:6,8 144:14 157:4 253:21 341:2 20:25 21:23 legal (1) 343:9 15:5 10:6 70:23 71:16 72:5,23 73:21 74:6 10nger (1) larger (2) 10:14 legal (1) 343:9 77:9,16 81:4,10 10 14:37:15 limida (4) 72:5,23 73:21 74:6 look (110) larger (79) 269:21 legal (1) 33:13 37:21,22 40:23 86:24 87:3,11,22 82:20 37:10,20 46:6 <tr< td=""><td></td><td>380:2</td><td>227:17 228:6,9</td><td>369:10 372:1</td><td>located (2)</td></tr<>		380:2	227:17 228:6,9	369:10 372:1	located (2)
language (2) lead (2) light (2) 146:20 379:16 38:13 357:17 Ja4:8 364:18 5:22 30:22 listing (7) logical (1) 1ankas (18) leaf (1) 342:5 listing (7) 14:6 268:17 296:14 314:16 214:11 215:17,24 lean (1) likewise (5) listings (3) 294:22 218:15,16,22 219:2 145:3 186:5 201:17 236:20 49:5 54:11 249:3 loke (1) 220:22 221:9,19 leans (1) 252:17,22 limited (21) 377:20 378:10 long (8) 1arge (5) 14:10 52:19 55:9,19,22,25 19:16 20:4 116:6,8 144:14 157:4 1argely (2) 24:6 164:10 166:11 222:7 331:18 332:1 189:1,8,18 189:1,8,18 253:21 341:2 1arger (2) 10:14 leagh (1) 343:9 72:5,23 73:21 74:6 221:15 1arger (79) 269:21 lind (4) 72:5,23 73:21 74:6 221:15 1asker (79) 4:7 5:3 11:7 13:4,13 1esions (3) 33:13 37:21,22 40:23 86:24 87:3,11,22 32:20 37:10,20 46:6 21:8 30:18 33:11 3:14 243:20 268:9	lang (3)	lawyers (1)	life (1)	380:17	363:13,14
38:13 357:17 344:8 364:18 5:22 30:22 listing (7) logical (1) 214:11 215:17,24 366:19 342:5 324:21 327:9,11,11 logistic (1) 218:15,16,22 219:2 220:22 221:9,19 lean (1) likewise (5) listings (3) 294:22 220:22 221:9,19 222:3,13 225:23 leans (1) 252:17,22 limited (21) 377:20 378:10 long (8) 226:15 leave (1) 17:16 50:24 51:2,3,11 literature (7) 24:5 26:15 76:25 180:18,20 181:12 204:11 357:4 left (5) 14:10 19:8,14 211:15 19:16 20:4 116:6,8 144:14 157:4 202:5 21:23 legal (1) 343:9 15:5,23 37:21 74:6 15:50:6 70:23 71:16 10:14<	268:14 270:4 272:22	82:7	137:15	listen (1)	lock (1)
38:13 357:17 lankas (18) 344:8 364:18 leaf (1) 5:22 30:22 liked (1) listing (7) logical (1) 314:16 logistic (1) 314:16 logist	language (2)	lead (2)	light (2)	146:20	379:16
lankas (18) leaf (1) liked (1) 14:6 268:17 296:14 314:16 logistic (1) 314:16 logistic (1) 214:11 215:17,24 366:19 lean (1) likewise (5) listings (3) 24:21 327:9,11,11 logistic (1) 294:22 loke (1) 379:16 loke (1) 379:16 long (8) long (1)		344:8 364:18	5:22 30:22	listing (7)	logical (1)
214:11 215:17,24 366:19 342:5 324:21 327:9,11,11 logistic (1) 216:5,14 218:10,13 218:15,16,22 219:2 145:3 186:5 201:17 236:20 49:5 54:11 249:3 loke (1) 220:22 221:9,19 222:3,13 225:23 252:11 limited (21) 377:20 378:10 long (8) 226:15 leave (1) 17:16 50:24 51:2,3,11 literature (7) 24:5 26:15 76:25 180:18,20 181:12 left (5) 14:10 52:19 55:9,19,22,25 19:16 20:4 116:6,8 144:14 157:4 204:11 357:4 24:6 164:10 166:11 222:7 331:18 332:1 189:1,8,18 253:21 341:2 20:25 21:23 legal (1) 343:9 1:5 10:6 70:23 71:16 longer (1) 21sager (2) 10:14 269:21 29:1,3,5,7 77:9,16 81:4,10 14:3,13,16 16:9 18:2 1asker (79) 269:21 line (24) 83:18 84:5,25 85:12 19:10 24:3 31:10,19 4:7 5:3 11:7 13:4,13 8:14 243:20 268:9 48:13 53:4 57:9 88:14 91:17,25 73:4 89:10 93:20,24		leaf (1)	liked (1)		
216:5,14 218:10,13 lean (1) likewise (5) listings (3) 294:22 218:15,16,22 219:2 145:3 186:5 201:17 236:20 49:5 54:11 249:3 loke (1) 220:22 221:9,19 222:3,13 225:23 252:11 limited (21) 377:20 378:10 long (8) 226:15 leave (1) 17:16 50:24 51:2,3,11 literature (7) 19:16 20:4 116:6,8 144:14 157:4 180:18,20 181:12 left (5) 14:11,13 197:1,25 198:8,14 211:15 189:18,18 253:21 341:2 20:25 21:23 legal (1) 343:9 15:5 10:6 70:23 71:16 10nger (1) 199:25 315:12 length (1) 29:1,3,5,7 71:9,16 81:4,10 14:3,13,16 16:9 18:2 1asker (79) 269:21 line (24) 83:18 84:5,25 85:12 19:10 24:3 31:10,19 4:7 5:3 11:7 13:4,13 26:30 s (3) 8:14 243:20 268:9 48:13 53:4 57:9 88:14 91:17,25 73:4 89:10 93:20,24	, ,				
218:15,16,22 219:2 145:3 leans (1) 252:17,22 literacy (2) 379:16 220:22 221:9,19 252:11 leans (1) 379:16 long (8) 226:15 leave (1) 17:16 50:24 51:2,3,11 literature (7) 24:5 26:15 76:25 180:18,20 181:12 left (5) 14:10 152:19 55:9,19,22,25 19:16 20:4 116:6,8 144:14 157:4 1argely (2) 24:6 164:10 166:11 262:17 306:21 222:7 331:18 332:1 litigation (56) 374:17 1arger (2) 10:14 29:1,3,5,7 74:18 75:3,16 76:22 look (110) 199:25 315:12 length (1) 29:1,3,5,7 77:9,16 81:4,10 14:3,13,16 16:9 18:2 1asker (79) 269:21 line (24) 83:18 84:5,25 85:12 19:10 24:3 31:10,19 4:7 5:3 11:7 13:4,13 lesions (3) 33:13 37:21,22 40:23 86:24 87:3,11,22 32:20 37:10,20 46:6 21:8 30:18 33:11 8:14 243:20 268:9 48:13 53:4 57:9 88:14 91:17,25 73:4 89:10 93:20,24		lean (1)	likewise (5)		
220:22 221:9,19 leans (1) 252:17,22 literacy (2) 379:16 222:3,13 225:23 252:11 limited (21) 377:20 378:10 long (8) 226:15 leave (1) 17:16 50:24 51:2,3,11 literature (7) 24:5 26:15 76:25 large (5) 14:10 52:19 55:9,19,22,25 19:16 20:4 116:6,8 144:14 157:4 180:18,20 181:12 left (5) 141:11,13 197:1,25 189:1,8,18 253:21 341:2 204:11 357:4 24:6 164:10 166:11 198:8,14 211:15 litigation (56) 374:17 largely (2) 262:17 306:21 222:7 331:18 332:1 1:5 10:6 70:23 71:16 longer (1) 20:25 21:23 legal (1) 343:9 72:5,23 73:21 74:6 221:15 larger (2) 10:14 linda (4) 74:18 75:3,16 76:22 look (110) 199:25 315:12 length (1) 29:1,3,5,7 77:9,16 81:4,10 14:3,13,16 16:9 18:2 lasker (79) 269:21 line (24) 83:18 84:5,25 85:12 19:10 24:3 31:10,19 4:7 5:3 11:7 13:4,13 8:14 243:20 268:9 48:13 53:4 57:9 88:14 91:17,25 73:4 89:10 93:20					
222:3,13 225:23 252:11 limited (21) 377:20 378:10 long (8) 226:15 14:10 17:16 50:24 51:2,3,11 19:16 20:4 116:6,8 144:14 157:4 180:18,20 181:12 204:11 357:4 189:18,20 164:10 166:11 189:8,14 211:15 189:1,8,18 253:21 341:2 204:11 357:4 24:6 164:10 166:11 262:17 306:21 198:8,14 211:15 1:5 10:6 70:23 71:16 10nger (1) 20:25 21:23 legal (1) 343:9 72:5,23 73:21 74:6 221:15 larger (2) 10:14 linda (4) 74:18 75:3,16 76:22 look (110) 199:25 315:12 length (1) 29:1,3,5,7 77:9,16 81:4,10 14:3,13,16 16:9 18:2 lasker (79) 269:21 line (24) 83:18 84:5,25 85:12 19:10 24:3 31:10,19 4:7 5:3 11:7 13:4,13 8:14 243:20 268:9 48:13 53:4 57:9 88:14 91:17,25 73:4 89:10 93:20,24	1 1				
226:15 leave (1) 17:16 50:24 51:2,3,11 literature (7) 24:5 26:15 76:25 large (5) 14:10 52:19 55:9,19,22,25 19:16 20:4 116:6,8 144:14 157:4 180:18,20 181:12 left (5) 141:11,13 197:1,25 189:1,8,18 253:21 341:2 204:11 357:4 24:6 164:10 166:11 198:8,14 211:15 litigation (56) 374:17 largely (2) 262:17 306:21 222:7 331:18 332:1 1:5 10:6 70:23 71:16 longer (1) 20:25 21:23 legal (1) 343:9 72:5,23 73:21 74:6 221:15 larger (2) 10:14 linda (4) 74:18 75:3,16 76:22 look (110) 199:25 315:12 length (1) 29:1,3,5,7 77:9,16 81:4,10 14:3,13,16 16:9 18:2 lasker (79) 269:21 line (24) 83:18 84:5,25 85:12 19:10 24:3 31:10,19 4:7 5:3 11:7 13:4,13 8:14 243:20 268:9 48:13 53:4 57:9 88:14 91:17,25 73:4 89:10 93:20,24					
large (5) 14:10 52:19 55:9,19,22,25 19:16 20:4 116:6,8 144:14 157:4 180:18,20 181:12 left (5) 14:11,13 197:1,25 189:1,8,18 253:21 341:2 204:11 357:4 24:6 164:10 166:11 198:8,14 211:15 litigation (56) 374:17 largely (2) 262:17 306:21 222:7 331:18 332:1 1:5 10:6 70:23 71:16 longer (1) 20:25 21:23 legal (1) 343:9 72:5,23 73:21 74:6 221:15 larger (2) 10:14 linda (4) 74:18 75:3,16 76:22 look (110) 199:25 315:12 length (1) 29:1,3,5,7 77:9,16 81:4,10 14:3,13,16 16:9 18:2 lasker (79) 269:21 line (24) 83:18 84:5,25 85:12 19:10 24:3 31:10,19 4:7 5:3 11:7 13:4,13 8:14 243:20 268:9 48:13 53:4 57:9 88:14 91:17,25 73:4 89:10 93:20,24			, ,		0 1 7
180:18,20 181:12 left (5) 141:11,13 197:1,25 189:1,8,18 253:21 341:2 204:11 357:4 24:6 164:10 166:11 198:8,14 211:15 litigation (56) 374:17 largely (2) 262:17 306:21 222:7 331:18 332:1 1:5 10:6 70:23 71:16 longer (1) 20:25 21:23 legal (1) 343:9 72:5,23 73:21 74:6 221:15 larger (2) 10:14 linda (4) 74:18 75:3,16 76:22 look (110) 199:25 315:12 length (1) 29:1,3,5,7 77:9,16 81:4,10 14:3,13,16 16:9 18:2 lasker (79) 269:21 line (24) 83:18 84:5,25 85:12 19:10 24:3 31:10,19 4:7 5:3 11:7 13:4,13 lesions (3) 33:13 37:21,22 40:23 86:24 87:3,11,22 32:20 37:10,20 46:6 21:8 30:18 33:11 8:14 243:20 268:9 48:13 53:4 57:9 88:14 91:17,25 73:4 89:10 93:20,24		, ,			
204:11 357:4 24:6 164:10 166:11 198:8,14 211:15 litigation (56) 374:17 largely (2) 262:17 306:21 222:7 331:18 332:1 1:5 10:6 70:23 71:16 longer (1) 20:25 21:23 legal (1) 343:9 72:5,23 73:21 74:6 221:15 larger (2) 10:14 linda (4) 74:18 75:3,16 76:22 look (110) 199:25 315:12 length (1) 29:1,3,5,7 77:9,16 81:4,10 14:3,13,16 16:9 18:2 lasker (79) 269:21 line (24) 83:18 84:5,25 85:12 19:10 24:3 31:10,19 4:7 5:3 11:7 13:4,13 lesions (3) 33:13 37:21,22 40:23 86:24 87:3,11,22 32:20 37:10,20 46:6 21:8 30:18 33:11 8:14 243:20 268:9 48:13 53:4 57:9 88:14 91:17,25 73:4 89:10 93:20,24					
largely (2) 262:17 306:21 222:7 331:18 332:1 1:5 10:6 70:23 71:16 longer (1) 20:25 21:23 legal (1) 343:9 72:5,23 73:21 74:6 221:15 larger (2) 10:14 linda (4) 74:18 75:3,16 76:22 look (110) 199:25 315:12 length (1) 29:1,3,5,7 77:9,16 81:4,10 14:3,13,16 16:9 18:2 lasker (79) 269:21 line (24) 83:18 84:5,25 85:12 19:10 24:3 31:10,19 4:7 5:3 11:7 13:4,13 lesions (3) 33:13 37:21,22 40:23 86:24 87:3,11,22 32:20 37:10,20 46:6 21:8 30:18 33:11 8:14 243:20 268:9 48:13 53:4 57:9 88:14 91:17,25 73:4 89:10 93:20,24	*	, ,			
20:25 21:23 legal (1) 343:9 72:5,23 73:21 74:6 221:15 larger (2) 10:14 linda (4) 74:18 75:3,16 76:22 look (110) 199:25 315:12 length (1) 29:1,3,5,7 77:9,16 81:4,10 14:3,13,16 16:9 18:2 lasker (79) 269:21 line (24) 83:18 84:5,25 85:12 19:10 24:3 31:10,19 4:7 5:3 11:7 13:4,13 lesions (3) 33:13 37:21,22 40:23 86:24 87:3,11,22 32:20 37:10,20 46:6 21:8 30:18 33:11 8:14 243:20 268:9 48:13 53:4 57:9 88:14 91:17,25 73:4 89:10 93:20,24				0 \ /	
larger (2) 10:14 linda (4) 74:18 75:3,16 76:22 look (110) 199:25 315:12 length (1) 29:1,3,5,7 77:9,16 81:4,10 14:3,13,16 16:9 18:2 lasker (79) 269:21 line (24) 83:18 84:5,25 85:12 19:10 24:3 31:10,19 4:7 5:3 11:7 13:4,13 lesions (3) 33:13 37:21,22 40:23 86:24 87:3,11,22 32:20 37:10,20 46:6 21:8 30:18 33:11 8:14 243:20 268:9 48:13 53:4 57:9 88:14 91:17,25 73:4 89:10 93:20,24					0 1
199:25 315:12 length (1) 29:1,3,5,7 77:9,16 81:4,10 14:3,13,16 16:9 18:2 lasker (79) 269:21 line (24) 83:18 84:5,25 85:12 19:10 24:3 31:10,19 4:7 5:3 11:7 13:4,13 lesions (3) 33:13 37:21,22 40:23 86:24 87:3,11,22 32:20 37:10,20 46:6 21:8 30:18 33:11 8:14 243:20 268:9 48:13 53:4 57:9 88:14 91:17,25 73:4 89:10 93:20,24				*	
lasker (79) 269:21 line (24) 83:18 84:5,25 85:12 19:10 24:3 31:10,19 4:7 5:3 11:7 13:4,13 lesions (3) 33:13 37:21,22 40:23 86:24 87:3,11,22 32:20 37:10,20 46:6 21:8 30:18 33:11 8:14 243:20 268:9 48:13 53:4 57:9 88:14 91:17,25 73:4 89:10 93:20,24					
4:7 5:3 11:7 13:4,13 lesions (3) 33:13 37:21,22 40:23 86:24 87:3,11,22 32:20 37:10,20 46:6 21:8 30:18 33:11 8:14 243:20 268:9 48:13 53:4 57:9 88:14 91:17,25 73:4 89:10 93:20,24					
21:8 30:18 33:11 8:14 243:20 268:9 48:13 53:4 57:9 88:14 91:17,25 73:4 89:10 93:20,24	, ,				
7		` '			•
34:7 40:13 43:3 letter (50) 71:4 139:23 143:10 92:13 93:4 96:8 99:23,25 100:2				· ·	The state of the s
	34:7 40:13 43:3	letter (50)	71:4 139:23 143:10	92:13 93:4 96:8	99:23,25 100:2
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

