

Reeves, William Final Played in Court

Reeves, William 01-23-2019
Reeves, William 01-24-2019



Total Time 03:07:02



Page/Line	Source	ID
10:11 - 10:21	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:19) 10:11 Q. Good morning, sir. 10:12 A. Good morning. 10:13 Q. My name is Brent Wisner, and I represent 10:14 the plaintiff in this lawsuit. I understand you have 10:15 been put forward as a witness to testify on behalf of 10:16 Monsanto; is that correct? 10:17 A. That's correct. 10:18 Q. What is your understanding of what your 10:19 role is here? 10:20 A. My role here is to represent the company 10:21 and speak on their behalf.	xReevesFINAL.1
14:10 - 14:22	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:31) 14:10 Q. Great. What exactly did you do to prepare 14:11 for your deposition today? 14:12 A. So the main thing I did was work with my 14:13 attorneys, who are here, and then review documents. 14:14 Q. And how much time did you spend preparing? 14:15 A. With my -- with our legal counsel, it was 14:16 probably in the realm of 150 to 200 hours, and then 14:17 reviewing documents is probably somewhere around 250 14:18 hours. 14:19 Q. So you spent upwards of 400 hours 14:20 preparing for this deposition? 14:21 A. Somewhere in there. I haven't done a firm 14:22 count.	xReevesFINAL.2
21:12 - 21:17	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:13) 21:12 Q. So one of the things you're here to talk 21:13 about, for example, is you're going to tell us 21:14 Monsanto's view on whether or not Roundup causes 21:15 non-Hodgkin's lymphoma? 21:16 A. Our knowledge and positions regarding the 21:17 carcinogenicity of glyphosate-based formulations.	xReevesFINAL.3
23:17 - 23:20	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:15) 23:17 Q. So first thing I want to talk -- so we're 23:18 going to talk about causation, okay? And I'm going to 23:19 write up here causation. All right? 23:20 A. Okay.	xReevesFINAL.4 RW2.1
23:24 - 24:14	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:27) 23:24 So one of the things that the jury is	xReevesFINAL.5

24:1 going to hear before they see your testimony is they're
 24:2 going to hear from our experts that sort of talk about
 24:3 what we call the three pillars of causation science;
 24:4 okay?

24:5 A. Okay.

24:6 Q. And the way we've divided that is in one
 24:7 pillar we have epidemiology; okay?

24:8 A. Okay.

24:9 Q. And in the next pillar, we have sort of
 24:10 animal carcinogenicity studies.

24:11 A. Okay.

24:12 Q. Like does it promote tumors essentially is
 24:13 when we're looking at there.

24:14 A. I understand.

25:16 - 25:23

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:21)

xReevesFINAL.6

25:16 Q. Yeah. That's how I'm dividing it. Just
 25:17 -- I want you to know what I'm doing so you're not
 25:18 confused or whatever. So the first one is going to be
 25:19 epi, right? The second one is going to be -- I'm going
 25:20 to call tox, but animal tox, okay?

RW2.2

RW2.3

25:21 A. Okay.

25:22 Q. And the third one is cell studies. Okay?

RW2.4

25:23 A. Okay.

28:7 - 29:3

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:38)

xReevesFINAL.7

28:7 Q. And who is Dr. Farmer?

28:8 A. Dr. Farmer is a scientist with our
 28:9 toxicology team.

clear

28:10 Q. And she's been working on glyphosate and
 28:11 Roundup for many years, right?

28:12 A. That's correct.

28:13 Q. And is she someone -- a resource that you
 28:14 would go to to talk about toxicology or the science
 28:15 behind Roundup?

28:16 A. Yes.

28:17 Q. I'm handing you a portion of her
 28:18 deposition -- I didn't print out the whole thing
 28:19 because it was really long -- but it's Exhibit 4. And
 28:20 you can see this was taken September 26th, 2018.

RW4.1

28:21 Do you see that?

28:22 [Exhibit 4 marked for identification.]

Page/Line	Source	ID
	28:23 A. Yes, I do. And could I have a moment to 28:24 review? Just to make sure I recall?	
	29:1 Q. Yeah, sure. It's just two pages, so go 29:2 ahead and review it.	
29:19 - 30:1	29:3 A. Thank you. Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:20)	xReevesFINAL.8
	29:19 Q. Let me just ask you. Do you agree with 29:20 that, that there is no evidence at all suggesting that 29:21 Roundup can cause any type of cancer?	RW4.2
	29:22 A. So the company's position is that there is 29:23 no evidence related to real-world exposures that would 29:24 indicate glyphosate or glyphosate-based formulations 30:1 cause cancer.	
31:1 - 31:12	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:42)	xReevesFINAL.9
	31:1 Q. So that leads us to the first pillar, 31:2 which we've called epidemiology; right?	clear - RW2.4
	31:3 A. That's right.	
	31:4 Q. And I know -- I'm just going to write here 31:5 for all three of these -- because this is really what 31:6 you're saying -- Monsanto, no evidence in real world; 31:7 is that right?	RW2.5
	31:8 A. Well, I would say across the board. The 31:9 animal studies show nothing. The epidemiology data 31:10 show no relationship.	
	31:11 Q. No evidence across the board?	
35:19 - 35:20	31:12 A. That's correct. Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:04)	xReevesFINAL.10
	35:19 Q. Okay, but you've never actually gone out 35:20 and taken blood from a human being exposed to Roundup?	
35:22 - 36:3	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:16)	xReevesFINAL.11
	35:22 A. We have not done that because we have the 35:23 data necessary for understanding that question and 35:24 human cells, leukocytes. We also have that study from 36:1 animals, and when you look at those two together, they 36:2 are accepted around the world of being predictive of 36:3 human health outcomes.	
36:14 - 36:22	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:22)	xReevesFINAL.12
	36:14 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) So let's talk about 36:15 epidemiology. I'm going to go through a couple of 36:16 studies with you, and just kind of quickly -- I don't	

36:17 want to spend too much time on this. We have experts
 36:18 for that. But I'm handing you Exhibit 5. This is a
 36:19 case control study; correct?
 36:20 [Exhibit 5 marked for identification.]
 36:21 A. That's correct. May I have a moment to
 36:22 review, please?

RW5.1

36:23 - 37:15

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:36)

xReevesFINAL.13

36:23 Q. Sure. Okay, great. So this is a study
 36:24 done by two scientists, Dr. Hardell and Eriksson;
 37:1 correct?
 37:2 A. That's correct.
 37:3 Q. And it was published in 1998; correct?
 37:4 A. That's correct.
 37:5 Q. So this is legitimately 20 years ago?
 37:6 A. Yes, it was 20 years ago.
 37:7 Q. And the title of it is a case control
 37:8 study of non-Hodgkin lymphoma and exposure to
 37:9 pesticides.
 37:10 Do you see that.
 37:11 A. Yes, I do.
 37:12 Q. And if we go into the study -- and I'll
 37:13 specifically draw your attention to Table 1. You see
 37:14 that?
 37:15 A. Yes, I do.

RW5.3

37:21 - 38:20

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:48)

xReevesFINAL.14

37:21 Q. And in here there is a listing for
 37:22 glyphosate and that has an odds ratio of 2.3. That's
 37:23 not statistically significant; correct?
 37:24 A. That's correct.
 38:1 Q. And then if you go down to Table 2, there
 38:2 is exposure to different types of herbicides with dose
 38:3 response. Do you see that?
 38:4 A. Yes, I do.
 38:5 Q. And it lists these herbicides -- and
 38:6 glyphosate is not specifically listed; right?
 38:7 A. No, it is not.
 38:8 Q. But in the other category, there is a odds
 38:9 ratio of 3.0. Do you see that?
 38:10 A. I do.
 38:11 Q. And you have -- for low exposure it's 2.0.

38:12 Do you see that?

38:13 A. I do see that.

38:14 Q. And for high exposure it's 6.8. That's

38:15 statistically significant. Do you see that?

38:16 A. I do see that.

38:17 Q. This is a study that came out in 1998 and

38:18 Monsanto was fully aware of this study; correct?

38:19 A. Yes, we were aware of this study at the

38:20 time.

42:22 - 43:1

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:12)

xReevesFINAL.15

42:22 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Fair enough. You would

42:23 agree, though, that the study was raising the index of

42:24 concern about there being a possible link between

43:1 glyphosate and non-Hodgkin's lymphoma?

43:6 - 43:8

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:06)

xReevesFINAL.16

43:6 A. Within Monsanto, no. There was no -- it

43:7 did not raise a concern with us.

43:8 Q. I'm handing you Exhibit 7.

RW7.1

43:14 - 44:1

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:19)

xReevesFINAL.17

43:14 Q. So this is a document. It's a review of

43:15 the Hardell and Eriksson study; right?

43:16 A. That's correct.

43:17 Q. And it was prepared by John Acquavella and

43:18 Donna Farmer of the Monsanto company?

43:19 A. That's correct.

43:20 Q. April 14th, 1999?

43:21 A. That's correct.

43:22 Q. And this is a document that Monsanto

43:23 created as part of its review and consideration of the

43:24 epidemiological science?

44:1 A. That's right.

45:7 - 45:16

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:24)

xReevesFINAL.18

45:7 Q. And it says it is clear, however, that the

45:8 widespread use of glyphosate and concerns about

45:9 pesticide-related health effects for farmers and their

45:10 families will raise the, quote, index of concern for

45:11 glyphosate and future agricultural epidemiological

45:12 studies. Did I read that right?

45:13 A. Yes, you did.

45:14 Q. So according to Dr. Farmer and Dr.

RW7.6

45:20 - 46:8	<p>45:15 Acquavella, this Hardell study did raise the index of 45:16 concern?</p> <p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:32)</p> <p>45:20 A. They are not saying that it raises the 45:21 index of concern for the company. It's not clear here 45:22 who they're saying, but the implication is that it's in 45:23 future epidemiologic studies. So it's -- perhaps other 45:24 researchers in the field might take more of an 46:1 interest.</p> <p>46:2 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) So this is 20 years ago; 46:3 right?</p> <p>46:4 A. That's correct.</p> <p>46:5 Q. And since Dr. Acquavella and Dr. Farmer 46:6 raised this concern about the Hardell study, did 46:7 Monsanto at that point investigate or explore the 46:8 possibility of conducting an epidemiological study?</p>	xReevesFINAL_19
46:11 - 47:18	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:01:28)</p> <p>46:11 A. I'm not convinced they're saying this 46:12 raises a concern for them. They are walking through 46:13 giving an analysis saying this is a small study with 46:14 only a few people, weak associations, and perhaps other 46:15 researchers in epidemiology may take more of an 46:16 interest.</p> <p>46:17 Q. So let's just be very clear. This is by 46:18 John Acquavella and Donna Farmer; correct?</p> <p>46:19 A. That's correct.</p> <p>46:20 Q. In the very last sentence after the -- in 46:21 a paragraph that begins in conclusion, that sentence 46:22 ends, it is clear, however, the widespread use of 46:23 glyphosate and concerns about pesticide-related health 46:24 effects for farmers and their families will raise the, 47:1 quote, "index of concern" for glyphosate and future 47:2 agricultural epidemiological studies. That's what it 47:3 says, right?</p> <p>47:4 A. Those are the words on the page.</p> <p>47:5 Q. And after they said that, that it raises 47:6 this index of concern for glyphosate in future 47:7 agricultural studies -- epidemiological studies -- did 47:8 Monsanto do their own study?</p> <p>47:9 A. We did not do that because we did not</p>	xReevesFINAL_20

47:10 believe this study provided the type of evidence that
47:11 warranted additional concern.

47:12 Q. Again, that goes back to where we started
47:13 this discussion today, that there is no evidence across
47:14 the board?

47:15 A. That's correct.

47:16 Q. I'm handing you another document. This is
47:17 Exhibit A to your -- 8 to your deposition.

RW8.1

47:18 [Exhibit 8 marked for identification.]

47:22 - 48:11

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:24)

xReevesFINAL.21

47:22 Q. So this is a document. It has the first
47:23 pages as an e-mail, and then there's an attachment to
47:24 it; correct?

48:1 A. That's correct.

48:2 Q. And one second. And as you can see here
48:3 the e-mail is from John Acquavella. Do you see that?

48:4 A. I do see that.

48:5 Q. To Dr. Farmer?

48:6 A. That's correct.

48:7 Q. Did you ever know Dr. Acquavella?

48:8 A. I've met him, but not while he worked at
48:9 Monsanto.

48:10 Q. And he was an epidemiologist, right?

48:11 A. That's correct.

49:14 - 50:1

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:28)

xReevesFINAL.22

49:14 Q. And then if you look at the bottom,
49:15 there's a paragraph. It says Hardell's most recent
49:16 study comes at a time when the U.S. National Cancer
49:17 Institute is getting ready to begin publishing papers
49:18 from their perspective agricultural health study of
49:19 60,000 farmers and their families. Thus the stage is
49:20 set for another round of epidemiologic studies to cause
49:21 significant concern for industry.

RW8.2

49:22 Do you see that?

49:23 A. I do see that.

49:24 Q. You would agree that the Hardell study
50:1 caused concern for the industry?

50:3 - 50:5

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:05)

xReevesFINAL.23

50:3 A. The word here on the page is concern, but
50:4 it's not really explained, but the context is for that

Page/Line	Source	ID
53:20 - 53:22	50:5 concern. Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:13)	xReevesFINAL_24
	53:20 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) I'm handing you another 53:21 study. This is Exhibit 9 to your deposition. 53:22 [Exhibit 9 marked for identification.]	RW9.1
54:2 - 55:3	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:01:02)	xReevesFINAL_25
	54:2 Q. So this is a study also published by 54:3 Hardell Eriksson, and now there is a new author -- 54:4 right? 54:5 A. Yes, there is. 54:6 Q. And it's titled exposure to pesticides as 54:7 risk factor for non-Hodgkin's lymphoma and hairy cell 54:8 leukemia, pooled analysis of two Swedish case control 54:9 studies. Do you see that? 54:10 A. Yes, I do. 54:11 Q. And this is from 2002, as you can see it 54:12 up there at the top. 54:13 A. Yes, I do see that. 54:14 Q. And so this was a follow-up study by Drs. 54:15 Hardell and Eriksson, which looked at a larger group of 54:16 people; correct? 54:17 A. Larger overall, but not much larger for 54:18 glyphosate use. 54:19 Q. And if you look at the results section -- 54:20 it's on Page 1045. You there? 54:21 A. Yes, I am. 54:22 Q. It reads, an increased risk was found for 54:23 exposure to herbicides, insecticides, fungicides, and 54:24 impregnating agents, Table 1. Regarding specific 55:1 agents, odds ratio was highest for glyphosate and MCPA. 55:2 You see that? 55:3 A. I do see that.	RW9.3
65:18 - 66:2	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:22)	xReevesFINAL_26
	65:18 Q. And I mean, I guess the first question is, 65:19 is did Monsanto at that point conduct an 65:20 epidemiological study? 65:21 A. No, because this study, as I describe, 65:22 doesn't raise a question. We have a very small number 65:23 of cases and controls. There's only 16 people here. 65:24 And when we look at the data in Table 7, as they adjust	RW9.5

66:7 - 66:7	66:1 for other exposures, the relationship goes away and 66:2 becomes nonsignificant.	xReevesFINAL_27
	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:02)	
66:9 - 66:19	66:7 Why didn't Monsanto then do it right?	xReevesFINAL_28
	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:27)	
	66:9 A. So when you look at this data, this study	
	66:10 does not say that concern for us. It does not say	
	66:11 there's something here that we need to look into. What	
	66:12 we're seeing is small numbers of people, very large	
	66:13 estimates of the odds ratio. This paper really isn't	
	66:14 of a quality to inform that kind of a decision. You	
	66:15 wouldn't take information like this and then go out and	
	66:16 start conducting very large-scale studies.	
	66:17 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) So this wasn't enough to	
	66:18 do anything?	
	66:19 A. This study --	
66:21 - 67:6	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:22)	xReevesFINAL_29
	66:21 A. -- is not sufficient to raise any concern,	
	66:22 because it shows no relationship.	
	66:23 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Well, that was two	clear
	66:24 thousand and -- was that 2002? Is that right? Right,	
	67:1 sir?	
	67:2 A. Sorry. 2002, yes, when they published it.	
	67:3 Q. Well, just before that came out, there was	
	67:4 another study called McDuffee. Are you familiar with	
	67:5 that study?	
	67:6 A. Yes, I am.	
69:18 - 70:9	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:36)	xReevesFINAL_30
	69:18 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) All right, Doctor. Thank	
	69:19 you for having a chance -- you had a chance to review	
	69:20 Exhibits 10, 11, and 12?	
	69:21 A. Yes.	RW10.1
	69:22 Q. We'll start off with Exhibit 10. This is	
	69:23 an e-mail exchange from Dr. Acquavella to several	
	69:24 Monsanto employees. Do you see that?	
	70:1 A. Yes, I do.	
	70:2 Q. And including those employees, of course,	
	70:3 is Dr. Farmer. Do you see that?	
	70:4 A. Oh, yes. Yes, I do.	
	70:5 Q. William Heydens?	

70:6 A. I'm having a hard time finding Dr.

70:7 Heyden -- oh, there we go. Yes.

70:8 Q. Dr. Goldstein?

70:9 A. Yes.

70:16 - 71:14

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:45)

xReevesFINAL_31

70:16 Q. And so this was a document sent by

70:17 Acquavella as part of his employment at Monsanto,

70:18 correct?

70:19 A. That's correct.

70:20 Q. And he writes all, the Canadian NHL

70:21 glyphosate abstract we discussed last week is on the

70:22 internet, so I think it is fair game to distribute, see

70:23 attached.

70:24 I am planning to attend the presentation

71:1 of this paper to talk to the author. I note that one

71:2 of her coauthors, J. R. McLaughlin, is an

71:3 epidemiologist I recently recruited to serve on

71:4 American College of Epidemiology Admissions Committee,

71:5 which I chair. You see that?

71:6 A. I do see that.

71:7 Q. And he goes on, I think we might want to

71:8 include him or even perhaps the first author after I

71:9 check her out. In the scientific outreach meeting, we

71:10 were thinking about for Canadian scientists.

71:11 Do you see that?

71:12 A. I do see that.

71:13 Q. Do you know what scientific outreach

71:14 meeting he's referring to?

71:16 - 71:17

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:07)

xReevesFINAL_32

71:16 A. Yeah, scientific outreach meeting. Not

71:17 without additional chair -- additional context.

71:22 - 72:16

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:45)

xReevesFINAL_33

71:22 Q. And if you turn the page, there's the

71:23 attachment to it, and this is that abstract that he's

71:24 referring to in his e-mail; right?

72:1 A. Yes.

72:2 Q. And if you look at the very bottom of the

72:3 abstract -- and the title of the abstract is

72:4 non-Hodgkin's lymphoma and the pesticide hypothesis,

72:5 dose response. Do you see that?

RW10.3

72:6 A. I do see that.
 72:7 Q. And dose response -- that's the general
 72:8 scientific principle that the more exposure you have to
 72:9 something, the more likely that disease outcome occurs?
 72:10 A. It -- well, if that disease outcome is
 72:11 associated with the exposure.
 72:12 Q. Absolutely -- right.
 72:13 A. So if this is something capable of -- if
 72:14 this substance is capable of resulting in a given
 72:15 disease, then the general understanding is the greater
 72:16 the exposure, the more likely that outcome is.

73:18 - 74:2

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:25)

xReevesFINAL_34

73:18 Q. But then it says, B, for more than two
 73:19 days per year of exposure to glyphosate resulted in an
 73:20 odds ratio of 2.11 with a confidence interval of 1.20
 73:21 to 3.72. Do you see that?

73:22 A. I do see that.

73:23 Q. So that's what was written in the original
 73:24 abstract; right?

74:1 A. Yeah. This is the abstract for the
 74:2 scientific meeting.

74:19 - 75:11

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:42)

xReevesFINAL_35

RW11.1

74:19 Q. So this is the next document. This is
 74:20 Exhibit 11. Do you see that, sir?
 74:21 A. I do see that.
 74:22 Q. And this was a memo prepared by Dr.
 74:23 Acquavella?
 74:24 A. Yes.
 75:1 Q. And it's dated August 24th, 2000; right?
 75:2 A. That's correct.
 75:3 Q. And again, this was prepared by Dr.
 75:4 Acquavella in his capacity while employed at Monsanto?
 75:5 A. Yes. He was at Monsanto at this time.
 75:6 Yes.
 75:7 Q. All right. Great. And if you look at the
 75:8 first blacked bullet point, he's actually talking about
 75:9 this specific study, the McDuffee study?
 75:10 A. Let me just make sure that's the same
 75:11 author list. Yes.

76:3 - 76:18

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:36)

xReevesFINAL_36

76:3 Q. He says since the organizers of the ISEE
76:4 meeting -- and I'll stop right there. That's the
76:5 meeting where this abstract was being presented; right?

76:6 A. Yes, that's correct.

76:7 Q. Asked me to chair the pesticide section,
76:8 which included this paper. I had the opportunity to
76:9 spend some time with the author. She struck me as a
76:10 reasonable person. I was expecting a Canadian of
76:11 Scottish descent, but Dr. McDuffee is of African
76:12 descent.

76:13 She doesn't seem to have any preconceived
76:14 notions about glyphosate. She agreed to share her
76:15 paper with me when it was ready for submission for
76:16 publication. She also agreed to come and present her
76:17 work to an industry audience.

76:18 Do you see that?

76:20 - 76:20

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:01)

RW11.2

xReevesFINAL_37

76:20 A. I do see those words.

77:4 - 77:8

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:18)

xReevesFINAL_38

77:4 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) So it looks like Dr.
77:5 Acquavella in his capacity working on Monsanto is
77:6 interfacing with Dr. McDuffee about this publication?
77:7 A. Yes. He's having -- apparently had a
77:8 conversation with Dr. McDuffee at the ISEE meeting.

78:11 - 78:19

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:22)

xReevesFINAL_39

78:11 Q. And he goes, it remains to be seen how
78:12 glyphosate is treated in the eventual publication from
78:13 this study and whether anyone picks up selectively on
78:14 the presumably confounded glyphosate finding that was
78:15 included in the meeting abstract. Obviously we need to
78:16 be as prepared as we can given limited information. I
78:17 mention some specific follow-up plans below.

78:18 Do you see that?

78:19 A. I do see that.

81:23 - 82:3

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:11)

xReevesFINAL_40

81:23 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Now, if we can turn to
81:24 Exhibit 12. This is the actual McDuffee study that was
82:1 published; correct?

RW12.1

82:2 A. Yes. This is a study from Dr. McDuffee
82:3 and her team.

Page/Line	Source	ID
82:9 - 82:15	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:17)</p> <p>82:9 Q. And as we see here, Dr. McDuffee -- and</p> <p>82:10 you can see the abstract here that was ultimately</p> <p>82:11 published; right?</p> <p>82:12 A. I do see that.</p> <p>82:13 Q. And there is no reference to the greater</p> <p>82:14 than two days use result for glyphosate, is there?</p> <p>82:15 A. Let me just make sure. There is no</p>	xReevesFINAL_41
82:9 - 82:15	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:17)</p> <p>82:9 Q. And as we see here, Dr. McDuffee -- and</p> <p>82:10 you can see the abstract here that was ultimately</p> <p>82:11 published; right?</p> <p>82:12 A. I do see that.</p> <p>82:13 Q. And there is no reference to the greater</p> <p>82:14 than two days use result for glyphosate, is there?</p> <p>82:15 A. Let me just make sure. There is no</p>	xReevesFINAL_42
82:16 - 82:21	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:17)</p> <p>82:16 mention of that.</p> <p>82:17 Q. But if we turn the page and you actually</p> <p>82:18 dig into the article. And Doctor, just to be clear,</p> <p>82:19 because it's not in the abstract, that means it</p> <p>82:20 wouldn't be picked up on literature searches; right?</p> <p>82:21 A. No, that's incorrect.</p>	<p>xReevesFINAL_43</p> <p>RW12.7</p>
82:24 - 83:11	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:26)</p> <p>82:24 Q. And here we have the frequency of exposure</p> <p>83:1 to selected herbicides, insecticides, fungicides, and</p> <p>83:2 fumigants stratified by the number of days per year of</p> <p>83:3 exposure. Do you see that?</p> <p>83:4 A. I do see that.</p> <p>83:5 Q. And of course we have the glyphosate</p> <p>83:6 number. Do you see that?</p> <p>83:7 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>83:8 Q. And for people who are exposed between</p> <p>83:9 zero and two days per year, there is no elevated rate;</p> <p>83:10 correct?</p> <p>83:11 A. That's correct.</p>	xReevesFINAL_44
83:23 - 84:6	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:18)</p> <p>83:23 Q. But then when you look at greater than two</p> <p>83:24 days per year we have an odds ratio of 2.12. Do you</p> <p>84:1 see that?</p>	xReevesFINAL_45

84:2 A. I do see that.

84:3 Q. And that result, according to this, is

84:4 statistically significant, correct?

84:5 A. Yes, it is, based on what appears to be a

84:6 rather small sample size of the entire population.

96:12 - 96:15

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:05)

xReevesFINAL_46

96:12 Q. I handed you another document. This is an

96:13 e-mail exchange that's been produced in this

96:14 litigation. It's Exhibit 13.

96:15 [Exhibit 13 marked for identification.]

RW13.1

96:19 - 98:7

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:01:15)

xReevesFINAL_47

96:19 Q. And is this is an e-mail exchange between

96:20 Dr. Farmer, Dr. Acquavella, and other Monsanto

96:21 employees. Do you see that?

96:22 A. I do.

96:23 Q. Including Dr. Heydens?

96:24 A. Yes, I do.

97:1 Q. Dr. Goldstein?

97:2 A. Yes.

97:3 Q. And this was a document that was shared

97:4 amongst Monsanto employees in the ordinary course of

97:5 their business?

97:6 A. That's correct.

97:7 Q. If you look at the bottom e-mail here,

97:8 it's from Dr. Acquavella. He talks about -- he's

97:9 talking about the McDuffee article. Do you see that?

97:10 A. I do see that.

97:11 Q. And he says the McDuffee article appeared

97:12 in the November issue of the journal Epidemiology

97:13 Biomarkers and Prevention. See abstract below. Unlike

97:14 the abstract presented at the International Society for

97:15 Environmental Epidemiology meeting, August 1999,

97:16 glyphosate is no longer mentioned as a risk factor in

97:17 the abstract. You see that?

97:18 A. I do see that.

97:19 Q. It says I will have to get the article and

97:20 see what it says in the small print; right?

97:21 A. I do see that.

97:22 Q. And then if you read, Donna Farmer

97:23 responds to this, John, I know. We don't yet know what

97:24 it says in the small print, but the fact that
 98:1 glyphosate is no longer mentioned in the abstract is a
 98:2 huge step forward. You see that?
 98:3 A. I do see that.
 98:4 Q. Then she says it removes it from being
 98:5 picked up by abstract searches, exclamation mark. You
 98:6 see that?
 98:7 A. I do see that.

99:12 - 99:14

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:07)

xReevesFINAL_48

99:12 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) So here Dr. Farmer is
 99:13 celebrating that the glyphosate result will not be
 99:14 picked up in abstract searches; correct?

99:17 - 100:1

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:30)

xReevesFINAL_40

99:17 A. When I look at this, I don't know
 99:18 celebrate is the right term for it, but what I don't
 99:19 understand is why -- the meaning of -- the impact of
 99:20 the abstract search, because when I do literature
 99:21 searches, you just do a basic search. It gives you a
 99:22 search of the whole text. The abstract search is
 99:23 something you have to specifically ask for. And so a
 99:24 regular literature search would pick this up. And it
 100:1 does get picked up when an agency does a review --

101:21 - 102:5

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:11)

xReevesFINAL_50

101:21 Q. So this is a series of e-mails between
 101:22 Monsanto employees; correct?
 101:23 A. Yes, it is.
 101:24 Q. Primarily Dr. Farmer, Dr. Acquavella, and
 102:1 Dr. Heydens; correct?
 102:2 A. That's correct.
 102:3 Q. And the subject of the e-mail is McDuffee
 102:4 paper?
 102:5 A. That's correct.

RW14.1

102:10 - 103:7

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:59)

xReevesFINAL_51

102:10 Q. And if we look -- the e-mail starts off
 102:11 with Dr. Acquavella sort of describing his quick review
 102:12 of the McDuffee article; correct?
 102:13 A. Yes, he does.
 102:14 Q. And then Bill Heydens responds, John, so
 102:15 if I understand the situation correctly, even though
 102:16 reference to glyphosate wasn't removed entirely, there

RW14.2

RW14.1

102:17 was a substantial reduction in emphasis, including but
102:18 not limited to removal from the abstract. Bill. Did I
102:19 read that right?

102:20 A. You did read that correctly.

102:21 Q. And then Dr. Acquavella responds, Right.

102:22 It is a good result, but not everything we wanted. The

102:23 invalid result could be cited as a second

102:24 glyphosate/NHL finding. However, it will not be picked

103:1 up by most of the usual suspects because it's not

103:2 mentioned in the abstract. John. Did I read that

103:3 right?

103:4 A. You did.

103:5 Q. So according to Dr. Acquavella, an

103:6 epidemiologist at Monsanto, this McDuffee was a second

103:7 NHL finding?

103:10 - 103:19

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:23)

xReevesFINAL_52

103:10 A. He says the invalid result could be cited.

103:11 So if someone wanted to argue using this invalid

103:12 result, they could say we have a second finding.

