

# FINAL SHOWN

---

Heydens, William 01-23-2017

Heydens, William 01-24-2017

---

[REDACTED]

**Total Time 01:07:46**





Page/Line

Source

ID

192:25 And so it says "Williams, et  
193:1 al., 2000." That's the paper we've been  
193:2 discussing, right?

193:3 A. That is correct.

193:4 Q. And it says, "An invaluable  
193:5 asset," right, sir?

193:6 A. That's what he has written  
193:7 there, yes.

193:8 - 193:9 **Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:02)**

EXHIBIT 312.12.1

WH2\_COMBINED\_06.5

193:8 Q. And that's a fair

193:9 characterization, you would agree?

193:12 - 194:3 **Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:44)**

WH2\_COMBINED\_06.6

193:12 THE WITNESS: So the Williams  
193:13 paper, the way I would characterize  
193:14 the Williams paper -- I think we  
193:15 talked a little bit about it this  
193:16 morning -- that was the first time  
193:17 that -- all the glyphosate toxicology  
193:18 data that existed for regulatory  
193:19 purposes in the publications, the  
193:20 first time that it was compiled  
193:21 together and reviewed by basically  
193:22 international experts. So that was a  
193:23 very important paper.

193:24 QUESTIONS BY MR. MILLER:

193:25 Q. And what David Saltmiras says

194:1 is that Monsanto responses to agencies? Is  
194:2 that one of the things the Williams paper was  
194:3 used for?

194:6 - 194:7 **Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:02)**

EXHIBIT 312.12.2

WH2\_COMBINED\_06.7

194:6 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure I  
194:7 know what he means by that.

194:23 - 195:2 **Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:13)**

WH2\_COMBINED\_06.8

194:23 Do you understand what David  
194:24 Saltmiras meant when he said in the slide  
194:25 panel that you reviewed in 2010 that it was  
195:1 going to be used for scientific affairs  
195:2 rebuttals?

EXHIBIT 312.12.3

195:5 - 195:11 **Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:08)**

WH2\_COMBINED\_06.9

195:5 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't

195:6 know. I mean, I'm looking at it now,  
 195:7 and I don't know exactly what David  
 195:8 meant by that.

195:9 QUESTIONS BY MR. MILLER:

195:10 Q. Do you know what the word

195:11 "rebuttals" means?

195:14 - 196:15

**Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:01:04)**

WH2\_COMBINED\_06.10

195:14 THE WITNESS: I know what the

195:15 word "rebuttals" means to me in this

195:16 context.

195:17 QUESTIONS BY MR. MILLER:

195:18 Q. Is what?

195:19 A. Well, to me it's scientific

195:20 affairs assessments or reviews. We do a

195:21 number of those where publications come out.

195:22 I think we probably talked about some of

195:23 them. Publications come out, and we have

195:24 those papers -- we will review those papers,

195:25 either ourselves and/or with other experts,

196:1 to understand what those papers are saying,

196:2 to understand if it's really -- if it's an

196:3 example of good science or if there's perhaps

196:4 some problems with the paper. And maybe

196:5 there's not problems with the paper. And

196:6 then maybe we need to understand more why the

196:7 results were there, and we may need to do

196:8 some work to do that.

196:9 So I look at it as a process of

196:10 assessing other people's scientific

196:11 information. That's what I see when I look

196:12 there.

196:13 Q. Do you understand also that the

196:14 publication Williams was going to be used for

196:15 regulatory reviews?

196:18 - 196:23

**Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:16)**

EXHIBIT 913.12.A

WH2\_COMBINED\_06.11

196:18 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't

196:19 know if it was. You'd have to -- we'd

196:20 have to look at that.

196:21 QUESTIONS BY MR. MILLER:

196:22 Q. Go to the page of the deck that

EXHIBIT 913.17.1

| Page/Line       | Source  | ID                |
|-----------------|---|-------------------|
| 196:24 - 197:5  | <p>196:23 starts with political science.</p> <p><b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:21)</b></p> | WH2_COMBINED_0812 |
|                 | 196:24 Do you have that page, sir?  |                   |
|                 | 196:25 A. Yes, I do.  |                   |
|                 | 197:1 Q. Dr. Saltmiras writes in that   | EXHIBIT 312.17.2  |
|                 | 197:2 section that "Williams has served us well in  |                   |
|                 | 197:3 toxicology over the last decade."   |                   |
|                 | 197:4 Do you see that, sir?   |                   |
|                 | 197:5 A. I do see that.   |                   |
| 197:15 - 197:17 | <p><b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:06)</b></p>  | WH2_COMBINED_0813 |
|                 | 197:15 Q. Would it be fair to say now   |                   |
|                 | 197:16 that Williams has served Monsanto well in  |                   |
|                 | 197:17 toxicology over the last decade?   |                   |
| 197:20 - 198:16 | <p><b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:52)</b></p>  | WH2_COMBINED_0814 |
|                 | 197:20 THE WITNESS: What I would say  |                   |
|                 | 197:21 is really what I said before: This   |                   |
|                 | 197:22 was -- it was a very important paper   |                   |
|                 | 197:23 because it was the first of its kind,  |                   |
|                 | 197:24 it was comprehensive of everything   |                   |
|                 | 197:25 that was out there up to that point in   |                   |
|                 | 198:1 time, and it was a very, like I said,   |                   |
|                 | 198:2 important paper for glyphosate.   |                   |
|                 | 198:3 So if people wanted to  |                   |
|                 | 198:4 understand what the science of  |                   |
|                 | 198:5 glyphosate says, that they had in one   |                   |
|                 | 198:6 place a full review. That paper had   |                   |
|                 | 198:7 not only the toxicology -- I failed to  |                   |
|                 | 198:8 mention previously toxicology of  |                   |
|                 | 198:9 glyphosate -- but it also looked at   |                   |
|                 | 198:10 surfactant. It looked at everything.   |                   |
|                 | 198:11 It looked at some formulations. So it  |                   |
|                 | 198:12 was a very important document.   |                   |
|                 | 198:13 QUESTIONS BY MR. MILLER:   |                   |
|                 | 198:14 Q. Fair to say you told Donna  |                   |
|                 | 198:15 Farmer that you would strangle Dr. Williams  |                   |
|                 | 198:16 if he wanted to rewrite the paper?   |                   |
| 198:19 - 198:20 | <p><b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:03)</b></p>  | WH2_COMBINED_0815 |
|                 | 198:19 THE WITNESS: I don't recall  |                   |
|                 | 198:20 having said that.  |                   |
| 210:18 - 210:20 | <p><b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:07)</b></p>  | WH2_COMBINED_0816 |

| Page/Line       | Source  | ID  |
|-----------------|---|---|
| 210:21 - 211:4  | <p>210:18 Q. Exhibit 3:28, an e-mail from<br/> 210:19 you concerning the glyphosate mammalian<br/> 210:20 manuscript.<br/> <b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:18)</b></p>  | <p>EXHIBIT 315.1.1<br/><br/> WH2_COMBINED_0817</p>    |
| 213:6 - 213:14  | <p>210:21 A. Okay.<br/> 210:22 Q. Do you remember sending this<br/> 210:23 e-mail, sir?<br/> 210:24 A. No, I do not.<br/> 210:25 Q. Let's take a look at it then.<br/> 211:1 This is an e-mail from you the year of the<br/> 211:2 Williams paper, 1999, right?<br/> 211:3 A. The Williams paper was 2000,<br/> 211:4 not '99.<br/> <b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:22)</b></p>   | <p>WH2_COMBINED_0818<br/> clear - EXHIBIT 316.1.1</p> |
| 214:3 - 214:10  | <p>213:6 Q. We're going to mark the<br/> 213:7 Williams paper 2000 --<br/> 213:8 A. If that's -- just so we're<br/> 213:9 clear, if that's what's -- that's not the<br/> 213:10 entire paper. That's part of it.<br/> 213:11 Q. Okay. What is exhibit -- then<br/> 213:12 you can mark on -- that's 3-29.<br/> 213:13 What is that, the short version<br/> 213:14 of the paper? How would you describe it?<br/> <b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:20)</b></p> | <p>WH2_COMBINED_0818</p>                              |
| 214:21 - 214:22 | <p>214:3 Q. The question is: How would you<br/> 214:4 describe what you're looking at,<br/> 214:5 Exhibit 3-29?<br/> 214:6 A. I would describe it as three<br/> 214:7 pages. I want to look at the backside and<br/> 214:8 make sure there's nothing on the back. I<br/> 214:9 would describe it as three pages from the<br/> 214:10 full publication.<br/> <b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:06)</b></p>   | <p>WH2_COMBINED_0820</p>                              |
| 215:15 - 215:24 | <p>214:21 And the authors are<br/> 214:22 Dr. Williams, Dr. Kroes and Dr. Munro?<br/> <b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:28)</b><br/> 215:15 THE WITNESS: Those are the<br/> 215:16 three authors.<br/> 215:17 QUESTIONS BY MR. MILLER:<br/> 215:18 Q. Let's go back to Exhibit 3-28.</p>  | <p>WH2_COMBINED_0821<br/><br/> EXHIBIT 315.1.1</p>    |