107.11.117.51	045 4046 1066 1	166 05 151 11 15	220 7 10 227 22	104 10 210 24
107:11 117:24	245:4 246:1 266:14	166:25 171:11,15	230:7,19 235:20	184:18 219:24
118:7 121:24	279:9 283:18	172:17 173:3 174:1	236:12,16,19 237:8	268:4 325:17
123:18 136:11	297:22 300:10	235:20 236:11,16	240:3,11 244:23	333:16 349:21
139:23 143:4	307:19 311:12	319:5,8,24	256:24 257:4,20	358:16 365:18
146:23 150:4	314:3 342:14 343:9	lymphomas (23)	299:24,25 302:17	366:5 375:23
152:13 155:9 172:9	348:1 370:8 372:24	165:6,14,25 166:7	342:16	marked (51)
176:13 179:8	looks (6)	169:16 170:7	males (1)	13:11,21 21:13 28:21
184:11 190:5,24	140:6 151:21 175:25	171:19 173:15,24	244:22	30:23 34:1,4 37:18
191:7,10,14,23	351:14 375:12	174:7,11,12 175:4	malignant (5)	40:16 41:22 43:7
193:13 201:8	378:4	178:24 319:10,12	173:15 235:19 236:11	48:15 52:25 57:11
207:23 212:7 213:1	loss (1)	319:13,14,21,23	236:16 327:3	60:21 65:12 68:18
216:19 217:1,17	76:3	320:7,10,13	mammalian (1)	71:6 73:9 88:10
219:11 224:21	lost (6)	lymphosarcoma (6)	155:3	89:16 106:10,14
230:5 234:17,18,20	100:21 174:4 234:16	321:13,18,21 322:18	mammals (5)	122:8,9 123:24
234:24 235:3,5	276:7 293:8 309:15	323:7,18	154:5,11 160:25	127:6 136:9 139:25
242:17,20 243:17	lot (6)	lymphosarcomas (12)	351:1 358:2	156:8 164:6 179:7
244:5 247:2 249:22	29:12 146:8 342:11	320:6,7,9,15 321:4,7	mammary (35)	181:5 184:20 220:4
256:1 258:4 259:19	347:16 371:23	321:17 322:7,16,24	186:13 187:10 191:20	243:21 268:7,10
265:8,10 266:23	375:22	322:24 324:3	192:12,17 193:1,18	278:17 326:9 334:7
268:16 269:4	lots (1)	lyon (2)	193:25 194:3,6,18	334:10 350:1
281:16 284:3 286:3	112:22	24:11 41:16	194:19,20,23 195:6	358:21 365:22
287:12 288:13	low (8)		195:24 196:4,11,21	366:12,21,24
292:15 294:1,3	271:1 288:6 289:23	M	197:6,18 198:9,20	373:19 376:1
297:3 306:3 310:6	290:4 292:4,5,9	m (20)	199:12 200:7 208:6	377:17
312:9 317:20 320:4	360:14	2:5 10:12 69:21,24	209:1,11,23 210:6,8	marking (2)
329:4 331:10	lowdose (3)	177:2 178:2,4	210:14 211:4,10,16	373:22 377:12
334:13 335:25	287:15,21 288:19	180:13,16 262:10	manuscript (2)	marriage (1)
336:3,9 337:7,17	lower (6)	262:13 327:16	23:6 72:8	384:17
339:5 341:19 343:7	214:11 254:7 272:20	328:24 329:20,23	march (48)	martin (2)
351:24 352:1	283:25 293:18	365:14,17 370:23	6:7,8,9,12,13,19 7:11	42:15 335:17
358:14 359:22	307:9	371:1 383:7	8:16 22:17 40:15,20	mary (5)
361:4,10 372:20	lowest (4)	machine (3)	41:22,24 42:6 43:3	1:24 2:11 10:16 384:4
373:10 376:15	292:17,25 293:1,16	33:19 35:2,12	43:7 52:25 53:6,8	384:24
378:22 379:15	lowit (3)	magazine (2)	53:13 55:4,20 57:11	mass (1)
380:15	107:1 111:12,19	122:11,17	57:13 71:6,16 75:12	28:4
looked (26)	lukic (1)	maintain (3)	75:17,17 76:13,25	match (3)
15:22 23:7 24:25 40:7	3:9	254:12 295:17 369:15	77:6,7 78:18 79:19	23:16,18 339:25
55:6 120:23 150:13	lunch (1)	maja (1)	79:21,25 80:3,17	matched (3)
175:11 178:10	178:7	3:9	81:1,12,24 83:11	22:12 197:11 292:7
194:24 216:9	luncheon (1)	major (2)	99:3 122:7,20 268:7	material (2)
229:15 238:1	177:3	167:18 358:11	268:12	371:16,17
244:20 249:25	lundy (22)	makeup (4)	marginal (5)	materials (2)
250:4 263:3 265:14	3:11,11,15 75:25	7:5 89:15,20 90:4	207:22 236:6 280:23	381:10 382:5
276:21 290:9	76:10,13 77:1,8,14	making (15)	283:21 354:2	math (2)
305:15 308:10	77:23 78:6,14,19	127:6 132:25 144:10	marginally (15)	125:15 193:11
314:3 315:20	79:7 80:6,7,14,14	145:1,10 181:20	235:16,17,18 240:17	matlab (2)
351:20 363:15	80:15,15 82:18,19	182:15,22 183:22	280:5,6,7,11 283:3	368:21 369:2
looking (37)	luxenberg (5)	243:9 275:4 293:11	284:13 285:24,25	matter (9)
14:21 16:2 22:23 26:5	2:10 3:3 78:20 80:8	342:12 359:23	286:15 287:5	10:4 37:3 38:1 58:14
71:24 88:23 155:2	80:16	372:22	353:24	78:5 79:8 261:14
179:24 201:6	lymph (2)	male (34)	mark (28)	344:1 384:19
205:12 217:13	167:19 248:25	185:14,24 186:4,12	13:5,6,14 30:19 33:11	matters (2)
223:11,16 226:3,5	lymphoid (3)	200:24 201:3,12	40:13 48:12 57:8	76:13,17
228:18 232:19,25	164:1,5 167:18	207:1,10 216:1	65:9 71:3 73:6 88:7	matthew (4)
234:19 235:13	lymphoma (15)	217:3 218:6,21	89:11 106:5 122:2	4:15 10:13 48:11
239:20 244:17	140:11 148:10 152:21	219:10,15,19 221:4	126:25 136:6 181:2	80:14
	l			I

	l	l	l	
mcgregor (2)	53:7,10,12,17 54:2	291:17 292:24	345:9,13	307:4,6
15:22,25	56:7,14 57:18 82:17	methods (5)	mills (1)	modifications (2)
mdl (1)	82:19 133:14 383:1	119:15 188:23 189:5	376:25	148:14 372:15
1:4	meetings (4)	189:15 312:17	mind (1)	modified (10)
mean (19)	33:15 56:21,24 121:1	mgs (1)	117:11	165:1 185:9 296:12
51:19 97:21 139:20	meets (1)	289:6	mine (1)	297:4,8 299:23
168:20,21 183:20	182:6	mice (94)	295:13	315:4 322:15
194:6 253:20	member (5)	23:19 160:6,7 163:24	minor (1)	324:20 327:25
262:23 270:17	25:13 36:25 48:17,20	164:1,15,24 165:1,6	382:14	molecular (1)
271:24 327:20	142:4	165:14 166:7 169:3	minus (1)	164:13
341:6,11,24 349:20	members (15)	169:17 170:8,22	176:2	moment (4)
367:20 372:3 375:6	40:12 41:4,19,25	171:3,13,23 172:5,5	minute (5)	124:12 147:16 259:21
meaning (3)	46:17 54:2 57:14,23	171.5,15,25 172.5,5	180:11 226:8 320:4	366:19
195:6 279:22 283:10	The state of the s	173:20,23 174:6,15		
	64:16,20,21,25 81:17 82:3 376:23	173.20,23 174.0,13	330:1 370:21	money (4)
means (7)			minutes (1)	96:22 133:2,22
17:16 149:21 170:24	memo (3)	176:18 185:18	330:12	135:19
170:25 275:22	100:12 101:12 110:19	224:22 227:9	misquoted (2)	monograph (24)
299:13 337:25	mentally (1)	228:24 229:22,23	90:23 91:11	11:12 12:1 15:25 39:4
measure (2)	235:12	230:2,7,8,19,20	missed (4)	43:2 44:5 46:11,22
27:5 194:9	mentioned (4)	231:1,1,10,11,19,20	124:19 281:23 311:23	47:4 48:4 52:5
measured (1)	78:23 209:16 259:13	232:7,8,17,25 234:4	371:23	53:16 66:11,21
28:16	330:24	235:2,20 236:12,16	missing (3)	67:10,13 68:6 77:19
measuring (4)	met (3)	236:19 240:3,11	155:17 156:1 157:18	77:20 153:1,2
27:23,25 28:9 353:17	64:13 114:7,8	251:16,20,21 252:4	mississippi (1)	257:24 258:10
mechanism (20)	meta (2)	252:7,19,24 253:8	48:11	351:21
12:12 23:19 41:12	372:17,17	253:22,25 254:22	mistake (6)	monographs (11)
42:7 43:23 44:9	metabolism (1)	255:1,6,16 256:24	98:19,20 197:2 202:6	5:9,15 6:4 13:10
46:18 48:18,21	160:13	257:4,20 260:5,10	253:5 280:3	19:23 21:11 23:11
53:12 159:12,15	metabolomics (1)	265:5 268:22	mistaken (1)	23:12 24:2 37:16
165:6,14 166:5	22:25	269:16 273:4	170:23	55:11
330:22 343:5 344:2	metanalyses (1)	274:18 278:2	misunderstanding (1)	monsanto (27)
344:15 352:24	19:3	288:15 291:13	305:17	4:4,12 9:19 87:22
mechanisms (13)	metastatic (1)	299:24,25 318:22	misunderstood (1)	91:18 92:13 93:5
9:6 40:25 43:25 54:25	168:21	318:25 319:2	313:17	111:20 113:20
159:5,10 160:4,6,11	method (1)	342:17	mix (1)	121:4 123:12
331:13 345:25	120:12	michael (1)	267:12	125:25 126:16
350:1 354:15	methodological (1)	4:13	mixed (1)	132:13,22 138:17
mechanistic (14)	316:16	micronucleus (1)	198:6	246:20 279:12,23
12:8,17,22 14:14	methodologically (2)	359:17	mo (1)	324:1 376:19,25
15:13 16:4,22 17:23	294:18 303:14	mid (2)	383:14	377:3,15,21 378:9
23:25 24:3 41:19	methodology (42)	288:9 290:4	model (9)	382:20
43:15 54:16 343:23	11:19 144:8,9 148:7	middle (2)	23:11 164:14,24	monsantos (1)
media (5)	148:19 149:9 150:4	217:11 218:1	172:10,22 173:10	378:13
10:2 81:15 82:1 121:8	188:21 189:21	middose (2)	173:12,16 344:21	month (3)
121:15	190:3,6,18 191:3,15	287:22 288:22	modeling (3)	92:21 267:24 335:8
medicines (1)		midvale (2)	0 1	months (27)
352:13	200:22 203:14	369:10,11	23:3 156:6,17	59:15,21 70:24 71:19
352:15 medium (7)	204:18 206:24	midway (3)	models (20)	71:22 74:6 75:1
	208:4 213:2,23	47:22 52:6 181:11	155:9 160:16,23	77:2 92:1,14 94:5
24:17 25:8,10 32:11	218:4 222:13	4/:22 52:6 181:11 midweek (2)	161:1,13,19 162:11	
33:4 34:12,19	229:25 232:16	` '	163:10,17 164:1,5	95:3,11 96:1 215:17
meeting (33)	233:25 234:25	48:5 51:21	169:15 170:7,14,17	216:6 219:5 233:11
13:18 33:15 34:22	235:21 236:18	midwest (1)	171:10,14,24	233:12 363:18,23
35:7 39:3,4,9,10	238:5,9 255:10,25	378:5	172:17 173:15	364:4,10,17 365:1
41:16 44:7,14 47:5	271:12 281:19	mike (2)	modern (1)	382:13,16
48:4,25 50:12,15	285:22 286:22	191:8,13	12:17	morning (3)
51:18,18,25 52:2,6	290:20,23 291:12	millions (2)	modification (2)	11:8 375:19,21
	ļ	ļ	Į.	

morse (15)	342:20,24 346:17	73:24 201:1,9 257:1	352:1,3,4	8:19 135:23,24
163:25 164:11 165:2	mutagenicity (3)	257:17 280:18	nonexposure (1)	136:16,21 137:7,14
165:4,21 166:10	346:9,13,14	neoplasm (3)	354:8	325:8,14,18,22
	mutagenistic (1)	164:2 173:19 244:21	nonhodgkins (10)	326:3,7,17 342:14
167:16,25 169:12	347:13			
169:23 170:5		neoplasms (1)	140:11 148:10 152:21	342:15 346:16
173:17,22 174:5,13	mutagens (1)	164:6	166:24 171:11,15	nuanced (2)
motivated (1)	342:9	neoplastic (5)	172:17 173:3 174:1	118:1 342:7
132:4	mutated (1)	8:13 168:3,19 243:20	175:4	null (6)
mouse (53)	169:6	268:9	nonmammalian (1)	203:5 204:16,22
8:5,14 45:10,13,13	mutation (4)	network (1)	358:4	205:4,8,18
164:5 165:23	344:17,22,24 347:18	23:3	nonsignificant (2)	number (78)
166:14 167:9,14,19	mutations (8)	never (12)	180:1,4	5:7 7:2 8:2 9:2 11:25
168:4 169:7,14,24	341:6,12,25 343:4,9	26:5 58:23 91:13	nope (1)	33:6 65:16 103:20
170:6,13,16 171:10	343:11,25 344:9	123:5 171:4 190:14	107:14	115:24 116:5
171:14,24 172:16	mute (2)	202:6,15 214:15	normal (7)	121:20 124:19
173:10,12,15	169:20 170:2	243:11 310:11	36:15 49:18 157:24	131:19 163:8
174:21 175:2,12		330:5	169:6 336:15	180:19,20 181:13
178:24 229:22,23	N	new (25)	353:15 373:14	183:13 185:1,4,15
232:23 233:4,7	name (11)	1:13,13 2:10,11,14	north (1)	185:16,21,25 186:5
235:13 243:21	10:13 21:16 45:6	3:6 5:21 10:10,10	369:11	186:25 187:19,24
251:24 254:16,18	78:22 112:6 113:1	18:17 22:11 26:15	northern (2)	231:5,18 232:8,9,17
255:4 257:2 268:10	129:14 191:12	30:21 107:25	1:2 10:7	232:22 267:3 298:8
268:18 270:6	278:7 385:1,3	118:19 119:1,2	northwest (1)	298:11,17 300:22
272:22 278:9 279:1	names (2)	185:9 191:8 224:1	4:5	301:10,15,21 304:9
280:19 282:22	46:24 113:7	273:12,13 293:10	notary (2)	306:19 307:7,15
283:6 304:1 324:1	narino (2)	384:2,7	2:13 384:6	308:21,22 311:14
370:3	364:2,7	news (4)	notation (2)	313:7,10,14,15,20
mouth (1)	national (6)	118:16 333:18 378:4	49:13 50:3	313:21,23 314:13
55:2	19:17 20:5 29:8,10	378:7	note (11)	314:20 315:12,16
move (2)	64:23 123:3	newspaper (1)	49:19,22 50:20 51:1	316:18,19,21 317:1
162:24 353:6	natural (1)	95:25	180:17 221:10	317:11 318:5,8,9,15
moved (1)	262:1	nfs (2)	237:12,24 242:24	319:24 321:3
54:20	nature (3)	169:16 170:8	302:4 347:21	343:10,11 345:12
moving (2)	138:5 277:12 290:13	nhl (25)	noted (1)	350:16 355:4,9
162:1,1		50:1,2 139:7,15,22	321:16	369:22
mrcc (1)	near (1) 185:16	140:19 149:12	notes (13)	numbers (33)
376:23				37:22 231:2 243:4
multiorgan (2)	necessarily (3)	163:11,17,18,22	6:10 48:10,14,23,23	275:13,20,21
251:13.13	38:11 183:20 265:3	164:15 165:7,15	49:9,24 51:17 55:6	299:14,17,20 300:5
	necrotic (1)	166:6,19 167:6	60:24 78:18 165:4	
multiple (15)	352:24	171:3,4,25 172:9,23	166:10	300:6,21,25 301:3
188:24 189:6,16	need (8)	174:8,16 176:18	notice (7)	303:8,10 306:24
190:7,8,11 245:5	16:5 63:19 262:1	nice (1)	9:12 35:3,7 365:19,21	307:1,2,5,24 308:8
270:23 275:15,17	320:9 366:19	37:22	366:1,9	308:19,20 314:20
275:19 276:1	370:16,20 382:7	niche (1)	notices (1)	316:5 324:12,12,17
321:16,21 324:15	needed (1)	167:19	33:14	327:24 328:5,17
multiplied (1)	12:16	niehs (2)	noting (1)	370:10
302:1	negative (24)	29:4 137:14	125:2	numeral (4)
multiply (1)	50:1,3 193:1,11,18	nine (2)	notion (2)	19:7 80:18 81:2
301:13	195:5,13,14,18	75:6,7	198:8 211:16	100:24
multistage (1)	197:14 209:20	nm (1)	november (19)	numerous (2)
344:21	213:24 214:13,15	359:8	6:18,20 64:24 65:17	121:7 160:22
murine (4)	214:16 215:6,6	nodes (2)	68:11,18,21 70:4,17	ny (1)
165:5,13 166:4,5	252:11 278:1	167:19 249:1	73:9,18 74:3,13,24	3:6
mutagen (3)	282:24 283:9	nominated (1)	129:10 130:7,13,25	
344:16 347:1,4	347:12,17 372:25	25:2	153:12	0
mutagenic (3)	neither (6)	noncarcinogens (3)	ntp (17)	object (7)
	1	1		