103:13 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) And he says --

103:14 A. He's not saying it's scientifically

103:15 justified.

103:16 Q. And he says it won't be picked up by most

103:17 of the usual suspects. Do you know who he's referring

103:18 to?

103:19 A. No, I do not.

104:11 - 104:19

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:24)

xReevesFINAL_53

104:11 John, darn, but at least it's out of the abstract and

104:12 not a huge discussion in the text. Regarding the

104:13 journal it is published in, how is it viewed? Is it a

104:14 premier journal or a lower-rung journal?

104:15 Do you see that?

104:16 A. Yes, I do.

104:17 Q. So again, it looks like Dr. Farmer and Dr.

104:18 Acquavella both believe that it is a good thing that

104:19 the glyphosate data was not in the abstract?

104:22 - 105:1

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:12)

xReevesFINAL_54

104:22 A. Yeah, I can't speak to why they viewed

104:23 this using these words or describe their view of it

104:24 using these words, but I don't believe that being out

Page/Line	Source	ID
106:19 - 106:21	105:1 of the abstract really prevents people from finding it. Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:02)	xReevesFINAL.55
	106:19 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) So I'm handing you	RW15.1
	106:20 Exhibit 15.	
	106:21 A. All right.	
107:3 - 107:8	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:14)	xReevesFINAL.56
	107:3 Q. And this is a memo prepared by Dr.	
	107:4 Acquavella, Marian Bleeke, Donna Farmer, Daniel	
	107:5 Goldstein, and Christophe Gustin; correct?	
	107:6 A. That is correct.	
	107:7 Q. It's dated June 11, 2012 -- sorry, 2002.	
	107:8 A. 2002.	
107:16 - 108:21	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:01:12)	xReevesFINAL.57
	107:16 Q. So if we turn the page, there's an	RW15.2
	107:17 introduction. Do you see that?	
	107:18 A. I do see that.	
	107:19 Q. And then there's a section that says macro	
	107:20 issues.	
	107:21 A. I do see that.	
	107:22 Q. I want to start off with the second	
	107:23 paragraph. It says allegations based on results from	
	107:24 epidemiologic studies have begun to affect our freedom	
	108:1 to operate. I'll stop right there. Do you understand	
	108:2 what that means, freedom to operate?	
	108:3 A. So freedom to operate within the company	
	108:4 has -- I think everyone defines it differently, just	
	108:5 depending on what role they're in and what sort of	
	108:6 function they're part of.	
	108:7 Q. Do you know what he means here when he	
	108:8 says the results of epidemiologic studies have begun to	
	108:9 affect our freedom to operate?	
	108:10 A. I can't speak for what Dr. Acquavella	
	108:11 specifically meant by that, again, just because people	
	108:12 tend to use it differently.	
	108:13 Q. In Canada, enabled by a recent Supreme	
	108:14 Court ruling, localities have cited epidemiologic	
	108:15 findings to ban non-essential use of pesticides,	
	108:16 usurping federal regulations that are based on	
	108:17 toxicologic data. Do you see that?	
	108:18 A. I do see that.	

108:24 - 109:7	<p>108:19 Q. So it appears then that the freedom to 108:20 operate that Dr. Acquavella is referring to is -- he's 108:21 worried people are banning it?</p>	xReevesFINAL_58
	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:29)</p>	
	<p>108:24 A. Yeah. He -- so in Canada, localities have 109:1 cited epidemiologic findings. They're -- and what he's 109:2 pointing out here is those reviews are not based on -- 109:3 those reviews are -- these bans are contradicting 109:4 federal regulations because -- and those federal 109:5 regulations are based on actual toxicological data.</p>	
109:10 - 110:1	<p>109:6 Q. Sure. And he's saying that that's what's 109:7 affecting Monsanto's freedom to operate?</p>	xReevesFINAL_59
	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:44)</p>	
	<p>109:10 A. Yeah, again, without Dr. Acquavella's 109:11 specific definition, it's very difficult to know 109:12 precisely what he's referring to. Is he -- is there 109:13 some bigger definition he has? Is it a narrower 109:14 definition? He doesn't -- he's got a footnote, but it 109:15 doesn't define what he means. 109:16 Q. Well, you know, I guess we'll just have to 109:17 read the text and infer from that what we will. The 109:18 next sentence says there are now six published studies 109:19 that arguably associate glyphosate and other pesticides 109:20 with lymphopietic cancers or adverse reproductive 109:21 outcomes.</p>	
	<p>109:22 Do you see that?</p>	
	<p>109:23 A. I do see that.</p>	
110:3 - 110:8	<p>109:24 Q. And lymphopietic cancers -- that's blood 110:1 cancers, right, in the lymphocytes?</p>	xReevesFINAL_60
	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:15)</p>	
	<p>110:3 A. So I'm not here to testify for the company 110:4 about specific medical issues, of what specific medical 110:5 terms mean. Speaking for myself, I can tell you that 110:6 is my understanding of that word.</p>	
	<p>110:7 Q. Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma is a lymphopietic 110:8 cancer?</p>	
110:10 - 111:11	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:01:08)</p>	xReevesFINAL_61
	<p>110:10 A. Again, I'm not here to testify for the 110:11 company about those topics, but speaking for myself, I 110:12 can tell you that is my understanding.</p>	

Page/Line	Source	ID
110:13	Q. (By Mr. Wisner) And he cites 4 through 6.	
110:14	You see that?	
110:15	A. Yes, he does.	
110:16	Q. Or I should say they do, because I don't	
110:17	actually know who the final author of this document is,	
110:18	but -- and if we look at 4 through 6, we have a study	RW15.7
110:19	from 1998. Do you see that?	
110:20	A. I do see that.	
110:21	Q. It's a Hardell study?	
110:22	A. It is.	
110:23	Q. We have the Hardell study we discussed	
110:24	from 1999?	
111:1	A. Yes, that's correct.	
111:2	Q. And we have the McDuffee study that we've	
111:3	discussed?	
111:4	A. I do see that.	
111:5	Q. So Dr. Acquavella is stating in this	RW15.2
111:6	memo -- sorry, I shouldn't say that. These doctors,	
111:7	Acquavella, Bleeke, Farmer, Goldstein, and Gustin, are	
111:8	stating in this memo that these studies -- three ones	
111:9	that we've talked about so far -- arguably associate	
111:10	glyphosate and other pesticides with lymphopoietic	
111:11	cancers; correct?	
111:14 - 111:16	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:10)	xReevesFINAL_02
111:14	A. The words on the page -- sorry. I think	
111:15	you just have to go with what the actual statement on	
111:16	the page is to get their understanding.	
112:11 - 112:21	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:24)	xReevesFINAL_03
112:11	Q. Then if you turn to the next page, the	RW15.3
112:12	paragraph continues. It talks about numerous other	
112:13	studies are ongoing in the U.S., Canada, and Europe.	
112:14	Do you see that?	
112:15	A. I do see that.	
112:16	Q. It says experience has shown that these	
112:17	studies will associate widely used pesticides with a	
112:18	number of diseases. Do you see that?	
112:19	A. I see that statement.	
112:20	Q. Is that why Monsanto didn't want to do an	
112:21	epi study?	
112:24 - 113:6	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:18)	xReevesFINAL_04

112:24 A. There is nothing here discussing
 113:1 Monsanto's view of it. This is simply the author's --
 113:2 they're just updating people on what is the AHS.
 113:3 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) I know, but I'm asking
 113:4 you, is that why Monsanto didn't do an epi study? Was
 113:5 it because experience has shown that these studies will
 113:6 associate widely used pesticides with disease?

113:9 - 113:11

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:05)

xReevesFINAL_65

113:9 A. I can't speculate about that. We're
 113:10 talking about a paragraph here where they're just
 113:11 simply describing the agricultural health study.

117:23 - 118:14

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:25)

xReevesFINAL_66

RW16.1

117:23 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) So Exhibit 16 is a
 117:24 document titled integrative assessment of multiple
 118:1 pesticides as risk factors for non-Hodgkin's lymphoma
 118:2 among men. Do you see that?

118:3 A. I do see that.

118:4 Q. This is an epidemiological study that
 118:5 you've reviewed before?

118:6 A. Yes, it is.

118:7 Q. It's one that Monsanto was fully aware of?

118:8 A. That's correct.

118:9 Q. And this was done by authors De Roos, et
 118:10 al. Do you see that?

118:11 A. I do see that.

118:12 Q. One of those authors is Dr. Dennis
 118:13 Weisenburger. Do you see that?

118:14 A. I do see that.

118:24 - 119:2

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:05)

xReevesFINAL_67

118:24 Q. You understand that this was a study that
 119:1 was essentially coming out of the National Cancer
 119:2 Institute?

119:5 - 120:4

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:01:16)

xReevesFINAL_68

RW16.9

119:5 A. Coming out of the National Cancer
 119:6 Institute? So we have to look at the author
 119:7 affiliations at the end to understand that.

119:8 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Sure. Lead author, De
 119:9 Roos, Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics,
 119:10 National Cancer Institute, USA. You see that?

119:11 A. I do see that, and then the other -- so

Page/Line	Source	ID	
<p>119:12 there's -- and then there's three others who were with 119:13 University of Nebraska, Kansas, and Iowa. 119:14 Q. Now, Dr. -- this publication explored 119:15 multiple exposures of pesticides and non-Hodgkin's 119:16 lymphoma; correct? 119:17 A. Yes, they were looking at ways to adjust 119:18 for other exposures. 119:19 Q. And one of those was in fact glyphosate; 119:20 correct?</p>	<p>119:21 A. It was included in this study.</p>	RW16.1	
<p>119:22 Q. And when they did the analysis, the data 119:23 on glyphosate -- if you want to look at it, it's on 119:24 Table 3 -- using the logistical regression, showed a 120:1 odds ratio of 2.1. That was statistically significant; 120:2 correct?</p>	<p>120:3 A. They have a logistic regression and a 120:4 hierarchical regression.</p>	RW16.5	
121:23 - 122:1	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:11)</p>	xReevesFINAL.69	
<p>121:23 Q. So in fact, the logistical regression that 121:24 was statistically significant, that actually adjusted 122:1 for exposure to every other pesticide on this list?</p>	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:04)</p>	xReevesFINAL.70	
123:17 - 123:18	<p>123:17 A. The logistic regression does include an 123:18 adjustment for other pesticides.</p>	xReevesFINAL.71	
129:14 - 129:16	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:08)</p>	clear	
<p>129:14 Q. You would agree this study, sir, from De 129:15 Roos 2003 -- it added fuel to the fire created by the 129:16 Hardell study?</p>	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:19)</p>	xReevesFINAL.72	
129:19 - 130:2	<p>129:19 A. So if you mean by fuel to the fire it 129:20 created a legitimate interest on our part or a 129:21 legitimate need for more study or a reliable basis to 129:22 conclude there was some issue with glyphosate that 129:23 Monsanto needed to look into in some other way, no, I 129:24 would not agree with that.</p>	RW17.1	
<p>130:1 Q. Well, I'm handing you Exhibit 17. 130:2 [Exhibit 17 marked for identification.]</p>	130:9 - 130:17	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:17)</p>	xReevesFINAL.73
<p>130:9 Q. So we have this series of e-mails. These 130:10 are e-mail exchanges between various Monsanto</p>			

Page/Line	Source	ID
	130:11 employees; correct?	
	130:12 A. That's correct.	
	130:13 Q. Included among those are Dr. Acquavella,	
	130:14 Dr. Goldstein, Dr. Farmer; correct?	
	130:15 A. That is correct.	
	130:16 Q. Bill Heydens is on there?	
	130:17 A. Yes, Dr. Heydens is there as well.	
131:8 - 131:10	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:05)	xReevesFINAL.74
	131:8 Q. And if you look at the first e-mail, it's	RW17.2
	131:9 actually citing the De Roos article we just looked at?	
	131:10 A. That is correct.	
132:12 - 132:20	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:27)	xReevesFINAL.75
	132:12 Q. And he says, quote, I'm afraid this could	RW17.1
	132:13 add more fuel to the fire for Hardell, et al; correct?	
	132:14 A. I do see that.	
	132:15 Q. And then if you look at the last sentence	
	132:16 in his e-mail he says it looks like NHL and other	
	132:17 lymphopietic cancers continue to be the main cancer	
	132:18 epidemiology issues both for glyphosate and alachlor.	
	132:19 Do you see that?	
	132:20 A. I do see that.	
134:5 - 134:7	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:11)	xReevesFINAL.76
	134:5 Q. So we have Hardell, Hardell,	RW2.6 - RW2.7
	134:6 McDuffee, and now we have De Roos 2003; right?	RW2.8 - RW2.9
	134:7 A. That's correct.	
135:5 - 135:6	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:04)	xReevesFINAL.77
	135:5 Q. I'd like to talk to you -- I just handed	RW18.1
	135:6 you Exhibit 18. That is another case control study;	
135:14 - 136:12	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:43)	xReevesFINAL.78
	135:14 Q. All right. So this is a case control	
	135:15 epidemiological study; correct?	
	135:16 A. That is correct.	
	135:17 Q. And it was published in 2008?	
	135:18 A. That's correct.	
	135:19 Q. It's titled pesticide exposure as risk	
	135:20 factor for non-Hodgkin lymphoma including	
	135:21 histopathological subgroup analysis. Do you see that?	
	135:22 A. I do see that.	
	135:23 Q. And it's -- again, has two authors that	
	135:24 we've seen previously, Dr. Eriksson as well as Hardell?	

136:1 A. That's correct.

136:2 Q. And there are some other researchers on
136:3 there as well?

136:4 A. That's correct.

136:5 Q. And this is a study that Monsanto has
136:6 reviewed and considered; correct?

136:7 A. That is correct.

136:8 Q. Now, this study listed results for
136:9 glyphosate; correct?

136:10 A. I'm sorry. It listed results?

136:11 Q. It has results for glyphosate?

136:12 A. Yes, it does. It includes results.

RW18.5

136:23 - 137:10

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:38)

xReevesFINAL.70

136:23 Q. And for glyphosate there is a univariate
136:24 result odds ratio of 2.02, which is statistically
137:1 significant, and there is a multivariate analysis
137:2 of 1.51, which is not statistically significant;
137:3 correct?

137:4 A. That's correct.

137:5 Q. And the authors also looked at sort of an
137:6 attempt at dose-response; correct?

137:7 A. I believe they did.

137:8 Q. And they looked specifically at -- draw
137:9 your attention to Table 2.

137:10 A. Yes.

RW18.3

137:14 - 138:9

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:40)

xReevesFINAL.80

137:14 Q. And they looked at glyphosate when it was
137:15 less than 10 days and when it was greater than 10 days;
137:16 right?

137:17 A. That's correct.

137:18 Q. And when it was less than 10 days, it was
137:19 an elevated odds ratio of 1.69, but it was not
137:20 statistically significant; correct?

137:21 A. That's correct.

137:22 Q. And when they looked at it for greater
137:23 than 10 days, it was elevated 2.36, and it was
137:24 statistically significant; correct?

138:1 A. That's correct.

138:2 Q. And the authors report on the glyphosate
138:3 data in this paper; correct?

Page/Line

Source

ID

138:4 A. Yes, they do.

RW18.5

138:5 Q. And if you look at starting at Page 661,
138:6 the bottom right paragraph.

138:7 A. That's correct.

138:8 Q. It's talking about glyphosate; right?

138:9 A. Yes.

139:4 - 140:8

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:56)

xReevesFINAL.81

139:4 Q. And then on the next page it kind of goes
139:5 into the actual study a little bit farther.

RW18.6

139:6 The authors state glyphosate was

139:7 associated with a statistically significant increased

139:8 odds ratio for lymphoma in our study, and the result

139:9 was strengthened by a tendency to dose-response effect

139:10 as shown in Table 2.

139:11 Do you see that?

139:12 A. I do see that.

139:13 Q. And then discuss their former study, very

139:14 few subjects were exposed to glyphosate, but a

139:15 nonsignificant odds ratio of 2.3 was found.

139:16 Do you see that?

139:17 A. I do see that.

139:18 Q. We actually went over that study earlier

139:19 today?

139:20 A. Yes, we did.

139:21 Q. And then it goes to say furthermore, a

139:22 metaanalysis combining that study with an investigation

139:23 on hairy cell leukemia, a rare NHL variant, showed an

139:24 odds ratio for glyphosate of 3.04, and it lists the

140:1 confidence interval.

140:2 Do you see that?

140:3 A. I do see that.

140:4 Q. Recent findings from other groups also

140:5 associate glyphosate with different B cell malignancies

140:6 such as lymphomas and myeloma.

140:7 Do you see that?

140:8 A. I do see that.

143:15 - 143:24

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:29)

xReevesFINAL.82

143:15 Q. So we have Eriksson -- I always spell his

RW2.9

143:16 name wrong. I wrote that on the thing. Do you see

RW2.10

143:17 that?

Page/Line

Source

ID

143:18 A. Eriksson? Yes, I do.

143:19 Q. Following the publication of this study,

143:20 isn't it true that Monsanto then took it upon itself to

143:21 actually combat the study?

143:22 A. Is there a particular document or

143:23 documents discussing --

143:24 Q. Do you have any knowledge about that?

144:2 - 144:6

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:07)

xReevesFINAL_83

144:2 A. I'd like to understand what you mean by

144:3 combat. If there's a document you have, I'd be happy

144:4 to review it.

144:5 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Okay. Handing you

144:6 Exhibit 19.

RW19.1

144:12 - 145:2

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:30)

xReevesFINAL_84

144:12 Q. So this is an e-mail exchange. It's

144:13 Exhibit 19. This is an e-mail -- series of e-mail

144:14 exchanges involving Dr. Farmer and other Monsanto

144:15 employees; correct?

144:16 A. That's correct.

144:17 Q. And if you look at the subject line, study

144:18 shows herbicides increase risk of non-Hodgkin's

144:19 lymphoma beyond pesticides, October 14th.

144:20 Do you see that?

144:21 A. I do see that.

144:22 Q. And as you go back and look at the actual

144:23 origination of this e-mail, you see that it's actually

144:24 talking about this exact study, the Eriksson 2008

145:1 study?

145:2 A. That's correct.

145:11 - 147:1

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:01:32)

xReevesFINAL_85

145:11 Q. And if you look at the last sort of

145:12 paragraph on here, the sort of last thing that's said

145:13 on the -- in this -- I guess some sort of press release

145:14 of some sort, is avoid carcinogenic herbicides and

145:15 foods by supporting organic agriculture and on lawns by

145:16 using nontoxic land care strategies that rely on soil

145:17 health, not toxic herbicides.

145:18 Do you see that?

145:19 A. I do see that.

145:20 Q. So then Dr. Farmer responds to this e-mail

RW19.2

RW19.1

145:21 that's been sent to her; right?

145:22 A. Yes.

145:23 Q. And she says -- and just to be clear, Dr.

145:24 Farmer is responding to this e-mail in the course of

146:1 her business; right?

146:2 A. Yes, she is.

146:3 Q. And she says thank you for forwarding

146:4 this. We have been aware of this paper for a while and

146:5 knew it would only be a matter of time before the

146:6 activists pick it up. I have some epi experts

146:7 reviewing it. As soon as I have that review we will

146:8 pull together a backgrounder to use in response. Here

146:9 is their bottom line, how do we combat this?

146:10 Do you see that?

146:11 A. I do see that.

146:12 Q. And then she actually pastes that sentence

146:13 that we read at the very end of the article. Do you

146:14 see that?

146:15 A. I do see that.

146:16 Q. So Dr. Farmer is saying how do we combat

146:17 this, and this is avoiding carcinogenic herbicides in

146:18 food by supporting organic agriculture and on lawns by

146:19 using nontoxic land care strategies that rely on soil

146:20 health and not toxic herbicides.

146:21 Do you see that?

146:22 A. I do see that.

146:23 Q. Do you -- as someone who speaks for

146:24 Monsanto, is this something that Monsanto wishes to

147:1 combat?

147:3 - 147:14

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:32)

xReevesFINAL.86

147:3 A. Could you help me under -- there's a

147:4 problem I'm having here. Here is their bottom line, is

147:5 the statement. I'm not sure who there is -- here is

147:6 their bottom line, period, period, period, how do we

147:7 combat this, question mark.

147:8 She's not saying here is our bottom line,

147:9 so I'm not really sure what this is referring to. I'm

147:10 having a hard time understanding whether this is -- it

147:11 doesn't appear to be our bottom line. Donna is saying

147:12 their bottom line.

Page/Line	Source	ID
147:17 - 147:24	147:13 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Yeah, and she's 147:14 combatting it.	xReevesFINAL.87
	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:18)	
	147:17 A. Yeah, I don't believe I can answer for 147:18 Donna on this one. I can't be inside her head to 147:19 explain what it is she meant by these words.	
	147:20 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Well, sir, it's just 147:21 basic English grammar; right? It says right here, here 147:22 is their bottom line, how do we combat this, and then 147:23 below that is their bottom line.	
	147:24 Do you see that?	
148:2 - 148:15	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:33)	xReevesFINAL.88
	148:2 A. Again, the way this is written, I can't 148:3 speak to what Donna meant by that.	
	148:4 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) I'm not asking you what 148:5 she meant by it. I'm asking you what it says right 148:6 here on this paper.	
	148:7 A. I see those words.	
	148:8 Q. So my question to you, sir, as a 148:9 representative from Monsanto, is do you think it's 148:10 appropriate for Dr. Donna Farmer to be discussing how 148:11 they're going to combat this sentence -- avoiding 148:12 carcinogenic herbicides in foods by supporting 148:13 organic agriculture and on lawns by using nontoxic land 148:14 care strategies that rely on soil health, not toxic 148:15 herbicides?	
148:18 - 148:21	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:06)	xReevesFINAL.89
	148:18 A. Again, I can't speak for Donna, for Dr. 148:19 Farmer, on this question.	
	148:20 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) I know. I'm asking you 148:21 to speak for Monsanto. Is this appropriate, sir?	
148:24 - 149:3	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:08)	xReevesFINAL.90
	148:24 A. These are Donna's statements, and I 149:1 believe they're most appropriately addressed to her. 149:2 We cannot speak for what our employees -- what their 149:3 position is in an e-mail written like this.	
152:3 - 152:24	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:50)	xReevesFINAL.91
	152:3 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) So all we can go on is 152:4 what Dr. Farmer says here?	
	152:5 A. We'd have to go on Donna Farmer's own	

152:6 words. She can explain that.

152:7 Q. She used the word combat; right?

152:8 A. That is a word that appears in her e-mail.

152:9 Q. So you mentioned this earlier. We were

152:10 going through the epidemiological study. I'm looking

152:11 at Exhibit 2 again. We've gone through Hardell's,

RW2.10

152:12 McDuffee, De Roos, Eriksson. And you mentioned that

152:13 between De Roos and Eriksson there was a study

152:14 published by the AHS; correct?

152:15 A. That's correct.

152:16 Q. That was the original publication of 2005?

152:17 A. Yes, that's right.

152:18 Q. So I'm going to write AHS 2005. Okay?

152:19 A. Yeah. Well, it's De Roos who's the

152:20 author.

152:21 Q. Okay, fair enough. Fair enough. There

152:22 was a De Roos -- there was also an AHS publication in

152:23 2018; correct?

RW2.11

152:24 A. Yes. And that was Andreotti, et al. So

153:9 - 153:22

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:24)

xReevesFINAL.02

153:9 Q. All right, we'll just put in there De

153:10 Roos. That work?

153:11 A. Yeah.

153:12 Q. And then we had an AHS?

153:13 A. And that was Andreotti.

153:14 Q. How do you spell it? Andreotti.

153:15 A. A-N-D --

153:16 Q. There we go.

153:17 A. There you go.

153:18 Q. Oh, crap. 2018; right?

153:19 A. 2017 is when it first appeared.

153:20 Q. Yeah, but it was officially published in

153:21 the journal 2018.

153:22 A. Yeah, the publication date is --

154:5 - 154:22

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:40)

xReevesFINAL.03

154:5 Q. So we have the AHS. And I want to talk to

154:6 you a little bit about the AHS. And I understand it's

154:7 Monsanto's position -- correct me if I'm wrong -- that

154:8 you guys believe the AHS is the most reliable and best

154:9 of the epidemiological studies?

clear

154:10 A. Our position is that the agricultural
154:11 health study with -- as envisioned -- as described at
154:12 the case control studies that they've done -- or I'm
154:13 sorry, as the cohort study -- provides the most
154:14 comprehensive look at pesticide exposure and health
154:15 risk, particularly with respect to glyphosate and
154:16 cancer.

154:17 Q. Do you believe there's any problems with
154:18 the study?

154:19 A. With the agricultural health study? Is
154:20 there a particular part of it? This is a very -- so
154:21 it's a very large study that looks at a lot of
154:22 different endpoints.

155:12 - 155:19

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:18)

xReevesFINAL_04

155:12 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Well, fair enough. I'm
155:13 not talking about the overall AHS study. I'm talking
155:14 about these two publications right here in front of us
155:15 that relate to glyphosate; right?

155:16 A. That is correct.

155:17 Q. And so my question is, does Monsanto right
155:18 now have any criticisms of the AHS's analysis of
155:19 Roundup?

155:21 - 156:14

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:33)

xReevesFINAL_05

155:21 A. Could you help me understand your question
155:22 a little more? Just in terms of --

155:23 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) What don't you understand
155:24 about my question?

156:1 A. Well, is there a document that you're
156:2 talking about, or is it just in general speaking at a
156:3 very high level about these two studies?

156:4 Q. Listen, you're here to speak for Monsanto
156:5 about its views and positions regarding epidemiology;
156:6 right?

156:7 A. Yes, I am.

156:8 Q. And I'm talking about two epidemiology
156:9 studies, and I'm just asking you straightforward, do
156:10 you think there are anything wrong with those studies?

156:11 A. We believe that both of those studies are
156:12 of high quality and do provide valuable information.

156:13 Q. So there's no criticisms that you can

Page/Line	Source	ID
156:16 - 156:17	156:14 think of offhand? Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:04)	xReevesFINAL_96
156:24 - 157:5	156:16 A. We would have to go through the study 156:17 line-by-line to understand that. Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:13) 156:24 Q. Now, it's true that numerous Monsanto 157:1 employees have made comments about the AHS before the 157:2 results were learned about; correct? 157:3 A. That is true. 157:4 Q. And those comments about the AHS were not 157:5 particularly flattering, were they?	xReevesFINAL_97
157:8 - 157:11	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:07) 157:8 A. Sorry. Is there a document that you'd 157:9 like to discuss?	xReevesFINAL_98
157:16 - 158:10	157:10 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Sure, we can go through 157:11 them. I'll hand you Exhibit 20 to your deposition. Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:31) 157:16 Q. So this is a document. It's dated July 157:17 22nd, 1997; right? 157:18 A. That is correct. 157:19 Q. And this is obviously before Monsanto knew 157:20 of any of the results of the agricultural health study 157:21 as it relates to Roundup? 157:22 A. That is correct. 157:23 Q. And this was a document prepared by John 157:24 Acquavella? 158:1 A. Yes. 158:2 Q. And he had at this time was an 158:3 epidemiologist employed by Monsanto? 158:4 A. That is correct. 158:5 Q. And just by curiosity, does Monsanto 158:6 currently employ any epidemiologists? 158:7 A. Not to my knowledge, no. 158:8 Q. After Dr. Acquavella left, do you know if 158:9 they ever hired an epidemiologist as an employee? 158:10 A. Not to my knowledge.	FW20.1 xReevesFINAL_99
159:11 - 159:15	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:08) 159:11 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Well, this was a document 159:12 produced to us by your company in this litigation, and 159:13 you agree that Dr. Acquavella is discussing the AHS in	xReevesFINAL_100

159:14 this document?

159:15 A. Yes.

160:14 - 161:22

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:01:11)

xReevesFINAL.101

160:14 Q. And I just want to point out a couple of
160:15 things that I thought were pretty interesting. Let's
160:16 go to the exposure assessment.

RW20.4

160:17 Do you see that?

160:18 A. I do see that.

160:19 Q. And you understand that one of the big
160:20 criticisms that our -- the plaintiff's experts have
160:21 raised with the AHS is specifically about exposure
160:22 misclassification.

160:23 Do you know that?

160:24 A. I do -- yes, I have heard that.

161:1 Q. Well, let's see what Dr. Acquavella has to
161:2 say. He says under exposure assessment, the exposure
161:3 assessment in the AHS will be inaccurate.

161:4 You see that?

161:5 A. I do see that.

161:6 Q. He doesn't say could be; right?

161:7 A. I understand -- seeing the words on the
161:8 page.

161:9 Q. He says will be inaccurate; right?

161:10 A. He used those words.

161:11 Q. And that's what he said about the AHS
161:12 before he ever knew the results related to glyphosate,
161:13 or Roundup?

161:14 A. That's correct.

161:15 Q. And the next sentence reads inaccurate
161:16 exposure -- sorry, the next paragraph -- inaccurate
161:17 exposure classification can produce spurious results.
161:18 The conventional thinking in epidemiology is that
161:19 exposure misclassification will most often obscure
161:20 exposure disease relationships.

161:21 Do you see that?

161:22 A. I do see that.

163:13 - 163:16

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:06)

xReevesFINAL.102

163:13 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) I'm going to hand you
163:14 another document. This is a document that I'm labeling
163:15 Exhibit 21 to your deposition.