| Page/Line       | Source   | ID                |
|-----------------|--|-------------------|
|                 | 215:19 It's an e-mail that you sent in July of 1999. |                   |
|                 | 215:20 Do you see that, Doctor?                      |                   |
|                 | 215:21 A. I do.                                      |                   |
|                 | 215:22 Q. And it's sent to imunro@cantox.            |                   |
|                 | 215:23 That's the same I. Munro who was an author of |                   |
|                 | 215:24 the Williams paper, right, sir?               |                   |
| 216:7 - 216:9   | <b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:05)</b>        | WH2_COMBINED_0622 |
|                 | 216:7 A. I. Munro would be Ian Munro at              |                   |
|                 | 216:8 Cantox.  |                   |
|                 | 216:9 Q. Same person?                                |                   |
| 216:23 - 217:4  | <b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:14)</b>        | WH2_COMBINED_0623 |
|                 | 216:23 THE WITNESS: Okay. Now I have                 |                   |
|                 | 216:24 3-28 and 3-29 in front of me, and Ian         |                   |
|                 | 216:25 Munro would be the same person.               |                   |
|                 | 217:1 QUESTIONS BY MR. MILLER:                       |                   |
|                 | 217:2 Q. All right. So you're writing                |                   |
|                 | 217:3 to Ian about this paper; is that fair,         |                   |
|                 | 217:4 Doctor?  |                   |
| 217:13 - 217:21 | <b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:31)</b>        | WH2_COMBINED_0624 |
|                 | 217:13 A. My -- this e-mail in 3-28                  |                   |
|                 | 217:14 refers to the Cantox publication.             |                   |
|                 | 217:15 Q. And you say in this e-mail that            | EXHIBIT 315.1.2   |
|                 | 217:16 you send to him, "Finally, attached are the   |                   |
|                 | 217:17 text, tables and references. I've sprouted    |                   |
|                 | 217:18 several new gray hairs during the writing of  |                   |
|                 | 217:19 this thing, but as best I can tell, at least  |                   |
|                 | 217:20 they have stayed attached to my head."        |                   |
|                 | 217:21 Did I read that correctly?                    |                   |
| 217:25 - 218:5  | <b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:07)</b>        | WH2_COMBINED_0625 |
|                 | 217:25 THE WITNESS: Yes, that is                     |                   |
|                 | 218:1 there in the document -- in the                |                   |
|                 | 218:2 e-mail.  |                   |
|                 | 218:3 QUESTIONS BY MR. MILLER:                       |                   |
|                 | 218:4 Q. So you got gray hair writing                |                   |
|                 | 218:5 this paper, okay?                              |                   |
| 218:10 - 218:15 | <b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:15)</b>        | WH2_COMBINED_0626 |
|                 | 218:10 Q. You can answer.                            |                   |
|                 | 218:11 A. Yes. So as I look at this now,             |                   |
|                 | 218:12 you know, probably what I was really          |                   |
|                 | 218:13 referring to was that it was a lengthy        |                   |

| Page/Line       | Source  | ID                |
|-----------------|---|-------------------|
| 218:18 - 218:22 | <p>218:14 process, as a seminal review paper would<br/>218:15 probably be.<br/><b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:09)</b></p>  | WH2_COMBINED_0627 |
| 219:2 - 219:11  | <p>218:18 A. Seminal and comprehensive.<br/>218:19 Q. Yes, sir.<br/>218:20 And you write that, "Everyone<br/>218:21 at Monsanto has agreed with adding you as an<br/>218:22 author. Please do so."<br/><b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:29)</b></p>  | EXHIBIT 315.1.3   |
| 219:12 - 219:15 | <p>219:2 Q. Did I read that correctly?<br/>219:3 A. You read that correctly. I<br/>219:4 don't know why that is there, because Ian was<br/>219:5 always going to be an author as far as -- to<br/>219:6 my recollection. I'm not sure why that's<br/>219:7 there.<br/>219:8 I mean, he participated in the<br/>219:9 review to the same degree that the other two<br/>219:10 scientists did, so I don't know why that's<br/>219:11 there.<br/><b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:11)</b></p> | WH2_COMBINED_0628 |
| 219:18 - 219:23 | <p>219:12 Q. Well, two months before that<br/>219:13 you wrote an e-mail where you said you would<br/>219:14 manage your experts as authors.<br/>219:15 Do you remember that, sir?<br/><b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:02)</b></p>  | c1c3c             |
| 219:24 - 220:2  | <p>219:18 THE WITNESS: I don't remember<br/>219:19 that.<br/>219:20 (Heydens Exhibit 3-30 marked<br/>219:21 for identification.)<br/>219:22 QUESTIONS BY MR. MILLER:<br/>219:23 Q. Let's take a look at it.<br/><b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:15)</b></p>   | WH2_COMBINED_0631 |
| 220:3 - 220:22  | <p>219:24 Exhibit 3-30, an e-mail you sent in May<br/>219:25 of '79. I have a copy for you and counsel.<br/>220:1 A. '79 or '99?<br/>220:2 Q. Excuse me, '99. My fault.<br/><b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:51)</b><br/>220:3 A. Okay.<br/>220:4 Q. Yes, sir.<br/>220:5 This is an e-mail that you</p>  | EXHIBIT 317.1.1   |
|                 |   | WH2_COMBINED_0632 |

220:6 wrote in May of '99, right, sir?

220:7 A. That appears to be correct,

220:8 yes.

220:9 Q. And you wrote it to a William

220:10 Graham, also a Monsanto employee?

220:11 A. Yes, that is correct.

220:12 Q. And I just want to go over a

220:13 few points in it. Your point number 2:

220:14 "Outside scientific experts who are

220:15 influential at driving science, regulators,

220:16 public opinion, et cetera, we would have

220:17 they" -- I think you meant "the," but I'll

220:18 ask you -- "we would have the people directly

220:19 or indirectly behind the scenes work on our

220:20 behalf."

220:21 Was that part of your strategy

220:22 in May of 1999?

221:1 - 221:13

**Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:33)**

221:1 THE WITNESS: Those words are

221:2 written there. I don't remember this

221:3 e-mail.

221:4 QUESTIONS BY MR. MILLER:

221:5 Q. Was one of your jobs to --

221:6 quote, "Monsanto people who are responsible

221:7 for dissemination and coordination of

221:8 scientific information within and outside of

221:9 Monsanto. They will play a role in

221:10 establishing and, quote, managing

221:11 relationships with outside experts."

221:12 My question to you, sir, is:

221:13 Why did you put "managing" in quotes there?

221:17 - 222:10

**Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:59)**

221:17 THE WITNESS: So as I said just

221:18 a moment ago, I don't remember this

221:19 e-mail. As I look at it now, I would

221:20 interpret that as just meaning who has

221:21 the contact relationship.

221:22 Usually with -- quite often,

221:23 anyway, with -- different scientists

221:24 would have perhaps different key

EXHIBIT 017.1.2

WH2\_COMBINED\_0633

EXHIBIT 017.1.3

WH2\_COMBINED\_0634

| Page/Line       | Source   | ID                |
|-----------------|--|-------------------|
|                 | 221:25 contact points. So, for instance, if<br>222:1 an external scientist was a genetic<br>222:2 toxicologist, then we might have one<br>222:3 of our own genetic toxicologists be<br>222:4 the contact person for that. So<br>222:5 that's what I think I meant by that.<br>222:6 QUESTIONS BY MR. MILLER:   |                   |
|                 | 222:7 Q. And number 4 you write, "As far<br>222:8 as how we get, quote, people to get up and<br>222:9 shout glyphosate is nontoxic," end quote.<br>222:10 Was that one of your jobs?   | EXHIBIT 217.1.4   |
| 222:14 - 222:15 | <b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:01)</b><br>222:14 QUESTIONS BY MR. MILLER:   | WH2_COMBINED_0635 |
| 222:17 - 222:23 | 222:15 Q. Was that one of your jobs, sir?<br><b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:18)</b><br>222:17 THE WITNESS: No. As I stated<br>222:18 this morning, it really -- my job is<br>222:19 to make sure that the best science<br>222:20 gets conducted on glyphosate and the<br>222:21 best science using sound principles is<br>222:22 communicated. That's always been my<br>222:23 role in glyphosate.  | WH2_COMBINED_0638 |
| 263:18 - 263:20 | <b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:09)</b><br>263:18 Q. Okay. Has there been a<br>263:19 decision to preclude the use of POEA as a<br>263:20 surfactant with glyphosate in Europe?  | WH2_COMBINED_0637 |
| 263:25 - 264:12 | <b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:54)</b><br>263:25 A. So I'm aware of some places in<br>264:1 Europe where that proposal -- and, in fact,<br>264:2 has taken place. What I will say is that is<br>264:3 due to political reasons and is not supported<br>264:4 by the scientific data.<br>264:5 In fact, the risk assessments<br>264:6 that have been done by the German BfR -- it<br>264:7 was approximately back in 2010, 2012. That<br>264:8 is the same organization -- or the same<br>264:9 regulatory agency who was the rapporteur for<br>264:10 glyphosate in the reevaluation. That very<br>264:11 agency evaluated tallow amine and came to the<br>264:12 conclusion that there's no unreasonable risk. | WH2_COMBINED_0638 |