121.12.105.10	149.2 11 25 140.15	220.1 222.1 20	202 (2)	72.12 74.22 120.0
131:12 195:10	148:3,11,25 149:15	320:1 322:1,20	oec (2)	73:12 74:23 129:9
226:22 234:6	150:7,17,21,25	323:17,19 332:7,15	172:25 277:12	130:6 131:14,15
267:22 321:15	153:24 154:15	333:4,5,12 336:17	oecd (6)	153:11 306:21
338:24	155:1,19,23 156:3	336:25 339:11,22	172:5,21 249:22	379:16,17
objecting (2)	158:7 159:9,22,25	340:6,13,20 341:8	250:2,4 277:8	operating (1)
335:11,13	160:20 161:23	341:14 345:3,10	office (3)	199:20
objection (378)	162:15 163:13	346:3 347:2 348:10	61:19,20 105:16	operations (1)
12:2,23 14:2 15:20	164:16 165:9,17	348:19 349:18	offices (1)	353:15
		351:4,19 352:20	2:9	
16:25 17:5 18:10,13	166:1,21 167:5,11			opine (14)
19:19 20:7 21:3	168:16 169:9	354:18 355:1,19	official (2)	186:9 191:18 197:17
22:1 24:20 26:4,12	170:10 171:16	356:5 357:1,15	105:21,22	213:4,14 219:8,18
26:23 27:7 28:12	172:2,18 173:4,7	359:10 363:25	officials (5)	232:16 234:12
29:19 30:5 31:3,14	174:2,9 175:5,23	364:13,20 367:8,18	103:21 104:3 112:15	236:9 251:14
32:5,17 34:14,25	176:19 178:20	368:14 381:21	113:4,18	256:23 346:21,25
35:10 37:5 38:9,23	182:1 183:7,16	382:9,12,25	oh (13)	opined (4)
· ·				210:9,18 218:5 234:3
40:4 42:11,19 43:18	185:6 186:16 187:3	objections (2)	7:3 19:8 42:22 89:14	
44:2 46:12 47:9,16	187:22 188:6,16	52:13 232:3	89:19 140:2 189:24	opining (2)
48:3,19 49:16,21	189:2,10 190:19	observation (1)	226:1 264:6 319:11	186:18 222:2
50:4,8,25 51:12	193:3,21 194:10	238:20	326:1 372:12 376:4	opinion (39)
52:4 53:14 54:21	196:15 197:20	observe (4)	ok (59)	39:15 54:15 58:13,16
55:10 56:4 57:4,19	198:22 200:13	184:14 186:5 306:16	17:11 30:12 40:22	141:5 147:25 148:8
58:9,21 59:11 60:6	202:11,25 204:3,25	313:4	43:20 68:20 69:19	148:20 149:10
		observed (28)		
61:5 62:2 63:16	205:7,15 206:2,17		75:21 83:25 88:16	154:8 188:3,13
64:1 65:4 66:14	207:20 208:10	158:17 185:15,21,25	107:11 128:18	196:10,10,13,23
67:5 68:16 69:1	209:7 210:12,21	187:19,24 188:10	131:24 141:16	197:4 200:22 202:8
70:25 72:6 74:7,20	211:12 213:8,18	230:6,17 231:2,5,9	158:25 162:1	206:7,13 207:16
77:10 80:9,11 81:19	215:14 216:3	231:18 302:25	163:16 170:4	208:25 209:4
81:21 83:8,19 84:7	219:21 222:15,24	303:6,10,16,23	179:14,15 196:1	211:10,14 215:11
85:2,13,17 86:7	224:9 225:5 228:13	304:13,13,14,15	201:5 214:19	215:25 232:24
87:4,13,23 89:8	230:22 231:13,23	313:21 318:22	216:13 223:16	236:15 286:22
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
90:1,16 91:6 92:2,6	232:2,12 233:2,5,19	319:15,17 323:8	225:19,22 235:7	321:14 331:4
92:15,16,22 93:6	234:14 236:13	324:21	240:7 257:5 260:12	339:23 340:19
95:10,23 96:9,19	238:12 239:7,14	obtain (1)	262:6 279:7 286:11	348:9 355:6,11,23
98:16 99:20 100:10	240:24 244:1	268:18	296:13 298:22	opinions (5)
100:20 101:17	245:19 246:4,14	obtained (2)	300:15,19 301:6	147:17 188:20 230:1
102:4,19 103:2,13	248:11 249:19	46:16 381:17	302:25 304:20	330:22 349:14
103:23 104:1,7,12	250:11,23 251:17	obviously (5)	305:16 308:24	opportunity (1)
104:19 105:2,7	252:13 255:17	31:17 77:4 102:6	315:3 318:7 319:19	330:17
· ·	256:5,13 258:20			
107:8 108:10		116:24 140:17	332:3 333:8 335:21	opposed (2)
109:24 111:1,22	259:4 261:2 264:16	occasional (1)	335:25 338:1	228:3 324:22
113:21 115:21	265:2 270:21 272:5	93:19	339:18 343:2	opposing (1)
116:3,14,20 117:3,8	272:15,25 275:18	occur (5)	344:12 349:15	26:21
117:23 118:6	277:5 278:13	168:15 344:22,24	354:22 358:13	opposition (1)
119:10,20 120:1,8	281:22 283:14	355:17 356:3	368:18 372:8	84:12
120:22 121:11	284:9 285:2,12	occurred (3)	378:16	oral (4)
120:22 121:11	287:2 289:20 290:6	250:22 310:11 361:7	once (1)	
				227:5,21,22,25
125:1,11 126:2,17	291:5,20 293:6	october (31)	127:14	order (6)
127:21 128:2 129:5	294:15 297:15	5:18 6:2 22:16 28:21	oncology (1)	34:9 98:4 140:3
129:12,21 130:8,14	298:4 299:8 300:24	29:1,3,23 33:24	57:22	158:19 179:25
131:6 132:6,15	301:24 304:17	34:4,8 35:6,12,13	ones (3)	374:14
133:4,7,24 134:6,10	305:25 307:3 308:2	82:22,25 88:15,18	105:10 201:6 277:14	ordinary (3)
135:1,8,11 136:25	308:16 309:5,14	89:19 90:25 91:15	onethird (1)	345:2,7,20
137:12 139:9,17	310:23 311:20		274:10	
		91:20,21 92:8,8		organ (4)
141:7,20 142:15,25	312:14 313:12	95:15 96:11,12	onward (1)	167:18 245:5 323:1
143:24 144:12	315:8,24 316:3,12	98:23 140:5 153:18	259:22	324:11
145:5,18 146:6	317:5,17 318:12	179:6	open (10)	organisms (1)

				. 1
organization (2)	187:19 188:10	287:11 288:2	167:17 168:1	party (1)
117:19 375:2	193:6,19 194:3,5	297:17 322:21	181:11 197:2 201:7	81:9
organizations (4)	209:17,18 215:3,4	326:12,14,15,22	213:9,10 223:24,25	pass (1)
81:15 82:1 115:25	215:10 221:11	327:10 331:11,12	297:18 341:22	370:17
116:5	230:6,18 231:5,9	331:15 334:17	350:13 360:3	passed (1)
organizer (2)	240:20,20 257:17	336:1,22 337:19	361:12,19	367:1
136:15 137:5	258:2,14,18 259:1	339:2 341:19,21	parallel (4)	pathogen (1)
organizing (2)	259:15 262:10,13	350:7 357:25 359:4	165:7,18 173:19	166:9
9:5 349:25	274:8 281:1 283:7	360:1 361:4,10,16	174:8	pathogenesis (1)
organophosphate (4)	287:5 290:25	361:17 362:7 375:1	parallels (2)	165:22
34:23 35:4,14 36:2	294:19 296:1,9	377:5,19 379:13	165:15,24	pathological (2)
organs (6)	301:10,22 303:22	385:8,10,12,14,16	parameters (2)	246:7 350:17
175:1 244:22 245:18	304:3 311:10,14	385:18,20,22	264:3,4	pathologist (5)
246:22 322:25	312:13 318:25	pages (3)	paraphrase (1)	242:2 247:1 248:14
324:15	319:2 322:9 328:24	18:2 216:10 244:20	148:4	261:1 313:1
origin (1)	329:20,23 365:14	paid (48)	parliament (3)	pathology (4)
241:19	365:17 370:23	24:7 72:4,22 73:20	64:9,22 114:25	137:1 246:18 275:23
original (10)	371:1 383:7	75:2 79:24 83:3	parliamentary (1)	275:24
8:10 215:2 220:2	page (167)	84:4 87:10,14 89:5	64:20	patience (1)
273:15 275:23	5:2,7 7:2 8:2 9:2 14:5	91:1,16 92:25 93:10	part (32)	380:21
276:24 281:16	14:17 15:1,2 18:12	94:16,20 95:3,17	21:17 30:16 31:11	pay (3)
285:4 328:12	18:12 19:1,7,12,21	96:2 98:12 101:8	37:7 43:24 59:20	93:12 98:7 132:7
378:19	21:16,16 31:10,21	102:13,23 103:11	64:19,21 78:9 79:16	paying (1)
orthree (1)	37:20 48:22 49:2,3	106:2 108:14	80:21 82:10 83:22	93:14
42:13	49:6 61:12 78:23	109:19,21 110:23	88:1 90:18 101:1	pazymino (1)
outcome (1)	80:4,18 81:2,13	111:19 112:16	134:8 138:7,10	357:13
384:18	90:5,6,12 91:4,8	113:19 115:2,18	150:8 154:17,19	peace (1)
outlets (2)	93:24 94:2 100:24	121:2,15 122:21,22	187:5 188:18	330:20
121:8,15	107:22 123:15	123:11,16 125:9,24	238:20,22 276:14	pearl (1)
outside (4)	136:11,14 140:7,8	126:15,19 132:12	305:6 324:10 331:1	3:8
25:2 81:4 130:25	143:4,8 157:5,12,24	132:20 138:15	353:5 380:4	pedram (1)
311:1	158:14 164:9 165:3	pancreas (2)	partially (1)	4:14
outstanding (1)	165:3 166:12	248:25 250:8	269:20	peerreviewed (1)
97:18	169:15,23 173:18	panel (6)	participants (2)	57:2
overall (8)	181:10 182:17	7:5 89:15,21 90:4,10	14:6 31:13	pending (1)
120:13 238:22 283:16	183:23 184:25	112:8	participate (1)	95:15
326:19 359:5,12,14	185:8 191:24,25	paper (25)	138:22	people (14)
372:20	192:4,12,21 195:22	15:22 52:9 93:19	participated (1)	28:5 35:21 36:16
owned (1)	196:20 197:3 198:4	169:13 175:8,25	62:7	59:13 64:13 68:9
55:11	198:5,6 206:11	190:2,17,22 191:2	participation (1)	113:9 121:13 147:3
oxidative (30)	207:3,4,5,24 213:3	244:4 248:21,22	59:8	149:22 228:17
137:20 331:21 344:8	213:7,10 214:19	263:1 266:12	particular (8)	348:24 363:5 372:6
349:14,16 350:8,11	219:11 220:15	267:15 271:14	45:25 62:16 84:19	pepsico (1)
350:14,24,25	221:7,8 223:9,14,22	327:22 350:4,4	166:8 173:3 175:14	376:25
351:10,16 352:2,14	223:25 225:21	351:21,24 370:12	182:16 265:12	perceive (1)
352:16,22 353:3,7	230:5,13 235:5,11	370:13,16	particularly (4)	59:14
353:11,13,18,19,22	236:25 237:1,5	papers (4)	14:17 33:15 109:17	perceived (3)
354:1,5,10,16,25	240:5,7 244:6,7	52:8 190:25 191:10	155:16	38:10,17 58:12
355:7,12	247:4,10 249:2	191:11	parties (2)	percent (14)
	252:1,2,17,21 253:3	papillomas (2)	11:3 384:16	31:12,24 139:20
<u>P</u>	253:12 259:20	327:17,18	partly (2)	202:1,4,4 267:10
p (63)	260:2 263:24 264:3	paragraph (26)	138:24 145:24	270:19 271:1,2,18
177:2 178:2,4 180:13	264:4 266:12,17	15:4,7 30:13 134:14	partnership (1)	271:19 338:19,20
180:16 182:6,23	268:16 269:14	140:18 143:9	377:3	percentage (4)
183:14 184:2	270:4,9 274:5,11	157:11 158:1,24	parts (3)	31:20,22 351:15,17
185:25 186:6	277:23 286:3,8	164:17 166:11	61:6 74:11 344:7	perception (1)
	I	I	I	I

38:15	337:16	151:18 152:2 163:9	211:2,5,7 212:2,10	10:4 11:2,8,9 13:23
perfectly (1)	physical (1)	208:19 291:22	211.2,3,7 212.2,10 212:14 213:21	14:20 16:11 28:23
262:7	41:15			53:2 60:23,25 61:13
		plays (1)	214:16,17,21 215:2	61:20 62:23 70:2
perform (1)	physically (1)	152:5	215:20 222:19,20	
372:10	235:12	please (17)	223:7,20 224:16	71:8 89:18 95:1
period (21)	picks (1)	10:18,25 21:7 22:4	225:8,12 226:1,8,9	106:16 109:4
22:19,21 24:11 39:19	292:11	29:21 81:23 124:12	233:23 234:2	122:10 126:6 139:5
40:21 43:16 44:15	pictures (1)	130:9 213:12	235:22 236:1,5	151:2,22 152:19
51:24 83:13 84:1	290:16	259:21 281:24	238:2 253:10 284:6	178:6 180:17 181:5
89:3 110:4 111:7	piece (1)	320:5 332:16,23	284:17 285:10,13	181:7 184:20
116:1 136:21 137:4	150:12	333:23 341:9	285:20 286:5,9,13	187:17 196:24
137:9 265:17	pieces (1)	379:14	287:3 289:2,4	220:3 254:14
269:10,11 354:3	22:2	plenary (6)	290:24 291:2,12,16	262:15 306:24
persist (1)	pile (1)	44:8 47:18,24 51:8,21	291:25	329:2,25 330:6,16
364:10	262:17	56:11	pooling (85)	330:21 334:12
persists (1)	pituitary (2)	plus (1)	179:4,25 188:21	335:6 365:25
364:25	206:9,15	170:8	189:21 190:3,6,18	369:17 371:4
person (1)	place (4)	point (22)	191:3,15,19 196:14	373:22 374:4
46:19	12:8 46:6 225:1	52:16 65:5 67:8	197:7,12 198:7	378:17 380:11,17
personally (3)	374:11	132:24 172:21	200:21 201:20	380:20 383:10
314:7 355:20,22	placed (2)	173:1 181:19	202:5,9 203:14,19	384:9
persons (1)	10:20 25:4	182:15,22 183:22	205:21,23 206:6,12	portier0000055 (2)
28:1	places (1)	220:21 239:19	206:23 207:8,17	7:9 106:13
pertains (2)	154:2	240:1 243:9 262:1	208:4,7 209:2,5	portiers (1)
50:20 90:17	plaintiff (1)	265:23 275:4	210:11,19 211:1,22	365:20
pertinent (1)	101:16	289:18 295:14	213:1,23 214:4	pose (6)
69:9	plaintiffs (81)	353:2 357:23	215:9,21 221:10	116:12,18 117:2,12
pesticide (4)	3:4,12 70:22 71:15	363:10	222:4,13 224:1,18	117:16,21
26:2,11 61:16 62:1	72:4,22 73:21 74:5	pointed (3)	225:25 226:13	positive (50)
pesticides (19)	74:18 75:2,6,15	98:20 305:10 323:22	229:24 232:15,20	18:16,22 124:19
26:21 27:2,6,23 28:10	77:15 79:20,25 81:6	pointing (1)	233:14,15,16,18,25	181:15,25 182:5,10
28:15,18 31:9,11,12	81:15 82:1,7,12,23	124:17	234:25 235:20	182:12,14 187:15
31:16,17,18,25 33:7	83:3,17 84:5,25	points (4)	236:17 237:8,9,12	193:9 194:17
35:22 105:17	87:2,11,21 91:16,25	23:25 24:4 171:13	237:21 238:8,18	195:15 197:17
122:13 380:6	92:12 93:3,12 94:10	290:11	239:20 284:11,12	201:17 202:21
pf4 (1)	94:16,21,25 95:4,20	politician (1)	284:13 285:6,22	203:5,21,22 206:25
67:25	96:2,7,16 97:11,19	113:14	286:21 292:23	207:10 208:8,23,25
ph (4)	98:10,14 99:14	pollution (1)	293:13 294:2,12	209:13 217:21
1:12 2:9 383:10	100:18 101:5	39:13	295:2,3,6,7,12,15	224:7,7 232:23
384:10	102:14,24 103:11	pool (19)	295:16,19,23 296:4	234:1,10 235:21,25
phenotype (1)	103:18 106:3 108:6	179:16 180:5 197:16	poolings (1)	236:4 239:6 243:12
166:15	108:13,15 109:19	201:22,23 205:20	225:18	253:6 254:4,5,6,9
philip (8)	109:22 110:24	207:16 210:25	pools (1)	254:21 283:1,3,12
129:3,7,14,19 130:10	111:6,20 112:16	222:23 223:2 224:6	85:19	309:23 343:15
130:16,23 131:3	113:19 115:3,19	237:20 241:16	popped (1)	346:8 372:4,24
philosophy (1)	120:20 121:3,16	284:25 289:23	175:14	positives (2)
150:9	122:22 123:11	293:9,11,12 296:4	poppy (1)	180:22 183:9
phist (16)	125:9,13,14,18,24	pooled (72)	360:14	possibilities (2)
262:21 263:6 266:10	126:15 132:12,20	85:6,10,21,24 86:3,20	pops (1)	315:4 348:23
267:2 271:16 272:3	138:16 369:9	86:25 87:7 119:16	204:20	possibility (5)
272:9,13,19 303:3	plausibility (1)	119:22 120:2,4,10	population (5)	16:16 163:11 205:13
303:11 308:25	153:23	120:12,14 178:17	45:22 155:3,5,6 200:1	306:17 308:14
309:9,18 312:2,11	plausible (1)	178:23 179:14,21	populations (1)	possible (9)
phone (3)	140:20	195:20,22 196:2	155:8	16:23 54:4 111:2
114:15 169:19,20	play (8)	198:16 199:6	portier (61)	203:11 261:4,4,13
phrase (1)	101:25 103:5 151:5	201:15,24 209:14	1:12 2:9 5:3 8:7,9,11	344:23 356:23
	l	I	I	I