RW21.1

164:1 - 164:17	<p>163:16 [Exhibit 21 marked for identification.]</p> <p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:36)</p> <p>164:1 Q. So Exhibit 21 is a series of e-mail exchanges; correct?</p> <p>164:2 exchanges; correct?</p> <p>164:3 A. That's correct.</p> <p>164:4 Q. And they are e-mail exchanges primarily related to correspondence within Monsanto's employees?</p> <p>164:5 related to correspondence within Monsanto's employees?</p> <p>164:6 A. Yes, that is correct.</p> <p>164:7 Q. Specifically Dr. Farmer and a Thomas Klevorn?</p> <p>164:8 Klevorn?</p> <p>164:9 A. That's correct.</p> <p>164:10 Q. And this document was created in the regular course of business; correct?</p> <p>164:11 regular course of business; correct?</p> <p>164:12 A. That is correct.</p> <p>164:13 Q. Good. All right. So I -- there's a discussion earlier in the e-mail about Hardell and other things, and I really want to focus on the e-mail from Dr. Farmer on the first page.</p> <p>164:14 discussion earlier in the e-mail about Hardell and other things, and I really want to focus on the e-mail from Dr. Farmer on the first page.</p> <p>164:15 other things, and I really want to focus on the e-mail from Dr. Farmer on the first page.</p> <p>164:16 from Dr. Farmer on the first page.</p> <p>164:17 A. Okay.</p>	xReevesFINAL.103
164:21 - 165:10	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:34)</p> <p>164:21 Q. And that is from Dr. Farmer?</p> <p>164:22 A. That is from Dr. Farmer.</p> <p>164:23 Q. And this is well before any results related to the AHS and Roundup have been published?</p> <p>164:24 related to the AHS and Roundup have been published?</p> <p>165:1 A. That is -- let me make sure here.</p> <p>165:2 Q. Well, 1999.</p> <p>165:3 A. Yes. I understand.</p> <p>165:4 Q. She goes, Tom, you're welcome. Life is always busy, work/home/work/home, the key is the balance.</p> <p>165:5 always busy, work/home/work/home, the key is the balance.</p> <p>165:6 balance.</p> <p>165:7 Regarding business, unfortunately we feel that Hardell is just the tip of the iceberg for these type of association epi studies. We have his two papers with NHL and hairy cell leukemia</p>	xReevesFINAL.104 RW21.1
165:14 - 167:13	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:02:03)</p> <p>165:14 What is of greater concern, however, is an American initiative called the AHS.</p> <p>165:15 American initiative called the AHS.</p> <p>165:16 Did I read that right?</p> <p>165:17 A. Yes, you did.</p> <p>165:18 Q. And she goes on to kind of describe the</p>	xReevesFINAL.105

165:19 AHS. Do you see that?

165:20 A. I do see that.

165:21 Q. And if you look at sort of the last

165:22 sentence in that paragraph, she says these

165:23 organizations believe that farmers and their families

165:24 are suffering from a variety of illnesses and that

166:1 these illnesses are caused by pesticides. No bias

166:2 there.

166:3 Do you see that?

166:4 A. I do see that.

166:5 Q. She goes on. The widespread and

166:6 ever-growing use of glyphosate caused the AHS

166:7 investigators to reevaluate and give more priority to

166:8 glyphosate.

166:9 Do you see that?

166:10 A. I do see that.

166:11 Q. So so far she's been discussing potential

166:12 biases that she believes may exist with the AHS?

166:13 A. Is that a question?

166:14 Q. Correct?

166:15 A. Yes. Yes. That appears to be what she's

166:16 saying here, that she's just describing what she knows

166:17 factually about the AHS and expressing concern over

166:18 bias.

166:19 Q. And then she describes some more of the

166:20 study. And then she just has this paragraph.

166:21 She reads many groups have been highly

166:22 critical of the study as being a flawed study. In

166:23 fact, some have gone so far as to call it junk science.

166:24 It is small in scope, and the retrospective

167:1 questionnaire on pesticide usage and self-reported

167:2 diagnoses also from the questionnaire is thought to be

167:3 unreliable.

167:4 But the bottom line is scary. There will

167:5 be associations identified between glyphosate use and

167:6 some health effects just because of the way the study

167:7 is designed.

167:8 Do you see that?

167:9 A. I do see that.

167:10 Q. So she feels in discussing the AHS to this

Page/Line	Source	ID
167:16 - 168:2	<p>167:11 employee at Monsanto, Thomas Klevorn, she decides to 167:12 relay to him that people are highly critical of the 167:13 study and have even called it junk science?</p> <p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:31)</p> <p>167:16 A. I don't really know what the basis is. 167:17 She says some -- or many groups have been highly 167:18 critical. I don't know what groups she's referring to. 167:19 She doesn't provide detail here to understand what the 167:20 basis for this statement is. 167:21 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) She says the bottom line 167:22 is scary, doesn't she? 167:23 A. Those are -- those are five words she 167:24 includes here, yes. 168:1 Q. She also characterizes the exposure 168:2 classification in AHS as being unreliable; correct?</p>	<p>xReevesFINAL.106 RW21.1</p>
168:5 - 168:12	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:20)</p> <p>168:5 A. She describes -- she uses the words, is 168:6 thought to be unreliable, but she doesn't clarify who's 168:7 saying that. I think that's the challenge with this 168:8 paragraph. And -- 168:9 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) I mean, she kind of 168:10 endorses that view in this e-mail. I mean, she says 168:11 she finds it scary, and she's talking about other 168:12 people calling it junk science; right?</p>	xReevesFINAL.107
168:15 - 168:17	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:06)</p> <p>168:15 A. I can't really speak to where Donna was -- 168:16 what she was trying to say here. This is -- she 168:17 appears to be relating statements from other people.</p>	xReevesFINAL.108
175:18 - 175:22	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:11)</p> <p>175:18 Q. And if I'm not mistaken, I think you've 175:19 testified that the only epidemiologist you ever know to 175:20 ever have been employed by Monsanto, that you know of, 175:21 obviously, is Dr. Acquavella? 175:22 A. That's correct.</p>	<p>xReevesFINAL.109 clear</p>
179:11 - 179:13	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:05)</p> <p>179:11 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) We're back to causation. 179:12 No evidence across the board. I want to talk about 179:13 animal toxicology data; okay?</p>	<p>xReevesFINAL.110 RW2.11</p>
181:5 - 181:7	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:07)</p> <p>181:5 A. There's 14 total long-term studies that</p>	xReevesFINAL.111

182:20 - 183:5	<p>181:6 have looked at glyphosate and its ability to cause 181:7 cancer in rats and mice.</p> <p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:28)</p> <p>182:20 Q. But I understand, to be clear, that it's 182:21 Monsanto's position, though, that none of those studies 182:22 suggest or indicate that glyphosate exposure causes the 182:23 promotion or creation of tumors in rodents? 182:24 A. That is correct.</p> <p>183:1 Q. And just to be clear, none of those mice 183:2 or rodent studies, those long-term ones, looked at 183:3 Roundup; right? 183:4 A. The two-year studies, or 18-month studies, 183:5 that is correct.</p>	xReevesFINAL.112
185:12 - 185:16	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:14)</p> <p>185:12 So, Monsanto hasn't done a long-term animal 185:13 carcinogenicity study on formulated Roundup. Fair 185:14 enough. 185:15 Has Monsanto done a long-term 185:16 carcinogenicity study on glyphosate since 1991.</p>	xReevesFINAL.113
185:18 - 186:1	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:20)</p> <p>185:18 A. We completed the studies that we needed to 185:19 do for EPA registration, registrations around the world 185:20 in 1991. Other companies since that time have done 185:21 additional studies, long-term. 185:22 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Isn't it true that the 185:23 EPA specifically asked Monsanto to redo a mouse study 185:24 and it refused? 186:1 A. That is not my understanding.</p>	xReevesFINAL.114 clear
186:4 - 186:18	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:36)</p> <p>186:4 Q. So let's start from the beginning of the 186:5 story; okay? Now, Roundup was put on the market in the 186:6 early 1970s; right? 186:7 A. That's correct. 186:8 Q. And it was approved at that time based on 186:9 studies that Monsanto had submitted to the EPA in the 186:10 1970s; right? 186:11 A. That's correct. 186:12 Q. The only animal carcinogenicity study that 186:13 had been done at that time, though, had been conducted 186:14 by a laboratory called IBT; correct?</p>	xReevesFINAL.115

186:15 A. That is correct.

186:16 Q. And it was subsequently learned after

186:17 Roundup was approved by the EPA that IBT had been

186:18 engaged in an unethical fraudulent conduct.

187:5 - 187:15

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:30)

xReevesFINAL.116

187:5 A. What they -- what happened in that

187:6 situation was that IBT, there were some findings there

187:7 that their results could not be verified. Monsanto at

187:8 that point talked to EPA, and the decision was we could

187:9 either keep going, and let's find out where are the

187:10 records. There was not a lot of confidence the records

187:11 could be found, so we chose to repeat those studies at

187:12 that time.

187:13 Q. So let's back up just a little bit.

187:14 People went to jail; right?

187:15 A. "People went to jail." Could --

192:22 - 193:7

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:29)

xReevesFINAL.117

192:22 Q. So the timeline then, based on these

192:23 documents from what we can reconstruct, is sometime

192:24 before August 1971 he worked at Monsanto; and by August

193:1 31, 1971, he worked at IBT; and at some point, by at

193:2 least October 4th, 1973, he was back at Monsanto?

193:3 A. That's correct.

193:4 Q. And you understand that Roundup was

193:5 approved after Dr. Wright had returned to Monsanto;

193:6 correct?

193:7 A. In the U.S., yes.

196:4 - 196:15

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:16)

xReevesFINAL.118

196:4 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) So Monsanto then redoes

196:5 the mouse study; right?

196:6 A. Yes, we did.

196:7 Q. And it was done at a laboratory called

196:8 Bio/dynamics?

196:9 A. That's correct.

196:10 Q. And that study has been published, and

196:11 it's often called Knezevich and Hogan?

196:12 A. That's correct.

196:13 Q. And that study was completed in about

196:14 1983; is that right?

196:15 A. That's correct.

Page/Line	Source	ID
209:24 - 210:8	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:22) 209:24 Q. -- is it was the study that was 210:1 ultimately submitted again in 1983 to Monsanto to 210:2 replace the IBT study -- prior to that, Roundup had 210:3 been being sold on the market for about eight years; 210:4 right? 210:5 A. That's correct. 210:6 Q. And during that time that it was being 210:7 sold on the market for eight years, there was no valid 210:8 carcinogenicity study for Roundup?</p>	xReevesFINAL.119
210:11 - 210:15	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:15) 210:11 A. We were not aware of the issues at IBT lab 210:12 at that time, so we and EPA and every other customer of 210:13 IBT labs had no way of knowing what had been going on 210:14 there. Once it was found out, we took action to 210:15 replace the study in consultation with EPA.</p>	xReevesFINAL.120
215:23 - 216:17	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:37) 215:23 Q. We're at Exhibit 25, and this is that 215:24 memorandum by William Dykstra. Do you see that? 216:1 A. I do see that. 216:2 Q. And it's reviewing the replacement mouse 216:3 study; correct? 216:4 A. I'm sorry, what was the wording you used 216:5 there? 216:6 Q. The replacement mouse study, it's 216:7 reviewing that? 216:8 A. It's reviewing the replacement mouse 216:9 study, yes. 216:10 Q. And it says conclusions, 1, glyphosate was 216:11 oncogenic in male mice, causing renal tubular adenomas, 216:12 a rare tumor, in a dose-related manner. 216:13 Did I read that right? 216:14 A. I do see those words. 216:15 Q. So Dr. Dykstra here is concluding that in 216:16 fact, based on this replacement study, there seems to 216:17 be an oncogenic effect?</p>	xReevesFINAL.121 RW25.1
216:19 - 217:12	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:36) 216:19 A. So again, this is Dr. Dykstra's -- this is 216:20 a memorandum he's writing to other people. It's not a 216:21 final agency determination. He's speaking on his own</p>	xReevesFINAL.122

216:22 behalf, his own opinion.

216:23 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Sure. As a scientist at
216:24 the EPA?

217:1 A. That's correct. It's his own opinion.

217:2 Q. Who is independently reviewing the mouse
217:3 data; right?

217:4 A. That's correct.

217:5 Q. And then Number 2, the information on the
217:6 oncogenicity of glyphosate was evaluated by a
217:7 toxicology branch ad hoc committee, which concluded
217:8 that this was an oncogenic response. A copy of the
217:9 consensus report of the committee is attached.

217:10 Do you see that?

217:11 A. I do see that.

217:12 Q. I'm going to hand you the next document.

218:2 - 218:12

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:16)

xReevesFINAL.123

218:2 Q. So you've seen this document before;
218:3 right?

RW27.1

218:4 A. Yes, I have.

218:5 Q. This is a document from the EPA; correct?

218:6 A. That is correct.

218:7 Q. And it's -- the date on here is March 4th,
218:8 1985; do you see that?

218:9 A. Yeah, stamped at the top.

218:10 Q. And it's titled consensus review of
218:11 glyphosate; right?

218:12 A. That is correct.

218:15 - 219:13

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:55)

xReevesFINAL.124

218:15 Q. It's a document that Monsanto has
218:16 considered in assessing its assessment of the safety of
218:17 glyphosate?

218:18 A. That's correct.

218:19 Q. It reads on February 11th, 1985, a group
218:20 of toxicology branch personnel met to evaluate and
218:21 discuss the database on glyphosate, and in particular
218:22 the potential oncogenic response of glyphosate.

218:23 Did I read that correctly.

218:24 A. That's correct.

219:1 Q. And then it says the following persons

219:2 were in attendance. Do you see that?

219:3 A. I do see that.

219:4 Q. And there are -- one, two, three, four,
219:5 five, six, seven -- eight people listed. Do you see
219:6 that?

219:7 A. I do see that.

219:8 Q. And by my count, there's -- one, two,
219:9 three, four, five -- six different PhDs. Is that
219:10 right?

219:11 A. Six -- yes, that's correct.

219:12 Q. And then there's a statistician in there?

219:13 A. That's correct.

220:5 - 220:23

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:37)

xReevesFINAL.125

220:5 Q. And then you see it's actually signed by
220:6 every one of those people. Do you see it?

220:7 A. Yes, I do see that.

220:8 Q. And one of them was obviously Dr. Dykstra;
220:9 right?

220:10 A. That's right.

220:11 Q. And it says right underneath all their
220:12 signatures, the signatures above indicate concurrence
220:13 with this consensus report; right?

220:14 A. That's correct.

RW27.3

220:15 Q. And if we turn to Section E in this
220:16 report, there is a classification of glyphosate. Do
220:17 you see that?

220:18 A. I do see that.

220:19 Q. And it reads in accordance with EPA
220:20 proposed guidelines, the panel has classified
220:21 glyphosate as a Category C oncogen.

220:22 Do you see that?

220:23 A. I do see that.

222:4 - 222:4

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:01)

xReevesFINAL.126

222:4 Q. I'm giving you Exhibit 28.

RW28.1

222:13 - 223:23

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:01:13)

xReevesFINAL.127

222:13 Q. So this is an internal Monsanto document.

222:14 It's dated February 22nd, 1985; correct?

222:15 A. Yes, that's correct.

222:16 Q. So this is after that February 11th, 1985,
222:17 consensus meeting; correct?

222:18 A. That's correct.

222:19 Q. And this was a document prepared in the
222:20 regular course of Monsanto's business; correct?

222:21 A. That's correct.

222:22 Q. And it says right here regarding meeting

222:23 February 21st, 1985. Do you see that?

222:24 A. I do see that.

223:1 Q. And it appears that there were different

223:2 people who were present at that meeting; right?

223:3 A. Yes, it lists a group of people.

223:4 Q. And it looks like there was people from

223:5 the EPA?

223:6 A. That's correct.

223:7 Q. And there were Monsanto employees;

223:8 correct?

223:9 A. That's correct.

223:10 Q. And one person by the name of Fred

223:11 Johannsen?

223:12 A. Yes, I see that name.

223:13 Q. And his initials would be F.J.; right?

223:14 A. Yes, that's correct.

223:15 Q. And in the document, it says the meeting

223:16 mood was relaxed, informal, and open. The toxicology

223:17 branch had decided on a course of action on February

223:18 11th.

223:19 Do you see that?

223:20 A. I do see that.

223:21 Q. That's referring specifically to that

223:22 consensus document we just looked at?

223:23 A. Yes.

227:20 - 228:2

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:25)

xReevesFINAL.128

227:20 Q. It says F.J. asked, quote, short of a new

227:21 study or finding tumors in the control groups, what can

227:22 we do to get this thing off Group C?

227:23 Do you see that?

227:24 A. Just making sure I understand the full

228:1 context of what they're talking about here. All right.

228:2 Yes, I do see that.

228:11 - 228:14

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:10)

xReevesFINAL.129

228:11 But it appears here that in a meeting with

228:12 the EPA, F.J. asked that short of finding a tumor in

Page/Line	Source	ID
228:17 - 229:10	<p>228:13 the control group, what would get this thing off Group 228:14 C; correct.</p> <p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:35)</p> <p>228:17 A. He also asked -- so the full statement is 228:18 short of a new study, so he's asking either a new study 228:19 or if there was something else in the control groups. 228:20 That's what he's saying here.</p> <p>228:21 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) That's right. At this 228:22 point, the data from Bio/dynamics and the data that the 228:23 EPA reviewed didn't have any tumors in the control 228:24 group for the kidneys; right?</p> <p>229:1 A. They did not, and there's a mention up 229:2 here of an agreement -- or a suggestion to relook at 229:3 tissues.</p> <p>229:4 Q. Yeah, they're going to resection them; 229:5 right?</p> <p>229:6 A. Resection, let's take a look.</p> <p>229:7 Q. That's right. But as of -- I mean, he's 229:8 straight-up speculating, short of finding a new tumor, 229:9 what's going to get it off Group C? That's what he 229:10 says.</p>	xReevesFINAL.130
229:13 - 229:14	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:02)</p> <p>229:13 A. That's not all that's there in that 229:14 statement.</p>	xReevesFINAL.131
233:3 - 233:4	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:02)</p> <p>233:3 All right, I'm handing 233:4 you Exhibit 29.</p>	xReevesFINAL.132
233:15 - 234:9	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:34)</p> <p>233:15 Q. So you've seen this document before, sir? 233:16 A. Yes, I have.</p> <p>233:17 Q. This is a memorandum also from the EPA; 233:18 correct? 233:19 A. That's correct.</p> <p>233:20 Q. It's a document that Monsanto has reviewed 233:21 and considered in its review and consideration of the 233:22 scientific data in this case? 233:23 A. That's correct.</p> <p>233:24 Q. And it's dated February 26, 1985; right? 234:1 A. That's right.</p> <p>234:2 Q. So this would be after that meeting that</p>	xReevesFINAL.133

Page/Line	Source	ID
	234:3 was discussed in the previous document?	
	234:4 A. That's correct.	
	234:5 Q. And it says here -- it's from Herbert	
	234:6 Lacayo. Do you see that?	
	234:7 A. Yes, the statistician.	
	234:8 Q. He's a statistician with the EPA?	
	234:9 A. That's correct.	
234:16 - 235:4	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:24)	xReevesFINAL.134
	234:16 Q. So we're talking about the mouse study	
	234:17 that we've been talking about so far?	
	234:18 A. That's correct.	
	234:19 Q. And he goes the registrant, Monsanto,	
	234:20 claims that such tumors are, quote, unrelated to	
	234:21 treatment.	
	234:22 Do you see that?	
	234:23 A. I do see that.	
	234:24 Q. And he says in support of that, they	
	235:1 provide historical data from Bio/dynamics and two other	
	235:2 laboratories; right?	
	235:3 A. That's what he says, yes.	
	235:4 Q. So then if you turn to Page 3 of this memorandum	
235:5 - 235:10	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:09)	RW29.3 xReevesFINAL.135
	235:5 Are you there?	
	235:6 A. Yes, I am.	
	235:7 Q. It's the last paragraph in the section	
	235:8 above it, so just before remarks on false positives.	
	235:9 Do you see that?	
	235:10 A. I do see that.	
235:14 - 235:23	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:26)	xReevesFINAL.136
	235:14 Under such circumstances, a prudent person	
	235:15 would reject the Monsanto assumption that glyphosate	
	235:16 dosing has no effect on kidney tumor production.	
	235:17 Another way of saying this is that if glyphosate were	
	235:18 truly unrelated to kidney production, we would expect	
	235:19 to see four or more tumors in less than one out of 100	
	235:20 experiments of the type sponsored by Monsanto. Thus,	
	235:21 glyphosate is suspect.	
	235:22 Do you see that?	
	235:23 A. I do see that.	
237:19 - 238:13	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:39)	xReevesFINAL.137

237:19 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Well, let's see what the
237:20 EPA statistician said. Turning to the last page,
237:21 it's -- the first sentence is we disagree with the
237:22 registrant's position.

RW29.4

237:23 Do you see that?

237:24 A. Yes, I do see that.

238:1 Q. The registrant -- that's Monsanto?

238:2 A. That's correct.

238:3 Q. We go to the last sentence on that
238:4 paragraph. The registrant wishes to avoid false
238:5 positives, while those concerned with the public health
238:6 wish to avoid false negatives. Hence, for this reason
238:7 alone, Monsanto's argument is unacceptable.

238:8 Do you see that?

238:9 A. Okay. So you just went down to the
238:10 bottom?

238:11 Q. Yeah, the last sentence in the paragraph.

238:12 A. Yeah, I just want to make sure I've got
238:13 all the context here.

238:13 - 239:13

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:01:06)

xReevesFINAL.138

238:13 I do understand that, yes. He

238:14 said that.

238:15 Q. And then you see the next --

238:16 second-to-last paragraph on the page, starts with
238:17 viewpoint. Do you see that?

238:18 A. Yes. I'm just -- okay. Yes, go ahead.

238:19 Go ahead.

238:20 Q. It says viewpoint is a key issue. Our
238:21 viewpoint is one of protecting the public health when
238:22 we see suspicious data. It is not our job to protect
238:23 registrants from false positives.

238:24 Again, registrants -- that's Monsanto;
239:1 right.

239:2 A. That's correct. Well, we are a registrant
239:3 of a product here.

239:4 Q. We sympathize with the registrant's
239:5 problem, but they will have to demonstrate that this
239:6 positive result is false.

239:7 Do you see that?

239:8 A. I see that, and what's giving me concern

Page/Line	Source	ID
239:17 - 239:23	<p>239:9 is that this only identifies a single author, but then 239:10 I get to this paragraph and they're talking about we, 239:11 our. It reads very strangely. 239:12 Q. Yeah, it sounds like someone is concerned 239:13 with suspicious data; right?</p>	xReevesFINAL.139
241:7 - 242:1	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:27) 239:17 A. Yeah, again, I can't really speak to what 239:18 Herbert Lacayo was saying here, but he's referring to 239:19 himself in the plural. And then as you look through 239:20 this paragraph, it just becomes -- there's punct -- 239:21 well, there's misspellings and grammatical errors, and 239:22 he's going well beyond the topic of statistics here. 239:23 So I'm not really sure what the basis is.</p>	xReevesFINAL.140
242:4 - 242:5	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:51) 241:7 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) So following this study 241:8 and following that conversation that Monsanto had 241:9 with the EPA that we discussed earlier, Monsanto hired 241:10 a guy by the name of Dr. Marvin Kushner; correct? 241:11 A. My understanding is that, yes, we did hire 241:12 Dr. Kushner. 241:13 Q. What was the purpose of Monsanto hiring 241:14 him? 241:15 A. He was a pathologist. 241:16 Q. What did you want him to do? 241:17 A. A pathologist's job is to look at tissues 241:18 from animal studies to understand is there evidence 241:19 here of some disease outcome. Specifically Dr. 241:20 Kushner looked at slides from this mouse study to 241:21 determine whether or not they were analyzed correctly 241:22 to begin with. 241:23 Q. And you would agree it would be highly 241:24 unscientific for him to have an opinion about what 242:1 those slides say before looking at them?</p>	clear
246:3 - 246:15	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:02) 242:4 A. Is there a document that you would like to 242:5 discuss?</p> <p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:19) 246:3 Q. You recognize this document? 246:4 A. Yes, I do. 246:5 Q. Seen it before?</p>	xReevesFINAL.141
		xReevesFINAL.142 RW30.1

Page/Line	Source	ID
	246:6 A. Yes, I have.	
	246:7 Q. This is an internal Monsanto document	
	246:8 dated April 3rd, 1985; correct?	
	246:9 A. That's correct.	
	246:10 Q. So this is after that meeting with the	
	246:11 EPA?	
	246:12 A. That's correct.	
	246:13 Q. This is after that memo we just looked at	
	246:14 from Dr. Lacayo specifically discussing suspicious	
	246:15 data?	
246:18 - 246:19	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:03)	xReevesFINAL.143
	246:18 A. The document was about a statistical	
	246:19 analysis of a letter that Monsanto had provided.	
248:4 - 248:6	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:04)	xReevesFINAL.144
	248:4 Q. And this document was created in the	
	248:5 regular course of Monsanto's business; correct?	
	248:6 A. That's correct.	
248:11 - 249:4	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:41)	xReevesFINAL.145
	248:11 Q. And it reads, starting in the second	
	248:12 paragraph, senior management at EPA is reviewing a	
	248:13 proposal to classify glyphosate as a Class C possible	
	248:14 human carcinogen because of kidney adenomas in male	
	248:15 mice.	
	248:16 Do you see that.	
	248:17 A. I do see that.	
	248:18 Q. Dr. Marvin Kushner will review kidney	
	248:19 sections and present his evaluation of them to the	
	248:20 EPA -- I'm sorry, to EPA in an effort to persuade the	
	248:21 agency that the observed tumors are not related to	
	248:22 glyphosate.	
	248:23 Do you see that.	
	248:24 A. I do see that.	
	249:1 Q. So as of April 3rd, 1985, Monsanto is	
	249:2 going to be hiring Dr. Kushner is an effort to	
	249:3 persuade the agency that the tumors are not related to	
	249:4 glyphosate?	
249:7 - 249:15	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:29)	xReevesFINAL.146
	249:7 A. Yeah, I can't really speak to what Dr.	
	249:8 George Levinskas had in mind when he hired Dr.	
	249:9 Kushner. His statement here is to T. F. Evans. I	

Page/Line	Source	ID
249:18 - 249:24	<p>249:10 don't know what his conversation was with Dr. Kuschner. 249:11 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) I mean, we could 249:12 speculate, or we could read what he says; right? He 249:13 straight-up says right here in an effort to persuade 249:14 the agency that the observed tumors are not related to 249:15 glyphosate. That's what it says; right? Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:12)</p>	xReevesFINAL.147
250:1 - 250:13	<p>249:18 A. Again, these are words from George 249:19 Levinskas to T. F. Evans. Nothing here tells me what 249:20 the conversation was with Dr. Kuschner. 249:21 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) So that's April 3rd, 249:22 1985; right? 249:23 A. That's correct. 249:24 Q. I'm handing you Exhibit 31. Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:29)</p>	RW31.1 xReevesFINAL.148
250:18 - 250:22	<p>250:1 [Exhibit 31 marked for identification.] 250:2 Q. Have you seen this document before, sir? 250:3 A. Yes, I have. 250:4 Q. This is a document dated April 3rd, 1985; 250:5 right? 250:6 A. That's correct. 250:7 Q. Same date as the document we just looked 250:8 at? 250:9 A. That's correct. 250:10 Q. And it's a letter addressed to Dr. Marvin 250:11 Kuschner; correct? 250:12 A. Just make sure. It is directed -- it is 250:13 addressed to Dr. Kuschner. Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:12)</p>	xReevesFINAL.149
251:14 - 251:21	<p>250:18 Q. And he says he's sending slides to -- God 250:19 bless you. He says here that he's sending slides to 250:20 Dr. Kuschner at the request of Dr. Long of Monsanto; 250:21 right? 250:22 A. That's correct. Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:28)</p> <p>251:14 Q. So if we compare the dates of the letter 251:15 from Exhibit 30 and -- sorry -- the letter, which is 251:16 Exhibit 31, with the memo from Monsanto, it appears 251:17 that on the very date that Mr. Levinskas is saying that 251:18 they're going to have Dr. Marvin Kuschner help them</p>	xReevesFINAL.150 RW3031.1

251:24 - 252:7	<p>251:19 persuade the agency that the observed tumors are 251:20 not related to glyphosate, they're actually sending the 251:21 slides to Dr. Kushner?</p> <p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:21)</p> <p>251:24 A. So the date of the letter from George 252:1 Levinskas to T. F. Evans is the same as the date of the 252:2 letter from Bio/dynamics to Dr. Kushner. 252:3 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) So unless George 252:4 "Kevinskas" somehow could see into the future, how 252:5 could he possibly know that Dr. Kushner would help 252:6 them persuade the agency that the tumors were not 252:7 related to the glyphosate?</p>	xReevesFINAL.151
252:10 - 253:21	<p>Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:01:19)</p> <p>252:10 A. I can't guess as to what was in George 252:11 Levinskas's thoughts at that time. 252:12 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Beyond what he wrote? 252:13 A. Yeah, all we have is what he wrote. We 252:14 don't know that that's the conversation he had with Dr. 252:15 Knezevich or Dr. Kushner. 252:16 Q. And if we look right here, at the back of 252:17 it is a laboratory receipt. You see that? 252:18 A. Yes, I do see that. 252:19 Q. And we have a sign -- it's signed by 252:20 Marvin Kushner? 252:21 A. Yes. 252:22 Q. And it's actually on April 14th, 1985; 252:23 right? 252:24 A. That's correct. 253:1 Q. It's 11 days after the memo by Mr. 253:2 Levinskas? 253:3 A. Yes, that's correct. 253:4 Q. So subsequent to this, Dr. Kushner 253:5 reviewed the kidney tumor slides; right? 253:6 A. Yes, that is correct. 253:7 Q. And he -- 253:8 A. He actually looked at slides from all the 253:9 kidneys -- 253:10 Q. That's right. 253:11 A. -- just to understand if they were any. 253:12 Q. And he discovered a tumor in the control</p>	<p>xReevesFINAL.152</p> <p>RW31.2</p> <p>clear</p>

253:13 group; correct?