| Page/Line       | Source   | ID                 |
|-----------------|--|--------------------|
| 264:16 - 264:16 | <b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:02)</b>        | WH2_COMBINED_06.96 |
|                 | 264:16 Q. Let's look at Exhibit 3-36, sir.           | HEYDENS 3.1.1      |
| 264:24 - 267:24 | <b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:03:50)</b>        | WH2_COMBINED_06.40 |
|                 | 264:24 Q. Is that your handwriting where             | HEYDENS 3.1.2      |
|                 | 264:25 we see on Exhibit 3-36 "reasons for defending |                    |
|                 | 265:1 tallow amines"?                                |                    |
|                 | 265:2 A. It looks like my handwriting.               |                    |
|                 | 265:3 Q. And this is an e-mail from you              | HEYDENS 3.1.3      |
|                 | 265:4 in the bottom of the first page of that        |                    |
|                 | 265:5 document, from Bill Heydens, January 2010, to  |                    |
|                 | 265:6 Richard Garnett.                               |                    |
|                 | 265:7 I believe he's a Monsanto                      |                    |
|                 | 265:8 employee in Europe?                            |                    |
|                 | 265:9 A. That is correct.                            |                    |
|                 | 265:10 Q. Yes, sir.                                  |                    |
|                 | 265:11 A. couple of comments. This is                |                    |
|                 | 265:12 you, quote, "First, there is still a strong   | HEYDENS 3.1.4      |
|                 | 265:13 sentiment in STL" --                          |                    |
|                 | 265:14 Is that St. Louis?                            |                    |
|                 | 265:15 A. That is correct.                           |                    |
|                 | 265:16 Q. Which is where the Monsanto                |                    |
|                 | 265:17 headquarters is?                              |                    |
|                 | 265:18 A. That is correct.                           |                    |
|                 | 265:19 Q. Okay. "There is still a strong             |                    |
|                 | 265:20 sentiment in St. Louis that we need to        |                    |
|                 | 265:21 continue to defend tallow amines, even though |                    |
|                 | 265:22 we prepare to switch over because of their    |                    |
|                 | 265:23 impending demise."                            |                    |
|                 | 265:24 Did I read that correctly?                    |                    |
|                 | 265:25 A. You did.                                   |                    |
|                 | 266:1 Q. And what did you understand in              |                    |
|                 | 266:2 2010?  |                    |
|                 | 266:3 Why was there an impending                     |                    |
|                 | 266:4 demise of tallow amine?                        |                    |
|                 | 266:5 A. Well, the conversation that we              |                    |
|                 | 266:6 were already hearing in our conversations      |                    |
|                 | 266:7 that, as you have already said, that there --  |                    |
|                 | 266:8 some of the regulatory agencies and some of    |                    |
|                 | 266:9 the -- some of the politicians were starting   |                    |
|                 | 266:10 to talk about enacting bans on tallow amines. |                    |

266:11 Q. And you were responding to an  
 266:12 e-mail that had come from you -- come to you  
 266:13 from a Richard Garnett, the Monsanto employee  
 266:14 in Europe, right, sir?

266:15 A. Yes.

266:16 Q. And he asked in his e-mail, the  
 266:17 top of page 2, "Anyway, there are  
 266:18 nonhazardous formulations, so why sell a  
 266:19 hazardous one?"

266:20 Do you remember him asking you  
 266:21 that question?

266:22 A. I think that's more a  
 266:23 rhetorical question, if you will.

266:24 Q. Back to the first page. What  
 266:25 you write, sir, is that you were very  
 267:1 worried -- excuse me. Let me get it right.  
 267:2 "Reason to do so: Domino  
 267:3 effect on ether amines, defend other world  
 267:4 areas to the best of our ability. Second, I  
 267:5 was in Brazil all last week - they are very  
 267:6 worried about this coming across the Atlantic  
 267:7 to their part of the American hemisphere."  
 267:8 Those were the reasons you were  
 267:9 defending tallow amines?

267:10 A. The reason why defending tallow  
 267:11 amines is because I believe -- we believe  
 267:12 that the science is behind tallow amines. If  
 267:13 the science is behind the product, then I  
 267:14 think it's -- certainly you should be making  
 267:15 sure that decisions are being made about your  
 267:16 material based on sound science.

267:17 Q. Well, you were going to defend  
 267:18 tallow amines or POEAs as long as the price  
 267:19 of them didn't get too high, right?

267:20 A. I'm not sure I said that.

267:21 Can you --

267:22 (Heydens Exhibit 3-37 marked  
 267:23 for identification.)

267:24 QUESTIONS BY MR. MILLER:

| Page/Line       | Source  | ID                |
|-----------------|---|-------------------|
|                 | 267:25 Q. Let's take a look at it.                  |                   |
|                 | 268:1 Exhibit 3-37.                                 |                   |
| 268:22 - 269:13 | <b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:48)</b>       | WH2_COMBINED_0542 |
|                 | 268:22 Q. Do you remember this series of            |                   |
|                 | 268:23 e-mails, sir?                                |                   |
|                 | 268:24 A. Ever so vaguely.                          |                   |
|                 | 268:25 Q. All right. Let's look at the              |                   |
|                 | 269:1 first page. This is an e-mail sent by you,    | _1_HEYDENS 3.1.1  |
|                 | 269:2 September 2010, regarding new formulations    |                   |
|                 | 269:3 LAS-POAE -- I'm sorry, POEA as surfactants,   |                   |
|                 | 269:4 right, sir?                                   |                   |
|                 | 269:5 A. Yes.                                       |                   |
|                 | 269:6 Q. And what you say in the second             | _1_HEYDENS 3.1.2  |
|                 | 269:7 paragraph is, "So for now, I think we         |                   |
|                 | 269:8 continue to defend POEA as long as the price  |                   |
|                 | 269:9 doesn't get too high, and we continue to      |                   |
|                 | 269:10 develop backups for when and if other areas  |                   |
|                 | 269:11 become in jeopardy."                         |                   |
|                 | 269:12 That was your plan as of                     |                   |
|                 | 269:13 September of 2010, right?                    |                   |
| 269:18 - 269:20 | <b>Heydens, William 01-23-2017 (00:00:08)</b>       | WH2_COMBINED_0543 |
|                 | 269:18 THE WITNESS: And that's not my               |                   |
|                 | 269:19 plan. There I am offering my personal        |                   |
|                 | 269:20 opinion.                                     |                   |
| 289:19 - 296:16 | <b>Heydens, William 01-24-2017 (00:06:09)</b>       | WH2_COMBINED_0544 |
|                 | 289:19 Q. Can you tell the jury what your           | clear             |
|                 | 289:20 profession is, Dr. Heydens?                  |                   |
|                 | 289:21 A. Yes. I'm a toxicologist by                |                   |
|                 | 289:22 profession.                                  |                   |
|                 | 289:23 Q. And what is your current title            |                   |
|                 | 289:24 at Monsanto?                                 |                   |
|                 | 289:25 A. Currently I'm product safety              |                   |
|                 | 290:1 assessment strategy lead.                     |                   |
|                 | 290:2 Q. And can you tell the jury what             |                   |
|                 | 290:3 you do in that role?                          |                   |
|                 | 290:4 A. In that role, my job is to work            |                   |
|                 | 290:5 with other scientists as we get new products  |                   |
|                 | 290:6 that come in that would need to be tested for |                   |
|                 | 290:7 safety to work on, devise the overall testing |                   |
|                 | 290:8 strategy and sets of studies that we would do |                   |

290:9 to support the safety of that product.  
290:10 Q. Are there standard studies or a  
290:11 guide to what kind of studies need to be done  
290:12 for a new product?  
290:13 A. There are for some -- for the  
290:14 traditional pesticides, there are a set of  
290:15 guideline studies. A couple different sets  
290:16 of guideline studies that we can use and we  
290:17 can -- if necessary, we can adapt those for a  
290:18 different product concept.  
290:19 Q. Are there any required studies  
290:20 that would have to be done for a new  
290:21 herbicide or pesticide?  
290:22 A. For new pesticides, for which  
290:23 herbicide is one, yes, there's a whole set of  
290:24 studies, a very comprehensive set of studies  
290:25 that need to be done, all way from acutes,  
291:1 subchronics, gene tox studies, reproductive  
291:2 toxicity, developmental toxicity, cancer,  
291:3 metabolism, just -- neurotoxicity,  
291:4 everything.  
291:5 Q. Who specifies what studies need  
291:6 to be done?  
291:7 A. Here in the United -- that's by  
291:8 regulatory agency. So here in the United  
291:9 States, that would be the Environmental  
291:10 Protection Agency.  
291:11 Q. I want to briefly review your  
291:12 background.  
291:13 Can you tell the jury where you  
291:14 went to college?  
291:15 A. For undergraduate, I went to  
291:16 Grand Valley State.  
291:17 Q. And what state is that in?  
291:18 A. That's in the state of  
291:19 Michigan.  
291:20 Q. And what degree did you receive  
291:21 from Grand Valley State?  
291:22 A. My degree was a bachelor's  
291:23 degree in biomedical sciences.

291:24 Q. Was that a bachelor of arts or  
291:25 a bachelor of science?  
292:1 A. A bachelor of science.  
292:2 Q. Okay. And what year did you  
292:3 get that degree?  
292:4 A. That was 1977.  
292:5 Q. And did you have any further  
292:6 academic training after you graduated from  
292:7 Grand Valley State?  
292:8 A. Yes.  
292:9 Q. What else did you do?  
292:10 A. I went to the University of  
292:11 Michigan, the toxicology program there, and  
292:12 culminated in receiving my Ph.D. in  
292:13 toxicology.  
292:14 Q. And what year did you get your  
292:15 Ph.D.?  
292:16 A. That was 1984.  
292:17 Q. Did you complete any class work  
292:18 on toxicology either as part of your BS  
292:19 degree or your Ph.D. degree?  
292:20 A. Completed -- the Ph.D. program  
292:21 the first two years was all class work, a  
292:22 variety of different toxicology classes and  
292:23 also other medical sciences such as  
292:24 pharmacology and things of that nature.  
292:25 Q. Did you write a thesis as part  
293:1 of your Ph.D. program?  
293:2 A. Yes, I wrote a thesis.  
293:3 Q. What was your thesis on?  
293:4 A. It was the effects of  
293:5 thiocyanate on postnatal -- on prenatal and  
293:6 postnatal development in rats.  
293:7 Q. And did you actually conduct  
293:8 experiments on animals as part of that Ph.D.  
293:9 thesis?  
293:10 A. Yes, approximately did that for  
293:11 almost three years.  
293:12 Q. Are there different kinds of  
293:13 toxicologists?

293:14 A. Yes, there's a variety of  
293:15 toxicologists. Generally there's people who  
293:16 are generalists and then there are other  
293:17 toxicologists who can specialize in a  
293:18 particular area.

293:19 Q. Is there an area called  
293:20 regulatory toxicology?

293:21 A. There is an area of regulatory  
293:22 toxicology.