	•			
possibly (6)	154:25 157:15	141:18,19,23 142:10	89:4	142:14,17,22 143:11
12:20 15:12 102:7	preliminary (4)	principles (3)	produced (12)	143:22 144:8,9
238:14 340:21	51:16,17,18 52:14	8:4 156:6,16	30:10 71:9 108:20	198:19
360:21	prepared (7)	printout (3)	109:1,2 110:6 119:6	proteomics (1)
poster (10)	13:16,25 14:4 86:24	6:14 60:20 376:7	119:11 157:2 171:6	22:25
127:10,17,19,24	87:9 97:6 268:13	prior (11)	273:12 366:3	proves (1)
				218:5
132:1,11,25 133:17	preparing (5)	40:2,6 51:25 76:13,25	producing (2)	
133:18,20	41:14 96:17 102:24	77:17 79:2 86:23	172:7 173:15	provide (12)
posts (1)	129:8 367:14	91:14,19 178:16	product (7)	18:19 42:16 46:1
263:12	presence (1)	prioritized (2)	80:19 100:25 101:6	93:14 114:23
potential (20)	15:23	38:21 39:25	101:20 102:9,12	120:18 129:17
39:8 58:12 66:6,19	present (8)	priority (9)	367:14	146:11 155:24
133:21 158:18	4:11 79:22 85:10	24:18 25:3,8,10 32:11	production (2)	157:16 180:3
160:24 169:15,25	214:21 215:1	33:4 34:13,19,19	171:17 366:2	308:12
170:6 171:25	238:16 363:23	private (17)	products (5)	provided (19)
173:18,24 213:5,15	364:10	63:14,25,25 74:17	1:4 10:5 34:20 145:16	20:18 28:23 47:25
215:12 228:8	presentation (20)	75:5 87:2,21 104:4	146:4	58:1,3 95:11 102:16
310:21 313:24	47:24 51:7,23 109:10	104:10,14,17 114:1	professional (4)	114:19,22 153:6,17
376:24	119:13 126:21,24	121:3 125:25	2:12 81:16 82:2 384:5	178:12 181:9
potentially (8)	127:10,17,19,24	132:13,21 135:19	proffering (1)	278:20 336:14
17:9,19 59:2 158:20	128:4 132:1,11,25	privilege (1)	119:18	379:25 381:11,19
162:13 309:23	133:12,13,17,20	76:7	program (13)	382:4
352:17 360:11	134:8	privileged (1)	25:2,16 29:10 46:17	provides (3)
powerpoint (1)	presentations (3)	97:13	66:11,21 67:10,13	263:23 327:4 370:13
109:9	48:5 119:7 256:16	pro (2)	67:14 68:6 119:1	providing (3)
powerpoints (2)	presented (12)	122:18,19	368:24 369:2	42:15 63:22 380:1
109:3,5	86:10 102:2 119:15	probable (1)	programmed (1)	province (2)
pptx (1)	121:1 127:10,25	54:5	369:6	364:2,7
109:11	147:18 178:17	probably (39)	programs (3)	ps (1)
practical (1)	321:2 324:9,10	25:15 46:23,24 71:25	368:8,19 369:5	184:12
314:14	325:12	91:12 108:19 125:7	progress (1)	public (23)
practice (1)	presenting (4)	129:23 139:22	344:16	2:13 7:21 81:17 82:3
316:16	63:13 124:23 129:2	148:4 152:21	progression (1)	118:9,13,19 127:5
preamble (32)	147:17	153:13 172:3 179:2	187:12	134:18 142:13,17
5:13 6:6 11:12,15,18	presents (1)	186:20 193:13,14	project (14)	142:18,22 143:10
12:5,14,15 13:3,16	362:8	194:13 212:18	5:21 27:4,13,19,21,22	143:16 144:6,8,10
13:21 16:15,21 18:1	president (1)	227:8,25 228:19	28:7 30:21 31:2,5,7	144:17,18 145:11
18:4,6,15,17 20:11	29:11	229:11 233:23	39:22 377:20	340:17 384:6
20:12,15,21 22:8,11		239:18 255:21	378:10	publication (15)
	press (1) 121:22	261:7 264:21	promoting (2)	75:7 77:21 171:12
37:7,9,11,17,21 39:6 51:4 54:19	presume (1)	265:20 266:7	27:4 142:9	172:15 173:9
		269:22 279:5 284:4		178:13 227:4 331:1
preambles (2) 19:14 20:2	50:9		property (7)	349:22 351:14
	pretty (4)	300:16,17,20	80:23 98:14 100:18	
precautionary (3)	58:2 151:25 315:11	308:21 345:8 368:7	101:4,15,21 102:10	381:3,19 382:4,21
141:18,23 142:10	349:11	problem (7)	proponent (2)	382:22
preceding (1)	previous (14)	91:12 114:17 158:4	141:17,25	publications (2)
362:6	13:1,2 18:15 20:11,12	172:5 183:9 337:10	proportions (3)	81:16 82:2
predict (1)	20:15,20 94:15	370:8	294:19 296:6 372:5	publicly (11)
174:22	222:18 225:7	problems (7)	proposed (1)	19:17 20:5,18 76:22
predictive (2)	269:18 277:14	52:8 66:9,20 110:18	173:11	89:4 104:16,23,24
175:21 176:18	326:21,22	124:16 125:2 345:6	proposing (1)	105:6 382:5,18
prefer (1)	previously (1)	process (3)	86:14	publicprotected (1)
267:24	358:25	55:23 57:1 338:3	protect (4)	144:19
preferably (2)	primarily (2)	processes (2)	142:18 143:16 144:18	publicprotective (1)
260:24,25	226:20 227:1	169:2 346:5	158:19	145:2
preferred (2)	principle (4)	proclaiming (1)	protective (8)	publish (1)
		l		l

	ı	ı		
56:20	70:11 74:9 76:7,11	quote (8)	271:16 272:3,18,21	230:12 260:3
published (16)	79:5 81:23 83:10,24	37:8 88:24 89:4 90:20	276:17	reaffirmed (2)
19:16 20:4 23:7 56:15	83:25 86:16,17,18	90:24 92:17 95:24	rates (9)	19:13 20:1
77:25 124:2,22	92:7 95:2,15 100:21	149:2	181:15 214:10,12	real (6)
126:12 171:22	102:8 103:7 104:22	quoted (6)	215:18 260:9 273:3	37:3 38:2,14 208:20
176:15 190:2,17	113:16 126:9	66:16 91:22 92:9,24	274:12,17 277:1	291:13 376:16
191:2 263:8 351:22	131:18 133:16	95:16 341:20	rats (71)	reality (1)
382:22	134:21 135:5	93.10 341.20	8:22 23:18 160:6,8	249:12
pull (6)	139:13 141:1,4	R	163:2 182:18	realize (2)
23:4 46:23,24 180:1	144:14 147:22	radio (1)	185:13,15,20,24	157:20 370:9
184:17 378:17	148:17,22 149:7,12	` /		
	149:19 150:10,11	118:25	186:4,13,15,23 187:8,20 188:5,11	really (16) 26:7 28:14 36:24
pulled (1)		raise (1)		
33:18	150:14 151:3	118:4	188:15 191:20,22	58:23 98:7 111:10
purported (2)	161:11 163:3,15	raised (2)	192:9,13 194:7,15	144:16 153:8 161:4
81:17 82:3	173:13 175:16	69:4 133:21	195:25 196:5,12,22	180:6 246:25
purpose (2)	179:1 187:18 196:1	raises (2)	197:6,18 198:11	248:13 294:9 302:7
143:15 163:20	213:11 217:22 225:8 226:11,16	180:22 200:3	200:24 201:4,12	344:4 345:15
purposes (8)	230:15 232:4 247:1	raising (3)	206:16 207:2,11	realm (1)
189:22 241:9 242:13	249:12 250:18	68:13,23 84:17	211:18 213:2,7,17	312:16
260:12 289:15	249:12 250:18 252:5 254:15	ramazzini (25)	214:23 216:1,12 217:3 218:7,20,21	realtime (2)
323:4 327:7,23	257:15 278:22	126:23 127:11,12,13		2:13 384:6
pursuant (3)	281:24 282:11	127:14,25 128:6,11	219:10,16,19 221:4 223:8,22 224:2	reask (1)
79:18 98:9 100:14	283:5 285:15	128:17,23 132:2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	130:22
pushes (1)		134:3,12 135:3,4,18	225:24 226:3,5	reason (23)
292:9	296:22,23 297:3 304:19,24 308:5	135:25 136:17,21	227:9,17 229:16	63:21 138:21 163:5
put (22)	309:7,16 311:23	137:6,10,18 138:2	299:22,25 300:1	183:2 187:8 199:2,8
23:24 35:3 60:16,24	-	138:14,18	302:6,24 307:7	199:10 216:7
152:17 169:20	323:24 329:3	ran (1)	326:8,11 342:17	238:19 239:4,10,19
202:15 212:24,25	332:11 336:11 337:5,11,13,14,19	46:19	reach (15)	292:2 385:4,8,10,12
222:9 238:24	337:21 338:4,8,10	random (1)	116:11 147:24 152:20	385:14,16,18,20,22
247:10 285:7	338:14 339:8,17	187:9	152:23 196:9,10,13	reasonable (1)
290:10 302:6 304:3	340:22 342:25	range (7)	197:4 200:22 202:8 209:3 215:25	314:16
305:13 308:17,21	343:12,19,23 363:4	202:4 260:5 291:22	209:3 213:23 222:10,21 236:22	reasoning (1)
314:6 322:9 337:11	365:10 366:18	292:10,10,21 311:1	reached (5)	202:17
putting (4)	367:11 371:7	ranging (1)	59:15,21 64:25	reasons (4)
24:4 190:8 228:7 303:22	376:18 381:22	266:3	188:19 235:14	138:24,25 295:10 347:5
	382:2	rare (18)	reaches (1)	
pvalue (11)	questioning (2)	218:3 296:19 304:1	116:1	rebuttal (29)
46:16 47:11 181:22	90:3 174:18	305:4,4,14 308:11	reaching (6)	8:8 97:6,24 98:2
193:8,9 196:7 207:12 211:3 259:5	questions (27)	309:4,20 311:9,16	11:21 12:9 148:8,19	184:17,19,24,25
259:6,8	7:4 23:14 89:15,20	312:2,4,10,25 313:8	149:9 230:1	206:7,11 213:3,13
259.0,0	138:11 147:4	314:25 315:2 rat (21)	reaction (1)	214:20 223:6,12,23 230:4,14,16 231:8
Q	310:17 321:1	45:7,10 143:6 162:25	329:7	
quality (1)	329:14 330:11	179:16,22 180:5	reactive (1)	235:9,10 286:4,6,9 296:12 306:4
62:9	335:11,13 336:4,14	183:25 188:19	344:7	319:22 322:22
quantifying (2)	336:19,21 356:12	194:22 196:3	read (13)	recall (77)
298:8,11	356:14 361:6 371:6	201:16 213:5,15	58:3 66:7 67:7 70:10	25:11 27:11,17,20
question (127)	371:8 374:3,6	216:9 224:6,17	93:18 118:16	32:22 36:21,24
14:13 16:11 19:25	375:14,19 380:21	226:14 229:25	140:15 156:10	39:18,23 44:18,19
20:13 22:3 27:9	383:4	325:2,5	278:23 328:12	44:25 45:17 46:7,8
29:20 32:7 38:25	quick (1)	rate (16)	338:17 359:11	46:20 48:2 49:15
39:2 43:19 45:7,18	376:16	199:18 214:13 242:25	371:20	50:10 51:7,13,14
45:20 53:23,24 54:8	quite (5)	246:24 249:7,17	reading (7)	52:12 53:7,11,15,19
57:7 58:15,23 64:3	312:19 324:15 332:21	260:16 267:10	93:9 94:11 103:5	54:1 55:4 56:8,9
64:11 68:20 70:10	354:11 375:18	270:18 271:13,14	134:15 144:15	57:25 58:3 70:6
UT.11 UO.2U /U.1U		210.10 211.13,14	15 1.15 1 1 1.15	31.23 30.3 10.0
	·	1	·	1

				Page 29
	<u> </u>	 I	 [I
57:25 58:3 70:6	177:2 178:4 180:11	115:14,17 374:15	relative (1)	repeat (4)
76:15 77:3,22 78:3	180:13,16 181:7	375:3,8	54:24	22:3 32:6 92:7 133:16
78:4 87:24 105:14	226:6 262:13	registered (8)	release (1)	replicate (1)
106:4 110:2,12	278:19 302:4	2:12 60:2 61:1,2,24	99:1	345:17
111:18,21,24	328:21,24 329:8,12	374:4,11 384:4	relevance (2)	replicates (2)
112:14,25 113:17	329:17,20,23,25	registration (7)	310:17 360:14	200:4 345:16
115:5 129:24 131:2	330:15 334:15,19	61:14,16 115:9	relevant (7)	replication (2)
131:8 136:1,4 143:1	336:2 358:23	130:11,24 375:3,7	17:9,19 175:3 276:5	345:6,19
146:12 153:3 258:5	365:14,17 369:21	regression (1)	298:12 299:16	reply (1)
258:8 307:23 328:8	370:22,23 371:1	294:22	370:4	124:1
332:12 333:2,7,14	383:7 384:13 385:5	regulation (1)	reliable (2)	report (210)
335:6 339:21 340:5	recorded (1)	134:19	264:23 267:19	5:17,20 6:23 8:6,8,10
340:10,15,16,23,25	229:21	regulator (4)	relied (1)	8:12,15,19,20 13:7
354:11 374:2	red (1)	64:17 113:13 145:1,9	356:10	13:24 14:3,6 15:6
received (6)	374:25	regulators (43)	rely (3)	19:11 21:13 30:20
40:11 48:10 52:23	reduce (1)	59:18,24 63:24 64:10	239:12 259:16 355:24	31:1,5,6 32:4,16,19
88:25 366:7 367:12	307:7	65:2 69:13 74:2,3	relying (1)	32:21 84:10,24
recess (8)	reevaluation (1)	74:15 83:5,15,16,22	226:13	85:11,25 86:4,12,24
69:22 177:3 180:14	274:14	84:3,11,22 85:5,6	remain (1)	88:10,13 97:7,24
262:11 328:22	refer (1)	85:21 86:5,13,21	221:24	98:2 139:11 147:18
329:21 365:15	326:12	87:9,19 88:5 102:3	remaining (2)	149:3,4 153:6,20
370:24	reference (2)	102:17 103:1 113:3	224:1 370:18	154:9 156:15 157:2
recipient (1)	295:11 334:22	116:25 117:15	remains (2)	157:4,5,24 162:6
42:1	referenced (1)	118:10,14,20 119:2	187:13 205:19	163:7 169:13
recipients (2)	244:4	129:10 130:5	remember (20)	171:10 180:18
68:13,23	references (1)	135:10 153:12	21:6 25:13 28:16,17	181:3,4,8,11,24
recognize (2)	263:17	265:22,24 266:1	31:16 54:23 55:1	182:23 184:2,18,19
54:17 157:4	referred (1)	290:3	56:12 72:11 84:16	184:23,24,25 185:3
recognized (1)	93:7	regulatory (9)	113:6 137:15	189:14 191:23
352:17	referring (1)	30:4 69:8,10 93:9,13	156:21 175:14	192:22 194:16
recollection (6)	50:6	180:3 256:17 310:2	178:22 227:25	195:21 196:24
53:9 111:3,8 179:17	refers (2)	310:12	292:5 328:16	198:3 206:7,11
328:15 356:20	260:10 380:12	reimbursed (2)	369:22 374:6	207:3 211:20 213:3
recombinant (2)	reflect (4)	24:10,12	remind (1)	213:14 214:20
169:18 170:9	16:15 316:20 329:25	reimbursement (2)	114:10	216:11 219:1,9,25
recommend (2)	334:15	24:13 88:25	removal (1)	220:3,7,12,13,16,17
55:22 246:6	reflected (3)	reject (9)	238:3	221:7,8 222:10,21
recommendation (5)	31:6 326:16 336:22	202:20 203:4,17	remove (2)	222:23 223:3,6,10
15:19 17:4 55:14,17	reflecting (1)	204:9,17,20,24	237:18 239:18	223:13,18,23
56:11	367:13	205:13,25	removed (5)	224:16 230:4,14,17
recommendations (7)	refresh (1)	rejecting (3)	196:13 197:10,23	231:8 235:6 236:24
14:15,25 15:18 20:25	53:8	202:22 203:7 204:1	198:15 239:11	237:1 238:17,24
21:24 22:10,13	regard (3)	rejection (2)	removing (2)	240:6 242:24
recommended (13)	140:19 336:5 349:14	204:5 205:18	197:13 239:2	243:18,19 244:8
11:11,25 12:4,7,19	regarding (9)	rejects (1)	renal (15)	247:3,11 252:1
15:5,11 16:21 18:1	65:17 74:15 90:9 95:8	204:21	174:17 175:2 176:17	253:12 254:21
18:5 25:9 34:18	124:9 127:17	related (8)	258:25 259:12	257:18 259:1,7,17
55:24	131:22 163:8	39:13 78:6 81:3 131:4	270:12,12 278:8	262:16 263:15,23
recommending (1)	330:22	137:1 174:22 380:6	285:23 286:1,23	264:11,12 266:11
172:8	regardless (1)	384:16	288:14,18,21	268:3,7,12 269:14
record (48)	354:20	relates (1)	292:16	270:1,4,9,17 271:4
10:19,21 13:24 21:21	regions (2)	1:8	reordered (1)	271:7 273:21 274:5
29:5 33:16 51:22	9:11 358:21	relating (3)	179:13	274:6 275:5 276:25
69:21,24 92:6 126:8	register (13)	129:20 130:2 136:23	repair (4)	277:23,24,25
132:18 146:22	60:10 61:15 62:14,16	relationship (3)	345:4,25 346:4	279:10 282:15,16
147:13 152:17,18	63:13,19,22 115:13	87:20 173:25 174:14	354:14	282:18 286:4,6,9,14
	I	l	l	I