253:14 A. In addition to some others, yes.

253:15 Q. And Monsanto then had him prepare a

253:16 report, and they submitted that report to the EPA;

253:17 correct?

253:18 A. Yes. And that report showed the

253:19 additional tumor in the control groups as well as some

253:20 additional tumors that he found in the treated groups

253:21 as well.

264:9 - 266:11

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:02:00)

xReevesFINAL.153

RW33.1

264:9 Q. And he writes the news you relayed to us

264:10 on the preliminary results of the resections was very

264:11 encouraging. We continue to believe that the result of

264:12 all of these effort will be that glyphosate is not

264:13 shown to be oncogenic.

264:14 Do you see that.

264:15 A. That's correct.

264:16 Q. And then he goes on, we now feel it is

264:17 important to begin to make plans and begin to prepare

264:18 our strategy on how we will both submit the results and

264:19 respond if the EPA does not accept our results.

264:20 Do you see that.

264:21 A. I do see that.

264:22 Q. We ask your cooperation with the

264:23 following, colon. Do you see that, sir?

264:24 A. I do see that.

265:1 Q. So it appears that he's going to discuss

265:2 Monsanto's plans and strategies; right?

265:3 A. He says it's to begin to make -- it is

265:4 important to begin to make plans, begin to prepare our

265:5 strategy.

265:6 Q. So he's talking about plans and strategy;

265:7 right?

265:8 A. Yes, he is talking about plans and

265:9 strategies.

265:10 Q. Number 1, we continue to feel it is

265:11 important to identify and contact those outside, quote,

265:12 experts, unquote, who we feel would testify on our

265:13 behalf both to EPA and SAP that, based on the results,

265:14 glyphosate is not oncogenic.

265:15 Do you see that.

265:16 A. Yes, I do.

265:17 Q. And then Number 2, we do not have a lot of
265:18 faith that, presented with the same evidence, Ted
265:19 Farber will want to back off and change his mind.
265:20 Did I read that right.

265:21 A. That is correct.

265:22 Q. Ted Farber, he was the head of the OPP at
265:23 the EPA; correct?

265:24 A. I'd have to go back and check. He was --
266:1 I know he was with the EPA.

266:2 Q. He was somebody with the EPA?

266:3 A. He was with the EPA.

266:4 Q. Hence we feel that it is equally as
266:5 important to identify and contact, quote, experts,
266:6 unquote, in the area of statistics who would be willing
266:7 to testify both to the EPA and SAP that 1-0-1-3 cannot
266:8 be considered significant. Also we will need opinions
266:9 on the proper way to handle historical controls.
266:10 Do you see that.

266:11 A. I do see that.

268:1 - 268:13

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:39)

xReevesFINAL.154

RW33.2

268:1 Q. This is August 28th, 1985. It reads we
268:2 appreciate your continued help in this area. It seems
268:3 imperative that we continue to do all that is possible
268:4 in order to have the agency reverse its decision.
268:5 Hopefully the testimony of several respected,
268:6 quote/unquote, experts will be enough to cause EPA to
268:7 change their minds. Should you have any questions,
268:8 feel free to contact either Tom or myself.
268:9 Did I read that right.

268:10 A. Yes, you did.

268:11 Q. You would agree with me that getting the
268:12 EPA to change its decision about glyphosate being a
268:13 Class C oncogen, that was really important to Monsanto?

268:15 - 269:2

Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:24)

xReevesFINAL.155

268:15 A. What was import -- what is important to
268:16 Monsanto and has always been important to Monsanto is
268:17 getting the science right, making sure the data are
268:18 accurate.

Page/Line	Source	ID
268:19 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) I don't see that in that 268:20 paragraph. Do you see that in that paragraph, getting 268:21 the science right, anywhere in there?		
268:22 A. What I can tell you, these are -- this 268:23 is a letter from Frank Serdy. What I can tell you, the 268:24 company's position -- we want to make sure we get the 269:1 science right, that we actually have accurate data in 269:2 front of the agency.		
274:6 - 274:10	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:12)	xReevesFINAL.156
274:6 Q. So as Monsanto predicted, there was in 274:7 fact a scientific advisory panel convened; correct?		clear
274:8 A. Yes. And this was following the discovery 274:9 by the pathology working group, and their conclusion 274:10 that indeed these tumors were there.		
282:20 - 283:4	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:28)	xReevesFINAL.157
282:20 Q. Then actually the EPA then issued a 282:21 guidance document ordering Monsanto to redo a mouse 282:22 study; correct?		
282:23 A. I don't know that they -- I don't believe 282:24 I've ever seen a document -- a guidance document that 283:1 ordered Monsanto to do something. Typically guidance 283:2 documents don't order specific companies to do specific 283:3 things. It's a data call-in.		
283:6 - 283:12	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:08)	xReevesFINAL.158
283:6 Q. This is a guidance document for 283:7 glyphosate; right?		
283:8 A. Yes.		
283:9 Q. From the EPA?		
283:10 A. That is correct.		
283:11 Q. Dated June 1986; right?		
283:12 A. That's correct.		
285:4 - 285:4	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:01)	xReevesFINAL.159
285:4 Q. Okay, great. Turn to Page 6.		RW36.10
285:5 - 285:10	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:08)	xReevesFINAL.160
285:5 A. Yes, I am.		
285:6 Q. And this is describing the mouse study; 285:7 right?		
285:8 A. At the very top?		
285:9 Q. Yeah. The first paragraph.		

285:10 A. Yes.

285:20 - 287:5 **Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:01:14)** xReevesFINAL.161

285:20 Q. Toxicology branch ad hoc oncogenicity

285:21 committee tentatively classified glyphosate as a Class

285:22 C oncogen. See that?

285:23 A. I do see that.

285:24 Q. The studies were reexamined by a

286:1 consulting pathologist and data were submitted

286:2 indicating that an additional kidney tumor had been

286:3 found in the control males. No renal tumors were found

286:4 in controls in the original examination. You see that?

286:5 A. Yes, I do.

286:6 Q. And that consulting pathologist was Dr.

286:7 Kuschner; right?

286:8 A. Yes.

286:9 Q. The agency then requested that additional

286:10 kidney sections from the mouse study be prepared and

286:11 examined. You agree with that; right?

286:12 A. I do see that, yes.

286:13 Q. The resultant microslides were examined by

286:14 a number of pathologists. Those examinations revealed

286:15 no additional tumors, but confirmed the presence of the

286:16 tumors identified in the original study report.

286:17 Do you see that?

286:18 A. I do see that.

286:19 Q. The apparent lesion in the control kidney

286:20 was not present in any of the additional sections.

286:21 After examination of the slides, the agency concluded

286:22 that this lesion did not represent a pathologically

286:23 significant change.

286:24 Do you see that?

287:1 A. I do see that.

287:2 Q. So that was the agency's conclusion about

287:3 this tumor in the control slide?

287:4 A. Yeah, this is their account of the

287:5 historical information regarding that.

287:20 - 288:4 **Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:17)** xReevesFINAL.162

287:20 Therefore, in order to fully address this RW36.11

287:21 question, the agency is requiring that this study be

287:22 repeated with a larger number of animals in each test

Page/Line	Source	ID
	287:23 group so that the statistical power of the study is 287:24 increased.	
	288:1 Do you see that?	
	288:2 A. I do see that.	
	288:3 Q. So the agency did in fact require an 288:4 additional study?	
288:7 - 288:8	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:02)	xReevesFINAL.163
	288:7 A. So what they're saying is the agency is 288:8 requiring.	
288:9 - 288:9	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:02)	xReevesFINAL.164
	288:9 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) That's an order; right?	
288:10 - 288:17	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:20)	xReevesFINAL.165
	288:10 A. Well, it would come in the forms -- so 288:11 earlier on this document discusses data call-in, so 288:12 that's the mechanism by which they would do it. This 288:13 could be -- this document would be recounting perhaps 288:14 conversations that the agency has had, but it's the 288:15 official data call-in authority that the agency uses to 288:16 say submit a study. So that would be a separate 288:17 document.	
293:5 - 293:13	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:18)	xReevesFINAL.166
	293:5 Q. And in fact, Monsanto never redid the 293:6 mouse study, did it?	
	293:7 A. We conducted a rat study.	
	293:8 Q. You didn't do the mouse one?	
	293:9 A. We conducted a rat study. That is 293:10 correct.	
	293:11 Q. I didn't even remotely ask you about a rat 293:12 study, so I don't know why you keep talking about that. 293:13 I asked you, did Monsanto ever repeat the mouse study?	
293:16 - 293:17	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:03)	xReevesFINAL.167
	293:16 A. We did not repeat the mouse study because 293:17 we were doing the rat study.	
305:16 - 305:22	Reeves, William 01-23-2019 (00:00:15)	xReevesFINAL.168
	305:16 Monsanto regularly has personal conversations with 305:17 people at the EPA; correct?	
	305:18 A. We have conversations with EPA 305:19 representatives.	
	305:20 Q. You guys share text messages; correct?	
	305:21 A. There are instances where EPA officials	

Page/Line	Source	ID
454:14 - 454:19	<p>305:22 and Monsanto employees have texted each other.</p> <p>Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:12)</p> <p>454:14 Q. Okay. All right. And finally,</p> <p>454:15 there's this last area of cell studies and I'm</p> <p>454:16 actually not going to ask you many questions about</p> <p>454:17 that. There's -- but you would agree there's been</p> <p>454:18 hundreds of studies?</p> <p>454:19 A. Yes, that's correct.</p>	xReevesFINAL.169
456:5 - 456:16	<p>Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:28)</p> <p>456:5 Q. Okay. And, you know, you would agree</p> <p>456:6 that there are many cell studies that did show --</p> <p>456:7 that were positive for genotoxicity; right?</p> <p>456:8 A. Typically those involve studies where</p> <p>456:9 they have somehow outright killed the cells and as</p> <p>456:10 those cells decompose, they misinterpret those --</p> <p>456:11 that decomposition as evidence of genetic damage,</p> <p>456:12 but it is not true evidence of genetic damage.</p> <p>456:13 Q. Okay. So all those positive studies</p> <p>456:14 that show genotoxicity, it's your opinion and</p> <p>456:15 Monsanto's position that they are not reliable</p> <p>456:16 studies; is that right?</p>	xReevesFINAL.170 RW2.11
456:20 - 458:11	<p>Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:34)</p> <p>456:20 A. Typically, that's what I have</p> <p>456:21 observed is that when they -- they treat the -- the</p> <p>456:22 cells in a way that outright kills them and that as</p> <p>456:23 those cells decompose, that decomposition is</p> <p>456:24 misinterpreted as genetic damage, but if there's</p> <p>456:25 particular studies you'd like to discuss.</p> <p>457:1 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) I would -- if I go</p> <p>457:2 through all those studies, we will literally be</p> <p>457:3 here for a week. So I -- I'm not going to do that.</p> <p>457:4 I just wanted to sort of make sure I understood</p> <p>457:5 Monsanto's position with regards to it.</p> <p>457:6 And that's why, and so, though, we've</p> <p>457:7 talked about epidemiology, we've talked about</p> <p>457:8 animal toxicology, and we obviously haven't talked</p> <p>457:9 about all the cells that -- we haven't talked about</p> <p>457:10 studies here but we've -- we've covered some of</p> <p>457:11 them; right?</p> <p>457:12 A. Yeah, examples of them.</p>	xReevesFINAL.171 clear

457:13 Q. Okay. And notwithstanding the stuff
457:14 that we have covered, it's -- it's still Monsanto's
457:15 position that there's no evidence across the board;
457:16 right?

RW2.11

457:17 A. Yes, our -- our position is that,
457:18 when you take all this data into account, you have
457:19 a very large body of evidence saying we fully
457:20 understand the carcinogenic potential of glyphosate
457:21 and Roundup-based herbicides, or glyphosate and
457:22 glyphosate-based herbicides, indicating there is no
457:23 carcinogenic potential.

457:24 There are additional studies that may
457:25 purport to have findings one way or the other but
458:1 when you look at those in particular, they often
458:2 have some sort of methodological flaw that prevents
458:3 either a conclusive outcome or a reliable source of
458:4 -- or from them being a reliable source of
458:5 information.

clear

458:6 Q. Okay. Monsanto, following the IARC
458:7 classification -- and just to be clear, you
458:8 understand the IARC has classified glyphosate as a
458:9 -- as a Class 2 probable human carcinogen; right?
458:10 A. I do understand that. We believe
458:11 it's a deeply-flawed classification.

458:15 - 459:2

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:26)

xReevesFINAL.172

458:15 But following the IARC
458:16 classification, Monsanto hired Intertek to prepare
458:17 a sort of expert panel review of what IARC did; do
458:18 you recall that?

458:19 A. I do recall that.

458:20 Q. And that was ultimately published in
458:21 a series of articles; correct?

458:22 A. I do recall that.

458:23 Q. Okay. And there was a couple of
458:24 scientists that we've been hearing about throughout
458:25 this deposition that were involved in that panel,
459:1 like, for example, Dr. Acquavella; right?

459:2 A. That is correct.

459:9 - 459:18

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:16)

xReevesFINAL.173

459:9 Q. And one of the primary points

459:10 of contact for Monsanto related to the Intertek
459:11 project was a person by the name of Ashley Roberts;
459:12 right?

459:13 A. That's correct.

459:14 Q. And Ashley Roberts was an employee of
459:15 Intertek?

459:16 A. That is correct.

459:17 Q. Also a scientist?

459:18 A. That is my understanding, yes.

460:3 - 460:4

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:03)

xReevesFINAL.174

460:3 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) Sir, I'm handing you
460:4 Exhibit 50 -- 58.

RW58.1

460:7 - 460:11

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:10)

xReevesFINAL.175

460:7 Q. All right. So this is a series of
460:8 emails that were between members of the Intertek
460:9 panel that were then forwarded to Dr. Heydens;
460:10 right?

RW58.1.1

460:11 A. Yes, that's correct.

460:17 - 461:4

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:22)

xReevesFINAL.176

460:17 Q. And this project with Intertek, that
460:18 was part of Monsanto's regular and ordinary course
460:19 of business; correct?

460:20 A. That's correct.

460:21 Q. All right. Now, before the actual
460:22 Intertek publications came out, the panel actually
460:23 gave presentations; right?

460:24 A. That is correct -- I am aware of at
460:25 least one presentation, yes.

461:1 Q. And in preparation for those
461:2 presentations, they create something called a
461:3 poster; right?

461:4 A. That's correct.

461:13 - 461:23

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:20)

xReevesFINAL.177

461:13 Q. Okay. And this email exchange is --
461:14 appear to be discussing a poster for presentation;
461:15 correct?

461:16 A. They do, yes.

461:17 Q. All right. And if we look at the --
461:18 look at an email starting on page 2.

461:19 Do you see that?

RW58.2.1

461:20 A. I do see that.

461:21 Q. All right. And there's an email from

461:22 Ashley Roberts at Intertek; right?

461:23 A. Yes.

462:22 - 464:2

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:52)

xReevesFINAL.178

462:22 Q. Yeah. Okay. "We are now looking for

462:23 a title for the abstract and was hoping that one of

462:24 the 2 versions below might fit the bill? Please

462:25 let me know if you like one of these titles and if

463:1 not if you could come up with an alternative

463:2 version."

463:3 Do you see that?

463:4 A. Yes.

463:5 Q. "We were thinking it could be

463:6 something like:" and then it looks like he proposes

463:7 two possible titles; right?

463:8 A. Yes, he does.

463:9 Q. The first one is "Expert Panel

463:10 Review of the Carcinogenic Potential of the

463:11 Herbicide Glyphosate."

463:12 See that?

463:13 A. Yes, I do see that.

463:14 Q. And then, "or something a little more

463:15 provocative, like: 'An Expert Panel Concludes

463:16 there is No Evidence that Glyphosate is

463:17 Carcinogenic to Humans."

463:18 You see that?

463:19 A. I do see that.

463:20 Q. All right. And then you see a

463:21 response from Dr. Thomas Sorahan?

463:22 A. Yes, I do see that.

463:23 Q. And copied on that response is Dr.

463:24 Acquavella?

463:25 A. Yes.

464:1 Q. Dr. Garabrant?

464:2 A. I do see that.

464:7 - 466:3

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:29)

xReevesFINAL.179

464:7 So Dr. Sorahan, he was actually

464:8 Monsanto's observer at the IARC Monograph; right?

464:9 A. That's correct.

464:10 Q. On glyphosate?

464:11 A. That's correct.

464:12 Q. Okay. "Dear Ashley, I prefer the

464:13 first title. If something more provocative is

464:14 wanted, then I think the second title should have

464:15 'no convincing evidence.' We can't" -- well, okay.

464:16 He says, "We can't say 'no evidence' because that

464:17 means there is not a single scrap of evidence, and

464:18 I don't see how we can go that far."

464:19 You see that?

464:20 A. I do see that.

464:21 Q. Dr. Sorahan is -- is saying, you

464:22 can't say no evidence because that's going too far;

464:23 right?

464:24 A. Well, I don't -- just simply the

464:25 words on the page, I don't --

465:1 Q. Yeah. Okay.

465:2 A. -- I can't interpret exactly what he

465:3 would say beyond that.

465:4 Q. Dr. Garabrant, he says, "I agree with

465:5 Tom's suggestion."

465:6 Right?

465:7 A. I do see that.

465:8 Q. Okay. And then we have an email from

465:9 Dr. Acquavella.

465:10 You see that?

465:11 A. I do see that.

465:12 Q. Dr. Acquavella, he used to work at

465:13 Monsanto; we discussed that?

465:14 A. That's correct.

465:15 Q. In fact, to the best of your

465:16 knowledge, he's the only epidemiologist that you've

465:17 ever known to work at Monsanto?

465:18 A. That's correct.

465:19 Q. Okay. "Ashley: I agree as well that

465:20 you can't say there is no evidence. If you want

465:21 something more provocative, perhaps consider: An

465:22 expert panel's review disagrees with IARC's recent

465:23 classification of the herbicide glyphosate. I

465:24 think that is the gist of the abstract anyway."

RW58.2.2

RW58.1.2

RW58.1.3

Page/Line	Source	ID
466:6 - 466:10	<p>465:25 You see that? 466:1 A. I do see that. 466:2 Q. So Dr. Acquavella is confirming that 466:3 you really can't say no evidence; right? Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:05)</p>	xReevesFINAL.180
466:12 - 466:13	<p>466:6 A. He is -- Dr. Acquavella is sharing 466:7 his opinion here. 466:8 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) Yeah. And he says, 466:9 "you can't say there is no evidence." 466:10 That's what he says? Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:02)</p>	xReevesFINAL.181
466:17 - 467:23	<p>466:12 A. Simply, we have the words on the page 466:13 that Dr. Acquavella wrote. Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:12) 466:17 Q. Okay. So we have these three experts 466:18 that Monsanto has, you know, consulted with, a 466:19 former Monsanto employee, discussing this phrase, 466:20 "no evidence." Will Monsanto now change its 466:21 position that there is no evidence across the 466:22 board? 466:23 A. We will not change our position. 466:24 These statements here, we would have to have more 466:25 information from these scientists to understand 467:1 what they literally meant and what they would 467:2 identify. But our position is, when you look 467:3 across all that data, you look at all the 467:4 epidemiology data, you look at all the animal data, 467:5 you look at all the cell data, there is nothing 467:6 there to indicate, when you look at all this stuff 467:7 together, when you look at the individual columns 467:8 of data, that glyphosate or glyphosate-based 467:9 herbicides can cause cancer. 467:10 Q. And so when you say there is no 467:11 evidence, when Monsanto says there is no evidence, 467:12 the only way you can really get there is by 467:13 ignoring the positive evidence; right? 467:14 A. We do not ignore it. We consider all 467:15 available information, just the way a regulatory 467:16 agency would. 467:17 Q. Well, you consider all the positive</p>	xReevesFINAL.182

clear

467:18 results and then find a way to say that they're
467:19 bad; right?

467:20 A. We do not find a way to say they're
467:21 bad. We study those studies to understand them,
467:22 and then critique them using agreed --
467:23 internationally-agreed scientific principles.

564:5 - 565:4

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:39)

xReevesFINAL.183

564:5 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) All right, Doctor, I
564:6 want to talk to you about regulators --

564:7 A. All right.

564:8 Q. -- in -- in the -- in the States;
564:9 okay?

564:10 A. Okay.

564:11 Q. So I'm not going to talk about anyone
564:12 outside of the United States, just within the
564:13 United States; okay?

564:14 A. Sure.

564:15 Q. All right. I understand that there's
564:16 -- there's -- there's various different groups of
564:17 scientists and regulatory authorities that have
564:18 some interaction with Monsanto as it relates to the
564:19 safety of Roundup; is that fair?

564:20 A. So just scientists and regulatory
564:21 agencies?

RW73.1

564:22 Q. Yeah.

564:23 A. Yes, that's correct.

564:24 Q. And one of them -- and you mentioned
564:25 before, of course, is probably the most -- the
565:1 primary one federally is the EPA; is that right?

RW73.2

565:2 A. That's correct.

565:3 Q. Okay. So I'm going to -- I'm going
565:4 to put the EPA on here.

565:12 - 569:8

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:03:32)

xReevesFINAL.184

565:12 Q. But there's also other -- other sort
565:13 of groups within the United States that --
565:14 regulatory groups that -- that assess or look at
565:15 Roundup; right?

565:16 A. That look at Roundup? Could you be
565:17 more specific?

565:18 Q. So, for example, you've heard of the

565:19 ATSDR?

565:20 A. They -- so I wouldn't classify them
565:21 as a regulatory agency. They are a -- they are --
565:22 well, they act as an advisory capacity. They will
565:23 take a look at a substance and typically their
565:24 advice is meant for EPA.

565:25 Q. Okay. But there is a -- it is a part
566:1 of the CDC; right?

566:2 A. Yes, it is.

566:3 Q. So it's part of the Centers of
566:4 Disease Control. And they -- they do look at the
566:5 toxicology and potential risks of products like --
566:6 like glyphosate?

566:7 A. They -- they look at a range of
566:8 compounds.

566:9 Q. Okay. So ATSDR. Do you know if, to
566:10 this day, ATS -- ATSDR has looked at whether or not
566:11 glyphosate or Roundup causes cancer?

566:12 A. According to their website, they have
566:13 completed the report and it's undergoing peer
566:14 review.

566:15 Q. Okay. So then we also have another
566:16 group called OSHA.
566:17 You've heard of them?

566:18 A. Yes, I do.

566:19 Q. And --

566:20 A. Or I have. Sorry.

566:21 Q. -- what is your understanding of
566:22 OSHA's interaction with -- related to Roundup?

566:23 A. They are -- so that's the
566:24 Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and
566:25 their role is -- one of -- they have many roles.

567:1 One of them is overseeing Material Safety Data
567:2 Sheets.

567:3 Q. Okay. And those are documents that
567:4 sort of outline the warnings or precautions related
567:5 to the use of Roundup in an occupational setting?

567:6 A. They would -- their Material Safety
567:7 Data Sheet, in my experience, covers glyphosate,
567:8 the active ingredient, and then would cover the

RW73.3

567:9 surfactants individually.

567:10 Q. Okay. And so that's OSHA; right?

RW73.4

567:11 A. That's correct.

567:12 Q. Okay. And the last one that -- and

567:13 maybe if there are some other ones you want to let

567:14 me know, please do. But the other one that I -- I

567:15 want to talk about is -- is California's EPA.

567:16 Are you familiar with California's

567:17 EPA?

567:18 A. Yes, I used to work there.

567:19 Q. As -- I was going to say, in fact,

567:20 you used to be employed by them; right?

567:21 A. Yes, that's correct.

567:22 Q. While you were there, did you know

567:23 Lauren Zeise?

567:24 A. I knew the name, but I never met her.

567:25 Q. And you know that Dr. Zeise, she

568:1 actually participated in the IARC Monograph; right?

568:2 A. I do know that, yes.

568:3 Q. Okay. And I think the -- the

568:4 organization is called OEHHA; right?

568:5 A. OEHHA.

568:6 Q. OEHHA?

568:7 A. O-E-H-H-A.

568:8 Q. O-E-H-H-A; right?

RW73.5

568:9 A. That's correct.

568:10 Q. And I'm just going to put under here

568:11 "Cal," so it's clear that this is not federal,

RW73.6

568:12 which these other ones are.

568:13 A. That's correct.

568:14 Q. Okay. All right. So I want to kind

568:15 of go through these generally speaking. Now,

568:16 within the EPA, there's actually more than just one

568:17 office; right? There's different programs?

568:18 A. That's true.

568:19 Q. There's the OPP?

568:20 A. That's correct.

568:21 Q. And there's also something called the

568:22 Office of Research and Development; right?

568:23 A. That's correct.

568:24 Q. Okay. And when you talk about the --
 568:25 the -- the -- the office within the EPA that has
 569:1 concluded that -- that Roundup is not a carcinogen,
 569:2 you're talking about the OPP, the Office of
 569:3 Pesticide Programs; right?

569:4 A. That's correct.

569:5 Q. All right. Okay. And then there's
 569:6 also this group called the Office of Research and
 569:7 Development and that's the ORD; right?

569:8 A. That's correct.

RW73.7

RW73.8

569:15 - 569:16

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:04)

xReevesFINAL.185

569:15 Q. Okay. All right. I'm handing you a
 569:16 document, it's Exhibit 74 to your deposition.

clear

570:1 - 570:11

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:23)

xReevesFINAL.186

570:1 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) Okay. So this is a
 570:2 document that summarizes the ORD's comments on the
 570:3 OPP's glyphosate cancer assessment.

570:4 Do you see that?

570:5 A. I do see that.

570:6 Q. It's dated December 14th, 2015.

570:7 A. I do see that.

570:8 Q. This is a document that you've seen
 570:9 in your capacity at Monsanto; right?

570:10 A. I may have. I've definitely seen the
 570:11 content. This is familiar content to me.

572:10 - 573:19

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:23)

xReevesFINAL.187

572:10 Q. Okay. So they had some scientists
 572:11 take a look at the report and they're offering
 572:12 their sort of summary opinions in this document?

572:13 A. That's correct.

572:14 Q. Okay. Go down to paragraph 3; right?

572:15 Do you see that?

572:16 A. I do see that.

572:17 Q. And then the second paragraph within
 572:18 that, it's "ORD's epidemiologists."

572:19 Do you see that?

572:20 A. I do see that.

572:21 Q. And it reads, "ORD's epidemiologists
 572:22 agree with IARC that there is 'limited evidence' of
 572:23 carcinogenicity in humans and understand IARC's

572:24 definition of 'limited evidence' as 'a positive
572:25 association has been observed' for which a causal
573:1 association is 'credible, but chance, bias, or
573:2 confounding could not be ruled out with reasonable
573:3 confidence (IARC Preamble, section B6)."

573:4 You see that?

573:5 A. I do see that.

573:6 Q. All right. And then it says, "OPP

573:7 preferred to dichotomize the epidemiology (sic)

573:8 evidence to be either 'causal' or 'not causal.'

573:9 This dichotomization appears to be the major factor

573:10 in the different positions between OPP and IARC

573:11 with regard to the epidemiological data."

573:12 Do you see that?

573:13 A. I do see that.

573:14 Q. And this is talking about, instead of

573:15 looking at all of the data sort of holistically,

573:16 they're accusing -- and I'm not saying that this is

573:17 true -- but they are saying that -- that -- the OPP

573:18 is really just saying yes/no for each study instead

573:19 of sort of looking at the whole picture.

573:22 - 574:15

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:47)

xReevesFINAL.188

573:22 A. I have the words here in front of me.

573:23 They're -- so the Office of Research and

573:24 Development is simply describing the ORD

573:25 epidemiologists look at data this way, and the

574:1 Office of Pesticide Programs looked at it in a way

574:2 that they describe differently from the way that

574:3 ORD did theirs -- did their review, I'm sorry.

574:4 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) Okay. Then on

574:5 number 4 it says, "Glyphosate has been tested in

574:6 large number of 2-year rat and mice studies,

574:7 including several studies conducted in the same

574:8 strains."

574:9 You see that?

574:10 A. I do see that.

574:11 Q. It says, "A wide range of tumors have

574:12 been observed in these studies, including adenomas

574:13 and some carcinomas."

574:14 Do you see that?