293:23 Q. Have you been involved in  
293:24 regulatory toxicology during your employment  
293:25 at Monsanto?

294:1 A. Most of my employment has been  
294:2 in regulatory toxicology.

294:3 Q. What does a regulatory  
294:4 toxicologist do?

294:5 A. A regulatory toxicologist is  
294:6 responsible for actually making sure that  
294:7 they either conduct the studies or make sure  
294:8 that the studies are conducted that are  
294:9 required by regulatory agencies for that  
294:10 product and for the safety and safety  
294:11 evaluations that need to be conducted.

294:12 Q. What did you do after you got  
294:13 your Ph.D.?

294:14 A. After receiving my Ph.D., I  
294:15 came to work for Monsanto.

294:16 Q. And why were you interested in  
294:17 a job at Monsanto?

294:18 A. I had actually -- when I was in  
294:19 graduate school between my first and second  
294:20 year, there was like an internship program  
294:21 where you could go to -- come to Monsanto and  
294:22 work in the toxicology lab that Monsanto had  
294:23 actually conducting the studies. That  
294:24 sounded interesting to me so I, in fact, did  
294:25 that and I went back to school to get my --

295:1 to finish out my Ph.D. and about the time  
295:2 that I was finishing my Ph.D., the lab, it  
295:3 was called the Environmental Health

295:4 Laboratory, had an opening, the person that  
295:5 had the opening who remembered me, called me  
295:6 up and said -- asked me if I wanted to come  
295:7 and apply for the role of that they had open.  
295:8 So I did apply and obviously I took it.

295:9 Q. And so what was your first  
295:10 position when you joined Monsanto?

295:11 A. My first position, I was an  
295:12 inhalation toxicologist.

295:13 Q. And where did you work in that  
295:14 first position at Monsanto?

295:15 A. That was -- that was at our  
295:16 toxicology lab, which was called the  
295:17 Environmental Health Laboratory.

295:18 Q. And sometimes that's referred  
295:19 to in documents as the EHL, correct?

295:20 A. That's correct.

295:21 Q. Okay. And where was the EHL  
295:22 located?

295:23 A. EHL is located just on the  
295:24 skirt -- it's in St. Louis, on the edge of  
295:25 St. Louis.

296:1 Q. And what did you do as an  
296:2 inhalation toxicologist at Monsanto's EHL?

296:3 A. I was responsible for -- I was  
296:4 for conducting the studies in the role of  
296:5 study director. And so, like I say, I was  
296:6 responsible for all aspects of the study  
296:7 conduct for those studies that were conducted  
296:8 by the inhalation route of exposure. And  
296:9 those could have been acute studies,  
296:10 subchronic studies, fertility and  
296:11 reproduction studies.

296:12 Q. Were you doing any studies on  
296:13 glyphosate in that role?

296:14 A. I may have just conducted one  
296:15 or two acute studies that would have been in  
296:16 that time frame.

297:5 - 299:11

**Heydens, William 01-24-2017 (00:02:18)**

297:5 Q. How long did you work at the

WH2\_COMBINED\_0645

297:6 EHL?

297:7 A. A little less than four years.

297:8 Q. So that would take us till

297:9 about 1987?

297:10 A. That is correct.

297:11 Q. What did you do after EHL?

297:12 A. After EHL I went to the --

297:13 what's called the product toxicology group.

297:14 That was a small group of toxicologists who

297:15 were responsible for the overall -- all the

297:16 products that were in or were coming into

297:17 Monsanto's agricultural pipeline.

297:18 Q. And how many products would you

297:19 have been assigned as a toxicologist at one

297:20 time in the products toxicology group?

297:21 A. It would vary. It could be as

297:22 few as two and possibly as many as four or

297:23 five.

297:24 Q. And was glyphosate one of the

297:25 products that you had responsibility for in

298:1 that role?

298:2 A. For a period of time, yes.

298:3 Q. And when was that time?

298:4 A. So I had responsibility for

298:5 that starting essentially in 1988 and into

298:6 1992.

298:7 Q. And at the time in 1998 when

298:8 you were first involved with glyphosate, had

298:9 glyphosate been approved in the United

298:10 States?

298:11 A. Yes, it had been.

298:12 Q. What were your main

298:13 responsibilities on glyphosate while you were

298:14 in the product toxicology group?

298:15 A. My main responsibilities would

298:16 have been to make sure that any studies that

298:17 were necessary were performed, the studies

298:18 both on glyphosate itself as well as studies

298:19 on glyphosate-containing formulations. Also

298:20 had some responsibilities for investigating

298:21 the toxicity of some surfactants and some  
298:22 other related materials that were part of the  
298:23 overall portfolio for Roundup.  
298:24 Q. And were any studies -- so the  
298:25 studies on glyphosate that you were involved  
299:1 in, where were those studies done during that  
299:2 time period?  
299:3 A. Most of the studies were done  
299:4 right there at our Environmental Health  
299:5 Laboratory. Some of them might have been  
299:6 done out at a contract resource agency, but  
299:7 for the most part at that lab.  
299:8 Q. And I think you said you were  
299:9 there until '92; is that correct?  
299:10 A. Well, I was there longer. That  
299:11 was the period that I worked on glyphosate.

300:5 - 301:4

**Heydens, William 01-24-2017 (00:00:58)**

WH2\_COMBINED\_06.48

300:5 Q. And what did you do in 1998?  
300:6 A. In 1998, then I just had a  
300:7 variety of special projects that I was  
300:8 assigned to.  
300:9 Q. And then during -- and then did  
300:10 you become the director of the toxicology  
300:11 group at some point?  
300:12 A. Yes. That happened in 1999.  
300:13 Q. And then what were your  
300:14 responsibilities as director of the  
300:15 toxicology group?  
300:16 A. As director of the toxicology  
300:17 group, as a combination you both have -- you  
300:18 have responsibilities that go just with  
300:19 management of all the people that are in the  
300:20 group, and then also you have scientific  
300:21 oversight responsibilities for the work that  
300:22 those toxicologists are doing.  
300:23 Q. And in 1999 when you became  
300:24 director of the toxicology group, was there a  
300:25 person handling the glyphosate products?  
301:1 A. Yes, there was.  
301:2 Q. Who was that?

302:9 - 303:5

301:3 A. At the time that I took that  
301:4 over, that would have been Donna Farmer.

**Heydens, William 01-24-2017 (00:01:15)**

302:9 Q. Okay. And did you take on any  
302:10 additional responsibilities at any point  
302:11 while you were in that role?

302:12 A. Yes. From the -- really from  
302:13 the period of 2000, excuse me, through 2005,  
302:14 2006, a number of other groups were rolled up  
302:15 under the function that I headed up; groups  
302:16 like ecotoxicology group, environmental  
302:17 sciences group. And then later in the period  
302:18 of 2006 to late in 2008, I was asked in  
302:19 addition to my responsibilities with the  
302:20 science groups, I was also asked to be an  
302:21 interim director for our chemical  
302:22 regulatory -- US chemical regulatory affairs  
302:23 group.

302:24 Q. And what did you do after 2008?

302:25 A. In 2008 because the --  
303:1 Monsanto's chemistry portfolio was expanding,  
303:2 again, quite rapidly and the needs were thus  
303:3 expanding and so I was asked to go full time  
303:4 as the lead for the chemical regulatory  
303:5 affairs group.

303:12 - 309:7

**Heydens, William 01-24-2017 (00:06:03)**

303:12 Q. And what does the chemistry  
303:13 regulatory affairs group do at Monsanto?

303:14 A. Chemical regulatory affairs  
303:15 group is responsible basically for -- they're  
303:16 kind of the go-betweens between the  
303:17 scientists, all of the work that gets done in  
303:18 the science, and the regulatory -- the  
303:19 regulatory officials like EPA.  
303:20 So they would be responsible  
303:21 for making sure that whatever documents and  
303:22 evaluations the agency needs or has asked  
303:23 for, making sure that they get it, that it's  
303:24 formatted properly and then submitted to the  
303:25 appropriate individuals.

WH2\_COMBINED\_0647

WH2\_COMBINED\_0648

304:1 Q. Going back to 1998 when you  
304:2 first joined -- well, soon after you joined  
304:3 the company, did you ever become responsible  
304:4 for regulatory submissions to the EPA on  
304:5 glyphosate, any submissions at all, or  
304:6 studies?

304:7 A. Myself directly?

304:8 Q. Yeah.

304:9 A. I did not make submissions, per  
304:10 se.

304:11 Q. All right. Were you  
304:12 responsible for any studies that would have  
304:13 been submitted to the EPA in support of a  
304:14 registration decision?

304:15 A. Yes. There were two studies.  
304:16 There was a rat reproduction study, and then  
304:17 there was a two-year rat study.

304:18 Q. And that two-year rat study, is  
304:19 that sometimes referred to as a rat  
304:20 carcinogenicity study?

304:21 A. Yes.

304:22 Q. Okay. And do you know when  
304:23 that study was completed?

304:24 A. That study was completed  
304:25 approximately 1990.

305:1 Q. Okay. And have you ever heard  
305:2 of the phrase "bioassay"?

305:3 A. Yes.

305:4 Q. What does that word refer to?

305:5 A. That's synonymous. It's the  
305:6 same as a carcinogenicity study, the way we  
305:7 use it.

305:8 Q. And what role did you have in  
305:9 that 1990 rat carcinogenicity study?

305:10 A. I joined the group shortly  
305:11 after that study began, so I -- at that point  
305:12 in time I became what was called the study  
305:13 monitor for that study.

305:14 Q. And can you explain what a  
305:15 study monitor does?

305:16 A. Yes.