207.10.11.10	100.25 110.6 266.2	110.5 120.12 150 2	24.10.25.0.10.25.2	117.17.01.104.17
287:10,11,19	108:25 119:6 366:2	119:5 120:13 158:2	24:18 25:8,10 35:2	117:17,21 124:17
289:16 296:12	requests (6)	194:12 254:12	35:15 40:1 47:1	125:3 140:10 156:7
299:3 303:8 306:4,4	71:10,10 108:23	262:24 290:9,11	57:24 62:9 65:18	156:17 158:9,12
306:25 312:13	366:2,23 367:7	291:22 292:5 321:9	66:13 78:9,11 93:13	159:1,2 195:24
315:22 318:21	require (1)	366:9	93:18 103:11 116:7	196:4 252:18
319:10,22 320:21	249:24	responses (1)	123:22 141:12	253:24 358:19
320:24 321:20	required (9)	254:11	147:3 179:3 229:15	360:5,10
324:6,7,8,9 326:6,7	11:20 18:15 100:1	responsive (3)	309:10 331:24	risks (8)
	164:13 168:3,9,14	366:23 367:2,6	332:2 336:6	5:10,16 6:5 13:11
326:12,19 330:23				
331:10 339:25	169:2,6	rest (4)	reviewed (24)	21:12 37:17 154:23
340:1 341:19,21	requires (2)	16:9 203:10,23 216:6	20:24 21:23 22:6,11	157:14
346:20,24 347:22	99:24 249:23	restate (1)	23:12 35:9 40:1	river (10)
348:3 349:7 355:5	requiring (1)	70:11	42:10 57:25 66:23	8:15 263:12 265:6,15
355:10 356:18	93:18	result (13)	68:8 79:15 84:19	268:1,6,13 277:2
357:10,24 361:24	rereading (1)	202:23 203:8 207:9	115:25 116:6 153:4	329:5 369:18
362:12 367:24	273:10	211:1 227:6 237:13	153:9 178:15 179:2	robertson (1)
369:19 371:17,23	reregistration (4)	237:25 238:3	179:18,20 260:25	3:8
372:2 378:20			314:17 331:25	robin (4)
	30:15 60:4 61:3,25	239:24 285:23		
381:16 382:8	research (14)	356:24 364:17	reviewing (6)	3:7 80:7,16 366:8
reported (27)	88:21 130:1 133:3,23	373:6	27:1 35:25 99:8,15,18	robyn (1)
1:24 31:8 192:11,21	134:5 135:20 137:7	resulted (5)	108:13	4:12
195:4 198:18	137:10,23 138:3	207:12 208:5 234:10	reviews (5)	rodent (8)
208:24 210:17	368:25 372:9	238:9 239:5	35:17 57:6 112:8,9	124:19 159:6 161:18
212:21 213:23	373:15 379:5	results (13)	134:20	163:10,17 180:21
224:7 226:12	researching (1)	18:9,16,18 31:8 198:6	revised (16)	326:4,17
227:15 234:1	100:13	201:15 213:21	12:16 85:15,18 181:2	rodents (7)
252:17 258:12	reservations (1)	278:25 291:17	181:8 189:14 207:3	155:12 159:14,18,19
259:5 270:13,15				
	382:14	294:12 359:12,14	220:12 221:6,8	161:15 162:16
272:21 280:19	reserve (1)	368:16	222:10 235:6,8	203:18
282:2 287:24 307:1	370:18	retain (1)	237:1 279:9 357:24	role (8)
307:8 342:19 352:2	residence (1)	82:6	revising (1)	38:7 39:24 101:25
reportedly (1)	369:14	retained (2)	119:24	103:5 121:15
342:23	respect (37)	83:17 87:1	revisions (1)	132:11 208:19
reporter (11)	30:3 45:18 50:16	retainer (1)	11:25	291:22
2:12,13 10:16,25	53:20 79:6 137:20	79:24	right (46)	roman (3)
90:14,19 91:10	142:19 145:13	retention (2)	19:8 53:25 76:7	157:5,9,25
151:8 339:8 384:5,6	146:2 148:8,20	78:17 93:21	104:21 109:18,25	room (8)
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			` '
reporters (1)	149:10 150:15,22	retired (1)	134:14 151:19	152:4 297:19 298:24
340:11	159:6 163:9,24	139:1	156:13 164:22	299:10,13 323:10
reporting (5)	171:10 173:5	retract (2)	168:13 172:10	345:1 370:20
10:14,17 223:19	174:24 179:5	273:8,19	193:12 196:23	root (1)
241:22 321:12	185:12 199:12	retracting (4)	198:2 204:8 206:10	109:11
reports (10)	209:4 211:10 216:1	273:20 274:23,24	221:23 231:7 243:6	ross (8)
19:17 20:5 224:7	218:13 219:3 228:8	275:2	253:4,5 255:7 262:3	48:11,17,20,23 49:24
235:21 248:22,24	229:16 232:25	returning (1)	262:17 263:16	50:21 52:23 55:6
257:2 277:24	257:15 274:8	213:10	271:21 301:17	roughly (2)
322:22 371:13	280:17 331:6		305:5 306:7 312:7	307:18 371:24
		returns (1)	328:8 330:13	
represent (3)	363:12,21	376:9		roundup (4)
33:17 82:7 220:9	respective (1)	reucker (2)	332:20 335:4 338:5	1:4 10:5 81:8,9
represented (1)	42:17	216:20 225:24	339:4 340:9 346:19	routes (2)
85:6	respond (3)	reuters (1)	356:9 359:11	8:21 326:8
representing (2)	64:5 345:25 354:24	376:4	361:11,18 369:4	row (1)
374:19,20	responding (3)	reverse (1)	375:11 379:20	378:5
reputable (1)	354:15,19,23	347:18	risk (26)	rows (1)
346:15	response (15)	review (29)	9:10 96:3 99:5 116:13	324:4
request (3)	71:9 100:4 108:22	7:15 15:25 23:10	116:18,22 117:2,13	rpr (2)
	71.7 100.7 100.22	1.13 13.23 23.10	110.10,22 117.2,13	- Pr (2)
	1	1	<u> </u>	1

				Page 31
	l	l	l	l
1:24 384:24	95:25 100:24 132:9	74:13 129:1 135:6	205:22,25 211:5	199:1 238:2 239:22
rule (3)	143:7 165:21	142:5,9 160:15	212:8 224:2 231:21	255:11,25 256:8
145:8 155:10 227:18	170:16 172:5	screen (3)	232:9,10 239:22	372:10 373:8
rules (4)	203:10 219:23	151:19 373:18 375:25	249:2 257:5 263:19	sent (32)
39:5 64:4 134:24	226:8 231:16,17	screening (7)	278:15 282:9	36:17 62:8 65:16
135:14	247:9,17 260:7,8	161:25 162:2,6,12,23	290:12 292:12	68:11,21 69:13 70:4
run (3)	263:17 267:6	162:23 172:23	297:6,9 300:12	70:13,20 71:23
47:12 269:22 312:11	268:15 270:8	screenshot (2)	301:10 302:16	72:17,19 73:5,12,13
running (1)	273:23 274:25	9:15,17	307:20 308:4 313:8	73:25 74:2,12,23
25:14	284:15 300:3,9	seattle (1)	318:24 320:20	82:22 83:21 88:6
runs (1)	359:18 362:11	369:11	328:12 334:4	93:2 96:6,13 104:8
368:17	375:1 376:6,22	second (39)	338:22,25 351:16	104:15 107:21
rusyn (2)	379:2,16,21	14:5 21:15 22:11	352:1 359:22 360:6	108:1,24 112:8,9
53:3 55:19	scale (1)	29:16 30:1,16 31:10	360:15,16 361:21	sentence (11)
33.3 33.19	376:11	33:23 61:12 66:24	362:10 373:10	15:9 42:13 59:20
S	scenes (1)		376:12 377:24	
		67:15 82:18 90:5,12		144:16 150:1 158:1
s (9)	103:21	107:1 143:9 154:19	379:1,6,18,22 380:7	180:24 221:21
83:15 84:3 85:6 87:8	scheme (1)	157:25 166:12	seeing (5)	279:14 360:3
123:3 136:12,14	53:22	180:25 181:11	334:21 351:6 357:25	361:13
137:11 380:2	science (31)	192:20 195:3 213:9	358:1,3	sentences (1)
safety (8)	7:20 11:10 12:6 13:7	216:20 223:23,25	seeking (1)	91:7
60:1 62:10 66:4	13:17 16:20 18:4,25	257:14 327:11	27:5	separate (8)
116:11 122:14,14	20:1 21:1,25 40:2	329:12 334:5 338:4	seeks (1)	18:17,24 76:6 93:3
146:15 379:6	54:12,13 69:9 100:8	341:22 359:4	203:15	95:20 96:6 197:12
saga (2)	112:8 122:11	361:11,12,19,19,22	seen (20)	352:9
7:19 127:3	124:24 127:4	secondary (1)	23:16,17 31:18 56:9	separated (1)
salary (1)	131:11,15 132:5	167:18	67:1,21 145:23	282:8
24:14	138:11 142:17,18	secondtolast (1)	187:7 202:1 203:21	separately (7)
salmonella (1)	142:24 150:3,15,20	53:9	215:18 218:14,16	241:23 251:14 282:16
347:19	314:15	section (9)	243:11 260:10	282:17 315:21
sames (1)	sciences (1)	30:7 42:12,22,23 44:4	274:19,25 330:5	321:22,23
	29:9	140:17 157:7	372:1,3	september (5)
224:23	scientific (36)	158:14 277:9	selected (2)	
sample (1)			, ,	1:14 2:4 10:11 378:1
204:11	7:15 19:15 20:3 40:8	sectioning (6)	128:16 244:22	384:22
sarcomas (2)	63:4 69:5 84:17,23	273:18 275:13 276:13	selfchosen (2)	sequence (2)
257:7 320:13	100:4 101:24	277:3,18,20	361:8,8	86:14,19
sat (2)	103:12,15,16 116:6	sections (14)	selfexposure (1)	series (5)
318:2,3	119:8,14 120:25	42:8,18,25 43:2 273:5	363:9	11:13 110:21 119:7
save (1)	121:22 123:23	273:11 274:3,15,17	selfreported (6)	336:4,14
329:15	124:16 127:15,16	275:7,15,17,19	361:1,14,25 362:4,8	serious (1)
saw (12)	133:3,23 134:5,20	276:2	362:18	69:6
67:2 110:15 162:25	135:20 138:23	see (85)	seminar (1)	seriously (2)
183:20 209:16	155:9 189:1,8,18	12:24 13:1,2 15:7	23:2	179:23 333:7
210:23 211:2	204:15,18 351:13	21:16 25:3 27:16	send (2)	serve (7)
227:20 231:19	351:25	32:20 42:22 46:21	36:19 93:19	25:12 36:6,9,12,14,16
239:4,9 372:16	scientifically (1)	49:3,8 55:18 59:2	sending (2)	36:22
saying (8)	294:17	63:2 89:22 91:5	57:21 110:17	served (14)
67:8 92:25 168:18	scientist (8)	107:17 118:8	senior (2)	11:9,16 20:24 21:22
221:15 256:17	22:15 24:8 25:20,23	140:12,17 150:4	25:20,23	22:5,9,14 24:15
	147:22 162:24	152:2 162:19		25:17 32:9,23 38:20
273:25 340:3,4			sense (6)	,
says (50)	191:2 382:19	163:15 176:11	35:24 227:13 315:5	79:10 156:20
15:16 17:12 19:22	scientists (20)	179:14 182:19	335:23 344:18,20	service (2)
35:3 38:4 50:1,5	24:9 26:15 62:6 65:6	183:19 184:12	sensitive (3)	136:12,14
51:2 61:18 67:11,12	65:17 66:3 68:3	185:2 186:1 188:12	239:22 240:1 372:14	serving (1)
72:9 80:12 81:7	69:12 70:4,14 72:2	193:6 197:23 201:5	sensitivity (11)	25:19
82:11 89:9 94:14	72:18,19 73:25	201:24 205:12,17	134:23 135:13 197:9	session (4)

session (4)	75:5 87:10 122:21	290:12 291:7	223:8,18,21 224:8	sorry (79)
44:8 51:8 56:11 178:1	significance (7)	345:17	225:14 226:24.25	14:18,22 31:20 32:21
set (17)	223:5 235:15 236:23	single (9)	227:10,11,14,17,20	45:14 59:19 63:2
71:12 148:1,23	257:22 283:8	18:9,19 98:25 150:12	228:7,9,17,23 229:4	71:21 81:22 90:11
149:13 150:5 154:8	291:23 381:17	173:9 310:7,8,9	229:7,12 248:25	107:10 113:8 114:9
183:24 199:23		323:2	319:4,7 324:23,24	114:13 122:5
	significant (102)	sit (1)	324:25 325:4,15	131:25 133:8 143:2
244:7,17 261:6,7	45:21 166:13,18	312:20		
273:16 333:25	167:8 181:22		326:2,18,20 327:8	167:24 169:17
334:16 384:11,21	192:25 193:19	site (19)	328:1,1,6,9,14	172:13 174:4
sets (5)	195:5,18 197:14,24	301:20,21 306:8	362:14	175:17 192:5 197:1
11:19 270:5 308:18	198:19 200:18	307:24 310:7,8,9	sl (4)	201:23 207:5,25
336:3 351:25	201:13,21 206:25	317:25 322:3,7,8	318:23 319:2,4,9	210:4,8 214:25
settings (2)	207:10,14,18	323:5,6 327:24,24	slices (1)	216:11 217:14
274:19 275:1	209:13,17,21 210:1	328:2,2,9 333:19	273:24	220:16 221:13
seven (5)	210:10,18 211:3,6	sites (101)	slide (3)	223:12 226:2,18
70:23 71:18,22 74:6	211:21 212:3,5,13	182:18 183:23 296:15	119:7,11 120:17	234:17,20 235:8
75:1	212:15,22 213:24	296:16,23 297:5,13	slides (2)	241:13,24 243:8
sex (3)	214:8 215:5,10	297:14,23 298:1,9	120:3,14	248:1 251:21
184:10 185:17 308:20	221:11 222:11,22	298:12,13,17 299:2	slight (1)	253:21 258:4 260:2
sexes (2)	235:18 236:7	299:3,7,20,23,24,25	372:14	266:18 269:5,18
18:18 302:6	237:14,23 240:14	299:25 300:7,10,21	slightly (3)	271:22 276:8
sheds (2)	240:17,19,22	300:22 301:1,3,7,8	241:12 341:16 342:6	281:23 287:17
5:22 30:22	243:13,15 253:6,16	301:10,12,17,22,25	slope (1)	288:25 293:7 297:2
short (3)	253:18 254:12	304:10 305:2,4,5,6	193:7	303:5 306:1 309:7
44:15 151:25 354:2	255:21 257:3,11,16	305:7,19,20,22	slow (1)	309:16 311:22
shortly (2)	257:19 258:2,14	306:9,19,25 307:7	214:25	317:13 320:4
33:3 56:23	277:25 278:11	307:14,15,25 308:8	small (7)	323:18 326:13
shot (2)	279:2,25 280:5,8,10	308:8,13,14 309:2,8	53:16 343:10,11	328:4 340:8 343:1
373:18 375:25	280:12,20 281:1	309:10,19 313:7,19	359:8,17,25 370:9	344:17 355:8
shouldnt (1)	282:24 283:1,3,9,12	313:21,21,24 314:6	smith (5)	357:22 359:13
373:7	283:21,24 284:4,12	314:8,9,13,17,20,24	4:15 10:13 331:1,16	361:17,21 376:5,16
show (16)	284:13,14 285:25	315:6,7,12,13,16,20	349:21	sort (6)
	285:25 286:15,25	316:6,7,21,24 317:1	snoo (1)	157:6 317:7 325:8
21:4 31:21 40:10 48:9	287:5,6 291:18	317:11,12 318:11		362:13 370:5
52:22 75:11 143:2	292:1,3,13 293:4	318:14,15 321:13	134:10	378:24
179:5 226:1 253:2	294:13,20 303:18		society (1)	
286:24 321:7 325:7	305:2 309:12,19	321:22,24,24 322:14,17 323:15	29:11	sorts (1)
373:21 374:24		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	soileau (1)	121:13
377:10	315:1 361:13,24	323:16,21 324:21	80:15	sought (1)
showing (2)	significantly (2)	324:24 328:1,6,10	soleau (1)	82:8
283:25 381:17	200:10 240:13	sitting (9)	3:11	sound (3)
shown (2)	signing (1)	39:18 111:4 191:1	solely (7)	154:23 157:14 294:18
351:16,17	71:14	307:22 317:10	12:21 15:13 187:21	source (10)
shows (8)	similar (6)	339:6,18 344:25	230:9,21 231:12	61:24 171:21 243:23
116:22 186:10 195:8	35:18,20 200:21	368:13	267:20	262:19,23 263:5
199:16 287:4	224:24 275:13	situations (1)	solid (1)	354:21 371:16,17
293:14 294:19	317:25	317:25	228:3	371:17
305:20	similarly (1)	six (2)	solve (1)	sources (1)
shut (1)	17:13	382:13,16	337:9	35:20
55:2	simple (2)	sixyear (1)	somebody (1)	south (2)
sick (1)	16:12 149:19	136:20	36:13	3:11 80:15
353:25	simplify (1)	size (1)	somewhat (1)	space (1)
side (5)	74:10	204:11	315:14	62:16
141:24 290:17,17	simply (11)	skin (47)	soon (1)	speak (7)
344:3,4	20:11 181:25 182:24	186:12 187:6 207:1,7	75:17	64:8 75:14 101:7
signed (6)	183:14 185:5 190:6	207:15 208:9,14	sooner (1)	112:12 337:8,14,15
70:21 71:13 73:20	203:11 238:20	210:3,4 211:19	151:24	speaks (1)
, 0.21 , 1.13 , 3.20		,	101.21	• ` ` '
	-	-	-	-