Page/Line	Source	ID
575:1 - 575:8	574:15 A. I do see that. Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:17)	xReevesFINAL.189
	575:1 Q. It says, "The ORD reviews noted that 575:2 the analysis of the cancer data in the assessment 575:3 was basically conducted on a study-by-study basis 575:4 instead of using a more inclusive, systematic 575:5 approach to provide an integrated analysis of the 575:6 data." 575:7 Do you see that?	
583:5 - 583:7	575:8 A. I do see that. Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:07)	xReevesFINAL.190
	583:5 Q. Okay, great. But to be clear, at 583:6 least we know from this third paragraph that ORD's 583:7 epidemiologists agree with IARC; correct?	
583:10 - 583:11	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:03)	xReevesFINAL.191
	583:10 A. So I -- I see the words written here 583:11 on the page.	
584:5 - 584:9	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:16)	xReevesFINAL.192
	584:5 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) Okay, great. So 584:6 going back to our exhibit here, we are in Exhibit 584:7 73. Under ORD, agrees with IARC.	RW73.8
	584:8 A. So I -- I'm not sure I would agree 584:9 with that characterization.	RW73.9
587:2 - 588:5	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:02)	xReevesFINAL.193
	587:2 All right. I want to move on 587:3 to the next one, the far right; okay? OEHHA under 587:4 -- in California; okay?	
	587:5 A. I do see that.	
	587:6 Q. Now, OEHHA, you've actually -- you've 587:7 actually worked at the California EPA; right?	
	587:8 A. That's right.	
	587:9 Q. And you understand there's something 587:10 called Proposition 65?	
	587:11 A. I do understand that.	
	587:12 Q. And under the Proposition 65 587:13 regulation, if IARC determines that a substance is 587:14 a probable or known human carcinogen, OEHHA and the 587:15 State of California has to also determine that it's 587:16 a human carcinogen; correct?	
	587:17 A. That is correct. They are not	

587:18 allowed additional scientific review. They simply
587:19 repeat what IARC says.

587:20 Q. Okay. So let me be clear, so you
587:21 agree, then, it follows IARC?

587:22 A. They do not do additional scientific
587:23 review. They simply repeat what IARC says.

587:24 Q. All right. So your testimony is that
587:25 the California EPA OEHHA does not do any scientific
588:1 review?

588:2 A. Following a determination that you're
588:3 describing from IARC, they do not do any subsequent
588:4 scientific review. They simply repeat what IARC
588:5 says.

RW73.10

600:18 - 601:11

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:38)

xReevesFINAL.194

600:18 Q. And isn't it true that Monsanto, once
600:19 this listing was made, went around and encouraged
600:20 people to send in letters to OEHHA to stop it?

600:21 A. Yes, because we believed it would be
600:22 false and misleading.

600:23 Q. Okay. And you had them send in
600:24 letters that you actually -- actually wrote for
600:25 them; right?

601:1 A. We -- when we do public comment
601:2 periods, particularly one where we feel strongly
601:3 about it, we will provide sample letters to people,
601:4 we will have what essentially amounts to a petition
601:5 where people are able to do that. In this case we
601:6 did it because we believe such a listing would be
601:7 false and misleading.

601:8 Q. Did you also do it for scientists?

601:9 A. To my knowledge, we spoke with
601:10 scientists about the false and misleading nature of
601:11 the proposed listing.

clear

605:4 - 606:10

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:02)

xReevesFINAL.195

605:4 Do you have any knowledge or do you
605:5 remember whether or not Monsanto authored any
605:6 letters to OEHHA in response to the notice of
605:7 listing for any scientists?

605:8 A. My recollection is that we provided
605:9 data and information that they have -- may have

605:10 found relevant --

605:11 Q. Okay.

605:12 A. -- to share. But, of course, OEHHA

605:13 wasn't going to consider it anyway.

605:14 Q. Okay. Well, I mean, why -- why'd you

605:15 do it, then?

605:16 A. We -- we submitted our own letter as

605:17 well. The hope was that perhaps if we have this

605:18 information out there, it may do some good, but

605:19 OEHHA has already told everyone we won't consider

605:20 any science in this comment period.

605:21 Q. Okay. So and just to be clear, you

605:22 guys submitted a letter that you knew wouldn't be

605:23 used?

605:24 A. It was our hope it could be used, the

605:25 letter that we wrote as -- on behalf of our

606:1 company.

606:2 Q. Mm-hmm.

606:3 A. But the language of the -- of the

606:4 announcement says they would not be considering any

606:5 scientific information.

606:6 Q. Okay. Well, I -- I -- I'm going to

606:7 challenge you on one of the things you said that,

606:8 that you guys just were -- were provided

606:9 background; okay?

606:10 I'm handing you a document, 78.

RW78.1

606:16 - 609:4

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:02:12)

xReevesFINAL.106

606:16 Q. Okay. Great. This is a -- an

606:17 internal email communication from Dr. Goldstein to

606:18 a guy named Dr. Samuel Cohen; right?

606:19 A. It -- it is an email from Dr.

606:20 Goldstein to Dr. Cohen. Dr. Cohen is not with

606:21 Monsanto.

606:22 Q. That's right, sorry. So Dr.

606:23 Goldstein obviously is.

606:24 A. That's right.

606:25 Q. And the Subject is "Glyphosate and

607:1 Prop 65 - Sam Cohen"?

607:2 A. That's correct.

607:3 Q. And this is a document Dr. Goldstein

RW78.1.1

607:4 prepared and did as part of his work at Monsanto?

607:5 A. That is correct.

607:6 Q. Okay. And the first email reads,

RW78.1.2

607:7 "Sam - Apologies that I was not able to get this

607:8 out yesterday. I wanted to provide you a draft

607:9 letter and was under the impression that a model

607:10 letter was available, but this was not the case (we

607:11 had models, but not appropriate to your expertise).

607:12 I consequently had to pull one together."

607:13 Do you see that?

607:14 A. I do see that.

607:15 Q. And if you look at the back of this

607:16 letter, this email exchange, there is an email

RW78.7

607:17 attachment.

607:18 Do you see that?

RW78.7.1

607:19 A. I do see that.

607:20 Q. And it is a draft letter; right?

607:21 A. I do see that.

607:22 Q. And it is -- if you look at the back,

607:23 it has a bunch of stuff and commentary about it and

607:24 then it has a "Sincerely."

RW78.9.1

607:25 Do you see that?

608:1 A. I do see that.

608:2 Q. And there's no signature; right?

608:3 A. That's correct.

608:4 Q. Okay. So Monsanto, at least in this

608:5 context, prepared a draft letter for Dr. Cohen;

608:6 right?

608:7 A. This actually reads very similar to a

608:8 letter Monsanto submitted, but he's -- Dr.

608:9 Goldstein here is explaining this commentary

608:10 throughout this about providing draft information,

608:11 people are able to do with it as they see fit. Dr.

608:12 Goldstein even admits he doesn't have, you know,

clear

608:13 much of the information that Dr. Cohen would

608:14 provide and he would be able to add in to this or

608:15 not. It would be up to Dr. Cohen what he does with

608:16 this. And again, it would not be considered by

608:17 OEHHA.

608:18 Q. All right. So let's be clear.

608:19 Monsanto wrote a letter for Dr. Cohen and gave it
608:20 to him?

608:21 A. We provided him a -- a draft of a
608:22 letter that he could work with as he saw fit, and
608:23 we -- Dr. Goldstein acknowledges in here many
608:24 times, edit as you see fit, you have other
608:25 information that I know you're more of an expert
609:1 in, and again we know, ultimately, this -- any
609:2 scientific information wasn't going to be
609:3 considered by OEHHA. They told us before the
609:4 comment period started.

609:5 - 609:8

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:10)

xReevesFINAL.197

609:5 Q. So let's go back to where we started.
609:6 I asked you if Monsanto ever wrote any letters for
609:7 any scientists. It appears, based on this
609:8 document, it did.

609:11 - 609:20

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:22)

xReevesFINAL.198

609:11 A. What he did is Dr. Goldstein gave Dr.
609:12 Cohen some information that he could use. Here is
609:13 a draft of something you want to work with. He
609:14 acknowledges that Dr. Gold -- that Dr. Cohen has
609:15 expertise in this area that Dr. Goldstein does not
609:16 himself possess, feel free to edit. And again, we
609:17 know OEHHA is not going to accept scientific
609:18 commentary to begin with.

609:19 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) Okay. So I'm
609:20 handing you a document 79.

RW79.2

609:22 - 612:3

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:02:04)

xReevesFINAL.199

609:22 A. All right.

609:23 Q. So this document is the letter that
609:24 Dr. Cohen sent to OEHHA; correct?

RW79.2.1

609:25 A. That is correct.

610:1 Q. And if you look, the last page of the
610:2 letter, it's actually signed by Dr. Cohen; right?

RW79.7.1

610:3 A. That is correct.

610:4 Q. And I don't see any reference to Dr.
610:5 Goldstein on here, do you?

610:6 A. No, because this is Dr. Cohen's work.

610:7 Q. Is it?

610:8 A. Yes, it is.

610:9 Q. Oh. Okay. I mean, we're on the last
610:10 page of that letter where the signature is. Let's
610:11 go back to there. And I'm looking at the -- at the
610:12 last page of the letter that was given to him from
610:13 -- from Dr. Goldstein. And if we're looking over
610:14 on the screen, you'll -- you'll see it. The last
610:15 paragraph in the draft letter begins with "In
610:16 closing."

RW7879.1

RW7879.1.1

610:17 You see that?

610:18 A. I do see that.

610:19 Q. And the letter that Dr. Cohen said
610:20 begins -- last paragraph begins "In closing";
610:21 right?

610:22 A. Yes. These two sentences appear to
610:23 be similar.

610:24 Q. I -- I don't know -- look, they
610:25 almost look identical; right? The first -- the
611:1 bottom one reads -- the one that was given to him
611:2 by Dr. -- Dr. Goldstein was, "In closing, I would
611:3 reiterate that regulatory authorities around the
611:4 world agree that there is no evidence that
611:5 glyphosate causes cancer, even at very high doses,
611:6 and that it is not genotoxic. I strongly disagree
611:7 with OEHHA's intention to list glyphosate under
611:8 Prop 65."

611:9 Do you see that?

611:10 A. I do see that.

611:11 Q. Those are the words that Dr.
611:12 Goldstein wrote?

611:13 A. And those are the words Dr. Cohen
611:14 agreed with and left in his letter under his own
611:15 decision-making.

611:16 Q. Oh, did you talk to him?

611:17 A. No, this is his own decision. He's
611:18 got his name on here. The letter -- the email from
611:19 Dr. Goldstein says, edit as you see fit --

clear

611:20 Q. Yeah, and he didn't.

611:21 A. -- add your own expertise in. So we
611:22 also see common paragraphs here about IARC and
611:23 their process and their scientific shortcomings

Page/Line	Source	ID
612:17 - 612:20	<p>611:24 that Dr. Cohen apparently added in, but ultimately, 611:25 at the end of the day, OEHHA wasn't going to be 612:1 considering scientific information -- 612:2 Q. I understand. 612:3 A. -- such as this letter. Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:10)</p>	xReevesFINAL.200
612:23 - 613:14	<p>612:17 Q. Okay. So this is a futile letter. 612:18 This is your own word, sir, and to be clear, it's 612:19 ghost written; correct? 612:20 A. No, that is incorrect. Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:26) 612:23 How is that not 612:24 ghost writing? 612:25 A. There is additional information in 613:1 here that's -- Dr. Cohen appears to have produced 613:2 himself. 613:3 Q. Fair enough. That paragraph. This 613:4 last one right here, that's ghost written? 613:5 A. I would not agree that's ghost 613:6 written. 613:7 Q. What -- what would you call that, 613:8 sir? 613:9 A. Dr. Cohen was free to do what he 613:10 wanted with the language in that letter that Dr. 613:11 Goldstein shared with him as an example of 613:12 information. 613:13 Q. And he chose to let Monsanto write 613:14 his own closing paragraph?</p>	xReevesFINAL.201
613:17 - 613:24	<p>Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:09) 613:17 A. I'm sorry, I can't speak for what was 613:18 in Dr. Cohen's mind. All I can say is he chose to 613:19 leave it in here because this is his work sent from 613:20 the University of Nebraska. 613:21 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) So your testimony, 613:22 this is not ghost writing? 613:23 A. It is not ghost writing. 613:24 Q. Okay.</p>	xReevesFINAL.202
613:24 - 614:3	<p>Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:11) 613:24 Q. Not ghost 613:25 writing. But it's verbatim; right?</p>	xReevesFINAL.203

Page/Line	Source	ID
614:9 - 614:16	<p>614:1 A. Those two sentences are the same as 614:2 what Dr. Goldstein provided, but the remainder of 614:3 the letter is quite different.</p> <p>Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:12)</p>	xReevesFINAL_204
615:14 - 615:22	<p>614:9 So notwithstanding 614:10 the futility of discussing science with OEHHA, Dr. 614:11 Farmer went out and actually met with OEHHA, didn't 614:12 she? 614:13 A. She did. 614:14 Q. She actually came to California; 614:15 right? 614:16 A. She did.</p> <p>Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:16)</p>	xReevesFINAL_205
617:18 - 617:21	<p>615:14 Q. Discuss science that you've testified 615:15 was futile? 615:16 A. They, in their -- in OEHHA's own 615:17 notice, they said they would not be considering 615:18 science as part of the public comment period. 615:19 Q. So why did she go? 615:20 A. Because it's important to present the 615:21 science any opportunity you have even, if the odds 615:22 are low that they're going to listen.</p> <p>Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:04)</p>	xReevesFINAL_206
617:25 - 618:11	<p>617:18 All right, Doctor, I've handed you 617:19 Exhibit 81. 617:20 Do you see that? 617:21 A. I do see that.</p> <p>Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:21)</p> <p>617:25 Q. All right. So this is dated July 618:1 2017; right? 618:2 A. That's correct. 618:3 Q. And this was two years after the 618:4 original listing; correct? 618:5 A. It was approximately two years, I 618:6 would agree. 618:7 Q. And this was specifically the final 618:8 decision of OEHHA to actually list glyphosate as a 618:9 chemical known to cause cancer; right? 618:10 A. Yes. They are announcing that 618:11 effective July 7th.</p>	xReevesFINAL_207

Page/Line	Source	ID
619:20 - 619:20	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:02)	xReevesFINAL.208
	619:20 Q. I'm handing you a document, 82.	
619:24 - 620:25	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:44)	xReevesFINAL.209
	619:24 Q. So this was the Notice of Proposed	
	619:25 Rulemaking, specifically the no significant risk	
	620:1 limit for glyphosate; right?	
	620:2 A. That is correct.	
	620:3 Q. And this is posted in 2017; right?	
	620:4 A. That's correct.	
	620:5 Q. And again this, like the original	
	620:6 listing, this one is asking for you to submit any	
	620:7 comments; correct?	
	620:8 A. That is correct.	
	620:9 Q. Scientific comments; right?	
	620:10 A. In -- in this one they're asking for	
	620:11 critique of the work they did that is based	
	620:12 directly off of IARC's work --	
	620:13 Q. Precise --	
	620:14 A. -- so that the scope of the	
	620:15 information they can consider is limited to what	
	620:16 IARC cited.	
	620:17 Q. Sure. But they are considering	
	620:18 scientific information; correct?	
	620:19 A. Yes, on that -- on that limited frame	
	620:20 of information from IARC.	
	620:21 Q. Okay, great. And they actually --	
	620:22 they submitted a -- issued a report that they asked	
	620:23 for people to have comments about; right?	
	620:24 A. That is correct.	
	620:25 Q. Giving you Exhibit 83. Do you see	
620:25 - 621:4	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:06)	xReevesFINAL.210
	620:25 Q. Do you see	
	621:1 this document, sir?	
	621:2 A. I do. I just want to make sure I'm	
	621:3 familiar with the whole thing.	
	621:4 Q. Sure.	
621:5 - 621:12	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:15)	xReevesFINAL.211
	621:5 A. All right.	
	621:6 Q. Okay. So this is a document that	
	621:7 reflects the Initial Statement of Reasons for	

Page/Line	Source	ID
627:8 - 627:13	<p>621:8 Glyphosate; right? 621:9 A. That's correct. 621:10 Q. And this document was submitted and 621:11 prepared by OEHHA; correct? 621:12 A. That is correct.</p>	xReevesFINAL.212
630:13 - 630:17	<p>Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:09) 627:8 But remember when we were talking 627:9 about Sam Cohen a second ago? 627:10 A. Yes, mm-hmm. 627:11 Q. Is he a paid Monsanto consultant? 627:12 A. He has consulted with us on some 627:13 topics in the past.</p>	xReevesFINAL.213
630:18 - 631:23	<p>Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:08) 630:13 Q. Okay. Great. All right. So going 630:14 back to this document in front of you, please let 630:15 me know when you're ready to discuss it. 630:16 A. And this is 84? 630:17 Q. That's right.</p> <p>Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:54) 630:18 A. All right. 630:19 Q. Okay, great. This is an internal 630:20 email exchange within Monsanto? 630:21 A. That is correct. 630:22 Q. It was document made in the regular 630:23 course of Monsanto's business? 630:24 A. It would appear so based on the 630:25 evidence here. 631:1 Q. Great. 631:2 A. Based on the text. 631:3 Q. And so you see a -- there is a -- an 631:4 email on the front and there's an attachment. 631:5 Do you see that? 631:6 A. I do see that. 631:7 Q. Let's go to the attachment. First 631:8 page is Monsanto. Social Media Outreach for 631:9 Monsanto's California Sites and People, A Request 631:10 for Support. 631:11 Do you see that? 631:12 A. I do see that. 631:13 Q. And then we turn the page. Broad</p>	xReevesFINAL.214
		RW84.1
		RW84.1.1
		RW84.3
		RW84.4

Page/Line	Source	ID
631:14 Objective. "The primary objective and challenge 631:15 that our social media plan is working to solve is 631:16 to maintain Monsanto's Freedom to Operate, with a 631:17 particular focus on California people and 631:18 interests."		RW84.4.1
631:19 Do you see that?		
631:20 A. I do see that.		
631:21 Q. The Challenge. "The company is held 631:22 up as the target of various interest groups, 631:23 including those opposing		RW84.4.2
631:25 - 632:9	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:26)	xReevesFINAL.215
631:25 pesticides, and more. Their efforts 632:1 have restricted our FTO," or Freedom to Operate, 632:2 "in various ways including blocking sales of safe, 632:3 sustainable solutions in certain areas, limiting 632:4 our ability to attract and keep employees, imposing 632:5 costly environmental restrictions on use of our 632:6 products, limiting our development of new 632:7 solutions, and ultimately sales of our products."		
632:8 Do you see that?		
632:9 A. I do see that.		
656:1 - 656:16	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:38)	xReevesFINAL.216
656:1 go back to this Exhibit 73. It's this chart we -- 656:2 we were using regarding regulatory reviews and 656:3 what have you.		RW73.10
656:4 And so we -- we talked a little bit		
656:5 about OEHHA; right?		
656:6 A. Yes, we did.		
656:7 Q. Following IARC; right?		
656:8 A. That's correct.		
656:9 Q. And then we also -- we also discussed 656:10 that it had -- does an NSRL analysis?		
656:11 A. That's correct.		RW73.11
656:12 Q. Okay, great. And -- and OSHA, we 656:13 talked about it briefly but I'll just fill it in.		
656:14 My understanding is that the Material Safety Data 656:15 Sheet requires a disclosure -- a disclosure of the 656:16 IARC classification.		
656:18 - 657:7	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:41)	xReevesFINAL.217
656:18 A. I have seen the -- the Material		

Page/Line	Source	ID
	656:19 Safety Data Sheet for glyphosate. It contains a	
	656:20 mention of IARC and knows that we do not agree with	
	656:21 it because it is not factually correct.	
	656:22 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) All right. So	
	656:23 discloses IARC. Okay.	RW73.12
	656:24 A. And notes our disagreement with their	
	656:25 conclusions.	
	657:1 Q. Sure. Notes MON disagreement; okay?	RW73.13
	657:2 A. That's correct.	
	657:3 Q. Okay. Great. And then we talked	
	657:4 about the ASTD -- S -- ATSDR. That's a -- an	
	657:5 evaluation that's in progress?	
	657:6 A. That is undergoing peer review at	RW73.14
	657:7 this time according to the ATSDR website.	
657:21 - 658:6	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:18)	xReevesFINAL.218
	657:21 Q. Okay, cool. So we've kind of covered	
	657:22 a couple of these different groups, and then we	
	657:23 look at the OPP; okay?	
	657:24 A. Yes, I see that.	
	657:25 Q. So the OPP issued a report; right?	
	658:1 A. Are you talking about the issue	
	658:2 paper?	
	658:3 Q. Yeah.	
	658:4 A. That the -- oh, yes. They -- they	
	658:5 issued a -- issue paper on carcinogenicity of	
	658:6 glyphosate.	
659:21 - 660:19	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:46)	xReevesFINAL.219
	659:21 Q. All right. So there's the OPP. And	
	659:22 then so we have the report; right? Which I'm	
	659:23 calling it -- you called it a white paper?	
	659:24 A. Yeah, they describe it as a white	
	659:25 paper.	
	660:1 Q. White paper. And then that was	RW73.15
	660:2 submitted to the SAP; right?	RW73.16
	660:3 A. Yes, for peer review.	
	660:4 Q. And that's a Scientific Advisory	
	660:5 Panel?	
	660:6 A. That's correct.	
	660:7 Q. And the Scientific Advisory Panel is	
	660:8 a group of -- of independent experts who	

660:9 essentially peer review the OPP's work; right?

660:10 A. That's right. They're -- they

660:11 require -- one of the main requirements is not

660:12 being an agency employee already.

660:13 Q. Monsanto took issue with people who

660:14 were going to participate on the SAP; correct?

660:15 A. That is correct.

660:16 Q. Specifically a guy named Dr. Infante?

660:17 A. That is correct.

clear

660:18 Q. Infante. I-n-f-a-n-t-e.

660:19 A. That's correct.

660:20 - 661:4

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:30)

xReevesFINAL.220

660:20 Q. Why did Monsanto object to having Dr.

660:21 Infante be involved with the SAP?

660:22 A. Our concern -- we have a letter

660:23 actually. As an industry, CropLife submitted it.

660:24 The -- the letter itself speaks to some conflicts

660:25 of interest that Dr. Infante appeared to have.

661:1 That information was shared with EPA and then he

661:2 was no longer on the SAP. There was never a

661:3 statement one way or the other about how EPA

661:4 reached their conclusion.

662:5 - 662:16

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:26)

xReevesFINAL.221

662:5 Q. And so to be clear, Monsanto objected

662:6 to a specific person participating, and that person

662:7 no longer participated.

662:8 A. The letter came from CropLife, an

662:9 agency of which we are a -- or a trade association

662:10 of which we are a member. The specific reasons for

662:11 his non-participation, EPA we never spoke out

662:12 about.

662:13 Q. Mons -- Monsanto --

662:14 A. Well, actually, they said he was

662:15 unavailable. I'm sorry. That was their statement,

662:16 he was unavailable.

663:15 - 664:24

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:31)

xReevesFINAL.222

663:15 Q. Okay. And you would agree that the

663:16 Scientific Advisory Panel that was convened and did

663:17 review the OPP's report was -- was a group of good

663:18 scientists?

663:19 A. So I don't have personal experience
 663:20 with those people. Monsanto's position is you want
 663:21 to have the best science in front of a -- a
 663:22 impartial group of people at the Science Advisory
 663:23 Panel so they can conduct an adequate peer review.

663:24 Q. Does Monsanto have any evidence or
 663:25 reason to believe that the SAP was not impartial?

664:1 A. No, it simply -- the concern that
 664:2 industry expressed prior to it was just to make
 664:3 sure, please make sure you've done all -- taken all
 664:4 efforts to make sure this is impartial.

664:5 Q. Now, before the SAP was convened,
 664:6 Monsanto's CEO, Hugh Grant, met with the EPA;
 664:7 correct?

664:8 A. That is my understanding, yes.

664:9 Q. And he specifically asked the EPA not
 664:10 to convene the SAP; correct?

664:11 A. Um, my understanding is that Mr.
 664:12 Grant shared the industry's concern that there was
 664:13 no SAP necessary, but if it did occur, please make
 664:14 sure it is unbiased and scientifically balanced.

664:15 Q. Okay. I'm handing you Exhibit 87.
 664:16 This is a copy of the Scientific Advisory Panel
 664:17 report; correct?

664:18 A. That is correct.

664:19 Q. And this is a document that you
 664:20 yourself -- and this is -- this -- just on the --
 664:21 before I move off from the chart we're looking at,
 664:22 and you can see up here on the screen, sir, that
 664:23 this is the SAP that's under -- that's -- that's
 664:24 reviewing the OPP work; right?

RW73.16.1

665:19 - 666:2

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:15)

xReevesFINAL.223

665:19 Q. All right. So you'd agree this is a
 665:20 fairly substantial report?

RW87.1

665:21 A. It -- it is --

665:22 Q. 99 pages; right?

665:23 A. Yeah, 99 pages. It's a lot of
 665:24 reading.

RW87.1.1

665:25 Q. Okay. And it was issued on March 16,
 666:1 2017; right?

Page/Line	Source	ID
670:3 - 670:16	<p>666:2 A. That's correct.</p> <p>Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:23)</p> <p>670:3 Q. Okay. Okay. And if we -- if we --</p> <p>670:4 if we open up the -- the document, in the</p> <p>670:5 Introduction on page 11, you see that there's</p> <p>670:6 Welcome and Opening Remarks.</p> <p>670:7 Do you see that?</p> <p>670:8 A. Yes, I see that.</p> <p>670:9 Q. And that was by Jack Housenger;</p> <p>670:10 right?</p> <p>670:11 A. That's correct.</p> <p>670:12 Q. And he was the director of the OPP;</p> <p>670:13 right?</p> <p>670:14 A. That's correct.</p> <p>670:15 Q. And he's someone that Monsanto has</p> <p>670:16 had significant personal interactions with.</p>	<p>xReevesFINAL.224</p> <p>RW87.13</p> <p>RW87.13.1</p>
670:19 - 671:4	<p>Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:22)</p> <p>670:19 A. Yeah, I'm not sure about personal</p> <p>670:20 interactions of any sort. What I can tell you is</p> <p>670:21 we interact with regulatory agencies and the people</p> <p>670:22 that work there to discuss science and the</p> <p>670:23 proceedings in front of them and how our products</p> <p>670:24 are proceeding through a review.</p> <p>670:25 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) In fact, I mean, I</p> <p>671:1 -- you guys have produced text messages between</p> <p>671:2 your regulatory guys and -- and Mr. -- Dr.</p> <p>671:3 Housenger; right?</p> <p>671:4 A. I have seen those.</p>	<p>xReevesFINAL.225</p> <p>clear</p>
689:10 - 689:18	<p>Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:19)</p> <p>689:10 Q. Okay. Okay, great. So let's talk</p> <p>689:11 about the EPA a little bit and then we can be done</p> <p>689:12 for the -- done with -- done with my questioning.</p> <p>689:13 Okay?</p> <p>689:14 A. All right.</p> <p>689:15 Q. Now, we discussed this earlier, but</p> <p>689:16 there are text messages between various EPA</p> <p>689:17 officials and Monsanto; correct?</p> <p>689:18 A. That is my understanding.</p>	<p>xReevesFINAL.226</p>
690:1 - 690:8	<p>Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:15)</p> <p>690:1 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) Doctor, I have</p>	<p>xReevesFINAL.227</p>

Page/Line	Source	ID
	690:2 handed you the next exhibit. I believe it's 88.	
	690:3 A. That's correct.	
	690:4 Q. This is a series of text messages;	
	690:5 correct?	
	690:6 A. That is correct.	
	690:7 Q. And these were text messages pulled	
	690:8 from Mr. Dan Jenkins' cell phone; correct?	
691:14 - 691:15	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:03)	xReevesFINAL_228
	691:14 A. And so if it is from -- from Dan	
	691:15 Jenkins' phone, that's our understanding.	
692:20 - 693:1	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:09)	xReevesFINAL_229
	692:20 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) You read Dan	
	692:21 Jenkins' deposition; right?	
	692:22 A. I have read his deposition.	
	692:23 Q. In his deposition he testified this	
	692:24 was from his phone, didn't he?	
	692:25 A. And this -- I remember him discussing	
	693:1 that. If this is that -- those MONGLY numbers --	
693:16 - 693:21	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:08)	xReevesFINAL_230
	693:16 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) I'm representing to	RW88.5
	693:17 you this was, in fact, the document shown to -- to	
	693:18 Mr. Jenkins in his deposition and he testified that	
	693:19 this was from his phone. Do you have any reason to	
	693:20 dispute that?	
	693:21 A. No, I do not.	
694:4 - 694:9	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:10)	xReevesFINAL_231
	694:4 Q. All right. And the way it works is	RW88.5.1
	694:5 this says "Message, Outgoing," and that means it's	
	694:6 something being sent from the phone, and then	
	694:7 there's an "Incoming" that means the message is	
	694:8 coming in; okay?	
	694:9 A. Okay.	
698:7 - 699:18	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:17)	xReevesFINAL_232
	698:7 Q. Okay, good. Then there's some --	RW88.4
	698:8 some personal conversations and then looks like	
	698:9 there's an outgoing message to Christina Lawrence.	RW88.4.2
	698:10 You see that?	
	698:11 A. I do see that.	
	698:12 Q. What is -- who is Christina Lawrence?	
	698:13 Do you know who that is?	

698:14 A. Yes. She was on the regulatory
698:15 policy and scientific affairs team. Well, she was
698:16 the lead of our -- our international team for that
698:17 group.

698:18 Q. Okay. And looks like he sends a
698:19 message to her. "Yep, I'm at EPA now for
698:20 glyphosate."

698:21 Do you see that?

698:22 A. I do see that.

698:23 Q. And this is dated March 30th, 2015?