305:17 So a study monitor is

305:18 responsible -- and this is starting at the

305:19 beginning. The study monitor is responsible

305:20 for placing the study, where it's going to

305:21 go; working with the laboratory personnel to

305:22 make sure that an appropriate protocol is put

305:23 in place; and then once the study actually

305:24 starts, just monitor as the name implies,

305:25 data that comes in over the course of the

306:1 study; and then at the end of the study,

306:2 there would be reviewing of the report that

306:3 comes out of that, making sure that it's --

306:4 you know, for clarity and things of that

306:5 nature; and then using those reports in any

306:6 safety assessments that may need to be done.

306:7 Q. Can you explain to the jury

306:8 what the purposes of a rat carcinogenicity

306:9 study are?

306:10 A. The primary purpose is to see

306:11 if the chemical has the ability to produce

306:12 tumors in the laboratory animals.

306:13 A. secondary purpose is just to

306:14 explore any potential toxicity that you might

306:15 observe after the animals have been exposed

306:16 throughout their lifetime.

306:17 Q. And what does the word

306:18 "carcinogenicity" mean in layman's terms?

306:19 A. It means the ability or the

306:20 possibility of causing cancer.

306:21 Q. And you just said that one of

306:22 the goals is to look for tumors.

306:23 How does that relate to

306:24 carcinogenicity?

306:25 A. Well, if that -- that is the

307:1 major end point of that study is to look to

307:2 see -- in a variety of tissues and organs to

307:3 see if any tumors were produced by the

307:4 chemical or not.

307:5 Q. Why are rodents used in these

307:6 studies?

307:7 A. Rodents are used because  
307:8 they're a good, practical species in that  
307:9 they're relatively small and they have  
307:10 relatively manageable lifespans. So for  
307:11 rats, their lifespan is approximately two  
307:12 years. For mice, their lifespan is  
307:13 approximately 18 months.  
307:14 So -- and because of their  
307:15 size, so what it enables you to do in those  
307:16 assays is you can have a relatively large  
307:17 number of animals that you study over a  
307:18 manageable period of time.

307:19 Q. Have the results from rodent  
307:20 studies been found to be useful in evaluating  
307:21 health effects for humans?

307:22 A. Yes, they are the standard  
307:23 model, and it's the standard studies that all  
307:24 regulatory agencies globally ask for to  
307:25 register lots of chemicals, but specifically  
308:1 here pesticides and herbicides as well.

308:2 Q. In evaluating whether there's  
308:3 tumors present, is there any evaluation of  
308:4 the tissues of the animal?

308:5 A. Yes.

308:6 Q. And is there a specialty in  
308:7 science that is related to tissue evaluation?

308:8 A. That would be pathology. So  
308:9 those determinations are made by board  
308:10 certified pathologists.

308:11 Q. And what is a pathologist  
308:12 looking at?

308:13 A. A pathologist is looking at  
308:14 actually -- that is the individual who looks  
308:15 at all the organs and tissues that come from  
308:16 all of those studies. And they will look at  
308:17 them both grossly, so that would be visually  
308:18 looking at the organs, and then also in a  
308:19 histopathological examination, which is where  
308:20 tissues are taken, they're sliced up, put

308:21 onto microscopic slides and then the  
308:22 pathologist then will examine them through  
308:23 the microscope.

308:24 Q. How many organs or tissues does  
308:25 a pathologist examine as part of an EPA  
309:1 regulatory rat study?

309:2 A. In those bioassays, typically  
309:3 40 to 45 different tissues and organs are  
309:4 examined.

309:5 (Heydens Exhibit 3-39 marked  
309:6 for identification.)

309:7 QUESTIONS BY MR. JOHNSTON:

309:8 - 317:24

**Heydens, William 01-24-2017 (00:09:49)**

WH2\_COMBINED\_0649

309:8 Q. I would like to mark as  
309:9 Exhibit 39 a document titled "Chronic Study  
309:10 of Glyphosate Administered in Feed to Albino  
309:11 Rats" on the letterhead of the Monsanto  
309:12 Agricultural Company.

EXHIBIT 716.1.1

309:13 Have you seen this document  
309:14 before?

309:15 A. Yes, I have.

309:16 Q. Can you tell the jury what the  
309:17 document that we've marked as 3-39 is,  
309:18 please?

309:19 A. This is the final report that  
309:20 was issued for the study, the rat study, that  
309:21 we just talked about.

309:22 Q. The study that you were the  
309:23 study monitor for that was completed in 1990?

309:24 A. That's correct.

309:25 Q. And where was this study  
310:1 conducted, can you tell from this document?

310:2 A. It was conducted at the  
310:3 Environmental Health Laboratory of Monsanto.

EXHIBIT 716.1.1

310:4 Q. Now, let's look at page 4 of  
310:5 this document, and it goes on to page 5.

310:6 Can you describe for the jury  
310:7 the kind of information that appears in the  
310:8 appendices to this kind of study report?

EXHIBIT 716.1.2

310:9 A. Yes. So starting over, sort of

310:10 over halfway down on page 4 is where the  
310:11 appendices are, and there's -- this is the  
310:12 summaries of all the different kinds of data  
310:13 that are obtained during the course of the  
310:14 study. So you'll see, first of all there,  
310:15 there's the survival data.

EXHIBIT 716.4.3

310:16 Q. What does that mean?

310:17 A. How well the animals survived,  
310:18 did the chemical cause some of the animals to  
310:19 die early or not.

310:20 Q. Okay. What else do you see  
310:21 there?

EXHIBIT 716.4.4

310:22 A. There's body weight data. So  
310:23 the body weights of the animals are taken  
310:24 every week to see how they're growing and  
310:25 what their body weights may be. And that's  
311:1 actually very informative information because  
311:2 sometimes it can be a very sensitive  
311:3 indicator of toxicity. It doesn't tell you  
311:4 what's going on, but it tells you that  
311:5 there's something that is going on that you  
311:6 need to know more about.

EXHIBIT 716.4.5

EXHIBIT 716.4.8

311:7 There's also food consumption  
311:8 data you'll see there. And then the next --  
311:9 then there's clinical science. What that's  
311:10 about is every week you take the animals out  
311:11 of the cage and you observe them. It's kind  
311:12 of similar to what -- if you go to the doctor  
311:13 to get a physical exam, what the doctor would  
311:14 do, well, we do that to the animals as well.

EXHIBIT 716.4.7

311:15 Then you'll see a summary of  
311:16 hematology, which is blood, white blood  
311:17 cells, red blood cells, things of that  
311:18 nature. And serum chemistry, so a series of  
311:19 enzymes and a lot of different things.  
311:20 Basically the same things if you and I went  
311:21 to the doctor and the doctor was going to do  
311:22 a physical on you and drew your blood to run  
311:23 a series of analyses on, that's what's done  
311:24 with the animals there and that's what's

EXHIBIT 716.4.8

311:25 summarized in those tables.

312:1 Q. If we look on page 5, there  
312:2 other summary tables that contain data and  
312:3 findings from the study?

312:4 A. Yes.

312:5 Q. Okay. And then if we look on  
312:6 page 6 of the table of contents, there's  
312:7 another set of tables and appendices; is that  
312:8 correct?

312:9 A. That is correct.

312:10 Q. Can you tell the jury what  
312:11 sorts of materials appear in Appendix 2, 3,  
312:12 4, 5, et cetera?

312:13 A. So these are the appendices  
312:14 what I was describing just previously, that  
312:15 was the summary data. So that's -- you would  
312:16 take all the information, like get means and  
312:17 averages and then show all of that summary  
312:18 information.

312:19 Here, these tables are showing  
312:20 all the individual data. So in these  
312:21 reports, the study requirements are that  
312:22 every piece of data that is generated  
312:23 throughout the course of the study is  
312:24 recorded in this report. So when you look  
312:25 here, you'll see -- and that's a lot of data  
313:1 obviously, and so that's why if you look all  
313:2 the way down to the end there, you'll see in  
313:3 this particular study that there's 2,175  
313:4 pages of overall evaluation and data.

313:5 Q. And is that data set given to  
313:6 the EPA as part of the submission of this  
313:7 study?

313:8 A. Yes.

313:9 Q. So the EPA has access to all of  
313:10 that data, correct?

313:11 A. Every single data point.

313:12 Q. Now, if you look on page 3 of  
313:13 the actual report, you see in the section on  
313:14 conclusions there?

EXHIBIT 716.1

EXHIBIT 716.1

EXHIBIT 716.2

313:15 A. Yes.

313:16 Q. Can you read for the jury what  
313:17 the last sentence of that conclusion  
313:18 paragraph states?

313:19 A. "An oncogenic effect was not  
313:20 observed in this study."

313:21 Q. And what does that mean?

313:22 A. That means that glyphosate did  
313:23 not produce tumors in the animals studied.

313:24 Q. And that means it didn't cause  
313:25 cancer in those animals?

314:1 A. That is correct.

314:2 Q. Do you agree with that  
314:3 conclusion?

314:4 A. I agree with that conclusion.

314:5 Q. Now, if you look on page 26 of  
314:6 the study, you see there's a statement of  
314:7 compliance that is signed?

314:8 A. Yes.

314:9 Q. And who is the signatory on  
314:10 that statement of compliance?

314:11 A. There's two signatures there:

314:12 There is the Larry Stout, who is the study  
314:13 director for the study; and also Roger Folk  
314:14 who is the laboratory for the EHL.

314:15 Q. And can you read what that  
314:16 statement of compliance says for the jury?

314:17 A. It says, "To the best of our  
314:18 knowledge, the study EHL 82122, parentheses,  
314:19 ML-87-148, was conducted in general  
314:20 conformance with the good laboratory  
314:21 practice, parenthetically, GLP, standards of  
314:22 the EPA, parentheses, USA, FIFRA, 40 CFR part  
314:23 160, and MAFF, parentheses, Japan, 1984, and  
314:24 the GLP principles of the OECD, parentheses,  
314:25 1981."

315:1 Q. What is good laboratory  
315:2 practices?