101:6	62:18,22 322:23	341:23	283:7 291:23	325:19 370:4
		starts (9)	283:7 291:23 298:13 312:16	strains (15)
spec (1)	spots (1)			` /
28:4	306:21	15:5 28:25 107:5	314:10 319:25	160:7 169:14,18,24
special (1)	sprague (27)	140:13 216:12	statistically (66)	170:6,9,13,14,15,22
28:2	185:15,20 187:8	240:7 360:4 361:13	192:25 194:17 195:5	171:2 199:19 266:5
specialist (8)	206:15 213:2,4,14	361:20	195:17 197:13	325:20,24
10:15 36:7,10,22 37:1	213:22 214:23	state (38)	198:19 200:18	street (2)
37:7,24 55:3	215:24 216:9,20	2:14 48:11 68:2 88:22	201:13 206:25	3:13 4:5
species (2)	217:3,9,23 218:7	132:3 140:19	207:9,14,18 209:13	strength (4)
18:19 308:20	219:10,15,19 221:4	143:10 163:9	209:17 210:10,18	54:25 66:20 67:12
speciesspecific (1)	223:7,21 224:2,5,17	169:22 181:12	211:6,20 212:2,4,12	68:6
164:12	225:24 226:14	182:16 185:12	212:15,22 213:24	stress (29)
specific (15)	spray (1)	196:20 202:19	214:7 215:5,9	137:21 331:22 344:8
23:20 64:13 132:16	362:24	203:3 219:2 230:5	222:11,22 236:7	349:14,16 350:9,11
154:21 160:18	spraying (9)	230:16,25 231:8	237:14,22 240:12	350:14,25 351:11
161:15 162:13	359:7,16 361:7	237:17 249:16	240:21 257:2,16,19	351:16 352:2,14,16
163:5,6 173:10,14	362:14 363:17,17	274:8 287:17	258:2,13 277:25	352:23 353:3,8,11
250:17 347:7,18	364:3,5,6	319:22 333:8 339:6	278:11 279:2,24	353:13,18,20,22
361:5	sprays (3)	339:7,19 341:16	280:5,7,9,11,19,25	354:1,5,10,17,25
specifically (17)	361:15 362:1,9	348:3 350:12 357:9	282:24 283:1,9,12	355:7,12
35:5 44:25 45:17	spreadsheet (1)	357:25 359:5	283:21,24 291:18	stressor (1)
49:17 54:6,23 59:25	369:7	364:22 384:2,7	291:25 292:2,13	350:24
64:4 66:17 78:22	spreadsheets (2)	stated (9)	293:4 294:13,20	strictly (1)
142:19 150:12	367:25 368:1	49:25 66:16 139:5	305:1 309:12,19	140:25
164:9 166:3 172:14	squamous (6)	145:14 146:1 241:3	315:1	strike (9)
247:4 270:6	326:24,25 327:3,15	257:25 266:2 332:4	stay (1)	87:17 121:19 154:7
specifics (1)	327:16,18	statement (34)	203:22	159:18 205:22
81:4	ss (1)	59:13 94:15 140:23	stays (1)	206:9 234:22
specified (1)	384:2	157:22,23 158:6,12	333:5	263:11 355:24
327:4	staff (7)	158:15,22 159:4	step (2)	strong (6)
spectrum (1)	24:5 25:14 36:25	161:5 184:22 245:2	54:18 72:15	12:22 15:13 17:8,18
139:19	43:11 62:12 63:9	273:8,19,20,22	stephanie (1)	17:22 54:16
spend (2)	64:16	274:22,25 276:24	335:18	strongest (3)
44:7,21	staffer (6)	280:13 292:22	steps (1)	17:8 357:19 358:8
spent (8)	63:1,9 64:5 114:15	295:8 332:13,18,20	60:8	strongly (1)
26:5 44:15 99:18	115:16 374:12	332:25 333:9	steve (3)	243:12
100:7,12,15 101:23	stage (1)	338:23 339:20	90:2 112:6,18	structure (1)
108:12	244:7	341:13 342:2,3	stimulate (3)	166:15
spit (1)	stamped (4)	359:23 statements (1)	66:21 67:13 68:7	studied (5)
368:8	7:6,8 106:10,13	90:8	stomach (1) 228:5	292:18 293:1,3,17,22
spleen (10) 167:17 241:8 247:7	stand (3)	states (15)	228:5 stop (1)	studies (228) 15:24 16:4 17:15,17
	17:11 94:14 134:4	1:1 10:6 18:18 83:6	151:23	
247:23 248:6 250:8	standard (5)	84:12 157:12	storage (1)	18:16 19:16 20:4 35:22,25 45:15
319:10,14,21	182:7 314:10 316:15	164:11 167:16,25	137:2	52:21 120:9,11
324:12	325:9 372:6 standardized (1)	169:12,23 170:5	story (1)	136:24 137:3,19
splenic (6)	349:11	227:4 299:19	26:8	143:6 154:18
319:12,13 320:6		369:15	stout (2)	155:16,18,22,24
322:18 323:7 324:3 spoke (1)	standards (1)	stating (3)	216:19 225:24	156:2 157:16,18
116:25	374:21 start (5)	92:10 95:17 198:1	straif (1)	170:20 178:19
spoken (4)	107:9 140:14 152:7	statistic (1)	25:15	179:16,22 180:1,2,6
104:2 112:11,13	202:6 204:15	193:14	straight (1)	180:21 183:5,25
113:4	started (2)	statistical (14)	162:21	192:8 194:23
spontaneous (3)	26:10 269:22	47:1 182:12 187:15	strain (7)	195:21,23 196:3
8:13 243:20 268:9	starting (4)	194:8 223:5 235:15	184:10 185:17 199:15	197:17 200:2,4,11
spot (3)	166:12 168:1 191:24	236:23 280:23	260:23 274:18	201:16,22,25 202:2
spot (5)	100.12 100.1 171.24	200.20 200.20	200.23 277.10	201.10,22,23 202.2
	•	•	•	•

202 15 21 22 205 4	161.0 162.12	40-24-24-41-9-12-10	141.11 14 202.16	152.0 201.4 10 10
203:15,21,23 205:4	161:9 162:12	40:24,24 41:8,12,19	141:11,14 203:16	153:9 381:4,10,18
205:24 207:8 209:5	181:14 183:10	41:25 42:4 43:14,16	205:13 308:19	382:5
209:15 210:2	192:1,11,20,24	43:24 44:9,13,13,17	316:5 323:10 331:5	supplied (2)
211:23 212:1	193:17,24 194:14	46:18,19 48:18,21	331:22 346:21,25	109:3,4
213:15,22 214:4	194:15,16,24,24	49:10,20,25 50:17	sufficiently (1)	supplier (1)
215:12,22 216:10	195:3,8,12,13,14,17	50:17,22 51:9,24	152:3	260:25
217:10,24 218:23	197:7,10,23 198:16	52:2 53:12 55:7,24	suggest (12)	supply (3)
219:5 221:1,10	198:17,18 199:3,4	99:1	66:11 67:16 173:22	155:17 156:1 157:17
223:2 224:6,17	200:8 201:1,2,10,10	subgroups (2)	174:5,13,20 213:15	
		44:11 47:25		support (17)
225:11 226:14	202:1,10 205:19,24		215:12 237:2 359:6	16:23 84:25 134:12
227:12,15 228:11	206:1,5,12 207:17	subject (1)	359:12,14	155:25 157:16
228:17 229:5,15,23	209:3 212:11 213:5	40:23	suggested (3)	160:16 197:4,25
229:23,23 230:1	215:17,18,24 216:5	submeeting (1)	12:11 294:22 316:20	198:8 205:22 206:6
233:1,4,7,10,15,17	216:20,21,21 217:1	53:16	suggesting (2)	206:13 208:21
233:18,22 234:11	217:2,13,15 218:14	submission (9)	312:22,24	211:15 243:12
234:12 235:13,22	218:15,16,22 219:4	88:14,17 94:6 103:8	suggestion (4)	355:6,11
236:1,5,20 237:3,8	220:22 221:9,19	108:16 140:4	67:24 206:8,14 298:5	supporting (2)
237:9,13,19,20,22	222:3,13 227:5,23	178:16 265:21	suggestions (3)	154:6,12
		266:1		· /
239:3 244:9,11,13	227:24 228:21		46:5 47:19 299:21	supports (1)
244:14 245:13	229:20 234:11,25	submissions (19)	suggestive (1)	251:18
247:6,8,16,19,22,25	238:1,8,8,11 240:4	84:10,21 85:5 86:5	144:25	suppose (1)
249:6,10 251:25	242:5,15 243:13	87:16,18 88:24	suggests (7)	142:11
253:23 254:1,3,3,17	244:11,21 246:20	91:14,19 94:22 95:7	66:25 123:15 171:23	sure (32)
254:19,20 255:14	248:1,2,3 249:18	102:1,2,16,25 116:9	172:15 199:19	11:14 22:12 29:22
255:16 257:2,7,18	250:20 251:25	142:21 153:17	200:3 213:5	32:8 43:20 46:13
260:5,8,22 261:10	252:5,16,21,25	290:2	sugimoto (28)	60:9 71:20 129:16
263:25 264:5,12,24	253:8,11,13,16,18	submitted (19)	240:4,12 242:5,15	175:7 193:14,23
267:13,20 268:17	254:4,4,6,8 255:4,6	85:20,24 87:8,19 94:6	243:13 245:17	225:10 230:11
	255:19 258:18,25	95:6,19 103:9,14		
268:18,22 269:1,7			246:19 248:10,18	235:4 237:4 266:18
269:16,24,25 270:7	259:6,16 260:3,14	120:6 125:5 129:9	249:8,18 250:1,7,20	281:17 290:19
270:15,16 271:25	261:11,17,20,22	153:11,16,17	253:11,14,15,20,21	300:13 304:6 332:5
272:23 275:12	264:2,4,10,11,15,18	178:23 220:7	255:6 256:10	332:14 333:1,10
276:11 278:9 279:1	265:7 267:17,24	290:24 291:6	280:24 281:6,12	338:18 339:10
279:6,22 280:18,19	269:22 270:17	subscribed (1)	284:23 285:4,9,11	340:11 349:20
281:21 282:1,2,23	272:22,24 273:5,7	383:12	suing (1)	359:24 367:19
282:25 283:6,11	276:6,18 277:22	subsequent (2)	111:20	369:3
284:11,13 286:2,12	279:12,12,16,17,19	97:4 162:11	sum (1)	suresh (34)
286:17,18,19	279:23,23 280:24	subsequently (1)	302:9	192:4,21 193:17,24
288:14 289:19	281:3,6,16 282:8,23	102:11		
291:8 292:16,20,24	283:8 284:2,23		summaries (1)	194:4 195:3,13,17
293:13 301:5 306:6	285:4,5 287:13	substance (13)	381:24	196:14 197:7,16,23
	f	76:5 78:8,8,15 79:9	summarized (1)	198:17 199:10,14
307:20 309:1,4	288:1 289:3 298:14	79:11 110:12	381:9	199:23 200:11
311:8 314:4 315:16	319:9 321:4 322:18	161:14 171:25	summary (15)	201:1,9 202:1,9,13
316:8 319:8 325:3,5	323:3,9 324:1,1,5,7	227:6 343:24	42:8,13,14,16,23	202:14 206:5,12
338:19 342:14	324:8,9 343:22	350:23 351:2	56:17 140:13,14	207:17 208:4,7,13
347:15,16 348:6,17	358:7,8,9,15,24	substances (4)	157:6 207:23 244:8	208:17,18 210:20
349:10 353:18	359:20 360:1,9,19	78:10 105:17 342:16	371:9,13 381:24,25	211:23 212:11
355:4,9,16,21,24	362:21 363:3,14	351:15	sun (2)	surfactants (3)
356:1,8,10,13,14,21	371:19,20	substantial (1)	226:20 227:1	145:15,22 146:3
357:11,12,18	studying (1)	96:21		
			sunlight (2)	surprise (1)
370:10 371:21	172:6	substantially (3)	225:4 354:4	354:7
372:1,4,19,19 381:6	stuff (1)	12:13 199:25 200:1	supplant (1)	surprised (2)
study (195)	110:16	subtleties (1)	16:5	181:17 346:16
16:7 18:9,19 45:7,10	subcommittee (1)	212:9	supplement (1)	sustainable (4)
45:11,13,13 46:11	41:4	sufficient (15)	179:20	9:21 376:10 377:16
50:7,12,14 155:11	subgroup (31)	17:14 18:7,20 56:2	supplemental (5)	377:23
		ĺ	(1)	
	-	-	-	-

	İ	ı	İ	i
swear (1)	take (28)	7:13 122:18 123:21	258:7,12,15 259:6	101:18 105:23
11:1	12:16 37:10 60:8	target (4)	283:17,19 295:25	117:4 118:24 123:6
sweep (1)	62:22 69:16 72:15	155:3,4,6,8	296:2,6 303:9,23,25	130:20 133:8,25
341:17	74:11 97:10 134:4	tasked (1)	304:4,5 318:3,4	135:15,16 140:12
swiss (12)	135:18 139:23	41:14	346:8 347:13,20	143:7 146:24 147:6
122:11,16 171:13,23	155:12 176:24	technical (3)	359:8,17 369:1,3	149:18 151:19
172:16 173:6 230:7	189:24 190:13	99:13,24 295:10	tested (5)	152:18 156:14
230:18 231:1,10,20	191:14 243:17	technically (2)	182:9 217:12 346:12	163:16 165:23
232:7	244:5 295:1 301:12	170:12 314:12	347:12,17	172:10,11,12,13
switched (1)	318:19 328:19	technique (1)	testes (3)	179:23 180:6
163:5	358:14 365:11	373:14	218:20 248:24 250:8	181:17 182:3 184:4
switzerland (2)	366:18 367:16	technology (3)	testified (4)	185:19 192:21
142:6,9	376:15 382:14	5:21 30:22 190:10	11:4 67:6 311:17	193:11 194:13
sworn (3)	taken (12)		374:8	196:23 197:2
	51:25 147:9 190:11	telephone (3)	testify (2)	200:16 204:17
11:4 383:12 384:11	261:10 273:6 275:7	4:13,14 105:11	300:19 321:10	205:2 206:21 207:2
system (4)		televised (1)		211:14 212:19
164:13 166:20 167:4	298:1 339:14	151:5	testifying (2)	
353:5	372:20 375:7 376:4	tell (15)	76:18,19	213:7 214:14 215:5
systemic (3)	377:20	19:5 61:8 90:21	testimony (25)	218:8 219:23 224:3
241:4 242:11 321:25	takes (3)	145:20 175:10	58:10 93:11 100:9	224:4,12 225:25
systems (4)	100:3 269:21 322:8	242:3 249:21	101:18,22 102:21	229:6 230:24
166:14 167:10,14	talk (19)	314:11 333:24	114:19,22,24 115:1	231:15 237:11
358:4	38:14 62:14 63:4	337:4 338:7,8	117:7 209:25	238:14,19 239:19
	132:3 134:15 139:3	339:13 348:13	258:21 276:4	240:4 244:16 247:9
	142:17 146:14	371:12	289:14 298:6,8	247:17 251:7,8
table (62)	162:20 215:23	telling (5)	299:1,22 300:13	252:9 254:12
107:20,24 108:17	216:15 282:13	66:2,8 91:10,22	303:15 320:8 330:4	258:21 260:1
174:11 183:24	294:24 295:1	279:21	364:15 384:13	263:14 264:2 270:8 273:1 278:4 280:2
184:5 185:9,11	296:11 357:12	tells (2)	testing (3)	284:2 286:25
208:2 211:21	365:11 371:20	254:13 306:5	31:5 294:19 372:5	287:24,24 288:17
212:24 213:10	374:14 talked (9)	ten (6)	tests (7)	288:25 289:24,25
217:16,17 225:21	54:12,14 115:12	23:8 113:11 268:21	182:23 296:9 311:18	290:21 299:12
226:12 240:22	142:13 191:17	269:1 330:24	343:22 347:6,23 348:1	300:3,9,17 301:15
244:5 247:2,18	196:12 201:20	331:13		306:1 307:2 314:18
270:8 286:6,8		tend (1)	text (5)	316:15 317:4
296:12,14,21 297:4	325:8 357:4 talking (45)	241:16	5:21 30:21 243:6 297:17 303:21	318:10 319:11,11
297:8 299:7,10	43:15 63:23 67:18	tenminute (1)	textbooks (1)	320:12 327:20
300:21,25 301:17	70:3,7,12,15,18	330:6	` /	332:3,10 335:16
303:17 304:8 306:3	106:21 124:10	term (4)	354:12	336:15 337:13
306:4,14 307:25 311:12 313:4,13,18	140:8 143:5 162:16	62:24 87:5 181:1 280:6	thank (11) 10:24 66:1 169:21	339:1 341:17 342:2
	164:25 166:3 168:7		184:8 219:13	342:3,7 353:12
315:4,23 319:16	168:8,11,25 170:20	terms (4)	225:11 264:6	355:13 361:7,8
320:22 321:25	172:12,25 173:2	51:4 79:18 98:9		362:3,11,16,25
322:6,9,11,12,15,15	191:25 199:4	100:14	319:12 372:8	365:4 366:6 369:20
322:21 323:2	203:25 209:22	terrible (3)	378:16 380:19	373:14 375:12,17
324:20 325:2 327:6 327:25 362:7,7	220:18 252:3	26:16 46:23 113:7	thanks (1) 328:19	378:19 382:2
tables (14)	259:10,23 279:11	terribly (2)		theoretical (3)
153:4,9 178:11,16	279:15 285:17	288:23 303:14	thats (151) 12:25 14:11 15:16,19	313:15 344:18,20
201:9 212:22 257:6	304:2 322:4 325:21	test (40)	16:18 24:23 28:2	therapies (1)
282:2 321:6 328:12	331:12 350:7 356:9	45:24 46:3,10 47:11 47:15 120:13 154:4	39:1,6 50:5,19 56:5	163:18
381:4,18 382:3,23	357:18 358:24,25		56:8 58:10 61:19	theres (5)
tail (1)	378:8,12	154:10 171:1 176:16 182:6	64:11 67:11,14	49:13 90:8 107:4
133:25	talks (3)	184:10 205:17	69:18 76:6 77:12	312:3 357:12
tails (2)	23:5 61:13 377:2	212:7 229:13	80:10 81:20 82:10	theyre (6)
202:24 203:9	tarazona (3)	240:17 257:11	89:2 94:14,19	24:10 38:12 119:21
202.27 203.7	(0)	270.17 237.11	07.2 77.17,17	
	1		1	