698:24 A. I do see that.

698:25 Q. So this is after the public
699:1 announcement of the IARC classification?

699:2 A. That is correct.

699:3 Q. Okay. Do you know what Mr. Jenkins
699:4 communicated with -- to EPA at that meeting?

699:5 A. That, I am not aware of. I believe
699:6 there is information on the docket at EPA that --
699:7 where they shared a slide deck that we presented,
699:8 but that -- whether or not that was this meeting, I
699:9 don't know.

699:10 Q. Okay. All right. So let's turn to
699:11 the next page, jump ahead quite a bit. Do you know
699:12 who Mary Manibusan is?

RW88.5

RW88.5.2

699:13 A. Yes, she is a consultant at -- oh,
699:14 I'm trying to remember the name of the company.
699:15 The -- Exponent.

699:16 Q. Okay. And she formerly worked at the
699:17 EPA?

699:18 A. That is my understanding, yes.

699:22 - 701:20

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:41)

xReevesFINAL.233

699:22 Q. Okay. And Mary Manibusan was
699:23 actually helping Monsanto and consulting with
699:24 Monsanto with regards to EPA issues?

699:25 A. It -- it could be, from this. I
700:1 haven't seen the actual document. I know we work
700:2 with Exponent, the company she works for.

700:3 Q. Okay. All right. So the one saying
700:4 "Message, Outgoing," it's on -- looks like it's
700:5 June 18, 2015.

RW88.5.3

700:6 You see that?

700:7 A. Yes, I do see that.

700:8 Q. And that's to Mary Manibusan.

700:9 You see that?

700:10 A. I do see that.

700:11 Q. And Mr. Jenkins says, "Hi Mary, do

700:12 you know folks at ATSDR in HHS?"

700:13 Do you see that?

700:14 A. I do see that.

700:15 Q. And that's that -- that agency that

700:16 was looking at glyphosate that we talked about

700:17 within the CDC?

700:18 A. That's correct.

700:19 Q. Okay. And then she says, "Yes.

700:20 Where specifically?"

700:21 You see that?

700:22 A. I do see that.

700:23 Q. And then he responds, "On Tox

700:24 Profiles."

700:25 You see that?

701:1 A. I do see that.

701:2 Q. And then she responds -- or then

701:3 looks like he says "yep" for some reason and she

701:4 responds, "It's been a while but I can."

701:5 Do you see?

701:6 A. Yes, I do see that.

701:7 Q. And then looks like she sends another

701:8 message right after that, "Sweetheart - I know lots

701:9 of people. You can count on me."

701:10 You see that?

701:11 A. I do see that.

701:12 Q. And then it looks like she says --

701:13 and then he says, a message to her, "We're trying

701:14 to do everything we can from having a domestic IARC

701:15 occur with this group. May need your help."

701:16 Do you see that?

701:17 A. I do see those words on the page.

701:18 Q. A domestic IARC, that would be a -- a

701:19 determination by ATSDR that Roundup is a probable

701:20 human carcinogen?

RW88.5.4

RW88.5.5

RW88.5.6

RW88.5.7

RW88.5.8

Page/Line	Source	ID
701:22 - 702:13	<p>Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:46)</p> <p>701:22 A. Yeah, I -- I'd be guessing if I had 701:23 to put myself in -- into what is Dan trying to say 701:24 here, or what is Mr. Jenkins trying to say here. 701:25 The -- my knowledge of ATSDR, in many cases, when 702:1 they look at a pesticide, they are looking back to 702:2 EPA to understand what did the agency conclude. 702:3 In some cases they will rely on that 702:4 very heavily. In some cases I have seen where 702:5 they, I don't -- they did not do the -- they did 702:6 not reach the same conclusion as EPA and it was 702:7 unclear as to whether or not they had reviewed 702:8 EPA's risk assessment. 702:9 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) Okay. We actually 702:10 have a -- a discussion, an email that kind of 702:11 discusses what they were talking about. I'm giving 702:12 you Exhibit 89. 702:13 A. All right.</p>	xReevesFINAL_234
702:17 - 702:20	<p>Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:03)</p> <p>702:17 Q. And keep those text messages handy, 702:18 we are going to go back to them. 702:19 A. Going back, okay. 702:20 Q. Yeah.</p>	xReevesFINAL_235
702:22 - 706:9	<p>Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:03:04)</p> <p>702:22 Q. All right. So this is a series of 702:23 internal email communications within Monsanto; 702:24 correct? 702:25 A. Yes, that is correct. 703:1 Q. And these documents were created in 703:2 the regular course of business; right? 703:3 A. It appears so. 703:4 Q. Okay, great. And if we start at the 703:5 very back of this proceeding -- well, starting on 703:6 page ending in 698. 703:7 You see that? 703:8 A. Yes, I do see that. 703:9 Q. This is an email from Michael Dykes. 703:10 You see that? 703:11 A. I do see that. 703:12 Q. Monsanto employee?</p>	xReevesFINAL_236

703:13 A. Yes, he is.

703:14 Q. And he's --

703:15 A. He was at the time.

703:16 Q. Okay. And he -- he issued -- he's --

703:17 it's titled a Report on Follow Up Discussion.

RW89.4.2

703:18 You see that?

703:19 A. I do see that.

703:20 Q. And then down here it says, "I then

RW89.4.3

703:21 asked for an update on ATSDR. He said they had --

703:22 they had checked with ATSDR and they were in fact

703:23 doing a glyphosate review."

703:24 You see that?

703:25 A. I do see that.

704:1 Q. Okay. "I explained that this

704:2 confirmed what we already understood but our

704:3 question was about the purpose and scope of such a

704:4 duplicative review by ATSDR. I told him that we

704:5 were concerned that ATSDR may come out any day with

704:6 a report."

704:7 You see that?

704:8 A. I do see that.

704:9 Q. And this is back in 2015; right?

704:10 A. Yes, it is.

704:11 Q. Okay. So over three years ago?

704:12 A. That is correct.

704:13 Q. Okay. And then Dan Jenkins responds.

RW89.3

704:14 You see that?

704:15 A. 697, let's make sure I got this --

RW89.3.1

704:16 Q. Yeah.

704:17 A. Yes.

704:18 Q. And he -- he says, "Can you clarify

704:19 what you're referring to with -- regarding reports

704:20 from ATSDR? They're not scheduled to put out

704:21 anything (sic) for public comment until October -

704:22 has this been accelerated?"

704:23 Do you see that?

704:24 A. That is correct.

704:25 Q. And then Michael Dykes responds, "The

RW89.3.2

705:1 person I talked with at HHS said they had checked

705:2 with ATSDR and confirmed their review of

705:3 glyphosate. I explained that their review was
705:4 duplicative and I was now concerned about another
705:5 glyphosate review coming any day. He said he
705:6 didn't know when but didn't expect anything out of
705:7 ATSDR for at least two weeks."

705:8 Do you see that?

705:9 A. I do see that.

705:10 Q. Okay. And then we have this email

RW89.2

705:11 from Dan Jenkins.

705:12 Do you see that? The next page.

RW89.2.1

705:13 A. Yes, I do see that.

705:14 Q. And it's dated June 23rd, 2015.

705:15 Do you see that?

705:16 A. Yes, I do.

705:17 Q. And he said, "Spoke to EPA." Right?

RW89.2.2

705:18 A. Yes.

705:19 Q. "ATSDR Director and Branch Chief have

705:20 promised Jack Housenger (Director of the US Office

705:21 of Pesticide Programs) to put their report 'on

705:22 hold' until after EPA releases its preliminary risk

705:23 assessment (PRA) for glyphosate."

705:24 Do you see that?

705:25 A. I do see that.

706:1 Q. So it looks like Mr. Jenkins was

706:2 speaking with Dr. Housenger at the OPP; correct?

706:3 A. Well, he -- he spoke to EPA. It's

706:4 unclear whether this came straight from Dr.

706:5 Housenger or from someone else.

706:6 Q. Okay. And according to what Mr.

706:7 Jenkins is saying here, is Jack Housenger reached

706:8 out to the ATSDR and they said they would hold off

706:9 on the report until the EPA did its report; right?

706:11 - 708:25

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:02:21)

xReevesFINAL.237

706:11 A. It -- it doesn't say exactly how this

706:12 occurred. It's -- it describes communications

706:13 between the ATS -- ATSDR Director and Branch Chief

706:14 and the Director of the Office of Pesticide

706:15 Programs but it doesn't -- it doesn't say exactly,

706:16 you know, who talked -- you know, who was calling

706:17 whom or -- or where this information specifically

706:18 came from.

706:19 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) Okay. It reads on,
706:20 "EPA will not have the final meeting of its
706:21 internal cancer review technical group until after
706:22 the IARC Monographs are published, and thus will
706:23 not put out the PRA until after this (guessing this
706:24 would mean around mid-August)."

706:25 Do you see that?

707:1 A. I do see that.

707:2 Q. And then it says, "ATSDR has cited a
707:3 GAO Audit report in arguing that their process is
707:4 distinguishable and not duplicative."

707:5 Do you see that?

707:6 A. I do see that.

707:7 Q. "They look at different endpoints and
707:8 told EPA they don't 'make a call on cancer,' but I
707:9 think we should continue to be cautious."

707:10 Do you see that?

707:11 A. I do see that.

707:12 Q. All right. So then Bill Heydens, Dr.

707:13 Heydens, responds; right?

707:14 A. I see that.

707:15 Q. He writes, "Distinguishable and not
707:16 duplicative? Seriously? And I will believe the
707:17 not 'making a call on cancer' part when I see it.
707:18 Anyway, at least they know they are being watched,
707:19 and hopefully that keeps them from doing anything
707:20 too stupid."

707:21 Do you see that?

707:22 A. I see those words on the page.

707:23 Q. Okay. Was it Monsanto's practice and
707:24 policies to let agencies know they were being
707:25 watched?

708:1 A. No, it is not Monsanto's practice or
708:2 policy.

708:3 Q. Okay. So then Daniel Jenkins
708:4 responds; right?

708:5 A. Yes.

708:6 Q. He says, "Completely agree. Mary
708:7 Manibusan told me yesterday that EPA has had

RW80.2.3

RW80.1

RW80.1.2

RW80.1.3

708:8 several issues in the past with ATSDR coming to
 708:9 different conclusions. She said they tried to
 708:10 execute several memorandums of understanding but
 708:11 were unsuccessful. She describes ATSDR as being
 708:12 very conservative and IARC like in regard (sic), as
 708:13 well as the fact that they are hazard based."

708:14 Do you see that?

708:15 A. I do see that.

708:16 Q. This "Makes me very nervous, but I

708:17 asked Jack whether or not he was worried about
 708:18 ATSDR coming out with something different and he
 708:19 said he wasn't and I think he was being genuine."

708:20 Do you see that?

708:21 A. I do see that.

708:22 Q. All right. So Mr. Jenkins is -- is

708:23 apparently having conversations about what Dr.

708:24 Housenger at the EPA thinks the ATSDR is going to

708:25 do.

RW88.1.4

709:2 - 709:6

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:13)

xReevesFINAL.238

709:2 A. He says he asked Jack, Dr.

709:3 Housenger's first name is Jack, but beyond that, it

709:4 -- Mr. Jenkins is not more specific.

709:5 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) Okay. So let's go

709:6 back to these text messages.

709:7 - 710:4

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:05)

xReevesFINAL.239

709:7 And it looks like, if you turn to the page ending

709:8 in 250?

709:9 A. Yes, I see that.

709:10 Q. All right. And we see close to the

709:11 bottom -- well -- well, I'll stop right there. You

709:12 see actually in the middle -- middle part of this

709:13 we have a series of text messages and they're

709:14 actually, looks like they're with Jack Housenger,

709:15 aren't they?

709:16 A. Okay. Okay. Let me -- let me just

709:17 make sure I understand how that's set up. So

709:18 outgoing gives you the date, the time, the

709:19 statement, and then it says who it went to; is that

709:20 correct?

709:21 Q. That's right.

RW88.6

RW88.6.1

709:22 A. Okay. So that -- this would -- this
 709:23 is saying this message went to Jack Housenger.
 709:24 Q. Yeah. For example, it says right
 709:25 here, on September 23rd, 2015, Mr. Jenkins texted
 710:1 Jack Housenger, "Dr. Oz is airing a segment
 710:2 tomorrow on glyphosate safety."
 710:3 You see that?
 710:4 A. I do see that.

710:22 - 711:5

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:12)

xReevesFINAL.240

710:22 Q. Okay. Then it looks like he sent
 710:23 another message to -- to Jack Housenger, "We will
 710:24 be posting a statement as soon as it airs."
 710:25 Do you see that?
 711:1 A. I do see that.
 711:2 Q. And then it looks like another
 711:3 message, "Cancer and IARC will come up."
 711:4 Do you see that?
 711:5 A. I do see that.

712:10 - 713:25

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:19)

xReevesFINAL.241

712:10 Q. Would it be common for Mr. Jenkins to
 712:11 be letting the director of the OPP know about a
 712:12 television show going on the air?
 712:13 A. It -- it -- it may have been for --
 712:14 for Mr. Jenkins. We don't have a policy at the
 712:15 company either way.
 712:16 Q. All right. So then --
 712:17 A. It would be up to him.
 712:18 Q. -- at the bottom of this -- we're
 712:19 getting close to being done here -- we have an
 712:20 outgoing message, do you see that, to Ty Vaughn
 712:21 again?
 712:22 A. Yes, I do see that.
 712:23 Q. And just to be clear, who is Ty
 712:24 Vaughn?
 712:25 A. Ty Vaughn, at this time, is the head
 713:1 of -- let me make sure I get this straight. He is
 713:2 -- so he is the -- the head of our regulatory -- so
 713:3 he's the head of the regulatory branch of a larger
 713:4 organization. Is regulatory and government
 713:5 affairs, so he's got the regulatory side.

RW88.6.2

713:6 Q. Okay. So he's kind of over the -- a
713:7 lot of the regulatory interactions with the EPA?

713:8 A. Yeah, so that would -- that would be,
713:9 for example, Dan Jenkins would have reported to Ty.

713:10 Q. Okay. And then it says, "Spoke to
713:11 EPA re gly"; right?

713:12 A. Yes.

713:13 Q. And that he says again, "Jones is
713:14 being briefed next then released PRA (still
713:15 October)."

713:16 You see that?

713:17 A. That is correct.

713:18 Q. He says next, "They will publish full
713:19 IARC analysis."

713:20 Do you see that?

713:21 A. I do see that.

713:22 Q. And then he says, "They feel they
713:23 aligned EFSA on phone call."

713:24 Do you see that?

713:25 A. I do see that.

714:23 - 715:15

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:37)

714:23 Do you know what he's referring to
714:24 there?

714:25 A. That I do not know.

715:1 Q. Do you know if the EPA placed any
715:2 pressure on EFSA to reach a specific conclusion?

715:3 A. Yeah, I am not aware of anything
715:4 along those lines.

715:5 Q. Okay. Then it says, "Pushed them to
715:6 make sure ATSDR is assigned, they said they would."

715:7 Do you see that?

715:8 A. I do see those words.

715:9 Q. Okay. Is it your understanding that
715:10 the FDA -- I'm sorry, the EPA agreed to ensure that
715:11 the ATSDR was aligned?

715:12 A. I have -- I have never heard any --
715:13 in my personal capacity, I have never heard anyone
715:14 at EPA saying they were going to tell ATSDR what to
715:15 do.

715:21 - 716:16

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:46)

RW88.6.3

RW88.6.4

RW88.6.5

xReevesFINAL.242

RW88.6.6

xReevesFINAL.243

715:21 So I'm handing you Exhibit --

clear

715:22 Exhibit 90.

715:23 A. All right.

715:24 Q. And actually, before I hand this to

715:25 you, I just want to ask you what you know -- know

716:1 about a guy named Jess Rowland.

716:2 A. My understanding is he was an EPA

716:3 employee and -- okay, making sure. And he worked

716:4 for the Office of Pesticide Programs and he was one

716:5 of the people who signed the final CARC report.

716:6 Q. Okay. So he was one of the people

716:7 that was -- obviously played some sort of role in

716:8 generating the CARC's analysis?

716:9 A. Yes, he was part of that process.

716:10 Q. Okay. And that was the preliminary

716:11 risk assessment we were talking about in those text

716:12 messages?

716:13 A. That -- that was my understanding,

716:14 yes.

716:15 Q. Okay. And I'm handing you Exhibit

RW00.1

716:16 90.

716:24 - 719:6

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:39)

xReevesFINAL.244

716:24 Okay. So you have Exhibit

716:25 90. This is a series of email exchanges within

717:1 Monsanto; correct?

RW00.1.1

717:2 A. That is correct.

717:3 Q. And an email exchange that involves

717:4 Dr. Heydens?

717:5 A. That is correct.

717:6 Q. Jenkins and Jennifer Listello?

717:7 A. That is correct.

717:8 Q. Okay. And these documents, these

717:9 emails were exchanged in the regular course of

717:10 Monsanto's business; correct?

717:11 A. That is correct.

717:12 Q. All right. I want to draw your

717:13 attention to an email from Dan Jenkins dated April

RW00.1.2

717:14 28, 2015.

717:15 Do you see that?

717:16 A. I do see that.

Page/Line

Source

ID

717:17 Q. And he says, "Hey - cc'ing Jen. So
717:18 Jess called me out of the blue this morning."

RW90.1.3

717:19 Do you see that?

717:20 A. I do see that.

717:21 Q. And this is referring to Jess

717:22 Rowland?

717:23 A. Yes, that is -- that is my

717:24 understanding.

717:25 Q. And then it starts with a quotation

RW90.2

718:1 mark.

718:2 Do you see that?

718:3 A. I do see that.

RW90.2.1

718:4 Q. And just to be clear, this is dated

718:5 April 28th; right?

718:6 A. Yes, it is. April 28th.

718:7 Q. So this is before IARC has published

718:8 its -- it's monograph?

718:9 A. Yes, they've issued a press release

718:10 but not the monograph.

718:11 Q. And the monograph is like an 80- or

718:12 90-page document describing all the things that

718:13 IARC thinks about glyphosate?

718:14 A. That's correct.

718:15 Q. Okay. And so obviously Jess Rowland

718:16 here doesn't have the benefit of that final

718:17 publication yet; right?

718:18 A. Yeah. So at this point he wouldn't

718:19 know what specific studies IARC relied on to reach

718:20 their conclusions.

718:21 Q. Okay. It says, "We have enough to

RW90.2.2

718:22 sustain our conclusions. Don't need gene tox or

718:23 epi. The only thing is the Cheminova study with

718:24 the sarcoma in mice - we have that study now and

718:25 its conclusions are irrelevant (because at limit

719:1 dose?)" -- I'll stop right there.

719:2 Did I read that right?

719:3 A. Those are the words on the page.

719:4 Q. "Because at limit dose," that's that

RW90.1.4

719:5 1,000 milligram issue we were discussing earlier;

719:6 right?

Page/Line	Source	ID
719:8 - 719:12	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:10) 719:8 A. Yeah, it -- it could be. You know, I 719:9 think here we've got Dan, despite his use of -- or 719:10 Mr. Jenkins, despite his use of quotes, seems to be 719:11 paraphrasing. This isn't written in complete 719:12 sentences.	xReevesFINAL.245 RW90.2.2
719:23 - 720:1	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:10) 719:23 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) It's a little weird, 719:24 if this is true, it's a little weird for an EPA 719:25 scientist to be asking for a rationale for 720:1 disregarding a tumor finding in a rat study; right?	xReevesFINAL.246
720:4 - 721:5	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:00) 720:4 A. Again, I -- I'm not sure this is -- 720:5 I'm not sure Dan is accurately transcribing what he 720:6 heard. It could also be interpreted that Dan is 720:7 saying because of limit, you know, like Dan doesn't 720:8 understand the basis, Dan was -- his training was 720:9 as an attorney and as an entomologist, so he 720:10 wouldn't know toxicology. So he may be guessing 720:11 here is what I'm saying. 720:12 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) Okay. "I am the 720:13 chair of the CARC and my folks are running this 720:14 process for glyphosate in reg review." 720:15 Do you see that? 720:16 A. I do see that statement. 720:17 Q. All right. I'm going to jump to the 720:18 next -- next paragraph. "Also, Jess called me for 720:19 a contact name at ATSDR." And that's that agency 720:20 we've been discussing for a while; right? 720:21 A. That's correct. 720:22 Q. Says, "I passed on to -- I passed on 720:23 Jesslyn's email. He told me no coordination is 720:24 going on and he wanted to establish some saying, 720:25 'If I can kill this, I should get a medal.'" 721:1 You see that? 721:2 A. I see those words on the page. 721:3 Q. And they're in quotation marks? 721:4 A. I see quotation marks around those 721:5 words.	xReevesFINAL.247 RW90.2.3 RW90.2.4 RW90.2.5 RW90.2.8
721:13 - 721:20	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:18)	xReevesFINAL.248

Page/Line	Source	ID
	721:13 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) Well, for 721:14 what it's worth, this is dated April 2015; right? 721:15 A. That is correct.	
	721:16 Q. So we're coming up to four years from 721:17 then and ATSDR still hasn't issued its report.	clear
	721:18 A. Yeah, all we know is that it's out 721:19 for peer review and they've named the peer 721:20 reviewers.	
722:17 - 722:23	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:19)	xReevesFINAL_249
	722:17 I am 722:18 handing you Exhibit 91, but isn't it true that, 722:19 before I hand this to you, Monsanto knew that Dr. 722:20 Rowland at the EPA was planning to retire soon? 722:21 A. I am unaware of our knowledge that we 722:22 had about Dr. Rowland's retirement plans.	
	722:23 Q. I'm handing you Exhibit 91.	RW01.1
723:3 - 723:12	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:18)	xReevesFINAL_250
	723:3 Q. All right. So this is an email 723:4 exchange within Monsanto; correct? 723:5 A. That is correct.	
	723:6 Q. It's dated in September 2015?	RW01.1.1
	723:7 A. That is correct.	
	723:8 Q. Goes from Mr. Jenkins to a 723:9 significant number of Monsanto employees? 723:10 A. Yes, there are a number of Monsanto 723:11 employees in the -- who are on the receiving list 723:12 here.	
723:17 - 724:8	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:38)	xReevesFINAL_251
	723:17 Q. Okay. And he writes right here, "No 723:18 questions but Dr. Jess Rowland at EPA is quite 723:19 proud of their recent endocrine conclusions and is 723:20 also on point regarding their IARC response." 723:21 You see that?	RW01.1.2
	723:22 A. I do see those words.	
	723:23 Q. "Jess will be retiring from the EPA 723:24 in 5 to 6 months and could be useful as we move 723:25 forward with ongoing glyphosate defense." 724:1 Did I read that right? 724:2 A. I see those words.	RW01.1.3
	724:3 Q. So Monsanto knew he was retiring?	

Page/Line	Source	ID
724:11 - 724:21	<p>724:4 A. Dan Jenkins was aware that he was 724:5 retiring and so he was sharing that information 724:6 here. 724:7 Q. And proposing that he would be very 724:8 useful for ongoing glyphosate defense; right? Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:24)</p>	xReevesFINAL.252
724:24 - 725:9	<p>724:11 A. Okay. He's -- those are the words on 724:12 the page. You know, from time to time we hire 724:13 consultants based on their expertise. 724:14 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) But he's still at 724:15 the EPA at this point; right? 724:16 A. Yes, he is. 724:17 Q. And even though he's still at the EPA 724:18 and he's in charge of the CARCs assessment at the 724:19 EPA, you have Daniel Jenkins saying that he'll be 724:20 retiring soon and that he might be useful for 724:21 glyphosate defense; right? Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:17)</p>	xReevesFINAL.253
725:11 - 725:13	<p>724:24 A. I -- I have no information in front 724:25 of me to say that there was any conversation with 725:1 -- with Dr. Rowlands about him being a consultant 725:2 for us. 725:3 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) While he was working 725:4 at the EPA? 725:5 A. Yeah, I am unaware of any 725:6 conversations actually about him working as a 725:7 consultant for us. 725:8 Q. This email suggests that there might 725:9 have been one; correct? Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:06)</p>	clear
730:10 - 730:11	<p>725:11 A. Yeah, again, I have no information to 725:12 indicate that Monsanto had a conversation with Dr. 725:13 Rowlands about being a consultant for us. Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:02)</p>	xReevesFINAL.254
730:16 - 731:17	<p>730:10 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) All right. Doctor, 730:11 can you pull up the text message exhibit. I just Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:07) 730:16 -- all right, turn to page ending in 251. 730:17 A. Okay. 730:18 Q. Okay. And then you see there is a</p>	xReevesFINAL.255
		RW88.7
		xReevesFINAL.256
		RW88.7.1

730:19 discussion, it's a -- looks like it's a outgoing
730:20 message from Dan Jenkins on October 1st, 2015.

730:21 Do you see that?

730:22 A. I do see that.

730:23 Q. To Philip Miller.

RW88.7.2

730:24 Do you see that?

730:25 A. I do see that.

731:1 Q. And he says, "Remember that ATSDR

RW88.7.3

731:2 said it would render its view in October as well."

731:3 Do you see that?

731:4 A. I do see that.

731:5 Q. And then he says -- he says in the

731:6 next text message also to Philip Miller -- who --

RW88.7.4

731:7 who's Philip Miller?

731:8 A. He is the director of regulatory and

731:9 -- at this time, he was the director of regulatory

731:10 and government affairs for Monsanto.

731:11 Q. Okay. And it says, "Told EPA to

RW88.7.5

731:12 please reach out and keep them aligned."

731:13 Do you see that?

731:14 A. I do see those words.

731:15 Q. So isn't it true that in fact

731:16 Monsanto reached out to the EPA and asked them to

731:17 make sure that the AS -- ATSDR was aligned?

731:19 - 731:24

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:14)

xReevesFINAL.257

731:19 A. Yeah, but I -- I can say that those

731:20 words that you read appear here. Because it's a

731:21 text message, it's hard to know, you know, if

731:22 you're not actually the person in the conversation,

731:23 what do they mean, but I -- I would agree those

731:24 words appear on this page.

732:5 - 733:8

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:48)

xReevesFINAL.258

732:5 Q. And you see there's a

732:6 text message on December 2nd, 2015?

RW88.9.1

732:7 A. Yes, I do see that.

732:8 Q. And it's incoming and it's from

732:9 Philip Miller; right?

732:10 A. That's correct.

732:11 Q. And that -- and Philip Miller, just

732:12 to be clear, that is -- that would be Jenkins's

Page/Line	Source	ID
	732:13 boss; right?	
	732:14 A. Yes.	
	732:15 Q. Okay. He says, "We need to share	RW88.9.2
	732:16 with EPA political and career staff they need to	
	732:17 get glyphosate PRA out now they are losing	
	732:18 credibility."	
	732:19 Do you see that?	
	732:20 A. I do see that.	
	732:21 Q. And then looks like there was	
	732:22 actually quite a few people on that text message	RW88.9.3
	732:23 and then there's an incoming text message, also	
	732:24 again from Philip Miller.	
	732:25 You see that?	
	733:1 A. I do see that.	
	733:2 Q. Apparently a few seconds later.	
	733:3 Says, "CBS news asked Hugh today if glyphosate	RW88.9.4
	733:4 causes cancer. Let them know they are failing	
	733:5 their duty to the public."	
	733:6 Do you see that?	
	733:7 A. I do see those words.	
	733:8 Q. "Hugh," that's Hugh Grant.	RW88.9.5
733:10 - 733:25	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:31)	xReevesFINAL.259
	733:10 A. Based on my memory --	
	733:11 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) Yeah.	
	733:12 A. -- as -- in my personal capacity, my	
	733:13 memory is, yes, that is Hugh Grant.	
	733:14 Q. Okay. Then looks like there's an	
	733:15 outgoing message from -- from Mr. Jenkins.	RW88.9.6
	733:16 Do you see that?	
	733:17 A. I do see that.	
	733:18 Q. "Speaking to Jack in about an hour.	
	733:19 We are in a meeting now working on drafting a	
	733:20 response. Speaking to scientist tomorrow morning."	
	733:21 Do you see that?	
	733:22 A. I do see that.	
	733:23 Q. Do you know if the "scientist" he's	
	733:24 referring to is Jess Rowland?	
	733:25 A. No, I do not know who that refers to.	
735:19 - 736:15	Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:54)	xReevesFINAL.260
	735:19 Q. Okay. Says, "According to Bradbury,	RW88.8.1

735:20 what we need to do is get some key Democrats on the
 735:21 hill to start calling Jim. This helps in several
 735:22 ways: Focuses on gly and gets him to move; shoots
 735:23 across his bow generally that he's being watched
 735:24 which is needed on several fronts and finally sets
 735:25 the stage for possible hearings. I laid this all
 736:1 out yesterday with Michael before our call and he
 736:2 agreed."

RW88.8.2

736:3 Do you see that?

736:4 A. I do see those words.

736:5 Q. Do you know what -- who Michael he's
 736:6 referring to?

736:7 A. Let's see. So earlier we -- we had
 736:8 the mention of Michael Dykes, and so that is my
 736:9 under -- my understanding would be this would be
 736:10 Michael Dykes from our Washington, DC, office where
 736:11 Dan works.

736:12 Q. And so it looks like they were laying
 736:13 out a plan to work with key democrats on the hill
 736:14 to let them know that they were being watched;
 736:15 right?