315:3 A. Good laboratory practices are a  
315:4 comprehensive set of not guidelines, of

EXHIBIT 7163.1

EXHIBIT 716\_26.1

EXHIBIT 716\_26.2

EXHIBIT 716\_26.3

CIVIL

315:5 requirements to ensure the quality and the  
315:6 integrity of the data of the studies that  
315:7 gets done. And it's a very comprehensive  
315:8 standard, set of standards, that go into  
315:9 play.

315:10 And basically what they do is  
315:11 they require virtually everything that gets  
315:12 done in a laboratory and in the studies in  
315:13 the laboratory that it has to be done in a  
315:14 specific way.

315:15 For every -- for every piece of  
315:16 equipment -- so there's kind of two  
315:17 components of that. There's requirements  
315:18 around all the equipment that's used in the  
315:19 laboratory, how it gets used, how it gets  
315:20 calibrated, how often it gets calibrated, so  
315:21 on and so forth. And then there's a set of  
315:22 requirements around -- for everything that  
315:23 you would do in a study, you have to have a  
315:24 standard operating procedure established for  
315:25 everything you do.

316:1 And then there's a set of  
316:2 requirements for what needs to go into the  
316:3 studies and what needs to go into the  
316:4 protocols.

316:5 Q. Does good laboratory practice  
316:6 regulations require any quality assurance  
316:7 processes?

316:8 A. Yes.

316:9 So a laboratory in order to be  
316:10 a GLP compliant laboratory, they have to have  
316:11 a separate QA group that reports not to the  
316:12 scientists, but actually reports directly  
316:13 into the laboratory director and it is their  
316:14 job to monitor all phases of work that gets  
316:15 done in the laboratory.

316:16 Q. And are they ever asked to  
316:17 inspect or conduct audits of the laboratory's  
316:18 findings?

316:19 A. Yes. That is a routine

316:20 function that they perform, so they'll be  
316:21 involved in all phases of the study.  
316:22 Starting off even before the study is  
316:23 generated, they will be involved in making  
316:24 sure that the protocols are GLP compliant and  
316:25 have everything in there that they need to  
317:1 do.  
317:2 Then during the conduct of the  
317:3 study, they will actually go in at different  
317:4 times and they will audit something -- an  
317:5 activity and activities that are being done  
317:6 in the study.  
317:7 And by audit, what that means  
317:8 is they actually walk in the room and they  
317:9 actually observe to see that what was  
317:10 supposed to be done was actually being done.  
317:11 Then -- and so there will be a  
317:12 series of those inspections throughout the  
317:13 study.  
317:14 Q. Is there a certifying agency  
317:15 for GLP compliant laboratories?  
317:16 A. Well, those are administered  
317:17 through -- here in the United States through  
317:18 the Environmental Protection Agency.  
317:19 Q. Does the EPA have any ability  
317:20 to verify that the lab is compliant with GLP?  
317:21 A. Yes. EPA periodically actually  
317:22 comes in and does site visits at the  
317:23 laboratories that are conducting those kinds  
317:24 of studies.

318:3 - 319:25

**Heydens, William 01-24-2017 (00:01:51)**

318:3 Q. I'm going to hand you what's  
318:4 been marked as Exhibit 3-40 is a document on  
318:5 the letterhead of the United States  
318:6 Environmental Protection Agency; is that  
318:7 correct?  
318:8 A. That is correct.  
318:9 Q. And it's dated July 22, 1996?  
318:10 A. Correct.  
318:11 Q. Can you tell -- have you seen

WH2\_COMBINED\_06.50

EXHIBIT 711.5.1

EXHIBIT 711.5.2

318:12 this document before?

318:13 A. Yes, I have.

318:14 Q. Can you tell the jury what this  
318:15 document is?

318:16 A. This is a document that was  
318:17 sent back to the laboratory, the  
318:18 Environmental Health Laboratory, after EPA  
318:19 had come in and actually done an inspection  
318:20 of the laboratory.

318:21 Q. And the cover letter states,  
318:22 "This letter is formal notification of the  
318:23 results of the September 14th and 17th, 1993  
318:24 inspection conducted by representatives of  
318:25 the Environmental Protection Agency pursuant  
319:1 to Sections 8 and 9 of the Federal  
319:2 Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act,  
319:3 FIFRA."

319:4 Did I read that correctly?

319:5 A. Correct.

319:6 Q. And if you turn to the next  
319:7 page, this is a two-sided copy, but you see  
319:8 that the third page of this exhibit is a  
319:9 cover page?

319:10 A. Yes.

319:11 Q. It says, "FIFRA GLP inspection  
319:12 report"?

319:13 A. Yes.

319:14 Q. Have you seen documents like  
319:15 this before?

319:16 A. Yes.

319:17 Q. What does this document  
319:18 contain?

319:19 A. This is the actual report from  
319:20 EPA that documents the fact that they did an  
319:21 inspection and what their conclusions are  
319:22 from the inspection.

319:23 Q. If you turn to the summary,  
319:24 which appears I think on the fifth page of  
319:25 this double-sided copy document, so it's on

320:1 the left-hand side, you see -- can you read  
320:2 for the jury what this paragraph says? "A  
320:3 FIFRA."

320:4 A. "A FIFRA GLP inspection was  
320:5 conducted at the Environmental Health  
320:6 Laboratory of the Monsanto Agricultural  
320:7 Company in St. Louis, Missouri, on  
320:8 September 14 through 17, 1993. A GLP  
320:9 standards compliance review was requested by  
320:10 LDIAD and was done. Three studies that were  
320:11 conducted by this laboratory and submitted to  
320:12 EPA were audited. The GLP inspection found  
320:13 that the procedures followed by the Monsanto  
320:14 EHL at the time of the inspection were in  
320:15 accord with the FIFRA GLP regulations. The  
320:16 data audits that were done found no  
320:17 discrepancies between the raw data and the  
320:18 reports submitted to EPA."

320:19 Q. Do you know whether one of the  
320:20 three studies that was audited was the 1990  
320:21 rat study that you were the study monitor on?

320:22 A. Yes, that was one of the  
320:23 studies that EPA reviewed.

320:24 Q. And found compliant with GLP?

320:25 A. That is correct.

321:3 - 321:15

**Heydens, William 01-24-2017 (00:00:24)**

WH2\_COMBINED\_0652

321:3 QUESTIONS BY MR. JOHNSTON:

321:4 Q. Do you know whether or not the  
321:5 1990 rat study that you were the study  
321:6 monitor on was found to be compliant with GLP  
321:7 when it was audited by the EPA?

321:8 A. Yes.

321:9 Q. So what did they find?  
321:10 What did EPA find when they  
321:11 audited the 1990 rat study?

321:12 A. No significant findings. They  
321:13 found that the results were what they were.

321:14 Q. And were they consistent with  
321:15 GLP?

321:18 - 321:23

**Heydens, William 01-24-2017 (00:00:08)**

WH2\_COMBINED\_0653

321:18 THE WITNESS: It states in  
 321:19 there that it's compliant with GLP.  
 321:20 QUESTIONS BY MR. JOHNSTON:  
 321:21 Q. Were they or were they not  
 321:22 compliant with GLP?  
 321:23 A. They were compliant with GLP.

321:24 - 322:9

**Heydens, William 01-24-2017 (00:00:18)**

WH2\_COMBINED\_0654

321:24 Q. You mentioned previously that  
 321:25 glyphosate was re-registered in 1993,  
 322:1 correct?

322:2 A. Correct.

322:3 Q. I would like to discuss the  
 322:4 toxicological data that EPA considered at  
 322:5 that time, so let me show you what we will  
 322:6 mark as 3-41.

322:7 (Heydens Exhibit 3-41 marked  
 322:8 for identification.)

322:9 QUESTIONS BY MR. JOHNSTON:

322:10 - 323:7

**Heydens, William 01-24-2017 (00:00:49)**

WH2\_COMBINED\_0655

322:10 Q. And you might want to write  
 322:11 3-41 on that because it's possible that I may  
 322:12 come back to that in later questions, so I  
 322:13 want you to be able to find it.

322:14 A. 3-41?

322:15 Q. 3-41, yes.

322:16 A. Oh, sorry.

322:17 Q. Have you seen this document  
 322:18 before?

322:19 A. Yes, I have.

322:20 Q. Can you tell the jury what this  
 322:21 document is?

322:22 A. This is EPA's re-registration  
 322:23 eligibility decision document, otherwise  
 322:24 known as the RED. It is the document that  
 322:25 EPA documents the conclusions of the agency  
 323:1 after they have gone through the  
 323:2 re-registration process.