		ı		
320:3,3 359:23	160:3 180:8 192:8	96:25 97:18 99:23	tom (2)	transformation (6)
thing (8)	192:15 194:22	100:3 108:4,5 110:4	112:21,23	164:14 168:3,19,20
62:21 72:9 87:25	195:23 196:2	111:6 113:15 114:8	tongue (1)	168:22 370:6
114:4 156:12 227:2	201:16,22,24 202:5	116:1,21 135:22	365:6	transgenic (2)
273:11 296:7	201:10,22,24 202.3	147:11,14 170:4	tool (4)	170:13 171:3
	204:7 206:20 209:5	177:1 178:3 179:21	161:25 162:2 372:13	
things (27)			372:13	transient (2) 359:9,18
12:18 22:22 110:19	210:2,25 211:5,22	180:12,15 189:13		*
129:23 139:3 140:3	212:1,24 215:22	209:10 220:21	top (9)	translated (3)
147:3 155:5,7	217:8,9,19,23	233:22,23 251:11	18:12 237:7 260:2	333:19,24 334:25
160:14 232:21	218:23 219:5 221:1	255:20 256:21	262:17 264:3	translates (2)
239:21 242:4	222:20 225:19	260:23 262:9,12	331:15 361:22	193:10 215:3
251:10,22 261:19	226:2,10 234:2	264:25 265:7,16	365:6 375:1	translation (10)
261:23 297:20	253:22 260:11	266:6 269:10,21,24	topic (3)	8:24 333:22 334:9,14
327:5 342:12 344:9	273:23 274:2	270:16 272:1,24	45:4 103:24 371:14	334:16 335:15
363:3,6,11 365:11	291:13,14 292:3,19	295:4,20 328:20,23	toss (1)	336:1,23 338:13,25
369:7 373:3	296:1,17 297:14	329:4,19,22 330:9	204:22	translator (6)
think (55)	298:10,18,21 299:4	330:10,20 345:16	total (60)	334:3,21,23 335:1
39:15 46:21 48:7 52:9	299:23 300:7,22	345:19 349:1 353:4	96:21 182:18 183:23	337:2 338:5
58:25 64:16 78:23	301:4 304:11	353:14 354:3	266:25 285:1	transparency (3)
98:18 99:2 105:3	305:22 306:10,19	365:13,16 370:18	296:15,16,23 297:5	61:15 134:23 135:13
112:6,19 118:16,22	306:23 307:16,19	370:25 373:4 380:4	297:13,23 298:1	treat (1)
128:25 137:15	308:1,9,15 314:22	383:6	299:2,7 300:21	352:13
144:15 149:2	314:24 315:17	times (10)	301:1,7,8,12,17,20	treated (4)
153:13 155:14	316:9,9,11 324:25	23:18 90:23 146:13	301:21,25 304:10	192:14,15,19 195:1
156:10 163:4 176:3	325:5 328:5,7,13	146:18 271:15	305:6,7,19,20 306:8	treatment (3)
180:25 184:22	357:12 363:3	272:2,20 340:14	306:18,25 307:24	196:5 228:24 229:18
190:21 191:22	threeormoretumor	345:9,13	308:8,13 313:19	tree (1)
195:22 206:20	322:22	timing (1)	314:6,13,16,19,23	41:4
210:3 223:9 226:4	threepage (2)	34:10	315:6,7,12 316:6	trees (1)
241:18 242:1 243:5	99:12 376:7	tissue (4)	317:1,11,11 318:11	366:17
279:4,5 282:8,9	threequarters (1)	250:22 251:2 320:16	318:14 321:23,24	trend (162)
300:20 316:25	136:13	321:3	322:2,14 323:5,16	45:24 46:3,10 47:11
317:14 319:22	throw (1)	tissues (3)	327:23,24 328:2,10	47:15 120:13 182:6
324:25 326:17	176:9	248:23 250:9 321:8	371:25	192:25 193:1,6,9,10
330:25 332:17	thumb (2)	title (2)	tough (1)	193:11,17,18 194:3
335:20 344:4 349:3	151:11,16	62:20 362:11	58:22	194:5,17 195:5,8
357:19 362:17	thyroid (8)	titled (1)	toxic (1)	197:14,18 201:17
363:5 373:17	218:19 219:9,14,18	376:8	105:17	203:5 206:25
374:16	220:19 221:3 222:8	titles (1)	toxicisch (1)	207:10,13 208:5,8
thinking (1)	222:12	29:12	338:9	208:24,25 209:13
352:10	ticket (1)	today (17)	toxicity (2)	210:1,10,19 211:6
third (9)	97:2	39:19 111:4 191:1	7:14 123:22	211:21 212:3,21
21:16 194:14 195:8	tied (2)	228:20 274:23	toxicological (3)	213:24 214:13,15
205:24 206:1 217:2	23:19 187:16	285:24 307:22	136:23 137:2 343:15	214:16 215:4,7,10
245:5 266:16 302:2	time (103)	317:10 330:18	toxicology (8)	221:11 223:20
thirdfromlast (1)	11:15 13:17 23:24	333:8 339:7,18	29:10,11 124:3,5,23	229:3,13 234:1,10
302:3	24:11 25:17 26:5,25	366:4 368:13	125:23 126:12	235:1,21,25 236:4,6
thought (11)	27:9 32:23 40:21	373:25 374:2	316:16	236:21 237:14,23
37:14 58:23 61:1	44:7,16,22 47:14	380:22	toxin (1)	238:10 239:6,12,18
175:9 226:18	51:24 58:22 69:20	todays (1)	26:17	240:2,9,10,15,16,20
265:11 273:9	69:23 70:20 71:2	383:6	trade (2)	240:20 241:9,23
305:17 341:20	72:16 79:3 82:13	told (14)	81:16 82:2	242:14 252:6,10,23
357:3 374:13	83:4,14 84:1 85:16	26:13 60:14 62:12	transcript (4)	253:6,6,9 254:5,7,9
three (86)	85:19,22 87:9 88:21	63:9,17 64:5 88:22	10:23 151:10,14,16	254:21,25 255:5,15
55:5 80:6 93:3 95:19	89:3 90:18 92:17	114:14,15 278:6,24	transcription (1)	256:3 257:3,19
96:6,13 128:8 160:2	93:2 95:19 96:5,10	295:8 318:4 375:8	385:7	258:7,11,15,19
				, , - ,

250.11.260.12	22.20.21.45.20	274:14 275:8 276:3	226:15 232:3	
259:11 260:13	23:20,21 45:20 154:21 162:24	276:4,14,19 277:9	233:10,11,15,16	U
263:13 271:17 272:4,9,13 274:9		277:10 278:1,8	235:16,22 236:1,19	u (9)
278:1,11 279:3	163:1,6 168:21 171:4 174:23	279:24 280:21	237:3,8,9,13,20	83:15 84:3 85:6 87:8
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	175:12,13,19,21	281:4 282:12,25	243:3,6,7 250:21	123:3 136:12,14
280:20 282:24			254:20 278:9,25	137:11 380:2
283:1,4,9,12,17,19	187:12 197:25	283:10,11,25 284:8 284:10,21 285:23	279:5,21 280:18	uhhuh (1)
286:1,16,25 287:7,9	198:7,14 199:16	286:1,23,25 287:7,9	283:20 286:1,12	43:12
289:13,16,18 290:5	203:20 208:20,21 211:3 214:11	287:20 288:14,18	288:13 292:16,24	ultimate (1)
290:9,12 291:18,24	217.3 214.11 215:18 217:21	291:13,13,14,19	293:13 296:25	215:11
292:1,11,13 293:4 294:13,19 295:25	218:3 219:3 224:24	292:16,19,25 293:2	304:1 305:2,3,8,14	ultimately (4)
296:2,6 303:9,12,18	226:15 227:7,7	293:15,21 296:17	307:19 309:20,24	36:6 56:1 73:12 234:3
303:23,25 304:4,5	234:1,4,9 235:2	296:19,25 297:14	309:25 310:9	um (1)
304:16,21,25	249:23 251:24	298:10,18,21 299:4	311:22,22 312:3,4	176:21
309:13 310:18,20	260:9 262:22	299:14,24 300:6,8	315:2 328:6 330:2	umhm (3)
311:15,21 312:1,5,6	266:16,20 287:14	300:23 302:20,24	330:11 331:6,20	274:7 276:15 360:7
313:9,11 317:12	288:21 292:15	303:1 304:1,2,9,11	333:17 357:13	unaware (1)
318:22 319:9,17	298:24 309:1,8	304:14 305:3,4,8,14	369:7 374:16	46:6
321:11 323:8 372:5	310:24 312:2,25	305:23 306:5,9,10	twofold (1)	uncertainty (1)
trends (27)	314:22 315:7 323:6	306:20,23 307:17	258:9	144:24
184:12 185:2,4,21,25	324:14 325:22,23	308:1,9,11,15 309:4	twopage (4)	unchanged (1)
186:5,24 187:20	326:3,24 327:3	309:20,21,24 310:1	98:25 99:9,19 373:24	364:5
188:10,12 230:18	381:11,11	310:1,3,10,20	twostage (1)	uncommon (3)
231:10,18 232:8,10	tumors (224)	311:10,16,22,25	338:3	35:16 345:21 376:9
240:22 257:16	45:5 143:12,18 144:2	312:3,4,4,10 313:9	twothirds (1)	undergone (1)
303:2,6 304:15	144:21 163:2,20	314:22,24,25 315:2	140:8	276:12
305:2 308:11,14	171:7 173:23 174:6	315:17 318:25	twoyear (2)	understand (34)
309:19 311:14	174:15,17,21,21,25	319:2 321:25	16:6 264:11	27:16 30:7 47:14
313:10 319:15	175:2 176:17	324:25 325:15	type (19)	55:23 57:1,5 63:8
triangle (1)	178:25 185:16	326:2,19,20 327:16	119:22 146:10 159:20	149:22 174:19
374:25	186:19,23 188:5,14	328:5,6 342:16	160:18 161:15,21	175:18 184:6,7
trichoepithelioma (2)	191:20 192:12	371:24 372:1 381:5	171:4 234:1,4 235:2	241:12 259:9 275:3
327:1,19	193:1,25 194:7,18	turn (7)	251:24 290:13	289:14 290:22
triple (1)	194:18,23,25 195:6	21:15 28:3 165:2	306:5 312:21 321:3	291:11 293:25
212:25	195:7,9,24 196:4,11	229:22 330:21	323:10,12 326:4	296:15 297:1,21
true (9)	197:6,15,18 198:20	339:2 371:5	354:8	304:6 309:7 310:16
139:13 159:3 161:5	199:12,17 200:7,9	turns (1)	typed (1)	310:17 312:23
167:6 229:6 238:14	205:5,9,14 206:9,15	370:11	266:16	313:3,6 318:18
256:7 260:1 384:13	208:6 209:1,11,23	twelve (1)	types (28)	320:11 340:2
trust (1)	210:1,8,17,23 211:4	247:21	16:4 119:17 161:2,6,7	358:12 375:5
242:3	211:11 213:6,16,25	twice (1)	162:13 170:17	understanding (24)
try (10)	214:6,14 215:13	107:14	174:6,25 175:20,21	12:17 26:9 62:3,4
160:16 161:19 163:23	218:11,14,16,20,21	two (102)	219:3 226:15	105:4 118:2 135:17
170:4 204:16,19	218:22 219:10,19	18:17,21,23 22:9	227:12 234:9 241:3	144:23 178:15
241:14 295:21	220:19 221:3 222:8	29:13,24 33:12,13	251:10 305:11	189:15 193:16
304:22,22	223:9 224:15,19,22	42:13 52:20 66:9,19	314:22 318:1	241:21 242:6 246:9 246:13,16 251:7,8
trying (13)	224:23 225:2	70:15,18 72:18	320:16 325:23,24	
16:13 26:16 136:3	226:19 227:14,20	74:12 77:2 91:7	326:4,18 346:6	299:6 304:18
149:23 158:23	232:17,22 241:3,4	99:12 106:6,17	347:23 381:11	362:20 363:2 366:20 367:4
179:19 201:19	242:11 250:17	121:23 125:10	typhimurium (1)	understood (3)
204:24 276:16	251:12 256:24	128:8 154:1 170:16	347:19	17:24 131:21 296:10
293:9 313:6 320:11	257:4,20 258:13,19	191:11 197:11,16	typical (5)	union (5)
343:18	258:25 259:12	199:5,11 200:2,11	51:20 52:5 246:7	7:16 123:24 335:9
tsg (2)	261:15 263:6	202:2,24 203:5,9,21	304:4 305:11	374:5 384:3
10:13,17	270:10,18 271:24	205:24 209:15	typically (2)	unions (1)
tumor (62)	273:3,6,13 274:10	210:1,17,23 211:2,7	245:21 312:24	124:7
				147.7
L				

	İ		Ī	I
unique (3)	231:5 296:1,9 304:3	vitro (8)	149:13 150:5	342:12,12
349:17,19 350:14	variety (1)	155:15,20 157:16	161:12 167:22	wide (2)
unit (1)	22:24	350:25 351:1 356:8	193:11 203:12	347:22,25
122:13	various (12)	356:13,19	204:21 229:19	wistar (37)
united (5)	26:21 64:22 90:8,13	vivo (3)	246:17 248:15,17	162:25 163:2 185:24
1:1 10:6 83:6 84:12	116:10 119:8 121:8	356:14,19 357:11	248:19 256:10	186:4,13,15,23
369:15	153:5 228:24 295:3	voiced (2)	263:10 277:16	187:20 188:11,15
unsound (3)	336:5 367:14	52:18,19	288:25 291:9 296:8	191:20,22 192:9,13
7:20 127:4 134:19		voicing (1)	304:25 307:23	192:20 194:7,15,22
unusual (1)	vary (1) 159:20	52:12	314:10,14 317:20	195:25 196:2,5,12
227:24			325:11,12,12 326:3	196:22 197:6,18
	vehicles (2)	volume (1)		
upcoming (1)	8:21 326:8	379:10	327:21 340:25	198:10 200:24
33:14	venal (1)		343:13,22 360:2	201:3,12,16 207:1
upper (1)	174:15		373:12,13 384:18	207:10 211:18
292:10	verbatim (2)	wait (1)	wayback (3)	216:12 226:3,5
urging (1)	337:11 338:8	140:24	33:19 35:1,12	326:11
119:1	verbiage (3)	walk (1)	ways (1)	wistarhan (2)
use (52)	17:1,6,7	251:23	296:1	8:22 326:8
19:2 20:16 86:5	verifiable (1)	walked (1)	weak (4)	witness (13)
102:22 134:19	294:17	114:4	221:2,16,24 222:7	3:4 5:2 11:1,3 93:17
142:17 149:17	verified (1)	want (29)	weaken (2)	179:12 318:20
155:8 160:15	47:10	18:2 27:16 53:24 63:3	66:10 67:9	332:16 370:17
169:15 170:7 171:5	verify (2)	133:10 140:15	weakening (1)	384:10,14,20 385:3
190:4,17 197:15	47:7 246:17	146:10 147:12	67:14	wonderful (1)
233:8 259:24 260:3	version (2)	152:1 185:13	weakens (2)	178:8
261:20 264:23	107:25 119:15	193:13 196:17	66:20 67:12	wood (27)
265:24 266:10	versus (1)	206:10 219:12	website (13)	192:6 194:15 195:14
267:3,5,19 284:16	313:10	237:4 249:1 261:20	9:18 33:18,21 62:17	198:16 199:3,5,5,6
284:17,25 294:16	video (1)	262:5 269:18	263:13,16,18,22	199:6,9,14 200:8
299:2 301:20 303:7	10:15	275:14,20 285:7,9	268:1,2 376:1,7,8	201:1,10 207:8
303:24 307:14,25	videographer (22)	329:13 332:12,22	wed (1)	209:3,15 210:11,19
311:7 325:20 330:9	4:15 10:1,24 69:20,23	335:10 366:16	152:14	238:8 239:3 252:21
348:24,25,25	176:22 177:1 178:3	371:7	week (5)	252:25 253:16,18
355:17 356:2,3,22	180:12,15 262:9,12	wanted (7)	25:22 43:25 47:20,23	254:24 281:3
356:24 368:8,19	328:20,23 329:16	23:14 139:2 217:17	52:6	word (5)
369:5 370:15 371:9	329:19,22 365:13	239:12 369:3,17	weight (4)	130:20 183:19 198:14
381:23	365:16 370:22,25	382:17	12:8 357:10,21	343:19 344:12
useful (2)	383:5	warrant (2)	358:11	words (2)
261:6 334:13	videorecorded (1)	331:24 332:1	weitz (5)	214:3 382:1
uses (2)	10:3	washington (2)	2:10 3:3 78:20 80:8	work (65)
169:25 325:18	videotape (3)	4:6 369:12	80:16	22:18,20 23:25 24:7
usual (1)			went (7)	27:14 29:15,16,25
349:3	151:18 152:5 176:23	wasnt (12)	` /	30:2,14,17 32:25
	view (1)	13:2 67:6 71:20	16:9 62:18 65:6 120:9	
usually (1)	66:10	101:11 128:20	146:13 211:25	39:5,12 41:11 43:15
41:1	views (1)	139:3 187:17	271:8	43:24 44:4 67:17
V	63:14	207:22 296:22	whats (8)	78:13 79:6 80:5,19
	vincent (1)	359:11 374:17	138:11 225:22 230:15	80:23 81:3,14,25
v (2)	112:12	375:19	278:22 290:21	82:24 83:22 88:20
169:16 170:8	virtually (1)	water (2)	327:22 339:25	90:17 93:4,7 94:11
valid (1)	260:8	26:18 49:14	367:9	95:21 96:7,17 97:3
261:6	virus (5)	way (51)	whatsoever (7)	97:8,12,24 98:2,11
value (6)	165:5,13,20 166:4,6	36:15 47:17 51:14	89:7 91:3,23 92:11	98:13 100:5,17,25
287:5 294:19 303:23	visiting (3)	53:15 54:10 56:5	101:25 217:11,25	101:3,6,8,15,20
311:11 322:10	22:15 24:8,9	57:6 84:18 85:18	whereof (1)	102:9,12,15 108:7
345:15	vitae (2)	113:6 142:2 144:15	384:20	110:23 115:8
values (4)	7:23 136:8	146:24 148:1,15,23	whos (2)	125:17 136:2