736:17 - 737:1

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:21)

xReevesFINAL.261

736:17 A. Yeah, this would be -- just because
 736:18 it's a text message and you don't have, you know,
 736:19 very complete sentences, this would be something
 736:20 that Dan, I think, can shed light on better than me
 736:21 but I -- I do see those words on the page.

736:22 Q. (BY MR. WISNER) So again we have
 736:23 another reference to people being watched.
 736:24 Do you see that?

RW88.8.3

736:25 A. I see the word "watched" on this
 737:1 page.

739:9 - 740:3

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:37)

xReevesFINAL.262

739:9 Q. So let's start with your -- some
 739:10 stuff about your personal background. How long
 739:11 have you -- well, who do you work for?

739:12 A. I work for Bayer Crop Science now.
 739:13 Prior to that it was Monsanto.

739:14 Q. How long had you worked for Monsanto?

739:15 A. I started in 2007, so now it's been

739:16 twelve years.

739:17 Q. Where do you live?

739:18 A. In St. Louis.

739:19 Q. Are you married?

739:20 A. Yes, I am.

739:21 Q. Do you have family in the area?

739:22 A. Yes, I do. We have two daughters and

739:23 I also have my parents are here and then some

739:24 aunts, uncles, and cousins.

739:25 Q. Where did you grow up?

740:1 A. In St. Louis as well.

740:2 Q. Where did you go to high school?

740:3 A. Kirkwood High School.

744:17 - 745:13

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:51)

xReevesFINAL.263

744:17 Q. (BY MR. BRENZA) What was the next
744:18 job you had?

744:19 A. Following that, I worked for the

744:20 University of Missouri, and that was as an

744:21 environmental health technician.

744:22 Q. And was that in -- from 1995 to 1996?

744:23 A. That's correct.

744:24 Q. What did you do as an environmental

744:25 health technician at the University of Missouri?

745:1 A. I -- I had two parts to that role.

745:2 One was doing fire and safety inspections in

745:3 laboratories, and then the other one was hazardous

745:4 materials management. And so that was any kind of

745:5 hazardous material that laboratories or farms would

745:6 have and we would help them make sure it was being

745:7 handled appropriately.

745:8 Q. What was the next job you had?

745:9 A. Following that I was a research -- a

745:10 graduate research associate at Texas A&M University

745:11 as part of going to graduate school there.

745:12 Q. So that was from 1996 to about 2000?

745:13 A. That's correct.

747:21 - 747:25

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:08)

xReevesFINAL.264

747:21 Q. What was the next position you worked
747:22 in?

747:23 A. After that I was a postdoctoral

747:24 researcher at the University of California at
747:25 Davis.

748:15 - 749:7

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:38)

xReevesFINAL.265

748:15 Q. What was the -- so after you finished
748:16 your postdoc research efforts, what was the next
748:17 job you had?

748:18 A. Then I -- after that I worked for the
748:19 California EPA, and this was for the State Water
748:20 Resources Control Board. I was an environmental
748:21 scientist but my focus was on fresh water
748:22 standards.

748:23 Q. What -- what office of the California
748:24 EPA did you work at?

748:25 A. So that was the State Water Resources
749:1 Control Board. This is the over -- this is the
749:2 office within California EPA that's responsible for
749:3 protecting water quality across the state.

749:4 Q. And was there a physical location
749:5 where you worked?

749:6 A. Yes. That was in Sacramento.
749:7 Downtown Sacramento.

749:24 - 750:24

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:12)

xReevesFINAL.266

749:24 Q. (BY MR. BRENZA) So you were working
749:25 in, at the California EPA on fresh water standards.
750:1 How -- how did that -- what exactly did you do with
750:2 respect to protecting the clean water of
750:3 California?

750:4 A. We had two functions in our group and
750:5 -- and I worked on both. One was developing new
750:6 water quality standards, you know, whether there --
750:7 there was one that the state was proposing to come
750:8 up with itself. So this would be, you know, a -- a
750:9 limit on some pollutant in water when I -- I worked
750:10 on a heavy metal called selenium, was one of them.
750:11 The other part of it -- so that was, let's -- you
750:12 know, we were adopting a new water quality standard
750:13 or -- or number for a contaminant.

750:14 The other half of it was reviewing
750:15 actions by the Regional Water Quality Control
750:16 Boards. They are the part of the -- of Cal EPA

750:17 that issues permits, say to a -- a wastewater
750:18 discharge. Like a sewage treatment plant. And if
750:19 the entities they had issued the permit to
750:20 disagreed with the permit, they could appeal to the
750:21 state and then I would provide a technical review
750:22 of the complaint and the response to it.

750:23 Q. About how long did you work
750:24 protecting California's clean water?

751:3 - 751:4

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:01)

xReevesFINAL_267

751:3 A. It was about two years and eight
751:4 months.

752:16 - 753:8

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:33)

xReevesFINAL_268

752:16 Q. Okay. What was the next position you
752:17 took after completing your time at the California
752:18 Water Board?

752:19 A. After that I was -- I took a role
752:20 with Tetra Tech. It's an environmental consulting
752:21 firm. And that was -- that was back in St. Louis,
752:22 which is where I was from originally.

752:23 Q. So you moved -- you moved back to St.
752:24 Louis at that time?

752:25 A. That's correct.

753:1 Q. And that was 2004?

753:2 A. That's correct.

753:3 Q. And Tetra Tech, what -- it's a -- you
753:4 said it's an environmental consulting firm?

753:5 A. That's correct.

753:6 Q. What was your position there?

753:7 A. I was a human health and
753:8 environmental risk assessor.

754:7 - 754:25

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:42)

xReevesFINAL_269

754:7 Q. Thank you. So am I correct that
754:8 after you completed your time at Tetra Tech, you --
754:9 you took a job at Monsanto?

754:10 A. That is correct.

754:11 Q. And what was the first position you
754:12 had at Monsanto?

754:13 A. I was a biotechnology regulatory
754:14 affairs manager.

754:15 Q. How did you decide to start working

754:16 at Monsanto?

754:17 A. Well, they, at that time, you know,
754:18 the -- much of what they were focused on was,
754:19 certainly on the biotechnology side, was very
754:20 interesting to me. They had several projects, one
754:21 of which I was very interested in was
754:22 drought-tolerant corn. And I -- they had an
754:23 opening within the biotechnology regulatory affairs
754:24 group and because of my background in regulatory
754:25 work, I decided to apply.

760:23 - 761:22

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:01)

xReevesFINAL.270

760:23 A. One of the groups I worked with
760:24 fairly heavily early on were bee keeping groups,
760:25 and as we talked to them, one of our understandings
761:1 became that, you know, they were -- they had
761:2 financial problems. Part of that is the result of
761:3 honey prices. You know, this is one of the main
761:4 things that they are selling from their crop of
761:5 bees is honey.

761:6 And the challenge is that honey is
761:7 coming into the US -- this is specific to US honey
761:8 growers. Honey is coming into the US from overseas
761:9 that may not be entirely honey. It may have corn
761:10 syrup or rice syrup added to it to dilute it, but
761:11 they're still getting the same price as honey. And
761:12 this depresses the price for US bee keepers. The
761:13 more honey on the market, the lower the price they
761:14 get. Even though this honey-like material isn't
761:15 really honey.

761:16 And they were -- they were wanting
761:17 the US Food and Drug Administration to create a
761:18 honey-identity standard to make sure that honey
761:19 being sold in the US is actually honey, and then
761:20 that would -- that would actually help them with
761:21 prices. It would make their businesses more
761:22 financially viable.

762:17 - 762:24

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:22)

xReevesFINAL.271

762:17 Q. (BY MR. BRENZA) Was there another
762:18 part of your work as the crop protection safety and
762:19 outreach lead?

762:20 A. Yes. The other -- the other thing I
762:21 was working on there were developing materials that
762:22 discussed the benefits and safety of our products.

762:23 Q. I'm going to hand you what I'm going
762:24 to mark as Exhibit 93. Is Exhibit 93 a document, a

762:25 - 764:6

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:02)

4101.1

xReevesFINAL.272

762:25 business record that you prepared when you were
763:1 working as the crop protection safety and outreach
763:2 lead?

763:3 A. Yes, it is.

763:4 Q. Is it based on facts and research
763:5 that you did to prepare it?

763:6 A. Yes, it is.

763:7 Q. And did you prepare it about the time
763:8 that you acquired those facts and research?

763:9 A. I did.

763:10 Q. Did you prepare it as part of your
763:11 job?

763:12 A. Yes, I did.

763:13 Q. Was it part of the -- did you prepare
763:14 it in the ordinary course of -- of business at
763:15 Monsanto?

763:16 A. I did.

763:17 Q. And was this document marked Exhibit
763:18 93 used by Monsanto?

763:19 A. Yes.

763:20 Q. How was it used by Monsanto in its
763:21 business?

763:22 A. We have this posted on our website.

763:23 We also have this -- we bring copies of this along
763:24 in booklet form and we share it with audiences.

763:25 When I go out and talk to groups, I'll bring along,
764:1 you know, at least one copy to show them and direct

764:2 them to it. Sometimes I bring along multiple
764:3 copies to hand out. When we have a trade show or

764:4 scientific meeting where we have a booth in the
764:5 exhibition hall, we'll have copies of this

764:6 available.

764:7 - 766:21

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:02:45)

xReevesFINAL.273

764:7 Q. Was -- well, we'll come back -- we'll

764:8 come back to Exhibit 93 in a minute. Let me -- let
764:9 me finish your employment history.

764:10 A. Sure.

764:11 Q. What was the next position you held

764:12 at Monsanto?

764:13 A. Starting in November of 2018, I

764:14 joined our agricultural affairs and sustainability

764:15 team and in that -- in that organization I am the

764:16 global health and safety issues management lead.

764:17 And so it's -- it's similar to the work I was doing

764:18 before but it has a -- responsibilities across our

764:19 portfolio of products rather than just crop

764:20 protection alone.

764:21 Q. Okay. So let's -- let's discuss a

764:22 little bit about glyphosate itself.

764:23 A. Sure.

764:24 Q. Is glyphosate an herbicide?

764:25 A. Yes, it is.

765:1 Q. What is an herbicide?

765:2 A. Those are -- herbicides are molecules

765:3 that you can use or a chemical you can use to kill

765:4 a weed.

765:5 Q. What's the a -- what's the history in

765:6 -- of the -- of realizing the weed control

765:7 potential of glyphosate?

765:8 A. This is a molecule that Monsanto

765:9 initially discovered its weed control properties.

765:10 Other companies had developed ways to synthesize

765:11 glyphosate over the years as part of their own work

765:12 but they did not realize it could work as a

765:13 herbicide.

765:14 Monsanto, as part of research into

765:15 herbicidal compounds, was synthesizing molecules,

765:16 looking at different ideas we had internally about

765:17 would -- trying to answer the question of would

765:18 this chemical structure work as a herbicide. And

765:19 after a few rounds of work, glyphosate was

765:20 identified and it was tested under greenhouse

765:21 conditions and found to actually be effective.

765:22 Q. Who discovered the herbicidal

clear

765:23 properties of glyphosate?

765:24 A. It was Dr. John Franz.

765:25 Q. When did he make that discovery?

766:1 A. That was in -- he was doing the

766:2 synthesis work and I believe the -- the discovery

766:3 of its -- of its ability to act as a herbicide was

766:4 1970.

766:5 Q. Was there anything unusual about the

766:6 herbicidal properties of glyphosate?

766:7 A. Yes. Glyphosate was act --

766:8 glyphosate acts on a broad spectrum of weeds, so

766:9 that means it kills grasses as well as broadleaves,

766:10 which are the plants like clover. It also acts

766:11 systemically. So when it's absorbed by the plant,

766:12 it goes down to the root and it can kill a weed at

766:13 the root so it won't grow back.

766:14 And this -- this combination is --

766:15 I'm not sure there was another product on the

766:16 market like that at the time, and I don't believe

766:17 there is now.

766:18 Q. Was testing done at the time to

766:19 evaluate the safety of glyphosate?

766:20 A. Yes, safety testing was conducted

766:21 early on in the process.

768:20 - 769:12

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:47)

xReevesFINAL.274

768:20 Q. (BY MR. BRENZA) What -- what was

768:21 favorable about glyphosate safety profile?

768:22 A. We had the -- the data work

768:23 demonstrating to us there was low toxicity, both to

768:24 humans and animals. It was not accumulating in the

768:25 environment, it was breaking down, and that it was

769:1 excreted rapidly from the body.

769:2 Q. Was the discovery of glyphosate and

769:3 the safety testing that accompanied it, did that

769:4 result in glyphosate being registered for use in --

769:5 in various countries?

769:6 A. That's correct.

769:7 Q. Was it registered for use in the

769:8 United States?

769:9 A. Yes, in the United States in 1975,

769:10 with the first sales occurring in 1976.

769:11 Q. Are you aware today how many

769:12 countries have registered glyphosate for use?

769:15 - 769:20

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:14)

xReevesFINAL.275

769:15 A. It's over a hundred.

769:16 Q. (BY MR. BRENZA) How does the use of

769:17 glyphosate worldwide compare to other pesticides

769:18 that are used?

769:19 A. It is the most commonly used

769:20 herbicide around the world.

784:20 - 786:24

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:02:32)

xReevesFINAL.276

784:20 Q. All right. So if -- do you remember

784:21 that you were asked a number of questions about the

784:22 mouse and rat studies that were originally -- well,

784:23 not originally used but were eventually used by

784:24 Monsanto to register glyphosate with the EPA?

784:25 A. I do.

785:1 Q. And there was a 1983 mouse study by

785:2 Knezevich and Hogan?

785:3 A. I do remember that.

785:4 Q. And as a result of that mouse study,

785:5 did the -- did the EPA reach a conclusion about --

785:6 a preliminary conclusion about the carcinogenicity

785:7 of glyphosate?

785:8 A. They -- they did have some

785:9 preliminary conclusions. They were not made final

785:10 by the agency.

785:11 Q. Do you remember that there was a

785:12 document you were shown where Monsanto had hired

785:13 somebody called Dr. -- named Dr. Kushner to review

785:14 the mouse biopsies?

785:15 A. I do recall that.

785:16 Q. Did Monsanto tell Dr. Kushner what he

785:17 should find with respect to his review of those

785:18 mouse biopsies?

785:19 A. No, Monsanto did not do that.

785:20 Q. How do you know that?

785:21 A. The -- so Monsanto, when we work with

785:22 external experts, you know, the -- you know, when

785:23 you're talking about the science experts, the idea

785:24 is that you want to find someone who knows their
 785:25 field, who understands the material that you're
 786:1 asking them to investigate and advise us on, but we
 786:2 also make sure, you know, we're not -- we're not
 786:3 going out there and telling them, you know -- we
 786:4 don't engage an expert and say this is what we want
 786:5 you to find, please do the following. It's please
 786:6 look into this and tell us what you find.
 786:7 Q. Now, why -- it may be obvious but why
 786:8 wouldn't you tell an expert what to find?
 786:9 A. So if -- if you're doing that, you
 786:10 know, they are not really acting as an expert, but
 786:11 more importantly, when you're doing something as
 786:12 serious as dealing with the regulatory agency, you
 786:13 know, putting information in front of them for them
 786:14 to make a conclusion, if you give them, you know,
 786:15 information that's false, that's not going to --
 786:16 they're going to spend their -- they're going to
 786:17 waste their time reviewing that and then they're
 786:18 going to come back to you and say not only did you
 786:19 waste our time, you gave us false information.
 786:20 This isn't -- that's not a productive
 786:21 interaction with the regulatory agency. You want
 786:22 to make sure you're giving them as much factual
 786:23 information as possible so that you're able to
 786:24 obtain the registration or the approval.

787:14 - 789:1

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:43)

xReevesFINAL.277

787:14 Q. Is Exhibit 95 the conclusion of the
 787:15 EPA about the proper classification of glyphosate
 787:16 based on mouse and rat studies?

800.1

800.1.1

787:17 A. Yes. Following the -- the two rat
 787:18 studies and the mouse study we discussed
 787:19 previously.

clear

787:20 Q. So let's -- let's talk about those
 787:21 studies for a moment. The -- the first rat study
 787:22 was found to have inadequate dosing of rats; right?
 787:23 A. That's correct. The -- the agency at
 787:24 the time expressed concern that the doses were too
 787:25 low to really inform full assessment, and since
 788:1 that time other regulatory agencies around the

788:2 world have -- have concluded the same thing about
788:3 it. That they're -- we have better data to rely on
788:4 than this.

788:5 Q. Did Monsanto commission a replacement
788:6 or repeat rat study to dose the rats with more
788:7 glyphosate?

788:8 A. Yes, we did.

788:9 Q. And at the same time they also
788:10 performed the mouse study that we heard so much
788:11 about yesterday?

788:12 A. Yes, the mouse study was underway
788:13 first, and the rat study began later on. So the
788:14 mouse data were available first.

788:15 Q. Now, when the mouse study -- the
788:16 mouse study received a number of different reviews
788:17 at the EPA; right?

788:18 A. That's correct.

788:19 Q. And there was some disagreement along
788:20 the way about what the mouse study -- that first
788:21 mouse study really showed?

788:22 A. That's correct.

788:23 Q. But in the end, the -- a number of
788:24 experts reviewed those, reviewed that mouse study
788:25 and concluded that it -- it provided evidence that
789:1 glyphosate was not a carcinogenic?

789:7 - 789:9

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:04)

xReevesFINAL.278

789:7 Q. (BY MR. BRENZA) What did the -- what
789:8 did the EPA ultimately conclude about that first
789:9 mouse study?

789:12 - 789:21

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:31)

xReevesFINAL.279

789:12 A. So based on -- on the documents that
789:13 I've seen, they concluded that they wanted, you
789:14 know, at -- as we discussed yesterday, they wanted
789:15 a repeat of the mouse study. Through conversations
789:16 with them we said we're having -- we have a rat
789:17 study coming. Let's see what that study shows.
789:18 And then at that time decide do we need to do
789:19 another mouse study.

789:20 Q. (BY MR. BRENZA) Okay. And is that
789:21 recorded on page 4 of Exhibit 95? Do you -- well,

899.4.1

789:22 - 792:2

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:02:23)

xReevesFINAL.280

789:22 let me -- let me ask it this way. Do you see the
789:23 second full paragraph on page 4 of Exhibit 95 --

789:24 A. Yes, I do.

789:25 Q. -- beginning with "HED"?

790:1 A. I do see that.

790:2 Q. It says, "HED deferred a decision on
790:3 the repeat of an additional mouse oncogenicity
790:4 study until the 1990 rat feeding study had been
790:5 evaluated by the Peer Review Committee."

790:6 A. That is correct. That's what it
790:7 says.

790:8 Q. Did -- did the EP -- so we heard the
790:9 questions yesterday about the EPA wanting a mouse
790:10 and a rat study and -- and Mr. Wisner suggested
790:11 that Monsanto refused to do one of the studies the
790:12 EPA wanted.

790:13 Is that a fair understanding of what
790:14 happened here?

790:15 A. No. What -- what the EPA is
790:16 describing here is that the health effects division
790:17 is HED. They deferred their decision about whether
790:18 we needed another repeat mouse study until they
790:19 could see the results of this repeated rat study.

790:20 Q. So are you familiar with the results
790:21 of the repeated rat study?

790:22 A. Yes, I am.

790:23 Q. And what did the repeated rat study
790:24 show about the safety of glyphosate?

790:25 A. EPA concluded that -- that this
791:1 repeated rat study, along with the existing mouse
791:2 study, supported a conclusion that glyphosate could
791:3 be classified in group E.

791:4 Q. What's -- and Group -- what is Group
791:5 E? Well, let me -- let me just direct your
791:6 attention to the -- the final page of Exhibit 95
791:7 says Classification.

791:8 Do you see that?

791:9 A. I do see that.

791:10 Q. And there it says, "Considering

clear

800.10

800.10.1

791:11 criteria confined EPA guidelines for classifying a
 791:12 carcinogen, the committee concluded that glyphosate
 791:13 should be classified as a Group E (evidence of
 791:14 non-carcinogenicity for humans), based on lack of
 791:15 convincing carcinogenicity evidence in adequate
 791:16 studies in two animal species."

791:17 You see that?

791:18 A. I do see that. That's what they
 791:19 concluded here.

791:20 Q. And so a Group E means what?

791:21 A. Group E, their description is
 791:22 "evidence of non-carcinogenicity for humans," that
 791:23 -- and that was their -- their definition here in
 791:24 1991 following that review.

791:25 Q. What were the two species in which
 792:1 non-carcinogenicity had been proven by studies?

792:2 A. Rat --

792:5 - 794:24

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:03:15)

xReevesFINAL.281

792:5 A. In rats and mice. Those were the two
 792:6 species.

792:7 Q. (BY MR. BRENZA) Are you aware of any
 792:8 rat or mice studies the EPA wanted Monsanto to
 792:9 perform that it didn't perform?

792:10 A. No, I am not.

792:11 Q. Was that even a feasible thing to
 792:12 have happen?

792:13 A. To conduct a rat or a mouse study?

792:14 Q. To refuse to conduct a rat or mouse
 792:15 study that the EPA asks you to perform?

792:16 A. Once -- once they issue -- we talked
 792:17 yesterday about a data call in. And so that's the
 792:18 way -- that's how EPA can order a registrant to
 792:19 turn in data.

792:20 You can -- you can have discussions
 792:21 about EPA, with EPA about data requirements and
 792:22 whether things are needed, but, you know, if -- if
 792:23 they decide you're going to do something, you don't
 792:24 have a -- you don't have a choice in that. In
 792:25 order to maintain your product registration, you
 793:1 have to give them the data they're asking for.

clear

793:2 Q. We heard some questions of you
793:3 yesterday about whether Monsanto tests formulations
793:4 of a combination of glyphosate and surfactants to
793:5 -- to form Roundup. Remember that?
793:6 A. That's correct.
793:7 Q. Are there tests that the company
793:8 performs on its formulations, its Roundup
793:9 formulations?
793:10 A. Yes, we do. We look at dermal
793:11 penetration. We discussed those earlier. We're
793:12 looking at the formulated product, how much
793:13 glyphosate crosses the skin and enters the body.
793:14 And what we see there is very low penetration,
793:15 regardless of -- of what surfactant is there and --
793:16 and regardless of whether a surfactant is there.
793:17 It's less than 1 percent of -- of what's on the
793:18 skin.
793:19 The other thing we do is, these are
793:20 called genotoxicity assays. So these are -- are
793:21 studies, we earlier referred to them as cell
793:22 studies. These are -- these studies allow us to
793:23 understand whether or not the formulated product
793:24 damages DNA, you know, genotype, gene for genes,
793:25 whether or not the formulated product damages DNA
794:1 in a way that would be indicative of a chemical
794:2 that can cause cancer.
794:3 And when we look at those studies,
794:4 you know, these are being conducted according to
794:5 international protocols, these are protocols that
794:6 governments around the world have agreed this is
794:7 how we should do this sort of a test to get
794:8 reliable results.
794:9 We do it according to those
794:10 protocols. Also under good laboratory practices to
794:11 ensure the data are traceable. That they've been
794:12 well documented and that you can recreate the study
794:13 and that, in particular, the agency can come and
794:14 audit those findings. They can come order you to
794:15 turn over the data so it can be looked at. Those
794:16 studies also tell us glyphosate-based herbicides

794:17 are not genotoxic.

794:18 And then finally, we also do some --

794:19 a series of about six toxicological screening

794:20 studies that look at more short-term toxicity into

794:21 some -- short-term into medium-term toxicity

794:22 studies, just to make sure we understand that the

794:23 formulated product is behaving the same way as the

794:24 individual components.

797:15 - 799:15

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:02:13)

xReevesFINAL.282

797:15 Q. Okay. Now, you -- there was a series

797:16 of questions where you were asked if Monsanto had

797:17 ever done a long-term carcinogenicity study on --

797:18 on Roundup.

797:19 A. I do recall that.

797:20 Q. What are the problems with performing

797:21 a long-term carcinogenicity study on a formulated

797:22 product like Roundup?

797:23 A. There -- there are a few reasons,

797:24 several reasons actually, why we haven't done that

797:25 kind of a test with the full formulated product to

798:1 go from, you know, a two year long study in rats or

798:2 18 month study in mice.

798:3 You know, first of all, when we look

798:4 across the data we have available, you know, when

798:5 we look at the epidemiology data, what we're seeing

798:6 is a -- a consistent message from those studies

798:7 that, you know, whether you're talking about the --

798:8 the cohort studies, the Agricultural Health Study

798:9 reports, there is no relationship between

798:10 glyphosate and cancer.

798:11 When we look at the -- the

798:12 case-control studies, some of the ones we discussed

798:13 yesterday, De Roos, McDuffie, studies like that,

798:14 what we see is that when you adjust for other

798:15 exposures in these people's lives, the relationship

798:16 between glyphosate use and cancer diminishes and

798:17 becomes non-statistically significant. So the

798:18 epidemiology data overall are telling us there

798:19 really isn't a relationship here.

798:20 When we look at the information we

798:21 have about glyphosate and the surfactant, the
 798:22 surfactants by themselves, we're also seeing
 798:23 information, all the information we have from
 798:24 these, you know, these studies conducted according
 798:25 to the international protocols under good
 799:1 laboratory practices are telling us there is no
 799:2 relationship between glyphosate and -- and these
 799:3 surfactants and the ability to cause cancer in an
 799:4 experimental system.

799:5 So we know from human data under --
 799:6 gathered under real world conditions, we know from
 799:7 experimental system data, whether that's animals or
 799:8 some of the cell studies we mentioned, we're not
 799:9 seeing anything there that's telling us there is a
 799:10 reason to do that sort of testing.

799:11 And then the other issues you think
 799:12 about is the feasibility. You know, so we have
 799:13 this problem --

799:14 Q. So let me --

799:15 A. I'm sorry.

799:24 - 802:6

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:02:32)

xReevesFINAL.283

799:24 Q. (BY MR. BRENZA) Now, I interrupted
 799:25 you. You were about to explain the feasibility
 800:1 problems that might exist if -- if you tried to
 800:2 perform a long-term carcinogenicity study on
 800:3 rodents.

800:4 A. Yes, our concern there --

800:5 Q. On -- on formulated product.

800:6 A. With formulated product, yes. The,
 800:7 you know, the concern we have about feasibility is
 800:8 whether or not you can obtain, you know, useful
 800:9 data. Can you get data from a study like that that
 800:10 can answer the question in -- in a way that, you
 800:11 know, is -- is meaningful.

800:12 When you think about feeding an
 800:13 animal a surfactant, these are essentially soaps.
 800:14 If I give them too large of a dose, they're going
 800:15 to get sick. Soaps, surfactants, when you -- when
 800:16 you feed them to animals, they cause irritation in
 800:17 their stomachs. They're either sick or they won't

800:18 eat. Sick animals, you do not conduct studies on
800:19 sick animals for two years and get meaningful data
800:20 at the other end. So we need to be very careful
800:21 about that.
800:22 The challenge comes when, if I have a
800:23 formulated product, I need to keep the ratio of
800:24 glyphosate to surfactant the same as it would be,
800:25 you know, in the -- in the product. And in order
801:1 to have enough glyphosate in there for -- so one of
801:2 their issues we mentioned earlier, the first rat
801:3 study, they said the glyphosate doses were too low,
801:4 we can't -- this isn't meaningful. So we need to
801:5 be able to reach a certain level of glyphosate.
801:6 In order to reach those levels of
801:7 glyphosate to have confidence that if we are going
801:8 to see something we would have, the surfactant at
801:9 that point is so high, you've made the animals --
801:10 you've -- you've essentially irritated their
801:11 stomachs, their digestive system so much, they're
801:12 not going to eat, they're going to be sick animals.
801:13 And so that, you know, at that point
801:14 you realize there isn't much feasibility there.
801:15 We're going to have to think about other ways to
801:16 answer that kind of question. And we already have
801:17 that information that we need.
801:18 We, you know, as I mentioned, the
801:19 epidemiology data are telling us we don't have a
801:20 relationship between glyphosate-based herbicide use
801:21 and cancer, the animal data are telling us we're
801:22 not seeing anything here that would indicate the
801:23 ability to cause cancer, and then the cell studies,
801:24 these mechanistic studies we talked about, also
801:25 show us, either with -- whether it's with the
802:1 formulated product or the individual components
802:2 alone, these products don't cause some -- don't
802:3 result in some change, you know, either in whole
802:4 animals or in cellular systems in, you know, cells
802:5 growing in a laboratory, that would indicate the
802:6 potential to cause cancer.

817:5 - 817:24

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:04)

xReevesFINAL.284

817:5 Q. (BY MR. BRENZA) Now, during your
817:6 questioning by Mr. Wisner you were asked a number
817:7 of questions about Exhibit 20.

817:8 Do you remember that?

817:9 A. I do recall.

817:10 Q. And one of the questions you were
817:11 asked about is whether John Acquavella voiced
817:12 concerns that the AHS study would be inaccurate or
817:13 unreliable?

817:14 A. That's correct.

817:15 Q. If you look at the -- the page with
817:16 -- ending in 873, you see that that's where John
817:17 Acquavella puts out some thoughts about the
817:18 exposure assessment that the AHS would use?

817:19 A. That's correct.

817:20 Q. And do you see that he notes that he
817:21 has some concerns about whether the AHS will
817:22 accurately identify previous exposures and -- well,
817:23 let's just stop there. Previous exposures?

817:24 A. Yes, I -- I do see that.