323:3 Q. And as part of the  
 323:4 re-registration eligibility decision for  
 323:5 glyphosate, did EPA conduct a human health

EXHIBIT 712.5.1

|                |   |  |
|----------------|---|--|
| 323:8 - 325:22 | <p>323:6 risk assessment?</p> <p>323:7 A. Yes, they did.</p> <p><b>Heydens, William 01-24-2017 (00:02:25)</b></p> <p>323:8 Q. Let's turn to the table of</p> <p>323:9 contents in this document. It's on page 2-</p> <p>323:10 of the actual report in this document.</p> <p>323:11 There's a heading called "Science</p> <p>323:12 Assessment," correct?</p> <p>323:13 A. That is correct.</p> <p>323:14 Q. Can you -- and then there's a</p> <p>323:15 subheading B.</p> <p>323:16 Can you read what that</p> <p>323:17 subheading is for the record, please?</p> <p>323:18 A. B is human health assessment.</p> <p>323:19 Q. Was a human health risk</p> <p>323:20 assessment conducted for glyphosate as part</p> <p>323:21 of the RED decision-making process?</p> <p>323:22 A. Yes, it was.</p> <p>323:23 Q. What sorts of items are</p> <p>323:24 evaluated as part of RED human health</p> <p>323:25 assessment that are listed here on this table</p> <p>324:1 of contents?</p> <p>324:2 A. It's a very detailed assessment</p> <p>324:3 that includes all of the toxicology studies</p> <p>324:4 that were done, the acute, subchronics,</p> <p>324:5 chronics, carcinogenicity, developmental,</p> <p>324:6 reproductive, metabolism, mutagenicity --</p> <p>324:7 Q. And this goes on to page 3,</p> <p>324:8 right?</p> <p>324:9 A. It goes on to page 3.</p> <p>324:10 Mutagenicity, metabolism, neurotoxicity,</p> <p>324:11 other toxicological end points, and then they</p> <p>324:12 determine a reference dose. That's the</p> <p>324:13 hazard assessment.</p> <p>324:14 Then there is an exposure</p> <p>324:15 assessment that is done as well in Section 2</p> <p>324:16 there for both dietary and occupational and</p> <p>324:17 residential exposures. And then the data</p> <p>324:18 from Section 1 and Section 2 then flows into</p> <p>324:19 a comprehensive risk assessment that is done</p> | <p>WH2_COMBINED_0658</p> <p>EXHIBIT 712.14.1</p> <p>EXHIBIT 712.14.2</p> <p>EXHIBIT 712.15.1</p> <p>EXHIBIT 712.15.2</p> <p>EXHIBIT 712.15.4</p> |
|----------------|---|--|

324:20 in Section 3. And then in this -- everything  
 324:21 that we've talked about here has been for the  
 324:22 mammalian and human risk assessment.  
 324:23 There's also an environmental  
 324:24 assessment that gets done in Section C where  
 324:25 there's exposure assessment that gets done,  
 325:1 and then also a possible ecological effects  
 325:2 on organisms in the environment.  
 325:3 Q. And did Monsanto conduct any  
 325:4 studies that were relied on by the EPA in  
 325:5 this evaluation in the 1993 RED?  
 325:6 A. Certainly some of the studies  
 325:7 Monsanto conducted, yes, were included in  
 325:8 here. One of them we just talked about.  
 325:9 Q. Did that include the rat  
 325:10 carcinogenicity studies that Monsanto had  
 325:11 previously conducted?  
 325:12 A. It included that study, yes.  
 325:13 Q. Did it include other rat  
 325:14 carcinogenicity -- other rodent  
 325:15 carcinogenicity studies?  
 325:16 A. It included other  
 325:17 carcinogenicity studies not conducted at  
 325:18 Monsanto but conducted by Monsanto.  
 325:19 Q. Let's look at the EPA's  
 325:20 evaluation of the rodent carcinogenicity data  
 325:21 on page 14 of the actual report. Page 15,  
 325:22 sorry.

325:23 - 327:25

**Heydens, William 01-24-2017 (00:02:26)**

325:23 Can you read for the jury the  
 325:24 paragraph that appears right above  
 325:25 "developmental toxicity"?  
 326:1 A. Yes.  
 326:2 "On June 26, 1991, the agency  
 326:3 classified glyphosate in Group E,  
 326:4 parentheses, evidence of non-carcinogenicity  
 326:5 for humans, based on a lack of convincing  
 326:6 evidence of carcinogenicity in adequate  
 326:7 studies with two animal species, rat and  
 326:8 mouse."

EXHIBIT 712.15.5

CWM

WH2\_COMBINED\_06.57

EXHIBIT 713.36.1

326:9 Q. So were there mouse studies  
326:10 submitted by Monsanto?  
326:11 A. Yes, there were.  
326:12 Q. How many?  
326:13 A. There was one mouse study.  
326:14 Q. And how many rat studies did --  
326:15 we've talked about one.  
326:16 Were there any others besides  
326:17 the one that you were involved in?  
326:18 A. There was another study, so a  
326:19 total of two.  
326:20 Q. Do you agree with EPA's  
326:21 classification of glyphosate?  
326:22 A. Yes, I do.  
326:23 Q. Now, let's turn to page 57.  
326:24 You see a heading called "Eligibility  
326:25 Determination Decision" -- sorry, let me say  
327:1 it again.  
327:2 Do you see a heading stating  
327:3 "Eligibility Decision"?  
327:4 A. Yes.  
327:5 Q. Can you read for the jury the  
327:6 two -- the first two paragraphs under the  
327:7 Eligibility Decision heading?  
327:8 A. "Based on the reviews of the  
327:9 generic data for the active ingredient  
327:10 glyphosate, the agency has sufficient  
327:11 information on the health effects of  
327:12 glyphosate and on its potential for causing  
327:13 adverse effects in fish and wildlife and the  
327:14 environment. The agency concludes that  
327:15 products containing glyphosate for all uses  
327:16 are eligible for re-registration. The agency  
327:17 has determined that glyphosate products,  
327:18 labeled and used as specified in this  
327:19 re-registration eligibility document, will  
327:20 not pose unreasonable risks or adverse  
327:21 effects to humans or the environment."  
327:22 Q. Do you agree with that  
327:23 conclusion in the RED document from 2003?

EXHIBIT 712.76.1

EXHIBIT 712.76.2

EXHIBIT 712.86.1

328:4 - 329:22

327:24 A. Yes, I do.

327:25 Q. I'm sorry, from 1993?

**Heydens, William 01-24-2017 (00:01:42)**

328:4 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.

328:5 QUESTIONS BY MR. JOHNSTON:

328:6 Q. Now, since the re-registration  
328:7 decision was issued by EPA in 1993, has  
328:8 glyphosate continued to be a patented product  
328:9 for Monsanto?

328:10 A. Yes, it was a patented product  
328:11 for a number of years.

328:12 Q. Is it still a patented product?

328:13 A. No, it is not.

328:14 Q. When did the patent expire?

328:15 A. There is a series of patents  
328:16 that started expiring in the 2000 to 2002  
328:17 time frame.

328:18 Q. As a result of the patents  
328:19 expiring, is there any consequence to who can  
328:20 sell glyphosate?

328:21 A. Once the patents expire, then  
328:22 other companies are free to develop and  
328:23 market their own glyphosate formulations.

328:24 Q. Did other companies manufacture  
328:25 glyphosate formulations?

329:1 A. Yes, they did. There were  
329:2 several.

329:3 Q. And did these companies have to  
329:4 get regulatory approval for their products?

329:5 A. Yes. All of them would need to  
329:6 get their own approval with EPA.

329:7 Q. Would they have to submit their  
329:8 own data to EPA?

329:9 A. They would have to do one of  
329:10 two things: They would have to either  
329:11 purchase the data from an existing registrant  
329:12 such as Monsanto, or they would have to  
329:13 develop the data themselves and submit it to  
329:14 the agency.

329:15 Q. Has the EPA evaluated the

WH2\_COMBINED\_0658

CWF

329:16 carcinogenic potential of glyphosate since  
329:17 the 1993 registration eligibility decision?

329:18 A. Yes, they have.

329:19 Q. Do you know when the first time  
329:20 they did that since then was?

329:21 A. Well, they've actually done it  
329:22 a number of times.

365:12 - 368:18

**Heydens, William 01-24-2017 (00:03:36)**

WH2\_COMBINED\_08 54

365:12 Q. Hand you what's been marked as  
365:13 Exhibit 3-45.

365:14 Can you tell the jury what this  
365:15 document is?

EXHIBIT 147.1.1

365:16 A. Yes. This is the results of  
365:17 work that we conducted on formulated product  
365:18 and this was published in the peer-reviewed  
365:19 literature.

EXHIBIT 147.1.2

365:20 Q. It was published in the Journal  
365:21 of Agricultural and Food Chemistry, correct?

365:22 A. That is correct.

365:23 Q. And it was published in 2008,  
365:24 correct?

365:25 A. Yes, it was.

366:1 Q. And can you tell the jury the  
366:2 title of this paper?

366:3 A. The title is, "Genotoxic  
366:4 Potential of Glyphosate Formulations:  
366:5 Mode-of-Action Investigations."

366:6 Q. And you were the first author  
366:7 on this paper, correct?

366:8 A. Yes, that is correct.

366:9 Q. Why did Monsanto undertake to  
366:10 write this paper?

366:11 A. We undertook this investigation  
366:12 because there were some reports in the open  
366:13 literature which suggested that glyphosate  
366:14 formulations were genotoxic. And it was our  
366:15 hypothesis that those studies had problems  
366:16 with them, which led to improper conclusions,  
366:17 and so we wanted to test to see if that was  
366:18 true or not.

END

366:19 Q. Can you generally describe the  
366:20 methods that you employed in doing this  
366:21 study?

366:22 A. Yes. Basically what we did was  
366:23 we selected two of the main studies that were  
366:24 done in the open literature and then we  
366:25 basically did the same study design as they  
367:1 did. So we replicated the study design and  
367:2 then went on to investigate in more detail  
367:3 what the relevance of the findings were.

367:4 Q. And what were the results of  
367:5 your experiments?

367:6 A. So the results of our  
367:7 experiments were basically that we -- for the  
367:8 most part, we could replicate what they had  
367:9 done. There was one important difference.  
367:10 There was one major finding that they  
367:11 reported that we could not reproduce, but  
367:12 basically we saw the same things that they  
367:13 saw.

367:14 But what we did see moreover,  
367:15 or more importantly, that the facts that they  
367:16 were reporting were only seen under  
367:17 conditions of extreme exposure and extreme  
367:18 toxicity to the cells to the point where in  
367:19 some cases they were actually killing cells.  
367:20 And when you got to that level, then you saw  
367:21 some of the responses that they were  
367:22 referring to as genotoxicity, but really are  
367:23 not direct genotoxicity but really are the  
367:24 result of the fact that you're just killing  
367:25 the cells.