150.16.267.12	202,2 262,2 269,0	100.1 212.5 220.10	057.17.02.059.2.14	67.10 057.05
159:16 367:13	203:2 362:3 368:9	198:1 212:5 220:18	257:17,23 258:3,14	67:18 257:25
371:16 376:19	writeup (1)	221:15,18,25	258:19 259:1,7	1149 (1)
378:13	307:21	229:11 243:9 253:4	281:1 283:7,22,24	243:5
worked (11)	writing (1)	253:5 279:11 293:9	284:5 301:11,13,16	12 (16)
23:6,9 27:11 56:6,8	65:7	294:1 311:12	303:7 312:13 319:1	15:19 31:10 89:19
79:1 103:17 115:6	written (14)	312:15,23 313:4	319:2	177:2 245:11 246:2
135:23 156:24	12:15 48:23 51:1 81:5	314:2 331:12	053 (2)	247:4,18 249:2
157:1	81:11 92:18 120:18	353:17 356:12	207:13 209:18	291:3 302:19,19,21
workers (2)	121:20,23 139:10	372:24 374:18,19	06 (1)	326:18,21 371:21
9:10 358:20	165:10 299:21	youve (4)	383:6	122 (1)
working (75)	342:6 382:1	151:4 174:4 234:16		7:10
11:20 19:14 20:2	wrong (7)	259:10	1	123 (1)
23:10 24:25 25:22	63:2 68:10 181:1	yup (1)	1 (47)	7:12
27:1,3,18 33:6 36:5	201:6 279:5 302:12	284:4	10:2 39:6 49:4,10	127 (1)
		204.4		7:18
36:22 40:3,7,11,21	374:18	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	107:24 158:14,24	
41:8,9 42:24 43:14	wrote (9)		178:2,4 180:13,16	128474 (1)
43:23,25 44:6 47:20	50:21 114:8 122:11	zealand (3)	182:22 202:4	1:25
48:6 50:12 51:8	182:3 189:11	118:19 119:1,2	220:10 244:13	12month (1)
53:10 54:2 55:12,13	231:15,16,16 338:6	zero (5)	263:24 264:3,4	248:1
55:15,21 56:1,10,13		243:2,4,5 317:21,22	271:1 287:14,15,19	13 (8)
56:14 57:14,17,23	X	2.3.2, 1,3 317.21,22	287:21 288:21	5:8,11 6:13 57:11,13
		0		
58:6,18 59:8 65:1	x (5)		289:5,10,10 292:7	97:1,4 249:2
66:12 67:18 72:21	1:3,7,10 157:5,9	0 (33)	293:23 294:5,6,6,7	1350 (1)
74:5,17 75:1,15,19	xavier (1)	188:11 202:4 207:13	294:7,10,10 297:10	4:5
76:12 77:1,8,14	133:12	215:3 230:18 231:5	302:20,21 305:19	136 (1)
78:6,19 79:10,16		231:10 257:23	306:3,4 322:21	7:23
80:12 83:2,12 92:18	Y	258:19 259:7	334:17 378:1,24	13r (2)
92:20 105:22 111:5	yeah (14)	287:14,20 288:9,10	385:5	370:2,5
113:15 120:19	69:19 71:25 97:25	289:7,9,10 292:8,8	10 (10)	14 (1)
125:9,12 257:24,25	122:25 140:6 174:4	292:8,8,9,9 293:23	69:21,24 214:20	34:17
258:11 369:4	230:14 243:7	293:23 294:5,5,6,7	225:21 257:6	1424 (2)
works (3)	271:21 280:1 309:6	294:8,8,10,10	266:12,17 299:24	243:2,4
146:24 193:12 380:4	309:15 342:1 376:5	000 (5)	300:5 302:21	15 (30)
workshop (1)	year (7)	79:24 96:16 98:5	100 (8)	6:11 19:2 48:15 98:5
15:5	25:19 99:4 122:20,25	125:16 289:10	23:11,12 139:20	183:24 185:9
	*		288:21 306:16,17	
world (2)	123:10 127:14	0000 (1)		240:22 267:6
91:23 117:19	128:23	285:9	306:21 351:21	296:12,14 297:4,8
worry (1)	years (8)	001 (2)	10003 (1)	299:7,10,25 300:5
145:11	25:5 26:20 105:20	5:17 21:13	3:6	301:17 303:17
worse (1)	125:10 264:14,19	003 (2)	101 (1)	304:8 307:25 313:4
265:12	266:3 269:12	215:4,11	176:2	313:13,18 315:4
wouldnt (17)	yields (1)	01 (4)	102 (1)	319:16 321:25
52:17 54:17 62:21	221:11	301:22 302:1,2 303:7	289:8	322:6,15 324:20
198:21 239:13	york (8)	03 (4)	106 (2)	327:25
251:5 277:18,19	1:13,13 2:10,11 3:6	193:10,19 194:5	7:6,8	150 (3)
294:25 314:5	10:10,10 26:16	262:10	11 (16)	125:16 293:15,21
316:14 320:12,21	youre (52)	04 (2)	6:12,16,18 52:25	151 (7)
337:9 346:16 354:7	14:21 29:15,17 35:24	2:5 10:12	65:12 68:11,18,21	5:8 13:6,9,24 14:21
370:15	41:25 46:13 63:4,6	041 (1)	143:4 235:5 249:2	19:11,21
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	, ,		
wristband (11)	70:7 78:13 79:12	221:12	286:3,8 302:15,17	1510 (2)
27:4,13,19,21,22 28:3	86:14 94:10 129:2	05 (35)	302:21	6:8 41:21
28:7 31:2,5,7 39:21	132:24,24 139:19	181:23 182:7,24	112 (17)	1511 (3)
wristbands (1)	140:8 143:5,21	183:14 184:2,13	33:15 34:22 35:7 36:5	6:9 43:5,6
30:17	161:8 170:2 181:20	186:1,6,24 187:20	36:23 40:3,7,21	1512 (3)
write (6)	182:15,22 183:12	196:8 230:6,18	41:9 44:1,6 47:20	6:10 48:13,14
43:1 103:6 132:8	183:22 191:25	231:5,10 236:7	51:9 57:18 59:9	1513 (3)
13.1 103.0 132.0	105.44 171.45	231.3,10 230.7	31.7 31.10 37.7	1010 (0)
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

6:12 52:24 53:2	1536 (2)	184 (1)	2000 (8)	97:5 125:6,12
1514 (3)	8:19 326:6	8:8	259:17 260:4 262:16	126:13,13 181:10
				*
6:13 57:9,10	1537 (2)	18month (24)	263:15 264:12	220:8,17 240:5
1515 (3)	334:6 337:18	233:15 234:11 235:22	270:1 271:4,6	278:17,25 366:11
6:14 60:19,20	1537german (1)	237:8 238:10	20005 (1)	383:14 384:22
1516 (6)	8:23	244:10,14 245:12	4:6	21 (11)
6:15 65:10,11,14 70:9	1538 (3)	247:19,22 248:2,7	2001 (1)	5:14,19 28:21 29:1,3
74:21	8:24 334:9,12	249:5,10 254:2,3,24	136:17	29:23 244:6,20
1517 (4)	1539 (2)	267:13,17 279:6	2005 (8)	299:25 300:5 375:3
6:17 68:17 70:8 74:21	9:3 349:23	280:17,18 284:11	6:18 11:10 13:8 20:23	21st (1)
1518 (4)	154 (2)	286:17	21:22 22:5,9 68:18	375:10
6:19 71:4,5 93:21	5:18 28:20	19 (15)	2006 (1)	22 (2)
1519 (3)	1540 (2)	69:21 82:20,22 99:15	136:17	244:6,20
6:20 73:7,8	9:8 358:18	99:18 100:7,12,15	2009 (1)	220 (1)
152 (8)	1541 (4)	101:9,22 102:22	163:25	8:10
5:11 13:14,19 14:17	9:12 365:19,21	108:6,12 302:6,11	2013 (2)	23 (4)
14:19,23 18:3 19:2	366:24	190 (1)	22:14,16	107:18 108:2 269:14
1520 (7)	1542 (4)	289:6	2014 (20)	270:4
6:22 88:8,9 139:24	9:13 366:6,10,21	1960s (1)	5:25 6:2 22:14,17	24 (8)
140:2 179:8,9	1543 (4)	26:1	24:15,22,24 25:18	122:3 215:17 216:6
1521 (3)	9:15 373:18,23	1979 (1)	32:3,9 33:23,24	216:12 219:5
7:3 89:12,13	374:24	269:23	34:1,4,11,16,21	233:11 267:24
1522 (4)	1544 (3)	1981 (4)	35:6 39:3,20	270:9
7:6 106:6,9,16	9:17 375:24,25	214:11 269:2,5,8	2015 (64)	243 (1)
1523 (5)	1545 (3)	1983 (5)	5:19 6:7,8,9,12,13,16	8:12
7:8 106:6,12,17	9:19 377:13,14	264:12 269:3 279:11	6:19,21 28:21 29:1	24month (39)
107:12	155 (4)	279:15 324:1	29:3,24 40:16,20	216:21 233:17 234:11
1524 (3)	5:20 30:19,20,25	1987 (2)	41:22,24 42:6 43:4	234:24 236:1,19
7:10 122:4,6	156 (4)	264:1,8	43:7 52:25 53:6,13	237:9,13,19,20,22
1525 (4)	5:24 8:3 33:13,25	1990 (3)	57:11,13 64:24	244:11 248:3 254:1
7:12 123:18,20	157 (3)	269:2,5,8	65:12,17 68:11 70:5	254:20 257:1,7,18
126:18	6:1 33:13 34:3	1995 (5)	70:17 71:6,16 73:9	261:20,22 267:12
1526 (4)	158 (2)	8:16 268:7,12 272:22	73:18 74:4,13,25	267:20,23 268:21
7:18 127:2,9,22	6:3 37:15	369:18	75:12 76:14,25	269:15 270:6,15
1527 (3)	159 (3)	1996 (2)	78:18 79:19,21 80:1	271:25 277:22
7:23 136:7,8	6:7 40:14,15	264:1,8	80:17 81:1,13,24	278:9 279:1,17,19
1528 (3)	16 (12)		82:15,18,20,22,24	279:22 284:12
8:3 156:5,15	5:25 33:23 34:1,7	2	82:25 83:11 91:20	286:2,12,18,19
1529 (2)	92:8 182:18 184:1	2 (31)	129:10 130:7,13,25	25 (1)
8:5 164:4	264:14,19 266:3,24	49:4,20,23,25 81:13	153:12 375:4,11	180:13
153 (3)	291:3	165:3 169:15,23	2016 (38)	26 (6)
5:14 21:9,10	160 (1)	173:18 202:4	7:11 8:22 88:15,18	127:1 215:17 216:5
1530 (8)	96:16	213:10 225:21	89:19 90:25 91:15	216:10 244:13
8:6 181:4,8 191:24,25	164 (1)	226:12 270:19	91:21 92:9 94:1,3,4	300:1
237:1 240:6 274:5	8:5	271:1,18 288:2,6,18	95:16 96:11,12 99:3	268 (1)
1531 (4)	16md02741vc (1)	289:5,8 292:7,8	99:7,11 102:14	8:15
8:8 184:18,19 223:13	1:6	294:8,8,10,10	106:18,18 107:19	26month (1)
1532 (3)	17 (3)	302:20,21 377:5	108:2,12,16,21	219:4
8:10 220:2 378:18	82:14,17 184:2	385:6	109:18 110:20	27 (8)
1533 (3)	18 (13)	20 (10)	122:7,20 126:21	6:20 73:9,18 74:24
8:12 243:19 266:13	92:1,14,21 96:25	75:17 77:6 97:23	140:5 153:18 179:6	180:16 181:10
1534 (5)	233:10 262:13	143:3 178:2,4	326:9 377:8 378:1	216:10 267:5
8:15 268:6 329:10	302:7,13,14,15,18	181:20 182:23	379:10	2741 (1)
330:3 369:24	302:7,13,14,13,16	311:17 312:9	2017 (22)	1:4
1535 (3)	181 (1)	200 (4)	1:14 2:4 8:18 9:14	278 (1)
8:17 278:16,19	8:6	25:1,4 292:25 293:2	10:11 96:14,25 97:1	8:17
2.1.7 2.0.10,12		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
	=	-	-	-

				Tage II
28 (6)	334 (2)	369:10	223:10,14,22,25	53:13 55:5,20 65:12
5:18 191:24 192:4,12	8:23,24	43 (2)	264:14,19 302:15	65:17 247:11 257:6
201:9 247:7	34 (6)	6:9 266:25	302:17,21,22 383:6	302:21 322:21
29 (23)	6:1 69:24 158:14	44 (2)	60 (1)	93 (2)
, ,	220:17 221:8 271:1	267:10 271:19	6:14	31:12,24
6:19 9:13 71:6,16				
75:12,18 77:7 78:18	349 (1)	46 (3)	61 (2)	955 (1)
79:19,21 80:1,3,17	9:3	247:5,16,24	7:9 106:14	289:9
81:1,12,24 83:11	35 (1)	48 (5)	65 (1)	970 (1)
247:14,21,24	207:24	6:10 202:1 237:1,5	6:15	193:9
302:10 365:14	358 (1)	328:24	68 (1)	99 (3)
366:11	9:8	49 (6)	6:17	288:15,18 292:6
298 (1)	36 (2)	287:20,21 289:5,7	6th (1)	993 (1)
289:8	259:22 328:21	292:6 329:20	384:21	362:7
2a (4)	365 (1)			994 (4)
53:21 54:5,20 75:8	9:12	5	7	359:4 361:4,11,17
2b (5)	366 (2)	5 (29)	7 (27)	995 (1)
17:10,20 53:21 54:4	5:4 9:13	1:14 2:4 10:11 19:12	6:2 7:11 8:17 14:17	360:1
54:20	37 (6)	19:21 42:9,13 79:24	15:1 18:2,12 33:24	997 (1)
	6:3 259:20,22 260:2	158:14,24 182:18	34:4,8,8 35:6,12	215:3
3	266:24 274:5	188:11 244:5,7	80:18,18 93:24 94:2	
3 (42)	373 (1)	247:18 252:10	100:24 122:7 140:7	
6:7,11 19:1,7 40:16	9:15	289:11 292:25	184:25 185:8 230:5	
40:20 48:15 49:4	375 (1)	293:14 299:24,25	230:13 278:17	
50:16,17 78:23 80:4	9:17	300:5,5 302:21,22	302:21 379:10	
80:19 81:2,20,22	376 (1)	365:14,17 370:23	700 (3)	
100:24 164:9 165:3	5:3	371:1	2:10 3:5 10:10	
166:12 225:22	377 (1)	50 (22)	70801 (1)	
247:2 262:10,13	9:19	26:20 181:10 182:17	3:14	
-				
270:19 271:1,18	38 (5)	183:23 287:15,16	71 (1)	
286:8 287:16,22	252:1,2 287:11	287:21,22 288:3,6,9	6:19	
288:14 289:11	333:22 370:23	288:10 289:5,8,9,10	715 (1)	
292:6 293:24 294:5	39 (3)	289:11,12 292:6	350:7	
294:6,7,10 302:20	252:17 277:23 288:2	329:23 338:19,20	73 (1)	
302:21 337:19		501 (1)	6:20	
385:7	4	3:13	744 (1)	
30 (13)	4 (44)	51 (3)	379:13	
5:20 93:25 94:3,4	6:8 19:12,21 37:20	200:8 263:25 264:5		
99:6,10 192:4,21	40:24 41:8,22,24,25	52 (4)	8	
201:9 302:10,11,11	42:4,6,8,9,12,13,18	6:12 196:20 198:5	8 (6)	
383:1	42:22,23,25 43:14	219:11	19:7 208:2 212:24	
31 (5)	44:4 49:4 53:5,8	53 (7)	291:2 302:21	
157:24,24 192:4	54:3 81:2 88:15	220:15,17 331:11,12	379:10	
207:5 377:8	158:1 179:6 225:22	341:19,21 371:1	85 (1)	
32 (11)	268:16 290:25	54 (1)	176:3	
37:21 177:2 192:6	293:1,20 297:17	357:25	86 (1)	
201:9 207:3,4 220:1	302:21,22 328:21	57 (1)	176:3	
220:6 326:12,15	328:24 329:20,23	6:13	874 (1)	
327:10	336:1,22 362:7		289:11	
326 (1)	40 (2)	6	88 (1)	
8:19	6:7 98:1	6 (35)	6:22	
329 (2)	41 (4)	5:3,17 6:9,11 18:2,12	89 (1)	
182:17 183:23	6:8 240:7 252:21	21:13 34:7 42:8,12	7:3	
33 (7)	253:3	42:18,22,25 43:4,7	,	
5:24 37:21 195:22	42 (3)	48:15 80:10,12	9	
197:3 198:4,6	240:5 253:12 271:19	158:1 206:11 213:3	9 (14)	
365:17	4224 (1)	213:7,10 217:17	2:5 6:16 10:12 53:6,8	
303.17	744 (1)	213.1,10 211.11	2.3 0.10 10:12 33:0,8	
	I	ı	ı	·