817:25 - 820:14

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:02:50)

xReevesFINAL.285

817:25 Q. Did the people who conducted the
818:1 Agricultural Health Study respond to criticisms
818:2 like those made by Dr. Acquavella to improve their
818:3 study protocol?

818:4 A. Yes, they did.

818:5 Q. What did they do in response to
818:6 criticisms from -- from Dr. Acquavella or others
818:7 like him?

818:8 A. The -- so one of the things we --
818:9 that they talk about here is the study
818:10 questionnaires, you know, will we -- can you get
818:11 accurate information from people. You know, if I
818:12 ask you a question today and then I come back in a
818:13 year, do I get the same answer?

818:14 They looked at that and the
818:15 Agricultural Health Study researchers published on
818:16 that and showed, yes, we have high confidence in
818:17 our -- in our survey to provide us useful
818:18 information.

818:19 Q. So they validated their surveys and
818:20 -- and showed that -- the concern that Dr.
818:21 Acquavella had voiced was -- had been remedied?

818:22 A. That's correct, they published that.
818:23 The other thing they did is look at -- we -- we
818:24 have a study where -- that they incorporated and
818:25 that's where the intensity-weighted lifetime days
819:1 comes in.

819:2 Q. So I'm going to hand you that study.
819:3 Is that a study that Dr. Acquavella actually
819:4 performed?

819:5 A. Yes, he is the main author on that --

819:6 Q. So I'm going to hand you --

819:7 A. -- publication.

819:8 Q. -- what's been marked as Exhibit 98.

819:9 This is a article with John Acquavella as the lead
819:10 author entitled Glyphosate Biomonitoring for
819:11 Farmers and Their Families: Results from the Farm
819:12 Family Exposure Study.

819:13 Do you see that?

819:14 A. Yes, I do.

819:15 Q. Is this -- is this Exhibit -- did I
819:16 mark it 98?

819:17 A. 98.

819:18 Q. Is this Exhibit 98 commonly referred
819:19 to as the Farm Family Health Study?

819:20 A. Farm Family Exposure Study is what we
819:21 called it.

819:22 Q. Farm Family Exposure Study. Is
819:23 Exhibit 98 one of the things that Monsanto did to
819:24 help improve the Agricultural Health Study?

819:25 A. Yes, it is.

820:1 Q. And what did Exhibit -- what did Dr.
820:2 Acquavella conclude about the exposures of people
820:3 who apply glyphosate?

820:4 A. What -- what Dr. Acquavella and his
820:5 -- and his co-authors here, this is, you know, John
820:6 Acquavella -- Dr. Acquavella at Monsanto and he
820:7 also has researchers from University of Minnesota
820:8 and Emory University in Atlanta, as well as

4036.1.1

820:9 Exponent, which is a consulting company. Dr.
 820:10 Acquavella and his co-authors found that exposure
 820:11 to glyphosate was actually very low among farmers
 820:12 and their families.

820:13 Q. If you would turn to the page
 820:14 numbered 324, and you see there is a -- a paragraph

822:20 - 823:15

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:56)

4036.4

xReevesFINAL.286

822:20 Q. The results reported in the Farm
 822:21 Family Exposure Study, are you aware of whether
 822:22 they inform the researchers of the Agricultural
 822:23 Health Study?

822:24 A. They did. I may have mentioned
 822:25 earlier they -- so one of the things in the
 823:1 Andreotti study, the 2018 update of the
 823:2 Agricultural Health Study, is they looked at these
 823:3 intensity-weighted lifetime days I described. So,
 823:4 you know, making sure you can distinguish between
 823:5 me killing dandelions in my yard or my driveway and
 823:6 someone who is out spraying a corn field for a, you
 823:7 know, good part of the day. It's not just, you
 823:8 know -- you would count that sometimes as one day,
 823:9 but intensity allows you to really understand the
 823:10 difference between me and a farmer.
 823:11 And that's what this Farm Family
 823:12 Exposure Study allowed was to give some
 823:13 understanding so you could separate out people and
 823:14 make sure you really were classifying them based on
 823:15 their exposure.

823:21 - 824:7

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:32)

xReevesFINAL.287

823:21 Q. Were -- was part of your job at
 823:22 Monsanto to develop an understanding of what IARC
 823:23 had done and why it had done it?

823:24 A. That is correct.

823:25 Q. And was another part of your job to
 824:1 understand what kind of response Monsanto could
 824:2 make to IARC?

824:3 A. That's correct.

824:4 Q. Was another part of your job to
 824:5 evaluate how other regulatory bodies around the
 824:6 world viewed what IARC had done?

Page/Line	Source	ID
824:8 - 824:10	824:7 A. It was. That was part of my job. Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:04)	xReevesFINAL_288
	824:8 Q. All right. I'm going to hand you 824:9 what I've marked as Exhibit 99.	4640.1
824:11 - 824:15	824:10 A. All right. Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:18)	xReevesFINAL_289
	824:11 Q. Is Exhibit 99 a business record you 824:12 prepared based on facts you had researched and 824:13 developed concerning IARC and the regulatory 824:14 evaluations of what IARC had done?	4640.1.1
825:1 - 826:10	824:15 A. It is. Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:32)	xReevesFINAL_290
	825:1 Q. (BY MR. BRENZA) Did you create 825:2 Exhibit 99 on or about the time that you acquired 825:3 the facts and knowledge of what IARC had done and 825:4 the world regulatory responses to it that you 825:5 created around the same time?	
	825:6 A. I did.	
	825:7 Q. Was it a part of your regular 825:8 business responsibilities at the time?	
	825:9 A. Yes, it was.	
	825:10 Q. And did the company rely on it in its 825:11 regular course of business?	
	825:12 A. Yes, the company did.	
	825:13 Q. Looking at page -- the first page of 825:14 the document you -- we've marked as Exhibit 99, do 825:15 you see that you've recorded information about the 825:16 IARC's rationale for its decision-making?	4640.1.2
	825:17 A. I do see that.	
	825:18 Q. And you see that there are a number 825:19 of different categories that you've evaluated?	
	825:20 A. Yes, I do see that.	
	825:21 Q. One of them is the epidemiological 825:22 data.	4640.1.3
	825:23 Do you see that?	
	825:24 A. Yes I do.	
	825:25 Q. And you said that the IARC had 826:1 concluded there was "limited evidence of glyphosate 826:2 causing non-Hodgkin's lymphoma in humans"; right?	
	826:3 A. Yes, that's correct.	

826:4 Q. What -- what's the meaning of
 826:5 "limited" in that sentence?
 826:6 A. So IARC has various classifications
 826:7 of evidence, one of them is -- is this term
 826:8 "limited," and my understanding of that is that
 826:9 they are -- they are seeing an association but
 826:10 chance, bias, and confounding cannot be ruled out.

826:11 - 826:21

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:22)

xReevesFINAL.201

4649.1.4

826:11 Q. Did IARC rely on animal studies?
 826:12 A. Yes, it did.
 826:13 Q. How many studies did IARC rely on?
 826:14 A. Four.
 826:15 Q. How many -- and we're talking about
 826:16 mouse and rat studies; right?
 826:17 A. Mouse and rat.
 826:18 Q. How many mouse and rat studies were
 826:19 available at the time IARC made its decision in --
 826:20 in 2015?
 826:21 A. There were fourteen.

828:4 - 830:2

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:43)

xReevesFINAL.202

5085.1.1

828:4 Q. Exhibit 100 is a -- a paper authored
 828:5 -- with the lead author of Helmut Greim dated 2015
 828:6 entitled Evaluation of carcinogenic potential of
 828:7 the herbicide glyphosate, drawing on tumor
 828:8 incidence data from fourteen chronic/
 828:9 carcinogenicity rodent studies.
 828:10 Do you see that?
 828:11 A. I do see that.
 828:12 Q. Is -- is Exhibit 100 the effort that
 828:13 Monsanto made to put it to the public domain and
 828:14 publish all the mouse and rat studies that had been
 828:15 done on glyphosate?
 828:16 A. It is -- it is the effort that
 828:17 Monsanto made as well as the glyphosate task force
 828:18 -- task force which is all the companies in the --
 828:19 who have registered glyphosate-based herbicides or
 828:20 glyphosate itself.
 828:21 Q. Okay. So, and you mentioned that in
 828:22 a number of questions that you were asked by Mr.
 828:23 Wisner. Glyphosate task force is a -- it's a --

828:24 it's a group of companies that --

828:25 A. Mm-hmm.

829:1 Q. -- and they share their -- they share

829:2 data; right?

829:3 A. That's the idea is they are able to

829:4 share data, and this would be an example of -- of

829:5 what they have done.

829:6 Q. And in some cases some of these mouse

829:7 studies were not done by Monsanto but they were

829:8 done by other companies that have an interest in

829:9 glyphosate?

829:10 A. Yes, and then they were -- these are

829:11 then submitted -- these studies are the ones that

829:12 are being used, you know, around the world to

829:13 submit to government agencies for review.

829:14 Q. And you'll see on the front page of

829:15 the Greim article there is a heading called -- a

829:16 heading for rouse -- Rat carcinogenicity and a

829:17 heading for Mouse carcinogenicity.

829:18 Do you see that?

829:19 A. That's correct.

829:20 Q. And the studies are numbered 1

829:21 through 14?

829:22 A. That's correct.

829:23 Q. Are those the fourteen studies that

829:24 IARC had -- should have had access to when it was

829:25 evaluating the carcinogenic potential of

830:1 glyphosate?

830:2 A. Yes.

830:3 - 832:2

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:02:11)

830:3 Q. In your analysis of the IARC

830:4 decision, did you reach an understanding why they

830:5 didn't consider the ten other studies involving

830:6 mouse -- mice and rats?

830:7 A. So their -- their statement is that

830:8 they -- IARC statement that they only consider

830:9 publicly available data and, therefore, they --

830:10 these are statements they have made outside of the

830:11 monograph.

830:12 So they have said, as part of the

5085.1.2

xReevesFINAL.293

clear

830:13 rules, that we only consider publicly available
830:14 data, and then in the monograph itself they said
830:15 they did not consider these studies because they
830:16 did not have sufficient information on some of the
830:17 studies.

830:18 Q. Did Monsanto, in addition to
830:19 publishing or -- or facilitating the publishing of
830:20 the Greim article, did Monsanto do -- take other
830:21 steps to try to get these mouse and rat studies to
830:22 IARC so they could be evaluated?

830:23 A. We did.

830:24 Q. And this was before they reached
830:25 their decision?

831:1 A. Yes, this was before they met. They
831:2 have -- IARC has data deadlines for each of their
831:3 meetings and so we had to provide this publication
831:4 to them prior to that data deadline. And Dr. Donna
831:5 Farmer was responsible for -- for sharing this with
831:6 them. She initially --

831:7 Q. And --

831:8 A. Oh, I'm sorry.

831:9 Q. -- when you say "this," you're
831:10 referring to mouse and rat studies?

831:11 A. Sorry. Yes, sharing the -- the Greim
831:12 publication with all of the mouse and rat studies
831:13 with IARC. She attempted to email this document to
831:14 them but did not receive a response. She then, in
831:15 an attempt to make sure they saw it, she used
831:16 what's called an electrile -- electronic file
831:17 transfer service and -- and the idea is you have to
831:18 click on a web link and that opens up the document
831:19 for you and the center gets a receipt so we would
831:20 know they had opened it.

831:21 We did not get a receipt saying they
831:22 had opened it so we did not know that they had, and
831:23 at that point Dr. Farmer, my understanding is she
831:24 saved it onto a thumb drive and then sent it to
831:25 IARC's offices via Fed Ex. And it was signature
832:1 required. So when they signed for the delivery, we
832:2 knew they had it.

832:8 - 832:12

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:15)

xReevesFINAL.294

832:8 Q. Now, of the four studies that IARC
832:9 decided to consider, did you evaluate how other
832:10 bodies, regulatory bodies had seen those same exact
832:11 studies?

832:12 A. I have. That is correct.

833:21 - 835:16

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:02:04)

xReevesFINAL.295

833:21 Q. Is there a difference in the type of
833:22 data that IARC considered and the type of data that
833:23 regulatory bodies considered apart from the four
833:24 mouse and rat studies we just discussed?

833:25 A. Yes, the, you know -- there -- there
834:1 were other differences, so if we look at, and we
834:2 call it mechanistic data, earlier we used the term
834:3 "cell data."

834:4 They -- you know, you have data in
834:5 the open literature, you know, that's been
834:6 conducted, say as part of a research laboratory at
834:7 a university. You also have data that's been
834:8 generated by a company like Monsanto or other
834:9 companies where we're -- we're looking at this
834:10 question of can glyphosate or glyphosate-based
834:11 herbicides damage genetic material in a way that
834:12 could indicate cancer.

834:13 Q. Are the studies that are done for
834:14 regulatory bodies required to abide by
834:15 international protocols?

834:16 A. They are.

834:17 Q. What's -- what are those protocols?

834:18 A. So these -- this is the Organization
834:19 of Economic Cooperation and Development and I
834:20 alluded to this earlier where these are
834:21 internationally accepted guidelines where, you
834:22 know, many countries around the world have agreed
834:23 this is how we want the study done so we can
834:24 interpret the data so we can make sure everyone is
834:25 using the same rule book so we can interpret the
835:1 data when we have them.

835:2 Q. Are there other standards that are
835:3 required for regulatory submissions?

835:4 A. Yes, all -- the other thing is along
 835:5 with that is good laboratory practices, you know, I
 835:6 mentioned earlier we have to be able to track the
 835:7 data, audit the data, know where the data are being
 835:8 kept, but then also you want to make sure that the
 835:9 results of these studies, these cellular studies,
 835:10 the mechanistic studies are telling us about, the
 835:11 potential to damage, DNA, are relevant to a human
 835:12 health risk assessment. That's really what, you
 835:13 know, when you're looking at a human health risk
 835:14 assessment, agencies require that they be
 835:15 informative of that. Be informative so they can be
 835:16 used in that risk assessment.

837:15 - 838:8

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:52)

xReevesFINAL_206

837:15 Q. And do you remember that Mr. Wisner
 837:16 showed you Exhibit 74 and --

837:17 A. Yes.

837:18 Q. -- and got you to say that part of
 837:19 the -- well, he thought you said that part of the
 837:20 EPA agreed with IARC instead of the other parts of
 837:21 the EPA. Remember that?

837:22 A. I did not say that.

837:23 Q. He was talking about the Office for
 837:24 Research and Development, ORD?

837:25 A. I -- I recall that part of the
 838:1 conversation.

838:2 Q. And he -- he claimed that you said
 838:3 that the ORD agreed with IARC and that the Office
 838:4 of Pesticide Programs did not agree with IARC.

838:5 A. I -- I recall that part of the
 838:6 conversation.

838:7 Q. Is that what you meant to say?

838:8 A. No, that is not.

841:11 - 842:2

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:34)

xReevesFINAL_207

841:11 Q. Okay. So if we -- if the question
 841:12 that Mr. Wisner is trying to answer with Exhibit --
 841:13 what we've marked as Exhibit 101 what he had marked
 841:14 as 73 --

841:15 A. 3.

841:16 Q. -- is whether they -- whether these

101.1

841:17 entities had reached a conclusion that IARC was
841:18 right about glyphosate, then that's not supported
841:19 for the ORD; correct?

841:20 A. That is correct.

841:21 Q. And so we would just cross that
841:22 out --

841:23 A. I agree.

841:24 Q. -- because that's not what you said

841:25 to Mr. Wisner, he -- it's just something he wrote

842:1 on the exhibit?

842:2 A. That's correct.

846:2 - 852:25

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:07:01)

xReevesFINAL.298

846:2 Q. Okay. So now I want to go through

846:3 your analysis of the world regulatory bodies.

4649.3

846:4 A. Okay.

846:5 Q. Also included in -- in the business

846:6 record marked as Exhibit 99. Did you make an

846:7 effort at the time you prepared Exhibit 99 to

4649.3.1

846:8 understand the regulatory conclusions of various

846:9 entities that had evaluated glyphosate after the

846:10 IARC decision?

846:11 A. Yes, I did.

846:12 Q. Is -- are those listed in Exhibit 99?

846:13 A. Yes, they are.

4649.4.1

846:14 Q. Let's turn to the first one you

846:15 reported on, the European Food Safety Authority.

846:16 Do you see that?

846:17 A. Yes, I do.

846:18 Q. What's the European Food Safety

846:19 Authority?

846:20 A. This is the regulatory body within

846:21 Europe that has responsibility for making final

846:22 determinations about the safety of pesticides

846:23 across the European Union.

4649.4.2

846:24 Q. What analysis did the European Food

846:25 Safety Authority make of glyphosate after the IARC

847:1 decision?

847:2 A. They -- they concluded that

847:3 glyphosate is unlikely to pose a carcinogenic risk

847:4 to humans.

847:5 Q. Let's turn to the next page. Do you
847:6 see you've reported on the Canadian Pest Management
847:7 Regulatory Agency?

4649.5.1

847:8 A. I do see that.

847:9 Q. Is that the, roughly, the Canadian
847:10 equivalent of the EPA?

847:11 A. In many ways, yes.

847:12 Q. And did you make an effort to
847:13 understand what the Canadian Pest Management
847:14 Regulatory Agency thought about the potential of
847:15 glyphosate to cause cancer even after IARC had
847:16 reached its conclusions?

847:17 A. I did.

847:18 Q. What did the Canadian Pest Management
847:19 Regulatory Agency conclude?

4649.5.2

847:20 A. They -- they also concluded that
847:21 glyphosate is unlikely to pose a human cancer risk.

847:22 Q. Turn to the next page. Do you see
847:23 that you've reported on the Japan Food Safety
847:24 Commission?

4649.6.1

847:25 A. I do see that.

848:1 Q. Did you make an effort to understand
848:2 where the Japan Food Safety Commission had come out
848:3 on the safety of glyphosate even after the IARC
848:4 decision?

848:5 A. I did.

848:6 Q. What did the Japan Food Safety
848:7 Commission conclude?

4649.6.2

848:8 A. They looked across a range of
848:9 endpoints and so they -- so their key statement was
848:10 "No neurotoxicity," no toxicity to the nervous
848:11 system, "carcinogenicity," it won't cause cancer,
848:12 "reproductive effects, teratogenicity," that's
848:13 developmental toxicity, "or genotoxicity was
848:14 observed." So this is consistent with what we were
848:15 seeing out of Europe and -- and Canada.

848:16 Q. Okay. Let's go to the next one. Did
848:17 you -- is there something called the JMPR?

4649.7.1

848:18 A. Yes. This is part of the World
848:19 Health Organization. So it's the Food and

848:20 Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and
848:21 the World Health Organization, and they -- they put
848:22 these two groups together to assess the risks of
848:23 pesticide residues on food.

848:24 Q. Did the -- is the JMPR part of the
848:25 World Health Organization?

849:1 A. That's correct.

849:2 Q. And that's the same organization that
849:3 IARC's part of?

849:4 A. That's correct.

849:5 Q. Did the JMPR agree with IARC?

849:6 A. No, they did not.

849:7 Q. What did the JMPR conclude?

849:8 A. "Glyphosate is unlikely to pose a
849:9 carcinogenic risk to humans from exposure through
849:10 the diet."

849:11 Q. Turn to the next one. European
849:12 Chemicals Agency.

849:13 Do you see that?

849:14 A. I do see that.

849:15 Q. What's the European Chemicals Agency?

849:16 A. So it -- that stands -- so they're
849:17 abbreviated ECHA, is the way people refer to them.
849:18 E-C-H-A. And they -- their job is to standardize
849:19 hazard warnings across Europe so that all members
849:20 of the European Union are looking at chemical
849:21 hazards the same way. They have a labeling and
849:22 warning system that they rely on, and that's what
849:23 ECHA's job is, develop the warning and enforce it.

849:24 Q. And had -- had ECHA reviewed the
849:25 safety of glyphosate after the IARC decision?

850:1 A. ECHA did review that. This is a
850:2 panel of -- of independent scientists they bring
850:3 together for this review.

850:4 Q. Did ECHA agree with the -- with IARC
850:5 about the carcinogenic potential of glyphosate?

850:6 A. They did not. They -- ECHA's
850:7 conclusion was there was "No hazard classification"
850:8 that -- I'm sorry. "No hazard classification for
850:9 carcinogenicity is warranted for glyphosate

4649.8.1

850:10 according to the" -- it's "CLP criteria," but that
850:11 stands for -- it's essentially their -- their rules
850:12 about how do we label products.

850:13 Q. All right. Turn to the next one.

4649.9.1

850:14 New Zealand. Did New Zealand's Environmental
850:15 Protection Authority evaluate the safety after the
850:16 IARC decision concerning glyphosate?

850:17 A. New Zealand did.

850:18 Q. And New Zealand didn't agree with
850:19 IARC either, did they?

850:20 A. They did not. They concluded
850:21 glyphosate is unlikely to be genotoxic or
850:22 carcinogenic.

850:23 Q. Turn to the very last page. I want
850:24 to skip over one for a second. We'll come back to
850:25 it. The Australian Pesticides and Veterinary

4649.11.1

851:1 Medicines Authority.

851:2 Do you see that?

851:3 A. I do see that.

851:4 Q. Is that the entity in Australia that
851:5 evaluates risks from things like glyphosate?

851:6 A. Yes, they are. They are the agency
851:7 that regulates pesticides, including glyphosate.

851:8 Q. Did you make an effort to understand
851:9 how the Australian regulatory body had considered
851:10 the safety of -- of glyphosate?

851:11 A. I did, and -- and what they were --
851:12 what they were doing is they were asked to please
851:13 take a look at glyphosate again following IARC and
851:14 determine do we need to -- do we need to go through
851:15 this whole analysis again or do the data we have
851:16 support the conclusions that we -- that we've
851:17 already adopted.

851:18 Q. And were they able to answer that
851:19 question?

851:20 A. They were.

851:21 Q. And did they answer it in a way that
851:22 agreed with IARC?

851:23 A. No, they did not. They said exposure
851:24 -- so the -- Australia concluded "Exposure to

851:25 glyphosate does not pose a carcinogenic risk to
852:1 humans."

852:2 Q. Okay. So we've looked at all these
852:3 regulatory bodies that had not agreed with IARC.

852:4 A. That's correct.

852:5 Q. Let's -- let's go to the one second
852:6 to the last page. Do you see that that's the
852:7 United States Environmental Protection Agency?

4649.10.1

852:8 A. I do see that.

852:9 Q. And the EPA is the entity that's
852:10 responsible for evaluating the safety of compounds
852:11 like glyphosate and Roundup?

852:12 A. That's correct.

852:13 Q. Did the EPA evaluate the safety of
852:14 glyphosate after the IARC decision?

852:15 A. It did.

852:16 Q. And we talked about that. Is that
852:17 the OPP evaluation?

852:18 A. That's correct.

852:19 Q. And what did the -- did the EPA agree
852:20 or disagree with IARC?

852:21 A. They disagreed.

852:22 Q. What did they conclude?

852:23 A. Gly -- so the United States EPA
852:24 classified glyphosate as "not likely to be
852:25 carcinogenic to humans."

864:16 - 865:8

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:41)

xReevesFINAL.299

864:16 Q. You mentioned that there had been
864:17 some work done to fix some of the problems that
864:18 Acquavella observed and that were reported in
864:19 Exhibit 20, his 1997 concerns regarding the
864:20 unreliability of the AHS.

RW20.1.1

864:21 Do you recall that?

864:22 A. I do recall that.

864:23 Q. And there was something that was done
864:24 with respect to making the questionnaire data
864:25 better; is that correct?

865:1 A. It was -- it wasn't about the -- the
865:2 questionnaire itself. It was the protocol for
865:3 administering it. They wanted to understand how

Page/Line	Source	ID
867:22 - 867:25	<p>865:4 reliable it was across time. 865:5 Q. They couldn't go back and change the 865:6 answers to the questionnaires they already had, 865:7 could they? 865:8 A. No, not to my knowledge. Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:08)</p>	xReevesFINAL.300
872:6 - 872:10	<p>867:22 Q. So you're aware that it's -- was it 867:23 somewhere around 37 percent of the participants 867:24 dropped out? 867:25 A. That's my recollection. Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:12)</p>	xReevesFINAL.301 clear
875:21 - 877:4	<p>872:6 When those people dropped out of -- 872:7 the 37 percent that were lost to follow-up, the 872:8 Andreotti team could not get answers to 872:9 questionnaires from them, could they? 872:10 A. They could not. Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:26)</p> <p>875:21 Q. You -- you went over Exhibit 74, 875:22 which was the Summary of ORD comments on OPP's 875:23 glyphosate cancer assessment. 875:24 Do you recall that? 875:25 A. Yes, I do recall that.</p> <p>876:1 Q. Can you pull that up? 876:2 A. Yes.</p> <p>876:3 Q. And you focused in on the -- their 876:4 defining the limited evidence by IARC. 876:5 Do you remember that? 876:6 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>876:7 Q. Relative to epidemiology? 876:8 A. I do recall that.</p> <p>876:9 Q. Was that the only arm of scientific 876:10 inquiry that ORD relied upon or these scientists 876:11 relied upon for issuing their opinions? 876:12 A. That was -- that was part of the 876:13 information they considered.</p> <p>876:14 Q. But they also considered the 876:15 toxicology and mechanistic studies as well; 876:16 correct? 876:17 A. They -- so what they were doing was 876:18 looking at the -- the CARC report that -- that was</p>	xReevesFINAL.302

876:19 being prepared for public release and so they
876:20 looked across the CARC report.

876:21 Q. And they found a number of
876:22 discrepancies or things they disagreed with;
876:23 correct?

876:24 A. They -- they shared some comments,
876:25 you know, and again the challenge here is they're
877:1 saying ORD, there's no -- the ORD reviewers, they
877:2 don't identify who those people are in this
877:3 document so it's hard to understand is this 20, is
877:4 it 2? We don't know that.

877:16 - 877:24

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:21)

xReevesFINAL.303

877:16 Q. -- if the jury were to get the idea
877:17 that you -- you -- that the ORD had only looked at
877:18 epidemiology based on your testimony, that would be
877:19 incorrect?

877:20 A. So again with this document, I think
877:21 the important part is to be able, you know, I think
877:22 only ORD can really speak to who are these people.
877:23 There's no information about who they were and what
877:24 they were doing.

877:25 - 878:21

Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:55)

xReevesFINAL.304

877:25 Q. So on the second page there, in the
878:1 second paragraph, you see where it says "OPP (and
878:2 EFSA) focused on pairwise comparisons" --

878:3 A. I do see that.

878:4 Q. -- "(which were generally not
878:5 significant), while IARC also uses trend tests,
878:6 which yielded several significant results."

878:7 Do you see that?

878:8 A. I do see that.

878:9 Q. And "In a few cases, OPP reported
878:10 trend test results that differed from those of IARC
878:11 but did not report which test they used. EPA's
878:12 Cancer Guidelines state that 'Trend tests and
878:13 pairwise comparison tests are the recommended tests
878:14 for determining whether chance, rather than a
878:15 treatment-related effect, is a plausible
878:16 explanation for an apparent increase in tumor
878:17 incidence. Significance in either kind of test is

Page/Line	Source	ID
879:21 - 880:18	<p>878:18 sufficient to reject the hypothesis that chance 878:19 accounts for the result." 878:20 Do you see that? 878:21 A. I do see those words. Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:01:02) 879:21 Q. Well, isn't this pointing out that 879:22 there, amongst -- this, amongst other methodology 879:23 supplied by the EPA, were departures from the EPA 879:24 guidelines for analyzing animal studies? 879:25 A. They were -- they were -- so as I 880:1 read this comment, what they're saying is we have 880:2 -- the Cancer Guidelines state and they have 880:3 information about how to do statistical analyses of 880:4 these studies, the white paper that EPA is now 880:5 using reflects that. And so this is essentially a 880:6 comment on a report that is no longer the primary 880:7 line of evidence for EPA.</p>	xReevesFINAL.305
880:19 - 880:25	<p>880:8 Q. Well, one -- one of the things I'm 880:9 trying to get at I think is that it seems like if 880:10 you have the opportunity or Monsanto has the 880:11 opportunity to read an analysis in a way that shows 880:12 there's no risk, they'll find that, and if there is 880:13 a way of reading where there is a risk, they'll 880:14 ignore it. Is that their protocol? 880:15 A. That is not our protocol. 880:16 Q. Doesn't it seem like that's what 880:17 they're doing, though? 880:18 A. No, it does not. Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:13) 880:19 Q. So IARC did not just rely on 880:20 epidemiology; right? 880:21 A. That is correct. 880:22 Q. And they didn't rely just on 880:23 toxicology; right? 880:24 A. They relied on animal studies and 880:25 epidemiology to reach their conclusion.</p>	xReevesFINAL.306
882:8 - 882:24	<p>Reeves, William 01-24-2019 (00:00:57) 882:8 Q. And so you're disregarding this 882:9 statement here that says "There is strong evidence 882:10 that exposure to glyphosate or glyphosate-based</p>	<p>xReevesFINAL.307 1019.78 1019.78.1</p>

Page/Line

Source

ID

Total Time = 03:07:02**Documents Shown**

101
1019
4036
4191
4649
5085
899
RW10
RW11
RW12
RW13
RW14
RW15
RW16
RW17
RW18
RW19
RW2
RW20
RW21
RW25
RW27
RW28
RW29
RW30
RW3031
RW31
RW33
RW36
RW4
RW5
RW58
RW7
RW73
RW78
RW7879

Page/Line

Source

ID

RW79
RW8
RW84
RW87
RW88
RW89
RW9
RW90
RW91