368:1 The other thing that we found  
368:2 was we added a component to the study -- in  
368:3 the studies that they did, these were studies  
368:4 where the test material was injected directly  
368:5 into the abdomen of the animals, and in  
368:6 some -- in one case, the study added a bunch  
368:7 of additional material to those test material  
368:8 that they injected. We added another

368:9 component where we exposed the animals to  
 368:10 that same test material with the additional  
 368:11 materials via the oral route of exposure,  
 368:12 which would be relevant for humans. And when  
 368:13 you do that, you don't see any of the effects  
 368:14 that they reported.

368:15 Q. And what conclusions can you  
 368:16 draw based on those results, those findings?

368:17 A. Our conclusion is that those  
 368:18 formulations do not produce genotoxicity.

397:4 - 398:13

**Heydens, William 01-24-2017 (00:01:27)**

397:4 Q. I hand you what's been marked  
 397:5 as Exhibit 3-50.

397:6 Have you seen this document  
 397:7 before?

397:8 A. Yes, I have.

397:9 Q. This is an article drafted by  
 397:10 Gary William, Robert Kroes and Ian Munro?

397:11 A. Correct. That's correct.

397:12 Q. And this is titled "Safety  
 397:13 Evaluation and Risk Assessment of the  
 397:14 Herbicide Roundup and Its Active Ingredient,  
 397:15 Glyphosate, for Humans," correct?

397:16 A. That is correct.

397:17 Q. What is this document to your  
 397:18 knowledge?

397:19 A. So this document summarizes the  
 397:20 evaluations that were done by these three  
 397:21 authors on various aspects of the toxicology  
 397:22 of glyphosate and Roundup.

397:23 Q. Yesterday plaintiffs marked  
 397:24 Exhibit 3-29 as the Gary Williams, Robert  
 397:25 Kroes and Ian Munro paper, correct?

398:1 A. Yes.

398:2 Q. That document was only three  
 398:3 pages long, correct?

398:4 A. Correct.

398:5 Q. 3-50, how long is the document  
 398:6 that we marked as number 3-50?

398:7 A. This document -- well, it takes

EXHIBIT 147.5.3

WH2\_COMBINED\_06.00

CWF

EXHIBIT 416.5.1

EXHIBIT 416.5.2

CWF

398:8 up pages 117 through 165, so approximately 50  
398:9 pages.

398:10 Q. And will you agree with me that  
398:11 all of those pages are contained in the  
398:12 document that I've marked as Exhibit 3-50?  
398:13 A. Let me look. Yes.

398:14 - 402:7

**Heydens, William 01-24-2017 (00:03:45)**

WH2\_COMBINED\_06.01

398:14 Q. Why did this paper get written?  
398:15 What caused this paper to be  
398:16 written?  
398:17 A. I think we talked a little bit  
398:18 about this yesterday, but so this -- prior to  
398:19 this project, there was really no -- not a  
398:20 lot of toxicology information in the open  
398:21 literature. Basically it's pretty  
398:22 uninteresting reading because the molecule is  
398:23 not toxic and journals aren't real enthused  
398:24 by getting data that doesn't really say --  
398:25 doesn't show any problems.  
399:1 But around -- in the late '90s,  
399:2 this is a point in time when some of the  
399:3 studies that we discussed yesterday, and  
399:4 actually discussed today, some of the studies  
399:5 with some problems, as it turns out, started  
399:6 to show up in the literature, primarily in  
399:7 the area of genotoxicity.  
399:8 So it was just thought at this  
399:9 point in time that it would be a good time to  
399:10 do a thorough review of all the information  
399:11 that was available on glyphosate at that  
399:12 point in time and just get that summarized in  
399:13 the open peer-reviewed literature, and that's  
399:14 what this project was about.  
399:15 Q. I want to ask you about the  
399:16 authors.  
399:17 Who is Gary Williams?  
399:18 A. Gary Williams is an  
399:19 internationally known expert on genotoxicity  
399:20 and carcinogenicity.  
399:21 Q. And where is he employed; do

399:22 you know?

399:23 A. He's employed at the New York  
399:24 Medical College. To my understanding, he is  
399:25 still there.

400:1 Q. How long has he been there; do  
400:2 you know?

400:3 A. I don't know how long he's been  
400:4 there exactly, but I believe it's in the  
400:5 range of 20 to 30 years.

400:6 Q. Can you tell me who Robert  
400:7 Kroes is?

400:8 A. Robert Kroes was a well-known  
400:9 general toxicologist from the Netherlands,  
400:10 again, with an international reputation.

400:11 Q. And do you know where Dr. Kroes  
400:12 is employed?

400:13 A. Unfortunately, Dr. Kroes passed  
400:14 away a number of years ago.

400:15 Q. Do you know where he was at the  
400:16 time he participated in this paper?

400:17 A. He was at the University of  
400:18 Utrecht.

400:19 Q. Okay. And who is Ian Munro?

400:20 A. Ian Munro is another scientist  
400:21 with an international reputation who had also  
400:22 been a regulatory toxicologist working for  
400:23 the Canadian government for a number of  
400:24 years. And at the time that this paper was  
400:25 produced, he -- actually at that point in  
401:1 time he had left and started Cantox, and he  
401:2 was working at Cantox at the time of this  
401:3 paper.

401:4 Q. What did he -- you said he  
401:5 left.

401:6 What had he left?

401:7 A. The Canadian government.

401:8 Q. Okay. Thank you.

401:9 And is he still employed by  
401:10 Cantox?

401:11 A. No. Unfortunately, Dr. Munro

401:12 passed away a few years ago as well.

401:13 Q. Do you know what data these

401:14 three experts -- expert authors reviewed in

401:15 preparing this paper?

401:16 A. They had access to all the

401:17 information that was available. All the

401:18 studies that Monsanto had. At the time those

401:19 were the only studies that existed as well as

401:20 studies that were out there in the

401:21 peer-reviewed literature of which at that

401:22 time there was not as much as there is now.

401:23 Q. I want to call your attention

401:24 to the last sentence of the abstract and ask

401:25 you to read that for the jury.

402:1 A. "It was concluded that, under

402:2 present and expected conditions of use,

402:3 Roundup herbicide does not pose a health risk

402:4 to humans."

402:5 Q. Now, I want to look back at the

402:6 acknowledgements for this paper on page 160

402:7 of the journal.

402:8 - 404:15

**Heydens, William 01-24-2017 (00:02:41)**

402:8 I want you to start with the

402:9 authors in the acknowledgement, and can you

402:10 read that for the jury, please?

402:11 A. "The authors were given

402:12 complete access to toxicological information

402:13 contained in the great number of laboratory

402:14 studies and archival material at Monsanto in

402:15 St. Louis, Missouri, and elsewhere. Key

402:16 personnel at Monsanto who provided scientific

402:17 support were William F. Heydens, Donna R.

402:18 Farmer, Marian S. Bleeke, Steven J. Wratten,

402:19 and Catherine H. Carr."

402:20 Q. Okay. You can stop there.

402:21 Your name is in that list of

402:22 folks, correct?

402:23 A. That is correct.

402:24 Q. And so this paper disclosed in

402:25 the acknowledgements that you were involved

EXHIBIT 416.1.3

EXHIBIT 416.44.1

WH2\_COMBINED\_06.02

EXHIBIT 416.44.2

403:1 in the preparation of the paper, didn't it?  
403:2 A. That is correct.  
403:3 Q. What was your role with respect  
403:4 to this paper?  
403:5 A. My role was I played a role  
403:6 primarily -- in the middle of the process.  
403:7 The way the process worked was that, you  
403:8 know, the expert panel, obviously they  
403:9 started with evaluation of all the data as  
403:10 they say here in the paper. Then they made  
403:11 their conclusions from there -- based on  
403:12 their evaluations. Then all of that was  
403:13 written up in a draft manuscript. That draft  
403:14 manuscript was written by the next person  
403:15 that's acknowledged there, Douglas W. Bryant.  
403:16 Then at that point --  
403:17 Q. Who did he work for?  
403:18 A. I'm sorry, he worked for  
403:19 Cantox.  
403:20 Q. Okay. What -- continue with  
403:21 your discussion of your role on the paper.  
403:22 A. Yes.  
403:23 So Douglas wrote the draft of  
403:24 the evaluation, like I say, took what the  
403:25 experts gave him, and he put that together in  
404:1 a draft. And then I received that draft, and  
404:2 that's the point in time where I made my  
404:3 contributions. So I provided some editing  
404:4 and rewriting. It was things like editing  
404:5 relatively minor things, editing for  
404:6 formatting, just for clarity, really just for  
404:7 overall readability to make it easier for  
404:8 people to read in a more organized fashion.  
404:9 I then provided that back to  
404:10 Douglas, and then it was up to Douglas and  
404:11 Ian and the other authors to complete that  
404:12 manuscript.  
404:13 Q. Did your edits change any of  
404:14 the authors' conclusions that they had  
404:15 reached prior to you receiving that draft?

Page/Line

Source

ID

404:18 - 404:22

**Heydens, William 01-24-2017 (00:00:05)**

WH2\_COMBINED\_0603

404:18 THE WITNESS: No, they did not.

404:19 QUESTIONS BY MR. JOHNSTON:

404:20 Q. Did your edits change any of

404:21 the authors' evaluations that are set forth

404:22 in this paper?

404:25 - 405:1

**Heydens, William 01-24-2017 (00:00:02)**

WH2\_COMBINED\_0604

404:25 THE WITNESS: No, they do

405:1 not -- did not.

  
  
**Total Time = 01:07:46****Documents Shown**

\_1\_HEYDENS 3

EXHIBIT 147

EXHIBIT 312

EXHIBIT 315

EXHIBIT 316

EXHIBIT 317

EXHIBIT 416

EXHIBIT 710

EXHIBIT 710\_

EXHIBIT 711

EXHIBIT 712

HEYDENS 3